Normality and quadraticity for special ample line bundles on toric varieties arising from root systems (1)

Travis Schedler (AIM/MIT); Qëndrim R. Gashi (U. Prishtina)

Sat, April 9, 5:00 PM, College of the Holy Cross

(arXiv:1102.4083)

Oda's and Sturmfels' conjectures (2)

Conjecture (Oda)

Let V be a smooth, projective toric variety, and $\mathcal{L}$ an ample line bundle. Then, the embedding of V given by $\mathcal{L}$ is projectively normal, i.e., the map

$$H^0(V, \mathcal{L})^{\otimes k} \to H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k) \tag{0.2}$$

is surjective for all $k \geq 1$.

Oda's and Sturmfels' conjectures (2)

Conjecture (Oda)

Let V be a smooth, projective toric variety, and $\mathcal{L}$ an ample line bundle. Then, the embedding of V given by $\mathcal{L}$ is projectively normal, i.e., the map

$$H^0(V, \mathcal{L})^{\otimes k} \to H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k) \tag{0.2}$$

is surjective for all $k \geq 1$.

In other words, the homogeneous coordinate ring of $V \subseteq \mathbf{P}(H^0(V, \mathcal{L}))$ is integrally closed, i.e., the affine cone over V is normal. (This depends on the embedding!!)

Oda's and Sturmfels' conjectures (2)

Conjecture (Oda)

Let V be a smooth, projective toric variety, and $\mathcal{L}$ an ample line bundle. Then, the embedding of V given by $\mathcal{L}$ is projectively normal, i.e., the map

$$H^0(V, \mathcal{L})^{\otimes k} \to H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k) \tag{0.2}$$

is surjective for all $k \geq 1$.

In other words, the homogeneous coordinate ring of $V \subseteq \mathbf{P}(H^0(V, \mathcal{L}))$ is integrally closed, i.e., the affine cone over V is normal. (This depends on the embedding!!)

Conjecture (Sturmfels)

Additionally, the ring $\bigoplus_{k \geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^{\otimes k})$ is quadratic.

Oda's and Sturmfels' conjectures (2)

Conjecture (Oda)

Let V be a smooth, projective toric variety, and $\mathcal{L}$ an ample line bundle. Then, the embedding of V given by $\mathcal{L}$ is projectively normal, i.e., the map

$$H^0(V, \mathcal{L})^{\otimes k} \to H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k) \tag{0.2}$$

is surjective for all $k \geq 1$.

In other words, the homogeneous coordinate ring of $V \subseteq \mathbf{P}(H^0(V, \mathcal{L}))$ is integrally closed, i.e., the affine cone over V is normal. (This depends on the embedding!!)

Conjecture (Sturmfels)

Additionally, the ring $\bigoplus_{k \geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^{\otimes k})$ is quadratic.

In other words, Oda says that this ring is generated in degree $k = 1$, and Sturmfels says the relations are in degree $k = 2$.

Toric varieties associated to the Weyl fan (3)

Fix a connected, reductive, complex algebraic group G with maximal torus T and Borel B. We are interested in the variety V obtained as the closure of a generic T-orbit in the flag variety G/B.

Toric varieties associated to the Weyl fan (3)

Fix a connected, reductive, complex algebraic group G with maximal torus T and Borel B. We are interested in the variety V obtained as the closure of a generic T-orbit in the flag variety G/B.

This variety V has been studied by many authors since at least 1990. It is a toric variety:

Toric varieties associated to the Weyl fan (3)

Fix a connected, reductive, complex algebraic group G with maximal torus T and Borel B. We are interested in the variety V obtained as the closure of a generic T-orbit in the flag variety G/B.

This variety V has been studied by many authors since at least 1990. It is a toric variety:

Let Δ be the set of roots, and let $Y, X, X^\vee$, and $Y^\vee$ be the root, weight, coroot, and coweight lattices, so $Y \subseteq X$ and $X^\vee \subseteq Y^\vee$.

