“What Is a Complex Matroid?”

Günter M. Ziegler

Konrad-Zuse-Zentrum für Informationstechnik Berlin (ZIB),
Heilbronner Strasse 10, 1000 Berlin 31, Federal Republic of Germany
ziegler@zib-berlin.de

Abstract. Following an “ansatz” of Björner and Ziegler [BZ], we give an axiomatic development of finite sign vector systems that we call *complex matroids*. This includes, as special cases, the sign vector systems that encode complex arrangements according to [BZ], and the complexified oriented matroids, whose complements were considered by Gel’fand and Rybnikov [GeR].

Our framework makes it possible to study complex hyperplane arrangements as entirely combinatorial objects. By comparing complex matroids with *2-matroids*, which model the more general 2-arrangements introduced by Goresky and MacPherson [GoM], the essential combinatorial meaning of a “complex structure” can be isolated.

Our development features a topological representation theorem for 2-matroids and complex matroids, and the computation of the cohomology of the complement of a 2-arrangement, including its multiplicative structure in the complex case. Duality is established in the cases of complexified oriented matroids, and for realizable complex matroids. Complexified oriented matroids are shown to be matroids with coefficients in the sense of Dress and Wenzel [D1], [DW1], but this fails in general.

Introduction

For $z \in \mathbb{C}$ define a *complex sign* $s^{(1)}(z) \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}$ according to whether the imaginary part $\Im(z)$ of z is positive or negative, or z is real and positive, negative, or zero:

$$s^{(1)}(z) := \begin{cases} i & \text{if } \Im(z) > 0, \\ j & \text{if } \Im(z) < 0, \\ + & \text{if } \Im(z) = 0 \text{ and } z > 0, \\ - & \text{if } \Im(z) = 0 \text{ and } z < 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } z = 0. \end{cases}$$

If $\mathcal{B} = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ is an arrangement of linear complex hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}^d$ given by $H_a = \ker(\ell_a)$, then we can associate a sign vector

$$\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}) := (\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\ell_1(\mathbf{z})), \dots, \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\ell_n(\mathbf{z}))) \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$$

with every $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$. Using this simple procedure, described in Section 1 of [BZ], every complex hyperplane arrangement $\mathcal{B}$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$ can be encoded by a system

$$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}(\mathcal{B}) := \{\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}) : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d\} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$$

of “complex sign vectors.” This sign vector system encodes the topological structure of $\mathcal{B}$ up to homeomorphism. It satisfies properties that are quite analogous to the (covector) axioms for oriented matroids.

More generally, let $\mathcal{B}'$ be a 2-arrangement in the sense of Goresky and MacPherson [GoM]: an arrangement of codimension-2 subspaces in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ such that all intersections have even codimension. After a choice of defining equations a very similar procedure [BZ, Section 8] associates a sign vector system $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{B}') \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ with every 2-arrangement.

In what follows we identify the main structural properties of the sign vector systems of complex arrangements and of 2-arrangements, and use them to develop axiom systems for 2-matroids and complex matroids. This proposes an answer to the question in the title, which arises naturally from our work in [BZ], and was also posed to us by R. D. MacPherson.

The two axiom systems are shown to be complete in the following sense: every 2-matroid can be represented by a pseudo 2-arrangement, that is, by an arrangement of codimension-2 subspheres in some S^{2d-1} (with an “oriented matroid frame”). This technical result allows us to reduce the theory of 2-matroids to the well-studied [BLS⁺] theory of oriented matroids. Every complex matroid satisfies an extra axiom, which is strong enough to guarantee a topological structure that resembles a complex arrangement at least up to its cohomological invariants.

The motivation for all this work is at least fourfold:

- The axiomatic framework allows us to test the quality of the combinatorial model. A successful development of the theory indicates that all the relevant combinatorial properties have been identified. Here “successful” means that the combinatorial model can be shown to capture the main geometric and topological properties of the situation. In our case, the main tests are
 - (i) topological representation,
 - (ii) duality theory, and
 - (iii) cohomological structure.
- The combinatorial framework can help in the study of complex arrangements, by explaining and exploiting the analogy to real arrangements and their description in terms of oriented matroids.

- The question about how well the geometric situation can be approximated by combinatorial methods is quite fundamental. Striking recent instances of this question are the problem of the “MacPhersonian” which appears in the work of Gel’fand and MacPherson on Pontrjagin classes [MP], [GeM], and the “Generalized Baues Problem” that occurred in Billera *et al.*’s [BKS] work on polyhedral subdivisions.
- Finally, the question “*What is a complex structure?*” is a fundamental one. In the axiomatic approach to 2-matroids this gets a precise framework: we can develop the combinatorial model for “even subspace arrangements” à la Goresky and MacPherson [GoM], and then isolate the combinatorial conditions that distinguish the arrangements with a complex structure from general ones.

For the development of this theory, we have three different options.

1. A plain axiomatic development, starting from a basic axiom system, could be performed. This could be done very much **in parallel** to the theory of oriented matroids, as expositied in [BLS⁺].
2. Starting from the axioms of a 2-matroid, we can construct an oriented matroid of double rank that “subdivides” it. Then the well-developed theory of oriented matroids can be used to derive the fundamental structural properties of 2-matroids. This amounts to a development of the theory of 2-matroids **on top of** oriented matroid theory. *This we do in what follows.*
3. A theory of “matroids with cellular coefficients” that covers the theory of oriented matroids as well as the theory of complex matroids (in various stratifications) and other relevant cases (e.g., the matroids with quaternionic coefficients) could be designed. This development **in generality** would probably be the most powerful alternative. One step in this direction is the theory of “matroids with coefficients” of Dress and Wenzel [D1], [DW1]–[DW3], which is very much in the spirit of what is needed. However, it is (in our opinion) too closely modeled after the paradigm of rings modulo a subgroup of units, and does not cover the case of 2-matroids, see Section 6. We do not attempt to carry out this program here.

1. An Axiom System

Most of the following conventions, definitions, and terminology are derived from oriented matroid conventions [BLS⁺, Chapter 4], as used before, see Definition 4.1 of [BZ]. We repeat them here in order to make this discussion reasonably self-contained. Also, we adapt the notation of elimination sets from [K], which turns out to be quite useful.

Definition 1.1. The set of *complex signs* is $\Sigma_2 := \{i, j, +, -, 0\}$. Its partial order is given by $i, j > +, - > 0$, that is,

Let E denote a finite *ground set*. A (complex) *sign vector* is an element of $\{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$. Sign vectors are partially ordered componentwise.

Definition 1.2. Let $Z, W \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ be complex sign vectors.

(i) The *real set* of Z is

$$\text{Re}(Z) := \{a \in E : Z_a \in \{+, -, 0\}\},$$

the *zero set* of Z is

$$\text{Ze}(Z) := \{a \in E : Z_a = 0\}.$$

Hence, $\text{Ze}(Z) \subseteq \text{Re}(Z) \subseteq E$. We use the notation

$$\underline{Z} := \{e \in E : Z_e \neq 0\} = E \setminus \text{Ze}(Z)$$

for the *nonzero support*.

- (ii) A sign vector X is called *real* if it lies in $\{+, -, 0\}^E$, that is, if $\text{Re}(X) = E$. A sign vector Z is *imaginary* if it lies in $\{i, j, 0\}^E$, that is, if $\text{Re}(Z) = \text{Ze}(Z)$. In this case we write it as $Z = iY$, for a real sign vector Y .
- (iii) The *composition* of Z and W is the sign vector $Z \circ W \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ defined componentwise by

$$(Z \circ W)_a := Z_a \circ W_a = \begin{cases} W_a & \text{if } W_a > Z_a, \\ Z_a & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(iv) The *separation set* of Z and W is

$$\begin{aligned} S(Z, W) &:= \{a \in E : Z_a = -W_a \neq 0\} \\ &= \{a \in E : (Z \circ W)_a \neq (W \circ Z)_a\}. \end{aligned}$$

- (v) Every $Z \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ can be written as $Z = X \circ iY$ for real vectors $X, Y \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$. In this case Y and $Y \circ X$ are uniquely determined, where $Y \leq Y \circ X$. Thus the representation $Z = X \circ iY$ with $X, Y \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$ exists and is unique if we additionally require $Y \leq X$.

- (vi) For $Z = X \circ iY$ with $X, Y \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$, we write $\Im(Z) := Y$ for the *imaginary part* of Z , and $\mathfrak{E}(Z) := i(Y \circ X)$ for the *epsilon scaling* of Z .

Note that all of these operations on vectors are performed componentwise, which makes them easy to handle. They should all be interpreted with respect to the $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$ -sign function

$$\mathbf{s}^{(1)}: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \{i, j, +, -, 0\}, \quad x + iy \mapsto \begin{cases} i & \text{if } y > 0, \\ j & \text{if } y < 0, \\ + & \text{if } y = 0, \ x > 0, \\ - & \text{if } y = 0, \ x < 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } y = x = 0. \end{cases}$$

This is also applied to vectors componentwise, so that if $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, then $Z := \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z})$ records the complex signs of the components of $\mathbf{z}$. The ratio behind part (vi) of Definition 1.2 is that $\mathfrak{E}(Z) = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(e^{i\varepsilon}\mathbf{z})$ for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$. In particular, $\mathfrak{E}(Z)$ is always imaginary, $\mathfrak{E}(\mathfrak{E}(Z)) = \mathfrak{E}(Z)$, and $\text{Ze}(\mathfrak{E}(Z)) = \text{Ze}(Z)$.

Definition 1.3 (see Section 9.4 of [BZ]). Let E be a finite ground set. A *2-matroid* is a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ of complex sign vectors that satisfies the following set of axioms:

- (K0) $(00 \cdots 0) \in \mathcal{X}$. [Zero]
- (K1) $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ implies $-Z \in \mathcal{X}$. [Symmetry]
- (K2) For all $Z, Z' \in \mathcal{X}$ we have $Z \circ Z' \in \mathcal{X}$. [Composition]
- (K3) For all $Z', Z'' \in \mathcal{X}$ and $f \in S(Z', Z'')$, there is a $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} Z_f &< Z'_f, \\ Z_g &= (Z' \circ Z'')_g \quad \text{for } g \notin S(Z', Z''), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$Z_g \leq Z'_g \quad \text{or} \quad Z_g \leq Z''_g \quad \text{for } g \in S(Z', Z''). \quad \text{[Elimination]}$$

- (K4) For $Z \in \mathcal{X}$, $Z_g \neq 0$, and $\sigma \in \{+, -, i, j\}$, there is a $Z' \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Ze}(Z') = \text{Ze}(Z)$ and $Z'_g = \sigma$. [Rotation]

These axioms are analogs of the covector axioms for oriented matroids [EM], [BLS⁺, 4.1.1]. In fact, $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^n$ is an oriented matroid if and only if it satisfies (K0)–(K3). In this case, $i\mathcal{L} \subseteq \{0, i, j\}^n$ and $\mathcal{L} \uplus \{(ii \cdots i), (jj \cdots j)\}$ also satisfy the axioms (K0)–(K3), but they are not 2-matroids. (For example, this includes the system $\{(00), (+0), (-0), (ii), (jj)\}$.) The only “new ingredient” is the rotation axiom (K4).

We note that (K0) is a simple consequence of (K1) and (K3) if $\mathcal{X} \neq \emptyset$.

The third condition in (K3), for the case $g \in S(Z', Z'')$, was not included in Theorems 4.3(3) and 9.4(3) of [BZ]. Note that it is vacuous in the oriented matroid case. We do not know whether it is implied by the other axioms. It enters the proofs for Lemmas 1.5 and 2.3, which are crucial steps of our development.

Let $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ be a sign vector system, and let $Z', Z'' \in \mathcal{K}$ be two sign vectors and $f \in S(Z', Z'')$. We say that $Z \in \mathcal{K}$ *eliminates f between Z' and Z''* if

$$\begin{cases} Z_g < Z'_g & \text{for } g = f, \\ Z_g = (Z' \circ Z'')_g & \text{for } g \notin S(Z', Z''), \\ Z_g \leq Z'_g \text{ or } Z_g \leq Z''_g & \text{for } g \in S(Z', Z'') \setminus f. \end{cases}$$

We define the *elimination set* $I_f(Z', Z'')$ to be the set of all sign vectors that eliminate f between Z' and Z'' .

With this, we can restate the 2-matroid axioms in more “shorthand” notation:

- (K0) $0 \in \mathcal{K}$. [Zero]
- (K1) $\mathcal{K} = -\mathcal{K}$. [Symmetry]
- (K2) $\mathcal{K} \circ \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{K}$. [Composition]
- (K3) $f \in S(Z', Z'')$ implies $I_f(Z', Z'') \neq \emptyset$. [Elimination]
- (K4) $\text{Ze}\{Z \in \mathcal{K} : Z_g \in \{0, \sigma\}\} = \text{Ze}(\mathcal{K})$ for $\sigma \neq 0, g \in E$. [Rotation]

In the next section we give a precise topological representation of all 2-matroids. The following should suffice as examples, for the moment. See also Example 4.3, which contains a classification of all 2-matroids on two elements.

Proposition 1.4.

