

# Incidence and Combinatorial Properties of Linear Complexes

Hans Havlicek

Institut für Diskrete Mathematik und Geometrie  
Technische Universität Wien  
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8–10  
A-1040 Wien  
Austria  
havlicek@geometrie.tuwien.ac.at

Corrado Zanella

Dipartimento di Tecnica e Gestione dei Sistemi Industriali  
Università di Padova  
Stradella S. Nicola 3  
I-36100 Vicenza  
Italy  
corrado.zanella@unipd.it

*Dedicated to Helmut Karzel on the occasion of his 80th birthday*

## Abstract

In this paper a generalisation of the notion of polarity is exhibited which allows to completely describe, in an incidence-geometric way, the linear complexes of  $h$ -subspaces. A generalised polarity is defined to be a partial map which maps  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces to hyperplanes, satisfying suitable linearity and reciprocity properties. Generalised polarities with the null property give rise to a linear complexes and vice versa. Given that there exists for  $h > 1$  a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces which contains no star –this seems to be an open problem over an arbitrary ground field –the combinatorial structure of a partition of the line set of the projective space into non-geometric spreads of its hyperplanes can be obtained. This line partition has an additional linearity property which turns out to be characteristic.

MSC 2000: 51A45, 51E20, 51E23, 05B25, 05B40

Keywords: Linear complex, Grassmannian, linear mapping, polarity, line spread, line partition.

## 1 Introduction

The notion of a linear complex has been investigated for longer than a century, and one could regard it as completely known. The classical approach is to define a linear complex of  $h$ -dimensional subspaces (shortly:  $h$ -subspaces) in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ ,

i.e., the  $n$ -dimensional projective space over a commutative field  $F$ , as the set of all  $h$ -subspaces whose Grassmann coordinates satisfy a non-trivial linear equation or, in a coordinate-free way, via a hyperplane section of the corresponding Grassmann variety. It is well known that each linear complex of *lines* ( $h = 1$ ) is the set of all lines which are contained in their polar subspace with respect to a (possibly degenerate) null polarity. The classification of these complexes reduces to the well known classification of non-zero alternating matrices over  $F$ . Also, a lot was written by leading classical authors on the theory of linear complexes of  $h$ -subspaces for  $h > 1$ , but seemingly, such a theory was developed for the complex numbers only. As regards the topics which will be dealt with in this paper see, among others, [2], [3], [5], [6], [17], and [19].

To our knowledge, no incidence-geometric approach to linear complexes exists for  $h > 1$ . Our goal is to adopt such a point of view and coherently describe linear complexes of  $h$ -subspaces. To accomplish this task, we first collect some results about *linear mappings* and *primes* (geometric hyperplanes) of Grassmannians over arbitrary fields (commutative or skew). In a Grassmannian over a proper skew field there is only one kind of prime, whence we rule out skew fields at an early stage of our investigation. In a Grassmannian over a commutative field primes and linear complexes are the same, but this result gives no explicit information about linear complexes.

In Section 5 the notion of *polarity* is generalised. This leads us to an incidence-geometric construction of linear complexes of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  in terms of *generalised null polarities*. A crucial problem for linear complexes of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  is the existence of *singular*  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces for  $h > 1$ . This problem is addressed in Section 6, where we also sketch a result from [2] for the case of complex numbers. However, a solution over an arbitrary field  $F$  presently seems beyond reach. If there exists a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces,  $h > 1$ , without singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces, then there is also a linear complex of planes without singular lines. Therefore, we focus on linear complexes of planes without singular lines, where we establish an intriguing relation with *linear line spreads*. Any linear complex of planes without singular lines gives rise to linear line spread, which turns out to be non-geometric in several cases, e. g. for a finite ground field. Finally, Section 7 is devoted to a connection between linear complexes of planes without singular lines and *linear line partitions*. This connection is used to show that certain projective spaces do not admit linear line partitions.

## 2 The Grassmannians of a projective space

A *semilinear space* is a pair  $\Sigma = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is a set of *points*,  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{P}}$  is a set of *lines*, and the following axioms hold:

- (i)  $|\ell| \geq 2$  for each  $\ell \in \mathcal{B}$ .
- (ii) For every  $X \in \mathcal{P}$  there exists at least one  $\ell \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $X \in \ell$ .
- (iii)  $|\ell \cap \ell'| \leq 1$  for every  $\ell, \ell' \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\ell \neq \ell'$ .

Note that some authors use slightly different axioms for a semilinear space; others speak of a *partial linear space* instead.

Given two points  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}$  we write  $X \sim Y$ , where “ $\sim$ ” is to be read as *collinear*, if there is an  $\ell \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $X, Y \in \ell$ . Otherwise,  $X$  and  $Y$  are said to be *non-collinear*,  $X \not\sim Y$ . If  $X \sim Y$  and  $X \neq Y$ , then the unique line  $\ell \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $X, Y \in \ell$  is denoted by  $XY$ .

Let  $F$  be a (commutative or non-commutative) field. We denote by  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  the  $n$ -dimensional projective space coordinatised by the field  $F$  and collect some basic notions which will be used throughout this article:

If  $X$  is a subspace of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  and  $\dim X = d$ , then  $X$  is called a  $d$ -subspace. Let  $U$  and  $W$  be two subspaces such that  $U \subseteq W$ . The *interval*  $[U, W]$  is the set of all subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  containing  $U$  and contained in  $W$ . The set of all  $d$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  belonging to  $[U, W]$  is denoted by  $[U, W]_d$ . In particular, for an interval  $[U, W]$  with  $\dim U = h - 1$  and  $\dim W = h + 1$  the set  $[U, W]_h$  is the *pencil* of  $h$ -subspaces determined by  $U$  and  $W$ .

Let  $[U, W]$  be an interval in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ ,  $\dim U =: k - 1$ . Then  $[U, W]$  carries the structure of a projective space, whose  $d$ -dimensional subspaces are precisely the  $(k + d)$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  containing  $U$  and contained in  $W$ . The projective space  $[U, W]$  is isomorphic to  $\text{PG}(\dim W - k, F)$ .

