# MATRIX COMMUTATORS 

M. F. SMILEY

Introduction. A classical theorem states that if a square matrix $B$ over an algebraically closed field $F$ commutes with all matrices $X$ over $F$ which commute with a matrix $A$ over $F$, then $B$ must be a polynomial in $A$ with coefficients in $F$ (2). Recently Marcus and Khan (1) generalized this theorem to double commutators. Our purpose is to complete the generalization to commutators of any order.

Let $F$ be an algebraically closed field and let $F_{n}$ be the ring of all $n$ by $n$ matrices with elements in $F$. We define $\Delta_{Y} Z=[Z, Y]=Z Y-Y Z$ for all $Y, Z$ in $F_{n}$.

Theorem. Let $A, B \in F_{n}$ be such that for some positive integer $s, \Delta_{A}{ }^{s} X=0$ for $X$ in $F_{n}$ implies that $\Delta_{X}{ }^{s} B=0$. Let the characteristic of $F$ be 0 or at least $n$. Then $B$ is a polynomial in $A$ with coefficients in $F$.

For $s=1$ we have the classical theorem except for the restriction on the characteristic of $F$. For $s=2$ we have the result of Marcus and Khan with a bit more freedom for the characteristic of $F$. We feel that even for $s=2$ our proof has interest. We first observe that $s>1$ is "rather without meaning" for semi-simple matrices and then we use this observation to reduce our theorem to the classical case. Here we call $A$ in $F_{n}$ semi-simple in case the roots of the minimal polynominal of $A$ are distinct.

1. Some lemmas. The results of this section will be used in the next section in which we will prove our theorem.

Lemma 1. If $A$ is semi-simple in $F_{n}$, then $\Delta_{A}{ }^{s} X=0$ for some positive integer s only if $\Delta_{A} X=0$.

Proof. We use induction on $s$. Let $E_{k}(k=1, \ldots, q)$ be the principal idempotents of $A$ so that $A=\mu_{1} E_{1}+\ldots+\mu_{q} E_{q}$ with $\mu_{k} \in F(k=1, \ldots, q)$. Then each $E_{k}$ is a polynomial in $A$ with coefficients in $F$. The Jacobi identity $[Y,[Z, W]]+[Z,[W, Y]]+[W,[Y, Z]]=0$ for all $Y, Z, W$ in $F_{n}$ shows that if $E=E_{k}(k=1, \ldots, q)$, then $\Delta_{A} \Delta_{E} Y-\Delta_{E} \Delta_{A} Y=0$ for all $Y$ in $F_{n}$. Now $\Delta_{A}{ }^{s} X=\left[\Delta_{A}{ }^{s-1} X, A\right]=0$ gives $\left[\Delta_{A}{ }^{s-1} X, E\right]=0$ and hence $\Delta_{A}{ }^{s-1} \Delta_{E} X=0$. By our inductive hypothesis, $\Delta_{A} \Delta_{E} X=0$ from which $\Delta_{E}{ }^{2} X=0$ follows at once. But $\Delta_{E}{ }^{2} X=2 E X E+X E-E X=0$ yields $E X=X E$ upon right and left multiplication by $E$. Thus $\Delta_{E} X=0$ for all $E=E_{k}(k=1, \ldots, q)$ and consequently $\Delta_{A} X=0$, completing our inductive proof of the lemma.

An alternative proof of Lemma 1 is suggested by the referee. We may assume that $A$ is a diagonal matrix and use the well-known matrix representation $L=I \otimes A-A \otimes I$ for $\Delta_{A}$, where $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product. But then $L$ is a diagonal matrix so that $L$ and $L^{s}$ have the same null-space, and this proves Lemma 1.

At this point we introduce the usual matrix units $e_{i j}(i, j=1, \ldots, k)$ in $F_{k}$. The matrix $e_{i j}$ has 1 in the $i$ th row and $j$ th column and zeros elsewhere.

Lemma 2. In $F_{k}$, let $C=\lambda I_{k}+e_{21}+e_{32}+\ldots+e_{k k-1}$ with $\lambda$ in $F$ and $X=e_{11}+2 e_{22}+\ldots+k e_{k k}$. Then $\Delta_{C}{ }^{2} X=0$, and for $Y=(C-\lambda) X$, $\Delta_{C}{ }^{2} Y=0$.
Proof. A simple computation shows that $\Delta_{C} X=X C-C X=C-\lambda I_{k}$. Since $\Delta_{C}(C-\lambda) T=(C-\lambda) \Delta_{C} T$ for all $T$ in $F_{k}$, the lemma follows. (The matrices $X$ and $Y$ are special cases of certain matrices used in (1) on pp. 273-274.)

Lemma 3. Let $C, X, Y$ be as in Lemma 2 and let $B \in F_{k}$. Assume that the characteristic of $F$ is 0 or at least $k$. Then $[B, X]=0$ implies that $B$ is a diagonal matrix and $[B, X]=[B, Y]=0$ implies that $B$ is a scalar matrix.

