

Note on exterior lines to two disjoint reguli

Rolando Pomareda

Abstract. Let \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 be two disjoint reguli in the projective 3-space over the field $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = p^e$, p an odd prime. If p is not a point in neither of the two doubly-ruled quadrics associated to the given reguli, then there is at least one line through P which does not meet neither of the two reguli.

1. Introduction

Let Σ be the projective 3-space over the field $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = p^e$, p an odd prime. Let a, b, c be any three skew lines in Σ . Through any point on a there passes exactly one line that meets b and c . Such a line is called a *transversal* of a, b and c ; there are exactly $q + 1$ transversals to any three skew lines, and they are mutually skew. Now let a', b', c' be any transversal to a, b and c . The set \mathcal{R} of transversals to a', b' and c' , which includes the lines a, b, c , is independent of the choice of a', b', c' , and is called the *regulus* determined by a, b and c . It can be shown that the same regulus is determined by any three of its $q + 1$ lines. Moreover, the set of transversals to any three lines of a regulus \mathcal{R} is independent of the particular choice of the three lines of \mathcal{R} , and forms a regulus \mathcal{R}' , called the *opposite* regulus to \mathcal{R} . Thus every line of \mathcal{R}' meets every line of \mathcal{R} , and \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' both cover the same $(q + 1)^2$ points of Σ , forming a *doubly-ruled quadric* \mathcal{D} . The lines of \mathcal{R} and the lines of \mathcal{R}' both lie in \mathcal{D} [5].

The main purpose of this note is to show that through any point exterior to two disjoint reguli there is at least one line disjoint to both reguli. Although the

Received 16 March 1989.

Supported in part by FONDECYT Project N. 0343 and DIB E-2586/8712.

proof is quite easy, the result we present appears to have been overlooked.

2. Desarguesian spreads in Σ

Let Σ be the projective 3-space over the field $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = p^e$, p an odd-prime. A spread W in Σ is a set of $q^2 + 1$ lines in Σ which are such that each point of Σ lies on exactly one line of W . Thus the lines of W are all mutually skew. We shall call a spread W desarguesian if the regulus determined by any three lines of W is contained in W . The following, which we state without proof, appear in [4]:

2.1 Lemma. *The number of desarguesian spreads of Σ is $\frac{1}{2}q^4(q^3 - 1)(q - 1)$.*

2.2 Lemma. *The number of reguli in Σ is $q^4(q^3 - 1)(q^2 + 1)$.*

2.3 Lemma. *Each desarguesian spread of Σ contains exactly $q(q^2 + 1)$ reguli and each regulus is contained in $\frac{1}{2}q(q - 1)$ desarguesian spreads.*

2.4 Lemma. *Let W and W' be two desarguesian spreads of Σ and assume that \mathcal{R} is a regulus contained in $W \cap W'$. If $|W \cap W'| > q + 1$, then $W = W'$.*

3. The number of lines which do not meet a regulus

3.1 Lemma. *Let \mathcal{R} be a regulus in Σ . If P is a point not contained in any line of \mathcal{R} , then there are exactly $\frac{1}{2}q(q - 1)$ lines of Σ through the point P which do not meet the ruled quadric covered by \mathcal{R} .*

Proof. There are exactly $\frac{1}{2}q(q - 1)$ desarguesian spreads containing \mathcal{R} , and P is contained in exactly one line of each desarguesian spread. By (2.4) these are all different lines. On the other hand if ℓ is a line such that $\mathcal{R} \cup \{\ell\}$ consists of lines all mutually skew that $\mathcal{R} \cup \{\ell\}$ is contained in a unique desarguesian spread. Hence the number of lines through P which do not meet any line of \mathcal{R} is exactly $\frac{1}{2}q(q - 1)$.

3.2 Lemma. *Let \mathcal{R} be a regulus in Σ . If P is a point not contained in any line of \mathcal{R} , then there are exactly $q + 1$ lines of Σ through the point P which*

intersect a unique line of \mathcal{R} and there are $\frac{1}{2}q(q + 1)$ lines of Σ through the point P which intersect two lines of \mathcal{R} .

