Pacific Journal of Mathematics

THE LEVI DECOMPOSITION OF A SPLIT (B, N)-PAIR

N. B. Tinberg

Vol. 91, No. 1 November 1980

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 91, No. 1, 1980

THE LEVI DECOMPOSITION OF A SPLIT (B, N)-PAIR

N. B. TINBERG

Let p be a prime number. If G is a finite group with a split (B, N)-pair of characteristic p then each parabolic subgroup G_J of G can be written as a semidirect product of certain subgroups C_J and L_J. Moreover G_J is the full normalizer of C_J in G.

1. Introduction. Let G be a Chevalley group. The set of its parabolic subgroups $\{G_J \mid J \subseteq R\}$ is indexed by the subsets of the set R of fundamental roots of the associated Lie algebra. Each G_J admits a decomposition of the following form:

$$G_J = C_J L_J$$

where $C_J \trianglelefteq G_J$ and $C_J \cap L_J = \{1\}$. Furthermore, G_J is the normalizer of C_J in G. This decomposition of G_J into the semidirect product of C_J and L_J is called the Levi decomposition and L_J and its conjugates in C_J are called the Levi subgroups of G_J (see [2, p. 118-119]). In this paper we show that if G is a finite group with a split (B, N)-pair of characteristic p then the parabolic subgroups of G admit a similar decomposition.

The difficulty in proving the existence of the Levi decomposition for an arbitrary finite group with a split (B, N)-pair is showing that $C_J \trianglelefteq G_J$ (Lemma 1) and that L_J is itself a group with a split (B, N)-pair (Lemma A). Curtis proves these facts in [5, Proposition 1.5(a), (d), p. 669] and concludes that G admits a Levi decomposition. However, his arguments depend on the use of the commutator relations ([5, Proposition 1.4(f), p. 669]) and the proof of these relations relies heavily on the Fong-Seitz classification ([6], [7]) of split (B, N)-pairs of rank 2. It is the advantage of this present note to prove the required facts without these commutator relations, but under the assumption

$$(*) \qquad U \cap U^{w_i} \trianglelefteq U \quad \text{for all} \quad w_i \in R .$$

The reader should note that (*) appears as a hypothesis in [7, Theorem D, p. 238]. Moreover, in the case when p is an odd prime (*) follows using a very strong result on 2-transitive permutation groups due to Kantor and Seitz ([8, Theorem C′, p. 131]. See [10, proof of Theorem 4.5].). That result is essential to the Fong-Seitz classification (see [6, p. 2]). By assuming (*) we too then employ the Kantor-Seitz result; however, since we do not refer to the Fong-

Seitz papers, we have achieved a substantial simplification of the existing proof.

Throughout our discussion $G = (G, B, N, R, U)$ will denote a finite group with a split (B, N)-pair of characteristic p and rank n (see [4, Definition 2.1, p. B-8]). Hence G satisfies the following conditions:

(i) G has a (B, N)-pair ([4, Definition 2.1, p. B-8]) where $H = B \cap N$ and the Weyl group $W = N/H$ is generated by the set of involutions $R = \{w_1, \cdots, w_n\}$.

(ii) $H = \bigcap_{n \in N} n^{-1}Bn$.

(iii) U is a normal p-subgroup of B; $B = U \cdot H$ is a semidirect product and H is abelian with order prime to p.

Notice that (iii) tells us that we always have a Levi decomposition in the case $J = \Phi$, $G_\Phi = B$.

The author wishes to thank J. A. Green for his helpful suggestions.

2. Preliminaries.

The Weyl group of a (B, N)-pair is isomorphic to the Weyl group of a root system in Euclidean space in such a way that R corresponds to the set of fundamental reflections (see [9, p. 439]). We therefore define $\Delta = \{a_i \mid w_i \in R\}$ to be the set of fundamental roots of this root system.

Let $\nu: N \to W$ be the natural epimorphism. For each subset $J \subseteq R$, the parabolic subgroup $G_J = (G_J, B, N_J, J, U)$ is an unsaturated split (B, N)-pair of characteristic p and rank $|J|$ where $W_J = \langle w_i \mid w_i \in J \rangle$ and $N_J = \nu^{-1}(W_J)$ (see [1, Proposition 1, p. 28]). The group $G_J = BN_JB$ is unsaturated (see [10]) since $\bigcap_{n \in N_J} n^{-1}Bn$ may be larger than H; that is, $\bigcap_{n \in N_J} U^n > 1$. Any $w \in W$ can be written as a minimal product of the generators in R. We denote by $l(w)$ the length of such an expression. For each $J \subseteq R$, w_J will denote the unique element of maximal length in W_J. In the case $J = R$ we write w_0 for w_R. If X is any subset of G and $g \in G$, then $X^g = g^{-1}Xg$.

