

# Multiplicatively Ordered and Directed Hybrid $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie Superalgebra\*

Ioannis Raptis<sup>†</sup>

Thursday 2nd of May 2024

## Abstract

A new set of algebraic numbers  $\mathbb{A}$  is introduced.  $\mathbb{A}$  is a four-dimensional algebra hitherto not encountered in either the usual algebraic varieties or supervarieties. The algebra is a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded and multiplicatively deformed version of the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$ , with structure similar to that of a  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie algebra as defined in [18], but it is shown to be neither that of a purely associative ( $\delta = +1$ ) Lie superalgebra, nor that of a purely antiassociative ( $\delta = -1$ ) Jordan-Lie superalgebra. Rather, it exhibits a novel kind of associativity, here called *multiplicatively normally ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associativity*, that is somewhat a hybrid between pure associativity and pure antiassociativity. In addition to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associativity, the generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  obey graded commutation relations encountered in both the usual  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie superalgebras ( $\delta = 1$ ) and in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Jordan-Lie superalgebras ( $\delta = -1$ ). They also satisfy a novel type of *ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Jacobi identities* that combine characteristics of the Jacobi relations obeyed by the generators of ungraded Lie,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Jordan-Lie algebras. Mainly due to these three structural algebraic features,  $\mathbb{A}$  is called a *hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebra*. Additionally, we present a heuristic and intuitive argument of how  $\mathbb{A}$  may arise in a similar way to how the real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  extend to the complexes  $\mathbb{C}$ ; the complexes  $\mathbb{C}$  to the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$ , and the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$  to Cayley's octonions  $\mathbb{O}$ , with every time each extension, which doubles the dimensionality of the corresponding vector space, being accompanied by a loss of some important (algebraic) structure. In fact,  $\mathbb{A}$  is seen to combine quintessential algebraic characteristics of all the four existing Euclidean division rings [8]:  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$ , thus further corroborating that it is a 4-fold hybrid of them all, apart from its additional super Lie algebra-like characteristics. We also witness

---

\*In belated loving memory of *Professor Joachim (Jim) Lambek*: teacher, university undergraduate academic advisor, research colleague, (homological) algebra mentor, and cordial friend.

<sup>†</sup>Supply & Substitute Secondary School Teacher of Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry, Reeson Education, London, United Kingdom; email: *irapti11@gmail.com*

that  $\mathbb{A}$ , unlike the division algebras  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$  that it combines and extends, is non-involutive (*i.e.*, it is not a  $\star$ -algebra), hence it derives its metric-norm directly from its binary product alone and not from a  $\star$ -involution (*i.e.*, the  $\mathbb{C}$ -conjugation unary operation observed in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$ ); moreover, its metric is non-Euclidean: it is a traceless Kleinian pseudo-metric  $\eta_{\mu\nu} = (1, -1, 1, -1)$ , of signature 0. Also as a result of its lack of  $\star$ -involution and a glaring absence of a two-sided (left/right) identity generator,  $\mathbb{A}$  is seen not to have formal multiplicative inverses of its generators, thus it is not a division ring. By contrast, the absence of inverses renders  $\mathbb{A}$  to a novel algebraic structure, here coined *one-sided identity, free generative, non-associative linear semigroup*, in which product strings of  $\mathbb{A}$ 's generators are viewed as words, which can then linearly combine over  $\mathbb{R}$  to form linear superpositions thereof. The said multiplication order defines  $\mathbb{A}$  as a novel kind of *alphabetic algebra*, hereby coined *the alphabet algebra*  $\mathbb{A}$ , whose structure as a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative and as a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Jordan-Lie superalgebra vitally depends on that lexicographic order of multiplication of the letter generators in its algebraic words. The present paper defines  $\mathbb{A}$ , works out its structure as a *hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebra* following Okubo and Kamiya in [18], it then compares it with the  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebra defined there, and it further abstracts and generalises it to a new category of *multiplicatively ordered (lexicographic) graded Lie algebraic-cum-nonassociative linear semigroup supervarieties*. Especially due to its novel multiplicatively ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative structure, we especially dwell on the (non)associativity properties of a general algebraic binary product, such as *alternativity, power associativity, flexibility, composability relative to a norm and Lie algebra admissibility*, and we compare  $\mathbb{A}$  to the four Euclidean division algebras ( $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$ ,  $\mathbb{O}$ ), their further extensions to the *sedenions*  $\mathbb{S}$  [9, 22] and the *trigintaduonions*  $\mathbb{T}$  [1, 25], as well as to the general *nonassociative Lie-type Okubo algebras* [15, 16, 17]. The algebra  $\mathbb{A}$  is of mathematical interest in its own right and the present paper mainly explores the new mathematical import of  $\mathbb{A}$ ; however, towards the end of the paper we discuss a couple of potential physical applications that have been intuited ever since its original inception by the present author three decades ago in the course of writing his Ph.D. thesis [20]. We leave more detailed elaborations on the physical import and applications of  $\mathbb{A}$  to another forthcoming paper [21].

Key words: Lie Algebras, Jordan Algebras, Jordan-Lie Superalgebras, Euclidean Division Rings and Non-Division Algebras,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Noncommutative and Nonassociative Algebras

New Key words: Hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie Superalgebra;  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -Graded Associativity; Normally/Lexicographically Ordered and Directed Algebraic Binary Product; Multiplicatively Normally Ordered,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -Graded Associative, Lie Admissible, Free Linear Semigroup

# 1 Paper Overview cum Introductory Remarks on Lie Superalgebras

In this opening section, we first recall the structure of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie algebras, commonly known as *Lie superalgebras* [6].

In Section 2, we recall the definition of an abstract  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie ( $\delta$ -J-L) algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  as given by Okubo and Kamiya in [18], which, as we shall see, includes as a particular case the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie superalgebra to be defined below.

We then introduce the concrete Hybrid Jordan-Lie superalgebra  $\mathbb{A}$  (Section 3), and finally we compare the key defining properties of the two structures (Section 4).

Here, in Section 4, we abstract and generalise  $\mathbb{A}$  on two fronts:

- As an abstract Hybrid  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative Jordan-Lie Superalgebra;
- As an abstract multiplicatively ordered and directed,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative free linear semigroup.

Section 5 compares the structure of  $\mathbb{A}$  against the four usual Euclidean division algebras: the reals ( $\mathbb{R}$ ), the complexes ( $\mathbb{C}$ ), the quaternions ( $\mathbb{H}$ ) and the octonions ( $\mathbb{O}$ ). We give an informal and heuristic Cayley-Dickson type of ring extension procedure of how  $\mathbb{R}$  can be extended, via  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{H}$ , all the way to  $\mathbb{O}$  by losing some important algebraic structure each step along the way. In particular, we dwell on the nonassociative character of  $\mathbb{A}$  and how this compares to the nonassociativity of the octonions  $\mathbb{O}$  [2, 12, 23], and beyond: to the algebras of *sedenions*  $\mathbb{S}$  [9, 22] and *trigintaduonions*  $\mathbb{T}$  [1, 25], which are further Cayley-Dickson type of extensions-complexifications of the 8-dimensional  $\mathbb{O}$  to 16 ( $\mathbb{S}$ ) and 32 ( $\mathbb{T}$ ) dimensions, respectively. Furthermore, by  $\mathbb{A}$ 's *Lie admissibility*, its non-associativity, its not having a 2-sided identity element, its being *non-involutive* and its supporting a non-Euclidean type of metric-norm, we liken it to *Okubo algebras* [15, 16, 17], albeit, *multiplicatively ordered* and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative ones, as defined in the present paper.

We conclude the paper (Section 6) with some brief remarks about a possible physical application and interpretation of  $\mathbb{A}$ , the details and full elaboration of which we leave for a forthcoming paper [21].

## 1.1 $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie Superalgebras

In theoretical physics, supersymmetry pertains to a symmetry between bosons and fermions [6]. Supergroups, or  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie groups, are the mathematical structures modelling continuous supersymmetry transformations between bosons and fermions. As Lie algebras consist of generators of Lie groups—the infinitesimal Lie group elements tangent to the identity [5], so  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie algebras, otherwise known as Lie

superalgebras, consist of generators of (or infinitesimal) supersymmetry transformations [6].

Like their ungraded Lie ancestors  $L$ , Lie superalgebras  $\mathcal{L}$

- (i) Are real or complex vector spaces that are  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded<sup>1</sup>

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^0 \oplus \mathcal{L}^1, \quad (1)$$

with grading function  $\pi$  given by

$$\pi(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{when } x \in \mathcal{L}^0, \\ 1, & \text{when } x \in \mathcal{L}^1. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

- (ii) Are associative algebras with respect to a bilinear product  $\cdot : \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  (simply write  $x \cdot y \equiv xy = z \in \mathcal{L}$  for the associative product  $\cdot$  of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\mathcal{L}$ ).
- (iii) Close under the so-called super-Lie bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}$  represented by the non-associative, bilinear,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded (anti-)commutator Lie product  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  defined as

$$[x, y] := \begin{cases} [x, y] = xy - yx \in \mathcal{L}^0, & \text{when } x, y \in \mathcal{L}^0, \\ \{x, y\} = xy + yx \in \mathcal{L}^0, & \text{when } x, y \in \mathcal{L}^1, \\ [x, y] = xy - yx \in \mathcal{L}^1, & \text{when } x \in \mathcal{L}^0 \text{ and } y \in \mathcal{L}^1. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

- (iv) With respect to  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , they obey the so-called super-Jacobi identities<sup>2</sup>.

