

TWO PARTITIONS OF A FLAG MANIFOLD

G. LUSZTIG

INTRODUCTION

0.1. Let G be a connected reductive group over an algebraically closed field \mathbf{k} . Let W be the Weyl group of G and let \mathcal{B} be the variety of Borel subgroups of G . In this paper we consider two partitions of \mathcal{B} into pieces indexed by the various $w \in W$. One partition (introduced in [L79]) consists of the subvarieties

$$(a) Y_{s,w} = \{B \in \mathcal{B}; pos(B, sBs^{-1}) = w\}$$

where s is in G_* (the open subset of G consisting of regular semisimple elements) and $pos : \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow W$ is the relative position map. The other partition (introduced in [DL76]) is defined when

(b) \mathbf{k} is an algebraic closure of a finite prime field;

and

(c) $F : G \rightarrow G$ is the Frobenius map for an \mathbf{F}_q -split rational structure on G (with \mathbf{F}_q being the subfield of \mathbf{k} with q elements); it consists of the subvarieties

$$(d) X_w = \{B \in \mathcal{B}; pos(B, F(B)) = w\}.$$

(The definition of the varieties in (a) was inspired by that of the varieties in (d).) One of the themes of this paper is to point out a remarkable similarity between $Y_{s,w}$ in (a) and the quotient $U^F \backslash X_w$ of X_w in (b), where U^F is the group of rational points of the unipotent radical of an F -stable $B \in \mathcal{B}$, acting by conjugation.

We show that $Y_{s,w}$ is affine when w has minimal length in its conjugacy class (the analogous result for $U^F \backslash X_w$ was known earlier). We show that the closure of $Y_{s,w}$ has the same type of singularities as the closure of a Bruhat cell (the analogous result for X_w was known earlier). We show that if \mathbf{k}, F, q are as in (b),(c), the number of fixed point of F^t on $Y_{s,w}$ and on $U^F \backslash X_w$ is the same (here $t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$); this result is implicit in [L78], [L79]. (This number can be expressed as a trace of left multiplication by the standard basis element T_w on the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of W .) We show that while the cohomologies of X_w give rise to a virtual G^F -module (see [DL76]) (so that the cohomologies of $U^F \backslash X_w$ give rise to a virtual module of the Hecke algebra of G^F with respect to B^F), the cohomologies of $Y_{s,w}$ give rise to a virtual W -module.

Supported by NSF grant DMS-1855773

But there is one key difference between $Y_{s,w}$ and $U^F \backslash X_w$: the former can be defined also in characteristic zero, while the latter cannot. A study of $Y_{s,w}$ over the real numbers can be found in §3.

Another biproduct of our study is a way to associate to any w in W (or more generally any Coxeter group) a subset $\mathfrak{E}(w)$ of W , see 1.10 and §5.

0.2. For any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ let U_B be the unipotent radical of B . For $B \in \mathcal{B}, w \in W$ let

$$\mathcal{B}_{B,w} = \{B' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B, B') = w\},$$

$$\mathcal{B}_{B,\leq w} = \{B' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B, B') \leq w\}.$$

Here \leq is the standard partial order on W . For w in W and B, B' in \mathcal{B} let

$$Z_{B,B',w} = \{B'' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B, B'') = z, \text{pos}(B', B'') = w\},$$

$$Z_{B,B',\leq w} = \{B'' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B, B'') = z, \text{pos}(B', B'') \leq w\}$$

where $z = \text{pos}(B, B')$. For a maximal torus T of G we set $\mathcal{B}^T = \{B \in \mathcal{B}; T \subset B\}$. For $s \in G_*$ let T_s be the unique maximal torus containing s .

Proposition 0.3. *Let $s \in G_*, w \in W, z \in W$. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}, B' \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$ be such that $\text{pos}(B, B') = z$.*

- (a) *There is a canonical isomorphism $Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_{B,B',w}$.*
- (b) *Let $Y_{s,\leq w} = \cup_{y \in W} Y_{s,y}$ (a closed subset of \mathcal{B}). There is a canonical isomorphism $Y_{s,\leq w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_{B,B',\leq w}$.*

Statement (a) is contained in the proof of [L79, 1.2].

Proposition 0.4. *Assume that \mathbf{k}, F are as in 0.1(b),(c). Let $w \in W, z \in W$. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}^F, B' \in \mathcal{B}^F$ be such that $\text{pos}(B, B') = z$.*

- (a) *There is a canonical isomorphism $U_B^F \backslash (X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z}) \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_{B,B',w}$.*
- (b) *Let $X_{\leq w} = \cup_{y \in W} X_y$ (a closed subset of \mathcal{B}). There is a canonical isomorphism $U_B^F \backslash (X_{\leq w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z}) \xrightarrow{\sim} Z_{B,B',\leq w}$.*

The action of U_B^F is by conjugation.

