

Singularities of Schubert Varieties, Tangent Cones and Bruhat Graphs

(12-12-2003)

JAMES B. CARRELL

JOCHEN KÜTTLER

Abstract

Let G be a semi-simple algebraic group over \mathbb{C} , B a Borel subgroup of G , T a maximal torus in B and P a parabolic in G containing B . In a previous work [7], the authors classified the singular T -fixed points of an irreducible T -stable subvariety X of the generalized flag variety G/P . It turns out that under the restriction that G doesn't contain any G_2 -factors, the key geometric invariant determining the singular T -fixed points of X is the linear span $\Theta_x(X)$ of the reduced tangent cone to X at a T -fixed point x . The goal of this paper is to describe this invariant at the maximal singular T -fixed points when X a Schubert variety in G/B and G doesn't contain any G_2 -factors. We first describe $\Theta_x(X)$ solely in terms of Peterson translates, which were the main tool in [7]. Then, taking a further look at the Peterson translates (with the G_2 -restriction), we are able to describe $\Theta_x(X)$ in terms of its isotropy submodule and the Bruhat graph of X at x . This refinement gives a purely root theoretic description, which should be useful for computations. Finally, still with the G_2 -restriction, these considerations lead us to a non-recursive algorithm for X 's singular locus solely involving only the root system of (G, T) and the Bruhat graph of X .

1. Introduction

Let G be a semi-simple algebraic group over an arbitrary algebraically closed field k , and suppose $T \subset B \subset P$ are respectively a maximal torus, a Borel subgroup and an arbitrary standard parabolic in G . Each G/P , including G/B , is a projective G -variety with only finitely many B -orbits. Every B -orbit contains a unique T -fixed point $x \in (G/P)^T$, and these cells define an affine paving of G/P . If $x \in (G/P)^T$, then the closure of the B -orbit Bx is called the Schubert variety in G/P associated to x . This Schubert variety will be denoted throughout by $X(x)$. We will use the well known fact that the T -fixed points in G/B are in one to one correspondence with the elements of the Weyl group $W = N_G(T)/T$, so we don't distinguish between elements of W and fixed points in G/B .

Schubert varieties are in general singular, and it's an old problem, inspired by a classical paper [8] of Chevalley, to describe their singular loci (or, equivalently, their smooth points). A related problem, with interesting consequences in representation theory, is to determine

The first author was partially supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada

The second author was partially supported by the SNF (Schweizerischer Nationalfonds)

the locus of rationally smooth points of a Schubert variety (cf. [9]). In fact, if G is defined over \mathbb{C} and simply laced (i.e. every simple factor is of type A , D or E), then all rationally smooth points of any Schubert variety in G/P are in fact smooth (see [7]).

In this paper, we consider the singular locus of a Schubert variety in an arbitrary G/P , where G does not contain any G_2 -factors. Our results are an outgrowth of [7], where we used Peterson translates (defined below) to characterize the T -fixed points in the singular locus of an irreducible T -stable subvariety $X \subset G/P$ (a T -variety for short).

Since every B -orbit meets $(G/B)^T$, the singular locus of a Schubert variety X consists of the B -orbits of its singular T -fixed points. Here we can make use of the well known natural ordering on $W = (G/B)^T$: if $x, y \in W$, then $x < y$ if and only if $X(x) \subset X(y)$ but $x \neq y$. This ordering can also be described as the Bruhat-Chevalley order on W (cf. [8]). It has two nice properties. First, if $X = X(w)$, then X^T is the interval $[e, w] = \{x \in W \mid x \leq w\}$. Secondly, if X is smooth (resp. singular) at $y \in X^T$, then it is smooth (resp. singular) at all $z \in X^T$ with $z > y$ (resp. $z \leq y$). Hence the problem of determining the singular locus of X boils down to identifying the maximal singular elements y of $[e, w]$. Such a y is called a *maximal singularity* of X .

Let us now recall the notion of a Peterson translate from [7]. Suppose for the moment that X is a T -variety in G/P , and let $E(X, x)$ denote the set of T -stable curves in X which contain the point $x \in X^T$. An element C of $E(X, x)$ is called *good* if C contains a smooth point of X . The *Peterson translate* of X along a good $C \in E(X, x)$ can be defined as

$$\tau_C(X, x) = \lim_{z \rightarrow x} T_z(X) \quad (z \in C \setminus C^T),$$

where $T_z(X)$ is the Zariski tangent space of X at z . Each Peterson translate $\tau_C(X, x)$ is a T -stable subspace of $T_x(X)$ such that $\dim \tau_C(X, x) = \dim X$. Clearly, X is smooth at x if and only if $\tau_C(X, x) = T_x(X)$. Each $T_x(C)$ is a T -stable line in $T_x(X)$, and the T -weights of these lines are certain elements of the root system Φ of the pair (G, T) . Furthermore, if $T_x(C)$ has weight $\alpha \in \Phi$, then $C^T = \{x, r_\alpha x\}$, where $r_\alpha \in W$ is the reflection corresponding to α . A T -curve $C \in E(X, x)$ is called *short* or *long* according to whether the T -weight of its tangent line $T_x(X)$ is short or long in Φ .

Now put $TE(X, x) = \sum_{C \in E(X, x)} T_x(C)$, and let $\Theta_x(X)$ be the linear span of the reduced tangent cone of X at x . Clearly, $TE(X, x) \subset \Theta_x(X)$. In fact, $TE(X, x) = \Theta_x(X)$ if G is simply laced and X is a Schubert variety [5]. (We will extend this to arbitrary T -varieties in G/P in §3.) A key question is whether $\tau_C(X, x) \subset TE(X, x)$. The following result combining Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 of [7] gives a partial answer in this setting.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume G has no G_2 -factors, and let X be a T -variety in G/P which is Cohen-Macaulay at the point $x \in X^T$. Then X is smooth at x if and only if $\tau_C(X, x) = TE(X, x)$ for at least one good T -curve C . Moreover,*

$$(1) \quad \tau_C(X, x) \subset \Theta_x(X)$$

for every good $C \in E(X, x)$. In fact, if C is good and also short, then $\tau_C(X, x) \subset TE(X, x)$.

Remark 1.2 In fact, the first assertion is true even if G has G_2 factors. However, as we show in Example 4.8, the identity (1) fails in G_2/B , as does the assertion about short curves.

Returning to the case of a Schubert variety X , this result reduces the problem of classifying the singular locus of X to describing $\Theta_x(X)$ when $E(X, x)$ contains a good curve and G doesn't have G_2 factors. Our main goal is to solve this for a maximal singularity of X .

The first of our two characterizations of $\Theta_x(X)$ at a maximal singularity goes as follows.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume G has no G_2 -factors, and suppose X is a Schubert variety in G/P . Then, for any $x \in X^T$ which is either smooth in X or a maximal singularity of X ,*

$$(2) \quad \Theta_x(X) = \sum_C \tau_C(X, x),$$

where the sum is over all $C \in E(X, x)$ with $C^T = \{x, y\}$, where $y > x$.

The proof is given in §4. We also include there a counter-example (Example 4.8) to Theorem 1.3 in the G_2/B case. Note that if x is maximal (or smooth), all T -curves C such that $C^T = \{x, y\}$ and $y > x$ are good. An algorithm for computing $\tau_C(X, x)$ was given in [7, §8], so (2) gives an explicit method of computing $\Theta_x(X)$.

