

IRREDUCIBLE DISCRETE SUBGROUPS IN PRODUCTS OF SIMPLE LIE GROUPS

AZER AKHMEDOV

ABSTRACT: We produce an example of an irreducible discrete subgroup in the product $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ which is not a lattice. This answers a question asked in [15]¹

1. INTRODUCTION

We are motivated by the following question of Fisher-Mj-van Limbeek (see Question 1.6 in [15]):

Question 1. Let G_1 and G_2 be semisimple groups over local fields and $\Gamma \leq G_1 \times G_2$ be a discrete subgroup with both projections dense. Is Γ in fact an irreducible lattice in the product $G_1 \times G_2$?

[15] and [9] discuss some very interesting motivations for this question relating it also to the following question of Greenberg-Shalom:

Question 2. Let G be a semisimple Lie group with finite center and without compact factors. Suppose $\Gamma \leq G$ is a discrete, Zariski-dense subgroup of G whose commensurator $\Delta \leq G$ is dense. Is Γ an arithmetic lattice in G ?

In its own turn, Question 2 is strongly motivated by Margulis-Zimmer Conjecture (see [21] and Conjecture 1.4 of [15]). Let us note that the object Δ in Question 2 is an important characterizing object; by a landmark theorem of Margulis, Δ detects arithmeticity of lattices (in real or p -adic semisimple Lie groups with finite center and without compact factors; see [18] or Theorem 1.1. in [15]).

We provide a negative answer to Question 1 by constructing a discrete free subgroup in a product with dense projections. Let us recall that an irreducible lattice Γ in a higher rank semi-simple Lie group without a compact factor has the following property:

¹In the forthcoming update of this paper, we will extend the result (i.e. Theorem 1.1) to all isotypic products of simple Lie groups with at least two factors and without a compact factor. The proof of this more general result uses the main idea of the current version.

(i) Γ contains a copy of \mathbb{Z}^2 (see [20]).

By property (i), Γ cannot be free. Non-freeness is a weak (still a meaningful) property of higher rank irreducible lattices, but it is the easiest (that we found) to use to produce an example that needed for Question 1.

Thus our aim will be to construct free discrete subgroups (with dense projections).

Both freeness and discreteness of subgroups can be difficult to establish in various contexts/environments. For connected Lie groups, there are elementary open questions in this area even for $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ [7], [16], [17]. For the group $\text{Diff}_+(I)$, the C_0 -discreteness has been studied in [2] where a characterization of such groups have been presented in $C^{1+\epsilon}$ regularity. A more complete characterization of such groups has been presented in [3] and [4]. In [5], the C^1 -discreteness question has been discussed and some elementary open questions have been raised. We also refer the reader to [6] which directly studies free and discrete subgroups of $\text{Diff}_+(I)$. It is interesting that the $\text{Homeo}_+(I)$ and $\text{Diff}_+(I)$ environments provide other tools (not discussed in this paper) for establishing freeness and discreteness of certain subgroups. We refer the reader to a series of remarkable papers [1], [10], [11], [12], [13], [22] which establish existence of free subgroups.

Our main result is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a free discrete subgroup $\Gamma \leq SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ such that the projection of Γ to each factor is dense.*

As pointed out in [15], it is easy to produce an example with a dense projection in one of the factors. Let us also recall a classical fact that the group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}])$ is an irreducible lattice in $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times S(2, \mathbb{R})$ by the faithful representation $\rho : SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}]) \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times S(2, \mathbb{R})$ given by $\rho(A) = (A, \sigma(A))$, $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}])$ where $\sigma : SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}]) \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}])$ is the Galois isomorphism obtained from the Galois automorphism $\sigma : \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ of the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ defined as $\sigma(m + n\sqrt{2}) = m - n\sqrt{2}$, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The discreteness of $\rho(SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}]))$ comes from the fact, in it, if $\rho(A)$ converges to identity in one factor, then it escapes to infinity in the other. This phenomenon is also causing a difficulty (among some other issues) in the attempts of constructing a straightforward example for the claim of Theorem 1.1. Let us also recall that by the main result of [8], every dense group in a semi-simple Lie group contains a dense free subgroup; this result seems somewhat relevant here, but in trying to apply it (or the idea of it), one has to

fight this time to preserve the discreteness of a subgroup in the product. Question 1 is indeed at a very interesting juncture of tensions among freeness, discreteness and denseness. Another manifestation of this lies in the fact that, to establish freeness, it is more suitable to use hyperbolic or parabolic elements whereas for denseness, elliptic elements are more efficient.