DEFINITIONS. Let $w \in W$. Then ${}_wU^- = U \cap U^{w_0w}$, ${}_wU^+ \cap U^w$. Write ${}_{w^{-1}}U^-$ as U_w^- and ${}_{w^{-1}}U^+$ as U_w^+. In the case $w = w_i$ we write U_i for ${}_{w_i}U^-$. Let $V_i = U_i^{w_i}$ and $V = U^{w_0}$. Set $G_i = \langle U_i, V_i \rangle$ and $H_i = H \cap G_i$.

Let $(w_i) \in N$ be such that $(w_i)H = w_i (w_i \in R)$. As in [3, Lemma 2.2, p. 351] we choose

(a) $$(w_i) \in G_i \quad \text{for each} \quad w_i \in R\ .$$

In which case

(b) $$G_i = U_iH_i \cup U_iH_i(w_i)U_i$$

for all $w_i \in R$ ([3, Lemma 2.7, p. 351]).

DEFINITIONS. For each $J \subseteq R$ let $L_J = \langle H, (U_i)^w \mid w \in W_J, w_i \in J\rangle$. Set $U_J = {}_{w_J}U^-$, $B_J = HU_J$.

Notice that $L_J = \langle H, (G_i)^w \mid w \in W_J, w_i \in J\rangle$ and that

$$L_J = \langle H, G_i \mid w_i \in J\rangle \tag{c}$$

by our choice of representatives (a).

LEMMA A. *If G is a finite group with a split (B, N)-pair then (L_J, B_J, N_J, J, U_J) is a split (B, N)-pair for any $J \subseteq R$.*

Curtis proved Lemma A using the commutator relations ([5, Proposition 1.4(f), Proposition 1.5(d), p. 669]). The following proof was suggested to the author by J. A. Green. We first require:

LEMMA B. *Let $w \in W_J$. Then ${}_wU^- \subseteq U_J$. In particular $U_i \subseteq U_J$ for all $w_i \in J$.*

Proof. Write $w_J = vw$ with $l(v) + l(w) = l(w_J)$. By [10, Lemma 2.2], $U_J = {}_wU^-({}_vU^-)^w$ and the result follows.

Proof of Lemma A. We verify the (B, N)-pair axioms as given, for example in [4, p. B-8]:

(i) $L_J = \langle B_J, N_J\rangle$ and $B_J \cap N_J \leqq N_J$.

Let $w_J = w_{i_1} \cdots w_{i_q}$ be a reduced expression for w_J with all $w_{i_s} \in J$ $(1 \leqq s \leqq q)$. Then

$$U_J = (U_{i_q})(U_{i_{q-1}})^{w_{i_q}} \cdots (U_{i_1})^{w_{i_2}\cdots w_{i_q}}$$

by [4, Proposition 3.3(vi), p. B-13]. Hence $U_J \leqq L_J$ and $B_J \subseteq L_J$ since $H \subseteq L_J$. By (a) and (c) L_J contains each (w_i) where $w_i \in J$ so that $N_J \subseteq L_J$. Hence $\langle B_J, N_J\rangle \subseteq L_J$. Conversely, if $w_i \in J$ then $U_i \subseteq U_J \subseteq \langle B_J, N_J\rangle$ by Lemma B and $Hw \subseteq N_J \subseteq \langle B_J, N_J\rangle$ all $w \in W_J$. Therefore $(U_i)^w \subseteq \langle B_J, N_J\rangle$ all $w \in W_J$ and $L_J \subseteq \langle B_J, N_J\rangle$. We also have that $H \subseteq B_J \cap N_J \subseteq B \cap N = H$ and (i) is proved.

(ii) The finite group $W_J \cong N_J/(N_J \cap B_J) = N_J/H$ is generated by the set J of involutions.