0.5. Let \mathbf{q} be an indeterminate. Let \mathcal{H} be the free $\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{q}]$ -module with basis $\{T_w; w \in W\}$. It is well known that there is a unique structure of associative $\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{q}]$ -algebra on \mathcal{H} such that $T_y T_{y'} = T_{yy'}$ if $l(yy') = l(y) + l(y')$ and $(T_y + 1)(T_y - \mathbf{q}) = 0$ if $l(y) = 1$. Here $l : W \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is the length function.

For w, w' in W we have $T_w T_{w'} = \sum_{w'' \in W} N_{w,w',w''} T_{w''}$ where $N_{w,w',w''} \in \mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{q}]$.

Corollary 0.6. *Assume that \mathbf{k}, F, q are as in 0.1(b),(c). Let $w \in W, z \in W$.*

- (a) *Assume that $s \in G_* \cap G^F$. Let $B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s} \cap \mathcal{B}^F$. Let $t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Then $\sharp(Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z})^{F^t} = N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(q^t)$.*
- (b) *Let $B \in \mathcal{B}^F$. Then $\sharp(U_B^F \backslash (X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z}))^{F^t} = N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(q^t)$.*

Corollary 0.7. *Assume that \mathbf{k}, F, q are as in 0.1(b),(c) and $t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Let $w \in W$.*

(a) *Assume that $s \in G_* \cap G^F$ and that T_s is split over F_q . Then $\sharp(Y_{s,w}^{F^t}) = \sum_{z \in W} N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(q^t) = \text{tr}(T_w : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H})_{\mathbf{q}=q^t}$.*

(b) *Let $B \in \mathcal{B}^F$. Then $\sharp(U_B^F \setminus X_w)^{F^t} = \sum_{z \in W} N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(q^t) = \text{tr}(T_w : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H})_{\mathbf{q}=q^t}$.*

Here $T_w : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is left multiplication by T_w in \mathcal{H} . Note that (a) can be deduced from [L79, 1.2]; (b) appears in [L78, 3.10(a)].

Proposition 0.8. *Let $w \in W, i \in \mathbf{Z}$. Assume that \mathbf{k}, F, q are as in 0.1(b),(c).*

(a) *If $s \in G_* \cap G^F$ and some/any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$ satisfies $F(B) = B$, then any eigenvalue of F on $H_c^i(Y_{s,w})$ is in $\{q^j; j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.*

(b) *If $B \in \mathcal{B}^F$, any eigenvalue of F on $H_c^i(U_B^F \setminus X_w)$ is in $\{q^j; j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$.*

0.9. Let \underline{W} be the set of conjugacy classes in W . For $w \in W$ we denote by \underline{w} the conjugacy class of w . In this subsection \mathbf{k} is as in 0.1(b). Assuming that F is as in 0.1(c) we define a map $G_* \cap G^F \rightarrow \underline{W}$, $s \mapsto [s]$ by $\text{pos}(B, F(B)) \in [s]$ for some/any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$. Let $w \in W$. As shown in [DL76], if F is as in 0.1(c), the finite group G^F acts naturally on $H_c^i(X_w)$ ($\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l$ -cohomology with compact support, $i \in \mathbf{Z}$), giving rise to a virtual representation $R_w = \sum_i (-1)^i H_c^i(X_w)$ of G^F ; moreover, R_w depends only on \underline{w} .

For $j \in \mathbf{Z}$ we denote by $H_c^i(X_w)_j$ the part of weight j of $H_c^i(X_w)$ and we set $R_{j,w} = \sum_i (-1)^i H_c^i(X_w)_j$ (a virtual representation of G^F). Note that $R_w = \sum_j R_{j,w}$.

The following result is proved in §2.

(a) *For any $j \in \mathbf{Z}$ there is a unique virtual representation $\mathfrak{R}_{j,w}$ of W such that for any F, q as in 0.1(c) and any $s \in G_* \cap G^F$ we have $\text{tr}(y, \mathfrak{R}_{j,w}) = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^i \text{tr}(F, H_c^i(Y_{s,w})_j) q^{-j/2}$ for some/any $y \in [s]$. Here $H_c^i(Y_{s,w})_j$ is the part of weight j of $H_c^i(Y_{s,w})$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{R}_w := \sum_j \mathfrak{R}_{j,w}$ depends only on \underline{w} .*

Another definition of $\mathfrak{R}_{j,w}$ (valid also in characteristic zero) is given in [L79, 1.2] (where it is denoted by $\rho_{j,w}$). We will not attempt to compare it with the present definition. In [L79] several arguments are based on a statement in [L79, p.327, line -6] which was stated without proof. That statement can be proved using the theory of character sheaves; this will not be done here.

0.10. Let $w \in W$. Let

$$(a) \quad \mathfrak{E}(w) = \{z \in W; N_{w,z,z} \neq 0\}.$$

From 0.6 we see that the following three conditions for $z \in W$ are equivalent.