Given a subgroup Γ in a product $G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_n$ of simple non-compact Lie groups with $n \geq 2$, we call Γ *irreducible* if for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\pi_i(\Gamma)$ is dense in G_i where $\pi_i : G \rightarrow G_i$ is the projection onto the i -th factor. Thus, Theorem 1.1 establishes an existence of a discrete irreducible subgroup in the product $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ which is not a lattice. In the forthcoming update of this paper, we will extend the result to all products $G = G_1 \times G_2 \times \dots \times G_n$ of simple Lie groups with $n \geq 2$ where the group G is *isotypic* (i.e. all simple factors of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ are isogenous to each other) and has no compact factors. Recall that by a result of Margulis, if G has no compact factors and admits an irreducible lattice, then it is isotypic. The converse (even without the assumption about compact factors) also holds, cf. [19].

In section 2, we will briefly review classical methods of establishing free subgroups. In Section 3, we discuss these methods in $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}])$ and indicate the difficulty in doing the same in $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}])$. Section 4 is devoted to a review of a key tool from the proof of the Tits Alternative for linear groups [14]. In the penultimate Section 5, we provide a proof of our main theorem. The final section is devoted to verifying conditions used in the proof of main theorem by specific choices of matrices and a direct computation.

Acknowledgement: I am thankful to David Fisher, Tsachik Gelander and Yehuda Shalom for being interested in this work; D.Fisher also pointed out an inaccuracy (related to Proposition 4.2) in the earlier draft of this paper.

2. KLEIN-SCHOTTKY METHOD

Let us review the argument due to Klein and Schottky which shows that the integral matrices $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ generate a free group of rank two.

We consider the action of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ on \mathbb{R}^2 and consider the open sets

$$U = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| > |y|\} \text{ and } V = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| < |y|\}$$

in \mathbb{R}^2 . The key observation is that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, $A^n(U) \subseteq V$ and $B^n(V) \subseteq U$. On the other hand, any word W in the alphabet $\{A^{\pm 1}, B^{\pm 1}\}$ is conjugate to a word W' which starts in $B^{\pm 1}$ and ends in $A^{\pm 1}$. Then, by taking $p \in U$, we obtain that $W'(p) \in V$. Hence $W'(p) \notin U$. Hence $W' \neq 1$, therefore $W \neq 1$. Notice that we also show that A and B generate a discrete free subgroup.

The argument above is also generalized as in the following lemma essentially due to F.Klein.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be a group acting on a compact Hausdorff topological space X by homeomorphisms, U, V be disjoint open sets in X and A, B be subgroups of G such that at least one of them has order at least three, moreover, $g(U) \subseteq V$ for all $g \in A \setminus \{1\}$ and $g(V) \subseteq U$ for all $g \in B \setminus \{1\}$. Then the subgroup of G generated by A and B is isomorphic to a free product $A * B$. Moreover, G is a discrete subgroup of $\text{Homeo}(X)$.*

Let us clarify that the topology of $\text{Homeo}(X)$ is the compact-open topology. If X is metrizable, then this topology can be given by a C_0 -metric on $\text{Homeo}(X)$.

We will use the following easy and direct modification of Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.2. *Let G be a group acting on a topological space by homeomorphisms and $A, B \leq G$ such that $\max\{|A|, |B|\} \geq 3$, and for all $a_i \in A \setminus \{1\}, b_i \in B \setminus \{1\}, 1 \leq i \leq k$, there exists disjoint open sets U, V in X such that $a_i(U) \subseteq V$ and $b_i(V) \subseteq U$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then the subgroup of G generated by A and B is isomorphic to a free product $A * B$.*

The proofs of both Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 are by the argument of Klein-Schottky as indicated above. The practical difference of Lemma 2.2 is that, here, the choice of open sets U, V depend on the data $\{a_1, b_1, \dots, a_k, b_k\}$. As a result, we cannot claim that the subgroup $\langle A, B \rangle$ is discrete in $\text{Homeo}(X)$ (in the case when X is compact). This is an interesting moment for us, because we are interested in methods which establish free groups without implying that the free group is also discrete. Although not using Lemma 2.2 directly, we will be using a somewhat similar idea that given a certain group G acting on a compact Hausdorff space X by homeomorphisms, we will derive another action of G by homeomorphisms on another compact Hausdorff space Y and using the ping-pong method establish that G splits as a free

product. G will be a discrete subgroup of $\text{Homeo}(Y)$, but not a discrete subgroup of $\text{Homeo}(X)$.

3. $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}])$ AND $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}])$

In this section, we let $d \geq 2$ be a square-free integer. We write $\sqrt{-d}$ to denote $\sqrt{d}i$. We will consider the rings $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}], \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}]$ and the groups $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}]), SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}])$ of integral matrices over these rings.

