

# The finite basis problem for unary matrix semigroups

Igor Dolinka

dockie@dmi.uns.ac.rs

Department of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Novi Sad

St Andrews, September 12, 2012



## Glossary of terms

The **equational theory**  $Eq(A)$  of an algebra  $A$

= the set of all identities (over some fixed countably infinite set  $X$  of variables, or letters) satisfied by  $A$ .

Let  $\Sigma$  be a set of identities. An identity  $p \approx q$  is a **consequence** of  $\Sigma$ , written  $\Sigma \models p \approx q$ ,

= every algebra that satisfies all identities from  $\Sigma$  also satisfies  $p \approx q$ .

If  $\Sigma \subseteq Eq(A)$  is such that every identity from  $Eq(A)$  is a consequence of  $\Sigma$ , then  $\Sigma$  is called an **(equational) basis** of  $A$ .

A fundamental property that an algebra  $A$  may or may not have is that of having a **finite** basis. If there is a finite basis for identities of  $A$ , then  $A$  is said to be **finitely based (FB)**. Otherwise, it is **nonfinitely based (NFB)**.

## Some classical positive results

Each of the following algebras is FB:

- ▶ finite groups (Oates & Powell, 1964)
- ▶ commutative semigroups (Perkins, 1968)
- ▶ finite lattices and lattice-based algebras (McKenzie, 1970)
- ▶ finite (associative) rings (L'vov; Kruse, 1973)
- ▶ algebras generating congruence distributive varieties with a finite residual bound (Baker, 1977)
- ▶ algebras generating congruence modular varieties with a finite residual bound (McKenzie, 1987)
- ▶ algebras generating congruence  $\wedge$ -semidistributive varieties with a finite residual bound (Willard, 2000)

## Negative results

Examples of finite NFB algebras:



		0	1	2
0		0	0	0
1		0	0	1
2		0	2	2

(Murskiĭ, 1965)

- ▶ a certain 6-element semigroup of matrices (Perkins, 1968)
- ▶ a certain finite *pointed* group (Bryant, 1982)
- ▶ the full transformation semigroup  $\mathcal{T}_n$  for  $n \geq 3$  and the full semigroup of binary relations  $\mathcal{R}_n$  for  $n \geq 2$
- ▶ a certain 7-element semiring of binary relations (ID, 2007)

**Tarski's Finite Basis Problem:** Is there any algorithmic way to distinguish between finite FB and NFB algebras?

# McKenzie's solution of the Tarski problem

No!

Theorem (McKenzie, 1996)

*There is no algorithm to decide whether a finite algebra is FB.*

This is exactly why it is so interesting to study the (N)FB property, especially for **finite** algebras.

**The Tarski-Sapir problem:** Is there an algorithm to decide whether a finite **semigroup** is FB? This problem is still open.

M. V. Volkov: *The finite basis problem for finite semigroups*, Sci. Math. Jpn. **53** (2001), 171–199.

[http://csseminar.kadm.usu.ru/MATHJAP\\_revisited.pdf](http://csseminar.kadm.usu.ru/MATHJAP_revisited.pdf)

## Volkov's NFB criterion (1989)

Let  $A_2$  be the 5-element semigroup given by the presentation

$$\langle a, b : a^2 = a = aba, b^2 = 0, bab = b \rangle.$$

This is just the Rees matrix semigroup over a trivial group  $E = \{e\}$  with the sandwich matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} e & e \\ 0 & e \end{pmatrix}$$

### Fact

Of all varieties generated by Rees matrix semigroups with trivial subgroups,  $A_2$  generates the largest one.

### Fact

$A_2$  is representable by matrices (over any field).

# Volkov's NFB criterion (1989)

## Theorem (M. V. Volkov, 1989)

Let  $S$  be a semigroup and  $T$  a subsemigroup of  $S$ . Assume that there exist a positive integer  $d$  and a group  $G$  satisfying  $x^d \approx e$  such that

- ▶  $a^d \in T$  for all  $a \in S$ , and
- ▶  $G \in \text{var } S$ , but  $G \notin \text{var } T$ .

If  $A_2 \in \text{var } S$ , then  $S$  is NFB.

