

Extending the Bruhat order and the length function from the Weyl group to the Weyl monoid

Claus Mokler

Universität Wuppertal, Fachbereich Mathematik
Gaußstraße 20
D-42097 Wuppertal, Germany
mokler@math.uni-wuppertal.de

Abstract

For a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra the category of admissible representations is an analogue of the category of finite dimensional representations of a semisimple Lie algebra. The monoid associated to this category and the category of restricted duals by a generalized Tannaka-Krein reconstruction contains the Kac-Moody group as open dense unit group and has similar properties as a reductive algebraic monoid. In particular there are Bruhat and Birkhoff decompositions, the Weyl group replaced by the Weyl monoid, [M 1].

We determine the closure relations of the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells, which give extensions of the Bruhat order from the Weyl group to the Weyl monoid. We show that the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells are irreducible and principal open in their closures. We give product decompositions of the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells. We define extended length functions, which are compatible with the extended Bruhat orders. We show a generalization of some of the Tits axioms for twinned BN-pairs.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2000. 17B67, 22E65.

Key words. Kac-Moody groups, algebra of strongly regular functions, Weyl monoid, Bruhat order, length function, reductive algebraic monoids, Renner monoid.

Introduction

The Kac-Moody group G constructed in [K,P 1] by V. Kac and D. Peterson is a group analogue of a semisimple, simply connected algebraic group. In particular there are Bruhat and Birkhoff decompositions

$$G = \bigcup_{w \in \mathcal{W}} B^\epsilon w B^\delta \quad (\epsilon, \delta) \in \{(+, +), (-, -), (-, +), (+, -)\} ,$$

and also certain multiplicative decompositions of the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells like $BwB = U_w \cdot wT \cdot U$ and $B^-wB = (U^w)^- \cdot wT \cdot U$. (Here T denotes a maximal torus, \mathcal{W} the Weyl group, and $B = B^+$, B^- denote opposite Borel subgroups containing T .) V. Kac and D. Peterson equipped in [K,P 2] a symmetrizable Kac-Moody group with a coordinate ring, the algebra of strongly regular functions $\mathbb{C}[G]$. This coordinate ring has many properties in common with the coordinate ring of a semisimple, simply connected algebraic group. It is an integrally closed domain, even a unique factorization domain. It admits a Peter and Weyl theorem, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{C}[G] \cong \bigoplus_{\Lambda \in P^+} L^*(\Lambda) \otimes L(\Lambda)$$

as $G \times G$ -modules. (Here $L(\Lambda)$ denotes an irreducible highest weight module with highest weight Λ , $L^*(\Lambda)$ its restricted dual, and P^+ the set of dominant weights.) As a difference, in the non-classical case, the multiplication map and the inverse map of G do not induce comorphisms. V. Kac and D. Peterson showed that the Zariski closures of the following Bruhat and Birkhoff cells are obtained similarly to the classical case, using the Bruhat order of the Weyl group \mathcal{W} :

$$\overline{B^\epsilon w B^\epsilon} = \bigcup_{w' \leq w} B^\epsilon w' B^\epsilon \quad \text{where } \epsilon \in \{+, -\}, \quad \overline{B^- w B^-} = \bigcup_{w' \geq w} B^- w' B^- .$$

In [M 1] we determined by a generalized Tannaka-Krein reconstruction the monoid with coordinate ring $(\widehat{G}, \mathbb{C}[\widehat{G}])$ associated to a natural category determined by the modules $L(\Lambda)$, $\Lambda \in P^+$, and a category of duals determined by $L^*(\Lambda)$, $\Lambda \in P^+$. For its history in connection with V. Kac, D. Peterson, and P. Slodowy please look at the introduction of [M 1]. The monoid \widehat{G} contains the Kac-Moody group G as open dense unit group. In particular its coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[\widehat{G}]$ is isomorphic to the algebra of strongly regular functions $\mathbb{C}[G]$ by the restriction map.

This monoid is a purely infinite-dimensional phenomenon. In the classical case it reduces to a semisimple simply connected algebraic group. It is a proper analogue of such a group. For generalizing some results of classical invariant theory it should be more fundamental than the Kac-Moody group itself.

In [M 1] we also showed that the monoid \widehat{G} has similar structural properties as a normal reductive algebraic monoid. In particular there are Bruhat and Birkhoff decompositions

$$\widehat{G} = \bigcup_{\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\delta \quad (\epsilon, \delta) \in \{(+, +), (-, -), (-, +), (+, -)\} ,$$

the Weyl group replaced by the Weyl monoid $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, which is an analogue of a Renner monoid. It contains the Weyl group as unit group and its idempotents correspond bijectively to the faces of the Tits cone.

In [M 2] we determined and investigated the \mathbb{C} -valued points of $\mathbb{C}[\widehat{G}]$. Identifying the elements of \widehat{G} with their evaluation morphisms, \widehat{G} embeds in the set of \mathbb{C} -valued points of $\mathbb{C}[\widehat{G}]$. The Bruhat decompositions of \widehat{G} do not extend, but one of the Birkhoff decompositions of \widehat{G} extends to a decomposition of the \mathbb{C} -valued points.

In [M 1], [M 2] the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells have not been investigated further. In particular their closure relations, which determine extensions of the Bruhat order from the Weyl group to the Weyl monoid, have not been determined.

For reductive algebraic monoids these questions have already been investigated: L. E. Renner studied in [Re 1], [Re 2] the closure relation of the Bruhat cells of a reductive algebraic monoid. Transferred to the Renner monoid he called this order the Bruhat-Chevalley order. He showed that all maximal chains between two elements have the same length. He also showed a monoid version of one of the Tits axioms for BN -pairs. An algebraic description of the Bruhat-Chevalley order has been obtained by E. A. Pennel, M. S. Putcha, and R. E. Renner in [Pe,Pu,Re]. An investigation of the lexicographic shellability has been started by M. S. Putcha in [Pu].

A length function for the Renner monoid of matrices over a finite field has first been introduced in [So] by L. Solomon. He also showed that this length function fits to the monoid generalization of one of the Tits axiom mentioned above. A length function for the Renner monoid of an arbitrary reductive algebraic monoid has been introduced and investigated by L. E. Renner in [Re 2] by a different approach. It has the property that the length of a maximal chain of the Bruhat-Chevalley order, which is contained in an orbit of the action of the product of the Weyl group on the Renner monoid, is given by the difference of the length of the maximal and the minimal element of the chain. He also showed that this length function fits to his monoid generalization of one of the Tits axioms. A subadditivity property has been shown by E. A. Pennel, M. S. Putcha, and R. E. Renner in [Pe,Pu,Re].

L. E. Renner gave in [Re 3] a product decomposition of a Bruhat cell of the wonderful compactification of a semisimple algebraic group.

Note also that many of these results just mentioned induce, by using the longest element of the Weyl group, corresponding results for the Birkhoff cells.

In this article we show that some of these results are also valid for the monoid \widehat{G} and the spectrum $\text{Specm } \mathbb{C}[\widehat{G}]$: In Section 2 we obtain a similar algebraic description of the closure relations of the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells of \widehat{G} , and of the Birkhoff cells of $\text{Specm } \mathbb{C}[\widehat{G}]$. We show that these relations are actually order relations, which is not automatic in our infinite dimensional situation. Transferred to the Weyl monoid we call these orders the extended Bruhat and Birkhoff orders.

We show that the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells are irreducible and principal open in their closures. We equip the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells with their coordinate rings as principal open sets and give product decompositions of these cells.

In Section 3 we extend the length function on the Weyl group to functions on

the Weyl monoid, compatible with the extended Bruhat orders. We show a generalization of some of the Tits axiom for groups with twinned BN -pairs.

To obtain these results is often more arduous as for reductive algebraic monoids, and we have to use different methods for the following reasons: Most of the theorems of algebraic geometry, which are used to investigate algebraic groups and monoids, break down for the infinite-dimensional varieties we have to use. In the non-classical case the multiplication map of \widehat{G} is not a morphism, only the left and right multiplications with elements of \widehat{G} are morphisms. The Weyl group and the Weyl monoid have infinitely many elements. In particular there is no longest element of the Weyl group, and there are infinitely many Bruhat and Birkhoff cells.

For our algebraic geometric investigations we mainly use the following two aids: The explicit description of the coordinate ring of \widehat{G} by the Peter and Weyl theorem. This allows to use properties of the action of parts of \widehat{G} on the irreducible highest weight representations $L(\Lambda)$, $\Lambda \in P^+$, to obtain algebraic geometric results. As an advantage our morphisms, closures, principal open sets are described very explicitly by using matrix coefficients. The monoid \widehat{G} does not act on the flag varieties, but it acts on the corresponding affine cones by morphisms. This allows to make use of the combinatorial properties of these cones described by V. Kac and D. Peterson in [K,P 1].

Contents

1 Preliminaries	4
2 Extensions of the Bruhat order	14
3 Extensions of the length function	31
References	38

1 Preliminaries

In this section we collect some basic facts about Kac-Moody algebras, minimal and formal Kac-Moody groups, and the corresponding monoid completions, which are used later. One aim is to introduce our notation. Another aim is to put these things, which are scattered between many articles and books, on equal footing appropriate for our goals.

All the material stated in this section about Kac-Moody algebras can be found in the books [K] (most results also valid for a field of characteristic zero with the same proofs), [Mo,Pi]. The facts about the minimal Kac-Moody group can be found in [K,P 1], [K,P 3], [Mo,Pi], about the formal Kac-Moody group in

[Sl], about the Kostant cones in [K,P 1], [Mo,Pi], about the algebra of strongly regular functions in [K,P 2], about the faces of the Tits cone in [Loo], [Sl], [M 1]. The facts about the monoid completion of the minimal Kac-Moody group can be found in [M 1], about the spectrum of \mathbb{F} -valued points of its coordinate ring in [M 2].

We denote by $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{Z}^+$, \mathbb{Q}^+ , resp. \mathbb{R}^+ the sets of strictly positive numbers of \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{Q} , resp. \mathbb{R} , and the sets $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{Z}_0^+$, \mathbb{Q}_0^+ , \mathbb{R}_0^+ contain, in addition, the zero. In the whole paper, \mathbb{F} is a field of characteristic 0 and \mathbb{F}^\times its group of units.

Generalized Cartan matrices: Starting point for the construction of a Kac-Moody algebra and its associated simply connected minimal and formal Kac-Moody groups is a *generalized Cartan matrix*, which is a matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with $a_{ii} = 2$, $a_{ij} \leq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, and $a_{ij} = 0$ if and only if $a_{ji} = 0$. Denote by l the rank of A , and set $I := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

For the properties of the generalized Cartan matrices, in particular their classification, we refer to the book [K]. In this paper we assume A to be symmetrizable.

Realizations: A *simply connected minimal free realization* of A consists of dual free \mathbb{Z} -modules H , P of rank $2n - l$, and linear independent sets $\Pi^\vee = \{h_1, \dots, h_n\} \subseteq H$, $\Pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\} \subseteq P$ such that $\alpha_i(h_j) = a_{ji}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Furthermore there exist (non-uniquely determined) fundamental dominant weights $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n \in P$ such that $\Lambda_i(h_j) = \delta_{ij}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. P is called the *weight lattice*, and $Q := \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$ the *root lattice*. Set $Q_0^\pm := \mathbb{Z}_0^\pm\text{-span}\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$, and $Q^\pm := Q_0^\pm \setminus \{0\}$.

We fix a system of fundamental dominant weights $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n$, and extend $h_1, \dots, h_n \in H$, $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_n \in P$ to a pair of dual bases $h_1, \dots, h_{2n-l} \in H$, $\Lambda_1, \dots, \Lambda_{2n-l} \in P$. We set $H_{rest} := \mathbb{Z}\text{-span}\{h_i \mid i = n+1, \dots, 2n-l\}$.

The Weyl group: Identify H and P with the corresponding sublattices of the following vector spaces over \mathbb{F} :

$$\mathbf{h} := \mathbf{h}_{\mathbb{F}} := H \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F} \quad , \quad \mathbf{h}^* := \mathbf{h}_{\mathbb{F}}^* := P \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F} \quad .$$

\mathbf{h}^* is interpreted as the dual of \mathbf{h} . Order the elements of \mathbf{h}^* by $\lambda \leq \lambda'$ if and only if $\lambda' - \lambda \in Q_0^+$.

Choose a symmetric matrix $B \in M_n(\mathbb{Q})$ and a diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)$, $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \in \mathbb{Q}^+$, such that $A = DB$. Define a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form on \mathbf{h} by:

$$\begin{aligned} (h_i \mid h) &= (h \mid h_i) := \alpha_i(h) \epsilon_i & i \in I, \quad h \in \mathbf{h} , \\ (h' \mid h'') &:= 0 & h', h'' \in \mathbf{h}_{rest} := H_{rest} \otimes \mathbb{F} . \end{aligned}$$

Denote the induced nondegenerate symmetric form on \mathbf{h}^* also by (\mid) .

The *Weyl group* $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}(A)$ is the Coxeter group with generators σ_i , $i \in I$, and relations

$$\sigma_i^2 = 1 \quad (i \in I) \quad , \quad (\sigma_i \sigma_j)^{m_{ij}} = 1 \quad (i, j \in I, i \neq j) \quad .$$

The m_{ij} are given by:

$a_{ij}a_{ji}$	0	1	2	3	≥ 4
m_{ij}	2	3	4	6	no relation between σ_i and σ_j

The Weyl group \mathcal{W} acts faithfully and contragrediently on \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{h}^* by

$$\sigma_i h := h - \alpha_i(h)h_i \quad , \quad \sigma_i \lambda := \lambda - \lambda(h_i)\alpha_i \quad , \quad i \in I, \quad h \in \mathbf{h}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbf{h}^* \quad ,$$

leaving the lattices H, Q, P , and the forms invariant. $\Delta_{re} := \mathcal{W}\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$ is called the set of *real roots*, and $\Delta_{re}^\vee := \mathcal{W}\{h_i \mid i \in I\}$ the set of *real coroots*. The map $\alpha_i \mapsto h_i, i \in I$, can be extended to a \mathcal{W} -equivariant bijection $\alpha \mapsto h_\alpha$.

The Tits cone and its faces: To illustrate the action of \mathcal{W} on $\mathbf{h}_\mathbb{R}^*$ geometrically, for $J \subseteq I$ define

$$\begin{aligned} F_J &:= \{ \lambda \in \mathbf{h}_\mathbb{R}^* \mid \lambda(h_i) = 0 \text{ for } i \in J, \quad \lambda(h_i) > 0 \text{ for } i \in I \setminus J \} \quad , \\ \overline{F_J} &:= \{ \lambda \in \mathbf{h}_\mathbb{R}^* \mid \lambda(h_i) = 0 \text{ for } i \in J, \quad \lambda(h_i) \geq 0 \text{ for } i \in I \setminus J \} \quad . \end{aligned}$$

$\overline{F_J}$ is a finitely generated convex cone with relative interior F_J . The parabolic subgroup \mathcal{W}_J of \mathcal{W} is the stabilizer of every element $\lambda \in F_J$. For $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}$ call σF_J a *facet* of *type* J .

The *fundamental chamber* $\overline{\mathcal{C}} := \{ \lambda \in \mathbf{h}_\mathbb{R}^* \mid \lambda(h_i) \geq 0 \text{ for } i \in I \}$ is a fundamental region for the action of \mathcal{W} on the convex cone $X := \mathcal{W}\overline{\mathcal{C}}$, which is called the *Tits cone*. The partition $\overline{\mathcal{C}} = \bigcup_{J \subseteq I} F_J$ induces a \mathcal{W} -invariant partition of X into facets.

