

The foundation of generalized parallel connections, 2-sums, and segment-cosegment exchanges of matroids

Matthew Baker, Oliver Lorscheid, Zach Walsh, and Tianyi Zhang

Abstract. We show that, under suitable hypotheses, the foundation of a generalized parallel connection of matroids is the relative tensor product of the foundations. Using this result, we show that the foundation of a 2-sum of matroids is the absolute tensor product of the foundations, and that the foundation of a matroid is invariant under segment-cosegment exchange.

1. Introduction

Pastures are algebraic objects that generalize partial fields. In [3], Baker and Lorscheid study the *foundation* of a matroid M , which is a pasture canonically attached to M that governs the representability of M over arbitrary pastures. In particular, the foundation F_M determines the set of projective equivalence classes of representations of M over partial fields. More precisely, for any pasture P , the set of (weak) P -representations of M , modulo rescaling equivalence, is canonically identified with the set of pasture homomorphisms from F_M to P .

Let M_1, M_2 be matroids with ground sets E_1 and E_2 respectively. If M_1 and M_2 have a common restriction T , and T is a modular flat¹ in either M_1 or M_2 , then one can define the *generalized parallel connection* $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ (cf. [12, p.441]) as the matroid on $E = E_1 \cup E_2$ such that F is a flat of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ if and only if $F \cap E_i$ is a flat of M_i for $i = 1, 2$.

There are some important constructions in matroid theory which make use of the generalized parallel connection, two of the most important being:

- (1) If M_1 and M_2 are simple and $T = \{p\}$ is a singleton that is not a loop or coloop in either M_1 or M_2 , then T is automatically a modular flat in both M_1 and M_2 . In this case, we define the *2-sum of M_1 and M_2 along p* , denoted $M_1 \oplus_2 M_2$ (or $M_1 \oplus_p M_2$, if we want to emphasize the dependence on p), to be the minor $P_T(M_1, M_2) \setminus T$ of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$.
- (2) If T is a co-independent triangle (i.e., 3-element circuit) in a matroid M , we define the *Delta-Wye exchange of M along T* , denoted $\Delta_T(M)$, to be the minor $P_T(M, M(K_4)) \setminus T$ of $P_T(M, M(K_4))$, where T is identified with a triangle in $M(K_4)$.

We thank Nathan Bowler and Rudi Pendavingh for numerous helpful suggestions. M.B. was supported by NSF grant DMS-2154224 and a Simons Fellowship in Mathematics. O.L. was supported by Marie Skłodowska Curie Fellowship MSCA-IF-101022339.

¹A flat T of a matroid M is called *modular* if $r(T) + r(F) = r(T \cap F) + r(T \cup F)$ for every flat F of M , where r is the rank function of M .

More generally, if M is a matroid with a co-independent set X such that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, one defines the *segment-cosegment exchange of M along X* to be $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$, where Θ_n is a certain matroid on $2n$ elements defined in [Section 5](#). When $n = 3$, we have $\Theta_3 \cong M(K_4)$ and the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X coincides with $\Delta_X(M)$.

It is known that a 2-sum of matroids M_1 and M_2 is representable over a partial field F if and only if M_1 and M_2 are both representable over F [[16](#), Corollary 2.4.31]. It is also known that if M is a matroid containing a co-independent set X such that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, then M is representable over a partial field F if and only if the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X is representable over F [[13](#), Corollary 3.6]. In this paper, we generalize these results in two important ways:

- We establish bijections between suitable rescaling classes of F -representations.
- We prove analogous results for representations over arbitrary pastures.

Our main theorems are as follows:

Theorem A. *Let M_1 and M_2 be matroids with a common restriction T . Suppose that either:*

- (1) *T is a modular flat of both M_1 and M_2 ; or*
- (2) *T is isomorphic to $U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$ and M_2 is isomorphic to Θ_n .*

Then the foundation of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ is isomorphic to $F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$.

Part (1) of [Theorem A](#) is proved in [Section 3](#), and part (2) is proved in [Section 5](#).

In the special case where $T = \emptyset$, we obtain the following corollary (also proved in [[7](#)]):

Corollary B. *The foundation of a direct sum $M_1 \oplus M_2$ is isomorphic to $F(M_1) \otimes F(M_2)$.*

Remark. When T is a modular flat in M_2 but not necessarily in M_1 , the generalized parallel connection $M = P_T(M_1, M_2)$ is still well-defined, but the identity $F(P_T(M_1, M_2)) \cong F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$ does not necessarily hold, even when $r(T) = 2$. We give an example at the end of [Section 3](#).

In certain situations, the foundations of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ and $P_T(M_1, M_2) \setminus T$ turn out to be isomorphic. The two most important examples are that of 2-sums and segment-cosegment exchanges:

Theorem C. *Let $E = E_1 \cup E_2$ with $E_1 \cap E_2 = \{p\}$, and let M_1 and M_2 be simple matroids on E_1 and E_2 , respectively. Then the foundation of the 2-sum $M_1 \oplus_p M_2$ is isomorphic to $F(M_1) \otimes F(M_2)$.*

Theorem D. *Let M be a matroid with a co-independent set X such that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$. Then the foundation of the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X is isomorphic to $F(M)$.*

A proof of [Theorem C](#) is given in [Section 4](#). [Theorem C](#) implies, in particular, that (under the hypotheses of [Theorem D](#)) for every partial field P there is a bijection between rescaling equivalence classes of P -representations of $M_1 \oplus_p M_2$ and pairs of

rescaling equivalence classes of P -representations of M_1 and M_2 . To the best of our knowledge, even this particular consequence of **Theorem C** is new.

Theorem D is proved in Section 5. It generalizes a result of Oxley–Semple–Vertigan [13, Corollary 3.6] which says that, under the hypotheses of **Theorem D**, for every partial field P there is a bijection between rescaling equivalence classes of P -representations of M and rescaling equivalence classes of P -representations of the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X .

The proof of **Theorem C** relies on part (1) of **Theorem A**, and the proof of **Theorem D** relies on part (2) of **Theorem A**.

Remark. The foundation of $M' = P_T(M_1, M_2) \setminus T$ is not in general isomorphic to the foundation of $P = P_T(M_1, M_2)$, even when M_1 and M_2 are both modular in M . For example, if M is any non-regular matroid on E and $M_1 = M_2 = M \oplus e$ for some $e \notin E$, then M is a modular flat of both M_1 and M_2 , so by **Theorem A** we have $F(M) \cong F(M_1) \otimes_{F(M)} F(M_2)$. However, $F(M') = F(e \oplus e') \cong \mathbb{F}_1^\pm$, whereas $F(M_1) \otimes_{F(M)} F(M_2) \cong F(M) \not\cong \mathbb{F}_1^\pm$.

Since the universal partial field of a matroid can be computed from its foundation (cf. [5, Lemma 7.48] and Section 5.1 below), **Theorem D** implies in particular an affirmative solution to Conjecture 3.4.4 in Stefan van Zwam’s thesis [16] (see Section 5.1 for a proof):

Corollary E. *Let M be a matroid with a co-independent set X such that $M|_X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, and assume that M is representable over some partial field. Then the universal partial field of the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X is isomorphic to the universal partial field of M .*

Theorem D also has the following consequence for excluded minors (which is proved in [13, Theorem 1.1] in the special case where P is a partial field); for a proof, see Corollary 5.13.

Corollary F. *Let P be a pasture, and let M be an excluded minor for representability over P . Then every segment-cosegment exchange of M is also an excluded minor for representability over P .*

By applying Theorems **C** and **D** to $\text{Hom}(F_M, P)$ for certain pastures P , we obtain some interesting consequences for P -representability. These consequences are already known when P is a partial field, but when $P = \mathbb{S}$ (the sign hyperfield) or \mathbb{T} (the tropical hyperfield), we obtain what appear to be new results. In order to state these corollaries precisely, we recall the following definitions:

Definition. (1) A matroid M is called *orientable* if $\text{Hom}(F_M, \mathbb{S})$ is non-empty. (This is equivalent to the usual notion of orientability, cf. [2, Example 3.33].)

(2) A matroid M is called *rigid* if $\text{Hom}(F_M, \mathbb{T})$ has more than one element. (This is equivalent to the condition that the base polytope of M has no non-trivial regular matroid polytope subdivision, cf. [6, Proposition B.1].) Equivalently, M is rigid if and only if every homomorphism $F_M \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$ factors through the canonical inclusion $\mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}$, where \mathbb{K} is the Krasner hyperfield.

We have the following straightforward corollaries of Theorems **C** and **D**, respectively.

Corollary G. *Let $E = E_1 \cup E_2$ with $E_1 \cap E_2 = \{p\}$, and let M_1 and M_2 be simple matroids on E_1 and E_2 , respectively. Then the 2-sum $M_1 \oplus_p M_2$ is orientable (resp. rigid) if and only if M_1 and M_2 are both orientable (resp. rigid).*

Proof. Let $N = M_1 \oplus_p M_2$ and F_{M_1} , F_{M_2} and F_N be the foundations of M_1 , M_2 and N , respectively. Then M_1 and M_2 are both orientable if and only if both $\text{Hom}(F_{M_1}, \mathbb{S})$ and $\text{Hom}(F_{M_2}, \mathbb{S})$ are non-empty. By the universal property of the tensor product in the category of pastures [3, Lemma 2.7], there is a canonical bijection

$$\text{Hom}(F_{M_1}, \mathbb{S}) \times \text{Hom}(F_{M_2}, \mathbb{S}) = \text{Hom}(F_{M_1} \otimes F_{M_2}, \mathbb{S}).$$

Moreover, by Theorem **C** we have $F_N \cong F_{M_1} \otimes F_{M_2}$. Thus M_1 and M_2 are both orientable if and only if

$$\text{Hom}(F_{M_1}, \mathbb{S}) \times \text{Hom}(F_{M_2}, \mathbb{S}) = \text{Hom}(F_{M_1} \otimes F_{M_2}, \mathbb{S}) = \text{Hom}(F_N, \mathbb{S})$$

is non-empty. This is, in turn, equivalent to $N = M_1 \oplus_p M_2$ being orientable.

The claim for rigid matroids follows from the same proof, replacing “orientable” by “rigid”, non-empty by singleton, and \mathbb{S} by \mathbb{T} throughout. \square

Corollary H. *Let M be a matroid with a co-independent set X such that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$. Then the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X is orientable (resp. rigid) if and only if M is orientable (resp. rigid).*

Proof. By Theorem **D**, the foundation of the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X is isomorphic to the foundation of M . Since the notions of orientability and rigidity for a matroid M depend only on the foundation of M , the claim follows. \square

2. Background on foundations and representations of matroids over pastures

In this section, we recall some background material from [3] which will be used throughout this paper. We also discuss some preliminary facts about generalized parallel connections which we will need.

2.1. Pastures. Pastures are a generalization of the notion of field in which we still have a multiplicative abelian group G , an absorbing element 0 , and an “additive structure”, but we relax the requirement that the additive structure come from a binary operation.

By a *pointed monoid* we mean a multiplicatively written commutative monoid P with an element 0 that satisfies $0 \cdot a = 0$ for all $a \in P$. We denote the unit of P by 1 and write P^\times for the group of invertible elements in P . We denote by $\text{Sym}_3(P)$ all elements of the form $a + b + c$ in the monoid semiring $\mathbb{N}[P]$, where $a, b, c \in P$.

Definition 2.1. A *pasture* is a pointed monoid P such that $P^\times = P - \{0\}$, together with a subset N_P of $\text{Sym}_3(P)$ such that for all $a, b, c, d \in P$

- (P1) $a + 0 + 0 \in N_P$ if and only if $a = 0$,
- (P2) if $a + b + c \in N_P$, then $ad + bd + cd$ is in N_P ,
- (P3) there is a unique element $\epsilon \in P^\times$ such that $1 + \epsilon + 0 \in N_P$.

We call N_P the *nullset of P* , and say that $a + b + c$ is *null*, and write symbolically $a + b + c = 0$, if $a + b + c \in N_P$. The element ϵ plays the role of an additive inverse of 1, and the relations $a + b + c = 0$ express that certain sums of elements are zero, even though the multiplicative monoid P does not carry an addition. For this reason, we will write frequently $-a$ for ϵa and $a - b$ for $a + \epsilon b$. In particular, we have $\epsilon = -1$.

A *morphism of pastures* is a multiplicative map $f : P \rightarrow P'$ of monoids such that $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = 1$ and $f(a) + f(b) + f(c) = 0$ in P' whenever $a + b + c = 0$ in P .

