

# ON SPLIT STEINBERG MODULES AND STEINBERG MODULES

DANIEL ARMEANU AND JEREMY MILLER

ABSTRACT. Answering a question of Randal-Williams, we show the natural maps from split Steinberg modules of a Dedekind domain to the associated Steinberg modules are surjective.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of this paper is to show that split Steinberg modules of a Dedekind domain surjects onto the corresponding Steinberg modules. This relates an important representation in the theory of homological stability with an important representation in the theory of duality groups. We begin by reviewing definitions.

Fix a Dedekind domain  $\Lambda$  and a rank- $n$  projective  $\Lambda$ -module  $M$ . The Tits building  $T(M)$  is defined to be the geometric realization of the poset of proper summands of  $M$  ordered by inclusion. By the Solomon-Tits theorem,  $T(M) \simeq \vee S^{n-2}$  and define the Steinberg module as

$$St(M) := \tilde{H}_{n-2}(T(M)).$$

Similarly, the split Tits building or Charney building  $\tilde{T}(M)$  is defined as the geometric realization of the poset of pairs of submodules  $(P, Q)$  with  $P \oplus Q = M$  ordered by inclusion on the first factor and reverse inclusion on the second factor. Charney [Cha80, Theorem 1.1] proved this complex is spherical and we call its top homology the split Steinberg module or Charney module

$$\tilde{St}(M) := \tilde{H}_{n-2}(\tilde{T}(M)).$$

There is a natural map

$$\tilde{St}(M) \rightarrow St(M)$$

induced by forgetting a complement. Randal-Williams [RW, Theorem 3.3] showed this map is surjective if  $\text{rank}(M) \leq 4$  and asked if surjectivity holds for all finitely-generated  $M$  [RW, Remark 3.4]. We answer this question in the affirmative.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a Dedekind domain and let  $M$  be a finitely-generated projective  $\Lambda$ -module. The map  $(P, Q) \mapsto Q$  induces a surjective homomorphism  $\tilde{St}(M) \rightarrow St(M)$ .

When  $\Lambda$  is Euclidean, work of Ash–Rudolph [AR79] imply that the  $St(M)$  is generated by integral apartment classes. These classes are clearly in the image of  $\tilde{St}(M)$  so Theorem 1.1 is straightforward for Euclidean domains. However, for many Dedekind domains, the Steinberg modules are not generated by integral apartment classes [CFP19, MPWY20] so a different argument is required.

Steinberg modules are important objects in representation theory, duality for arithmetic groups [BS73], and algebraic  $K$ -theory [Qui73]. In contrast, split Steinberg modules are primarily used to study homological stability [Cha80, Hep20, GKRWa, GKRWb, KMP22, BMS]. We hope Theorem 1.1 will help strengthen the connection between these different areas (e.g. potential connections between the homology near the virtual cohomological dimension of arithmetic groups and the edge of their stable range).

**Acknowledgments.** We thank Oscar Randal-Williams for helpful conversations.

## 2. DEFINITIONS AND KNOWN RESULTS

In this section, we collect basic definitions and previously known results related to posets.

**Notation 2.1.** Let  $M$  be a finitely-generated projective module over a Dedekind domain  $\Lambda$ . Let  $K, V$  be proper summands of  $M$ . Let  $S_M$  be the poset associated to  $\tilde{T}(M)$ . Define the following subposets of  $S_M$ :

$$\begin{aligned} S_M(\subseteq K, \supseteq) &= \{(P, Q) \in S_M : P \oplus Q = M, P \subseteq K\} \\ S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V) &= \{(P, Q) \in S_M : P \oplus Q = M, Q \supseteq V\} \end{aligned}$$

---

THE AUTHORS WERE SUPPORTED BY NSF GRANT DMS-2202943.  
Date: July 26, 2024.

$$S_M(\subseteq K, \supseteq V) = \{(P, Q) \in S_M : P \oplus Q = M, P \subseteq K, Q \supseteq V\}.$$

The next definition is needed to state Lemma 2.3.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be posets. The height of  $a \in A$  denoted  $ht(a)$  is the maximal  $k$  such that there exists a chain  $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_k = a$  in  $A$ . Given a poset map  $F : A \rightarrow B$ . The poset fiber of  $b \in B$  denoted  $F_{\leq b}$  is  $\{a \in A : F(a) \leq b\}$ .