We denote the set of faces of the Tits cone X by $\mathcal{R}(X)$. These faces can be described as follows: A set $\Theta \subseteq I$ is called *special*, if either $\Theta = \emptyset$, or else all connected components of the generalized Cartan submatrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in \Theta}$ are of non-finite type. Set $\Theta^\perp := \{ i \in I \mid a_{ij} = 0 \text{ for all } j \in \Theta \}$. Every face of the Tits cone X is \mathcal{W} -conjugate to exactly one of the faces

$$R(\Theta) := X \cap \{ \lambda \in \mathbf{h}_\mathbb{R}^* \mid \lambda(h_i) = 0 \text{ for all } i \in \Theta \} = \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \overline{F_\Theta} \quad , \quad \Theta \text{ special} \quad .$$

The parabolic subgroup \mathcal{W}_Θ is the pointwise stabilizer of $R(\Theta)$, and the parabolic subgroup $\mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ is the stabilizer of the set $R(\Theta)$ as a whole.

The relative interior of $R(\Theta)$ is given by the union of the facets $\sigma F_{\Theta \cup \Theta_f}$, where $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$, and Θ_f is a subset of Θ^\perp , which is either empty, or else for which all connected components of $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in \Theta_f}$ are of finite type.

The Weyl monoid: The Weyl group acts on the monoid $(\mathcal{R}(X), \cap)$. The semidirect product $\mathcal{R}(X) \rtimes \mathcal{W}$ consists of the set $\mathcal{R}(X) \times \mathcal{W}$ with the structure of a monoid given by

$$(R, \sigma) \cdot (S, \tau) := (R \cap \sigma S, \sigma \tau) \quad .$$

For $R \in \mathcal{R}(X)$ let $Z_\mathcal{W}(R) := \{ \sigma \in \mathcal{W} \mid \sigma \lambda = \lambda \text{ for all } \lambda \in R \}$ be the pointwise stabilizer of R . The Weyl monoid $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ is defined as the monoid $\mathcal{R}(X) \rtimes \mathcal{W}$ factored by the congruence relation

$$(R, \sigma) \sim (R', \sigma') : \iff R = R' \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma' \sigma^{-1} \in Z_\mathcal{W}(R) \quad .$$

We denote the congruence class of (R, σ) by $\varepsilon(R)\sigma$.

Assigning to $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}$ the element $\sigma := \varepsilon(X)\sigma \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, the Weyl group \mathcal{W} identifies with the unit group of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. It acts in the obvious way on $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, the partition of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ into $\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$ -orbits given by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{W}} = \bigcup_{\Theta \text{ special}} \mathcal{W} \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \mathcal{W} . \quad (1)$$

Assigning to $R \in \mathcal{R}(X)$ the element $\varepsilon(R) := \varepsilon(R)1 \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, the monoid $(\mathcal{R}(X), \cap)$ embeds into $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. Its image are the idempotents of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. By this map, the action of \mathcal{W} on $\mathcal{R}(X)$ identifies with the restricted conjugation action of \mathcal{W} on $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, i.e.,

$$w\varepsilon(R)w^{-1} = \varepsilon(wR) , \quad w \in \mathcal{W} , \quad R \in \mathcal{R}(X) . \quad (2)$$

Recall that a monoid M is called an *inverse monoid*, if for every element $m \in M$ there exists a unique element $m^{inv} \in M$, such that $mm^{inv}m = m$ and $m^{inv}mm^{inv} = m^{inv}$. The *inverse map* $^{inv} : M \rightarrow M$ is an involution extending the inverse map of the unit group. The Weyl monoid $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ is an inverse monoid with inverse map $^{inv} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ given by $(\sigma\varepsilon(R))^{inv} = \varepsilon(R)\sigma^{-1}$, $\sigma \in \mathcal{W}$, and R a face of X .

The following formulas, which follow immediately from the definition of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, will be used later at many places: Let $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and Θ be special. Then

$$w\varepsilon(R(\Theta))w^{-1} = \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \iff w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} , \quad (3)$$

$$w\varepsilon(R(\Theta)) = \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \iff \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w = \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \iff w \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta . \quad (4)$$

The Kac-Moody algebra: The *Kac-Moody algebra* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A)$ is the Lie algebra over \mathbb{F} generated by the abelian Lie algebra \mathfrak{h} and $2n$ elements e_i, f_i , ($i \in I$), with the following relations, which hold for any $i, j \in I$, $h \in \mathfrak{h}$:

$$\begin{aligned} [e_i, f_j] &= \delta_{ij} h_i , \quad [h, e_i] = \alpha_i(h) e_i , \quad [h, f_i] = -\alpha_i(h) f_i , \\ (ad e_i)^{1-a_{ij}} e_j &= (ad f_i)^{1-a_{ij}} f_j = 0 \quad (i \neq j) . \end{aligned}$$

The *Chevalley involution* $*$: $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ is the involutive anti-automorphism determined by $e_i^* = f_i$, $f_i^* = e_i$, $h^* = h$, ($i \in I$, $h \in \mathfrak{h}$).

The nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form (\mid) on \mathfrak{h} extends uniquely to a nondegenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form (\mid) on \mathfrak{g} .

We have the *root space decomposition*

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \quad \text{where} \quad \mathfrak{g}_\alpha := \{ x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h, x] = \alpha(h)x \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h} \} .$$

In particular $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{h}$, $\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha_i} = \mathbb{F}e_i$, and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_i} = \mathbb{F}f_i$, $i \in I$.

The set of roots $\Delta := \{ \alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^* \setminus \{0\} \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \neq \{0\} \}$ is invariant under the Weyl group, $\Delta = -\Delta$, and Δ spans the root lattice Q . We have $\Delta_{re} \subseteq \Delta$, and $\Delta_{im} := \Delta \setminus \Delta_{re}$ is called the set of *imaginary roots*.

Δ , Δ_{re} , and Δ_{im} decompose into the disjoint union of the sets of *positive* and

negative roots $\Delta^\pm := \Delta \cap Q^\pm$, $\Delta_{re}^\pm := \Delta_{re} \cap Q^\pm$, $\Delta_{im}^\pm := \Delta_{im} \cap Q^\pm$.
There is the *triangular decomposition* $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$, where $\mathfrak{n}^\pm := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^\pm} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$.

Irreducible highest weight representations: For every $\Lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ there exists, unique up to isomorphism, an irreducible representation $(L(\Lambda), \pi_\Lambda)$ of \mathfrak{g} with highest weight Λ . It is \mathfrak{h} -diagonalizable, and we denote its set of weights by $P(\Lambda)$. Any such representation carries a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form $\langle \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle \rangle : L(\Lambda) \times L(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ which is contravariant, i.e., $\langle \langle v | xw \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle x^*v | w \rangle \rangle$ for all $v, w \in L(\Lambda)$, $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. This form is unique up to a nonzero multiplicative scalar.

The category \mathcal{O}_{adm} : The category \mathcal{O} is defined as follows: Its objects are the \mathfrak{g} -modules V , which have the properties:

- (1) V is \mathfrak{h} -diagonalizable with finite dimensional weight spaces.
- (2) There exist finitely many elements $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, such that the set of weights $P(V)$ of V is contained in the union $\bigcup_{i=1}^m \{ \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \lambda \leq \lambda_i \}$.

The morphisms of \mathcal{O} are the morphisms of \mathfrak{g} -modules.

Call a \mathfrak{g} -module V *admissible*, if V is \mathfrak{h} -diagonalizable with set of weights $P(V) \subseteq P$ and the elements of \mathfrak{g}_α act locally nilpotent on V for all $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$. (If the generalized Cartan matrix is degenerate, then admissible is slightly stronger than *integrable*, which means V is \mathfrak{h} -diagonalizable and the elements of \mathfrak{g}_α act locally nilpotent on V for all $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$.) Examples of admissible representations are the adjoint representation (\mathfrak{g}, ad) , and the irreducible highest weight representations $(L(\Lambda), \pi_\Lambda)$, $\Lambda \in P^+ := P \cap \overline{C}$.

We denote by \mathcal{O}_{adm} the full subcategory of the category \mathcal{O} , whose objects are admissible modules. This category generalizes the category of finite dimensional representations of a semisimple Lie algebra, keeping the complete reducibility theorem. Every object of \mathcal{O}_{adm} is isomorphic to a direct sum of the admissible irreducible highest weight modules $L(\Lambda)$, $\Lambda \in P^+$. The set of weights of a module of \mathcal{O}_{adm} is contained in $X \cap P$ because of $\bigcup_{\Lambda \in P^+} P(\Lambda) = X \cap P$.

The minimal and formal Kac-Moody groups G and G_f , the monoids \widehat{G} and \widehat{G}_f : The monoid \widehat{G} , can be obtained by a Tannaka-Krein reconstruction from the category \mathcal{O}_{adm} and its corresponding category of restricted duals, compare [M 1], Section 4. It can also be characterized as follows:

- (a) The monoid \widehat{G} acts on every module of \mathcal{O}_{adm} . Two elements $\hat{g}, \hat{g}' \in \widehat{G}$ are equal if and only if for all modules V of \mathcal{O}_{adm} and for all $v \in V$ we have $\hat{g}v = \hat{g}'v$.
- (b) There are the following elements of \widehat{G} acting on the modules of \mathcal{O}_{adm} in a particular way:

- (1) For every $h \in H$, $s \in \mathbb{F}^\times$ there exists an element $t_h(s) \in \widehat{G}$, such that for every module V of \mathcal{O}_{adm} we have

$$t_h(s)v_\lambda = s^{\lambda(h)}v_\lambda, \quad v_\lambda \in V_\lambda, \quad \lambda \in P(V).$$

(2) For every $x \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$, there exists an element $\exp(x) \in \widehat{G}$, such that for every module V of \mathcal{O}_{adm} we have

$$\exp(x)v = \exp(\pi(x))v \quad , \quad v \in V \quad .$$

(3) For every face R of the Tits cone there exists an element $e(R) \in \widehat{G}$, such that for every module V of \mathcal{O}_{adm} we have

$$e(R)v_\lambda = \begin{cases} v_\lambda & \lambda \in R \\ 0 & \lambda \in X \setminus R \end{cases} \quad , \quad v_\lambda \in V_\lambda, \quad \lambda \in P(V) \quad .$$

\widehat{G} is generated by the elements of (1), (2), and (3).

The unit group G of \widehat{G} is generated by the elements of (1) and (2). It is the *minimal Kac-Moody group*, which we call *Kac-Moody group* for short.

The *Chevalley involution* $*$: $\widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ is the involutive anti-isomorphism determined by $\exp(x_\alpha)^* := \exp(x_\alpha^*)$, $t^* := t$, $e(R)^* := e(R)$, where $x_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$, $t \in T$, and $R \in \mathcal{R}(X)$. It is compatible with any nondegenerate symmetric contravariant form $\langle \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle \rangle$ on any module V of \mathcal{O}_{adm} , i.e., $\langle \langle xv | w \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle v | x^*w \rangle \rangle$, $v, w \in V$, $x \in \widehat{G}$.

In this paper we are interested in the monoid \widehat{G} and the spectrum of \mathbb{F} -valued points of its coordinate ring, which will be defined soon. To describe the \mathbb{F} -valued points we need a second monoid \widehat{G}_f , extending \widehat{G} , which we define already now: Set $\mathbf{n}_f := \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and $\mathfrak{g}_f := \mathbf{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathbf{n}_f$. The Lie bracket of \mathfrak{g} extends in the obvious way to a Lie bracket of \mathfrak{g}_f . Every \mathfrak{g} -module of \mathcal{O}_{adm} can be extended to a \mathfrak{g}_f -module. The monoid \widehat{G}_f can be characterized as follows:

(a) The monoid \widehat{G}_f acts on every module of \mathcal{O}_{adm} . Two elements $\hat{g}, \hat{g}' \in \widehat{G}$ are equal if and only if for all modules V of \mathcal{O}_{adm} , and for all $v \in V$, we have $\hat{g}v = \hat{g}'v$.

(b) \widehat{G}_f extends \widehat{G} and it contains the following elements:

(4) For every $x \in \mathbf{n}_f$ there exists an element $\exp(x) \in \widehat{G}_f$, such that for any admissible representation (V, π) we have

$$\exp(x)v = \exp(\pi(x))v \quad , \quad v \in V \quad .$$

\widehat{G}_f is generated by \widehat{G} and the elements of (4).

The unit group G_f of \widehat{G}_f is generated by G and the elements of (4). It is the *formal Kac-Moody group*.

Note that the groups G , G_f as well as the monoid \widehat{G} , \widehat{G}_f act faithfully on the sum $\bigoplus_{\Lambda \in P^+} L(\Lambda)$.

The groups G and G_f have the following important structural properties:

(a) The elements of (1) induce an embedding of the torus $H \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}^\times$ into $G \subseteq G_f$. Its image is denoted by T . For $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$ the elements of (2) induce an embedding of $(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, +)$ into $G \subseteq G_f$. Its image U_α is called the *root group* belonging to α .

Let $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}^+$ and $x_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, $x_{-\alpha} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ such that $[x_\alpha, x_{-\alpha}] = h_\alpha$. There exists an injective homomorphism of groups $\phi_\alpha : \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{F}) \rightarrow G$ with

$$\phi_\alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} := \exp(sx_\alpha), \quad \phi_\alpha \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ s & 1 \end{pmatrix} := \exp(sx_{-\alpha}), \quad (s \in \mathbb{F}^\times).$$

(b) Denote by N the subgroup generated by T and $n_\alpha := \phi_\alpha \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$. The Weyl group \mathcal{W} can be identified with the group N/T by the isomorphism $\kappa : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow N/T$ given by $\kappa(\sigma_\alpha) := n_\alpha T$, $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$. We denote an arbitrary element $n \in N$ with $\kappa^{-1}(nT) = \sigma \in \mathcal{W}$ by n_σ . The set of weights $P(V)$ of an admissible \mathfrak{g} -module (V, π) is \mathcal{W} -invariant, and $n_\sigma V_\lambda = V_{\sigma\lambda}$, $\lambda \in P(V)$.

(c) Let U^\pm be the subgroups generated by U_α , $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}^\pm$. Let $U_f := \exp(\mathfrak{n}_f)$. Then U^\pm and U_f are normalized by T . Set

$$B^\pm := T \ltimes U^\pm, \quad B_f := T \ltimes U_f.$$

The pairs (B^\pm, N) are twinned BN-pairs of G with the property $B^+ \cap B^- = B^\pm \cap N = T$. The pair (B_f, N) is a BN-pair of G_f with $B_f \cap N = T$. There are the *Bruhat* and *Birkhoff decompositions*

$$G = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{W}} B^\epsilon \sigma B^\delta, \quad G_f = \bigcup_{\sigma \in \mathcal{W}} B^\epsilon \sigma B_f, \quad \epsilon, \delta \in \{+, -\}.$$

(d) There are also Levi decompositions of the standard parabolic subgroups. In this article we only use the corresponding decompositions for the groups U^\pm and U_f : Set $\Delta_J^\pm := \Delta^\pm \cap \sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_j$, and $(\Delta^J)^\pm := \Delta^\pm \setminus \sum_{j \in J} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_j$. Similarly define $(\Delta_J)_{re}^\pm$ and $(\Delta^J)_{re}^\pm$ by replacing Δ^\pm by Δ_{re}^\pm . Set $(\mathfrak{n}_J)^\pm := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_J^\pm} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, $(\mathfrak{n}_f)_J := \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_J^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, and $(\mathfrak{n}_f)^J := \prod_{\alpha \in (\Delta^J)^+} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. We have

$$U^\pm = U_J^\pm \ltimes (U^J)^\pm, \quad U_f = (U_f)_J \ltimes (U_f)^J.$$

Here U_J^\pm is the group generated by U_α , $\alpha \in (\Delta_J)_{re}^\pm$. $(U^J)^\pm$ is the smallest normal subgroup of U^\pm containing U_α , $\alpha \in (\Delta^J)_{re}^\pm$. This group equals $\bigcap_{\sigma \in \mathcal{W}_J} \sigma U^\pm \sigma^{-1}$. Furthermore $(U_f)_J := \exp((\mathfrak{n}_f)_J)$ and $(U_f)^J := \exp((\mathfrak{n}_f)^J)$.

For $w \in \mathcal{W}$ set $U_w := U \cap wU^-w^{-1}$, $U^w := U \cap wUw^{-1}$, and $(U_f)^w := U_f \cap wU_fw^{-1}$. Then $U_w = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_w} U_\alpha$ (arbitrary order of the product), where $\Phi_w = \Delta_{re}^+ \cap w\Delta_{re}^- = \Delta^+ \cap w\Delta^-$. The multiplication maps $U_w \times U^w \rightarrow U$ and $U_w \times (U_f)^w \rightarrow U_f$ are bijective. Set $U_w^- := (U_w)^*$ and $(U^w)^- := (U^w)^*$.

