

# A remark on the Riemann-Roch-Weil Theorem

By Kisao TAKEUCHI

A. Weil proved in [1] the generalized Riemann-Roch theorem for generalized matrix divisors in the algebraic function field  $k$  in one variable. There he considered the case where the Riemann surface  $\mathfrak{R}$  of  $k$  contains a finite number of elliptic points but no parabolic points for a simply connected covering surface. Here we shall consider the case where  $\mathfrak{R}$  contains also a finite number of parabolic points.

In §1 we shall define a local divisor at a parabolic point. In §2 we shall prove the Riemann-Roch-Weil theorem in our case. In §3 we shall define the holomorphic form associated with a matrix representation  $\mathfrak{M}$  of  $\Gamma$ . All the holomorphic forms associated with  $\mathfrak{M}$ , make a vector space over the complex number field. We shall calculate the dimension of this vector space by applying the Riemann-Roch-Weil theorem.

## § 1. Divisors of Riemann Surface.

Let  $k$  be a field of algebraic functions in one variable over the complex number field  $C$ ,  $\mathfrak{R}$  be its Riemann surface and  $g$  be its genus. We take a finite set  $\{P_1, \dots, P_s\}$  of points on  $\mathfrak{R}$  and attach an integer  $n_\lambda$  to each point  $P_\lambda$  ( $1 \leq \lambda \leq s_1$ ) and  $\infty$  to  $P_\lambda$  ( $s_1+1 \leq \lambda \leq s$ ). We can construct a simply connected covering Riemann surface  $\mathfrak{R}$  over  $\mathfrak{R} - \{P_{s_1+1}, \dots, P_s\}$  whose covering transformation group  $\Gamma$  is generated by  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_g, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_g, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s\}$  and has  $(s_1+1)$ -fundamental relations,

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_1 \beta_1 \alpha_1^{-1} \beta_1^{-1} \cdots \alpha_g \beta_g \alpha_g^{-1} \beta_g^{-1} \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_s = 1 \\ \gamma_\lambda^{n_\lambda} = 1 \quad (1 \leq \lambda \leq s_1). \end{cases}$$

From now on we put the assumption

$$2g - 2 + \sum_{\lambda=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_\lambda}\right) > 0.$$

From this assumption it follows that  $\mathfrak{R}$  is isomorphic to the upper half plane  $\mathfrak{H}$ . Hence we regard  $\mathfrak{R}$  and  $\Gamma$  as  $\mathfrak{H}$  and a Fuchsian group of the first kind on  $\mathfrak{H}$  respectively. Let  $\mathfrak{P}$  be the set of all parabolic points with respect to  $\Gamma$ . Put  $\mathfrak{H} \cup \mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{H}^*$ , then  $\Gamma$  operates on  $\mathfrak{H}^*$ . Let us consider the quotient space  $\Gamma \backslash \mathfrak{H}^*$  and we denote the equivalence class of  $z$  ( $z \in \mathfrak{H}^*$ ) by  $\Gamma(z)$ . As usual we can make

the quotient space  $\Gamma \backslash \mathfrak{H}^*$  a compact Riemann surface by defining the local coordinate as follows.

(i) For an ordinary point  $z_0$  of  $\mathfrak{H}$ , take the local coordinate  $\tau = z - z_0$  at  $z_0$  and the local coordinate  $t = \tau$  at  $\Gamma(z_0)$ .

(ii) For an elliptic point  $z_0$  of  $\mathfrak{H}$  with the isotropy group  $\Gamma_{z_0}$  of order  $n_{z_0}$ , take the local coordinate  $\tau = \frac{z - z_0}{z - \bar{z}_0}$  at  $z_0$  and the local coordinate  $t = \tau^n$  ( $n = n_{z_0}$ ) at  $\Gamma(z_0)$ .

(iii) For a finite parabolic point  $z_0$  with the isotropy group  $\Gamma_{z_0} = \{\gamma^n | n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  take the local coordinate  $t = e^{2\pi i \tau}$  at  $\Gamma(z_0)$ , where  $\tau = -1/h(z - z_0)$ . Then  $\gamma(\tau) = \tau + 1$ . It is well-known that  $\Gamma \backslash \mathfrak{H}^* \approx \mathfrak{R}$ .

Now, we define  $k_P$  and  $K_P$  for each point  $P$  of  $\mathfrak{R}$  as follows.

(i) For  $P = \Gamma(z_0)$ ,  $z_0 \in \mathfrak{H}$  we denote by  $k_P$  the set of all meromorphic functions  $f(t)$  at  $t = 0$  and by  $K_P$  the set of all meromorphic functions  $f(\tau)$  at  $\tau = 0$ .

