

# Symmetric translation nets

By Dieter Jungnickel at Gießen

---

## 1. Introduction

Let  $\Sigma$  be an incidence structure with a parallelism  $\parallel$  (i.e. an equivalence relation on the block set of  $\Sigma$  such that each  $\parallel$ -class partitions the point set of  $\Sigma$ ).  $\Sigma$  is called an  $(s, r; \mu)$ -net provided that any two non-parallel blocks intersect in precisely  $\mu$  points and that there are  $r$  parallel classes each of which has  $s$  blocks in it. It is easily seen that an  $(s, r; \mu)$ -net is the same as an affine  $1$ - $(s^2\mu, s\mu, r)$ -design. Such structures have found considerable interest; in case  $\mu=1$  they are just the well-known Bruck nets (see [4], [5]) which are equivalent to mutually orthogonal sets of Latin squares providing a very important tool in the construction of block designs. We mention two special classes of  $(s, r; \mu)$ -nets: A *complete*  $(s, \mu)$ -net is an  $(s, r; \mu)$ -net with  $r = \frac{s^2\mu - 1}{s - 1}$ . This is the maximum value of  $r$  one may have in any  $(s, r; \mu)$ -net and it is reached in fact precisely when simultaneously  $\Sigma$  is an (affine) 2-design. For a proof, see e.g. the survey paper of Mavron [14] who also discusses the second special class of nets we want to consider, i.e. *symmetric*  $(s, \mu)$ -nets: These are  $(s, s\mu; \mu)$ -nets whose dual is likewise an  $(s, s\mu; \mu)$ -net.

The author has studied nets with various types of collineation groups in a series of papers (for references, cf. [9]). Here we will be concerned once more with *translation* nets, i.e. with  $(s, r; \mu)$ -nets admitting a collineation group  $G$  acting regularly on the point set and fixing each parallel class of  $\Sigma$ . Translation nets have been studied in case  $\mu=1$  by Sprague [16] and in general by the author in [9]. There we have given lower and upper bounds on  $r$  for various types of translation groups (abelian, nilpotent, . . .). The main result of this paper was that the maximum value for  $r$  in a non-elementary abelian  $p$ -group is roughly only the  $p$ -th part of that in the corresponding elementary abelian group (see [9], Section 4). Using this and the result of Schulz [15] who proved that any translation 2-design has a  $p$ -group (in fact of exponent  $p$ ) as its translation group we obtained:

**Theorem 1.** *An affine translation 2-design with parameters  $(s, \mu)$  and translation group  $G$  exists iff*

- (i)  *$s$  is a prime power and  $\mu$  a power of  $s$ ;*
- (ii)  *$G$  is elementary abelian.*

0075-4102/82/0335-0010\$02.00

Copyright by Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Previously, this was only known if one had required the existence of a non-trivial central dilatation. Regarding symmetric nets, we had shown

**Lemma 1.** *A symmetric translation  $(s, \mu)$ -net with nilpotent translation group  $G$  exists iff*

- (i)  $s$  and  $\mu$  are powers of the same prime  $p$ ;
- (ii)  $G$  is elementary abelian.

We conjectured that the hypothesis that  $G$  be nilpotent is unnecessary in this case, too. We shall now use arguments in analogy to those of Schulz [15] to show the following

**Lemma 2.** *The translation group of a symmetric translation net is necessarily a  $p$ -group.*

Combining Lemmas 1 and 2, we immediately have

**Theorem 2.** *A symmetric translation  $(s, \mu)$ -net with translation group  $G$  exists iff*

- (i)  $s$  and  $\mu$  are powers of the same prime  $p$ ;
- (ii)  $G$  is elementary abelian.

The constructive part of this assertion was already given in [10]. We will now proceed to proving Lemma 2 using the classification of all finite groups with a partition (i.e. a set of subgroups which pairwise intersect in 1 only and which cover the group).

