

Lecture 17

1) \mathbb{Q} -factorial terminalizations from induction, II.

Ref: [B], Ch. 1; [L1], Sec 4;

1.0) Reminder

We work to prove the following theorem, Sec 1.1 of Lec 16.

Thm 1: Let L be a minimal Levi in G s.t. $\tilde{O} = \text{Ind}_L^G(\tilde{O}_L)$

Then $Y = \text{Ind}_p^G(X_L)$ is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial terminalization of X
(= $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}]$).

We have reduced this to proving:

Thm 2: If \tilde{O} is birationally rigid (i.e. cannot be induced from a cover in a proper Levi). Then X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial & terminal, equivalently, $K_X = \{0\}$.

A key to proving Thm 2 is Namikawa's result on the existence of a universal graded Poisson deformation X_{K_X/W_X}

of X over k_x/W_x .

1.1) Lifting Hamiltonian actions.

Our 1st step in the proof is the following general result that allows to extend Hamiltonian actions to deformations.

Proposition: Let X be a conical symplectic singularity, G is a simply connected semisimple group w. Hamiltonian action on X that commutes w. the \mathbb{C}^* -action. Let X_Z be a graded Poisson deformation of X ($Z = \text{Spec}(B)$ from Sec 1.6 of Lec 16). Then the G -action extends to a Hamiltonian G -action on X_Z that commutes w. \mathbb{C}^* & makes $X_Z \rightarrow Z$ G -invariant.

Proof: We can reduce to the case when $\mathfrak{g} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]$ (exercise). G & \mathbb{C}^* commute, so we see that $\{\mathfrak{g}, \cdot\}$ preserves the grading, hence $\mathfrak{g} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]_d$ (where $d = -\deg\{\cdot\}$). Note that $\mathbb{C}[X_Z]_d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]_d$. We claim that the kernel, K , is a nilpotent Lie algebra.

Indeed, an element $f \in K$ is of the form $\sum_i b_i f_i$ w.

$b_i \in \mathbb{C}[Z]_{d_i}$, $0 < d_i < d$, $f_i \in \mathbb{C}[X_Z]_{d-d_i}$ (we can take a graded basis

2]

in $\mathbb{C}[X]$, say $f_i, i \in I$, then lift them to homogeneous $f_i \in \mathbb{C}[X]_z$, these elements generate the $\mathbb{C}[z]$ -module $\mathbb{C}[X_z]$ by graded Nakayama and we take any decomposition of f . The bounds on the degrees are b/c all gradings are positive.

The elements b_i are Poisson central in $\mathbb{C}[X_z]$, from the definition. So $\{\sum_i b_i f_i, \sum_j b_j' f_j'\} = \sum_{i,j} b_i b_j' \{f_i, f_j'\}$. Note that $\min\{\deg b_i, \deg b_j'\} > \min\{\deg b_i\}$. From here we deduce that the $d+1$ -fold brackets vanish on K .

Also note that $\dim K < \infty$. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the preimage of $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathbb{C}[X]_d$ in $\mathbb{C}[X_z]_d$ so that we have a Lie algebra SES

$$0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow 0$$

Since K is nilpotent, Levi's thm ([B], Ch. 1, Sec 6.8) shows that the SES splits and so we have an embedding $\mathfrak{g} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[X_z]_d$ lifting $\mathfrak{g} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]_d$. The representation of \mathfrak{g} in $\mathbb{C}[X_z]$ by taking $\{ \cdot \}$ preserves $\mathbb{C}[X_z]_{\leq k} \forall k$. These spaces are finite dimensional again by the positivity of the grading. So the \mathfrak{g} -action of $\mathbb{C}[X_z]$ integrates to \mathfrak{G} . Since \mathfrak{g} acts by derivations, \mathfrak{G} acts by automorphisms giving $\mathfrak{G} \curvearrowright X_z$. To show that this action is Hamiltonian & finish the proof is left as

an exercise.

□

Rem: The condition that G is simply connected can be removed (exercise).

1.2) Structure of deformation X_λ .

Let \tilde{O} be a G -equivariant cover of a nilpotent orbit in \mathfrak{g} .

Suppose $\mathfrak{h}_x \neq \{0\}$. We pick a nonzero element $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}_x$.