(ii) For  $P = \Gamma(z_0)$ ,  $z_0 \in \mathfrak{B}$  we denote by  $k_P$  the set of all meromorphic functions  $f(t)$  at  $t = 0$ , by  $k_P^{(n)}$  the set of all meromorphic functions  $f(t_n)$  ( $t_n = t^{1/n}$ ), at  $t_n = 0$  and put  $K_P = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} k_P^{(n)}$ . Then  $K_P$  is the algebraic closure of  $k_P$ . Each element  $f \in K_P$  can be expressed as  $f = t^{\alpha_0}(\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 t^{\alpha_1} + \dots)$  where  $\alpha_0 \neq 0$  and each  $\alpha_i$  ( $i = 0, 1, \dots$ ) is a rational number. We denote the local index of  $f$  at  $P$  by  $i_P(f) = \alpha_0$  and  $f \succ_P 0$  when  $i_P(f) \geq 0$ .

Let  $F = (f_{ij})$  be a function matrix of  $K_P$ , namely a square matrix of degree  $r$ , with entries  $f_{ij} \in K_P$ . We define the local index of  $F$  at  $P$  by  $i_P(F) = i_P(\det(F))$  and denote  $F \succ_P 0$  if all  $f_{ij} \succ_P 0$  ( $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, r$ ). It follows immediately  $i_P(F_1 F_2) = i_P(F_1) + i_P(F_2)$ .

A local divisor  $\Theta_P$  of degree  $r$  at  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$  is defined as follows<sup>(\*)</sup>. Put  $U_P = \{F \in GL(r, K_P) | F \succ_P 0, F^{-1} \succ_P 0\}$ , which is a subgroup of  $GL(r, K_P)$  invariant under each transformation of the isotropy group  $\Gamma_{z_0}$ . Then a local divisor  $\Theta_P$  is defined as a left coset  $U_P \theta_P$  ( $\theta_P \in GL(r, K_P)$ ) which is invariant under each transformation of  $\Gamma_{z_0}$ . We define the local index of  $\Theta_P$  by  $i_P(\Theta_P) = i_P(\theta_P)$ . This is independent of the choice of the representative  $\theta_P$ .

PROPOSITION 1. Let  $\Theta_P$  be a local divisor of degree  $r$  at an elliptic or a parabolic point  $P$ , then  $\theta_P$  can be chosen in the form

$$\theta_P = \begin{pmatrix} t^{d_1} & & & 0 \\ & \cdot & & \\ & & \cdot & \\ 0 & & & t^{d_r} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \theta_{0P}(t)$$

<sup>(\*)</sup> This definition is given by A. Weil [1] in case  $P$  is an ordinary point or an elliptic point.

where  $\theta_{0P}(t)$  belongs to  $GL(r, k_P)$ ,  $d_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq r$ ) is a rational number such that  $0 \leq d_i < 1$ , and  $d_i$  is a multiple of  $1/n_P$  when  $P$  is elliptic.

PROOF. This was proved by A. Weil [1] in case  $P$  is elliptic. Hence we consider the parabolic case. By the definition of  $\theta_P$ , there exists  $V \in U_P$  such that  $\theta_P^y = V \cdot \theta_P$ . It is easy to see  $\theta_P^{y^r} = V^{r-1} \cdot \dots \cdot V^1 \cdot V \cdot \theta_P$ . If we take another representative  $\theta'_P$  of  $\theta_P$ , there exists  $U \in U_P$  such that  $\theta'_P = U \theta_P$ . Then  $\theta_P^{y^r} = (U^r V U^{-1}) \theta'_P$ . Put  $V' = U^r V U^{-1}$ , then we have  $V'(0) = U(0)V(0)U^{-1}(0)$  for  $t=0$ . Since there exists an integer  $l$  such that  $\theta_P^{y^l} = \theta_P$  by the definition of  $\theta_P$ , we have  $V'^{l-1} V'^{l-2} \dots V' V = E$  (unit matrix) and hence  $V'(0) = E$  for  $t=0$ . We know that there exists  $M \in GL(r, C)$  such that  $V(0) = M^{-1}DM$  where

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} \xi_l^{d_1} & & 0 \\ & \cdot & \\ 0 & & \xi_l^{d_r} \end{pmatrix},$$

$d_i$ 's are rational integers such that  $0 \leq d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_r \leq l-1$ ,  $\xi_l$  is a  $l$ -th primitive root of 1. Put  $\theta'_P = M \theta_P$ , then  $\theta_P^{y^r} = V' \theta'_P$  where  $V'(0) = M \cdot V(0)M^{-1} = D$ . Hence we can assume that  $\theta_P^y = V \cdot \theta_P$ ,  $V(0) = D$ , without loss of generality. Put  $\theta_P^{y^v} = V_v \theta_P$  and  $\bar{\theta}_P = \sum_{v=0}^{l-1} D^{-v} \theta_P^{y^v} = \sum_{v=0}^{l-1} (D^{-v} \cdot V_v) \theta_P$ , then  $\sum_{v=0}^{l-1} D^{-v} V_v \succ_P 0$ ,  $V_v(0) = D^v$  and  $(\sum_{v=0}^{l-1} D^{-v} V_v)(0) = l \cdot E$ . Hence  $\sum_{v=0}^{l-1} D^{-v} V_v$  belongs to  $U_P$  and we have  $\theta_P = U_P \bar{\theta}_P$ . It is easy to see that  $\theta_P^y = D \cdot \bar{\theta}_P$ . Put

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} t^{d_1/l} & & 0 \\ & \cdot & \\ 0 & & t^{d_r/l} \end{pmatrix}$$

then  $(\Delta^{-1} \bar{\theta}_P)^y = \Delta^{-1} \bar{\theta}_P$  and there exists  $\theta_{0P}(t) \in GL(r, k_P)$  such that  $\bar{\theta}_P = \Delta \cdot \theta_{0P}$

(q.e.d.)

