

HESENBERG VARIETIES OF CODIMENSION ONE IN THE FLAG VARIETY

LAURA ESCOBAR, MARTHA PRECUP, AND JOHN SHARESHEAN

ABSTRACT. We study geometric and topological properties of Hessenberg varieties of codimension one in the type A flag variety. Our main results: (1) give a formula for the Poincaré polynomial, (2) characterize when these varieties are irreducible, and (3) show that all are reduced schemes. We prove that the singular locus of any nilpotent codimension one Hessenberg variety is also a Hessenberg variety. A key tool in our analysis is a new result applying to all (type A) Hessenberg varieties without any restriction on codimension, which states that their Poincaré polynomials can be computed by counting the points in the corresponding variety defined over a finite field. The results below were originally motivated by work of the authors in [arXiv:2107.07929] studying the precise relationship between Hessenberg and Schubert varieties, and we obtain a corollary extending the results from that paper to all codimension one (type A) Schubert varieties.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider Hessenberg varieties of type A. Given a positive integer n , let $G = GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $B \subseteq G$ the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and \mathfrak{b} be the respective Lie algebras of G and B . We consider the action of G on \mathfrak{g} by conjugation. Given $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ and a B -invariant subspace $H \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$, the type A *Hessenberg variety* $\mathcal{B}(x, H)$ consists of all gB in the flag variety $\mathcal{B} := G/B$ satisfying $g^{-1}xg \in H$.

We assume throughout that H contains the Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b} , as was assumed by De Mari and Shayman in [DMS88] and by De Mari, Procesi and Shayman in [DMPS92], seminal works on Hessenberg varieties. Under this assumption, there is a unique *Hessenberg vector* $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{m}(1), \dots, \mathbf{m}(n))$, that is, a weakly increasing sequence from $[n]$ satisfying $\mathbf{m}(i) \geq i$ for all $i \in [n]$, such that H consists of all matrices $a = (a_{ij}) \in \mathfrak{g}$ such that $a_{ij} = 0$ if $i > \mathbf{m}(j)$. We write $H = H(\mathbf{m})$ in this case. We omit the assumption from [DMS88, DMPS92] that x is regular and semisimple.

Of particular interest herein is the case where $H = H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})$ with

$$\mathbf{m}_{\max} := (n-1, n, \dots, n).$$

Notice that $H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})$ is the unique maximal proper B -invariant subspace of \mathfrak{g} , hence our choice of notation. We observe that if x is not scalar, then $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ has codimension one in \mathcal{B} . Conversely, we showed in [EPS21] that if $\mathcal{B}(x, H)$ has codimension one in \mathcal{B} , then $H = H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})$ or there is some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $x - \lambda I_n$ has rank one. We continue our study of codimension one Hessenberg varieties in this manuscript, concentrating on $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$.

One of our main tools is a result that applies with no condition on codimension and could be of use in other settings. We define as usual the *Poincaré polynomial* of $\mathcal{B}(x, H)$ by

$$\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H); q) := \sum_j \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(H^j(\mathcal{B}(x, H); \mathbb{C}))q^j.$$

Given a Hessenberg vector \mathbf{m} , the variety $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ admits an affine paving, as shown by Tymoczko in [Tym06b]. It follows that the (singular) cohomology of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ is concentrated in even degrees. So $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m})); q^{1/2})$ is a polynomial in q . It follows from the particulars of

Tymoczko's result that, given any x and $H(\mathbf{m})$ as above, there exists an upper triangular integer matrix x' such that

$$\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m})); q) = \text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x', H(\mathbf{m})); q).$$

We may assume that x' is in what Tymoczko calls highest form and permuted Jordan form, which will be defined later. In addition, we may assume that the eigenvalues of x are integers. In particular, x' is the sum of a diagonal integer matrix s and a strictly upper triangular $0 - 1$ matrix n . We write m_s for the largest absolute value of an entry of s . Given any prime p , let $\bar{x}' \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ be the matrix obtained from x' by reducing each entry modulo p . Let $\bar{G} = GL_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and let \bar{B} be the subgroup of \bar{G} consisting of upper triangular matrices. The Hessenberg vector \mathbf{m} determines a subspace $\bar{H}(\mathbf{m})$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ in the same way it determines $H(\mathbf{m})$. We define

$$\mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}', \bar{H}(\mathbf{m})) := \{g\bar{B} \in \bar{G}/\bar{B} \mid g^{-1}\bar{x}'g \in \bar{H}(\mathbf{m})\}.$$

Theorem 1 (The point count heuristic). *If $p > 2m_s$, then*

$$(1.1) \quad |\mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}', \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}))| = \text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x', H(\mathbf{m})); p^{1/2}).$$

We prove Theorem 1 in Section 3 through close examination of Tymoczko's affine paving construction. The point count heuristic allows us to compute the Poincaré polynomial of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ using elementary methods. For example, we obtain a simple formula for the Poincaré polynomial of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ for arbitrary x . It is not hard to enumerate $\mathcal{B}_p(y, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ for arbitrary $y \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$. The following result appears in Section 4 below.

Proposition 2. *If $y \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ fixes exactly k 1-dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}_p^n , then*

$$|\mathcal{B}_p(y, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))| = [n - 2]_p! ([n]_p [n - 2]_p + kp^{n-2}).$$

The next result follows quickly from Theorem 1 and Proposition 2.

Theorem 3. *If $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ has exactly ℓ pairwise distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \ker(x - \lambda_j I_n) = d_j$ for each $j \in [\ell]$, then the Poincaré polynomial of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is*

$$(1.2) \quad \text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q) = [n - 2]_{q^2}! \left([n]_{q^2} [n - 2]_{q^2} + q^{2n-4} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} [d_j]_{q^2} \right)$$

Our proof of (1.2) using the point count heuristic is much simpler than applying previously known Betti number formulas from, e.g., [Tym06b, Pre13], which each require multiple cases. Theorem 1 (through Theorem 3) is also helpful in understanding the geometry of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$. We obtain the following result in Section 6.

Theorem 4. *For $x \in \mathfrak{g}$, the variety $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is reducible if and only if there is some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $x - \lambda I_n$ has rank one.*

It follows immediately from Theorem 4 that $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is reducible if and only if x is nilpotent with Jordan decomposition corresponding to the partition $(2, 1^{n-2})$ or x is semisimple and conjugate to a diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(c_1, \dots, c_1, c_2)$ such that $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ with $c_1 \neq c_2$.

The proof of Theorem 4 relies on Theorem 1 and the examination of affine patches. Let B_- be the Borel subgroup consisting of all lower triangular matrices in G and let $U_- \simeq \mathbb{C}^{\binom{n}{2}}$ be the unipotent radical of B_- , consisting of all matrices $I + n$ with n strictly lower triangular. The patch in \mathcal{B} centered at a point gB is $\mathcal{N}_g := gB_-B/B$. Each coset in this patch has a unique representative of the form guB with $u \in U_-$. It follows that \mathcal{N}_g is open in \mathcal{B} and isomorphic with affine space

$\mathbb{C}^{\binom{n}{2}}$. Now for $gB \in \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$, we see that $\mathcal{N}_{g,x}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}} := \mathcal{N}_g \cap \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is an open neighborhood of gB in $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ that is isomorphic to an affine hypersurface in U_- cut out by a certain determinant. Using this fact, we will show that $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is equidimensional. This allows us to determine whether or not $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is irreducible by calculating its top Betti number, which Theorem 3 renders easy.

Examination of patches enables us to determine the singular locus of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ when x is nilpotent. Indeed, the point gB is smooth in $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ if and only if it is smooth in $\mathcal{N}_{g,x}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$. Direct calculation yields the next result, which we prove in Section 5. We remark that this method was used to determine the singular loci of the members of another class of Hessenberg varieties, the Petersen varieties, by Insko and Yong in [IY12]. These patches were also used by Abe, Dedieu, Galetto and Harada in [ADGH18], by Abe, Fujita and Zeng in [AFZ20], and by Da Silva and Harada in [DSH22].

Theorem 5. *If $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent, then the singular locus of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is $\mathcal{B}(x, H((1, n-1, \dots, n-1, n)))$.*

We consider also the scheme theoretic structure of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ defined as in [ITW20, Section 4]. Use of patches yields the following result, which we prove in Section 8.

Theorem 6. *Suppose $n \geq 3$. For any $x \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the scheme $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})) \subseteq GL_n(\mathbb{C})/B$ is reduced.*

Combining Theorems 1, 3 and 5, we settle a problem we studied in [EPS21]: we determine which Schubert varieties of codimension one in \mathcal{B} are isomorphic with some Hessenberg variety in \mathcal{B} . Write w_0 for the longest element in the Weyl group $W = S_n$ of G . For $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, let s_i denote the simple reflection $(i, i+1) \in S_n$. Given $w \in S_n$, the Schubert variety $X_w \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ has codimension one if and only if $w = s_i w_0$ for some $i \in [n-1]$. It follows from work of Tymoczko in [Tym06a] that both $X_{s_1 w_0}$ and $X_{s_{n-1} w_0}$ are Hessenberg varieties in \mathcal{B} . We showed in [EPS21] that if $3 \leq i \leq n-3$ then no Hessenberg variety in \mathcal{B} is isomorphic with $X_{s_i w_0}$. (Both Tymoczko's result and ours do not involve the assumption $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq H$.) In Section 7, we obtain the following extension of these results.

Corollary 7. *If $i \in \{2, n-2\}$ then no Hessenberg variety in \mathcal{B} is isomorphic with either of $X_{s_i w_0}$. Therefore, for $j \in [n-1]$, the three conditions*

- *some Hessenberg variety in \mathcal{B} is isomorphic with $X_{s_j w_0}$;*
- *$X_{s_j w_0}$ is a Hessenberg variety; and*
- *$j \in \{1, n-1\}$*

are equivalent.