Consider the natural morphism $\mathbb{C}\lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_x/W_x$, it's \mathbb{C}^\times -equivariant.

So, we can form the graded deformation $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ of $X = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}]$.

By Proposition in Sec 1.1, we have a Hamiltonian action of

G on $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ commuting w. the \mathbb{C}^\times -action & the moment map

$\mu: X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is \mathbb{C}^\times -equivariant, where \mathbb{C}^\times acts on \mathfrak{g}^* by

t. $\alpha = t^2 \alpha$. Let $\eta: X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\lambda$ be the natural morphism. Our next

goal is to describe X_λ .

Lemma 1) $\forall z \neq 0$, $X_{z\lambda}$ has a unique open G -orbit of the same dimension as $\dim \tilde{O}$, denote it by \tilde{O}_λ .

2) $(\mu, \nu): X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathbb{C}\lambda$ is finite, hence $\mu: X_\lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is finite; moreover, $\mu(\tilde{O}_\lambda) =: O_\lambda$ is an orbit & $\mu: \tilde{O}_\lambda \rightarrow O_\lambda$ is a cover.

3) O_λ is not nilpotent.

Proof: 1): repeats that of Case 3 in Sec 2.2 of Lec 14: use that $\dim X = \dim X_{z\lambda}$ as the deformation is flat & that the locus of points in $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ w. maximal orbit dimension is open, & that $X_{z\lambda}$ is irreducible, equiv. $\mathbb{C}[X_{z\lambda}]$ is a domain - the latter follows from $\text{gr } \mathbb{C}[X_{z\lambda}] \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[X]$.

2): $\mu: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is finite \Rightarrow [graded Nakayama, exercise]
 $(\mu, \nu): X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathbb{C}\lambda$ is finite $\Rightarrow \mu: X_\lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ is finite.

And $\mu(\tilde{O}_\lambda)$ is a G -orbit & $\tilde{\mu}: \tilde{O}_\lambda \rightarrow \mu(\tilde{O}_\lambda)$ is a cover b/c \tilde{O}_λ carries a transitive Hamiltonian action, see Sec 1.2 of Lec 3.

3) Assume O_λ is nilpotent $\Rightarrow O_{z\lambda} = z \cdot O_\lambda = O_\lambda \Rightarrow O \subset \mu(X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}) = \tilde{O}_\lambda$;
 $\dim O = \dim X = \dim X_\lambda = \dim O_\lambda \Rightarrow O = O_\lambda$. By 2), the morphism

$X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \xrightarrow{(\mu, \nu)} \tilde{O} \times \mathbb{C}\lambda$ is finite; it's $G \times \mathbb{C}^\times$ -equivariant & Poisson.

HW problem 1: We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \times \mathbb{C}\lambda & \longrightarrow & X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \mathbb{O} \times \mathbb{C}\lambda & \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrow is a $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^\times$ -equivariant Poisson isomorphism.

So $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \cong \mathbb{C}\lambda \times_{\mathfrak{h}_x/\mathfrak{w}_x} X_{\mathfrak{h}_x/\mathfrak{w}_x}$ for the zero map $\mathbb{C}\lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_x/\mathfrak{w}_x$. But the map $\mathbb{C}\lambda \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_x/\mathfrak{w}_x$ s.t. \exists isom'm $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}\lambda \times_{\mathfrak{h}_x/\mathfrak{w}_x} X_{\mathfrak{h}_x/\mathfrak{w}_x}$ is unique by Namikawa's thm in Sec 1.6 of Lec 16. Since $\lambda \neq 0$, we arrive at a contradiction. \square

We proceed to giving an explicit description of X_λ .

HW problem 2: The inclusion $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda \hookrightarrow X_\lambda$ yields $\mathbb{C}[X_\lambda] \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda]$.

We'll need an equivalent description. We use a construction from Sec 1.3 in Lec 15. Take $\bar{\zeta} \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and let

$\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{Z}_G(\bar{\zeta}_s)$ & $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda := \mu^{-1}(\bar{\zeta}_s + \mathcal{O}_\lambda)$, where $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \subset \mathfrak{k}^*$ is the nilpotent

orbit corresponding to \mathcal{O}_λ .

