

# DECOMPOSITIONS OF SCHUBERT VARIETIES AND SMALL RESOLUTIONS

SCOTT LARSON

ABSTRACT. We provide a method for gluing (small) resolutions of singularities of Schubert varieties  $X_w$ . An explicit isomorphism of  $X_w$  with an (iterated) bundle is constructed when  $w$  has an (iterated) BP decomposition. Combined with the first result this gives many new small resolutions of Schubert varieties. In type A, this can be expressed in terms of pattern avoidance. Also we show resolutions of Schubert varieties constructed quite generally are in fact Gelfand-MacPherson resolutions.

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Bott-Samelson Type Varieties	3
2. The Monoid $(W, \star)$	7
3. Fiber Bundle Decompositions and BP Decompositions	9
4. Small Resolutions	16
5. Gelfand-MacPherson Resolutions	19
6. $A_{n-1}$	25
References	29

## INTRODUCTION

Geometry of Schubert varieties governs certain key properties of the representation theory in category  $\mathcal{O}$  and of complex reductive groups. The importance of Schubert varieties is reflected by vast literature on their geometry, including a rich history of their desingularizations. Small resolutions of singularities can enable computing Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials (as in, e.g., [20]) and characteristic cycles (as in [7]).

Our original motivation for this paper was to construct small resolutions. Let  $G$  be a complex connected reductive algebraic group and  $B$  a fixed Borel subgroup. For notational convenience, we let  $G_w = \overline{BwB} \subseteq G$ , where quotienting by  $B$  gives a Schubert variety in the flag variety  $G/B$ . It was soon realized that all resolutions of Schubert varieties we studied from the literature are particular examples of the morphism

$$\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} \rightarrow G_w \tag{1}$$

---

*Date:* November 11, 2019.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E47, 14M15.

*Key words and phrases.* small resolutions, Schubert varieties, flag varieties, Bott-Samelson, BP decomposition, fiber bundles, pattern avoidance.

(as described in Definition 1.8), where  $R_i$  is a parabolic subgroup stabilizing  $G_{w_{i-1}}$  and  $G_{w_i}$ , and  $\mu$  is defined by multiplication. This suggests that if any  $G_w/B$  has a small resolution, then  $G_w/B$  has a small resolution of the form (1) (after quotienting by  $B$  on the right). Moreover, in our quest for finding small fiber dimensions, it was eventually realized that all fiber bundle structures on Schubert varieties can be described by the same formula – namely, when fibers of  $\mu$  have dimension zero.

The morphism  $\mu$  will always be  $(B \times B)$ -equivariant, but it is a recurring obstacle to check for equivariance with respect to the stabilizer of  $G_w$  in  $G \times G$ . When the map

$$\mu : G_v \times^R G_w \rightarrow G_u \tag{2}$$

is an isomorphism (as described in Corollary 3.3), it is interesting that the natural action on  $G_u$  is typically larger than the action on  $G_v \times^R G_w$ .

Let  $R \subseteq P$  be parabolic subgroups of  $G$  containing  $B$ . Richmond-Slofstra [15] describe exactly when the morphism  $\pi : G/R \rightarrow G/P$  restricts to a fiber bundle on  $G_w R/R$ , by a Coxeter-theoretic condition called BP decomposition. Our main result in this direction describes the fiber bundle structure on  $G_w R/R$  explicitly as a Bott-Samelson type variety by using (2), as in Proposition 3.11.

Our key Lemma 4.10 shows how to take two small resolutions of the form (1) and construct new resolutions using (2). Applying the lemma to isomorphisms of the form (2) requires having enough equivariance, and what we are often able to show is that a small resolution (1) of  $G_w$  can be made maximally equivariant, satisfying

$$\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1}) \tag{3a}$$

$$\tau(w) = \tau(w_m), \tag{3b}$$

where  $\tau$  is defined in (2.4). These conditions guarantee that any standard parabolic subgroup of  $G$  stabilizing  $G_w$  by left multiplication also stabilizes  $G_{w_0}$  on the left, and likewise for  $G_w$  and  $G_{w_m}$  on the right. Equations (3) are indeed stronger than necessary for applying Lemma 4.10.

Using the above methods we obtain our goal of explicitly constructing new small resolutions for families of Schubert varieties, e.g., in Proposition 6.8. This family is best described using a pattern avoidance result of [2]. We view Lemma 4.10 as highlighting the importance of determining small resolutions in low rank. On the way, we classify all Schubert varieties for  $W$  of type  $A_{n-1}$  ( $n \leq 6$ ) admitting *any* small resolution.

It is important to describe small resolutions explicitly, and in some cases multiple nonisomorphic small resolutions may occur (as is well-known). In particular, fiber dimensions are needed to determine whether the resolution is small, and then cohomology of fibers are needed to compute intersection cohomology. Thus in our opinion, another main result of this paper appears in §5, which simplifies a large family of resolutions to the form constructed by Gelfand-MacPherson [9] for which there exists a formula for  $\dim(\mu^{-1}(\text{pt}))$ . This relies essentially on [15], and our perspective on the corresponding results. In particular, every smooth Schubert variety  $G_w$  in a simply laced group admits an isomorphism of the form (1), where (3) holds true, such that for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $G_{w_i}$  is a parabolic subgroup.

I thank Edward Richmond for explaining the remarkable work in Richmond-Slofstra [15] to me, and I thank Roger Zierau for many helpful conversations.

## 1. BOTT-SAMELSON TYPE VARIETIES

Bott-Samelson [6] constructed certain quotients by group actions in the category of smooth manifolds, which proved useful in studying the topology of compact Lie groups and symmetric spaces. The same construction for algebraic varieties has been useful in studying properties of Schubert varieties. We recall this construction here and apply it to Schubert varieties. Then we describe a proper map  $\mu$  from such a variety to a flag variety. We conclude this section by characterizing when  $\mu$  is a resolution of singularities of a Schubert variety. Of particular interest is characterizing when  $\mu$  is birational and when  $\mu$  is an isomorphism.

Let  $X$  be an algebraic variety and let  $H$  be a linear algebraic group. Suppose that  $X$  is a  $H$ -variety with a right action. Let  $X/H$  be the quotient space with the quotient topology, let  $\pi : X \rightarrow X/H$  be the quotient map, and for any  $U \subseteq X/H$  open let  $\mathcal{O}_{X/H}(U)$  be the set of functions  $f : U \rightarrow k$  such that  $f \circ \pi|_{\pi^{-1}(U)}$  is in  $\mathcal{O}_X(\pi^{-1}(U))$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{O}_{X/H}(U)$  may be identified with the ring of invariant functions  $\mathcal{O}_X(\pi^{-1}(U))^H$  on  $\pi^{-1}(U)$ . Then  $X/H$  is a ringed space, but may fail to be an algebraic variety. All quotients we consider will be varieties, in particular they occur naturally as subvarieties of a quotient  $G \times^{H_1} \cdots \times^{H_m} G$  (as in (1.6)).

Suppose that the right action of  $H$  on  $X$  is free and let  $Y$  be a left  $H$ -variety. Then  $X \times Y$  is a  $H$ -variety with a free right action by  $(x, y)h = (xh, h^{-1}y)$ . Let  $X \times^H Y$  denote the quotient space  $(X \times Y)/H$  and let  $\rho : X \times Y \rightarrow X \times^H Y$  be the quotient map. There exists a natural map of  $X \times^H Y$  onto  $X/H$  which makes the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times Y & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X \times^H Y & \longrightarrow & X/H \end{array}$$

where the other maps are the natural quotient maps.

One may check the quotient  $X \times^H Y \times^{H'} Y'$  is isomorphic to both  $(X \times^H Y) \times^{H'} Y'$  and  $X \times^H (Y \times^{H'} Y')$  as ringed spaces. As noted in [6], there is an obvious extension to more factors to obtain ringed spaces

$$X_0 \times^{H_1} X_1 \times^{H_2} \cdots \times^{H_m} X_m. \quad (1.1)$$

Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and let  $H_1, \dots, H_m$  be closed subgroups. For every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $H_i$  acts freely on  $G$  by multiplication on the right and  $G/H_i$  is an algebraic variety. Observe that for every  $1 \leq i < m$ ,  $H_i$  also acts on  $G$  by multiplication on the left, such that the actions of  $H_i$  and  $H_{i+1}$  on  $G$  associate. The quotient  $G \times^{H_1} \cdots \times^{H_m} G$  is an algebraic variety.

To see this, define  $\tilde{\varphi} : G \times \cdots \times G \rightarrow G \times \cdots \times G$  by

$$\tilde{\varphi}(g_0, \dots, g_m) = (g_0, g_0 g_1, \dots, g_0 g_1 \cdots g_m) \quad (1.2)$$

a morphism of varieties. Let  $\pi : G \times \cdots \times G \rightarrow G/H_1 \times \cdots \times G/H_m \times G$  denote the projection morphism of varieties. Then  $\pi \circ \tilde{\varphi}$  is constant on  $(H_1 \times \cdots \times H_m)$ -orbits, so gives a morphism of ringed spaces  $\varphi : G \times^{H_1} \cdots \times^{H_m} G \rightarrow G/H_1 \times \cdots \times G/H_m \times G$ , where

$$\varphi[g_0, \dots, g_m] = (g_0 H_1 / H_1, \dots, g_0 \cdots g_{m-1} H_m / H_m, g_0 \cdots g_m). \quad (1.3)$$

Define  $\tilde{\psi} : G \times \cdots \times G \rightarrow G \times \cdots \times G$  by

$$\tilde{\psi}(g_0, \dots, g_m) = (g_0, g_0^{-1} g_1, g_1^{-1} g_2, \dots, g_{m-1}^{-1} g_m), \quad (1.4)$$

a morphism of varieties. Note  $\tilde{\psi}$  is the inverse morphism of  $\tilde{\varphi}$ . Let  $\rho : G \times \cdots \times G \rightarrow G \times^{H_1} \cdots \times^{H_m} G$  be the quotient morphism. Then  $\rho \circ \tilde{\psi}$  is constant on  $(H_1 \times \cdots \times H_m)$ -orbits, so gives a morphism of ringed spaces  $\psi : G/H_1 \times \cdots \times G/H_m \times G \rightarrow G \times^{H_1} \cdots \times^{H_m} G$ , where

$$\psi(g_1 H_1/H_1, \dots, g_{m-1} H_m/H_m, g_m) = [g_1, g_1^{-1} g_2, g_2^{-1} g_3, \dots, g_{m-1}^{-1} g_m].$$

Then  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are inverse morphisms, so the ringed spaces are isomorphic. Hence the quotient is an algebraic variety.

All of our quotients will embed naturally into  $G \times^{H_1} \cdots \times^{H_m} G$  and again be algebraic varieties, so we can think of this as providing a safety zone for the ringed spaces on the quotient to be an algebraic variety. We illustrate this point of view by considering a simple case before presenting the general construction in (1.6).

Let  $G_0, \dots, G_m$  be closed subgroups of  $G$ , and for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , let  $H_i$  be a closed subgroup of  $G$  in  $G_{i-1} \cap G_i$ . Then  $G_0 \times^{H_1} \cdots \times^{H_m} G_m$  is an algebraic variety. Indeed, the morphism  $\tilde{\varphi}$  defined in (1.2) restricts to a closed embedding  $\tilde{\iota} : G_0 \times \cdots \times G_m \rightarrow G \times \cdots \times G$ . Hence the morphism  $\tilde{\psi}$  defined in (1.4) restricts to the inverse morphism, so  $\iota$  is an embedding of ringed spaces. The image of  $\iota$  is the fibered product

$$G_0/H_1 \times_{G/G_1} G/H_2 \times_{G/G_2} \cdots \times_{G/G_{m-1}} G/H_m \times_{G/G_m} G \quad (1.5)$$

which is a closed subvariety of the product. Therefore  $\iota$  is a closed embedding of algebraic varieties.

Our main construction uses Schubert varieties to construct quotient varieties as in (1.1). We note that this idea has appeared before by various authors (as in, e.g., [14]). The resulting varieties will be iterated fiber bundles of the corresponding Schubert varieties.

From now on, let  $G$  be a connected reductive algebraic group and fix a Borel subgroup  $B$  along with a maximal torus  $T \subseteq B$ . Let  $X = G/B$  be the flag variety of  $G$ . There are finitely many  $B$ -orbits on  $X$

$$X = \coprod_{w \in W} B\dot{w}B/B$$

where  $W = N_G(T)/T$  is the Weyl group of  $G$  and  $\dot{w}$  is a representative of  $w$  in  $N_G(T)$ , the normalizer of  $T$ . Let  $S$  be the set of simple reflections in  $W$  with respect to  $B$ .

We identify a standard parabolic subgroup  $B \subseteq P_I \subseteq G$  with subsets of simple reflections  $\emptyset \subseteq I \subseteq S$  such that for every  $s \in I$ ,  $P_I$  contains  $\dot{s}$  in  $G$ . In particular,  $P_I$  has semisimple rank  $\#I$ . We write  $X^I = G/P_I$  for the flag variety of  $G$  corresponding to  $I$ . There are finitely many  $B$ -orbits on  $X^I$

$$X^I = \coprod_{w \in W^I} B\dot{w}P_I/P_I$$

where  $(W_I, I)$  is the Weyl group generated by  $I$ , and we let  $W^I$  be the set of maximal length representatives of cosets in  $W/W_I$ . We set  $w_I = \max(W_I)$ , so in particular,  $w_S = \max(W)$ .

Given  $w \in W$ , let

$$\begin{aligned} G_w &= \overline{B\dot{w}B} \\ X_w &= \overline{B\dot{w}B/B} \\ X_w^I &= \overline{B\dot{w}P_I/P_I} \end{aligned}$$

be closures in  $G$ ,  $X$ , and  $X^I$ . In particular,  $G_{w_I} = P_I$ . Let  $\pi : G \rightarrow X$  be the quotient map, which is a fiber bundle with fiber  $B$ . Then base change of  $\pi$  with respect to the inclusion  $X_w \subseteq X$  gives a fiber bundle  $\pi' : G_w \rightarrow X_w$  with fiber  $B$  (as shown in Lemma 4.4).

The main construction used in this paper is as follows. Let  $w_0, \dots, w_m \in W$ . If for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $H_i$  stabilizes  $G_{w_{i-1}}$  by right multiplication and  $G_{w_i}$  by left multiplication, the quotient

$$G_{w_0} \times^{H_1} \dots \times^{H_m} G_{w_m} \tag{1.6}$$

is a well-defined ringed space – and in fact is an algebraic variety. Indeed, define  $\iota : G_{w_0} \times^{H_1} \dots \times^{H_m} G_{w_m} \rightarrow G/H_1 \times \dots \times G/H_m \times G$  by

$$\iota[g_0, \dots, g_m] = (g_0H_1/H_1, g_0g_1H_2/H_2, \dots, g_0 \cdots g_m) \tag{1.7}$$

the same formula as in (1.3). The diagram given by universal properties of quotients

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{w_0} \times \dots \times G_{w_m} & \xrightarrow{\subseteq} & G \times \dots \times G \\ \downarrow \rho' & & \downarrow \rho \\ G_{w_0} \times^{H_1} \dots \times^{H_m} G_{w_m} & \longrightarrow & G \times^{H_1} \dots \times^{H_m} G \end{array}$$

commutes. It follows that the image  $Z$  of  $\iota$  is closed, since the closed subset  $G_{w_0} \times \dots \times G_{w_m}$  of  $G \times \dots \times G$  is  $\rho$ -saturated and  $\rho$  is a surjective open map of topological spaces. Similar to (1.5),  $\iota$  is a closed embedding of algebraic varieties.

