

Werk

Titel: Some non-maximal arithmetic groups

Autor: Allan, N.

Jahr: 1968

PURL: https://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?320387429_0002|log12

Kontakt/Contact

[Digizeitschriften e.V.](#)
SUB Göttingen
Platz der Göttinger Sieben 1
37073 Göttingen

✉ info@digizeitschriften.de

SOME NON-MAXIMAL ARITHMETIC GROUPS

by

Nelo D. ALLAN

Let k be a non-finite Dedekind domain, and \mathcal{O} be the ring of its integers. We shall assume that the ring $R = \mathcal{O}/(2)$ is finite. Let us denote by $M_n(k)$ (resp. $M_n(\mathcal{O})$) the ring of all n by n matrices with entries in k (resp. in \mathcal{O}), and $GL_n(k)$ its group of units. We denote by $SL_n(k)$ the subgroup of $GL_n(k)$ whose elements g have determinant, $\det g$, equal to one. Let $H \in M_n(\mathcal{O})$ be a symmetric matrix, i.e., $H = {}^t H$ where ${}^t H$ denotes the transpose matrix of H . We let $G = SO(H) = \{g \in SL_n(k) \mid {}^t g H g = H\}$, and we let $G_{\mathcal{O}} = G \cap M_n(\mathcal{O})$. We want to exhibit certain H for which $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal in G , in the sense that there exists a subgroup Δ of G such that Δ contains $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ properly and $[\Delta : G_{\mathcal{O}}]$ is finite.

1. Preliminaries. Let L be an order in $M_n(k)$; we shall denote by L_{ij} the fractional ideal generated by all the (i,j) -entries of all the elements of L ; we shall write

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} L_{11} & \dots & L_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ L_{n1} & \dots & L_{nn} \end{pmatrix} .$$

We shall say that L is a direct summand if as an \mathcal{O} -module L is a direct sum of $L_{ij} e_{ij}$ where e_{ij} are the units of $M_n(k)$.

It is well known that in our case the maximal orders in $M_n(k)$ are conjugate to the ones which are direct summands and $L_{nn} = L_{ij} = \mathfrak{o}$, $i, j \neq n$, and $L_{in} = \mathfrak{a}^{-1}$, $L_{nj} = \mathfrak{a}$, $i, j \neq n$, for some fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} of k , i.e.,

$$L = L(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathfrak{o} & \dots & \mathfrak{o} & \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathfrak{o} & \dots & \mathfrak{o} & \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \\ \mathfrak{a} & \dots & \mathfrak{a} & \mathfrak{o} \end{pmatrix}$$

If L is one of such orders, then by looking at the expansion of g^{-1} , $g \in Sl_n(k)$, we see that $L \parallel Sl_n(k)$ is a group. Consequently if $G \subset Sl_n(k)$, then $\Delta = G \cap L$ is a group.

For our purposes we shall assume \mathfrak{a} to be integral.

LEMMA 1. If $R = \mathfrak{o}/\mathfrak{a}$ is finite, then Δ is commensurable to $G_{\mathfrak{o}}$, i.e., $\Delta \cap G_{\mathfrak{o}}$ has finite index in both $G_{\mathfrak{o}}$ and Δ .

Proof: We shall follow Ramanathan's proof (1). First we consider the subgroup $\Delta(\mathfrak{a}) = \{g \in G_{\mathfrak{o}} \mid g \equiv E \pmod{\mathfrak{a}}\}$. The index $[G_{\mathfrak{o}} : \Delta(\mathfrak{a})]$ is finite because it is at most the order of the group $GL_n(R)$, which is clearly finite. Suppose that $g, g' \in \Delta$ and that $\mathfrak{a}(g_{ij} - g'_{ij})$ is divisible by \mathfrak{a}^2 for all (i, j) , i.e., $g' = g + V$, $V = (v_{ij})$ and $v_{ij} \equiv 0$ modulo \mathfrak{a} for all (i, j) ; hence $g^{-1}g' = E + g^{-1}V$, and it is easy to see that $g^{-1}V \in M_n(\mathfrak{o})$. Consequently $g^{-1}g' \in G_{\mathfrak{o}} \parallel \Delta$. Now there is only finitely many classes $\mathfrak{a}L$ modulo \mathfrak{a}^2 , hence only finitely many classes Δ modulo $\Delta \cap G_{\mathfrak{o}}$, i.e., $[\Delta : \Delta \cap G_{\mathfrak{o}}]$ is finite. Next as $G_{\mathfrak{o}} \supset \Delta \parallel G_{\mathfrak{o}} \supset \Delta(\mathfrak{a})$, it follows that $[G_{\mathfrak{o}} : \Delta \cap G_{\mathfrak{o}}]$ is finite. q.e.d.