The derived minimal Kac-Moody group G' is identical with the Kac-Moody group as defined in [K,P 1]. It is generated by the root groups U_α , $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}$. We have $G = G' \rtimes T_{rest}$, where $T_{rest} := H_{rest} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}$ is a subtorus of T . The group G_f is identical with the Kac-Moody group of [Sl] for a simply connected minimal free realization.

The monoid \widehat{G} has the following important structural properties: The Kac-Moody group G is the unit group of \widehat{G} . Every idempotent is G -conjugate to

some idempotent $e(R(\Theta))$, Θ special. We have

$$\widehat{G} = \dot{\bigcup}_{\Theta \text{ special}} Ge(R(\Theta))G .$$

We get an abelian submonoid of \widehat{G} by $\widehat{T} := \dot{\bigcup}_{R \in \mathcal{R}(X)} Te(R)$. We get a submonoid of \widehat{G} by $\widehat{N} := \dot{\bigcup}_{R \in \mathcal{R}(X)} Ne(R)$. Define a congruence relation on \widehat{N} as follows:

$$\hat{n} \sim \hat{n}' : \Longleftrightarrow \hat{n}T = \hat{n}'T \Longleftrightarrow \hat{n}' \in \hat{n}T \Longleftrightarrow \hat{n} \in \hat{n}'T .$$

The Weyl monoid $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ is isomorphic to the monoid \widehat{N}/T , an isomorphism $\kappa : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{N}/T$ given by $\kappa(\sigma\varepsilon(R)) = n_\sigma e(R)T$.

\widehat{G} has *Bruhat* and *Birkhoff decompositions*:

$$\widehat{G} = \dot{\bigcup}_{\hat{n} \in \widehat{N}} U^\epsilon \hat{n} U^\delta = \dot{\bigcup}_{\hat{\sigma} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}} B^\epsilon \hat{\sigma} B^\delta , \quad \epsilon, \delta \in \{+, -\} .$$

For later reference we state the following formulas, which are useful for computations in \widehat{G} :

(α) Let R, S be faces of the Tits cone, and $n_\sigma \in N$. Then

$$e(R)e(S) = e(R \cap S) , \quad n_\sigma e(R) n_\sigma^{-1} = e(\sigma R) .$$

(β) An element g of T, N, U, U^- , resp. G satisfies

$$e(R(\Theta))g = e(R(\Theta))$$

if and only if it satisfies

$$g^* e(R(\Theta)) = e(R(\Theta))$$

if and only if it is contained in $T_\Theta, N_\Theta, U_\Theta, U_\Theta^- \ltimes (U^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp})^-$, resp. $G_\Theta \ltimes (U^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp})^-$. Here T_Θ is the subtorus of T generated by $t_{h_j}(s)$, $j \in \Theta$, $s \in \mathbb{F}^\times$, N_Θ is the subgroup of N generated by T_Θ and n_{α_j} , $j \in \Theta$, and G_Θ is the subgroup of G generated by $U_{\alpha_j}^\pm$, $j \in \Theta$.

(γ) An element g of T, N, U, U^- , resp. G satisfies

$$ge(R(\Theta))g^{-1} = e(R(\Theta))$$

if and only if it is contained in the groups $T, N_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} T, U_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}, U_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}^-$, resp. $G_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} T$.

(δ) In particular we have

$$\begin{aligned} Ue(R(\Theta)) &= U_{\Theta^\perp} e(R(\Theta)) = e(R(\Theta)) U_{\Theta^\perp} , \\ e(R(\Theta)) U^- &= e(R(\Theta)) U_{\Theta^\perp}^- = U_{\Theta^\perp}^- e(R(\Theta)) . \end{aligned}$$

Sets with coordinate rings: We call a point separating algebra of functions $\mathbb{F}[A]$ on a set A a *coordinate ring*. The closed sets of the *Zariski topology* on A are given by the zero sets of the functions of $\mathbb{F}[A]$. The set A is irreducible if and only if $\mathbb{F}[A]$ is an integral domain.

A morphism of sets with coordinate rings $(A, \mathbb{F}[A])$ and $(B, \mathbb{F}[B])$ consists of a map $\phi : A \rightarrow B$, whose comorphism $\phi^* : \mathbb{F}[B] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[A]$ exists. In particular a morphism is Zariski continuous.

If $(B, \mathbb{F}[B])$ is a set with coordinate ring, and A is a nonempty subset of B , we get a coordinate ring on A by restricting the functions of $\mathbb{F}[B]$ to A .

If $(A, \mathbb{F}[A])$ is a set with coordinate ring and $f \in \mathbb{F}[A] \setminus \{0\}$, the principal open set $D_A(f) := \{a \in A \mid f(a) \neq 0\}$ is equipped with a coordinate ring by identifying the localization $\mathbb{F}[A]_f$ in the obvious way with an algebra of functions on $D_A(f)$. The principal open set $D_A(f)$ is irreducible if and only if A is irreducible.

If $(A, \mathbb{F}[A])$ and $(B, \mathbb{F}[B])$ are sets with coordinate rings, then the product $A \times B$ is equipped with a coordinate ring by identifying the tensor product $\mathbb{F}[A] \otimes \mathbb{F}[B]$ in the obvious way with an algebra of functions on $A \times B$. The product $A \times B$ is irreducible if and only if A and B are irreducible.

The coordinate ring of \widehat{G} : By the Tannaka Krein reconstruction given in [M 1], Section 4, the monoid \widehat{G} is equipped with a natural coordinate ring. It can also be defined as follows: For a module V of \mathcal{O}_{adm} , $v, w \in V$, and $\langle\langle \mid \rangle\rangle$ a nondegenerate symmetric contravariant bilinear form on V , call the function $f_{vw} : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$ defined by $f_{vw}(x) := \langle\langle v \mid xw \rangle\rangle$, $x \in \widehat{G}$, a *matrix coefficient* of \widehat{G} . The set of all such matrix coefficients $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ is a coordinate ring on \widehat{G} , which is an integral domain. For a set $M \subseteq \widehat{G}$ we denote by \overline{M} its Zariski closure.

The Chevalley involution $* : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ is a morphism. We denote its comorphism also by $* : \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ and call it *Chevalley involution*. Right and left multiplications with elements of \widehat{G} are morphisms. In particular an action of $\widehat{G} \times \widehat{G}$ on \widehat{G} from the right by morphisms is given by

$$x(g, h) := g^* x h \quad x, g, h \in \widehat{G} .$$

The comorphisms induce an action of $\widehat{G} \times \widehat{G}$ on $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ from the left.

In this article we fix a nondegenerate symmetric contravariant bilinear form on $L(\Lambda)$ for every $\Lambda \in P^+$. The coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ admits a *Peter-Weyl theorem*: The map $\bigoplus_{\Lambda \in P^+} L(\Lambda) \otimes L(\Lambda) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ induced by $v \otimes w \mapsto f_{vw}$ is an isomorphism of $\widehat{G} \times \widehat{G}$ -modules. It identifies the direct sum of the switch maps of the factors with the Chevalley involution.

The algebra of *strongly regular functions* $\mathbb{F}[G]$ is obtained by restricting the functions of $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ onto G . The restriction map is an isomorphism from $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ to $\mathbb{F}[G]$. Restricting the functions of $\mathbb{F}[G]$ onto G' , resp. T_{rest} gives the algebras $\mathbb{F}[G']$, resp. $\mathbb{F}[T_{rest}]$ the first identical with the algebra of strongly regular functions as defined in [K,P 2], the second the classical coordinate ring of the

torus T_{rest} . The multiplication map $G' \times T_{rest} \rightarrow G$ is an isomorphism.

The monoids \widehat{T} , \widehat{N} , \widehat{G} are the Zariski closures of T , N , G , and G is the Zariski open dense unit group of \widehat{G} .

Denote by \leq the Bruhat order on \mathcal{W} . Lemma 3.4 of [K,P 2] is also valid for the slightly enlarged group G , which we use here. It gives the relative closures of Bruhat and Birkhoff cells of G :

$$\overline{B^\epsilon w B^\epsilon} \cap G = \bigcup_{\substack{w' \in \mathcal{W} \\ w' \leq w}} B^\epsilon w' B^\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{B^- w B} \cap G = \bigcup_{\substack{w' \in \mathcal{W} \\ w' \geq w}} B^- w' B, \quad (5)$$

where $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$.

The spectrum of \mathbb{F} -valued points of $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$: We denote the \mathbb{F} -valued points of $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$, i.e., the homomorphisms of algebras from $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ to \mathbb{F} , by $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$. A function $f \in \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ induces a function on $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$, assigning to $\phi \in \text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ the value $\phi(f)$. We denote this function also by f . In this way $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ is equipped with a coordinate ring isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$. Its Zariski topology coincides with the relative topology induced by the topology of the spectrum of $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$. For a set $M \subseteq \text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ we denote by \overline{M}^{spm} its Zariski closure.

As a set, the \mathbb{F} -valued points of $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ can be described as follows: There is a surjective map $\diamond : \widehat{G}_f \times \widehat{G}_f \rightarrow \text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ given by

$$(x \diamond y)(f_{vw}) := \langle \langle xv \mid yw \rangle \rangle \quad , \quad x, y \in \widehat{G}_f, \quad v, w \in L(\Lambda), \quad \Lambda \in P^+.$$

The set of fibres of this map coincides with the partition of $\widehat{G}_f \times \widehat{G}_f$ corresponding to the equivalence relation, which is generated by

$$(x, zy) \sim (z^*x, y) \quad , \quad x, y \in \widehat{G}_f, \quad z \in \widehat{G}.$$

In particular $x \diamond zy = xz^* \diamond y$, $x, y \in \widehat{G}_f$, $z \in \widehat{G}$.

The monoid $\widehat{G}_f \times \widehat{G}_f$ acts in a natural way on $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ by morphisms from the right. The map \diamond is equivariant, i.e.,

$$(x \diamond y)(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = x\tilde{x} \diamond y\tilde{y} \quad , \quad x, \tilde{x}, y, \tilde{y} \in \widehat{G}_f.$$

The Chevalley involution of $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ induces an involutive morphism $*$ on $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$, also called *Chevalley involution*. Using the map \diamond it can be described by

$$(x \diamond y)^* = y \diamond x \quad , \quad x, y \in \widehat{G}_f.$$

In [M 2] we investigated the $G_f \times G_f$ -orbit decomposition (closure relation of the orbits, irreducibility of the orbits, coverings of the orbits by big cells, transversal stratified slices to the orbits). As an aid for these investigations, we showed the *Birkhoff decomposition*

$$\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}] = \bigcup_{\hat{w} \in \mathcal{W}} B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f.$$

Note that \widehat{G}_f embeds into $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ by assigning $x \in \widehat{G}_f$ the element $1 \diamond x$. In this way this decomposition of $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ extends one of the Birkhoff decompositions of \widehat{G} , and a corresponding Birkhoff decomposition, which holds for \widehat{G}_f .

The Kostant cones: Fix $\Lambda \in P^+$. Recall that we have fixed a nondegenerate symmetric contravariant bilinear form $\langle\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle\rangle$ on $L(\Lambda)$. Equip $L(\Lambda)$ with the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[L(\Lambda)]$ generated by the matrix coefficients f_v , $v \in L(\Lambda)$, where $f_v(w) := \langle\langle v | w \rangle\rangle$ for all $w \in L(\Lambda)$. It is a symmetric algebra in the linear space given by these functions. For a set $M \subseteq L(\Lambda)$ denote by \overline{M} its Zariski closure.

The set $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda := G(L(\Lambda)_\Lambda) \subseteq L(\Lambda)$ is Zariski closed. It is called *Kostant cone*.

Now assume that $\Lambda \in F_J$, $J \subseteq I$. Denote by \mathcal{W}^J the set of minimal coset representatives of $\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_J$. Because the parabolic subgroup \mathcal{W}_J is the \mathcal{W} -stabilizer of Λ , the evaluation map $\mathcal{W}^J \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^J \Lambda = \mathcal{W}\Lambda$ is bijective. By this map the Bruhat order on \mathcal{W}^J induces an order on $\mathcal{W}\Lambda$. The corresponding inverse order on $\mathcal{W}\Lambda$ is denoted by \preceq . If $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{W}\Lambda$ then $\lambda \preceq \mu$ implies $\lambda \leq \mu$.

For $v \in L(\Lambda)$ denote by $\text{supp}(v)$ the set of weights of the nonzero weight space components of v . Denote by $S(v)$ the convex hull of $\text{supp}(v)$ in $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$.

For $v \in \mathcal{V}_\Lambda \setminus \{0\}$ the vertices of $S(v)$ are given by $S(v) \cap \mathcal{W}\Lambda$. The edges of $S(v)$ are parallel to real roots. The two vertices of an edge are comparable in \preceq . $S(v)$ has one maximal and one minimal vertex.

For $\lambda \in \mathcal{W}\Lambda$ set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\Lambda^+(\lambda) &:= \{ v \in \mathcal{V}_\Lambda \setminus \{0\} \mid \lambda \text{ is the minimal vertex of } S(v) \} , \\ \mathcal{V}_\Lambda^-(\lambda) &:= \{ v \in \mathcal{V}_\Lambda \setminus \{0\} \mid \lambda \text{ is the maximal vertex of } S(v) \} . \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\lambda)^\epsilon = U^\epsilon(L(\Lambda)_\Lambda \setminus \{0\})$, and $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda \setminus \{0\} = \dot{\bigcup}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{W}\Lambda} \mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\lambda)^\epsilon$ where $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$, and

$$\overline{\mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\lambda)^+} \setminus \{0\} = \dot{\bigcup}_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}\Lambda, \mu \succeq \lambda} \mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\mu)^+ , \quad \overline{\mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\lambda)^-} \setminus \{0\} = \dot{\bigcup}_{\mu \in \mathcal{W}\Lambda, \mu \preceq \lambda} \mathcal{V}_\Lambda(\mu)^- .$$

The Kostant cones are the affine cones of the flag varieties. For our investigations they are more important than the flag varieties, because the monoid \widehat{G} acts on the Kostant cones by morphisms, but it does not act on the flag varieties. In particular $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda = \widehat{G}(L(\Lambda)_\Lambda)$.

2 Extensions of the Bruhat order

Since $\widehat{G} \times \widehat{G}$ acts on \widehat{G} by morphisms, the closures of the $B^{-\epsilon} \times B^\delta$ -orbits, $\epsilon, \delta \in \{+, -\}$, are unions of $B^{-\epsilon} \times B^\delta$ -orbits. Because of the Bruhat and Birkhoff decompositions

$$\widehat{G} = \dot{\bigcup}_{\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\delta$$

the closure relations of the $B^{-\epsilon} \times B^\delta$ -orbits determine relations on $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$:

Definition 2.1 For $\hat{w}, \hat{w}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ and $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$ define:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{w}' \leq_{\epsilon\epsilon} \hat{w} & : \iff B^\epsilon \hat{w}' B^\epsilon \subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon} . \\ \hat{w} \leq_{-+} \hat{w}' & : \iff B^- \hat{w}' B \subseteq \overline{B^- \hat{w} B} .\end{aligned}$$

Remarks: (1) Due to this definition

$$\overline{B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon} = \bigcup_{\substack{\hat{w}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \\ \hat{w}' \leq_{\epsilon\epsilon} \hat{w}}} B^\epsilon \hat{w}' B^\epsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{B^- \hat{w} B} = \bigcup_{\substack{\hat{w}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \\ \hat{w}' \geq_{-+} \hat{w}}} B^- \hat{w}' B .$$

(2) Due to equations (5) the relations \leq_{++} , \leq_{--} , and \leq_{-+} extend the Bruhat order \leq of the Weyl group \mathcal{W} .

The relations \leq_{++} , \leq_{--} , and \leq_{-+} are the closure relations of orbit decompositions. Therefore these relations are reflexive and transitive. But we can not conclude that they are antisymmetric, because for this we would need to know that the orbits are locally closed.