One can compute $\text{Poin}(X_{s_i w_0}; q)$ directly and use Theorem 3 to show that, for $i \in \{2, n-2\}$, $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q) = \text{Poin}(X_{s_i w_0}; q)$ if and only if x is nilpotent of rank two. For such x we compute $|\mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}', \bar{H}((1, n-1, \dots, n-1, n)))|$ and so determine the Poincaré polynomial of the singular locus $\mathcal{B}(x, H(1, n-1, \dots, n-1, n))$ of $\mathcal{B}(x, \mathbf{m}_{\max})$ using Theorems 1 and 5. A beautiful result conjectured by Lakshmibai and Sandhya in [LS90] and proved, independently, by Manivel in [Man01], by Kassel-Lascoux-Reutenauer in [KLR03], and by Billey-Warrington in [BW03] allows us to determine the singular loci of the two $X_{s_i w_0}$ in question. We complete the proof of Corollary 7 by comparing the Poincaré polynomials of these singular loci with those of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(1, n-1, \dots, n-1, n))$ for x nilpotent of rank two.

Acknowledgements: Escobar is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1855598 and NSF CAREER Grant DMS 2142656. Precup is partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1954001. Shreshian was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 1518389.

2. NOTATION AND PRELIMINARIES

We review here various known results about the general linear group, flag varieties, and Hessenberg varieties. A reader familiar with basic facts about these objects can skip most of this section and refer back when necessary, but may wish to consult Remark 2.3 which sets notation for the remainder.

2.1. Basic notation. The symbol \mathbb{N} will denote the set of positive integers. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and S_n denote the symmetric group on $[n]$. For an integer partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$, $|\lambda|$ will denote the value $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \lambda_j$.

2.2. The flag variety. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{F} be a field. We use two different models for the *flag variety* $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(n, \mathbb{F})$. First, \mathcal{B} consists of all full flags

$$V_\bullet = \{0 = V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_n = \mathbb{F}^n \mid \dim_{\mathbb{F}} V_i = i \text{ for all } i\}.$$

Having fixed a basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ for \mathbb{F}^n , we define the flag $E_\bullet \in \mathcal{B}$ by

$$E_j = \mathbb{F}\{e_i \mid i \leq j\}$$

for each $j \in [n]$. We use the basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ to coordinatize $GL_n(\mathbb{F})$. So, $a = (a_{ij}) \in GL_n(\mathbb{F})$ maps e_j to $\sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij}e_i$.

The natural action on $G_{\mathbb{F}} := GL_n(\mathbb{F})$ on \mathbb{F}^n determines a transitive action of $G_{\mathbb{F}}$ on the set \mathcal{B} of full flags. The stabilizer of E_\bullet in this action is the Borel subgroup $B_{\mathbb{F}}$ of upper triangular matrices in $G_{\mathbb{F}}$. So, the map from the coset space $G_{\mathbb{F}}/B_{\mathbb{F}}$ to \mathcal{B} sending $gB_{\mathbb{F}}$ to $g(E_\bullet)$ is a bijection. We make no distinction between \mathcal{B} and $G_{\mathbb{F}}/B_{\mathbb{F}}$, other than referring to the set of flags as the *flag model* for \mathcal{B} and $G_{\mathbb{F}}/B_{\mathbb{F}}$ as the *coset model*. We use whichever model suits our purposes at any time.

2.3. The symmetric group and Bruhat order. We denote elements of S_n using one-line notation,

$$w = [w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n] \in S_n$$

where $w_i = w(i)$ in the natural action of w on $[n]$. For $i \in [n-1]$, we write s_i for the *simple reflection* exchanging i and $i+1$ and fixing all $j \in [n] \setminus \{i, i+1\}$. Each $w \in S_n$ is a product of simple reflections,

$$w = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_\ell},$$

with each $i_j \in [n-1]$. Given such a product with ℓ as small as possible, we say that w has *length* ℓ and write $\ell(w) = \ell$.

An *inversion* of w is a pair $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ such that $i < j$ and $w_i > w_j$. We write $\text{Inv}(w)$ for the set of inversions of w and $\text{inv}(w)$ for $|\text{Inv}(w)|$. It is well known that $\ell(w) = \text{inv}(w)$.

An expression of $w \in S_n$ as a product of $\ell(w)$ simple reflections is a *reduced word* for w . The *Bruhat order* \leq_{br} on S_n is the partial order in which $v \leq_{\text{br}} w$ if some reduced word for v is a (not necessarily consecutive) subword of some reduced word for w .

The *tableau criterion* gives another characterization of the Bruhat order. Given $w \in S_n$ and $1 \leq p \leq q \leq n$, we write $I_{p,q}(w)$ for the p^{th} smallest element of $\{w_i \mid i \in [q]\}$. So, for example, if $w = [5, 2, 3, 4, 1] \in S_5$, then $I_{2,4}(w) = 3$, as 3 is the second smallest element of $\{5, 2, 3, 4\}$. The following result of Ehresmann appears as [BB05, Theorem 2.6.3].

Theorem 2.1 (Tableau Criterion). *Let $v, w \in S_n$. Then $v \leq_{\text{br}} w$ if and only if $I_{p,q}(v) \leq I_{p,q}(w)$ whenever $1 \leq p \leq q \leq n$.*

2.4. Schubert cells and Schubert varieties. Given $w \in S_n$, we write \dot{w} for the element of $G_{\mathbb{F}}$ mapping e_j to e_{w_j} for each $j \in [n]$. Now the *Bruhat decomposition* states that $G_{\mathbb{F}}$ is the disjoint union of $B_{\mathbb{F}} - B_{\mathbb{F}}$ double cosets, each containing exactly one \dot{w} ,

$$G_{\mathbb{F}} = \bigsqcup_{w \in S_n} B_{\mathbb{F}} \dot{w} B_{\mathbb{F}}.$$

We obtain a corresponding decomposition of the flag variety

$$(2.1) \quad G_{\mathbb{F}}/B_{\mathbb{F}} = \bigsqcup_{w \in S_n} (B_{\mathbb{F}} \dot{w} B_{\mathbb{F}})/B_{\mathbb{F}}.$$

The *Schubert cell* associated to $w \in S_n$ is

$$C_w := (B_{\mathbb{F}} \dot{w} B_{\mathbb{F}})/B_{\mathbb{F}}.$$

The set C_w is isomorphic with affine space $\mathbb{F}^{\ell(w)}$. The *Schubert variety* associated to w is

$$X_w := \bigcup_{v \leq_{\text{br}} w} C_v.$$

If \mathbb{F} is algebraically closed then X_w is the Zariski closure of C_w in \mathcal{B} .

2.5. Hessenberg varieties in the flag and coset models. Having fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{F}}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{\mathbb{F}}$, respectively, for the \mathbb{F} -Lie algebras of all $n \times n$ matrices and all $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over \mathbb{F} . These are the respective Lie algebras of $G_{\mathbb{F}}$ and $B_{\mathbb{F}}$.

The *adjoint representation* is the action of $G_{\mathbb{F}}$ on $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{F}}$ by conjugation. A *Hessenberg space* is a subspace of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{F}}$ that is $B_{\mathbb{F}}$ -invariant under this action. Given $x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{F}}$ and Hessenberg space $H \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{F}}$, the associated *Hessenberg variety* is

$$\mathcal{B}(x, H) := \{gB_{\mathbb{F}} \in G_{\mathbb{F}}/B_{\mathbb{F}} \mid g^{-1}xg \in H\}.$$

We assume throughout that $\mathfrak{b}_{\mathbb{F}} \subseteq H$. As explained in the Introduction, each such Hessenberg space is of the form $H = H(\mathbf{m})$ for some Hessenberg vector $\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{m}(1), \dots, \mathbf{m}(n))$. It is straightforward to see that in the flag model,

$$\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m})) = \{V_{\bullet} \mid xV_i \subseteq V_{\mathbf{m}(i)} \text{ for all } i \in [n]\}.$$

The flag and coset models of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ define the same scheme-theoretic structure on $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ by [ITW20, Theorem 10].

2.6. Conjugation of Lie algebra elements and translation of Hessenberg varieties. We will use without comment that fact that if $g \in G_{\mathbb{F}}$, $x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{F}}$, and $H \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{F}}$ is a Hessenberg space, then

$$\mathcal{B}(g^{-1}xg, H) = g\mathcal{B}(x, H).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{B}(g^{-1}xg, H)$ and $\mathcal{B}(x, H)$ are isomorphic varieties.

2.7. The number of points in certain finite varieties. We recall some notation and facts that will be useful when \mathbb{F} is the finite field \mathbb{F}_q for some prime power q . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, write $[n]_t$ for the polynomial $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} t^j$ and set

$$[n]_t! := \prod_{j=1}^n [j]_t.$$

It is straightforward to compute that for every prime power q ,

$$(2.2) \quad |\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)| = [n]_q$$

and

$$(2.3) \quad |G_{\mathbb{F}_q}/B_{\mathbb{F}_q}| = [n]_q!.$$

A consequence of the Bruhat decomposition (2.1) is that

$$(2.4) \quad \text{Poin}(G_{\mathbb{C}}/B_{\mathbb{C}}; q^{1/2}) = \sum_{w \in S_n} q^{\ell(w)} = [n]_q! = |G_{\mathbb{F}_q}/B_{\mathbb{F}_q}|$$

where the second equality is well known, see e.g. [Sta12, Corollary 1.3.13]. Thus, Theorem 1 can be seen as a generalization of this result.

2.8. A remark about nilpotent linear transformations. We require the following straightforward result in the proof of Proposition 7.5 below. Here \mathbb{F} is an arbitrary field.