An algebraic variety of the form (1.6) was considered independently by [8] and [11], with  $G_{w_i}$  minimal parabolic subgroups ( $w_i = s_i \in S$ ), and  $H_i$  Borel subgroups. This variety enjoys many nice properties, such as being a smooth iterated fiber bundle of  $\mathbf{P}^1$ 's, after quotienting by a Borel subgroup on  $G_{w_m}$ . This construction was used to provide a resolution of singularities for any Schubert variety. Resolutions of this form are often called Demazure resolution, Bott-Samelson resolution, Bott-Samelson-Demazure-Hansen resolution, etc.

Demazure's resolution was generalized by Gelfand-MacPherson [9] using more general parabolic subgroups, i.e.,  $w_i = w_{I_i}$ , for various  $I_i \subseteq S$ . The quotients we consider (1.6) may be viewed as generalizations of those of [9]. These will have an iterated fiber bundle structure, but will not in general be smooth.

If for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we take  $H_i$  to be a parabolic subgroup  $R_i$ , then we define a proper algebraic morphism  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X$  and show the domain is an iterated fiber bundle. We will be interested in cases where  $\mu$  is either an isomorphism or is a resolution of singularities (onto its image), so we provide a proof that  $\mu$  is always proper, describe precisely when  $\mu$  is birational, and characterize when the domain of  $\mu$  is smooth in terms of Weyl group elements.

**Definition 1.8.** Define  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X$  by

$$\mu[g_0, \dots, g_m B/B] = g_0 \cdots g_m B/B. \tag{1.9}$$

Observe that for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $B$  stabilizes  $G_{w_i}$  on the left and on the right. From here and below, we assume that for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , the parabolic subgroup  $R_i$  is a parabolic subgroup containing  $B$  corresponding to simple reflections  $J_i$ .

**Proposition 1.10.**

- (i) The map  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X$  defined in (1.9) is a proper algebraic morphism with image  $X_w$  for some  $w \in W$ .
- (ii) The variety  $G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B$  is an iterated Zariski locally trivial fiber bundle.
- (iii) The map  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$  is birational if and only if

$$\ell(w) = \sum_{i=0}^m \ell(w_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \ell(w_{J_i}) \quad (1.11)$$

i.e.,  $\mu$  is birational if and only if it is generically finite.

- (iv) The variety  $G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B$  is smooth if and only if for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , the Schubert variety  $X_{w_i}$  is smooth.

*Proof of (i).* Define  $\iota : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X^{J_1} \times \dots \times X^{J_m} \times X$  by

$$\iota[g_0, \dots, g_m B/B] = (g_0 R_1/R_1, g_0 g_1 R_2/R_2, \dots, g_0 \dots g_m B/B).$$

Similar to (1.7),  $\iota$  is a closed embedding. Hence  $G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B$  is a projective variety. It follows that  $\mu$  is a proper algebraic morphism, since any algebraic morphism between projective varieties is a projective morphism. The quotient  $G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B$  is irreducible since it is the image of the irreducible product  $G_{w_0} \times \dots \times G_{w_m}$  under the quotient morphism. It follows that the image of  $\mu$  is closed ( $\mu$  is proper), irreducible (the domain of  $\mu$  is irreducible), and  $B$ -stable ( $\mu$  is  $B$ -equivariant). Hence the image of  $\mu$  is equal to  $X_w$  for some  $w \in W$ .  $\square$

*Proof of (ii).* Let  $R$  be a standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to  $J \subseteq S$ , and let  $w \in W$  such that  $R$  stabilizes  $G_w$  by right multiplication. By [12], the map  $\pi : G \rightarrow X^J$  has local sections. It follows that the base change to  $G_w \rightarrow X_w^J$  also has local sections. By [18, §5.5.8], the map  $G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} Y \rightarrow X_{w_0}^{J_1}$  has local sections, where  $Y = G_{w_1} \times^{R_2} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B$ . The claim follows by recursion.  $\square$

*Proof of (iii).* By part (ii), the dimension of the domain of  $\mu$  is

$$\dim(X_{w_0}^{J_1}) + \dim(Y) = \ell(w_0) - \ell(w_{J_1}) + \dim(Y)$$

where the equality follows from the fiber bundle  $X_{w_0} \rightarrow X_{w_0}^{J_1}$  with fiber  $R_1/B$ . Hence the dimension of the domain of  $\mu$  is  $\sum_{i=0}^m \ell(w_i) - \sum_{i=1}^m \ell(w_{J_i})$  by recursion. It follows that  $\mu$  is generically finite if and only if (1.11) holds true.

It remains to show that  $\mu$  is in fact birational. We will first show that

$$\mu^{-1}(B\dot{w}B/B) \cong B\dot{w}B/B \times \mu^{-1}(\dot{w}B/B).$$

Then (1.11) will force  $\mu^{-1}(\dot{w}B/B)$  to be finite by generic finiteness. The irreducibility of the domain of  $\mu$  forces the open set  $\mu^{-1}(B\dot{w}B/B)$  to be irreducible, which will then force  $\mu^{-1}(\dot{w}B/B)$  to be a single point.

Let  $U$  be the unipotent radical of  $B$ . The closed irreducible subgroup  $U_{w^{-1}} = U \cap \dot{w} \dot{w}_S U \dot{w}_S \dot{w}^{-1}$  of  $U$  is described by [18, §8.3.5]. Then [18, §8.3.6] gives an isomorphism  $\eta : B\dot{w}B/B \cong U_{w^{-1}}$  having inverse  $u \mapsto u\dot{w}B/B$ . Define  $\alpha : B\dot{w}B/B \times \mu^{-1}(x) \rightarrow \mu^{-1}(B\dot{w}B/B)$  by  $\alpha(x, y) = \eta(x)y$ , where  $x \in B\dot{w}B/B$  and  $y \in \mu^{-1}(\dot{w}B/B)$ .

Define  $\beta : \mu^{-1}(B\dot{w}B/B) \rightarrow B\dot{w}B/B \times \mu^{-1}(\dot{w}B/B)$  by  $\beta(y) = (\mu(y), \eta(\mu(y))^{-1}y)$ , where  $y \in \mu^{-1}(B\dot{w}B/B)$ . It is a routine calculation to check that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are inverse regular maps. It follows that  $\mu$  is birational.  $\square$

*Proof of (iv).* By part (ii), the variety  $G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B$  is the total space of a fiber bundle with base  $X_{w_0}^{J_1}$  and fiber  $Y = G_{w_1} \times^{R_2} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B$ . Hence the fiber bundle is smooth if and only if both  $X_{w_0}^{J_1}$  and  $Y$  are smooth.

The fiber bundle  $X_{w_0} \rightarrow X_{w_0}^{J_1}$  has smooth fiber  $R_1/B$  since it is the base change of  $X \rightarrow X^{J_1}$  by  $X_{w_0}^{J_1} \subseteq X^{J_1}$  inclusion. Hence  $X_{w_0}^{J_1}$  is smooth if and only if  $X_{w_0}$  is smooth. By recursion, the iterated fiber bundle is smooth if and only if for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , the Schubert variety  $X_{w_i}$  is smooth.  $\square$

## 2. THE MONOID $(W, \star)$

We use  $\mu$  to define a monoid product  $\star$  on the Weyl group  $W$ . The monoid is used to define a function  $\tau$  from  $W$  to subsets of simple reflections, where  $\tau(w)$  is often called the  $\tau$ -invariant or the right descents of  $w$ . Comparing  $\tau$  to another function  $\sigma$  called the support will be used repeatedly in this paper to study  $(W, \star)$ . This monoid coincides with that of Richardson-Springer [14].

Recall that a *monoid* is a set together with an associative law of composition  $M \times M \rightarrow M$  such that  $M$  contains an identity element.

Define  $\star : W \times W \rightarrow W$  by  $v \star w = u$ , where  $X_u$  is the image of  $\mu : G_v \times^R X_w \rightarrow X$  as in Proposition 1.10 part (i). Explicitly, we have

$$X_{v \star w} = \text{Im}(\mu) = \overline{B\dot{v}B\dot{w}B/B}$$

where  $\mu$  is defined by any parabolic subgroup  $R \supseteq B$  such that  $R$  stabilizes  $G_v$  on the right and  $X_w$  on the left (the image of  $\mu$  does not depend on the choice of  $R$ ). Equivalently,  $v \star w$  may be defined in  $G$  by

$$G_{v \star w} = G_v G_w \tag{2.1}$$

i.e.,  $\overline{B(v \star w)B} = \overline{B\dot{v}B\dot{w}B}$ . The monoid associativity and identity element properties are easy to see.

**Facts 2.2.** *There are a few easy facts about  $\star$  that we will use many times.*

- (a) For any  $v, w \in W$ , we have  $(v \star w)^{-1} = w^{-1} \star v^{-1}$ .
- (b) If  $J \subseteq S$  and  $w_J$  is the long element of  $W_J$ , then  $G_{w_J} = P_J$  and  $G_{v \star w_J} = G_v P_J$ .
- (c)  $v, w, vw \leq v \star w$ .

*Proof.* (a) Apply the group inverse to (2.1). (b) See [18, §8.4.3]. (c) We have  $X_v, X_w, X_{vw} \subseteq G_v G_w/B = X_{v \star w}$  since  $B$  is contained in each  $G_u$ .  $\square$

Consider  $w \in W$  and  $s \in S$ . It is well-known that

$$G_w G_s = \overline{B\dot{w}B\dot{s}B} = \begin{cases} \overline{B\dot{w}\dot{s}B}, & \ell(ws) = \ell(w) + 1, \\ \overline{B\dot{w}B}, & \ell(ws) = \ell(w) - 1. \end{cases}$$

e.g., by [18, §8.3.7]. Therefore,

$$w \star s = \begin{cases} ws, & \ell(ws) = \ell(w) + 1, \\ w, & \ell(ws) = \ell(w) - 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

**Definition 2.4.** Define the function  $\tau$  from  $W$  to subsets of  $S$  by

$$\tau(w) = \{s \in S \mid w \star s = w\},$$

called the  $\tau$ -invariant of  $w$ . This set of simple reflections is often called the *right descents* of  $w$ . The terminology of  $\tau$ -invariant is popular in representation theory (as, e.g., in [5]).

**Facts 2.5.** *The following is a list of easy facts.*

- (a)  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \{s \in S \mid s \star w = w\}$ .
- (b) If  $s_\alpha$  is the reflection in the simple root  $\alpha$ , then  $s_\alpha$  is in  $\tau(w)$  if and only if  $w\alpha < 0$ .
- (c)  $\tau(w) \subseteq \tau(v \star w)$ .
- (d) If  $J \subseteq S$  then  $\tau(w_J) = J$ .

*Proof.* (a) The relation  $\overline{B\dot{s}B\dot{w}B}^{-1} = \overline{B\dot{w}^{-1}B\dot{s}B}$  holds in  $G$ . (b) Let  $\Phi$  be the set of roots of  $(G, T)$ , let  $\Phi^+$  be the roots of  $(B, T)$ , and let

$$\Phi(w) = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid w\alpha \in -\Phi^+\}$$

be the *right inversions* of  $w$ . Then

$$\Phi(ws_\alpha) = \begin{cases} s_\alpha\Phi(w) \cup \{\alpha\}, & \text{if } w\alpha \in \Phi^+, \\ s_\alpha(\Phi(w) \setminus \{\alpha\}), & \text{if } w\alpha \in -\Phi^+, \end{cases}$$

by [18, §8.3.1]. The claim follows by (2.3) since  $\ell(w) = \#\Phi(w)$ . (c) If  $s \in \tau(w)$  then

$$(v \star w) \star s = v \star (w \star s) = v \star w$$

so  $s \in \tau(v \star w)$ . (d) The relation  $\tau(w_J) = \Phi(w_J) \cap S$  holds by (b). Observe that  $\Phi(w_J)$  is the set of roots corresponding to the Levi of  $P_J$  by [18, §8.4]. Hence  $\Phi(w_J) \cap S = J$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $v = s_1 \cdots s_k$  and  $w = t_1 \cdots t_\ell$  be reduced expressions. Then the following hold.*

- (a)  $v = s_1 \star \cdots \star s_k$ .
- (b) For some  $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_j \leq \ell$ ,

$$v \star w = s_1 \cdots s_k t_{i_1} \cdots t_{i_j} \tag{2.7}$$

*is a reduced expression.*

- (c)  $\ell(v), \ell(w) \leq \ell(v \star w) \leq \ell(v) + \ell(w)$ .
- (d) If  $\ell(v \star w) = \ell(v) + \ell(w)$ , then  $v \star w = vw$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $G_v \subseteq \overline{B\dot{s}_1B \cdots B\dot{s}_kB}$ , so  $v \leq s_1 \star \cdots \star s_k$ . But  $k = \ell(v) \geq \ell(s_1 \star \cdots \star s_k)$  by (2.3), so  $v = s_1 \star \cdots \star s_k$ . (b) This follows from (a) and (2.3). (c) This is immediate from (b). (d)  $vw \leq v \star w$  by Facts 2.2 part (c). By (b), the only way  $k + j = k + \ell$  is for every  $1 \leq h \leq \ell$ , we have  $i_h = h$ .  $\square$

*Remark 2.8.* If  $\leq_R$  denotes the *right weak order* on  $W$  (as, e.g., in [18, §3.1]), then Proposition 2.6 tells us that  $v \leq_R v \star w$ , for any  $v, w \in W$ .

**Definition 2.9.** Define the function  $\sigma$  from  $W$  to subsets of  $S$  by

$$\sigma(w) = \{s \in S \mid s \leq w\}$$

called the *support* of  $w$ .



Thus  $s \in \sigma(w)$  if and only if  $G_s \subseteq G_w$ . The ‘subword property’ of Bruhat order [4, Theorem 2.2.2] easily implies that if  $w \in W$ , then all reduced expressions for  $w$  contain the same simple reflections. The support of  $w$  is this set of simple reflections.

**Facts 2.10.** *The following is a list of simple facts.*

- (a)  $\sigma(w^{-1}) = \sigma(w)$ .
- (b)  $\sigma(w_J) = J$ .
- (c) If  $v \leq w$  then  $\sigma(v) \subseteq \sigma(w)$ .
- (d)  $\tau(w) \subseteq \sigma(w)$ .
- (e)  $\sigma(v \star w) = \sigma(v) \cup \sigma(w)$ .