Let $F \subseteq Y^\vee \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ be the Weyl fan: this is the fan whose maximal facets are the Weyl chambers.

Toric varieties associated to the Weyl fan (3)

Fix a connected, reductive, complex algebraic group G with maximal torus T and Borel B. We are interested in the variety V obtained as the closure of a generic T-orbit in the flag variety G/B.

This variety V has been studied by many authors since at least 1990. It is a toric variety:

Let Δ be the set of roots, and let $Y, X, X^\vee$, and $Y^\vee$ be the root, weight, coroot, and coweight lattices, so $Y \subseteq X$ and $X^\vee \subseteq Y^\vee$.

Let $F \subseteq Y^\vee \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ be the Weyl fan: this is the fan whose maximal facets are the Weyl chambers.

Goal: to prove Oda's and Sturmfels' conjecture for certain ample line bundles on this variety V.

Toric varieties associated to the Weyl fan (3)

Fix a connected, reductive, complex algebraic group G with maximal torus T and Borel B. We are interested in the variety V obtained as the closure of a generic T-orbit in the flag variety G/B.

This variety V has been studied by many authors since at least 1990. It is a toric variety:

Let Δ be the set of roots, and let $Y, X, X^\vee$, and $Y^\vee$ be the root, weight, coroot, and coweight lattices, so $Y \subseteq X$ and $X^\vee \subseteq Y^\vee$.

Let $F \subseteq Y^\vee \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ be the Weyl fan: this is the fan whose maximal facets are the Weyl chambers.

Goal: to prove Oda's and Sturmfels' conjecture for certain ample line bundles on this variety V.

From now on V is as above and $T \subseteq V$ is the torus.

Special ample line bundles (4)

T-equivariant ample line bundles $\mathcal{L}$ on V are equivalent to polytopes $P \subseteq Y \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ whose vertices μ_σ are in bijection with the Weyl chambers σ, such that, for adjacent chambers σ and σ',

$$\mu_\sigma - \mu_{\sigma'} = r_{\sigma,\sigma'}\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}, r_{\sigma,\sigma'} > 0,$$

where $\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ is the unique root positive on σ and negative on σ'.

Special ample line bundles (4)

T-equivariant ample line bundles $\mathcal{L}$ on V are equivalent to polytopes $P \subseteq Y \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ whose vertices μ_σ are in bijection with the Weyl chambers σ, such that, for adjacent chambers σ and σ',

$$\mu_\sigma - \mu_{\sigma'} = r_{\sigma,\sigma'}\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}, r_{\sigma,\sigma'} > 0,$$

where $\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ is the unique root positive on σ and negative on σ'. A basis of T-stable vectors of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L})$ is given by the lattice vectors $Y \cap P$ of P.

Special ample line bundles (4)

T-equivariant ample line bundles $\mathcal{L}$ on V are equivalent to polytopes $P \subseteq Y \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ whose vertices μ_σ are in bijection with the Weyl chambers σ, such that, for adjacent chambers σ and σ',

$$\mu_\sigma - \mu_{\sigma'} = r_{\sigma,\sigma'}\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}, r_{\sigma,\sigma'} > 0,$$

where $\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ is the unique root positive on σ and negative on σ'. A basis of T-stable vectors of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L})$ is given by the lattice vectors $Y \cap P$ of P.

Definition

(e.g., Kottwitz) A *special ample line bundle* on V is one such that μ_σ lies in the Weyl chamber corresponding to σ, for all σ. Call P a *special ample polytope*.

Special ample line bundles (4)

T-equivariant ample line bundles $\mathcal{L}$ on V are equivalent to polytopes $P \subseteq Y \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$ whose vertices μ_σ are in bijection with the Weyl chambers σ, such that, for adjacent chambers σ and σ',

$$\mu_\sigma - \mu_{\sigma'} = r_{\sigma,\sigma'}\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}, r_{\sigma,\sigma'} > 0,$$

where $\alpha_{\sigma,\sigma'}$ is the unique root positive on σ and negative on σ'. A basis of T-stable vectors of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L})$ is given by the lattice vectors $Y \cap P$ of P.