Let the subgroups A, B, C be defined as

$$A = \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle, B = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & m + n\sqrt{d} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : m, n \in 2\mathbb{Z} \right\}, \text{ and}$$

$$C = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & m + n\sqrt{-d} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : m, n \in 2\mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Notice that $A \cong \mathbb{Z}, B \cong \mathbb{Z}^2, C \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$. A can be viewed as a subgroup of both $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}])$ and $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}])$, whereas $B \leq SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}])$ and $C \leq SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}])$.

We will fix the notations A, B, C for the rest of this section.

Notice that the subgroup B is dense in $\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} 1 & x \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} : x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$.

The rings $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}]$ and $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}]$ significantly differ from each other, and this difference also reflects in the properties and structures of groups $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}])$ and $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}])$. We will recall the notion of a normed ring to highlight these differences.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative ring. A function $\|\cdot\| : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is called a *norm* if it satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $\|x\| = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$;
- (ii) $\|-x\| = \|x\|$;
- (iii) $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$;
- (iv) $\|xy\| \leq \|x\| \cdot \|y\|$.

$\|\cdot\|$ is called a *strict norm* if it satisfies properties (i)-(iii) and, instead of (iv), the following stronger property:

- (iv)' $\|xy\| = \|x\| \cdot \|y\|$.

For all $x = m - n\sqrt{d} \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}]$, we let $\|x\|_1 = \sqrt{m^2 - dn^2}$. Then $\|\cdot\|_1$ satisfies properties (i), (ii) and (iv) (in fact, it even satisfies a stronger property (iv)'), but does not satisfy property (iii), the triangle inequality. In contrast, in the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}]$, we can define the norm

$\|m + n\sqrt{d}i\| = \sqrt{m^2 + dn^2}$ and this even becomes a strict norm. Using this strict norm, we can prove the following

Proposition 3.2. *The subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}])$ generated by the subgroups A and C is isomorphic to $A * C \cong \mathbb{Z} * \mathbb{Z}^2$.*

The proof follows the same Klein-Schottky scheme: Let $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}]$. We consider the action of $SL(2, \mathcal{R})$ on \mathcal{R}^2 . Let $U = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^2 : \|x\| > \|y\|\}$, $V = \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}^2 : \|x\| < \|y\|\}$. Then $(A \setminus \{1\})(U) \subseteq V$ and $(C \setminus \{1\})(V) \subseteq U$, hence we can apply Lemma 2.1.

Let us emphasize that the subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}])$ generated by the subgroups A and B does not split into their free products, and because of the lack of a norm, we cannot execute the same idea. In fact, it is problematic to even find a weak (satisfactory) analog of Proposition 3.2.

4. MATRICES WITH DOMINANT EIGENVALUES

In this section, we will briefly review the tools used in the proof of Tits Alternative for linear groups. Our terminology is somewhat different from the one used in [14]. In particular, we will restrict ourselves to the real case, but the discussions can be generalized to any locally compact normed field (in particular, to any local field) as it is done in [14].

Definition 4.1. An eigenvalue λ of a matrix $C \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ is called *dominant* if λ is real, has multiplicity 1 and $|\lambda| > \max\{|\mu|, 1\}$ for any other eigenvalue μ of C . A matrix $C \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ is called *hyperbolic-like* if both C and C^{-1} have dominant eigenvalues.

The group $GL(n, \mathbf{k})$, for any field \mathbf{k} , has a standard action on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{k}}^{n-1}$. If $C \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ is hyperbolic-like, then it has unique and distinct *attracting and repelling points* $a, b \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^{n-1}$, and *characteristic crosses* Π_a, Π_b such that for any compact $K_1 \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^{n-1} \setminus \Pi_a$, $K_2 \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^{n-1} \setminus \Pi_b$ there exist open neighborhoods U_1, U_2 of a, b respectively and a natural $N \geq 1$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $A^n(K_i) \subseteq U_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 2$. The points a, b are indeed (the class of) eigenvectors of C , corresponding to the biggest and smallest eigenvalues; $\Pi_a = \mathbb{P}(V_a)$, $\Pi_b = \mathbb{P}(V_b)$ are projectivizations of subspaces $V_a, V_b \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of dimensions $n-1$ (so Π_a, Π_b are subvarieties of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^{n-1}$ of dimension $n-2$; moreover, $a \notin \Pi_a, b \notin \Pi_b$ and $a \in \Pi_b, b \in \Pi_a$).

If we let Λ_C be the set of eigenvalues, with λ, μ being the biggest and the smallest eigenvalue, then, in the subspaces V_a, V_b are associated with the set of eigenvalues $\Lambda \setminus \{\lambda\}$ and $\Lambda \setminus \{\mu\}$ respectively. In the case when $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$, we have $V_a = \text{Span}(\Lambda \setminus \{\lambda\})$ and $V_b = \text{Span}(\Lambda \setminus \{\mu\})$.