*Proof.* (a) If  $G_s \subseteq G_w$  then  $G_s \subseteq G_{w^{-1}}$ , by taking the inverse. (b) If  $s$  is in  $\sigma(w_J)$  then  $G_s \subseteq G_{w_J} = P_J$ . Hence  $s$  is in  $J$ . If  $s$  is in  $J$  then  $s \leq w_J$  so  $s$  is in  $\sigma(w_J)$ . (c) Let  $s$  be in  $\sigma(v)$ . Then  $s \leq v$ . Hence  $s \leq w$  and  $s$  is in  $\sigma(w)$ . (d) Let  $s$  be in  $\tau(w)$ . Then  $G_w P_s = G_w$  so  $P_s \subseteq G_w$  since  $B \subseteq G_w$ . Hence  $s$  is in  $\sigma(w)$ . (e) Let  $s$  be in  $\sigma(v \star w)$ . Then Proposition 2.6 part (b) shows  $s$  is in  $\sigma(v)$  or  $\sigma(w)$ . If  $s$  is in  $\sigma(v) \cup \sigma(w)$  then  $G_s \subseteq G_v G_w = G_{v \star w}$ . Hence  $s$  is in  $\sigma(v \star w)$ .  $\square$

The following Lemma will be used later on.

**Lemma 2.11.** *Let  $w$  be in  $W$  and  $I \subseteq S$ . The following are equivalent.*

- (a)  $X_w = P_I/B$ .
- (b)  $w = w_I$ .
- (c)  $\sigma(w) = \tau(w) = I$ .

*Proof.* If  $X_w = P_I/B$  then  $G_w = P_I = G_{w_I}$  so  $w = w_I$ . Suppose that  $w = w_I$  so  $\sigma(w) = I$  and  $\tau(w) = I$  by Facts 2.10 (b) and Facts 2.5 (d). Suppose  $\sigma(w) = \tau(w) = I$ . Then  $G_w \subseteq P_I$  since  $G_v \subseteq P_{\sigma(v)}$  always holds. For every  $s \in I = \tau(w)$ , we have  $G_w P_s = G_w$ . Since  $P_I$  is generated by  $\{P_s \mid s \in I\}$  we have  $G_w P_I = G_w$ , so  $P_I \subseteq G_w$ .  $\square$

### 3. FIBER BUNDLE DECOMPOSITIONS AND BP DECOMPOSITIONS

Richmond-Slofstra define the notion of BP decomposition in any Coxeter group. They use this to prove that a necessary and sufficient condition for the morphism  $\pi : X_w^J \rightarrow X_w^I$  to be a fiber bundle, where  $J \subseteq I$ , is characterized in terms of BP decompositions. So, in this case, the geometry of  $X_w^J$  is reduced to the geometry of a Schubert variety in a simpler flag variety  $X_w^I$  and a smaller dimensional  $X_u^J$  in the same flag variety as  $X_w^J$ .

In this section, we describe the fiber bundle structure of  $X_w^J$  explicitly as a Bott-Samelson type variety. We choose to work only with  $X_w$  for notational convenience, but the general case follows directly using, for example, Lemma 4.4. Our main result in this section is Proposition 3.11, which provides three isomorphisms of the form  $\mu$ , as in Proposition 1.10, onto  $X_w$  whenever  $w$  admits a BP decomposition. The various isomorphisms will allow us to: (i) describe  $X_w$  in terms of smaller dimensional Schubert varieties in the same flag variety, (ii) describe  $X_w$  in terms of Schubert varieties in smaller flag varieties, and (iii) force  $\mu$  to satisfy maximal equivariance, as in (3).

We apply our perspective to some results from [15] that we will need in later sections. One main result we will use from [15, Theorem 3.6] provides a fiber

bundle structure for any  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth (also known as rationally smooth) Schubert variety, with base a Schubert variety in a maximal parabolic flag variety.

Using our second isomorphism in Proposition 3.11, we can iterate this procedure directly to describe their sequence of fiber bundles [15, Corollary 3.7] as a single Bott-Samelson type variety. This leads to the definition of complete BP decomposition from [16], which we use repeatedly in the sequel.

We consider the morphism  $\mu$  of Proposition 1.10 and give some information on the fiber. This will be applied to determine when  $\mu$  is birational, and also provide information on  $\tau$  and  $\sigma$ .

Let  $u = v \star w$ , set  $J = \tau(v) \cap \tau(w^{-1})$ , and let  $R = P_J$  be the corresponding standard parabolic subgroup. By Proposition 1.10, the map

$$\mu : G_v \times^R X_w \rightarrow X_u, \quad \mu[g, x] = gx$$

is well-defined and proper. Note that  $G_v R \subseteq G_v P_{\tau(v)} \subseteq G_v$  by definition of  $\tau(v)$ ; similarly  $R G_w \subseteq G_w$ , so  $R$  stabilizes  $G_v$  and  $G_w$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *If  $y \leq u$ , then*

$$\mu^{-1}(\dot{y}B/B) \cong X_v^J \cap \dot{y}X_{w^{-1}}^J.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi : G_v \times^R X_w \rightarrow X_v^J \times X_u$  by

$$\varphi[g, x] = (gR/R, gx),$$

as in (1.3). The diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_v \times^R X_w & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \text{Im}(\varphi) \\ & \searrow \mu & \swarrow \text{pr}_2 \\ & & X_u \end{array}$$

commutes. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{-1}(\dot{y}B/B) &\cong \text{pr}_2^{-1}(\dot{y}B/B) \\ &= \{(gR/R, \dot{y}B/B) \in X_v^J \times X_u \mid g^{-1}\dot{y} \in G_w\} \\ &\cong \{gR/R \in X_v^J \mid g \in \dot{y}G_{w^{-1}}\} \\ &= X_v^J \cap \dot{y}X_{w^{-1}}^J \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where the second isomorphism is projecting to the first factor.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.3.**  *$\mu$  is an isomorphism if and only if*

$$\sigma(v) \cap \sigma(w) \subseteq J = \tau(v) \cap \tau(w^{-1}).$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\mu$  is an isomorphism. We need to show  $\sigma(v) \cap \sigma(w) \subseteq J$ . By (3.2), we have  $\mu^{-1}(B/B) \cong X_v^J \cap X_{w^{-1}}^J$ , which is equal to the point  $\{R/R\}$  since  $\mu$  is an isomorphism. Let  $s \in \sigma(v) \cap \sigma(w)$ . Then  $G_s = P_s \subseteq G_v$  by definition of  $\sigma(v)$ . So  $G_s R \subseteq G_v R$ . Also  $G_s R/R \subseteq X_{w^{-1}}^J$  by definition of  $s \in \sigma(w) = \sigma(w^{-1})$ . So  $G_s R/R \subseteq X_v^J \cap X_{w^{-1}}^J = \{R/R\}$ , that is,  $G_s R = R$ . So  $s \in \tau(w_J^{-1}) = \tau(w_J) = J$ .

Conversely, by upper semi-continuity of proper morphisms, it suffices to show that the fiber  $\mu^{-1}(B/B)$  is a point. Observe  $X_v^J \cap X_{w^{-1}}^J$  is closed and  $B$ -stable, so it is a union of Schubert varieties. Let  $X_y^J$  be an irreducible component. But  $\sigma(y) \subseteq \sigma(v) \cap \sigma(w^{-1}) \subseteq J$  so  $X_y^J = G_y R/R = R/R$ . Now  $\mu$  is a bijective morphism onto a normal variety, so is an isomorphism by Zariski's Main Theorem.  $\square$

*Remark 3.4.* Recall that  $J = \tau(v) \cap \tau(w^{-1}) \subseteq \sigma(v) \cap \sigma(w)$  always holds by Facts 2.10 (d). So  $\mu$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $\tau(v) \cap \tau(w^{-1}) = \sigma(v) \cap \sigma(w)$ .

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $I_0, I_1 \subseteq S$  and  $w = w_{I_0} \star w_{I_1}$ . For  $R_1 = P_{I_0} \cap P_{I_1}$  the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to  $I_0 \cap I_1$ ,*

$$\mu : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} P_{I_1} / B \rightarrow X_w$$

*is always an isomorphism. Furthermore,*

$$\mu' : P_{\tau(w^{-1})} \times^R P_{\tau(w)} / B \rightarrow X_w, \quad (3.6)$$

*where  $R = P_{\tau(w^{-1})} \cap P_{\tau(w)}$ , is an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* The relation (3.3) holds since  $\sigma(w_I) = \tau(w_I) = \sigma(w_I^{-1})$ , so  $\mu$  is an isomorphism. For the second statement, note that  $w = w_{I_0} \star w_{I_1}$  implies that  $I_0 \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$  and  $I_1 \subseteq \tau(w)$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_{\tau(w)} &= (w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_{I_0}) \star (w_{I_1} \star w_{\tau(w)}) \\ &= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w \star w_{\tau(w)} \\ &= w. \end{aligned}$$

Now the first statement applies to conclude  $\mu'$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

In this section, we provide three isomorphisms of the form  $\mu$  to  $X_w$ , whenever  $w$  admits a BP decomposition.

Suppose  $J \subseteq S$  and  $w \in W$ . By [4, Corollary 2.4.5], there exists a unique minimal (with respect to Bruhat order) element  $u_0$  in the coset  $wW_J$ . We may therefore write  $w = u_0 u_1$  for  $u_1$  in  $W_J$ . This expression for  $w$  is called the *parabolic decomposition* of  $w$  with respect to  $J$ .

**Facts 3.7.** *Let  $w = u_0 u_1$  be a parabolic decomposition with respect to  $J$ .*

- (a)  $\ell(w) = \ell(u_0) + \ell(u_1)$  and  $w = u_0 u_1 = u_0 \star u_1$ .
- (b)  $w = u_0 u_1$  is also a parabolic decomposition with respect to  $\sigma(u_1)$ .
- (c) Suppose  $J \subseteq \tau(w)$ . Then  $w = (w w_J^{-1}) w_J$  is parabolic with respect to  $J$ . In particular, if  $J \subseteq I$ , then  $w_I = (w_I w_J^{-1}) w_J$  is parabolic with respect to  $J$ .
- (d) If  $w = u_0 u_1$  is a parabolic decomposition, then  $\tau(u_0) \cap \tau(u_1^{-1}) = \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* (a) See [4, Proposition 2.4.4] for the first statement. The second statement follows from Proposition 2.6. (b) The relation  $\sigma(u_1) \subseteq J$  shows that  $u_0$  is also minimal with respect to  $\sigma(u_1)$ . (c) Let  $w = u_0 u_1$  be the parabolic decomposition of  $w$  with respect to  $J$ . Suppose (for a contradiction) that  $u_1$  is not equal to  $w_J$ . Then there exists  $s$  in  $J$  such that  $\ell(u_1 s) = \ell(u_1) + 1$ . Let  $v_0 v_1$  be the parabolic decomposition of  $v = w s$  with respect to  $J$ . Then  $v = u_0 u_1 s$ ,  $u_0 = \min(wsW_J) = \min(wW_J)$ , and  $u_1 s$  in  $W_J$  force  $v_0 = u_0$  and  $v_1 = u_1 s$  by the uniqueness of parabolic decomposition. Hence  $\ell(w) = \ell(v_0) + \ell(v_1) = \ell(u_0) + \ell(u_1 s) = \ell(u_0) + \ell(u_1) + 1$  gives us the desired contradiction, since  $\ell(w) = \ell(u_0) + \ell(u_1)$ . (d) The minimal element  $u_0$  satisfies  $\tau(u_0) \cap J = \emptyset$  since  $\ell(u_0 s) > \ell(u_0)$  for every  $s$  in  $J$ . But  $\tau(u_1^{-1}) \subseteq \sigma(u_1^{-1}) = \sigma(u_1) \subseteq J$  so the claim follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $u = vw$  be any expression for which  $\ell(u) = \ell(v) + \ell(w)$ . Then  $\tau(u) \subseteq \tau(v) \cup \sigma(w)$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $\ell(w)$ . If  $\ell(w) = 0$  then  $u = v$  and there is nothing to prove.

Assume  $\ell(w) \geq 1$  and consider reduced expressions

$$v = s_1 \cdots s_k, \quad w = t_1 \cdots t_\ell$$

where  $\ell \geq 1$ . Then  $u = s_1 \cdots s_k t_1 \cdots t_\ell$  is a reduced expression. Let  $s \in \tau(u) \setminus \sigma(w)$  and write  $t = t_\ell$ . Claim:  $s \in \tau(ut)$ .

Consider  $I = \{s, t\}$  and let  $u = u_0 u_1$  be the parabolic decomposition of  $u$  with respect to  $I$ . We have  $s, t \in \tau(u)$ , so  $u_1 = w_I$  by Facts 3.7 (c). Any reduced expression of  $w_I$  alternates  $s$  and  $t$ , so we can find  $y < w$  such that  $w_I = yst$ , where  $\ell(w_I) = \ell(y) + \ell(s) + \ell(t)$ . Then  $ut = u_0 y s$  such that  $\ell(ut) = \ell(u_0) + \ell(y) + 1$ , so  $ut = u_0 \star y \star s$  by Proposition 2.6. It follows that  $ut \star s = ut$ , i.e.,  $s \in \tau(ut)$  as claimed.

Apply the induction hypothesis to  $ut = v(wt)$ , so we have  $s \in \tau(v)$  since  $s \notin \sigma(wt)$ . It follows that  $\tau(u) \subseteq \tau(v) \cup \sigma(w)$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.9.** A *Billey-Postnikov decomposition* (or *BP decomposition*) of  $w$  with respect to  $I$  is a parabolic decomposition  $w = u_0 u_1$  with respect to  $I$  such that

$$\sigma(u_0) \cap I \subseteq \tau(u_1^{-1}). \quad (3.10)$$

Note that a BP decomposition with respect to  $I$  is also a BP decomposition with respect to  $\sigma(u_1)$  since

$$\sigma(u_0) \cap \sigma(u_1) \subseteq \tau(u_1^{-1})$$

holds true.

**Proposition 3.11.** *Suppose  $w = u_0 u_1$  is a BP decomposition with respect to some  $I$ . Let  $J = \sigma(u_0) \cap \sigma(u_1)$ ,  $J' = \tau(u_1^{-1})$ , and  $J'' = \tau(w_0)$ , where  $w_0 = u_0 \star w_{J'}$ . Let  $v_0 = u_0 \star w_J$ ,  $w_1 = w_{J'} \star u_1$ , and let  $R, R', R''$  be the standard parabolic subgroups corresponding to  $J, J', J''$  respectively. Then the following hold.*

- (i)  $w = v_0 \star u_1$ ,  $J = \tau(v_0) \cap \tau(u_1^{-1})$ , and  $\mu : G_{v_0} \times^R X_{u_1} \rightarrow X_w$  is an isomorphism.
- (ii)  $w = w_0 \star u_1$ ,  $J' = \tau(w_0) \cap \tau(u_1^{-1})$ , and  $\mu' : G_{w_0} \times^{R'} X_{u_1} \rightarrow X_w$  is an isomorphism such that  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1})$ .
- (iii)  $w = w_0 \star w_1$ ,  $J'' = \tau(w_0) \cap \tau(w_1^{-1})$ , and  $\mu'' : G_{w_0} \times^{R''} G_{w_1} \rightarrow G_w$  is an isomorphism such that  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1})$  and  $\tau(w) = \tau(w_1)$ .

