ON ENDOMORPHISMS OF EXTENSIONS IN TANNAKIAN CATEGORIES

PAYMAN ESKANDARI

Abstract. We prove some analogues of Schur's lemma for endomorphisms of extensions in Tannakian categories. More precisely, let $\mathbf{T}$ be a neutral Tannakian category over a field of characteristic zero. Let E be an extension of A by B in $\mathbf{T}$. We consider conditions under which every endomorphism of E that stabilizes B induces a scalar map on $A \oplus B$. We give a result in this direction in the general setting of arbitrary $\mathbf{T}$ and E, and then a stronger result when $\mathbf{T}$ is filtered and the associated graded objects to A and B satisfy some conditions. We also discuss the sharpness of the results.

1. Introduction

Let K be a field of characteristic zero and $\mathbf{T}$ a Tannakian[1] category over K. Given any object X of $\mathbf{T}$, let $End_{\mathbf{T}}(X)$ be the endomorphism algebra of X. Given a subobject Y of X, denote the subalgebra of $End_{\mathbf{T}}(X)$ consisting of the endomorphisms that restrict to an endomorphism of Y (i.e. that map Y to Y) by $End_{\mathbf{T}}(X;Y)$.

Let A and B be nonzero objects of $\mathbf{T}$. Fix an extension of A by B:

$$0 \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow 0. \tag{1}$$

In this note we prove some analogues of Schur's lemma for $End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B)$.

The extension (1) induces a homomorphism of algebras

$$\Omega : End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B) \to End_{\mathbf{T}}(B) \times End_{\mathbf{T}}(A) \qquad \phi \mapsto (\phi_B, \phi_A), \tag{2}$$

where given $\phi \in End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B)$, its image (ϕ_B, ϕ_A) is characterized by the commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_B} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi_A} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array} \tag{3}$$

The image of Ω always contains the diagonal copy of K in $End_{\mathbf{T}}(B) \times End_{\mathbf{T}}(A)$ (as the image of scalar endomorphisms of E). Roughly speaking, it is natural to expect that the further away (1) is from splitting, the smaller the image of Ω should be. We shall prove two results in this spirit. The first is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ be the Lie algebra of the kernel of the homomorphism from the Tannakian group of E to the Tannakian group of $A \oplus B$, naturally considered as a subobject of the internal Hom object $Hom(A,B)$ (see §2 below for details). Assume that $\mathfrak{u}(E) = Hom(A,B)$. Then the image of Ω is equal to the diagonal copy of K.*

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 18M25, 08A35 (primary); 14F42, 14C30, 20G05 (secondary).

[1] Throughout the paper, all Tannakian categories are neutral. We will freely use the language of Tannakian categories. See [3] for a reference.

The works [8] and [9] of Hardouin (in the case where A and B are semisimple) and [4] of the author and Kumar Murty (for arbitrary possibly non-semisimple A and B) give a characterization of the subobject $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ of $Hom(A,B)$. A summary of this characterization is recalled in §2 below. It follows from this characterization that the condition that $\mathfrak{u}(E) = Hom(A,B)$, which we refer to as the maximality of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$, implies that the extension class

$$\mathcal{E} \in Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(A,B))$$

(where $Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}$ is the Ext^1 group in $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbb{1}$ is the unit object) corresponding to (1) under the canonical isomorphism

$$Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(A,B) \cong Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(A,B))$$

is *totally nonsplit*, i.e. for any proper subobject C of $Hom(A,B)$ the pushforward of $\mathcal{E}$ along the quotient $Hom(A,B) \to Hom(A,B)/C$ is nonsplit. (Equivalently, an extension $0 \to X \to Y \to \mathbb{1} \to 0$ is totally nonsplit if the only subobject of Y that is mapped onto $\mathbb{1}$ is Y.)

In the case where A and B are semisimple, the maximality of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is equivalent to the total nonsplitting of $\mathcal{E}$. But in general, the two conditions are not equivalent, as the examples in §5 illustrate. The second result of the paper asserts that in some important settings one can relax the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1 from assuming maximality of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ to assuming total nonsplitting of $\mathcal{E}$.