DEFINITION. As usual, a divisor  $\theta$  of degree  $r$  on  $\mathfrak{X}$  is defined as a system of local divisors  $\{\theta_P\}$  ( $P \in \mathfrak{X}$ ) such that  $\theta_P = E$  for almost all  $P$ . We define the total index of  $\theta$  by  $I(\theta) = \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{X}} i_P(\theta_P)$ .

§ 2. The Riemann-Roch-Weil Theorem.

Let a divisor  $\theta$  of degree  $r$  and a divisor  $\theta'$  of degree  $r'$  be given. Put  $L(\theta, \theta') = \{\phi \in M(r \times r', k) \mid \theta \phi \theta'^{-1} \succ_P 0 \text{ for all } P \in \mathfrak{X}\}$ , then  $L(\theta, \theta')$  is a vector space over  $C$ . By Proposition 1 we can assume that

(1)  $\theta_P = \Delta_P \theta_{0P}$ ,  $\Delta_P = (\delta_{ij} t^{d_i})$  ( $0 \leq d_i < 1$ ),  $\theta_{0P} = (\theta_{ij}) \in GL(r, k_P)$ ,  $\theta'_P = \Delta'_P \theta'_{0P}$ ,  $\Delta'_P = (\delta'_{ij} t^{d'_j})$  ( $0 \leq d'_j < 1$ ),  $\theta'_{0P} = (\theta'_{ij}) \in GL(r', k_P)$  where  $d_h = d'_k = 0$  when  $P$  is an ordinary point, and

$d_h, d'_k$  are multiples of  $1/n_P$  when  $P$  is an elliptic point. We denote  $\nu_P = \sum_{h=1}^r \sum_{k=1}^{r'}$   $\langle d_h - d'_k \rangle$  where  $\langle x \rangle = x - [x]$ .

Let  $d_j$  be a differential of  $k$ . We call  $(f_{ij})d_j$  for  $f_{ij} \in k$ , a differential matrix of  $k$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of all  $r' \times r$  differential matrices of  $k$  such that  $\theta' \frac{dI}{d\tau} \theta^{-1} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D}_0$  be the subset of  $\mathcal{D}$  consisting of all  $dI$ 's such that at each parabolic point  $P$ ,  $S_{kh}(t) \succ_P 0$  holds for each pair  $(k, h)$  with  $d_h = d'_k$  at  $P$  where  $(S_{kh}(t)) = \theta'_0 \frac{dI}{dt} \theta_0^{-1}$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{D}$  is a vector space over  $C$  and  $\mathcal{D}_0$  is a subspace of  $\mathcal{D}$ . We denote  $l(\theta, \theta') = \text{dimension of } L(\theta, \theta')$  and  $d_0 = \text{dimension of } \mathcal{D}_0$ .

THEOREM (Riemann-Roch-Weil).

$$l(\theta, \theta') = r'I(\theta) - rI(\theta') - rr'(g-1) - \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} \nu_P + d_0.$$

PROOF. We can prove this theorem by the same method as Weil [1]. But it is necessary to consider here the parabolic points which did not appear in his case. Let  $\psi = (\varphi_{ij}) \in L(\theta, \theta')$ . Then  $\theta\psi\theta'^{-1} = \Delta\Psi\Delta'^{-1} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ , where  $\Psi = (\psi_{hk}) = \theta_0\psi\theta_0'^{-1}$ . Since  $-1 < d_h - d'_k < 1$ , we obtain  $\Psi \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Put  $\theta_0^{-1} = (\mathcal{G}_{ij})$  and  $\theta_0'^{-1} = (\mathcal{G}'_{ij})$ .

Let us attach a non-negative integer  $b(P)$  to each point  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ , such that

$$-b(P) \leq \min_{j, k} (i_P(\mathcal{G}_{jk})) + \min_{j, k} (i_P(\mathcal{G}'_{jk})).$$

where  $b(P) = 0$  in case  $\theta_P = E_r$  and  $\theta'_P = E_{r'}$ . Then  $\varphi_{ij}$  belongs to  $L(\prod_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} P^{b(P)})$ . If we take  $\{b(P)\}$  such that  $\sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} b(P) > 2g - 2$ , then by the Riemann-Roch theorem

$$l(\prod_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} P^{b(P)}) = \dim L(\prod_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} P^{b(P)}) = \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} b(P) - g + 1.$$

Let us attach a non-negative integer  $a(P)$  to each  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$  such that  $-a(P) \leq i_P(\theta_{ij})$  for  $1 \leq i, j \leq r$  and  $-a(P) \leq i_P(\theta'_{kl})$  for  $1 \leq k, l \leq r'$ , where  $a(P) = 0$  in case  $\theta_P = E_r$  and  $\theta'_P = E_{r'}$ .  $\psi_{hk}$  has a pole at each  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$  at most of order  $2a(P) + b(P)$  and satisfies the following condition.