2. MAIN RESULT. We shall use the block notation for the matrices and write

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} V & 0 \\ 0 & W \end{pmatrix},$$

where V is r by r and W is s by s , $r + s = n$; such H we shall denote sometimes by $V \perp W$. If $p^\alpha | 2$, p prime, α a positive integer, we say that H is p^α -even, if for any integral 1 by n matrix x , ${}^t x H x \equiv 0 \pmod{p^\alpha}$. (As $p^\alpha | 2$, to say that H is p^α -even is equivalent to say that p^α divides all the diagonal entries of H , where $H = (h_{ij})$, since mod 2 , and a fortiori modulo p^α , ${}^t x H x \equiv x_1^2 h_{11} + \dots + x_n^2 h_{nn}$.) We shall denote by $J(a)$, $a \in \mathcal{O}$, the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & a \end{pmatrix}.$$

We may assume that $2 \nmid a$, otherwise we can replace $J(a)$ by ${}^t S J(a) S = J(a + 2\lambda) = J(0)$ **where**

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$a = -2\lambda$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{O}$: under such replacement, the maximality or not of $G_{\mathcal{O}}$, for $H = V \perp J(a)$, is not affected.

LEMMA 2. Let $G = SO(H)$, $H = V \perp J(a)$. If V is p^α -even, and $p^\alpha \nmid a$, then the \mathcal{O} -ring generated by $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ in $M_n(k)$ is contained in the order $L(p)$.

Proof: Since $G_{\mathcal{O}} \subset M_n(\mathcal{O})$, it suffices to prove that for all $j = 1, \dots, n-1$, $p | g_{nj}$. If we write $g \in G_{\mathcal{O}}$ as

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix},$$

A being $n-2$ by $n-2$ and D being 2 by 2 , then

${}^t_{gHg} = H$ implies that ${}^t_{AVA} + {}^t_{CJ(a)C} = V$ and ${}^t_{BVB} + {}^t_{DJ(a)D} = J(a)$. Let us write $V = (v_{ij})$; now V is \mathfrak{p}^α -even, so that $\mathfrak{p}^\alpha | v_{ii}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n-2$. Let us write $C = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-2})$, where x_j are the column vectors of C , and similarly $D = (y_1, y_2)$. We have

$$({}^t_{AVA})_{jj} + {}^t_{x_j J(a) x_j} = v_{jj}, \quad j = 1, \dots, n-2,$$

$$({}^t_{BVB})_{jj} + {}^t_{y_j J(a) y_j} = \delta_{j2} a, \quad j=1,2, \delta_{12}=0, \delta_{22}=1.$$

Consequently if $z = x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, y_1$, then

$${}^t_{zJ(a)z} \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^\alpha}.$$

Writing ${}^t z = {}^t(z_1, z_2)$, this implies that

$$2z_1 z_2 + az_2^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^\alpha}$$

or

$$az_2^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^\alpha},$$

and as $\mathfrak{p}^\alpha \nmid a$, thus $\mathfrak{p} | z_2$. This means precisely that the last row of C is divisible by \mathfrak{p} , as well as the entry (2,1) of D .

q.e.d.

THEOREM 1. Let V be \mathfrak{p}^α -even and let $\mathfrak{p}^\alpha \nmid a$. Suppose that we can find in \mathcal{O} a unit η and an element b such that $(ba/2)$ lies in \mathfrak{p}^{-1} but is not integral and $\eta^2 + b\eta = 1$. Then $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal in G , in the sense explained before.

Proof: As $\mathcal{O}/(2)$ is finite, we have \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p} finite and $\Delta = L(\mathfrak{p}) \cap G$ is commensurable to $G_{\mathcal{O}}$. It suffices to show that Δ contains $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ properly. We consider $g = E_{n-2} \perp g'$ with

$$g' = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^{-1} & ab/2 \\ 0 & \eta \end{pmatrix}$$

Clearly $g \in L(\mathfrak{p})$, and it is easy to see that

$${}^t g' J(a) g' = J(ab\eta + \eta^2 a) = J(a(b\eta + \eta^2)) = J(a).$$

Therefore $g \in L(\mathfrak{p}) \cap G$ and $g \notin G_{\mathcal{O}}$.

q.e.d.

COROLLARY. Let W be any unimodular matrix, i.e., $W \in M_{n-2}(\mathcal{O})$ and $\det W$ is a unit, and let $c \in \mathfrak{p}^x$. Let us assume also the existence of η and b like in the theorem. If $H = W \perp cJ(a)$, then $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal.

Proof: First of all, we observe that if $\det H \neq 0$ then $g \in SO(H)$ if and only if ${}^t g \in SO(H^{-1})$, for as $g^{-1} \in SO(H)$, ${}^t g^{-1} H g^{-1} = H$ if and only if $g H^{-1} g = H^{-1}$. Now the mapping $g \rightsquigarrow {}^t g$ maps subgroups onto subgroups, and preserves **integrality** of matrices and indices; hence $SO(H)_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal if and only if $SO(H^{-1})_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal. Now $H^{-1} = W^{-1} \perp c^{-1} J(a)^{-1}$, or $c H^{-1} = c W^{-1} \perp J(a)^{-1}$. As before our situation does not change if we replace $J(a)^{-1}$ by $J(0) J(a)^{-1} J(0) = J(-a)$. Hence $SO(H)_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal if and only if $SO(H')_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal where $H' = c W^{-1} \perp J(-a)$. Finally it is easy to see that $c W^{-1}$ is \mathfrak{p}^x -even, consequently $SO(H')_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal. Therefore, $SO(H)_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal.

q.e.d.