2.2. Representations of matroids over pastures. Let P be a pasture and let M be a matroid on the finite set E . There are various “cryptomorphic” descriptions of weak P -matroids, for example in terms of “weak P -circuits”, cf. [2]. For the purposes of the present paper, however, it will be more convenient to define weak P -matroids in terms of modular systems of hyperplane functions, as in [3, Section 2.3]. The point here is that generalized parallel connections are defined in terms of flats, so we have easier access to the hyperplanes of a generalized parallel connection than to the bases or circuits.

Definition 2.2. Let \mathcal{H} be the set of hyperplanes of M .

- (1) Given $H \in \mathcal{H}$, we say that $f_H : E \rightarrow P$ is a *P -hyperplane function* for H if $f_H(e) = 0$ if and only if $e \in H$.
- (2) A triple of hyperplanes $(H_1, H_2, H_3) \in \mathcal{H}^3$ is *modular* if $F = H_1 \cap H_2 \cap H_3$ is a flat of corank 2 such that $F = H_i \cap H_j$ for all distinct $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.
- (3) A *modular system* of P -hyperplane functions for M is a collection of P -hyperplane functions $f_H : E \rightarrow P$, one for each $H \in \mathcal{H}$, such that whenever H_1, H_2, H_3 is a modular triple of hyperplanes in \mathcal{H} , the corresponding functions f_{H_i} are linearly dependent, i.e., there exist constants c_1, c_2, c_3 in P , not all zero, such that

$$c_1 f_{H_1}(e) + c_2 f_{H_2}(e) + c_3 f_{H_3}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$.

Definition 2.3. (1) A *P -representation* of M is a modular system of P -hyperplane functions for M .

- (2) Two P -representations $\{f_H\}$ and $\{f'_H\}$ of M are *isomorphic* if there is a function $H \mapsto c_H$ from \mathcal{H} to P^\times such that $f'_H(e) = c_H f_H(e)$ for all $e \in E$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}$.
- (3) Two P -representations $\{f_H\}$ and $\{f'_H\}$ of M are *rescaling equivalent* if there are functions $H \mapsto c_H$ from \mathcal{H} to P^\times and $e \mapsto c_e$ from E to P^\times such that $f'_H(e) = c_H c_e f_H(e)$ for all $e \in E$ and $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

When P is a partial field, a rescaling equivalence class of P -representations of M is the same thing as a projective equivalence class of P -representations of M in the sense of [14]. When P is a field, the equivalence between the notion of representability provided in Definition 2.3 and the usual notion of matroid representability over a field is precisely the content of “Tutte’s representation theorem”, cf. [15, Theorem 5.1].

Remark 2.4. The notion of rescaling classes of P -representations given by Definition 2.3 is compatible with the notion of rescaling classes of P -representations given in [5, Section 1.4.7]. Indeed, by [3, Thm. 2.16], for every modular system $\{f_H\}$ of hyperplane

functions for M in P , there is a weak Grassmann-Plücker function $\Delta : E^r \rightarrow P$ representing M such that

$$\frac{f_H(e)}{f_H(e')} = \frac{\Delta(e, e_2, \dots, e_r)}{\Delta(e', e_2, \dots, e_r)}$$

for every $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and all $e, e', e_2, \dots, e_r \in E$ such that $\{e_2, \dots, e_r\}$ spans H and $\{e', e_2, \dots, e_r\}$ is a basis of M . The weak Grassmann-Plücker function Δ is uniquely determined up to a constant $c \in P^\times$, and two modular systems of hyperplane functions $\{f_H\}$ and $\{f'_H\}$ correspond to the same weak Grassmann-Plücker function $\Delta : E^r \rightarrow P$ (up to a constant) if and only if there is a function $H \mapsto c_H$ from \mathcal{H} to P^\times such that $f'_H = c_H f_H$ for all $H \in \mathcal{H}$.

Two weak Grassmann-Plücker functions Δ and Δ' are rescaling equivalent if there are a constant $c \in P^\times$ and a function $e \mapsto c_e$ from $E \rightarrow P^\times$ such that

$$\Delta'(e_1, \dots, e_r) = c \cdot c_{e_1} \cdots c_{e_r} \cdot \Delta(e_1, \dots, e_r).$$

Consequently, we have

$$\frac{\Delta'(e, e_2, \dots, e_r)}{\Delta'(e', e_2, \dots, e_r)} = \frac{c_e \cdot \Delta(e, e_2, \dots, e_r)}{c_{e'} \cdot \Delta(e', e_2, \dots, e_r)} = \frac{c_e \cdot f_H(e)}{c_{e'} \cdot f_H(e')},$$

where $H \in \mathcal{H}$ and $e, e', e_2, \dots, e_r \in E$ are as before. This establishes a bijection

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{rescaling classes of weak Grassmann-} \\ \text{Plücker functions for } M \text{ in } P \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{\sim} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{rescaling classes of modular systems} \\ \text{of hyperplane functions for } M \text{ in } P \end{array} \right\}.$$

2.2.1. The universal pasture and the foundation. Let $\mathcal{X}_M^I(P)$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_M^R(P)$) be the set of isomorphism classes (resp. rescaling equivalence classes) of P -representations of M . It is shown in [3] that the functors \mathcal{X}_M^I and \mathcal{X}_M^R are representable by the universal pasture $\tilde{F}(M)$ and the foundation $F(M)$, respectively. This is equivalent to the fact that $\mathcal{X}_M^I(P) = \text{Hom}(\tilde{F}(M), P)$ (resp. $\mathcal{X}_M^R(P) = \text{Hom}(F(M), P)$) functorially in P .

In particular, in order to show that some pasture F' is isomorphic to the foundation of M , it is equivalent to show that for every morphism of pastures $P \rightarrow P'$ there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}(F', P) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{X}_M^R(P) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Hom}(F', P') & \xrightarrow{\cong} & \mathcal{X}_M^R(P'). \end{array}$$

We will use this observation frequently throughout the paper. A similar characterization holds, of course, for the universal pasture of M .

2.3. Facts about generalized parallel connections. Throughout this section, let M_1, M_2 be matroids with ground sets E_1 and E_2 , respectively, and assume there exists a common subset T of E_1 and E_2 such that $M_1|_T = M_2|_T$ and T is a modular flat in M_2 .

We have the following formula for the rank of flats in $P_T(M_1, M_2)$.

Proposition 2.5. [8, Proposition 5.5] *If r, r_1, r_2 are the rank functions of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$, M_1 , and M_2 respectively, then for any flat F of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ we have:*

$$(1) \quad r(F) = r_1(F \cap E_1) + r_2(F \cap E_2) - r_1(F \cap T).$$

In particular,

$$(2) \quad r(P_T(M_1, M_2)) = r(M_1) + r(M_2) - r(M_1|T).$$

When T is modular in both M_1 and M_2 , there is a straightforward description of the hyperplanes of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$; the proof follows easily from Proposition 2.5.

Proposition 2.6. [10, Proposition 22] *Assume that T is a modular flat in both M_1 and M_2 . A subset $H \subseteq E_1 \cup E_2$ is a hyperplane of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ if and only if*

- (1) $H \cap E_1$ is a hyperplane of M_1 that contains T , and H contains E_2 , or
- (2) $H \cap E_2$ is a hyperplane of M_2 that contains T , and H contains E_1 , or
- (3) $H \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i for $i = 1, 2$, and T is not contained in H .

Proof. Let r be the rank function of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$, and let $r(H \cap T) = r(T) - k$ where $0 \leq k \leq r(T)$. Since T is a modular flat in M_i we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(T) + r(H \cap E_i) &= r(T \cap H) + r((T \cup H) \cap E_i) \\ &= r(T) - k + r((T \cup H) \cap E_i) \\ &\leq r(T) - k + r(E_i), \end{aligned}$$

and it follows that $r(H \cap E_i) \leq r(E_i) - k$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(H) &= r(E_1) + r(E_2) - r(T) - 1 \\ &= r(H \cap E_1) + r(H \cap E_2) - r(H \cap T) \\ &= r(H \cap E_1) + r(H \cap E_2) - (r(T) - k) \\ &\leq (r(E_1) - k) + (r(E_2) - k) - (r(T) - k) \\ &= r(E_1) + r(E_2) - r(T) - k, \end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from (2) and the fact that H is a hyperplane of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$, and the second follows from (1). By comparing the first and last lines, we see that $k \leq 1$. By comparing the first and third lines, we have

$$r(E_1) + r(E_2) - 1 = r(H \cap E_1) + r(H \cap E_2) + k.$$

If $k = 0$ then $T \subseteq H$ and (1) or (2) holds, and if $k = 1$ then (3) holds. \square

A similar result holds for corank-2 flats.

Proposition 2.7. *Assume that T is a modular flat in both M_1 and M_2 . A subset $F \subseteq E_1 \cup E_2$ is a corank-2 flat of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ if and only if*

- (1) $T \subseteq F$ and there is some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ so that $E_i \subseteq F$ and $F \cap E_{3-i}$ is a corank-2 flat of M_{3-i} , or
- (2) $T \subseteq F$ and $F \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i for $i = 1, 2$, or
- (3) $r_{M_1}(F \cap T) = r_{M_1}(T) - 1$, and there is some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ so that $F \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i and $F \cap E_{3-i}$ is a corank-2 flat of M_{3-i} , or
- (4) $r_{M_1}(F \cap T) = r_{M_1}(T) - 2$, and $F \cap E_i$ is a corank-2 flat of M_i for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Let r be the rank function of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$, and let $r(F \cap T) = r(T) - k$ where $0 \leq k \leq r(T)$. As in the proof of Proposition 2.6, we know that $r(F \cap E_i) \leq r(E_i) - k$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(F) &= r(E_1) + r(E_2) - r(T) - 2 \\ &= r(F \cap E_1) + r(F \cap E_2) - r(F \cap T) \\ &= r(F \cap E_1) + r(F \cap E_2) - (r(T) - k) \\ &\leq (r(E_1) - k) + (r(E_2) - k) - (r(T) - k) \\ &= r(E_1) + r(E_2) - r(T) - k, \end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from (2) and the fact that F is a corank-2 flat of $P_T(M_1, M_2)$, and the second follows from (1). By comparing the first and last lines, we see that $k \leq 2$. By comparing the first and third lines, we have

$$r(E_1) + r(E_2) - 2 = r(F \cap E_1) + r(F \cap E_2) + k.$$

If $k = 0$ then $T \subseteq F$ and (1) or (2) holds. If $k = 1$ then (3) holds, and if $k = 2$ then (4) holds. \square

We will also need analogous results when $r(T) = 2$ and T is not assumed to be modular in M_1 . We replace T with X here, because we will apply this result in the case that $M_2 = \Theta_n$.

Proposition 2.8. *Let M_1, M_2 be matroids with ground sets E_1 and E_2 , respectively, and assume there exists a common subset X of E_1 and E_2 such that $M_1|_X = M_2|_X$ and X is a modular flat in M_2 . Assume furthermore that $M_2|_X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$. A subset $H \subseteq E_1 \cup E_2$ is a hyperplane of $P_X(M_1, M_2)$ if and only if*

- (1) $E_1 \subseteq H$ and $H \cap E_2$ is a hyperplane of M_2 that contains X , or
- (2) $E_2 \subseteq H$ and $H \cap E_1$ is a hyperplane of M_1 that contains X , or
- (3) $H \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i for $i = 1, 2$ and $|H \cap X| = 1$, or
- (4) $H \cap E_1$ is a hyperplane of M_1 that is disjoint from X , and $H \cap E_2$ is a corank-2 flat of M_2 that is disjoint from X .

Proof. Let r be the rank function of $P_X(M_1, M_2)$, and let $r(H \cap X) = r(X) - k$ where $0 \leq k \leq 2$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(H) &= r(E_1) + r(E_2) - r(X) - 1 \\ &= r(H \cap E_1) + r(H \cap E_2) - r(H \cap X) \\ &= r(H \cap E_1) + r(H \cap E_2) - (r(X) - k), \end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from (2) and the fact that H is a hyperplane of $P_X(M_1, M_2)$, and the second follows from (1). It follows that

$$r(E_1) + r(E_2) - 1 = r(H \cap E_1) + r(H \cap E_2) + k.$$

If $k = 0$ then $X \subseteq H$ and (1) or (2) holds. If $k = 1$ then (3) holds. Finally, if $k = 2$ then $X \cap H = \emptyset$. Since X is a rank-2 modular flat in M_2 , this implies that $r(H \cap E_2) \leq r(E_2) - 2$, and it follows that (4) holds. \square

A similar result holds for corank-2 flats.