(2)  $\psi_{hk} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$  and  $\psi_{hk}(0) = 0$  for  $(h, k)$  with  $d_h < d'_k$ .

(2) is equivalent to

$$\text{Res}_P(t^\rho \cdot \psi_{hk}(t)) = 0 \text{ at each point } P \text{ on } \mathfrak{R}$$

for  $0 \leq \rho \leq 2a(P) + b(P) - 1$ , and for  $\rho = -1$  for the pair  $(h, k)$  with  $d_h < d'_k$  at  $P$ . This condition can be described by  $\Phi$  as follows.

(3)  $\text{Res}_P \{ t^\rho (\sum_{i, j} \theta_{hi} \varphi_{ij} \mathcal{G}'_{jk}) \} = 0$  at each  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$

for  $1 \leq h \leq r$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq r'$ ,  $0 \leq \rho \leq 2a(P) + b(P)$  and moreover for  $\rho = -1$  for the pair  $(h, k)$  with  $d_h < d'_k$ .

Now, put  $\mathfrak{M}(P) = \{(h, k); d_h < d'_k\}$  and  $m(P) =$ the number of the element of  $\mathfrak{M}(P)$ . Since there are  $rr'(2a(P) + b(P)) + m(P)$  equations (3) at each point  $P$  on  $\mathfrak{R}$ , we obtain in total  $\sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} \{rr'(2a(P) + 2b(P)) + m(P)\}$  equations. The number of unknowns is  $rr'(\sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} b(P) - g + 1)$ . If we obtain the number of independent relations among the left hand sides of (3), we can calculate  $l(\Theta, \Theta')$ .

If there exists a system  $\{C_{h,k}^{(P,\rho)}\} \neq \{0\}$ ,  $C_{h,k}^{(P,\rho)} \in C$  such that

$$\sum_{h,k,\rho,P} C_{h,k}^{(P,\rho)} \text{Res}_P \{t^\rho (\sum_{i,j} \theta_{hi} \varphi_{ij} \mathfrak{D}'_{jk})\} = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi_{ij} \in L(\prod_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} P^{b(P)}) \text{ then}$$

$$(4) \quad \sum_{i,j} [\sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} \text{Res}_P (\sum_{h,k,\rho} C_{h,k}^{(P,\rho)} t^\rho \theta_{hi} \varphi_{ij} \mathfrak{D}'_{jk})] = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi_{ij} \in L(\prod_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} P^{b(P)}).$$

Put

$$(5) \quad R_{kh}^{(P)}(t) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq \rho \leq 2a(P) + b(P) - 1 \\ \rho = -1 \text{ if } (h,k) \in \mathfrak{M}(P)}} C_{h,k}^{(P,\rho)} t^\rho \text{ and } R = \{(R_{kh}^{(P)})\}$$

(4) is equivalent to the following condition (6)

$$(6) \quad \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} \text{Res}_P \{(\sum_{k,h} \mathfrak{D}'_{jk} R_{kh}^{(P)} \theta_{hi}) \varphi\} = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in L(\prod_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} P^{b(P)})$$

and for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq r'$ .

By a lemma which was proved by Weil [1] pp. 58-59, there exists a differential matrix  $dI = (dI_{jk})$  of  $k$  such that  $\sum_{k,h} \mathfrak{D}'_{jk} R_{kh}^{(P)} \theta_{hi} = \frac{dI_{ji}}{dt} \pmod{t^{b(P)}}$ . Hence there exists a system  $M = \{M^{(P)}\}$  such that  $M^{(P)} \succ_P 0$  at each point  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$  and

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = \Theta_0^{-1} R \Theta_0 + M(t) \cdot t^{b(P)}.$$

From this it follows that

$$\Theta' \frac{dI}{d\tau} \Theta^{-1} = \alpha_P \mathcal{A}'_P (R + \Theta'_0 M \Theta_0^{-1} \cdot t^{b(P)}) \cdot \mathcal{A}'_P^{-1} t^{1 - \frac{1}{n_P}}$$

where  $\alpha_P$  is a constant. Put  $N^{(P)} = (N_{kh}^{(P)}) = \Theta'_0 M^{(P)} \Theta_0^{-1} \cdot t^{b(P)}$ , then by the choice of  $b(P)$  we have  $N^{(P)} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Since  $d'_k - d_h + 1 - \frac{1}{n_P} \geq 0$  at each point  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$  and  $d'_k - d_h + 1 - \frac{1}{n_P} \geq 1$  for the pair  $(h, k) \in \mathfrak{M}(P)$ , we obtain  $\Theta' \frac{dI}{d\tau} \Theta^{-1} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Hence  $dI$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}$ . Moreover

$$S_{kh} = R_{kh}^{(P)} + N_{kh}^{(P)} \succ_P 0$$

for  $(h, k)$  with  $d_h = d'_k$  at each parabolic point  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Hence  $dI$  belongs to  $\mathcal{D}_0$ .