We will use the notation A_C, R_C for attractive and repelling points of C respectively and write $\mathcal{F}_C = \{A_C, R_C\}$, i.e. $A_C := a, R_C := b$. We also will write $\Pi_C^+ := \Pi_a, \Pi_C^- := \Pi_b$ and $\Pi_C = \Pi_C^+ \cup \Pi_C^-$. Let us note that if C is hyperbolic-like, then for all $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathcal{F}_{C^n} = \mathcal{F}_C$; moreover, if $n > 0$, then $A_{C^n} = A_C, R_{C^n} = R_C$ and if $n < 0$, then $A_{C^n} = R_C, R_{C^n} = A_C$. By a standard ping-pong argument, we will obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $n \geq 1$, and $A, B \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ be hyperbolic-like matrices such that $\mathcal{F}_A \cap (\mathcal{F}_B \cup \Pi_B) = \mathcal{F}_B \cap (\mathcal{F}_A \cup \Pi_A) = \emptyset$. Then there exists $N \geq 1$ such that for all $m, k \geq N$, the matrices A^m, B^k generate a free group of rank two.*

Let us note that, for any hyperbolic-like matrix $C \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$, we also have $\mathcal{F}_C \subset \Pi_C$ therefore the statement of Proposition 4.2 can be simplified by observing that $\mathcal{F}_A \cup \Pi_A = \Pi_A$ and $\mathcal{F}_B \cup \Pi_B = \Pi_B$.

We also would like to note (recall) the following easier fact which will be used in the sequel as well.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $n \geq 1$, and $A, B \in GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ be hyperbolic-like matrices such that $\mathcal{F}_A \cap \mathcal{F}_B = \emptyset$ and $A(\mathcal{F}_B) \cap \mathcal{F}_B = \emptyset$. Then $AB \neq BA$.*

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

A typical ping-pong table involves (big enough powers) of hyperbolic or parabolic elements; the dynamics of the actions allows to find copies of non-abelian free subgroups. By the nature of the argument, typically one can also establish the discreteness of these free subgroups. In this section, we will use different arguments to establish freeness of certain subgroups which are generated not by hyperbolic or parabolic elements, but by elliptic ones. Here, the obtained free subgroups will not be discrete, but they will rather be dense.

Let \mathbb{E}^2 and \mathbb{H}^2 denote the Euclidean plane and the hyperbolic plane with their standard metrics, respectively. We will identify \mathbb{E}^2 with \mathbb{R}^2 and \mathbb{H}^2 with the upper half-plane $\mathbb{R}_+^2 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y > 0\}$ considering Poincare model on the latter. This also allows us to view

\mathbb{R}_+^2 as a domain of both \mathbb{E}^2 and \mathbb{H}^2 . We will also fix an orientation on \mathbb{H}^2 (hence we fix an orientation on \mathbb{E}^2).

Recall that the orientation preserving isometry group $\text{Iso}_+(\mathbb{E}^2) \cong SO(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ of the Euclidean plane \mathbb{E}^2 is standardly generated by rotations and translations whereas for the orientation preserving isometry group $\text{Iso}_+(\mathbb{H}^2) \cong PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ of the hyperbolic plane, besides rotations and translation we also distinguish the parabolic isometries. The maximal compact subgroups (which is unique up to a conjugacy in any connected Lie group) of these (very different) Lie groups actually coincide, both being isomorphic to $SO(2, \mathbb{R})$. In both groups, a rotation either generates a finite group (if it is a torsion) or an infinite group with the closure isomorphic to \mathbb{S}^1 .

We will build a homomorphism $\Phi : SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{r}]) \rightarrow GL(4, \mathbb{R})$ as a key tool in the proof of Theorem 1.1. A crucial property of this homomorphism will lie in the fact that even for elliptic matrices $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{r}])$, the associated matrix $\Phi(A)$ in $GL(4, \mathbb{R})$ can still be hyperbolic-like.

Let $r \geq 2$ be a square-free integer. Any matrix $A \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{r}])$ acts on $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{r}]^2$. Any $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{r}]^2$ can be written as $X + \sqrt{r}Y \in \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{r}]^2$ with $X = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ z \end{bmatrix}$ and $Y = \begin{bmatrix} y \\ t \end{bmatrix}$. Letting $A = \begin{bmatrix} a + m\sqrt{r} & b + n\sqrt{r} \\ c + k\sqrt{r} & d + l\sqrt{r} \end{bmatrix}$ we obtain that $A\theta = \begin{bmatrix} ax + rmy + bz + rnt \\ cx + rky + dz + rlt \end{bmatrix} + \sqrt{r} \begin{bmatrix} mx + ay + nz + bt \\ kx + cy + lz + dt \end{bmatrix}$.

Then we define $\Phi(A) = \begin{bmatrix} a & rm & b & rn \\ m & a & n & b \\ c & rk & d & rl \\ k & c & l & d \end{bmatrix}$. One can check directly

that Φ is a monomorphism.