- (i) We have $Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z^{-1}} \neq \emptyset$ for some, or equivalently, any $s \in G_*, B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$.
- (ii) We have $X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B_0,z^{-1}} \neq \emptyset$ for some, or equivalently, any $B \in \mathcal{B}^F$ (here \mathbf{k}, F are as in 0.1(b),(c)).
- (iii) We have $z \in \mathfrak{E}(w)$.

We use that $N(w, z, z) \neq 0$ implies $N(w, z, z)(q) \neq 0$ for any $q \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$, since

(b) $N(w, w', w'')$ is a polynomial in $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q} - 1$ with coefficients in \mathbf{N} .
 I believe that the subsets $\mathfrak{E}(w)$ of W deserve further study. A beginning of such a study can be found in §5.

0.11. I thank Xuhua He for useful discussions.

1. PROOF OF PROPOSITIONS 0.3, 0.4, 0.8

1.1. We prove Proposition 0.3(a). There is a unique $B'^- \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$ such that $B' \cap B'^- = T_s$. Let $U_z = U_B \cap U_{B'^-}$. We identify U_z with $\mathcal{B}_{B,z}$ by $u \mapsto uB'u^{-1}$. Hence we can identify

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} &= \{u \in U_z; \text{pos}(uB'u^{-1}, suB'u^{-1}s^{-1}) = w\} \\ &= \{u \in U_z; \text{pos}(B', u^{-1}suB'u^{-1}s^{-1}u) = w\} \\ &= \{u \in U_z; \text{pos}(B', s^{-1}u^{-1}suB'u^{-1}s^{-1}us) = w\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the isomorphism $U_z \xrightarrow{\sim} U_z$ given by $u \mapsto s^{-1}u^{-1}su$ (recall that $s \in G_*$) we obtain an identification

$$(a) \ Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} = \{u' \in U_z; \text{pos}(B', u'B'u'^{-1}) = w\}.$$

Now $u' \mapsto u'B'u'^{-1}$ identifies

$$\{u' \in U_z; \text{pos}(B', u'B'u'^{-1}) = w\} = \{B'' \in \mathcal{B}_{B,z}; \text{pos}(B', B'') = w\} = Z_{B,B',w}.$$

Combining with (a) we obtain 0.3(a). The same proof (replacing $= w$ by $\leq w$) gives 0.3(b). Note that the isomorphisms in 0.3 are given by $uB'u^{-1} \mapsto s^{-1}u^{-1}suB'u^{-1}s^{-1}us$ with $u \in U_z$.

1.2. We prove Proposition 0.4(a). Let $B'^- \in \mathcal{B}^F$ such that $B' \cap B'^-$ is a maximal torus contained in B . Let $U_z = U_B \cap U_{B'^-}$. We identify U_z with $\mathcal{B}_{B,z}$ by $u \mapsto uB'u^{-1}$. Hence we can identify

$$\begin{aligned} X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} &= \{u \in U_z; \text{pos}(uB'u^{-1}, F(uB'u^{-1})) = w\} \\ &= \{u \in U_z; \text{pos}(B', u^{-1}F(u)B'F(u^{-1})u) = w\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the isomorphism $U_s^F \backslash U_z \xrightarrow{\sim} U_z$ given by $u \mapsto u^{-1}F(u)$ (coming from Lang's theorem) we obtain an identification

$$U_z^F \backslash (X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z}) = \{u' \in U_z; \text{pos}(B', u'B'u'^{-1}) = w\}.$$

This can be identified with $Z_{B,B',w}$ as in 1.1. This proves 0.4(a). The same proof (replacing $= w$ by $\leq w$) gives 0.4(b). Note that the isomorphisms in 0.4 are given by $uB'u^{-1} \mapsto u^{-1}F(u)B'F(u)^{-1}u$ with $u \in U_z$.

1.3. Let T be a maximal torus of G . Let w_0 be the longest element of W . For any $B \in \mathcal{B}^T$ let ${}^B\mathcal{B} = \{B' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B', B) = w_0\}$, an open set in \mathcal{B} . We show:

$$(a) \ \mathcal{B} = \cup_{B \in \mathcal{B}^T} ({}^B\mathcal{B}).$$

Let $B' \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}^T$. We have $\text{pos}(B_1, B') = z$ for some $z \in W$. We can find $B \in \mathcal{B}^T$ such that $\text{pos}(B, B_1) = w_0 z^{-1}$. Since $l(w_0 z^{-1}) + l(z) = l(w_0)$ we must have $\text{pos}(B, B') = w_0$. Thus $B' \in {}^B\mathcal{B}$. This proves (a).

1.4. Let $w \in W, s \in G_*$. We show:

(a) $Y_{s,w}$ is smooth of pure dimension $l(w)$.