- (1) For every complex arrangement, the sign vector system $\mathcal{K} := \mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, as described in the introduction, forms a 2-matroid.
- (2) The sign vector system derived from any 2-arrangement $\mathcal{B} = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ by choosing defining equations (as in Example 8.5 of [B2] and Theorem 4.1 of [Z]) is a 2-matroid. For this let $H_a = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : l_a(z) = l'_a(z) = 0\}$, where $\text{rank}\{l_a, l'_a : a \in A\}$ is even for all $A \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, and set

$$\mathcal{K} := \{\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}(z) := (\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(l_1(z) + il'_1(z)), \dots, \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(l_n(z) + il'_n(z))) : z \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}\}.$$

- (3) The sign vector system $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L}$ of a complexified oriented matroid is a 2-matroid, where $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^n$ is the covector span of an oriented matroid [GeR], [BZ, Example 8.6].
- (4) The system $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{L}' \circ i\mathcal{L}$ for $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}' \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^n$ is a 2-matroid if and only if $\mathcal{L}', \mathcal{L}$ are oriented matroids, and the underlying matroids of $\mathcal{L}'$ and $\mathcal{L}$ coincide (i.e., $\text{Ze}(\mathcal{L}') = \text{Ze}(\mathcal{L})$). In this case we refer to $\mathcal{K} := \mathcal{L}' \circ i\mathcal{L}$ as a quasi-complexified 2-matroid.

Proof. Note that (1) is a special case of (2), and (3) is a special case of (4). Verification is easy in each of these cases: see also the proof given for part (1) in Theorem 4.3 of [BZ].

For (2), for every $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ we can find $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with $\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}) = Z$. Then we have $\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ for (K0), $\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(-\mathbf{z}) = -\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z})$ for (K1), and

$$\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z} + \varepsilon \mathbf{z}') = \mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}) \circ \mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}')$$

for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$. For (K3) we consider $\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(1)}(\lambda \mathbf{z} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{z}')$ and adjust λ (with $0 < \lambda < 1$) to satisfy $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}((l_f + il'_f)(\lambda \mathbf{z} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{z}')) < \mathbf{s}^{(1)}((l_f + il'_f)(\mathbf{z}))$. Finally, for (K4) we consider $\pm \mathbf{s}^{(1)}((1/z_g)\mathbf{z})$ and $\pm \mathbf{s}^{(1)}((i/z_g)\mathbf{z})$.

In the situation of (4) it is easy to see that $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{L}'$ have to be oriented matroids, see parts (ii) and (iii) of Lemma 1.5 below. For the converse, (K0), (K1), and (K2) are satisfied by construction. For (K3), consider $X' \circ iX$, $Y' \circ iY \in \mathcal{L}' \circ i\mathcal{L}$. If $e \in S(X, Y)$, then we take $U \in I_e(X, Y)$, to find that $(X' \circ Y') \circ iU \in I_e(X' \circ iX, Y' \circ iY)$ eliminates correctly. For $e \in S(X', Y')$ with $X_e = Y_e = 0$, we take $U' \in I_e(X', Y')$, and check that $U' \circ i(X \circ Y) \in I_e(X' \circ iX, Y' \circ iY)$ eliminates as required. Finally, (K4) requires that for every nonzero covector $X \in \mathcal{L}$ we find a nonzero covector $X' \in \mathcal{L}'$ with the same support, and conversely. Considering minimal nonzero covectors (cocircuits), this means that the underlying matroids of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}'$ coincide. $\square$

In the following lemma we construct a matroid and two oriented matroids associated with a 2-matroid, generalizing the discussion of Section 4 of [BZ].

Lemma 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ be a 2-matroid.*

- (i) $L := \{Z \in \mathcal{X} : Z \in \mathcal{X}\}$, ordered by inclusion, is a geometric lattice. The corresponding matroid is denoted by $M = M(\mathcal{X})$. The rank of $\mathcal{X}$ is defined to be $r = r(\mathcal{X}) := r(M(\mathcal{X})) = r(L)$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{L} := \{\mathfrak{Z}(Z) : Z \in \mathcal{X}\} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^E$ is the set of covectors of an oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}} = \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{L})$, whose rank is denoted by $r^{\mathbb{R}} := r(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}})$.
- (iii) $\mathcal{L}' := \mathcal{X} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E$ is the set of covectors of an oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}' = \mathcal{M}'(\mathcal{L}')$, whose rank is denoted by $r' := r(\mathcal{M}')$.
- (iv) There are strong maps of matroids $M^{\mathbb{R}} := \mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow M \rightarrow \mathcal{M}' =: M'$. In particular, $r' \leq r \leq r^{\mathbb{R}}$.

Proof. (i) We consider $L := Z\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq 2^E$ as a collection of subsets (“flats”) of E . It contains E by (K0) and is closed under intersection by (K2).

For every flat $A' \in L$ we have to show that the minimal flats that properly contain A' partition $E \setminus A'$. Let $e \notin A'$ and let $\overline{A'} \cup e$ be the smallest flat that contains $A' \cup e$. If it is not minimal, then we find $A' \subset A'' \subset \overline{A'} \cup e$ and $f \in A'' \setminus A'$ with $e \notin A''$.

Now by (K4) we can find $Z', Z'' \in \mathcal{X}$ with $Z\mathcal{E}(Z') = A'$, $Z\mathcal{E}(Z'') = A''$, and $Z'_e = -Z''_e = +$. By (K3) there is some $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ with $Z_e = 0$, $Z_f \neq 0$, and $f \in \underline{Z} \subseteq (\underline{Z'} \cup \underline{Z''}) \setminus e = \underline{Z'} \setminus e$. Hence for $A := Z\mathcal{E}(Z)$ we get $e \in A$ with $A' \subset A$, $f \notin A$, contradicting the definition of $\overline{A'} \cup e$.

(ii) Axioms (K0)–(K3) for 2-matroids reduce to the covector axioms for oriented matroids [EM], [BLS⁺, 4.1.1] under the map $Z \mapsto \mathfrak{Z}(Z)$.

(iii) Similarly, axioms (K0)–(K3) for the 2-matroid $\mathcal{K}$ restrict to the oriented matroid axioms for $\mathcal{L}'$.

(iv) Let $A = Ze(Z) \in L$ for some $Z \in \mathcal{K}$. By reorientation according to (K4), we get for every $e \in E \setminus A$ a covector $Z^{(e)} \in \mathcal{L}'$ with $Ze(Z^{(e)}) = Ze(Z)$ and $Z_e^{(e)} = i$. Composing all these covectors $Z^{(e)}$ for $e \in E \setminus A$ we get by (K2) a covector $Z' \in \mathcal{L}'$ with $Ze(Z') = Ze(Z)$ and $Z' \in \{i, j, 0\}^E$. For this Z' we find $A = Ze(Z) = Ze(Z') = Ze(\Im(Z')) \in Ze(\mathcal{L}') = L(\mathcal{M}^R)$.

Finally, for $X \in \mathcal{L}'$ we also have $X \in \mathcal{K}$, so every flat of M' is a flat of M . $\square$

The following theorem characterizes quasi-complexified 2-matroids and complexified oriented matroids. Its second part extends Proposition 5.8 of [BZ], whose proof is not applicable here.

Theorem 1.6.

(1) *The following conditions are equivalent, for every 2-matroid*

$$\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E.$$

- (i) $r = r^R$.
- (i') $r = r'$.
- (ii) $M = M^R$, i.e., for every $Z \in \mathcal{K}$ there is some $Z' \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\underline{Z}' = \Im(Z)$.
- (ii') $M = M'$, i.e., for every $Z \in \mathcal{K}$ there is some real $X \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\underline{X} = \underline{Z}$.
- (iii) $i\Im(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$.
- (iii') $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E) \circ i\Im(\mathcal{K})$.
- (iv) $\mathcal{K}$ is a quasi-complexified 2-matroid.
- (2) *The following conditions are all equivalent, and imply the previous ones, for every 2-matroid $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$.*
 - (v) $\Im(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{K}$.
 - (vi) $\mathcal{K} = \Im(\mathcal{K}) \circ i\Im(\mathcal{K})$.
 - (vi') $\mathcal{K} = (\mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E) \circ i(\mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E)$.
 - (vii) $\mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E = \Im(\mathcal{K})$.
 - (viii) $\mathcal{K}$ is a complexified oriented matroid.

Proof. We start with part (1). (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) follows from Lemma 1.5(iv), since every rank-preserving strong map of matroids on the same ground set is the identity. From the same argument we get (i') $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii').

(iii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) is obvious. We also get (iii') $\Rightarrow$ (ii'), since the underlying matroids of $\Im(\mathcal{K})$ and of $\mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E$ have to coincide by Proposition 1.4(4).

For (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (ii') we use that every support is a union of minimal nonempty supports. Thus it suffices to consider $Z \in \mathcal{K}$ with minimal nonempty support. By (K4) we may assume that Z is not imaginary. Then from (ii) we get that there is some $Z' \in \mathcal{K}$ with $\underline{Z}' = \Im(Z) \subset \underline{Z}$, so $Z' = 0$ by minimality, and Z is real.

For (ii') $\Rightarrow$ (iii) let $Z \in \mathcal{K}$ have some $\{+, -\}$ -components. By (ii'), we find a real vector X with the same support as Z . Thus by elimination between Z and $\pm X$ we find a new vector in $\mathcal{K}$ with the same imaginary components, but less $\{+, -\}$ -components than Z . Iterating, we get $i\Im(Z) \in \mathcal{K}$.

For (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii'), let $Z = X \circ iY \in \mathcal{K}$ for $X, Y \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$. From (iii) we know that $iY \in \mathcal{K}$, so eliminating between Z and $-iY$ we obtain a vector $Z' \in \mathcal{K}$ whose support is contained in that of Z , and which agrees with Z in the real components of Z . Iterating this, we obtain a real vector $Z'' \in \mathcal{K}$ which agrees with Z in the real components of Z , and thus $Y \circ X = Y \circ Z'' \in \mathcal{K}$.

Finally, (iii') $\Leftrightarrow$ (iv) is clear.

In part (2), observe that the implications (viii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (vi) $\Rightarrow$ (v) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) are obvious.

For (v) $\Rightarrow$ (vi) we use that $M^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow M'$ is a strong map by Lemma 1.5(iv). Now from (v) we get that every flat of $M^{\mathbb{R}}$ is a flat of M' , and thus $M^{\mathbb{R}} = M'$. However, now from $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E$ we conclude that the oriented matroids $\mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{K})$ and $\mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^E$ have the same set of cocircuits, and thus they coincide.

Now (viii) $\Rightarrow$ (vi') $\Rightarrow$ (vii) $\Rightarrow$ (v) is again clear, and we are done. $\square$

We call $e \in E$ a *loop* of $\mathcal{K}$ if $Z_e = 0$ for all $Z \in \mathcal{K}$. The loops of a 2-matroid $\mathcal{K}$ coincide with the loops of its underlying matroid M , and with the loops of $\mathcal{K}^{\mathbb{R}}$ (by axiom (K4)). In some cases (like Theorem 3.1) it is convenient to assume that $\mathcal{K}$ is loop-free, or that all loops have been deleted from $\mathcal{K}$ (in the obvious way).

Finally, for any sign vector $Z \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ and $A \subseteq [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ we define the *reorientation* $-_A Z$ of Z on A by

$$(-_A Z)_a = \begin{cases} -Z_a & \text{if } a \in A, \\ Z_a & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Similarly, we define the reorientation of any sign vector system

$$\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$$

by $-_A \mathcal{K} := \{-_A Z : Z \in \mathcal{K}\}$. Clearly, $-_A \mathcal{K}$ is a 2-matroid if and only if $\mathcal{K}$ is one.

Remark 1.7. The reader may observe that the main results of our theory, including Lemma 2.4 and Theorem 3.5 below, can be extended to more general 2-matroids that do not necessarily satisfy (K4). Such 2-matroids can, besides loops, contain elements that are *real* or *imaginary* in the sense that $Z_e \in \{+, -, 0\}$ (resp. $Z_e \in \{i, j, 0\}$) for all $Z \in \mathcal{K}$. This covers the cases of oriented matroids $\mathcal{L}$ (for which every element is real) and of systems of the form $i\mathcal{L}$, for which all elements are imaginary. We do not pursue this extra generality. Let us only note that Lemma 1.5(i) becomes false without (K4).

2. Extension Lemma

The goal of this section is to prove Extension Lemma 2.4. This quite innocent-looking lemma is the key step in our reduction of 2-matroids to oriented matroids. We start with three simple preparatory lemmas. For simplicity we write

$W \in [Z', Z'']$ if for every $e \in E$ we have $W_e \leq Z'_e$ or $W_e \leq Z''_e$, or both. This is satisfied if $W \leq Z'$, if $W \leq Z''$, or if $W \in I_e(Z', Z'')$ for some $e \in S(Z', Z'')$.

Lemma 2.1. Assume that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ satisfies (K2). Then

- (i) $S(Z', Z'') = S(Z' \circ Z'', Z'' \circ Z')$, and
- (ii) $I_f(Z', Z'') = I_f(Z' \circ Z'', Z'' \circ Z')$ for $f \in S(Z', Z'')$.