Now, we will choose $r = 2$ (we could still work with any square-free r). Let $(a_i, m_i)_{i \geq 1}$ be the sequence of all non-negative solutions of the Pell equation $a^2 - 2m^2 = 1$ where $a_1 < a_2 < \dots$. (As is well known, we have $a_i = k_{2i}, m_i = h_{2i}$ where $(\frac{h_i}{k_i})$ is the sequence of the continued fraction of $\sqrt{2}$. Thus the sequence $(a_i, m_i)_{i \geq 1}$ is given as $(1, 0), (3, 2), (17, 12), (99, 70), \dots$. The odd terms of the sequence $(\frac{h_i}{k_i})$ correspond to the solutions of the partner equation $a^2 - 2m^2 = -1$).

For all $i \geq 1$, we let $P_i = \begin{bmatrix} a_i - m_i\sqrt{2} & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $Q_i = \sigma(P_i) = \begin{bmatrix} a_i + m_i\sqrt{2} & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$

Then we have

$$\Phi(P_i) = \begin{bmatrix} a_i & -2m_i & -1 & 0 \\ -m_i & a_i & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \Phi(Q_i) = \begin{bmatrix} a_i & 2m_i & -1 & 0 \\ m_i & a_i & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Notice that the matrix P_i is elliptic for all $i \geq 1$, but the matrix Q_i is hyperbolic unless $i = 1$. On the other hand, for sufficiently big i , the matrices $\Phi(P_i)$ and $\Phi(Q_i)$ are both hyperbolic-like. Indeed, the characteristic polynomials of both $\Phi(P_i)$ and $\Phi(Q_i)$ are given as

$$p(\lambda) = \lambda^4 - 2\sqrt{2m_i^2 - 1}\lambda^3 + \lambda^2 - 2\sqrt{2m_i^2 - 1}\lambda + 1.$$

This polynomial satisfies the equation $p(\lambda) = \lambda^4 p(1/\lambda)$, and this easily implies that if $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$ are the roots of $p(\lambda)$ such that $|\lambda_1| \geq |\lambda_2| \geq |\lambda_3| \geq |\lambda_4|$, then λ_1, λ_4 are real with $\lambda_1 > 1 > \lambda_4 > 0$ (the middle roots λ_2, λ_3 are imaginary).

Using the above observations, one can obtain that the matrices $\Phi(P_i)$ and $\Phi(Q_i)$ are hyperbolic-like for all $i \geq 2$. The eigenvectors of $\Phi(P_i)$ and $\Phi(Q_i)$ are easily computable, and viewed as elements of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^3$, they depend on i . Letting $u_i, v_i \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^3$ be the eigenvectors of $\Phi(P_i)$ corresponding to λ_4 and λ_1 respectively, we observe that u_i is an attractive point of $\Phi(P_i)$ whereas v_i is a repelling point of $\Phi(P_i)$. Similarly, if $u'_i, v'_i \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^3$ be the eigenvectors of $\Phi(Q_i)$ corresponding to λ_4 and λ_1 respectively, we observe that u'_i, v'_i are attractive and repelling points of $\Phi(Q_i)$ respectively.

We can choose and fix distinct $i, j \geq 2$ such that the following conditions hold:

- (1) $\mathcal{F}_{\Phi(P_i)} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\Phi(Q_j)} = \emptyset = \mathcal{F}_{\Phi(Q_i)} \cap \mathcal{F}_{\Phi(P_j)}$;
- (2) $\mathcal{F}_{\Phi(P_i)} \cap \Pi_{\Phi(Q_j)} = \emptyset = \mathcal{F}_{\Phi(Q_j)} \cap \Pi_{\Phi(P_i)}$;
- (3) For all sufficiently big $M, N \in \mathbb{N}$, $[\Phi(Q_i)^M \Phi(P_j)^N \Phi(Q_i)^{-M}, \Phi(P_j)^N] \neq 1$ and $[\Phi(Q_j)^M \Phi(P_i)^N \Phi(Q_j)^{-M}, \Phi(P_i)^N] \neq 1$.

Notice that, since Φ is a monomorphism, condition (3) is implied by the conditions

$$[Q_i^M P_j^N Q_i^{-M}, P_j^N] \neq 1 \text{ and } [Q_j^M P_i^N Q_j^{-M}, P_i^N] \neq 1$$

for all non-zero integer M . Thus it is straightforward (a direct computation) to satisfy conditions (1)-(3). For condition (3), alternatively, for sufficiently big M and N , it immediately follows from condition (1) and Proposition 4.3.

Now we are ready for a quick finishing argument. We let $f = (P_i, Q_i), g = (Q_j, P_j)$ and $\Gamma := \Gamma_N = \langle f^N, g^N \rangle$.