Proof. By (3.1) there are

$$q^2 + q + 1 - \frac{1}{2}q(q - 1) = \frac{(q + 2)(q + 1)}{2}$$

lines of Σ through P which intersect lines of \mathcal{R} . Moreover, any one of these lines meet either one or two lines of \mathcal{R} . Let x denote the number of lines which meet one line of \mathcal{R} and let y denote the number of lines which meet two lines of \mathcal{R} . Hence

$$x + 2y = (q + 1)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad x + y = \frac{(q + 2)(q + 1)}{2}$$

Thus $x = q + 1$ and $y = \frac{1}{2}q(q + 1)$.

4. Exterior lines to two disjoint reguli

We say that two reguli in Σ are disjoint if the corresponding ruled quadrics are disjoint. Let \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 be any two disjoint reguli. Coordinates may be chosen so that the lines of \mathcal{R}_1 have the form

$$\{(x, y)/x = (0, 0)\} \cup \left\{ (x, y)/y = \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix} \right\}_{u \in \text{GF}(q)}$$

and (x, y) represents a 4-vector over $\text{GF}(q)$. Hence the lines of \mathcal{R}_2 have the form

$$\{(x, y)/y = xM_i\} \tag{4.1}$$

where M_i is a 2 by 2 matrix with entries in $\text{GF}(q)$, $M_i - M_j$ is a nonsingular matrix for $i \neq j$, and for each $i = 1, \dots, q + 1$, $M_i - xI$ is a nonsingular matrix for all $x \in \text{GF}(q)$. Here $I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Let P be a point not in any line of $\mathcal{R}_1 \cup \mathcal{R}_2$.

It is well known that all reguli in Σ are in one orbit of $\text{PGL}(4, q)$. Moreover the stabilizer of a regulus in $\text{PGL}(4, q)$ is isomorphic to $\text{PGL}(2, q) \times \text{PGL}(2, q)$. In fact, the stabilizer of \mathcal{R}_1 is induced by the following subgroup of $\text{GF}(4, q)$

$$\left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{pmatrix} / A \in \text{GL}(2, q) \right\} \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha I & \beta I \\ \gamma I & \delta I \end{pmatrix} / \alpha\delta - \beta\gamma \neq 0 \right\}.$$

Also, the stabilizer of \mathcal{R}_1 acts transitively on the points not on any line of \mathcal{R}_1 .

Thus, without loss of generality we may assume that the point P is represented by the vector $(1, 0, 0, 1)$, and a line through the point P not intersecting any line of \mathcal{R}_1 has the form

$$\left\{ (x, y) \mid y = x \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

where $4c = \gamma - d^2$ and γ a nonsquare in $\text{GF}(q)$. Note that $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & u \end{pmatrix}$ must be nonsingular for all u in $\text{GF}(q)$.

Let \mathcal{E}_P the collection of all these lines. Next we calculate the number of lines in \mathcal{E}_P disjoint to a given line in \mathcal{R}_2 . Denote by $\mathcal{E}_P(\ell)$ the number of lines in \mathcal{E}_P which meet ℓ .

4.2 Lemma. *Let \mathcal{R}_2 be a regulus represented as in (4.1). If*

$$\ell = \left\{ (x, y) \mid y = x \begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ t & u \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

is an arbitrary line of \mathcal{R}_2 then the following hold:

- (a) *If $r^2 - (1-s)^2t - ur(1-s) = 0$ then $\mathcal{E}_P(\ell) = 0$.*
 (b) *If $r^2 - (1-s)^2t - ur(1-s)$ is a nonzero square in $\text{GF}(q)$ then $\mathcal{E}_P(\ell) = \frac{q-1}{2}$.*
 (c) *If $r^2 - (1-s)^2t - ur(1-s)$ is a non square in $\text{GF}(q)$ then $\mathcal{E}_P(\ell) = \frac{q+1}{2}$.*