Let  $V$  be the set of all systems  $R = \{R_{kh}^{(P)}\}$  ( $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ ) which is given by (5) satisfy-

ing the relations (4).  $V$  is a vector space over  $C$ . By the fact explained above, there exists a linear mapping  $f$  from  $V$  into  $\mathcal{D}_0$  defined by  $f(R) \equiv \theta_0^{-1} R \theta_0 \pmod{t^{b(P)}}$ . We shall prove that  $f$  is surjective. Put

$$R(t) = \theta_0^{-1} \frac{dI}{dt} \theta_0^{-1} - t^{2a(P)+b(P)} \cdot T^{(P)} \quad \text{where } T^{(P)} \succ_P 0, \text{ then we have}$$

$$\frac{dI}{dt} \equiv \theta_0^{-1} R \theta_0 \pmod{t^{b(P)}}$$

and

$$\theta_0^{-1} \frac{dI}{d\tau} \theta_0^{-1} = \alpha_P(R_{kh}^{(P)} t_{k'}^{d_k-d_h+1-\frac{1}{n_P}}) + \alpha_P(T_{kh}^{(P)} \cdot t_{k'}^{d_k-d_h+1-\frac{1}{n_P}}) \cdot t^{2a(P)+b(P)}.$$

By the definition of  $\mathcal{D}_0$  we have  $R_{kh}^{(P)}(t) = p_{kh}(t) + \beta_{kh}/t$  where  $p_{kh}(t)$  is a polynomial of degree  $2a(P)+b(P)-1$  and  $\beta_{kh}/t$  appears if and only if  $(h, k) \in \mathfrak{M}(P)$ , and

$$\sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} \text{Res}_P \{ (\sum_{k, h} \mathcal{D}'_{jk} R_{kh} \theta_{ht}) \varphi \} = \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} \text{Res}_P \left( \varphi \frac{dI_{ji}}{dt} \right) = 0 \text{ for all } \varphi \in L(\Pi P^{b(P)}).$$

Therefore  $R \in V$  and we see that  $f$  is surjective.

Since  $\dim V = \dim \mathcal{D}_0 + \dim \text{Ker}(f)$ , it remains to calculate  $\dim \text{Ker}(f)$ . By the same method as in Weil [1] we have

$$\dim \text{Ker}(f) = \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} \{ 2a(P)rr' + r'i_P(\theta_0) - r'i_P(\theta'_0) \}.$$

Therefore  $\dim V = d_0 + (\sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} 2a(P)) \cdot rr' + r'I(\theta_0) - r'I(\theta'_0)$  which is the number of independent relations among the left hand sides of (3). Therefore the number of independent equations among (3) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} \{ rr'(2a(P)+b(P)) + m(P) \} - \{ (\sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} 2a(P))rr' + r'I(\theta_0) - r'I(\theta'_0) + d_0 \} \\ & = rr' \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} b(P) + rI(\theta') - r'I(\theta) + \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} \nu_P - d_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since there are  $rr' \{ \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} b(P) - g + 1 \}$  unknowns, we obtain

$$l(\theta, \theta') = r'I(\theta) - r'I(\theta') - rr'(g-1) - \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} \nu_P + d_0 \quad (\text{q.e.d.})$$

**§ 3. Holomorphic forms associated with a representation of  $\Gamma$ .**

Let  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  be a Fuchsian group of fractional linear transformations on the unit disk  $\mathfrak{N} = \{w \mid |w| < 1\}$  of the first kind. Let  $\{\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\sigma})\}$  be a matrix representation of degree  $r$  of  $\tilde{\Gamma}$ . H. Poincaré defined the zetafuchsian series

$$\tilde{\Theta}_*(w) = \sum_{\sigma \in \tilde{\Gamma}} \mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\sigma})^{-1} \tilde{F}(\tilde{\sigma}w) \left( \frac{d\tilde{\sigma}w}{dw} \right)^m$$

where  $\tilde{F}(w)=(\tilde{f}_{ij}(w))$ ,  $\tilde{f}_{ij}(w)$  is a rational function which is holomorphic on some neighbourhood of the unit circle  $\{w||w|=1\}$ .

**Theorem (Poincaré [3] pp. 445-450).**

Let  $\{w_1, \dots, w_r\}$  be the set of all the poles of  $\tilde{f}_{ij}(w)$ ,  $(i, j=1, \dots, r)$ . If all the proper values of  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\gamma})$  for any parabolic transformation  $\tilde{\gamma}$  have absolute value 1, then for sufficiently large positive integer  $m$ ,  $\Theta_*(w)$  converges absolutely and uniformly on any compact set contained in  $\mathfrak{N} - (\bigcup_{i=1}^r \tilde{\Gamma}(w_i))$ .

Now we come back to the upper half plane  $\mathfrak{H}$  and a matrix representation  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma)$  of  $\Gamma$ .