The  $h$ -th *Grassmannian* of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ ,  $0 \leq h \leq n - 1$ , is the semilinear space  $\Gamma(n, h, F) = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$ , where  $\mathcal{P}$  is the set of all  $h$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ , and  $\mathcal{B}$  is the set of all pencils of  $h$ -subspaces. When the field is clear from the context we simply write  $\Gamma(n, h)$ . If  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  admits a correlation (e. g., for a commutative field  $F$ ) then  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$  is isomorphic to  $\Gamma(n, n - h - 1, F)$ . In order to avoid confusion, the elements of  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  will be called *G-points* and *G-lines*, respectively, where “G” abbreviates “Grassmann”.

We consider the Grassmannian  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$  for a fixed  $h$ . If a set  $I$  of G-points is a  $d$ -dimensional projective space with respect to the G-lines contained in  $I$ , then  $I$  is called a  $d$ -G-subspace. A  $d$ -G-subspace  $I$  is thus a set of  $h$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  pairwise meeting in  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces. Hence there exists an  $(h - 1)$ -subspace  $U$  of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  such that  $U \subset X$  for all  $X \in I$ , or there exists an  $(h + 1)$ -subspace  $V$  of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  such that  $X \subset V$  for all  $X \in I$ ; both conditions hold for  $d \leq 1$ .

Next, we describe the maximal G-subspaces of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$ . We start by recalling two notions: If  $U$  is an  $(h - 1)$ -subspace of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ , the *star* with *centre*  $U$  is the set of all  $h$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  containing  $U$ . Consequently, a star is an  $(n - h)$ -G-subspace. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  denote the set of stars. A *dual star* is the set of all  $h$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  contained in a fixed  $(h + 1)$ -subspace. The dual stars are  $(h + 1)$ -G-subspaces, and the set of all dual stars will be denoted by  $\mathcal{T}$ . For  $h = 1$  a dual star is a *ruled plane*. If  $h = 0, n - 1$ , then  $\mathcal{P}$  is the only maximal G-subspace. Otherwise, the set of all maximal G-subspaces partitions into the families  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ .

### 3 Linear mappings

Let  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P}'$  be sets. We say that  $\chi$  is a *partial map* of  $\mathcal{P}$  into  $\mathcal{P}'$ , if there is a subset  $\mathbb{D}(\chi)$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  such that  $\chi : \mathbb{D}(\chi) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$  is a map in the usual sense. The set  $\mathbb{D}(\chi)$  is called the *domain* of  $\chi$ . Let  $\mathbb{A}(\chi) = \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathbb{D}(\chi)$  be the *exceptional subset* of  $\chi$ . The elements of  $\mathbb{A}(\chi)$  are called *exceptional points* of  $\chi$ . If  $\mathbb{A}(\chi) = \emptyset$ , then  $\chi$  is *global*. We maintain the notation  $\chi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$  even when  $\chi$  is not global.

In order to have a less complicated notation we extend the definition of  $\chi$  to

the power set of  $\mathcal{P}$  by defining

$$\phi^x := (\phi \cap \mathbb{D}(\chi))^x = \{X^x \mid X \in \phi \cap \mathbb{D}(\chi)\} \text{ for every } \phi \in 2^{\mathcal{P}}.$$

Thus  $\chi$  assigns to *every* subset of  $\mathcal{P}$  a subset of  $\mathcal{P}'$ .

Next, let  $\Sigma = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$  and  $\Sigma' = (\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{B}')$  be semilinear spaces. A partial map  $\chi : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}'$  is called a *linear mapping*, if for each  $\ell \in \mathcal{B}$  one of the following holds:

- (i)  $\ell^x \in \mathcal{B}'$ , and  $\chi$  maps  $\ell$  bijectively onto  $\ell^x$ .
- (ii)  $\ell^x = \{P'\}$ , where  $P' \in \mathcal{P}'$ , and  $|\ell \cap \mathbb{A}(\chi)| = 1$ .
- (iii)  $\ell \subseteq \mathbb{A}(\chi)$ .

Obviously, these three conditions are mutually exclusive. This linear mapping will also be denoted by  $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma'$ .

If  $X, Y$  are distinct collinear points in  $\mathbb{A}(\chi)$ , then the line  $XY$  is a subset of  $\mathbb{A}(\chi)$  by (iii). In particular, for a projective space  $\Sigma$  this implies that  $\mathbb{A}(\chi)$  is a subspace of  $\Sigma$ . In the case that  $\chi$  is global, condition (i) holds for all lines, whence distinct collinear points have distinct images. However, the images of non-collinear points may coincide.

There is one type of linear mapping deserving special mention: A *full projective embedding* is a global and injective linear map  $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma'$  for which  $\Sigma'$  is a projective space.

The linear mappings between projective spaces allow the following explicit description:

**Theorem 1.** [4, 14] *Let  $\Sigma$  and  $\Sigma'$  be projective spaces, and let  $\chi : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma'$  be a linear mapping. Then the partial map  $\chi$  splits into a projection from  $\mathbb{A}(\chi)$  onto a complementary subspace in  $\Sigma$ , say  $U$ , and a collineation between  $U$  and a subspace of  $\Sigma'$ .*

The linear mappings between Desarguesian projective spaces are –up to one particular case – the geometric counterpart of the semilinear maps between vector spaces; the exceptional points correspond to non-zero vectors in the kernel. The situation is different if the image of the linear mapping is a line. Here the collineation from the above theorem is just a bijection which, of course, need not be induced by a semilinear bijection between the underlying vector spaces.

We now shortly exhibit full projective embeddings of a Grassmannian  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$ . In doing so, the Grassmannians  $\Gamma(n, 0, F)$  and  $\Gamma(n, n-1, F)$  will be excluded, since they are a priori projective spaces. Hence we have  $0 < h < n-1$  which implies  $n \geq 3$ .