Proposition 2.9. *With hypotheses as in [Proposition 2.8](#), a subset $F \subseteq E_1 \cup E_2$ is a corank-2 flat of $P_X(M_1, M_2)$ if and only if*

- (1) $E_1 \subseteq F$ and $F \cap E_2$ is a corank-2 flat of M_2 that contains X ,
- (2) $E_2 \subseteq F$ and $F \cap E_1$ is a corank-2 flat of M_1 that contains X ,
- (3) For each $i = 1, 2$, $F \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i that contains X ,
- (4) $|F \cap X| = 1$, $F \cap E_1$ is a hyperplane of M_1 , and $F \cap E_2$ is a corank-2 flat of M_2 ,
or
- (5) $|F \cap X| = 1$, $F \cap E_1$ is a corank-2 flat of M_1 , and $F \cap E_2$ is a hyperplane of M_2 ,
- (6) $F \cap X = \emptyset$, $F \cap E_1$ is a hyperplane of M_1 , and $F \cap E_2$ is a corank-3 flat of M_2 ,
or
- (7) $F \cap X = \emptyset$, and $F \cap E_i$ is a corank-2 flat of M_i for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Let r be the rank function of $P_X(M_1, M_2)$, and let $r(F \cap X) = r(X) - k$ where $0 \leq k \leq 2$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} r(F) &= r(E_1) + r(E_2) - r(X) - 2 \\ &= r(F \cap E_1) + r(F \cap E_2) - r(F \cap X) \\ &= r(F \cap E_1) + r(F \cap E_2) - (r(X) - k), \end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from (2) and the fact that F is a corank-2 flat of $P_X(M_1, M_2)$, and the second follows from (1). It follows that

$$r(E_1) + r(E_2) - 2 = r(F \cap E_1) + r(F \cap E_2) + k.$$

If $k = 0$ then $X \subseteq F$ and (1), (2), or (3) holds. If $k = 1$ then (4) or (5) holds. Finally, if $k = 2$ then $X \cap F = \emptyset$. Since X is a rank-2 modular flat in M_2 , this implies that $r(F \cap E_2) \leq r(E_2) - 2$, and it follows that (6) or (7) holds. \square

3. The foundation of a generalized parallel connection

The following theorem implies [Theorem A\(1\)](#), and also proves the analogous result for universal pastures.

Theorem 3.1. *Let M_1 and M_2 be matroids with a set T so that $M_1|_T = M_2|_T$ and T is a modular flat of both M_1 and M_2 , and let $M = P_T(M_1, M_2)$. Then $\tilde{F}(M) \cong \tilde{F}(M_1) \otimes_{\tilde{F}(T)} \tilde{F}(M_2)$ and $F(M) \cong F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$.*

Proof. For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ let E_i be the ground set of M_i . Let P be a pasture. We will define a map from a subset of $\mathcal{X}_{M_1}^I(P) \times \mathcal{X}_{M_2}^I(P)$ (the subset for which the induced representations for T are in the same isomorphism class) to $\mathcal{X}_M^I(P)$ and vice versa. Then we will show these two maps are well-defined and inverse to each other. It will be clear from the definition of the resulting bijection that it is functorial in P . Therefore, by the universal property of the tensor product, we will obtain an isomorphism $\tilde{F}(M) \cong \tilde{F}(M_1) \otimes_{\tilde{F}(T)} \tilde{F}(M_2)$. Passing to rescaling classes instead of isomorphism classes shows that $F(M) \cong F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$ as well.

First, if we have a modular system \mathcal{H} of P -hyperplane functions of M , then by [Proposition 2.6](#) we can simply restrict to E_i to obtain a modular system \mathcal{H}_i of hyperplane functions for M_i , for $i = 1, 2$. Conversely, let \mathcal{H}_i be a modular system of P -hyperplane functions of M_i for $i = 1, 2$ with $\mathcal{H}_1|_T = \mathcal{H}_2|_T$. By scaling functions in

\mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 , we may assume that if $f, f' \in \mathcal{H}_1 \cup \mathcal{H}_2$ have the same support in T , then $f(e) = f'(e)$ for all $e \in T$. For each hyperplane H of M we define a function f_H by declaring that if $H \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane for some $i = 1, 2$, then $f_H(e) = f_{H \cap E_i}(e)$ for all $e \in E_i$.

Let \mathcal{H} be the set of all f_H for hyperplanes H of M . By [Proposition 2.6](#), the complements of the supports of the functions in \mathcal{H} forms the set of hyperplanes of M . Restricting the functions in \mathcal{H} to E_i for $i = 1, 2$ results in the systems \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 , which shows that the two maps are inverse to each other. It remains to show \mathcal{H} is in fact a modular system.

Let F be a corank-2 flat of M and let (H, H', H'') be a modular triple of hyperplanes of M such that $H \cap H' \cap H'' = F$. We will show that $f_H, f_{H'}, f_{H''}$ are linearly dependent. There are four different cases to consider, stemming from the four cases for F in [Proposition 2.7](#).

Case 1: Suppose $T \subseteq F$ and there is some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ so that $E_i \subseteq F$ and $F \cap E_{3-i}$ is a corank-2 flat of M_{3-i} . We may assume that $i = 1$. Then $(H \cap E_2, H' \cap E_2, H'' \cap E_2)$ is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M_2 , and since $f_{H \cap E_2}, f_{H' \cap E_2}, f_{H'' \cap E_2}$ are linearly dependent in \mathcal{H}_2 it follows that $f_H, f_{H'}, f_{H''}$ are linearly dependent in \mathcal{H} .

Case 2: Suppose $T \subseteq F$ and $F \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i for $i = 1, 2$. The only hyperplanes of M containing F are $F \cup E_1$ and $F \cup E_2$, so there is no modular triple of hyperplanes that all contain F .

Case 3: Suppose $r_{M_1}(F \cap T) = r_{M_1}(T) - 1$, and there is some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ so that $F \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i and $F \cap E_{3-i}$ is a corank-2 flat of M_{3-i} . We may assume that $i = 1$. Then $(H \cap E_2, H' \cap E_2, H'' \cap E_2)$ is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M_2 , so there are constants c, c', c'' so that

$$c \cdot f_{H \cap E_2}(e) + c' \cdot f_{H' \cap E_2}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H'' \cap E_2}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E_2$. If none of H, H', H'' contains E_1 , then $c + c' + c'' = 0$ because $H \cap E_2, H' \cap E_2, H'' \cap E_2$ all have the same restriction to T . Similarly, if $E_1 \subseteq H''$, then $c + c' = 0$. In either case it follows that $c \cdot f_H(e) + c' \cdot f_{H'}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$ for all $e \in E_1 \cup E_2$.

Case 4: Suppose $r_{M_1}(F \cap T) = r_{M_1}(T) - 2$ and $F \cap E_i$ is a corank-2 flat of M_i for $i = 1, 2$. Then there are constants c, c', c'' so that

$$c \cdot f_{H \cap E_1}(e) + c' \cdot f_{H' \cap E_1}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H'' \cap E_1}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E_1$, and constants d, d', d'' so that

$$d \cdot f_{H \cap E_2}(e) + d' \cdot f_{H' \cap E_2}(e) + d'' \cdot f_{H'' \cap E_2}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E_2$. By setting $e = t$ for some $t \in (T \cap H_3) - (H_1 \cup H_2)$, the first equation shows that $\frac{c}{c'} = -\frac{f_{H' \cap E_1}(t)}{f_{H \cap E_1}(t)}$, and the second equation shows that $\frac{d}{d'} = -\frac{f_{H' \cap E_2}(t)}{f_{H \cap E_2}(t)}$. It follows that $\frac{c}{c'} = \frac{d}{d'}$. Repeating this argument shows that (c, c', c'') is a scalar multiple of (d, d', d'') , and it follows that $c \cdot f_H(e) + c' \cdot f_{H'}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$ for all $e \in E_1 \cup E_2$.

The four cases combine to show that \mathcal{H} is a modular system of P -hyperplane functions for M , as desired. So we have defined maps from $\mathcal{X}_{M_1}^I(P) \times \mathcal{X}_{M_2}^I(P)$ to $\mathcal{X}_M^I(P)$ and vice versa that are inverse to each other and functorial in P , which shows that $\tilde{F}(M) \cong \tilde{F}(M_1) \otimes_{\tilde{F}(T)} \tilde{F}(M_2)$. Since these maps induce maps from $\mathcal{X}_{M_1}^R(P) \times \mathcal{X}_{M_2}^R(P)$

to $\mathcal{X}_M^R(P)$ and vice versa that are also inverse to each other and functorial in P , it follows that $F(M) \cong F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$ as well. \square

Remark 3.2. When T is only a modular flat in M_2 , the generalized parallel connection $P_T(M_1, M_2)$ is still well-defined. However, the identity $F(P_T(M_1, M_2)) \cong F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$ does not always hold in this more general setting, even when $r(T) = 2$. For example, let M_1 and M_2 be the rank-3 matroids spanned by the two planes of the matroid shown in Figure 1, and let T be the line spanned by the intersection of these two planes. Then T is a modular flat of M_2 , so $M = P_T(M_1, M_2)$ is well-defined. However, one can check, using the Macaulay2 package developed by Chen and Zhang (cf. [9])², that $F(M) \not\cong F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$. Specifically, $F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$ has 30 hexagons (in the sense of [3, Figure 1]) while $F(M)$ has 31 hexagons.

We briefly explain how this extra hexagon in $F(M)$ arises from the fact that T is not a modular flat of M_1 . Let $H = E(M_1) - T$ and let $\{a, b, c, d\} = E(M_2) - T$. Then $H \cup a$, $H \cup b$, $H \cup c$, and $H \cup d$ are all hyperplanes of M that are not of the form described in Proposition 2.6. Moreover, $(H \cup a, H \cup b, H \cup c, H \cup d)$ is a modular quadruple of hyperplanes of M , which corresponds to a hexagon of $F(M)$ (see [3, Definitions 3.3 and 3.4]). The pasture obtained from $F(M)$ by deleting this hexagon is isomorphic to $F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$ (as verified via Macaulay2), so the discrepancy between $F(M)$ and $F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$ arises directly from the fact that T is not a modular flat of M_1 .




Figure 1. A generalized parallel connection for which $F(P_T(M_1, M_2))$ is not isomorphic to $F(M_1) \otimes_{F(T)} F(M_2)$.

4. The foundation of a 2-sum

In this section, we study the special case in which $T = \{p\}$ is a singleton that is not a loop or a coloop in either M_1 or M_2 . In this case, the **2-sum** of M_1 and M_2 with basepoint p is the matroid with ground set $(E(M_1) \cup E(M_2)) - p$ and set of circuits

$$\mathcal{C}(M_1 \setminus p) \cup \mathcal{C}(M_2 \setminus p) \cup \{(C_1 \cup C_2) - p \mid p \in C_1 \in \mathcal{C}(M_1) \text{ and } p \in C_2 \in \mathcal{C}(M_2)\},$$

²The software described in [9] is now available through the standard distribution of Macaulay2 as the package “foundations.m2”.

where $\mathcal{C}(N)$ denotes the set of circuits of the matroid N . The 2-sum of M_1 and M_2 with basepoint p is denoted by $M_1 \oplus_2 M_2$ or $M_1 \oplus_p M_2$. When M_1 and M_2 are simple, we can also define $M_1 \oplus_p M_2$ to be $P_p(M_1, M_2) \setminus p$, where $P_p(M_1, M_2)$ is the parallel connection of M_1 and M_2 along p [12, Proposition 7.1.20]. (We need M_1 and M_2 to be simple or else p may not be a flat in M_1 or M_2).

We seek to prove Theorem C, which states that $F(M_1 \oplus_p M_2) \cong F(M_1) \otimes F(M_2)$. We know from Theorem 3.1 that $F(P_p(M_1, M_2)) \cong F(M_1) \otimes F(M_2)$, so it suffices to show that $F(M_1 \oplus_p M_2) \cong F(P_p(M_1, M_2))$. We first show that the sets of hyperplanes of $M_1 \oplus_p M_2$ and $P_p(M_1, M_2)$ are closely related.