Remark 2.2. *If $x \in M_n(\mathbb{F})$ is nilpotent and $V_{n-1} \subseteq \mathbb{F}^n$ is an x -invariant $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace, then V_{n-1} contains $\text{Im}(x)$.*

Proof. Assume for contradiction that $xV_{n-1} \subseteq V_{n-1}$ but there is some $v \in \mathbb{F}^n$ with $xv \notin V_{n-1}$. Then

$$x\mathbb{F}^n = x(V_{n-1} + \mathbb{F}xv) \not\subseteq V_{n-1}$$

forces $x^2v \notin V_{n-1}$. So, $\mathbb{F}^n = V_{n-1} + \mathbb{F}x^2v$. Iterating, we obtain the contradiction $0 = x^n v \notin V_{n-1}$. \square

2.9. The general linear vs. special linear group over \mathbb{C} . Our main results are all stated and proved under the assumption that $G_{\mathbb{C}} = GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. They hold also if we assume $G_{\mathbb{C}} = SL_n(\mathbb{C})$. Recall that $SL_n(\mathbb{C})$ has Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $n \times n$ matrices with trace 0. As $SL_n(\mathbb{C})$ acts transitively on the set $\{V_{\bullet}\}$ of all full flags in \mathbb{C}^n , there is an isomorphism between the flag varieties $GL_n(\mathbb{C})/B$ and $SL_n(\mathbb{C})/(B \cap SL_n(\mathbb{C}))$, where B is the group of nonsingular upper triangular complex matrices. Let \mathfrak{s} be the set of scalar matrices in $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and let \mathfrak{b} be the Lie algebra of B . The map sending H to $H \cap \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a bijection from the set of B -invariant subspaces of $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ containing \mathfrak{b} to the set of $B \cap SL_n(\mathbb{C})$ -invariant subspaces of $\mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ containing $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Indeed, the inverse map sends H' to $H' + \mathfrak{s}$.

One can define Hessenberg varieties in $SL_n(\mathbb{C})/(B \cap SL_n(\mathbb{C}))$ as they were defined in $GL_n(\mathbb{C})/B$. Given $x \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$, there is some scalar λ such that $x - \lambda I_n \in \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$. If $H \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a Hessenberg space containing \mathfrak{b} , then

$$\mathcal{B}(x, H) = \mathcal{B}(x - \lambda I_n, H) \cong \mathcal{B}(x - \lambda I_n, H \cap \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})) \subseteq SL_n(\mathbb{C})/(B \cap SL_n(\mathbb{C})).$$

Conversely, if $x \in \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $H' \subseteq \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is a $B \cap SL_n(\mathbb{C})$ -invariant subspace containing $\mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$, then

$$\mathcal{B}(x, H') \cong \mathcal{B}(x, H' + \mathfrak{s}) \subseteq GL_n(\mathbb{C})/B.$$

The upshot of all of this is that if one considers only Hessenberg spaces containing a Borel subalgebra, then there is a bijection between the set of Hessenberg varieties in $GL_n(\mathbb{C})/B$ and the set of

Hessenberg varieties in $SL_n(\mathbb{C})/(B \cap SL_n(\mathbb{C}))$ under which corresponding varieties are isomorphic. A similar statement holds for any reductive algebraic group with irreducible root system of type A_{n-1} . Matters are more complicated if one does not assume that Hessenberg spaces contain Borel subalgebras but this will not arise in our work below.

We conclude by choosing shorthand notation for the relevant groups for use in Sections 3-8.

Remark 2.3. For the remainder of the paper we use the notation G for $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ and \overline{G} for $G_{\mathbb{F}_p}$ and similarly for their subgroups and respective Lie algebras. In addition, $\mathcal{B} = G_{\mathbb{C}}/B_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\mathcal{B}_p := G_{\mathbb{F}_p}/B_{\mathbb{F}_p}$ throughout. In Section 3 below we write C_w for the Schubert cell $B\dot{w}B/B$ in \mathcal{B} and $C_{w,p}$ for the Schubert cell $\overline{B}\dot{w}\overline{B}/\overline{B}$ in \mathcal{B}_p .

3. PROOF OF THE POINT COUNT HEURISTIC

A close examination of Tymoczko’s paper [Tym06b] will yield a proof of Theorem 1. Given a matrix $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ we may assume, up to replacing x with a conjugate, that $x = s + n$ where $s, n \in \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ are commuting matrices with n nilpotent and s diagonal.

Definition 3.1. Suppose $\lambda = (\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^r)$ is a list of partitions such that $|\lambda^1| + \dots + |\lambda^r| = n$. We say that $x = s + n \in \mathfrak{g}$ is of type λ if

- (1) s has exactly r distinct eigenvalues c_1, \dots, c_r ,
- (2) if $s_{ii} = s_{kk}$ with $i < k$, then $s_{jj} = s_{kk}$ whenever $i < j < k$,
- (3) for each $i \in [r]$, the eigenspace E_i of s associated to eigenvalue c_i has dimension $|\lambda^i|$, and
- (4) for each $i \in [r]$, the Jordan form of the restriction of n to E_i , denoted herein by n_{c_i} , has Jordan blocks whose sizes are given by the parts of λ^i .

Matrices of the same type need not have the same eigenvalues and so need not be conjugate. We show below, however, that $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m})); q) = \text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(y, H(\mathbf{m})); q)$ for every Hessenberg vector \mathbf{m} whenever x and y have the same type.

We describe how to fix a representative of each conjugacy class of \mathfrak{g} , as in [Tym06b]. Given $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ we say that x_{ij} is a *pivot* of x if $x_{ij} \neq 0$ and if all entries below and to its left vanish. Suppose n is a nilpotent matrix with Jordan blocks whose sizes are given by the parts of partition λ . Take the Young diagram of shape λ and label the boxes with $[n]$ starting at the bottom of the leftmost column, incrementing by one while moving up, then moving to the lowest box of the next column and so on. The **highest form** of n is the matrix with $n_{ij} = 1$ if i labels a box immediately to the left of j and $n_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. All nonzero entries of the highest form of n are pivots, and the highest form is an upper triangular representative for the conjugacy class in which the set of columns containing pivots is right justified. That is, if a pivot appears in column i with $i < n$, then a pivot in appears column $i + 1$.

If $x = s + n \in \mathfrak{g}$ is in Jordan normal form and of type $\lambda = (\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^r)$, then we may write $x = \sum_{i=1}^r (s_i + n_{c_i})$ where $s_i + n_{c_i}$ acts as x does on the eigenspace E_i and annihilates E_j when $j \neq i$. Replacing each $n_{c_i} \in \mathfrak{gl}(E_i)$ with its highest form, we obtain a fixed representative for the conjugacy class of x . We say that this representative is in **highest form and permuted Jordan form** (abbreviated below using the acronym **HFPJF**).

Example 3.2. Suppose $n = 6$ and $\lambda = ((2, 2), (2))$. Let $c_1 = 1$ and $c_2 = -1$. The highest form of n_{c_1} and n_{c_2} are obtained from the following labelings of the Young diagrams for $(2, 2)$ and (2) , respectively.



The first matrix below in Jordan form and has type λ ; the second is of type λ and is the representative for its conjugacy class in HFPJF.

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Notice that in the second matrix the pivots for each n_{c_i} occur in columns as far to the right as possible in each block.

Given a matrix $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ in HFPJF, a permutation $w \in S_n$, and fixed Hessenberg vector \mathbf{m} , we define

$$d_{w,x}^{\mathbf{m}} := \left| \left\{ (i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \mid \begin{array}{l} s_{ii} = s_{kk} \text{ and if } n_{kj} \text{ is a pivot of} \\ n_{s_{ii}}, \text{ then } \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(j)) \geq w^{-1}(i) \end{array} \right\} \right| \\ + |\{(i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \mid s_{ii} \neq s_{kk} \text{ and } \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(k)) \geq w^{-1}(i)\}|.$$

The following theorem is [Tym06b, Theorem 6.1]. Note that Tymoczko's conventions for permutation multiplication differ from ours, which is why w^{-1} appears in the formula for $d_{w,x}^{\mathbf{m}}$ above instead of w .

Theorem 3.3 (Tymoczko). *Fix a Hessenberg vector \mathbf{m} and suppose $x = s + n$ is in HFPJF. For each $w \in S_n$, $C_w \cap \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m})) \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $n \in \dot{w}H(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$, in which case $C_w \cap \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ is isomorphic to the affine space $\mathbb{C}^{d_{w,x}^{\mathbf{m}}}$.*

By Theorem 3.3, each $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ is paved by affines. Such a paving determines the Betti numbers of any variety. A key observation is that if x is in HFPJF and $w \in S_n$, then the nonnegative integer $d_{w,x}^{\mathbf{m}}$ depends on the type of x but not on the eigenvalues c_i of x . This yields the following result.

Corollary 3.4. *Suppose \mathbf{m} is a Hessenberg vector and $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ is of type λ . Let $x' = s + n \in \mathfrak{g}$ be the representative for x in HFPJF. Then*

$$\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m})); q) = \sum_{\substack{w \in S_n \\ n \in \dot{w}H(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}}} q^{2d_{w,x'}^{\mathbf{m}}}.$$

In particular, if $x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$ have the same type, then for every Hessenberg vector \mathbf{m} the Hessenberg varieties $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))$ and $\mathcal{B}(y, H(\mathbf{m}))$ have the same Poincaré polynomial.

We are ready to state and prove a slightly stronger version of Theorem 1 after recalling some notation and introducing some additional objects. Given an integer matrix $x \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$, we write \bar{x} for the element of $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ obtained by reducing each entry of x modulo p , \bar{B} for the subgroup of $\bar{G} := GL_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ consisting of upper triangular matrices, and \mathcal{B}_p for the flag variety \bar{G}/\bar{B} . A Hessenberg vector \mathbf{m} determines a Hessenberg subspace $\bar{H}(\mathbf{m})$ of $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ containing the Lie algebra $\bar{\mathfrak{b}}$ of \bar{B} , and the Hessenberg variety $\mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}))$ consists of those $g\bar{B} \in \mathcal{B}_p$ satisfying $g^{-1}\bar{x}g \in \bar{H}(\mathbf{m})$.