(3) The Chevalley involution $* : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ is a morphism with $(B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\delta)^* = B^{-\delta} \hat{w}^{inv} B^{-\epsilon}$, $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, $\epsilon, \delta \in \{+, -\}$. From the definition of the extended Bruhat orders follows immediately, that the inverse map $^{inv} : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is an isomorphism of the relations $(\mathcal{W}, \leq_{\epsilon\epsilon})$ and $(\mathcal{W}, \leq_{-\epsilon-\epsilon})$, $\epsilon = +, -$. It is an automorphism of (\mathcal{W}, \leq_{-+}) .

(4) In this article we do not treat the Birkhoff cells $B\hat{w}B^-$, $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. These cells can not be treated in a similar way as the Birkhoff cells $B^- \hat{w} B$, $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, because the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ does not contain the matrix coefficients of the admissible lowest weight representations. Even the relative closures of BwB^- , $w \in \mathcal{W}$, in the Kac-Moody group G have not been determined.

Our first aim is to determine these relations explicitly. To this end we introduce three normal forms of the elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, which are similar to the standard form of an element of a Renner monoid introduced in [Pe,Pu,Re].

For $J \subseteq I$ denote by \mathcal{W}^J the minimal coset representatives of $\mathcal{W}/\mathcal{W}_J$, and denote by ${}^J\mathcal{W}$ the minimal coset representatives of $\mathcal{W}_J \backslash \mathcal{W}$.

Proposition 2.2 Let $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$.

(I) There exists a uniquely determined special set Θ , and uniquely determined elements $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$, $w_2 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$, such that

$$\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 .$$

(II) There exists a uniquely determined special set Θ , and uniquely determined elements $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$, $w_2 \in {}^\Theta \mathcal{W}$, such that

$$\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 .$$

(III) There exists a uniquely determined special set Θ , and uniquely determined elements $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$, $w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$, $w_3 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$, such that

$$\hat{w} = w_1 w_2 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_3 = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 w_3 .$$

Remarks: (1) By applying the inverse map $^{inv} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ to an element \hat{w} in normal form I resp. II we obtain the element \hat{w}^{inv} in normal form II resp. I. By applying this map to an element \hat{w} in normal form III we obtain the element \hat{w}^{inv} in normal form III.

(2) As shown in the following proof, the multiplication map of \mathcal{W} restricts to bijective maps

$$\mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \times \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}^\Theta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \times {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W} \rightarrow {}^\Theta \mathcal{W} . \quad (6)$$

Therefore we can read off the normal forms I and II from the normal form III.

Proof: 1) We first show the existence and uniqueness of normal form I: We have $\widehat{\mathcal{W}} = \dot{\bigcup}_{\Theta \text{ special}} \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta))\mathcal{W}$, and by using formulas (3) and (4) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta))\mathcal{W} &= \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp \varepsilon(R(\Theta))} \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} {}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W} \\ &= \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} {}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} {}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \mathcal{W}_\Theta \mathcal{W}^\Theta = \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} {}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \mathcal{W}^\Theta . \end{aligned}$$

To show the uniqueness let $w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2$ and $w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2$ be normal forms I of the same element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. Then by using equation (2) we find

$$\varepsilon(w_1 R(\Theta)) w_1 w_2 = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 = w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 = \varepsilon(w'_1 R(\Theta')) w'_1 w'_2 ,$$

which is equivalent to

$$w_1 R(\Theta) = w'_1 R(\Theta') \quad \text{and} \quad w'_1 w'_2 (w_1 w_2)^{-1} \in w'_1 \mathcal{W}_{\Theta'} (w'_1)^{-1} .$$

From the first equation follows $\Theta = \Theta'$ and $w_1 \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} = w'_1 \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$. Since the minimal coset representatives w_1, w'_1 are uniquely determined we find $w_1 = w'_1$. Inserting in the second expression we get $w'_2 w_2^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta$, resp. $\mathcal{W}_\Theta w'_2 = \mathcal{W}_\Theta w_2$. Because the minimal coset representatives w_2, w'_2 are uniquely determined this implies $w_2 = w'_2$.

2) The existence and uniqueness of normal form II follows from the existence and uniqueness of normal form I by using the inverse map $^{inv} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$.

3) If we show the bijectivity of the restricted multiplication maps (6), then the existence and uniqueness of normal form I and II together with formula (3) imply the existence and uniqueness of normal form III. We only have to show the bijectivity of the first map, the bijectivity of the second follows by applying the inverse map of \mathcal{W} .

We have $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} = \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_\Theta$, and the corresponding multiplicative decomposition of the elements are unique. It remains to show that $\mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_\Theta \subseteq \mathcal{W}^\Theta$. If $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ and $w_2 \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$ then for all $i \in \Theta$ we have

$$w_1 w_2 \alpha_i = w_1 \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ .$$

Therefore $w_1 w_2 \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$. □

The following theorem describes the relations \leq_{++} , \leq_{--} , and \leq_{-+} explicitly. The description of 1a) (iii) is similar to the result for reductive algebraic monoids obtained in [Pe,Pu,Re].

For $J \subseteq I$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$ denote by w^J the minimal coset representative of $w\mathcal{W}_J$, and by Jw the minimal coset representative of \mathcal{W}_Jw .

Theorem 2.3

1a) Let $\hat{w} = w_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$, $\hat{w}' = w'_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta'))w'_2$ be elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $\hat{w} \leq_{++} \hat{w}'$
- (ii) $\Theta \supseteq \Theta'$ and there exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta',\perp}$ such that $w_1 \leq (w'_1w)^\Theta$ and $w_2 \geq {}^\Theta(w^{-1}w'_2)$.
- (iii) $\Theta \supseteq \Theta'$ and there exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta',\perp}\mathcal{W}_\Theta$ such that $w_1 \leq w'_1w$ and $w_2 \geq w^{-1}w'_2$.

b) Let $\hat{w} = w_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$, $\hat{w}' = w'_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta'))w'_2$ be elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form II. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $\hat{w} \leq_{--} \hat{w}'$
- (ii) $\Theta \supseteq \Theta'$ and there exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta',\perp}$ such that $w_1 \geq (w'_1w)^\Theta$ and $w_2 \leq {}^\Theta(w^{-1}w'_2)$.
- (iii) $\Theta \supseteq \Theta'$ and there exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta',\perp}\mathcal{W}_\Theta$ such that $w_1 \geq w'_1w$ and $w_2 \leq w^{-1}w'_2$.

2) Let $\hat{w} = w_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$, $\hat{w}' = w'_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta'))w'_2$ be elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ both in normal form I, or both in normal form II. Then the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) $\hat{w} \geq_{-+} \hat{w}'$
- (ii) $\Theta \supseteq \Theta'$ and there exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta',\perp}$ such that $w_1 \geq (w'_1w)^\Theta$ and $w_2 \geq {}^\Theta(w^{-1}w'_2)$.

Proof: We only have to prove the statements of the theorem, which use normal form I. Then the statements which use normal form II follow by applying the inverse map ${}^{inv} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, compare Remark (3) following Definition 2.1, and Remark (1) following Proposition 2.2.

(a) First we show the equivalence of (ii) and (iii) of 1a): Let (ii) be valid. Choose an element $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta$ such that ${}^\Theta(w^{-1}w'_2) = \tilde{w}^{-1}w^{-1}w'_2$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &\leq (w'_1w)^\Theta = (w'_1w\tilde{w})^\Theta \leq w'_1w\tilde{w}, \\ w_2 &\geq {}^\Theta(w^{-1}w'_2) = (w\tilde{w})^{-1}w'_2. \end{aligned}$$

Let (iii) be valid. Write the element w in the form $w = \tilde{w}\tilde{w}'$ with $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta',\perp}$ and $\tilde{w}' \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta$. From $w_1 \leq w'_1w$ follows $w_1 = w_1^\Theta \leq (w'_1w)^\Theta = (w'_1\tilde{w})^\Theta$. Similarly we get $w_2 \geq {}^\Theta(\tilde{w}^{-1}w'_2)$.

The easy part in the following proof of the equivalence (i) and (ii) in 1), 2a) is the direction from (ii) to (i). The proof of this direction, which uses only the formulas for the relative closures of the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells of a Kac-Moody group, is for 1a) similar, and for 2) a modification of the corresponding proof in [Pe,Pu,Re]. The proof of the opposite direction is quite different.

(b) To prepare the proof of the direction from (i) to (ii) of 1a) and 2) first note:

Let $\Lambda \in P^+$, and let $v, v' \in \mathcal{V}_\Lambda$ such that $\langle\langle v | v' \rangle\rangle \neq 0$. Since different weight spaces of $L(\Lambda)$ are $\langle\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle\rangle$ -orthogonal we have $\text{supp}(v) \cap \text{supp}(v') \neq \emptyset$. Let λ be an element of this intersection. Then the biggest vertex of $S(v)$ is bigger than λ , which is bigger than the smallest vertex of $S(v')$ (with respect to \preceq).

(c) Now we can prove the direction from (i) to (ii) of 1a) and 2): Let $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and $B^\epsilon \hat{w} B \subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon \hat{w}' B}$.

Choose an element $\Lambda \in F_\Theta \cap P$. Choose elements $v_{w_1 \Lambda} \in L(\Lambda)_{w_1 \Lambda} \setminus \{0\}$ and $v_{w_2 \Lambda} \in L(\Lambda)_{w_2 \Lambda} \setminus \{0\}$. To cut short the notation set $g := f_{v_{w_1 \Lambda} v_{(w_2)^{-1} \Lambda}}$.

Since $\Lambda \in R(\Theta)$, for any element $\hat{n}_{\tilde{w}} \in \hat{N}$ belonging to \tilde{w} we have

$$g(\hat{n}_{\tilde{w}}) = \langle\langle v_{w_1 \Lambda} | \hat{n}_{w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 v_{(w_2)^{-1} \Lambda}} \rangle\rangle \neq 0.$$

Therefore g does not vanish entirely on the closure $\overline{B^\epsilon \hat{w}' B}$, which implies that it also can not vanish entirely on $B^\epsilon \hat{w}' B$. Therefore there exists an element $\hat{n}_{\tilde{w}'} \in \hat{N}$ belonging to \tilde{w}' , and elements $u_\epsilon \in U^\epsilon$, $u \in U$, such that

$$g(u_\epsilon \hat{n}_{\tilde{w}'} u) = \langle\langle (u_\epsilon)^* v_{w_1 \Lambda} | \hat{n}_{w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 u v_{(w_2)^{-1} \Lambda}} \rangle\rangle \neq 0.$$

The vertices of $S(u v_{(w_2)^{-1} \Lambda})$ are of the form

$$\tilde{w} \Lambda \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W} \quad \text{such that} \quad \tilde{w}^\Theta \leq ((w_2)^{-1})^\Theta = (w_2)^{-1}.$$

Therefore the vertices of $S(\hat{n}_{w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 u v_{(w_2)^{-1} \Lambda})}$ are of the form

$$w'_1 w'_2 \tilde{w} \Lambda \quad \text{with} \quad \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W} \quad \text{such that} \quad \tilde{w}^\Theta \leq (w_2)^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad w'_2 \tilde{w} \Lambda \in R(\Theta').$$

Here the inequality $\tilde{w}^\Theta \leq (w_2)^{-1}$ is equivalent to ${}^\Theta(\tilde{w}^{-1}) \leq w_2$. By comparing the type of facets in the formula $w'_2 \tilde{w} \Lambda \in R(\Theta')$ on the left and on the right we find

$$F_\Theta \subseteq \overline{F_{\Theta'}} \quad \text{resp.} \quad \Theta \supseteq \Theta' \quad \text{resp.} \quad R(\Theta) \subseteq R(\Theta').$$

We also get $w'_2 \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta' \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_\Theta = \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_{\Theta'} \mathcal{W}_\Theta = \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_\Theta$. Set $w := w'_2 \tilde{w}$. We have shown that $\Theta \supseteq \Theta'$, and the vertices of $S(\hat{n}_{w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 u v_{(w_2)^{-1} \Lambda})}$ are of the form

$$w'_1 w \Lambda \quad \text{with} \quad w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_\Theta \quad \text{such that} \quad {}^\Theta(w^{-1} w'_2) \leq w_2.$$

$w_1 \Lambda$ is the biggest resp. smallest vertex of $(u_\epsilon)^* v_{w_1 \Lambda}$ for $\epsilon = +$ resp. $\epsilon = -$. Using (b) we conclude that there exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_\Theta$ such that ${}^\Theta(w^{-1} w'_2) \leq w_2$ and

$$w_1 \Lambda \quad \begin{cases} \succeq & w'_1 w \Lambda & \text{for } \epsilon = + \\ \preceq & w'_1 w \Lambda & \text{for } \epsilon = - \end{cases}.$$

These inequalities are equivalent to

$$w_1 = w_1^\Theta \quad \begin{cases} \leq & (w'_1 w)^\Theta & \text{for } \epsilon = + \\ \geq & (w'_1 w)^\Theta & \text{for } \epsilon = - \end{cases}.$$

Obviously there also exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$, which satisfies the required inequalities..

(d) To prepare the proof of the direction from (ii) to (i) of 1a) and 2), we need the following formula: Let $w_1, w'_1 \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $w_1 \leq w'_1$ for $\epsilon = +$, and $w_1 \geq w'_1$ for $\epsilon = -$. Let $w_2 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$. By using equation (5) for the relative closures of the Bruhat and Birkhoff cells of G , and formula (δ) stated in the part 'The minimal and formal Kac-Moody group G and G_f , the monoids \widehat{G} and \widehat{G}_f ' of the section 'Preliminaries' we find

$$\begin{aligned} B^\epsilon w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B &\subseteq B^\epsilon w_1 B \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B \subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon w'_1 B \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B} \\ &\subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon w'_1 B \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B} = \overline{B^\epsilon w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 \underbrace{w_2^{-1} U_{\Theta^\perp} w_2}_{\subseteq U^+} B} = \overline{B^\epsilon w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B} . \end{aligned}$$

(e) Now we show the direction from (ii) to (i) of 1a) and 2): By using (d) and formulas (2), (4) we find

$$\begin{aligned} (w'_2)^{-1} w \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) T w_2 &= ((w'_2)^{-1} w)^{\Theta} \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) T w_2 \subseteq \overline{B w_2^{-1} \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B} \\ &= \overline{B \varepsilon(w_2^{-1} R(\Theta)) B} . \end{aligned}$$

The closure \overline{B} is a monoid. It contains B . It contains the closure $\overline{T} = \widehat{T}$, in particular it contains the elements $e(R)$, $R \in \mathcal{R}(X)$. Therefore the last set of the preceeding formula is contained in \overline{B} . From this follows

$$\begin{aligned} w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 T &= w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 (w'_2)^{-1} w \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 T \\ &\in w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 \overline{B} \subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 B} . \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we get by using formula (3):

$$w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 T = w'_1 w \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 T = w'_1 w \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 T .$$

Therefore

$$B^\epsilon w'_1 w \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B \subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta')) w'_2 B} . \quad (7)$$

Due to the first inequalities of 1a) (ii) and 2) (ii) we get by using (d) and formula (4) once more:

$$B^\epsilon w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B \subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon (w'_1 w)^{\Theta} \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B} = \overline{B^\epsilon w'_1 w \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B} . \quad (8)$$

From the inclusions (7) and (8) follows (i). \square

By using the explicit description of \leq_{++} , \leq_{--} , and \leq_{-+} given in the last theorem, we now can show that these relations are order relations.