The following is Church and Putnam [CP17, Proposition 2.3] (see also Quillen [Qui78, Theorem 9.1]).

**Lemma 2.3 (Church-Putnam).** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be posets. Fix  $m \geq 0$  and let  $F : A \rightarrow B$  be a map of posets. Assume  $B$  is Cohen-Macaulay of dimension  $d$  and that for all  $b \in B$ , the poset fiber  $F_{\leq b}$  is  $(ht(b) + m)$ -spherical. Then  $\tilde{H}_i(A) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_i(B)$  is an isomorphism when  $i < d + m$  and surjective for  $i \leq d + m$ .

In particular, the case when  $m = 0$  will give surjectivity of the induced map  $\tilde{St}(M) \rightarrow St(M)$ .

Recall for a poset  $X$  and a vertex  $v$  of  $X$ ,  $Link(v) := \{x \in X : x < v \text{ or } x > v\}$ . The following is a well-known result from Combinatorial Morse Theory.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let  $X$  be the vertices of a poset. Let  $Y$  and  $V$  be a partition of vertices of  $X$  with no edges between vertices of  $V$  then

$$|X| \simeq |Y| \cup \bigcup_{v \in V} Cone(|Link(v) \cap Y|).$$

In particular, if  $|Y| \simeq \vee S^n$  and  $|Link(v) \cap Y| \simeq \vee S^{n-1}$  for all  $v \in V$ , then  $|X| \simeq \vee S^n$ .

The following due to Charney [Cha80, Theorem 1.1].

**Theorem 2.5 (Charney).** Let  $\Lambda$  be a Dedekind domain. Let  $M$  be a rank- $n$  projective  $\Lambda$ -module. Let  $H_0$  and  $L_0$  be rank- $(n-1)$  and rank-1 summands of  $M$  respectively. Then,  $|S_M|$ ,  $|S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq L_0)|$ , and  $|S_M(\subseteq H_0, \supseteq)|$  are homotopy equivalent to  $\vee S^{n-2}$ .

### 3. MAIN RESULT

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1, which states that the map  $(P, Q) \mapsto Q$  induces a surjective homomorphism  $\tilde{St}(M) \rightarrow St(M)$  for  $M$  a finitely-generated projective module over a Dedekind domain. The bulk of this section will be spent proving  $S_M(\subseteq, V_0 \supseteq)$  is highly-connected. This will let us apply Lemma 2.3 for  $m = 0$  to deduce  $\tilde{St}(M)$  surjects onto  $St(M)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $M$  be a rank- $n$  projective module over a Dedekind domain  $\Lambda$  and let  $V_0$  be a proper nonzero rank- $k$  summands of  $M$ . Then  $S_M(\subseteq, V_0 \supseteq) \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ .

The case  $k = 1$  is due to Charney (see Theorem 2.5). This theorem will be proven by induction on  $rank(M)$ . Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5 will be used in the inductive step of this argument. The following is our induction hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 3.2.** Assume for all  $W$  with  $2 \leq rank(W) = m < n$  projective modules over a Dedekind domain and all proper rank- $k$  summands  $V$  with  $rank(V) = k \geq 2$  that  $|S_W(\subseteq, \supseteq V)| \simeq \vee S^{m-k-1}$ .

The following filtration will be used to inductively show  $|S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0)| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ .

**Notation 3.3.** Let  $M$  be a rank- $n$  projective module over a Dedekind domain  $\Lambda$ . Let  $V_0$  be a rank- $k$  summand of  $M$ . Choose  $L_0$  a rank-1 summand of  $V_0$  and  $H_0$  a rank- $(n-1)$  summand of  $M$  with  $H_0 \oplus L_0 = M$  (such an  $L_0$  and  $H_0$  always exist and this implies  $V_0 \not\subseteq H_0$ ). We define the following:

$$X_0 := S_M(\subseteq H_0, \supseteq V_0) \subsetneq S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0).$$

$$T_i := \{(A, B) \in S_M : rank(A) = n - k - 1 - i, rank(B) = k + i + 1, A \not\subseteq H_0, B \supseteq V_0\}.$$

$X_i$  the subposet of  $S_M$  containing vertices  $X_0 \cup T_0 \cup \dots \cup T_i$ .