Lemma 4.1. *Let M_1 and M_2 be simple matroids so that $E(M_1) \cap E(M_2) = \{p\}$ for some element p that is not a coloop of M_1 or M_2 , and let $M = P_p(M_1, M_2)$ and $M' = M_1 \oplus_p M_2$. Let \mathcal{H} and \mathcal{H}' be the sets of hyperplanes of M and M' respectively. Then*

- (1) $\mathcal{H}' = \{H - p \mid H \in \mathcal{H}\}$,
- (2) if (H_1, H_2, H_3) is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M , then $(H_1 - p, H_2 - p, H_3 - p)$ is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M' , and
- (3) conversely, if (H'_1, H'_2, H'_3) is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M' , then

$$(\text{cl}_M(H'_1), \text{cl}_M(H'_2), \text{cl}_M(H'_3))$$

is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M .

Proof. For $i = 1, 2$ let E_i be the ground set of M_i . We first prove (1). Since M is obtained from M' by deleting p , it follows that $\mathcal{H}' \subseteq \{H - p \mid H \in \mathcal{H}\}$, so we need only show that the reverse containment holds as well. Let $H' = H - p$ for some $H \in \mathcal{H}$. If $p \notin H$ then clearly $H - p \in \mathcal{H}'$. If $p \in H$ then $E_i \subseteq H$ for some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ by Proposition 2.6. Since p is not a coloop of M_i , it follows that H and $H - p$ have the same rank in M , and so $H - p \in \mathcal{H}'$.

We next prove (2). Suppose (H_1, H_2, H_3) is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M . Let $L = H_1 \cap H_2 \cap H_3$. It suffices to show that if $p \in L$, then $r_M(L - p) = r_M(L)$. If $p \in L$, then by Proposition 2.6, each of H_1, H_2 , and H_3 contains E_1 or E_2 . If $E_1 \in H_1$ and $E_2 \in H_2$ then (H_1, H_2, H_3) is not a modular triple, so without loss of generality we may assume $E_1 \subseteq L$. Since p is not a coloop of M_1 , it follows that $r_M(L - p) = r_M(L)$, as desired.

Finally, we prove (3). Suppose (H'_1, H'_2, H'_3) is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M' , and let $L' = H'_1 \cap H'_2 \cap H'_3$. Then

$$r(M) - 2 = r(M') - 2 = r_{M'}(L') = r_M(\text{cl}_M(L')) = r_M(\text{cl}_M(H'_1) \cap \text{cl}_M(H'_2) \cap \text{cl}_M(H'_3)),$$

which shows that $(\text{cl}_M(H'_1), \text{cl}_M(H'_2), \text{cl}_M(H'_3))$ is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M . \square

The following is a restatement of Theorem C.

Theorem 4.2. *Let M_1 and M_2 be matroids so that $E(M_1) \cap E(M_2) = \{p\}$ for some element p that is not a loop or a coloop of M_1 or M_2 . Then $F(M_1 \oplus_p M_2) \cong F(M_1) \otimes F(M_2)$.*

Proof. It follows from [12, 7.1.15 (v)] that $\text{si}(M_1 \oplus_p M_2) = \text{si}(M_1) \oplus_p \text{si}(M_2)$, so by [3, Corollary 4.9] we may assume that M_1 and M_2 are simple. Let $M = P_p(M_1, M_2)$ and

$M' = M_1 \oplus_p M_2$, so $M' = M \setminus p$. Let $E = E(M)$, and let $E' = E - p$. For $i = 1, 2$ let $E_i = E(M_i)$ and let $E'_i = E_i - p$.

Let P be a pasture. Given functions $f_i: E'_i \rightarrow P$ for $i = 1, 2$, we define $f_1 * f_2$ to be the function from E' to P so that $(f_1 * f_2)(e) = f_i(e)$ when $e \in E'_i$. Using modular systems of hyperplane functions, we first define a map Φ from $\mathcal{X}_M^R(P)$ to $\mathcal{X}_{M'}^R(P)$ and a map Ψ from $\mathcal{X}_{M'}^R(P)$ to $\mathcal{X}_M^R(P)$. Then we will show that these two maps are well-defined and inverse to each other. The maps will be functorial in P by construction, and so we will obtain an isomorphism $F(M_1 \oplus_p M_2) \cong F(M_1) \otimes F(M_2)$.

Let \mathcal{H} be a modular system of P -hyperplane functions of M . We define Φ by restricting to E' , so $\Phi(\mathcal{H}) = \{f_H|_{E'} \mid f_H \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Now let \mathcal{H}' be a modular system of P -hyperplane functions of M' . We define Ψ by extending the functions in \mathcal{H}' to p . If f_H is in \mathcal{H}' and H contains E'_1 or E'_2 , then $H \cup p$ is a hyperplane of M , so we define $f_{H \cup p}(p) = 0$. Otherwise, H is also a hyperplane of M . To define $f_H(p)$, we first fix a hyperplane H_0 of M' such that H_0 contains neither E'_1 nor E'_2 . Then there exists a unique $c \in P^\times$ such that a scalar multiple of $f_H|_{E'_1} * (c \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_2})$ is in \mathcal{H}' . We define $f_H(p) = c$. We first show that this definition is symmetric in E'_1 and E'_2 . To do so, we first prove the following technical claim.

Claim 1. *Let K and L be hyperplanes of M' so that neither contains E'_1 or E'_2 and $K \cap E'_2 = L \cap E'_2$. Let g_K and g_L be scalar multiples of f_K and f_L so that $g_K|_{E'_2} = g_L|_{E'_2}$. Then, for any scalar multiples $g_{K'}$ and $g_{L'}$ of $f_{K'}$ and $f_{L'}$, respectively, with $g_{K'}|_{E'_1} = g_K|_{E'_1}$, $g_{L'}|_{E'_1} = g_L|_{E'_1}$ and $K' \cap E_2 = L' \cap E_2$, we have $g_{K'}|_{E'_2} = g_{L'}|_{E'_2}$.*

Proof. Fix L , and suppose that the claim is false. Choose K so that the claim is false for K and $r_{M'}(K \cap L)$ is maximal with this property. Since $K \cap E'_2 = L \cap E'_2$, this is equivalent to the maximality of $r_{M'}(K \cap L \cap E'_1)$. Assume we are given $K', L', g_{K'}$, and $g_{L'}$. If $K \cap E'_1 = L \cap E'_1$, then $K = L = K' = L'$ and the result holds. So $K \cap E'_1 \neq L \cap E'_1$, which means that there is a hyperplane H of M' (possibly $H = L$) so that

- $H \cap E'_2 = L \cap E'_2 = K \cap E'_2$,
- (K, H) is a modular pair of M' , and
- $r_{M'}(H \cap L) > r_{M'}(K \cap L)$.

Define H' to be the hyperplane of M' with $H' \cap E'_1 = H \cap E'_1$ and $H' \cap E'_2 = K' \cap E'_2 = L' \cap E'_2$. By the maximality of $r_{M'}(K \cap L)$ we know that the claim is true for H and L , and so $g_{H'}|_{E'_2} = g_{L'}|_{E'_2}$.

We will complete the proof by showing that $g_{K'}|_{E'_2} = g_{H'}|_{E'_2}$. Let $X_1 = K \cap H \cap E'_1$, so X is a corank-2 flat of M'_1 . Let $X = [\text{cl}_{M_1}(X \cup p) \cup E_2] - p$. By Proposition 2.6 and Lemma 4.1, X is a hyperplane of M' . Moreover, (K, H, X) is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M' , so there are constants c, c' so that

$$g_K(e) + c \cdot g_H(e) + c' \cdot f_X(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E'$. Since $g_K|_{E'_2} = g_L|_{E'_2}$ by assumption and $f_X(e) = 0$ for all $e \in E'_2$, we see that $c = -1$, and so

$$g_K(e) - g_H(e) + c' \cdot f_X(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E'$.

Next, note that (K', H', X) is also a modular triple of M' , because $K' \cap H' \cap X$ is the union of $K \cap H \cap E'_1$ and $K' \cap E_2$, which is a corank-2 flat of M' . So there are constants d, d' so that

$$g_{K'}(e) + d \cdot g_{H'}(e) + d' \cdot f_X(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E'$. By plugging in $a \in (H' - (K' \cup X)) \cap E'_1$, we see that $g_{K'}(a) + d' \cdot f_X(a) = 0$. Since $g_{K'}(a) = g_K(a)$ by assumption, this implies that $g_K(a) + c' \cdot f_X(a) = 0$, and it follows that $c' = d'$. By plugging in $b \in (K' - (H' \cup X)) \cap E'_1$, we have $d \cdot g_{H'}(b) + d' \cdot f_X(b) = 0$. Since $g_{H'}(b) = g_H(b)$ by assumption and $d' = c'$, this means that $d \cdot g_H(b) + c' \cdot f_X(b) = 0$, and it follows that $d = -1$. Therefore, by plugging in $e \in E'_2 - (H' \cup K')$, we see that $g_{K'}(e) - g_{H'}(e) = 0$, and so $g_{K'}|_{E'_2} = g_{H'}|_{E'_2}$, as desired. \square

We have the following corollary, which is the only application of Claim 1 that we will need. It shows that the map from \mathcal{H}' to \mathcal{H} does not depend on whether we restrict H_0 to E'_1 or to E'_2 .

Claim 2. *Let H be a hyperplane of M' that contains neither E'_1 nor E'_2 . If $f_H|_{E_1} * (c \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_2})$ is in \mathcal{H}' for some scalar c , then a scalar multiple of $(c \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_1}) * f_H|_{E'_2}$ is also in \mathcal{H}' .*

Proof. Let K be the hyperplane of M' with $K \cap E'_1 = H \cap E'_1$ and $K \cap E'_2 = H_0 \cap E'_2$. Note that $f_K = f_H|_{E'_1} * (c \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_2})$ by assumption. Let $L = H_0$ and $K' = H$, and let L' be the hyperplane of M' with $L' \cap E'_1 = H'_0 \cap E'_1$ and $L' \cap E'_2 = H \cap E'_2$. Let $g_K = f_K$ and $g_L = c \cdot f_L$; then $g_K|_{E'_2} = g_L|_{E'_2} = c \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_2}$. Let $g_{K'}$ and $g_{L'}$ be scalar multiples of $f_{K'}$ and $f_{L'}$, respectively, so that $g_{K'}|_{E'_1} = g_K|_{E'_1}$ and $g_{L'}|_{E'_1} = g_L|_{E'_1}$. Then $g_{K'} = f_{K'}$ because $f_{K'}|_{E'_1} = g_K|_{E'_1} = f_H|_{E'_1}$. By applying Claim 1, we know that $g_{K'}|_{E'_2} = g_{L'}|_{E'_2}$. Then

$$g_{L'}|_{E'_1} = g_L|_{E'_1} = c \cdot f_L|_{E'_1} = c \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_1}$$

and

$$g_{L'}|_{E'_2} = g_{K'}|_{E'_2} = f_{K'}|_{E'_2} = f_H|_{E'_2},$$

and so $g_{L'} = (c \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_1}) * f_H|_{E'_2}$ and the claim holds. \square

Next, we will show that $\Psi(\mathcal{H}')$ is a modular system of P -hyperplane functions of M . Let F be a corank-2 flat of M , and let (H_1, H_2, H_3) be a modular triple of hyperplanes of M so that $H_1 \cap H_2 \cap H_3 = F$. By Lemma 4.1, $(H_1 - p, H_2 - p, H_3 - p)$ is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M' , so there are constants c_1, c_2, c_3 so that

$$c_1 \cdot f_{H_1}(e) + c_2 \cdot f_{H_2}(e) + c_3 \cdot f_{H_3}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E'$. We need only show that this also holds for $e = p$. We consider two cases based on F as described in Proposition 2.7 with $T = \{p\}$. (Outcomes (1) and (2) of Proposition 2.7 will be combined, and Outcome (4) does not occur because $\{p\}$ has rank 1.)

Case 1: Suppose $p \in F$. Then $f_{H_i}(p) = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Case 2: Suppose $p \notin F$, and there is some $i \in \{1, 2\}$ so that $F \cap E_i$ is a hyperplane of M_i and $F \cap E_{3-i}$ is a corank-2 flat of M_{3-i} . We may assume that $i = 1$, using Claim 2. There are two subcases. First suppose that $p \in H_j$ for some $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. We may assume that $j = 1$. Then H_1 contains E_1 , so $f_{H_1}|_{E_1} = 0$ and we have $f_{H_2}|_{E'_1} = -\frac{c_2}{c_3} \cdot f_{H_3}|_{E'_1}$.