Theorem 2.4 *The relations \leq_{++} , \leq_{--} , and \leq_{-+} are order relations on $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, which extend the Bruhat order on \mathcal{W} .*

Proof: It remains to show that these relations are antisymmetric. Let $\hat{w} = w_1 e(R(\Theta))w_2$, $\hat{w}' = w'_1 e(R(\Theta'))w'_2 \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ be elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I, and let $\hat{w} \leq_{++} \hat{w}'$, $\hat{w}' \leq_{++} \hat{w}$. Due to the last theorem we have $\Theta = \Theta'$, and there exist elements $w, \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$ such that

$$w_1 \leq (w'_1 w)^\Theta, \quad w'_1 \leq (w_1 \tilde{w})^\Theta, \quad (9)$$

$$w_2 \geq {}^\Theta(w^{-1}w'_2), \quad w'_2 \geq {}^\Theta(\tilde{w}^{-1}w_2). \quad (10)$$

Remark (2) following Proposition 2.2 implies $\mathcal{W}^\Theta \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} = \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} = \mathcal{W}^\Theta$. Therefore the inequalities of (9) and (10) are equivalent to

$$w_1 \leq w'_1 w, \quad w'_1 \leq w_1 \tilde{w}, \quad (11)$$

$$w_2 \geq w^{-1}w'_2, \quad w'_2 \geq \tilde{w}^{-1}w_2. \quad (12)$$

Since $w_2, w'_2 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$ and $w^{-1}, \tilde{w}^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \subseteq \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ from (12) follows

$$l(w_2) \geq l(w^{-1}w'_2) = l(w^{-1}) + l(w'_2) \geq l(w'_2) \geq l(\tilde{w}^{-1}w_2) = l(\tilde{w}^{-1}) + l(w_2) \geq l(w_2).$$

This implies $l(w_2) = l(w'_2)$, and inserting in this chain of inequalities we find $l(w^{-1}) = l(\tilde{w}^{-1}) = 0$. Therefore $w^{-1} = \tilde{w}^{-1} = 1$. Inserting in (11), (12), we get

$$w_1 \leq w'_1, \quad w'_1 \leq w_1, \quad (13)$$

$$w_2 \geq w'_2, \quad w'_2 \geq w_2. \quad (14)$$

Due to the antisymmetry of the Bruhat order of \mathcal{W} we get $w_1 = w'_1$ and $w_2 = w'_2$.

The antisymmetry of \leq_{-+} can be proved similarly, only ' \leq ' has to be exchanged by ' \geq ' in (9), (11), (13).

Because the inverse map $^{inv} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ is an isomorphism of the relations \leq_{++} and \leq_{--} , also the relation \leq_{--} is antisymmetric. \square

For $\Lambda \in P^+$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{W}\Lambda$ fix elements $v_\lambda \in L(\Lambda)_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$, $v_\mu \in L(\Lambda)_\mu \setminus \{0\}$ and set

$$g_{\lambda\mu} := f_{v_\lambda v_\mu} \quad (15)$$

for short. By using the antisymmetry of the extended Bruhat orders just proved we show:

Theorem 2.5 *Let $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. The Bruhat and Birkhoff cells $B\hat{w}B$, $B^-\hat{w}B^-$, and $B^-\hat{w}B$ are principal open in their closures, i.e., for*

$$(\epsilon, \delta) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (+, +) \\ (-, -) \\ (-, +) \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{let } \hat{w} = w_1 \epsilon(R(\Theta))w_2 \quad \text{be } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{normal form I,} \\ \text{normal form II,} \\ \text{normal form I or II,} \end{array} \right.$$

and let $\Lambda \in F_\Theta \cap P^+$. Then

$$\overline{B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\delta} \cap D_{\widehat{G}}(g_{w_1 \Lambda w_2^{-1} \Lambda}) = B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\delta. \quad (16)$$

Proof: 1) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(e(R(\Theta))) w_2$ be in normal form I. Let $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and $\delta = +$.

We first show the inclusion ' \subseteq ' of (16). Because of the Bruhat and Birkhoff decompositions of \widehat{G} , any element of \widehat{G} can be written in the form $u_\epsilon \hat{n}_{\hat{w}'} u$ with $u_\epsilon \in U^\epsilon$, $u \in U$, and $\hat{n}_{\hat{w}'} \in \widehat{N}$ belonging to $\hat{w}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$.

If $u_\epsilon \hat{n}_{\hat{w}'} u \in \overline{B^\epsilon \hat{w} B}$, then we also have $B^\epsilon \hat{w}' B \subseteq \overline{B^\epsilon \hat{w} B}$. By definition $\hat{w}' \leq_{++} \hat{w}$ for $\epsilon = +$, and $\hat{w}' \geq_{-+} \hat{w}$ for $\epsilon = -$.

In part (c) of the proof of Theorem 2.3 we have seen that

$$g_{w_1 \Lambda w_2^{-1} \Lambda}(u_\epsilon \hat{n}_{\hat{w}'} u) \neq 0$$

implies $\Theta \supseteq \Theta'$ and there exists an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta' \perp}$ such that ${}^\Theta(w^{-1} w_2') \leq w_2$ and

$$w_1 \begin{cases} \leq & (w_1' w)^\Theta & \text{for } \epsilon = + \\ \geq & (w_1' w)^\Theta & \text{for } \epsilon = - \end{cases}.$$

Due to Theorem 2.3 itself, from this follows $\hat{w}' \geq_{++} \hat{w}$ for $\epsilon = +$, and $\hat{w}' \leq_{-+} \hat{w}$ for $\epsilon = -$.

Due to the last theorem the relations \leq_{++} , \leq_{-+} are antisymmetric. Therefore we get $\hat{w}' = \hat{w}$.

To show the inclusion ' \supseteq ' of (16) let $u_\epsilon \in U^\epsilon$, $u \in U$, and let $\hat{n}_{\hat{w}} \in \widehat{N}$ belong to $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}} = \widehat{N}/T$. Write $\hat{n}_{\hat{w}}$ in the form $\hat{n}_{\hat{w}} = n_{w_1} e(R(\Theta)) n_{w_2}$ with $n_{w_1}, n_{w_2} \in N$ belonging to $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{W}$. We have

$$g_{w_1 \Lambda w_2^{-1} \Lambda}(u_\epsilon \hat{n}_{\hat{w}} u) = \left\langle \left\langle n_{w_1}^* u_\epsilon^* v_{w_1 \Lambda} \mid e(R(\Theta)) n_{w_2} u v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda} \right\rangle \right\rangle \quad (17)$$

The vertices of $S(n_{w_2} u v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda})$ are of the form $w_2 \tilde{w} \Lambda$ where $\tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$ and $\tilde{w} \leq w_2^{-1}$. Furthermore Λ is a vertex.

Now we want to determine which vertexes of this form are also vertexes of $S(e(R(\Theta)) n_{w_2} u v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda})$. Because of Λ is contained in the relative interior of $R(\Theta)$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} w_2 \tilde{w} \Lambda \in R(\Theta) &\iff w_2 \tilde{w} R(\Theta) \subseteq R(\Theta) \iff w_2 \tilde{w} R(\Theta) = R(\Theta) \\ &\iff w_2 \tilde{w} \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \iff \tilde{w} \in w_2^{-1} \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \end{aligned}$$

In this case we get $w_2^{-1} \leq \tilde{w}$ because w_2^{-1} is a minimal coset representative of $\mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$. Because of the antisymmetry of the Bruhat order of \mathcal{W} this implies $w_2^{-1} = \tilde{w}$. Therefore Λ is the only vertex of $S(e(R(\Theta)) n_{w_2} u v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda})$ and we have

$$e(R(\Theta)) n_{w_2} u v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda} = n_{w_2} v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda}.$$

Inserting in equation (17) we find

$$\begin{aligned} g_{w_1 \Lambda w_2^{-1} \Lambda}(u_\epsilon \hat{n}_{\hat{w}} u) &= \left\langle \left\langle n_{w_1}^* u_\epsilon^* v_{w_1 \Lambda} \mid n_{w_2} v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda} \right\rangle \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left\langle n_{w_1}^* v_{w_1 \Lambda} \mid n_{w_2} v_{w_2^{-1} \Lambda} \right\rangle \right\rangle \neq 0 \end{aligned}$$

2) By applying the Chevalley involution $*$: $\widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ on (16) for $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$, and $\delta = +$ we find the equation

$$\overline{B^-(\hat{w})^{inv} B^{-\epsilon}} \cap D_{\widehat{G}}(g^*) = B^-(\hat{w})^{inv} B^{-\epsilon} ,$$

from which follow the remaining statements of the theorem by Remark (1) following Proposition 2.2. \square

The next two theorems give product decompositions of $B\hat{w}B$, $B^-\hat{w}B^-$, and $B^-\hat{w}B$, $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, as principal open sets in their closures. These generalize the product decompositions of sets $BwB = U_w \cdot wT \cdot U$, and $B^-wB = (U^w)^- \cdot wT \cdot U$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$, given in [K,P 1] for Kac-Moody groups. The decomposition of $B\hat{w}B$, $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, is nearly similar to the corresponding decomposition of a Bruhat cell of the wonderful compactification of a semisimple algebraic group in [Re 3].

Theorem 2.6

1a) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I, and let \hat{n} be a corresponding element of \widehat{N} . Then

$$B\hat{w}B = U_{w_1} \hat{n} (w_2^{-1} T^\Theta w_2) (U \cap w_2^{-1} U^\Theta w_2) .$$

b) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form II, and let \hat{n} be a corresponding element of \widehat{N} . Then

$$B^-\hat{w}B^- = (U^- \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1}) (w_1 T^\Theta w_1^{-1}) \hat{n} U_{w_2^{-1}}^- .$$

2) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I or in normal form II, and let \hat{n} be a corresponding element of \widehat{N} . Then

$$\begin{aligned} B^-\hat{w}B &= (U^- \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1}) \hat{n} (w_2^{-1} T^\Theta w_2) (U \cap w_2^{-1} U^\Theta w_2) \\ &= (U^- \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1}) (w_1 T^\Theta w_1^{-1}) \hat{n} (U \cap w_2^{-1} U^\Theta w_2) . \end{aligned}$$

Remark: It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{w_1} &= U \cap w_1 U^- w_1^{-1} = U \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1} , \\ U_{w_2^{-1}}^- &= U \cap w_2^{-1} U^- w_2 = U \cap w_2^{-1} (U^\Theta)^- w_2 . \end{aligned}$$

In this sense the formulas of 1) are symmetric in the first and last factor.

Proof: We only have to show the statements of the theorem which involve normal form I. Then the statements which involve normal form II follow by applying the Chevalley involution $*$: $\widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$, together with the Remark (1) following Proposition 2.2.

Write \hat{n} in the form $\hat{n} = n_1 e(R(\Theta))n_2$ with $n_1, n_2 \in N$ corresponding to $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$, $w_2 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$. For the following transformations we make use of the

formulas (β) , (γ) , and (δ) stated in the part “The minimal and formal Kac-Moody group G and G_f , the monoids \widehat{G} and \widehat{G}_f ” of the section “Preliminaries”.

1) By using the first equation of (δ) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
B\hat{w}B &= U_{w_1}U^{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))Tn_2U = U_{w_1}n_1\underbrace{w_1^{-1}U^{w_1}w_1}_{\subseteq U}e(R(\Theta))Tn_2U \\
&\subseteq U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))U_{\Theta^\perp}Tn_2U = U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))Tn_2\underbrace{w_2^{-1}U_{\Theta^\perp}w_2}_{\subseteq U}U \\
&= U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))Tn_2U = U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))Tn_2U_{w_2^{-1}}U^{w_2^{-1}} \\
&= U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))w_2U_{w_2^{-1}}w_2^{-1}Tn_2U^{w_2^{-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

$w_2U_{w_2^{-1}}w_2^{-1}$ is generated by the root groups

$$U_\beta \quad \text{where} \quad \beta \in \Delta_{re}^-, \quad w_2^{-1}\beta \in \Delta_{re}^+.$$

Since $w_2^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ these root groups coincide with the root groups

$$U_\beta \quad \text{where} \quad \beta \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \{ \alpha_i \mid i \in (\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \}, \quad w_2^{-1}\beta \in \Delta_{re}^+,$$

which are contained in $(U^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp})^-$. By using formula (2) we find

$$B\hat{w}B \subseteq U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))Tn_2U^{w_2^{-1}},$$

and the reverse inclusion is obvious. We have

$$U^{w_2^{-1}} \subseteq w_2^{-1}Uw_2 = w_2^{-1}U_\Theta w_2 \rtimes w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2.$$

Because of $w_2^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$, the group $w_2^{-1}U_\Theta w_2$ is contained in U . Clearly it is also contained in $w_2^{-1}Uw_2$. Therefore it is contained in $U^{w_2^{-1}}$.

An element $x \in w_2^{-1}Uw_2$ can be written in the form $x = p_1(x)p_2(x)$ with $p_1(x) \in w_2^{-1}U_\Theta w_2$ and $p_2(x) \in w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2$. Obviously $p_2(U^{w_2^{-1}}) \supseteq U^{w_2^{-1}} \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2$.

The reverse inclusion follows because for $x \in U^{w_2^{-1}}$ we have

$$w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2 \ni p_2(x) = p_1(x)^{-1}x \in U^{w_2^{-1}}.$$

We get

$$p_2(U^{w_2^{-1}}) = U^{w_2^{-1}} \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2 = U \cap w_2^{-1}Uw_2 \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2 = U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2.$$

By using this equation and two times formula (β) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
B\hat{w}B &= U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))Tn_2U^{w_2^{-1}} = U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))\underbrace{w_2p_1(U^{w_2^{-1}})w_2^{-1}}_{\subseteq U_\Theta}Tn_2p_2(U^{w_2^{-1}}) \\
&= U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))Tn_2(U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2) = U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))T^\Theta n_2(U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2) \\
&= U_{w_1}n_1e(R(\Theta))n_2(w_2^{-1}T^\Theta w_2)(U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2).
\end{aligned}$$

2) By using the first equation of (δ) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
B^- \hat{w} B &= (U^{w_1})^- U_{w_1}^- n_1 e(R(\Theta)) T n_2 U = (U^{w_1})^- n_1 \underbrace{w_1^{-1} U_{w_1}^- w_1}_{\subseteq U^+} e(R(\Theta)) T n_2 U \\
&\subseteq (U^{w_1})^- n_1 e(R(\Theta)) U_{\Theta^\perp} T n_2 U = (U^{w_1})^- n_1 e(R(\Theta)) T n_2 \underbrace{w_2^{-1} U_{\Theta^\perp} w_2}_{\subseteq U} U \\
&= (U^{w_1})^- n_1 e(R(\Theta)) T n_2 U .
\end{aligned}$$

The reverse inclusion is obvious. In the same way as before we get

$$\begin{aligned}
B^- \hat{w} B &= (U^{w_1})^- n_1 e(R(\Theta)) T n_2 (U \cap w_2^{-1} U^\Theta w_2) \\
&= (U^{w_1})^- n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 (w_2^{-1} T^\Theta w_2) (U \cap w_2^{-1} U^\Theta w_2) .
\end{aligned}$$

Treating the first factor in a similar way we find

$$\begin{aligned}
B^- \hat{w} B &= (U^- \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1}) n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 (w_2^{-1} T^\Theta w_2) (U \cap w_2^{-1} U^\Theta w_2) \\
&= (U^- \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1}) (w_1 T^\Theta w_1^{-1}) n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 (U \cap w_2^{-1} U^\Theta w_2) .
\end{aligned}$$

□

We equip $B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\delta$ with its coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\delta]$ as a principal open set in its closure, $(\epsilon, \delta) \in \{(++), (--), (-+)\}$, $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$.

Recall that the torus T of the Kac-Moody group can be described by the following isomorphism of groups:

$$\begin{aligned}
H \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}^\times &\rightarrow T \\
\sum_{i=1}^{2n-l} h_i \otimes s_i &\mapsto \prod_{i=1}^{2n-l} t_{h_i}(s_i) .
\end{aligned}$$

The group algebra $\mathbb{F}[P]$ of the lattice P can be identified with the classical coordinate ring on T , identifying $\sum c_\lambda e_\lambda \in \mathbb{F}[P]$ with the function on T defined by

$$\left(\sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda} e_{\lambda} \right) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{2n-l} t_{h_i}(s_i) \right) := \sum_{\lambda} c_{\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^{2n-l} (s_i)^{\lambda(h_i)} , \quad (s_i \in \mathbb{F}^\times) .$$

Similarly, for $J \subseteq I$ and $w \in \mathcal{W}$, the classical coordinate ring of the torus $wT^J w^{-1}$, where

$$T^J := \left\{ \prod_{\substack{i=1, \dots, 2n-l \\ i \notin J}} t_{h_i}(s_i) \mid s_i \in \mathbb{F}^\times \right\} ,$$

is given by the group algebra $\mathbb{F}[wP^J]$, where

$$P^J := \mathbb{Z}\text{-span} \{ \Lambda_i \mid i = 1, \dots, 2n-l, i \notin J \}$$

(In general the classical coordinate rings of these tori do not coincide with the restriction of the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ onto these tori. It is possible to show that $wT^J w^{-1}$ is principal open in its closure, and the classical coordinate ring of $wT^J w^{-1}$ is the coordinate ring of this principal open set. But we do not need this for the following considerations.)