Let also $\pi_i : SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow SL(2, \mathbb{R}), 1 \leq i \leq 2$ be the projections onto the first and second coordinates. Then $\pi_1(\Gamma) = \langle P_i, Q_j \rangle$ and $\pi_2(\Gamma) = \langle Q_i, P_j \rangle$. Then $\pi_2(\Gamma) = \sigma \pi_1(\Gamma)$ hence the subgroup Γ of $SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \times SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ is discrete.

Notice that the matrix P_i is elliptic but not a torsion. We claim that for sufficiently big N , the subgroup $\langle P_i^N, Q_j^N \rangle$ is non-Abelian free. Indeed, if not, then there is a non-trivial relation between $\Phi(P_i)^N$ and $\Phi(Q_j)^N$. But these matrices are hyperbolic-like with $\mathcal{F}_{\Phi(P_i)} \cap \Pi_{\Phi(Q_j)} = \mathcal{F}_{\Phi(Q_j)} \cap \Pi_{\Phi(P_i)} = \emptyset$. Then by Proposition 4.2, we obtain a contradiction. Thus for sufficiently big N (we will fix this N) $\pi_1(\Gamma)$ is a free group of rank two, hence so is Γ .

Thus we established that Γ is both discrete and non-Abelian free. It remains to show that the projections of Γ to first and second coordinates are both dense. Since P_i is an elliptic non-torsion element, the closure $\overline{\langle P_i^N \rangle}$ is isomorphic to \mathbb{S}^1 . By condition (2), the closure $\overline{\pi_1(\Gamma)} = \overline{\langle P_i^N, Q_j^N \rangle}$, as a Lie subgroup, contains infinitely many copies of \mathbb{S}^1 , hence it is at least two-dimensional (let us also recall a classical fact, due to E.Cartan, that a closed subgroup of a Lie group is a Lie subgroup). On the other hand, since two-dimensional connected Lie groups are solvable (hence do not contain a copy of \mathbb{F}_2), the closure $\overline{\langle P_i^N, Q_j^N \rangle}$, as a Lie subgroup, must be 3-dimensional. Hence $\overline{\langle P_i^N, Q_j^N \rangle} = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$. Similarly, $\overline{\langle P_j^N, Q_i^N \rangle} = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$.

6. VERIFYING CONDITIONS (1) AND (2)

In this section, we will provide specific examples and direct elementary computations to verify conditions (1) and (2) that we used in the previous section. We have already defined u_i, v_i as the eigenvectors of $\Phi(P_i)$ corresponding to eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_4 respectively. We also have defined u'_i, v'_i as the eigenvectors of $\Phi(Q_i)$ corresponding to eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_4 respectively.

Let now, for all $i \geq 1$, w_i, \overline{w}_i be the eigenvectors of $\Phi(P_i)$ corresponding to the middle eigenvalues λ_3 and $\lambda_4 = \overline{\lambda_3}$ respectively. Similarly, we let w'_i, \overline{w}'_i be the eigenvectors of $\Phi(Q_i)$ corresponding to the middle eigenvalues λ_3 and $\lambda_4 = \overline{\lambda_3}$ respectively.

We now let $i = 2$ and $j = 3$. Thus $a_i = a_2 = 3, m_i = m_2 = -2$ and $a_j = a_3 = 17, m_j = m_3 = 12$.

$$\text{Then we have } \Phi(P_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & -4 & -1 & 0 \\ -2 & 3 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } \Phi(Q_3) = \begin{bmatrix} 17 & 24 & -1 & 0 \\ 12 & 17 & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

For the matrix $\Phi(P_2)$: We compute that

$u_2 = \langle a, b, -\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, v_2 = \langle c, d, -\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, w_2 = \langle e + fi, g + hi, \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle$
where a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h are non-zero real numbers.

Recall that the attracting point of $\Phi(P_2)$ is represented by the vector u_2 , i.e. by $[u_2] \in \mathbb{RP}^3$, and the repelling point is represented by the vector v_2 , i.e. by $[v_2] \in \mathbb{RP}^3$. Also, the characteristic cross $\Pi_{[u_2]}$ is associated with the subspace $\text{Span}(v_2, w_2, \overline{w}_2)$ in \mathbb{R}^4 . Computing this we get it as

$$U := \text{Span}(v_2, \langle e, g, \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, \langle f, h, 0, 0 \rangle).$$

Here, $\langle f, h, 0, 0 \rangle \in \text{Span}(w_2, \overline{w}_2)$ therefore we have $\frac{f}{h} = \sqrt{2}$.