From now on we consider the case where  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma)$  ( $\sigma \in \Gamma$ ) takes only a finite number of different matrices. Let  $\rho$  be the isomorphism from  $\mathfrak{N}$  to  $\mathfrak{H}$  defined by  $z = \rho(w) = i \frac{1+w}{1-w}$ . Put  $\tilde{\sigma} = \rho^{-1}\sigma\rho$ ,  $\tilde{\Gamma} = \rho^{-1}\Gamma\rho$ ,  $\mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\sigma}) = \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)$ , then we can apply the above theorem and

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_*(w) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{M}(\tilde{\sigma})^{-1} \tilde{F}(\tilde{\sigma}w) \left( \frac{d\tilde{\sigma}w}{dw} \right)^m = \sum_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)^{-1} \tilde{F}(\rho^{-1}\sigma z) \left( \frac{d\rho^{-1}\sigma z}{d\rho^{-1}z} \right)^m \\ &= \left( \sum_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)^{-1} F(\sigma z) \left( \frac{d\sigma z}{dz} \right)^m \right) \cdot \left( \frac{dz}{d\rho^{-1}(z)} \right)^m \end{aligned}$$

where  $F(z) = (f_{ij}(z)) = \tilde{F}(\rho^{-1}z) \left( \frac{d\rho^{-1}(z)}{dz} \right)^m$ .

Put  $\Theta_*(z) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Gamma} \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)^{-1} F(\sigma z) \left( \frac{d\sigma z}{dz} \right)^m$ , then  $\Theta_*(z)$  converges absolutely and uniformly on compact set contained in  $\mathfrak{H} - \bigcup_{j=1}^l \Gamma(z_j)$ , where  $\{z_1, \dots, z_l\}$  is the set of all poles of  $f_{ij}(z)$  ( $i, j=1, 2, \dots, r$ ). Here we can take  $F(z) = E_r \cdot \frac{1}{(z-\beta)^{2m}}$  where  $\beta$  is an arbitrary point in  $\mathfrak{H}$  and we can easily find  $\beta$  such that  $\det(\Theta_*(z)) \neq 0$ .

We shall consider  $\Theta_*(z)$  near each parabolic point  $z_0$ . Here we may assume  $z_0 = i\infty$ . Take  $\tau = \frac{z}{h}$ ,  $t = e^{2\pi i\tau}$  such that  $\Gamma_\infty = \{\gamma^n | \gamma(\tau) = \tau + 1\}$ , then  $\Gamma = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \sigma_j \Gamma_\infty$  where  $\sigma_j = \frac{\alpha_j z + \beta_j}{\gamma_j z + \delta_j}$  ( $\gamma_j \neq 0$ ).

$$\text{Put } F_j(z) = \mathfrak{M}(\sigma_j)^{-1} F(\sigma_j z) \left( \frac{d\sigma_j(z)}{dz} \right) = \mathfrak{M}(\sigma_j)^{-1} \frac{(\alpha_j \delta_j - \beta_j \gamma_j)^m}{(\alpha_j - \beta_j \gamma_j)^{2m}} \frac{1}{(z - \sigma_j^{-1}(\beta))^{2m}}$$

then

$$\Theta_*(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathfrak{M}(\gamma^n)^{-1} F_j(\gamma^n z) = A_P^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} D_P^n A_P F_j(\gamma^n z)$$

where  $A_P$  is a constant matrix such that  $D_P = A_P \mathfrak{M}(\gamma) A_P^{-1}$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i a_1} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ & & e^{2\pi i a_r} \end{pmatrix} \quad (0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_r < 1).$$

Put

$$A_P(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i a_1 \tau} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ & & e^{2\pi i a_r \tau} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $A_P^{-1} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} D_P^{-n} A_P F_j(\gamma^n z)$  is invariant under the transformation  $\gamma$ , we can express  $A_P^{-1} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} D_P^{-n} A_P F_j(\gamma^n z) = (\theta_j^{(h, k)}(t))$  and  $A_P^{-1} A_P \theta_*(z) = \sum_{j=1}^r \theta_j(t)$ . Since  $t \theta_j^{(h, k)}(t) = \alpha_{h, k}$   $\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-2\pi i a_h} \cdot e^{-2\pi i (a_h - 1)\tau}}{(\tau - \sigma_j^{-1}(\beta) + n)^{2m}}$  then we have  $|t \cdot \theta_j^{(h, k)}(t)| \leq |\alpha_{h, k}| \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{|\tau - \sigma_j^{-1}(\beta) + n|^{2m}}$ , and  $t \cdot \theta_j^{(h, k)}(t) \rightarrow 0$  ( $\text{Im } \tau \rightarrow \infty$ ). Hence  $t \cdot \theta_j^{(h, k)}(t)$  is zero at  $t=0$ . It follows that  $\theta_j^{(h, k)}(t)$  is holomorphic at  $t=0$  and  $A_P^{-1} A_P \theta_*(z)$  is also holomorphic at  $t=0$ . Therefore we have  $\theta_*(z) = A_P^{-1} \cdot A_P(\tau) \theta_0(t)$  where  $\theta_0(t) \in GL(r, k_P)$ . At each finite parabolic point  $z = x_0$  ( $x_0$ : real) we have  $\theta_*(z) = A_P^{-1} \cdot A_P(\tau) \theta_0(t) \left(\frac{d\tau}{dz}\right)^m$  where  $\tau = -\frac{1}{h} \frac{1}{(z - x_0)}$ ,  $t = e^{2\pi i \tau}$ ,  $\Gamma_{x_0} = \{\gamma^n; \gamma(\tau) = \tau + 1\}$ ,  $\theta_0(t) \in GL(r, k_P)$ .

