

The character of the Weil representation of a finite abelian group of odd order

Frieder Ladisch

Abstract. Let V be a finite abelian group of odd order, equipped with a non-degenerate, alternating form $\omega: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. We give closed formulas for the character values of the Weil representation associated with (V, ω) . These formulas generalize the ones given by S. Gurevich and R. Hadani (2007) and by T. Thomas (2008, 2013) from finite vector spaces to abelian groups. Our formulas do not involve the choice of a Lagrangian subgroup of V . Our proofs are based on an elementary algebraic approach introduced by H. N. Ward (1972, 2017) for finite vector spaces over fields.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). Primary 11F27, Secondary 20C15.

Keywords. Weil character, Weil representation, symplectic groups, oscillator representation, finite abelian groups.

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries and Notation	5
3. The symplectic algebra	7
4. The Weil representation	9
5. The Weil character: simple properties	11
6. Values on elements of odd order	14
7. Bilinear forms over principal ideal rings	15
8. Signs of automorphisms	17
9. Quadratic Gauss sums on abelian groups	20
10. Factorization of a symplectic automorphism	23
11. Proofs of the main theorems	25
12. Corollaries and Examples	29
References	33

1. Introduction

1.1. Results

Let R be a finite, commutative ring of odd order with some primitive additive character $\lambda: (R, +) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$, where *primitive* means that no nonzero ideal is contained in $\text{Ker } \lambda$. Let V be a finite module over R , with a symplectic form $\omega: V \times V \rightarrow R$. The symplectic group $\text{Sp}(V) = \text{Sp}_R(V, \omega)$ consists of the R -linear automorphisms of V preserving the

form ω , This group has a well known representation W called the *Weil representation*, after a celebrated paper by André Weil [42], who studied analogous representations in the case when V is a locally compact abelian group. In this paper, we give formulas for the character, $\text{tr } W$, of the Weil representation W in the situation where V is a finite module as described above. (This includes the case that V is a finite abelian group of odd order).

Our first main result is the following:

Theorem A. *Let $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ have odd order. Then*

$$\text{tr } W(-g) = \text{tr } W(-1_V) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr } W(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{v \in V} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}\omega(v, vg)\right).$$

This result has a surprisingly simple proof in the approach we use in this paper. As mentioned in the abstract, this approach is essentially due to H. N. Ward [39, 40], who considered vector spaces over finite fields. In Sections 3 and 4, we will give a fairly detailed and self-contained exposition of Ward's construction of the Weil representation, extending it to the case of finite abelian groups. We will also explain how to define the (canonical) Weil representation W associated to (V, ω, λ) , independently of whether $\text{Sp}(V)$ is a perfect group or not.

Ward's explicit construction immediately yields a convolution formula for $\text{tr } W$ (see Proposition 5.2), from which Theorem A follows easily (see Proposition 6.1 and Corollary 6.2).

In the case when the orders of g and V both are powers of the same prime, the second formula in Theorem A was proved by I. M. Isaacs [19, Theorem 6.1], with a much longer proof. In a different context, this formula appears in my dissertation¹ [23, Corollary 4.34].

The formula for $\text{tr } W(g)$ in Theorem A is in general not correct when $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ has even order. Before we introduce all the definitions necessary for the general formula, we give another special case. When α is or induces a permutation of some finite set X , then $\text{sign}_X(\alpha)$ denotes the *sign* or *signature* of this permutation.

Theorem B. *Let $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ be such that $1 - g$ is invertible. Then*

$$\text{tr } W(g) = (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|V|}-1}{2}} \text{sign}_V(1 - g).$$

We collect some elementary properties of sign for automorphisms of finite R -modules in Section 8. For example, when $R = F$ is a finite field of odd order and $\alpha \in \text{GL}(n, F)$, then $\text{sign}_{F^n}(\alpha) = 1$ if and only if $\det(\alpha)$ is a square in F^* . In view of this, Theorem B generalizes a result of S. Gurevich and R. Hadani [15, Theorem 2.2.1], which was obtained using algebraic geometry.

For the general formula, we need some more notation. For $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$, define a bilinear form B_g on $X = V(1 - g)$ by

$$B_g(v(1 - g), w(1 - g)) = \omega(v, w(1 - g)) \quad \text{for } v, w \in V.$$

¹When writing my dissertation (2008), I was not aware that the “magic character” appearing there and in Isaacs's work is in fact the character of a Weil representation.

Then B_g is well-defined and non-degenerate as form on $X = V(1 - g)$ (see [Lemma 2.4](#) below).

Second, for an arbitrary *symmetric*, non-degenerate bilinear form $q: X \times X \rightarrow R$, set

$$\gamma_\lambda(q) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X|}} \sum_{x \in X} \lambda(\tfrac{1}{2}q(x, x)).$$

We will prove some elementary properties of such normalized *Gauss sums* in [Section 9](#), for example that $\gamma_\lambda(q)^2 = (-1)^{(|X|-1)/2}$. (In the finite field case, $\gamma_\lambda(q)$ is the *Weil index* in the usual sense [\[42, 27\]](#), but we do not need this.)

The following main result is proved in [Section 11](#), and [Theorem B](#) is deduced as [Corollary 11.5](#).

Theorem C. *Let $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ and write $X = V(1 - g)$. If $q: X \times X \rightarrow R$ is a non-degenerate, symmetric form, then there is a unique $\alpha \in \mathrm{GL}_R(X)$ such that $q(x, y) = B_g(x\alpha, y)$ for all $x, y \in X$. Then*

$$\mathrm{tr} W(g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \mathrm{sign}_X(\alpha) \gamma_\lambda(-q).$$

When R is a finite field of odd order, then $\mathrm{sign}_X(\alpha) = 1$ in [Theorem C](#) if and only if q and B_g have the same discriminant. (In general, B_g is not symmetric.) It follows that in the finite field case, the formula in [Theorem C](#) reduces to the one developed by T. Thomas in his 2013 paper [\[37, Corollary 1.4\]](#). The formula in Thomas's earlier paper [\[36, Theorem 1A\]](#) follows easily by elementary rules for the evaluation of Gauss sums (cf. [Example 12.1](#)).

At least when R is a finite principal ideal ring, for example, $R = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, it is not difficult to see that there exist non-degenerate, symmetric forms on any finite R -module. In our proof of [Theorem C](#), we will show that for a finite principal ideal ring R , there is such a form q for which the α in [Theorem C](#) has even parity, that is, $\mathrm{sign}_X(\alpha) = 1$, and so $\mathrm{tr} W(g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \gamma_\lambda(-q)$. (Thomas [\[37, p. 1538\]](#) takes the viewpoint that the form B_g , which is in general not symmetric, determines an element of the Witt ring modulo a certain ideal. Thus B_g determines an equivalence class of symmetric forms and the Weil index γ_λ is constant on this equivalence class.) In general, we can always view V and X just as abelian groups, and thus replace R by $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ with suitable m .

The Weil representation depends on the primitive linear character $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$. As a corollary of our results, we prove in [Corollary 12.10](#) the following nice formula, which relates the characters of the Weil representations W_λ and W_{λ^2} :

$$\mathrm{tr} W_\lambda(g) \cdot \mathrm{tr} W_\lambda(-g) = (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|V|}-1}{2}} \cdot \mathrm{tr} W_{\lambda^2}(g^2).$$

For finite fields, this formula is due to R. Guralnick, K. Magaard and P. H. Tiep [\[14, Theorem 1.2\]](#). (We have $\mathrm{tr} W_\lambda = \mathrm{tr} W_{\lambda^2}$ on $\mathrm{Sp}_R(V)$ if and only if 2 is a square in R .)

1.2. Background

Weil representations were introduced by A. Weil [42] for locally compact abelian groups, in particular vector spaces over local fields or adelic rings. Weil representations for symplectic vector spaces over finite fields appeared probably first in a 1961 paper by B. Bolt, T. G. Room, and G. E. Wall [4], independently of Weil’s work. Although Weil suggested that the case of finite abelian groups would merit closer investigation [42, p. 143–144], most of the literature on Weil representations associated to finite abelian groups is concerned with the case of vector spaces over finite fields.