We now turn our attention on the  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie Superalgebras studied in [18].

## 2 $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie Superalgebra

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a finite dimensional vector space over a field  $K$  of characteristic not 2 which, for familiarity, one may wish to identify with  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ . Also, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^0 \oplus \mathcal{A}^1, \quad (4)$$

with grader  $\pi$  given by

---

<sup>1</sup>It is tacitly assumed that both  $\mathcal{L}^0$  and  $\mathcal{L}^1$  in (27) are linear subspaces of  $\mathcal{L}$  whose only common element is the zero vector 0.  $\mathcal{L}^0$  is usually referred to as *the even subspace of  $\mathcal{L}$* , while  $\mathcal{L}^1$  as *the odd subspace of  $\mathcal{L}$* .

<sup>2</sup>For more details about the properties (i)–(iv) of Lie superalgebras, the reader is referred to [6]. We will encounter them in a slightly different guise and in more detail when we define  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebras in the next section.

$$\pi(x) := \begin{cases} 0, & \text{when } x \in \mathcal{A}^0, \\ 1, & \text{when } x \in \mathcal{A}^1, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

as in (27) and (2) for  $\mathcal{L}$  above<sup>3</sup>.

Next, we consider only homogeneous elements of  $\mathcal{A}$  (*i.e.*, either  $x \in \mathcal{A}^0$  or  $x \in \mathcal{A}^1$ , but not  $z = \alpha x + \beta y$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{A}^0$ ,  $y \in \mathcal{A}^1$ ;  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ )<sup>4</sup>, and as in (1.3) of [18] we define

$$(-1)^{xy} := (-1)^{\pi(x)\pi(y)}.$$

Let also  $xy$  be a bilinear product in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying

$$(xy)z = \delta x(yz), \quad \delta = \pm 1, \quad (6)$$

with respect to which  $\mathcal{A}$  is said to be a  $\delta$ -*associative algebra*. In particular, for  $\delta = +1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is an *associative algebra*; while for  $\delta = -1$ , it is *antiassociative*.

Consider also a second bilinear product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$

$$\langle x, y \rangle := xy - \delta(-1)^{xy}yx, \quad (7)$$

satisfying

$$\pi(\langle x, y \rangle) = \pi(x) + \pi(y) \pmod{2}, \quad (8)$$

$$\langle x, y \rangle = -\delta(-1)^{xy} \langle y, x \rangle, \quad (9)$$

and

$$(-1)^{xz} \langle \langle x, y \rangle, z \rangle + (-1)^{yx} \langle \langle y, z \rangle, x \rangle + (-1)^{zy} \langle \langle z, x \rangle, y \rangle = 0, \quad (10)$$

or equivalently

$$(-1)^{xz} \langle x, \langle y, z \rangle \rangle + (-1)^{yx} \langle y, \langle z, x \rangle \rangle + (-1)^{zy} \langle z, \langle x, y \rangle \rangle = 0. \quad (11)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>In [18],  $\sigma(x)$  is used instead of  $\pi(x)$  to symbolise the grading function. See (1.2) in [18].

<sup>4</sup>In theoretical physics, this forbidding of linear combinations between bosons and fermions is known as the Wick-Wightman-Wigner superselection rule [27]. The direct sum split between the even and the odd subspaces in (27) and (4) is supposed to depict precisely this constraint to free superpositions between quanta of integer and half-integer spin (*i.e.*, bosons and fermions, respectively). Mainly because of [27] we decided to symbolise the grading function in (2) and (5) by ' $\pi$ ' (for '*intrinsic parity*') rather than by ' $\sigma$ ' as in [18]. In the literature, the set-theoretic (disjoint) union ' $\cup$ ' is sometimes used instead of ' $\oplus$ ' between the even and odd subspaces of a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded vector space [6]—it being understood that these two subspaces have only the trivial zero (0) vector in common, as noted in footnote 1. ' $\cup$ ' too is supposed to represent the aforesaid spin-statistics superselection rule.

$\mathcal{A}$ , satisfying (4)–(11), is called a  $\delta$ -*J-L algebra* [18]. Also, one can easily verify that for  $\delta = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the associative  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie superalgebra  $\mathcal{L}$  defined in (i)–(iv) of section 1<sup>5</sup>. The antiassociative ( $\delta = -1$ ) case is coined *Jordan-Lie superalgebra* in [18]—here to be referred to as *J-L algebra*  $\mathcal{J}$  for short. We may summarise all this as follows

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}, & \text{for } \delta = +1, \\ \mathcal{J}, & \text{for } \delta = -1. \end{cases}$$

For future use, we quote, without proof, the following lemma and two corollaries from [18]<sup>6</sup>:

- **Lemma:** *In every antiassociative algebra  $A$ , any product involving four or more elements of  $A$  is identically zero<sup>7</sup>.*
- **Corollary 1:** *Antiassociative algebras have no idempotent elements and, as a result, no units (i.e., identity elements)<sup>8</sup>.*
- **Corollary 2:** *Let  $\mathcal{J}$  be a J-L algebra as defined above. Then  $\mathcal{J}$  is nilpotent of length at most 3 (write:  $\mathcal{J}_4 = 0$ )<sup>9</sup>.*

### 3 Introducing the Alphabetic Hybrid Jordan-Lie Superalgebra $\mathbb{A}$

Let  $\mathbb{A}$  be a 4-dimensional vector space over  $\mathbb{R}$  spanned by  $\mathcal{G} = \{a, b, c, d\}$ <sup>10</sup> and also be  $2 \oplus 2$ -dimensionally  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded thus

$$\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}^0 \oplus \mathbb{A}^1 = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{a, b\} \oplus \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{c, d\}. \quad (12)$$

Let  $\circ : \mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}$  be a bilinear product that closes in  $\mathbb{A}$  which, in terms of  $\mathbb{A}$ 's generators in  $\mathcal{G}$ , is encoded in the following  $(4 \times 4)$ -multiplication ( $\cdot$ product) table

---

<sup>5</sup>In particular, the expression (3) in (iii) is encoded in (7)–(9) above, while the ‘graded Jacobi identities’ property (iv) of  $\mathcal{L}$  is expressed by (10) or (11).

<sup>6</sup>Proofs can be read directly from [18].

<sup>7</sup>Lemma 1.1 in [18].

<sup>8</sup>Corollary 1.2 in [18].

<sup>9</sup>Corollary 1.1 in [18].

<sup>10</sup>The alphabetic symbolism of the four basis vectors (generators) in  $\mathcal{G}$  will be explained subsequently.

$\circ$	$a$	$b$	$c$	$d$
$a$	$a$	$b$	$-d$	$-c$
$b$	$b$	$-a$	$-d$	$c$
$c$	$c$	$d$	$a$	$-b$
$d$	$d$	$-c$	$b$	$-a$

(13)

From table (13), one can straightforwardly extract the following information:

- *The binary product  $\circ$  is not commutative.* In particular,  $a$  commutes only with  $b$ ; while,  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $d$  mutually anticommute. Moreover,  $a$  is a right-identity, but not a left one.
- *$\circ$  is not (anti)associative.* For example, one can evaluate

$$c = -ad = a(bc) \neq \begin{cases} (ab)c = bc = -d, & (\delta = +1); \\ -(ab)c = -bc = d, & (\delta = -1). \end{cases}$$

- $a$  and  $c$  are  $\sqrt{a}$ , while  $b$  and  $d$  are  $\sqrt{-a}$ .
- The even subspace of  $\mathbb{A}$  in (12),  $\mathbb{A}^0 := \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{a, b\}$ , is isomorphic to the complex numbers  $\mathbb{C}$  if one makes the following correspondence between the unit vectors (generators) of  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{C}$

$$\mathbb{A}^0 \ni a \longrightarrow 1 \in \mathbb{C} \text{ and } \mathbb{A}^0 \ni b \longrightarrow i \in \mathbb{C} \text{ (} i^2 = -1 \text{ and } b^2 = -a\text{)}.$$

with  $\mathbb{A}^0$  being the subalgebra of even elements of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

- The product of an even and an odd generator is odd, while the product of two odd generators is even. Together with the second observation above, we may summarise this to the following

$$\pi(xy) = \pi(x) + \pi(y) \pmod{2}.$$

- The inhomogeneous vector  $\mathbf{n}_1 = b + c$  and the odd vector  $\mathbf{n}_2 = c + d$  are nilpotent.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>We will return to these two vectors in the last section when we discuss norm issues in  $\mathbb{A}$ . The reader should note that  $\mathbf{n}_1$  violates the aforementioned Wick-Wightman-Wigner spin-statistics superselection rule [27] as it linearly combines vectors in the even and the odd subspaces of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