First, assume that  $F$  is a non-commutative field. By [14, Satz 3.6], no full projective embedding of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$  exists for  $0 < h < n-1$ .

Next, we assume  $F$  to be a commutative field. Let  $N = \binom{n+1}{h+1} - 1$  and

$$\wp_{n,h} : \Gamma(n, h, F) \rightarrow \text{PG}(N, F)$$

be the map defined by  $X^{\wp_{n,h}} = F(v_0 \wedge v_1 \wedge \dots \wedge v_h)$ , where  $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_h$  is a basis of  $X$  meant as an  $(h+1)$ -dimensional subspace of  $F^{n+1}$ , and  $\text{PG}(N, F)$  is represented as  $(h+1)$ -th exterior power of  $F^{n+1}$ . This definition is independent on the choice of the basis, and  $\wp_{n,h}$  is a full projective embedding, called the

*Plücker embedding.* Its image  $\mathcal{P}^{\wp_{n,h}} = \mathcal{G}_{n,h}$  is a *Grassmann variety*. Each Grassmann variety is intersection of quadrics [18, pp. 184–188]; in particular,  $\mathcal{G}_{3,1}$  is the well-known *Klein quadric*.

So, the question remains of describing all full projective embeddings of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$  when  $F$  is commutative. An answer can be given in terms of linear mappings.

**Theorem 2.** [14] *Let  $F$  be a commutative field and let  $\Sigma'$  be a projective space. If  $\chi : \Gamma(n, h, F) \rightarrow \Sigma'$  is a linear mapping, then there exists a unique linear mapping  $\mu : \text{PG}(N, F) \rightarrow \Sigma'$  such that  $\chi = \wp_{n,h}\mu$ .*

By this universal property, we may obtain all full projective embeddings of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$  (to within collineations) as a product of  $\wp_{n,h}$  by a (possibly trivial) projection whose centre does not meet any secant of the Grassmann variety  $\mathcal{G}_{n,h}$ . Therefore, each fully embedded Grassmannian is a (possibly trivial) projection of a Grassmann variety  $\mathcal{G}_{n,h}$ . In [22] and [23] sufficient conditions for the (non-) existence of a non-trivial projection are given.

For other questions and literature on linear mappings the reader is referred to the book [7] (different terminology), [4] (including a survey of older literature), and [15].

## 4 Primes and linear complexes

A *prime* of a semilinear space  $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$  is a proper subset  $L$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ , such that for each  $\phi \in \mathcal{B}$  either  $\phi \subseteq L$ , or  $|\phi \cap L| = 1$ . Note that some authors call such a subset a *geometric hyperplane*.

From now on  $\Gamma(n, h, F) = (\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{B})$  is a Grassmannian. It is easily seen that the set of all  $h$ -subspaces having non-empty intersection with a fixed  $(n-h-1)$ -subspace is a prime of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$ . Somewhat surprisingly,  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$  has no other primes, if  $F$  is a non-commutative field. This beautiful result can be found in [13].

Next, let  $F$  be a commutative field and  $\wp_{n,h} : \Gamma(n, h, F) \rightarrow \text{PG}(N, F)$  the related Plücker embedding. If  $H$  is a hyperplane of  $\text{PG}(N, F)$ , then

$$K = (H \cap \mathcal{G}_{n,h})^{\wp_{n,h}^{-1}}$$

is called a *linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces* in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ . Cf., e. g. [5, p. 322]. If  $\varphi$  is a  $G$ -line, then either  $\varphi \subseteq K$ , or  $|\varphi \cap K| = 1$ . Since  $\mathcal{G}_{n,h}$  generates  $\text{PG}(N, F)$ , we have  $K \neq \mathcal{P}$ . Thus each linear complex is a prime of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$ . Conversely, we have the following result; its short proof is taken from [14, p. 179]:

**Proposition 3.** *If  $F$  is commutative, then each prime of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$  is a linear complex.*

*Proof.* Let  $L$  be a prime of  $\Gamma(n, h, F)$ . Define a partial map  $\chi : \Gamma(n, h, F) \rightarrow \Sigma'$ , where  $\Sigma'$  is a point, by setting  $\mathbb{A}(\chi) = L$ . Obviously, this  $\chi$  is linear. By Theorem 2,  $\chi = \wp_{n,h}\mu$ , where  $\mu : \text{PG}(N, F) \rightarrow \Sigma'$  is a linear mapping. Then

$$X \in L \Leftrightarrow X \in \mathbb{A}(\chi) \Leftrightarrow X^{\wp_{n,h}} \in \mathbb{A}(\mu),$$

and the latter exceptional set is a hyperplane by Theorem 1.  $\square$

In [20] a self-contained proof of Proposition 3 is given.

## 5 Generalised polarities arising from a linear complex

Up to the end of the paper  $F$  denotes a *commutative* field.

Our first aim is to generalise the concept of polarity. Suppose that  $\chi : \Gamma(n, k) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)^*$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ , is linear. So,  $\chi$  is a partial map of the set of  $k$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  into its hyperplane set. We say that such a  $\chi$  is a (*generalised*) *polarity* if for all  $U_1, U_2 \in \Gamma(n, k)$  with  $U_1 \sim U_2$  the following holds:

$$U_1 \subseteq U_2^\chi \text{ implies } U_2 \subseteq U_1^\chi. \quad (1)$$

In (1) it is understood that for  $U \in \mathbb{A}(\chi)$ ,  $U^\chi = \{U\}^\chi$  is the whole projective space. When speaking of “polarities” below, we always mean “generalised polarities”.