Let us recall that the Tannakian category $\mathbf{T}$ is said to be filtered if it is equipped with a filtration $W_\bullet$ satisfying similar properties to the weight filtration on mixed Hodge structures, i.e. $W_\bullet$ is indexed by $\mathbb{Z}$, functorial, exact, increasing, finite on every object, and it respects the tensor structure. This means that for every integer n we have an exact linear functor $W_n : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbf{T}$ such that for every object X of $\mathbf{T}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{n-1}X &\subset W_nX \qquad (\forall n) \\ W_nX &= 0 \qquad (\forall n \ll 0) \\ W_nX &= X \qquad (\forall n \gg 0), \end{aligned}$$

and such that the inclusions $W_nX \subset X$ for various X give a morphism of functors from W_n to the identity. Compatibility with the tensor structure means that for every objects X and Y and every n,

$$W_n(X \otimes Y) = \sum_{p+q=n} W_p(X) \otimes W_q(Y).$$

We will refer to $W_\bullet$ as the weight filtration. By the weights of an object X we mean the integers n such that $W_nX/W_{n-1}X$ is not zero. The associated graded of X is defined to be $Gr^W X := \bigoplus_n W_nX/W_{n-1}X$. The prototype examples of filtered Tannakian categories are various Tannakian categories of mixed motives and the category of mixed Hodge structures.

We can now state the second result of the paper:

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\mathbf{T}$ is a filtered Tannakian category with the weight filtration denoted by $W_\bullet$. Suppose moreover that condition (i) or (ii) below holds:*

(i) *The associated graded $Gr^W E$ is semisimple and there are no nonzero morphisms $Gr^W A \to Gr^W B$.*
(ii) *The sets of weights of A and B are disjoint.*

Then if $\mathcal{E}$ (defined as above) is totally nonsplit, the image of Ω will be equal to the diagonal copy of K.

In any reasonable category of mixed motives, $Gr^W E$ is always semisimple. In the category of mixed Hodge structures, $Gr^W E$ is semisimple if E is graded polarizable. Of course, it is only useful to include condition (ii) as a separate condition in the statement if $Gr^W E$ is not known to be semisimple.

Theorem 1.2 is used crucially in the paper [6], where we give a classification result for mixed motives with maximal unipotent radicals of motivic Galois groups and a given associated graded with respect to the weight filtration. Note that the assertion of Theorem 1.2 can be equivalently replaced by

$$End_{\mathbf{T}}(E; B) \cong K,$$

i.e. every element of $End_{\mathbf{T}}(E; B)$ is a scalar endomorphisms of E. Indeed, the kernel of Ω is canonically isomorphic to $Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(A, B)$, where $Hom_{\mathbf{T}}$ is the Hom group in $\mathbf{T}$. Since the functor that sends an object X to $Gr^W X$ is faithful, under condition (i) or (ii) of Theorem 1.2 $Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(A, B)$ will be zero.

Below, we first recall the characterization of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ mentioned above, and then prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The final section of the note includes some further remarks. In particular, we give an example that shows that in the general setting of Theorem 1.1 one cannot relax the maximality condition to total nonsplitting. Also, we discuss an example involving 1-motives that shows that in the setting where $\mathbf{T}$ is filtered and the sets of weights of A and B are disjoint, the total nonsplitting of $\mathcal{E}$ does not imply maximality of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$, so that in this setting the second theorem is indeed stronger than the first one. We also discuss a generalization of Theorem 1.2 (see §5.3).

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Kumar Murty for many helpful discussions. I would also like to thank the anonymous referee for a careful reading of the paper and several suggestions that helped improve the exposition of the paper.