From 1.3(a) we have an open covering $Y_{s,w} = \cup_{B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}} (Y_{s,w} \cap {}^B\mathcal{B})$. It is enough to prove that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$, $Y_{s,w} \cap {}^B\mathcal{B}$ is smooth of pure dimension $l(w)$. Define $B' \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$ by $B \cap B' = T_s$. By 0.3(a) we can identify $Y_{s,w} \cap {}^B\mathcal{B} = Z_{B,B',w} = \{B'' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B, B'') = w_0, \text{pos}(B', B'') = w\}$. (The identification is by $uB'u^{-1} \mapsto s^{-1}u^{-1}suB'u^{-1}s^{-1}us$ with $u \in U_B$.) This is the intersection of the smooth irreducible subvariety $\{B'' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B', B'') = w\}$ of dimension $l(w)$ of \mathcal{B} with the open subset $\{B'' \in \mathcal{B}; \text{pos}(B, B'') = w_0\}$ of \mathcal{B} hence it is smooth of pure dimension $l(w)$. This proves (a).

Another (longer) proof of (a) is given in [L79, 1.1].

1.5. In this subsection we assume that \mathbf{k}, F are as in 0.1(b),(c). Let $w \in W$. The following result appears in [DL76, 1.4].

(a) X_w is smooth of pure dimension $l(w)$.

We give an alternative proof of (a) similar to that in 1.4. Let T be a maximal torus of G such that $F(T) = T$. From 1.3(a) we have an open covering $X_w = \cup_{B \in \mathcal{B}^T} (X_w \cap {}^B\mathcal{B})$. It is enough to prove that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}^T$, $X_w \cap {}^B\mathcal{B}$ is smooth of pure dimension $l(w)$.

Define $B' \in \mathcal{B}^T$ by $B \cap B' = T$. By 0.4(a) we can identify $U_B^F \backslash (X_w \cap {}^B\mathcal{B}) = Z_{B,B',w}$ where as in the proof in 1.4, $Z_{B,B',w}$ is smooth of pure dimension $l(w)$. The conjugation action of U_B^F on $X_w \cap {}^B\mathcal{B}$ is free since the conjugation action of U_B on ${}^B\mathcal{B}$ is free (and transitive). It follows that $X_w \cap {}^B\mathcal{B}$ is smooth of pure dimension $l(w)$. This proves (a).

1.6. Let $s \in G_*, w \in W$. Let $T = T_s$. We show:

(a) $Y_{s,\leq w}$ is equal to the closure of $Y_{s,w}$ in \mathcal{B} .

Let $B_1 \in Y_{s,\leq w}$. We have $B_1 \in Y_{s,y}$ for a unique $y \in W$. By 1.3(a) we can find $B \in \mathcal{B}^T$ such that $B_1 \in {}^B\mathcal{B}$. Define $B' \in \mathcal{B}^T$ by $B \cap B' = T$. By 0.3(b) the open set $Y_{s,\leq w} \cap {}^B\mathcal{B}$ of $Y_{s,\leq w}$ is identified ${}^B\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B',\leq w}$, an open set in $\mathcal{B}_{B',\leq w}$. Under this identification B_1 becomes an element $B_2 \in {}^B\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B',y}$. Since ${}^B\mathcal{B}$ is open in \mathcal{B} we have

$${}^B\mathcal{B} \cap (\text{closure of } \mathcal{B}_{B',w} \text{ in } \mathcal{B}) \subset \text{closure of } {}^B\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B',w} \text{ in } {}^B\mathcal{B}.$$

In particular we have $B_2 \subset \text{closure of } {}^B\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B',w} \text{ in } {}^B\mathcal{B}$. Using again the identification above we deduce that B_1 is in the closure of $Y_{s,w} \cap {}^B\mathcal{B}$ in ${}^B\mathcal{B}$ and in particular B_1 is in the closure of $Y_{s,w}$ in \mathcal{B} . This proves (a).

Now let B_1, B, B', B_2, y be as in the proof of (a). Let $\mathfrak{H}_{B_1}^i$ be the stalk at B_1 of the i -th cohomology sheaf of the intersection cohomology complex of $Y_{s,\leq w}$ with coefficients in $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l|_{Y_{s,w}}$ (this is defined in view of (a) and 1.4(a)). From the proof of (a) we see that

$$(b) \mathfrak{H}_{B_1}^i = {}'\mathfrak{H}_{B_2}^i,$$

where ${}'\mathfrak{H}_{B_2}^i$ is the stalk at $B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{B',y}$ of the i -th cohomology sheaf of the intersection cohomology complex of $\mathcal{B}_{B',\leq w}$ with coefficients in $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l|_{\mathcal{B}_{B',w}}$.

Note that if $w \in W$ and \mathbf{k}, F are as in 0.1(b),(c), then results similar to (a),(b) are known to hold for $X_{\leq w}$.