This is immediate from the definitions. It implies that axiom (K3) need only be checked for pairs Z', Z'' with $Ze(Z') = Ze(Z'')$ and $Re(Z') = Re(Z'')$.

Lemma 2.2. Let $W, Z', Z'' \in \mathcal{X}$, with $W \in [Z', Z'']$ and $f \in S(Z', Z'')$.

- (i) If $W_f < Z'_f$, then $f \in S(Z', W \circ Z'')$, and $I_f(Z', W \circ Z'') \subseteq I_f(Z', Z'')$.
- (ii) If $W_f = Z'_f$, then $f \in S(W \circ Z'', Z'')$, and $I_f(W \circ Z'', Z'') \subseteq I_f(Z', Z'')$.
- (iii) If $W_f < Z'_f$ and $Z \in I_f(Z', Z'')$, then $W \leq W \circ Z \in I_f(Z', Z'')$.

Proof. The proofs for (i) and (ii) are easy, since we can argue componentwise. For this note that by replacing $Z'' \rightarrow W \circ Z''$ (resp. $Z' \rightarrow W \circ Z''$) we get smaller separation sets: $S(Z', W \circ Z'') \subseteq S(Z', Z'')$ (resp. $S(W \circ Z'', Z'') \subseteq S(Z', Z'')$). Thus the stronger condition (i.e., if g is not in the separation set) has to be verified on a smaller set of elements g .

Similarly, (iii) easily follows componentwise. We do this proof to demonstrate the general pattern.

$Z_f = -Z''_f \neq 0$, so $Z_f < Z'_f$, where $W_f < Z'_f$. Thus $W_f \circ Z_f < Z'_f$.

If $Z'_g = Z''_g$, then $Z_g = Z'_g$, where $W_g \leq Z'_g$. Thus $W_g \circ Z_g \leq Z'_g$.

If $Z'_g = -Z''_g \neq 0$, then $Z_g \leq Z'_g$ or $Z_g \leq Z''_g$, and also $W_g \leq Z'_g$ or $W_g \leq Z''_g$. Thus $W_g \circ Z_g \leq Z'_g$ or $W_g \circ Z_g \leq Z''_g$. $\square$

Lemma 2.3. Assuming (K2), axiom (K3) is equivalent to

$$(K3') \quad S(Z', Z'') \neq \emptyset \text{ implies } \bigcup_{g \in S(Z', Z'')} I_g(Z', Z'') \neq \emptyset. \quad [\text{Elimination}]$$

Proof. We use induction on $|S(Z', Z'')|$: by Lemma 2.1 we can assume that we are given $Z', Z'' \in \mathcal{X}$ of the same support and $f \in S(Z', Z'')$. By (K3') there is $Z \in I_g(Z', Z'')$ for some $g \in S(Z', Z'')$. If $Z_f < Z'_f$, then we are done. If $Z_f = Z'_f$, then we can replace Z' by $Z \circ Z''$, and be done by induction and Lemma 2.2(ii). The case $Z_f = Z''_f$ is handled symmetrically. $\square$

Now we go for the “big step.” Figure 2.1 is supposed to give the intuition for what is actually happening: we interpret the situation with respect to a real hyperplane $H_e^{\mathbb{R}} \cong \{Z \in \mathcal{X} : Z_e \in \{+, -, 0\}\}$ and to a flat $H_e \cong \{Z \in \mathcal{X} : Z_e = 0\} \subseteq H_e^{\mathbb{R}}$ of real codimension 2. The “new” hyperplane $H_e^{\mathbb{R}}$ is supposed to be inserted in such a way that $H_e = H_e^{\mathbb{R}} \cap H_e^{\mathbb{R}}$, where $H_e^{\mathbb{R}}$ arises from $H_e^{\mathbb{R}}$ by a small rotation in clockwise order. In Fig. 2.1 each of the nine cells of the subdivision of the plane by $H_e^{\mathbb{R}}$ and $H_e^{\mathbb{R}}$ are labeled by the pair (Z_e, Z_e) .

Fig. 2.1. Sketch for the construction of $\mathcal{K} \uplus e^!$ in Lemma 2.4.

More algebraically, this corresponds (for the case of a complex hyperplane arrangement) to the insertion of a second copy $\ker(\ell_e)$ of the complex hyperplane $\ker(\ell_e)$, which is given by $\ell_e(z) := e^{ie}\ell_e(z)$, for small enough $\varepsilon > 0$.

Having this picture in mind, we write down the set of sign vectors of the extended arrangement in terms of the original one, and verify that the extension again satisfies the axioms.

Extension Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^E$ be a 2-matroid, and $e \in E$. Then*

$$\mathcal{K}^! := \mathcal{K}_1^! \uplus \mathcal{K}_2^! \uplus \mathcal{K}_3^! \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^{E \uplus e^!}$$

is a 2-matroid on the extended ground set $E \uplus \{e^!\}$, where

$$\mathcal{K}_1^! := \{\pm(Z, i) : Z \in \mathcal{K}, Z_e \in \{i, +\}\},$$

$$\mathcal{K}_2^! := \{\pm(Z, 0) : Z \in \mathcal{K}, Z_e = 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{K}_3^! := \{\pm(Z, i), \pm(Z, +) : W, Z \in \mathcal{K}, W \leq Z, W_e = +, Z_e = j\}.$$

Note that in this lemma $\mathcal{K}_1^! \uplus \mathcal{K}_2^! = \{(Z, \mathbb{C}(Z_e)) : Z \in \mathcal{K}\}$.

Proof. We assume that the axioms (K0)–(K4) hold for $\mathcal{K}$, and using this we verify “(K0)[!]–(K4)[!]”, where (Ki)[!] denotes the validity of (Ki) for $\mathcal{K}^!$. Here (K0)[!] and (K1)[!] are clear by construction.

(K2)[!]. Let $(Z, \tau), (Z', \tau') \in \mathcal{K}^!$. Using (K1)[!], we may assume that $\tau \in \{0, +, i\}$. We distinguish three cases:

If $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{K}_1^!$, then $\tau \circ \tau' = i$. We get that $(Z \circ Z', i) \in \mathcal{K}_1^!$ unless $Z_e = +$ and $Z'_e = j = (Z \circ Z')_e$. In this case we get $(Z \circ Z', i) \in \mathcal{K}_3^!$.

If $(Z, 0) \in \mathcal{K}_2^!$, then $\tau \circ \tau' = \tau'$, $Z_e = 0$, $(Z \circ Z')_e = Z'_e$. Furthermore, if $W \leq Z'$, then $Z \circ W \leq Z \circ Z'$ with $(Z \circ W)_e = W_e$, so $(Z', \tau') \in \mathcal{K}_i^!$ implies

$$(Z \circ Z', \tau \circ \tau') \in \mathcal{K}_i^!$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

If $(Z, \tau) \in \mathcal{K}_3^1$, then $W \leq Z \leq Z \circ Z'$ with $W_e = +$, $(Z \circ Z')_e = Z_e = j$, $\tau \in \{+, i\}$ and $\tau \circ \tau' \in \{+, i, j\}$. In this case we conclude that $(Z \circ Z', +)$, $(Z \circ Z', i) \in \mathcal{K}_3^1$ and $(Z \circ Z', j) \in \mathcal{K}_1^1$, so all bases are covered.

(K3)¹. Using **(K2)¹** and Lemma 2.3, it suffices to verify **(K3')¹**.

For this, let (Z', τ') , $(Z'', \tau'') \in \mathcal{K}^1$ and $f \in S((Z', \tau'), (Z'', \tau''))$. With **(K2)¹** and Lemma 2.1, we can assume that (Z', τ') and (Z'', τ'') have the same support, so $Z'_g = \pm Z''_g$ for all $g \in E$, and $\tau' = \pm \tau''$. We distinguish three main cases.

To reduce the number of subcases we have to consider, we make the following observations. First, using **(K1)¹**, we may assume that $Z'_e \in \{0, +, i\}$. Also, if $Z'_e = Z''_e$ and $\tau'_e = -\tau''_e$ (in Case II below), then we may assume that $\tau'_e \in \{0, +, i\}$, using the symmetry between (Z', τ') and (Z'', τ'') . Similarly, if $Z'_e = -Z''_e$ and $\tau'_e = \tau''_e$ (in Case I), then we may assume that $\tau'_e \in \{0, +, i\}$, using the symmetry together with **(K1)¹**. Also, by construction we find that

$$(Z'_e, \tau'), (Z''_e, \tau'') \in \{\pm(i, i), \pm(+, i), (0, 0), \pm(j, i), \pm(j, +)\}.$$

In the following we only consider those nontrivial subcases that are not ruled out by these assumptions we can make.

Case I: $e \in S(Z', Z'')$, that is, $Z'_e = -Z''_e \neq 0$.

(I.1) $Z'_e = -Z''_e = +$. This implies $\tau' = -\tau'' = i$. Choose some $Z \in I_e(Z', Z'')$.

Then $Z_e = 0$, and we can use $(Z, 0) \in \mathcal{K}_2^1$.

(I.2) $Z'_e = -Z''_e = i$. Then $\tau' \in \{i, j, -\}$, $\tau'' \in \{i, j, +\}$, and there are three subcases left to consider.

Let $\tau' = \tau'' = i$. By construction, we get $W'' < Z''$ with $W''_e = +$.

Now $W''_e < Z''_e$, so by Lemma 2.2(i) and (iii) we find $Z \in I_e(W'' \circ Z', Z'')$ $\subseteq I_e(Z', Z'')$ with $W'' \leq Z$, which implies $Z_e \in \{+, i, j\}$. For $Z_e \in \{+, i\}$ we get $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{K}_1^1$, and for $Z_e = j$ we get $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{K}_3^1$.

For $\tau' = -\tau'' = -$ we get $W' < Z'$ and $W'' < Z''$ with $W'_e = -$, $W''_e = +$.

Now $W'_e < Z'_e$, thus by Lemma 2.2(i) and (iii) we can choose a

$$U' \in I_e(Z', W' \circ Z'') \subseteq I_e(Z', Z'')$$

that satisfies $W' \leq U'$, and thus $- = W'_e \leq U'_e < Z'_e = i$, that is, $U'_e = -$. Symmetrically, we get $U'' \in I_e(Z', Z'')$ with $U''_e = +$. Now we choose $Z \in I_e(U', U'')$. This Z satisfies $Z \in I_e(Z', Z'')$ (check componentwise), and $Z_e = 0$, so $(Z, 0) \in \mathcal{K}_2^1$ meets all conditions.

For $\tau' = -\tau'' \in \{i, j\}$, let $Z \in I_e(Z', Z'')$. If $Z_e = 0$, then we have $(Z, 0) \in \mathcal{K}_2^1$, for $Z_e = +$ we use $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{K}_1^1$, and for $Z_e = -$ we use $(Z, j) \in \mathcal{K}_1^1$.

Case II: $e \notin S(Z', Z'') \neq \emptyset$. In this case we choose some $f \in S(Z', Z'')$, so we have $Z'_f = -Z''_f \neq 0$, but $Z'_e = Z''_e$.

- (II.1) $Z'_e = Z''_e = 0$. Take $Z \in I_f(Z', Z'')$, then $(Z, 0) \in \mathcal{X}_2^1$ satisfies (K3)¹.
 (II.2) $Z'_e = Z''_e = +$. Then $\tau' = \tau'' = i$. Taking $Z \in I_f(Z', Z'')$, we get $Z_e = Z'_e = +$, so $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{X}_1^1$ eliminates as required.
 (II.3) $Z'_e = Z''_e = i$. We are left with two subcases:
 For $\tau' = \pm \tau'' = i$ we take $Z \in I_f(Z', Z'')$, where $Z_e = i$. From this we get $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{X}_1^1$, which satisfies (K3)¹.
 Assume $\tau' = \tau'' \in \{-, j\}$. In this case there are $W' < Z'$, $W'' < Z''$ in $\mathcal{X}$ with $W'_e = W''_e = -$.
 Now we could have $W'_f < Z'_f$, in which case we can choose

$$Z \in I_f(Z', W' \circ Z'') \subseteq I_f(Z', Z'')$$

with $W' \leq Z$, by Lemma 2.2(i) and (iii). This implies that $(Z, -)$, $(Z, j) \in \mathcal{X}_3^1$, and we are done. Analogously we proceed if $W''_f < Z''_f$.

The last possibility is that $W'_f = Z'_f$ and $W''_f = Z''_f$. In this case we choose $Z \in I_f(Z', Z'')$ and $W \in I_f(W', W'')$. Now by Lemma 2.2(iii) $W \leq W \circ Z \in I_f(Z', Z'')$, which satisfies $W_e = W'_e = -$ and $(W \circ Z)_e = Z_e = Z'_e = i$, so $(W \circ Z, \tau') \in \mathcal{X}_3^1$ solves the problem.

Case III: $S(Z', Z'') = \emptyset$, that is, $Z' = Z''$ and $f = e^1$. $(Z', +)$, $(Z', -) \in \mathcal{X}^1$ is impossible. If (Z', i) , $(Z', j) \in \mathcal{X}^1$, then $Z'_e \in \{i, j\}$, and by (K1)¹ we may assume $Z'_e = j$. However, this implies $(Z', +) \in \mathcal{X}_3^1$, and we are done.