Let $U \leq B$ denote the unipotent subgroup of upper triangular matrices with 1's on the diagonal. Set $U_- := \dot{w}_0 U \dot{w}_0^{-1}$, the unipotent subgroup of lower triangular matrices with 1's on the diagonal. Write \bar{U} and \bar{U}_- for the analogous subgroups of \bar{G} . For each $w \in S_n$, consider the subgroup $\bar{U}_w := \bar{U} \cap \dot{w}\bar{U}_-\dot{w}^{-1}$. There is a bijection

$$(3.1) \quad \bar{U}_w \rightarrow C_{w,p} = \bar{B}\dot{w}\bar{B}/\bar{B}, \quad u \mapsto u\dot{w}\bar{B}.$$

and $|\bar{U}_w| = p^{\ell(w)}$. Finally, given $i \in [n]$, let \bar{U}_i be the subgroup of \bar{U} consisting of all $u \in \bar{U}$ such that $u_{jk} = 0$ unless $j \in \{i, k\}$.

The follow lemma gives us a finite field version of [Tym06b, Lemma 5.2].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $g \in \bar{U}$ and \mathbf{m} be a Hessenberg vector. Suppose $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{s} + \mathbf{n} \in \mathfrak{g}$ has integer entries and is in HFPJF and $w \in S_n$ satisfies $\mathbf{n} \in \dot{w}H(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$. For each $i \in [n-1]$, set*

$$d_i := \left| \left\{ (i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \mid \begin{array}{l} s_{ii} = s_{kk} \text{ and if } n_{kj} \text{ is a pivot of} \\ n_{s_{ii}}, \text{ then } w^{-1}(i) \leq \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(j)) \end{array} \right\} \right| \\ + |\{(i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \mid s_{ii} \neq s_{kk} \text{ and } \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(k)) \geq w^{-1}(i)\}|.$$

If p is a prime such that no two distinct entries of \mathbf{x} have difference divisible by p , then for each i the set

$$(3.2) \quad \{u \in \bar{U}_i \cap \bar{U}_w \mid (u^{-1}g^{-1}\bar{x}gu)_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all } j > i, \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(j)) < w^{-1}(i)\}$$

has cardinality p^{d_i} .

Proof. Our assumptions on the prime p guarantee that $s_{ii} \neq s_{jj}$ if and only if $\bar{s}_{ii} \neq \bar{s}_{jj}$. Since \mathbf{n} is a $0-1$ matrix we furthermore have that \mathbf{n} and $\bar{\mathbf{n}}$ have the same pivots, and in particular, that $n_{s_{ii}}$ and $\bar{n}_{s_{ii}}$ have pivots that occur in the rightmost columns. Since $g \in \bar{U}$, g is upper triangular with 1's on the diagonal. We have

$$g^{-1}\bar{x}g = g^{-1}(\bar{\mathbf{s}} + \bar{\mathbf{n}})g = \bar{\mathbf{s}} + \mathbf{n}'$$

where $\mathbf{n}' := g^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{n}}g + g^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{s}}g - \bar{\mathbf{s}} \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is a nilpotent matrix. Since $\bar{\mathbf{s}}$ is diagonal, $(g^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{s}}g - \bar{\mathbf{s}})_{ij} = 0$ whenever $s_{ii} = s_{jj}$. In particular, we get that nilpotent matrices $n'_{s_{ii}}$ and $\bar{n}_{s_{ii}}$ and $n_{s_{ii}}$ have pivots in exactly the same entries (cf. [Tym06b, Proposition 4.6]).

By definition,

$$\bar{U}_i \cap \bar{U}_w = \left\{ I_n + \sum_{(i \neq \ell)} a_{i\ell} E_{i\ell} \mid a_{i,\ell} \in \mathbb{F}_p, a_{i,\ell} = 0 \text{ unless } (i < \ell) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \right\}.$$

To complete the proof, we argue that the system of equations defining the set (3.2) is consistent and has d_i free variables. Let $u = I_n + \sum_{(i \neq \ell)} a_{i,\ell} E_{i,\ell}$ be a generic element of $\bar{U}_i \cap \bar{U}_w$. Note that $u^{-1} = I_n - \sum_{(i \neq \ell)} a_{i,\ell} E_{i,\ell}$. A straightforward computation now yields

$$\begin{aligned} (u^{-1}g^{-1}\bar{x}gu)_{ij} &= (u^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{s}}u)_{ij} + (u^{-1}\mathbf{n}'u)_{ij} \\ &= (\bar{s}_{ii} - \bar{s}_{jj})a_{ij} + n'_{ij} - \sum_{\substack{(i < \ell) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \\ \ell < j}} a_{i\ell} n'_{\ell j}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(j)) < w^{-1}(i)$, then $(i < j) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1})$ and using the formula above we see that each of the linear equations defining the set (3.2) is of the form

$$(3.3) \quad 0 = (\bar{s}_{ii} - \bar{s}_{jj})a_{ij} + n'_{ij} - \sum_{\substack{(i < \ell) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \\ \ell < j}} a_{i\ell} n'_{\ell j}.$$

If $s_{ii} \neq s_{jj}$, then (3.3) has solution

$$a_{ij} = (\bar{s}_{jj} - \bar{s}_{ii})^{-1} \left(n'_{i,j} - \sum_{\substack{(i < \ell) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \\ \ell < j}} a_{i\ell} n'_{\ell j} \right).$$

Now suppose $s_{ii} = s_{jj}$ and (3.3) has at least one nonzero term, namely, there exists ℓ with $i \leq \ell < j$ such that $n'_{\ell j} \neq 0$. Since x is in HFPJF, all the pivots of $n'_{s_{ii}}$ occur in the rightmost columns, so n' and therefore n must have a pivot in column j and row k with $\ell \leq k < j$. Equivalently, entry (k, j) is a pivot of $n_{s_{ii}} = n_{s_{kk}}$, and our assumption that $n \in \dot{w}H(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$ implies $w^{-1}(k) \leq \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(j))$ so $w^{-1}(k) < w^{-1}(i)$. Thus $(i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1})$ and $n'_{kj} \neq 0$ so the term $a_{ik} n'_{kj}$ appears in the sum on the RHS of (3.3). This shows that, in the case where $s_{ii} = s_{jj}$, equation (3.3) is not vacuous if and only if there exists $(i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1})$ such that $n_{s_{ii}}$ has a pivot in entry (k, j) . Furthermore, in this case, the equation has solution:

$$a_{ik} = (n'_{kj})^{-1} \left(n'_{i,j} - \sum_{\substack{(i < \ell) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \\ \ell < j, \ell \neq k}} a_{i\ell} n'_{\ell j} \right).$$

We have now shown that each equation in the system has a solution, and the system must in fact be consistent since each solution corresponds to either a unique pair $(i < j) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1})$ such that $s_{ii} \neq s_{jj}$ or a unique pair $(i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1})$ such that $s_{ii} = s_{kk}$ and entry (k, j) is a pivot of $n_{s_{ii}}$ (all pivots must occur in distinct rows). The number of free variables in the system is equal to the number of inversions $(i < j)$ of w^{-1} such that $s_{ii} \neq s_{jj}$ and $w^{-1}(i) \leq \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(j))$ plus

$$\left| \left\{ (i < k) \in \text{Inv}(w^{-1}) \mid \begin{array}{l} s_{ii} = s_{kk} \text{ and if } n_{kj} \text{ is a pivot of} \\ n_{s_{ii}}, \text{ then } w^{-1}(i) \leq \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(j)) \end{array} \right\} \right|.$$

The proof of the lemma is complete. \square

The following implies Theorem 1 and generalizes (2.4), a classical result for the flag variety.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose $x = s + n \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ has integer entries and is in HFPJF and let \mathbf{m} be a Hessenberg vector. If p is a prime such that no two distinct entries of x have difference divisible by p , then the cardinality of the Hessenberg variety $\mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m})) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_p$ is $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m})); p^{1/2})$.*

Proof. Let $w \in S_n$. Since n is a $0-1$ matrix, $\bar{n}_{ij} \neq 0$ if and only if $n_{ij} \neq 0$. We therefore have $n \in \dot{w}H(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$ if and only if $\bar{n} \in \dot{w}\bar{H}(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$. Furthermore, for every $g \in \bar{U}_w$ we get $g^{-1}\bar{n}g = \bar{n} + y$ where

$$y \in \mathbb{F}_p \{E_{ij} \mid \text{there exists } (k < \ell) \text{ such that } i < k, j > \ell, n_{k\ell} \neq 0\}$$

Thus we may conclude that $g^{-1}\bar{n}g \in \dot{w}\bar{H}(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$ implies $\bar{n} \in \dot{w}\bar{H}(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$ since \bar{n} and y have disjoint support in $\mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$. This proves that

$$(3.4) \quad C_{w,p} \cap \mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m})) \neq \emptyset \Leftrightarrow \bar{n} \in \dot{w}\bar{H}(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1} \Leftrightarrow n \in \dot{w}H(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}.$$

To complete the proof, we argue that $|C_{w,p} \cap \mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}))| = p^{d_{w,x}^m}$ whenever $n \in \dot{w}H(\mathbf{m})\dot{w}^{-1}$.