3. APPLICATIONS. We shall look first into the case where k is a dyadic local field with residue class field having more than two elements. We observe the fol-

lowing trivial lemma.

LEMMA 3. Let \mathfrak{p} be the prime of \mathcal{O} and let $(2) = \mathfrak{p}^\alpha$, $\alpha \geq 1$. If $a \in \mathfrak{p}$, then the equation

$$x^2 + ax + 1 = 0$$

is always solvable in \mathcal{O} , and its solution is a unit.

Proof: In \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p} our equation become $x^2 - 1 = 0$. By Hensel's lemma $x^2 + ax - 1 = 0$ is always solvable in \mathcal{O} , $a \in \mathfrak{p}$, and its solution does not lie in \mathfrak{p} .

q.e.d.

Now we discuss the unramified case:

THEOREM 2. If k is an unramified dyadic field, then $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal in G for $H = V \perp cJ(\epsilon)$ if

- a) V is even, $2 \nmid \epsilon$ and $c = 1$.
- b) V is unimodular, $c = 2$ and $2 \nmid \epsilon$.

Proof: We first observe that in theorem 1 we can take $b = \eta^{-1} - \eta$ and $x = \eta$. It remains to show that we can always choose η such that $2 \nmid b$. Now \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p} is a finite dimensional vector space over the prime field, hence its group of units has odd order, i.e., if $\eta \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2}$, then $\eta^2 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2}$.

q.e.d.

THEOREM 3. Let k be a dyadic ramified field. Then $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal in G , for $H = V \perp cJ(a)$, if

- a) V is π^λ -even, $c = 1$, $a = \epsilon \pi^\beta$, ϵ unit and $\alpha \geq \lambda > \beta > 0$.
- b) V is unimodular, $c = \pi^\lambda$, $a = \epsilon \pi^\beta$, ϵ unit and $\alpha \geq \lambda > \beta > 0$.

Proof: In order to verify our assertion we find a solution η of $x^2 + \pi^{\alpha-\beta-1}x = 1$ and set $b = \pi^{\alpha-\beta-1}$ and $\eta = x$ in the proof of theorem 1, in the case where $\alpha > \beta + 1$. In the case where $\alpha = \beta + 1$, we consider the equation $x^2 + bx = 1$, $b = \eta^{-1} - \eta$, $x = \eta$ where η is a unit such that $\eta \nmid \eta^{-1} - \eta$. It is always possible to find such unit because \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p} has more than two elements. The case b) follows from the corollary and from a).

q.e.d.

Now we shall study some consequences for the case k is an algebraic number field.

THEOREM 4. Suppose that 2 is unramified in k and that there exists a unit $\eta \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $\eta \not\equiv 1$ (modulo 2). Then $G_{\mathcal{O}}$ is not maximal in G for $H = V \mid cJ(a)$ in the following cases:

- a) V is even, $c = 1$, $a = \text{unit}$.
- b) V is unimodular, $c = 2$, $a = \text{unit}$.

Proof: Clearly the case b) follows from a) by corollary of theorem 1. Next we observe that we can sharpen lemma 2, to get the \mathcal{O} -ring generated by G contained in $L(2)$; as V is even, we can work all congruences of that lemma modulo 2, and from the last congruence $az_2^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ we get that $z_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$, because if $\mathfrak{p} \mid 2$, then $\mathfrak{p}^2 \nmid 2$. Hence $2 \mid g_{nj}$, $j \neq n$, for all $g = (g_{ij}) \in G_{\mathcal{O}}$. Now in the proof of theorem 1 it suffices to take $b = \eta^{-1} - \eta$, $x = \eta$, and it is easily seen that ab is relatively prime to 2.

q.e.d.

COROLLARY. If k is a quadratic number field with

discriminant a , $a \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$, and if the basic unit of k is $\omega = (m + n\sqrt{a})/2$, m, n being odd integers, then we have the same conclusion as in theorem 4.

Proof: For $\omega^{-1} - \omega = -m$ or \sqrt{a} and in both cases $2 \nmid \omega^{-1} - \omega$.

We close this note observing that our last corollary applies to the case where

$$a = -3, 5, 13, 21, 29, 53, 61, 69, 77, 85, 93.$$

(See table 1, (2)).

REFERENCES

1. K. RAMANATHAN, Discontinuous Groups F , Goeth. Nach. (1964), 145-164.
2. Z. BOREVICH, I. SHAFAREVICH, Number Theory, Academic Press, 1966, New York.

Departamento de Matemáticas
y Estadística
Universidad Nacional de Colombia

(Recibido en febrero de 1968)

ERRATA: Lines 12 and 13, page 23, should read: "2, and a fortiori modulo \mathfrak{f}^α , $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 h_{ii} + \dots + x_n^2 h_{nn}$, where $\sum x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$."