(K4)¹. We consider $(Z, \tau) \in \mathcal{X}^1$ with $(Z, \tau)_g \neq 0$, and $\sigma \neq 0$. By (K1)¹, we can assume that $\tau, \sigma \in \{+, i\}$.

We first treat the case $g = e^1$. For $(Z, +) \in \mathcal{X}^1$ we always have $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{X}^1$. Similarly, for $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{X}_3^1$ we have $(Z, +) \in \mathcal{X}_3^1$. For $(Z, i) \in \mathcal{X}_1^1$ we get $Z_e \in \{+, i\}$. With (K4) we find $U, W \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\underline{U} = \underline{W} = \underline{Z}$ and $U_e = +$, $W_e = j$. Thus we get $(U \circ W, +) \in \mathcal{X}_3^1$ with $\underline{U \circ W} = \underline{Z}$, as required.

Finally, assume $g \in E$: for this let $(Z, \tau) \in \mathcal{X}^1$ with $Z_g \neq 0$, and let $Z' \in \mathcal{X}$ have $\underline{Z} = \underline{Z'}$ and $Z'_g = \sigma \neq 0$. Now if $(Z, \tau) \in \mathcal{X}_2^1$, then we conclude $Z_e = Z'_e = 0$ and thus $(Z', 0) \in \mathcal{X}_2^1$ satisfies the conditions. Otherwise, if $(Z, \tau) \in \mathcal{X}_1^1 \cup \mathcal{X}_3^1$, we get that $Z_e \neq 0$, and thus $Z'_e \neq 0$. This means that we can either use $(Z', i) \in \mathcal{X}_1^1$, if $Z'_e \in \{+, i\}$, or we can use $(Z', j) \in \mathcal{X}_1^1$, if $Z'_e \in \{-, j\}$. $\square$

Note that if e is a loop in $\mathcal{X}$, then both e and e^1 are loops in $\mathcal{X}^1$. Otherwise the matroid $M^1 := M(\mathcal{X}^1)$ is obtained by inserting e^1 into M as an element that is parallel to e , while $\{e, e^1\}$ is independent in the oriented matroid $\mathcal{M}^R(\mathcal{X}^1)$.

3. Reduction and Representation Theorem

At this stage of our work it is easy to construct an oriented matroid that “represents” a given 2-matroid, although the precise analysis of the geometric situation needs some care. Definition 3.1 contains the basic construction, and we

assume its notation for the whole section. The exclamation mark is consistently used to denote the basic doubling operation, with $F! := F \uplus \{a + n : a \in F\}$ for subsets $F \subseteq [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$: it is never used to denote factorials or excitement!

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ be a loop-free 2-matroid of rank r on $[n]$. Let $L := \text{Ze}(\mathcal{K})$ be the geometric lattice of flats associated with $\mathcal{K}$ by Lemma 1.5(i), and let $r = r(\mathcal{K}) := r(L)$ be its rank.

From this, construct

$$\mathcal{K}! := ((\cdots((\mathcal{K} \uplus 1!) \uplus 2! \uplus \cdots) \uplus n!) \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^{2n},$$

the *doubled 2-matroid* on $\{1, \dots, n, 1', \dots, n'\} \cong [2n]$ obtained from $\mathcal{K}$ by n successive single element extensions according to Lemma 2.4. The lattice of flats of $\mathcal{K}!$ is denoted by $L! := \text{Ze}(\mathcal{K}!)$.

The *oriented matroid frame* of $\mathcal{K}$ is the set of real sign vectors

$$\mathcal{L}! := \mathfrak{I}(\mathcal{K}!) = \{\mathfrak{I}(Z) : Z \in \mathcal{K}!\} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^{2n},$$

which is the covector set of an oriented matroid by Lemma 1.5(ii).

The constructions in this section depend on a linear ordering of the ground set, which we prescribe by identifying the ground set with $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For example, it is not clear that the single element extensions of Definition 3.1 commute (they do not). Similarly, for the construction of minors, which we need below, we tacitly assume that the elements of a deletion or contraction keep the induced linear order (even if they are relabeled as $\{1, \dots, m\}$).

Lemma 3.2.

- (i) The map $\mathfrak{I} : \mathcal{K}! \rightarrow \{+, -, 0\}^{2n}$ is injective.
- (ii) The flats of $\mathcal{K}!$ are given by $L! = \{F! : F \in L\}$: so we get a canonical isomorphism $L \cong L!$.
- (iii) The flats of the underlying matroid of $\mathcal{L}!$ are given by $\text{Ze}(\mathcal{L}!)$. We have $F! \in \text{Ze}(\mathcal{L}!)$ if and only if $F \in L$.

Proof. (i) The map $\mathfrak{I} : \mathcal{K}! \rightarrow \{+, -, 0\}^{2n}$ is injective, since its inverse is given by

$$\mathfrak{I}^{-1} : \mathcal{L}! \rightarrow \mathcal{K}!, \quad (X, Y) \mapsto (Y \circ iX, (-X) \circ iY).$$

For this observe that $\mathfrak{I}(Z_e) = 0$ implies $Z_e = \mathfrak{I}(Z_e)$, and $\mathfrak{I}(Z_e) = 0$ implies $Z_e = -\mathfrak{I}(Z_e)$, from the construction of Lemma 2.4.

(ii) Since the extensions of Lemma 2.4 add new elements that are parallel to old ones, we get $L \cong L!$ canonically, where $L! = \{F! : F \subseteq [n]\}$ is the geometric lattice of $\mathcal{K}!$.

(iii) For every $F \in L$ there is some imaginary sign vector $iX \in \mathcal{X}$ with $\text{Ze}(iX) = F$. We conclude $(iX, iX) \in \mathcal{X}!$, hence $(X, X) \in \mathcal{L}!$ and thus $F! \in \text{Ze}(\mathcal{L}!)$. For the converse let $F! \in \text{Ze}(\mathcal{L}!)$ and take $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{L}!$ with $\text{Ze}(X) = \text{Ze}(Y) = F$. Then $\Im^{-1}(X, Y) = (Y \circ iX, (-X) \circ iY) = (iX, iY) \in \mathcal{X}!$, which implies $iX \in \mathcal{X}$ and thus $F \in L$. $\square$

The definition of minors of 2-matroids $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ follows the model (and the geometric intuition) of oriented matroids, see Lemma 4.1.8 of [BLS⁺]. We denote the deletion of F from a sign vector Z by $Z \setminus F = (Z_f: f \notin F)$, and the restriction to the entries in F by $Z|_F = (Z_f: f \in F)$. With this, for $F \subseteq [n]$ we define the *deletion* of F from $\mathcal{X}$ by

$$\mathcal{X} \setminus F := \{Z \setminus F: Z \in \mathcal{X}\},$$

and the *contraction* of $\mathcal{X}$ by F as

$$\mathcal{X} / F := \{Z \setminus F: Z \in \mathcal{X}, Z|_F = 0\}.$$

Note that if $\mathcal{X}$ is a 2-matroid, then so is any deletion or contraction. The two operations commute; a *minor* is defined as any deletion of a contraction (or contraction of a deletion) of $\mathcal{X}$.

Lemma 3.3.

- (i) $\mathcal{X}! / F! = (\mathcal{X} / F)!$,
 $\mathcal{X}! \setminus F! = (\mathcal{X} \setminus F)!$.
- (ii) $\Im(\mathcal{X}! / F!) = \Im(\mathcal{X}!) / F!$,
 $\Im(\mathcal{X}! \setminus F!) = \Im(\mathcal{X}!) \setminus F!$.

Proof. For (i), we can use induction on $|F|$, and thus only consider the case $F = \{f\}$. However, this then amounts to saying that contraction and deletion commute with the $!$ -extensions. Specifically, we need four statements, which are easily checked from the construction of $\mathcal{X}' \uplus e^!$, for a 2-matroid $\mathcal{X}'$:

- $(\mathcal{X}' \uplus e^!) / f = (\mathcal{X}' / f) \uplus e^!$ for $f \notin \{e, e^!\}$,
- $(\mathcal{X}' \uplus e^!) \setminus f = (\mathcal{X}' \setminus f) \uplus e^!$ for $f \notin \{e, e^!\}$,
- $(\mathcal{X}' \uplus e^!) \setminus \{e, e^!\} = \mathcal{X}' \setminus e$,
- $(\mathcal{X}' \uplus e^!) / \{e, e^!\} = \mathcal{X}' / e$.

The most subtle case occurs in the second statement for the inclusion “ $\subseteq$ ”. If $(Z \setminus f, \tau) \in (\mathcal{X}' \setminus f)_3^!$ with $Z_e = j$, then there exists some $W \setminus f < Z \setminus f$ with $W_e = +$. If $W < Z$ does not hold in this case, then we replace Z by $W \circ Z$, and are done.

For part (ii), we get the first equality from the proof of Lemma 3.2(i), the second one is trivial. $\square$

Note that there are no complicated isomorphisms involved in Lemma 3.3, it just states an equality of two sign vector systems (complex for part (i), real for part (ii)).

However, let us mention that care has to be taken in handling the $!$ -construction: it certainly depends on the order of the elements, and the single element extensions that produce it cannot in general be interchanged.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a 2-matroid of rank 1. Then $\mathcal{L}!$ is an oriented matroid of rank 2.*

Proof. We may assume that $\mathcal{K}$ has no loops, so that $\text{Ze}(\mathcal{K}) = \{\emptyset, [n]\}$ and $\mathcal{K} \setminus \mathbf{0} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -\}^n$.

Claim 1. *For all $a \in [n]$ there is a unique $Z \in \mathcal{K}$ with $Z_a = +$.*

In fact, existence of Z follows from (K4). If there was a second one, Z' say, we would conclude $\mathbf{0} \in I_a(Z, -Z')$. Thus for all $b \in [n]$ we have either $Z_b = Z'_b = 0$ or $b \in S(Z, -Z')$, which shows $Z = Z'$.

Claim 2. *For all $a \in [n]$ there is a unique $Z \in \mathcal{K}!$ with $Z_a = +$.*

For this we only have to show that uniqueness cannot be lost under the extensions of Lemma 2.4. For this assume $Z_a = \pm$, $Z_e = j$ and there is some $W < Z$ with $W_e = +$. However, this implies either $W_a = Z_a$, contradicting Claim 1, or $W_a = 0$, contradicting that we have rank 1.

Claim 3. *For all $a \in [n]$ there is a unique $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{L}!$ with $X_a = 0$, $Y_a = +$.*

This we get from Claim 2, using the formula for $\mathfrak{Z}^{-1}$ in the proof of Lemma 3.2(i).

Claim 4. $r(\mathcal{L}!) = 2$.

Here $r(\mathcal{L}!) \leq 2$ follows from the fact that $r(\mathcal{L}!/a) = 1$ for $a \in [n]$, by Claim 3. The rest follows from the fact that $\{a, a + n\}$ is independent in $\mathcal{L}$ for $a \in [n]$, by construction. $\square$

The main goal of the rest of this section is to explain the geometry of $\mathcal{K}!$ and $\mathcal{L}!$. For this we rely on:

- The topological representation of oriented matroids by 1-pseudoarrangements, according to the Topological Representation Theorem [FL], [EM], [BLS⁺, Chapter 5]. Here we use the prefix “1-” to indicate that we are talking of subspheres of codimension 1 in the sphere $S^{r(\mathcal{L})-1}$.
- The concept of 2-pseudoarrangements $\mathcal{A}$, as defined by Definition 8.3 of [BZ]: this is an arrangement of codimension 2 subspheres $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ in S^{2r-1} with the property that every intersection of some of them has an even codimension. Furthermore, the existence of a *signed real frame* is required, that is, of a 1-pseudoarrangement $\{T_1, \dots, T_n, U_1, \dots, U_n\}$ such that every pseudosphere

S_a of codimension 2 can be written as the intersection of the corresponding two codimension 1 pseudospheres: $S_a = T_a \cap U_a$.

- The $s^{(1)}$ -stratification of a 2-arrangement $\mathcal{B}$ with respect to a real frame [BZ, Definition 8.6], which is the cell decomposition of S^{2r-1} given by all the intersections of spheres in $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ and spheres in $\{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$: this is constructed as a map

$$s_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}: S^{2d-1} \rightarrow \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$$

which is (for $1 \leq a \leq n$, $\mathbf{x} \in S^{2d-1}$) defined by

$$(s_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}))_a = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a^+, \\ j & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a^-, \\ + & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a \cap U_a^+, \\ - & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a \cap U_a^-, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in T_a \cap U_a. \end{cases}$$

This cell decomposition, the $s^{(1)}$ -stratification of $\mathcal{B}$, is a regular CW decomposition of S^{2r-1} by Theorem 8.10 of [BZ]. Thus it is completely encoded in the associated complex sign vector system $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)} := s_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}(S^{2r-1})$, with its natural partial order.