### 3.1 ‘Naive’ Cayley-Dickson type division ring extension heuristics

Let us try to gain some more insight into the non-associativity of  $\circ$  by making a formal correspondence between the ‘units’ of  $\mathbb{A}$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  and the standard unit quaternions  $\mathcal{U} = \{1, i, j, k\}$  in  $\mathbb{H}$

$$\begin{aligned} a &\longrightarrow 1, & b &\longrightarrow i, \\ c &\longrightarrow j, & d &\longrightarrow k. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Then, one may wish to recall that the *associative division algebra*  $\mathbb{H}^{12}$  can be obtained from  $\mathbb{C}$  by adjoining  $j = \sqrt{-1}$  to the generators  $\{1, i\}$  of  $\mathbb{C}$  and by assuming that it commutes with 1

$$1j = j1 = j$$

but that *it anticommutes with  $i$*  and that *it closes in  $\mathbb{H}^{13}$*

$$ij = -ji = k \in \mathbb{H}$$

In fact, one assumes that by transposing  $i$  with  $j$ ,  $i$  gets conjugated [10, 2, 23], as follows

$$ij = ji^* = -ji \Leftrightarrow \{i, j\} := ij + ji = 0$$

Then, *by assuming associativity, one verifies that  $k$  too is a  $\sqrt{-1}$ , that also anticommutes with both  $i$  and  $j$*

$$\begin{aligned} k^2 &= (ij)(ij) = i(ji)j = -i^2j^2 = -1, \\ ki &= (ij)i = i(ji) = -i(ij) = -ik \Leftrightarrow \{i, k\} := ik + ki = 0 \end{aligned}$$

thus one completes the following well-known multiplication table for the four unit quaternions

$\bullet$	1	$i$	$j$	$k$
1	1	$i$	$j$	$k$
$i$	$i$	-1	$k$	- $j$
$j$	$j$	- $k$	-1	$i$
$k$	$k$	$j$	- $i$	-1

(15)


---

<sup>12</sup>We may write  $\bullet$  for the associative binary product of quaternions (*i.e.*,  $\bullet : \mathbb{H} \otimes \mathbb{H} \longrightarrow \mathbb{H}$ ), but omit it in actual products, that is to say, we simply write  $xy$  ( $x, y \in \mathbb{H}$ ). We assumed the same thing for  $x \cdot y$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{A}$ , as well as for  $x \circ y$  in  $\mathbb{A}$  (for instance, see (ii) in section 1).

<sup>13</sup>That is to say,  $ij = k$  is also a unit quaternion generator in  $\mathbb{H}$ , thus completing the set of four unit quaternion generators  $\{1, i, j, k\}$ .



• **A passing note on ‘3-chirality’.** At this point, it is important to note that in the case of the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$ , from (15) one assumes the ‘left chiral’ order of multiplication for the anti-commuting unit quaternions:  $ijk = -1$ ;<sup>14</sup> while, in the case of our  $\mathbb{A}$ , and in view of the formal correspondence between the respective  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{A}$  generators that we made in (14), one can see straight from the binary multiplication table of  $\mathbb{A}$  in (13) that we assume the opposite ‘right chiral’ order of multiplication of the three anticommuting unit generators of  $\mathbb{A}$ :  $dcb = -a$ . The ‘reason’ for assuming this multiplication order and not its opposite  $bcd = a$  will become transparent as the paper unfolds below.

• **The crux of the argument.** If we were to emulate the naive and heuristic Cayley-Dickson extension of  $\mathbb{C}$  to  $\mathbb{H}$  shown above in the case of  $\mathbb{A}$ , thus adjoin  $c$  to  $b$  in  $\mathbb{A}^0 \simeq \mathbb{C}$  and require according to (13) that they anticommute, as well as that *the binary product  $\circ$  be associative*, we would get

$$d^2 = (cb)(cb) = cbcb = -c^2b^2 = -(a)(-a) = a \quad (16)$$

which disagrees with entry (4, 4) in table (13). Similarly for the generator  $c$ .<sup>15</sup> Clearly then, as also noted above, (the product  $\circ$  in)  $\mathbb{A}$  is neither associative<sup>16</sup> nor antiassociative<sup>17</sup>

• **Question:** *How can we obtain agreement between products like the one in (16)—which arise rather naturally upon trying to extend  $\mathbb{C}$  to  $\mathbb{A}$  in the same manner that  $\mathbb{C}$  is extended to  $\mathbb{H}$  [10, 2, 23]—with the entries of the multiplication table (13)? Evidently, we need a new (anti)associativity-type of law for the binary product  $\circ$ .*

### 3.2 $\mathbb{A}$ viewed as a free generated algebra

To this end, one might first wish to regard  $\mathbb{A}$  as a *free algebraic structure*,<sup>18</sup> and first define:

---

<sup>14</sup>The epithet ‘left/right’ chiral for the multiplication orders  $ijk = -1$  and its opposite  $kji = 1$  respectively arises from the fact that the three mutually anticommuting unit quaternions (or equivalently, the Pauli spin matrices) geometrically represent rotations in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , which can be set to be clockwise or anti-clockwise [11, 2].

<sup>15</sup>We encourage the reader to try to calculate  $c^2 = (bd)(bd)$  in a manner similar to (16) above.

<sup>16</sup> $\delta = 1$  in (6).

<sup>17</sup> $\delta = -1$  in (6).

<sup>18</sup>Broadly speaking, a free algebraic structure  $\mathcal{A}$  is a set of generating elements  $\mathcal{G}$  called *letters*, endowed with a binary multiplication operation—the algebraic product concatenation of the letter-generators in  $\mathcal{G}$ —that is subject to certain ‘constraints’, formally called *rules* or *relations*, for the formation and evaluation of product strings of letters called *words*. See next.

**Definition 1:** A product string  $w$  of generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  of length  $l$  greater than or equal to 3<sup>19</sup> is said to be *(N)ormal (T)ime (O)rdered*<sup>20</sup> if it is of the following ‘right-to-left alphabetical order’ or ‘lexicographic-syntax’

$$\overleftarrow{w} := d^s c^r b^q a^p, \quad p, q, r, s \in \mathbb{N}; \quad l(w) := p + q + r + s. \quad (17)$$

Then we impose the following three *rules* or *relations*<sup>21</sup> onto the total contraction of any word of length  $l \geq 3$ :<sup>22</sup>

**Rule 0:** Before contracting totally a word  $w$  of length  $l \geq 3$ , it should be brought into *NTO*-ed form in the following two steps:

- (a) When the right-identity letter  $a$  is found in an extreme left or intermediate position in  $w$ , it should be contracted with the adjacent letter on its right according to (13).<sup>23</sup>
- (b) The other three mutually anticommuting generators  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $d$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  should be pairwise swapped within  $w$  so that they are ultimately brought to the form  $\pm d^s c^r b^q$ .

A couple of comments are due here:

1) Above, (a) implies that the length of a word may change upon *NTO*-ing it. This is allowed to happen in  $\mathbb{A}$ . For the algebraic structure of  $\mathbb{A}$  that we wish to explore here not all words assembled by free (arbitrary)  $\circ$ -concatenations of letters in  $\mathcal{G}$  are significant. *Only NTO-ed words are structurally significant*,<sup>24</sup> and any given  $w$  has a unique *NTO*-ed form  $\overleftarrow{w}$  fixed according to (i) and (ii) above. Rule 0 prompts

---

<sup>19</sup>As noted in the previous footnote, in *free algebra* jargon, such product strings  $w$  are called *words* and their factors, which are elements of  $\mathcal{G}$ , are called *letters* (which, in turn, makes  $\mathcal{G}$   $\mathbb{A}$ ’s 4-letter alphabet!). The number  $l$  of letters in a word  $w$  is its *length*, and we write  $l(w)$ . Formally speaking, a

word  $w$  of length  $l$  is a member of  $\overbrace{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{A} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{A}}^{l \text{ factors } \mathbb{A}}$ . The  $4^2 = 16$  possible words of length 2 in  $\mathbb{A}$  are the ones depicted in the multiplication table (13) above.

<sup>20</sup>Write ‘*NTO*-ed’ and symbolise the word by  $\overleftarrow{w}$ . We originally encountered this term in this author’s doctoral thesis [20] where we borrowed it from Quantum Field Theory jargon [7, 24], as a conflation of the usual *normally* and *time* ordered products of quantum field operators there.

<sup>21</sup>Again, this is free algebra jargon.

<sup>22</sup>By ‘*total contraction*’ of a word of length  $l \geq 3$  we mean the reduction of the word to a single signed ( $\pm$ ) letter in  $\mathcal{G}$  after  $l - 1$  pairwise contractions of its constituent letters according to (13). Again, formally speaking, the product  $\circ : \mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  in (13) represents the contraction of 2-words in  $\mathbb{A}$ , so

analogously, the total contraction of words of length  $l$  may be cast as  $\circ^{l-1} : \overbrace{\mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{A} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{A}}^{l-1 \text{ times}} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ .

<sup>23</sup>As it were, the ‘natural’ position of  $a$  in a word is to the extreme right. This seems to suit  $a$ ’s role as a right-identity in  $\mathbb{A}$  (13).