For  $k = 0$  our definition is in accordance with the usual definition of a (possibly degenerate) polarity. Likewise, the following result is well known for  $k = 0$  in the non-degenerate case. See, e. g. [1, p. 110, Cor. 1]: “*Null systems are polarities*”.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $\chi : \Gamma(n, k) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)^*$ ,  $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ , be a linear mapping, and assume that  $\chi$  satisfies the null property*

$$U \subseteq U^\chi \text{ for each } U \in \mathbb{D}(\chi). \quad (2)$$

*Then  $\chi$  is a polarity.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are distinct  $k$ -subspaces such that  $U_1 \sim U_2$  in  $\Gamma(n, k)$ . By the linearity of  $\chi$ , one of the following holds: (i)  $U_1, U_2 \in \mathbb{D}(\chi)$  and  $U_1^\chi \neq U_2^\chi$ ; then  $(U_1 U_2)^\chi$  is the pencil of hyperplanes through  $U_1^\chi \cap U_2^\chi$ . (ii) There is a unique  $U_0 \in U_1 U_2$  such that  $U_0 \in \mathbb{A}(\chi)$ , and a hyperplane  $E$  of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  exists such that  $U \in U_1 U_2$ ,  $U \neq U_0$  implies  $U^\chi = E$ . (iii)  $U_1, U_2 \in \mathbb{A}(\chi)$  so that  $U_1 U_2 \subseteq \mathbb{A}(\chi)$ .

Let  $P$  be a point. In any case we have

$$P \in U_1^\chi \cap U_2^\chi \Rightarrow (P \in U^\chi \text{ for all } U \in U_1 U_2). \quad (3)$$

In order to prove (1), assume that the above subspaces satisfy  $U_1 \subseteq U_2^\chi$ . Since  $U_1 \subseteq U_1^\chi$ , by (3) we have, for each  $U \in U_1 U_2$ , that  $U_1 \subseteq U^\chi$ . On the other hand,  $U \subseteq U^\chi$  implies  $(U \vee U_1) \subseteq U^\chi$ , where  $U \vee U_1$  denotes the join in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ . Now take  $U'_1, U'_2 \in U_1 U_2$  with  $U'_1 \neq U'_2 \neq U_1 \neq U'_1$ . For  $i = 1, 2$  we obtain

$$U_1 \vee U_2 = U'_i \vee U_1 \subseteq U'^{\chi}_i.$$

So, (3) yields  $U_1 \vee U_2 \subseteq U_1^\chi$ , and in particular  $U_2 \subseteq U_1^\chi$ .  $\square$

Taking into account the above theorem, a linear mapping  $\Gamma(n, k) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)^*$  with the null property (2) will be called a (*generalised*) *null polarity*.

Now we turn back to linear complexes:

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $K$  be a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces of  $\Sigma = \text{PG}(n, F)$ ,  $1 \leq h \leq n - 1$ , and let  $[U, W]$  be an interval of  $\Sigma$  with  $\dim U \leq h - 1$  and  $\dim W \geq h + 1$ . Then*

$$K(U, W) := K \cap [U, W]_h,$$

i.e., the set consisting of all elements of  $K$  containing  $U$  and contained in  $W$ , is a linear complex of  $(h - 1 - \dim U)$ -subspaces in the projective space  $[U, W]$ , unless  $[U, W]_h \subseteq K$ .

*Proof.* A pencil  $\varphi$  of  $(h - 1 - \dim U)$ -subspaces with respect to the projective space  $[U, W]$  is a pencil of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\Sigma$ ; from  $\varphi \subseteq K$  or  $|\varphi \cap K| = 1$  we have  $\varphi \subseteq K(U, W)$  or  $|\varphi \cap K(U, W)| = 1$ , respectively. Therefore, if  $[U, W]_h \not\subseteq K$ , then  $K(U, W)$  is a prime, and hence a linear complex, of the  $(h - 1 - \dim U)$ -th Grassmannian of  $[U, W]$ .  $\square$

As a particular case of the above proposition, if  $P$  is a point of  $\Sigma$ , then the set  $K_P = K(P, \Sigma)$ , consisting of all elements of  $K$  incident with  $P$ , is a linear complex of  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces in the  $(n - 1)$ -dimensional projective space  $[P, \Sigma]$ , unless  $K_P = [P, \Sigma]_h$ .

As a further consequence, if  $S = [U, \Sigma]_h$  is the star with centre an  $(h - 1)$ -subspace  $U$ , then either (i)  $S \subseteq K$ , or (ii) there is a hyperplane  $E$  of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  such that for each  $X \in S$ , we have  $X \in K$  if, and only if,  $X \subseteq E$ . If (i) holds, then  $U$  is called a *singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspace* of  $K$ ; otherwise  $E$  is the *polar hyperplane* of  $U$ . Similarly, if  $T = [\emptyset, V]_h$ ,  $\dim V = h + 1$ , is a dual star, then either (i)  $T \subseteq K$ , or (ii) there is a point  $P$  of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  such that for each  $X \in T$ , we have  $X \in K$  if and only if  $P \in X$ . If (i) holds, then  $V$  is called a *total  $(h + 1)$ -subspace* of  $K$ ; otherwise  $P$  is the *pole* of  $V$ .

We are now in a position to introduce the following crucial notion. If  $K$  is a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces,  $1 \leq h \leq n - 1$ , we will denote by  $\uparrow K$  the partial map of the set of all  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  into the dual projective space  $\text{PG}(n, F)^*$ , defined as follows: given an  $(h - 1)$ -subspace, say  $U$ , if  $U$  is singular, then  $U \in \mathbb{A}(\uparrow K)$ ; otherwise  $U^{\uparrow K}$  is the polar hyperplane of  $U$ , i.e., the union of all elements of  $K$  containing  $U$ . In view of Theorem 6 below, this mapping  $\uparrow K$  will be called the *null polarity defined by  $K$* .