*Proof.* (i) It is enough to show that

$$\sigma(v_0) \cap \sigma(u_1) \subseteq J$$

by (3.3). But  $\sigma(v_0) = \sigma(u_0 \star w_J) = \sigma(u_0) \cup J$  by Facts 2.10.

(ii) The relation

$$\sigma(w_0) \cap \sigma(u_1) \subseteq J'$$

holds since  $\sigma(w_0) \cap \sigma(u_1) = \sigma(u_0 \star w_{J'}) \cap \sigma(u_1) = (\sigma(u_0) \cup J') \cap \sigma(u_1)$  and  $J \subseteq J'$ .

By Facts 2.5, we have  $\tau(w_0^{-1}) \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$  since  $w = w_0 \star u_1$ . The other inclusion takes more work. We prove  $\tilde{\mu}' : G_{w'_0} \times^{R'} X_{u_1} \rightarrow X_w$  is an isomorphism, where  $w'_0 = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u_0 \star w_{J'}$ . Once this is done, we will have  $w_0 = u_0 \star w_{J'} \leq w'_0$ . But the dimensions of the fiber bundle gives  $\ell(w) = \dim(X_w) = \ell(w'_0) - \ell(w_{J'}) + \ell(u_1)$  and  $\ell(w) = \dim(X_w) = \ell(w_0) + \ell(u_1) - \ell(w_{J'})$ , from  $\mu'$ . Therefore,  $\ell(w_0) = \ell(w'_0)$ , so  $w_0 = w'_0$ . That is,  $w_0 = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u_0 \star w_{J'}$ . So  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_{\tau(w^{-1})}^{-1}) \subseteq \tau(w_0^{-1})$ , and we will have the final statement of (ii).

We now prove that  $\tilde{\mu}'$  is an isomorphism. First  $w'_0 \star u_1 = (w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u_0 \star w_{J'}) \star u_1 = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u_0 \star (w_{J'} \star u_1) = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star (u_0 \star u_1) = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w = w$ . Next,  $\tau(w'_0) \cap \tau(u_1^{-1}) = \tau(u_1^{-1}) = J'$ , since  $\tau(u_1^{-1}) = J' \subseteq \tau(w'_0)$  by Facts 2.5. Then the condition for isomorphism of (3.3)

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(w'_0) \cap \sigma(u_1) &= (\tau(w^{-1}) \cup \sigma(u_0) \cup J') \cap \sigma(u_1) \\
&= (\tau(w^{-1}) \cap \sigma(u_1)) \cup (\sigma(u_0) \cap \sigma(u_1)) \cup (J' \cap \sigma(u_1)) \\
&\subseteq (\tau(w^{-1}) \cap \sigma(u_1)) \cup J' \quad \text{by (3.10)} \\
&\subseteq ((\tau(u_1^{-1}) \cup \sigma(u_0^{-1})) \cap \sigma(u_1)) \cup J' \quad \text{by Lemma 3.8} \\
&\subseteq (J' \cap \sigma(u_1)) \cup (\sigma(u_0) \cap \sigma(u_1)) \cup J' \\
&\subseteq (J' \cap \sigma(u_1)) \cup J' \quad \text{by (3.10)} \\
&\subseteq J'
\end{aligned}$$

is satisfied.

(iii) The relation

$$\sigma(w_0) \cap \sigma(w_1) \subseteq J''$$

holds since  $\sigma(w_0) \cap \sigma(w_1) = (\sigma(u_0) \cup J') \cap (J' \cup \sigma(u_1))$  and  $J \subseteq J' \subseteq J''$ .

By Facts 2.5, we have  $\tau(w_1) \subseteq \tau(w)$  since  $w = w_0 \star w_1$ . We prove  $\tilde{\mu}'' : G_{w_0} \times^{R''} G_{w'_1} \rightarrow G_w$  is an isomorphism, where  $w'_1 = w_1 \star w_{\tau(w)}$ . Similar to the proof of (ii), this will give the final statement of (iii).

The subset of simple reflections

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma(w_0) \cap \sigma(w'_1) &= (\sigma(u_0) \cup J') \cap (J' \cup \sigma(u_1) \cup \tau(w)) \\
&\subseteq J'' \cup ((\sigma(u_0) \cup J') \cap \tau(w)) \\
&= J'' \cup (\sigma(u_0) \cap \tau(w)) \cup (J' \cap \tau(w))
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

is contained in  $J''$  if and only if  $\sigma(u_0) \cap \tau(w) \subseteq J''$ . Let  $s$  be in  $\sigma(u_0) \cap \tau(w)$ . If  $s$  is in  $\sigma(u_1)$  then  $s$  is in  $\sigma(u_0) \cap \sigma(u_1) = J \subseteq J' \subseteq J''$ . It remains to show that if  $s$  is in  $\sigma(u_0) \cap \tau(w)$  but not  $\sigma(u_1)$  then  $s$  is in  $J''$ .

Let  $w_0 = u_0 w_{J'}$  and  $u_1^{-1} = v_1 w_{J'}$  be parabolic decompositions with respect to  $J'$ . Then  $w = u_0 u_1 = (u_0 w_{J'}) v_1^{-1}$  satisfies  $\ell(w) = \ell(u_0 w_{J'}) + \ell(v_1^{-1})$  since  $\ell(u_0) + \ell(u_1) = \ell(u_0) + \ell(w_{J'}) + \ell(v_1^{-1}) = \ell(u_0 w_{J'}) + \ell(v_1^{-1})$ . Applying Lemma 3.8 to the above relation shows that  $s$  is in  $\tau(u_0 w_{J'}) = \tau(u_0 \star w_{J'}) = \tau(w_0)$  since  $\sigma(v_1^{-1}) \subseteq \sigma(u_1)$  by Facts 2.10. But  $J'' = \tau(w_0)$  so the claim follows.  $\square$

*Remark 3.13.* The first isomorphism to  $X_w$  in Proposition 3.11 (i) is best for providing small dimensional  $X_{v_0}$  and  $X_{u_1}$  in the same flag variety as  $X_w$  (i.e., this is the best chance of giving  $\ell(v_0) < \ell(w)$ ). In this paper, we will most often use the second isomorphism in Proposition 3.11 (ii) because it is best suited for describing  $X_w$  in terms of a Schubert variety in a smaller flag variety  $X_{w_0}^{J'}$  and a smaller dimensional Schubert variety  $X_{u_1}$  in the same flag variety as  $X_w$ . We will use an isomorphism similar to Proposition 3.11 (iii) in the sequel when we need to satisfy (3). However, ensuring that  $\ell(w_1) < \ell(w)$  can require additional care.

In this section, we recall grassmannian BP decompositions from [15]. We use Proposition 3.11 to describe all  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth Schubert varieties as Bott-Samelson type varieties. This leads naturally to the notion of a complete BP decomposition, which is an iterated version of grassmannian BP decomposition.

We recall terminology from [15]. A *generalized grassmannian* is a flag variety  $X^I$  such that  $\#(S \setminus I) = 1$ . A *grassmannian Schubert variety* is a Schubert variety  $X_w^I$  in a generalized grassmannian. A *grassmannian parabolic decomposition* is a parabolic decomposition of  $w$  with respect to  $I$  such that  $\#(\sigma(w) \cap I) = \#\sigma(w) - 1$ . A *grassmannian BP decomposition* is a BP decomposition that is a grassmannian parabolic decomposition.

**Facts 3.14.** *We list some facts describing the terminology, along with some easy facts we will use.*

- (a) *If  $w = u_0 u_1$  is a grassmannian parabolic decomposition with respect to  $I$ , then  $X_w^I$  is isomorphic to a grassmannian Schubert variety (possibly for a smaller group).*
- (b) *If  $\#(\sigma(w) \setminus \tau(w)) \leq 1$ , then  $X_w^{\tau(w)}$  is isomorphic to a grassmannian Schubert variety such that  $X_w \rightarrow X_w^{\tau(w)}$  is the base change of the fiber bundle  $X \rightarrow X^{\tau(w)}$  with respect to inclusion.*
- (c) *A grassmannian BP decomposition  $w = u_0 u_1$  with respect to  $I$  is also a grassmannian BP decomposition of  $w$  with respect to  $\sigma(u_1)$ .*
- (d) *If  $w = u_0 u_1$  is a grassmannian BP decomposition with respect to  $I$  then  $\#\tau(u_0) = 1$ .*

*Proof.* (a) Let  $L_{\sigma(w)}$  be the (connected reductive) Levi subgroup of  $P_{\sigma(w)}$ . Then  $X_w^I \subseteq G/P_I$  is isomorphic to  $X_w^{\sigma(w) \cap I} \subseteq L_{\sigma(w)}/(L_{\sigma(w)} \cap P_{\sigma(w) \cap I})$  since the inclusion of flag varieties gives a closed embedding of Schubert varieties of the same dimension. Note that  $L_{\sigma(w)} \cap P_{\sigma(w) \cap I}$  is a parabolic subgroup of  $L_{\sigma(w)}$  containing the Borel subgroup  $L_{\sigma(w)} \cap B$ , and it corresponds to the simple reflections  $\sigma(w) \cap I$  (e.g., by [18, §8.4]). The flag variety corresponding to the Levi is a generalized grassmannian since  $\#(\sigma(w) \setminus (\sigma(w) \cap I)) = 1$  by definition of grassmannian parabolic decomposition.

(b) Suppose that  $\#(\sigma(w) \setminus \tau(w)) \leq 1$ . If  $\sigma(w) = \tau(w)$  then  $X_w = P_{\tau(w)}/B$  and  $P_{\tau(w)}/P_{\tau(w)}$  is isomorphic to the minimum Schubert variety in any (grassmannian) flag variety. Note that  $X_w \rightarrow X_w^{\tau(w)}$  is always the base change of the fiber bundle  $X \rightarrow X^{\tau(w)}$  with respect to inclusion.

If  $\#(\sigma(w) \setminus \tau(w)) = 1$  then  $X_w^{\tau(w)}$  is isomorphic to a grassmannian Schubert variety by (a), since the parabolic decomposition of  $w$  with respect to  $\tau(w)$  is grassmannian.

(c) Suppose that  $w = u_0 u_1$  is a grassmannian BP decomposition with respect to  $I$ . Then it is a BP decomposition with respect to  $\sigma(u_1)$  by (3.9). So it is enough to show that  $\#(\sigma(w) \setminus \sigma(u_1)) = 1$  to give the grassmannian condition for parabolic decompositions. Let  $s$  be the unique simple reflection in  $\sigma(w)$  not in  $I$ , by definition of grassmannian parabolic decomposition of  $w$  with respect to  $I$ . Then  $s$  is not in  $\sigma(u_1) \subseteq I$ , so  $s$  is in  $\sigma(u_0)$  since  $\sigma(w) = \sigma(u_0) \cup \sigma(u_1)$ . Let  $t$  be any element of  $\sigma(u_0)$  such that  $s \neq t$ . Then  $t$  is in  $I$  by the uniqueness of  $s$ . By definition of BP decomposition,  $\sigma(u_0) \cap I \subseteq \tau(u_1^{-1})$  so  $t$  is in  $\sigma(u_1)$  and the claim follows.

(d) If  $w = u_0 u_1$  is a grassmannian BP decomposition with respect to  $I$  then it is with respect to  $\sigma(u_1)$ . Then  $\#(\sigma(w) \setminus \sigma(u_1)) = 1$  by definition of grassmannian parabolic decomposition. But  $\tau(u_0) \cap \sigma(u_1) = \emptyset$  by definition of parabolic decomposition. The claim follows.  $\square$

Richmond-Slofstra [15] show that any  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth Schubert variety  $X_w$  yields a grassmannian BP decomposition  $w = u_0 u_1$ . Thus any  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth Schubert variety  $X_w$  is a fiber bundle with base a grassmannian Schubert variety  $X_{u_0}^I$  and fiber  $X_{u_1}$  a smaller  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth Schubert variety. It follows that the procedure can be applied recursively to reduce the geometry of every  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth Schubert variety to grassmannian Schubert varieties. We use Proposition 3.11 to describe a resulting Bott-Samelson type structure on every  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth Schubert variety. Here it is essential that we use Proposition 3.11 (ii) to give us (3a), and enable a recursive procedure.

**Theorem 3.15.** *Let  $X_w$  be a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth Schubert variety. Then there exists an isomorphism  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$ , such that for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $\#\tau(w_i) \geq \#\sigma(w_i) - 1$ . We also have  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1})$ .*

*Proof.* The following proof leads to the definition of complete BP decomposition, but could be simplified slightly without this goal in mind. Suppose  $X_w$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth. If  $\#\sigma(w) \leq 1$  then  $G_w = P_{\sigma(w)}$  and the theorem is trivial by letting  $\mu$  be the identity map, so assume that  $\#\sigma(w) \geq 2$ .

Let  $w = u_0 u_1$  be a grassmannian BP decomposition with respect to  $I$ , such that  $\#(\sigma(w) \cap I) = \#\sigma(w) - 1$ , as we can do by [15, Theorem 3.6]. Then  $\#\sigma(u_1) \geq 1$  by Facts 3.14 (c) along with the definition of grassmannian BP decomposition. More precisely, we have  $\sigma(w) = \{s\} \cup \sigma(u_1)$ , where  $\{s\} = \tau(u_0)$  by Facts 3.14 (d). We also have  $\ell(u_1) < \ell(w)$  since  $\ell(w) = \ell(u_0) + \ell(u_1)$  and  $u_0 \neq e$ .

Let  $J = \tau(u_1^{-1})$  and  $w_0 = u_0 \star w_J$ , so Proposition 3.11 (ii) gives the isomorphism  $\mu_1 : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} X_{u_1} \rightarrow X_w$  such that  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1})$ . Since  $X_w$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth and  $\mu_1$  is an isomorphism,  $X_{u_1}$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth.

If  $\#\sigma(u_1) = 1$  then  $\#\sigma(u_1) = \#\tau(u_1)$  is a simple reflection and we are done, so assume that  $\#\sigma(u_1) \geq 2$ . Let  $\mu_2 : G_{w_1} \times^{R_2} X_{u_2} \rightarrow X_{u_1}$  be an isomorphism such that  $\tau(u_1^{-1}) = \tau(w_1^{-1})$  by the above discussion. Then

$$\tau(w_0) \cap \tau(u_1^{-1}) = \tau(w_0) \cap \tau(w_1^{-1})$$

shows that  $\mu' : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} G_{w_1} \times^{R_2} X_{u_2} \rightarrow X_w$  is a well-defined morphism. Hence we argue recursively to get the desired isomorphism  $\mu$ .  $\square$

**Definition 3.16.** A *complete BP decomposition* of  $w$  is a factorization in the Weyl group  $w = u_0 \cdots u_m$ , where for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , the product  $u_i(u_{i+1} \cdots u_{m+1})$  (with  $u_{m+1} = e$ ) is a BP decomposition with respect to  $\sigma(u_{i+1} \cdots u_{m+1})$  such that  $\#\sigma(u_i \cdots u_m) = m + 1 - i$ . Our definition is equivalent to the original definition in [16] and the definition provided by [2].