We denote by  $\theta_*(z)$  in case  $r=1$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(\sigma)$  is trivial. Put

$$(7) \quad \Theta(z) = \theta_*(z) / \theta_*(z), \text{ then we have } \Theta(\sigma z) = \mathfrak{M}(\sigma) \Theta(z)$$

for all  $\sigma \in \Gamma$ . Hence we can regard  $\Theta(z)$  as a divisor of degree  $r$  on  $\mathfrak{M}$ .

PROPOSITION 2. The total index  $I(\Theta)$  of  $\Theta(z)$  given by (7), is equal to 0.

PROOF. Since  $\frac{1}{\det(\Theta)} d(\det(\Theta))$  is  $\Gamma$ -invariant, then it is a differential of  $k$  and

$$i_P(\Theta) = i_P(\det(\Theta)) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_P \frac{1}{\det(\Theta)} \frac{d(\det(\Theta))}{dt} = \text{Res}_P \left( \frac{1}{\det(\Theta)} d(\det(\Theta)) \right)$$

By the Residue theorem, we have  $I(\Theta) = \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{R}} i_P(\Theta) = \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{M}} \text{Res}_P \left( \frac{1}{\det(\Theta)} d(\det(\Theta)) \right) = 0$  (q.e.d.)

DEFINITION. A vector  $f(z) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(z) \\ \vdots \\ f_r(z) \end{pmatrix}$  is called a holomorphic form associated

with  $\mathfrak{M}$  of weight  $m$ , if  $f$  satisfies the following two conditions.



1)  $f(\sigma z) = \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)f(z) \left(\frac{d\sigma z}{dz}\right)^{-m}$  (for all  $\sigma \in \Gamma$ ). Assume that  $f$  satisfies 1). At

each point  $z_0$  on  $\mathfrak{S}^*$  let  $\Gamma_{z_0} = \{\gamma\}$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(\gamma) = A \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i a_1} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & e^{2\pi i a_r} \end{pmatrix} A^{-1}$  ( $0 \leq a_1 \leq a_2 \leq$

$\dots \leq a_r < 1$ ). Then we see

$$f(z) \left(\frac{d\tau}{dz}\right)^{-m} = A \begin{pmatrix} t^{a_1} & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ & & t^{a_r} \end{pmatrix} F(t) \left(\frac{dt}{d\tau}\right)^m \text{ where } A \in GL(r, C), F(t) = \begin{pmatrix} F_1(t) \\ \vdots \\ F_r(t) \end{pmatrix}.$$

2)  $F_i(t)$  is meromorphic at  $t=0$  and  $f(z) \left(\frac{d\tau}{dz}\right)^{-m} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{N}$ .

Let  $M_m(\Gamma, \mathfrak{M})$  be the set of all holomorphic forms associated with  $\mathfrak{M}$ . It is a vector space over  $C$ . We shall calculate the dimension of  $M_m(\Gamma, \mathfrak{M})$ . Let  $f \in M_m(\Gamma, \mathfrak{M})$  and  $\Theta$  be the matrix given by (7). Put  $\Phi(z) = (\Phi_i(z)) = \Theta^{-1} f \left(\frac{dj}{dz}\right)^{-m}$ . Since  $\Phi(\sigma z) = \Phi(z)$  for all  $\sigma \in \Gamma$  and  $\Phi$  is meromorphic at each point  $P \in \mathfrak{N}$ ,  $\Phi_i(z)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq r$ ) belongs to  $k$ . By the condition 2) we have

$$\Theta \Phi \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^m = f(z) \left(\frac{d\tau}{dz}\right)^{-m} \succ_P 0 \text{ for all } P \in \mathfrak{N}.$$

Hence  $\Phi \in L \left(\Theta \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^m, 1\right)$ .

Therefore,  $M_m(\Gamma, \mathfrak{M})$  is isomorphic to  $L \left(\Theta \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^m, 1\right)$  and

$$\dim M_m(\Gamma, \mathfrak{M}) = l \left(\Theta \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^m, 1\right).$$

By Theorem 1 and Proposition 2.

$$\begin{aligned} l \left(\Theta \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^m, 1\right) &= I \left(\Theta \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^m\right) - r(g-1) - \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{N}} \nu_P + d_0 = I(\Theta) + \\ &+ mr I \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right) - r(g-1) - \sum_{P \in \mathfrak{N}} \nu_P + d_0 = r \left\{ (2m-1)(g-1) + m \sum_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_i}\right) \right\} \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{h=1}^r \left\langle a_h - \frac{m}{n_i} \right\rangle + d_0. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to calculate  $d_0$ . Since we have assumed that  $\{\mathfrak{M}(\sigma) | \sigma \in \Gamma\}$  is a finite set,  $\Gamma' = \{\sigma \in \Gamma | \mathfrak{M}(\sigma) = E\}$  is also a Fuchsian group of the 1st kind and all

the Fuchsian functions with respect to  $\Gamma'$  make an algebraic function field  $k'$  which is a finite extension over  $k$ . Since  $\theta$  is invariant under each transformation of  $\Gamma'$ , we have  $\theta \in GL(r, k')$ . From the definition it follows that  $\mathscr{D} \cong L\left(\left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^{1-m}, \theta\right)$  and  $\mathscr{D} \supset \mathscr{D}_0$ .