Moreover, a multiple of $f_{H_2}|_{E'_1} * (f_{H_2}(p) \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_2})$ is in \mathcal{H}' , by the definition of $f_{H_2}(p)$. Hence, a multiple of $f_{H_3}|_{E'_1} * (-\frac{c_3}{c_2} \cdot f_{H_2}(p) \cdot f_{H_0}|_{E'_2})$ is in \mathcal{H}' by the definition of $f_{H_3}(p)$, and so $f_{H_3}(p) = -\frac{c_3}{c_2} \cdot f_{H_2}(p)$. So when $e = p$ we have

$$0 + c_2 \cdot f_{H_2}(p) + c_3 \cdot \left(-\frac{c_2}{c_3} \cdot f_{H_2}(p) \right) = 0,$$

as desired.

In the second subcase, $p \notin H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_3$. Then H_1 , H_2 , and H_3 all have the same restriction to E'_1 , and so $f_{H_i}|_{E'_1}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ are scalar multiples of each other. By definition, $(f_{H_1}(p), f_{H_2}(p), f_{H_3}(p))$ is a scalar multiple of $(f_{H_1}(e), f_{H_2}(e), f_{H_3}(e))$ for any $e \in E'_1 - F$. Hence $c_1 \cdot f_{H_1}(p) + c_2 \cdot f_{H_2}(p) + c_3 \cdot f_{H_3}(p) = 0$.

It follows that $\Psi(\mathcal{H}')$ is a modular system of hyperplane functions, as claimed.

Next we will show that Φ and Ψ are inverses of one another. It is clear that $\Phi \circ \Psi$ is the identity map regardless of the choice of H_0 . In the case of $\Psi \circ \Phi$, let H_0 be the hyperplane that we fixed. Note that H_0 is also a hyperplane of M . Let $f_{H_0} \in \mathcal{H}$, and let $f_H \in \mathcal{H}$ for an arbitrary hyperplane H of M . Let $\overline{f_H}$ be the function in $\Psi \circ \Phi(\mathcal{H})$ such that $\overline{f_H}(e) = f_H(e)$ for all $e \in E'$. If $p \in H$ then $\overline{f_H} = f_H$. If $p \notin H$, then let $K = (H \cap E_1) \cup (H_0 \cap E_2)$; by Proposition 2.6, we know that K is a hyperplane of M . Since $K \cap E_1 = H_0 \cap E_1$ we may assume, by scaling $f_K \in \mathcal{H}$, that $f_K|_{E_2} = f_{H_0}|_{E_2}$. In particular, $f_K(p) = f_{H_0}(p)$. Since $K \cap E_1 = H \cap E_1$, we know that $f_K|_{E_1}$ is a scalar multiple of $f_H|_{E_1}$, and in particular we have $f_K|_{E_1} = \frac{f_K(p)}{f_H(p)} \cdot f_H|_{E_1} = \frac{f_{H_0}(p)}{f_H(p)} \cdot f_H|_{E_1}$. Then $f_K = \left(\frac{f_{H_0}(p)}{f_H(p)} \cdot f_H|_{E_1} \right) * f_{H_0}|_{E_2}$. So, by definition, $\overline{f_H}(p) = \frac{1}{f_{H_0}(p)} \cdot f_H(p)$. The constant $\frac{1}{f_{H_0}(p)}$ only depends on the hyperplane H_0 , so \mathcal{H} and $\Psi \circ \Phi(\mathcal{H})$ are in the same rescaling class. \square

5. The foundation of a segment-cosegment exchange

In this section we show that if M is a matroid with a co-independent set X so that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, then the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X has the same foundation as M . We first recall the relevant definitions, which first appeared in [13].

For each integer $n \geq 2$, the matroid Θ_n has ground set $X \sqcup Y$ where $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$, and the following bases:

- Y ,
- $(Y - \{y_i\}) \cup \{x_j\}$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$, and
- $(Y - Y') \cup X'$ where $Y' \subseteq Y$ and $X' \subseteq X$ and $|Y'| = |X'| = 2$.

The set X is a modular flat of Θ_n and $\Theta_n|X \cong U_{2,n}$. Therefore, if M is any matroid with $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$, the generalized parallel connection $P_X(M, \Theta_n)$ is well-defined.

The matroid $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$ is called the *segment-cosegment exchange* of M along X . When $n = 2$, $\{x_i, y_i\}$ is a series pair of $P_X(M, \Theta_2)$ for $i = 1, 2$, so $P_X(M, \Theta_2) \setminus X \cong M$. When $n = 3$ we have $\Theta_3 \cong M(K_4)$ (the cycle matroid of the graph K_4), and $P_X(M, \Theta_3) \setminus X$ is also called the *Delta-Wye exchange* of M along X [1].

We next state some properties of Θ_n . There are three different types of hyperplanes of Θ_n , depending on the size of their intersection with X . This is straightforward to prove using the above description of the bases of Θ_n .

Proposition 5.1. *If H is a hyperplane of Θ_n , then either*

- (1) $H = (Y - y_i) \cup x_i$ for some $i \in [n]$, or
- (2) $H = (Y - \{y_i, y_j\}) \cup x_k$ for distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$, or
- (3) $H = (X \cup Y) - \{y_i, y_j, y_k\}$ for distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$.

Using the previous proposition, it is straightforward to show that there are four types of corank-2 flats of Θ_n . Note that outcomes (1) and (2) only occur when $n \geq 4$.

Proposition 5.2. *If F is a corank-2 flat of Θ_n , then either*

- (1) $F = (X \cup Y) - \{y_i, y_j, y_k, y_l\}$ for distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$, or
- (2) $F = (Y - \{y_i, y_j, y_k\}) \cup x_l$ for distinct $i, j, k, l \in [n]$, or
- (3) $F = (Y - \{y_i, y_j, y_k\}) \cup x_i$ for distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$, or
- (4) $F = Y - \{y_i, y_j\}$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$.

We will combine Propositions 5.1 and 5.2 with Propositions 2.6 and 2.9 to characterize the small corank flats of $P_X(M, \Theta_n)$.

We next turn our attention to representations of $U_{2,n}$, and prove two properties that hold for any modular system of hyperplane functions of $U_{2,n}$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let P be a pasture, and let \mathcal{H} be a modular system of P -hyperplane functions for $U_{2,n}$ on the ground set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. Then*

- (1) $f_{x_i}(x_j) = -f_{x_j}(x_i)$ for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$, and
- (2) for all $1 \leq i < j < k \leq n$ we have

$$f_{x_j}(x_k) \cdot f_{x_i}(e) + f_{x_k}(x_i) \cdot f_{x_j}(e) + f_{x_i}(x_j) \cdot f_{x_k}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in X$.

Proof. It follows from [3, Theorem 2.16] that the function $\Delta: X^2 \rightarrow P$ defined by $\Delta(x_i x_j) = f_{x_i}(x_j)$ is a (weak) Grassmann-Plücker function, which implies that (1) and (2) hold. \square

Finally, we need a general lemma about rescaling a modular system of hyperplane functions along a triangle.

Lemma 5.4. *Let M be a matroid with a triangle $T = \{x, y, z\}$, and let P be a pasture. Let \mathcal{H} be a modular system of P -hyperplane functions for M . Then there is a modular system \mathcal{H}' of P -hyperplane functions for M that is rescaling equivalent to \mathcal{H} and has the following properties:*

- (1) If H is a hyperplane of M so that $|H \cap T| = 1$, then $f_H \in \mathcal{H}'$ has values 0, 1, and -1 on T .
- (2) If H is a hyperplane of M disjoint from T , then $f_H \in \mathcal{H}'$ satisfies $f_H(x) + f_H(y) + f_H(z) = 0$.

Proof. Let L be a corank-2 flat of M disjoint from $\text{cl}(T)$. Let H_x, H_y , and H_z be $\text{cl}(L \cup x)$, $\text{cl}(L \cup y)$, and $\text{cl}(L \cup z)$, respectively. Note that (H_x, H_y, H_z) is a modular triple. By scaling functions in \mathcal{H} , we may assume that if H is a hyperplane and $H \cap T = \{x\}$, then $f_H(y) = 1$. Similarly, we may assume that if $H \cap T = \{y\}$ then $f_H(z) = 1$, and if $H \cap T = \{z\}$ then $f_H(x) = 1$. Now, scale \mathcal{H} by $\frac{-1}{f_{H_x}(z)}$ at z and by $\frac{-1}{f_{H_y}(x)}$ at x , and let \mathcal{H}' be the resulting system of P -hyperplane functions for M . Note that $f_{H_x}(z) = -1$ and $f_{H_y}(x) = -1$, as desired.

We first show that $f_{H_z}(y) = -1$. Since (H_x, H_y, H_z) is a modular triple, there are constants c', c'' so that

$$f_{H_x}(e) + c' \cdot f_{H_y}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H_z}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E(M)$. Setting $e = z$ shows that $c' = 1$, and setting $e = x$ shows that $c'' = 1$. Then setting $e = y$ shows that $f_{H_z}(y) = -1$, as desired.

Now we prove (1). We present the argument only for hyperplanes H with $H \cap T = \{x\}$, but the argument is very similar when $H \cap T \in \{y, z\}$. Suppose there is a hyperplane H of M with $H \cap T = \{x\}$ so that $f_H(z) \neq -1$, and let $r(H \cap H_x)$ be maximal with these properties. Since $H \neq H_x$, there is a hyperplane H' (possibly H_x) so that $H' \cap T = \{x\}$ and (H', H) is a modular pair, and $r(H' \cap H_x) > r(H \cap H_x)$. By the maximality of $r(H \cap H_x)$, we know that $f_{H'}(z) = -1$.

Let $L = H \cap H'$, and let $H'' = \text{cl}(L \cup T)$. Then (H, H', H'') is a modular triple because L is a corank-2 flat of M , so there are constants c, c'' so that

$$c \cdot f_H(e) + f_{H'}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E(M)$. Setting $e = y$ shows that $c = -1$, and then setting $e = z$ shows that $f_H(z) = -1$, a contradiction. This establishes (1).

We now prove (2). Let H be a hyperplane of M which is disjoint from T . Let L be a corank-2 flat of M contained in H , and let $H_x = \text{cl}(L \cup x)$, $H_y = \text{cl}(L \cup y)$. Then (H, H_x, H_y) is a modular triple, so there are constants c and c' so that

$$f_H(e) + c \cdot f_{H_x}(e) + c' \cdot f_{H_y}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E(M)$. By setting $e = x$, we see that $c' = -\frac{f_H(x)}{f_{H_y}(x)}$, and by setting $e = y$, we see that $c = -\frac{f_H(y)}{f_{H_x}(y)}$. Setting $e = z$ then gives

$$f_H(z) - \frac{f_H(y)}{f_{H_x}(y)} \cdot f_{H_x}(z) - \frac{f_H(x)}{f_{H_y}(x)} \cdot f_{H_y}(z) = 0,$$

and since $\frac{f_{H_x}(z)}{f_{H_x}(y)} = \frac{f_{H_y}(z)}{f_{H_y}(x)} = -1$ by (1), this simplifies to $f_H(z) + f_H(y) + f_H(x) = 0$. \square

We now prove that forming the generalized parallel connection with Θ_n preserves foundations. Note that we do not require X to be co-independent; that is only necessary for the subsequent argument in which we delete X .

Theorem 5.5. *Let M_1 be a matroid with a set X so that $M_1|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, and let $M = P_X(M_1, \Theta_n)$. Then $F(M) \cong F(M_1)$.*

Proof. When $n = 2$ we know that the cosimplification of M is isomorphic to M_1 because $\{x_i, y_i\}$ is a series pair of M for $i = 1, 2$. So by [3, Corollary 4.9], we may assume that $n \geq 3$. Let E_1 be the ground set of M_1 , and let $E_2 = X \cup Y$ be the ground set of Θ_n with $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$. Let $E = E_1 \cup E_2$.

Let P be a pasture. Given a system \mathcal{H} of P -hyperplane functions for M , we define a system \mathcal{H}_1 of P -hyperplane functions for M_1 by restriction to E_1 . Conversely, let \mathcal{H}_1 be a modular system of P -hyperplane functions for M_1 . Note that \mathcal{H}_1 induces a modular system of P -hyperplane functions of $U_{2,n}$ by restriction to X ; we write f_{x_i} for the function in $\mathcal{H}_1|_X$ corresponding to the hyperplane x_i of $M_1|_X$. By rescaling the functions in \mathcal{H}_1 we may assume that, for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$, if H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 with $H_1 \cap X = \{x_i\}$, then $f_{H_1}(x_j) = f_{x_i}(x_j)$. We will define a modular system \mathcal{H} of P -hyperplane functions for M so that $\mathcal{H}|_{E_1} = \mathcal{H}_1$, up to rescaling equivalence.