Theorem 2.7

1a) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I, and let \hat{n} be a corresponding element of \widehat{N} . The map

$$m : U_{w_1} \times w_2^{-1}T^\Theta w_2 \times (U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2) \rightarrow B\hat{w}B ,$$

defined by $m(u, t, \tilde{u}) := u\hat{n}t\tilde{u}$, is an isomorphism.

b) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form II, and let \hat{n} be a corresponding element of \widehat{N} . The map

$$m : (U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}) \times w_1T^\Theta w_1^{-1} \times U_{w_2}^- \rightarrow B^-\hat{w}B^- ,$$

defined by $m(u, t, \tilde{u}) := u\hat{n}t\tilde{u}$, is an isomorphism.

2) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I or in normal form II, and let \hat{n} be a corresponding element of \widehat{N} . The map

$$m : (U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}) \times w_2^{-1}T^\Theta w_2 \times (U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2) \rightarrow B^-\hat{w}B ,$$

defined by $m(u, t, \tilde{u}) := u\hat{n}t\tilde{u}$, is an isomorphism.

Proof: We only have to show the statements of the theorem which involve normal form I. Then the statements which involve normal form II follow easily by using the Chevalley involution $*$: $\widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$, together with Remark (3) following Definition 2.1 and Remark (1) following Proposition 2.2.

Due to the last theorem the maps m of 1a) and 2) are surjective. We show that the corresponding comorphisms m^* are well defined and surjective. This is sufficient, because the surjectivity of the maps m imply the injectivity of the comorphisms m^* , and the surjectivity of the comorphisms m^* imply the injectivity of the maps m .

To 1a): To show that the comorphism

$$m^* : \mathbb{F}[B\hat{w}B] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[U_{w_1}] \otimes \mathbb{F}[w_2^{-1}P^\Theta] \otimes \mathbb{F}[U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2]$$

is well defined, write \hat{n} in the form $\hat{n} = n_1 e(R(\Theta))n_2$ with $n_1, n_2 \in N$ corresponding to $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$, $w_2 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$.

Fix an element $\Lambda \in F_\Theta$, and fix $v_1 \in L(\Lambda)_{w_1\Lambda} \setminus \{0\}$, $v_2 \in L(\Lambda)_{w_2^{-1}\Lambda} \setminus \{0\}$. For $u \in U_{w_1}$, $t \in w_2^{-1}T^\Theta w_2$, and $\tilde{u} \in (U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2)$ we have

$$f_{v_1 v_2}(m(u, t, \tilde{u})) = \langle \langle v_1 \mid u n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 t \tilde{u} v_2 \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle u^* v_1 \mid n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 t \tilde{u} v_2 \rangle \rangle .$$

Because of $\tilde{u} \in w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2$ we get $\tilde{u} v_2 = v_2$. Because of

$$u^* \in U_{w_1}^* = (U \cap w_1 U^- w_1^{-1})^* = U^- \cap w_1 U w_1^{-1}$$

we get $u v_1 = v_1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f_{v_1 v_2}(m(u, t, \tilde{u})) &= \langle \langle v_1 \mid n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 t v_2 \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle v_1 \mid n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle e_{w_2^{-1}\Lambda}(t) \\ &= \underbrace{\langle \langle v_1 \mid n_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle}_{\neq 0} e_{w_2^{-1}\Lambda}(t) . \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Now let $N \in P^+$ and $v, w \in L(N)$. Choose $\langle\langle \mid \rangle\rangle$ -dual bases of $L(N)$ by choosing $\langle\langle \mid \rangle\rangle$ -dual bases

$$(a_{\tau i})_{i=1, \dots, m_\tau} \quad , \quad (b_{\tau i})_{i=1, \dots, m_\tau}$$

of $L(N)_\tau$ for every $\tau \in P(N)$. For $u \in U_{w_1}$, $t \in w_2^{-1}T^\Theta w_2$, and $\tilde{u} \in (U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{vw}(m(u, t, \tilde{u})) &= \langle\langle v \mid un_1 e(R(\Theta))n_2 t \tilde{u} w \rangle\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\tau, i} \langle\langle v \mid un_1 e(R(\Theta))n_2 t a_{\tau i} \rangle\rangle \langle\langle b_{\tau i} \mid \tilde{u} w \rangle\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\tau, i \\ w_2 \tau \in R(\Theta)}} \langle\langle v \mid un_1 n_2 a_{\tau i} \rangle\rangle e_\tau(t) \langle\langle b_{\tau i} \mid \tilde{u} w \rangle\rangle . \end{aligned}$$

A summand of this sum is nonzero at the most if $w \neq 0$, and if τ is bigger than an element of $\text{supp}(w)$, which is only possible for finitely many non-zero summands. Furthermore $R(\Theta) \cap P = X \cap P^\Theta$. Taking into account (18) we therefore get for $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} m^* \left(\frac{f_{vw}}{(f_{v_1 v_2})^p} \Big|_{B\hat{w}B} \right) & \tag{19} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\tau, i \\ \tau \in w_2^{-1}P^\Theta}} \frac{1}{\langle\langle v_1 \mid n_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle\rangle^p} f_{v n_1 n_2 a_{\tau i}} \Big|_{U_{w_1}} \otimes e_{\tau - p(w_2^{-1})_\Lambda} \otimes f_{b_{\tau i} w} \Big|_{U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2} . \end{aligned}$$

Because $\mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ is spanned by the matrix coefficients f_{vw} , $v, w \in L(N)$, $N \in P^+$, we have shown that the comorphism m^* is well defined.

To show the surjectivity of m^* , it is sufficient to find elements of $\mathbb{F}[B\hat{w}B]$, which are mapped onto a system of generators of $\mathbb{F}[U_{w_1}] \otimes \mathbb{F}[w_2^{-1}P^\Theta] \otimes \mathbb{F}[U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2]$.

a) Let $v \in L(\Lambda)$. For $u \in U_{w_1}$, $t \in w_2^{-1}T^\Theta w_2$, and $\tilde{u} \in (U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\langle v_1 \mid un_1 e(R(\Theta))n_2 t \tilde{u} v \rangle\rangle &= \langle\langle u^* v_1 \mid n_1 e(R(\Theta))n_2 t \tilde{u} v \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle v_1 \mid n_1 e(R(\Theta))n_2 t \tilde{u} v \rangle\rangle \\ &= \langle\langle t n_2^* e(R(\Theta))n_1^* v_1 \mid \tilde{u} v \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle t n_2^* n_1^* v_1 \mid \tilde{u} v \rangle\rangle = \langle\langle n_2^* n_1^* v_1 \mid \tilde{u} v \rangle\rangle e_{w_2^{-1}\Lambda}(t) . \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (18) we therefore get

$$m^* \left(\frac{f_{v_1 v}}{f_{v_1 v_2}} \Big|_{B\hat{w}B} \right) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{\langle\langle v_1 \mid n_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle\rangle}}_{\neq 0} 1 \otimes 1 \otimes f_{n_2^* n_1^* v_1 v} \Big|_{U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2} \tag{20}$$

We have $n_1^* v_1 \in L(\Lambda)_\Lambda \setminus \{0\}$. Due to Theorem 5.6 of [M 1] the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[U^\Theta]$ is generated by the functions $f_{n_1^* v_1 v} \Big|_{U^\Theta}$, $v \in L(\Lambda)$. Therefore its restriction $\mathbb{F}[w_2 U w_2^{-1} \cap U^\Theta]$ is generated by

$$f_{n_1^* v_1 n_2 v} \Big|_{w_2 U w_2^{-1} \cap U^\Theta} \quad , \quad v \in L(\Lambda) .$$

It is easy to check that we get an isomorphism

$$\phi : U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2 \rightarrow w_2 U w_2^{-1} \cap U^\Theta$$

by $\phi(u) := n_2 u n_2^{-1}$. For $u \in U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2$ we have

$$\phi^*(f_{n_1^* v_1 n_2 v} |_{w_2 U w_2^{-1} \cap U^\Theta})(u) = \langle \langle n_1^* v_1 | n_2 u n_2^{-1} n_2 v \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle n_2^* n_1^* v_1 | u v \rangle \rangle .$$

Therefore the functions

$$\phi^*(f_{n_1^* v_1 n_2 v} |_{w_2 U w_2^{-1} \cap U^\Theta}) = f_{n_2^* n_1^* v_1 v} |_{U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2} , \quad v \in L(\Lambda) ,$$

which appear in (20), generate the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2]$.

b) Let $N \in \overline{F_\Theta} \cap P$ and $\tilde{v}_1 \in L(N)_{w_1 N} \setminus \{0\}$, $\tilde{v}_2 \in L(N)_{w_2^{-1}N} \setminus \{0\}$. Let $p \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Similar to (18) we find

$$m^* \left(\frac{f_{\tilde{v}_1 \tilde{v}_2}}{(f_{v_1 v_2})^p} |_{B \hat{w} B} \right) = \underbrace{\frac{\langle \langle \tilde{v}_1 | n_1 n_2 \tilde{v}_2 \rangle \rangle}{\langle \langle v_1 | n_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle^p}}_{\neq 0} 1 \otimes e_{w_2^{-1}(N-p\Lambda)} \otimes 1 . \quad (21)$$

It is easy to check that $(\overline{F_\Theta} \cap P) - \mathbb{N}_0 \Lambda = P^\Theta$. Therefore the functions $e_{w_2^{-1}(N-m\Lambda)}$, $N \in \overline{F_\Theta} \cap P$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, span the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[w_2^{-1}P^\Theta]$.

c) Let $v \in L(\Lambda)$. For $u \in U_{w_1}$, $t \in w_2^{-1}T^\Theta w_2$, and $\tilde{u} \in (U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \langle v | u n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 t \tilde{u} v_2 \rangle \rangle &= \langle \langle v | u n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 t v_2 \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle v | u n_1 e(R(\Theta)) n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle e_{w_2^{-1}\Lambda}(t) \\ &= \langle \langle v | u n_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle e_{w_2^{-1}\Lambda}(t) . \end{aligned}$$

Taking into account (18) we therefore get

$$m^* \left(\frac{f_{v v_2}}{f_{v_1 v_2}} |_{B \hat{w} B} \right) = \underbrace{\frac{1}{\langle \langle v_1 | n_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle}}_{\neq 0} f_{v n_1 n_2 v_2} |_{U_{w_1}} \otimes 1 \otimes 1 . \quad (22)$$

$U_{w_1} = U \cap w_1 U^- w_1^{-1}$ is generated by the root groups U_α , $\alpha \in \Delta_{re}^+ \cap w_1 \Delta_{re}^-$. Since $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$ we have $\Delta_{re}^+ \cap w_1 \Delta_{re}^- = \Delta_{re}^+ \cap w_1 (\Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta)$. This implies

$$U_{w_1} = U \cap w_1 U^- w_1^{-1} \subseteq U \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1} ,$$

and the reverse inclusion is obvious. We have $n_2 v_2 \in L(\Lambda)_\Lambda \setminus \{0\}$. Due to Theorem 5.6 of [M 1] the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[(U^\Theta)^-]$ is generated by the functions $f_{v n_2 v_2} |_{(U^\Theta)^-}$, $v \in L(\Lambda)$. Therefore its restriction $\mathbb{F}[w_1^{-1} U w_1 \cap (U^\Theta)^-]$ is generated by

$$f_{n_1^* v n_2 v_2} |_{w_1^{-1} U w_1 \cap (U^\Theta)^-} , \quad v \in L(\Lambda) .$$

It is easy to check that we get an isomorphism

$$\phi : U \cap w_1 (U^\Theta)^- w_1^{-1} \rightarrow w_1^{-1} U w_1 \cap (U^\Theta)^-$$

by $\phi(u) := n_1^{-1}un_1$. For $u \in U_{w_1} = U \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}$ we have

$$\phi^*(f_{n_1^*v n_2 v_2} |_{w_1^{-1}U_{w_1} \cap (U^\Theta)^-})(u) = \langle \langle n_1^*v | n_1^{-1}un_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle v | un_1 n_2 v_2 \rangle \rangle$$

Therefore the functions

$$\phi^*(f_{n_1^*v n_2 v_2} |_{w_1^{-1}U_{w_1} \cap (U^\Theta)^-}) = f_{v n_1 n_2 v_2} |_{U_{w_1}}, \quad v \in L(\Lambda),$$

which appear in (22) generate the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[U_{w_1}]$.

To 2): We use the same notations as in the first part of this proof. For $u \in U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}$ we have $u^* \in w_1 U^\Theta w_1^{-1}$. Therefore also $u^*v_1 = v_1$. Completely parallel to the first part of this proof we get formula (19) with $B\hat{w}B$ replaced by $B^- \hat{w}B$, and U_{w_1} replaced by $U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}$. In particular it follows that the comorphism

$$m^* : \mathbb{F}[B^- \hat{w}B] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}[U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}] \otimes \mathbb{F}[w_2^{-1}P^\Theta] \otimes \mathbb{F}[U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2]$$

is well defined.

Also completely parallel to a) and b) of the first part of this proof we get the formulas (20) and (21) with $B\hat{w}B$ replaced by $B^- \hat{w}B$. Therefore we have found elements of $\mathbb{F}[B^- \hat{w}B]$, which are mapped onto a system of generators of $1 \otimes 1 \otimes \mathbb{F}[U \cap w_2^{-1}U^\Theta w_2]$, and $1 \otimes \mathbb{F}[w_2^{-1}P^\Theta] \otimes 1$.

Completely parallel to the proof of formula (22), we get formula (22) with $B\hat{w}B$ replaced by $B^- \hat{w}B$, and U_{w_1} replaced by $U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}$. An easy modification of the corresponding argument of a) of the first part of the proof shows that the functions $f_{v n_1 n_2 v_2} |_{U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}}$, $v \in L(\Lambda)$, generate the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[U^- \cap w_1(U^\Theta)^-w_1^{-1}]$. □

Next we want to show that the orbits are irreducible. For this we first state a theorem of [M 2]. Equip \widehat{G}_f with a coordinate ring by identifying with the coordinate ring of $1 \diamond \widehat{G}_f \subseteq \text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]$ via the injective map $\widehat{G}_f \rightarrow 1 \diamond \widehat{G}_f$, $x \mapsto 1 \diamond x$. Denote the Zariski closure of $M \subseteq \widehat{G}_f$ by $\overline{\overline{M}}$. To use later note that due to Theorem 16 of [M 2] this closure coincides with the closure denoted by $\overline{\overline{M}}$ in [M 2]. Now Theorem 4 of [M 2] gives:

Theorem 2.8 *Let D_1, D_2 be irreducible subgroups of G_f , and $x \in \widehat{G}$. The $D_1 \times D_2$ -orbit of the element $1 \diamond x \in \text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[G]$ is irreducible.*

There is a similar theorem for \widehat{G} :

Theorem 2.9 *Let D_1, D_2 be irreducible subgroups of G , and let $x \in \widehat{G}$. The $D_1 \times D_2$ -orbit $D_1^* x D_2$ is irreducible.*

The proof of this theorem can be extracted from a part of the proof of Theorem 2.8. For the convenience of the reader we sketch the proof.

Proof: Let $x \in \widehat{G}$ and $Or := D_1^* x D_2$ its $D_1 \times D_2$ -orbit. Let A_1 and A_2 be

closed subsets of \widehat{G} , such that $Or \subseteq A_1 \cup A_2$. We have to show $Or \subseteq A_1$ or $Or \subseteq A_2$.