In this case, for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , let

$$\sigma(u_i \cdots u_m) = \{s_i, \dots, s_m\},$$

where  $s_i$  is the unique simple reflection in  $\sigma(u_i \cdots u_m) \setminus \sigma(u_{i+1} \cdots u_m)$ . For every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , let  $J_i = \tau((u_i \cdots u_m)^{-1})$  and set

$$\begin{aligned} w_0 &= u_0 \star w_{J_1} \\ w_1 &= u_1 \star w_{J_2} \\ &\vdots \\ w_{m-1} &= u_{m-1} \star w_{J_m} \\ w_m &= u_m. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

**Facts 3.18.** Let  $\tilde{w} = (u_0, \dots, u_m)$  be a complete BP decomposition of  $w$ .

- (a)  $w = w_0 \star \cdots \star w_m$ .
- (b) For every  $0 \leq i < m$ ,  $J_{i+1} \subseteq \tau(w_i)$ .
- (c) For every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $J_i = \tau(w_i^{-1}) \subseteq \tau(w_{i-1})$ . We also have  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1})$ .
- (d) For every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $\tau(w_i) = \sigma(w_i)$  or  $\tau(w_i) = \sigma(w_i) \setminus \{s_i\}$ .

*Proof.* We prove (d), since the remaining statements follow from above proofs. First note that for  $0 \leq i < m$ ,  $\sigma(w_i) = \sigma(u_i) \cup \sigma(w_{J_{i+1}}) = \sigma(u_i) \cup J_{i+1} = \{s_i\} \cup J_{i+1}$  since  $\sigma(u_i) \cap \sigma(u_{i+1} \cdots u_m) \subseteq \tau((u_{i+1} \cdots u_m)^{-1}) = J_{i+1}$  by definition of BP decomposition. But  $J_{i+1} \subseteq \tau(w_i)$  by (b), so  $\sigma(w_i) = \{s_i\} \cup J_{i+1} \subseteq \{s_i\} \cup \tau(w_i)$  gives the desired statement.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.19.** The map  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$  is an isomorphism.

*Remark 3.20.* In particular, if a Schubert variety  $X_w$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth, then there exists a complete BP decomposition  $\tilde{w} = (u_0, \dots, u_m)$  such that the isomorphism in Theorem 3.15 is given by Corollary 3.19.

#### 4. SMALL RESOLUTIONS

We recall the definition of small resolution from [10] and we recall a result from [17] which allows us to change base of a small resolution. Then we show how a small resolution of the form  $\mu$  for  $X_w$  provides a small resolution for  $X_{w^{-1}}$ . We conclude this section by showing how to glue together small resolutions of the form  $\mu$  to construct new small resolutions.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\tilde{Y}$  and  $Y$  be irreducible complex algebraic varieties. A *resolution of singularities* of  $Y$  is an algebraic morphism  $\xi : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$  such that properties (1)-(3) hold true: (1)  $\xi$  is proper, (2)  $\xi$  is birational, and (3)  $\tilde{Y}$  is smooth. A resolution is often required to satisfy: (4)  $\xi$  is an isomorphism over the smooth locus of  $Y$ , in which we call it a *strict* resolution of singularities.

**Definition 4.2.** A resolution of singularities  $\xi : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$  is *small* means for every  $r > 0$ ,

$$\text{codim}_Y \{y \in Y \mid \dim(\xi^{-1}(y)) \geq r\} > 2r, \tag{4.3}$$

where  $\text{codim}_Y(\emptyset) = \infty$ .

A small resolution of a Schubert variety is strict, and can sometimes be used to compute the singular locus (as in [17]).

It is often easier to describe resolutions in  $G/P$  for  $P$  a maximal parabolic subgroup than to work directly with  $G/B$ . It is then possible to describe explicitly a resolution  $G/B$ . The following appears in a similar form in Sankaran-Vanchinathan [17, Theorem 2.4].



**Lemma 4.4.** [17, Theorem 2.4] *Let  $\xi : \tilde{Y} \rightarrow Y$  be an algebraic morphism between irreducible varieties and let  $\zeta : Z \rightarrow Y$  be a Zariski locally trivial fiber bundle with irreducible fiber  $F$ . Then base change*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{Y} \times_Z Z & \xrightarrow{\xi'} & Z \\ \zeta' \downarrow & & \downarrow \zeta \\ \tilde{Y} & \xrightarrow{\xi} & Y \end{array}$$

*satisfies the following properties.*

- (i) *The morphism  $\zeta'$  is a Zariski locally trivial fiber bundle with fiber  $F$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\xi$  is a proper birational algebraic morphism then  $\xi'$  is a proper birational algebraic morphism.*
- (iii) *Suppose that  $\xi$  and  $\xi'$  are resolutions. Then  $\xi$  is a small resolution if and only if  $\xi'$  is a small resolution.*

The Schubert variety  $X_w$  is smooth (or  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth) if and only if  $X_{w-1}$  is smooth (respectively,  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth), but  $X_w$  is not necessarily isomorphic to  $X_{w-1}$ , as shown in [15]. We show that  $X_w$  has a small resolution of the form  $\mu$  if and only if  $X_{w-1}$  has a small resolution of the form  $\mu$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$  and  $\mu' : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} \rightarrow G_w$  be given by multiplication. Then the diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & G_w \\ \pi' \downarrow & & \downarrow \pi \\ G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X_w \end{array}$$

*is a base change.*

*Proof.* Let  $Z = G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \times_{X_w} G_w$  be the fibered product of  $\mu$  and  $\pi$ .

Then the universal property of fibered product provides a morphism  $\alpha : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} \rightarrow Z$ . Explicitly, we have

$$\alpha[g_0, \dots, g_m] = ([g_0, \dots, g_m B/B], g_0 \cdots g_m).$$

Define  $\beta : Z \rightarrow G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}$  by

$$\beta([g_0, \dots, g_{m-1}, g_m B/B], g) = [g_0, \dots, g_{m-1}, (g_0 \cdots g_{m-1})^{-1}g]$$

which is the morphism induced by quotienting  $\text{pr}_1 : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} \times_{X_w} G_w \rightarrow G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}$ . Then  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are inverse algebraic morphisms.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$  be a small resolution of  $X_w$ . Then  $\nu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_0}^{-1}/B \rightarrow X_{w-1}$  is a small resolution of  $X_{w-1}$ .*

*Proof.* Consider the base change

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & G_w \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m}/B & \xrightarrow{\mu} & X_w \end{array}$$

by Lemma 4.5, and consider a similar diagram for  $\nu$ . For  $v \in W$ , define  $\alpha_v : G_v \rightarrow G_{v^{-1}}$  by

$$\alpha_v(g) = g^{-1}$$

so  $\alpha_v$  is an isomorphism. Let  $\beta : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} \rightarrow G_{w_0^{-1}} \times^{R_m} \dots \times^{R_1} G_{w_0^{-1}}$  be the map on quotients induced by the various  $\alpha_{w_i}$  and reversing coordinates. We have a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{w_0^{-1}} \times^{R_m} \dots \times^{R_1} G_{w_0^{-1}} & \xrightarrow{\nu'} & G_{w_0^{-1}} \\ \downarrow \beta^{-1} & & \downarrow \alpha_w^{-1} \\ G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & G_w \end{array} \quad (4.7)$$

so  $\mu'$  is a small resolution if and only if  $\nu'$  is a small resolution. The claim follows by Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

*Remark 4.8.* Proposition 4.6 shows that  $X_w$  has a fiber bundle decomposition if and only if  $X_{w^{-1}}$  has a fiber bundle decomposition, since (4.7) shows  $\mu$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $\nu$  is an isomorphism (regardless of all  $G_{w_i}$  being smooth). However, as remarked in [15], a BP decomposition of  $w$  does not necessarily give a BP decomposition of  $w^{-1}$ .

A fiber bundle decomposition of  $X_w$  allows us to glue small resolutions of the form  $\mu$ , if we assume some compatibility with equivariance.

**Lemma 4.9.** *Let  $R$  be any standard parabolic group stabilizing  $G_v$  by right multiplication, and let  $F$  be a left  $R$ -variety. Then  $\rho : G_v \times F \rightarrow G_v \times^R F$  is a fiber bundle with fiber  $R$ .*

**Key Lemma 4.10.** *Let  $\nu : G_{v_0} \times^{R'_1} \dots \times^{R'_n} G_{v_n} / B \rightarrow X_v$  be a small resolution of  $X_v$ , and let  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} / B \rightarrow X_w$  be a small resolution of  $X_w$ . Then  $G_{v_0} \times^{R'_1} \dots \times^{R'_n} G_{v_n} \times^R G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} / B \rightarrow G_v \times^R X_w$  is a small resolution, where  $R$  is the parabolic subgroup corresponding to  $\tau(v_n) \cap \tau(w_0^{-1})$ .*

*Proof.* Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 show that  $\nu$  is a small resolution if and only if the base change  $\nu'$  to  $G_v$  is a small resolution. The diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{v_0} \times^{R'_1} \dots \times^{R'_n} G_{v_n} \times G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} / B & \xrightarrow{(\nu', \mu)} & G_v \times X_w \\ \downarrow \pi' & & \downarrow \pi \\ G_{v_0} \times^{R'_1} \dots \times^{R'_n} G_{v_n} \times^R G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} G_{w_m} / B & \xrightarrow{[\nu', \mu]} & G_v \times^R X_w \end{array}$$

is a base change of fiber bundles with fiber  $R$ . Since  $(\nu', \mu)$  is a small resolution then  $[\nu', \mu]$  is a small resolution by Lemma 4.4.  $\square$

We will apply Lemma 4.10 to Schubert varieties of the form  $X_u \cong G_v \times^R X_w$ . Note it is essential to check that small resolutions of  $X_v$  and  $X_w$  give rise to the same  $R$  from Lemma 4.10 as in the isomorphism of  $X_u$ . It would be interesting (and useful) to know whether every Schubert variety  $X_w$  admitting a small resolution, admits a (possibly different) small resolution that satisfies (3).

## 5. GELFAND-MACPHERSON RESOLUTIONS

We recall the construction in [9, §2.11] providing a resolution of singularities for any Schubert variety  $X_w^I$ . The resolution is uniquely determined by subsets of simple reflections  $I_0, \dots, I_m$  that they call resolution data. These resolutions are described as iterated base changes of flag varieties, which enables us to compute fibers explicitly. In particular, [17] provides a formula for all fiber dimensions.

In this section, we consider Schubert varieties  $X_w^I$  such that (i)  $w$  is maximal in its  $W_I$ -coset, (ii)  $(W_{\sigma(w)}, \sigma(w))$  is a simply laced Coxeter system, and say that  $X_w^I$  is a *simply laced* Schubert variety. Note that condition (i) is without loss of generality since  $X_w^I = X_v^I$  whenever  $wW_I = vW_I$ . We show that *any* resolution  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} X_{w_m}^I \rightarrow X_w^I$  is isomorphic to a Gelfand-MacPherson resolution. In other words, there exists a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_n} P_{I_n}/P_I & \xrightarrow{\mu'} & G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} X_{w_m}^I \\ & \searrow \nu & \swarrow \mu \\ & & X_w^I \end{array}$$

for some  $I_0, \dots, I_n$  such that  $\mu'$  is an isomorphism. We further show that if we take  $X_w^I$  smooth and  $\mu$  the identity (resolution) morphism, then  $\mu'$  satisfies (3).

**Definition 5.1.** A sequence  $(I_i)$  of sets of simple reflections

$$\emptyset = I_0, I_1, \dots, I_m = I$$

is called *resolution data* for the Schubert variety  $X_w^I$  if the iterated base change

$$Z(I_i) := (P_{I_0}/P_{I_0}) \times_{X^{I_0}} X^{I_0 \cap I_1} \times_{X^{I_1}} \dots \times_{X^{I_{m-1}}} X^{I_{m-1} \cap I_m}$$

projects birationally onto  $X_w^I$ .

We remark that the original definition of resolution data is given in terms of the Grothendieck group of a subcategory of a derived category of sheaves on  $X^I$  with the analytic topology, but is equivalent to the definition given here. When all sets  $I_1, \dots, I_{m-1}$  have one element, it is the Demazure resolution.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $(I_i)$  be resolution data for  $X_w^I$ . Let  $\mu : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} P_{I_1} \times^{R_2} \dots \times^{R_m} P_{I_m}/P_{I_m} \rightarrow X_w^I$  be given by*

$$\mu[g_0, \dots, g_m P_{I_m}/P_{I_m}] = g_0 \cdots g_m P_{I_m}/P_{I_m}$$

where for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $R_i = P_{I_{i-1}} \cap P_{I_i}$ . Let  $\varphi : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} P_{I_1} \times^{R_2} \dots \times^{R_m} P_{I_m}/P_{I_m} \rightarrow Z(I_i)$  be given by

$$\varphi[g_0, \dots, g_m P_{I_m}/P_{I_m}] = (P_{I_0}/P_{I_0}, g_0 R_1/R_1, \dots, g_0 \cdots g_{m-1} R_m/R_m)$$

and  $\nu : Z(I_i) \rightarrow X_w^I$  projection. Then  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} P_{I_m}/P_{I_m} & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & Z(I_i) \\ & \searrow \mu & \swarrow \nu \\ & & X_w^I \end{array}$$

commutes. As a consequence, we have  $w = w_{I_0} \star \dots \star w_{I_m}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is the same as that of (1.3).  $\square$

*Example 5.3.* We provide a simple example that is one of Zelevinskiĭ's small resolutions. Let  $W = S_4$  of type  $A_3$ . Consider  $w = (4\ 2\ 3\ 1)$ , as in §6, so  $\tau(w) = \{1, 3\}$ . We have

$$X_w^{\tau(w)} = \{E \in \text{Gr}_2(\mathbf{C}^4) \mid \dim(\mathbf{C}^2 \cap E) \geq 1\}.$$

Let  $I_1 = \{1, 3\}$ ,  $I_2 = \{2, 3\}$ ,  $I_3 = \{1, 3\}$ . Then  $Z(I_i)$  may be identified with the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \mathbf{C}^4 & & \\
 & & | & \swarrow & \\
 & & \mathbf{C}^3 & & \\
 & & | & & \\
 & & \mathbf{C}^2 & \xlongequal{\quad} & F^2 & & E^2 \\
 & & | & & | & & | \\
 & & \mathbf{C}^1 & & F^1 & \xlongequal{\quad} & E^1 \\
 & & | & \swarrow & \searrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & & & 
 \end{array}$$

where vertical flags are coordinates of  $Z(I_i)$ , and horizontal equal signs provide the fibered product relations. So

$$Z(I_i) = \{(F^1, E^2) \in \text{Gr}_1(\mathbf{C}^2) \times \text{Gr}_2(\mathbf{C}^4) \mid F^1 \subseteq E^2\}$$

gives the projection  $\text{pr}_2 : Z(I_i) \rightarrow X_w^{\tau(w)}$ .