Recall, Sec 1.3 of Lec 15, that $\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda] \xrightarrow{\sim} Y_{\xi_s} = G \times^L (\xi_s \times X_\lambda) (= G \times^P \{(\alpha, x) \in (\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^* \times X_\lambda \mid \alpha|_{\mathfrak{h}} = \mu(x) + \xi_s\})$. This is a G -equivariant Poisson isomorphism intertwining the moment maps. So we have $X_\lambda \xrightarrow{\sim} Y_{\xi_s}$ w. the same properties. Here's the description of X_λ that we need:

$$Y_{\xi_s} \xrightarrow{\sim} X_\lambda \quad (1)$$

1.3) Identification of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ w. $\text{Ind}_L^G(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda)$.

Finally, we identify $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ w. $\text{Ind}_L^G(\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_\lambda)$. Identify $\mathbb{C}\xi_s$ w. $\mathbb{C}\lambda$ by sending ξ_s to λ . Thx to (1), we have a $G \times \mathbb{C}^\times$ -equivariant Poisson morphism that intertwines the maps to $\mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathbb{C}\lambda$

$$\mathbb{C}^\times \times_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \longrightarrow X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \quad (2)$$

More precisely, we use $\mathbb{C}^\times \times Y_{\xi_s} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^\times \times X_\lambda$ & the actions of \mathbb{C}^\times (and G) on $Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}, X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ to deduce $\mathbb{C}^\times \times_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^\times \times_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$, yielding (2) (there are some technicalities swept under rug).

By 2) of Lemma, $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathbb{C}\lambda$ is finite, hence

$\overline{\neq}$

proper. Apply the valuative criterium of properness (Hartshorne's book, Chapter 2, Sec. 4) to the rational map

$$Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \quad (3)$$

We see that (3) extends (uniquely) to a morphism $\rho: Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}^{\circ} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$, where $Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}^{\circ} \subset Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ is the domain of def'n of (3), it's open & the complement has $\text{codim} \geq 2$. G -equivariance of (2) $\Rightarrow Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}^{\circ}$ is G -stable $\Rightarrow \tilde{O}' := \text{Ind}_L^G(\tilde{O}_2) \subset Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}^{\circ}$. Also ρ intertwines the morphisms to $\mathfrak{g}^* \times \mathbb{C}\lambda$. Both \tilde{O}, \tilde{O}' are covers of orbits of $\dim = \dim \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ via μ . So $\dim \tilde{O}' = \dim \tilde{O}$.

Hence $\rho: \tilde{O}' \rightarrow \tilde{O}$ is a cover $\leadsto \mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}] \subset_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}']$. On the other hand, we have $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}] \simeq_{\text{gr}} \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda]$ (Sec. 1.6 of Lec 16) & $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}'] \simeq [\text{Sec 2 of Lec 14}] \simeq_{\text{gr}} \mathbb{C}[Y_\lambda]$. These are G -linear isomorphisms. By (1), $\mathbb{C}[Y_\lambda] \simeq \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda]$. So $\mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}] \simeq_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}']$. Note that $G \curvearrowright \mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}], \mathbb{C}[\tilde{O}']$ are rational. Now $\tilde{O} \simeq \tilde{O}'$ follows from

Claim: Let $H \subset G$ be an algebraic subgroup. Then \forall fin. dim. G -irrep V have $\text{Hom}_G(V, \mathbb{C}[G/H]) \simeq (V^*)^H$, so is finite dimensional.

Sketch of proof: By the algebraic version of the Peter-Weyl thm, $\mathbb{C}[G] \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{\mathbb{C} \times G} \bigoplus_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{U}^*$, where the sum is taken over all G -irreps \mathcal{U} . Then $\mathbb{C}[G/H] \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[G]^H \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{U} \otimes (\mathcal{U}^*)^H$ and the claim follows. \square

Conclusion: Our assumption was $\mathcal{H}_x \neq \{0\}$. We see that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is not birationally rigid. So, if $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is birationally rigid, then $\mathcal{H}_x = \{0\}$. This finishes the proof of Thm 2.

Remark: The morphism $Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}^0 \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ extends to $Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ b/c $\mathbb{C}[Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}] = \mathbb{C}[Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}^0]$ (by Hartogs) & $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ is affine. Once we know that $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}' \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}$, we see that $Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}^0 \hookrightarrow X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}$ (as sets), in fact, this is an open embedding. From here we deduce $X_{\mathbb{C}\lambda} \cong \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[Y_{\mathbb{C}\lambda}]$.