Let $d_1 \in D_1$. The map $\gamma_{d_1} : D_2 \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ defined by $\gamma_{d_1}(d_2) := d_1^* x d_2$, $d_2 \in D_2$, is a morphism.

Similarly, for $d_2 \in D_2$, the map $\delta_{d_2} : D_1 \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ defined by $\delta_{d_2}(d_1) := d_1^* x d_2$, $d_1 \in D_1$, is a morphism.

Let $d_1 \in D_1$. Because of $\gamma_{d_1}(D_2) \subseteq Or$, we have $\gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_1) \cup \gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_2) = D_2$. Furthermore $\gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_1)$ and $\gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_2)$ are closed. Because of the irreducibility of D_2 we get $\gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_1) = D_2$ or $\gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_2) = D_2$.

Therefore the sets

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &:= \{ d_1 \in D_1 \mid \gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_1) = D_2 \} , \\ B_2 &:= \{ d_1 \in D_1 \mid \gamma_{d_1}^{-1}(A_2) = D_2 \} \end{aligned}$$

satisfy $B_1 \cup B_2 = D_1$.

Note that for $d_1 \in D_1$ and $d_2 \in D_2$ we have $\gamma_{d_1}(d_2) = \delta_{d_2}(d_1)$. The set B_1 is closed, because of

$$B_1 = \{ d_1 \in D_1 \mid \gamma_{d_1}(d_2) \in A_1 \text{ for all } d_2 \in D_2 \} = \bigcap_{d_2 \in D_2} \underbrace{\delta_{d_2}^{-1}(A_1)}_{\text{closed}} .$$

Similarly, the set B_2 is closed. Because of the irreducibility of D_1 we get $B_1 = D_1$ or $B_2 = D_1$, which is equivalent to $Or \subseteq A_1$ or $Or \subseteq A_2$. \square

Proposition 2.10 *B and B^- are irreducible.*

Proof: The Chevalley involution $* : \widehat{G} \rightarrow \widehat{G}$ is an isomorphism, which maps B onto B^- . Therefore it is sufficient to show that B is irreducible.

Due to Corollary 2.5 we have $D_{\overline{B}}(g_{\Lambda\Lambda} |_{\overline{B}}) = B$. Due to Theorem 2.7 the multiplication map

$$m : U \times T \rightarrow D_{\overline{B}}(g_{\Lambda\Lambda} |_{\overline{B}})$$

is an isomorphism. Here U is irreducible because its coordinate ring is a symmetric algebra, compare [K,P 2], Lemma 4.3. The torus T , which is equipped with its classical coordinate ring, is irreducible. Therefore also the principal open set $D_{\overline{B}}(g_{\Lambda\Lambda} |_{\overline{B}})$ is irreducible, which implies that \overline{B} is irreducible, which implies that B is irreducible. \square

Combining the last proposition with Theorem 2.9 we get:

Corollary 2.11 *The Bruhat and Birkhoff cells $B\hat{w}B$, $B^-\hat{w}B^-$, and $B^-\hat{w}B$ are irreducible for every $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$.*

At last we consider the Birkhoff cells of $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[G]$. They have similar properties as the Birkhoff cells of \widehat{G} :

Theorem 2.12 *Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I or in normal form II, and let \hat{n} be a corresponding element of \widehat{N} . The closure of the Birkhoff cell $B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f$ is given by*

$$\overline{B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f}^{Spm} = \bigcup_{\substack{\hat{w}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \\ \hat{w}' \geq_{-+} \hat{w}}} B_f \diamond \hat{w}' B_f . \quad (23)$$

The Birkhoff cell $B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f$ is irreducible. It is principal open in its closure, i.e.,

$$\overline{B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f} \cap D_{\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[\widehat{G}]}(g_{w_1 \Lambda w_2^{-1} \Lambda}) = B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f . \quad (24)$$

Equip $B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f$ with its coordinate ring as a principal open set in its closure. Equip the torus $w_2^{-1} T^\Theta w_2$ with its classical coordinate ring. Then the map

$$m : (U_f \cap w_1 U_f^\Theta w_1^{-1}) \times w_2^{-1} T^\Theta w_2 \times (U_f \cap w_2^{-1} U_f^\Theta w_2) \rightarrow B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f , \quad (25)$$

defined by $m(u, t, \tilde{u}) := u \diamond \hat{n} t \tilde{u}$, is an isomorphism.

Proof: We first show the equation (23): It is easy to adapt step (c), $\epsilon = -$, of the proof of Theorem 2.3 to show the inclusion ' \subseteq '. To show the reverse inclusion, note that for $M \subseteq \widehat{G}$ we have

$$1 \diamond \overline{M} \subseteq \overline{1 \diamond M}^{Spm} .$$

Let $\hat{w}' \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ such that $\hat{w}' \geq_{-+} \hat{w}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} B \diamond \hat{w}' B &= 1 \diamond B^- \hat{w}' B \subseteq 1 \diamond \overline{B^- \hat{w} B} \subseteq \overline{1 \diamond B^- \hat{w} B}^{Spm} = \overline{B \diamond \hat{w}' B}^{Spm} \\ &\subseteq \overline{B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f}^{Spm} . \end{aligned}$$

Since $B_f \times B_f$ acts on $\text{Specm } \mathbb{F}[G]$ by morphisms, we find by applying $B_f \times B_f$ to this inclusion:

$$B_f \diamond \hat{w}' B_f \subseteq \overline{B_f \diamond \hat{w} B_f}^{Spm} .$$

It is easy to adapt the proof of Theorem 2.5 to show equation (24).

Because of Theorem 2.8, to show the irreducibility of $B_f \hat{w} B_f$, it is sufficient to show the irreducibility of $B_f \subseteq \widehat{G}_f$.

The relative topology on B induced by \widehat{G}_f is the same as the relative topology on B induced by \widehat{G} . Due to Proposition 2.10 B is irreducible. Therefore it is sufficient to show

$$\overline{\overline{B_f}} = \overline{\overline{B}} . \quad (26)$$

Due to [M 2], Theorem 9 (1) we have $\overline{\overline{U}} = U_f$. Due to Proposition 1 of [M 2] $\overline{\overline{B}}$ is a monoid. Because T and U are contained in B we find $B_f = T U_f \subseteq \overline{\overline{B}}$,

from which follows the inclusion ' \subseteq ' in (26). The reverse inclusion is obvious.

Due to Theorem 9 (2) of [M 2] we have $\overline{U^\Theta} = U_f^\Theta$. Therefore the coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[U_f^\Theta]$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{F}[U^\Theta]$ by the restriction map. Due to part (a) of the proof of Theorem 21 in [M 2] we have $e(R(\Theta))(U_f)_\Theta = e(R(\Theta))$. Using these results it is not difficult to adapt the proof of Theorem 2.6 and Theorem 2.7 to show that the map m in (25) is an isomorphism. \square

3 Extensions of the length function

We first define three extensions of the length function $l : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ of the Weyl group to functions $l_{++}, l_{--} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and $l_{-+} : \widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ of the Weyl monoid by using the normal forms of the elements of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. The length function l_{++} is similar to the length function of a Renner monoid given in [Re 2] up to additive constants on the orbits given by the action of the product of the Weyl group on the Renner monoid. The functions l_{++}, l_{--} are allowed to take positive and negative values. It is not possible to make l_{++}, l_{--} positive on the $\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$ -orbits of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ by adding constants, because in general these functions can take arbitrary positive and negative values on such orbits.

Definition 3.1

1a) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I. Set

$$l_{++}(\hat{w}) := l(w_1) - l(w_2) \in \mathbb{Z} .$$

b) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form II. Set

$$l_{--}(\hat{w}) := -l(w_1) + l(w_2) \in \mathbb{Z} .$$

2) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I or in normal form II. Set

$$l_{-+}(\hat{w}) := l(w_1) + l(w_2) \in \mathbb{N}_0 .$$

Remarks:

(1) We have $l_{++}(\hat{w}) = l_{--}(\hat{w}^{inv})$, and $l_{-+}(\hat{w}) = l_{-+}(\hat{w}^{inv})$.

(2) If $\hat{w} = w_1 w_2 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_3 = w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 w_3$ is an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form III, then

$$\begin{aligned} l_{++}(\hat{w}) &= l(w_1) + l(w_2) - l(w_3) , \\ l_{--}(\hat{w}) &= -l(w_1) + l(w_2) + l(w_3) , \\ l_{-+}(\hat{w}) &= l(w_1) + l(w_2) + l(w_3) . \end{aligned}$$

The length function $l : \mathcal{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0$ is compatible with the Bruhat order on \mathcal{W} and the natural order on \mathbb{N}_0 . Similar things hold for the extensions of the length function restricted to the $\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{W}$ -orbits of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$:

Proposition 3.2 *Let Θ be special, and $\hat{w}, \hat{w}' \in \mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta))\mathcal{W}$. Equip $\mathcal{W}_\varepsilon(R(\Theta))\mathcal{W}$ with the restriction of the extended Bruhat order $\leq_{\varepsilon\delta}$, $(\varepsilon\delta) \in \{(++), (--), (-+)\}$.*

a) Then $\hat{w} \not\leq_{\varepsilon\delta} \hat{w}'$ implies $l_{\varepsilon\delta}(\hat{w}) \not\leq l_{\varepsilon\delta}(\hat{w}')$.

b) The length of every chain joining \hat{w} and \hat{w}' is finite, and does not extend $l_{\varepsilon\delta}(\hat{w}') - l_{\varepsilon\delta}(\hat{w})$. In particular there exists a maximal chain joining \hat{w} and \hat{w}' .

Proof: b) follows immediately from a). We only have to prove the cases $(++)$, $(-+)$ of a). Then the case $(--)$ follows from the case $(++)$ by using the inverse map ${}^{inv}\widehat{\mathcal{W}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$, combining Remark (3) following Definition 2.1 and Remark (1) following Definition 3.1.

Recall that for elements $u, v \in \mathcal{W}$ we have

$$|l(u) - l(v)| \leq l(uv) \leq l(u) + l(v) , \quad (27)$$

and for $J \subseteq I$, $u_J \in \mathcal{W}_J$, ${}^J u \in {}^J \mathcal{W}$ we have

$$l(u_J {}^J u) = l(u_J) + l({}^J u) . \quad (28)$$

Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$, $\hat{w}' = w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w'_2$ be in normal form I, i.e., $w_1, w'_1 \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$ and $w_2, w'_2 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$.

a) If $\hat{w} \not\leq_{++} \hat{w}'$ then due to Theorem 2.3 there exist an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$, such that

$$w_1 \leq (w'_1 w)^\Theta = w'_1 w \quad \text{and} \quad w_2 \geq {}^\Theta(w^{-1}w'_2) = w^{-1}w'_2 .$$

Furthermore we have $w_1 \neq w'_1 w$ or $w_2 \neq w^{-1}w'_2$ because otherwise we get by using formula (3):

$$\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2 = w'_1 w \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w^{-1}w'_2 = w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w'_2 = \hat{w}' .$$

Now $l : (\mathcal{W}, \leq) \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}_0, \leq)$ is an order morphism. By using equation (28) and inequality (27) we get

$$\begin{aligned} l_{++}(\hat{w}) &= l(w_1) - l(w_2) \not\leq l(w'_1 w) - l(w^{-1}w'_2) = l(w'_1 w) - l(w^{-1}) - l(w'_2) \\ &\leq l(w'_1 w w^{-1}) - l(w'_2) = l_{++}(\hat{w}') . \end{aligned}$$

b) If $\hat{w} \not\leq_{-+} \hat{w}'$ then due to Theorem 2.3 there exist an element $w \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$, such that

$$w'_1 \geq (w_1 w)^\Theta = w_1 w \quad \text{and} \quad w'_2 \geq {}^\Theta(w^{-1}w_2) = w^{-1}w_2 .$$

Furthermore we have $w'_1 \neq w_1 w$ or $w'_2 \neq w^{-1}w_2$ because otherwise

$$\hat{w}' = w'_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w'_2 = w_1 w \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w^{-1}w_2 = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2 = \hat{w} .$$

By using that $l : (\mathcal{W}, \leq) \rightarrow (\mathbb{N}_0, \leq)$ is an order morphism, by using equation (28) and inequality (27) we get

$$\begin{aligned} l_{-+}(\hat{w}') &= l(w'_1) + l(w'_2) \not\geq l(w_1 w) + l(w^{-1}w_2) = l(w_1 w) + l(w^{-1}) + l(w_2) \\ &\geq l(w_1 w w^{-1}) + l(w_2) = l_{-+}(\hat{w}) . \end{aligned}$$

□

For a reductive algebraic monoid the length of any maximal chain of the Bruhat-Chevalley order, which joins two elements in an orbit of the action of the product of the Weyl group on the Renner monoid, is given by the difference of the length functions of these elements. This follows from the definition of the length function in [Re 2], the algebraic description of the Bruhat Chevalley order in [Pe,Pu,Re], and the Theorem in Section 7 of [Re 1], which states that if an element covers another then the dimension difference of the corresponding Bruhat cells is one. The algebraic geometric proof of this theorem can not be generalized to the Kac-Moody setting.

A combinatorial proof working for a Renner monoid and the Weyl monoid is not easy to find, although some particular cases are not difficult to treat. In a separate article this will be investigated further.

For an element $w \in \mathcal{W}$ and $i \in I$ the length of $\sigma_i w$ and w , and the length of $w\sigma_i$ and w are related in the following way:

$$l(\sigma_i w) = \begin{cases} l(w) + 1 & \text{for } w^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \\ l(w) - 1 & \text{for } w^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \end{cases}, \quad (29)$$

$$l(w\sigma_i) = \begin{cases} l(w) + 1 & \text{for } w\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \\ l(w) - 1 & \text{for } w\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \end{cases}. \quad (30)$$

The next theorem gives the generalization for the extended length functions. To cut short our notation we set $\mathcal{W}_J J := \mathcal{W}_J \{ \alpha_i \mid i \in J \}$, $J \subseteq I$.

Theorem 3.3 1) *Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form I. Let $i \in I$. We have:*

$$\begin{aligned} l_{++}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) &= \begin{cases} l_{++}(\hat{w}) + 1 & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ l_{++}(\hat{w}) & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ l_{++}(\hat{w}) - 1 & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \end{cases} \\ l_{--}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) &= \begin{cases} l_{--}(\hat{w}) + 1 & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\Delta_{re}^+ \cap \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp) \\ l_{--}(\hat{w}) & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ l_{--}(\hat{w}) - 1 & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\Delta_{re}^- \cap \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp) \end{cases} \\ l_{-+}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) &= \begin{cases} l_{-+}(\hat{w}) + 1 & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ l_{-+}(\hat{w}) & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ l_{-+}(\hat{w}) - 1 & \text{for } w_1^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In all three cases the extended lengths of $\sigma_i \hat{w}$ and \hat{w} are equal if and only if the elements $\sigma_i \hat{w}$ and \hat{w} are equal.

2) *Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2$ be an element of $\widehat{\mathcal{W}}$ in normal form II. Let $i \in I$. We have:*

$$l_{++}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) = \begin{cases} l_{++}(\hat{w}) + 1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\Delta_{re}^+ \cap \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp) \\ l_{++}(\hat{w}) & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ l_{++}(\hat{w}) - 1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\Delta_{re}^- \cap \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
l_{--}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) &= \begin{cases} l_{++}(\hat{w}) + 1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta\Theta \\ l_{++}(\hat{w}) & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta\Theta \\ l_{++}(\hat{w}) - 1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta\Theta \end{cases} \\
l_{-+}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) &= \begin{cases} l_{-+}(\hat{w}) + 1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta\Theta \\ l_{-+}(\hat{w}) & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta\Theta \\ l_{-+}(\hat{w}) - 1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta\Theta \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

In all three cases the extended lengths of $\hat{w}\sigma_i$ and \hat{w} are equal if and only if the elements $\hat{w}\sigma_i$ and \hat{w} are equal.

Proof: We only have to show the statements 2) of the theorem, which involve normal form II. Then the statements 1), which involve normal form I, follow easily by using Remark (1) following Definition 3.1 and Remark (1) following Proposition 2.2. We make use of the formulas (3) and (4) without further mentioning.