2. Recollections on Tannakian groups of extensions

To simplify the notation, we fix a choice of fiber functor and identify $\mathbf{T}$ with the category of finite dimensional (algebraic) representations of an affine group scheme $\mathcal{G}$ over K (with $\mathcal{G}$ = the Tannakian group of $\mathbf{T}$ with respect to the fiber functor). We will use the same symbol for an object of $\mathbf{T}$ and its underlying vector space. For any object X of $\mathbf{T}$ and any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we denote the image of g in $GL(X)$ by g_X. The image of $\mathcal{G}$ in $GL(X)$ is denoted by $\mathcal{G}(X)$; this is the Tannakian group of the Tannakian subcategory $\langle X \rangle$ generated by X. (Recall that $\langle X \rangle$ is the smallest full Tannakian subcategory of $\mathbf{T}$ which contains X and is closed under taking subquotients.)

We should point out that even though we think of $\mathbf{T}$ as the category of representations of $\mathcal{G}$, all the objects in $\mathbf{T}$ that appear in the following text (in particular, the object $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ introduced below) will be intrinsic to the Tannakian category $\mathbf{T}$. For this reason, we often prefer to use the terms *object* and *subobject* (= object and subobject in $\mathbf{T}$) instead of the terms $\mathcal{G}$*-representation* and $\mathcal{G}$*-subrepresentation*.

As they were in the Introduction, the Ext and Hom groups in $\mathbf{T}$ are denoted by $Ext_{\mathbf{T}}$ and $Hom_{\mathbf{T}}$. We use the notations Hom and End (without any decorations) to refer to the Hom and End groups in the category of vector spaces. As we have adopted the convention of denoting an object of $\mathbf{T}$ and its underlying vector space by the same symbol, for any objects X and Y of $\mathbf{T}$ the notation $Hom(X, Y)$ will refer to both the internal Hom (which is an object of $\mathbf{T}$) and the Hom space in the category of vector spaces between the underlying vector spaces. This should not lead to confusion as the relevant interpretation will be clear from the context.

Given a vector space X and a subspace Y of X, denote the subalgebra of $End(X)$ consisting of linear maps on X which map Y to Y by $End(X;Y)$. Similarly, the subgroup of $GL(X)$ consisting of the elements which map Y to itself is denoted by $GL(X;Y)$. Given an object X of any category, the identity map on X is denoted by Id_X. We will sometimes simply write Id if X is clear from the context.

Fix objects A, B and E of $\mathbf{T}$ and the exact sequence (1). Let $\mathcal{U}(E)$ be the kernel of the natural map

$$\mathcal{G}(E) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}(B \oplus A). \tag{4}$$

Choosing a section of $E \twoheadrightarrow B$ in the category of vector spaces to identify

$$E = B \oplus A$$

as vector spaces, we have an embedding

$$\mathcal{U}(E) \to W_{-1}GL(B \oplus A; B) := \{\begin{pmatrix} Id_B & f \\ 0 & Id_A \end{pmatrix} : f \in Hom(A,B)\}.$$

The group $W_{-1}GL(B \oplus A; B)$ is unipotent and abelian and hence so is $\mathcal{U}(E)$. Since $W_{-1}GL(B \oplus A; B)$ is abelian, the embedding above is actually canonical, i.e. does not depend on the choice of the section of $E \twoheadrightarrow A$ used to identify $E = B \oplus A$.

Let $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ be the Lie algebra of $\mathcal{U}(E)$. Then $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ can be identified as a subspace of $Hom(A,B)$ with the exponential map $\mathfrak{u}(E) \to \mathcal{U}(E)$ simply sending

$$f \in \mathfrak{u}(E) \subset Hom(A,B) \qquad \text{to} \qquad \begin{pmatrix} Id & f \\ 0 & Id \end{pmatrix}.$$

Through the adjoint representation of $\mathcal{G}(E)$ on $\mathfrak{u}(E)$, the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is naturally equipped with a $\mathcal{G}$-action. The inclusion $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset Hom(A,B)$ is compatible with the $\mathcal{G}$-actions, making $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ a subobject of the internal Hom $Hom(A,B)$ (see [4, §3.1], for instance). This subobject has a nice description, which we recall now.

