

ON THE (B, N) -CONSTRUCTION

YOUNG KWON SONG

1. Introduction

In this paper, k will denote an arbitrary field. If m, n are natural numbers, then $M_{m \times n}(k)$ will denote the set of all $m \times n$ matrices with entries in k . Every k -algebras will be assumed to contain a (multiplicative) identity $1 \neq 0$. A k -subspace R_0 of a k -algebra R will be called a k -subalgebra of R if R_0 is closed under multiplication from R and R_0 contains the identity of R . We will assume all k -algebra homomorphisms take the identity to identity.

Let R be a commutative, k -subalgebra of $M_{n \times n}(k)$. R is called a maximal, commutative, k -subalgebra of $M_{n \times n}(k)$ if R satisfies the following property : If R' is a commutative, k -subalgebra of $M_{n \times n}(k)$ and $R \subseteq R'$, then $R = R'$. Thus, a maximal, commutative, k -subalgebra of $M_{n \times n}(k)$ is a maximal element with respect to inclusion in the set of all maximal, commutative, k -subalgebras of $M_{n \times n}(k)$. We will denote the set of all maximal, commutative, k -subalgebra of $M_{n \times n}(k)$ by $\mathcal{M}_n(k)$.

Maximal, commutative, k -subalgebras of $M_{n \times n}(k)$ come in many different shapes and sizes. Here are a few examples.

EXAMPLE 1. Let p and q be positive integers such that $|p - q| \leq 1$. Set $n = p + q$. Let

$$(1) \quad R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} xI_p & Z \\ O_{q \times p} & xI_q \end{pmatrix} \mid x \in k, Z \in M_{p \times q}(k) \right\}.$$

In (1), I_p denotes the identity matrix of size p by p and $O_{q \times p}$ denotes the zero matrix of size q by p . Then, R is a commutative, k -subalgebra

Received May 3, 1996. Revised December 16, 1996.

1991 AMS Subject Classification: 13A99.

Key words: (B, N) -construction.

This paper is partly supported by GARC.

shows that $\mathcal{C} \in \Omega$. It was conjectured that every $R \in \Omega$ is a (B, N) -construction. If k is the real numbers, then we will construct a k -algebra $(\mathcal{S}, J(\mathcal{S}), k) \in \Omega$ that is not a (B, N) -construction.

2. (B, N) -construction

In this section, we will let

$$\check{E}_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 & O & O \\ O & O_{10} & O \\ E_{ij} & O & O_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Here, E_{ij} is the (i, j) -th matrix unit in $M_{2 \times 2}(k)$ and O_n is the $n \times n$ zero matrix.

Now, we will construct a new k -algebra $(\mathcal{S}, J, k) \in \Omega$ with the following matrices. Let

$$(3) \quad \delta_i = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 & O & O \\ P_i & O_{10} & O \\ O & Q_i & O_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 8.$$

Here,

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 \\ I_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_3 = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 \\ O_2 \\ I_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_4 = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ I_2 \\ O_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P_5 = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ E_{11} \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_6 = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ E_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_7 = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ E_{21} \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_8 = \begin{pmatrix} O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ O_2 \\ E_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$Q_1 = (I_2 \ O_2 \ O_2 \ O_2 \ E_{11}), \quad Q_2 = (O_2 \ I_2 \ O_2 \ O_2 \ E_{12})$$

$$Q_3 = (O_2 \ O_2 \ I_2 \ O_2 \ E_{21}), \quad Q_4 = (O_2 \ O_2 \ O_2 \ I_2 \ E_{22})$$

$$Q_5 = (E_{11} \ O_2 \ E_{21} \ O_2 \ O_2), \quad Q_6 = (E_{12} \ O_2 \ E_{22} \ O_2 \ O_2)$$

$$Q_7 = (O_2 \ E_{11} \ O_2 \ E_{21} \ O_2), \quad Q_8 = (O_2 \ E_{12} \ O_2 \ E_{22} \ O_2).$$

If we let $\mathcal{S} = k[\delta_1, \dots, \delta_8, \check{E}_{11}, \check{E}_{12}, \check{E}_{21}, \check{E}_{22}]$, it is easy to check that $\mathcal{S} \in \Omega$.

THEOREM 2.1. *Suppose k is the field of real numbers. Then, \mathcal{S} is not a (B, N) -construction.*

Proof. Suppose \mathcal{S} is a (B, N) -construction. Then, by [1: Theorem 4], \mathcal{S} contains an ideal I which satisfies the following two properties.

(4)

(a) $Ann_{\mathcal{S}}(I) = I$

(b) $0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}/I \longrightarrow 0$ splits as k -algebras.