We adapt Tymocko's proof of Theorem 3.3 to the finite field setting (see [Tym06b, Theorem 6.1]). Define

$$Z_i := \{u \in (\bar{U}_n \bar{U}_{n-1} \dots \bar{U}_i) \cap \bar{U}_w \mid (u^{-1}\bar{x}u)_{jk} = 0 \text{ for all } k > j \geq i, \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(k)) < w^{-1}(j)\}.$$

If $u \in (\bar{U}_n \bar{U}_{n-1} \dots \bar{U}_i) \cap \bar{U}_w$ then

$$(3.5) \quad u = gu' \text{ with } u' \in \bar{U}_i \cap \bar{U}_w \text{ and } g \in (\bar{U}_n \bar{U}_{n-1} \dots \bar{U}_{i+1}) \cap \bar{U}_w.$$

Furthermore, since conjugation by an element in \bar{U}_i affects only the first i rows of an upper triangular matrix, if $u = gu' \in Z_i$ then $g \in Z_{i+1}$. Thus the factorization from (3.5) yields a well defined

projection $\pi_i : Z_i \rightarrow Z_{i+1}$ defined by $\pi_i(u) = gu$. We obtain a sequence of projections

$$Z_1 \xrightarrow{\pi_1} Z_2 \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \cdots Z_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\pi_{n-1}} Z_n = \{I_n\}$$

such that for each $g \in Z_{i+1}$,

$$\pi_i^{-1}(g) = \{u \in \bar{U}_i \cap \bar{U}_w \mid (u^{-1}g^{-1}\bar{x}gu)_{ik} = 0 \text{ for all } k > i, \mathbf{m}(w^{-1}(k)) < w^{-1}(i)\}.$$

By Lemma 3.5, $|\pi_i^{-1}(g)| = p^{d_i}$. Since $d_{w,x} = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} d_j$, we see that $|Z_1| = p^{d_{w,x}}$. To complete the proof, note that the bijection $\bar{U}_w \rightarrow C_{w,p}$ defined as in (3.1) restricts to a bijection $Z_1 \rightarrow C_{w,p} \cap \mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}))$. Therefore $|C_{w,p} \cap \mathcal{B}_p(\bar{x}, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}))| = p^{d_{w,x}}$, as desired. \square

4. PROOFS OF PROPOSITION 2 AND THEOREM 3

Recall that Proposition 2 says that if $y \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ fixes exactly k 1-dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}_p^n , then

$$(4.1) \quad |\mathcal{B}_p(y, \bar{H}(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))| = [n-2]_p! ([n]_p [n-2]_p + kp^{n-2}).$$

To prove (4.1) we count full flags $0 \subset V_1 \subset \cdots \subset V_{n-1} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n$ in \mathcal{B}_p satisfying

$$(4.2) \quad yV_1 \subset V_{n-1}$$

using the formulas (2.2) and (2.3). For each 1-dimensional subspace $Z \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n$, we count the number of flags that satisfy $V_1 = Z$ and (4.2). If Z is an eigenspace for y , then any flag satisfying $V_1 = Z$ satisfies (4.2) and we may pick V_i for $i \geq 2$ such that $Z \subset V_2 \subset \cdots \subset V_{n-1} \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n$ in any way we want. In particular, $V_2/Z \subset \cdots \subset V_{n-1}/Z \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n/Z \simeq \mathbb{F}_p^{n-1}$ is a complete flag in \mathbb{F}_p^{n-1} every element of the flag variety of $GL_{n-1}(\mathbb{F}_p)$ arises in this way. It follows that the number of flags satisfying (4.2) in which V_1 is an eigenspace for y is

$$(4.3) \quad k[n-1]_p! = [n-2]_p! k[n-1]_p.$$

If Z is not an eigenspace for y , every full flag satisfying (4.2) and $V_1 = Z$ is obtained by first picking an $(n-1)$ -dimensional subspace $V \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $Z + yZ \subseteq V$, and then picking V_i ($2 \leq i \leq n-2$) such that $Z \subset V_2 \subset \cdots \subset V_{n-2} \subset V$. Picking V amounts to choosing a hyperspace in $\mathbb{F}_p^n/Z + yZ \simeq \mathbb{F}_p^{n-2}$, so there are $[n-2]_p$ many choices. By similar reasoning as in the previous case we get that there are $[n-2]_p!$ ways to pick the V_i . We see now that the number of flags satisfying (4.2) in which V_1 is not an eigenspace for y is

$$(4.4) \quad ([n]_p - k) [n-2]_p [n-2]_p!.$$

Now (4.1) follows from (4.3), (4.4), and straightforward calculation.

Recall also that Theorem 3 says that if $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ has exactly ℓ pairwise distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$ and $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \ker(x - \lambda_j I) = d_j$ for each $j \in [\ell]$, then the Poincaré polynomial of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is

$$(4.5) \quad \text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q) = [n-2]_{q^2}! \left([n]_{q^2} [n-2]_{q^2} + q^{2n-4} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} [d_j]_{q^2} \right).$$

Given such x , there exist $x^* \in \mathfrak{g}$ in HFPJF and $g \in G$ such that

$$x^* = g^{-1}xg$$

and thus $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ and $\mathcal{B}(x^*, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ have the same Poincaré polynomial. Write $x^* = s + n$ with s diagonal and n a strictly upper triangular 0–1 matrix. Let s' be the diagonal matrix obtained from s by replacing each entry λ_i with i , for all $i \in [\ell]$. Set $x' := s' + n$. So, x' has integer entries and is in HFPJF and has eigenvalues $1, \dots, \ell$ with respective multiplicities d_1, \dots, d_ℓ . By

Corollary 3.4, $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}^*, H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max}))$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}', H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max}))$ have the same Poincaré polynomial. Now fix $p > 2\ell$ and let $\bar{\mathfrak{x}}' \in \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F}_p)$ be as in Theorem 1. We observe that $\bar{\mathfrak{x}}'$ has eigenvalues $1, \dots, \ell \in \mathbb{F}_p$ with respective multiplicities d_1, \dots, d_ℓ . It follows that there are exactly $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} [d_j]_p$ many 1-dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{F}_p fixed by $\bar{\mathfrak{x}}'$. Now (4.5) follows from Theorem 1 and Proposition 2.

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 5

Our aim is to show that if $\mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent then the singular locus of $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max}))$ is $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, (1, n-1, \dots, n-1, n))$. We begin by restating basic facts that were presented in the introduction. The unipotent radical U_- of the Borel subgroup B_- opposite to B consists of all lower triangular matrices with diagonal entries equal to 1. As a variety, U_- is an affine space with coordinates z_{ji} , $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.

We observe that U_-B/B is open in \mathcal{B} , as its complement consists of those gB such that some minor of g obtained from a northwest justified submatrix is zero. It follows that for a subvariety $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ and $gB \in \mathcal{V}$, the intersection $gU_-B/B \cap \mathcal{V}$ is an open neighborhood of gB in \mathcal{V} . With this in mind, given $\mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}$ we define as in the Introduction

$$\mathcal{N}_{g,\mathfrak{x}}^{\mathfrak{m}} := gU_-B/B \cap \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}))$$

for each $gB \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}))$. Since smoothness is a local property we have that given $\mathfrak{x} \in \mathfrak{g}$, the Hessenberg variety $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}))$ is smooth at a point gB if and only if the quasiprojective variety $\mathcal{N}_{g,\mathfrak{x}}^{\mathfrak{m}}$ is smooth at gB .

We aim now to understand $\mathcal{N}_{g,\mathfrak{x}}^{\mathfrak{m}_{\max}}$. Given the set

$$\mathbf{z} := \{z_{ji} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$$

of variables, we define $u \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}])$ by

$$(5.1) \quad u := [u_1 | u_2 | \dots | u_n]$$

with columns

$$u_i = e_i + \sum_{j=i+1}^n z_{ji} e_j$$

for each $i \in [n]$. Any matrix $a = [a_1 | a_2 | \dots | a_n] \in U_-$ is obtained from u by substituting some $a_{ji} \in \mathbb{C}$ for each z_{ji} .

Assume that $gB \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max}))$. Given $a \in U_-$ as above, consideration of the flag model for \mathcal{B} yields quickly that

$$gaB \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max})) \text{ if and only if } \mathfrak{x}ga_1 \in \mathbb{C}\{ga_i \mid i \in [n-1]\}.$$

Equivalently,

$$gaB \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max})) \text{ if and only if } \det([xga_1 | ga_1 | \dots | ga_{n-1}]) = 0.$$

We define

$$(5.2) \quad A_g := [xgu_1 | gu_1 | \dots | gu_{n-1}] \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}])$$

and observe that $\det(A_g) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$. Our identification of gU_-B/B with affine space yields the following.

Lemma 5.1. *If $gB \in \mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max}))$ then there is an isomorphism of varieties from $\mathcal{N}_{g,\mathfrak{x}}^{\mathfrak{m}_{\max}}$ to the affine hypersurface $\mathcal{V}(\det(A_g))$, which sends gB to the zero vector. Therefore, gB is a smooth point in $\mathcal{B}(\mathfrak{x}, H(\mathfrak{m}_{\max}))$ if and only if $(0, \dots, 0)$ is a smooth point in $\mathcal{V}(\det(A_g))$.*

Now we prove Theorem 5.

Proof of Theorem 5. Assume $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent and $gB \in \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$. By Lemma 5.1 and the Jacobian criterion for smoothness, gB is a smooth point if and only if $\det(A_g)$ has a nonzero linear term. Write

$$g = [v_1 | \dots | v_n].$$

So, $v_i = ge_i$ for all $i \in [n]$. Now, for each i , set

$$v_i^* := \sum_{j=i+1}^n z_{ji} v_j \in M_{n,1}(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]).$$

We observe that

$$A_g = [xv_1 + xv_1^* | v_1 + v_1^* | \dots | v_{n-1} + v_{n-1}^*].$$

Using multilinearity, we write $\det(A_g)$ as the sum of 2^n terms of the form

$$(5.3) \quad \det([t_0 | t_1 | \dots | t_{n-1}]),$$

where $t_0 \in \{xv_1, xv_1^*\}$ and $t_i \in \{v_i, v_i^*\}$ for each $i \in [n-1]$. If there exist $i, j \in [n-1]$ such that $t_i = v_i^*$ and $t_j = v_j^*$ then the determinant in (5.3) has no linear term. The same holds if $t_0 = xv_1^*$ and there is some $i \in [n-1]$ with $t_i = v_i^*$. (Indeed, in both these cases, the matrix $[t_0 | t_1 | \dots | t_{n-1}]$ contains two columns whose entries are polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$ with no constant term.) If $t_0 = xv_1$ and $t_i = v_i$ for all $i \in [n-1]$ we have that $\det([t_0 | t_1 | \dots | t_{n-1}]) \in \mathbb{C}$. The remaining terms from (5.3) are

$$D_0 := \det([xv_1^* | v_1 | v_2 | \dots | v_{n-1}])$$

and, for each $i \in [n-1]$,

$$D_i := \det([xv_1 | v_1 | \dots | v_{i-1} | v_i^* | v_{i+1} | \dots | v_{n-1}]).$$

Using multilinearity again, we see that

$$(5.4) \quad D_0 = \sum_{j=2}^n z_{j1} \det([xv_j | v_1 | \dots | v_{n-1}]),$$

and

$$(5.5) \quad D_i = z_{ni} \det([xv_1 | v_1 | \dots | v_{i-1} | v_n | v_{i+1} | \dots | v_{n-1}])$$

for each $i \in [n-1]$.