To prove Theorem 3.1, we will prove that  $|X_i| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n-k-1$  and  $k \geq 2$ . Note that  $S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0) = X_{n-k-1}$ . The following lemma gives  $|X_0| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** Let  $M$  be a rank- $n$  projective module over a Dedekind domain  $\Lambda$ . Let  $V_0$  be a rank- $k$  summand of  $M$  with  $k \geq 2$ . Choose  $L_0$  a rank-1 summand of  $V_0$  and  $H_0$  a rank- $(n-1)$  summand of  $M$  with  $H_0 \oplus L_0 = M$ . Assume Hypothesis 3.2. Then  $|X_0| = |S_M(\subseteq H_0, \supseteq V_0)| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ .

*Proof.* The maps  $(P, Q) \mapsto (P, Q \cap H_0)$  and  $(P, \bar{Q}) \mapsto (P, \bar{Q} \oplus L_0)$  give isomorphisms between

$$\{(P, Q) : P \subseteq H_0, Q \supseteq V_0\} \text{ and } \{(P, \bar{Q}) : P \oplus \bar{Q} = H_0, \bar{Q} \supseteq H_0 \cap V_0\} = S_{H_0}(\subseteq, \supseteq H_0 \cap V_0).$$

Note  $P \neq H_0$  since  $k \geq 2$ . Recall  $H_0 \not\supseteq V_0$ , so  $\text{rank}(H_0 \cap V_0) = k-1$  inside of  $H_0$ , hence  $|X_0| = |S_{H_0}(\subseteq, \supseteq H_0 \cap V_0)| \simeq \vee S^{n-1-(k-1)-1} = \vee S^{n-k-1}$  by Hypothesis 3.2.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** Let  $M$  be a rank- $n$  projective module over a Dedekind domain  $\Lambda$ . Let  $V_0$  be a rank- $k$  summand of  $M$  with  $k \geq 2$ . Choose  $L_0$  a rank-1 summand of  $V_0$  and  $H_0$  a rank- $(n-1)$  summand of  $M$  with  $H_0 \oplus L_0 = M$ . Assume Hypothesis 3.2. Then  $|X_i| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n-k-1$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $i$ . The base case  $i = 0$  is given by Lemma 3.4. Assume we have shown  $|X_j| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$  for  $0 \leq j < i \leq n-k-1$ . To show  $|X_i| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ , we verify the hypothesis of Lemma 2.4 with  $X = X_i, Y = X_{i-1}$ , and  $V = T_i$ . There are no edges between vertices of  $T_i$  and  $|X_{i-1}| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$  by the induction hypothesis. It remains to check  $|\text{Link}(A, B) \cap X_{i-1}| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-2}$  for  $(A, B) \in T_i$ .

Note  $\text{Link}(A, B) \cap X_{i-1} = \{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) > (A, B)\} * \{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) < (A, B)\}$ . In words,  $\text{Link}(A, B)$  decomposes as the join of  $(P, Q)$  ‘‘bigger’’ than  $(A, B)$  and  $(P, Q)$  ‘‘smaller’’ than  $(A, B)$ .

**Part I:**  $|\{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) > (A, B)\}| \simeq \vee S^i$

Let  $(P, Q) \in X_{i-1}$  with  $(P, Q) > (A, B)$ . Either  $(P, Q) \in X_0$  or  $(P, Q) \in T_j$  for  $j < i$ . If  $(P, Q) \in X_0$  then  $P \not\subseteq H_0$  and  $Q \subseteq V_0$ . If  $(P, Q) \in T_j$  for  $j < i$  then  $P \subseteq H_0, \text{rank}(P) < n-k-i-2 = \text{rank}(A), Q \supseteq V_0$ . Hence  $(P, Q) \in X_{i-1}$  amounts to  $\text{rank}(P) < \text{rank}(A)$  and  $Q \supseteq V_0$ .  $(P, Q) > (A, B)$  gives  $P \supseteq A, Q \subsetneq B$ . Thus,  $\{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) > (A, B)\} = \{(P, Q) : A \subseteq P, V_0 \subseteq Q \subsetneq B\}$ . The condition on  $\text{rank}(P) < \text{rank}(A)$  is implied by  $(P, Q) < (A, B)$ . The map  $(P, Q) \mapsto (P \cap B, Q)$  gives an isomorphism between

$$\{(P, Q) : A \subseteq P, V_0 \subseteq Q \subsetneq B\} \text{ and } \{(\bar{P}, Q) : \bar{P} \oplus Q = B, V_0 \subseteq Q\} = S_B(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0).$$

Since  $\text{rank}(B) = k+i+1$  and  $\text{rank}(V_0) = k$  inside  $B$  as  $V_0 \subsetneq B$ ,  $|S_B(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0)|$  is homotopy equivalent to  $\vee S^{(k+i+1)-k-1} = \vee S^i$  by Hypothesis 3.2.