S. Tanaka [34, 35] used Weil representations associated to $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/p^\ell\mathbb{Z}$ to construct the irreducible representations of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})$. Weil representations of finite abelian groups in general were also studied by A. Prasad [28], K. Dutta and A. Prasad [9] and N. Kaiblinger and M. Neuhauser [21]. By now, there is also an extensive literature on Weil representations of $\mathrm{Sp}(2n, R)$ and unitary groups over finite rings R [7, 8, 13, 32, 33] (to name just a few references).

The absolute value of the character of the Weil representation of a vector space over a finite field was determined by R. Howe [18]. Formulas for values of the Weil character of the symplectic group of a vector space over a finite field were given by P. Gerardin [11] and K. Shinoda [31], but these formulas are quite complicated and partly depend on case analysis. Formulas for the character values on a set of generating elements of the symplectic group were given by M. Neuhauser [26], using concrete matrices for the Weil representation.

At the same time as Howe, but in a completely different context, the character of the Weil representation associated with a finite abelian p -group was studied extensively by I. M. Isaacs [19]. (In Isaacs’s paper, the term “Weil representation” is not used. The relation of Isaacs’s work to the Weil representation and its character can perhaps best be seen from his Theorems 4.7 and 4.8.) Isaacs proved that $|\mathrm{tr} W(g)|^2 = |\mathbf{C}_V(g)|$ [19, Thms. 3.5(a), 4.8], and gave an algorithm for determining the signs of $\mathrm{tr} W(g)$ for all $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$, without giving a closed formula. He also proved our [Theorem A](#) under the assumption that g has p -power order.

A quite elementary approach to the Weil representation associated to a finite abelian group was given by A. Prasad [28]. Prasad used his methods to give a very simple proof of the equality $|\mathrm{tr} W(g)|^2 = |\mathbf{C}_V(g)|$ for arbitrary abelian groups.

In the case where V is a vector space over a finite field, S. Gurevich and R. Hadani [15] found a simple formula for $\mathrm{tr} W(g)$ when $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ is such that $g - 1$ is invertible (essentially the one in [Theorem B](#) above). Their proof uses techniques of algebraic geometry. T. Thomas [36, Theorem 1A] [37, Corollary 1.4] found simple formulas for $\mathrm{tr} W(g)$ for arbitrary $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$, where V is a vector space over a (finite or local) field. Thomas’s approach works uniformly for finite and local fields, and uses machinery like the Weil index, the Maslov index and a construction of the metaplectic group as an extension of the symplectic group by a subfactor group of the Witt group. A more elementary, but rather longish proof of Thomas’s results was given by A.-M. Aubert and T. Przebinda [2]. In the finite field case, H. N. Ward [40] gave a short and elementary proof of a version

of Thomas's character formula, building on his approach to the Weil representation from 1972 [39]. Our proof of [Theorem C](#) owes a significant debt to the ideas in Ward's preprint [40]. The methods of our proofs are rather elementary, and we have made an effort to make the paper self-contained.

2. Preliminaries and Notation

Throughout, we will assume the following:

2.1. Basic Setup. R is a finite commutative ring (with 1) such that 2 is invertible in R , and $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ is a primitive additive character of R , where *primitive* means that $\text{Ker } \lambda$ contains no nonzero ideal of R . (A finite ring R has a primitive additive character if and only if R is a finite Frobenius ring. We refer the reader to T. Honold's paper [17] and the references therein.)

Additionally, V is a finite module over R and $\omega: V \times V \rightarrow R$ is a non-degenerate, bilinear alternating form on V . We write $\text{Sp}_R(V, \omega)$ (or simply $\text{Sp}(V)$ when R and ω are clear from context) for the group of R -linear automorphisms g of V preserving the form, that is, $\omega(vg, wg) = \omega(v, w)$ for all $v, w \in V$.

(The case of a finite abelian group V of odd order is covered by $R = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, where m is any odd multiple of the exponent of V .)

If $B: U \times W \rightarrow R$ is a bilinear form on the product of two R -modules, and if $X \leq U$ and $Y \leq W$, we write

$$X^B = \{ w \in W \mid B(x, w) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in X \} \quad \text{and} \\ {}^BY = \{ u \in U \mid B(u, y) = 0 \text{ for all } y \in Y \}.$$

We call B *non-degenerate* when $U^B = 0$ and ${}^BW = 0$. For $B = \omega$, we write X^\perp instead of X^ω .

2.2. Lemma. *Let R be a finite commutative ring with a primitive additive character $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$, and let $B: U \times W \rightarrow R$ be a non-degenerate bilinear form. Then the maps $U \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(W, R)$ and $W \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(U, R)$ induced by B are isomorphisms. For $X, \tilde{X} \leq U$, we have:*

- (a) $w \in X^B \iff \lambda(B(x, w)) = 1$ for all $x \in X$.
- (b) ${}^B(X^B) = X$.
- (c) $(X + \tilde{X})^B = X^B \cap \tilde{X}^B$ and $(X \cap \tilde{X})^B = X^B + \tilde{X}^B$.
- (d) $|U| = |X||X^B| = |W|$.

Similar statements hold on the other side for submodules $Y, \tilde{Y} \leq W$.

Proof. We begin with (a). For $w \in W$ and $X \leq U$, the set $B(X, w)$ is an ideal of R . As $\text{Ker}(\lambda)$ contains no non-zero ideals, $\lambda(B(X, w)) = 1$ implies $w \in X^B$. The direction " \implies " is clear, so (a) follows.

In particular, we see that the multiplicative form $\mu(x, y) = \lambda(B(x, y))$ induces injections $W \hookrightarrow \widehat{U} := \text{Hom}(U, \mathbb{C}^*)$ and $U \hookrightarrow \widehat{W}$. From $|U| = |\widehat{U}|$ and $|W| = |\widehat{W}|$, these must be isomorphisms. The isomorphism $W \rightarrow \widehat{U}$ is the composition of the injective maps $w \mapsto B(\cdot, w) \mapsto \lambda \circ B(\cdot, w)$, so all these are isomorphisms. Similarly, we have an isomorphism $W/X^B \rightarrow \widehat{X}$ for every submodule $X \leq U$. Thus $|W| = |X||X^B|$, and the rest follows easily. \square

The following will often be used without further reference, especially the case $r = s = 1$:

2.3. Lemma. *Assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#) and $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$, and let $rs = 1_R$ for $r, s \in R$. Then $\text{Ker}(r - g) = (V(s - g))^\perp$.*

Proof. We have $\omega(v, w(s - g)) = \omega(v(s - g^{-1}), w)$. Thus the non-degeneracy of ω yields: $v \in (V(s - g))^\perp \iff 0 = v(s - g^{-1}) = v(g - r)sg^{-1} \iff v \in \text{Ker}(r - g)$. \square

Following C. E. Wall [38] and T. Thomas [36, 37], we introduce a bilinear form on $V(1 - g)$ for any $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$.

2.4. Lemma. *Assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#) and let $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$. Define*

$$B_g(v(1 - g), w(1 - g)) = \omega(v, w(1 - g)).$$

Then

$$B_g: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$$

is a well-defined, non-degenerate bilinear form with $B_g(x, y) - B_g(y, x) = \omega(x, y)$ for all $x, y \in V(1 - g)$.

We should note here that $B_g(x, y) = -\sigma_g(x, y) = -\Theta_g(y, x)$, where σ_g is the form used by T. Thomas [37], and Θ_g is H. N. Ward's [40] "theta form". Our convention follows C. E. Wall [38].