As in §1, let

$$\mathcal{E} \in Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(A,B))$$

be the element corresponding to the class of (1) under the canonical isomorphism

$$Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(A,B) \cong Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(A,B)).$$

For any subobject $C \subset Hom(A,B)$, the pushforward of $\mathcal{E}$ along the quotient map

$$Hom(A,B) \to Hom(A,B)/C$$

is denoted by $\mathcal{E}/C$. The following characterization of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ was proved in [4]:

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 3.3.1 of [4], see also Lemma 3.4.3 of [5])**.** *Given any subobject C of $Hom(A,B)$, we have $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset C$ if and only if the pushforward*

$$\mathcal{E}/C \in Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(A,B)/C)$$

is in the image of the natural injection

$$Ext^1_{\langle A\oplus B\rangle}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(A,B)/C) \to Ext^1_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(A,B)/C),$$

where $Ext^1_{\langle A\oplus B\rangle}$ is the Ext^1 group in the Tannakian subcategory $\langle A \oplus B\rangle$ of $\mathbf{T}$ generated by $A \oplus B$. (Thus $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is the smallest subobject of $Hom(A,B)$ with this property.)

In the case where A and B are semisimple, this was earlier proved by Bertrand in [2] in the setting of D-modules, and by Hardouin in [8] and [9] in the setting of arbitrary Tannakian categories. In this case, the statement simplifies to the following:

Theorem 2.2 (Theorem 2 of [9])**.** *Suppose A and B are semisimple. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be as above. Then given any subobject C of $Hom(A, B)$, we have $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset C$ if and only if the pushforward $\mathcal{E}/C$ splits.*

Note that in the general case (where A or B is not semisimple), by Theorem 2.1 if C is any subobject of $Hom(A, B)$ such that $\mathcal{E}/C$ splits, then C contains $\mathfrak{u}(E)$. The pushforward $\mathcal{E}/\mathfrak{u}(E)$ however may not split. See the examples in §5 below.

We also recall an explicit description of $\mathcal{E}$ (see [4, §3.2] for details). Let

$$Hom(A, E)^{\dagger} := \{f \in Hom(A, E) : \text{the composition } A \xrightarrow{f} E \twoheadrightarrow A \text{ is a scalar multiple of } Id_A\}.$$

It is easy to see that this is a subobject of $Hom(A, E)$. The element $\mathcal{E}$ is the class of the extension

$$0 \longrightarrow Hom(A, B) \longrightarrow Hom(A, E)^{\dagger} \longrightarrow \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow 0. \tag{5}$$

Here, the injective map is simply the obvious embedding, sending $f \in Hom(A, B)$ to

$$A \xrightarrow{f} B \hookrightarrow E.$$

The surjective map in (5) is the map that sends $f \in Hom(A, E)^{\dagger}$ to $a \in K$, where

$$A \xrightarrow{f} E \twoheadrightarrow A$$

is $a \cdot Id_A$.

3. Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for $A = \mathbb{1}$

The goal of this section is to prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in the case where $A = \mathbb{1}$; the general case will be deduced from this in the next section. In this case, identifying $Hom(\mathbb{1}, B) = B$ the extension $\mathcal{E}$ is simply given by (1). Theorem 2.1 asserts that $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is the smallest subobject of B such that $\mathcal{E}/\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is an extension of $\mathbb{1}$ by $B/\mathfrak{u}(E)$ in the subcategory $\langle B \rangle$. If B is semisimple, $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is the smallest subobject of B such that $\mathcal{E}/\mathfrak{u}(E)$ splits.

We first establish a lemma:

Lemma 3.1. *Assume $A = \mathbb{1}$. Let $\lambda : E \to B_0$ be a morphism from E to an object B_0, such that B_0 belongs to the subcategory $\langle B \rangle$. Then $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset B \cap \ker(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Set $B' := B \cap \ker(\lambda)$. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & \ker(\lambda) & \longrightarrow & \ker(\lambda)/B' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & B/B' & \longrightarrow & E/\ker(\lambda) & \longrightarrow & E/(B+\ker(\lambda)) & \longrightarrow & 0\,, \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & &
\end{array} \tag{6}$$

where the maps are inclusions and quotient maps. The rows and columns are exact.