**Part II:**  $|\{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) < (A, B)\}| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-i-3}$ .

Let  $(P, Q) \in X_{i-1}$  with  $(P, Q) < (A, B)$ . Recall  $(P, Q) \in T_j$  for  $j < i$  implies  $\text{rank}(P) < \text{rank}(A)$ , but  $(P, Q) < (A, B)$  implies  $P \subsetneq A$  and therefore  $\text{rank}(P) > \text{rank}(A)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $(P, Q) \in X_0$ .  $(P, Q) \in X_0$  means  $P \subseteq H_0$  and  $Q \supseteq V_0$ , and  $(P, Q) < (A, B)$  means  $P \subsetneq A$  and  $Q \subsetneq B$ . Combining these conditions gives  $\{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) < (A, B)\} = \{(P, Q) : P \subseteq A \cap H_0, Q \supseteq B\}$ . The map  $(P, Q) \mapsto (P, Q \cap A)$  gives an isomorphism between

$$\{(P, Q) : P \subseteq A \cap H_0, Q \supseteq B\} \text{ and } \{(P, \bar{Q}) : P \oplus \bar{Q} = A, P \subseteq H_0 \cap A\} = S_A(\subseteq H_0 \cap A, \supseteq).$$

We have  $\text{rank}(A) = n-k-1-i$  and  $\text{corank}(H_0 \cap A) = 1$  inside  $A$  as  $\text{rank}(H_0) = n-1$  and  $A \not\subseteq H_0$ , hence  $|S_A(\subseteq H_0 \cap A, \supseteq)|$  is homotopy equivalent to  $\vee S^{(n-k-i-1)-2} = \vee S^{n-k-i-3}$  by Theorem 2.5.

**Part III:**  $|X_i| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ .

From Part I and Part II we have  $|\{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) > (A, B)\}| \simeq \vee S^i$  and  $|\{(P, Q) \in X_{i-1} : (P, Q) < (A, B)\}| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-i-3}$ . Hence  $|X_i| \simeq \vee S^i * \vee S^{n-k-i-3} \cong \vee S^{n-k-2}$ .  $\square$

We now prove Theorem 3.1 which states  $|S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0)|$  is  $(n-k-1)$ -spherical, where  $M$  is a rank- $n$  projective module over a Dedekind domain and  $V_0$  is a rank- $k$  proper, nonzero summand of  $M$ .

*Proof.* We proceed by induction. Theorem 2.5 proven by Charney gives the base case when  $\text{rank}(M) = 2$  and also the case that  $\text{rank}(V_0) = 1$ . Assume for all  $W$  with  $2 \leq \text{rank}(W) = m < n$  projective modules over a Dedekind domain and all proper rank- $k$  summands  $V$  with  $\text{rank}(V_0) = k \geq 2$  that  $|S_W(\subseteq, \supseteq V)| \simeq \vee S^{m-k-1}$ . Consider the filtration  $|X_0| \subsetneq |X_1| \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq |X_{n-k-1}| = |S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0)|$  as in Notation 3.3. By Lemma 3.5,  $|S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0)| = |X_{n-k-1}| \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ .  $\square$

The following corollary of Theorem 3.1 is not needed to prove Theorem 1.1, so we do not provide a proof, but it can be obtained by dualizing and following Charney’s strategy in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 1.1 [Cha80, Theorem 1.1].

**Corollary 3.6.** Let  $M$  be a rank- $n$  projective module over a Dedekind domain  $\Lambda$ . Let  $K_0$  be a corank- $k$  summand of  $M$ . Then  $S_M(\subseteq K_0, \supseteq) \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$ .