## 2. The proof

Let  $\Sigma$  be a symmetric translation  $(s, \mu)$ -net with translation group  $G$ . Then  $\Sigma$  may be represented in the following way (see [9]): points are the elements of  $G$  and blocks are the cosets of a family  $\mathcal{U} = \{U_1, \dots, U_{s\mu}\}$  of subgroups of  $G$  satisfying

- (1)  $|U_i| = s\mu$  for  $i = 1, \dots, s\mu$ ;
- (2)  $|U_i \cap U_j| = \mu$  whenever  $i \neq j$ ;

and then also

- (3)  $U_i U_j = G$  whenever  $i \neq j$ .

(In fact one chooses the  $U_i$  to be the stabilizers in  $G$  of the blocks through 1). We now denote by  $N$  the set of all points not joined to 1, i.e.

- (4)  $N = \{g \in G: 1 \text{ and } g \text{ are not joined}\}.$

As  $\Sigma$  is a symmetric net, not being joined it induces an equivalence relation on the point set; using this, one immediately sees that  $N$  is a subgroup (of order  $s$ ) of  $G$ , as collineations preserve the property of being (not) joined.

Next recall that a *line* of  $\Sigma$  is the intersection of all blocks joining two given points (which are on a common block at all). Lines either are equal or intersect in at most 1 point. Now it is easily seen that  $N$  together with all stabilizers  $G_L$  (where  $L$  is any line through 1) forms a partition  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $G$ . Assume first that  $\mu=1$ ; then in fact  $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{U}\cup\{N\}$  is a congruence partition in the sense of André [1], i.e.  $\mathcal{P}$  describes an affine translation plane. It is well-known that  $G$  then has to be an (elementary abelian)  $p$ -group.

Thus assume  $\mu\neq 1$  henceforth. As  $\mathcal{P}$  is a (non-trivial) partition of  $G$ , the results of Baer [2], [3], Kegel [11] and Suzuki [17] imply that  $G$  is one of the following: a  $p$ -group of order  $>p$ , a Frobenius group, an  $HT(p)$ -group or isomorphic to  $S_4$ , to  $PGL(2, p^n)$  or  $PSL(2, p^n)$  with  $p^n\geq 4$ , or to a Suzuki group  $Sz(q)$ . We will eliminate all but the first case, thus proving Lemma 2.

First assume that  $G$  is a Frobenius group; let  $K$  be its kernel and  $H$  a Frobenius complement of  $G$ . Using Folgerung 4.9 of Baer [2]  $H$  has no non-trivial partition; thus  $H$  is contained in a component  $X$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Let  $a$  denote the order of  $H$  and  $b$  the order of  $K$ ; then  $a|b-1$  and in particular  $(a, b)=1$ . Now assume first that  $X\subset N$ ; then  $a|s$  and  $b=s\mu\frac{s}{a}$  contradicting  $(a, b)=1$ . Thus  $H$  is contained in a line stabilizer, hence in a block stabilizer  $U$ ; therefore  $a|s\mu$ . Again  $b=s\frac{s\mu}{a}$  and as  $(a, b)=1$  we conclude that  $(a, s)=1$ , i.e.  $a|\mu$ , say  $\mu=ac$ . Then  $b=s^2c$  and  $(a, c)=1$ . Now consider the set  $\mathcal{V}=\{U_i\cap K: i=1, \dots, s\mu\}$ . Note that each  $U_i\cap K$  has order  $sc$ , as  $U_iK=G$  for reasons of cardinality; also always  $|(U_i\cap K)\cap(U_j\cap K)|=|(U_i\cap U_j)\cap K|=c$  ( $i\neq j$ ) using (2) and  $(U_i\cap U_j)K=G$  (again for reasons of cardinality:  $a|\mu$  and  $s^2c=|K|$ ). But this shows that  $\mathcal{V}$  satisfies conditions (1) and (2) with  $\mu$  replaced by  $c$ ; thus  $\mathcal{V}$  defines an  $(s, s\mu; c)$ -net. But  $N\subset K$ , as no Frobenius complement may intersect  $N$  non-trivially (because of  $(s, a)=1$ ); hence this new net still contains points which are not joined. But this implies (see [7]) that  $r\leq sc < s\mu$ , a contradiction.