Keeping in mind the bijection from cosets to flags mentioned in Section 2, we see that $gB \in \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ implies $xv_1 \in \mathbb{C}\{v_i \mid i \in [n-1]\}$. Write

$$xv_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \gamma_k v_k,$$

with each $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{C}$. We observe that, for each $i \in [n-1]$, $\gamma_i \neq 0$ if and only if $D_i \neq 0$. Similarly, $D_0 = 0$ if and only if $xv_j \in \mathbb{C}\{v_i \mid i \in [n-1]\}$ whenever $2 \leq j \leq n$. Note that the only variable that appears more than once in the D_i 's is z_{n1} . Since we are guaranteed to have a linear term as long as a coefficient of some other z_{ni} is nonzero, let us consider the case in which $\gamma_1 \neq 0$ and $\gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_{n-1} = 0$. This implies that v_1 is an eigenvector of x . Since x is nilpotent, the only eigenvalue of x is zero, so $xv_1 = 0$ and $D_1 = 0$.

It follows now that gB is a smooth point in $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ if and only if some D_i is nonzero. We conclude that gB is a singular point of $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ if and only if both

- $v_1 \in \ker(\mathbf{x})$, and
- $\text{im}(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}\{v_i \mid i \in [n-1]\}$.

Recalling the bijection from cosets to flags once more completes the proof of Theorem 5. \square

Example 5.2. Consider $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ with $\mathbf{x} = \text{diag}(1, 0, 0) \in \mathfrak{gl}_3(\mathbb{C})$. Let g be the identity matrix and note that gB is a singular point of this Hessenberg variety since

$$\det(A_g) = \det \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & z_{21} & 1 \\ z_{31} & z_{31} & z_{32} \end{bmatrix} = z_{21}z_{32} - z_{21}z_{31}$$

does not have a nonzero linear term. Since $gB \notin \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H((1, n-1, \dots, n-1, n)))$ we see that the nilpotent hypothesis is a necessary assumption in the statement of Theorem 5.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

Here we prove Theorem 4, which characterizes those \mathbf{x} for which $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is irreducible. We continue using the notation appearing in the previous section. It is known (see for example [ADGH18]) that the flag variety \mathcal{B} has open cover

$$\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{w \in W} \dot{w}U_-B/B.$$

We therefore obtain an open cover,

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})) = \bigcup_{w \in W} \mathcal{N}_{\dot{w}, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$$

of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$.

By Lemma 5.1, each $\mathcal{N}_{\dot{w}, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$ is isomorphic with a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{\binom{n}{2}}$ and is therefore Cohen-Macaulay, which in turn implies equidimensional (see, for example, [Eis95, Corollary 18.11]). In particular, each irreducible component of $\mathcal{N}_{\dot{w}, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$ has codimension one in $\mathbb{C}^{\binom{n}{2}}$.

Now assume that $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is reducible. By Theorem 3, $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is connected. (Indeed, $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q)$ has constant coefficient 1.) Therefore, there exist distinct irreducible components Y_1 and Y_2 of $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ such that $Y_1 \cap Y_2 \neq \emptyset$. Fix $gB \in Y_1 \cap Y_2$ and let $w \in W$ such that $gB \in \mathcal{N}_{\dot{w}, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$. Each $Y_i \cap \mathcal{N}_{\dot{w}, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$ is an irreducible component of $\mathcal{N}_{\dot{w}, \mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$ and therefore has dimension $\binom{n}{2} - 1$. It follows that $\dim Y_i = \binom{n}{2} - 1 = \dim \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$. This proves $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is equidimensional.

We conclude that $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is reducible if and only if the degree

$$2 \dim \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})) = n^2 - n - 2$$

polynomial $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q)$ is not monic. Recall from Theorem 3 that if \mathbf{x} has eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$ with respective multiplicities d_1, \dots, d_ℓ , then

$$\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q) = [n-2]_{q^2}! \left([n]_{q^2} [n-2]_{q^2} + q^{2n-4} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} [d_j]_{q^2} \right).$$

The polynomial $[n-2]_{q^2}! [n]_{q^2} [n-2]_{q^2}$ is monic of degree $n^2 - n - 2$, and $[n-2]_{q^2}! q^{2n-4}$ has degree $n^2 - 3n + 2$. It follows that $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{x}, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q)$ is not monic if and only if

$$(6.2) \quad \max_{j \in [\ell]} (d_j - 1) = n - 2.$$

We observe that (6.2) holds exactly when $x - \lambda_j I$ has rank one for some j , and Theorem 4 follows.

7. PROOF OF COROLLARY 7

Recall that the simple reflections s_2 and s_{n-2} act, respectively, as the transpositions $(2, 3)$ and $(n-2, n-1)$ in the natural permutation action of S_n . The longest element $w_0 \in S_n$ maps each $i \in [n]$ to $n+1-i$. Our aim is to show that if $i \in \{2, n-2\}$ then no Hessenberg variety in \mathcal{B} is isomorphic with the Schubert variety $X_{s_i w_0}$. We know that $\dim X_{s_i w_0} = \binom{n}{2} - 1$. Lemma 5.5 of [EPS21] says that if $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ and Hessenberg space $H \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ satisfy $\dim \mathcal{B}(x, H) = \binom{n}{2} - 1$, then at least one of

- $H = H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})$ or
- $x - \lambda I_n$ has rank one for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$

must hold. It follows immediately from [EPS21, Lemma 5.9] that if $i \in \{2, n-2\}$ and $x - \lambda I_n$ has rank one for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, then there is no Hessenberg space $H \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ such that $X_{s_i w_0}$ and $\mathcal{B}(x, H)$ are isomorphic. So, it remains to show that there do not exist $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $i \in \{2, n-2\}$ such that $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ and $X_{s_i w_0}$ are isomorphic. The next result is our first step toward this goal.

Proposition 7.1. *If $i \in \{2, n-2\}$, $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q) = \text{Poin}(X_{s_i w_0}; q)$, then there is some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $x - \lambda I_n$ is nilpotent of rank two.*

Proof. It is shown in [EPS21, Example 5.2] that

$$(7.1) \quad \text{Poin}(X_{s_2 w_0}; q^{1/2}) = \text{Poin}(X_{s_{n-2} w_0}; q^{1/2}) = [n-2]_q! ([n]_q [n-1]_q - q^{2n-3} - q^{2n-4}).$$

Combining (7.1) and Theorem 3, we see that if $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ has eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell$ with respective multiplicities d_1, \dots, d_ℓ and $i \in \{2, n-2\}$ with $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q) = \text{Poin}(X_{s_i w_0}; q)$ then

$$[n]_q [n-2]_q + q^{n-2} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} [d_j]_q = [n]_q [n-1]_q - q^{2n-3} - q^{2n-4},$$

from which it follows that

$$q^{n-1} + q^{n-2} + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} [d_j]_q = [n]_q.$$

We see now that if $\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})); q) = \text{Poin}(X_{s_i w_0}; q)$ under the given conditions on x and i , then $\ell = 1$ and $d_1 = n-2$. \square

Since $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max})) = \mathcal{B}(x - \lambda I_n, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ for every $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ and every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, it suffices now to show that if $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent of rank two and $i \in \{2, n-2\}$, then $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ and $X_{s_i w_0}$ are not isomorphic. We compare the Euler characteristics of the singular loci of the varieties in question, examining the Schubert varieties first. The next result was conjectured by Lakshmibai and Sandhya in [LS90] and proved, independently, by Manivel in [Man01], by Kassel-Lascoux-Reutenauer in [KLR03], and by Billey-Warrington in [BW03].

Lemma 7.2. *Given $w \in S_n$, let Z_w consist of all $v \in S_n$ satisfying either*

- (1) *There exist $1 \leq i < j < k < \ell \leq n$ and $1 \leq i' < j' < k' < \ell' \leq n$ such that*
 - (a) $w_k < w_\ell < w_i < w_j$;
 - (b) $v_{i'} = w_k, v_{j'} = w_i, v_{k'} = w_\ell, v_{\ell'} = w_j$; and
 - (c) *if v' is obtained from w by replacing w_i, w_j, w_k, w_ℓ with w_k, w_i, w_ℓ, w_j , respectively, and w' is obtained from v by replacing $v_{i'}, v_{j'}, v_{k'}, v_{\ell'}$ with $v_{j'}, v_{\ell'}, v_{i'}, v_{k'}$, respectively, then*

$$(7.2) \quad v' \leq v \leq w' \leq w$$

in Bruhat order, or

(2) There exist $1 \leq i < j < k < \ell \leq n$ and $1 \leq i' < j' < k' < \ell' \leq n$ such that

(a) $w_\ell < w_j < w_k < w_i$;

(b) $v_{i'} = w_j, v_{j'} = w_\ell, v_{k'} = w_i, v_{\ell'} = w_k$; and

(c) if v' is obtained from w by replacing w_i, w_j, w_k, w_ℓ with w_j, w_ℓ, w_i, w_k , respectively, and w' is obtained from v by replacing $v_{i'}, v_{j'}, v_{k'}, v_{\ell'}$ with $v_{k'}, v_{i'}, v_{\ell'}, v_{j'}$, respectively, then

$$(7.3) \quad v' \leq v \leq w' \leq w$$

in Bruhat order.

Let $Z_{w, \max}$ be the set of Bruhat maximal elements of Z_w . Then the singular locus of X_w is $\bigcup_{v \in Z_{w, \max}} X_v$.

