

## The $n$ -point-invariants of the projective line and cross-ratios of $n$ -tuples

by WALTER BENZ (Waterloo, Ontario)

Consider the projective group  $\Gamma(S)$  of the projective line  $S' = S \cup \{\infty\}$  over the sfield  $S$ . Denote by  $[n; S]$ , where  $n$  is a positive integer, the set of all ordered  $n$ -tuples  $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)$ , where  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n$  are distinct points of  $S'$ . If  $I \neq \emptyset$  is a set and  $\omega$  a mapping of  $[n; S]$  in  $I$ ,

$$\omega: [n; S] \rightarrow I,$$

we will call the pair  $(I, \omega)$  a  $n$ -point-invariant of  $\Gamma(S)$  iff for all  $\gamma \in \Gamma(S)$  and for all  $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) \in [n; S]$  the equation

$$(A_1^\gamma, A_2^\gamma, \dots, A_n^\gamma)^\omega = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)^\omega$$

holds, where — generally spoken — the image of the object  $A$  under the mapping  $\lambda$  is denoted by  $A^\lambda$ .

If  $(I, \omega), (I', \omega')$  are  $n$ -point-invariants we will call them equivalent in case there is a bijection

$$\alpha: [n; S]^\omega \rightarrow [n; S]^{\omega'}$$

such that

$$[(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)^\omega]^\alpha = (A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)^{\omega'}$$

for all  $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) \in [n; S]$ .

This relation is an equivalence relation on the class of  $n$ -point-invariants of  $\Gamma(S)$ .

Denote by  $\Sigma$  the set of all  $\Gamma(S)$ -orbits on  $[n; S]$  and by  $\sigma$  the mapping, which associates to every element of  $[n; S]$  its orbit. Then, of course, all  $n$ -point-invariants are given by  $(I, \sigma \cdot \mu)$ , where  $I \neq \emptyset$  is an arbitrary set and  $\mu: \Sigma \rightarrow I$  an arbitrary mapping.

Up to equivalence there is just one 1-point-invariant because  $\Gamma(S)$  operates transitively on  $[1; S]$ . Moreover, up to equivalence there is just one 2-point-invariant and just one 3-point-invariant. If  $S$  denotes the field  $C$  of complex numbers, so  $S'$  the completed complex plane, we get at once well-known geometric examples of 4-point-invariants, which

are not equivalent. For instance  $(I_\nu, \omega_\nu)$ ,  $\nu = 1, 2, 3, 4$  are pairwise non-equivalent, where

$$I_1 = I_2 = \{0, 1\}, \quad I_3 = \text{torus group mod } \pi, \quad I_4 = C$$

and

$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)^{\omega_1} = 1$  (resp.  $= 0$ ) in case  $(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4) \in [4; S]$  is cocircular, i.e. on a common circle (resp. non-cocircular);

$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)^{\omega_2} = 1$  (resp.  $= 0$ ) in case  $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4$  is harmonic (non-harmonic);

$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)^{\omega_3} = \text{angle mod } \pi$ , which leads around  $A_2$  in the positive sense (defined by an indikatrix on the sphere) from the circle through  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  to the circle through  $A_1, A_2, A_4$  for  $(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4) \in [4; S]$ ;

$$(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4)^{\omega_4} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4 & A_3 \end{bmatrix} \equiv DV(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4).$$

All 4-point-invariants have been characterized by Aczél, Gołab, Kuczma, Siwek in the real case, [1]; in [2] the same has been done for all 4-point-invariants in the sfield (skew-field) case. S. Topa solves in [4] a more general functional equation for the field case than that involved in the question of characterizing all 4-point-invariants.

In the present note we would like to characterize all  $n$ -point-invariants,  $n \geq 4$ , in the case of an arbitrary sfield. Let  $m$  be equal to  $n - 3$ . We are interested in all ordered  $m$ -tuples  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m)$  of elements  $a_\nu \in S \setminus \{0, 1\}$ . We define  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \sim (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$  iff there exists  $a \in S^* \equiv S \setminus \{0\}$  with  $\beta_\nu = a a_\nu a^{-1}$  for all  $\nu = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . This is an equivalence relation. Denote by  $\langle (a_1, \dots, a_m) \rangle$  the equivalence class of  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  and by  $E_m$  the set

$$\{ \langle (a_1, \dots, a_m) \rangle \mid a_1, \dots, a_m \in S \setminus \{0, 1\} \}.$$