Proof of [Lemma 2.4](#). (cf. [38, Lemma 1.1.1, Eq. 1.1.3], [40, Lemma 3.4]) Set $\alpha = 1 - g$, that is, $g = 1 - \alpha$. Then the equation $\omega(vg, wg) = \omega(v, w)$ translates to

$$\omega(v\alpha, w\alpha) = \omega(v, w\alpha) + \omega(v\alpha, w).$$

Thus $v_1\alpha = v_2\alpha$ implies $\omega(v_1, w\alpha) = \omega(v_2, w\alpha)$, so B_g is well-defined. Also, if $w\alpha$ is such that $0 = B_g(v\alpha, w\alpha) = \omega(v, w\alpha)$ for all $v \in V$, then $w\alpha = 0$ by non-degeneracy of ω . Thus B_g is non-degenerate. Finally, from

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(v\alpha, w\alpha) &= \omega(v, w\alpha) + \omega(v\alpha, w) \\ &= \omega(v, w\alpha) - \omega(w, v\alpha) \\ &= B_g(v\alpha, w\alpha) - B_g(w\alpha, v\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

we see $B_g(x, y) - B_g(y, x) = \omega(x, y)$ for $x, y \in V\alpha = V(1 - g)$. \square

When $B: X \times X \rightarrow R$ is a bilinear form and 2 is invertible in R , then we can write $B = B_s + B_a$ with $B_s(x, y) = (1/2)(B(x, y) + B(y, x))$ symmetric and $B_a(x, y) = (1/2)(B(x, y) - B(y, x))$ alternating. We have seen $(B_g)_a = \omega/2$ (on $V(1 - g)$). In [Section 11](#), we need the following facts about the symmetric part (also known as *Cayley form* [\[37\]](#)):

2.5. Lemma. *Set $Q_g(x, y) = (1/2)(B_g(x, y) + B_g(y, x))$. Then*

$$Q_g(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\omega(vg, w) + \omega(wg, v)) = \frac{1}{2}B_g(x(1 + g), y)$$

for $x = v(1 - g)$, $y = w(1 - g)$. The radical of Q_g is $\text{Ker}(1 + g)$.

Proof. The formulas for Q_g can be verified by straightforward calculations. Notice that $v = (1/2)v(1 - g) + (1/2)v(1 + g)$ for all $v \in V$, and thus $\text{Ker}(1 + g) \subseteq V(1 - g)$. The claim on the radical follows from B_g being non-degenerate. \square

3. The symplectic algebra

In this section, we extend definitions and results of Ward [\[39, 40\]](#) from the situation where R is a finite field to our more general situation. The proofs are essentially the same.

3.1. Definition. Assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#) and let $\mathbb{K} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^*$ be a field containing the values of λ . The **symplectic algebra** $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbb{K}, V, \lambda \circ \omega)$ is the twisted group ring of V over \mathbb{K} with factor set $\lambda \circ (\frac{1}{2}\omega)$. This means that \mathcal{A} has a \mathbb{K} -basis

$$\{b_v \mid v \in V\}$$

indexed by V , and multiplication is given by

$$b_v b_w = \lambda(\frac{1}{2}\omega(v, w)) b_{v+w} = (\lambda \circ \omega)(v/2, w) b_{v+w}. \quad (1)$$

(Since 2 is invertible in R , this makes sense.)

The factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is not present in Ward's definition. We have introduced this factor for consistency with the usual definition of the Heisenberg group. The **Heisenberg group** $H = H(V, R, \omega)$ is the set $V \times R$ with multiplication defined by

$$(v, r)(w, s) = (v + w, r + s + \frac{1}{2}\omega(v, w)).$$

It is routine to verify that H is a group with this multiplication, with center $\mathbf{Z}(H) = 0 \times R \cong R$. Moreover, $(v, r) \mapsto b_v \lambda(r)$ is a group homomorphism from H into the unit group of \mathcal{A} , with kernel $\text{Ker } \lambda$. As we will see below, \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to a matrix ring over \mathbb{K} . The resulting representation of H is known as the *Schrödinger representation of type λ* , and is the unique irreducible representation of H lying over λ . These facts allow to translate between the approach taken here and others like the one by A. Prasad [\[28\]](#).

3.2. Lemma. *The algebra \mathcal{A} has the following properties:*

- (a) $b_0 = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the identity.
- (b) Every b_v is a unit with inverse $(b_v)^{-1} = b_{-v}$.
- (c) $b_w^{-1} b_v b_w = \lambda(\omega(v, w)) b_v$.
- (d) The center of \mathcal{A} is $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{K}1_{\mathcal{A}}$.

Proof. Easy calculations. (d) follows from (c) and the non-degeneracy of $\lambda \circ \omega$. \square

3.3. Proposition (cf. [39, Theorem 1.3]). *The symplectic algebra \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to the $n \times n$ matrix algebra over \mathbb{K} , where $n^2 = |V|$.*

Proof. Let $L \leq V$ be a Lagrangian submodule, that is, a submodule with $L^\perp = L$. (Notice that any submodule maximal subject to $L \subseteq L^\perp$ is Lagrangian.) Then $|V| = |L|^2$ by Lemma 2.2. Set

$$e := \frac{1}{|L|} \sum_{x \in L} b_x.$$

Then $eb_x = b_x e = e$ for $x \in L$ and $e^2 = e$. For $t \notin L$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} eb_t e &= \frac{1}{|L|^2} \sum_{x, y \in L} b_x b_t b_y \\ &= \frac{1}{|L|^2} b_t \sum_{x, y \in L} \lambda(\omega(x, t)) b_x b_y && \text{(Lemma 3.2(c))} \\ &= \frac{1}{|L|^2} b_t \sum_{z, x \in L} \lambda(\omega(x, t)) b_z = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows since $x \mapsto \lambda(\omega(x, t))$ is a nontrivial character of L for $t \notin L$.

Now let T be a set of coset representatives of L in V , that is, $V = \bigcup_{t \in T} (L + t)$, and form the set of elements

$$e_{st} := b_s^{-1} e b_t, \quad s, t \in T.$$

From the above it follows that $e_{st} e_{qr} = \delta_{tq} e_{sr}$. Moreover, using Lemma 3.2(c), we get

$$\sum_{t \in T} e_{tt} = \sum_{t \in T} \frac{1}{|L|} \sum_{x \in L} b_t^{-1} b_x b_t = \frac{1}{|L|} \sum_{x \in L} \sum_{t \in T} \lambda(\omega(x, t)) b_x = b_0 = 1_{\mathcal{A}}.$$

(Here we use that $t \mapsto \lambda(\omega(x, t))$ is a nontrivial character of V/L for $x \neq 0$.) Therefore, the elements e_{st} for $s, t \in T$ form a full set of matrix units, and their \mathbb{K} -span is a $|T| \times |T|$ matrix ring over \mathbb{K} [24, 17.4, 17.5]. Since $e_{ss} b_v = \mu(s, v) b_s^{-1} e b_t = \mu(s, v) e_{st}$ for some $\mu(s, v) \in \mathbb{K}$ and the $t \in T$ with $L + s + v = L + t$, we see that $b_v = \sum_s e_{ss} b_v$ is in the \mathbb{K} -span of the e_{st} 's and so the matrix units span \mathcal{A} . As $|V| = |L||T| = |T|^2$, the proposition follows. \square

3.4. Remark. The last result and its proof remain valid when \mathbb{K} is a ring such that $|V|$ is invertible in \mathbb{K} and such that there exists a primitive character $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^*$.

Since \mathcal{A} is a matrix ring, it has a trace function $\text{tr}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. We need the trace on the canonical basis.

3.5. Lemma. $\text{tr } b_v = n\delta_{v,0}$, where $n = \sqrt{|V|}$.

Proof. $\text{tr } b_0 = n$ is clear since $b_0 = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$. For $v \neq 0$, there exists $w \in V$ with $\lambda(\omega(v, w)) \neq 1$. Thus $\text{tr } b_v = 0$ for $v \neq 0$ follows from Lemma 3.2(c). \square

4. The Weil representation

There is a natural action of $\text{Sp}_R(V, \omega) = \text{Sp}(V)$ on \mathcal{A} , namely

$$\left(\sum_{v \in V} c_v b_v \right)^g = \sum_{v \in V} c_v b_{vg} \quad (c_v \in \mathbb{K}).$$

The usual construction of the Weil representation is as follows: Since $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathbf{M}_n(\mathbb{K})$, there exists, for any $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$, an invertible element $P(g) \in \mathcal{A}$ (unique up to scalars), such that $b_{vg} = b_v^{P(g)}$ for all $v \in V$. We can view $P: \text{Sp}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \cong \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{K})$ as a projective representation, and one can show that this can be made into an honest representation.