1.7. We prove Proposition 0.8. Let B be as in (a),(b). Using the decompositions

$$Y_{s,w} = \sqcup_{z \in W} (Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z}),$$

$$U_B^F \backslash X_w = \sqcup_{z \in W} (U_0^F \backslash (X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z})),$$

we see that it is enough to show that for any $z \in W$ and any $i \in \mathbf{Z}$, any eigenvalue of F on $H_c^i(Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z})$ is in $\{q^j; j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ (in case (a)) and any eigenvalue of F on $H_c^i(U_0^F \backslash (X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z}))$ is in $\{q^j; j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ (in case (b)). Using 0.3, 0.4, we see that it is enough to show that for any $z \in W$ and any $i \in \mathbf{Z}$, any eigenvalue of F on $H_c^i(Z_{B,B',w})$ is in $\{q^j; j \in \mathbf{Z}\}$ where B' is as in 0.3, 0.4. This is a special case of [L78, 3.7].

1.8. We prove Corollary 0.6. Let B be as in 0.6. Using 0.3, 0.4 we see that it is enough to prove that for some $B' \in \mathcal{B}^F$ with $\text{pos}(B, B') = z$ we have

$$(a) \#(Z_{B,B',w}^{F^t}) = N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(q^t).$$

This is a special case of [L78, 3.7].

2. CONSTRUCTION OF $\mathfrak{R}_{j,w}$

2.1. For any $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ let $\mathcal{H}_n = \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{q}]} \mathcal{H}$ where $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l$ is viewed as a $\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{q}]$ -algebra via $\mathbf{q} \mapsto n$. Then \mathcal{H}_n is a $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l$ -algebra with $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l$ -basis $\{T_w; w \in W\}$. If $n \neq -1$, the algebra \mathcal{H}_n is semisimple and the irreducible \mathcal{H}_n -modules (up to isomorphism) are in natural bijection $E_n \leftrightarrow E$ with $\text{Irr}(W)$, the set of irreducible W -modules over $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l$ (up to isomorphism), once \sqrt{n} has been chosen.

In this section we assume that \mathbf{k} is as in 0.1(b). Let $w \in W, j \in \mathbf{Z}$. Note that the uniqueness of $\mathfrak{R}_{j,w}$ in 0.9(a) is clear since for any $y \in W$ we can find F, q as in 0.1(c) and $s \in G_* \cap G^F$ such that $y \in [s]$. We now prove the existence of $\mathfrak{R}_{j,w}$ in 0.9(a).

Let F, q be as in 0.1(c). Let \mathcal{F}_q be the vector space of functions $\mathcal{B}^F \rightarrow \bar{\mathbf{Q}}_l$. By assigning to the basis element T_w of \mathcal{H}_q the linear map $T_w : \mathcal{F}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_q$ given by $f \mapsto f'$ where $f'(B) = \sum_{B' \in \mathcal{B}^F; \text{pos}(B, B')=w} f(B')$, we identify \mathcal{H}_q with a subalgebra of $\text{End}(\mathcal{F}_q)$. We have a canonical decomposition $\mathcal{F}_q = \oplus_{E \in \text{Irr}(W)} E_q \otimes [E]_q$ (as a (\mathcal{H}_q, G^F) -module) where $[E]_q$ is an irreducible representation of G^F .

Let $s \in G_* \cap G^F$. Let $|W|$ be the order of W . For $t \in \mathbf{N}$ we set $F_t = F^{1+t|W|}, q_t = q^{1+t|W|}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^i \text{tr}(F_t, H_c^i(Y_{s,w})) \\ &= \#(B \in Y_{s,w}; F_t(B) = B) = \#(B \in \mathcal{B}^{F_t}; \text{pos}(B, sBs^{-1}) = w) \\ &= \text{tr}(sT_w : \mathcal{F}_{q_t} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{q_t}) = \sum_{E \in \text{Irr}(W)} \text{tr}(T_w, E_{q_t}) \text{tr}(s, [E]_{q_t}). \end{aligned}$$

By [DL76, 7.8] we have $\text{tr}(s, [E]_{q_t}) = ([E]_{q_t} : R_{y, q_t})$ where $y \in [s]$, R_{y, q_t} is defined as R_y in 0.3(a) with F, q replaced by F_t, q_t and $([E]_{q_t} : R_{y, q_t})$ denotes multiplicity of an irreducible G^{F_t} -module in a virtual G^{F_t} -module. Note that the conjugacy class $[s]$ in W associated to s and to F_t is independent of t since $F^{|W|}(B) = B$ for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ that contains s . Moreover, from [L84] it is known that $([E]_{q_t} : R_{y, q_t})$ is independent of t . Thus we have

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^i \text{tr}(F_t, H_c^i(Y_{s, w})) = \sum_{E \in \text{Irr}(W)} \text{tr}(T_w, E_{q_t}) ([E]_q : R_y).$$