If  $(P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4) \in [4; S]$  we define

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ P_4 & P_3 \end{pmatrix} = (P_2 - P_3)^{-1} (P_1 - P_3) (P_1 - P_4)^{-1} (P_2 - P_4),$$

where in case  $\infty$  occurs in  $\{P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4\}$  we just cancel both expressions  $(P_\nu - P_\mu)$  containing  $\infty$ , so for instance

$$\begin{pmatrix} \infty & P_2 \\ P_4 & P_3 \end{pmatrix} = (P_2 - P_3)^{-1} (P_2 - P_4).$$

Because of  $(P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4) \in [4; S]$  we have always

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ P_4 & P_3 \end{pmatrix} \in S \setminus \{0, 1\}.$$

By

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4, \dots, A_n & A_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

we understand the element

$$\left\langle \left( \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4 & A_3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_5 & A_3 \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_n & A_3 \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\rangle$$

of  $E_{n-3}$  for  $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) \in [n; S]$ ,  $n \geq 4$ . (For  $n = 4$  we get the well-known cross ratios in the sfield case.)

Then the following theorem is true:

**THEOREM.** *Let  $n \geq 4$  be an integer. Consider an arbitrary non-empty set  $I$ , and an arbitrary mapping*

$$\Omega: E_{n-3} \rightarrow I.$$

Define

$$(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n)^\omega = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4, \dots, A_n & A_3 \end{bmatrix}^\Omega$$

for  $(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n) \in [n; S]$ . Then  $(I, \omega)$  is a  $n$ -point-invariant. Moreover, there are no other  $n$ -point-invariants.

**Remark.** The content of this theorem is in other words the statement, that

$$(A_1, \dots, A_n), (B_1, \dots, B_n) \in [n; S]$$

belong to the same  $\Gamma(S)$ -orbit iff their "generalized cross ratios"

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4, \dots, A_n & A_3 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ B_4, \dots, B_n & B_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

are equal.

In this connection we would like to emphasize that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_\nu & A_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ B_\nu & B_3 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \nu = 4, \dots, n,$$

is not sufficient in general for having  $(A_1, \dots, A_n), (B_1, \dots, B_n)$  in the same orbit. Nevertheless, it is sufficient of course, in case  $S$  is a field. For the sfield case we have the following counter example:

Let  $S$  be the set of quaternions and consider  $(\infty, 0, 1, i, 2i), (\infty, 0, 1, -i, 2i) \in [5; S]$ . Here

$$\begin{bmatrix} \infty & 0 \\ i & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \infty & 0 \\ -i & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \infty & 0 \\ 2i & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \infty & 0 \\ 2i & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is true because of

$$\langle -i \rangle = \langle j(-i)j^{-1} \rangle = \langle i \rangle \quad (1).$$

(1) By  $1, i, j, k$  we denote the Hamiltonian basis of the quaternions over the reals.

In case  $(\infty, 0, 1, i, 2i)$ ,  $(\infty, 0, 1, -i, 2i)$  would be in the same  $\Gamma(S)$ -orbit there would exist an inner automorphism

$$z \rightarrow aza^{-1}, \quad a \in S^*$$

such that  $-i = aia^{-1}$ ,  $2i = a(2i)a^{-1}$ ; but this is obviously not true. Thus, for describing orbits it is not sufficient to define a generalized cross ratio by

$$\left\langle \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4 & A_3 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle, \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_5 & A_3 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle, \dots, \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_n & A_3 \end{array} \right) \right\rangle \right\rangle;$$

but everything works as we have to prove, by using

$$\left\langle \left( \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4 & A_3 \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_5 & A_3 \end{array} \right), \dots, \left( \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_n & A_3 \end{array} \right) \right) \right\rangle,$$

so by using the earlier defined generalized cross ratios

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4, \dots, A_n & A_3 \end{array} \right].$$

In order to prove the theorem we start with a lemma, which characterizes generalized cross ratios in another way (see [3] for the case  $n=4$ ):

LEMMA 1. Denote by  $\Gamma \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ P & Q & R \end{pmatrix}$  the set of all  $\gamma \in \Gamma(S)$  such that

$$A^\gamma = P, \quad B^\gamma = Q, \quad C^\gamma = R.$$

Then for  $(A, B, C, D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{m=n-3}) \in [n; S]$  the equation

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{array} \right] = \left\{ (D_1^\gamma, D_2^\gamma, \dots, D_m^\gamma) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

holds.