We also have the isomorphism  $\varphi : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} P_{I_1} \times^{R_2} P_{I_2} \times^{R_2} P_{I_3}/P_{I_3} \rightarrow Z(I_i)$  by (the proof of) Lemma 5.2. So  $Z(I_i)$  is a smooth, irreducible, iterated fiber bundle. Then

$$\text{pr}_2^{-1}(E) = \begin{cases} \{\mathbf{C}^2 \cap E\}, & E \neq \mathbf{C}^2, \\ \text{Gr}_1(\mathbf{C}^2), & E = \mathbf{C}^2, \end{cases}$$

shows  $(I_i)$  is resolution data, since the fiber of  $\text{pr}_2$  is generically a point. Moreover, it shows that  $\text{pr}_2$  is a small resolution. Note we could (and typically do) use  $\varphi$  to conclude that  $(I_i)$  is resolution data by counting dimensions and applying Proposition 1.10.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $X_w$  be a simply laced Schubert variety. Let  $t$  be a simple reflection in  $\sigma(w)$  and  $I = \sigma(w) - \{t\}$ . Let  $w = u_0 u_1$  be the parabolic decomposition of  $w$  with respect to  $I$ . Then  $X_w^I$  is smooth if and only if  $u_0 \star w_J = w_{\sigma(u_0)}$ , where  $J = I \cap \sigma(u_0) = \sigma(u_0) \setminus \{t\}$ .*

*Proof.* Richmond-Slofstra [15, Theorem 3.8] show in the simply laced case that  $X_{u_0}^J$  is smooth if and only if  $u_0$  is the maximum element of the minimal length representatives of  $W_{\sigma(u_0)}/W_J$ . By considering maximal length representatives, this is equivalent to  $u_0 \star w_J = \max(W_{\sigma(u_0)}) = w_{\sigma(u_0)}$  since the function  $w \mapsto u_0$  from  $W$  to minimal length representatives is order preserving by [4, Proposition 2.5.1] (and  $u_0 \star w_J$  is always the maximum of  $u_0 W_J$ ).

If  $X_w^I$  is smooth then  $X_{w \star w_I}$  is smooth since it is the pull-back of  $X_w^I$ . Observe that  $w = u_0 \star u_1$  by Facts 3.7, so  $w \star w_I = u_0 \star u_1 \star w_I = u_0 \star w_I = u_0 \star w_J \star w_I$  since  $\sigma(u_1) \cup J \subseteq I$ . But  $\mu : G_{u_0 \star w_J} \times^{P_J} P_I/B \rightarrow X_{w \star w_I}$  is an isomorphism by (3.3),

since  $J = \sigma(u_0) \cap I$ . Hence  $X_{u_0}^J$  is smooth, so  $u_0 \star w_J = w_{\sigma(u_0)}$  by the previous paragraph.

If  $u_0 \star w_J = w_{\sigma(u_0)}$  then the first paragraph shows  $X_{u_0}^J$  is smooth, and the isomorphism  $\mu$  (from the previous paragraph) shows that  $X_{w \star w_I}$  is smooth, and so is  $X_{w \star w_I}^I = X_w^I$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let  $X_w$  be a simply laced Schubert variety.*

- (i)  $X_w$  is smooth if and only if there exists an isomorphism  $\mu : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} P_{I_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$  such that  $\tau(w^{-1}) = I_0$ .
- (ii)  $X_w$  is smooth if and only if there exists an isomorphism  $\mu' : P_{I'_0} \times^{R'_1} \dots \times^{R'_{m'}} P_{I'_{m'}} \rightarrow G_w$  such that  $\tau(w^{-1}) = I'_0$  and  $\tau(w) = I'_{m'}$ .

*Proof of (i).* If there exists such an isomorphism then  $X_w$  is smooth by Proposition 1.10.

If  $X_w$  is smooth then  $X_w$  is  $\mathbf{Q}$ -smooth so we can apply [15] (as in Theorem 3.15) to get a complete BP decomposition  $\tilde{w} = (u_0, \dots, u_n)$ . Recall the definition of  $s_0, \dots, s_n$  and  $w_0, \dots, w_n$  from Facts 3.18, and for every  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $J_i = \tau((u_i \dots u_n)^{-1})$ . The isomorphism  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{P_{J_1}} \dots \times^{P_{J_n}} X_{w_n} \rightarrow X_w$  from Corollary 3.19 is such that for every  $0 \leq i \leq n$ , we have  $J_i = \tau(w_i^{-1})$  and  $\#\tau(w_i) \geq \#\sigma(w_i) - 1$ , by Facts 3.18 (d). Note that  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1})$  by Facts 3.18 (c).

The smoothness of  $X_w$  along with fiber bundle structures implies that for every  $0 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $X_{w_i}$  and  $X_{w_i}^{\tau(w_i)}$  are smooth. By Lemma 5.4, for every  $0 \leq i < n$ , we have  $w_i = w_{\sigma(u_i)} \star w_{J_{i+1}} = w_{\tau(w_i^{-1})} \star w_{\tau(w_i)}$  and  $w_n = s_n = w_{\tau(w_n)} = w_{\tau(w_n^{-1})} \star w_{\tau(w_n)}$ . Hence a repeated application of (3.6) shows that

$$G_{w_0} \times^{P_{J_1}} \dots \times^{P_{J_n}} X_{w_n} \cong P_{\tau(w_0^{-1})} \times^{R_1} P_{\tau(w_0)} \times^{R_2} \dots \times^{R_{m-1}} P_{\tau(w_n^{-1})} \times^{R_m} P_{\tau(w_n)}/B$$

where all  $R_i$  are intersections of neighboring parabolic subgroups,  $m = 2n + 1$ , and for every  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $R_{2i} = P_{J_i}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of (ii).* Consider the set  $A = \{0 \leq i \leq n \mid w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_i \neq w_{\tau(w^{-1})}\}$  depending on the complete BP decomposition of  $w$ . If  $A$  is empty then for every  $0 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_i = w_{\tau(w^{-1})}$  forces  $\sigma(w_i) \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$ . But  $w = w_0 \star \dots \star w_n$  (by Facts 3.18), so

$$\sigma(w) = \bigcup_{i=0}^n \sigma(w_i) \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$$

by Facts 2.10. Hence  $w = w_{\sigma(w)}$  by Lemma 2.11. In this case,  $\mu = \text{id}$  is the desired isomorphism of  $X_w$ .

From now on,

$$A \neq \emptyset \tag{5.6}$$

is a running assumption. Define  $k = \min(A)$  so by (5.6),  $0 \leq k \leq n$  is well-defined.

We proceed by induction on  $\ell(w)$ . Let  $\ell = \ell(w)$ . Assume for every  $u$  such that  $X_u$  is smooth and  $\ell(u) < \ell$ , then there exists an isomorphism  $\mu_u : P_{I_0^u} \times^{R_1^u} \dots \times^{R_{n'}^u} P_{I_{n'}^u}/B \rightarrow X_u$  such that  $\tau(u^{-1}) = I_0^u$  and  $\tau(u) = I_{n'}^u$ .

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} w &= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w \\ &= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_0 \star \dots \star w_n \\ &= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_k \star \dots \star w_n \end{aligned}$$

since for every  $0 \leq i < k$ , we have  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_i = w_{\tau(w^{-1})}$ .

Set  $I = \tau(w^{-1}) \setminus \{s_k\}$  and let  $u = w_I \star (u_{k+1} \cdots u_n)$ . We claim that  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u = w$ . The claim is equivalent to showing  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u_{k+1} \star \cdots \star u_n = w$  since  $I \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$ . The relation  $\sigma(u_k) \subseteq \tau(w_k^{-1}) = \tau((u_k \cdots u_n)^{-1}) = J_k$  holds since  $w_k = w_{\sigma(u_k)} \star w_{J_{k+1}}$ . Hence  $\sigma(u_k) \subseteq \tau(w_{k-1})$  since  $w_{k-1} = u_{k-1} \star w_{J_k}$ . The definition of  $k$  forces  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_{k-1} = w_{\tau(w^{-1})}$  and so  $\sigma(w_{k-1}) \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$ . Hence  $\sigma(u_k) \subseteq \tau(w_{k-1}) \subseteq \sigma(w_{k-1}) \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$ . So

$$\begin{aligned}
w &= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w \\
&= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_0 \star \cdots \star w_n \\
&= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_k \star \cdots \star w_n \\
&= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_{\sigma(u_k)} \star w_{J_{k+1}} \star w_{k+1} \star \cdots \star w_n \\
&= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_{k+1} \star \cdots \star w_n \\
&= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u_{k+1} \star \cdots \star u_n \\
&= w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u_{k+1} \cdots u_n
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

gives the claim.

By Corollary 3.3, the morphism  $\mu' : P_{\tau(w^{-1})} \times^{P_I} X_u \rightarrow X_w$  is an isomorphism since

$$\begin{aligned}
\tau(w^{-1}) \cap \sigma(u) &= \tau(w^{-1}) \cap (I \cup \sigma(u_{k+1} \cdots u_n)) \\
&= (\tau(w^{-1}) \cap I) \cup (\tau(w^{-1}) \cap \sigma(u_{k+1} \cdots u_n))
\end{aligned}$$

is contained in  $I$ .

We see that  $\tau(u) = \tau(w)$  as follows. The morphism  $\mu'' : P_{\tau(w^{-1})} \times^{P_I} X_{u \star w_{\tau(w)}} \rightarrow X_w$  is onto  $X_w$  since  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star u \star w_{\tau(w)} = w \star w_{\tau(w)} = w$ . By Corollary 3.3,  $\mu''$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $\tau(w^{-1}) \cap (\sigma(u) \cup \tau(w)) \subseteq I$ . But this holds since  $\tau(w^{-1}) \cap \tau(w) \subseteq \tau(w^{-1}) \setminus \{s_k\} = I$  by Lemma 5.9 below. By comparing dimensions with  $\mu'$ , the relation  $\tau(w) \subseteq \tau(u)$  must hold. So  $\tau(u) = \tau(w)$  since  $\tau(u) \subseteq \tau(w)$  by Facts 2.5 (c).

Then  $X_u$  is smooth (by the isomorphism  $\mu'$ ) such that  $\ell(u) < \ell(w) = \ell$  (since  $s_k$  is in  $\sigma(w) \setminus \sigma(u)$ ) and  $\tau(u) = \tau(w)$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exists an isomorphism  $\mu_u : P_{I_0^u} \times^{R_1^u} \cdots \times^{R_{n'}^u} P_{I_{n'}^u} / B \rightarrow X_u$  such that  $\tau(u^{-1}) = I_0^u$  and  $\tau(u) = I_{n'}^u$ . Therefore,  $\mu'$  and  $\mu_u$  give an isomorphism  $P_{\tau(w^{-1})} \times^{P_I} P_{I_0^u} \times^{R_1^u} \cdots \times^{R_{n'}^u} P_{I_{n'}^u} / B \rightarrow X_w$  such that  $\tau(w) = \tau(u) = I_{n'}^u$ .  $\square$

To complete the proof of Theorem 5.5 we need to prove Lemma 5.9. For this we first need a definition.

**Definition 5.8.** Define a function  $\partial$  from  $W$  to subsets of simple reflections

$$\partial(w) = \{s \in S \mid s \notin \sigma(w), \exists t \in \sigma(w), st \neq ts\},$$

called the *boundary* of  $w$ .

Then  $\partial(w)$  is the set of simple reflections which are adjacent to  $\sigma(w)$  in the Coxeter graph of  $W$ . Note that  $\partial(w) = \partial(w^{-1})$ , for each  $w \in W$ . In the proof of Theorem 5.5, recall that  $X_w$  is a smooth simply laced Schubert variety,  $\tilde{w} = (u_0, \dots, u_n)$  is a complete BP decomposition of  $w$ ,  $A = \{0 \leq i \leq n \mid w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_i \neq w_{\tau(w^{-1})}\}$ , and  $k = \min(A)$  when  $A$  is nonempty.

**Lemma 5.9.**  $s_k \notin \tau(w)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $w^{-1} = v_0 v_1$  be the parabolic decomposition of  $w^{-1}$  with respect to  $\tau(w^{-1})$ . Then  $v_1 = w_{\tau(w^{-1})}$  by Facts 3.7. Note  $w = v_1^{-1} v_0^{-1} = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} v_0^{-1}$ . We will show that

$$s_k \in \partial(v_0).$$

Recall that

$$w = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_{k+1} \star \cdots \star w_n \quad (5.10)$$

by (5.7). Hence Proposition 2.6 gives  $\sigma(v_0) \subseteq \sigma(w_{k+1} \star \cdots \star w_n)$ , so  $s_k$  is not in  $\sigma(v_0)$ .

We are reduced to showing that there exists  $t$  in  $\sigma(v_0)$  such that  $s_k t \neq t s_k$ . Let  $(w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_k)^{-1} = v'_0 v'_1$  be the parabolic decomposition with respect to  $\tau(w^{-1})$ . Note  $v'_1 = w_{\tau(w^{-1})}$  and  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_k = w_{\tau(w^{-1})} (v'_0)^{-1}$ . The relation  $v'_0 \leq v_0$  holds by [4, Proposition 2.5.1] since  $(w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_k)^{-1} \leq w^{-1}$ . Hence  $\sigma(v'_0) \subseteq \sigma(v_0)$  and we show that there exists  $t$  in  $\sigma(v'_0)$  such that  $s_k t \neq t s_k$ .

Note that the Coxeter graph of  $\sigma(u_k)$  is connected since  $\tau(u_k) = \{s_k\}$  is a single element by definition of grassmannian BP decomposition  $u_k(u_{k+1} \cdots u_n)$ . Let  $K$  be the connected component of the Coxeter graph of  $\sigma(w_k)$  such that  $s_k$  is in  $K$ . In particular,  $\sigma(u_k) \subseteq K$ . Let  $s$  be in a connected component of  $\sigma(w_k)$  other than  $K$ . Then  $\sigma(w_k) = \sigma(u_k \star w_{\tau(w_k)}) = \sigma(u_k) \cup \tau(w_k)$  shows  $s$  is in  $\tau(w_k)$ . We also have  $s \star w_k = s \star u_k \star w_{\tau(w_k)} = u_k \star s \star w_{\tau(w_k)} = u_k \star w_{\tau(w_k)}$  since  $s$  is not adjacent to  $\sigma(u_k)$ . Hence  $s$  is in  $\tau(w_k^{-1})$ . So  $K \not\subseteq \sigma(u_k)$  since we would have  $\sigma(w_k) \subseteq \tau(w_k^{-1})$  which contradicts  $w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_k \neq w_{\tau(w^{-1})}$  and  $\tau(w_k^{-1}) \subseteq \tau(w^{-1})$  by definition of  $k$ .