From 0.8 we see that $H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_{j'} = 0$ if j' is odd, while if j' is even $F^{|W|}$ acts on $H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_{j'}$ as $q^{j' |W|/2}$ times a unipotent transformation so that $\text{tr}(F_t, H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_{j'}) = \text{tr}(F, H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_{j'}) q^{j' t |W|/2}$. We see that

$$\sum_{i, j' \text{ in } \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^i \text{tr}(F, H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_{j'}) q^{-j'/2} q_t^{j'/2} = \sum_{E \in \text{Irr}(W)} \text{tr}(T_w, E_{q_t}) ([E]_q : R_y).$$

It is known that for $E \in \text{Irr}(W)$ we have $\text{tr}(T_w, E_{q_t}) = \sum_{j' \in \mathbf{Z}} \mu_{w, E; j'} q_t^{j'/2}$ for $t \in \mathbf{N}$ where $\mu_{w, E; j'} \in \mathbf{Z}$ are independent of t and are zero for all but finitely many j' . Thus we have

(a)

$$\sum_{i, j' \text{ in } \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^i \text{tr}(F, H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_{j'}) q^{-j'/2} q_t^{j'/2} = \sum_{E \in \text{Irr}(W), j' \in \mathbf{Z}} \mu_{w, E; j'} ([E]_q : R_y) q_t^{j'/2}$$

for $t \in \mathbf{N}$. By comparing the coefficient of $q_t^{j/2}$ in the two sides of (a), we obtain

$$(b) \quad \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^i \text{tr}(F, H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_j) q^{-j/2} = \sum_{E \in \text{Irr}(W)} \mu_{w, E; j} ([E]_q : R_y).$$

Now for $E \in \text{Irr}(W)$ we set $R_E = |W|^{-1} \sum_{z \in W} \text{tr}(z, E) R_z$ (a rational linear combination of representations of G^F) and we use the equality $([E]_q : R_{E'}) = ([E']_q : R_E)$ for E, E' in $\text{Irr}(W)$ (a known property [L84] of the nonabelian Fourier transform). We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathbf{Z}} (-1)^i \text{tr}(F, H_c^i(Y_{s, w})_j) q^{-j/2} &= \sum_{E, E' \text{ in } \text{Irr}(W)} \text{tr}(y, E') ([E]_q : R_{E'}) \mu_{w, E; j} \\ &= \sum_{E, E' \text{ in } \text{Irr}(W)} \text{tr}(y, E') ([E']_q : R_E) \mu_{w, E; j} \\ &= \sum_{E' \in \text{Irr}(W)} \text{tr}(y, E') ([E']_q : \sum_{E \in \text{Irr}(W)} \mu_{w, E; j} R_E) = \sum_{E' \in \text{Irr}(W)} \text{tr}(y, E') ([E']_q : R_{j, w}) \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality can be deduced from [L84, 3.8]. We see that $\mathfrak{R}_{j, w} := \sum_{E' \in \text{Irr}(W)} ([E']_q : R_{j, w}) E'$ has the properties stated in 0.9(a). Note that $\mathfrak{R}_w = \sum_j \mathfrak{R}_{j, w} = \sum_{E' \in \text{Irr}(W)} ([E']_q : R_w) E'$ depends only on \underline{w} since R_w has such a property. This completes the proof of 0.9(a).

2.2. From the proof in 2.1 we see that for $E \in \text{Irr}(W)$, $w \in W$, $j \in 2\mathbf{N}$ we have

$$(a) (E : \mathfrak{R}_{j,w}) = ([E]_q : R_{j,w})$$

where the left hand side is a multiplicity as a W -module and the right hand side is a multiplicity as a G^F -module. It follows that

$$(b) (E : \mathfrak{R}_w) = ([E]_q : R_w).$$

3. OVER REAL NUMBERS

3.1. In this section we assume that $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{C}$ and that G has a given split \mathbf{R} -structure. Let $G(\mathbf{R})$, $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$ be the set of real points of G, \mathcal{B} . Let $s \in G_* \cap G(\mathbf{R})$ be such that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}^{T_s}$ we have $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$. Let $w \in W$ and let $Y_{s,w}(\mathbf{R}) = Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$. This is a smooth manifold of pure (real) dimension equal to $l(w)$. (See 1.4(a).)