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $K$  be a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\Sigma = \text{PG}(n, F)$ ,  $1 \leq h \leq n - 1$ . Then the following assertions hold:*

- (a) *The partial map  $\uparrow K : \Gamma(n, h - 1) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)^*$  is a null polarity with non-empty domain.*
- (b) *The image of  $\uparrow K$  generates a subspace of  $\text{PG}(n, F)^*$  with dimension at least  $h$ .*

*Proof.* (a) We use induction on  $h$ ; for  $h = 1$  this is well known [5, p. 322]. So, let  $h > 1$  and let  $\varphi$  be a pencil of  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces. There is a point, say  $P$ , incident with every  $U \in \varphi$ . If  $K_P = [P, \Sigma]_h$ , then  $\varphi \subseteq \mathbb{A}(\uparrow K)$ . Otherwise, by induction assumption,  $\uparrow K_P$  is a linear mapping. Thus the linearity of  $\uparrow K$  follows by observing that the restrictions of  $\uparrow K$  and  $\uparrow K_P$  to  $\varphi$  coincide. Since  $U \subseteq U^{\uparrow K}$  holds for all  $U \in \mathbb{D}(\uparrow K)$  by definition,  $\uparrow K$  is a null polarity according to Theorem 4. Finally,  $K \neq \Gamma(n, h)$  implies that not all  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces can be singular, whence the domain of  $\uparrow K$  is non-empty.

(b) Assume to the contrary that the image of  $\uparrow K$  generates a subspace of  $\text{PG}(n, F)^*$  with a smaller dimension. So the intersection of all hyperplanes in the image of  $\uparrow K$  contains an  $(n - h)$ -subspace  $X$ , say. We show that this implies the contradiction  $\mathbb{D}(\uparrow K) = \emptyset$ : Given an  $(h - 1)$ -subspace  $U$  we argue by induction on  $k := \dim U \cap X$ . For  $k = -1$  there is no hyperplane passing

through  $U \vee X$ , whence  $U \in \mathbb{A}(\uparrow K)$ . Next, assume  $k > -1$ . Then there is a point  $P \in \Sigma$  outside  $U \vee X$ . Also, there exists a point  $Q \in U \cap X$ . Let  $V$  be a complement of  $Q$  with respect to  $U$ . Then  $U$  is an element of the pencil  $[V, V \vee P \vee Q]_{h-1}$ . All other elements of this pencil meet  $X$  in a subspace of dimension  $k - 1$ , whence they belong to  $\mathbb{A}(\uparrow K)$  by the induction hypothesis. The linearity of  $\uparrow K$  yields  $U \in \mathbb{A}(\uparrow K)$ , as required.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.** *The set of all singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces of the linear complex  $K$  is equal to  $(\mathcal{G}_{n,h-1} \cap W)^{\wp_{n,h-1}^{-1}}$  for some subspace  $W$  of  $\text{PG}(\binom{n+1}{h} - 1, F)$  with*

$$\binom{n+1}{h} - (n+2) \leq \dim W \leq \binom{n+1}{h} - (h+2).$$

**Corollary 8.** *If  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces of  $K$ , and  $U_1 \sim U_2$  in  $\Gamma(n, h - 1)$ , then each element of the pencil determined by  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  is a singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspace of  $K$ .*

We have seen that  $\uparrow K$  is a null polarity. Conversely, we have:

**Theorem 9.** *Let  $\chi : \Gamma(n, h - 1) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)^*$ ,  $1 \leq h \leq n - 1$ , be a linear mapping with non-empty domain satisfying the null property (2). Then there is a unique linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces, say  $K$ , such that  $\chi = \uparrow K$ .*

*Proof.* We define a set  $K$  of  $h$ -subspaces by setting  $X \in K$  if, and only if, there is an  $(h - 1)$ -subspace  $U \subseteq X$  such that  $X \subseteq U^\chi$ . Any linear complex with the required properties necessarily has to coincide with this  $K$ .

The mapping  $\chi$  is a polarity by Theorem 4. From (1) we infer that if  $X \in K$ , then  $X \subseteq W^\chi$  for every  $(h - 1)$ -subspace  $W$  of  $X$ . If  $\varphi$  is the pencil of  $h$ -subspaces determined by the  $(h - 1)$ -subspace  $U_\varphi$  and the  $(h + 1)$ -subspace  $V_\varphi$ ,  $U_\varphi \subseteq V_\varphi$ , then the  $G$ -points of  $\varphi$  belonging to  $K$  are exactly the elements  $X \in \varphi$  such that  $X \subseteq U_\varphi^\chi$ . Therefore, either  $\varphi \subseteq K$  or  $|\varphi \cap K| = 1$ , whence  $K$  is a prime. The proof is now accomplished by applying Proposition 3.  $\square$

The above theorem is a generalisation of the classical one, characterising a linear complex of lines as a set arising from a (possibly degenerate) null polarity  $\text{PG}(n, F) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)^*$ .

By dual arguments we obtain a linear mapping  $\downarrow K : \Gamma(n, h + 1) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)$ ,  $0 \leq h \leq n - 2$ , the *dual polarity* of  $K$ . There holds:

**Theorem 10.** *Let  $\chi : \Gamma(n, h + 1) \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)$ ,  $0 \leq h \leq n - 2$ , be a linear mapping with non-empty domain, and assume that for each  $V \in \mathbb{D}(\chi)$ ,  $V^\chi \subseteq V$ . Then there is a unique linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces, say  $K$ , such that  $\chi = \downarrow K$ .*

## 6 Existence of singular $(h - 1)$ -subspaces

We start with the following technical result.