Definition

(e.g., Kottwitz) A *special ample line bundle* on V is one such that μ_σ lies in the Weyl chamber corresponding to σ, for all σ. Call P a *special ample polytope*.

Theorem (Gashi, S.)

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a special ample line bundle on V. Then, the homogeneous coordinate ring $H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$ is normal and quadratic.

The key proposition and a lemma of Stembridge (5)

Let P be a polytope corresponding to a special ample line bundle. Think of this as a convex region in $X \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$. For any root α, let $\alpha^{\vee}$ be the corresponding coroot.

The key proposition and a lemma of Stembridge (5)

Let P be a polytope corresponding to a special ample line bundle. Think of this as a convex region in $X \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$. For any root α, let $\alpha^\vee$ be the corresponding coroot.

Proposition

If $v \in P$ and $\langle v, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$ for $\alpha \in \Delta$, then $v - \alpha \in P$.

The key proposition and a lemma of Stembridge (5)

Let P be a polytope corresponding to a special ample line bundle. Think of this as a convex region in $X \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$. For any root α, let $\alpha^\vee$ be the corresponding coroot.

Proposition

If $v \in P$ and $\langle v, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$ for $\alpha \in \Delta$, then $v - \alpha \in P$.

Next, for two dominant weights $x, y \in Y$, say that $x \preceq y$ if $y - x$ is a nonnegative combination of positive roots. Say that y *covers* x if $x \prec y$ and, for all $z \in Y$ such that $x \preceq z \preceq y$, either $z = x$ or $z = y$.

The key proposition and a lemma of Stembridge (5)

Let P be a polytope corresponding to a special ample line bundle. Think of this as a convex region in $X \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}$. For any root α, let $\alpha^\vee$ be the corresponding coroot.

Proposition

If $v \in P$ and $\langle v, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$ for $\alpha \in \Delta$, then $v - \alpha \in P$.

Next, for two dominant weights $x, y \in Y$, say that $x \preceq y$ if $y - x$ is a nonnegative combination of positive roots. Say that y *covers* x if $x \prec y$ and, for all $z \in Y$ such that $x \preceq z \preceq y$, either $z = x$ or $z = y$.

Lemma (Stembridge)

Suppose that x, y are dominant and y covers x. Then $y - x \in \Delta$.

Proof of normality (6)

We have to show that, for all $k \geq 1$ and all lattice vectors $x \in kP \cap X$ (corresponding to a basis vector of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$), that there exist lattice vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in P \cap X$ such that $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$.

Proof of normality (6)

We have to show that, for all $k \geq 1$ and all lattice vectors $x \in kP \cap X$ (corresponding to a basis vector of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$), that there exist lattice vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in P \cap X$ such that $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$.

Using the action of the Weyl group (which sends P to another special ample polytope), it is enough to suppose that x is dominant. Let σ be the dominant chamber.

Proof of normality (6)

We have to show that, for all $k \geq 1$ and all lattice vectors $x \in kP \cap X$ (corresponding to a basis vector of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$), that there exist lattice vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in P \cap X$ such that $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$.

Using the action of the Weyl group (which sends P to another special ample polytope), it is enough to suppose that x is dominant. Let σ be the dominant chamber.

We proceed by induction on the order $\prec$. The top such in kP is the vertex $k\mu_\sigma = \mu_\sigma + \cdots + \mu_\sigma$.

Proof of normality (6)

We have to show that, for all $k \geq 1$ and all lattice vectors $x \in kP \cap X$ (corresponding to a basis vector of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$), that there exist lattice vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in P \cap X$ such that $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$.

Using the action of the Weyl group (which sends P to another special ample polytope), it is enough to suppose that x is dominant. Let σ be the dominant chamber.