Proof. The line

$$\left\{ (x, y) \mid y = x \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \right\}$$

in \mathcal{E}_P meets ℓ in and only if $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ t & u \end{pmatrix}$ is a singular matrix. Now, replacing $4c = \gamma - d^2$ in the determinant of this matrix, this condition is equivalent to

$$r^2 - (1-s)^2t - ur(1-s) + \left(\frac{1-s}{2}\right)^2 \gamma$$

is square in $\text{GF}(q)$. Let m and n denote $r^2 - (1-s)^2t - ur(1-s)$ and $\left(\frac{1-s}{2}\right)^2$ respectively. Hence, if $m = 0$, and since $s \neq 1$, we have that $n\gamma$ is a non square for each γ non square in $\text{GF}(q)$, so (a) follows.

If $0 \neq m$ is a square in $\text{GF}(q)$ then there are $\frac{q+1}{4}$ non squares γ in $\text{GF}(q)$, in case $q-1$ is a non square in $\text{GF}(q)$, for which $m+n\gamma$ is a square in $\text{GF}(q)$,

and $\frac{q-1}{4}$ non squares γ in $\text{GF}(q)$, in case -1 is a square in $\text{GF}(q)$, for which $m+n\gamma$ is a square in $\text{GF}(q)$ [1]. In the first case there are $1 + \left(\frac{q+1}{4} - 1\right) 2$ such pairs of elements (c, d) , and in the second case there are $2 \frac{q-1}{4}$ such pairs (c, d) . Thus (b) follows. If m is a non square in $\text{GF}(q)$, then there are $\frac{q+1}{4}$ non squares γ in $\text{GF}(q)$, in case -1 is a non square in $\text{GF}(q)$, for which $m+n\gamma$ is a square in $\text{GF}(q)$, and $\frac{q+3}{4}$ non squares γ in $\text{GF}(q)$, in case -1 is a square in $\text{GF}(q)$, for which $m+n\gamma$ is a square in $\text{GF}(q)$. In the first case there are $2 \cdot \frac{q+1}{4} = \frac{q+1}{2}$ such pairs of elements (c, d) , and in the second case there are $1 + 2 \cdot \left(\frac{q+3}{4} - 1\right) = \frac{q+1}{2}$ such pairs of elements (c, d) . Thus (c) follows, and the proof of the lemma is complete.

4.3 Remark. Now, if ℓ is the line

$$\left\{ (x, y) \mid y = x \begin{pmatrix} r & s \\ t & u \end{pmatrix} \right\},$$

then we denote by $\ell^1 = \{(c, d) \mid r(d-u) - (s-1)(c-t) = 0\}$. Thus, any pair (c, d) in ℓ^1 determines a line through P which meet ℓ . Clearly $|\ell^1 \cap m^1| \geq 2$ implies $\ell^1 = m^1$ for any two lines ℓ and m .

If $C_\gamma = \{(c, d) \mid 4c = \gamma - d^2\}$ for γ non square in $\text{GF}(q)$, then we have proved in lemma 4.2 that $|\ell^1 \cap C_\gamma| \leq \frac{q+1}{2}$, for each line ℓ in \mathcal{R}_2 .

Let $\mathcal{R}_2 = \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_{q+1}\}$. Assume that $\ell_i^1 \neq \ell_j^1$ for $i \neq j$, $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, q+1$.

If a pair (c, d) in C_γ determines a line through P which meets \mathcal{R}_2 then it determines a set $\{i, j\} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, q+1\}$ as follows: if t meets only the line ℓ_i we say that (c, d) determines $\{i, i\}$, and if t meets the lines ℓ_i and ℓ_j we say that (c, d) determines $\{i, j\}$. By assumption, if (c, d) determines $\{i, j\}$ and (c', d') determines $\{i', j'\}$ then $(c, d) \neq (c', d')$ implies $\{i, j\} \neq \{i', j'\}$.