The previous paragraph shows that we can take a path of minimal length  $t_1, \dots, t_h$  from  $s_k = t_1$  to  $t_h \in \partial(u_k)$  such that for every  $1 \leq i \leq h$ , we have  $t_i$  in  $K$ . Note that  $\{t_2, \dots, t_h\} \subseteq \tau(w_k)$  since  $\tau(w_k) = \sigma(w_k) \setminus \{s_k\}$ . We see that  $t_h$  is not in  $\tau(w^{-1})$  as follows. Let  $t_h = s_j$  for some  $k < j \leq n$ , where  $s_j$  is the unique simple reflection in  $\sigma(u_j) \setminus \sigma(u_{j+1} \cdots u_n)$ . Then  $t_h$  is not in  $\tau(w_k^{-1})$  by [15, Lemma 6.4] since  $u_k(u_{k+1} \cdots u_n)$  is a parabolic decomposition,  $t_h$  is in  $\partial(u_k)$ , and  $\tau(w_k^{-1}) = \tau((u_{k+1} \cdots u_n)^{-1})$  by Proposition 3.11. For every  $0 \leq i < k$ ,  $t_h$  is not in  $\sigma(w_i)$  since  $\sigma(w_i) = \sigma(u_i \star w_{\tau(w_{i+1})}) = \{s_i\} \cup \tau(w_{i+1}^{-1})$  such that  $s_i \neq s_j$  by definition of complete BP decomposition. It follows that  $t_h$  is not in  $\tau(w^{-1})$  since  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w_0^{-1})$ .

Identifying  $W_{\{t_2, \dots, t_h\}}$  with  $S_h$  of type  $A_{h-1}$ , permutations of  $\{1, \dots, h\}$ , (by assuming the path is of minimal length in a simply connected Coxeter graph) gives

$$t_2 \cdots t_h = (2 \ 3 \ \cdots \ h \ 1)$$

as in §6. So  $\tau(t_2 \cdots t_h) = \{t_h\}$  and hence  $t_2 \cdots t_h$  is minimal with respect to  $\tau(w^{-1})$ . Therefore the relation  $(w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star (t_h \cdots t_2))^{-1} \leq (w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_{\tau(w_k)})^{-1} = (w_{\tau(w^{-1})} \star w_k)^{-1}$  shows that  $t_2 \cdots t_h \leq v'_0$  by [4, Proposition 2.5.1].

Setting  $t = t_2$  gives our claim as follows. We have  $\sigma(t_2 \cdots t_h) \subseteq \sigma(v'_0)$  by the end of the last paragraph, and hence  $t$  is in  $\sigma(v'_0)$ . But  $t$  is in  $\partial(s_k) = \partial(t_1)$  since  $K$  is connected.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.11.** *Let  $X_w^I$  be a simply laced Schubert variety. Suppose that  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} X_{w_m}^I \rightarrow X_w^I$  is a resolution of singularities. Then there exists resolution data  $(I_i)$  for  $X_w^I$  and an isomorphism  $\varphi : Z(I_i) \rightarrow G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} X_{w_m}^I$  such that*

the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z(I_i) & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} X_{w_m}^I \\ & \searrow \nu & \swarrow \mu \\ & & X_w^I \end{array}$$

commutes.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume that  $I \subseteq \tau(w)$ . For every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $G_{w_i}$  is smooth since  $\mu$  is a resolution of singularities. Then  $X_{w_i}$  is simply laced since  $w_i \leq w$  by Facts 2.10 (c), so the claim follows by Theorem 5.5 and Theorem 4.10.  $\square$

*Remark 5.12.* By [13, Remark 3.4], Corollary 5.11 shows that all resolutions constructed in Perrin [13] are of the form Gelfand-MacPherson, for some resolution data.

*Example 5.13.* We provide an example to show that if  $X_w$  is not simply laced, the conclusions of Lemma 5.4, Theorem 5.5, and Corollary 5.11 may fail to hold. Let  $W$  be the Weyl group of type  $C_2$  with Dynkin diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \leftarrow \bullet \\ 1 \quad 2 \end{array}$$

and let  $w = s_2 s_1 s_2$ . It is well known that  $X_w$  is smooth. This can be seen by taking the BP decomposition  $u_0 = s_2 s_1$  and  $u_1 = s_2$  with respect to  $I = \tau(w) = \{2\} = \sigma(w) - \{t\}$ , where  $t = s_1$ . Then  $X_{u_0}^{\tau(w)}$  is smooth by [15, Theorem 3.8], where we set  $W = C_2$ ,  $s = s_1$ , and  $k = n = 2$ . Hence  $X_w$  is also smooth, since it is a fiber bundle with base  $X_{u_0}^{\tau(w)}$  and fiber  $P_2/B$ . Observe that we have  $J = \sigma(u_0) \setminus \{t\} = I$  and  $u_0 \star w_J = w$ , but  $w_{\sigma(u_0)} = s_2 s_1 s_2 s_1$ . It is clear that  $X_w$  does not admit resolution data such that the corresponding Gelfand-MacPherson resolution is an isomorphism.

Indeed, if there exists such an isomorphism, we can assume  $m = \ell - 1$  (possibly with  $I_i = I_{i+1}$  for some  $i$ ) such that for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $I_i \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} P_{I_1} \times^{R_2} P_{I_2} \cong G_w$ . Note  $\#I_i = 1$  since  $w < w_{\{1,2\}}$ . It follows that  $I_0 = \{2\} = I_2$  and  $I_1 = \{1\}$ , which does not provide an isomorphism.

**Corollary 5.14.** *Let  $X_w$  be a smooth simply laced Schubert variety. Then  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w)$  if and only if  $\tau(w) = \sigma(w)$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\tau(w) = \sigma(w)$  then  $w = w_{\tau(w)}$  by Lemma 2.11. Hence  $w = w^{-1}$  in this case.

If  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \tau(w)$ , let  $\mu : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_m} P_{I_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$  be an isomorphism such that  $I_0 = \tau(w^{-1})$  and  $I_m = \tau(w)$  by Theorem 5.5. It follows that for every  $s \in \tau(w)$  and  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , we have  $s \in I_i$ . Indeed, if there exists  $0 < i < m$  such that  $s \notin I_i$  then  $[\dot{s}, 1, \dots, 1, \dot{s}B/B]$  and  $[1, \dots, B/B]$  are different points in the fiber of  $\mu$  over  $B/B$ . This contradicts  $\mu$  being an isomorphism. Hence for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , we have  $\tau(w) \subseteq I_i$ . Then for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $\tau(w) = I_i$  since  $I_m$  is always contained in  $\tau(w)$  (so  $I_m = \tau(w)$  in this case) and  $P_{I_0} \times^{P_{I_1}} P_{I_1} \cong P_{I_0}$  whenever  $I_1 \subseteq I_0$ . Therefore  $\tau(w) = \sigma(w)$ .  $\square$



6.  $A_{n-1}$ 

Fix  $G = GL(n, \mathbf{C})$  and let  $B$  be the upper triangular matrices in  $G$ . We recall a family of small resolutions described by Zelevinskiĭ [20], and we use Lemma 4.10 to provide a new family of small resolutions in Proposition 6.8. This family of small resolutions can be summarized using pattern avoidance. Then we describe all Schubert varieties with small resolutions for  $A_{n-1}$  ( $n \leq 6$ ). We conclude with an example to show that pattern avoidance does not characterize the property ‘ $X_w$  admits a small resolution’.

$G$  is of type  $A_{n-1}$  acting on the left of  $\mathbf{C}^n$  as usual. The standard basis  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  of  $\mathbf{C}^n$  fixes our choice of maximal torus  $T \subseteq B$  as the stabilizer of all lines  $\langle e_i \rangle$ . We identify the Weyl group  $W = N_G(T)/T$  with  $S_n$ , the set of permutations of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , by letting  $\langle e_{w(i)} \rangle = w \langle e_i \rangle$ . We denote a permutation  $w$  in one-line notation  $w = (w(1) \cdots w(n))$ . The simple roots in the Dynkin diagram are labeled by

$$\bullet \cdots \bullet \cdots \bullet \cdots \bullet$$

1    2                     $n-1$

*Remark 6.1.* All resolutions in this section are Gelfand-MacPherson resolutions (as in [9] and §5). The reason for this is explained in Corollary 5.11. As a result, the resolutions can be described explicitly as an iterated base change, and a formula for fiber dimensions is provided by [17].

Zelevinskiĭ [20] described a family of resolutions for every grassmannian Schubert variety for  $G$  by using a general construction of Gelfand-MacPherson (as described in §5). He also showed each grassmannian Schubert variety has at least one small resolution.

Zelevinskiĭ used the iterated base change provided by Gelfand-MacPherson [9] to describe the resolutions in terms of incidence relations of flags. Here we return to the description of resolutions using Bott-Samelson type varieties, following, e.g., [17], and the original construction of Demazure.

Let  $1 \leq k \leq n$ ,  $\hat{k} = \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{k\}$ , and consider a grassmannian Schubert variety  $X_w^{\hat{k}} \subseteq X^{\hat{k}} = G/P_{\hat{k}}$ , where we are choosing  $w$  to be maximal in its  $W_{\hat{k}}$ -coset. We point out that  $w$  maximal in its coset is equivalent to

$$w(1) > w(2) > \cdots > w(k), \quad w(k+1) > \cdots > w(n).$$

All of Zelevinskiĭ’s resolutions (as mentioned) are

$$P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} P_{\hat{k}}/P_{\hat{k}} \rightarrow X_w^{\hat{k}}. \quad (6.2)$$

It is important for us that in each of the resolutions of [20],  $I_0 = \tau(w^{-1})$ . In the language of [20],  $I_0 = \{s_j \mid j \text{ is not a valley}\}$ . The *valleys* are the  $j \neq n$  that begin each string of consecutive terms in  $(w(1), \dots, w(k))$ . As  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \{s_j \mid j+1 \text{ appears left of } j \text{ in } w\}$ , we have that  $\tau(w^{-1}) = S \setminus \{\text{valleys}\} = I_0$ . For example, in type  $A_7$  with  $k = 4$  and  $w = (8 \ 5 \ 3 \ 2 \ 7 \ 6 \ 4 \ 1)$ , the valleys are 5 and 3, and  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \{1, 2, 4, 6, 7\}$ . When the resolutions (6.2) are pulled back to resolutions of  $X_w \subseteq G/B$ , they become

$$P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} P_{\hat{k}}/B \rightarrow X_w. \quad (6.3)$$

When  $w$  is not equal to the long element of  $W$ ,  $\tau(w) = \hat{k}$ .

This discussion shows that a restatement of the main result of [20] is the following.

**Theorem 6.4** ([20]). *If  $w \in S_n$  is maximal in its  $W_{\hat{k}}$ -coset, then there is a small resolution*

$$P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} P_{I_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$$

*satisfying (3), i.e.,  $I_0 = \tau(w^{-1})$  and  $I_m = \tau(w)$ .*

**Corollary 6.5.** *If  $w \in S_n$  satisfies  $\#\tau(w) \geq \#\sigma(w) - 1$ , then there exists a small resolution  $\mu : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} P_{I_m}/B \rightarrow X_w$  satisfying (3).*

*Proof.* Let  $w \in W = S_n$  such that  $\#\tau(w) \geq \#\sigma(w) - 1$ . If  $\#\tau(w) = \#\sigma(w)$  then  $X_w = P_{\sigma(w)}/B$  by Lemma 2.11, and we are done. We can assume that  $\sigma(w)$  is connected by applying Lemma 4.10 to  $G_{w_0} \times^B \cdots \times^B X_{w_m} \rightarrow X_w$ , where  $\sigma(w_i)$  are pairwise disjoint and non-adjacent, so an isomorphism by Corollary 3.3. Then, for example, repeatedly applying (3.6) gives the desired resolution satisfying (3).

If  $\#\tau(w) = \#\sigma(w) - 1$  then  $X_w^{\tau(w)}$  is isomorphic to a grassmannian Schubert variety for a smaller group of type  $A_{\#\sigma(w)}$  by Facts 3.14 (b). There exists resolution data for the corresponding grassmannian Schubert variety given by Corollary 6.5. The corresponding parabolic subgroups of the original  $G$  gives resolution data for  $X_w^{\tau(w)}$  by Proposition 1.10, since birational holds true by (1.11). The corresponding resolution is small since the formula for fiber dimensions in [17] shows the dimensions are the same. We have  $I_0 = \tau(w^{-1})$  since this holds true for the resolution in the smaller group. By Theorem 6.4, we have a small resolution of  $X_w$  with  $I_0 = \tau(w^{-1})$  and  $I_m = \tau(w)$ .  $\square$

*Example 6.6.* Let  $w = (4\ 2\ 3\ 1)$  with reduced expression  $w = s_1 s_3 s_2 s_1 s_3$ . In this case  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \{1, 3\} = \tau(w)$ . Then  $\#\tau(w) = \#\sigma(w) - 1$  (and  $w$  satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 6.4), so  $X_w$  has a small resolution by Corollary 6.5 (and Theorem 6.4). By Theorem 6.4, the two small resolutions corresponding to ‘neat ordering of peaks’, as defined in [20], can be described by  $\mu : P_{1,3} \times^{P_3} P_{2,3} \times^{P_3} P_{1,3}/B \rightarrow X_w$  and  $\nu : P_{1,3} \times^{P_1} P_{1,2} \times^{P_1} P_{1,3}/B \rightarrow X_w$ .

*Example 6.7.* Let  $w = (1\ 5\ 3\ 4\ 2)$ . Note  $X_w$  is not the pull-back of a grassmannian Schubert variety, but  $\#\tau(w) = \#\sigma(w) - 1$ , so is isomorphic to the pull-back of a grassmannian Schubert variety  $X_u$  for a smaller group, where  $u = (4\ 2\ 3\ 1)$ .

In this section, we obtain a new family of small resolutions by applying Lemma 4.10 to [20]. The family is best described by recalling a pattern avoidance result of [2]. Then using Proposition 4.6, we see that the family extends to be stable under the function  $w \mapsto w^{-1}$ .

**Proposition 6.8.** *If  $w$  avoids the patterns*

$$(3\ 4\ 1\ 2), (5\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 1), (6\ 3\ 5\ 2\ 4\ 1)$$

*then  $X_w$  and  $X_{w^{-1}}$  have small resolutions.*

*Proof.* [2, Theorem 1.4, Proposition 2.6] shows that  $w$  avoids this list of patterns if and only if it has a complete BP decomposition. Hence we can apply Facts 3.18 to get a fiber bundle decomposition  $G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \cdots \times^{R_m} X_{w_m} \rightarrow X_w$  such that for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ , we have  $\tau(w_i) = \sigma(w_i)$  or  $\tau(w_i) = \sigma(w_i) \setminus \{s_i\}$ . By Corollary 6.5, for every  $0 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $X_{w_i}$  admits a small resolution satisfying (3). Hence we can use Lemma 4.10 to obtain a small resolution of  $X_w$ . Then Proposition 4.6 gives us a small resolution of  $X_{w^{-1}}$ .  $\square$

*Example 6.9.* Let  $w = (6\ 3\ 5\ 2\ 4\ 1)$ . Note  $w$  does not satisfy Proposition 6.8. Then  $w^{-1} = (6\ 4\ 2\ 5\ 3\ 1)$  satisfies Proposition 6.8 (and Corollary 6.5). Therefore  $X_w$  has a small resolution.