We proceed by induction on the order $\prec$. The top such in kP is the vertex $k\mu_\sigma = \mu_\sigma + \cdots + \mu_\sigma$.

All other $x \in Y \cap kP$ satisfy $x \preceq k\mu_\sigma$. So it is enough to show that: if $x, y \in Y \cap kP \cap \sigma$, y covers x, and $y = y_1 + \cdots y_k$ for $y_i \in Y \cap P$, then also $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$ for some $x_i \in Y \cap P$.

Proof of normality (6)

We have to show that, for all $k \geq 1$ and all lattice vectors $x \in kP \cap X$ (corresponding to a basis vector of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$), that there exist lattice vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in P \cap X$ such that $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$.

Using the action of the Weyl group (which sends P to another special ample polytope), it is enough to suppose that x is dominant. Let σ be the dominant chamber.

We proceed by induction on the order $\prec$. The top such in kP is the vertex $k\mu_\sigma = \mu_\sigma + \cdots + \mu_\sigma$.

All other $x \in Y \cap kP$ satisfy $x \preceq k\mu_\sigma$. So it is enough to show that: if $x, y \in Y \cap kP \cap \sigma$, y covers x, and $y = y_1 + \cdots y_k$ for $y_i \in Y \cap P$, then also $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$ for some $x_i \in Y \cap P$.

Indeed, by Stembridge's lemma, $x = y - \alpha$ for a positive root α. Since x and y are dominant, $\langle y, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 2$. So, for some i, $\langle y_i, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$.

Proof of normality (6)

We have to show that, for all $k \geq 1$ and all lattice vectors $x \in kP \cap X$ (corresponding to a basis vector of $H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$), that there exist lattice vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in P \cap X$ such that $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$.

Using the action of the Weyl group (which sends P to another special ample polytope), it is enough to suppose that x is dominant. Let σ be the dominant chamber.

We proceed by induction on the order $\prec$. The top such in kP is the vertex $k\mu_\sigma = \mu_\sigma + \cdots + \mu_\sigma$.

All other $x \in Y \cap kP$ satisfy $x \preceq k\mu_\sigma$. So it is enough to show that: if $x, y \in Y \cap kP \cap \sigma$, y covers x, and $y = y_1 + \cdots y_k$ for $y_i \in Y \cap P$, then also $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$ for some $x_i \in Y \cap P$.

Indeed, by Stembridge's lemma, $x = y - \alpha$ for a positive root α. Since x and y are dominant, $\langle y, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 2$. So, for some i, $\langle y_i, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$.

Then the proposition implies that $y_i - \alpha \in P$ as well. So, $x = y_1 + \cdots + y_{i-1} + (y_i - \alpha) + y_{i+1} + \cdots + y_k$. $\square$

Proof of quadraticity (7)

Above we used that, if P is special ample, so is kP. More generally, if $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are special ample, so is $P_1 + \cdots + P_k$. The following generalizes our main theorem:

Proof of quadraticity (7)

Above we used that, if P is special ample, so is kP. More generally, if $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are special ample, so is $P_1 + \cdots + P_k$. The following generalizes our main theorem:

Theorem (Gashi-S.)

(i) *If* $x \in Y \cap (P_1 + \cdots + P_k)$ *then* $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$ *for some* $x_i \in Y \cap P_i$.

Proof of quadraticity (7)

Above we used that, if P is special ample, so is kP. More generally, if $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are special ample, so is $P_1 + \cdots + P_k$. The following generalizes our main theorem:

Theorem (Gashi-S.)

(i) *If* $x \in Y \cap (P_1 + \cdots + P_k)$ *then* $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$ *for some* $x_i \in Y \cap P_i$.