In this paper, we take a more constructive approach, which is essentially due to H. N. Ward [39, Proposition 2.1], who considers the case where R is a finite field. The same idea works in our more general situation. We use the form B_g introduced in Lemma 2.4.

4.1. Theorem. For $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$,

$$P(g) = \sum_{x \in V(1-g)} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}B_g(x, x)\right) \cdot b_x \in \mathcal{A} \quad (2)$$

is invertible and we have $(b_v)^{P(g)} = b_{vg}$ for all $v \in V$. For $g, h \in \text{Sp}(V)$, we have $P(g)P(h) = c(g, h)P(gh)$ with

$$c(g, h) = \sum_{x \in V(1-g) \cap V(1-h)} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}(B_g(x, x) + B_h(x, x))\right).$$

Proof. Let $v \in V$. Then

$$b_v \cdot b_v^{-g} = b_v \cdot b_{-vg} = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}\omega(v, -vg)\right) \cdot b_{v-vg} = \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}B_g(x, x)\right) \cdot b_x$$

for $x = v(1 - g)$. This shows that

$$P(g) = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \sum_{v \in V} b_v b_v^{-g}. \quad (3)$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} b_w \cdot P(g) \cdot b_w^{-g} &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \sum_{v \in V} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}\omega(w, v)\right) b_{w+v} \left(\lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}\omega(w, v)\right) b_{w+v}\right)^{-g} \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \sum_{v \in V} b_{w+v} b_{w+v}^{-g} = P(g) \end{aligned}$$

and thus $b_w \cdot P(g)P(g^{-1}) = P(g)P(g^{-1}) \cdot b_w$ for all $w \in V$. Therefore, $P(g)P(g^{-1}) \in \mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{K}b_0$. Thus to show that $P(g)$ is invertible, it suffices to show that the coefficient of b_0 in $P(g)P(g^{-1})$ is not zero.

More generally, for $g, h \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$, let $c(g, h)$ be the coefficient of b_0 in $P(g)P(h)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} c(g, h) &= \sum_{x \in V(1-g) \cap V(1-h)} \lambda(\tfrac{1}{2}B_g(x, x))\lambda(\tfrac{1}{2}B_h(-x, -x))\lambda(\tfrac{1}{2}\omega(x, -x)) \\ &= \sum_{x \in V(1-g) \cap V(1-h)} \lambda\left(\tfrac{1}{2}(B_g(x, x) + B_h(x, x))\right). \end{aligned}$$

For $h = g^{-1}$, the equality $v(1 - g) = -vg(1 - g^{-1})$ yields $V(1 - g) = V(1 - g^{-1})$, and $B_{g^{-1}}(x, x) = -B_g(x, x)$ for all $x \in V(1 - g)$. Thus $c(g, g^{-1}) = |V(1 - g)| \neq 0$, and $P(g)$ is invertible.

Since also $P(g)P(h)P(gh)^{-1} \in \mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{K}b_0$ and the coefficient of b_0 in $P(gh)$ is 1, we see that $P(g)P(h) = c(g, h)P(gh)$ as claimed. The proof is complete. \square

Although it is well known, even in this generality [7, 19, 28], we give here the simple proof that P can be made into an honest representation. We give the proof because at the same time we define “the” *canonical* Weil representation.

4.2. Lemma. *Set*

$$T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{v \in V} b_v.$$

Then $T^2 = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\mathrm{tr} T = 1$ and $TP(g) = P(g)T$ for all $g \in G$.

Proof. That $T^2 = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$ follows from a straightforward computation in \mathcal{A} , or alternatively from $T = (1/\sqrt{|V|})P(-\mathrm{id}_V)$ and Theorem 4.1. For the trace, use Lemma 3.5. Finally, $T^{P(g)} = T$ is clear from $(b_v)^{P(g)} = b_{vg}$. \square

By Proposition 3.3, \mathcal{A} is a matrix ring. Let M be a simple \mathcal{A} -module, so $M \cong \mathbb{K}\sqrt{|V|}$. Let E_{\pm} be the eigenspaces of T in M for the eigenvalues ± 1 . Then $M = E_+ \oplus E_-$. When $c \in \mathcal{A}$ centralizes T , then c maps E_{\pm} into itself. In particular, the E_{\pm} are invariant under $P(g)$ for all $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$.

4.3. Theorem. *Let T , M and E_{\pm} be as above. Then for any $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$, there is a unique $W(g) \in \mathcal{A}^*$ such that*

- (a) $(b_v)^{W(g)} = b_{vg}$ for all $v \in V$, and
- (b) $\det W(g)|_{E_+} = \det W(g)|_{E_-}$.

Moreover, $W(gh) = W(g)W(h)$ for all $g, h \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$.

Proof. Let $d_{\pm} = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} E_{\pm}$. Then $d_+ - d_- = \mathrm{tr} T = 1$. For $c \in \mathcal{A}^*$ with $cT = Tc$, consider $\eta(c) := \det c|_{E_+} \cdot (\det c|_{E_-})^{-1}$. For a scalar μ , we have $\eta(\mu c) = \mu^{d_+ - d_-} \eta(c) = \mu \eta(c)$. It follows that $\eta(\eta(c)^{-1}c) = 1$ and that this is the unique scalar multiple of c for which η is 1.

Let $P(g)$ be as in [Theorem 4.1](#). Then $W(g) := \eta(P(g))^{-1}P(g)$ is the unique element in \mathcal{A}^* satisfying (a) and (b). Since $\eta(W(g)W(h)) = \eta(W(g))\eta(W(h)) = 1$, we must have $W(g)W(h) = W(gh)$. \square

We call $W = W_{\omega,\lambda}$ **the (canonical) Weil representation** associated to ω, λ . (Notice that V and R are implicit in ω and λ .) Since $\mathcal{A} \cong \text{End}_{\mathbb{K}}(M) \cong \mathbf{M}_{\sqrt{|V|}}(\mathbb{K})$, we can view $W: \text{Sp}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^* \cong \text{GL}_{\mathbb{K}}(M)$ as a representation in the usual sense. The character $\psi = \psi_{\omega,\lambda}$ of W is called **the (canonical) Weil character**.

The purpose of this paper is to find a formula for $\psi_{\omega,\lambda}(g)$. The point of the next remark is that it is no loss of generality to assume $R = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. (The situation would be different if we were to study the decomposition of ψ into irreducible characters, as in [7, 9, 28].)

4.4. Remark. Since $\lambda(R) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^*$ is a finite cyclic subgroup of order m (say), we can write $\lambda = \lambda' \circ \kappa$, where $\kappa: R \rightarrow R' := \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ is a surjective group homomorphism and λ' a faithful linear character of $(R', +)$. We get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & R & & \\ & \omega \nearrow & \downarrow \kappa & \searrow \lambda & \\ V \times V & & & & \mathbb{C}^* \\ & \searrow \omega' & \downarrow & \nearrow \lambda' & \\ & & R' & & \end{array}$$

In general, κ is not a ring homomorphism, because $\text{Ker } \lambda$ contains no non-zero ideal of R , but the composed form $\omega' = \kappa \circ \omega$ is bi-additive and thus R' -bilinear, as $R' = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. Thus $(V, R', \omega', \lambda')$ satisfies [Basic Setup 2.1](#). The symplectic algebra depends only on the bilinear form (bicharacter) $\lambda \circ \omega: V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$. Clearly,

$$\text{Sp}_R(V, \omega) \subseteq \text{Sp}_{R'}(V, \omega') = \text{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}}(V, \lambda \circ \omega).$$

For $g \in \text{Sp}_R(V, \omega)$, we have $W_{\omega', \lambda'}(g) = W_{\omega, \lambda}(g)$. This follows easily by first observing that the analogous result for the P defined in [Theorem 4.1](#) holds.

5. The Weil character: simple properties

In this and the next section, we assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#), and we let $W: \text{Sp}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the canonical Weil representation associated to the data (V, R, ω, λ) , and $\psi = \text{tr } W$ its character.