<sup>24</sup>This will be amply justified in the sequel.

us to call  $\mathbb{A}$  ‘*multiplicatively ordered*’ and this alphabetico-syntactic ordering may be formally cast as follows

$$\text{Lexicographic product ordering } \textit{from - right - to - left} : d > c > b > a \quad (18)$$

since, once again, every *NTO*-ed word is of the form  $\overleftarrow{w} := d^s c^r b^q a^p$  according to (17). The generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  are ordered thus.

It follows that, since in its transition to its unique *NTO*-ed form a word may change length, the latter is not a significant structural trait of  $\mathbb{A}$ , but the order (18) is.

2) Normal ordering respects superpositions of words in  $\mathbb{A}$ . In other words, *NTO*-ing is a linear operation; symbolically

$$\overleftarrow{\alpha w_1 + \beta w_2} = \alpha \overleftarrow{w_1} + \beta \overleftarrow{w_2}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$$

The other two rules that we impose on the total contraction of a *NTO*-ed word of length  $l \geq 3$  are:

**Rule 1:** Every *NTO*-ed word of length  $l$  greater than 2 contracts fully to a (signed) letter in  $\mathcal{G}$  by  $l - 1$  sequential pair-contractions of letters in it according to (13) (*f*)rom (*r*)ight (*t*)o (*l*)eft<sup>25</sup> (*i.e.*, in the multiplicative order depicted in (18)). We may call this rule for  $\circ$  *ordered* or *directed associativity*.

**Rule 2:** Moreover, ordered associativity is  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \overleftarrow{w_1} = \dots oe'e &\longrightarrow (\overleftarrow{w_1}) = (-1)^{[\pi(e)+\pi(e')]} \dots o(e'e) = + \dots oe'', \quad e'' = (e'e) \text{ from (13)} \\ \overleftarrow{w_2} = \dots o''o'o &\longrightarrow (\overleftarrow{w_2}) = (-1)^{[\pi(o)+\pi(o')]} \dots o''(o'o) = + \dots o''e, \quad e = (o'o) \text{ from (13)} \quad (19) \\ \overleftarrow{w_3} = \dots o'oe &\longrightarrow (\overleftarrow{w_3}) = (-1)^{[\pi(e)+\pi(o)]} \dots o'(oe) = - \dots o'o'', \quad o'' = (oe) \text{ from (13)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $(\overleftarrow{w})$  signifies the commencement of the pairwise sequential total contraction of the *no*-ed word  $w$  frtl *à la* rule 1; ‘*e*’ stands for (*e*)ven and ‘*o*’ for (*o*)dd letters in  $\overleftarrow{w}$ ; and ‘ $e'' = (e'e)$  from (13)’ at end of the first row of (19) signifies the contraction and substitution of the product pair  $e'e$  by  $e''$  according to (13).<sup>26</sup> Thus, rule 2 essentially says that *when an odd and an even letter contract within a no-ed word  $\overleftarrow{w}$ , one must put a minus sign in front of  $\overleftarrow{w}$* . In view of rules 0–2, we call  $\circ$  in  $\mathbb{A}$  a ‘ $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded ordered associative product’. The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded ordered associativity of  $\mathbb{A}$  is somewhat ‘in between’ the pure associativity of a Lie superalgebra  $\mathcal{L}$  ( $\delta = 1$ ) and the pure antiassociativity of a J-L algebra  $\mathcal{J}$  ( $\delta = -1$ ) as defined above.

Due to rules 0–2,  $\mathbb{A}$  may be called a *multiplicatively ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative algebra*.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>Write ‘frtl’.

<sup>26</sup>And from now on,  $(xy)$  in  $\mathbb{A}$  will indicate precisely this ‘contraction of  $xy$  and its substitution by the corresponding entry from (13)’ process.

<sup>27</sup>From now on we will most often drop the adverb ‘multiplicatively’ above and simply refer to  $\mathbb{A}$  as an ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative algebra.

Having rules 0–2 in hand, we are now in a position to show that words such as the one displayed in (16) contract consistently with the binary multiplication table (13), thus we provide an answer to the question following (16) above. So, we check that

$$d^2 = (cb)(cb) = cbc b \stackrel{R0}{=} -c^2 b^2 \stackrel{R1}{=} -c^2 (b^2) \stackrel{(13)}{=} cca \stackrel{R1}{=} c(ca) \stackrel{R2}{=} -c^2 \stackrel{(13)}{=} -a, \quad (20)$$

is in agreement with (13).<sup>28</sup>

### 3.3 The Lie Admissibility of $\mathbb{A}$

Now we can give the rest of the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie algebra-like structural properties of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

- First, there is a bilinear product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle: \mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$  represented by the non-associative,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded (anti-commutator) Lie product  $[\cdot, \cdot]$  as follows

$$[x, y] := \begin{cases} [x, y] = xy - yx \in \mathbb{A}^0, & \text{when } x, y \in \mathbb{A}^0, \\ \{x, y\} = xy + yx \in \mathbb{A}^0, & \text{when } x, y \in \mathbb{A}^1, \\ \{x, y\} = xy + yx \in \mathbb{A}^1, & \text{when } x \in \mathbb{A}^0 \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{A}^1, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

which is similar to (3), and it also satisfies

$$\pi(\langle x, y \rangle) = \pi(x) + \pi(y) \pmod{2} \quad (22)$$

as well as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x, y \rangle &:= xy - \delta(-1)^{xy}yx = -\delta(-1)^{xy} \langle y, x \rangle = \\ &= \begin{cases} xy - (-1)^{xy}yx, & \text{when } x, y \in \mathbb{A}^0 \text{ or } x, y \in \mathbb{A}^1; \quad \underline{\delta = 1}, \\ xy + (-1)^{xy}yx, & \text{when } x \in \mathbb{A}^0 \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{A}^1; \quad \underline{\delta = -1}, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

similar to (7), (8) and (9), respectively.<sup>29</sup>

- Second, the following eight possible super-Jacobi identities

$$\begin{aligned} &[\{d, c\}, a] + \{\{c, a\}, d\} + \{\{a, d\}, c\} = 0, \\ &[\{d, c\}, b] + \{\{c, b\}, d\} + \{\{b, d\}, c\} = 0, \\ &\{[a, b], d\} + \{\{b, d\}, a\} + \{\{d, a\}, b\} = 0, \\ &\{[a, b], c\} + \{\{b, c\}, a\} + \{\{c, a\}, b\} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and

---

<sup>28</sup>We note that in (20),  $R0$ , for instance, refers to ‘Rule 0’ (similarly for  $R1$  and  $R2$ ). Again, for ‘practice’ the reader can also verify that  $c^2 = (bd)(bd) = \dots = a$ , in agreement with (13).

<sup>29</sup>We will comment further on (21) and (22)-(23) in the next section when we compare  $\mathbb{A}$  and the  $\delta$ -J-L algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of [18].

$$\begin{aligned}
\{d, \{c, a\}\} + \{c, \{a, d\}\} + [a, \{d, c\}] &= 0, \\
\{d, \{c, b\}\} + \{c, \{b, d\}\} + [b, \{d, c\}] &= 0, \\
\{a, \{b, d\}\} + \{b, \{d, a\}\} + \{d, [a, b]\} &= 0, \\
\{a, \{b, c\}\} + \{b, \{c, a\}\} + \{c, [a, b]\} &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

are satisfied. These are the analogues in  $\mathbb{A}$  of expressions (10) and (11) for the  $\delta$ -J-L algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  in [18].

In view of the novel and quite idiosyncratic normally ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative multiplication structure  $\circ$  of  $\mathbb{A}$  (rules 0–2), we must specify to the reader who wishes to verify patiently that the graded Jacobi relations (24) and (25) hold how to actually contract them. To this end, we define:

• **Definition 2:** The contraction of a super-Jacobi relation is said to be performed ‘*(f)rom (i)nside (t)o (o)utside*’<sup>30</sup> when the inner  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ -brackets are opened and contracted first, and then the outer ones. Analogously, the contraction of a super-Jacobi relation is said to be *foti* (i.e., ‘*(f)rom (o)utside (t)o (i)nside*’) when the outer brackets are opened first, then the inner ones, and then the resulting superpositions of words of length 3 are totally contracted according to rules 0–2.

• **Scholium:** The conscientious reader can check, by using (13), that *the super-Jacobi relations (24) and (25) are satisfied by the fito mode of contraction, but not by the foti one.*

For instance, also to give an analytical example of the two kinds of contraction, we evaluate the third expression in (25) by both *fito* and *foti* means

$$\begin{aligned}
\underline{\text{fito}} : \quad & \{a, \{b, d\}\} + \{b, \{d, a\}\} + \{d, [a, b]\} = \{a, (bd) + (db)\} + \\
& \{b, (da) + (ad)\} + \{d, (ab) - (ba)\} \stackrel{(13)}{=} \{b, d - c\} = \{b, d\} - \{b, c\} = 0 \\
\underline{\text{foti}} : \quad & \{a, \{b, d\}\} + \{b, \{d, a\}\} + \{d, [a, b]\} = a\{b, d\} + \{b, d\}a + b\{d, a\} + \\
& \{d, a\}b + d[a, b] + [a, b]d = abd + adb + bda + dba + \\
& bda + bad + dab + adb + dab - dba + abd - bad = 2(ab)d + 2(da)b + \\
& 2(ad)b + 2bda = 2(-db + da - cb - dba) = 2(c + d - d + c) = 2c \neq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

• **Result:** This indicates that, by virtue of the ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative product structure of  $\mathbb{A}$ ,

*$\mathbb{A}$  is a Lie superalgebra-like structure with respect to the fito, but not the foti, mode of contraction of its graded Jacobi relations.*

This is another peculiar feature of  $\mathbb{A}$ —an immediate consequence of its ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative multiplication idiosyncrasy.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup>Write *fito*.