Case I: Suppose $\ker(\lambda) \not\subset B$, so that B' is a proper subobject of $\ker(\lambda)$. Being a nonzero subobject of the unit object, $\ker(\lambda)/B'$ must be isomorphism to $\mathbb{1}$. Thus $\mathcal{E}$ (= the second row) is the pushforward of an extension of $\mathbb{1}$ by B' (the first row). It follows that $\mathcal{E}/B'$ splits and $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset B'$ by Theorem 2.1.

Case II: Suppose $\ker(\lambda) \subset B$, so that $B' = \ker(\lambda)$. Then the third row of the diagram is the pushforward $\mathcal{E}/B'$. By assumption, $E/\ker(\lambda)$ is in the subcategory generated by B. Again $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset B'$ by Theorem 2.1. □

We can now establish Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in the case that $A = \mathbb{1}$. Let $\phi \in End_{\mathbf{T}}(E; B)$. Then $\phi_{\mathbb{1}}$ (= the induced map on $\mathbb{1}$ by ϕ) is equal to $a \cdot Id_{\mathbb{1}}$ for some $a \in K$. The endomorphism $\lambda := \phi - a \cdot Id_E$ of E then factors through B, i.e is the composition with the inclusion $B \hookrightarrow E$ of a morphism $E \to B$, which we also denote by λ.

To obtain Theorem 1.1, apply the previous lemma to λ. We get $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset B \cap \ker(\lambda)$. The assumption that $\mathfrak{u}(E) = B$ thus gives $B \subset \ker(\lambda)$, i.e. $\phi = a \cdot Id$ on B, as desired.

We now turn our attention to Theorem 1.2. We thus further assume that $\mathbf{T}$ is a filtered Tannakian category and that either (i) $Gr^W E$ is semisimple and

$$Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Gr^W B) = 0,$$

or (ii) 0 is not a weight of B (note that $A = \mathbb{1}$ is pure of weight 0). Both conditions guarantee that the kernel of $\lambda : E \to B$ cannot be contained in B. Indeed, this is simply by weight considerations if (ii) holds. On the other hand, if (i) holds, after applying the associated graded functor the sequence (1) splits. Choosing a section for the sequence (which will be unique because $Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Gr^W B)$ vanishes), if $\ker(\lambda) \subset B$ we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & \mathbb{1} & & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Gr^W \ker(\lambda) & \longrightarrow & Gr^W E & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & Gr^W B \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \\ & & Gr^W B & & & & \end{array}$$

(with obvious maps and the row being exact). We thus get a nonzero morphism $\mathbb{1} \to Gr^W B$.

Thus $B' := B \cap \ker(\lambda)$ is a proper subobject of $\ker(\lambda)$. Considering the diagram (6) with B' and $\lambda : E \to B$ as in here, the extension $\mathcal{E}$ is the pushforward of the top row along the inclusion $B' \hookrightarrow B$, so that $\mathcal{E}/B'$ splits. If $\mathcal{E}$ is totally nonsplit, we get $B' = B$ and $B \subset \ker(\lambda)$. Thus we have also established Theorem 1.2 when $A = \mathbb{1}$.

4. Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 for arbitrary A

We now assume that A is arbitrary. The extension $\mathcal{E}$ is now given by (5). Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 or 1.2 for the extension given in (1). Then the hypotheses also hold for the extension given in (5), i.e. if (5) is taken as our original (1): To see this for Theorem 1.1, note that in view of Theorem 2.1 we have $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset \mathfrak{u}(Hom(A,E)^\dagger)$, as the subcategory $\langle Hom(A,B) \rangle$ is contained in $\langle A \oplus B \rangle$; to see it for Theorem 1.2 note that

$$Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Gr^W Hom(A,B)) = Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}, Hom(Gr^W A, Gr^W B)) = Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(Gr^W A, Gr^W B).$$

Thus by the special case of the results already proved we know that the image of the map

$$End_{\mathbf{T}}(Hom(A,E)^\dagger; Hom(A,B)) \longrightarrow End_{\mathbf{T}}(Hom(A,B)) \times End_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbb{1}) \tag{7}$$

induced by (5) is the diagonal copy of K. Hence the general case of the results will be established if we prove the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose the image of* (7) *is the diagonal copy of* K. *Then so is the image of* (2).