Next assume that  $G$  is an  $HT(p)$ -group, i.e.  $G$  is neither a Frobenius nor a  $p$ -group, and one has  $[G:H_p(G)]=p$  (where  $H_p(G)$  is the subgroup of  $G$  generated by all elements of order  $\neq p$ ). According to a result of Hughes and Thompson [8], there exists an element  $g$  in  $H=H_p(G)$  of order  $p$ . But  $H$  is nilpotent (see Kegel [12]) and thus the centre  $Z(H)$  of  $H$  has order divisible by  $p$  and also by another prime (otherwise  $G$  would be a  $p$ -group). Using Folgerung 2.3 of Baer [2] one has that  $H$  is contained in a component of  $\mathcal{P}$ ; as  $H$  is a maximal subgroup of  $G$  it coincides with this component and then  $H$  also must be a component of  $\mathcal{U}$ ; but this implies  $\mu=1$ , a contradiction.

If  $G=S_4$ , then necessarily  $s=2$  and  $\mu=6$ ; thus all components have order 12 which is absurd, as the only subgroup of  $S_4$  of order 12 is  $A_4$ .

Next let  $G = PSL(2, q)$  where  $q$  is even. Then  $G$  has order  $s^2\mu = (q+1)q(q-1)$  and contains elements of order  $q+1$  and of order  $q-1$  (see Dickson [6], § 260). Clearly no such element can be in  $N$  (otherwise  $q+1$  (resp.  $q-1$ ) would divide  $s$ , hence  $(q+1)^2$  (resp.  $(q-1)^2$ ) would divide  $|G|$ ) and thus these elements are in components of  $\mathcal{U}$ ; as all such components have the same order  $s\mu$  we conclude that  $(q+1)(q-1) | s\mu$ , i.e. that  $[G : U] \leq q$  for  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ . But according Dickson [6], § 262  $G$  has no subgroup of index  $< q+1$  unless  $q=2$ , which were absurd.

Next let  $G = PSL(2, q)$  where  $q = p^n$  is odd. Then  $G$  has order  $s^2\mu = \frac{(q+1)q(q-1)}{2}$  and contains elements of orders  $\frac{q+1}{2}$  and  $\frac{q-1}{2}$  (see [6], § 260). As before one sees that  $\frac{(q+1)(q-1)}{4}$  divides  $s\mu$ ; but  $G$  also contains an element of order  $p$  and clearly  $p | s\mu$ . Thus  $\frac{p(q+1)(q-1)}{4}$  divides  $s\mu$  and one has  $[G : U] \leq \frac{2q}{p} < q$  for  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ . Again using [6], § 262  $q$  is one of 3, 5, 7, 9 or 11; in these cases 3, 5, 7, 6, 11 are the smallest possible indices which immediately rule out all cases except  $q=9$ . In this case  $s=12$ ,  $\mu=5$  and all components  $U$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  are isomorphic to  $A_5$  (see [6], § 260). But  $U$  contains an element of order  $\frac{q-1}{2} = 4$  and  $A_5$  does not contain such an element, a contradiction.

Now let  $G = PGL(2, q)$ . If  $q$  is even, then  $PGL(2, q) = PSL(2, q)$  has already been seen to be impossible. Thus let  $q = p^n$  be odd. Then  $G$  has order  $s^2\mu = (q+1)q(q-1)$  and contains elements of orders  $p$ ,  $q-1$  and  $q+1$ . As before, one sees that  $\frac{p(q^2-1)}{2}$  divides  $s\mu$  (note that  $(q+1, q-1) = 2$  in this case!). Choose a component  $U$  of  $\mathcal{U}$  and put  $U_0 := U \cap PSL(2, q)$ . Then either  $U \leq PSL(2, q)$  and  $[G : U] \leq \frac{q}{p}$  which is immediately seen to be impossible using [6], § 262 again; or  $U_0$  has order  $\frac{|U|}{2}$  and we have  $[PSL : U_0] \leq \frac{2q}{p}$ . As above, application of [6], § 262 leaves only the possibility  $q=9$ ; but then  $G$  contains an element of order  $q-1=8$ , and so  $PSL$  contains its square, i.e. an element of order 4, and one gets a contradiction as before. ( $U_0$  then would be isomorphic to  $A_5$ ).