## Corollary

The following semigroups are NFB:

- ▶ the full transformation semigroup  $\mathcal{T}_n$  ( $n \geq 3$ )
- ▶ the full semigroup of binary relations  $\mathcal{B}_n$  ( $n \geq 2$ )
- ▶ the semigroup of partial transformations  $\mathcal{PT}_n$  ( $n \geq 2$ )
- ▶ matrix semigroups  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$  for any  $n \geq 2$  and any *finite* field  $\mathbb{F}$

# Unary semigroups

## Unary semigroup

= a structure  $(S, \cdot, *)$  such that  $(S, \cdot)$  is a semigroup and  $*$  is a unary operation on  $S$

## Involution semigroup

= a unary semigroup satisfying  $(xy)^* \approx y^*x^*$  and  $(x^*)^* \approx x$

## Examples

- ▶ groups
- ▶ inverse semigroups
- ▶ regular  $*$ -semigroups ( $xx^*x \approx x$ )
- ▶ matrix semigroups with transposition  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}) = (M_n(\mathbb{F}), \cdot, {}^T)$

## 'Unary version' of Volkov's Theorem

For a unary semigroup  $S$ , let  $H(S)$  denote the **Hermitian subsemigroup** of  $S$ , generated by  $aa^*$  for all  $a \in S$ .

For a variety  $\mathbf{V}$  of unary semigroups, let  $H(\mathbf{V})$  be the subvariety of  $\mathbf{V}$  generated by all  $H(S)$ ,  $S \in \mathbf{V}$ .

Furthermore, let  $K_3$  be the 10-element unary Rees matrix semigroup over a trivial group  $E = \{e\}$  with the sandwich matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} e & e & e \\ e & e & 0 \\ e & 0 & e \end{pmatrix},$$

while  $(i, e, j)^* = (j, e, i)$  and  $0^* = 0$ .

### Fact

$K_3$  generates the variety of all **strict combinatorial regular \*-semigroups** (studied by K. Auinger in 1992).

# 'Unary version' of Volkov's Theorem

Theorem (K. Auinger, M. V. Volkov, cca. 1991/92)

Let  $S$  be a unary semigroup such that  $\mathbf{V} = \text{var } S$  contains  $K_3$ . If there exist a group  $G$  which belongs to  $\mathbf{V}$  but not to  $\mathbf{H}(\mathbf{V})$ , then  $S$  is NFB.

## Corollary

The following unary semigroups are NFB:

- ▶ the full involution semigroup of binary relations  $\mathcal{R}_n^{\vee}$  ( $n \geq 2$ ), endowed with relational converse
- ▶ matrix semigroups with transposition  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is a finite field,  $|\mathbb{F}| \geq 3$
- ▶ matrix semigroups  $(M_2(\mathbb{F}), \cdot, \dagger)$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is either a finite field such that  $|\mathbb{F}| \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , or a subfield of  $\mathbb{C}$  closed under complex conjugation, and  $\dagger$  is the unary operation of taking the *Moore-Penrose inverse*.

## Further applications (Auinger, ID, Volkov, 2012)

Aside the few 'sporadic' cases, the following involution semigroups are NFB:

- ▶ the *partition semigroup*  $\mathfrak{C}_n$ ,
- ▶ the *Brauer semigroup*  $\mathfrak{B}_n$ ,
- ▶ the *partial Brauer semigroup*  $P\mathfrak{B}_n$ ,
- ▶ the *annular semigroup*  $\mathfrak{A}_n$ ,
- ▶ the *partial annular semigroup*  $P\mathfrak{A}_n$ ,
- ▶ the *Jones semigroup*  $\mathfrak{J}_n$ ,
- ▶ the *partial Jones semigroup*  $P\mathfrak{J}_n$ .

All these semigroups play significant roles in representation theory.

## However...

The Auinger-Volkov paper remained unpublished for 20 years (!), because the following question remained unsettled.

### Problem

*Exactly which of the involution semigroups  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$  are NFB,  $n \geq 2$ ,  $\mathbb{F}$  is a finite field?*

Also, the following open problem was both intriguing and inviting.

### Problem

*Do finite **INFB** involution semigroups exist at all?*

## INFB...(?)

An algebra  $A$  is **inherently nonfinitely based (INFB)** if:

- ▶  $A$  generates a locally finite variety, and
- ▶ any locally finite variety  $\mathbf{V}$  containing  $A$  is NFB.