For each hyperplane H of M , we will define the corresponding function $f_H \in \mathcal{H}$ by separately considering the five different possibilities for the type of H . These five possibilities arise by applying Propositions 2.6, 5.1, and 5.2; note that we split outcome (3) of Proposition 2.6 into two separate cases depending on the form of the hyperplane of Θ_n :

- (1) If $H = E_1 \cup (Y - \{y_i, y_j, y_k\})$ for distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$ with $i < j < k$, define
 - $f_H(y_i) = f_{x_j}(x_k)$,
 - $f_H(y_j) = f_{x_k}(x_i)$, and
 - $f_H(y_k) = f_{x_i}(x_j)$.
- (2) If $H = H_1 \cup E_2$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 that contains X , define $f_H(e) = f_{H_1}(e)$ for all $e \in E$.
- (3) If $H = H_1 \cup ((Y - y_i) \cup x_i)$ for $i \in [n]$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 with $H_1 \cap X = \{x_i\}$, define
 - $f_H(e) = f_{H_1}(e)$ for all $e \in E_1$ (in particular, $f_H(x_j) = f_{x_i}(x_j)$ for all distinct $i, j \in [n]$), and
 - $f_H(y_i) = 1$.
- (3') If $H = H_1 \cup ((Y - \{y_i, y_j\}) \cup x_k)$ for distinct $i, j, k \in [n]$ with $i < j$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 with $H_1 \cap X = \{x_k\}$, define
 - $f_H(e) = f_{H_1}(e)$ for all $e \in E_1$ (in particular, $f_H(x_l) = f_{x_k}(x_l)$ for all $l \notin \{i, j, k\}$),
 - $f_H(y_i) = \frac{-f_{x_j}(x_k)}{f_{x_i}(x_j)}$, and
 - $f_H(y_j) = \frac{f_{x_i}(x_k)}{f_{x_i}(x_j)}$.
- (4) If $H = H_1 \cup (Y - \{y_i, y_j\})$ for distinct $i, j \in [n]$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 disjoint from X , define
 - $f_H(e) = f_{H_1}(e)$ for all $e \in E_1$,
 - $f_H(y_i) = \frac{f_{H_1}(x_j)}{f_{x_i}(x_j)}$, and

$$\bullet f_H(y_i) = \frac{f_{H_1}(x_i)}{f_{x_j}(x_i)}.$$

We now have a well-defined map from \mathcal{H}_1 to a set \mathcal{H} of hyperplane functions for M . We still need to show that \mathcal{H} is a modular system, but we first comment that the inverse of this map is the map defined by restriction to E_1 . This is because the restriction of any function f_H in \mathcal{H} to E_1 gives a hyperplane function in \mathcal{H}_1 when the support of $f_H|_{E_1}$ is the complement of a hyperplane of M_1 . So it suffices to show that \mathcal{H} satisfies the modular system axiom.

Let F be a corank-2 flat of M , and let (H, H', H'') be a modular triple of hyperplanes of M with $H \cap H' \cap H'' = F$. By Proposition 2.9, there are seven possibilities for F , which we consider separately. (Some cases only occur when $n \geq 4$ or $n \geq 5$.) We split outcome (4) of Proposition 2.9 into two cases depending on the form of the hyperplane of Θ_n . Also, each hyperplane or corank-2 flat of Θ_n is associated with a given subset of $[n]$; we will explicitly choose this subset without loss of generality to improve readability. We also choose (H, H', H'') up to permutation.

Case 1: $F = E - \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$. Then $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup y_1, F \cup y_2, F \cup y_3)$. We will show that

$$[f_{x_1}(x_4)] \cdot f_H(e) - [f_{x_2}(x_4)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. Without loss of generality, this only needs to be checked for $e = y_1$ and $e = y_4$. When $e = y_1$, by applying (1) we have

$$-[f_{x_2}(x_4)] \cdot f_{x_3}(x_4) + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_{x_2}(x_4) = 0.$$

When $e = y_4$, using (1) we have

$$[f_{x_1}(x_4)] \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3) - [f_{x_2}(x_4)] \cdot f_{x_1}(x_3) + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_{x_1}(x_2),$$

which is equal to 0 by Proposition 5.3.

Case 2: $F = F_1 \cup E_2$, where F_1 is a corank-2 flat of M_1 that contains X . Then there is a modular triple (H_1, H'_1, H''_1) of hyperplanes of M_1 so that $(H, H', H'') = (H_1 \cup E_2, H'_1 \cup E_2, H''_1 \cup E_2)$. So there are constants c, c', c'' such that

$$c \cdot f_{H_1}(e) + c' \cdot f_{H'_1}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''_1}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E_1$, and it follows from (2) that

$$c \cdot f_H(e) + c' \cdot f_{H'}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$.

Case 3: $F = H_1 \cup (Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 that contains X . Then there is no modular triple of hyperplanes containing F , because the only hyperplanes containing F are $F \cup E_1$ and $F \cup E_2$.

Case 4: $F = H_1 \cup ((Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}) \cup x_4)$ where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 with $H_1 \cap X = \{x_4\}$. There are two subcases. In the first subcase, $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup y_1, F \cup y_2, F \cup y_3)$. We will show that

$$(a) [f_{x_1}(x_4) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot f_H(e) + [f_{x_4}(x_2) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + [f_{x_3}(x_4) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_2)] \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. When $e \in E_1$, this follows from Proposition 5.3 and the fact that $f_H(e) = f_{H'}(e) = f_{H''}(e)$ by (3'). When $e = y_1$, using (3'), the left-hand side of (a) becomes

$$[f_{x_4}(x_2) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{-f_{x_3}(x_4)}{f_{x_1}(x_3)} + [f_{x_3}(x_4) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_2)] \cdot \frac{-f_{x_2}(x_4)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)},$$

which is equal to 0 by Proposition 5.3.

In the second subcase, $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup y_1, F \cup y_2, F \cup E_1)$. We will show that

$$[f_{x_3}(x_1) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot f_H(e) + [f_{x_2}(x_3) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. When $e \in E_1$ this follows from the fact that $f_H(e) = f_{H'}(e) = f_{H''}(e)$ by (3'). When $e = y_1$, using (1) and (3'), we have

$$[f_{x_3}(x_1) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{-f_{x_3}(x_4)}{f_{x_1}(x_3)} + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3) = 0,$$

and when $e = y_3$, using (1) and (3'), the left-hand side of (a) becomes

$$[f_{x_3}(x_1) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_2}(x_4)}{f_{x_2}(x_3)} + [f_{x_2}(x_3) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_1}(x_4)}{f_{x_1}(x_3)} + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_{x_1}(x_2),$$

which is equal to 0 by Proposition 5.3.

Case 4': $F = H_1 \cup ((Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}) \cup x_1)$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 with $H_1 \cap X = \{x_1\}$. Then $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup y_1, F \cup \{y_2, y_3\}, F \cup E_1)$. We will show that

$$[f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot f_H(e) + [f_{x_3}(x_2)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. When $e \in E_1$, this follows from the fact that $f_H(e) = f_{H'}(e) = f_{H''}(e)$ by (3) and (3'). When $e = y_1$, using (1) and (3), we have

$$[f_{x_3}(x_2)] \cdot 1 + f_{x_2}(x_3) = 0.$$

When $e = y_3$, using (1) and (3'), we have

$$[f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_2}(x_1)}{f_{x_2}(x_3)} + f_{x_1}(x_2) = 0.$$

Case 5: $F = F_1 \cup H_2$, where F_1 is a corank-2 flat of M_1 , H_2 is a hyperplane of Θ_n , and $F_1 \cap X = H_2 \cap X = \{x_1\}$. Then $(H \cap E_1, H' \cap E_1, H'' \cap E_1)$ is a modular triple of hyperplanes of M_1 , so there are constants c, c', c'' so that

$$c \cdot f_{H \cap E_1}(e) + c' \cdot f_{H' \cap E_1}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H'' \cap E_1}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E_1$. By (2), this implies that $c \cdot f_H(e) + c' \cdot f_{H'}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$ for all $e \in E_1$, so we only need to show that this also holds for all y_i . At most one of H, H', H'' contains E_2 ; we may assume that H and H' do not contain E_2 . If H'' also does not contain E_2 , then plugging in $e = x_2$ shows that $c + c' + c'' = 0$, because the functions $f_H|_{E_1}, f_{H'}|_{E_1}, f_{H''}|_{E_1}$ are equal for all x_i since they have the same restriction to X . Similarly, $f_H(y_i) = f_{H'}(y_i) = f_{H''}(y_i)$ for all $i \in [n]$, because H, H', H'' have the same restriction to E_2 . It follows that $c \cdot f_H(e) + c' \cdot f_{H'}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$ for all $e \in E$. If $E_2 \subseteq H''$, then using the same reasoning and plugging in x_2 shows that $c + c' = 0$, and again it follows that $c \cdot f_H(e) + c' \cdot f_{H'}(e) + c'' \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$ for all $e \in E$.

Case 6: $F = H_1 \cup (Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 disjoint from X . Lemma 5.4 (1) implies that by scaling \mathcal{H}_1 at the triangle $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$, we may assume

that if H_0 is a hyperplane of M_1 with $|H_0 \cap \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}| = 1$ then f_{H_0} takes values 0, 1, and -1 on $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$. It follows from Lemma 5.4 (2) that $f_{H_1}(x_1) + f_{H_1}(x_2) + f_{H_1}(x_3) = 0$. We may further assume, by rescaling functions, that $f_{x_1}(x_2) = 1$.

We now consider two subcases. In the first subcase, $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup y_1, F \cup y_2, F \cup y_3)$. We will show that

$$(b) \quad [f_{H_1}(x_1) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot f_H(e) + [f_{H_1}(x_2) \cdot f_{x_3}(x_1)] \cdot f_H(e) + [f_{H_1}(x_3) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_2)] \cdot f_H(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$.

When $e \in E_1$, we know that $f_H(e) = f_{H'}(e) = f_{H''}(e) = f_{H_1}(e)$ by (4). Since $f_{x_1}(x_2) = 1$, we know that $f_{x_1}(x_3) = -1$, and so by Proposition 5.3 we have $f_{x_3}(x_1) = 1$. Similarly, $f_{x_2}(x_3) = 1$, and then (b) holds because $f_{H_1}(x_1) + f_{H_1}(x_2) + f_{H_1}(x_3) = 0$ by Lemma 5.4 (2).

When $e = y_1$, using (4), the equation (b) reduces to

$$[f_{H_1}(x_2) \cdot f_{x_3}(x_1)] \cdot \frac{f_{H_1}(x_3)}{f_{x_1}(x_3)} + [f_{H_1}(x_3) \cdot f_{x_1}(x_2)] \cdot \frac{f_{H_1}(x_2)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)} = 0.$$

In the second subcase, $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup y_1, F \cup y_2, F \cup E_1)$. It is similarly straightforward to check that

$$(c) \quad [f_{x_1}(x_3) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot f_H(e) + [f_{x_3}(x_1) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + [f_{H_1}(x_3)] \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. When $e \in E_1$, this follows from the fact that $f_H(e) = f_{H'}(e) = f_{H_1}(e)$ by (4). When $e = y_1$, applying (1) and (4) gives

$$[f_{x_3}(x_1) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{f_{H_1}(x_3)}{f_{x_1}(x_3)} + [f_{H_1}(x_3)] \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3) = 0,$$

and when $e = y_3$, applying (4) shows that the left-hand side of (c) is equal to

$$[f_{x_1}(x_3) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{f_{H_1}(x_2)}{f_{x_3}(x_2)} + [f_{x_3}(x_1) \cdot f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{f_{H_1}(x_1)}{f_{x_3}(x_1)} + [f_{H_1}(x_3)] \cdot f_{x_1}(x_2).$$

This is equal to 0 because, as described in the previous subcase, $f_{x_1}(x_2) = f_{x_3}(x_1) = f_{x_2}(x_3) = 1$ and $f_{H_1}(x_1) + f_{H_1}(x_2) + f_{H_1}(x_3) = 0$.

Case 7: $F = F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_1, y_2\})$, where F_1 is a corank-2 flat of M_1 disjoint from X . We first prove:

Claim 3. *Let (H_i, H_j, H_k) be a modular triple of hyperplanes of M_1 so that $H_i \cap X = \{x_i\}$, $H_j \cap X = \{x_j\}$, and $H_k \cap X = \{x_k\}$. Then*

$$[f_{x_j}(x_k)] \cdot f_{H_i}(e) - [f_{x_i}(x_k)] \cdot f_{H_j}(e) + [f_{x_i}(x_j)] \cdot f_{H_k}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E_1$.