(iii) For all $w_i \in J$ and $w \in W_J$ there holds $w_iB_Jw \subseteq B_JwB_J \cup B_Jw_iwB_J$. To prove (iii) we need only show that

$$(w_i)u(w) \in B_JwB_J \cup B_Jw_iwB_J \tag{1}$$

for any $u \in U_J$. By [4, Proposition 3.3(iii), p. B-13] we may write $u = u_1u_2$ with $u_1 \in U_w^-$, $u_2 \in U_w^+$. By Lemma B, $u_1 \in U_J$. So $u_2 \in U_J$ and $u_2 \in U_w^+ \cap U_J = U \cap U^{w^{-1}} \cap U \cap U^{w_0w_J}$ and $(w)^{-1}u_2(w) \in U^w \cap U \cap U^{w_0w_Jw} \subseteq {}_{w_Jw}U^- \subseteq U_J$ by Lemma B. Therefore

$$(w_i)u(w) = (w_i)u_1(w)(w)^{-1}u_2(w) \in (w_i)u_1(w)B_J .$$

It is therefore sufficient to prove (1) for any $u(=u_1) \in U_w^+$. We examine the following two cases:

Case I. $l(w_iw) = l(w) + 1$. By [4, Proposition 3.3(i), p. B-13] and Lemma B

$$(U_w^-)^{w_i} \subseteq ({}_{w_i}U^-)\cdot(U_w^-)^{w_i} = U_{w_iw}^- \subseteq U_J .$$

If $u \in U_w^-$ then

$$(w_i)u(w)B_J = (w_i)u(w_i)^{-1}(w_i)(w)B_J \subseteq U_Jw_iwB_J .$$

Hence if

(2) $\qquad l(w_iw) = l(w) + 1 \quad \text{then} \quad (w_i)u(w) \in B_Jw_iwB_J$

for any $u \in U_J$.

Case II. $l(w_iw) = l(w) - 1$. Writing $v = w_iw$ we then have $w = w_iv$ with $l(v) + 1 = l(w_iv)$ and as above

$$U_w^- = U_{w_iv}^- = {}_{w_i}U^-(U_v^-)^{w_i} = (U_v^-)^{w_i}U_i .$$

Therefore $(U_w^-)^{w_i} = (U_v^-)(U_i)^{w_i} \subseteq U_J(U_i)^{w_i}$ by Lemma B. If $u \in U_w^-$ we have $(w_i)u(w) = (w_i)u(w_i)^{-1}(w_i)(w) \in B_JgvB_J$ for some $g \in G_i$. From (b) *either* g lies in $U_iH_i \subseteq B_J$ in which case $(w_i)u(w_i) \in B_Jw_iwB_J$ *or* g lies in $U_iH_i(w_i)H_i \subseteq B_Jw_iB_J$ in which case $(w_i)u(w) \in B_Jw_iB_JvB_J \subseteq B_Jw_ivB_J = B_JwB_J$ using (2) (with v replacing w). Thus (1) holds in Case II.

(iv) For all $w_i \in J$, $w_iB_Jw_i \neq B_J$. Now $U_i \subseteq B_J$ so that $w_iB_Jw_i \supseteq (U_i)^{w_i}$. If (iv) were false then $w_iB_Jw_i = B_J \supseteq (U_i)^{w_i}$ so that $(U_i)^{w_i} \subseteq U$ contrary to [4, Proposition 3.3(v), p. B-13].

The (B, N)-pair is saturated since

$$(U_J)^{w_J} \cap U_J = U \cap U^{w_0w_J} \cap U^{w_J} \cap U^{w_0} \subseteq U \cap V = \{1\} .$$

3. *Proof of the Theorem.* We now state our theorem and prove it by a succession of lemmas. Assume (*) holds:

THEOREM (*Levi Decomposition*). *Let $G = (G, B, N, R, U)$ be a finite group with a split (B, N)-pair of characteristic p. For each subset $J \subseteq R$, there exist subgroups C_J and L_J such that*

(a) *$G_J = C_JL_J$ where $C_J \trianglelefteq G_J$ and $C_J \cap L_J = \{1\}$.*

(b) *The normalizer in G of C_J is G_J.*

Fix $J \subseteq R$. Let $C_J = \bigcap_{n \in N_J} U^n$. Then $C_J = U \cap U^{w_J}$ and $C_J^w = C_J$ for all $w \in W_J$ by [10, Lemma 2.1 and the subsequent remark]. It can easily be shown that C_J is generated by certain root subgroups of G as in [5, p. 669] or [2, p. 119]. In the special case $J = R$ we know that $C = C_R = U \cap U^{w_0} = \{1\}$ since G is saturated.