<sup>31</sup>In the next two sections we will discuss in more detail these ‘multiplication oddities’ of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

## 4 Comparing $\mathcal{A}$ with $\mathbb{A}$

We can now compare  $\mathbb{A}$  with the abstract  $\delta$ -J-L algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  defined in [18]. Below, we itemise this comparison:

- (i) As vector spaces, both  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathbb{A}$  are finite dimensional and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded [(4), (12)].
- (ii) With respect to multiplication, while  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\delta$ -associative (*i.e.*, associative  $\mathcal{L}$  for  $\delta = 1$  or antiassociative  $\mathcal{J}$  for  $\delta = -1$ ),  $\mathbb{A}$  is multiplicatively *NTO*-ordered and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative—a trait somewhat ‘in between’ pure associativity and pure antiassociativity [(6), (17, 18, 19)]; hence,

$\mathbb{A}$  is coined a hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie Superalgebra.

- (iii) With respect to the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded commutation relations  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ ,  $\mathbb{A}$  combines characteristics of both Lie superalgebras  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A}|_{\delta=1}$  and J-L algebras  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{A}|_{\delta=-1}$ . In particular, as [(7, 9), (21)] depict:

(a)  $\mathbb{A}$  is like  $\mathcal{L}$  with respect to the ‘homogeneous’  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ -relations obeyed by even and odd elements.<sup>32</sup>

while:

(b)  $\mathbb{A}$  is like  $\mathcal{J}$  with respect to the ‘inhomogeneous’, ‘mixed spin-statistics’ commutation relations between bosons and fermions.<sup>33</sup>

moreover:

(c) The  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ -relations ‘close’ in  $\mathbb{A}$  in exactly the same way that they close in  $\mathcal{A}$ <sup>34</sup> [(8), (22)].

- (iv) The generators of  $\mathbb{A}$ , unlike those in  $\mathcal{A}$ , obey ‘externally ungraded’ Jacobi relations.<sup>35</sup>

*In this formal respect,  $\mathbb{A}$  is like an ungraded Lie algebra  $L$ .*

- (v) We return a bit to the comparison of the multiplication structure of the two algebras (ii), now also in connection with the Jacobi relations in (iv) above, and note that for the (anti)associative  $\delta$ -J-L superalgebras it is immaterial whether one evaluates their super-Jacobi relations (10) and (11) *fito* or *foti*, because they are ‘multiplicatively unordered’ structures.<sup>36</sup>

On the other hand, as we saw in (26) for example, exactly because of the ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative multiplication structure of  $\mathbb{A}$ , *fito*-contracted Jacobis are satisfied in  $\mathbb{A}$ , but *foti* ones are not, therefore it crucially depends on the ordered multiplication

---

<sup>32</sup>That is to say, even elements obey antisymmetric commutation relations, while odd elements obey symmetric anticommutation relations. As noted earlier, this is a concise algebraic statement of the celebrated *spin-statistics connection* [19, 27, 6].

<sup>33</sup>That is, the commutation relation between an even and an odd element of  $\mathbb{A}$ , like in  $\mathcal{J}$ , is symmetric (*i.e.*, the anticommutator bracket  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \equiv \{ \cdot, \cdot \}$ ).

<sup>34</sup>That is, in both  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathbb{A}$  the homogeneous  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ -relations close in their even subspaces, while the inhomogeneous ones in their odd subspaces.

<sup>35</sup>That is, the three external factors  $(-1)^{xz}$ ,  $(-1)^{yx}$  and  $(-1)^{zy}$  present in the Jacobi expressions (10) and (11) for  $\mathcal{A}$  are simply missing in the corresponding ones, (24) and (25), for  $\mathbb{A}$ .

<sup>36</sup>That is, it does not matter in what order one contracts pairs of generators in words of length greater than 2 in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

structure  $\circ$  whether  $\mathbb{A}$  is a Lie-like algebra (*fito*) or not (*foti*). Such a dependence is absent from the multiplicative unordered  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{J}$  algebras.<sup>37</sup>

- (vi) Also in connection with (v) above, we note in view of the lemma and the two corollaries concluding section 2 that:
  - ( $\alpha$ ) Because  $\mathbb{A}$  is not purely antiassociative, words of length greater than or equal to 4 in it do not vanish identically as they do in  $\mathcal{J}$  for instance.<sup>38</sup>
  - ( $\beta$ ) Like the antiassociative  $\mathcal{J}$ ,  $\mathbb{A}$  has no idempotents and no two-sided identity element. However, as we saw in the previous section,  $\mathbb{A}$  has a right-identity, namely,  $a$ .<sup>39</sup>
  - ( $\gamma$ ) As a corollary of ( $\alpha$ ) above, and unlike  $\mathcal{J}$ ,  $\mathbb{A}$  is not nilpotent of length at most 4.
- (vii) Finally, in connection with (iii) and (iv) above, we note that our choice of the symmetric anticommutator relation (as in  $\mathcal{J}$ ) instead of the antisymmetric commutator relation (as in  $\mathcal{L}$ ) for the inhomogeneous  $\langle \dots \rangle$ -relations in  $\mathbb{A}$  can be justified as follows: had we assumed  $[e, o]$  instead of  $\{e, o\}$ , the *fito* contraction of the first super-Jacobi expression in (24) would yield

$$\begin{aligned} [\{d, c\}, a] + \{[c, a], d\} + \{[a, d], c\} &= \{c + d, d\} + \{-c - d, c\} = \\ \{d, d\} - \{c, c\} &= -2a - 2a = -4a \neq 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence the graded Jacobi identities would not have been obeyed by the generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  and, as a result, the latter could not qualify as an admissible Lie algebra [5, 13, 6].

We can distill the remarks above to the following important statement (result):

- **Result:** The Lie admissibility of  $\mathbb{A}$  (*i.e.*, the fact that  $\mathbb{A}$  qualifies as an admissible (graded) Lie algebra obeying (graded) Jacobi identities) [5, 13, 6] vitally depends on the fact that its algebraic binary product is normally ordered (*NTO*-ed) and that its Jacobi anti-commutator relations are contracted in the *fito*, but not in the *foti*, order of contraction.

## 5 Closing remarks about $\mathbb{A}$

Our concluding remarks about  $\mathbb{A}$  concentrate on the following four issues:

---

<sup>37</sup>The ‘multiplicative unorderliness’ of both  $\mathcal{A}|_{\delta=1} = \mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{A}|_{\delta=-1} = \mathcal{J}$  is encoded in the (anti)associativity relation (6) imposed on their products, since on the one hand associativity simply means that the left-to-right contraction of a 3-letter word is the same as the right-to-left one, while on the other, antiassociativity means essentially the same thing under the proviso that one compensates with a minus sign for one order of contraction relative to the other. Both associativity and antiassociativity however, unlike the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associativity in  $\mathbb{A}$  (19), do not depend on the grade of the letters involved in the binary contractions within words of length greater than or equal to 3.

<sup>38</sup>See lemma in section 2.

<sup>39</sup>See corollary 1 in section 2.



- (1) We compare  $\mathbb{A}$  against the other four possible Euclidean division rings, namely, the reals ( $\mathbb{R}$ ), the complexes ( $\mathbb{C}$ ), the quaternions ( $\mathbb{H}$ ) and the octonions ( $\mathbb{O}$ ).
- (2) As a particular case of (1), we remark about the ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative  $\mathbb{A}$  *versus* the multiplicatively unordered, because purely associative, quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$ , and we briefly comment on the representation theory of  $\mathbb{A}$ .
- (3) We abstract  $\mathbb{A}$  to a new type of Lie algebraic supervariety hitherto not encountered in the literature: a general hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{JL}$ , additionally possessing the novel multiplication structure of a normally ordered,  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative, free linear semigroup.
- (4) In the concluding Section 6, we discuss a possible physical application and interpretation of  $\mathbb{A}$  as originally anticipated in [20].

### 5.0.1 Comparing $\mathbb{A}$ to $\mathbb{R}$ , $\mathbb{C}$ , $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{O}$

(1) To make the aforesaid comparison, we first recall how abstract algebraic structure gets lost upon climbing the dimensional ladder from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{O}$ :

- Going from  $\mathbb{R}$  of dimension  $2^0 = 1$  to  $\mathbb{C}$  of dimension  $2^1 = 2$ , one loses *order*.<sup>40</sup>
- Going from  $\mathbb{C}$  of dimension  $2^1 = 2$  to  $\mathbb{H}$  of dimension  $2^2 = 4$ , one loses *commutativity*.
- Going from  $\mathbb{H}$  of dimension  $2^2 = 4$  to  $\mathbb{O}$  of dimension  $2^3 = 8$ , one loses *associativity*.
- And if one wished to extend the octonions to an algebra-like structure of dimension  $2^4 = 16$ ,<sup>41</sup> there would be no more abstract algebraic structure to be lost [8, 10].