In the next result, E_{\pm} are as defined before [Theorem 4.3](#). We also write simply -1 for the central involution in $\text{Sp}(V)$ sending v to $-v$.

5.1. Proposition. *Let ψ_+ and ψ_- be the characters of W on E_+ and E_- , respectively. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(-1) &= (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|V|}-1}{2}}, \\ \psi_+(g) &= \frac{\psi(g) + \psi(-1)\psi(-g)}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_-(g) = \frac{\psi(g) - \psi(-1)\psi(-g)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We use the notation from the proof of [Theorem 4.3](#): It follows from that proof that $W(-1) = (\det T|_{E_+})(\det T|_{E_-})^{-1} \cdot T = (-1)^{d_-} T$. Thus $\psi(-1) = (-1)^{d_-} \operatorname{tr} T = (-1)^{d_-}$. From $d_+ + d_- = \dim M = \sqrt{|V|}$ and $d_+ - d_- = \operatorname{tr} T = 1$ it follows that $d_- = (\sqrt{|V|} - 1)/2$.

The projection of M to E_\pm is given by $e_\pm = (1 \pm T)/2 = (1 \pm \psi(-1)W(-1))$. From this the other formulas follow. \square

By using Ward's concrete formula for a projective representation equivalent with W , we get a convolution formula for ψ :

5.2. Proposition. *Let $g, h \in \operatorname{Sp}(V)$. Then*

$$\psi(gh) = \frac{\psi(g)\psi(h)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{x \in V(1-g) \cap V(1-h)} \lambda \left(\frac{1}{2} (B_g(x, x) + B_h(x, x)) \right).$$

Proof. Let $P(g)$ be as defined in [Theorem 4.1](#). Then $W(g) = \mu(g)P(g)$ for some $\mu(g) \in \mathbb{K}$ (in fact, we computed $\mu(g)$ in the proof of [Theorem 4.3](#)), and by taking traces, we see that we must have $\psi(g) = \mu(g)\sqrt{|V|}$. From $W(gh) = W(g)W(h)$ and $P(g)P(h) = c(g, h)P(gh)$ it follows that

$$\frac{\psi(gh)}{\sqrt{|V|}} = \frac{\psi(g)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \frac{\psi(h)}{\sqrt{|V|}} c(g, h).$$

From the value of $c(g, h)$ in [Theorem 4.1](#), the result follows. \square

For the sake of completeness, we give a simple proof of the following result, although it is well known [[18](#), [19](#), [28](#)].

5.3. Proposition. *We have*

$$|\psi(g)|^2 = |\operatorname{Ker}(g - 1)| = |\mathbf{C}_V(g)| \quad \text{for all } g \in \operatorname{Sp}(V).$$

Proof. The linear map $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ sending a to $a^{W(g)}$ has trace

$$\operatorname{tr} W(g)^{-1} \operatorname{tr} W(g) = |\psi(g)|^2,$$

as is seen when using a set of matrix units as basis of \mathcal{A} . On the other hand, $\{b_v \mid v \in V\}$ is a basis of \mathcal{A} , and $b_v^{W(g)} = b_{vg}$. The result follows. \square

5.4. Proposition.

- (a) *The order of the character $g \mapsto \det W(g)$ divides the order of λ .*
- (b) *Suppose that the order of $g \in \operatorname{Sp}(V)$ is prime to $|V|$. Then $\psi(g)$ is rational.*

Proof. Our results so far are valid over the field $\mathbb{K} := \mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$ generated by the values of λ . It follows that $\operatorname{tr} W(g)$, $\det W(g)$ and $\det W(g)|_{E_\pm} \in \mathbb{K}$ (where $E_\pm = \operatorname{Ker}(I \mp T)$ as defined before [Theorem 4.3](#)). This already shows that the order of $\det W(g)|_{E_+}$ divides $2\mathbf{o}(\lambda)$. As $\det W(g) = (\det W(g)|_{E_+})^2$, (a) follows.

Now suppose that $\gcd(\mathbf{o}(g), |V|) = 1$. The eigenvalues of $W(g)$ lie in a field \mathbb{L} obtained by adjoining a primitive $\mathbf{o}(g)$ th root of unity to \mathbb{Q} , and thus $\operatorname{tr} W(g) \in \mathbb{L}$. Since $\gcd(\mathbf{o}(g), |V|) = 1$, we have $\mathbb{K} \cap \mathbb{L} = \mathbb{Q}$ [[25](#), Corollary on p. 204]. Thus $\psi(g) = \operatorname{tr} W(g) \in \mathbb{Q}$ as claimed. \square

Another proof of (a) is by showing that $\mathrm{Sp}(V)$ is generated by elements of order dividing the order of λ (which coincides with the characteristic of R , since λ is primitive). In fact, it seems that $\mathrm{Sp}(V)$ is perfect with only certain exceptions, so that $\mathrm{Sp}(V)$ either has no nontrivial linear characters or only ones of order 3. (For example, for $V = (\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z})^2$ or $V = (\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z})^2$, the symplectic group $\mathrm{Sp}(V)$ is not perfect.) W. Klingenberg [22, Corollary to Theorem 3] has shown that $\mathrm{Sp}_R(V)$ is a perfect group when $V \cong R^{2n}$ and R is a local ring with $|R/\mathbf{J}(R)| > 3$. His proof can be extended to the case where $|R/\mathbf{J}(R)| = 3$ and $n > 1$.

The next result, together with the facts that $\psi(g)^2 = |\mathbf{C}_V(g)|$ and $\psi(g)$ is rational, allows to compute $\psi(g)$ inductively for elements of 2-power-order. We need only the case $g^2 = 1$, which can also be proved directly.

5.5. Proposition. *Let $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ have order 2^k . Then*

$$\psi(g) \equiv (\psi_{\langle g^2 \rangle}, 1_{\langle g^2 \rangle})_{\langle g^2 \rangle} \pmod{4}.$$

(Here, $(\alpha, \beta)_H = (1/|H|) \sum_{h \in H} \alpha(h) \overline{\beta(h)}$ denotes the usual inner product for class function on a finite group H , and 1_H the trivial character of H .)

Proof of Proposition 5.5. The eigenvalues of $W(g)$ are 2^k -th roots of unity. Since $W(g)$ as matrix can be realized over $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda)$, the roots of unity ε and $\varepsilon^{-1} = \bar{\varepsilon}$ occur with the same multiplicity as eigenvalue in $W(g)$, and except for $\varepsilon = \pm 1$, also ε and $-\varepsilon$ occur with the same multiplicity. It follows that

$$\psi(g) = \mathrm{tr} W(g) = m_1 + m_{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \det W(g) = (-1)^{m_{-1}},$$

where $m_{\pm 1}$ are the multiplicities of the eigenvalues ± 1 . By Proposition 5.4 (a), we have $\det W(g) = 1$, so m_{-1} must be even. Thus

$$\psi(g) = m_1 - m_{-1} \equiv m_1 + m_{-1} \pmod{4}.$$

But $m_1 + m_{-1}$ is the multiplicity of 1 as eigenvalue of $W(g^2)$. This is the multiplicity of the trivial character of $\langle g^2 \rangle$ as a constituent of the restricted character $\psi_{\langle g^2 \rangle}$. By the orthogonality relations of character theory, the result follows. \square

5.6. Corollary. *Let $t \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ be an involution and set $c = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(t)|}$, $d = \sqrt{|V(1-t)|}$. Then c and d are positive integers and*

$$\psi(t) = (-1)^{\frac{d-1}{2}} c.$$

Proof. By Proposition 5.3 and Proposition 5.4, $\psi(t) = \pm c \in \mathbb{Q}$. By Proposition 5.5 with $k = 1$, it follows that $\psi(t) \equiv \psi(1) = cd \pmod{4}$, and thus the result. \square

5.7. Example. Let $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ be an element with $g^2 = -1$. (The Weil representation of such an element encodes the discrete Fourier transformation.) By Proposition 5.5, we have $\psi(g) \equiv (\psi(1) + \psi(-1))/2 \pmod{4}$. It follows that $\psi(g) = 1$ if $\psi(1) \equiv 1, 3 \pmod{8}$ and $\psi(g) = -1$ if $\psi(1) \equiv 5, 7 \pmod{8}$, or, more succinctly, $\psi(g) = \left(\frac{-2}{\psi(1)}\right)$ (Jacobi-Symbol).