We now prove Theorem 1.1 which states the map from  $\tilde{T}(M)$  to  $T(M)^{op}$  given by  $(P, Q) \mapsto Q$  induces a surjective map  $\tilde{St}(M) \rightarrow St(M)$ .

*Proof.* We verify the hypotheses of Lemma 2.3 with  $A = \tilde{T}(M), B = T(M)^{op}$  and  $m = 0$ .  $T(M)^{op}$  is Cohen-Macaulay by the Solomn–Tits Theorem, so it remains to check the poset fiber of  $V_0 \in T(M)^{op}$  is  $ht(V_0)$ -spherical. Let  $\text{rank}(V_0) = k < n$ . A maximal chain containing  $V_0$  in  $T(M)^{op}$  is of the form  $A_{n-1} \supseteq A_{n-2} \supseteq \dots \supseteq V_0$ , where  $A_i$  are rank- $i$  summands of  $M$ . This gives  $ht(V_0) = n - k - 1$ .  $F_{\leq V_0} = \{(P, Q) : P \oplus Q = M, Q \supseteq V_0\} = S_M(\subseteq, \supseteq V_0) \simeq \vee S^{n-k-1}$  by Theorem 3.1. Hence, the induced map from  $\tilde{St}(M) \mapsto St(M)$  is surjective.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [AR79] A. Ash and L. Rudolph, *The modular symbol and continued fractions in higher dimensions*, Invent. Math. **55** (1979), no. 3, 241–250. MR 553998
- [BMS] Calista Bernard, Jeremy Miller, and Robin J. Sroka, *Partial bases and homological stability of  $GL_n(R)$  revisited*, Preprint, [arXiv:2405.09998](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.09998).
- [BS73] A. Borel and J.-P. Serre, *Corners and arithmetic groups*, Comment. Math. Helv. **48** (1973), 436–491, Avec un appendice: Arrondissement des variétés à coins, par A. Douady et L. Hérault. MR 0387495
- [CFP19] T. Church, B. Farb, and A. Putman, *Integrality in the Steinberg module and the top-dimensional cohomology of  $SL_n O_K$* , Amer. J. Math. **141** (2019), no. 5, 1375–1419. MR 4011804
- [Cha80] R.M. Charney, *Homology stability for  $GL_n$  of a Dedekind domain*, Invent. Math. **56** (1980), no. 1, 1–17. MR 557579
- [CP17] T. Church and A. Putman, *The codimension-one cohomology of  $SL_n \mathbb{Z}$* , Geom. Topol. **21** (2017), no. 2, 999–1032. MR 3626596
- [GKRWa] S. Galatius, A. Kupers, and O. Randal-Williams,  *$E_\infty$ -cells and general linear groups of finite fields*, Annales scientifiques de l’École normale supérieure (to appear), [arXiv:1810.11931](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11931).
- [GKRWb] ———,  *$E_\infty$ -cells and general linear groups of infinite fields*, Preprint, [arXiv:2005.05620](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.05620).
- [Hep20] Richard Hepworth, *On the edge of the stable range*, Mathematische Annalen **377** (2020), no. 1, 123–181.
- [KMP22] Alexander Kupers, Jeremy Miller, and Peter Patzt, *Improved homological stability for certain general linear groups*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **125** (2022), no. 3, 511–542. MR 4480882
- [MPWY20] Jeremy Miller, Peter Patzt, Jennifer C. H. Wilson, and Dan Yasaki, *Non-integrality of some Steinberg modules*, J. Topol. **13** (2020), no. 2, 441–459. MR 4092772
- [Qui73] D. Quillen, *Finite generation of the groups  $K_i$  of rings of algebraic integers*, Higher K-Theories, Springer, 1973, pp. 179–198.
- [Qui78] ———, *Homotopy properties of the poset of nontrivial  $p$ -subgroups of a group*, Advances in Mathematics **28** (1978), no. 2, 101–128.
- [RW] Oscar Randal-Williams,  *$E_\infty$ -cells and general linear groups of infinite fields*, Preprint, [arXiv:2405.07566](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07566).

*Email address:* darmeanu@purdue.edu

Purdue University, Department of Mathematics, 150 N. University, West Lafayette IN, 47907, USA

*Email address:* jeremymiller@purdue.edu

Purdue University, Department of Mathematics, 150 N. University, West Lafayette IN, 47907, USA