- Similarly, the $s^{(2)}$ -stratification

$$s_{\mathcal{B}}^{(2)}: S^{2d-1} \rightarrow \{+, -, 0\}^{2n}$$

is defined (for $1 \leq a \leq 2n$, $\mathbf{x} \in S^{2d-1}$) by

$$(s_{\mathcal{B}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{x}))_a = \begin{cases} + & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq n \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in T_a^+, \\ - & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq n \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in T_a^-, \\ 0 & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq n \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in T_a, \\ + & \text{if } n+1 \leq a \leq 2n \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in U_{a-n}^+, \\ - & \text{if } n+1 \leq a \leq 2n \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in U_{a-n}^-, \\ 0 & \text{if } n+1 \leq a \leq 2n \text{ and } \mathbf{x} \in U_{a-n}. \end{cases}$$

Its sign vector system $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(2)} := s_{\mathcal{B}}^{(2)}(S^{2r-1}) \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^{2n}$ is itself an oriented matroid of rank $2r$.

The following theorem contains both the reduction of 2-matroids to oriented matroids, and the topological representation theorem for 2-matroids. For simplicity we only consider loop-free 2-matroids.

Reduction and Representation Theorem 3.5.

- (1) Let $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ be a loop-free 2-matroid of rank r on $[n]$, let $\mathcal{K}!$ be the corresponding doubled 2-matroid, and let $\mathcal{L}!$ be the oriented matroid frame

of $\mathcal{K}!$. Let $\{T_1, \dots, T_n, U_1, \dots, U_n\}$ be a 1-pseudoarrangement in S^{2r-1} that represents $\mathcal{L}!$, and $S_a := T_a \cap U_a$. Then:

$\mathcal{B} := \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ is a 2-pseudoarrangement,

$\mathcal{F} := \{T_1, \dots, T_n, U_1, \dots, U_n\}$ is a signed real frame for $\mathcal{B}$,

$\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}$ is the face poset of the $\mathfrak{s}^{(1)}$ -stratification of $\mathcal{B}$, and

$\mathcal{L}! = \mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(2)}$ is the face poset of the $\mathfrak{s}^{(2)}$ -stratification of $\mathcal{B}$ associated with the frame $\mathcal{F}$.

- (2) Conversely, if $\mathcal{B} = \{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$ is a 2-pseudoarrangement with a signed real frame $\mathcal{F} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n, U_1, \dots, U_n\}$, then its $\mathfrak{s}^{(1)}$ face poset $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}$ (with respect to the frame $\mathcal{F}$) is a 2-matroid. Let $\mathcal{L}!$ be the oriented matroid frame for $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}$ and let $\mathcal{F}' = \{T'_1, \dots, T'_n, U'_1, \dots, U'_n\}$ be a 1-pseudoarrangement in S^{2r-1} that represents $\mathcal{L}!$. Then there is a homeomorphism $S^{2r-1} \rightarrow S^{2r-1}$ that identifies $S_a = T_a \cap U_a$ with $S'_a := T'_a \cap U'_a$, and T_i with T'_i (but not in general U_i with U'_i). In particular, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'$ represent the same 2-arrangement.

Proof. Here we rely on the work done in Section 8 of [BZ], in particular the fact that the $\mathfrak{s}^{(1)}$ -stratification of a 2-arrangement yields a regular cell complex, by Theorem 8.10 of [BZ]. With this, the main point that is left to prove for (1) is that $\mathcal{B}$ is a 2-arrangement, that is, that for each $F \subseteq [n]$ the set $F! = F \uplus \{a + n : a \in F\}$ has even rank in the underlying matroid $\underline{\mathcal{L}}!$, and $\text{rank } 2$ if $F = \{a\}$. The key to this is

$$r^{\mathbb{R}}!(F!) = 2 \cdot r(F) \quad \text{for all } F \subseteq [n], \quad (*)$$

where r denotes the rank function of L , while $r^{\mathbb{R}}!$ is the rank function of the underlying matroid of $\mathcal{L}!$.

Now $(*)$ is certainly correct for $F = \emptyset$, where both ranks vanish. We use induction on $r(F)$. Consider flats $F \subsetneq F'$ in L , that is, F' contains F , but with no flat between. This means that $M/F \setminus ([n] \setminus F')$ has rank 1. We have to verify $r^{\mathbb{R}}!(F')! - r^{\mathbb{R}}!(F)! = 2$.

Using (K2) + (K4) we can find imaginary vectors $iY < iY'$ in $\mathcal{K}$ with $\text{Ze}(Y) = F$ and $\text{Ze}(Y') = F'$. From the construction of $\mathcal{K}!$ and $\mathcal{L}!$ we now get that $(Y', Y') < (Y, Y)$ are vectors in $\mathcal{L}!$, with $\text{Ze}(Y, Y) = F!$, $\text{Ze}(Y', Y') = F'!$. Since the zero map on oriented matroids is order inverting and cover preserving [BLS⁺, Theorem 4.1.14(ii)], this is equivalent to showing that the oriented matroid $\mathcal{L}!/F!/([n] \setminus F')!$ has rank 2. By Lemma 3.3, we get that this is $\mathfrak{Z}(\mathcal{K}/F!/([n] \setminus F')!)$. Thus we are done by Lemma 3.4.

For part (2), the key result is that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}$ is a 2-matroid: this is proved in Proposition 8.12 of [BZ]. The rest now follows from the description of the geometry in Section 8 of [BZ]. $\square$

Theorem 3.5 allows us to develop the whole theory of 2-matroids “on top of” the theory of oriented matroids. As examples, we list some results that can be lifted to 2-matroids by Theorem 3.5.

Corollary 3.6. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a 2-matroid of rank $r = r(M)$, whose oriented matroids have ranks $r^{\mathbb{R}} = r(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}})$ and $r' = r(\mathcal{M}')$. Then $0 \leq r' \leq r \leq r^{\mathbb{R}} \leq 2r$ with $r' + r^{\mathbb{R}} = 2r$, where $r' = r = r^{\mathbb{R}}$ holds if and only if $\mathcal{K}$ is a quasi-complexified oriented matroid.*

Proof. $r' \leq r \leq r^{\mathbb{R}}$ was proved in Lemma 1.5. For $r^{\mathbb{R}} \leq 2r$ we observe that $\mathcal{L}!$ is an oriented matroid extension of $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}}$, with $r^{\mathbb{R}} = r(\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}}) \leq r(\mathcal{L}!) = 2r$.

Now consider a topological representation of $\mathcal{K}$. Then $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}}$ is represented by the 1-pseudoarrangement $\{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ in S^{2r-1} . Thus $r^{\mathbb{R}}$ is the codimension of $\mathbf{T} := \bigcap_{a=1}^n T_a$ in S^{2r-1} . At the same time, $\mathbf{T}$ consists of all the cells with real sign vectors, and thus $\mathcal{M}'$ is represented by the 1-pseudoarrangement $\{\mathbf{T} \cap S_1, \dots, \mathbf{T} \cap S_n\}$ in $\mathbf{T}$. Thus

$$r^{\mathbb{R}} = (2r - 1) - \dim(\mathbf{T}) = (2r - 1) - (r' - 1) = 2r - r'.$$

The case of equality $r' = r = r^{\mathbb{R}}$ is characterized in Theorem 1.6. □

Corollary 3.7. *For every 2-matroid $\mathcal{K}$ of rank r , the poset $(\mathcal{K}, \leq)$ is the face poset of a PL CW-sphere S^{2r-1} .*

Proof. This follows from the PL version of the Topological Representation Theorem [FL] for oriented matroids, due to Edmonds and Mandel [EM], [BLS⁺, Chapter 5]. □

Let us now identify some interesting subposets in 2-matroids, following Section 3 of [BZ]. By Theorem 3.5, $\mathcal{K}$ is the face poset of a $(2r - 1)$ -sphere. Similarly,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{link}} := \{Z \in \mathcal{K} : Z_a = 0 \text{ for some } a \in [n]\},$$

the *link poset*, is the face poset of a cell decomposition of $\bigcup \mathcal{B}$. Thus we get that the order complex $\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{link}} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$ is homeomorphic to $\bigcup \mathcal{B}$. Similarly, with the yoga of Section 3 of [BZ], we see that the poset $\mathcal{K}$ determines the complement space $S^{2r-1} \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{B}$ up to homeomorphism. Setting

$$\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}} := \mathcal{K} \setminus \mathcal{K}_{\text{link}},$$

we find that $\mathbf{0} \oplus (\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}})^{\text{op}}$ is the face poset of a CW-complex Γ_{comp} that is homotopy equivalent to (in fact, a deformation retract of) the complement $S^{2r-1} \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{B}$. Here $\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}})$ is the barycentric subdivision of Γ_{comp} .

The following collects some basic topological results. For this, recall that a *circuit* of M is a minimal dependent subset $C \subseteq [n]$, corresponding to a

minimal subset of $\mathcal{B}$ for which the codimension of the intersection is less than twice the cardinality. A *broken circuit* is a set $C \setminus \min(C)$ for a circuit C . With this we define the *broken circuit complex* as the set system

$$\mathbf{BC}(M) = \{A \subseteq [n]: A \text{ does not contain a broken circuit}\}.$$

Finally, the *characteristic polynomial* of M is

$$\chi(t) = \sum_{A \in \mathbf{BC}(M)} (-1)^{|A|} t^{r-|A|}.$$

Corollary 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{K}$ be a 2-matroid, with underlying matroid M of rank r .*

- (1) *The link complex $\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{link}} \setminus \mathbf{0})$ of a 2-arrangement is a disjoint union of circles, if $r = 2$, and for $r > 2$ it is homotopy equivalent to a wedge of spheres:*

$$\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{link}} \setminus \mathbf{0}) \simeq \bigvee_{A \in \mathbf{BC}(M) \setminus \emptyset} S^{2r-2-|A|}.$$

- (2) *The complement $\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}})$ is stably homotopy equivalent to a wedge of spheres:*

$$\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}}) \sim \bigvee_{A \in \mathbf{BC}(M) \setminus \emptyset} S^{|A|}.$$

The cohomology algebra $H^(\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}}); \mathbb{Z})$ of the complement has a presentation of the form*

$$0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow \Lambda^* \mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{n} H^*(\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}}); \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow 0.$$

Here the relation ideal I is generated by relations of the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^k \varepsilon_i \mathbf{e}_{a_0} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{e}_{a_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mathbf{e}_{a_k}$$

for circuits $A = \{a_0, \dots, a_k\} \subseteq [n]$ and $\varepsilon_i \in \{+1, -1\}$, and

$$\{\pi(\mathbf{e}_A): A \in \mathbf{BC}(M)\}$$

is a $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis for $H^(\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}}); \mathbb{Z})$. In particular, $H^*(\Delta(\mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}}); \mathbb{Z})$ is free over $\mathbb{Z}$, generated in dimension 1, and has the Poincaré polynomial $(-t)^r \chi(-1/t)$.*

Proof. With Theorem 3.5, these are immediate consequences of Theorem 6.6 of

[BZ] (for $r \neq 3$) and Corollary 3.3 of [ZŽ] for part (1), and of Theorem 3.4 of [ZŽ] and Corollary 7.3 of [BZ] for part (2). $\square$

4. Complex Matroids

As we have seen, every 2-arrangement gives rise to a 2-matroid. However, 2-matroids are really more general than complex arrangements: for example, they have a completely different representation theory [GoM, p. 257], and they have structurally different cohomology algebras [Z]. Therefore, the need arises to distinguish a class of complex matroids among the more general 2-matroids.

Definition 4.1. A *complex matroid* is a 2-matroid that satisfies the additional axiom (K5):

(K5) If $iX \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathbf{0}$ with $X \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$, then $X \circ iY \in \mathcal{X}$ for some $Y < X$, $Y \in \{+, -, 0\}^n$. [Complex structure]

To get a feeling for what this axiom means geometrically, we first prove that it holds for complex arrangements and for complexified oriented matroids. Then we discuss examples, including a complete discussion of the case of rank 1.

Proposition 4.2.

- (i) Let $\mathcal{B} = \{\ker(\ell_1), \dots, \ker(\ell_n)\}$ be a complex arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^d$. Then $\mathcal{X} := \mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{B}}^{(1)}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ is a complex matroid.
- (ii) Let $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^n$ be an oriented matroid. Then $\mathcal{X} := \mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L}$ is a complex matroid.

Proof. For (ii), we can simply choose $Y = \mathbf{0}$. For (i), take $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ with

$$Z^0 = iX = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}),$$

and consider $Z^t := \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(e^{-it}\mathbf{z})$ for real $t \in \mathbb{R}$. The $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$ -function is semicontinuous, thus the $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}$ -strata are open in their linear hull [BZ, Section 1]. Since Z^0 is imaginary, we conclude $Z^0 \circ Z^t = Z^0$ for all t . Thus $\{t \in \mathbb{R} : Z^t = Z^0\}$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}$, and $t_0 := \min\{t > 0 : Z^t \neq Z^0\}$ exists.

Now $Z_a^t = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\ell_a(e^{-it}\mathbf{z})) = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(e^{-it}\ell_a(\mathbf{z}))$, from which we see that $\mathcal{E}(Z^{t_0}) = Z^t$ for $0 \leq t < t_0$, which proves the claim. $\square$

In the situation of Proposition 4.2(i), we call

- the sequence of complex linear forms $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in (\mathbb{C}^d)^*$, or, equivalently,
- the complex vector space $V := \{(\ell_1(\mathbf{z}), \dots, \ell_n(\mathbf{z})) : \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$

a *complex realization* of $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(V)$. For the equivalence, see the proof of Theorem 2.5 of [BZ].