Our second characterization uses Theorem 1.3 to get an expression for $\Theta_x(X)$ in which Peterson translates are out of the picture. For this, we need to bring in some more concepts. For any $x \in X^T$, let $B_x \subset B$ be the isotropy subgroup of x . That is, B_x is the subgroup of B namely the subgroup generated by T and all root subgroups U_α of B which fix x . As usual, a root α such that $U_\alpha \subset B$ is taken to be positive, and we write $\alpha > 0$. The condition that $U_\alpha x = x$ is equivalent to $x^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$. Thus, for any Schubert variety X in G/P , $\Theta_x(X)$ is a B_x -submodule of $T_x(G/P)$. The *isotropy submodule* of $\Theta_x(X)$ is the smallest B_x -submodule $\mathbb{T}_x(X)$ of $T_x(X)$ which contains $TE(X, x)$.

We will show that if $C \in E(X, x)$ is good, then the roots which correspond to T -lines in the T -module $\tau_C(X, x)/(\mathbb{T}_x(X) \cap \tau_C(X, x))$ can be explicitly described in terms of the notion of an orthogonal B_2 -pair, which is now defined. For each $\gamma \in \Phi$, let \mathfrak{g}_γ denote the T -stable line in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$ of weight γ . In other words, \mathfrak{g}_γ is the root line of weight γ .

Definition 1.4 Let $X = X(w)$ be a Schubert variety in G/B , and assume $x < w$. Suppose μ and ϕ are long, positive orthogonal roots such that the following three conditions hold:

- (i) $\mathfrak{g}_{-\mu} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\phi} \subset TE(X(w), x)$ (hence $x < r_\mu x$, $r_\phi x \leq w$),
- (ii) there exists a subroot system Φ' of Φ of type B_2 containing μ and ϕ , and
- (iii) if α and β form the unique basis of Φ' contained in $\Phi^+ \cap \Phi'$ with α short and β long, then

$$r_\alpha x < x, \quad \text{and} \quad r_\alpha r_\beta x \leq w.$$

Then we say that $\{\mu, \phi\}$ form an *orthogonal B_2 -pair* for X at x .

Our second characterization of $\Theta_x(X)$ at a maximal singularity goes as follows.

Theorem 1.5. *Assume G has no G_2 -factors, and suppose x is a maximal singularity of a Schubert variety X in G/B . Then for each T -weight γ of the quotient $\Theta_x(X)/\mathbb{T}_x(X)$, there exists an orthogonal B_2 -pair $\{\mu, \phi\}$ for X at x such that*

$$(3) \quad \gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi).$$

In other words, at a maximal singularity of X , every T -weight of $\Theta_x(X)$ not in $\mathbb{T}_x(X)$ is a weight arising from a B_2 -pair at x as in (3).

This is proved in §5. We also obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for a T -fixed point x of a Schubert variety to be a smooth point, which is also proved in §5.

Theorem 1.6. *Assume G has no G_2 -factors, let X be a Schubert variety in G/B , and let $x \in X^T$. Then X is smooth at x if and only if the following three conditions hold.*

(1) $|E(X, x)| = \dim X$, and some $C \in E(X, x)$ is good.

(2) We have $\mathbb{T}_x(X) = TE(X, x)$, and

(3) If $\{\mu, \phi\}$ is an orthogonal B_2 -pair for X at x , and $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$, then $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$. Consequently, $r_\gamma x \leq w$.

Corollary 1.7. *There exists a non-recursive algorithm involving only the Bruhat graph and the root system Φ which classifies the smooth T -fixed points of a Schubert variety in G/B .*

The notion of an orthogonal B_2 -pair arises from the Schubert variety $X = X(r_\alpha r_\beta r_\alpha)$ in B_2/B , where α and β are the short and long simple roots in B_2 . The T -fixed point $x = r_\alpha$ is the unique maximal singularity of X . Now the weights of $TE(X, x)$ are $\alpha, -\beta$ and $-(\beta + 2\alpha)$. Furthermore, B_x is generated by $T, U_\beta, U_{\alpha+\beta}$ and $U_{2\alpha+\beta}$, so it is easy to see that $TE(X, x)$ is already a B_x -submodule of $T_x(X)$. But $\{\beta, \beta + 2\alpha\}$ give an orthogonal B_2 -pair at x such that $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \Theta_x(X)/TE(X, x)$, where $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi) = -(\alpha + \beta)$. (See Example 5.2 and [7] for more details.)




Figure 1: α and β are the short and long simple roots in a $\Phi^+(B_2)$ containing $\{\mu, \phi\}$.

Figure 1 illustrates the portion of Bruhat graph of a Schubert variety X arising from an orthogonal B_2 -pair $\{\mu, \phi\}$ at x . If x is on a good T -curve and there is no edge in $\Gamma(X)$ at x corresponding to a T -curve C with $x < r_\gamma x \leq w$, where $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$, then X is singular at x .

Let us describe the algorithm of Corollary 1.7. Suppose we want to determine whether a Schubert variety $X = X(w)$ is smooth at $x \in X^T$. Consider any descending path

$$w > x_1 > x_2 > \cdots > x_m > x$$

in $\Gamma(X)$. If X is singular at any x_i , then it is singular at x . Thus, suppose X is smooth at x_m . Then the edge $x_m x$ is a good T -curve in X , so it suffices to check the conditions of Theorem 1.6 for this T -curve. Checking that the number of T -curves is $\dim X$ amounts to showing $|\{\gamma > 0 \mid r_\gamma x \leq w\}| = \ell(w)$, where $\ell(w)$ is the length of w , since $\ell(w) = \dim X(w)$. Verifying the second condition amounts to showing that $TE(X, x)$ is B_x -stable. This requires verifying that if $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$, then $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma+\alpha} \subset TE(X, x)$ for all $\alpha > 0$ such that $x^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$, $\gamma + \alpha \in \Phi$ and $x^{-1}(\alpha + \gamma) < 0$. The third condition is verifiable from the Bruhat graph at x , so the algorithm involves only Φ and $\Gamma(X)$. The non-recursivity is due to the fact that we only need to consider a single path in $\Gamma(X)$ from w to x .

It might also be useful to remark that unlike checking whether a Schubert variety X is smooth at a fixed point x , checking for rational smoothness at x via the Bruhat graph requires that one count the number of edges in $\Gamma(X)$ at all vertices $y \geq x$ [5]. Therefore it appears to be easier to use the Bruhat graph to identify the smooth points than the rationally smooth points. B. Boe and W. Graham have formulated the following lookup conjecture: a Schubert variety X in G/P is rationally smooth at x if and only if $|E(X, y)| = \dim X$ for all y on an edge of $\Gamma(X)$ containing x . Some special cases of the lookup conjecture are verified in [4], but the general conjecture is open. Theorem 1.6 says that as far as smoothness is concerned, one has to examine $\Gamma(X)$ two steps above and one step below x . This might be considered somewhat unexpected.

Finally, let us mention that this paper has connections with the work of S. Billey and A. Postnikov [3] and very likely also S. Billey and T. Braden [1]. However, unlike the situation in [3], our results do not say anything in the G_2 case, as noted in Remark 4.8.

2. Preliminaries

We will throughout use the terminology and notation of [7], some of which was already introduced in §1. In particular, the G_2 -hypothesis is always in effect.