Finally it remains to consider the Suzuki group  $Sz(q)$  (for the Suzuki groups, see Suzuki [18] or Lüneburg [13]). Here  $|G| = s^2\mu = (q^2+1)q^2(q-1)$  where  $q = 2^{2a+1}$ ; furthermore  $G$  contains elements of orders 4,  $q-1$ ,  $q+r+1$ ,  $q-r+1$  where  $r^2 = 2q$ , i.e.  $r = 2^{a+1}$ . As before one sees that  $(q-1)(q+r+1)(q-r+1) = (q-1)(q^2+1)$  divides  $s\mu$ ; and clearly also  $4 | s\mu$  (if  $g$  has order 4, then either  $g \in N$  and  $4 | s$  or  $g \in U$  (for some  $U \in \mathcal{U}$ ) and  $4 | s\mu$ ). Thus one has  $[G : U] \leq \frac{q^2}{4}$  which is impossible in  $Sz(q)$  (see [18] or [13]).

Hence indeed  $G$  is a  $p$ -group and the proof of Lemma 2 (and thus of Theorem 2) is complete.

**Note added in proof.** In the mean time, T. C. Hine and V. C. Mavron have given an elementary proof for Theorems 1 and 2 in their paper "Translations of symmetric and complete nets", to appear in Math. Z.

### References

- [1] *J. André*, Über nicht-desarguessche Ebenen mit transitiver Translationsgruppe, Math. Z. **60** (1954), 156—186.
- [2] *R. Baer*, Partitionen endlicher Gruppen, Math. Z. **75** (1961), 333—372.
- [3] *R. Baer*, Einfache Partitionen endlicher Gruppen mit nicht-trivialer Fittingscher Untergruppe, Arch. Math. **12** (1961), 81—89.
- [4] *R. H. Bruck*, Finite nets. I, Numerical invariants, Canadian J. Math. **3** (1951), 94—107.
- [5] *R. H. Bruck*, Finite nets. II, Uniqueness and imbedding, Pacific J. Math. **13** (1963), 421—457.
- [6] *L. E. Dickson*, Linear groups, New York 1955.
- [7] *T. C. Hine, V. C. Mavron*, Embeddable transversal designs, Discr. Math. **29** (1980), 191—200.
- [8] *D. R. Hughes, J. G. Thompson*, The  $H_p$ -problem and the structure of the  $H_p$ -groups, Pacific J. Math. **9** (1959), 1097—1102.
- [9] *D. Jungnickel*, Existence results for translation nets. In: Finite Geometries and Designs, LMS Lecture Notes **49** (1981), 172—196.
- [10] *D. Jungnickel*, A class of uniform Klingenberg matrices, Ars Comb. **10** (1980), 91—94.
- [11] *O. H. Kegel*, Nicht-einfache Partitionen endlicher Gruppen, Arch. Math. **12** (1961), 170—175.
- [12] *O. H. Kegel*, Die Nilpotenz der  $H_p$ -Gruppen, Math. Z. **75** (1961), 373—376.
- [13] *H. Lüneburg*, Die Suzukigruppen und ihre Geometrien, Lecture Notes in Math. **10**, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York 1965.
- [14] *V. C. Mavron*, Resolvable designs, affine designs, and hypernets, To appear.
- [15] *R.-H. Schulz*, Über Blockpläne mit transitiver Dilatationsgruppe, Math. Z. **98** (1967), 60—82.
- [16] *A. P. Sprague*, Nets with Singer group fixing each parallel class, To appear.
- [17] *M. Suzuki*, On a finite group with a partition, Arch. Math. **12** (1961), 241—254.
- [18] *M. Suzuki*, On a class of doubly transitive groups, Ann. Math. **75** (1962), 105—145.

---

Mathematisches Institut, Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen, Arndtstr. 2, D-6300 Gießen

Eingegangen 26. Januar 1982