LEMMA 1. $C_J \trianglelefteq G_J$.

Proof. The result follows by [10, Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3].

LEMMA 2. *Let* $L_J = \langle H, G_i \mid w_i \in J \rangle$. *Then* $G_J = \langle C_J, L_J \rangle$.

Proof. Notice that $\langle C_J, L_J \rangle = \langle C_J, B_J, N_J \rangle$ by (i) in the proof of Lemma A so that $\langle C_J, L_J \rangle = \langle C_J, U_J, N_J \rangle = \langle B, N_J \rangle$ by [4, Proposition 3.3(ii), p. B-13] and the result follows.

Since $C_J \trianglelefteq G_J$,

LEMMA 3. $G_J = C_J L_J$.

LEMMA 4. $U \cap L_J \subseteq U_J$.

Proof. By Lemma A, we have a Bruhat Decomposition

$$L_J = \bigcup_{w \in W_J} B_J w B_J .$$

If $w \neq 1$, $w \in W_J$ then $B_J w B_J$ does not intersect B since $B_J w B_J \subseteq BwB$ and $BwB \cap B$ is empty. Hence $B \cap L_J \subseteq B_J$ and Lemma 4 follows.

LEMMA 5. $C_J \cap L_J = \{1\}$.

Proof. $C_J \cap L_J = C_J \cap U \cap L_J \subseteq C_J \cap U_J = \{1\}$ by [4, Proposition 3.3(iii), p. B-13].

The proof of the following lemma is based on [2, p. 120].

LEMMA 6. *The normalizer,* $N_G(C_J)$, *of* C_J *in* G *is* G_J.

Proof. We know that $G_J \subseteq N_G(C_J)$ so that $N_G(C_J) = G_K$ with $J \subseteq K$. If $J \subset K$ take $w_i \in K$, $w_i \notin J$. Then by [4, Proposition 3.3(v), p. B-13], $U_i \subseteq {}_wU^+$ for any $w \in W_J$ since $w(a_i) > 0$ all $w \in W_j$. But $C_J = \bigcap_{w \in W_J} {}_wU^+$ so that $U_i \subseteq C_J$. Since $w_i \in G_K$, $U_i^{w_i} \subseteq C_J^{w_i} = C_J$. On the other hand $U_i^{w_i w_0} \subseteq U$ by [4, Proposition 3.3(v), p. B-13] since $w_i(a_i) = -a_i$. Therefore, $U_i^{w_i} \subseteq C_J \cap V \subseteq C \cap V = \{1\}$ and $U_i = \{1\}$, contrary to the (B, N)-pair axioms since for all $w_i \in R$, $w_i U w_i \neq U$ and $U = U_{iw_i} U^+$ (see [4, Proposition 3.3(iii), p. B-13]).

REFERENCES

1. N. Bourbaki, *Groupes et algébres de Lie*, Chapters 4, 5, 6, Herman, Paris, 1968.
2. R. W. Carter, *Simple groups of Lie type*, John Wiley & Sons, London-New York-Sydney-Toronto: Interscience, 1972.
3. R. W. Carter and G. Lusztig, *Modular representations of finite groups of Lie type*, Proc. London Math. Soc., (3) **32** (1976), 347-384.
4. C. W. Curtis, *Modular representations of finite groups with split* (B, N)*-pairs*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics No. 131, (B-1)-(B-39). Berlin-Heidelberg-New York: Springer, 1970.
5. ———, *Reduction theorems for characters of finite groups of Lie type*, J. Math. Soc. Japan, **27,** No. 4, (1975).
6. P. Fong and G. Seitz, *Groups with a* (B, N)*-pair of rank* 2. *I,* Inventiones Math., **21** (1973), 1-57.
7. ———, *Groups with a* (B, N)*-pair of rank* 2. *II,* Inventiones Math., **24** (1974), 191-239.
8. W. M. Kantor and G. Seitz, *Some results on 2-transitive groups*, Inventiones Math., **13** (1971), 125-142.
9. F. Richen, *Modular representations of split* (B, N)*-pairs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **140** (1969), 435-460.
10. N. Tinberg, *Modular representations of finite groups with unsaturated split* (B, N)*-pairs,* Canada. J. Math., **XXXII,** No. 3 (1980), 714-733.

Received September 27, 1978 and in revised form September 12, 1979.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CARBONDALE, IL 62901
AND
OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE
LOS ANGELES, CA 91206

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 91, No. 1 November, 1980