Now let \mathcal{M} be the set of all subsets $\{i, j\}, i \neq j = 1, 2, \dots, q+1$.

If \mathcal{M}_α denote the collection of all subsets S of \mathcal{M} for which $|\{j \mid \{i, j\} \in S\}| \leq \alpha$ for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, q+1$, then it is clear that for each $S \in \mathcal{M}_\alpha$ we have

$$|S| \leq \alpha \cdot \frac{q+1}{2} \quad 4.4$$

We are now ready to prove the following theorem.

4.5 Theorem. Let \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 be two disjoint reguli in the projective 3-space over the field $\text{GF}(q)$ where $q = p^e$, p an odd prime. If P is not a point in neither of the two doubly-ruled quadrics associated to the given reguli, then there is at least one line through P which does not meet neither of the two reguli.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that the two reguli and the point P are as above. If the regulus \mathcal{R}_2 is such that there are lines ℓ_i and ℓ_j , $i \neq j$ for which $\ell_i^1 = \ell_j^1$, then the number of lines through P that meet \mathcal{R}_2 is smaller or equal than the number of lines through P that meet a regulus for which this situation does not occur. Hence we consider only this case.

By (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4) the number of lines through P which does not meet \mathcal{R}_1 but meet \mathcal{R}_2 is smaller or equal to

$$q + 1 + \left(\frac{q + 1}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{q^2 + 6q + 5}{4}.$$

Note there is a set I of $q + 1$ lines through P that are tangent to \mathcal{R}_2 , and a set D of $\frac{1}{2}q(q - 1)$ lines through P that are disjoint from \mathcal{R}_1 . Of the lines of D there are at most $\frac{q + 1}{2}$ lines which intersect a given line ℓ of \mathcal{R}_2 . If $J \in D - I$ and J intersects ℓ then J also must intersect another line $m \neq \ell$ of \mathcal{R}_2 . Thus the number of lines of D which intersect $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq 1 + q + \frac{(q + 1)^2}{2}$. Therefore, the number of lines through P which do not meet neither \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_2 is greater or equal to

$$\frac{q(q - 1)}{2} = \frac{q^2 + 6q + 5}{4} = \frac{q^2 - 8q - 5}{4}$$

Hence if $q > 7$, there is at least one line through P which does not meet neither of the two reguli.

Assume now $q = 7$. Let α denote the number of lines through P which intersect a unique line of \mathcal{R}_2 . Therefore the number of lines through P which intersect \mathcal{R}_2 does not exceed

$$\alpha + \frac{q + 1 - \alpha}{2} + \frac{q - 1}{2} \frac{q + 1}{2} = \frac{q^2 + 2q + 1 + 1 + 2\alpha}{4} = 16 + \frac{1 + 2\alpha}{4}$$

where $0 \leq \alpha \leq 8$. Hence, there is at least one line through P which does not meet neither of the two reguli.

For $q = 3$ and 5 direct calculations show the existence of such lines.

4.6 Note. If two reguli are not disjoint then there is a Desarguesian plane containing them. If the two reguli of $\text{PG}(3, q)$ share precisely one line, then they are contained in exactly one regular spread of $\text{PG}(3, q)$ [3]. The case when the two reguli share two lines is considered in [2].

References

1. L. E. Dickson, "Linear Groups," Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1958.
2. H. Gevaert and N. L. Johnson, *On maximal partial spreads in $\text{PG}(3, q)$ of dimension $q^2 - q + 1$, $q^2 + q + 2$* , ARS. Combinatoria 26 (1988).
3. H. Gevaert, N. L. Johnson, and J. A. Thas, *Spreads covered by reguli*, Simon Stevin 62 (1988). number 1
4. H. Lüneburg, "Translation planes," Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.
5. O. Veblen and J. W. Young, "Projective Geometry," Vol 1, Ginn, Boston, 1910.

R. Pomareda
 Departamento de Matemáticas
 Facultad de Ciencias
 Universidad de Chile
 Casilla 653. Santiago
 Chile