**Proposition 11.** *Assume that  $k, h$ , and  $n$  are integers such that  $1 \leq k \leq h \leq n - 1$ . Let  $K$  be a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  having no singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspace. Then  $\text{PG}(n + k - h, F)$  contains a linear complex of  $k$ -subspaces having no singular  $(k - 1)$ -subspace.*



*Proof.* Let  $W$  be any  $(h - k - 1)$ -subspace of  $\Sigma = \text{PG}(n, F)$ . The intersection  $K_W = K \cap [W, \Sigma]_h$  is a set of  $k$ -subspaces of  $[W, \Sigma] \cong \text{PG}(n + k - h, F)$ . If  $L$  is a  $(k - 1)$ -subspace of  $[W, \Sigma]$ , then  $L$  is an  $(h - 1)$ -subspace of  $\Sigma$ , containing  $W$ . By assumption an  $h$ -subspace  $X$  of  $\Sigma$  exists that contains  $L$  and does not belong to  $K$ . Such  $X$  is a  $k$ -subspace of  $[W, \Sigma]$ , containing  $L$  and not belonging to  $K_W$ . Now Proposition 3 easily yields the assertion.  $\square$

A linear complex  $K$  of lines is the set of all self-conjugate lines of a null polarity with non-empty domain in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ . Since each alternating matrix has even rank,  $K$  always has a singular point for  $n$  even; on the other hand, for each odd  $n$  there are linear complexes of lines without singular points. Thus, by Proposition 11 with  $k = 1$ , we have that if  $n - h \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , then each linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  has a singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspace. In our proof of Proposition 11 the subspace  $W$  was chosen arbitrarily. Hence this result can be refined as follows:

**Proposition 12.** *Let  $K$  be a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ . If  $1 \leq h \leq n - 1$  and  $n - h \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , then each  $(h - 2)$ -subspace in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  is contained in a singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspace.*

The question concerning the existence of total  $(h + 1)$ -subspaces is dealt with in [2] over the field  $\mathbb{C}$  of complex numbers as follows. The *product* of a linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces, say  $K$ , and a linear complex of points, i.e., a hyperplane  $H$ , is the set

$$K \cdot H := \{X \in \Gamma(n, h + 1, \mathbb{C}) \mid \exists Y \in K : Y \subseteq X \cap H\}$$

If  $[\emptyset, H]_h \subseteq K$  then  $H$  is called a *total hyperplane* of  $K$ ; in this case  $K \cdot H$  is the set of all  $(h + 1)$ -subspaces of  $\text{PG}(n, \mathbb{C})$ . Otherwise,  $K \cdot H$  is a linear complex of  $(h + 1)$ -subspaces in  $\text{PG}(n, \mathbb{C})$ . Let  $H_0, H_1, \dots, H_n$  be independent hyperplanes in  $\text{PG}(n, \mathbb{C})$ . Then the set  $\Theta$  of all total  $(h + 1)$ -subspaces of  $K$  is the intersection of  $K \cdot H_0, K \cdot H_1, \dots, K \cdot H_n$ ; that is,  $\Theta$  is represented on the Grassmann variety  $\mathcal{G}_{n, h+1}$  as intersection with at most  $n + 1$  hyperplanes. (This is dual to our Corollary 7, and holds over an arbitrary ground field.) Since  $\mathcal{G}_{n, h+1}$  is an algebraic variety with dimension  $(h + 2)(n - h - 1)$ , a sufficient condition for the existence of total  $(h + 1)$ -subspaces is

$$(h + 2)(n - h - 1) - (n + 1) \geq 0,$$

that is

$$(h + 1)(n - h - 2) \geq 1.$$

Since  $h + 1 \geq 1$ , the condition reads  $n - h - 2 > 0$  or, equivalently,  $h < n - 2$ . Summarising, we obtain:

**Theorem 13.** [2] *Each linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\text{PG}(n, \mathbb{C})$ , with  $h < n - 2$ , has a total  $(h + 1)$ -subspace.*

Dually, there holds:

**Corollary 14.** *Each linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces in  $\text{PG}(n, \mathbb{C})$ , with  $h \geq 2$ , has a singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspace.*

A *line spread* of a projective space  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  is a set of lines, say  $\mathcal{F}$ , such that each point of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  belongs to exactly one line of  $\mathcal{F}$ . A line spread is called *geometric* (or *normal*) if for every pair of distinct lines of  $\mathcal{F}$ , say  $\ell, m$ , the lines of  $\mathcal{F}$  in the solid  $\ell \vee m$  form a spread of  $\ell \vee m$ . The line spread  $\mathcal{F}$  is *linear* if  $\mathcal{F}^{\wp_{n,1}}$  is the intersection of the Grassmann variety  $\mathcal{G}_{n,1}$  with a subspace of its ambient space  $\text{PG}(M, F)$  with  $M := (n^2 + n - 2)/2$ .

**Proposition 15.** *Let  $K$  be a linear complex of planes in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  having no singular line. Then  $n$  is even. For each hyperplane  $H$  in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ , let  $\mathcal{F}_H$  be the set of all lines whose polar hyperplane is  $H$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}_H$  is a line spread of  $H$ .*

*Proof.* By Proposition 12,  $n$  is even. Let  $A$  and  $H$  be a point and a hyperplane in  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ , respectively, such that  $A \in H$ . The set  $S$  of all lines of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  containing the point  $A$  is a subspace of  $\Gamma(n, 1)$  isomorphic to  $\text{PG}(n - 1, F)$ . Since  $\uparrow K$  is global, its restriction to  $S$  is a collineation. As a consequence,  $S^{\uparrow K}$  is the set of all hyperplanes through  $A$ . So, a unique line  $\ell$  through  $A$  exists such that  $\ell^{\uparrow K} = H$ . This proves that  $\mathcal{F}_H$  is a line spread of  $H$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 16.** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 15 the line spread  $\mathcal{F}_H$  is linear. More precisely,*

$$\mathcal{F}_H^{\wp_{n,1}} = R \cap \mathcal{G}_{n,1},$$

where  $R$  is an  $(M - n)$ -subspace of the ambient space  $\text{PG}(M, F)$  of the Grassmann variety  $\mathcal{G}_{n,1}$ . Furthermore, in each of the following cases the line spread  $\mathcal{F}_H$  is not geometric.