*Example 6.10.* Let  $w = (6\ 4\ 5\ 7\ 3\ 2\ 1)$ . Then  $w$  satisfies Proposition 6.8. The decomposition

$$\tilde{w} = (s_3 s_2 s_1 s_5 s_4 s_3 s_2, s_1, s_5 s_4 s_3, s_6 s_5 s_4, s_6 s_5, s_6)$$

is a complete BP decomposition. As in (3.17), let

$$\begin{aligned} w_0 &= s_1 s_2 s_1 s_3 s_2 s_1 s_4 s_3 s_2 s_5 s_4 s_3 s_2 s_1 = (6\ 4\ 5\ 3\ 2\ 1\ 7) \\ w_1 &= s_1 s_3 s_4 s_3 s_5 s_4 s_3 = (2\ 1\ 6\ 5\ 4\ 3\ 7) \\ w_2 &= s_3 s_4 s_3 s_5 s_4 s_3 s_6 s_5 s_4 = (1\ 2\ 6\ 7\ 5\ 4\ 3) \\ w_3 &= s_4 s_5 s_4 s_6 s_5 s_4 = (1\ 2\ 3\ 7\ 6\ 5\ 4) \\ w_4 &= s_5 s_6 s_5 = (1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 7\ 6\ 5) \\ w_5 &= s_6 = (1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 7\ 6) \end{aligned}$$

with corresponding isomorphism  $\mu : G_{w_0} \times^{R_1} \dots \times^{R_5} X_{w_5} \rightarrow X_w$ .

Then  $P_{\{1,2,3,5\}} \times^{P_{\{1,2,3\}}} P_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \times^{P_{\{1,3,4\}}} P_{\{1,3,4,5\}} \rightarrow G_{w_0}$  is a small resolution such that  $\tau(w_0^{-1}) = I_0$  and  $\tau(w_0) = I_2$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ ,  $X_{w_i}$  is smooth since  $w_i$  avoids 3412 and 4231. Hence  $\mu : P_{\{1,2,3,5\}} \times^{P_{\{1,2,3\}}} P_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \times^{P_{\{1,3,4\}}} P_{\{1,3,4,5\}} \times^{R_1} G_{w_1} \times^{R_2} \dots \times^{R_5} X_{w_5} \rightarrow X_w$  is a small resolution.

We provide an example in §6.11 to show that the property ‘ $X_w$  admits a small resolution’ is not characterized by pattern avoidance. Along the way we provide data to show which Schubert varieties admit small resolutions in  $W = S_5$  of type  $A_4$  and  $W = S_6$  of type  $A_5$ . We conclude that for  $n \leq 6$  and  $w \in W = S_n$  of type  $A_{n-1}$ , then  $X_w$  has a small resolution if and only if  $X_w$  does not have factorial singular locus.

Let  $W = S_5$  of type  $A_4$ . There are 120 Schubert varieties in  $X$ , and 119 of these have small resolutions. The remaining Schubert variety corresponding to  $w = (4\ 5\ 3\ 1\ 2)$  is known to be singular and factorial by [19]. It is well-known that a singular and factorial (or more generally  $\mathbf{Q}$ -factorial) algebraic variety does not admit *any* small resolution (as e.g., in [13]).

There are 88 smooth Schubert varieties, so the small resolutions in this case are the identity morphism. There are 8 singular Schubert varieties with small resolutions by [3] (avoiding 321-hexagon patterns) and 14 by Proposition 6.8. Table 1 provides a description for small resolutions of the form  $P_{\tau(w^{-1})} \times^{R_1} G_{w_1} \times^{R_2} P_{\tau(w)} \rightarrow X_w$  for the remaining 9 singular Schubert varieties with small resolutions. This table was constructed by finding  $w_1$  such that  $w = w_{I_0} \star w_1 \star w_{I_2}$ , where  $I_0 = \tau(w^{-1})$ ,  $I_2 = \tau(w)$ , and the dimension formula of [17] shows smallness. This was accomplished with help of the atlas software [1].

A similar classification holds for  $W = S_6$  of type  $A_5$ . There are 720 Schubert varieties in  $X$ , and exactly 701 of these have small resolutions.

There are 366 smooth Schubert varieties, 43 singular Schubert varieties  $X_w$  such that  $w$  avoids 321-hexagon patterns, and 127 singular Schubert varieties satisfying Proposition 6.8 (55 for which  $w$  or  $w^{-1}$  satisfy Corollary 6.5). Out of the remaining 165 Schubert varieties with small resolutions, 56 have fiber bundle decompositions  $X_u \cong G_v \times^R X_w$  such that  $v, w < u$ . We remark that Proposition 6.8 does not

TABLE 1. Small resolutions for  $W = S_5$ 

$w$	$\tau(w^{-1})$	$w_1$	$\tau(w)$	$\tau(w_1^{-1})$	$\tau(w_1)$
( 3 5 1 4 2 )	{2, 4}	( 2 1 5 4 3 )	{2, 4}	{1, 3, 4}	{1, 3, 4}
( 4 2 5 1 3 )	{1, 3}	( 3 2 1 5 4 )	{1, 3}	{1, 2, 4}	{1, 2, 4}
( 4 5 1 3 2 )	{2, 3}	( 2 1 5 4 3 )	{2, 4}	{1, 3, 4}	{1, 3, 4}
( 3 5 4 1 2 )	{2, 4}	( 2 1 5 4 3 )	{2, 3}	{1, 3, 4}	{1, 3, 4}
( 4 3 5 1 2 )	{2, 3}	( 3 2 1 5 4 )	{1, 3}	{1, 2, 4}	{1, 2, 4}
( 4 5 2 1 3 )	{1, 3}	( 3 2 1 5 4 )	{2, 3}	{1, 2, 4}	{1, 2, 4}
( 5 2 3 4 1 )	{1, 4}	( 1 4 3 2 5 )	{1, 4}	{2, 3}	{2, 3}
( 5 3 4 1 2 )	{2, 4}	( 4 3 1 5 2 )	{1, 3}	{2, 3}	{1, 2, 4}
( 4 5 2 3 1 )	{1, 3}	( 4 1 5 3 2 )	{2, 4}	{2, 3}	{1, 3, 4}

assert that the small resolution satisfies (3) (so care must be taken when applying Lemma 4.10), but we have checked that this does hold true for  $n \leq 6$ .

There are 109 Schubert varieties with small resolutions that are not described by above considerations, and 91 of these  $X_w$  have the property that  $\#\sigma(w) = 5$ . These resolutions were found using atlas software [1] to compute fiber dimensions of Gelfand-MacPherson resolutions. One can find many small resolutions recursively by first looking for small resolutions satisfying (3). We provide in Table 2, 53 Schubert varieties  $X_w$  such that all  $w$  or  $w^{-1}$  provides the list of 91 small resolutions above. To reconstruct the small resolution from Table 2, let  $(I_0, \dots, I_m)$  give a small resolution of  $X_{w_1}$  such that  $I_0 = \tau(w_1^{-1})$  and  $I_m = \tau(w_1)$ . Then  $(\tau(w^{-1}), I_0, \dots, I_m, \tau(w))$  gives a small resolution of  $X_w$ . This accounts for all Schubert varieties having small resolutions.

There are 19 Schubert varieties that are either singular and factorial, or contain the (singular and factorial) interval  $[1\ 4\ 3\ 2\ 5, 4\ 5\ 3\ 1\ 2]$ . It follows that these Schubert varieties do not admit *any* small resolution.

*Example 6.11.* Let  $w = (4\ 6\ 3\ 1\ 5\ 2)$  in  $W = S_6$  of type  $A_5$ , so  $\tau(w^{-1}) = \{2, 3, 5\} = \tau(w)$ . Let  $I_0 = \{2, 3, 5\}$ ,  $I_1 = \{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ , and  $I_2 = \{2, 3, 5\}$ . Then  $\mu : P_{I_0} \times^{R_1} P_{I_1} \times^{R_2} P_{I_2}/B \rightarrow X_w$  is a small resolution by Table 2, where  $J_1 = \{2, 5\} = J_2$ . The permutation  $w$  contains the pattern  $u = 45312$ , and  $X_u$  does not have a small resolution since it is factorial. Therefore small resolutions are not characterized by pattern avoidance.

TABLE 2. Small resolutions for  $W = S_6$ 

$w$	$w_1$	$w$	$w_1$
(4 6 1 2 5 3)	(3 1 6 2 5 4)	(5 2 6 4 1 3)	(3 2 1 6 5 4)
(3 6 1 4 5 2)	(2 1 5 4 3 6)	(5 4 2 6 1 3)	(4 3 2 1 6 5)
(5 2 6 1 3 4)	(4 2 1 6 3 5)	(6 2 3 5 4 1)	(1 6 3 5 4 2)
(4 2 6 1 5 3)	(3 2 1 6 5 4)	(6 2 4 3 5 1)	(1 5 4 3 2 6)
(5 2 3 6 1 4)	(1 4 3 2 6 5)	(6 3 2 4 5 1)	(5 3 2 4 1 6)
(5 6 1 2 4 3)	(3 1 6 2 5 4)	(6 4 5 1 2 3)	(5 4 1 6 2 3)
(4 6 1 5 2 3)	(3 1 6 5 2 4)	(5 6 1 4 3 2)	(2 1 6 5 4 3)
(5 6 1 3 2 4)	(4 1 6 3 2 5)	(4 6 5 1 3 2)	(2 1 6 5 4 3)
(4 6 1 3 5 2)	(2 1 5 4 3 6)	(5 4 6 1 3 2)	(3 2 1 6 5 4)
(5 3 6 1 2 4)	(4 3 1 6 2 5)	(6 3 5 1 4 2)	(6 2 1 5 4 3)
(3 6 1 5 4 2)	(2 1 6 5 4 3)	(5 6 3 1 4 2)	(4 3 1 6 5 2)
(4 3 6 1 5 2)	(3 2 1 6 5 4)	(6 3 4 5 1 2)	(2 5 4 1 6 3)
(4 3 5 6 1 2)	(3 2 5 1 6 4)	(5 3 6 4 1 2)	(4 3 1 6 5 2)
(5 2 6 1 4 3)	(3 2 1 6 5 4)	(5 4 3 6 1 2)	(4 3 2 1 6 5)
(5 2 4 6 1 3)	(1 4 3 2 6 5)	(6 4 2 5 1 3)	(5 4 2 1 6 3)
(6 2 3 4 5 1)	(1 5 3 4 2 6)	(5 4 6 2 1 3)	(4 3 2 1 6 5)
(5 3 2 6 1 4)	(4 3 2 1 6 5)	(6 2 5 3 4 1)	(1 5 4 3 2 6)
(4 6 5 1 2 3)	(3 1 6 5 2 4)	(6 4 2 3 5 1)	(1 5 4 3 2 6)
(5 4 6 1 2 3)	(4 3 1 6 2 5)	(6 4 5 1 3 2)	(6 2 1 5 4 3)
(5 6 1 3 4 2)	(4 1 6 3 2 5)	(6 3 5 4 1 2)	(2 6 5 4 1 3)
(4 6 1 5 3 2)	(2 1 6 5 4 3)	(5 6 3 4 1 2)	(4 6 3 1 5 2)
(5 3 6 1 4 2)	(4 3 1 6 5 2)	(6 4 3 5 1 2)	(5 4 3 1 6 2)
(6 3 4 1 5 2)	(5 2 1 4 3 6)	(6 4 5 2 1 3)	(5 4 2 1 6 3)
(5 3 4 6 1 2)	(2 5 4 1 6 3)	(6 5 2 3 4 1)	(1 5 4 3 2 6)
(4 6 3 1 5 2)	(3 2 1 6 5 4)	(6 5 3 4 1 2)	(5 4 3 1 6 2)
(4 3 6 5 1 2)	(3 2 1 6 5 4)	(6 4 5 2 3 1)	(5 4 1 6 3 2)
(6 2 4 5 1 3)	(1 5 4 2 6 3)		

## REFERENCES

- [1] *Atlas of lie groups and representations*, <http://liegroups.org/>. version 1.0.7.
- [2] Timothy Alland and Edward Richmond, *Pattern avoidance and fiber bundle structures on Schubert varieties*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **154** (2018), 533–550. MR3718076
- [3] Sara C. Billey and Gregory S. Warrington, *Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials for 321-hexagon-avoiding permutations*, J. Algebraic Combin. **13** (2001), no. 2, 111–136. MR1826948
- [4] Anders Björner and Francesco Brenti, *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 231, Springer, New York, 2005. MR2133266
- [5] W. Borho and J.-L. Brylinski, *Differential operators on homogeneous spaces. III. Characteristic varieties of Harish-Chandra modules and of primitive ideals*, Invent. Math. **80** (1985), no. 1, 1–68. MR784528
- [6] Raoul Bott and Hans Samelson, *Applications of the theory of Morse to symmetric spaces*, Amer. J. Math. **80** (1958), 964–1029. MR0105694
- [7] P. Bressler, M. Finkelberg, and V. Lunts, *Vanishing cycles on Grassmannians*, Duke Math. J. **61** (1990), no. 3, 763–777. MR1084458
- [8] Michel Demazure, *Désingularisation des variétés de Schubert généralisées*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **7** (1974), 53–88. Collection of articles dedicated to Henri Cartan on the occasion of his 70th birthday, I. MR0354697

- [9] Sergei Gelfand and Robert MacPherson, *Verma modules and Schubert cells: a dictionary*, Paul Dubreil and Marie-Paule Malliavin Algebra Seminar, 34th Year (Paris, 1981), 1982, pp. 1–50. MR662251
- [10] Mark Goresky and Robert MacPherson, *Intersection homology. II*, *Invent. Math.* **72** (1983), no. 1, 77–129. MR696691
- [11] H. C. Hansen, *On cycles in flag manifolds*, *Math. Scand.* **33** (1973), 269–274 (1974). MR0376703
- [12] Jens Carsten Jantzen, *Representations of algebraic groups*, Second, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, vol. 107, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. MR2015057
- [13] Nicolas Perrin, *Small resolutions of minuscule Schubert varieties*, *Compos. Math.* **143** (2007), no. 5, 1255–1312. MR2360316
- [14] R. W. Richardson and T. A. Springer, *The Bruhat order on symmetric varieties*, *Geom. Dedicata* **35** (1990), no. 1-3, 389–436. MR1066573
- [15] Edward Richmond and William Slofstra, *Billey-Postnikov decompositions and the fibre bundle structure of Schubert varieties*, *Math. Ann.* **366** (2016), no. 1-2, 31–55. MR3552231
- [16] ———, *Staircase diagrams and enumeration of smooth Schubert varieties*, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **150** (2017), 328–376. MR3645580
- [17] Parameswaran Sankaran and P. Vanchinathan, *Small resolutions of Schubert varieties in symplectic and orthogonal Grassmannians*, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **30** (1994), no. 3, 443–458. MR1299524
- [18] T. A. Springer, *Linear algebraic groups*, second, *Modern Birkhäuser Classics*, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2009. MR2458469
- [19] Alexander Woo and Alexander Yong, *Governing singularities of Schubert varieties*, *J. Algebra* **320** (2008), no. 2, 495–520. MR2422304
- [20] A. V. Zelevinskiĭ, *Small resolutions of singularities of Schubert varieties*, *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* **17** (1983), no. 2, 75–77. MR705051