Said otherwise, for any **finite** set of identities  $\Sigma$  satisfied by  $A$ , the variety defined by  $\Sigma$  is **not** locally finite.

Therefore, problems concerning INFB algebras are in fact **Burnside**-type problems.

INFB algebras are a **powerful tool** for proving the NFB property; namely, the INFB property is “contagious”:

if  $\text{var } A$  is locally finite and contains an INFB algebra  $B$ , then  $A$  is NFB.

In particular,  $B$  is NFB.

## Finite INFB semigroups: a success story

M. V. Sapir, 1987: a full description of (finite) INFB semigroups.

**Zimin words:**  $Z_1 = x_1$  and  $Z_{n+1} = Z_n x_{n+1} Z_n$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

**Theorem (Sapir, 1987)**

*Let  $S$  be a finite semigroup. Then*

$$S \text{ is INFB} \iff S \not\cong Z_n \approx W$$

*for all  $n \geq 1$  and all words  $W \neq Z_n$ .*

Sapir also found an **effective** structural description of finite INFB semigroups, thus proving

**Theorem (Sapir, 1987)**

*It is decidable whether a finite semigroup is INFB or not.*

## Examples of finite INFB semigroups

The example: the 6-element Brandt inverse monoid

$$B_2^1 = \langle a, b : a^2 = b^2 = 0, aba = a, bab = b \rangle \cup \{1\}.$$

$B_2^1$  is representable by matrices (over any field):

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

$B_2^1$  is obtained by adjoining an identity element to the Rees matrix semigroup over the trivial group  $E = \{e\}$  with the sandwich matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} e & 0 \\ 0 & e \end{pmatrix}$$

# Examples of finite INFB semigroups

## Proposition

$B_2^1$  fails to satisfy a nontrivial identity of the form  $Z_n \approx W$ . Hence, it is INFB.

## Corollary

For any  $n \geq 2$  and any (semi)ring  $R$ , the matrix semigroup  $\mathcal{M}_n(R)$  is (I)NFB.

Since  $B_2^1 \in \text{var } A_2^1$ , where  $A_2$  is the 5-element semigroup from Volkov's theorem, we have that  $A_2^1$  is (I)NFB as well.

The same argument applies to  $\mathcal{T}_n$  ( $n \geq 3$ ),  $\mathcal{R}_n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ),  $\mathcal{PT}_n$  ( $n \geq 2$ ),...

# What a difference an involution makes? Well...

How on Earth is the case of unary semigroups different?

For example, an involution  $*$  can be defined on  $B_2^1$  by  $a^* = b$ ,  $b^* = a$ , the remaining 4 elements (which are idempotents:  $0, 1, ab, ba$ ) being fixed. This turns  $B_2^1$  into an inverse semigroup.

Surprise...!!!

Theorem (Sapir, 1993)

*$B_2^1$  is not INFB as an inverse semigroup. In fact, there is no finite INFB inverse semigroup at all!*

Still, the inverse semigroup  $B_2^1$  is NFB (Kleiman, 1979).

So, once again:

Problem

*Do finite INFB involution semigroups exist at all?*

# An INFB criterion for involution semigroups

Yes!

Theorem (ID, 2010)

*Let  $S$  be an involution semigroup such that  $\text{var } S$  is locally finite. If  $S$  fails to satisfy any nontrivial identity of the form*

$$Z_n \approx W,$$

*where  $W$  is an involutorial word (a word over the 'doubled' alphabet  $X \cup X^*$ ), then  $S$  is INFB.*

How about a (finite) example?

## 'C'mon baby, let's do the twist...!'

**Rescue:** Luckily,  $B_2^1$  admits one more involution aside from the inverse one: define the nilpotents  $a, b$  (and, of course,  $0, 1$ ) to be fixed by  $*$ , which results in  $(ab)^* = ba$  and  $(ba)^* = ab$ .

In this way we obtain the **twisted Brandt monoid**  $TB_2^1$ .

### Proposition

$TB_2^1$  fails to satisfy a nontrivial identity of the form  $Z_n \approx W$ .  
Hence, it is INFB.

Similarly to  $B_2^1$ , this little guy is quite powerful.

### Remark

Analogously, one can also define  $TA_2^1$ , the “involutional version” of  $A_2^1$ , which is also INFB.