(ii) *If* $x_1 + \cdots + x_k = x_1' + \cdots x_k'$ *for* $x_i, x_i' \in Y \cap P_i$, *then* $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ *and* $(x_1', \ldots, x_k')$ *are related by moves* ($\alpha \in \Delta$)*:*

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_i + \alpha, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{j-1}, x_j - \alpha, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_k).$$

Proof of quadraticity (7)

Above we used that, if P is special ample, so is kP. More generally, if $P_1, \ldots, P_k$ are special ample, so is $P_1 + \cdots + P_k$. The following generalizes our main theorem:

Theorem (Gashi-S.)

(i) *If $x \in Y \cap (P_1 + \cdots + P_k)$ then $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_k$ for some $x_i \in Y \cap P_i$.*

(ii) *If $x_1 + \cdots + x_k = x_1' + \cdots x_k'$ for $x_i, x_i' \in Y \cap P_i$, then $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ and $(x_1', \ldots, x_k')$ are related by moves ($\alpha \in \Delta$):*

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}, x_i + \alpha, x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{j-1}, x_j - \alpha, x_{j+1}, \ldots, x_k).$$

Now, we can induct on k, applying the pair $(P_1, P_2 + \cdots + P_k)$. This reduces to the case $k = 2$. We will only prove (ii), since (i) is essentially the same as before.

Strengthened normality and quadraticity

In fact the strengthened theorem implies:

Strengthened normality and quadraticity

In fact the strengthened theorem implies:

Corollary

Let $\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_k$ be special ample line bundles. Then the multi-homogeneous coordinate ring $\bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(V, \mathrm{Sym}^m(\mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{L}_k)))$ is normal and quadratic.

Strengthened normality and quadraticity

In fact the strengthened theorem implies:

Corollary

Let $\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_k$ be special ample line bundles. Then the multi-homogeneous coordinate ring $\bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(V, \mathrm{Sym}^m(\mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{L}_k)))$ is normal and quadratic.

Remark

In terms of polytopes, this says that the Cayley sum polytope $P_1 * \cdots * P_k$ is normal and its semigroup ring is quadratic. [[This polytope is the convex hull of $\bigcup P_i \times \{e_i\} \subseteq (Y \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}) \times \mathbf{R}^k$ where $\mathbf{R}^k$ has basis vectors $e_1, \ldots, e_k$.]]

Quadraticity for $k = 2$ (9)

Suppose $x_1 + x_2 = x = x_1' + x_2'$ for $x_i, x_i' \in P_i$. We may assume x is dominant and induct on $\prec$.

Quadraticity for $k = 2$ (9)

Suppose $x_1 + x_2 = x = x_1' + x_2'$ for $x_i, x_i' \in P_i$. We may assume x is dominant and induct on $\prec$.

Lemma

Let α be a simple root, $(x_1, x_2), (x_1 + \alpha, x_2) \in P_1 \times P_2$, and $\langle x, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq -1$. If $((x_1 + \alpha) + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$ for $\beta \in \Delta$, then:

Quadraticity for $k = 2$ (9)

Suppose $x_1 + x_2 = x = x_1' + x_2'$ for $x_i, x_i' \in P_i$. We may assume x is dominant and induct on $\prec$.

Lemma

Let α be a simple root, $(x_1, x_2), (x_1 + \alpha, x_2) \in P_1 \times P_2$, and $\langle x, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq -1$. If $((x_1 + \alpha) + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$ for $\beta \in \Delta$, then:

(i) *$(x_1 + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$; or*

Quadraticity for $k = 2$ (9)

Suppose $x_1 + x_2 = x = x'_1 + x'_2$ for $x_i, x'_i \in P_i$. We may assume x is dominant and induct on $\prec$.

Lemma

Let α be a simple root, $(x_1, x_2), (x_1 + \alpha, x_2) \in P_1 \times P_2$, and $\langle x, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq -1$. If $((x_1 + \alpha) + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$ for $\beta \in \Delta$, then:

(i) $(x_1 + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$; *or*

(ii) $(x_1 + (\alpha + \beta), x_2 - (\alpha + \beta)) \in P_1 \times P_2$, *and either:*

Quadraticity for $k = 2$ (9)

Suppose $x_1 + x_2 = x = x_1' + x_2'$ for $x_i, x_i' \in P_i$. We may assume x is dominant and induct on $\prec$.