Let us first recall some of the standard facts and notations concerning roots, weights, T -curves and so on. The T -fixed point set of a T -variety $X \subset G/P$ is denoted by X^T . It's well known that the mapping $w \rightarrow n_w B$ is a bijection the Weyl group $W = N_G(T)/T$ of (G, T) with $(G/B)^T$, so we assume $W = (G/B)^T$. The projection $\pi : G/B \rightarrow G/P$ is an equivariant closed morphism, so $(G/P)^T$ may be identified with W/W_P , W_P being the parabolic subgroup of W associated to P . The elements of W/W_P thus parameterize the Schubert varieties in G/P .

Every T -curve in $E(X, x)$ has the form $C = \overline{U_\alpha x}$ for a unique root $\alpha \in \Phi$. If $P = B$, then $C^T = \{x, r_\alpha x\}$. If X is a Schubert variety in G/B , say $X = X(w)$, then $C = \overline{U_\alpha x} \subset X$ if and only if both $x, r_\alpha x \leq w$. By [5, LEMMA A], $|E(X, x)| \geq \dim X$ for every T -variety X . Furthermore, every T -curve in G/P is the image of a T -curve in G/B under the closed morphism $\pi : G/B \rightarrow G/P$. Also, recall that as T -modules,

$$T_x(G/B) = \bigoplus_{x^{-1}(\gamma) < 0} \mathfrak{g}_\gamma.$$

A property of T -varieties in G/P , used freely throughout the paper is the following: each T -fixed point $x \in G/P$ is *attractive*; that is, all the weights of the tangent space $T_x(G/P)$ lie on one side of a hyperplane in $X(T)$, and in addition, each fixed point x has a T -stable open affine neighborhood. Since X is irreducible and any $x \in X^T$ is attractive, the affine open T -stable neighborhood of x is unique. It will be denoted by X_x . It is well known, and not hard to see, that there is a closed T -equivariant embedding of X_x into the tangent space $T_x(X)$ of X at x , thanks again to the fact that x is attractive.

Assuming $X_x \subset T_x(X)$, it follows that, for any T -stable line $L \subset T_x(X)$, we may choose a linear equivariant projection $T_x(X) \rightarrow L$ and restrict it to X_x . Identifying L with \mathbb{A}_k^1 we thus obtain a regular function $f \in k[X_x]$, which is a T -eigenvector of weight $-\alpha$ if L has weight α . We say f *corresponds to* L , if it is obtained in the described way.

3. Some General Results on $\Theta_x(X)$

In this section, we will establish some general properties of an arbitrary T -variety X in G/P . For Schubert varieties these properties are well known (see [6]). Let $\mathfrak{T}_x(X)$ be the reduced tangent cone to X at any $x \in X^T$, so $\Theta_x(X) = \text{span}_k(\mathfrak{T}_x(X))$.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose G has no G_2 -factors. Let $L = \mathfrak{g}_\omega \subset \Theta_x(X)$ be a T -stable line with weight ω . Then the following hold.*

(i) *If ω is long, then $L \subset TE(X, x)$. Otherwise, there exist roots α, β such that $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\beta \subset TE(X, x)$ and*

$$(4) \quad \omega = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \beta).$$

(ii) *In particular, if G is simply laced, then $\Theta_x(X) = TE(X, x)$.*

(iii) *If X is a Schubert variety and L does not correspond to a T -curve, then α and β are long negative orthogonal roots in a copy of $B_2 \subset \Phi$.*

Proof. Let $z \in k[X_x]$ be a T -eigenfunction corresponding to L and let $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n \in k[X_x]$ be T -eigenfunctions which correspond to the T -curves C_1, C_2, \dots, C_n through x . Notice that since $X_x \subset T_x(X)$ each T -curve $C \in E(X_x, x)$ is in fact a coordinate line in $T_x(X)$. This follows from the fact that all T -curves are smooth and no two T -weights of $T_x(X)$ are proportional. Let \tilde{x}_i , resp. \tilde{z} denote linear projections $T_x(X) \rightarrow T_x(C_i)$, resp. $T_x(X) \rightarrow L$, which restrict to $x_i, z \in k[X_x]$.

Since the (restriction of the) projection $X_x \rightarrow \bigoplus_C T_x(C) = TE(X, x)$ has a finite fibre over 0, $k[X_x]$ is a finite $k[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ -module by the graded version of Nakayama's Lemma. In particular $z \in k[X_x]$ is integral over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, so we obtain a relation

$$(5) \quad z^N = p_{N-1}z^{N-1} + p_{N-2}z^{N-2} + \dots + p_1z + p_0,$$

where N is a suitable integer and $p_i \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Without loss of generality we may assume that every summand on the right hand side is a T -eigenvector with weight $N\omega$. Let $P_i \in k[\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_n]$ be a polynomial restricting to p_i , having the same weight $(N-i)\omega$ as p_i . Then every monomial m of P_i has this weight too. If for all i every such monomial m has degree $\deg m > N-i$, then $p_i z^{N-i}$ is an element of M^{N+1} , where M is the maximal ideal of x in $k[X_x]$. This means that \tilde{z} vanishes on the tangent cone of X_x , so $L \not\subset \Theta_x(X)$, which is a contradiction. Thus, there is an i and a monomial m of P_i , such that $\deg m \leq d = N-i$. Let $m = c\tilde{x}_1^{d_1}\tilde{x}_2^{d_2}\dots\tilde{x}_n^{d_n}$, with integers d_j and a nonzero $c \in k$. So $\sum_j d_j \leq d$. Let α_j be the weight of \tilde{x}_j . Then we have

$$d\omega = \sum d_j \alpha_j$$

After choosing a new index, if necessary, we may assume that $d_j \neq 0$ for all j . Let $(,)$ be a Killing form on $X(T) \otimes \mathbb{R}$ which induces the length function on Φ . We have to consider two cases. First suppose that ω is a long root, with length say l . Then $(\alpha_j, \omega) \leq l^2$ with equality if and only if $\alpha_j = \omega$. Thus, $dl^2 = \sum d_j (\alpha_j, \omega) \leq d \max_j (\alpha_j, \omega) \leq dl^2$ and so there is a j with $\alpha_j = \omega$ and we are done, since this implies $\tilde{z} = \tilde{x}_j$. Hence, $L = C_j$.

Now suppose ω is short, with its length also denoted l . In this case $(\alpha_j, \omega) \leq l^2$. Since $dl^2 = d(\omega, \omega) = \sum_j d_j (\alpha_j, \omega)$ and since $\sum d_j \leq d$, it follows that all α_j satisfy $(\alpha_j, \omega) = l^2$. If there is a j such that $\alpha_j = \omega$, then, as above, we are done. Otherwise for each j , α_j is long, and α_j and ω are contained in a copy $B(j) \subset \Phi$ of B_2 . There is a long root $\beta_j \in B(j)$ with $\alpha_j + \beta_j = 2\omega$. We have to show that there are j_0 and j_1 so that $\beta_{j_0} = \alpha_{j_1}$. Fix $j_0 = 1$ and let $\alpha = \alpha_1, \beta = \beta_1$. Then $(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. This gives us the result: $dl^2 = d(\omega, \beta) = 0 + \sum_{j>1} d_j (\alpha_j, \beta)$. Now if all (α_j, β) are less or equal l^2 , this last equation cannot hold, since $\sum_{j>1} d_j < M$. We conclude that there is a j_1 so that $(\alpha_{j_1}, \beta) = 2l^2$ (the squared long root length), hence $\alpha_{j_1} = \beta$, and we are through with (i).