For w in W and B, B' in \mathcal{B}^{T_s} let $Z_{B,B',w}$ be as in 0.2. Then $Z_{B,B',w}$ is defined over \mathbf{R} and we set $Z_{B,B',w}(\mathbf{R}) = Z_{B,B',w} \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{R})$. Let $z = \text{pos}(B, B')$. The following result can be deduced from [R98, 6.1]:

$$(a) \chi_c(Z_{B,B',w}(\mathbf{R})) = N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(-1)$$

where χ_c is Euler characteristic in cohomology with compact support. Using (a) and the homeomorphism $Y_{s,w}(\mathbf{R}) \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} \cong Z_{B,B',w}(\mathbf{R})$ deduced from 0.3(a) we see that

$$\chi_c(Y_{s,w}(\mathbf{R}) \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z}) = N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(-1).$$

Using this and the partition $Y_{s,w}(\mathbf{R}) = \cup_{z \in W} (Y_{s,w}(\mathbf{R}) \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z})$, we deduce:

Proposition 3.2. *We have $\chi_c(Y_{s,w}(\mathbf{R})) = \sum_{z \in W} N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(-1) = \text{tr}(T_w : \mathcal{H}_{-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{-1})$.*

Here $T_w : \mathcal{H}_{-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{-1}$ is left multiplication by T_w in \mathcal{H}_{-1} .

4. AFFINENESS

4.1. Let $s \in G_*$, $w \in W$. Assume that w has minimal length in \underline{w} . We show:

(a) $Y_{s,w}$ is affine.

The proof is a modification of the proof of the analogous result for X_w given in [BR08]. As in [loc.cit.] we can assume that w is elliptic and good (as defined in [loc.cit.]). For such w , it is shown in [loc.cit.] that for some $n \geq 1$, the variety

$$\begin{aligned} V = \{ & (B_0, B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n) \in \mathcal{B}^{n+1}; \\ & \text{pos}(B_0, B_1) = \text{pos}(B_1, B_2) = \dots = \text{pos}(B_{n-1}, B_n) = w \} \end{aligned}$$

is affine. Define $\phi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{n+1}$ by $B \mapsto (B, sBs^{-1}, s^2Bs^{-2}, \dots, s^nBs^{-n})$. Then ϕ is an isomorphism of \mathcal{B} onto a closed subvariety V' of \mathcal{B}^{n+1} . Then $V \cap V'$ is closed in V hence is affine. Now ϕ restricts to an isomorphism of $Y_{s,w}$ onto $V \cap V'$ hence $Y_{s,w}$ is affine.

5. THE SUBSET $\mathfrak{E}(w)$ OF W

5.1. In this section W is allowed to be any Coxeter group. For any w, w', w'' in W , the polynomials $N_{w,w',w''} \in \mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{q}]$ can be defined in terms of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra \mathcal{H} with basis $\{T_w; w \in W\}$ attached as in 0.5 to W . As in 0.10(a) for any $w \in W$ we define a subset of W by

$$\mathfrak{E}(w) = \{z \in W; N_{w,z,z} \neq 0\}.$$

For example, if $w = 1$, then $\mathfrak{E}(w) = W$; if $w = \sigma$, $l(\sigma) = 1$, then $\mathfrak{E}(w) = \{z \in W; l(\sigma z) = l(z) - 1\}$.

(a) *If W is finite and w_0 is the longest element of W , then for any w we have $w_0 \in \mathfrak{E}(w)$. In particular, $\mathfrak{E}(w) \neq \emptyset$.*

We argue by induction on $l(w)$. If $w = 1$ we have $T_w T_{w_0} = T_{w_0}$ and the desired result holds. Assume now that $l(w) > 0$. We have $w = \sigma z$ where $l(\sigma) = 1, l(z) = l(w) - 1$. From the definition we have $N_{w,w_0,w_0} = N_{z,w_0,w_0}(\mathbf{q} - 1) + N_{z,w_0,\sigma w_0}$. Since any $N_{a,b,c}$ satisfies 0.10(b) and $N_{z,w_0,w_0} \neq 0$ by the induction hypothesis, it follows that $N_{w,w_0,w_0} \neq 0$. This proves (a).

(b) *If W is a finite Weyl group and w is a Coxeter element of minimal length in W then $\mathfrak{E}(w) = \{w_0\}$.*

Assume that \mathbf{k}, F, q are as in 0.1(b),(c). Let B, B' be in \mathcal{B}^F . Using [L76, 2.5] we have $X_w \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} = \emptyset$ for $z \neq w_0$. Using this and 0.4(a), we see that $Z_{B,B',w} = \emptyset$ if $\text{pos}(B, B') \neq w_0$. Using now 0.6, we see that $N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}}(q) = 0$ if $z \neq w_0$. Since q can take infinitely many values we see that $N_{w,z^{-1},z^{-1}} = 0$ if $z \neq w_0$, so that $\mathfrak{E}(w) \subset \{w_0\}$. By (a) we have $\mathfrak{E} \neq \emptyset$ and (b) follows.

(c) *Assume that $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ and that W has generators σ_1, σ_2 and relations $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = 1$ and $(\sigma_1 \sigma_2)^{2n} = 1$ (a dihedral group of order $4n$). Let $w = (s_1 s_2)^k$ where $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We have $\mathfrak{E}(w) = \{z \in W; l(z) \geq 2n - k + 1\}$.*

The proof is by computation.