Proof. Let $\phi \in End_{\mathbf{T}}(E; B)$. We will show that (ϕ_B, ϕ_A) is in the diagonal copy of K. Adding a suitable scalar multiple of Id_E to ϕ if necessary, we may assume that ϕ is an automorphism (recall that K is of characteristic zero). Let $\phi^\dagger \in End(Hom(A, E))$ be the map that sends any $f \in Hom(A, E)$ to the composition

$$A \xrightarrow{\phi_A^{-1}} A \xrightarrow{f} E \xrightarrow{\phi} E.$$

Since ϕ_A and ϕ are morphisms in $\mathbf{T}$, so is $\phi^\dagger$. Since B is stable under ϕ, the map $\phi^\dagger$ stabilizes $Hom(A, B)$. Moreover, if f is in $Hom(A, E)^\dagger$ with $f \pmod{A} = Id_A$, then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} A & \xrightarrow{\phi_A^{-1}} & A & \xrightarrow{f} & E & \xrightarrow{\phi} & E \\ & & & \overset{Id}{\searrow} & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & & & A & \xrightarrow{\phi_A} & A, \end{array}$$

so that $\phi^\dagger(f)$ is also in $Hom(A, E)^\dagger$ with $\phi^\dagger(f) \pmod{A}$ being the identity map on A. We conclude that:

(i) $\phi^\dagger$ restricts to an element of $End_{\mathbf{T}}(Hom(A, E)^\dagger; Hom(A, B))$, and
(ii) denoting this restriction also by $\phi^\dagger$, we have $\phi^\dagger_{\mathbb{1}} = Id$ (where $\phi^\dagger_{\mathbb{1}}$ is the map induced on $\mathbb{1}$ by $\phi^\dagger \in End_{\mathbf{T}}(Hom(A, E)^\dagger)$).

Since the image of (7) is the diagonal copy of K, it follows that the restriction of $\phi^\dagger$ to $Hom(A, B)$ is also the identity map. That is, for every linear map $f : A \to B$, we have

$$\phi_B f \phi_A^{-1} = f.$$

Since A and B are nonzero, by elementary linear algebra ϕ_A and ϕ_B are both scalar maps and they are given by multiplication with the same element of K. □

5. Further remarks

5.1. If (1) is an arbitrary extension in a general Tannakian category $\mathbf{T}$ (with no extra assumptions on (1) or $\mathbf{T}$), total nonsplitting of $\mathcal{E}$ (= the extension of $\mathbb{1}$ by $Hom(A, B)$ corresponding to (1) under the canonical isomorphism) does not guarantee that the image of Ω is K. Thus the hypothesis of maximality of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ in Theorem 1.1 cannot be relaxed to total nonsplitting.

For example, given any field K of characteristic zero, take $\mathbf{T}$ be the category of finite dimensional algebraic representations of the subgroup $\mathcal{G}$ of GL_3 (over K) consisting of all the matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & a & b \\ & 1 & a \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the missing entries are zero. Let B be K^2 with the action of $\mathcal{G}$ given by left multiplication by the top left 2×2 submatrix, and E be K^3 with the canonical action of $\mathcal{G}$ through left multiplication. We have an embedding $B \hookrightarrow E$ given by $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_1, x_2, 0)$, fitting into a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow E \longrightarrow \mathbb{1} \longrightarrow 0,$$

with the map $E \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{1}$ being projection onto the third coordinate. It is easy to see that the extension above is totally nonsplit. However, E has an endomorphism

$$\phi : (x_1, x_2, x_3) \mapsto (x_2, x_3, 0)$$

which stabilizes B but its restriction to B is not a scalar multiple of the identity.

It is worth mentioning that here, by Theorem 1.1 $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is not maximal, so that this also gives an example that shows that in general, total nonsplitting of $\mathcal{E}$ does not imply that $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ must be maximal (in particular, in general $\mathcal{E}/\mathfrak{u}(E)$ does not have to split). See the next subsection for a more interesting example that also illustrates this.