Since $\check{E}_{ij}I = 0$ for $i, j = 1, 2$, $\check{E}_{ij} \in I$, $i, j = 1, 2$ by (a). Notice that $\delta_1 \notin I$. Otherwise, $\delta_1^2 = 0$ by (a). Since $\delta_1^2 = \check{E}_{11} + \check{E}_{22}$, this is impossible. Thus, $\delta_1 \notin I$. Let $\nu : \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}/I$ be the natural homomorphism. Let $\theta : \mathcal{S}/I \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}$ be a splitting map. Then, $\theta(\delta_1 + I) = \delta_1 + r$, where $r \in I$. Since θ is a k -algebra homomorphism, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1^2 + 2\delta_1 r &= \delta_1^2 + 2\delta_1 r + r^2 \\ &= (\delta_1 + r)^2 = (\theta(\delta_1 + I))^2 \\ &= \theta((\delta_1 + I)^2) = \theta(\check{E}_{11} + \check{E}_{22} + I) \\ (5) \qquad &= \theta(0 + I) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $r = \sum_{i=1}^8 t_i \delta_i + \sum_{j,\ell=1}^2 s_{j\ell} \check{E}_{j\ell}$, for some real numbers $t_i, s_{j\ell}$. Then, (5) implies

$$(6) \qquad (1 + 2t_1 + 2t_5)\check{E}_{11} + 2t_6\check{E}_{12} + (1 + 2t_1)\check{E}_{22} = 0.$$

Thus, $t_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$, $t_5 = t_6 = 0$. Hence, we have

$$(7) \qquad r = -\frac{1}{2}\delta_1 + t_2\delta_2 + t_3\delta_3 + t_4\delta_4 + t_7\delta_7 + t_8\delta_8 + \sum_{j,\ell=1}^2 s_{j\ell}\check{E}_{j\ell}.$$

Since $r \in I$, $r^2 = 0$ by (a). Thus,

$$(8) \qquad \begin{aligned} &(\frac{1}{4} + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_4^2 + 2t_2t_7)\check{E}_{11} + 2t_2t_8\check{E}_{12} + 2t_4t_7\check{E}_{21} \\ &+ (\frac{1}{4} + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_4^2 + 2t_4t_8)\check{E}_{22} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have the following four equations.

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} t_2 t_3 &= 0 \\ t_4 t_7 &= 0 \\ \frac{1}{4} + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_4^2 + 2t_2 t_7 &= 0 \\ \frac{1}{4} + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_4^2 + 2t_4 t_8 &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that there is no real solution of the equations given in (9). Since $t_2 t_8 = 0$, $t_2 = 0$ or $t_8 = 0$. Thus, we have the following two cases to consider.

Case 1: $t_2 = 0$

Case 2: $t_8 = 0$

We will show both cases lead to a contradiction.

Case 1: Suppose $t_2 = 0$. Then, from the third equation in (9), we have $\frac{1}{4} + t_3^2 + t_4^2 = 0$. This is impossible since t_3 and t_4 are real numbers.

Case 2: Suppose $t_8 = 0$. Then, the fourth equation in (9) implies $\frac{1}{4} + t_2^2 + t_3^2 + t_4^2 = 0$. This is again impossible.

Thus, the equations in (9) have no real solutions. This implies that there is no $r \in I$ such that $\theta(\delta_1 + I) = \delta_1 + r$. Thus, there is no splitting map of the exact sequence given in (4). Therefore, \mathcal{S} is not a (B, N) -construction. \square

In Theorem 2.1, we proved that \mathcal{S} is not a (B, N) -construction if k is the field of real numbers. But as we will see, if k is the field of complex numbers, then \mathcal{S} is a (B, N) -construction. More generally, we prove $\mathcal{S} \in \Omega$ is a (B, N) -construction if k is an algebraically closed field.

THEOREM 2.2. *Suppose k is an algebraically closed field. Then, \mathcal{S} is a (B, N) -construction.*

Proof. Since k is an algebraically closed field, the polynomial $f(x) = x^2 + 1 \in k[x]$ has a root i . Set $\alpha_1 = \delta_1 - i\delta_2$, $\alpha_2 = \delta_3 - i\delta_4$, $\alpha_3 = \delta_5 - i\delta_7$, and $\alpha_4 = \delta_6 - i\delta_8$. Then, $\alpha_1 \delta_5 = \check{E}_{11}$, $\alpha_1 \delta_6 = \check{E}_{12}$, $\alpha_2 \delta_5 = \check{E}_{21}$, $\alpha_2 \delta_6 = \check{E}_{22}$. Thus, the ideal I generated by $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$ contains \check{E}_{mn} for all $m, n = 1, 2$. It is easy to check $I = L(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \check{E}_{11}, \check{E}_{12}, \check{E}_{21}, \check{E}_{22})$. Thus, $\dim_k(I) = 8$.