We may subsume and organise the results of the comparison above into the following table

Algebra	Order	L/R-Identity	Commutativity	Associativity	
Reals ( $\mathbb{R}$ )	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Complexes ( $\mathbb{C}$ )	×	✓	✓	✓	
Quaternions ( $\mathbb{H}$ )	×	✓	×	✓	(27)
Octonions ( $\mathbb{O}$ )	×	✓	×	×	
Alphabet ( $\mathbb{A}$ )	✓	×	×	×	

We can then summarise the comparison above by saying that  $\mathbb{A}$  combines characteristics of all those four Euclidean division rings  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$ , in the following sense:

<sup>40</sup>Although, one gains algebraic ploynomial solution completeness by solving equations such as  $x^2 + 1 = 0$ .

<sup>41</sup>The formal procedure of extending  $\mathbb{C}$  to  $\mathbb{H}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  to  $\mathbb{O}$ , and  $\mathbb{O}$  to  $\mathbb{S}$ , is known as the *Cayley-Dickson extension*. The algebra  $\mathbb{S}$  could be coined ‘*decahexanions*’, but is more commonly known as the *sedonions*  $\mathbb{S}$  [9, 22].

- (a)  $\mathbb{A}$  is a vector space over  $\mathbb{R}$ .
- (b)  $\mathbb{A}$ 's even subalgebra  $\mathbb{A}^0$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}$ .
- (c)  $\mathbb{A}$  is a 4-dimensional vector space like  $\mathbb{H}$ , and its 3-subspace spanned by the mutually anticommuting  $b$ ,  $c$  and  $d$  reminds one of the subspace of real quaternions (*i.e.*,  $\mathbb{H}$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ ) spanned by the three imaginary (*i.e.*,  $\sqrt{-1}$ ) quaternion units  $i$ ,  $j$  and  $k$ .<sup>42</sup> Also, by comparing the multiplication tables (13) and (15) for  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{H}$  respectively, one immediately realises that the former is a sort of *multiplicative deformation* of the latter.<sup>43</sup>
- (d) Like the algebra of octonions  $\mathbb{O}$ ,  $\mathbb{A}$  is not associative.<sup>44</sup>
- (e) Furthermore, the novel multiplicatively normally ordered (NTO-ed),  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative structure of  $\mathbb{A}$  recalls a bit the linearly ordered  $\mathbb{R}$ .

### 5.0.2 Comments on possible ‘matrix’ representations of $\mathbb{A}$

(2) We stressed above the close similarities between  $\mathbb{A}$  and  $\mathbb{H}$ . Now we would like to gain some more insight into the novel non-associativity of  $\mathbb{A}$  by comparing it with the associative quaternions. As a bonus from such a comparison, we will also comment briefly on a possible representation of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

So, we may recall from [11] the real 4-dimensional left ( $L$ ) and right ( $R$ ) matrix ‘self-representations’<sup>45</sup> of quaternions over  $\mathbb{R}$

$$\text{Left : } ab = c \longrightarrow L(a)[b] = [c] \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Right : } bc = d \longrightarrow R(c)[b] = [d], \quad (28)$$

where  $[b]$  is a column vector in  $\mathbb{R}^4$ ,<sup>46</sup> while both  $L(a)$  and  $R(c)$  are  $(4 \times 4)$ -real matrices.<sup>47</sup> The crucial point is that, because  $\mathbb{H}$  is associative,

$$(ab)c = a(bc) \Rightarrow R(c)L(a)[b] = L(a)R(c)[b] \Leftrightarrow [L(\mathbb{H}), R(\mathbb{H})] = 0, \quad (29)$$

and similarly, for a purely antiassociative algebra like  $\mathcal{J}$  before, it follows that

---

<sup>42</sup>With the important difference that  $c$  in  $\mathbb{A}$  is a ‘real’, not an imaginary, unit (*i.e.*,  $c = +\sqrt{a} \neq \sqrt{-a}$ ).

<sup>43</sup>With most notable ‘deformation features’ of the generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  relative to those of  $\mathbb{H}$  being  $c$ 's squaring to  $a$  unlike  $j$ 's squaring to  $-1$  mentioned in the last footnote, and  $a$ 's role only as a right-identity unlike  $1$ 's role in  $\mathbb{H}$  as a two-sided identity. In fact, from the diagonals of their respective multiplication tables (15) and (13), one could say that the unit quaternions in  $\mathcal{U}$  naturally support a metric of *Lorentzian signature*  $\text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$  (:absolute trace 2) [11, 26], while the units of  $\mathbb{A}$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  support a metric of *traceless Kleinian signature*  $\text{diag}(1, -1, 1, -1)$ . See ensuing discussion on  $\mathbb{A}$ 's norm below, as well as the correspondence (14) in section 3.

<sup>44</sup>See further, more detailed remarks on Associativity in the next subsection.

<sup>45</sup>The epithet ‘self’ refers to the representation of  $\mathbb{H}$  (by real matrices) induced by the quaternions’ own algebraic product.

<sup>46</sup>That is, in the expansion of the real quaternion  $b$  in the standard unit quaternion basis  $\mathcal{U}$ :  $b = b_0 1 + b_1 i + b_2 j + b_3 k$ , the entries of the 4-vector  $[b]$  are the real numbers  $b_\mu$ .

<sup>47</sup>It is easy to check that the maps  $L$  and  $R$  are homomorphisms of  $\mathbb{H}$  (*i.e.*, representations of  $\mathbb{H}$ ).

$$\{L(\mathcal{J}), R(\mathcal{J})\} = 0. \quad (30)$$

We may summarise (29) and (30) to the following:

The left and right self-representations of an *associative* algebra *commute*, while those of an *antiassociative* algebra *anticommute*.

It follows that the self-representations of  $\mathbb{A}$ , which is neither purely associative nor purely associative (but somewhat in between the two), will neither commute nor anticommute with each other. As a matter of fact, since  $\mathbb{A}$  is multiplicatively ordered *frtl*, only its left self-representation would be relevant (if it actually existed<sup>48</sup>).

### 5.0.3 Abstracting and generalising $\mathbb{A}$

(3) The abstraction of  $\mathbb{A}$  to a general hybrid  $\delta$ -J-L algebra  $\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{L}$  is straightforward:

A finite dimensional  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded vector space  $\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{L}$  over a field  $K$  of characteristic not 2, together with a normally ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative free algebraic product between its generators and a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie-like bracket  $\langle \dots \rangle$  satisfying (21)–(25), is called an *abstract hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebra*.

In fact, since the binary product  $\circ$  in  $\mathbb{A}$  is normally ordered and ‘directed’ :from right to left) in the *NTO*-ed sense, it resembles a semigroup product; albeit, a *free, nonassociative* (: $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative) *linear semigroup over  $\mathbb{R}$* , subject to the aforementioned free relations or product concatenation and contraction rules.

Thus, all in all:

*$\mathbb{A}$  is an instance of an abstract hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebra and a free, normally ordered, graded associative, linear semigroup.*

Before we give our last remarks on a possible physical application of  $\mathbb{A}$  in the concluding section, we turn our attention to matters of *associativity* of an algebraic binary product so as to shed more light on the novel and quite peculiar binary multiplication structure  $\circ$  of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

---

<sup>48</sup>This author has not been able to construct yet a matrix representation of  $\mathbb{A}$  based on its ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative product. *In toto*, since our  $\mathbb{A}$  is nonassociative, one would expect it *not* to have a standard linear (:matrix) representation in  $M_4(\mathbb{R})$ , as all (real) matrix algebras are associative under matrix multiplication. Of course, like with all the usual Lie algebraic varieties and supervarieties, we could alternatively look directly into a possible representation of the non-associative (under the Lie bracket  $\langle \dots \rangle$  now)  $\mathbb{A}$  by a (possibly graded) Lie algebra  $End(V)$  of endomorphisms of a suitable (possibly graded) vector space  $V$ . However, this alternative has not been seriously pursued or explored yet.

## 5.1 Varia on Associativity

Now that we have seen that extending the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$  to the octonions  $\mathbb{O}$  results in losing associativity of the algebraic product, we recall that if one followed a general Cayley-Dickson complexification-type of formal procedure for further extending the algebra of octonions  $\mathbb{O}$  to the  $2^4 = 16$ -dimensional algebra of the *sedonions*  $\mathbb{S}$  [9, 22], and, moreover, doubled the latter to the  $2^5 = 32$ -dimensional algebra  $\mathbb{T}$  of the so-called *trigintaduonions* [1, 25], we would witness the following progressive weakening of associativity.