Proposition 7.3. Define $v(2)$ and $v(n-2)$ in S_n by

$$v(2)_i := \begin{cases} n+1-i & 1 \leq i \leq n-4 \\ 2 & i = n-3 \\ 1 & i = n-2 \\ 4 & i = n-1 \\ 3 & i = n \end{cases}$$

and

$$v(n-2)_i := \begin{cases} n-2 & i = 1 \\ n-3 & i = 2 \\ n & i = 1 \\ n-1 & i = 4 \\ n+1-i & 5 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Then

(1) the singular locus of $X_{s_2 w_0}$ is $X_{v(2)}$, and

(2) the singular locus of $X_{s_{n-2} w_0}$ is $X_{v(n-2)}$.

Proof. We begin with (1). Let $w = s_2 w_0$ and write

$$w = [n, n-1, \dots, 5, 4, 2, 3, 1]$$

and

$$v(2) = [n, n-1, \dots, 5, 2, 1, 4, 3]$$

in one-line notation. We show first that $v(2) \in Z_w$. If we set $(i, j, k, \ell) = (i', j', k', \ell') = (n-3, n-2, n-1, n)$ we see that Lemma 7.2(2) can be applied, with $v' = v = v(2)$ and $w' = w$.

Now assume $v \in Z_w$. We observe that v, w must be as in Lemma 7.2(2), with $(j, k, \ell) = (n-2, n-1, n)$. It follows that

$$(v'_{n-2}, v'_{n-1}, v'_n) = (1, n+1-i, 3)$$

for some $i \in [n-3]$. By the tableau criterion, $v' \leq v$ implies $1 \in \{v_{n-2}, v_{n-1}, v_n\}$. As $v_{j'} = w_\ell = 1$, we see that $j' \in \{n-2, n-1, n\}$. It follows that $(j', k', \ell') = (n-2, n-1, n)$. Therefore,

$$(v_{n-2}, v_{n-1}, v_n) = (w_\ell, w_i, w_k) = (1, n+1-i, 3),$$

for some $i \in [n-3]$. Applying the tableau criterion again, we get that $v \leq v(2)$. Indeed, $I_{p,q}(v) \leq I_{p,q}(w_0) = I_{p,q}(v(2))$ for $(p, q) \notin \{(1, n-3), (1, n-2), (2, n-2), (1, n-1), (2, n-1)\}$ and the remaining cases follow from our analysis. So, $Z_{w, \max} = \{v(2)\}$ and (1) follows from Lemma 7.2.

The proof of (2) is similar: If we set $w = s_{n-2} w_0$ we conclude that $v(n-2) \in Z_w$ by applying Lemma 7.2(2) with $(i, j, k, \ell) = (1, 2, 3, 4)$. If $v \in Z_w$, then v, w must be as in Lemma 7.2(2) with $(i, j, k) = (1, 2, 3)$. Now $(v'_1, v'_2, v'_3) = (n-2, n+1-\ell, n)$ for some $4 \leq \ell \leq n$. By the tableau

criterion, $n \in \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, hence $(i', j', k') = (1, 2, 3)$ and $(v_1, v_2, v_3) = (n-2, n+1-\ell, n)$. It follows that $v \leq v(n-2)$, and this implies (2). \square

Corollary 7.4. *If $i \in \{2, n-2\}$ and $v(i)$ is as in Proposition 7.3 then the Euler characteristic of $X_{v(i)}$ satisfies*

$$\chi(X_{v(i)}) = (n-2)!(n^2 - 5n + 6).$$

Proof. We obtain the Euler characteristic by counting the number of $u \leq v(i)$ in the Bruhat order. Fix $u = [u_1, \dots, u_n] \in S_n$. Using the tableau criterion, we see that $u \not\leq v(2)$ if and only if $\{u_{n-1}, u_n\} \cap \{1, 2\} \neq \emptyset$ and $u \not\leq v(n-2)$ if and only if $\{u_1, u_2\} \cap \{n-1, n\} \neq \emptyset$. The Corollary follows from a straightforward inclusion-exclusion argument. \square

Proposition 7.5. *Assume $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ is nilpotent of rank two and consider the Hessenberg vector $\mathbf{m} = (1, n-1, \dots, n-1, n)$.*

- (1) *If $x^2 = 0$, then $\chi(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))) = (n-2)!(n^2 - 5n + 8)$.*
- (2) *If $x^2 \neq 0$, then $\chi(\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}))) = (n-2)!(n^2 - 5n + 7)$.*

Proof. We use Theorem 1, assuming without loss of generality that x is in highest form and permuted Jordan form. So, we fix any prime $p > 2$ and count flags $0 = V_0 \subset V_1 \subset \dots \subset V_n = \mathbb{F}_p^n$ satisfying

- (a) $V_1 \subseteq \ker(\bar{x})$ and
- (b) $\text{Im}(\bar{x}) \subseteq V_{n-1}$.

Note that Remark 2.2 allows us to replace $\bar{x}V_{n-1} \subseteq V_{n-1}$, implied by our choice of \mathbf{m} , with (b) as stated.

We observe that $\bar{x}^2 = 0$ if and only if $x^2 = 0$ and consider first the case $x^2 = 0$. We fix 1-dimensional $Z \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and count flags satisfying (a) and (b) in which $V_1 = Z$. If $Z \subseteq \text{Im}(\bar{x})$ then we can choose V_{n-1} to be any of the $[n-2]_p$ hyperplanes in \mathbb{F}_p^n containing the 2-dimensional subspace $\text{Im}(\bar{x})$ and then choose V_2, \dots, V_{n-2} in any of $[n-2]_p!$ ways. Since $\dim \text{Im}(\bar{x}) = 2$ there are $[2]_p$ possibilities for Z and it follows that there are

$$[2]_p [n-2]_p [n-2]_p!$$

flags satisfying (a) and (b) in which $V_1 \subset \text{Im}(\bar{x})$.

Now consider the case of 1-dimensional $Z \subset \mathbb{F}_p^n$ such that $Z \subseteq \ker(\bar{x})$ and $Z \not\subseteq \text{Im}(\bar{x})$. Since $\bar{x}^2 = 0$, we know that $\text{Im}(\bar{x}) \subseteq \ker(\bar{x})$. Therefore, there are $[n-2]_p - [2]_p$ possibilities for Z . Having fixed one such Z , we can choose V_{n-1} containing $Z + \text{Im}(\bar{x})$ in $[n-3]_p$ ways, and then choose V_2, \dots, V_{n-2} in $[n-2]_p!$ ways. We see there are

$$([n-2]_p - [2]_p) [n-3]_p [n-2]_p!$$

flags satisfying (a) and (b) in which $V_1 \not\subseteq \text{Im}(\bar{x})$. Direct computation, along with Theorem 1, gives

$$\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, \mathbf{m}); q) = [n-2]_{q^2}! \left([n-2]_{q^2} [n-3]_{q^2} + (1+q^2)q^{2n-6} \right),$$

and (1) follows.

The case $x^2 \neq 0$ is handled similarly. We observe first that in this case

$$\dim(\ker(\bar{x}) \cap \text{Im}(\bar{x})) = 1.$$

Arguing as we did above, consider first the case in which $V_1 = \ker(\bar{x}) \cap \text{Im}(\bar{x})$. Then we calculate that there are

$$[n-2]_p [n-2]_p!$$

flags satisfying (a), (b), and $V_1 = \ker(\bar{x}) \cap \text{Im}(\bar{x})$. On the other hand, if $V_1 \not\subseteq \text{Im}(\bar{x})$ we get

$$p[n-3]_p[n-3]_p[n-2]_p!$$

flags satisfying (a) and (b). As above, Theorem 1 now yields

$$\text{Poin}(\mathcal{B}(x, \mathbf{m}); q) = [n-2]_{q^2}! \left([n-2]_{q^2} + q^2[n-3]_{q^2}^2 \right)$$

and (2) follows. \square

Propositions 7.4 and 7.5 together imply that the singular loci of the Schubert variety $X_{s_i w_0}$ (for $i \in \{2, n-2\}$) and that of the Hessenberg variety $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ (where x is nilpotent of rank two) are not isomorphic. The proof of Corollary 7 is now complete.

8. PROOF OF THEOREM 6

We use Lemma 5.1 to show that for $n \geq 3$, the Hessenberg variety $\mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ is a reduced scheme for any $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. Recall the definition of $A_g \in M_{n \times n}(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}])$ from (5.2). The next result suffices, since $\det(A_g)$ generates the ideal defining each open neighborhood $\mathcal{N}_{g,x}^{\mathbf{m}_{\max}}$ of $gB \in \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$ (cf. Lemma 5.1).

Proposition 8.1. *Assume $n \geq 3$. If $gB \in \mathcal{B}(x, H(\mathbf{m}_{\max}))$, then $\det(A_g)$ generates a radical ideal in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$.*

We will need two preliminary lemmas to prove Proposition 8.1. Recall that, given a set S of variables, a *term order* on S is a total ordering \preceq of the set $\mathcal{M}(S)$ of monomials in the elements of S satisfying, for all $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathcal{M}(S)$ and all $s \in S$, the conditions

- $\mu_1 \prec \mu_1 s$, and
- $\mu_1 s \preceq \mu_2 s$ whenever $\mu_1 \preceq \mu_2$.

We observe that 1 is the minimum element of $\mathcal{M}(S)$ with respect to any term order.

Given a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[S]$, the *initial term* $\text{in}_{\preceq}(f)$ of f is the monomial appearing with nonzero coefficient in f that is maximal with respect to \preceq . If $I = (f_1, \dots, f_k)$ is an ideal in $\mathbb{C}[S]$, the *initial ideal* $\text{in}_{\preceq}(I)$ is $(\text{in}_{\preceq}(f_1), \dots, \text{in}_{\preceq}(f_k))$.

The next result is well known, see e.g. [HH11, Proposition 3.3.7].