Let $\beta \in \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{S}}(I)$. Then, $\beta = \sum_{n=1}^8 t_n \delta_n + \sum_{m,n=1}^2 s_{mn} \check{E}_{mn}$ for some $t_n, s_{mn} \in k$. Since $\alpha_n \in I$ for all $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $\alpha_n \beta = 0$ for all $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$. From $\alpha_1 \beta = \alpha_2 \beta = 0$, we have

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} (t_1 - it_2 + t_5 - it_7) \check{E}_{11} + (t_6 - it_8) \check{E}_{12} + (t_1 - it_2) \check{E}_{22} &= 0 \\ (t_3 - it_4) \check{E}_{11} + (t_5 - it_7) \check{E}_{21} + (t_3 - it_4 + t_6 - it_8) \check{E}_{22} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (10) implies

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} t_1 - it_2 + t_5 - it_7 &= 0 \\ t_3 - it_4 + t_6 - it_8 &= 0 \\ t_6 - it_8 &= 0 \\ t_1 - it_2 &= 0 \\ t_3 - it_4 &= 0 \\ t_5 - it_7 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have $t_1 = it_2, t_3 = it_4, t_5 = it_7$, and $t_6 = it_8$. Hence,

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta &= it_2 \delta_1 + t_2 \delta_2 + it_4 \delta_3 + t_4 \delta_4 + it_7 \delta_5 + it_8 \delta_6 \\ &\quad + t_7 \delta_7 + t_8 \delta_8 + \sum_{m,n=1}^2 s_{mn} \check{E}_{mn} \\ &= it_2 \alpha_1 + it_4 \alpha_2 + it_7 \alpha_3 + it_8 \alpha_4 + \sum_{n,n=1}^2 s_{mn} \check{E}_{mn}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\beta \in I$ and hence $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{S}}(I) \subseteq I$. Since $I^2 = 0$, $I \subseteq \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{S}}(I)$. Thus, $\text{Ann}_{\mathcal{S}}(I) = I$.

Notice that $\Delta = \{I_{14} + I, \delta_1 + I, \delta_3 + I, \delta_5 + I, \delta_6 + I\}$ is a k -vector space basis of \mathcal{S}/I . Since $\dim_k(I) = 8$ and $\dim_k(\mathcal{S}) = 13$, we have $\dim_k(\mathcal{S}/I) = 5$. Since $i\alpha_n \in I$ for all $n = 1, 2, 3, 4$, we have

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta_2 + I &= -i\delta_1 + I \\ \delta_4 + I &= -i\delta_3 + I \\ \delta_7 + I &= -i\delta_5 + I \\ \delta_8 + I &= -i\delta_6 + I. \end{aligned}$$

Let θ be the k -vector space homomorphism from \mathcal{S}/I to \mathcal{S} defined as follows:

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \theta(I_{14} + I) &= I_{14} \\ \theta(\delta_1 + I) &= \frac{1}{2} \delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} i \delta_2 \\ \theta(\delta_3 + I) &= \frac{1}{2} \delta_3 + \frac{1}{2} i \delta_4 \\ \theta(\delta_5 + I) &= \frac{1}{2} \delta_5 + \frac{1}{2} i \delta_7 \\ \theta(\delta_6 + I) &= \frac{1}{2} \delta_6 + \frac{1}{2} i \delta_8. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \theta(\delta_2 + I) &= \theta(-i\delta_1 + I) = -i\theta(\delta_1 + I) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_2 - \frac{1}{2}i\delta_1 \\ \theta(\delta_4 + I) &= \theta(-i\delta_3 + I) = -i\theta(\delta_3 + I) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_4 - \frac{1}{2}i\delta_3 \\ \theta(\delta_7 + I) &= \theta(-i\delta_5 + I) = -i\theta(\delta_5 + I) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_7 - \frac{1}{2}i\delta_5 \\ \theta(\delta_8 + I) &= \theta(-i\delta_6 + I) = -i\theta(\delta_6 + I) = \frac{1}{2}\delta_8 - \frac{1}{2}i\delta_6 \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that θ is a k -algebra homomorphism.

Recall $\nu : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}/I$ is the natural homomorphism defined by $\nu(r) = r + I$ for $r \in \mathcal{S}$. Then, easy computations show that $\nu\theta(r + I) = r + I$ for all $r \in \mathcal{S}$. This implies the exact sequence

$$(16) \quad 0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}/I \longrightarrow 0$$

splits as k -algebras. Therefore, the ideal I of \mathcal{S} satisfies the two conditions in [1:Theorem 4] and \mathcal{S} is a (B, N) -construction. \square

Theorem 2.1 and 2.2 show that the question: “When is $(R, J(R), k) \in \Omega$ a (B, N) -construction?” depends on the field k . From Theorem 2.2, one could ask that every $(R, J, k) \in \Omega$ is a (B, N) -construction if k is an algebraically closed field. At present, this conjecture is opened.

References

1. W. C. Brown and F. W. Call, *Maximal Commutative Subalgebras of $n \times n$ Matrices*, Communications in Algebra. **21(12)** (1993), 4439-4460.
2. W. C. Brown, *Two Constructions of Maximal Commutative Subalgebras of $n \times n$ Matrices*, Communications in Algebra. **22(10)** (1994), 4051-4066.
3. R. C. Courter, *The Dimension of Maximal Commutative Subalgebras of K_n* , Duke Mathematical J. **32** (1965), 225-232.

Global Analysis Research Center
Department of Mathematics
Seoul National University
Seoul 151-742, Korea