The proof of (ii) is obvious. For (iii), let S be the slice (cf. [7,]) to $X(w)$ at x . Then, locally, $X = S \times Bx$, where the weights of $TE(S, x)$ consist of the roots $\alpha < 0$ such that $x < r_\alpha x \leq w$. Since $L \not\subset TE(X, x)$, the only possibility is that $L \subset \Theta_x(S)$ because Bx is smooth (and so $TE(Bx, x) = \Theta_x(Bx)$) and $\Theta_x(X) = \Theta_x(S) \oplus \Theta_x(Bx)$. Now we may apply part (i) to S . \square

The following generalizes a well known property of Schubert varieties to arbitrary T -varieties.

Corollary 3.2. *Suppose L is a T -invariant line $\mathfrak{F}_x(X)$. Then $L \subset TE(X, x)$.*

Proof. We have already shown that in equation (5), some P_i contains a monomial of degree at most $d = i$. Taking homogeneous parts of degree N in (5), we therefore get a homogeneous polynomial

$$f = \tilde{z}^N - \sum P_j \tilde{z}^{N_j}.$$

vanishing on $\mathfrak{T}_x(X)$. Hence $f(L) = 0$. But as $\tilde{z}(L) \neq 0$, this implies some $P_j(L) \neq 0$ as well, which means that \tilde{z} occurs in a monomial of P_j , hence $L \subset TE(X, x)$ by the construction of the P_j . \square

An interesting consequence of Corollary 3.2 is that the linear spans of the tangent cones of two T -varieties behave nicely under intersections.

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose the G is simply laced and that X and Y are T -varieties in G/P . Suppose also that $x \in (X \cap Y)^T$. Then*

$$\Theta_x(X \cap Y) = \Theta_x(X) \cap \Theta_x(Y).$$

Consequently, if both X and Y are nonsingular at x , then $X \cap Y$ is nonsingular at x if and only if $|E(X \cap Y, x)| = \dim(X \cap Y)$.

Proof. The first claim is clear since $E(X, x) \cap E(Y, x) = E(X \cap Y, x)$. For the second, note that if X and Y are nonsingular at x , then

$$\begin{aligned} T_x(X) \cap T_x(Y) &= \Theta_x(X) \cap \Theta_x(Y) \\ &= \Theta_x(X \cap Y) \\ &\subset T_x(X \cap Y) \\ &\subset T_x(X) \cap T_x(Y) \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\dim T_x(X \cap Y) = |E(X \cap Y)|$, and the result follows. \square

For example, it follows that in the simply laced setting, the intersection of a Schubert variety $X(w)$ and a dual Schubert variety $Y(v) = \overline{B^-}y$ is nonsingular at any $x \in [v, w]$ as long as $X(w)$ and $Y(v)$ are each nonsingular at x .

4. $\Theta_x(X)$ at a Maximal Singularity

The aim of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. In fact, we will derive it as a consequence of a general result about the connection between $\tau_C(X, x)$ and $\Theta_x(X)$ for an arbitrary T -variety in G/P assuming x is at worst an isolated singularity.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose $X \subset G/P$ is a T -variety, where G has no G_2 -factors. Then for each $x \in X^T$, we have*

$$\Theta_x(X) \subset \tau(X, x) := \sum_{C \in E(X, x)} \tau_C(X, x).$$

In particular, if x is either smooth in X or an isolated singularity, then

$$\Theta_x(X) = \sum_{C \in E(X, x)} \tau_C(X, x).$$

Before proving Theorem 4.1, we will give the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. The result is obvious if x is smooth, so assume it is a maximal singularity. Then there exists a slice representation $X_x = S \times Bx$, where S has an isolated singularity at x and $E(S, x)$ consists of the T -curves in X containing a smooth point of X_x . To get the result, we apply Theorem 4.1 to S and use the fact that $\Theta_x(X) = \Theta_x(S) \oplus \Theta_x(Bx)$. Indeed,

$$\Theta_x(S) \oplus \Theta_x(Bx) = \sum_{C \in E(S, x)} \tau_C(S, x) \oplus TE(Bx, x),$$

so it suffices to show that $TE(Bx, x) \subset \tau_C(X, x)$ for any $C \in E(S, x)$ since clearly $\tau_C(S, x) \subset \tau_C(X, x)$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(Bx, x)$. Then there is a curve $D \subset Bx$ with $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma = T_x(D)$. In fact, $D = U_\gamma x$. Thus, the smooth T -stable surface $\Sigma = C \times D \subset X_x = S \times Bx$, and Proposition 3.4 of [7] implies $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \tau_C(\Sigma, x) \subset \tau_C(X, x)$.

$\Sigma = \overline{U_\gamma C}$ is a T -surface
hard to see

□

The proof of Theorem 4.1 will use several lemmas. To begin with, let R be a Noetherian graded commutative ring, with irrelevant ideal $I = \bigoplus_{d>0} R_d$. Then $\bigcap_{l>0} I^l = 0$. Thus, for each $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ there is an $l > 0$ such that $r \in I^l \setminus I^{l+1}$. We set $\text{in}(r) = r + I^{l+1} \in I^l/I^{l+1} \subset \text{gr } R = \text{gr}_I R$, and $\text{in}(0) = 0 \in \text{gr } R$. Recall that for $r, s \in R$, $\text{in}(r)\text{in}(s) = \text{in}(rs)$ or $\text{in}(r)\text{in}(s) = 0$. We say $r \in R$ *vanishes on the tangent cone* if $\text{in}(r)$ does, i.e. if $\text{in}(r)$ is nilpotent. In the case that R is the coordinate ring of an affine variety Z with regular \mathbb{G}_m -action such that I corresponds to a maximal ideal and hence to an attractive \mathbb{G}_m -fixed point z , then $\text{in}(r)$ induces indeed a function on the reduced tangent cone of Z at z , and r vanishes on the tangent cone if and only if this function does. In what follows we will consider closed and T -stable subvarieties of $T_x(X)$. We therefore choose a one parameter subgroup λ of T , such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \lambda(t)v = 0$ for all $v \in T_x(X)$. Then the \mathbb{G}_m -action by λ^{-1} induces a (positive) grading of $k[T_x(X)]$ which carries over to any T -stable closed subvariety (note that the grading induced by λ would be negative).

For convenience we extend the definition of $\Theta_x(Z)$ also to reducible varieties. Also notice that $\Theta_x(Z)$ may be canonically identified with $T_0(\mathfrak{T}_z(Z)) \subset T_z(Z)$. To set up an induction on the dimension of X , we need the following

Lemma 4.2. *Let $Z \subset T_x(X)$ be a closed T -stable subvariety with $Z = Z_1 \cup Z_2 \cup \cdots \cup Z_d$ the decomposition into irreducible components. Then*

$$\Theta_0(Z) = \Theta_0(Z_1) + \Theta_0(Z_2) + \cdots + \Theta_0(Z_d).$$

Proof. Since every component Z_i of Z is T -stable it has to contain 0. Therefore the proof is a simple consequence of the following well known fact: if a variety $Y = A \cup B$ is the union of two closed subvarieties then for every point x in the intersection $A \cap B$ we have $\mathfrak{T}_x(Y) = \mathfrak{T}_x(A) \cup \mathfrak{T}_x(B)$. □

Let $Z \subset T_x(X)$ be an irreducible T -stable subvariety, and let $L \subset \Theta_0(Z)$ be a T -stable line with weight ω , say. Moreover, suppose ω is short with respect to a Killing form

$(\ , \)$ on $X(T)$. Denote by $z \in k[Z]$ the restriction of a linear T -equivariant projection $T_x(X) \rightarrow L \cong \mathbb{A}_k^1$. We fix z for the moment.