Proof. With $B=\Sigma b_{1 j} e_{i j}$ we find that $B X=\Sigma j b_{i j} e_{i j}$ and $X B=\Sigma i b_{i j} e_{i j}$. Hence $[B, X]=0$ gives $b_{i j}=0$ for $i \neq j$ and $i, j=1, \ldots, k$. With $B=\operatorname{diag}\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{k}\right), \quad Y B=b_{1} e_{21}+2 b_{2} e_{32}+\ldots+(k-1) b_{k-1} e_{k k-1}$ and $B Y=b_{2} e_{21}+2 b_{3} e_{32}+\ldots+(k-1) b_{k} e_{k k-1}$. Hence $[B, Y]=0$ yields $b_{1}=b_{2}=\ldots=b_{k}$ so that $B$ is a scalar matrix.
2. Proof of the theorem. In this section we use the lemmas of $\S 1$ to prove our theorem. Since we shall use the classical result $(s=1)$ in our proof, we assume that $s$ is at least 2 .
We may clearly assume that $A \in F_{n}$ is in Jordan normal form:

$$
A=\operatorname{diag}\left(C_{1}, \ldots, C_{t}\right)=\operatorname{diag}\left(J_{1}, \ldots, J_{q}\right)
$$

where each $C_{i}(i=1, \ldots, t)$ is an $n_{i}$ by $n_{i}$ matrix corresponding to an elementary divisor $\left(x-\lambda_{i}\right)^{p^{p}}$ of $A$ and each $J_{k}$ is an $m_{k}$ by $m_{k}$ matrix with a single characteristic root $\mu_{k}$ and $\mu_{k} \neq \mu_{l}$ for $k \neq l(k, l=1, \ldots, q)$.

Take $X=\operatorname{diag}(1, \ldots, n)$ and use Lemma 2 to obtain $\Delta_{A}{ }^{2} X=0$ and hence $\Delta_{x}{ }^{s} B=0$. By Lemma 1, since $X$ is semi-simple, $\Delta_{X} B=0$ and $B$ must be diagonal by Lemma 3. We write $B=\operatorname{diag}\left(B_{1}, \ldots, B_{t}\right), X=\operatorname{diag}\left(X_{1}, \ldots\right.$, $X_{t}$ ) conformally with $A=\operatorname{diag}\left(C_{1}, \ldots, C_{t}\right)$. With $Y=\operatorname{diag}\left(\left(C_{1}-\lambda_{1}\right)\right.$ $\left.X_{1}, \ldots,\left(C_{t}-\lambda_{t}\right) X_{t}\right)$, we have $\Delta_{A}{ }^{2} Y=0$ by Lemma 2 and also $\Delta_{A}{ }^{2}(X+Y)$ $=0$. Since $X+Y$ is semi-simple, $\Delta_{X+Y} B=\Delta_{Y} B=0$. By Lemma 3, $B_{i}=c_{i} I_{n i}$ with $c_{i}$ in $F(i=1, \ldots, t)$. Now let $C_{i}$ and $C_{i+1}$ have the same characteristic root $\lambda$ and let $U$ be an $\left(n_{i}+n_{i+1}\right)$-rowed square matrix whose only non-zero element is 1 in the last row and first column. If $Z=\operatorname{diag}(0, U, 0)$ in conformity with $A=\operatorname{diag}\left(C_{1}, \ldots, C_{t}\right)$, then $Z A=A Z=\lambda Z$ so that
$\Delta_{A} Z=0$. Since $X+Z$ is semi-simple, we obtain $\Delta_{X+Z} B=\Delta_{Z} B=0$ from which $c_{i}=c_{i+1}$ follows. Thus if $B=\operatorname{diag}\left(B_{01}, \ldots, B_{0 q}\right)$ in conformity with $A=\operatorname{diag}\left(J_{1}, \ldots, J_{q}\right)$, then $B_{0 k}=d_{k} I_{m k}$ with $d_{k}$ in $F(k=1, \ldots, q)$. Now if $[W, A]=0$ it is well known that $W=\operatorname{diag}\left(W_{1}, \ldots, W_{q}\right)$ in conformity with $A=\operatorname{diag}\left(J_{1}, \ldots, J_{q}\right)$. A direct proof of this statement goes as follows. Partition $W$ into blocks $W_{k l}$ in conformity with $A=\operatorname{diag}\left(J_{1}, \ldots, J_{q}\right)$. If $Y=W_{k l}$ with $k \neq l$, then $[W, A]=0$ gives $(\rho I+C) Y=Y D$ with $C$ and $D$ nil-potent and $\rho$ non-zero in $F$. Thus $Y\left(R_{D}-R_{C}\right)=\rho Y$ where $R_{D}, L_{C}$ denote right and left multiplications by $C, D$, respectively. Since $C$ and $D$ are nil-potent, so is $R_{D}-L_{C}$, and it follows that $\rho^{i} Y=0, Y=0$. Now we see that $[W, A]=0$ for $W$ in $F_{n}$ implies that $[W, B]=0$ and we complete the proof of our theorem by an appeal to the classical case.
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