Proof. We may assume that $(i, j, k) = (1, 2, 3)$. There are constants c_1, c_2, c_3 so that

$$c_1 \cdot f_{H_1}(e) + c_2 \cdot f_{H_2}(e) + c_3 \cdot f_{H_3}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E_1$. By plugging in $e = x_1, x_2, x_3$ and using the assumption that $H \cap X = \{x_l\}$ implies $f_{H_1}(x_m) = f_{x_l}(x_m)$ for all $l, m \in [n]$, we see that

$$(c_1, c_2, c_3) = (f_{x_2}(x_3), f_{x_3}(x_1), f_{x_1}(x_2))$$

up to multiplication by a scalar. This proves the claim. \square

We now consider three subcases. In the first subcase, $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup \{x_1, y_2\}, F \cup \{x_2, y_1\}, F \cup x_3)$. We will show that

$$[f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot f_H(e) - [f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + [f_{x_1}(x_2)] \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. When $e \in E_1$, this holds by Claim 3 with $(i, j, k) = (1, 2, 3)$ and $(H_i, H_j, H_k) = (H, H', H'')$. When $e = y_1$, using (3) and (4) we have

$$[f_{x_2}(x_3)] \cdot 1 + [f_{x_1}(x_2)] \cdot \frac{-f_{x_2}(x_3)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)} = 0.$$

In the second subcase, $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup \{x_1, y_2\}, F \cup x_3, F \cup x_4)$. We will show that

$$(d) \quad [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_H(e) - [f_{x_1}(x_4)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + [f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. When $e \in E_1$, this holds by Claim 3 with $(i, j, k) = (1, 3, 4)$ and $(H_i, H_j, H_k) = (H, H', H'')$. When $e = y_2$, applying (3') shows that

$$-[f_{x_1}(x_4)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_1}(x_3)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)} + [f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_1}(x_4)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)} = 0.$$

When $e = y_1$, by applying (3) and (3'), the left-hand side of (d) becomes

$$[f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot 1 - [f_{x_1}(x_4)] \cdot \frac{-f_{x_2}(x_3)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)} + [f_{x_1}(x_3)] \cdot \frac{-f_{x_2}(x_4)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)},$$

which is equal to 0 by Proposition 5.3.

In the third subcase, $(H, H', H'') = (F \cup x_3, F \cup x_4, F \cup x_5)$. We will show that

$$(g) \quad [f_{x_4}(x_5)] \cdot f_H(e) - [f_{x_3}(x_5)] \cdot f_{H'}(e) + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot f_{H''}(e) = 0$$

for all $e \in E$. When $e \in E_1$ this holds by Claim 3 with $(i, j, k) = (3, 4, 5)$ and $(H_i, H_j, H_k) = (H, H', H'')$. When $e = y_2$, using (3), the left-hand side of (g) becomes

$$[f_{x_4}(x_5)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_1}(x_3)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)} - [f_{x_3}(x_5)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_1}(x_4)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)} + [f_{x_3}(x_4)] \cdot \frac{f_{x_1}(x_5)}{f_{x_1}(x_2)},$$

which is equal to 0 by Proposition 5.3.

These seven cases combine to show that \mathcal{H} is in fact a modular system of P -hyperplane functions for M . So, for any pasture P , we have defined a map from $\mathcal{X}_{M_1}^R(P)$ to $\mathcal{X}_M^R(P)$. The inverse of the map from $\mathcal{X}_M^R(P)$ to $\mathcal{X}_{M_1}^R(P)$ is the natural map defined by restriction to E_1 , which is clearly functorial in P . This implies that M_1 and M have isomorphic foundations. \square

This has the following corollary in the special case that $M_1 \cong U_{2,n}$.

Corollary 5.6. *For all $n \geq 2$, the matroids $U_{2,n}$ and Θ_n have isomorphic foundations.*

We next delete X from $P_X(M, \Theta_n)$ and show that this preserves the foundation when X is co-independent in M . We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 5.7. *If P is a finitely generated pasture and $f : P \rightarrow P$ is a homomorphism which restricts to a surjection $P^\times \rightarrow P^\times$ of multiplicative groups, then f is an isomorphism.*

Proof. A surjective homomorphism from a finitely generated abelian group to itself is necessarily an isomorphism, cf. [11, Proof of Lemma 29.2]. So f is a bijection on underlying sets, and by construction $f(N_P) \subseteq N_P$. It suffices to prove that the map from P to P which sends $x \in P$ to $f^{-1}(x) \in P$ is a homomorphism.

Let $g : P \rightarrow P'$ be the homomorphism of pastures induced by the inverse map $f^{-1} : P \rightarrow P$, i.e., P' has the same underlying set as P , and we define the null set of P' to consist of all formal sums of the form $\sum a_i y_i$ such that $\sum a_i f^{-1}(y_i) \in N_P$. Then $g \circ f : P \rightarrow P'$ is the identity map on underlying sets, and therefore $N_P \subseteq N_{P'}$. For the reverse containment, suppose $\sum a_i y_i \in N_{P'}$. By definition, there exist $x_i \in P$ such that $f(x_i) = y_i$ and $\sum a_i x_i \in N_P$. Since $f : P \rightarrow P$ is a homomorphism, we must have $\sum a_i f(x_i) \in N_P$, which means that $N_{P'} \subseteq N_P$. \square

We next show that the natural map from $F(P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X)^\times$ to $F(P_X(M, \Theta_n))^\times$ is surjective.

Lemma 5.8. *Let M_1 be a matroid with a co-independent set X such that $M_1|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$. Let $M = P_X(M_1, \Theta_n)$, and let $M' = M \setminus X$. Then the natural map of multiplicative groups from $F(M')^\times$ to $F(M)^\times$ is surjective.*

Proof. When $n = 2$, we know that the cosimplification of M is isomorphic to M_1 because $\{x_i, y_i\}$ is a series pair of M for $i = 1, 2$. So, by [3, Corollary 4.9], we may assume that $n \geq 3$. Since the multiplicative group of the foundation of a matroid is generated by universal cross ratios [3, Theorem 4.5], it suffices to prove that every universal cross ratio of M is the image of some universal cross ratio of M' . By [3, Corollary 3.7], it suffices to prove that if F is a corank-2 flat of M and $[\begin{smallmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_F \in F(M)$ is a universal cross ratio, there is a universal cross ratio $[\begin{smallmatrix} e'_1 & e'_2 \\ e'_3 & e'_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_{F'}$ of $F(M')$ with image $[\begin{smallmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_F$ in $F(M)$. By Proposition 2.9, there are seven possibilities for F , which we consider separately. Also, each hyperplane or corank-2 flat of Θ_n is associated with a given subset of $[n]$; we will choose this subset explicitly without loss of generality to improve readability.

Case 1: $F = E - \{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$. Then $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \notin X$ and X is spanned in M by $F - X$ (because X is co-independent in X), so we may simply take $[\begin{smallmatrix} e'_1 & e'_2 \\ e'_3 & e'_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_{F'} = [\begin{smallmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_{F-X}$.

Case 2: $F = F_1 \cup E_2$, where F_1 is a corank-2 flat of M_1 that contains X . Then $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \notin X$ and X is spanned in M by $F - X$, so we may simply take $[\begin{smallmatrix} e'_1 & e'_2 \\ e'_3 & e'_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_{F'} = [\begin{smallmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_{F-X}$.

Case 3: $F = H_1 \cup (Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 that contains X . Then M/F has at most two parallel classes (namely, $E_1 - F$ and $E_2 - F$), so the cross ratio is trivial.

Case 4: $F = H_1 \cup ((Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}) \cup x_i)$ for some $i \in \{1, 4\}$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 with $H_1 \cap X = \{x_i\}$. Then M/F has at most four parallel classes: $E_1 - F$, $\{y_1\}$, $\{y_2\}$, and $\{y_3\}$. Since X is co-independent in M_1 , there is some $a \in E_1 - (H_1 \cup X)$. So by parallel substitution with a , we may assume that $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \cap X = \emptyset$, and it follows that $[\begin{smallmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{smallmatrix}]_F$ is the image of a cross ratio of $F(M')$.

Case 5: $F = F_1 \cup H_2$, where F_1 is a corank-2 flat of M_1 , H_2 is a hyperplane of Θ_n , and $F_1 \cap X = H_2 \cap X = \{x_1\}$. We consider two subcases, depending on the form of H_2 .

First, suppose that $H_2 = (Y - y_1) \cup x_1$. Then y_1 is in the same parallel class as $X - x_1$ in M/F and x_1 is spanned by $F - x_1$ in M . So by replacing $e_i \in X$ with y_1 and F with $F - x_1$, we obtain a cross ratio of $F(M')$ whose image under the natural map from $F(M')$ to $F(M)$ is $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F$.

In the second subcase, suppose that $H_2 = (Y - \{y_2, y_3\}) \cup x_1$. Set $F' = (F - y_1) \cup \{y_2, y_3\}$. Since all elements in $E_2 - F$ are parallel in M/F , and F and F' have the same restriction to E_1 , it follows that $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F'} = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F$, possibly after replacing e_i with y_1 if $e_i \in X \cup Y$. Since $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F'}$ falls into the first subcase of Case 5, it follows that $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F$ is the image of a cross ratio from $F(M')$.

Case 6: $F = H_1 \cup (Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\})$, where H_1 is a hyperplane of M_1 disjoint from X . Then M/F has at most four nontrivial parallel classes: $E_1 - H_1$, y_1 , y_2 , and y_3 . Let $a \in E_1 - (H_1 \cup X)$; such an element exists because X is co-independent in M_1 . Then a is in the parallel class $E_1 - H_1$ of M/F , so if $e_i \in X$ then we may replace e_i with a to obtain a cross ratio of $F(M')$.

Case 7: $F = F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_1, y_2\})$, where F_1 is a corank-2 flat of M_1 disjoint from X . Note that $\{x_1, y_2\}$ and $\{x_2, y_1\}$ are parallel pairs in M/F . We first prove:

Claim 4. *If $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \subseteq E(M_1)$, then $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_i, y_j\})} = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_k, y_l\})}$ for all $i, j, k, l \in [n]$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove this in the case that $(i, j, k, l) = (1, 3, 2, 3)$. Let $Y' = Y - \{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$. In M/Y' , the set $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ is a triad. Since $y_3 \notin \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ and $\{y_1, y_2\}$ is a series pair in $M/Y' \setminus y_3$, it follows that $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup Y' \cup y_1} = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup Y' \cup y_2}$, which is the same as $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_2, y_3\})} = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_1, y_3\})}$. \square

Let k be minimal so that every cross ratio $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F$ with $|\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \cap X| \leq k$ is the image of a cross ratio of $F(M')$. By the minimality of k , we may assume that $x_1, x_2 \notin \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$; otherwise we may replace x_1 with y_2 or x_2 with y_1 using parallel substitution. Suppose that $k < \max(4, n - 2)$, and let $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F$ be a cross ratio of $F(M)$ with $|\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\} \cap X| = k + 1$.

We consider two cases. First suppose that $k \in \{2, 3\}$. Since X is co-independent in M_1 and F_1 is a corank-2 flat of M_1 , there are distinct elements $a, b \in E(M_1) - (F_1 \cup X)$. Let $c \in \{a, b\} - \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$. Then by swapping indices, we may assume that $e_3, e_4 \in X$. By the ‘‘tip relation’’ [3, Section 4.6], we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & c \end{bmatrix}_F \cdot \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ c & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F.$$

By the minimality of k , the two cross ratios on the right-hand side are images of cross ratios of $F(M')$, and therefore so is $\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ e_3 & e_4 \end{bmatrix}_F$.