Thus, a 2-matroid is *complex realizable* (and thus, in particular, it is a complex matroid) if there exists a complex vector subspace $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ with $s^{(1)}(V) = \mathcal{K}$.

More generally, we say that a 2-matroid is *realizable* if there is a real vector subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ such that $s^{(1)}(V) = \mathcal{K}$. In this case we necessarily have that the dimension

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}}(V \cap \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n : z_a = 0 \text{ for } a \in A\})$$

is even for all $A \subseteq [n]$. We note that the representation theory of 2-matroids and complex matroids is hardly studied at all, see also Problem 7.4.

Example 4.3. The following gives a complete list of the 2-matroids on two elements.

First, we have the 2-matroids with two loops, $\mathcal{K} = \{00\}$, or with exactly one loop and one coloop, $\mathcal{K} = \{00, 0+, 0-, 0i, 0j\}$ and $\mathcal{K} = \{00, +0, -0, i0, j0\}$, or with two coloops, $\mathcal{K} = \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^2$. All these 2-matroids correspond to complexified real arrangements, and are trivially complex.

The interesting case is when $\mathcal{K}$ has no loops or coloops, so the underlying matroid is $M = U_{1,2}$. By Lemma 3.4, we find four cases in this situation (up to reorientation, i.e., reversing all signs on the second element), see Fig. 4.1. In the first two, the associated real matroid $M^{\mathbb{R}}$ has rank 1 as well, in the second two it has rank 2. Also, we can see that two of these 2-matroids are complex, two are not.

Fig. 4.1. 2-matroids with underlying matroid $U_{1,2}$.

At this point let us mention three alternative axioms for the complex structure:

(K5') If $iX \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{0\}$, with $X \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$, then $(-X) \circ iY \in \mathcal{X}$ for some $Y < X$, $Y \in \{+, -, 0\}^n$.

(K5'') If $X \circ iY \in \mathcal{X}$ with $X, Y \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$ and $Y \leq X$, then $iX \in \mathcal{X}$.

(K5''') If $X \in \mathcal{X}$ with $X \in \{+, -, 0\}^E$, then $iX \in \mathcal{X}$.

Note that axiom (K5''), which we may abbreviate by $\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, is satisfied on $\mathcal{X}_4$, although this is not a complex matroid. Thus (K5'') does not imply (K5) for 2-matroids. (K5'') trivially implies (K5'''), which says that $\mathcal{M}^{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}'$ is a strong map of oriented matroids (compare with Lemma 1.5(iv)).

We think, however, that

$$(K5) \Leftrightarrow (K5') \Rightarrow (K5'') \Leftrightarrow (K5''').$$

In fact, this would follow from Conjecture 4.7 below. In the following development, we do not use (K5') and (K5''), and show that (K5) itself is good enough to ensure complex structure in rank 1, and to control the cohomological structure.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ be a 2-matroid on $[n]$ of rank 1. Assume that $a = 1$ is not a loop. Then $\mathcal{X}$ can be realized over $\mathbb{C}$ by*

$$\ell_a(z) = \begin{cases} z & \text{for } a = 1, \\ \alpha_a z & \text{if the restriction } \mathcal{X}|_{\{1, a\}} \text{ is complex,} \\ \alpha_a \bar{z} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for suitable $\alpha_a \in \mathbb{C}$, $2 \leq a \leq n$. (Here $\alpha_a = 0$ if and only if a is a loop.)

Proof. This we get from Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 3.5 and the fact that every oriented matroid of rank 2 is realizable, together with Example 4.3. $\square$

For the four 2-matroids in Fig. 4.1, we have, for example, the following coordinatizations:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{X}_1) \quad \ell_1(z) &= z, \ell_2(z) = z. \\ (\mathcal{X}_2) \quad \ell_1(z) &= z, \ell_2(z) = -\bar{z}. \\ (\mathcal{X}_3) \quad \ell_1(z) &= z, \ell_2(z) = -iz. \\ (\mathcal{X}_4) \quad \ell_1(z) &= z, \ell_2(z) = i\bar{z}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ be a 2-matroid. If $\mathcal{X}$ is a complex matroid, then so is every minor of $\mathcal{X}$.*

Proof. This is trivial for a contraction $\mathcal{X}/e \cong \{Z \in \mathcal{X} : Z_e = 0\}$. Thus we consider $\mathcal{X} \setminus e = \{Z \setminus e : Z \in \mathcal{X}\}$, and take some $Z \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $Z \setminus e$ is imaginary. By (K2) we may assume $Z_e \in \{0, +, i\}$.

If $Z_e = 0$, so that Z is of the form $Z = (iY, 0)$, then we are done by (K5). If $Z = (iY, +)$, then from the 2-matroid axioms we derive that $(iY, j) \in \mathcal{K}$. Now by (K5) we either get directly that (K5) holds for $Z \setminus e$, or we conclude that $(iY, -) \in \mathcal{K}$, in which case we can eliminate e between $(iY, +)$ and $(iY, -)$ to get $(iY, 0) \in \mathcal{K}$. Finally, if $Z = (iY, i)$, then we can directly apply (K5), and we are either done, or we conclude $(iY, +) \in \mathcal{K}$, so we are reduced to the previous case. $\square$

Corollary 4.6. *Every complex matroid of rank 1 is complex realizable. Furthermore, there is a natural bijection between the complex matroids of rank at most 1 and the oriented matroids of rank at most 2 on the same ground set.*

Conjecture 4.7. *If $\mathcal{K}$ is a 2-matroid of rank r , and $\mathcal{K} \setminus A$ is complex for every deletion of corank 1, then $\mathcal{K}$ is complex.*

This conjecture is an analogue to the “corank 2 theorems” about oriented matroids, see [LV], [BLS⁺, Section 3.6], and [DW3], since by Lemma 3.4 the 2-matroids of rank 1 have an oriented matroid frame of rank 2.

Some intuition for these questions comes from the example $\mathcal{B}'$ of [Z]: it leads to noncomplex 2-matroids of corank 2 over the matroid $U_{2,4}$. Here every 1-point deletion has corank 1. The point is that every deletion can be made complex, by possibly conjugating elements, but there is no complex structure globally.

We need a “dual version” of Proposition 4.4 and Corollary 4.6.

Proposition 4.8.

- (1) *Let $\mathcal{K} \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ be a 2-matroid of corank 1 such that $a = n$ is not a coloop. Then $\mathcal{K}$ can be realized in $\mathbb{C}^{n-1} \cong \mathbb{R}^{2n-2}$ by*

$$\ell_a(\mathbf{z}) = \begin{cases} z_a & \text{if } 1 \leq a < n, \\ \sum_{e=1}^{n-1} \ell_a^e(z_e) & \text{for } a = n, \end{cases}$$

where $\ell_a^e(z_e) = \alpha_e z_e$ for some $\alpha_e \in \mathbb{C}$ if the contraction of $\mathcal{K}$ to $\{e, n\}$ is complex, and $\ell_a^e(z_e) = \alpha_e \bar{z}_e$ for some $\alpha_e \in \mathbb{C}$ otherwise.

- (2) *In particular, if $\mathcal{K}$ is a complex matroid of corank at most 1, then it is realizable by a complex hyperplane arrangement.*

Proof. By induction on n we may assume that $\mathcal{K}$ has no coloops. The associated oriented matroid frame $\mathcal{L}!$ has corank 2, and hence is $\mathbb{R}$ -realizable in $\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}$. Using that $\{1, \dots, n-1, 1^1, \dots, (n-1)^1\}$ is a basis, we can choose “nice” coordinates (i.e., linear forms on $\mathbb{R}^{2n-2}$) $x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}$ for a realization

of $\mathcal{L}^!$, such that

$$a = n \quad \text{is represented by} \quad \ell_n = \sum_{e=1}^{n-1} y_e,$$

$$a = n^! \quad \text{is represented by} \quad \ell_{n^!} = \sum_{e=1}^{n-1} x_e,$$

$$a = e \quad \text{is represented by} \quad \ell_e = a_e x_e + b_e y_e,$$

and

$$a = e^! \quad \text{is represented by} \quad \ell_{e^!} = c_e x_e + d_e y_e,$$

for $1 \leq e < n$. The determinants $a_e d_e - b_e c_e$ do not vanish, by the evenness condition of Theorem 3.5.

If $a_e d_e - b_e c_e > 0$, then we can obtain $\ell'_e = b_e x_e - a_e y_e$ as a combination $\ell'_e = \lambda_e \ell_e + \mu_e \ell_{e^!}$ with $\lambda_e \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\mu_e > 0$. If $a_e d_e - b_e c_e < 0$, then we similarly obtain $\ell'_e = -b_e x_e + a_e y_e$. We may replace ℓ_e by ℓ'_e : this yields a different oriented matroid frame for the same 2-matroid $\mathcal{X}$. Then we can introduce complex coordinates on $\mathbb{R}^{2n-2} = \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$:

$$z_e := \ell'_e + i\ell_e = (b_e + ia_e)(x_e + iy_e) \quad (\text{resp. } z_e := \ell'_e + i\ell_e = (-b_e + ia_e)(x_e - iy_e)).$$

For these z_e , and setting $\alpha_e^{-1} = \pm b_e + ia_e$, we get a realization of $\mathcal{X}$ as described by the proposition. $\square$

Theorem 4.9. *The cohomology algebra $\tilde{H}^*(\Delta(\mathcal{X}_{\text{comp}}); \mathbb{Z})$ of any complex matroid $\mathcal{X}$ is isomorphic to the Orlik–Solomon algebra $OS(M)$ of the underlying matroid, that is, for a complex matroid $\varepsilon_i = (-1)^i$ can be chosen in the presentation of Corollary 3.8(2).*

Proof. We need the cohomology classes constructed in Corollary 7.3 of [BZ] to satisfy the Orlik–Solomon relations. This is true in complex arrangements, and it is preserved under deletion of elements that are not involved in the relations. This reduces the statement to the case of complex matroids of corank at most 1, which are complex realizable by Proposition 4.8. $\square$

We note that this contains both the result for complex arrangements due to Orlik and Solomon [OS], and the result for complexified oriented matroids, due to Gel'fand and Rybnikov [GeR], [R].

5. Duality

In this section we start the work on a duality theory for complex matroids. For this, we denote by A^T the transpose and by $\bar{A}$ the conjugate of a matrix (or vector) A . We call two vectors $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ *orthogonal* if $\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \rangle := \mathbf{z}^T \bar{\mathbf{w}} = 0$. This can be used to define that $Z, W \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ are *orthogonal*, denoted by $Z \perp W$, if there exist $\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^d$ with $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}) = Z$, $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\mathbf{w}) = W$, and $\langle \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{w} \rangle = 0$. Then we define, for $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$,

$$\mathcal{K}^* := \{W \in \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n : W \perp Z \text{ for all } Z \in \mathcal{K}\}.$$

(This is analogous to the usual definition [BLS⁺, Section 3.4] for oriented matroids.)

Example 5.1. Here we compute the duals and double-duals of the 2-matroids of rank 1 listed in Fig. 4.1.

- (1) The complex matroid $\mathcal{K}_1 = \{00, ++, --, ii, jj\}$ is a complexified oriented matroid: $\mathcal{K}_1 = \mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L}$ for $\mathcal{L} = \{00, ++, --\}$. We easily find

$$\mathcal{K}_1^* = \{00, +-, -+, ij, ji\} = \{00, +-, +- \}^* \circ i\{00, +-, +- \}^*,$$

which is again a complexified oriented matroid, and $\mathcal{K}_1^{**} = \mathcal{K}_1$.

- (2) For the 2-matroid $\mathcal{K}_2 = \{00, +-, -+, ii, jj\}$ (which is quasi-complexified, but not complex), we find $\mathcal{K}_2^* = \{00, ii, jj\}$, which is not a 2-matroid.
- (3) The dual of the complex matroid $\mathcal{K}_3 = \{00, +j, ij, i+, ii, -i, ji, j-, jj\}$ turns out to be a reorientation of it:

$$\mathcal{K}_3^* = \{00, j+, ji, +i, ii, i-, ij, -j, jj\} = {}_{-(2)}\mathcal{K}_3,$$

and thus $\mathcal{K}_3^{**} = \mathcal{K}_3$.

- (4) For the 2-matroid $\mathcal{K}_4 = \{00, +i, ii, i+, ij, -j, jj, j-, ji\}$, finally we find $\mathcal{K}_4^* = \{00, ii, ij, jj, ji\}$, which again fails to be a 2-matroid.

This indicates that there probably is no reasonable duality theory for 2-matroids. However, for complex matroids a good duality theory can be expected. We prove this here for the realizable case: whenever $\mathcal{K}$ is a realizable complex matroid, then $\mathcal{K}^*$ is also a complex matroid, and $\mathcal{K}^{**} = \mathcal{K}$. This amounts to a “complex Farkas lemma”; we derive it from the following “real” transposition theorem “of Farkas type.”