- (a) *The field  $F$  is quadratically closed.*
- (b) *The field  $F$  is finite.*

*Proof.* By Theorems 2 and 6, the null polarity  $\uparrow K$  can be written as

$$\uparrow K = \wp_{n,1} \pi \kappa,$$

where  $\wp_{n,1}$  is the Plücker embedding,  $\pi$  is a projection of  $\text{PG}(M, F)$  from a subspace  $C$  with dimension  $(M - n - 1)$  onto a complementary  $n$ -subspace  $D$ , and  $\kappa : D \rightarrow \text{PG}(n, F)^*$  is a collineation. The non-existence of singular lines yields

$$C \cap \mathcal{G}_{n,1} = \emptyset.$$

So,  $\mathcal{F}_H^{\wp_{n,1}}$  is the intersection of  $\mathcal{G}_{n,1}$  with the subspace  $R := C \vee H^{\kappa^{-1}}$  of  $\text{PG}(M, F)$ .

Now suppose that (a) or (b) holds. We assume that  $\mathcal{F}_H$  is a geometric line spread. By the above, there is a hyperplane, say  $J$ , of  $\text{PG}(M, F)$ , such that  $J \cap R = C$ , whence

$$J \cap \mathcal{F}_H^{\wp_{n,1}} = \emptyset.$$

As  $\mathcal{F}_H$  is geometric, there is a solid  $U$  of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  such that the lines of  $U$  belonging to  $\mathcal{F}_H$  form a line spread of  $U$ , say  $\mathcal{F}_1$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{F}_1^{\wp_{n,1}}$  is the intersection of  $R$  with a quadric  $Q_5^+$  (the Klein quadric representing the lines of  $U$ ). By the table in [16, pp. 29–31] (which remains true, mutatis mutandis, also for an infinite field),  $\mathcal{F}_1^{\wp_{n,1}}$  has to be an elliptic quadric  $Q_3^-$ . This is impossible if (a) holds. On the other hand, for a finite field  $F$  we get from  $J \cap Q_3^- = \emptyset$  the contradiction that  $Q_3^-$  would have an exterior plane [16, p. 17].  $\square$

The proof from the above cannot be carried over to all infinite fields, since an elliptic quadric may have an exterior plane.

*Remark 1.* Proposition 11 for  $k = 2$  together with the previous theorem implies the following: Any linear complex of  $h$ -subspaces,  $h > 1$ , having no singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces, yields a non-geometric linear line spread if  $F$  satisfies one of the conditions (a) or (b). The authors do not know, whether under these circumstances non-geometric linear line spreads exist or not. In case of their non-existence, Theorem 13 of Baldassarri and Corollary 14 would also hold for projective spaces over finite or quadratically closed fields.

## 7 Linear line partitions

A *line partition*  $\Omega$  of a projective space  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  is a partition of its line set into line spreads of hyperplanes such that each hyperplane contains precisely one of these spreads. Each line partition of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$  induces a surjective map  $\pi_\Omega$  of the line set onto the dual space  $\text{PG}(n, F)^*$  as follows: It assigns to each line  $\ell$  the unique hyperplane containing the equivalence class of  $\ell$ . Observe that this  $\pi_\Omega$  is globally defined on the line set.

Line partitions of finite projective spaces were investigated in [9, 10, 11, 12, 21]. Here  $n$  necessarily has to be even. In particular, we quote the following result:

**Theorem 17.** [10, 11] *Each finite projective space  $\text{PG}(2^i - 2, q)$  with  $i \geq 2$  admits a line partition.*

A line partition  $\Omega$  will be called *linear* if  $\pi_\Omega$  from the above is a linear mapping. The linear line partitions are closely related with certain linear complexes.

**Theorem 18.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a line partition of  $\text{PG}(n, F)$ . Denote by  $K$  the set of all planes  $\varepsilon$  such that a line  $\ell$  exists which satisfies the condition*

$$\ell \subseteq \varepsilon \subseteq \ell^{\pi_\Omega}.$$

*This  $K$  is a linear complex of planes if, and only if,  $\Omega$  is linear. In this case,  $K$  has no singular line.*

*Proof.* If  $\Omega$  is linear, then  $\chi := \pi_\Omega$  satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 9. This implies that  $K$  is a linear complex of planes without singular lines.

Conversely, assume that the given set  $K$  is a linear complex of planes. Let  $\ell$  be a non-singular line. Then  $\ell^{\pi_\Omega}$  and  $\ell^{\uparrow K}$  are hyperplanes which obviously are identical. Next, we show that singular lines do not exist. Assume to the contrary that  $\ell'_1$  is a singular line. Since  $\uparrow K$  has a non-empty domain, also a non-singular line  $\ell'_2$  exists. There is a line which has a point in common with  $\ell'_1$  and  $\ell'_2$ , respectively. This line is either singular or non-singular. Hence there exists a pencil of lines containing a singular line  $\ell_1$  and a non-singular line  $\ell_2$ , say. Since  $\uparrow K$  is linear, there is another non-singular line  $\ell_3 \neq \ell_2$  in this pencil. We infer from the above and from the linearity of  $\uparrow K$  that

$$\ell_2^{\pi_\Omega} = \ell_2^{\uparrow K} = \ell_3^{\uparrow K} = \ell_3^{\pi_\Omega}.$$

Thus the distinct incident lines  $\ell_2$  and  $\ell_3$  belong to the same line spread, a contradiction. Therefore  $\pi_\Omega = \uparrow K$  which in turn implies the linearity of  $\Omega$ .  $\square$

By Proposition 15 and Theorem 18, there is a bijective correspondence between linear complexes of planes without singular lines and linear line partitions. The linear complex  $K$  defined in the theorem will be called the linear complex of planes *related* to the linear line partition  $\Omega$ .

**Proposition 19.** *No projective space  $\text{PG}(4, F)$  admits linear line partitions.*

*Proof.* A linear complex of planes, say  $K$ , in  $\text{PG}(4, F)$  is dual to a linear complex of lines  $K^*$  in  $\text{PG}(4, F)^*$ . The singular lines of  $K$  are dual to ruled planes of  $K^*$ . Let  $S$  be the set of all singular points of  $K^*$  (actually, hyperplanes of  $\text{PG}(4, F)$ ). If  $S$  is a dual plane, then obviously  $K^*$  contains ruled planes. Otherwise  $S$  is a point and there is a line  $\ell$  of  $K^*$  such that  $S \notin \ell$ . The plane  $S \vee \ell$  is a ruled plane in  $K^*$ . This proves that each linear complex of planes in  $\text{PG}(4, F)$  has at least one singular line.  $\square$

Some finite four-dimensional projective spaces admit line partitions. In particular this holds in  $\text{PG}(4, q)$  for  $q = 2, 3$  [10] and for  $q = 5, 8, 9$  [21]. By the above all these line partitions are necessarily non-linear.