We divide two cases.

(I)  $m > 1$

If  $\psi = (\psi_i) \in L\left(\left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^{1-m}, \theta\right)$ , then  $\varrho = (\varrho_i) = \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^{1-m} \psi \theta^{-1} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Put  $\phi = (\phi_i) = \psi \theta^{-1} = \varrho \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^{m-1}$ . Since  $I(\phi_i) = I(\varrho_i) + (m-1)I\left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right) > 0$  and  $\phi_i \in k'$ , we have  $\phi_i = 0$ . This implies  $\mathscr{D} \cong L\left(\left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^{1-m}, \theta\right) = (0)$ , and hence  $\mathscr{D}_0 \cong \{0\}$ ,  $d_0 = \dim \mathscr{D}_0 = 0$ .

(II)  $m = 1$

In this case we have  $\mathscr{D} \cong L(1, \theta)$ . Let  $\psi \in L(1, \theta)$ . Since  $\psi \theta^{-1} \succ_P 0$  for all  $P \in \mathfrak{R}$ , we have  $\psi \theta^{-1} = C$  (a constant vector). And  $(\psi \theta^{-1})^\sigma = \psi^\sigma \theta^{-1\sigma} = \psi \cdot \theta^{-1} \cdot \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)^{-1} = (\psi \theta^{-1}) \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)^{-1}$ , hence  $C = C \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)$  for all  $\sigma \in \Gamma$ . We obtain  $L(1, \theta) = \{C \theta | C = C \mathfrak{M}(\sigma)\}$  and hence  $\mathscr{D} \cong \{C | C = C \mathfrak{M}(\sigma) \text{ for all } \sigma \in \Gamma\}$ . Decompose  $\mathfrak{M}$  into the irreducible representations of  $\Gamma$ . Then  $\dim \mathscr{D}$  is the multiplicity of the trivial representation in  $\mathfrak{M}$ .

Now we shall calculate  $\dim \mathscr{D}_0$ .

(II<sub>1</sub>): In case where  $\Gamma'$  contains no parabolic transformations, we have  $\mathscr{D}_0 = \mathscr{D}$  and hence  $d_0 = \dim \mathscr{D}$ .

(II<sub>2</sub>): In case where  $\Gamma'$  contains at least one parabolic transformation. Let us consider the case  $\{m(\sigma)\} = 1$  and hence  $\theta = 1$ . Then  $\mathscr{D} = \{dI | \frac{dI}{d\tau} \left(\frac{dj}{d\tau}\right)^{-1} \succ_P 0 \text{ for all } P \in \mathfrak{R}\}$  and  $\mathscr{D}_0 = \{c dj | c \frac{dj}{dt} \cdot \left(\frac{dj}{dt} \cdot t_P\right)^{-1} \succ_P 0 \text{ for each parabolic point } P\} = \{0\}$  and  $d_0 = 0$ . In the general case we have also  $d_0 = 0$  by decomposing  $\mathfrak{M}$  into irreducible representations. Thus we have proved the following theorem.

**THEOREM 2.** *If  $\mathfrak{M}$  is a matrix representation of degree  $r$  of  $\Gamma$  such that  $\{\mathfrak{M}(\sigma) | \sigma \in \Gamma\}$  is a finite set, then*

$$\dim M_m(\Gamma, \mathfrak{M}) = r \{ (2m-1)(g-1) + m \sum_{\lambda=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{1}{n_\lambda}\right) \} - \sum_{\lambda=1}^s \sum_{h=1}^r \langle a_h - \frac{m}{n_\lambda} \rangle + d_0$$

where  $d_0$  is the multiplicity of the trivial representation in  $\mathfrak{M}$  when  $m=1$  and  $\Gamma$  contains no parabolic transformations, otherwise  $d_0$  is 0.

**References**

- [ 1 ] A. Weil: Généralisation des fonctions abéliennes, *J. Math. pures appl.* **17** (1938), 47-87.
- [ 2 ] H. Poincaré: Sur les fonctions fuchsiennes, *Acta math.* **1** (1882), 193-294 (Oeuvres II, 169-257).
- [ 3 ] H. Poincaré: Mémoire sur les fonctions zetafuchsiennes, *Acta math.* **5** (1884), 209-278 (Oeuvres II, 402-462).
- [ 4 ] A. Weil: Über Matrizenringen auf Riemannschen Flächen und den Riemann-Rochschen Satz, *Abh. Hamburg* **11** (1936), 111-115.

(Received Nov. 20, 1965)