Next suppose that $k \in \{0, 1\}$. We only present the case where $k = 1$; the case where $k = 0$ is quite similar. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $e_1, e_2 \notin X$ and that $(e_3, e_4) = (x_i, x_j)$ for distinct $i, j \in X$. Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ x_i & x_j \end{bmatrix}_F = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ x_i & x_j \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_i, y_j\})} = \begin{bmatrix} e_1 & e_2 \\ y_j & y_i \end{bmatrix}_{F_1 \cup (Y - \{y_i, y_j\})},$$

where the first equality holds by Claim 4 and the second holds because $\{x_i, y_j\}$ and $\{x_j, y_i\}$ are parallel pairs in $M/(Y - \{y_i, y_j\})$. Since the third cross ratio is also a cross ratio of $F(M')$, it follows that $[\begin{smallmatrix} e_1^1 & e_2^2 \\ x_i & x_j \end{smallmatrix}]_F$ is the image of a cross ratio of $F(M')$. \square

We can now prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.9. *Let M be a matroid with a co-independent set X so that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$. Then the foundation of the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X is isomorphic to the foundation of M .*

Proof. Let $P = P_X(M, \Theta_n)$, let $M' = P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$, and let $P' = P_Y(M^*, \Theta_n^*)$. By [12, Proposition 11.5.11], M^* is isomorphic to the segment-cosegment exchange of $(M')^*$ along Y . (Equivalently, M is isomorphic to the cosegment-segment exchange of M along Y .) It follows from Theorem 5.5 that we have isomorphisms $F(M) \rightarrow F(P)$ and $F((M')^*) \rightarrow F(P')$. Hence, we have the following diagram of homomorphisms of pastures:

$$(8) \quad F(M) \xrightarrow{\cong} F(M^*) \rightarrow F(P') \xrightarrow{\cong} F((M')^*) \xrightarrow{\cong} F(M') \rightarrow F(P) \xrightarrow{\cong} F(M).$$

Here, the maps $F(M) \rightarrow F(M^*)$ and $F((M')^*) \rightarrow F(M')$ are the natural isomorphisms given by [3, Proposition 4.7], and the maps $F(P') \rightarrow F((M')^*)$ and $F(P) \rightarrow F(M)$ are the inverses of the isomorphisms $F(M) \rightarrow F(P)$ and $F((M')^*) \rightarrow F(P')$.

By Lemma 5.8, the homomorphisms $F(M^*) \rightarrow F(P')$ and $F(M') \rightarrow F(P)$ restrict to surjective homomorphisms of multiplicative groups. It follows that the composition of the maps in (8) induces a surjection of multiplicative groups. By Lemma 5.7, we conclude that the composite map is an isomorphism, which means that all the intermediate maps must be isomorphisms as well. In particular, $F(M') \cong F(P)$. On the other hand, we know from Theorem 5.5 that $F(P) \cong F(M)$, and thus $F(M') \cong F(M)$ as desired. \square

We have the following corollary in the case that $n = 3$.

Theorem 5.10. *Let M be a matroid with a co-independent triangle T . Then the foundation of the Delta-Wye exchange of M along T is isomorphic to the foundation of M .*

Remark 5.11. Note that if replace the foundation by the universal pasture in the statement of Theorem 5.9, the result remains true. This follows formally from Corollary 7.14 and Remark 7.15 of [5] upon noting that there is a bijection between connected components of M and connected components of the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X ; see Lemma 5.12 below for a straightforward proof of this fact.

Lemma 5.12. *If M is a matroid with a co-independent set X so that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, then there is a bijection between the connected components of M and the connected components of the segment-cosegment exchange $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$.*

Proof. If $n = 2$, then M and $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$ are isomorphic because $\{x_i, y_i\}$ is a series pair for $i = 1, 2$, so we may assume that $n \geq 3$. If M is connected, then $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$ is connected by [12, pg. 456, Ex. 6] and the result follows, so we may assume that M is disconnected. Since $n \geq 3$ we know that $M|X$ is connected, and therefore X is contained

some component of M . So $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ where M_1 is connected and $X \subseteq E(M_1)$ (and M_2 may or may not be connected).

We will first show that $P_X(M, \Theta_n) = P_X(M_1, \Theta_n) \oplus M_2$. Let E , E_1 , and E_2 be the ground sets of M , M_1 , and M_2 , respectively. For a matroid N we write $\mathcal{F}(N)$ for the set of flats of N . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(P_X(M, \Theta_n)) &= \{F \subseteq E \cup Y \mid F \cap E \in \mathcal{F}(M) \text{ and } F \cap (X \cup Y) \in \mathcal{F}(\Theta_n)\} \\ &= \{F \subseteq E \cup Y \mid F \cap E_i \in \mathcal{F}(M_i) \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \text{ and } F \cap (X \cup Y) \in \mathcal{F}(\Theta_n)\} \\ &= \{F \subseteq E \cup Y \mid F \cap (E_1 \cup X \cup Y) \in \mathcal{F}(P_X(M_1, \Theta_n)) \text{ and } F \cap E_2 \in \mathcal{F}(M_2)\} \\ &= \mathcal{F}(P_X(M_1, \Theta_n) \oplus M_2). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first and third lines follow from the definition of generalized parallel connection, and the second and fourth lines follow from the characterization of flats of a direct sum [12, Proposition 4.2.16]. Therefore $P_X(M, \Theta_n) = P_X(M_1, \Theta_n) \oplus M_2$, and it follows from [12, Proposition 4.2.19] that $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X = (P_X(M_1, \Theta_n) \setminus X) \oplus M_2$. Since $P_X(M_1, \Theta_n) \setminus X$ is connected by [12, pg. 456, Ex. 6], it follows that the components of $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$ are precisely $(E_1 - X) \cup Y$ and the components of M_2 . This gives a bijection between the components of M and the components of $P_X(M, \Theta_n) \setminus X$ in which E_1 maps to $(E_1 - X) \cup Y$ and every other component of M maps to itself. \square

We turn to the proof of Corollary F from the Introduction, whose statement we now recall:

Corollary 5.13. *Let P be a pasture, and let M be an excluded minor for representability over P . Then every segment-cosegment exchange of M is also an excluded minor for representability over P .*

Proof. Let M be an excluded minor for P -representability, so M is not P -representable, but every proper minor of M is P -representable. In particular, it follows from [3, Lemma 4.9] that M is simple and cosimple. Let $M \setminus X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, and let M' be the segment-cosegment exchange of M on X . It follows from Theorem 5.9 that M' is not P -representable, so it suffices to show that every proper minor of M' is P -representable. If $n = 2$, then $M' \cong M$ and the result holds, so we may assume that $n \geq 3$. Let $e \in E(M')$. We consider two cases. First suppose that $e = y_i$ for some $i \in [n]$. By [13, Lemma 2.13] we know that M' / y_i is isomorphic to the segment-cosegment exchange of $M \setminus x_i$ along $X - x_i$. Since $M \setminus x_i$ is P -representable, it follows from Theorem 5.9 that M' / y_i is also P -representable. In $M' \setminus y_i$, the set $Y - y_i$ is contained in a series class because $M' \setminus Y \cong U_{2,n}$. By [3, Lemma 4.9], the cosimplification of $M' \setminus y_i$ has foundation isomorphic to the foundation of $M' \setminus y_i$. Since the cosimplification of $M' \setminus y_i$ is a minor of M' / y_j for some $j \neq i$, it follows that $M' \setminus y_i$ is P -representable.

Next suppose that $e \notin Y$. Then $M' \setminus e = P_X(M \setminus e, \Theta_n) \setminus X$ by [12, Proposition 11.4.14 (iv)], and since $M \setminus e$ is P -representable it follows from Theorem 5.9 that $M' \setminus e$ is P -representable. It remains to show that M' / e is P -representable. If e is not spanned by X in M , then by [13, Lemma 2.16] we know that M' / e is isomorphic to the segment-cosegment exchange of M / e along X , and it follows from Theorem 5.9 that M' / e is P -representable. So we may assume that e is spanned by X in M . Then $M \setminus (X \cup e) \cong U_{n+1}^2$ because M is

simple, so U_{n+1}^2 is P -representable, and therefore U_{n+1}^{n-1} is P -representable by [3, Proposition 4.7]. By [13, Lemma 2.15] we know that M'/e is isomorphic to the 2-sum of $M/e \setminus (X - x_i)$ and a copy of U_{n+1}^{n-1} for some $i \in [n]$. Since both of these matroids are P -representable, it follows from Theorem C that M'/e is P -representable. \square

5.1. Application to a conjecture by Pendavingh and van Zwam. In this final section, we turn to the proof of Corollary E. As preparation, we recall that the universal partial field \mathbb{P}_M of a representable matroid M is determined by its foundation F_M .

According to [4, Lemma 2.14], for every pasture P that maps to some partial field F , there is a universal map $\pi_P : P \rightarrow \Pi P$ to a partial field ΠP such every other map $f : P \rightarrow F$ to a partial field F factors uniquely through π_P .

The partial field ΠP is defined as follows: let I be the ideal of the group ring $\mathbb{Z}[P^\times]$ which is generated by all terms $a + b + c$ that appear in the null set N_P . Then ΠP is the partial field $(P^\times, \mathbb{Z}[P^\times]/I)$; as a pasture, it can be described as

$$\Pi P = P // \langle a + b + c \mid a + b + c \in I \rangle.$$

The pasture morphism $\pi_P : P \rightarrow \Pi P$ is the quotient map. Note that since P maps to some partial field, I is a proper ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[P^\times]$ and thus ΠP is indeed a partial field (since $1 \neq 0$).

If $P = F_M$ is the foundation of a representable matroid M , its universal partial field is $\mathbb{P}_M = \Pi F_M$. This follows at once from a comparison of the universal properties of ΠF_M and \mathbb{P}_M : either of these partial fields represents the functor that associates with a partial field F the set of rescaling classes of M over F .

Corollary 5.14. *Let M be a matroid with a co-independent set X such that $M|X \cong U_{2,n}$ for some $n \geq 2$, and assume that M is representable over some partial field. Then the universal partial field of the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X is isomorphic to the universal partial field of M .*

Proof. Let M' be the segment-cosegment exchange of M along X . Let F_M and $F_{M'}$ be the foundations of M and M' , respectively. By Theorem 5.9, $F_{M'} \simeq F_M$, which implies

$$\mathbb{P}_{M'} = \Pi F_{M'} \simeq \Pi F_M = \mathbb{P}_M,$$

since the functor Π preserves isomorphisms. \square

References

- [1] Safwan Akkari and James Oxley. Some extremal connectivity results for matroids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 52(2):301–320, 1991.
- [2] Matthew Baker and Nathan Bowler. Matroids over partial hyperstructures. *Adv. Math.*, 343:821–863, 2019.
- [3] Matthew Baker and Oliver Lorscheid. Foundations of matroids. Part 1: Matroids without large uniform minors. To appear in *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, [arXiv:2008.00014](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.00014), 2020.
- [4] Matthew Baker and Oliver Lorscheid. Lift theorems for representations of matroids over pastures. Preprint, [arXiv:2107.00981](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.00981), 2021.
- [5] Matthew Baker and Oliver Lorscheid. The moduli space of matroids. *Adv. Math.*, 390:Paper No. 107883, 118, 2021.
- [6] Matthew Baker and Oliver Lorscheid. On a theorem of Lafforgue. Preprint, [arXiv:2309.01746](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.01746), 2023.

- [7] Matthew Baker, Oliver Lorscheid, and Tianyi Zhang. Foundations of matroids without large uniform minors. Part 2: Further theory, examples, and computational methods. Preprint, [arXiv:2310.19952](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.19952), 2023.
- [8] Tom Brylawski. Modular constructions for combinatorial geometries. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 203:1–44, 1975.
- [9] Justin Chen and Tianyi Zhang. Representing matroids via pasture morphisms. Preprint, [arXiv:2307.14275](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.14275), 2023.
- [10] Winfried Hochstättler and Robert Nickel. Joins of oriented matroids. *European J. Combin.*, 32(6):841–852, 2011. Matroids, Polynomials and Enumeration.
- [11] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative algebra*, volume 56 of *Mathematics Lecture Note Series*. Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, MA, second edition, 1980.
- [12] James Oxley. *Matroid Theory (Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics)*. Oxford University Press, Inc., 2006.
- [13] James Oxley, Charles Semple, and Dirk Vertigan. Generalized Δ - Y exchange and k -regular matroids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 79(1):1–65, 2000.
- [14] Rudi A. Pendavingh and Stefan H. M. van Zwam. Lifts of matroid representations over partial fields. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 100(1):36–67, 2010.
- [15] William T. Tutte. Lectures on matroids. *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B*, 69B:1–47, 1965.
- [16] Stefan H. M. van Zwam. Partial fields in matroid theory. PhD thesis, Eindhoven, 2009. Online available at www.math.lsu.edu/~svanzwam/pdf/thesis-online.pdf.

Matthew Baker, School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA
Email address: mbaker@math.gatech.edu

Oliver Lorscheid, University of Groningen, the Netherlands
Email address: o.lorscheid@rug.nl

Zach Walsh, School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA
Email address: zwalsh6@gatech.edu

Tianyi Zhang, School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA
Email address: kafuka@gatech.edu