## Examples of finite INFB involution semigroups

- ▶  $\mathcal{R}_n^\vee$ , the involution semigroup of binary relations, is (I)NFB for all  $n \geq 2$ ,
  - ▶ **Reason:**  $TB_2^1$  embeds into  $\mathcal{R}_2^\vee$ .
- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{F})$ , provided  $|\mathbb{F}| \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ ,
  - ▶ **Reason:** This is precisely the case when  $-1$  has a square root in  $\mathbb{F}$ , which is sufficient and necessary for  $TB_2^1$  to embed into  $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{F})$ .
- ▶  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$  for **all**  $n \geq 3$  and **all** finite fields  $\mathbb{F}$ .
  - ▶ **Reason:**  $TB_2^1$  embeds into  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$  as a consequence of the **Chevalley-Warning theorem** from algebraic number theory (!!!).

So, what about  $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{F})$  if  $|\mathbb{F}| \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ ?

(We already know it is NFB.)

# Non-INFB results

## Theorem (ID, 2010)

*Let  $S$  be a finite involution semigroup satisfying a nontrivial identity of the form  $Z_n \approx W$  such that  $B_2^1 \notin \text{var } S$ . Then  $S$  is not INFB.*

**Proof idea:** Either  $W$  is an ordinary semigroup word, or for any  $*$ -fixed idempotent  $e$  of  $S$ ,  $\text{var } eSe$  consists of involution semilattices of Archimedean semigroups.

## Theorem (ID, 2010)

*Let  $S$  be a finite semigroup satisfying an identity of the form  $Z_n \approx Z_n W$ . Then  $S$  is not INFB.*

**Proof idea:** Stretching the approach of Margolis & Sapir (1995) developed for finitely generated quasivarieties of semigroups to what seems to be the final limits of that method: certain semigroup quasiidentities can be “encoded” into unary semigroup identities.

# Non-INFB results

## Corollary

No finite regular  $*$ -semigroup is INFB.  
(Namely,  $x \approx x(x^*x)$  holds.)

## Corollary (ID, 2010)

For any finite group  $G$ , the involution semigroup of subsets  $\mathcal{P}_G^* = (\mathcal{P}(G), \cdot, *)$  is not INFB.  
(Namely,  $\mathcal{P}_G^*$  satisfies  $Z_n \approx Z_n x_1^* x_1$  for  $n = |G| + 2$ .)

## Remark

The ordinary power semigroup  $\mathcal{P}_G = (\mathcal{P}(G), \cdot)$  is INFB if and only if  $G$  is not Dedekind.

## Non-INFB results

### Proposition (Crvenković, 1982)

*If a finite involution semigroup  $S$  admits a Moore-Penrose inverse  $\dagger$ , then the inverse is term-definable in  $S$ .*

In particular, such a semigroup satisfies  $x \approx x \cdot w(x, x^*) \cdot x$  for some  $w \implies$  it is not INFB.

### Proposition

*The involution semigroup of  $2 \times 2$  matrices over a finite field  $\mathbb{F}$  with transposition admits a Moore-Penrose inverse if and only if  $|\mathbb{F}| \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ .*

This completes our classification! 

# Solution to the (I)NFB problem for matrix involution semigroups

Theorem (Auinger, ID, Volkov)

Let  $n \geq 2$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  be a finite field. Then

- (1)  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$  is not finitely based;
- (2)  $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$  is INFB if and only if either  $n \geq 3$ , or  $n = 2$  and  $|\mathbb{F}| \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ .

# The gap

Unfortunately, we have not yet accomplished a full classification of finite involution semigroups with respect to the INFB property. We don't know what to do with finite involution semigroups (if they exist) such that:

- (a)  $B_2^1 \in \text{var } S$ ,
- (b)  $S$  satisfies a nontrivial identity of the form  $Z_n \approx W$ ,
- (c)  $S$ , however, fails to satisfy an identity of the form  $Z_n \approx Z_n W'$ .

This “gap” does not occur for ordinary semigroups, as (b) renders (a) impossible. But this is no longer the case for involution semigroups!

## Test-Example

Is  $xyxzyx \approx yxx^*xzxyx$  implying the non-INFB property?

# TAPADH LEAT!

## THANK YOU!

---

Questions and comments to:

**[dockie@dmu.ac.uk](mailto:dockie@dmu.ac.uk)**

Further information may be found at:

**<http://sites.dmu.ac.uk/personal/dolinkai>**