**Proposition 20.** *No finite projective space  $\text{PG}(6, q)$  admits linear line partitions.*

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be a linear complex of planes in  $\text{PG}(6, q)$ , without singular lines. Denote by  $K_H$  the set of planes in  $K$  which are contained in some hyperplane  $H$ . This  $K_H$  is a linear complex of planes in the five-dimensional finite projective space  $H$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_H$  be the line spread in  $H$  given according to Proposition 15. The elements of  $\mathcal{F}_H$  are precisely the singular lines of  $K_H$ . In [8, Theorem 14] it is shown that (to within projective transformations) a unique linear complex of planes in  $\text{PG}(5, q)$  exists such that its singular lines form a line spread; moreover, this spread turns out to be geometric. This contradicts Proposition 16.  $\square$

*Remark 2.* It seems to be unknown whether or not linear line partitions do exist. In particular we do not know, if the line partitions of  $\text{PG}(2^i - 2, q)$  by Fuji-Hara and Vanstone (cf. Theorem 17) are linear. As a matter of fact, to our knowledge, the proof of their existence is only sketched in the literature.

*Remark 3.* The authors conducted an extensive computer-based search for linear complexes of planes without singular lines in  $\text{PG}(8, q)$ ,  $q = 2, 3$ , but no examples were found. Thus a proof for the (non)-existence of linear complexes of  $h$ -subspaces,  $h \geq 2$ , having no singular  $(h - 1)$ -subspaces remains an enticing open problem, even in the finite case.

Acknowledgement. The second author acknowledges financial support from the National Research Project “Strutture geometriche, Combinatoria e loro Applicazioni” of the Italian *Ministero dell’Università e della Ricerca*, PRIN 2005.

## References

- [1] R. Baer, *Linear Algebra and Projective Geometry*, Academic Press, New York, San Francisco, London, 1952.
- [2] M. Baldassarri, I sistemi algebrici di spazi e l’insieme dei loro spazi totali, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **21** (1952), 171–197.

- [3] E. Bompiani, Complessi lineari di piani nello spazio a cinque dimensioni, *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei, VIII. Ser., Rend., Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Nat.* **14** (1953), 719–723.
- [4] H. Brauner, Eine geometrische Kennzeichnung linearer Abbildungen, *Monatsh. Math.* **77** (1973), 10–20.
- [5] W. Burau, *Mehrdimensionale projektive und höhere Geometrie*, Mathematische Monographien **5**, VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1961.
- [6] A. Comessatti, Sugl'indici di singolarità a più dimensioni delle varietà abeliane, *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **5** (1934), 50–79.
- [7] C.-A. Faure and A. Frölicher, *Modern Projective Geometry*, Mathematics and its Applications **521**, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [8] E. Ferrara Dentice and C. Zanella, Bose-Burton type theorems for finite Grassmannians, *Discrete Math.* (2008), doi:10.1016/j.disc.2007.12.023. See also: *Electron. Notes in Discrete Math.* **26** (2006), 59–66.
- [9] R. Fuji-Hara and S. A. Vanstone, Affine geometries obtained from projective planes and skew resolutions on  $AG(3, q)$ , Combinatorics '81 (Rome, 1981), *Ann. Discrete Math.* **18** (1983), 355–375.
- [10] R. Fuji-Hara and S. A. Vanstone, On a line partitioning problem for  $PG(2k, q)$ , Proceedings of the conference on combinatorial and incidence geometry: principles and applications (La Mendola, 1982), *Rend. Sem. Mat. Brescia* **7** (1984), 337–341.
- [11] R. Fuji-Hara, M. Jimbo, and S. A. Vanstone, Some results on the line partitioning problem in  $PG(2k, q)$ , *Utilitas Math.* **30** (1986), 235–241.
- [12] R. Fuji-Hara, A. Munemasa, and V. D. Tonchev, Hyperplane partitions and difference systems of sets, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **113** (2006), 1689–1698.
- [13] J. I. Hall and E. E. Shult, Geometric hyperplanes of nonembeddable Grassmannians, *European J. Combin.* **14** (1993), 29–35.
- [14] H. Havlicek, Zur Theorie linearer Abbildungen I, II, *J. Geom.* **16** (1981), 152–167, 168–180.
- [15] H. Havlicek, A generalization of Brauner's theorem on linear mappings, *Mitt. Math. Sem. Gießen* **215** (1994), 27–41.
- [16] J. W. P. Hirschfeld, *Finite Projective Spaces of Three Dimensions*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1985.
- [17] U. Morin, Sul sistema degli  $S_k$  totali di un complesso lineare di  $S_n$ , *Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova* **5** (1934), 24–49.
- [18] B. Segre, *Lectures on Modern Geometry*, Cremonese, Roma, 1961.
- [19] C. Segre, Sui complessi lineari di piani nello spazio a cinque dimensioni, *Annali di Mat. (3)* **27** (1918), 75–123.

- [20] E. Shult, Geometric hyperplanes of embeddable Grassmannians, *J. Algebra* **145** (1992), 55–82.
- [21] V. D. Tonchev, Partitions of difference sets and code synchronization, *Finite Fields Appl.* **11** (2005), 601–621.
- [22] A. L. Wells, jr., Universal projective embeddings of the Grassmannian, half spinor and dual orthogonal geometries, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2)* **34** (1983), 375–386.
- [23] C. Zanella, Embeddings of Grassmann spaces, *J. Geom.* **52** (1995), 193–201.