5.2. Assume that $\mathbf{T}$ is filtered and that A and B have disjoint sets of weights. Then total nonsplitting of $\mathcal{E}$ still does not imply maximality of $\mathfrak{u}(E)$, so that Theorem 1.2 is indeed stronger than Theorem 1.1 in this setting. The example provided in §6.10 of [5] using the work [10] of Jacquinot and Ribet on deficient points on semiabelian varieties illustrates this. If we take $\mathbf{T}$ to be the category of mixed Hodge structures, E to be the 1-motive denoted by M in §6.10 of [5], and we take $B = W_{-1}M$ and $A = M/W_{-1}M = \mathbb{1}$, then the sequence (1) (given by the natural inclusion and quotient maps) is totally nonsplit, the weights of A and B are disjoint, and $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ (which is the same as $\mathfrak{u}_{-1}(M)$ in §6.10 of [5]) is not maximal. In fact, we have $\mathfrak{u}(E) = 0$. See *loc. cit.*

Continuing to work in the category of mixed Hodge structures, here we include a somewhat simpler example which avoids using deficient points. Let J be a simple complex abelian variety of positive dimension. Let N be a nonsplit extension of $\mathbb{1}$ by $H_1(J)$. Then $N^\vee(1)$ is a nonsplit extension of $H^1(J)(1)$ by $\mathbb{Q}(1)$, which after a choice of polarization can be thought of as a nonsplit extension of $H_1(J)$ by $\mathbb{Q}(1)$. Since the Ext^2 groups vanish in the category of mixed Hodge structures (see [1], for example), there is an object E fitting into the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Q}(1) & \longrightarrow & N^\vee(1) & \longrightarrow & H_1(J) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \| & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Q}(1) & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & 0\,, \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & & \mathbb{1} & = & \mathbb{1} & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 & &
\end{array}$$

in which the rows and columns are exact and the top row and the right column are our nonsplit extensions. (See [7, Lemma 9.3.8] or [5, Lemma 6.4.1].)

Take the first vertical extension of the diagram to play the role of our (1); it will also be our $\mathcal{E}$. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is totally nonsplit, as $\mathbb{Q}(1)$ is the unique maximal proper subobject of $N^\vee(1)$ and the pushforward $\mathcal{E}/\mathbb{Q}(1)$ (= the right column) is nonsplit. On the other hand,

$\mathcal{E}/\mathbb{Q}(1)$ is an extension in the subcategory generated by $N^\vee(1)$, hence by Theorem 2.1 we have $\mathfrak{u}(E) \subset \mathbb{Q}(1)$. In particular, $\mathfrak{u}(E)$ is not maximal.

5.3. In the proof of the case $A = \mathbb{1}$ of Theorem 1.2 the only place where the filtration on $\mathbf{T}$ and condition (i) or (ii) played a part is when we concluded that the kernel of $\lambda : E \to B$ (with λ as in the proof) is not contained in B. Combining with Lemma 4.1 we obtain the following generalization of Theorem 1.2:

Theorem 5.1. *Let* (1) *be an extension in any Tannakian category* $\mathbf{T}$ *over a field of characteristic 0. Suppose that the kernel of any morphism*

$$Hom(A,E)^\dagger \to Hom(A,B) \tag{8}$$

is not contained in $Hom(A,B)$*. Then if* $\mathcal{E}$ *(i.e. the extension of* $\mathbb{1}$ *by* $Hom(A,B)$ *corresponding to* (1)*, as before) is totally nonsplit, the image of* Ω *will be the diagonal copy of* K*.*

In particular, this can be applied in the following situation: Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is a reductive subgroup of the group $\mathcal{G}(E)$ (= the Tannakian group of $\langle E\rangle$). Every object of $\langle E\rangle$ can also be considered as an $\mathcal{R}$-representation. In the (semisimple) category of $\mathcal{R}$-representations, we can choose a splitting of $\mathcal{E}$ to decompose

$$Hom(A,E)^\dagger \simeq Hom(A,B) \oplus \mathbb{1}.$$

Suppose that there are no nonzero $\mathcal{R}$-equivariant maps $A \to B$, or equivalently

$$\mathbb{1} \to Hom(A,B).$$

Then the kernel of any morphism (8) in $\mathbf{T}$ cannot be contained in $Hom(A,B)$, and hence the image of Ω will be the diagonal copy of K. In fact, since $Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(A,B)$ is zero, we get $End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B) \cong K$.