### 5.1.1 Alternativity

When one extends  $\mathbb{H}$  to  $\mathbb{O}$  [2, 12, 23], one loses associativity; however, the octonion binary product still obeys a weaker form of associativity coined *alternativity*. That is to say,

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{O} : \begin{cases} (xx)y = x(xy), & \text{Left-Alternativity,} \\ y(xx) = (yx)x, & \text{Right-Alternativity.} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

• **Result:** Our alphabet algebra  $\mathbb{A}$  is not alternative. Here is a sample calculation, always following the multiplication table of the generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  in (13), showing the violation of Left-Alternativity in  $\mathbb{A}$ :

$$d(dc) = db = -c, \quad (dd)c = -ac = d \Rightarrow d(dc) \neq (dd)c \quad (32)$$

### 5.1.2 Power Associativity

If one further extends the octonions  $\mathbb{O}$  to the sedonions  $\mathbb{S}$  [9, 22], one loses even alternativity; however, the sedenion product still obeys a weaker form of associativity coined *power associativity*. That is to say,

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{S} : (xx)x = x(xx) \quad (33)$$

and for powers of  $x$  greater than 3.<sup>49</sup>

• **Result:** Our alphabet algebra  $\mathbb{A}$  is not power associative. Again, here is a sample calculation, always following the multiplication table of the generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  in (13), showing the violation of Power Associativity in  $\mathbb{A}$ :

$$d(dd) = -da = -d, \quad (dd)d = -ad = c \Rightarrow d(dd) \neq (dd)d \quad (34)$$

### 5.1.3 Flexibility

Finally, if one wished to further extend the sedonions  $\mathbb{S}$  to the algebra of *trigintaduonions*  $\mathbb{T}$  [1, 25], one should further relax power associativity to a still weaker form of associativity coined *flexibility*. That is to say,

---

<sup>49</sup>For instance, for  $x^4$ , for all  $x$  in a power associative algebra, we would observe:  $(xx)xx = x(xx)x = xx(xx)$ .

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{T} : (xy)x = x(yx) \tag{35}$$

- **Result:** Our alphabet algebra  $\mathbb{A}$  is flexible. One need only check, always using (13), that the following twelve equations hold between the four generators of  $\mathbb{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} a(ba) &= (ab)a \\ b(ab) &= (ba)b \\ a(ca) &= (ac)a \\ c(ac) &= (ca)c \\ a(da) &= (ad)a \\ d(ad) &= (da)d \\ b(cb) &= (bc)b \\ c(bc) &= (cb)c \\ b(db) &= (bd)b \\ d(bd) &= (db)d \\ c(dc) &= (cd)c \\ d(cd) &= (dc)d \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

- We may organise the results of the comparisons above into the following table:

Algebra	Associativity	Alternativity	Power Associativity	Flexibility
Quaternions $\mathbb{H}$	✓	✓	✓	✓
Octonions $\mathbb{O}$	×	✓	✓	✓
Sedenions $\mathbb{S}$	×	×	✓	✓
Trigintaduonions $\mathbb{T}$	×	×	×	✓
Alphabet $\mathbb{A}$	×	×	×	✓

Thus, we observe that *in matters of algebraic product associativity, our 4-dimensional alphabet algebra  $\mathbb{A}$  is more like the 32-dimensional algebra of trigintaduonions  $\mathbb{T}$ .*

## 5.2 Miscellaneous Structural-Algebraic Matters on Identity, Involution, Norm and Lie Admissibility

### 5.2.1 Matters of Identity, Involution and Norm

All four ‘generalised number’ algebras, regarded as algebras over the field of reals  $\mathbb{R}$ : the real numbers  $\mathbb{R}$  themselves, the complexes  $\mathbb{C}$ , the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$  and the octonions  $\mathbb{O}$  are commonly known *Euclidean division rings*, because:

- They all have a multiplicative 2-sided identity: namely, the number 1.

- $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$  all have a unary operation, called *conjugation*  $\star : A \rightarrow A$ , which, to every element  $x$  in the corresponding algebra  $A$ , assigns its conjugate  $x^\star$  in  $A$  (which can be readily seen to commute with  $x$  itself).<sup>50</sup>
- For the non-commutative  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$ , conjugation acts as an *involution*, in the sense that it reverses the order of the algebraic product of the corresponding elements:  $(x_1x_2)^\star = x_2^\star x_1^\star$ .<sup>51</sup>
- Having defined conjugation, the *norm* of the elements in  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$  is defined via the act of conjugation to be:  $\mathcal{N}(x) \equiv \|x\| = \sqrt{xx^\star} = \sqrt{x^\star x}$ .
- Furthermore, the norm is seen to be *real Euclidean*, of positive definite signature:  $\mathcal{N}(\cdot) = \|\cdot\| : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\forall x \in A : \|x\| \geq 0$ .<sup>52</sup> This is why all four division rings  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$  are called *Euclidean*.
- Finally, all four Euclidean division rings above are *composition algebras*  $\mathcal{A}$ , in the following defining sense:

$$\mathcal{N}(xy) = \mathcal{N}(x)\mathcal{N}(y) \quad (\forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}) \quad (37)$$

where  $\mathcal{N}(x) \equiv \|x\|$  is *the norm of  $x$* , as defined above.

• **By contrast,  $\mathbb{A}$ ...**

- $\mathbb{A}$  does not have a multiplicative 2-sided identity: the generator  $a$  serves only as a right-identity (13).
- $\mathbb{A}$  does not have a conjugation operation that reverses the order of multiplication of its generators. On the contrary,  $\mathbb{A}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded, *lexicographically/normally ordered multiplicative structure* (semigroup).
- In  $\mathbb{A}$ , we can define a ‘pseudo-norm’ type of map, not via a conjugation/involution unary operation as in the other four Euclidean division rings, but simply by squaring each generator and taking the (real number) coefficient of the result:  $\|x\| = \text{Coeff}_{\mathbb{R}}(x^2)$
- With this pseudo-norm type of map, from the diagonal of the multiplication table (13), the reader immediately notices the the norms of the four generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  are:  $\|a\| = +1$ ,  $\|b\| = -1$ ,  $\|c\| = +1$  and  $\|d\| = -1$ , respectively.
- Thus, the pseudo-metric  $\eta$  that is naturally associated with the pseudo-norm on the natural standard basis of generators of  $\mathbb{A}$  above is an indefinite, Kleinian-type of metric, of 0-signature:  $\eta_{\mu\nu} = (1, -1, 1, -1)$ ;  $\text{tr}(\eta_{\mu\nu}) = 0$  (traceless).

---

<sup>50</sup>For  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\star$  is simply the complex conjugation map, while for the reals  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\star$  simply reduces to the identity map as every real number is self-conjugate.

<sup>51</sup> $\mathbb{C}$  is a commutative algebra, hence conjugation does not affect the order of multiplication.

<sup>52</sup>In  $\mathbb{R}$ , the norm is simply the absolute value of a real number.

- $\mathbb{A}$  is manifestly not a composition algebra (i.e.,  $\mathcal{N}(xy) \neq \mathcal{N}(x)\mathcal{N}(y)$ ), as one can straightforwardly verify.
- Finally, and *en passant*, we note that, with the pseudo-norm defined above, we can readily find four *null* (:nilpotent) vectors in  $\mathbb{A}$ , namely:  $n_{1,2} = d \pm c$  and  $n_{3,4} = c \pm b$ , as one can readily verify that  $n_\mu^2 = 0$ . For example, for  $\mu = 1$ ,  $\|n_1\| = \text{Coeff}_{\mathbb{R}}(n_1^2) = \text{Coeff}_{\mathbb{R}}[(d+c)^2] = \text{Coeff}_{\mathbb{R}}[(d+c)(d+c)] = \text{Coeff}_{\mathbb{R}}[d^2 + dc + cd + c^2] = \text{Coeff}_{\mathbb{R}}[-a + b - b + a] = 0$ .

### 5.2.2 Lie Admissibility and Brief Comparison to Okubo Algebras

We witnessed above how our alphabetic algebra  $\mathbb{A}$  combines structural characteristics from, and in a way extends, all the four Euclidean division rings  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}$ ,  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $\mathbb{O}$ , and their extensions to  $\mathbb{S}$  and  $\mathbb{T}$ , plus we have seen that it admits a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie bracket type of bilinear product with respect to which it qualifies as a *Lie admissible algebra* [13].

We then saw that, with respect to the said  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Lie bracket, certain *fito*-ordered  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded Jacobi identities are satisfied, which make  $\mathbb{A}$  qualify as a  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie Superalgebra in the sense of Okubo and Kamiya [18].