Lemma 8.2. *Let I be an ideal in $\mathbb{C}[S]$. If $\text{in}_{\preceq}(I)$ is square-free with respect to some term order on $\mathcal{M}(S)$, then I is radical.*

Given a total ordering $<_S$ of the variables in S , the associated *lexicographic term order* on $\mathcal{M}(S)$ is obtained by setting $\mu_1 \preceq \mu_2$ if and only if, when the variables appearing in $\mu_1 = s_1 \dots s_j$ and $\mu_2 = t_1 \dots t_k$ are written in weakly decreasing order, either $j \leq k$ and $s_i = t_i$ for all $i \in [j]$ or there is some r such that $s_i = t_i$ for all $i < r$ and $s_r <_S t_r$.

The following lemma is the key technical result of this section.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $m \geq n \geq 3$, $\mathbf{z} = \{z_{ji} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n\} \sqcup \{z_{j1} \mid n+1 \leq j \leq m\}$, and $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in \mathbb{C}[z_{21}, \dots, z_{m1}]$ be linear. Let $u \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}])$ be as in (5.1) and define*

$$(8.1) \quad L := [\ell|u_1| \dots |u_{n-1}] \in M_{n,n}(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]) \quad \text{where } \ell := \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i e_i \in M_{n,1}(\mathbb{C}[z_{21}, \dots, z_{m1}]).$$

Then

- (1) $\det(L) = 0$ if and only if $\ell = cu_1$ for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$.
- (2) Moreover, there exists a lexicographic term order \preceq on $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{z})$ such that $\text{in}_{\preceq}(\det(L))$ is square-free.

Proof. The backward direction of (1) is obvious. To prove the forward direction and (2), we proceed by induction on n .

Suppose $n = 3$. Now

$$(8.2) \quad \det(L) = \det \begin{bmatrix} \ell_1 & 1 & 0 \\ \ell_2 & z_{21} & 1 \\ \ell_3 & z_{31} & z_{32} \end{bmatrix} = (z_{32}z_{21} - z_{31})\ell_1 - z_{32}\ell_2 + \ell_3.$$

Write $\ell_i = a_{i1} + \sum_{j=2}^m a_{ij}z_{j1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Substituting these expressions into (8.2) and collecting like terms we obtain the following formula for $\det(L)$:

$$(8.3) \quad a_{12}z_{32}z_{21}^2 + a_{13}z_{32}z_{31}z_{21} + (a_{11} - a_{22})z_{32}z_{21} - a_{12}z_{31}z_{21} - a_{13}z_{31}^2 - a_{23}z_{32}z_{31} - a_{21}z_{32} \\ + a_{32}z_{21} + (a_{33} - a_{11})z_{31} + a_{31} + \left(\sum_{j=4}^m a_{1j}z_{32}z_{21}z_{j1} - a_{1j}z_{31}z_{j1} - a_{2j}z_{32}z_{j1} + a_{3j}z_{j1} \right).$$

If (8.3) is the zero polynomial, then $a_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$ and $a_{11} = a_{22} = a_{33}$. The forward direction of (1) now follows. Notice that (8.3) has only two monomial terms containing squares: $z_{32}z_{21}^2$ with coefficient a_{12} and z_{31}^2 with coefficient a_{13} . If $a_{13} = 0$ and $a_{12} = 0$ then (2) is immediate, as (8.3) is then a sum of square-free monomials. By inspection, if $a_{13} \neq 0$ then the lexicographic term order \preceq associated to a total ordering of \mathbf{z} in which z_{32} is the maximal element and z_{31} is the maximal element of $\mathbf{z} \setminus \{z_{32}\}$ yields $\text{in}_{\preceq}(\det(L)) = z_{32}z_{31}z_{21}$. The final case is $a_{13} = 0$ and $a_{12} \neq 0$. Taking the lexicographic term order \preceq associated to a total ordering of \mathbf{z} in which z_{21} is the maximal element and z_{31} is the maximal element of $\mathbf{z} \setminus \{z_{21}\}$ gives $\text{in}_{\preceq}(\det(L)) = z_{31}z_{21}$. This completes the proof of the base case.

Assume now that $n > 3$. For $i, j \in [n]$ write $L(i, j)$ for the matrix obtained from L by deleting the i^{th} row and the j^{th} column. Expanding along the last column, we see that

$$(8.4) \quad \det(L) = \pm z_{n,n-1} \det(L(n, n)) \mp \det(L(n-1, n))$$

Let $\mathbf{z}' = \{z_{ji} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n-1\} \sqcup \{z_{j1} \mid n \leq j \leq m\}$ and note that $L(n, n) \in M_{n-1, n-1}(\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}'])$.

Suppose first that $\det(L(n, n)) = 0$. By the induction hypothesis, there exists $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\ell_1 = c$ and $\ell_i = cz_{i1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq n-1$. We observe that, in this case, $\det(L) = \pm \det(L(n-1, n)) = \pm(\ell_n - cz_{n1})$. If $\det(L) = 0$ then $\ell_n = cz_{n1}$, proving (1). Claim (2) follows immediately from the fact that ℓ_n is linear.

Next suppose $\det(L(n, n)) \neq 0$. Since $z_{n,n-1}$ does not appear in any monomial term of $\det(L(n-1, n))$, we have $\det(L) \neq 0$ and (1) is vacuously true. By the induction hypothesis, there exists a lexicographic term order \preceq' on $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{z}')$ such that $\text{in}_{\preceq'}(\det(L(n, n)))$ is square-free. Let \preceq be the lexicographic term order associated to any total order which respects the total order on \mathbf{z}' corresponding to \preceq' and with maximal element $z_{n,n-1}$. Equation (8.4) now implies $\text{in}_{\preceq}(\det(L)) = z_{n,n-1} \text{in}_{\preceq'}(\det(L(n, n)))$. The proof is now complete. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 8.1.

Proof of Proposition 8.1. Set $\mathbf{y} := g^{-1}\mathbf{x}g$ and

$$A'_g := [yu_1 | u_1 | \dots | u_{n-1}].$$

Comparing A'_g to the definition of A_g in (5.2), we observe that $A_g = gA'_g$, hence $\det(A'_g)$ and $\det(A_g)$ generate the same ideal in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{z}]$. Now A'_g is as in Lemma 8.3, where

$$\ell_i = y_{i1} + \sum_{j=2}^n y_{ij} z_{j1} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Proposition 8.1 now follows from Lemma 8.2 and 8.3(2). \square

The next example demonstrates that the assumption $n \geq 3$ was necessary in the statements of Proposition 8.1 and Lemma 8.3. Indeed, the example shows that $\mathcal{B}(x, \mathbf{m}_{\max})$ is not reduced when $n = 2$ and x is nilpotent.

Example 8.4. Let $y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & y_{12} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, where $y_{12} \in \mathbb{C}^*$. If A'_g is as in the proof of Proposition 8.1, we have that $A'_g = \begin{bmatrix} y_{12} z_{21} & 1 \\ 0 & z_{21} \end{bmatrix}$ and $\det A'_g = y_{12} z_{21}^2$ does not generate a radical ideal.

REFERENCES

- [ADGH18] Hiraku Abe, Lauren DeDieu, Federico Galetto, and Megumi Harada. Geometry of Hessenberg varieties with applications to Newton-Okounkov bodies. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 24(3):2129–2163, 2018.
- [AFZ20] Hiraku Abe, Naoki Fujita, and Haozhi Zeng. Geometry of regular Hessenberg varieties. *Transform. Groups*, 25(2):305–333, 2020.
- [BB05] Anders Björner and Francesco Brenti. *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, volume 231 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2005.
- [BW03] Sara C. Billey and Gregory S. Warrington. Maximal singular loci of Schubert varieties in $SL(n)/B$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(10):3915–3945, 2003.
- [DMPS92] F. De Mari, C. Procesi, and M. A. Shayman. Hessenberg varieties. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 332(2):529–534, 1992.
- [DMS88] Filippo De Mari and Mark A. Shayman. Generalized Eulerian numbers and the topology of the Hessenberg variety of a matrix. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 12(3):213–235, 1988.
- [DSH22] Sergio Da Silva and Megumi Harada. Gröbner bases for regular nilpotent hessenberg varieties and toric degenerations, 2022. arXiv:2207.08573.
- [Eis95] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.
- [EPS21] Laura Escobar, Martha Precup, and John Shreshian. Which Schubert varieties are Hessenberg varieties?, 2021. arXiv:2107.07929.
- [HH11] Jürgen Herzog and Takayuki Hibi. *Monomial ideals*, volume 260 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011.
- [ITW20] Erik Insko, Julianna Tymoczko, and Alexander Woo. A formula for the cohomology and K -class of a regular Hessenberg variety. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 224(5):106230, 14, 2020.
- [IY12] Erik Insko and Alexander Yong. Patch ideals and Peterson varieties. *Transform. Groups*, 17(4):1011–1036, 2012.
- [KLR03] Christian Kassel, Alain Lascoux, and Christophe Reutenauer. The singular locus of a Schubert variety. *J. Algebra*, 269(1):74–108, 2003.
- [LS90] V. Lakshmibai and B. Sandhya. Criterion for smoothness of Schubert varieties in $Sl(n)/B$. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Math. Sci.*, 100(1):45–52, 1990.
- [Man01] L. Manivel. Le lieu singulier des variétés de Schubert. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (16):849–871, 2001.
- [Pre13] Martha Precup. Affine pavings of Hessenberg varieties for semisimple groups. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 19(4):903–922, 2013.
- [Sta12] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Volume 1*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2012.
- [Tym06a] Julianna S. Tymoczko. Hessenberg varieties are not pure dimensional. *Pure Appl. Math. Q.*, 2(3, Special Issue: In honor of Robert D. MacPherson. Part 1):779–794, 2006.

[Tym06b] Julianna S. Tymoczko. Linear conditions imposed on flag varieties. *Amer. J. Math.*, 128(6):1587–1604, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS, ONE BROOKINGS DRIVE, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63130, U.S.A.

Email address: laurae@wustl.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS, ONE BROOKINGS DRIVE, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63130, U.S.A.

Email address: martha.precup@wustl.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS, ONE BROOKINGS DRIVE, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63130, U.S.A.

Email address: jshareshian@wustl.edu