(d) *Assume that W has generators σ_1, σ_2 and relations $\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 = 1$ (an infinite dihedral group). Let $w = (s_1 s_2)^k$ where $k \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. We have $\mathfrak{E}(w) = \emptyset$. We have $\mathfrak{E}(s_1 s_2 s_1) = \{s_1 s_2, s_1 s_2 s_1, s_1 s_2 s_1 s_2, s_1 s_2 s_1 s_2 s_1, \dots\}$.*

The proof is by computation.

5.2. Let $W^\bullet = \{w \in W; \mathfrak{E}(w) \neq \emptyset\}$. If W is finite then by 5.1(a) we have $w_0 \in \mathfrak{E}(w)$ for any $w \in W$; thus in this case $W^\bullet = W$. If W is infinite then it may happen that $W^\bullet \neq W$. For example in the setup of 5.1(d) we have $s_1 s_2 \notin W^\bullet$.

(a) *For any $w \in W^\bullet$ and any $z \in \mathfrak{E}(w)$ we have $\deg(N_{w,z,z}) \leq l(w)$.*

The proof is immediate; see for example [L20, 2(b)].

For any $w \in W^\bullet$ we set

(b) $d(w) = \max_{z \in \mathfrak{E}(w)} \deg N_{w,z,z}$.

From (a) we have

(c) $d(w) \leq l(w)$ for all $w \in W^\bullet$.

If W is finite we have $d(w) = l(w)$ for all $w \in W = W^\bullet$; indeed, by the proof of 5.1(a), we have $\deg N_{w,w_0,w_0} = l(w)$. If W is infinite then it may happen that

$d(w) < l(w)$ for some $w \in W^\bullet$. For example in the setup of 5.1(d) we have $d(s_1 s_2 s_1) = 2 < 3 = l(s_1 s_2 s_1)$.

For $w \in W^\bullet$ we define $\mathfrak{E}'(w) = \{z \in \mathfrak{E}(w); \deg N_{w,z,z} = d(w)\}$ (a nonempty set). If W is finite and w is such that any simple reflection of W appears in any reduced decomposition of w then

(d) $\mathfrak{E}'(w) = \{w_0\}$.

This can be deduced from [L78, p.29, lines 2-4] (which was stated without proof) or it can be deduced from results in [L20, no.2].

5.3. We return to the setup in 0.1 and we assume that G is adjoint, that $s \in G_*$ and that $w \in W$ is elliptic, of minimal length in \underline{w} . Then $T = T_s$ acts on $Y_{s,w}$ by conjugation. The following result can be deduced from [L11, 5.2].

(a) *Any isotropy group of the T -action on $Y_{s,w}$ is finite.*

In the case where w is a Coxeter element of minimal length, we have the following stronger result.

(b) *$Y_{s,w}$ is a principal homogeneous space for T .*

Let $B \in \mathcal{B}^T$. Let $B' \in \mathcal{B}^T$ be such that $B \cap B' = T$. From 5.1(b) we see (using 0.6) that $Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,z} = \emptyset$ if $z \neq w_0$. Hence $Y_{s,w} = Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,w_0}$. From 1.1(a) we can identify $Y_{s,w} = Y_{s,w} \cap \mathcal{B}_{B,w_0}$ (with its T -action by conjugation) and $\{u' \in U_B; \text{pos}(B', u'B'u'^{-1}) = w\}$ (with its T -action by conjugation); by [L76, 2.2] this last T -space is principal homogeneous. This proves (b).

REFERENCES

- [BR08] C.Bonnafé and R.Rouquier, *Affineness of Deligne-Lusztig varieties for minimal length elements*, J.Alg. **320** (2008), 1200-1206.
- [DL76] P.Deligne and G.Lusztig, *Representations of reductive groups over finite fields*, Ann. Math. **103** (1976), 103-161.
- [L76] G.Lusztig, *Coxeter orbits and eigenspaces of Frobenius*, Invent.Math. **28** (1976), 101-159.
- [L78] G.Lusztig, *Representations of finite Chevalley groups*, Regional Conf. Series in Math.39, Amer. Math. Soc., 1978.
- [L79] G.Lusztig, *On the reflection representation of a finite Chevalley group*, Representation theory of Lie groups, LMS Lect. Notes Ser.34, Cambridge U.Press, 1979, pp. 325-337.
- [L84] G.Lusztig, *Characters of reductive groups over a finite field*, Ann. Math. Studies, vol. 107, Princeton U.Press, 1984.
- [L11] G.Lusztig, *From conjugacy classes in the Weyl group to unipotent classes*, Represent.Th. **15** (2011), 494-530.
- [L20] G.Lusztig, *Positive conjugacy classes in Weyl groups*, Bull Inst.Math.Acad.Sin. **15** (2020), 277-285.
- [R98] K.Rietsch, *Total positivity and real flag varieties*, MIT Ph.D. Thesis, 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, M.I.T., CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139