Lemma 5.2 [SW, p. 23]. *Let $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ and $\mathbf{N} \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times n}$ be real matrices. Then either there is a vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{M}\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{N}\mathbf{x} > \mathbf{0}$ (componentwise) or there are vectors $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ with $\mathbf{M}^T \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{N}^T \mathbf{u} = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{u} \geq \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}$, but not both.*

Theorem 5.3. *Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be a complex subspace of dimension r , let $\mathcal{K} := \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(V)$ be the complex matroid it represents, and let $V^\perp \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ be the orthogonal complement of V . Then*

$$\mathcal{K}^* = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(V^\perp).$$

In particular, the dual $\mathcal{K}^$ is a complex matroid, and $\mathcal{K}^{**} = \mathcal{K}$.*

Proof. First take $Z \in \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(V^\perp)$, with $Z = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z})$, and $W \in \mathcal{K}$, with $W = \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\mathbf{w})$. Then we have $\mathbf{w}^T \bar{\mathbf{z}} = 0$ by construction, and thus $W \perp Z$. This proves $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(V^\perp) \subseteq \mathcal{K}^*$.

For the reverse inclusion, assume that $Z \notin \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(V^\perp)$. After relabeling and re-orientation, it suffices to consider Z of the form

$$Z = (00 \cdots 00 | + + \cdots + + | ii \cdots ii) \in \{0, +, i\}^n,$$

with a zeros, b pluses, and c i 's, say.

Assuming $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V) = r$, we find $A \in \mathbb{C}^{r \times n}$ with $V^\perp = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n : A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}\}$ and $V = \{\bar{A}^T \mathbf{w} : \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{C}^r\}$.

Now $Z \notin \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(V^\perp)$ says that there is no $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ with $\mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\mathbf{z}) = Z$ and $A\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}$. Setting $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} + i\mathbf{y}$ for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A = A_{\text{Re}} + iA_{\text{Im}}$ for $A_{\text{Re}}, A_{\text{Im}} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$, this means that there are no $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{Re}}\mathbf{x} - A_{\text{Im}}\mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{0}, & A_{\text{Im}}\mathbf{x} + A_{\text{Re}}\mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ (I_a \mid O \mid O)\mathbf{x} &= \mathbf{0}, & (I_a \mid O \mid O)\mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ (O \mid I_b \mid O)\mathbf{x} &> \mathbf{0}, & (O \mid I_b \mid O)\mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ & & (O \mid O \mid I_c)\mathbf{y} &> \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned}$$

where I_a denotes an identity matrix of size a , O denotes a zero matrix, and $\mathbf{0}$ is a zero vector of appropriate size. Equivalently, with $\hat{\mathbf{x}} := \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \hat{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}: \quad & \begin{pmatrix} A_{\text{Re}} & -A_{\text{Im}} \\ A_{\text{Im}} & A_{\text{Re}} \\ I_a & O & O & O & O & O \\ O & O & O & I_a & O & O \\ O & O & O & O & I_b & O \end{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{0}, \\ & \begin{pmatrix} O & I_b & O & O & O & O \\ O & O & O & O & O & I_c \end{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{x}} > \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 5.2 there exist $\hat{\mathbf{w}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2r+n}$, $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{R}^{b+c}$ with $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \geq \mathbf{0}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \neq \mathbf{0}$ that satisfy

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{\text{Re}}^T & A_{\text{Im}}^T & I_a & O & O \\ & & O & O & O \\ & & O & O & O \\ & & O & I_a & O \\ -A_{\text{Im}}^T & A_{\text{Re}}^T & O & O & I_b \\ & & O & O & O \end{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{w}} + \begin{pmatrix} O & O \\ I_b & O \\ O & O \\ O & O \\ O & O \\ O & I_c \end{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Now putting

$$\hat{\mathbf{w}} =: \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}' \\ \mathbf{w}'' \\ \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \mathbf{b}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{w} := \mathbf{w}' + i\mathbf{w}''$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{u}} =: \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{c}_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

we can rewrite this as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\text{Re}}^T \mathbf{w}' + A_{\text{Im}}^T \mathbf{w}'' + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} &= \mathbf{0}, \\ -A_{\text{Im}}^T \mathbf{w}' + A_{\text{Re}}^T \mathbf{w}'' + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{b}_2 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{c}_2 \end{pmatrix} &= \mathbf{0}, \end{aligned}$$

that is,

$$\bar{A}^T \mathbf{w} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 + i\mathbf{a}_2 \\ \mathbf{b}_1 + i\mathbf{b}_2 \\ i\mathbf{c}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{c}_2 \geq \mathbf{0}, \quad \text{not both equal to zero.}$$

Now letting

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}} := i\bar{A}^T \mathbf{w} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_2 - i\mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{b}_2 - i\mathbf{b}_1 \\ \mathbf{c}_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

we find that there exists a vector $W = s^{(1)}(\tilde{w}) \in \mathcal{K}$ with

$$W = \underbrace{(** \cdots **)}_{\text{arbitrary}} \mid \underbrace{(** \cdots **)}_{\in \{j, +, -, 0\}} \mid \underbrace{(\oplus \oplus \cdots \oplus \oplus)}_{\in \{+, 0\}}$$

with some j in the middle part, or some $+$ in the third part, or both. However, this implies that $W \not\perp Z$, and thus $Z \notin \mathcal{K}^*$. $\square$

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L}'$ be a quasi-complexified 2-matroid. Then $\mathcal{K}^* \subseteq \mathcal{L}^* \circ i\mathcal{L}'^*$, and $\mathcal{K}^{**} \supseteq \mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L}$. In particular, the following three conditions are equivalent for quasi-complexified 2-matroids:*

- (i) $\mathcal{K}$ is a complex matroid.
- (ii) $\mathcal{K}$ is a complexified oriented matroid.
- (iii) $\mathcal{K}^* = \mathcal{L}^* \circ i\mathcal{L}'^*$.

Proof. To see $\mathcal{L}^* \circ i\mathcal{L}'^* \subseteq \mathcal{K}^*$, assume that for some real X', Y' we have $X' \circ iY' \perp X \circ iY$ for all $X \circ iY \in \mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L}'$. In particular, this implies $X' \circ iY' \perp X$ for all $X \in \mathcal{L}$. Looking at the imaginary part, this yields $Y' \in \mathcal{L}^*$. Now assume that $Y' \circ X' \notin \mathcal{L}^*$, then there is some $X \in \mathcal{L}$ with $X \not\perp Y' \circ X'$. However, if $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y'} \neq \emptyset$, then we get $X \perp Y' \circ X'$ from $Y' \in \mathcal{L}^*$, and if $\underline{X} \cap \underline{Y'} = \emptyset$ but $\underline{X} \cap \underline{X'} \neq \emptyset$, then we get $X \not\perp X' \circ iY'$, a contradiction.

Next we verify the other inclusion in the case $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}'$. For this we take $X, Y \in \mathcal{L}$ and $X', Y' \in \mathcal{L}^*$ and have to show $X \circ iY \perp X' \circ iY'$. If $\underline{Y} \cap \underline{Y'} \neq \emptyset$, then this already implies the claim (for arbitrary real X, X'). If $\underline{Y} \cap \underline{Y'} = \emptyset$ but $\underline{Y} \cap \underline{X'} \neq \emptyset$, then for corresponding vectors y and x' the sum $(iy)^T \overline{x'}$ has summands of both positive and negative imaginary part, so we can choose y and x' to get a zero sum, which proves the claim. Thus we can assume $\underline{Y} \cap \underline{Y'} = \underline{Y} \cap \underline{X'} = \emptyset$, and by symmetry also $\underline{Y'} \cap \underline{X} = \emptyset$. However, now orthogonality follows from $X \perp X'$.

From this we also get $\mathcal{K}^{**} \supseteq (\mathcal{L}^* \circ i\mathcal{L}'^*)^* = \mathcal{L}^{**} \circ i\mathcal{L}^{**} = \mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L}$.

Now (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i) is obvious, and the converse is clear by looking at cocircuits, i.e., vectors with minimal nonempty supports. Also we have already verified (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii).

Now if (ii) fails, that is $\mathcal{L} \neq \mathcal{L}'$, then we can find $X \in \mathcal{L}$ and $Y \in (\mathcal{L}')^*$ with $X \not\perp Y$, since the underlying matroids coincide. This means that $iY \not\perp X$, and thus $X \notin \mathcal{K}^*$, and hence (iii) fails. $\square$

We note that the last proof is most conveniently formulated in the language of fuzzy rings, where the scalar product $Z^T \tilde{W} := \bigoplus_{e \in E} Z_e \odot \tilde{W}_e$ can be explicitly defined and evaluated. We discuss the set-up for this in the next section.

6. 2-Matroids and "Matroids with Coefficients"

In this section we explain why the theory of "matroids with coefficients" by Dress and Wenzel [D1], [DW1]–[DW3] does not support complex matroids.

The key observation is the following. Consider the strata of the sign function $s^{(1)}$, that is, the maximal subsets of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$ that have the same complex sign. If we define the sum or product of two such strata pointwise, then we get that *the sum or product of two strata is again a union of strata*. This allows us to define a ring structure K on the nonempty sets of signs, with zero element $\{0\}$, unit $\{+\}$, and negative unit $\{-\}$. In what follows we simplify notation by omitting some set brackets.

Lemma 6.1. *The ring of nonempty sets of signs $K := 2^{\{i, j, +, -, 0\}} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ is a fuzzy ring in the sense of Dress [D1] with addition and multiplication defined elementwise by the following tables:*

$\oplus$	0	+	-	i	j	$\odot$	0	+	-	i	j
0	0	+	-	i	j	0	0	0	0	0	0
+	+	+	0+-	i	j	+	0	+	-	i	j
-	-	0+-	-	i	j	-	0	-	+	j	i
i	i	i	i	i	0+-ij	i	0	i	j	-ij	+ij
j	j	j	j	0+-ij	j	j	0	j	i	-ij	-ij

A smaller subring of this ring K is the fuzzy ring

$$K' = \{0, +, -, i, j, 0+-, +ij, -ij, 0+-ij\},$$

which is generated by the one-element subsets of $\{i, j, +, -, 0\}$.

Proof. The axioms are all trivial to check. We only note that in the notation of [D1] and [DW1]–[DW3] for K we have the zero element $0_K = \{0\}$, the one element $1_K = \{+\}$, the negative-one $\varepsilon = \{-\}$, the subset of noninvertibles $K_0 = \{S \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\} : 0 \in S\}$, and the group of units $K^* = \{+, -\}$ (which is denoted $\hat{K}$ in [D1] and $K^\times$ in [DW1]). K' is a fuzzy subring with the same zero and units. $\square$

Now we can ask about the matroids with coefficients in K . It turns out, however, that K has too few units (namely, only $+$ and $-$) to have nontrivial matroids with coefficients.

Proposition 6.2.

- (i) *The matroids with coefficients in K (or K') on the ground set $[n]$ are canonically equivalent to the complexified oriented matroids on the same ground set.*
- (ii) *Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ be a 2-matroid. Then $\mathcal{X}$ presents a matroid with coefficients over K (and over K') if and only if it is a quasi-complexified oriented matroid, $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{L}' \circ i\mathcal{L}$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{X}$ is in this case equivalent (as a matroid with coefficients in K (resp. K')) to the complexified oriented matroid $\mathcal{L}' \circ i\mathcal{L}'$.*

Proof. This is quite trivial once the definitions have been decoded. Since we do not want to go into details, we only sketch a few hints for the interested reader. The set of units of K and of K' is $K^* = \{+, -\}$. The *support* of $Z \in K^n$ is $\underline{Z} = \{e \in [n]: Z_e \neq 0\}$, while the *proper support* is $\underline{\underline{Z}} := \{e \in [n]: Z_e \in \{+, -\}\}$.

(i) Let $\mathbf{K} \subseteq K^n$ be a matroid with coefficients in K or K' . We only consider the *minimal presentation* of $\mathbf{K}$, which is a subset of $\{+, -, 0\}^n$, using the defining property of a matroid with coefficients. Now it is easily seen that $\mathcal{C}^* \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^n$ is the minimal presentation of a matroid with coefficients if and only if it is the set of cocircuits $\mathcal{C}^* = \min(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{0\})$ of an oriented matroid, and different oriented matroids define different matroids with coefficients.

(More generally, the matroids with coefficients over a fuzzy ring are canonically equivalent to the matroids with coefficients over the subring generated by 0 and the units; for K and K' this subring is

$$\{0, +, -, + - 0\} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{R}^+,$$

the canonical fuzzy ring for oriented matroids.)

(ii) For a 2-matroid $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ to present a matroid with coefficients over K it is required that for every $Z \in \mathcal{K}$ we find $Z' \in \mathcal{K} \cap \{+, -, 0\}^n =: \mathcal{L}'$ with the same support. Thus $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{L}' \circ i\mathcal{L}$ is quasi-complexified by condition (ii') of Theorem 1.6(1). However, this implies that $\mathcal{K}$, the oriented matroid $\mathcal{L}'$, and the complexified oriented matroid $\mathcal{L}' \circ i\mathcal{L}'$ present the same matroid with coefficients. $\square$

Thus the theory of matroids with coefficients does not cover complex matroids. The reason for this failure can be seen in the basic construction of the fuzzy rings that serve as coefficient domains: it is too closely modeled after a quotient of a ring by a subgroup of units. Thus it does not allow for the type of equivalence relations such as the *finite* topological stratifications that yield CW-models.