Lemma

Let α be a simple root, $(x_1, x_2), (x_1 + \alpha, x_2) \in P_1 \times P_2$, and $\langle x, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq -1$. If $((x_1 + \alpha) + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$ for $\beta \in \Delta$, then:

(i) *$(x_1 + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$; or*

(ii) *$(x_1 + (\alpha + \beta), x_2 - (\alpha + \beta)) \in P_1 \times P_2$, and either: (a) $\alpha + \beta \in \Delta$, or (b) $(x_1 + \alpha, x_2 - \alpha) \in P_1 \times P_2$.*

Quadraticity for $k = 2$ (9)

Suppose $x_1 + x_2 = x = x_1' + x_2'$ for $x_i, x_i' \in P_i$. We may assume x is dominant and induct on $\prec$.

Lemma

Let α be a simple root, $(x_1, x_2), (x_1 + \alpha, x_2) \in P_1 \times P_2$, and $\langle x, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq -1$. If $((x_1 + \alpha) + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$ for $\beta \in \Delta$, then:

(i) *$(x_1 + \beta, x_2 - \beta) \in P_1 \times P_2$; or*

(ii) *$(x_1 + (\alpha + \beta), x_2 - (\alpha + \beta)) \in P_1 \times P_2$, and either: (a) $\alpha + \beta \in \Delta$, or (b) $(x_1 + \alpha, x_2 - \alpha) \in P_1 \times P_2$.*

Using the lemma, provided the theorem (ii) holds for $y = x + \alpha$ with $\langle y, \alpha \rangle \geq 1$ and α *simple*, it also holds for x.

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Lemma

Suppose that $x \in P$ is dominant, $x \prec \mu$ and α is simple. Then there exists a sequence $x + \alpha = u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_m = y$ s.t.:

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Lemma

Suppose that $x \in P$ is dominant, $x \prec \mu$ and α is simple. Then there exists a sequence $x + \alpha = u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_m = y$ s.t.:

(i) *$x \prec y \preceq \mu$, and y is dominant and covers x;*

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Lemma

Suppose that $x \in P$ is dominant, $x \prec \mu$ and α is simple. Then there exists a sequence $x + \alpha = u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_m = y$ s.t.:

(i) *$x \prec y \preceq \mu$, and y is dominant and covers x;*

(ii) *All the u_i are in P;*

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Lemma

Suppose that $x \in P$ is dominant, $x \prec \mu$ and α is simple. Then there exists a sequence $x + \alpha = u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_m = y$ s.t.:

(i) *$x \prec y \preceq \mu$, and y is dominant and covers x;*

(ii) *All the u_i are in P;*

(iii) *For all i, $u_{i+1} = u_i + \beta_i$ for β_i simple and $\langle u_i, \beta_i^\vee \rangle = -1$.*

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Lemma

Suppose that $x \in P$ is dominant, $x \prec \mu$ and α is simple. Then there exists a sequence $x + \alpha = u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_m = y$ s.t.:

(i) *$x \prec y \preceq \mu$, and y is dominant and covers x;*

(ii) *All the u_i are in P;*

(iii) *For all i, $u_{i+1} = u_i + \beta_i$ for β_i simple and $\langle u_i, \beta_i^\vee \rangle = -1$.*

In fact, (iii) implies (i) and (ii) using the main proposition ($u_i \in P$ if and only if $u_{i+1} \in P$ since $\langle u_{i+1}, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$ and $\langle u_i, \alpha^\vee \rangle \leq -1$).