Similarly, the characteristic cross $\Pi_{[v_2]}$ is associated with the subspace $\text{Span}(u_2, w_2, \overline{w}_2)$ in \mathbb{R}^4 . Computing this we get it as

$$V := \text{Span}(u_2, \langle e, g, \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, \langle f, h, 0, 0 \rangle).$$

Thus we have $\Pi_{\Phi(P_2)} = \Pi_{[u_2]} \cup \Pi_{[v_2]} = \mathbb{P}(U) \cup \mathbb{P}(V)$.

Let us also present the numerical values for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$:

$$\lambda_1 \approx 5.65148, \lambda_2 \approx 0.0857864 + 0.996314i, \lambda_3 \approx 0.0857864 - 0.996314i, \lambda_4 \approx 0.176945;$$

and for the numbers a, \dots, h :

$$a \approx -7.9924, b \approx 5.65148, c \approx -0.250238, d \approx 0.176945,$$

$$e \approx 0.12132, f \approx 1.409, g \approx 0.0857864, h \approx 0.996314.$$

For the matrix $\Phi(Q_3)$: We have

$u'_2 = \langle a', b', -\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, v'_2 = \langle c', d', -\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, w'_2 = \langle e' + f'i, g' + h'i, \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle$
where $a', b', c', d', e', f', g', h'$ are non-zero real numbers.

The attracting point of $\Phi(Q_3)$ is represented by the vector by $[u'_2] \in \mathbb{RP}^3$, and the repelling point is represented by $[v'_2] \in \mathbb{RP}^3$. The characteristic cross $\Pi_{[u'_2]}$ is associated with the subspace $Span(v'_2, w'_2, \overline{w'_2})$ in \mathbb{R}^4 . Computing this we get it as

$$U' := Span(v'_2, \langle e', g', \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, \langle f', h', 0, 0 \rangle)$$

where $\langle f', h', 0, 0 \rangle \in Span(w'_2, \overline{w'_2})$ therefore we have $\frac{f'}{h'} = -\sqrt{2}$.

Similarly, the characteristic cross $\Pi_{[v'_2]}$ is associated with the subspace $Span(u'_2, w'_2, \overline{w'_2})$ in \mathbb{R}^4 , and it is equal to

$$V' := Span(u'_2, \langle e', g', \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, \langle f', h', 0, 0 \rangle).$$

Thus we have $\Pi_{\Phi(Q_3)} = \Pi_{[u'_2]} \cup \Pi_{[v'_2]} = \mathbb{P}(U') \cup \mathbb{P}(V')$.

We also would like to present the numerical values for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4$ (These are the eigenvalues of $\Phi(Q_3)$ this time; we use the same letters by abuse of notation):

$$\lambda_1 \approx 33.9411, \lambda_2 \approx 0.0147186 + 0.999892i, \lambda_3 \approx 0.0147186 - 0.999892i, \lambda_4 \approx 0.0294628$$

and for the numbers a', \dots, h' :

$$a' \approx 48, b' \approx 33.9411, c' \approx 0.0416667, d' \approx 0.0294628,$$

$$e' \approx -0.0208153, f' \approx -1.41406, g' \approx 0.0147186, h' \approx 0.999892.$$

To verify our conditions (1) and (2) (condition (3) is already verified in the previous section) we need to show that

$$\{u_2, v_2\} \cap (U' \cup V') = \emptyset \text{ and } \{u'_2, v'_2\} \cap (U \cup V) = \emptyset.$$

We will show that $u'_2 \notin U$ (all other seven tasks are equally short and very similar as we point out below).

We write a vector in $U = Span(v_2, \langle e, g, \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle, \langle f, h, 0, 0 \rangle)$ as

$$\alpha v_2 + \beta \langle e, g, \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle + \gamma \langle f, h, 0, 0 \rangle.$$

Recalling that $v_2 = \langle c, d, -\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle$ and letting

$$u'_2 = \langle a', b', -\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle = \alpha \langle c, d, -\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle + \beta \langle e, g, \sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle + \gamma \langle f, h, 0, 0 \rangle \quad (1)$$

we obtain $\alpha = 1, \beta = 0$. Then we obtain a system

$$c + \gamma f = a', d + \gamma h = b'$$

which yields $\frac{a'-c}{b'-d} = \frac{f}{h} = \sqrt{2}$. But the numerical values of a', c, b', d immediately imply that the latter is not the case; we have $\frac{a'-c}{b'-d} \approx 1.4290373 \not\approx \sqrt{2}$.