Lemma 4.3. *With the preceding notation, let $f \in k[Z]$ correspond to another T -equivariant linear projection onto some line $L' \subset T_x(X)$. Then z vanishes on the tangent cone of $\mathcal{V}(f)$ if and only if $\text{in}(z)^l = \text{in}(h)\text{in}(f)$ for some positive integer l and a suitable T -eigenvector $h \in k[Z]$.*

Proof. The if is clear, so suppose z vanishes on the tangent cone of $\mathcal{V}(f)$. By definition this means that there is an integer l and there are elements $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_r \in I(\mathcal{V}(f))$, the ideal of $\mathcal{V}(f)$, such that $\text{in}(z)^l = a_1 \text{in}(g_1) + a_2 \text{in}(g_2) + \dots + a_r \text{in}(g_r)$ for suitable $a_i \in \text{gr } k[Z]$. Since $\text{in}(z)$ is homogeneous and since $\text{in}(I(\mathcal{V}(f)))$ is an homogeneous ideal, we may assume that all of the a_i are homogeneous as well. Moreover the a_i and g_i may be chosen to be T -eigenvectors. Omitting any indices i for which $a_i \text{in}(g_i) = 0$ we may lift the a_i equivariantly to $\bar{a}_i \in k[Z]$, such that $\text{in}(\bar{a}_i) = a_i$. Then we have $0 \neq \text{in}(\bar{a}_i) \text{in}(g_i) = \text{in}(a_i g_i)$. Leaving out degrees different from l we may assume that $\sum \text{in}(\bar{a}_i) \text{in}(g_i) = \text{in}(\sum \bar{a}_i g_i)$. Now $\sum \bar{a}_i g_i$ is a T -eigenvector g contained in the ideal of $\mathcal{V}(f)$. A suitable n th power of g is contained in $f k[Z]$. $\text{in}(z)$ is not nilpotent, and due to $\text{in}(z)^l = \text{in}(g)$ also $\text{in}(g)$ is not nilpotent, therefore $\text{in}(g)^n = \text{in}(g^n)$. Replacing l by nl we may assume that $\text{in}(z)^l = \text{in}(g)$ for a $g \in f k[Z]$. In other words $\text{in}(z)^l = \text{in}(hf)$ for a suitable T -eigenvector $h \in k[Z]$.

It remains to show that $\text{in}(hf) = \text{in}(h)\text{in}(f)$ which is equivalent to $\text{in}(h)\text{in}(f) \neq 0$. So suppose that $\text{in}(h)\text{in}(f) = 0$. This means that $h \notin M^{l-1}$ with M the maximal ideal of 0 . Otherwise $\text{in}(h)\text{in}(f)$ would equal $\text{in}(hf)$ by definition. We conclude that $h \in M^n$ for some $n < l - 1$, implying that there is a homogeneous polynomial P in some linear T -homogeneous coordinates x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m of $T_x(X)$ of the same T -weight as h , and of degree n , such that, restricted to Z , $h = P$ modulo M^{n+1} . By the definition of f we may even assume that x_1 restricted to Z is f . Replacing P by any monomial of P and letting d_i be the degree of x_i in P , we see that $l\omega = \alpha_1 + \sum d_i \alpha_i$ with α_i the weight of x_i . Applying (\cdot, ω) on both sides this gives $l(\omega, \omega) = (\alpha_1, \omega) + \sum d_i (\alpha_i, \omega)$. Since $(\alpha_1, \omega) \leq (\omega, \omega)$ for all i this is impossible since $n = \sum d_i < l - 1$. Hence the claim. \square

As an easy consequence we get

Lemma 4.4. *If Z and z are as above, and f corresponds to the projection to any other T -stable line of $T_x(X)$ with a short weight, then z does not vanish on the tangent cone of $\mathcal{V}(f)$.*

Proof. By the last Lemma we know, that if z vanishes on the tangent cone of $\mathcal{V}(f)$, there is a T -eigenvector $h \in k[Z]$ such that $\text{in}(z) = \text{in}(h)^l \text{in}(f)$. Choosing a monomial as in the proof of the previous Lemma, we get a relation $l\omega = \alpha_1 + \sum d_i \alpha_i$ with $\sum d_i = l - 1$. But $(\alpha_1, \omega) < (\omega, \omega)$, because α_1 is short, and $(\alpha_i, \omega) \leq (\omega, \omega)$ for all i , so no such relation exists. \square

For reasons which will become clear in the proof of the Theorem, we now restrict our attention to varieties Z in $T_x(X)$ such that $T_0(Z)$ contains exactly one T -stable line with a short weight.

Lemma 4.5. *If $L \subset \Theta_0(Z)$ is the only line in $T_0(Z)$, and if $C \in E(Z, 0)$ is any T -curve, then $L \subset T_p(Z)$ for all $p \in C^o = C \setminus \{0\}$.*

Proof. Choose any equivariant embedding $Z \subset T_0(Z)$. Then, if $C = L$ as a subset of $T_0(Z)$, there is nothing to show. Otherwise C is a coordinate line of $T_0(Z)$ having a long T -weight α , say. If $L \not\subset T_p(Z)$ for a $p \in C^o$ there is a T -eigenfunction f in the ideal of Z in $k[T_0(Z)]$, such that $df_p(L) \neq 0$. We may assume that $k[T_0(Z)] = k[z, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ with z as above corresponding to L , and the x_i corresponding to the long lines of $T_0(Z)$. Then we write $f = P_0 + P_1z + P_2z^2 + \dots + P_dz^d$ with the P_i T -eigenfunctions and polynomials in the x_i only. Without loss of generality P_iz^i has the same weight as f . It follows that $df_p = dP_{0,p} + P_1(p)dz_p$ because z vanishes on C . By assumption $P_1(p)$ is nonzero, implying that there is a monomial of the form x^l contained in P_1 , where x is the coordinate corresponding to C and $l \geq 1$. Thus, the T -weight of f is $l\alpha + \omega$. On the other hand P_0 is nonzero. For if $P_0 = 0$, then f is divisible by z , and therefore $f = hz$ for some h . But Z is irreducible and clearly z does not vanish on Z , so h vanishes on Z . Now z and h vanish in p forcing df_p to be zero as well, a contradiction. With P_0 being nonzero it follows that there is a monomial in the x_i of weight $l\alpha + \omega$. This clearly shows that $\omega = (l\alpha + \omega) - l\alpha$ is contained in the \mathbb{Z} -submodule of $X(T)$ generated by all long weights of $T_0(Z)$. The next lemma shows that this is impossible and therefore ends the proof. \square