Note that this scenario directly generalizes the situation of Theorem 1.2: If $\mathbf{T}$ is filtered, taking $\mathcal{R}$ to be $\mathcal{G}(Gr^W E)$ embedded in $\mathcal{G}(E)$ via the section of $\mathcal{G}(E) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{G}(Gr^W E)$ induced by $Gr^W : \langle E\rangle \to \langle Gr^W E\rangle$ we recover case (i) of Theorem 1.2. Taking $\mathcal{R}$ to be the multiplicative group $\mathbb{G}_m$ embedded in $\mathcal{G}(E)$ through a (possibly noncentral) cocharacter $\mathbb{G}_m \to \mathcal{G}(E)$ that induces the weight grading on the associated gradeds we recover case (ii) of the result.

5.4. We have

$$\ker(\Omega) = Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(A,B),$$

where $Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(A,B)$ is considered as a subset of $End_{\mathbf{T}}(E)$ via

$$(A \xrightarrow{f} B) \quad \mapsto \quad (E \twoheadrightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \hookrightarrow E).$$

Whenever $Im(\Omega) = K$, the natural embedding of K into $End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B)$ as the space of scalar maps provides a section for the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(A,B) \longrightarrow End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B) \xrightarrow{\Omega} Im(\Omega) \longrightarrow 0.$$

This gives an isomorphism

$$End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B) \cong K \oplus Hom_{\mathbf{T}}(A,B).$$

The isomorphism is initially of vector spaces only, but transferring the multiplication on $End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B)$ to the right hand side it becomes an isomorphism of algebras. The multiplication on the right is given by

$$(a,f)(a',f') = (aa', af' + a'f)$$

and the embedding of K is through the first factor. In particular, $End_{\mathbf{T}}(E;B)$ is commutative if $Im(\Omega)=K$.

References

[1] A. A. Beilinson, Notes on absolute Hodge cohomology, Applications of Algebraic K-theory to Algebraic Geometry and Number Theory, Part I, Proceedings of a Summer Research Conference held June 12-18, 1983, in Boulder, Colorado, Contemporary Mathematics 55, American Mathematical Society, Providence, Rhode Island, pp. 35–68

[2] D. Bertrand, Unipotent radicals of differential Galois group and integrals of solutions of inhomogeneous equations, Math. Ann. 321 (2001), no. 3, 645–666

[3] P. Deligne and J.S. Milne, Tannakian Categories, In Hodge Cycles, Motives, and Shimura Varieties, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 900, Springer-Verlog, Berlin (1982)

[4] P. Eskandari, V. K. Murty, The fundamental group of an extension in a Tannakian category and the unipotent radical of the Mumford-Tate group of an open curve, to appear in the Pacific Journal of Mathematics

[5] P. Eskandari, V. K. Murty, On unipotent radicals of motivic Galois groups, Algebra & Number Theory 17-1 (2023), pp 165-215

[6] P. Eskandari, On blended extensions in filtered tannakian categories and mixed motives with maximal unipotent radicals, preprint, arXiv:2307.15487, 2023

[7] A. Grothendieck, Modèles de Néron et monodromie, SGA VII.1, no 9, Springer LN 288, 1968

[8] C. Hardouin, Hypertranscendance et Groupes de Galois aux différences, arXiv 0609646v2, 2006

[9] C. Hardouin, Unipotent radicals of Tannakian Galois groups in positive characteristic, Arithmetic and Galois theories of differential equations, 223-239, Sémin. Congr., 23, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2011

[10] O. Jacquinot and K. Ribet, Deficient points on extensions of abelian varieties by G, J. Number Theory, 25: 2 (1986), 133-151

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg MB, Canada
Email address: p.eskandari@uwinnipeg.ca