Similarly, for the other seven cases, we obtain that:

$$v'_2 \notin U \text{ because } \frac{c'-c}{d'-d} \approx -1.9995952 \not\approx \sqrt{2};$$

$$u'_2 \notin V \text{ because } \frac{c'-a}{d'-b} \approx -1.4295699 \not\approx \sqrt{2};$$

$$v'_2 \notin V \text{ because } \frac{a'-a}{b'-b} \approx -1.9792559 \not\approx \sqrt{2};$$

$$u_2 \notin U' \text{ because } \frac{a-c'}{b-d'} \approx -1.4295699 \not\approx -\sqrt{2};$$

$$v_2 \notin U' \text{ because } \frac{c-c'}{d-d'} \approx -1.9995952 \not\approx -\sqrt{2};$$

$$u_2 \notin V' \text{ because } \frac{c-a'}{d-b'} \approx 1.4290373 \not\approx -\sqrt{2};$$

$$v_2 \notin V' \text{ because } \frac{a-a'}{b-b'} \approx -1.9792559 \not\approx -\sqrt{2}.$$

We use the $\not\approx$ sign above to indicate the deviations starting the second digit after the decimal point. Notice that the numbers 1.4295699 and 1.4290373 are close to $\sqrt{2}$ (but stay at least 0.01 apart), and this is expected essentially due to the facts that the ratio $\frac{a_k}{m_k}$ converges to $\sqrt{2}$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ where (a_k, m_k) is the k -th solution of the Pell equation $a^2 - 2m^2 = 1$ and the vectors $\langle \pm\sqrt{2}, 1 \rangle$ are eigenvectors of matrices $\begin{bmatrix} a & 2m \\ m & a \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} a & -2m \\ -m & a \end{bmatrix}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. A. Adeleke, A. M. W. Glass and L. Morley, *Arithmetic permutations*, London Math. Soc. **43** (1991), 255-268.
- [2] A. Akhmedov, *A weak Zassenhaus lemma for subgroups of Diff(I)*. Algebraic and Geometric Topology. vol.14 (2014) 539-550.
- [3] A. Akhmedov, *On groups of homeomorphisms of the interval with finitely many fixed points*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.03850>
- [4] A. Akhmedov, *On groups of diffeomorphisms of the interval with finitely many fixed points*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.03852>
- [5] A. Akhmedov, *Questions and remarks on discrete and dense subgroups of Diff(I)*, Journal of Topology and Analysis, vol. 6, no. 4, (2014), 557-571.
- [6] A. Akhmedov, *On free discrete subgroups of Diff(I)*. Algebraic and Geometric Topology, vol.10, no.4, (2010) 2409-2418.
- [7] A. F. Beardon, *Some remarks on nondiscrete Möbius groups*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math. —bf 21 (1996), 69-79

- [8] E. Breuillard and T. Gelander, *On dense free subgroups of Lie groups*, J. Algebra 261 (2003), no. 2, p. 448–467.
- [9] N. Brody, D. Fisher, M. Mj and W. van Limbeek. *Greenberg-Shalom’s Commensurator Hypothesis and Applications*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.07785>
- [10] S. D. Cohen, *The group of translations and positive rational powers is free*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **46** (1995) 21–93.
- [11] S. D. Cohen, *Composite rational functions which are powers*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edinburgh, **83A** (1979), 11-16.
- [12] S. D. Cohen and A. M. W. Glass, *Composites of translations and odd rational powers act freely*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **51** (1995) 73–81.
- [13] S. D. Cohen and A. M. W. Glass, *Free groups from fields*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **55**(2) (1997), 309-319
- [14] J. D. Dixon. *The Tits Alternative*, Carleton Math Series No 225.
- [15] D. Fisher, M. Mj and W. van Limbeek. *Commensurators of normal subgroups of lattices*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.04027>
- [16] S.-H. Kim and T. Koberda. *Non-freeness of groups generated by two parabolic elements with small rational parameters*. 2019. To appear in Michigan Math. J., arXiv:1901.06375.
- [17] R. C. Lyndon and J. L. Ullman. —em Groups generated by two parabolic linear fractional transformations. Canadian J. Math., 21:1388–1403, 1969.
- [18] G. A. Margulis, Discrete subgroups of semisimple Lie groups, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)], vol. 17, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991. MR 1090825 (92h:22021)
- [19] D. W. Morris, *Introduction to Arithmetic Groups*, Deductive Press (2015) arxiv.org/abs/math/0106063
- [20] G. Prasad, M. Raghunathan, Cartan subgroups and lattices in semi-simple groups. Ann. of Math. (2) 96 (1972), 296–317.
- [21] Y. Shalom and G. Willis. *Commensurated subgroups of arithmetic groups, totally disconnected groups and adelic rigidity*. Geom. Funct. Anal., **23**(5), (2013) 1631–1683.
- [22] S. White, *The group generated by $x \rightarrow x + 1$ and $x \rightarrow x^p$ is free*, Journal of Algebra, **118** (1988), 408-422.

AZER AKHMEDOV, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY, PO BOX 6050, FARGO, ND, 58108-6050

Email address: `azer.akhmedov@ndsu.edu`