6. Values on elements of odd order

We keep the notation introduced in the last section, in particular in [Proposition 5.1](#). The ideas in the next proof are taken from Isaacs's paper [\[19, Theorem 5.3\]](#).

6.1. Proposition. *For any $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ of odd order,*

$$\psi(-g) = \psi(-1) \quad \text{and} \quad \psi_+(g) - \psi_-(g) = 1.$$

Proof. Recall that ψ_{\pm} is the character of W on E_{\pm} . It follows from the formulas in [Proposition 5.1](#) that $\psi_+(g) - \psi_-(g) = \psi(-1)\psi(-g)$ for all $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$. Since $\psi(-1) = \pm 1$, the two claims of the proposition follow from each other.

Let $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ have odd order. Then $\mathbf{C}_V(-g) = \mathrm{Ker}(1 + g) = 0$. It follows from [Proposition 5.3](#) that $|\psi_+(g) - \psi_-(g)| = |\psi(-g)| = 1$. Let $U \leq \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ be a subgroup of odd order and let $(\cdot, \cdot)_U$ denote the usual inner product for class functions on U . Consider the virtual character $\psi_+ - \psi_-$. Then

$$(\psi_+ - \psi_-, \psi_+ - \psi_-)_U = \frac{1}{|U|} \sum_{g \in U} |\psi_+(g) - \psi_-(g)|^2 = 1$$

and thus $\pm(\psi_+ - \psi_-)_U \in \mathrm{Irr} U$. Since $\psi_+(1) - \psi_-(1) = 1$, it follows that $\mu := (\psi_+ - \psi_-)_U$ is a linear character of U . Taking determinants yields $\det(\psi_+)_U = \mu \det(\psi_-)_U$ and thus $\mu = 1_U$ by the definition of the canonical Weil character ψ . This shows $1 = (\psi_+ - \psi_-)(g)$ for all g of odd order, as claimed. \square

The next result is the second part of [Theorem A](#) from the introduction.

6.2. Corollary. *Let $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ have odd order. Then*

$$\psi(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{v \in V} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}\omega(v, vg)\right).$$

Proof. By the convolution formula from [Proposition 5.2](#) applied to $g = (-1)(-g)$, we have

$$\psi(g) = \frac{\psi(-1)\psi(-g)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{x \in V(1 - (-1)) \cap V(1 - (-g))} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}(B_{-1}(x, x) + B_{-g}(x, x))\right).$$

By [Proposition 6.1](#), $\psi(-1)\psi(-g) = 1$. By [Lemma 2.5](#) (or direct computation), $B_{-1}(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in V(1 - (-1)) = 2V = V$. As g has odd order, $\mathrm{Ker}(1 + g) = \{0\}$ and thus $V(1 - (-g)) = V(1 + g) = V$. For $x = v(1 + g)$, we have

$$B_{-g}(x, x) = \omega(v, v(1 + g)) = \omega(v, vg).$$

Thus the result follows. \square

We conclude this section with a digression and show that our definition of the *canonical* Weil representation W is equivalent to the one of Isaacs [19, (5.2)]. This also yields a more representation theoretic characterization of W .

6.3. Remark. Let π be the set of primes dividing $|V|$, and let G be any group acting on V by symplectic automorphisms (so there is a homomorphism $G \rightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ defined). Then the restriction of the canonical Weil representation to G is the unique group homomorphism $W: G \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^*$ such that the following hold:

- (a) $W(g)^{-1}aW(g) = a^g$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $g \in G$.
- (b) The order of the character $g \mapsto \det W(g)$ is a π -number.
- (c) For any π -subgroup U , the trivial character 1_U is the unique constituent of the character ψ_U of $W|_U$ occurring with odd multiplicity.

Proof. The canonical Weil representation has all these properties: (b) follows from Proposition 5.4 (a). By Proposition 6.1, we have $(\psi_+ - \psi_-)_U = 1_U$ for any odd order subgroup U , and thus $\psi_U = (\psi_+ - \psi_-)_U + 2(\psi_-)_U = 1_U + 2(\psi_-)_U$. Thus (c) holds for subgroups of odd order, and this includes π -subgroups.

It remains to show that these properties determine W . Suppose \widetilde{W} is another such homomorphism. Since $\mathbf{Z}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathbb{K}1_{\mathcal{A}}$, it follows from Condition (a) that $\widetilde{W}(g) = \mu(g)W(g)$, where $\mu: G \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^*$ is a linear character. As $\det \widetilde{W}(g) = \mu(g)^{\psi(1)} \det W(g)$ and $\det W(g)$ are supposed to have order a π -number, and since $\psi(1) = \sqrt{|V|}$ is also a π -number, it follows that $\mathbf{o}(\mu)$ is a π -number. Let U be a π -subgroup. As 1_U occurs in ψ_U with odd multiplicity, μ_U occurs in $(\mu\psi)_U$ with odd multiplicity. By Condition (c) for \widetilde{W} we must have $\mu_U = 1_U$. Now we have shown that $\mathbf{o}(\mu)$ is a π -number, but the restriction of μ to any π -subgroup is trivial. Thus $\mu = 1$ and $\widetilde{W} = W$ as claimed. \square

7. Bilinear forms over principal ideal rings

This is the first of several sections which prepare the proof of the main result (Theorem C).

Throughout this section, R denotes a *principal ideal ring* (PIR), that is, a commutative ring with 1 in which every ideal is a principal ideal. We do *not* assume that R is a domain: for example, the results hold for $R = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. The ideas in the next proposition are extracted from an unpublished note by P.-Y. Gaillard [10].

7.1. Proposition. *Let R be a PIR and $B: U \times W \rightarrow R$ a bilinear form, where U, W are R -modules. Then $B(U, W) := \{ B(u, w) \mid u \in U, w \in W \}$ is an ideal, and if $B(U, W) = RB(u, w)$, then*

$$U = Ru + {}^B w \quad \text{and} \quad W = Rw + u^B.$$

When B is non-degenerate, these sums are direct sums.

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} be the set of all ideals of the form $RB(x, y)$, and let $RB(u, w)$ be maximal in \mathcal{I} . Since $B(U, w)$ is an ideal and R a PIR, we have $B(U, w) \in \mathcal{I}$, and so $B(U, w) =$

$RB(u, w)$ by maximality. Let $x \in U$. Then $B(x, w) = rB(u, w)$ for some $r \in R$, and so $x - ru \in {}^Bw$. This shows $U = Ru + {}^Bw$. The same argument on the other side shows that $B(u, W) = RB(u, w)$ and $W = Rw + u^B$. When B is non-degenerate, then $Ru \cap {}^Bw \subseteq {}^B(Rw + u^B) = {}^BW = \{0\}$ and thus $U = Ru \oplus {}^Bw$. In the same way, $U^B = \{0\}$ implies $Rw \cap u^B = 0$.

It remains to show that $B({}^Bw, u^B) \subseteq RB(u, w)$. Let $x \in {}^Bw$ and $y \in u^B$. Then $B(ru + sx, w + y) = rB(u, w) + sB(x, y)$ for $r, s \in R$. It follows that the ideal

$$I = \{ rB(u, w) + sB(x, y) \mid r, s \in R \}$$

is a member of \mathcal{I} . By maximality, $I = RB(u, w)$, and thus $B(x, y) \in RB(u, w)$. Thus $B(U, W) = RB(u, w)$ is an ideal. \square

7.2. Corollary. *Let R be a PIR and $B: U \times W \rightarrow R$ a non-degenerate bilinear form, where the modules U and W are finitely generated. Then there are elements $u_1, \dots, u_r \in U$ and $w_1, \dots, w_r \in W$ such that*

$$U = Ru_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Ru_r \quad \text{and} \quad W = Rw_1 \oplus \dots \oplus Rw_r,$$

and $B(u_i, w_j) = \delta_{ij}d_i$ with $Rd_1 \geq Rd_2 \geq \dots \geq Rd_r$.