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Lemma

Suppose that $x \in P$ is dominant, $x \prec \mu$ and α is simple. Then there exists a sequence $x + \alpha = u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_m = y$ s.t.:

(i) *$x \prec y \preceq \mu$, and y is dominant and covers x;*

(ii) *All the u_i are in P;*

(iii) *For all i, $u_{i+1} = u_i + \beta_i$ for β_i simple and $\langle u_i, \beta_i^\vee \rangle = -1$.*

In fact, (iii) implies (i) and (ii) using the main proposition ($u_i \in P$ if and only if $u_{i+1} \in P$ since $\langle u_{i+1}, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$ and $\langle u_i, \alpha^\vee \rangle \leq -1$). To prove (iii), we use a study of *the numbers game*, of which the above are moves.

Strengthening of Stembridge's lemma (10)

Problem: if $x \in P := P_1 + P_2$ is dominant and $x \prec \mu$, there need not exist a simple α with $x + \alpha$ dominant and in P.

Lemma

Suppose that $x \in P$ is dominant, $x \prec \mu$ and α is simple. Then there exists a sequence $x + \alpha = u_1 \mapsto u_2 \mapsto \cdots \mapsto u_m = y$ s.t.:

(i) *$x \prec y \preceq \mu$, and y is dominant and covers x;*

(ii) *All the u_i are in P;*

(iii) *For all i, $u_{i+1} = u_i + \beta_i$ for β_i simple and $\langle u_i, \beta_i^\vee \rangle = -1$.*

In fact, (iii) implies (i) and (ii) using the main proposition ($u_i \in P$ if and only if $u_{i+1} \in P$ since $\langle u_{i+1}, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 1$ and $\langle u_i, \alpha^\vee \rangle \leq -1$).
To prove (iii), we use a study of *the numbers game*, of which the above are moves.
Now, inductively, we can deduce the result for $x \in Y \cap P \cap \sigma$ from the result for $y \in Y \cap P \cap \sigma$. $\square$

Questions! (11)

1. **Koszulity:** Is the homogeneous coordinate ring $\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$ Koszul?

Questions! (11)

1. **Koszulity:** Is the homogeneous coordinate ring $\bigoplus_{k \geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$ Koszul?
   Remark: Sam Payne studied a dual variety to V and, in types A, B, C, and D, he proved the corresponding ring is normal and Koszul (without speciality assumptions); his methods do not extend to exceptional type, and do not work here.

Questions! (11)

1. **Koszulity:** Is the homogeneous coordinate ring $\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$ Koszul?
   Remark: Sam Payne studied a dual variety to V and, in types A, B, C, and D, he proved the corresponding ring is normal and Koszul (without speciality assumptions); his methods do not extend to exceptional type, and do not work here.
   (Also, what about extending Sturmfels' conjecture, replacing quadraticity with Koszulity? There are no known counterexamples.)

Questions! (11)

1. **Koszulity:** Is the homogeneous coordinate ring $\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$ Koszul?
   Remark: Sam Payne studied a dual variety to V and, in types A, B, C, and D, he proved the corresponding ring is normal and Koszul (without speciality assumptions); his methods do not extend to exceptional type, and do not work here.
   (Also, what about extending Sturmfels' conjecture, replacing quadraticity with Koszulity? There are no known counterexamples.)
2. **Speciality:** Is there a way to drop the speciality assumption on the bundle $\mathcal{L}$?

Questions! (11)

1. **Koszulity:** Is the homogeneous coordinate ring $\bigoplus_{k\geq 0} H^0(V, \mathcal{L}^k)$ Koszul?
   Remark: Sam Payne studied a dual variety to V and, in types A, B, C, and D, he proved the corresponding ring is normal and Koszul (without speciality assumptions); his methods do not extend to exceptional type, and do not work here.
   (Also, what about extending Sturmfels' conjecture, replacing quadraticity with Koszulity? There are no known counterexamples.)
2. **Speciality:** Is there a way to drop the speciality assumption on the bundle $\mathcal{L}$?
3. **White's Conjecture:** This says that semigroup rings associated to matroid polytopes are quadratic. In the type A case, these correspond to certain nef divisors which are not ample (except for the uniform matroid). Can our methods extend to this case? (Question posed by Sam Payne).