On the other hand, the fuzzy rings $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}^+$ and $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}^+$, which the theory of matroids with coefficients would suggest for studying complex matroids, are infinite. Here $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}^+$ is the fuzzy ring of all subsets of the circle S^1 , while $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}^+$ is essentially the ring of all arcs on this circle.

However, a theory of matroids with coefficients that allows for a topological structure is not available. (Such a theory would avoid the (interesting) Reorientation Problem in Section 7.6.) This leads to the desire for a theory of matroids with “cellular” coefficient domains that is more general (and simpler) than the Dress–Wenzel theory. This new theory should cover, e.g., the present case of complex matroids and 2-matroids, and more general ones, like the k -matroids of Björner and Ziegler [BZ, Section 9.3].

7. Some Problems

In this section we sketch six areas of future research. All of them can be considered as major quality criteria for the concept of a “complex matroid.” We note that in the context of matroids with coefficients, duality is established

in [D1], the basis version is available in [DW2], while the reduction to corank 2 is established (for perfect fuzzy rings) in [DW3]. We hope to attack these problems in future work.

7.1. Duality

We assume that the proof of Theorem 5.3 can be “lifted” to an oriented matroid setting, to prove that $\mathcal{K}^*$ is a complex matroid and $\mathcal{K}^{**} = \mathcal{K}$ in the nonrepresentable case also. This certainly seems plausible, since it also works for a complexified oriented matroid (Theorem 5.4).

The alternative would be to construct $\mathcal{K}^*$ from an oriented matroid frame of $\mathcal{K}$. The problem here is that it is not clear that the $!$ -construction behaves well under duality. However, from the well-known formula for the rank function of the dual matroid it is easy to see that if $\mathcal{L}!$ defines a real frame for a 2-matroid, then the dual oriented matroid is the real frame for a 2-matroid as well. The goal would be to adjust the “free parameters” of the $!$ -construction in such a way that the 2-matroid (which can be defined in terms of $\mathcal{L}!^*$) coincides with $\mathcal{K}^*$.

7.2. Basis Axioms

Assume that a complex hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^d$ is given as

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\ker(\ell_1), \dots, \ker(\ell_n)\}.$$

Then all the relevant data are encoded in the set of *Grassmann–Plücker maps*

$$\chi: \binom{[n]}{d} \rightarrow \{i, j, +, -, 0\}, \quad \{a_1, \dots, a_d\} \mapsto \mathbf{s}^{(1)}(\alpha \det_{\mathbb{C}}(\ell_{a_1}, \dots, \ell_{a_d}))$$

that we get for various $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. The problem is to characterize 2-matroids and complex matroids in terms of their Grassmann–Plücker maps.

7.3. Corank 2

It is one of the deeper facts about oriented matroids that important structural properties can be reduced to corank 2 (see [LV] and Sections 3.6 and 7.1 of [BLS⁺]). Similar reductions should be possible for 2-matroids and for complex matroids. Conjecture 4.7 is an attempt in this direction. In the basis version, a reduction of the general Grassmann–Plücker conditions on a 2-matroid to the 3-term conditions would be requested.

We note here that this type of problem becomes nontrivial because a complex matroid is not in general determined by its cocircuit signatures. This means that,

for example, it is not good enough to rely on signed cocircuits when constructing the dual complex matroid. Also, there does not seem to be a simple complex analogue for the conformal decomposition of covectors into cocircuits, which is an extremely useful tool for similar situations in the oriented matroid case [BLS⁺, Proposition 3.7.2].

7.4. Orientability

The following problem for 2-matroids and complex matroids is nearly untouched: which matroids M occur as the underlying matroids of 2-matroids (resp. complex matroids)? In other words, which matroids are 2-orientable (resp. complex orientable)?

In particular, examples (with proofs!) of matroids that are

- not 2-orientable,
- 2-orientable but not complex orientable,
- complex orientable but not complex realizable,

should be given.

We have obvious candidates at least for the first two cases, namely, the Fano matroid F_7 (resp. the non-Desargues matroid), but no effective criteria for nonorientability. The fact that the non-Desargues matroid is 2-realizable [GoM, p. 257] shows that noncanonical things (from the point of view of matroid representation theory) can happen.

7.5. Complex $\mathbf{s}^{(2)}$ -Matroids

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{H_1, \dots, H_n\}$ be a linear complex hyperplane arrangement in $\mathbb{C}^d$, and consider the $\mathbf{s}^{(2)}$ -stratification $\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(2)}: \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \{+, -, 0\}^{2n}$ that we get from

$$(\mathbf{s}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{z}))_a = \begin{cases} \mathbf{s}(\Im(\ell_a(\mathbf{z}))) & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq n, \\ \mathbf{s}(\Re(\ell_{a-n}(\mathbf{z}))) & \text{if } n < a \leq 2n. \end{cases}$$

This yields an oriented matroid frame $\mathcal{X}^{(2)} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^{2n}$ for the 2-matroid $\mathcal{X}^{(1)}(\mathcal{A})$. Furthermore, with the particular choice of taking real and complex parts we get that $\mathcal{X}^{(2)}$ admits an action of the dihedral group $I_2(4)$ (the symmetry groups of the square), induced by multiplication with “+i” and conjugation, which permutes and reorients the elements of $\mathcal{X}^{(2)}$.

The question arises [D2] whether this $I_2(4)$ -action can be used to define a complex structure for even $\mathbf{s}^{(2)}$ -oriented matroids $\mathcal{X}^{(2)} \subseteq \{+, -, 0\}^{2n}$. In particular, does every complex matroid $\mathcal{X}^{(1)} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ admit a “ $\mathcal{X}^{(2)}$ -frame” of this symmetric type? Conversely, is the 2-matroid derived from such a $\mathcal{X}^{(2)}$ -matroid with $I_2(4)$ -action complex?

7.6. Reorientation

The problem of characterizing which complex matroids realize the same (i.e., homeomorphic) 2-arrangements in S^{2r-1} is subtle. We note that this *reorientation problem* corresponds to rescaling operations $\ell_a \rightarrow \alpha_a \ell_a$ ($\alpha_a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus 0$) in the realized case.

Clearly, if $\mathcal{L}! \cup f$ is an extension of $\mathcal{L}!$ such that $\{e, e!, f\}$ forms a 3-circuit, then the corresponding exchange $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow (\mathcal{K} \cup f) \setminus e$ preserves the 2-arrangement. However, it is not at all clear that exchanges of this type connect every pair of complex matroids that represent the same 2-arrangement.

In fact, we note that the oriented matroid program $(\mathcal{L}!, e, e!)$ can be *non-euclidean* in the sense of Edmonds and Mandel [EM], [BLS⁺, Section 10.5], so the space of such extensions can be disconnected [SZ]. The smallest examples for this occur over $U_{2,4}$, corresponding to noneuclidean orientations $\mathcal{L}!$ of $U_{4,8}$. This indicates that the *reorientation space* of a complex matroid is not a torus in general.

7.7. Affine Complex Matroids

If $\mathcal{K} \subseteq \{i, j, +, -, 0\}^n$ is a complex matroid and $g \in [n]$ is a fixed element (not a loop), then the sign vector system $\mathcal{K}^+ := \{Z \in \mathcal{K} : Z_g = +\}$ is an *affine complex matroid*. Note that $\mathbf{0} \cup (\mathcal{K}^+ \cap \mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}})$ is again the face poset of a regular CW complex Γ_{comp}^+ .

If $\mathcal{K}$ is complex realizable, then $\mathcal{K}^+$ is the sign vector system of an affine complex hyperplane arrangement, and Γ_{comp}^+ has the homotopy type of the complement of this affine arrangement; in particular, we get

$$\Gamma_{\text{comp}} \simeq \Gamma_{\text{comp}}^+ \times \mathbb{C}^*. \quad (*)$$

The problem is to prove (*) also in the case where $\mathcal{K}$ is not realizable.

In the case of a complexified oriented matroid, we have (in the notation of Section 4.1 of [BLS⁺])

$$\mathcal{K}^+ = (\mathcal{L} \circ i\mathcal{L})^+ = \{X \circ iY : X_g = +, Y_g = 0\} \cong \mathcal{L}^+ \circ i(\mathcal{L}/g),$$

and $\mathcal{K}^+ \cap \mathcal{K}_{\text{comp}} = \mathcal{T}^+ \circ i(\mathcal{L}/g)$ is the affine *Salveti complex* [S] of an oriented matroid, where the linear case was analyzed in Section 4 of [BZ].

Furthermore, it is desired to characterize the affine systems $\mathcal{K}^+$ intrinsically. The recent work of Karlander [K] in the oriented matroid case suggests that this might not be easy.

7.8. Spaces of Complex Matroids

Using complex matroids, we can try to define *complex combinatorial differential manifolds* in analogy of MacPherson’s real combinatorial differential manifolds [MP].

The classifying space for complex vector bundles over such manifolds should be the *CM-Grassmannian*: the order complex of the set of all complex matroids of rank r on the ground set $[n]$, ordered by *weak maps* $\mathcal{K}^1 \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{K}^2$. These are defined by the condition that for every $Z \in \mathcal{K}^2$ there is a $W \in \mathcal{K}^1$ with $W \geq Z$ —see Proposition 7.7.5 of [BLS⁺] for the oriented matroid case.

We refer to [GeM], [B], [MP], and [MZ] for recent work in this direction for the real case.

References

- [B] E. K. Babson: A Combinatorial Flag Space, Ph.D. Thesis, MIT, 1993.
- [BKS] L. J. Billera, M. M. Kapranov, and B. Sturmfels: Cellular strings on polytopes, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, to appear.
- [BLS⁺] A. Björner, M. Las Vergnas, B. Sturmfels, N. White, and G. M. Ziegler: *Oriented Matroids*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications, Vol. 46, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [BZ] A. Björner and G. M. Ziegler: Combinatorial stratification of complex arrangements, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **5** (1992), 105–149.
- [D1] A. W. M. Dress: Duality theory for finite and infinite matroids with coefficients, *Adv. in Math.* **59** (1986), 97–123.
- [D2] A. W. M. Dress: Personal communication, Djursholm, 1992.
- [DW1] A. W. M. Dress and W. Wenzel: Endliche Matroide mit Koeffizienten, *Bayreuth. Math. Schr.* **26** (1988), 37–98.
- [DW2] A. W. M. Dress and W. Wenzel: Grassmann–Plücker relations and matroids with coefficients, *Adv. in Math.* **86** (1991), 68–110.
- [DW3] A. W. M. Dress and W. Wenzel: Perfect matroids, *Adv. in Math.* **91** (1992), 158–208.
- [EM] J. Edmonds and A. Mandel: Topology of Oriented Matroids, Ph.D. Thesis of A. Mandel, University of Waterloo, 1982.
- [FL] J. Folkman and J. Lawrence: Oriented matroids, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* **25** (1978), 199–236.
- [GeM] I. M. Gel’fand and R. D. MacPherson: A combinatorial formula for the Pontrjagin classes, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **26** (1992), 304–309.
- [GeR] I. M. Gel’fand and G. L. Rybnikov: Algebraic and topological invariants of oriented matroids, *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **40** (1990), 148–152.
- [GoM] M. Goresky and R. MacPherson: *Stratified Morse Theory*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 3, vol. 14, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988.
- [K] J. Karlander: A characterization of affine sign vector systems, Preprint, KTH, Stockholm, 1992.
- [LV] M. Las Vergnas: Oriented matroids as signed geometries real in corank 2, in: *Finite and Infinite Sets* (Proc. 6th Hungarian Combinatorial Conf., Eger, 1981), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 555–565.
- [MP] R. D. MacPherson: Combinatorial differential manifolds, Preprint, 1992.
- [MZ] N. E. Mnëv and G. M. Ziegler: Combinatorial models for the finite-dimensional Grassmannians, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, this issue, pp. 241–250.
- [OS] P. Orlik and L. Solomon: Combinatorics and topology of complements of hyperplanes, *Invent. Math.* **56** (1980), 167–189.

- [R] G. L. Rybnikov: Personal communication, Luminy, 1991.
- [S] M. Salvetti: Topology of the complement of real hyperplanes in $\mathbb{C}^N$, *Invent. Math.* **88** (1987), 603–618.
- [SW] J. Stoer and Ch. Witzgall: *Convexity and Optimization in Finite Dimensions I*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, vol. 163, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.
- [SZ] B. Sturmfels and G. M. Ziegler: Extension spaces of oriented matroids, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **10** (1993), 23–45.
- [Z] G. M. Ziegler: On the difference between real and complex arrangements, *Math. Z.* **212** (1993), 1–11.
- [ZŽ] G. M. Ziegler and R. T. Živaljević: Homotopy types of arrangements via diagrams of spaces, *Math. Ann.* **295** (1993), 527–548.

Received April 22, 1992, and in revised form February 18, 1993.

Note added in proof. For the Orientability Problem 7.4, L. Lovász has observed that 2-matroids satisfy Ingleton's "necessary condition for representability" (A. W. Ingleton, Representation of matroids, in: *Proc. Conf. on Combinatorial Mathematics and Its Applications* (D. J. A. Welsh, ed.), Academic Press, London, 1971, pp. 149–167) and consequently the Vámos matroid is not 2-orientable.