Lemma 4.6. *Let Γ be a \mathbb{Z} -submodule of $X(T)$ generated by long roots. If the Killing form F is normalized such that $(\omega, \omega) = 1$ is the short root length, then the function $f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ given by $f(\gamma) = (\gamma, \gamma)$ has actually values in $2\mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. If α, β are long roots, then $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Indeed, $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{0, \pm 1, \pm 2\}$ by general properties of root systems. Hence, $(\gamma, \delta) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\gamma, \delta \in \Gamma$, as well. Now $f(\gamma + \delta) = f(\gamma) + f(\delta) + 2(\alpha, \delta) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$, if $f(\gamma)$ and $f(\delta)$ are even integers. The result follows by induction on the length of a shortest representation $\gamma = \sum n_i \alpha_i$ with $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots$ the long generators of Γ . The length of such a representation is just $\sum |n_i|$. So, if n_1 is nonzero and positive, then $\gamma = \alpha_1 + (n_1 - 1)\alpha_1 + \sum_{i>2} n_i \alpha_i$. The induction hypothesis for α_1 and $(n_1 - 1)\alpha_1 + \sum_{i>2} n_i \alpha_i$ give the result for γ by the above arguments. If n_1 is negative we may use $-\gamma$, since $f(\gamma) = f(-\gamma)$. Finally, if n_1 is zero, we may replace α_1 with any other α_i such that $n_i \neq 0$. \square

We are now in a position to prove the Theorem.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We proceed by induction on $\dim Z$ for an irreducible T -stable subvariety $Z \subset X \subset T_x(X)$. Of course there is nothing to show when $\dim Z \leq 1$. If $\dim Z > 1$, let $L \subset \Theta_0(Z)$ be any T -stable line that has a short weight ω , say. Let z be a corresponding function of $k[Z]$. Suppose there is another line with short weight in $T_0(Z)$. By the previous lemma, if f is a corresponding function z does not vanish on the tangent cone of $\mathcal{V}(f)$. Thanks to Lemma 4.2, z does not vanish on the tangent cone of at least one irreducible component Z' of $\mathcal{V}(f)$. In particular this implies that L is contained in $\Theta_0(Z')$. By induction $L \subset \tau(Z', 0) \subset \tau(Z, 0)$. This concludes the case that there is a short line in $T_0(Z)$ different from L . So suppose L is the only line in $T_0(Z)$ with a short weight. Then

$L \subset T_p(Z)$ for all $p \in C^o$ and any curve $C \in E(Z, 0)$. For each such C it then follows that $L \subset \tau_C(Z, 0)$. By Theorem 3.1 all the lines in $\Theta_0(Z)$ with long T -weights are tangent to T -curves, so they are contained in $\tau(Z, 0)$. \square

We complete this section with an example that shows the G_2 -restriction is necessary. We need the following general fact about $\Theta_x(X)$ proved in [6].

Proposition 4.7. *Suppose X is a Schubert variety in G/B and $x \in X^T$. Let \mathcal{H} denote the convex hull in $\Phi \otimes \mathbb{R}$ of the T -weights of $TE(X, x)$. Then every T -weight of $\Theta_x(X)$ lies in \mathcal{H} .*

Example 4.8 Now suppose α and β are the short and long simple roots in the root system of G_2 , and consider the Schubert variety X in G_2/B corresponding to $w = r_\beta r_\alpha r_\beta r_\alpha$. By [2, p. 168], the singular locus of X is the Schubert variety $X(r_\beta r_\alpha)$, so $x = r_\beta r_\alpha$ is a maximal singularity. By a direct check, the T -weights of $TE(X, x)$ are $-\alpha$, β , $\alpha + \beta$ and $-\lambda$, where $\lambda = 3\alpha + 2\beta$ is the highest root. Thus the weights in \mathcal{H} are $-\alpha$, β , $\alpha + \beta$, $-(\beta + 2\alpha)$ and $-\lambda$. The good T -curves in $E(X, x)$ correspond to $-\alpha$ and $-\lambda$. We claim that $-(3\alpha + \beta)$ is a weight in $\tau_C(X, x)$, where C corresponds to $-\lambda$. Indeed, put $y = r_\lambda x$. Then one sees that the weights of $TE(X, y)$ are β , $\alpha + \beta$, $-(\beta + 2\alpha)$ and λ . By inspection, $TE(X, y)$ is a $\mathfrak{g}_{-\lambda}$ -submodule of $T_y(G_2/B)$, so, by the algorithm in [7, §8] (summarized in Remark 5.3 below), the weights of $\tau_C(X, x)$ are obtained by reflecting the weights of $TE(X, y)$ by r_λ . Thus $\tau_C(X, x)$ has weights

$$r_\lambda(\beta) = -(3\alpha + \beta), \quad r_\lambda(\alpha + \beta) = -(2\alpha + \beta), \quad r_\lambda(-(\beta + 2\alpha)) = \alpha + \beta, \quad \text{and} \quad r_\lambda(\lambda) = -\lambda.$$

Since $-(3\alpha + \beta)$ isn't in \mathcal{H} , Theorem 1.3 may fail without the G_2 -restriction.

5. Proof of Theorems 1.5 and 1.6

The goal of this section is to study the T -weights in $\tau_C(X, x)$ for a Schubert variety in G/B and to eventually prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.6. As usual, we will suppose throughout that G does not contain any G_2 -factors. Let $X = X(w)$ and assume C is a good T -curve in X such that $C^T = \{x, y\}$, where $y > x$. Thus we can write $C = \overline{U_{-\mu}x}$, where $\mu > 0$, and it follows that $y = r_\mu x > x$. Since $\tau_C(X, x) \subset TE(X, x)$ if μ is short, we can ignore this case and suppose μ is long. Recall also that if $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \Theta_x(X)$ and γ is long, then $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$.

To begin, we need a result similar to Theorem 3.1 for $\tau_C(X, x)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose γ is a short root such that $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \tau_C(X, x)$. If $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \not\subset TE(X, x)$, then there exists a long root ϕ orthogonal to μ such that $\mathfrak{g}_{-\phi} \subset TE(X, x)$, and*

$$(6) \quad \gamma = -\frac{1}{2}(\mu + \phi).$$

In addition, the roots γ, μ, ϕ lie in a copy of B_2 contained in Φ . When $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$, there exists a T -surface in $S \subset X$ containing C and the T -curve corresponding to γ .

Proof. This follows from [7, Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.2]. \square

We will see below that if $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \not\subset TE(X, x)$, then $\phi > 0$. The notion of an orthogonal B_2 -pair arises from the following illuminating example worked out in detail in [7, Example 8.4].

Example 5.2 Let G be of type B_2 , and let $w = r_\alpha r_\beta r_\alpha$, where α is the short simple root and β is the long simple root. Put $X = X(w)$. The singular set of X is $X(r_\alpha)$, so $x = r_\alpha$ is X 's unique maximal singular point. There are two good T -curves at x , namely $C = \overline{U_{-\beta}x}$ and $D = \overline{U_{-(2\alpha+\beta)}x}$. Suppose $y = r_\beta x$ and $z = r_{2\alpha+\beta}x$. Then

$$T_y(X) = \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha+\beta} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad T_z(X) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-(\alpha+\beta)} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{2\alpha+\beta}.$$

Thus, by the algorithm of [7, §3],

$$\tau_C(X, x) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-(\alpha+\beta)} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_D(X, x) = \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-(\alpha+\beta)} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-(2\alpha+\beta)}.$$

Note that the weight at x that does not give a T -curve, namely $-(\alpha+\beta)$, is in both Peterson translates. The next result extends this example to the general case.