From a more general vantage,  $\mathbb{A}$  may be regarded as a multiplicatively ordered and  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -graded associative version of *Okubo algebras*, which are non-Euclidean (:pseudo-metric) generalisations of the quaternions  $\mathbb{H}$  and the octonions  $\mathbb{O}$  [15, 16, 17]. To make further analogies with our  $\mathbb{A}$  in view of our associativity remarks earlier, *Okubo algebras are non-associative composition algebras, flexible algebras, Lie admissible algebras, power associative, yet non-alternative algebras, and, like our  $\mathbb{A}$ , they do not have a 2-sided identity element.*

## 6 Heuristic Smatterings on a Possible Application to Theoretical Physics

We conclude the present paper by allowing ourselves some leeway and latitude so as to discuss briefly a possible physical application and concomitant interpretation of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

The alphabetic algebra  $\mathbb{A}$  was originally conceived in this author's Ph.D. thesis [20], but not in the rather sophisticated  $\delta$ -J-L superalgebra guise presented above. The basic intuition in [20] was to give a simple '*generative grammar*'-like theoretical scenario for the creation of spacetime from a finite number of quanta (generators) which were supposed to inhabit the quantum spacetime substratum commonly known as the vacuum [4]. Thus, it was envisaged that a spacetime-like structure could arise from the algebraic combinations of a finite number of quanta, as it were, a combinatory-algebraic process modelling the *aufbau* of spacetime from quantum spacetime numbers filling the vacuum.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, by the very alphabetic character of  $\mathbb{A}$  and its alphabetically ordered algebraic structure, this syntactic *lexicographic*

---

<sup>53</sup>Thus,  $\mathbb{A}$  could be coined 'quantum spacetime arithmetic' and the imagined process of building spacetime from such abstract numbers is akin, at least in spirit, to how relativistic spacetime was assembled from abstract digits and a suitable code or 'algorithm' for them in [3].

process representing the building of spacetime was envisaged to encode the germs of the primordial ‘*quantum arrow of time*’ in the sense that a primitive ‘temporal directedness’ is already built into the algebraic structure of those quantum spacetime numbers—a basic order or ‘*taxis*’ inherent in the very rules for the algebraic combinations of the generators of  $\mathbb{A}$ , as we saw before.

In view of the intimate structural similarities between  $\mathbb{A}$  and the quaternion division algebra  $\mathbb{H}$  mentioned above, and since the latter are so closely tied to the structure of relativistic spacetime and the best unification between quantum mechanics and (special) relativity that has been achieved so far, namely, the Dirac equation [11]<sup>54</sup>, we can imagine that  $\mathbb{A}$  could be somehow used in the future to represent algebraically a ‘time-directed’ sort of Minkowski spacetime and a time-asymmetric version of the Dirac equation that would appear to be supported rather naturally by the former.

In this line of thought, in a forthcoming paper [21] we entertain the possibility of arriving at an inherently and genuinely *Time-Asymmetric Dirac Equation* by entirely algebraic means. This project comes to answer a 70 years’ old conundrum that Lambek faced when he first derived the Dirac Equation using quaternions, as posited in [11]:

*To use real quaternions over the field  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers, or complex quaternions over the field  $\mathbb{C}$  of complexes?*

In [11], Jim Lambek very tellingly recalls how he told Paul Dirac back in the 50s that he could derive his famous equation for the electron’s dynamics using (admittedly, complex) quaternions (over  $\mathbb{C}$ )—commonly referred to as *biquaternions*—for which Dirac appeared not to have been greatly impressed.<sup>55</sup> Four decades later, upon writing [11], Jim came to ‘regret’ not to have challenged back Dirac, by saying: “...*alright, but can you derive your equation using real quaternions over the field  $\mathbb{R}$  of real numbers?*”. Of course, we do now have real spinor representations of the Dirac  $\Gamma$ -matrices, called *Majorana representations* [14], but that is *not* what Lambek meant to challenge Dirac about. Lambek simply wanted to find out whether Dirac could derive his equation from real quaternions (over  $\mathbb{R}$ ) alone, not whether there are real representations of the spinorial wave functions involved in it. Our hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie superalgebra  $\mathbb{A}$  may be able to address this ‘deficiency’ and arrive at a genuinely real ( $\mathbb{A}$  is an *algebra* over  $\mathbb{R}$ ) Dirac-type of equation which, *a fortiori*, is *inherently time-asymmetric*.

However, the quest in this direction is far from its completion.

---

<sup>54</sup>For example, in [11] Minkowski vectors are represented by hermitian biquaternions, Lorentz transformations by unimodular complex quaternions (essentially, the biquaternion analogues of the elements of  $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ —the double covering of the Lorentz group), the 3-generators  $\sigma_i$  of the Pauli spin Lie algebra  $su(2)$  are just the three mutually anticommuting ‘imaginary’ quaternions multiplied by the complex number  $i$  in front ( $i^2 = -1$ ), and, most importantly, the Dirac equation can be derived very simply and entirely algebraically from  $\mathbb{H}$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  (*i.e.*, from biquaternions). Also, as noted in footnote 40, the Lorentzian signature (and even the dimensionality!) of Minkowski spacetime is effectively encoded in (the diagonal of) the multiplication table (15) of the unit quaternions in  $\mathcal{U}$  [26].

<sup>55</sup>A reaction that, as Lambek recalls in [11], unfortunately discouraged him from further pursuing his Mathematical/Theoretical Physics interests, and rather focus his attention solely on Mathematics.



We would like to close the present paper in the spirit of the last paragraph with a suitable quote from the end of [10] that, in a sense, vindicates our perspective on  $\mathbb{A}$  as a multiplicatively ordered and directed ‘*free generative algebra*’:

“In the beginning was the word.  
The word became self-referential/periodic.  
In the sorting of its lexicographic orders,  
The word became topology, geometry and  
The dynamics of forms;  
Thus were chaos and order  
Brought forth together  
From the void.”  
(from **CODA**)

## Acknowledgments

Some early ‘prophetic’ remarks by Jim Lambek about  $\mathbb{H}$  in [11] almost three decades ago and in subsequent private correspondence before the year 2004, helped this author clarify by analogy and juxtaposition some crucial structural-algebraic features of  $\mathbb{A}$ .

## References

- [1] Cawagas, R. E., Carrascal, A. L., Bautista L. A., Sta. Maria J. P., Urrutia J. D., and Nobles B., *The Subalgebra Structure of the Cayley-Dickson Algebra of Dimension 32 (trigintaduonion)*, math.arXiv.org, pre-print: **arXiv:0907.2047v3** (2009).
- [2] Conway, J. H. and Smith, D. A., *On Quaternions and Octonions: Their Geometry, Arithmetic, and Symmetry*, CRC Press (2003).
- [3] Finkelstein, D., *Space-Time Code*, Physical Review, **184**, 1261 (1969).
- [4] Finkelstein, D., *Theory of Vacuum*, in *The Philosophy of Vacuum*, Eds. Brown, H. and Saunders, S., Clarendon Press, Oxford (1991).
- [5] Erdmann, K. and Wildon, M. J., *Introduction to Lie Algebras*, Springer Undergraduate Mathematics Series, Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York (2006).
- [6] Freund, P. G. O., *Introduction to Supersymmetry*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1989).
- [7] Haag, R., *Local Quantum Physics: Fields, Particles, Algebras*, Second Edition, Springer (1996).
- [8] Hurwitz, A., *Über die Composition der quadratischen Formen von Beliebig vielen Variablen*, Nachrichten von der königlichen Gersellschaft der Wissenschaften in Göttingen (1898).

- [9] Imaeda, K. and Imaeda, M., *Sedenions: algebra and analysis*, Applied Mathematics and Computation, **115**, 77 (2000).
- [10] Kauffman, L. H., *Knots and Physics*, Series on Knots and Everything, volume 1, World Scientific, Singapore (1991).
- [11] Lambek, J., *If Hamilton had prevailed: quaternions in physics*, Mathematical Intelligencer, **17**, 7 (1995).
- [12] Lounesto, P., *Octonions and Triality*, Advances in Applied Clifford Algebras, **11**, 191 (2001).
- [13] *Lie Admissible Algebras*, Wikipedia Reference.
- [14] NLab, *Majorana (Real) Spinor Representations*, online reference link: <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/Majorana+spinor>
- [15] Okubo, S., *Pseudo-quaternion and pseudo-octonion algebras*, Hadronic Journal, **1**, 1250 (1978).
- [16] Okubo, S. and Osborn, J. M., *Algebras with nondegenerate associative symmetric bilinear forms permitting composition*, Communications in Algebra, **9**, 1233 (1981).
- [17] *Okubo Algebras*, Wikipedia Reference.
- [18] Okubo, S. and Kamiya, N., *Jordan-Lie Super Algebra and Jordan-Lie Triple System*, Journal of Algebra, **198**, 388 (1997).
- [19] Pauli, W., *On the Connection between Spin and Statistics*, Physical Review, **58**, 716 (1940).
- [20] Raptis, I., *Axiomatic Quantum Timespace Structure: A Preamble to the Quantum Topos Conception of the Vacuum*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK (1998).
- [21] Raptis, I., *Three Potential Physical Applications of a Hybrid  $\delta$ -Jordan-Lie Superalgebra: Extended Supersymmetry, Time-Irreversible Free Generative Linear Semigroups, and the Time-Asymmetric Dirac Equation* (forthcoming paper in preparation).
- [22] *The Algebra of Sedenions*, Wikipedia Reference.
- [23] Springer, T. A. and Veldkamp, F. D., *Octonions, Jordan Algebras and Exceptional Groups*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York (2000).
- [24] Streater, R. F. and Wightman, A. S., *PCT, Spin Statistics, and All That*, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics and Physics, **30**, Princeton University Press (2000).
- [25] *The Algebra of Trigintaduonions*, Wikipedia Reference.

- [26] Trifonov, V., *A Linear Solution of the Four-Dimensionality Problem*, Europhysics Letters, **32**, 621 (1995).
- [27] Wick, G. C., Wightman, A. S. and Wigner, E. P., *The intrinsic parity of elementary particles*, Physical Review, **88**, 101 (1952).