Proof. Let  $\varepsilon$  be an element of  $\Gamma \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and let  $\alpha_\nu \equiv (D_\nu)^\varepsilon$ ,  $\nu = 1, 2, \dots, m$ . Because of the bijectivity of  $\varepsilon$  we have  $\alpha_\nu \in S \setminus \{0, 1\}$ . Moreover,

$$\left\{ (D_1^\gamma, \dots, D_m^\gamma) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} = \left\{ (\alpha_1^\delta, \dots, \alpha_m^\delta) \mid \delta \in \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} \infty & 0 & 1 \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

holds. Because of the fact that  $\Gamma \begin{pmatrix} \infty & 0 & 1 \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  contains exactly inner automorphisms of  $S$ , we get

$$\left\{ (D_1^\gamma, \dots, D_m^\gamma) \mid \gamma \in \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} = \langle (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \rangle \in E_m.$$

Denote for the moment  $\left\{ (D_1^v, \dots, D_m^v) \mid v \in \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\}$  by

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{array} \right]^*$$

Thus we put

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{array} \right]^* = \langle (a_1, \dots, a_m) \rangle \in E_m,$$

where  $a_v = (D_v)^\varepsilon$ ,  $v = 1, 2, \dots, m$  with an arbitrary  $\varepsilon \in \Gamma \begin{pmatrix} A & B & C \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .

Case 1:  $A = \infty$ .

If we take (be aware of  $(A, B, C, D_1, \dots, D_m) \in [n; S]$ )

$$z^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{C-B} (z-B) \quad \text{for } z \in S$$

and  $\infty^\varepsilon = \infty$ , so

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{array} \right]^* = \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1 & C \end{array} \right), \left( \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_2 & C \end{array} \right), \dots, \left( \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_m & C \end{array} \right) \right\rangle = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{array} \right].$$

Case 2:  $B = \infty$ .

Take

$$z^\varepsilon = \begin{cases} (C-A) \frac{1}{z-A} & \text{for } z \neq \infty, A, \\ 0 & \text{for } z = \infty, \\ \infty & \text{for } z = A. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (a_1, \dots, a_m) \rangle &= \left\langle \left( (C-A) \frac{1}{D_1-A}, \dots, (C-A) \frac{1}{D_m-A} \right) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left( \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1 & C \end{array} \right), \dots, \left( \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_m & C \end{array} \right) \right\rangle = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{array} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Case 3:  $C = \infty$ .

Take

$$z^\varepsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{z-A} (A-B) + 1 & \text{for } z \neq \infty, A, \\ 1 & \text{for } z = \infty, \\ \infty & \text{for } z = A. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{D_v-A} (A-B) + 1 = \frac{1}{D_v-A} ((A-B) + (D_v-A)) = \frac{1}{A-D_v} (B-D_v)$$

and therefore,

$$\langle (a_1, \dots, a_m) \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{bmatrix}.$$

Case 4:  $\infty \notin \{A, B, C\}$ .

Define

$$a \equiv (B - A)(B - C)^{-1}(C - A), \quad c \equiv a(A - B)^{-1}$$

and

$$z^s = \begin{cases} a \frac{1}{z - A} + c & z \neq \infty, A, \\ c & \text{for } z = \infty, \\ \infty & z = A. \end{cases}$$

This is the mapping  $\psi(a, 1, c, A)$  in the notation of [3]. For  $D_v = \infty$  we have

$$D_v^s = c = (A - B) \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ D_v & C \end{pmatrix} (A - B)^{-1}.$$

For  $D_v \neq \infty$  we get (be aware of  $D_v \notin \{A, B, C\}$ )

$$D_v^s = a \frac{1}{D_v - A} + c = (A - B) \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ D_v & C \end{pmatrix} (A - B)^{-1}.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (a_1, \dots, a_m) \rangle &= \left\langle \left( t \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ D_1 & C \end{pmatrix} t^{-1}, \dots, t \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ D_m & C \end{pmatrix} t^{-1} \right) \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle \left( \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ D_1 & C \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ D_m & C \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

holds with  $t \equiv A - B$ . Now altogether we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{bmatrix}^* = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ D_1, \dots, D_m & C \end{bmatrix}.$$

LEMMA 2. Consider  $(A_1, \dots, A_n) \in [n; S]$  and  $\gamma \in \Gamma(S)$ . Then