Remark 5.3 We will use the algorithm in [7, §3] in several places to compute a Peterson translate $\tau_C(X, x)$. Let us briefly summarize how this works. Suppose $C = \overline{U_{-\mu}x}$, where $\mu > 0$ and $y = r_\mu x$. Consider the weights of the form $\nu + k\mu$ in $T_y(X)$, and form a (possibly partial) μ string consisting of roots of the form $\kappa - j\mu$, where $0 \leq j \leq r$, such that $y^{-1}(\kappa - j\mu) < 0$ for each j , but $y^{-1}(\kappa - (r+1)\mu) > 0$. Then the roots $r_\mu(\kappa - j\mu)$ occur as weights in $\tau_C(X, x)$, and every weight occurring in $\tau_C(X, x)$ arises in this way.

Recall that $(,)$ is a W -invariant inner product on $X(T) \otimes \mathbb{R}$. Assuming γ is as in the last Lemma, we now say more about \mathfrak{g}_γ .

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose γ is a short root such that $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \tau_C(X, x)$. If either $(\gamma, \mu) \geq 0$, or in the equation (6) one has $\phi < 0$, then $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$. On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \not\subset TE(X, x)$, then the following statements hold:*

- (a) $\gamma < 0$,
- (b) $(\gamma, \mu) < 0$, hence $\delta := \gamma + \mu \in \Phi$,
- (c) if $x^{-1}(\delta) < 0$, then $\mathfrak{g}_\delta \subset \tau_C(X, x) \cap TE(X, x)$ (and, of course, conversely), and
- (d) $\phi > 0$.

Remark 5.5 Example 5.2 shows that one can have $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \tau_C(X, x) \cap TE(X, x)$ yet still have $(\gamma, \mu) < 0$.

Proof. If $(\gamma, \mu) \geq 0$, it follows immediately from Lemma 5.1 that $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$. Suppose γ and has the form (6), where $\phi < 0$, and put $\delta = \gamma + \mu$. Since $(\gamma, \mu) < 0$, $\delta \in \Phi$. Moreover, since $\phi < 0$, we have $\delta > 0$. Now if $\gamma > 0$, then $r_\gamma x < x$, since $x^{-1}(\gamma) < 0$. Thus $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$ if $\gamma > 0$.

Next, suppose $\gamma < 0$. We will consider the two cases $x^{-1}(\delta) < 0$ and $x^{-1}(\delta) > 0$ separately. Assume first that $x^{-1}(\delta) < 0$. Since $\tau_C(X, x)$ is a \mathfrak{g}_μ -submodule of $T_x(X)$ (cf. [7, §3]) and $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \tau_C(X, x)$, we therefore know that

$$\mathfrak{g}_\delta \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \tau_C(X, x).$$

Since μ is long and there are no G_2 -factors, Proposition 8.1 [7] implies

$$\mathfrak{g}_\delta \oplus \mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset T_y(X).$$

Since $\gamma < 0$, we therefore get the inequality $y < r_\gamma y \leq w$, and hence X is also nonsingular at $r_\gamma y$. Moreover, since $\phi < 0$ and $x^{-1}(\phi) = y^{-1}(\phi) > 0$, it also follows that $\mathfrak{g}_{-\phi} \subset TE(X, y)$, which equals $T_y(X)$ since X is smooth at y . Since there are no G_2 factors, $\mu, \delta, -\phi$ constitute a complete γ -string occurring as T -weights of $T_y(X)$. Letting E be the good T -curve in X such that $E^T = \{y, r_\gamma y\}$, we have $\tau_E(X, y) = T_y(X)$, so the string $\mu, \delta, -\phi$ also has to occur as T -weights of $T_{r_\gamma y}(X)$. In particular, $\mathfrak{g}_{-\phi} \subset TE(X, r_\gamma y) = T_{r_\gamma y}(X)$, and hence $r_\phi r_\gamma y \leq w$. But this means

$$r_\gamma x = r_\gamma r_\mu y = r_\gamma r_\mu r_\gamma r_\gamma y = r_\phi r_\gamma y \leq w,$$

so $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$.

Next, assume $x^{-1}(\delta) > 0$. Since μ is long, $r_\mu(\delta) = \delta - \mu = \gamma$, hence $y^{-1}(\delta) = x^{-1}(\gamma) < 0$. Thus, since $\delta > 0$, $\mathfrak{g}_\delta \subset T_y(X)$. Furthermore,

$$y^{-1}(-\gamma) = -x^{-1}r_\mu(\gamma) = -x^{-1}(\delta) < 0,$$

so $\mathfrak{g}_{-\gamma} \subset T_y(X)$. It follows that $r_\gamma y < y$. As $-\phi > 0$, $U_{-\phi} r_\gamma y \subset X$ as well. We claim $U_{-\phi} r_\gamma y \neq r_\gamma y$, which then proves that $r_\phi r_\gamma y \leq w$. But

$$(r_\gamma y)^{-1}(-\phi) = y^{-1}(r_\gamma(-\phi)) = y^{-1}(\mu) < 0,$$

hence we get the claim. Finally, we note that $r_\phi r_\gamma r_\mu = r_\gamma$, so it follows that $r_\gamma x \leq w$. Therefore, if $\phi < 0$, we get $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$.

Now suppose $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \not\subset TE(X, x)$. Then (a) is immediate and (b) follows from (6). Since $\tau_C(X, x)$ is a \mathfrak{g}_μ -submodule of $T_x(X)$, $\mathfrak{g}_\delta \subset \tau_C(X, x)$ since $x^{-1}(\delta) < 0$. Then γ is given by (6), so $(\delta, \mu) \geq 0$ (since μ is long). Thus, Lemma 5.1 implies $\mathfrak{g}_\delta \subset TE(X, x)$. On the other hand, if $x^{-1}(\delta) > 0$, then $\mathfrak{g}_\delta \not\subset T_x(X)$. This establishes (c). The assumption that $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \not\subset TE(X, x)$ immediately implies that ϕ is positive giving (d). \square

Remark 5.6 Let X be a Schubert variety, and suppose $x \in X^T$ is a maximal singularity where $|E(X, x)| = \dim X$. In this case, the second author has shown that the multiplicity $\tau_x(X)$ of X at x is exactly 2^d , where

$$d = |\{\alpha \in x(\Phi^-) \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \tau_C(X, x) \text{ and } r_\alpha x \not\leq w\},$$

for any good $C \in E(X, x)$ ([11]).

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose $C = \overline{U_{-\mu}x}$ is a good T -curve, where $\mu > 0$, and let $y = r_{\mu}x$. Assume $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$ but $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x(X)$. Then there exists a positive root ϕ such that $\{\mu, \phi\}$ is an orthogonal B_2 -pair for X at x such that $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$. Conversely, suppose that for some $\phi > 0$, $\{\mu, \phi\}$ is an orthogonal B_2 -pair for X at x , and $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$. Then $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$ but $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x(X)$. By Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 5.4, there exists a long positive root ϕ orthogonal to μ such that $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$. Put $y = r_{\mu}x$, and note X is smooth at y . To show that $\{\mu, \phi\}$ is an orthogonal B_2 -pair, we have to consider two cases.