Proof. By [Proposition 7.1](#), $B(U, W) = RB(u_1, w_1)$ for some $u_1 \in U$ and $w_1 \in W$, and we have $U = Ru_1 \oplus {}^Bw_1$ and $W = Rw_1 \oplus u_1^B$. We can then repeat the argument for $B: {}^Bw_1 \times u_1^B \rightarrow R$. The process stops since U and W are noetherian. \square

7.3. Corollary. *Let R be a local PIR such that 2 is invertible in R . Let $Q: U \times U \rightarrow R$ be a symmetric bilinear form on the module U . Then there is $x \in U$ with $Q(U, U) = RQ(x, x)$.*

Proof. Any ideal of R has the form $R\pi^n$, where $R\pi$ is the maximal ideal of R . In particular, the ideals of R form a chain.

By [Proposition 7.1](#), there exist $u, w \in U$ with $Q(U, U) = RQ(u, w)$. As

$$Q(u, w) = \frac{1}{2} \left(Q(u + w, u + w) - Q(u, u) - Q(w, w) \right),$$

and since the ideals of R form a chain, we have $Q(U, U) = RQ(x, x)$ for at least one $x \in \{u + w, u, w\}$. \square

7.4. Corollary. *Let R be a finite PIR of odd order and $Q: U \times U \rightarrow R$ a symmetric bilinear form on the module U . Then there is $u \in U$ with $Q(U, U) = RQ(u, u)$.*

Proof. Any finite ring is the direct product of finitely many finite, local rings, say $R = R_1 \times \dots \times R_\ell$ [[1](#), Theorem 8.7]. We have a corresponding orthogonal idempotent decomposition $1 = e_1 + \dots + e_\ell$, where $R_i = Re_i$ and $e_i = 1_{R_i}$. Then $U = e_1U \oplus \dots \oplus e_\ell U$ and $Q(e_iU, e_jU) = 0$ for $i \neq j$, and $Q(e_iU, e_iU) \subseteq Re_i = R_i$. By [Corollary 7.3](#), for each i , there is an element $u_i = e_iu_i \in e_iU$ such that $Q(e_iU, e_iU) = RQ(u_i, u_i)$. Then $u = u_1 + \dots + u_\ell$ has the desired property. \square

By the usual Gram-Schmidt process, it follows that for U finitely generated, U/U^Q can be written as an orthogonal sum of cyclic modules.

As the proof shows, the last corollary holds when R is a direct product of finitely many local PIRs with 2 invertible. On the other hand, [Corollary 7.4](#) does not hold for arbitrary PIRs, not even when 2 is invertible. For example, the form over the polynomial ring $R = \mathbb{F}_3[x]$ on $U = R^2$ with Gram matrix $\begin{pmatrix} x & 1 \\ 1 & x-1 \end{pmatrix}$ can not be written as orthogonal sum [\[12, Example 6.19\(ii\)\]](#).

For symplectic forms, we have the following:

7.5. Corollary. *Let R be a PIR and $\omega: V \times V \rightarrow R$ an alternating and non-degenerate form on the finitely generated R -module V . Then $V = Re_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Re_m \oplus Rf_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Rf_m$, where $\omega(e_i, f_j) = \delta_{ij}d_i$ and $\omega(e_i, e_j) = \omega(f_i, f_j) = 0$ for all i, j , and $Rd_1 \geq Rd_2 \geq \cdots \geq Rd_m$.*

Proof. As in the proof of [Corollary 7.2](#), begin with $u_1 = e_1$ and $w_1 = f_1$ such that $\omega(V, V) = R\omega(e_1, f_1)$. Then by [Proposition 7.1](#), $V = Re_1 \oplus {}^\perp f_1 = Rf_1 \oplus e_1^\perp$. As ω is alternating, we have $e_1 \in e_1^\perp$ and $f_1 \in f_1^\perp = {}^\perp f_1$. So in the next step, we can choose $u_2 = f_1$ and $w_2 = e_1$. The proof follows. \square

8. Signs of automorphisms

Let U be a finite abelian group. Every automorphism g of U permutes U , and we write $\text{sign}(g) = \text{sign}_U(g)$ for the sign of this permutation. Thus we have a natural character $\text{sign}: \text{Aut}(U) \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$. This character has been studied by a number of people, in particular P. Cartier [\[6\]](#) and A. Brunyate and P. L. Clark [\[5\]](#). We state and prove the results we need later.

In the first two results, we actually do not need that U is abelian, and so we use multiplicative notation (so $-u$ becomes u^{-1} , and so on). These results are due to Cartier [\[6, p. 38–39\]](#).

8.1. Lemma. *Let π be a permutation of a finite group U which commutes with taking inverses: for all $u \in U$, we have $(u^{-1})\pi = (u\pi)^{-1}$. Choose $P \subseteq U$ such that $U = P \cup P^{-1} \cup I$ (disjoint union), where $I = \{u \in U \mid u^2 = 1\}$. Then*

$$\text{sign}(\pi) = (-1)^{|P \cap P^{-1}|} \text{sign}(\pi_I).$$

Proof. The assumption on π yields that π maps I onto itself. Let τ be the product of all the transpositions (u, u^{-1}) with $u \in P \cap P^{-1}$. Then $\pi\tau$ maps P , P^{-1} and I onto itself, and the permutations on P and P^{-1} are related by $(u^{-1})(\pi\tau) = (u\pi\tau)^{-1}$. Thus the restriction of $\pi\tau$ to $P \cup P^{-1}$ is an even permutation. The result follows. \square

8.2. Lemma. *Let U be a finite group of odd order and $N \trianglelefteq U$ a normal subgroup. Let $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(U)$ be an automorphism that maps N into itself. Then $\text{sign}(\alpha) = \text{sign}(\alpha_{U/N}) \text{sign}(\alpha_N)$.*

Proof. Choose $P_1 \subseteq N$ and $P_2 \subseteq U/N$ such that $N = P_1 \cup P_1^{-1} \cup \{1\}$ and $U/N = P_2 \cup P_2^{-1} \cup \{1_{U/N}\}$. Let $\hat{P}_2 = \{u \in U \mid Nu \in P_2\}$ be the pre-image of P_2 in U . Then for $P = \hat{P}_2 \cup P_1$, we have $U = P \cup P^{-1} \cup \{1\}$. By [Lemma 8.1](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sign}(\alpha) &= (-1)^{|P\alpha \cap P^{-1}|} = (-1)^{|\hat{P}_2\alpha \cap \hat{P}_2^{-1}|} (-1)^{|P_1\alpha \cap P_1^{-1}|} \\ &= (-1)^{|N||P_2\alpha_{U/N} \cap P_2^{-1}|} \text{sign}(\alpha_N) \\ &= (-1)^{|P_2\alpha_{U/N} \cap P_2^{-1}|} \text{sign}(\alpha_N) \\ &= \text{sign}(\alpha_{U/N}) \text{sign}(\alpha_N). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Let R be a finite ring and $a \in R$ be invertible. We write $\text{sign}_R(a)$ for the sign of the permutation of R defined by $r \mapsto ra$.

8.3. Lemma (Zolotarev, Lerch, Frobenius).

- (a) Let \mathbb{F} be a finite field of odd order and $0 \neq a \in \mathbb{F}$. Then $\text{sign}_{\mathbb{F}}(a) = 1$ if and only if a is a square in \mathbb{F} .
- (b) Let $R = \mathbb{Z}/m$ with m odd and $a \in R^*$. Then $\text{sign}_R(a) = \left(\frac{a}{m}\right)$ (the Jacobi symbol).

Proof. \mathbb{F}^* is a cyclic group of even order, and the squares form the unique subgroup of index 2. When $\mathbb{F}^* = \langle a \rangle$, then $\text{sign}_{\mathbb{F}}(a) = -1$, because the corresponding permutation forms one long cycle of length $|\mathbb{F}^*| = |\mathbb{F}| - 1$. This shows the first part.