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1^\gamma & A_2^\gamma \\ A_4^\gamma, \dots, A_n^\gamma & A_3^\gamma \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4, \dots, A_n & A_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Proof. Lemma 1 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ \begin{array}{cc} A_1^\gamma & A_2^\gamma \\ A_4^\gamma, \dots, A_n^\gamma & A_3^\gamma \end{array} \right] &= \left\{ (A_4^{\gamma\tau}, \dots, A_n^{\gamma\tau}) \mid \tau \in \Gamma \left( \begin{array}{ccc} A_1^\gamma & A_2^\gamma & A_3^\gamma \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right) \right\} \\ &= \left\{ (A_4^\delta, \dots, A_n^\delta) \mid \delta \in \Gamma \left( \begin{array}{ccc} A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right) \right\} = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4, \dots, A_n & A_3 \end{array} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of Lemma 2 we get that the pairs  $(I, \omega)$  of the theorem are  $n$ -point-invariants.

It remains to prove that every  $n$ -point-invariant can be described as was done in the theorem.

So let us consider an arbitrary  $n$ -point-invariant  $(I, \omega)$ . We have to prove that

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} A_1 & A_2 \\ A_4, \dots, A_n & A_3 \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} B_1 & B_2 \\ B_4, \dots, B_m & B_3 \end{array} \right]$$

implies  $(A_1, \dots, A_n)^\omega = (B_1, \dots, B_n)^\omega$  for elements  $(A_1, \dots, A_n), (B_1, \dots, B_n)$  of  $[n; S]$ . With

$$\xi \in \Gamma \left( \begin{array}{ccc} A_1 & A_2 & A_3 \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right), \quad \eta \in \Gamma \left( \begin{array}{ccc} B_1 & B_2 & B_3 \\ \infty & 0 & 1 \end{array} \right)$$

and Lemma 2 we get

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} \infty & 0 \\ A_4^\xi, \dots, A_n^\xi & 1 \end{array} \right] = \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \infty & 0 \\ B_4^\eta, \dots, B_n^\eta & 1 \end{array} \right]$$

and so

$$\langle (A_4^\xi, \dots, A_n^\xi) \rangle = \langle (B_4^\eta, \dots, B_n^\eta) \rangle.$$

This implies the existence of an element  $t \in S^*$  such that  $A_v^\xi = t B_v^\eta t^{-1}$  for  $v = 4, \dots, n$ .

Denote the inner automorphism of  $S$ , induced by  $t$ , by  $\iota$ . Then we have

$$A_v^\gamma = B_v, \quad v = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

with  $\gamma \equiv \xi \iota^{-1} \eta^{-1} \in \Gamma(S)$ . Thus

$$(A_1, \dots, A_n)^\omega = (A_1^\gamma, \dots, A_n^\gamma)^\omega = (B_1, \dots, B_n)^\omega$$

is true.

As an application we determine in case  $S$  is the sfield of quaternions

$$\left[ \begin{array}{cc} \infty & 0 \\ i, 2i & 1 \end{array} \right] = \langle (i, 2i) \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{cc} \infty & 0 \\ -i, 2i & 1 \end{array} \right] = \langle (-i, 2i) \rangle.$$

Because there is no inner automorphism  $\varrho$  such that  $(-i)^\varrho = i$  and  $(2i)^\varrho = 2i$  we get  $\langle(i, 2i)\rangle \neq \langle(-i, 2i)\rangle$ , what implies that  $(\infty, 0, 1, i, 2i)$ ,  $(\infty, 0, 1, -i, 2i)$  are in different orbits in correspondence with our previous example.

#### References

- [1] J. Aczél, S. Gołąb, M. Kuczma und E. Siwek, *Das Doppelverhältnis als Lösung einer Funktionalgleichung*, Ann. Polon. Math. 9 (1960), p. 183-187.
- [2] W. Benz, *Die 4-Punkt-Invarianten in der projektiven Geraden über einem Schiefkörper*, ibidem 21 (1968), p. 97-101.
- [3] W. Benz, *Zur Geometrie der Körpererweiterungen*, Can. J. Math. XXI (1969), p. 1097-1122.
- [4] S. Topa, *On a generalization of the functional equation for the harmonic ratio of four points on a projective line over an arbitrary commutative field*, Ann. Polon. Math. 23 (1970), p. 65-72.

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 10. 1. 1971*

---