

ON COLLINEAR AND QUASI-COLLINEAR INVOLUTIONS

Richard GABRIEL

Hardtstr. 36, D-76185 Karlsruhe, Germany

We show that involution collinearity and involution quasi-collinearity are equivalent concepts in the projective group $P_1(F)$.

An element $i \neq e$ in a group with unity e is said to be an *involution* if $i^2 = e$.

Three involutions i_1, i_2, i_3 , where at least two of them are different, are said to be *collinear* if their product also is an involution: $i_1 i_2 i_3 = i$. This definition was given by J.Hjemslev and G.Hessenberg; later Bachmann [1] used it in order to develop a plane geometry foundation based on group theory. In [2] we have investigated it in various groups and algebras, especially in symmetric groups.

Three involutions i_1, i_2, i_3 are said to be *quasi-collinear* if there exists an element $c \neq e$ such that the products

$$c i = i'_1, c i_2 = i'_2, c i_3 = i'_3$$

all are involutions. We have introduced this definition in [3] in connection with uniqueness of the solution to a three-message problem in a group.

Let F be a field and $P_1(F)$ the associated projective group; it consists of all homographies of F , i.e. of all maps of the form:

$$y = \frac{ax + b}{cx + d}, \quad x \in F,$$

with $a, b, c, d \in F$. Such a map can be homeomorphically represented by the matrix:

$$K = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$$

Then the product of two homographies corresponds to the products of the two associated matrices. An involution is characterized by $d = -a$ and $\det K \neq 0$.

Proposition. For any three involutions i_1, i_2, i_3 in $P_1(F)$ the following statements are equivalent:

- (i) i_1, i_2, i_3 are collinear: $i_1 i_2 i_3 = i$;
- (ii) i_1, i_2, i_3 are quasi-collinear: $c i = i'_1, c i_2 = i'_2, c i_3 = i'_3, c \neq e$;
- (iii) the matrices:

$$K_1 = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 \\ x_3 & -x_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K_2 = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 & y_2 \\ y_3 & -y_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K_3 = \begin{bmatrix} z_1 & z_2 \\ z_3 & -z_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

associated with the involutions i_1, i_2, i_3 are linearly dependent.

Proof. Obviously, (iii) is equivalent to

$$\begin{vmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 & \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \mathbf{y}_1 & \mathbf{y}_2 & \mathbf{y}_3 \\ \mathbf{z}_1 & \mathbf{z}_2 & \mathbf{z}_3 \end{vmatrix} = 0 \quad (\text{iv})$$

We will show that both (i) and (ii) are equivalent to (iv). First, let us calculate the product

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_1 \mathbf{K}_2 \mathbf{K}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 & -\mathbf{x}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 & \mathbf{y}_2 \\ \mathbf{y}_3 & -\mathbf{y}_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1 & \mathbf{z}_2 \\ \mathbf{z}_3 & -\mathbf{z}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{y}_1 \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{x}_2 \mathbf{y}_3 \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{y}_2 \mathbf{z}_3 - \mathbf{x}_2 \mathbf{y}_1 \mathbf{z}_3 & * \\ * & \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{y}_1 \mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{y}_3 \mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{x}_3 \mathbf{y}_2 \mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{x}_1 \mathbf{y}_1 \mathbf{z}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{a} & \mathbf{b} \\ \mathbf{c} & \mathbf{d} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Now it is clear that $\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{d} = 0$, that is, (i) is equivalent to (iv).

Second, let $\mathbf{C} \neq \lambda \mathbf{I}$ be a matrix with $\det \mathbf{C} \neq 0$ consider the products

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 & \mathbf{c}_2 \\ \mathbf{c}_3 & \mathbf{c}_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 & \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 & -\mathbf{x}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{x}_3 & * \\ * & \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{c}_4 \mathbf{x}_1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 & \mathbf{c}_2 \\ \mathbf{c}_3 & \mathbf{c}_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 & \mathbf{y}_2 \\ \mathbf{y}_3 & -\mathbf{y}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \mathbf{y}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{y}_3 & * \\ * & \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{y}_2 - \mathbf{c}_4 \mathbf{y}_1 \end{bmatrix} \\ \mathbf{C} \mathbf{K}_3 &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 & \mathbf{c}_2 \\ \mathbf{c}_3 & \mathbf{c}_4 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}_1 & \mathbf{z}_2 \\ \mathbf{z}_3 & -\mathbf{z}_1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{c}_1 \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{z}_3 & * \\ * & \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{c}_4 \mathbf{z}_1 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

These matrices are associated with involutions if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{c}_4) \mathbf{x}_1 + \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{x}_2 + \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{x}_3 &= 0 \\ (\mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{c}_4) \mathbf{y}_1 + \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{y}_2 + \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{y}_3 &= 0 \\ (\mathbf{c}_1 - \mathbf{c}_4) \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{c}_3 \mathbf{z}_2 + \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{z}_3 &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{v})$$

and it is easy to see that (v) is equivalent to (iv).

Remarks.

1. Statement (ii) is a consequence of statement (i) even in an arbitrary group \mathbf{G} . Indeed, from $\mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{i}_2 \mathbf{i}_3 = \mathbf{i}$ we get

$$(\mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{i}_2) \mathbf{i}_3 = \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{i}'_3, (\mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{i}_2) \mathbf{i}_2 = \mathbf{i}_1 = \mathbf{i}'_2, (\mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{i}_2) \mathbf{i}_1 = \mathbf{i}'_1.$$

With $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{i}_1 \mathbf{i}_2 \neq \mathbf{e}$, statement (ii) is satisfied as soon as $\mathbf{i}_1 \neq \mathbf{i}_2$.

2. In a Bachmann geometry, the group $\mathbf{P}_1(\mathbf{F})$ is essential. Therefore, collinearity and quasi-collinearity in $\mathbf{P}_1(\mathbf{F})$ are equivalent concepts.

3. In an infinite symmetric group there are, however, quasi-collinear involutions which are not collinear.

REFERENCES

1. BACHMANN, F., *Aufbau der Geometrie aus dem Spiegelungsbegriff*. Berlin, 1959.
2. GABRIEL, R., *Eine Kollinearitätsbedingung für Involutionen in Gruppen und Algebren*. J. Reine Angew. Math. **267**, pp.20 – 49, 1974.
3. GABRIEL, R., *Three-message problem in a symmetric group with application to a cryptographic method*. Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. **45**, pp. 937 - 941, 2000.

Received February 26, 2003