Let $\hat{w} = w_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2$ be in normal form II, i.e., $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$, $w_2 \in {}^\Theta\mathcal{W}$. Let $w_2 = bc$ with $b \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}$ and $c \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}\mathcal{W}$.

a) We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{w}\sigma_i = \hat{w} &\iff \varepsilon(R(\Theta))w_2\sigma_iw_2^{-1} = \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) \\
&\iff \sigma_{w_2\alpha_i} = w_2\sigma_iw_2^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta \iff w_2\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_\Theta\Theta
\end{aligned}$$

b) Let $w_2\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}\Theta^\perp$, which is equivalent to $c\alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp}\Theta^\perp$. Then

$$\hat{w}\sigma_i = w_1b\varepsilon(R(\Theta))c\sigma_i = w_1b\varepsilon(R(\Theta))\sigma_{c\alpha_i}c = w_1b\sigma_{c\alpha_i}\varepsilon(R(\Theta))c.$$

Note that the expression on the right is in normal form III with $b\sigma_{c\alpha_i}$ as middle part. Now $c\alpha_i$ can be written in the form $c\alpha_i = \sum_{j \in \Theta} n_j\alpha_j$ with either all $n_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ or all $n_j \in -\mathbb{N}_0$. Applying c^{-1} we get

$$\alpha_i = \sum_{j \in \Theta} n_j c^{-1}\alpha_j.$$

Because of $c^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ we have $c^{-1}\alpha_j \in \Delta_{re}^+ \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0\text{-span}\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ for all $j \in \Theta$. This implies that there exists an index $j \in \Theta$ such that $\alpha_i = c^{-1}\alpha_j$. In particular $c\alpha_i$ is a simple root. By using Remark (2) following Definition 3.1 and equation (30) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
l_{++}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) - l_{++}(\hat{w}) &= l_{--}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) - l_{--}(\hat{w}) = l_{-+}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) - l_{-+}(\hat{w}) \\
&= l(b\sigma_{c\alpha_i}) - l(b) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i = bc\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \\ -1 & \text{for } w_2\alpha_i = bc\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

c) Let $w_2\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re} \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)$, which is equivalent to $c\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re} \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)$.

We first show $c\sigma_i \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}\mathcal{W}$: Because of $c^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ we have

$$c^{-1}\alpha_j \in \Delta_{re}^+ \quad \text{for all } j \in \Theta \cup \Theta^\perp.$$

Due to our assumption on $c\alpha_i$, from this follows

$$c^{-1}\alpha_j \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \{\alpha_i\} \subseteq \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \{\alpha_i\} \cup \{-\alpha_i\} \quad \text{for all } j \in \Theta \cup \Theta^\perp.$$

Applying σ_i we get

$$\sigma_i c^{-1}\alpha_j \in \Delta_{re}^+ \quad \text{for all } j \in \Theta \cup \Theta^\perp,$$

which implies $\sigma_i c^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$, or equivalent $c\sigma_i \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}\mathcal{W}$.

Now $\hat{w}\sigma_i = w_1\varepsilon(R(\Theta))bc\sigma_i$ is in normal form III with $c\sigma_i$ as last part. By using Remark (2) following Definition 3.1 and equation (30) we find

$$\begin{aligned} l_{++}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) - l_{++}(\hat{w}) &= -l_{--}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) + l_{--}(\hat{w}) = -l_{-+}(\hat{w}\sigma_i) + l_{-+}(\hat{w}) \\ &= -l(c\sigma_i) + l(c) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{for } c\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \\ -1 & \text{for } c\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $c\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^\pm \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)$ is equivalent to $w_2\alpha_i = bc\alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^\pm \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)$.

Putting together the cases a), b), and c) part 2) of the theorem follows. \square

For the monoid of matrices over a finite field, and more general for a reductive algebraic monoid a generalization of one of the Tits axioms for BN-pairs has been given in [So], [Re 2] by using the length function. The next theorem gives a generalization of some of the Tits axioms for groups with twinned BN-pairs, compare [Ti], for the monoid \hat{G} :

Theorem 3.4 *Let $i \in I$, let $\hat{w} \in \widehat{\mathcal{W}}$. Let $\epsilon \in \{+, -\}$. We have:*

$$(B^\epsilon \sigma_i B^\epsilon)(B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon) = \begin{cases} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) \\ B^\epsilon \sigma_i \hat{w} B^\epsilon & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) + 1 \\ B^\epsilon \sigma_i \hat{w} B^\epsilon \dot{\cup} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) - 1 \end{cases}.$$

$$(B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon)(B^\epsilon \sigma_i B^\epsilon) = \begin{cases} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) \\ B^\epsilon \hat{w} \sigma_i B^\epsilon & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) + 1 \\ B^\epsilon \hat{w} \sigma_i B^\epsilon \dot{\cup} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^\epsilon & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) - 1 \end{cases}.$$

We have:

$$(B^{-\epsilon} \sigma_i B^{-\epsilon})(B^{-\epsilon} \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon}) = \begin{cases} B^{-\epsilon} \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) \\ B^{-\epsilon} \sigma_i \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) - 1 \\ B^{-\epsilon} \sigma_i \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon} \dot{\cup} B^{-\epsilon} \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) + 1 \end{cases}.$$

$$(B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon})(B^{-\epsilon} \sigma_i B^{-\epsilon}) = \begin{cases} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) \\ B^\epsilon \hat{w} \sigma_i B^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) - 1 \\ B^\epsilon \hat{w} \sigma_i B^{-\epsilon} \dot{\cup} B^\epsilon \hat{w} B^{-\epsilon} & \text{if } l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{\epsilon\epsilon}(\hat{w}) + 1 \end{cases}.$$

Proof: For the following transformations we use the formulas (β) and (γ) stated in the part “The minimal and formal Kac-Moody group G and G_f , the monoids \widehat{G} and \widehat{G}_f ” of the section “Preliminaries” several times.

1) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2$ be in normal form I, i.e., $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^\Theta$, $w_2 \in {}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp} \mathcal{W}$.

a) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_i B \hat{w} &= \sigma_i T U^i U_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 = T U^i \sigma_i U_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 \\
&= T U^i \sigma_i w_1 U_{w_1^{-1} \alpha_i} \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 \\
&= \begin{cases} T U^i \sigma_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ T U^i \sigma_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) U_{w_1^{-1} \alpha_i} w_2 & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} T U^i \sigma_i \hat{w} & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ T U^i \sigma_i \hat{w} U_{w_2^{-1} w_1^{-1} \alpha_i} & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $w_2^{-1} \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ we have $w_2^{-1} w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re})^\pm$ if $w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap (\Delta_{re})^\pm$. We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
B \sigma_i B \hat{w} B &= B \sigma_i \hat{w} B \quad \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta. \\
B \sigma_i B \hat{w} B^- &= B \sigma_i \hat{w} B^- \quad \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap \Delta_{re}^-) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta.
\end{aligned}$$

b) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_i B \hat{w} &= \sigma_i T U^i U_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 = T U^i \sigma_i U_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 \\
&= T U^i (\sigma_i U_i \sigma_i^{-1}) \sigma_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 \subseteq T U^i (U_i \cup U_i \sigma_i U_i) \sigma_i w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 \\
&= B \sigma_i \hat{w} \cup B \sigma_i (\sigma_i w_1 U_{(\sigma_i w_1)^{-1} \alpha_i}) \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 \\
&= B \sigma_i \hat{w} \cup \begin{cases} B w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) w_2 & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \\ B w_1 \varepsilon (R(\Theta)) U_{-w_1^{-1} \alpha_i} w_2 & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases} \\
&= B \sigma_i \hat{w} \cup \begin{cases} B \hat{w} & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \\ B \hat{w} U_{-w_2^{-1} w_1^{-1} \alpha_i} & \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $-w_2^{-1} w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re})^\mp$ if $w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap (\Delta_{re})^\pm$. Note also that $\sigma_i U_i \sigma_i^{-1}$ contains elements of U_i and $U_i \sigma_i U_i$. We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
B \sigma_i B \hat{w} B &= B \sigma_i \hat{w} B \cup B \hat{w} B \quad \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta. \\
B \sigma_i B \hat{w} B^- &= B \sigma_i \hat{w} B^- \cup B \hat{w} B^- \quad \text{for } w_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap \Delta_{re}^+) .
\end{aligned}$$

Due to Part 1) of the last theorem, we get from a) and b):

$$\begin{aligned}
B \sigma_i B \hat{w} B &= \begin{cases} B \hat{w} B & \text{if } l_{++}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{++}(\hat{w}) \\ B \sigma_i \hat{w} B & \text{if } l_{++}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{++}(\hat{w}) + 1 \\ B \sigma_i \hat{w} B \dot{\cup} B \hat{w} B & \text{if } l_{++}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{++}(\hat{w}) - 1 \end{cases} . \\
B \sigma_i B \hat{w} B^- &= \begin{cases} B \hat{w} B^- & \text{if } l_{--}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{--}(\hat{w}) \\ B \sigma_i \hat{w} B^- & \text{if } l_{--}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{--}(\hat{w}) - 1 \\ B \sigma_i \hat{w} B^- \dot{\cup} B \hat{w} B^- & \text{if } l_{--}(\sigma_i \hat{w}) = l_{--}(\hat{w}) + 1 \end{cases} .
\end{aligned}$$

2) Let $\hat{w} = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2$ be in normal form II, i.e., $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ and $w_2 \in {}^\Theta \mathcal{W}$.

a) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{w} B \sigma_i &= w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 U_i U^i T \sigma_i = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 U_i \sigma_i U^i T \\
&= w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) U_{w_2 \alpha_i} w_2 \sigma_i U^i T \\
&= \begin{cases} w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 \sigma_i U^i T & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ w_1 U_{w_2 \alpha_i} \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 \sigma_i U^i T & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \hat{w} \sigma_i U^i T & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta \\ U_{w_1 w_2 \alpha_i} \hat{w} \sigma_i U^i T & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $w_1 \in \mathcal{W}^{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}$ we have $w_1 w_2 \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re})^\pm$ if $w_2 \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap (\Delta_{re})^\pm$. We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
B \hat{w} B \sigma_i B &= B \hat{w} \sigma_i B \quad \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap \Delta_{re}^+) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta. \\
B^- \hat{w} B \sigma_i B &= B^- \hat{w} \sigma_i B \quad \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^- \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta) \cup \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta.
\end{aligned}$$

b) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{w} B \sigma_i &= w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 U_i U^i T \sigma_i = w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 U_i \sigma_i U^i T \\
&= w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 \sigma_i (\sigma_i^{-1} U_i \sigma_i) U^i T \subseteq w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 \sigma_i (U_i \cup U_i \sigma_i U_i) U^i T \\
&= \hat{w} \sigma_i B \cup w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) U_{w_2 \sigma_i \alpha_i} w_2 B \\
&= \hat{w} \sigma_i B \cup \begin{cases} w_1 \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \\ w_1 U_{-w_2 \alpha_i} \varepsilon(R(\Theta)) w_2 B & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases} \\
&= \hat{w} \sigma_i B \cup \begin{cases} \hat{w} B & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp) \\ U_{-w_1 w_2 \alpha_i} \hat{w} B & \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $-w_1 w_2 \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re})^\mp$ if $w_2 \alpha_i \in \mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap (\Delta_{re})^\pm$. Note also that $\sigma_i^{-1} U_i \sigma_i$ contains elements of U_i and $U_i \sigma_i U_i$. We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned}
B \hat{w} B \sigma_i B &= B \hat{w} \sigma_i B \cup B \hat{w} B \quad \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in (\Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_{\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp}(\Theta \cup \Theta^\perp)) \cup (\mathcal{W}_{\Theta^\perp} \Theta^\perp \cap \Delta_{re}^-). \\
B^- \hat{w} B \sigma_i B &= B^- \hat{w} \sigma_i B \cup B^- \hat{w} B \quad \text{for } w_2 \alpha_i \in \Delta_{re}^+ \setminus \mathcal{W}_\Theta \Theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to Part 2) of the last theorem, from a) and b) follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
B \hat{w} B \sigma_i B &= \begin{cases} B \hat{w} B & \text{if } l_{++}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{++}(\hat{w}) \\ B \hat{w} \sigma_i B & \text{if } l_{++}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{++}(\hat{w}) + 1 \\ B \hat{w} \sigma_i B \cup B \hat{w} B & \text{if } l_{++}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{++}(\hat{w}) - 1 \end{cases} \\
B^- \hat{w} B \sigma_i B &= \begin{cases} B^- \hat{w} B & \text{if } l_{--}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{--}(\hat{w}) \\ B^- \hat{w} \sigma_i B & \text{if } l_{--}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{--}(\hat{w}) - 1 \\ B^- \hat{w} \sigma_i B \cup B^- \hat{w} B & \text{if } l_{--}(\hat{w} \sigma_i) = l_{--}(\hat{w}) + 1 \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining cases of the theorem follow by applying the Chevalley involution $*$: $\hat{G} \rightarrow \hat{G}$, together with Remark (3) following Definition 2.1 and Remark (1) following Definition 3.1.

□

Acknowledgment. I would like to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for providing my main financial support, when most of this article has been elaborated. I also would like to thank the TMR-Program ERB FMRX-CT97-0100 “Algebraic Lie Theory” for providing some financial support for traveling.

References

- [K] V. G. Kac, Infinite dimensional Lie algebras, Cambridge University Press, 1990
- [K,P 1] V. G. Kac, D. H. Peterson, Infinite flag varieties and conjugacy theorems, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **80** (1983), 1778-1782
- [K,P 2] V. G. Kac, D. H. Peterson, Regular functions on certain infinite-dimensional groups, in Arithmetic and Geometry, Progress in Math. **36**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1983, 141-166
- [K,P 3] V. G. Kac, D. H. Peterson, Defining relations on certain infinite-dimensional groups, Proceedings of the Cartan conference, Lyon 1984, Astérisque, 1985, Numero hors serie, 165-208
- [Loo] E. J. Looijenga, Invariant theory for generalized root systems, Inventiones math. **61** (1980), 1-32
- [M 1] C. Mokler, An analogue of a reductive algebraic monoid, whose unit group is a Kac-Moody group, arXiv.org e-print: math.AG/0204246, submitted to Memoirs of the AMS
- [M 2] The \mathbb{F} -valued points of the algebra of strongly regular functions of a Kac-Moody group, Transformation Groups **7** (2002), 343-378
- [Mo,Pi] R. V. Moody, A. Pianzola, Lie Algebras With Triangular Decompositions, Canadian Mathematical Society Series of Monographs and Advanced Texts, John Wiley & Sons, 1995
- [Pe,Pu,Re] E. A. Pennel, M. S. Putcha, L. E. Renner, Analogue of the Bruhat Chevalley order for reductive monoids, Journal of Algebra, **196** (1997), 339-368
- [Pu] M. S. Putcha, Shellability in reductive monoids, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, **354** (2002), 413-426
- [Re 1] L. E. Renner, Analogue of the Bruhat Decomposition for Algebraic Monoids, Journal of Algebra **101** (1986), 303-338
- [Re 2] L. E. Renner, Analogue of the Bruhat Decomposition for Algebraic Monoids II, The length function and trichotomy, Journal of Algebra **175** (1995), 695-714

- [Re 3] L. E. Renner, An explicit Cell Decomposition of the Wonderful Compactification of a Semisimple Algebraic Group, to appear in the Canadian Mathematical Bulletin
- [Sl] P. Slodowy, Singularitäten, Kac-Moody-Liealgebren, assoziierte Gruppen und Verallgemeinerungen, Habilitationsschrift, Bonn, 1984
- [So] L. Solomon, The Bruhat decomposition, Tits system and Iwahori ring for the monoid of matrices over a finite field, *Geom. Dedicata* **30** (1990), 15-49
- [Ti] J. Tits, Twin buildings and groups of Kac-Moody type, L.M.S. Lecture Notes **165** (Proceedings of a conference on groups, combinatorics and geometry, Durham 1990), Cambridge University Press, 1992, 249-286