Case 1. μ is simple. Then $\alpha = \gamma + \phi$ is the short simple root. We have to show that if $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x(X)$, then $r_{\alpha}x < x$ and $r_{\alpha}r_{\mu}x \leq w$. But $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \not\subset \mathbb{T}_x(X)$ implies $x^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$, since if $x^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$, then the fact that $\gamma = -\phi + \alpha$ would say $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \mathbb{T}_x(X)$. Hence $r_{\alpha}x < x$.

Since $r_{\mu}(\alpha) = -\gamma$, it follows that $y^{-1}(\alpha) = x^{-1}(-\gamma) > 0$, so $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \subset T_y(G/B)$. But $y^{-1}(\gamma) = x^{-1}(-\alpha) > 0$, hence $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \not\subset T_y(G/B)$. Hence, by the algorithm for computing the Peterson translate in [7] and the fact that $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$, we infer that $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \subset T_y(X)$. Therefore, $r_{\alpha}y = r_{\alpha}r_{\mu}x \leq w$, as was to be shown.

Case 2. ϕ is simple. Here $\alpha = \gamma + \mu$ is the short simple root, and $r_{\mu}(\gamma) = \alpha$. As in Case 1, $x^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$, so $r_{\alpha}x < x$. Now $y^{-1}(\alpha) = x^{-1}(\gamma) < 0$, so $r_{\alpha}y < y$ and hence $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \subset T_y(X)$. Also, $y^{-1}(\gamma) = x^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$, so $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset T_y(G/B)$. Thus the algorithm for $\tau_C(X, x)$ says that $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$. But as $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$ too, we have to conclude that $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset T_y(X)$, due to the fact that γ and α comprise a μ string. Hence $r_{\gamma}y \leq w$. But since we are in a B_2 where α and ϕ are the simple roots, $r_{\gamma}r_{\mu} = r_{\alpha}r_{\phi}$. Hence $r_{\alpha}r_{\phi}x \leq w$, so Case 2 is finished.

To prove the converse, we need to consider Cases 1 and 2 again with the assumption that $x^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$, which follows from the condition that $r_{\alpha}x < x$. The argument is, in fact, very similar to the above, but we will outline it anyway. Assume first that $\mu = \beta$, i.e. μ is simple. As $r_{\alpha}r_{\beta}x \leq w$, we see that $r_{\alpha}y \leq w$. But $y^{-1}(-\alpha) = x^{-1}(\gamma) < 0$, consequently $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \subset T_y(X)$. Also, $y^{-1}(\gamma) = x^{-1}(-\alpha) > 0$, so $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \not\subset T_y(G/B)$. Thus by the algorithm for computing $\tau_C(X, x)$, the weight $r_{\beta}(-\alpha)$ occurs in $\tau_C(X, x)$. Hence, $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$.

On the other hand, if ϕ is simple, then $\mu = \beta + 2\alpha$. Thus, $y^{-1}(\alpha) = x^{-1}(\gamma) < 0$, so $r_{\alpha}y < y$, hence $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} \subset T_y(X)$. But $r_{\alpha}r_{\phi}x \leq w$ means $r_{\gamma}r_{\mu}x \leq w$, that is, $r_{\gamma}y \leq w$. As $y^{-1}(\gamma) = x^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$, $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} + \mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset T_y(Y)$. Since α and γ make up a $\beta + 2\alpha$ -string in B_2 , $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} + \mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$ also. This finishes the proof. \square

We now prove Theorems 1.5 and 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Suppose $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \Theta_x(X)$. Since x is either smooth or a maximal singularity, Theorem 1.3 $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \tau_C(X, x)$ for some good C . If C is short, then $\tau_C(X, x) \subset TE(X, x)$, by Theorem 1.1, hence $\tau_C(X, x) \subset \mathbb{T}_x(X)$. Thus we can suppose C is long. But then, by Theorem 5.7, either $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma} \subset \mathbb{T}_x(X)$ or there exists a B_2 -pair $\{\mu, \phi\}$ for X at x such that $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$. Hence Theorem 1.5 is proven. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Suppose $C \in E(X, x)$ is good and $\dim TE(X, x) = \dim \mathbb{T}_x(X) = \dim X$. If C is short, then X is smooth at x by Theorem 1.1. Hence we may suppose C is

long. Suppose there exists a T -line \mathfrak{g}_γ in $\tau_C(X, x)$ which is not in $\mathbb{T}_x(X)$. Then by Theorem 5.7, there is an orthogonal B_2 -pair $\{\mu, \phi\}$ for X at x for which $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$. But then by assumption, $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$. This contradicts the choice of \mathfrak{g}_γ , so $\tau_C(X, x) \subset \mathbb{T}_x(X) = TE(X, x)$. Hence, by Theorem 1.1 again, X is smooth at x .

For the converse, suppose X is smooth at x . Then conditions (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.5 clearly hold. Suppose $\{\mu, \phi\}$ is a B_2 -pair for X at x and $\gamma = -1/2(\mu + \phi)$. By the converse assertion of Theorem 5.7, $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset \tau_C(X, x)$, where $C \in E(X, x)$ is the T -curve of weight μ at x . Since x is smooth, $\tau_C(X, x) = TE(X, x)$, so $\mathfrak{g}_\gamma \subset TE(X, x)$. \square

References

- [1] S. Billey and T. Braden: *Lower Bounds for Kazhdan-Lusztig Polynomials from Patterns*, To appear in Transf. Groups.
- [2] S. Billey and V. Lakshmibai: *Singular loci of Schubert varieties*. Progress in Mathematics **182**, Birkhäuser Boston- Basel-Berlin, 2000.
- [3] S. Billey and A. Postnikov: *Smoothness of Schubert Varieties Via Patterns in Root Systems* (2003), arXiv:math.CO/0205179 v1.
- [4] B. Boe and W. Graham: *A lookup conjecture for rational smoothness*. Amer. J. Math.
- [5] J. Carrell: *The Bruhat Graph of a Coxeter Group, a Conjecture of Deodhar, and Rational Smoothness of Schubert Varieties*. Proc. Symp. in Pure Math. A.M.S. **56** (1994), Part I, 53-61.
- [6] J. Carrell: *The span of the tangent cone of a Schubert variety*. Algebraic Groups and Lie Groups, Australian Math. Soc. Lecture Series **9**, Cambridge Univ. Press (1997), 51-60.
- [7] J. Carrell and J. Kuttler: *Singular points of T -varieties in G/P and the Peterson map*. Invent. Math. **151** (2003), 353-379 DOI:10.1007/s00222-002-0256-5.
- [8] C. Chevalley: *Sur les décompositions cellulaires des espaces G/B* , Proc. Symp.2 Pure Math. A.M.S. **56** (1994), Part I, 1-25.
- [9] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig: *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Invent. Math. **53** (1979), 165-184.
- [10] S. Kumar: *Nil Hecke ring and singularity of Schubert varieties*, Inventiones Math. **123** (1996), 471-506.
- [11] J. Kuttler: *The Singular Loci of T -Stable Varieties in G/P* , thesis, U. of Basel (2003)

James B. Carrell
 Department of Mathematics
 University of British Columbia
 Vancouver, Canada V6T 1Z2
 carrell@math.ubc.ca

Jochen Kuttler
 Mathematisches Institut
 Universität Basel
 CH-4051 Basel
 Switzerland
 kuttler@math.unibas.ch