The second part can be proved using [Lemma 8.2](#) and induction on m : For $m = k\ell$ with $k, \ell > 1$, we have $R/kR \cong \mathbb{Z}/k$ and $kR \cong \mathbb{Z}/\ell$. For m prime, the result follows from the first part. \square

We see that [Lemma 8.1](#) generalizes the Gauss-Schering lemma from elementary number theory. The next result was proved by I. Schur [30, p. 151] for $R = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, by P. Cartier [6, p. 41] for finite fields, and by Brunyate and Clark [5, Theorem 6.1] as part of a more general result.

8.4. Lemma. Let R be a commutative ring of finite, odd order, and let $g \in \text{Aut}_R(R^d) = \text{GL}(d, R)$. Then

$$\text{sign}_{R^d}(g) = \text{sign}_R(\det(g)).$$

(On the left, we view g as a permutation of R^d , and on the right, $\det(g)$ as a permutation of R .)

Proof. Suppose that $R = R_1 \times R_2$, a direct product of two rings. Let $1 = e_1 + e_2$ be the corresponding idempotent decomposition. Any R -module U is the direct sum $U = Ue_1 \oplus Ue_2$. We see that $\det(g) = \det(ge_1) + \det(ge_2)$, where $\det(ge_i) \in R_i = Re_i$ is the determinant of ge_i as element in $\text{GL}(d, R_i)$. Also, $\det(g)$ acts on R_i in the same way as $\det(ge_i) = \det(g)e_i$, and g acts on $R_i^d = R^d e_i$ as ge_i does. By [Lemma 8.2](#), we are reduced to prove the lemma for R_1 and R_2 .

Since any finite ring R is the direct product of finitely many *local* rings [1, Theorem 8.7], we may assume that R is local. Then any column of an invertible matrix over R contains

at least one unit. By the usual Gauss elimination process, it follows that an invertible matrix is a product of matrices which differ in exactly one entry from the identity matrix (when this entry is on the main diagonal, it must be a unit of R). For matrices of this kind, the assertion follows immediately from [Lemma 8.2](#). \square

For the rest of this section, we assume again that R is a finite, commutative ring with a primitive additive character $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$, in which 2 is invertible.

8.5. Definition. Let $B, C: U \times W \rightarrow R$ be two non-degenerate bilinear forms on the finite R -modules U and W . Then there is a unique $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_R(U)$ such that $B(u, w) = C(u\alpha, w)$ for all $u \in U, w \in W$. We define $\text{sign}(B/C) := \text{sign}(\alpha)$.

The existence of α in the preceding definition follows since B and C both induce isomorphisms $U \rightarrow \text{Hom}(W, R)$ ([Lemma 2.2](#)).

We will only need the case $U = W$. The definition is maybe motivated by the following lemma and its proof:

8.6. Lemma. Suppose R is a finite field and $B, C: U \times U \rightarrow R$ two bilinear forms. Then $\text{sign}(B/C) = 1$ if and only if $\text{disc}(B) = \text{disc}(C)$.

Proof. Let S be the standard inner product with respect to some basis of U , and let G_B and G_C be the Gram matrices of B and C with respect to that basis. If we view G_B as the matrix of a linear map, then obviously $B(u, w) = S(uG_B, w)$ for all $u, w \in U$. Similarly, $C(u, w) = S(uG_C, w)$. Thus $B(u, w) = C(uG_B(G_C)^{-1}, w)$ and so $\text{sign}(C/B) = \text{sign}(G_B G_C^{-1}) = \text{sign}_R(\det G_B) \text{sign}_R(\det G_C)^{-1}$ by [Lemma 8.4](#). By [Lemma 8.3](#), sign_R is the quadratic character on R . By definition, the discriminant of B is $\det G_B$ modulo the squares in R . The result follows. \square

8.7. Lemma. Let $B: U \times U \rightarrow R$ be a non-degenerate bilinear form on the finite module U . Suppose that $U = X \oplus Y$ with $B(Y, X) = 0$. When Q_X and Q_Y are non-degenerate forms on X and Y , respectively, then $\text{sign}((Q_X \oplus Q_Y)/B) = \text{sign}(Q_X/B_X) \text{sign}(Q_Y/B_Y)$.

Of course, $Q_X \oplus Q_Y$ is the form on $X \oplus Y$ defined by

$$(Q_X \oplus Q_Y)(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) = Q_X(x_1, x_2) + Q_Y(y_1, y_2)$$

for $x_1, x_2 \in X, y_1, y_2 \in Y$. When Q_X and Q_Y are symmetric, then so is $Q_X \oplus Q_Y$.

Proof of Lemma 8.7. As $B(Y, X) = 0$ and B is non-degenerate, the restrictions $B|_X$ and $B|_Y$ are also non-degenerate. Thus there are $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(X)$ and $\tau \in \text{Aut}(Y)$ with

$$Q_X(x_1, x_2) = B(x_1\sigma, x_2) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_Y(y_1, y_2) = B(y_1\tau, y_2).$$

Since $B|_Y$ is non-degenerate, there is, for each $x \in X$, an element $x\kappa \in Y$ such that $B(x, y) = B(x\kappa, y)$ for all $y \in Y$. The map $\kappa: X \rightarrow Y$ is an homomorphism. Define

$\alpha: U \rightarrow U$ by $(x + y)\alpha = x\sigma - x\sigma\kappa + y\tau$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} B((x_1 + y_1)\alpha, x_2 + y_2) &= B(x_1\sigma - x_1\sigma\kappa + y_1\tau, x_2 + y_2) \\ &= B(x_1\sigma, x_2) + B(x_1\sigma, y_2) - B(x_1\sigma\kappa, y_2) + B(y_1\tau, y_2) \\ &= Q_X(x_1, x_2) + Q_Y(y_1, y_2) \\ &= (Q_X \oplus Q_Y)(x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\text{sign}((Q_X \oplus Q_Y)/B) = \text{sign}(\alpha)$. Now $\alpha|_Y = \tau$, and α on $U/Y \cong X$ is σ . The result follows from [Lemma 8.2](#). \square

9. Quadratic Gauss sums on abelian groups

As in [Basic Setup 2.1](#), let R be a finite commutative ring of odd order (equivalently, 2 is invertible in R), and let $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ be a linear character such that $\text{Ker } \lambda$ contains no nonzero ideal of R . Let X be a finite R -module, and let $q: X \times X \rightarrow R$ be a symmetric, non-degenerate bilinear form. We define the (generalized quadratic) *Gauss sum* $\gamma_\lambda(q)$ corresponding to λ and (X, q) as

$$\gamma_\lambda(q) := \gamma_\lambda(X, q) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X|}} \sum_{x \in X} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(x, x)\right).$$

(The factor $\frac{1}{2}$ is there to obtain consistency with the *Weil index* over finite fields [[36](#), [42](#)]. Otherwise, this factor is not really important.)

By [Lemma 2.2](#), the form $\lambda \circ q: X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ is also non-degenerate, and obviously, $\gamma_\lambda(q)$ depends only on $\lambda \circ q$.

Gauss sums have the following well-known properties:

9.1. Lemma.

- (a) $\gamma_\lambda(q_1 \oplus q_2) = \gamma_\lambda(q_1)\gamma_\lambda(q_2)$ for forms q_i on X_i ($i = 1, 2$) and $q_1 \oplus q_2$ their direct sum, a form on $X_1 \oplus X_2$.
- (b) When $U \leq X$ is isotropic (that is, $U \subseteq U^q$), then q induces a non-degenerate form \tilde{q} on U^q/U , and $\gamma_\lambda(q) = \gamma_\lambda(\tilde{q})$.
- (c) When (X, q) contains a Lagrangian submodule L (that is, $L^q = L$), then $\gamma_\lambda(q) = 1$.
- (d) $|\gamma_\lambda(q)| = 1$.

Proof. Statement (a) is a routine computation. In the situation of (b), we have $(U^q)^q = U$, so $\tilde{q}(s_1 + U, s_2 + U) := q(s_1, s_2)$ (where $s_1, s_2 \in U^q$) is well-defined and non-degenerate. Write

$$X = \bigcup_{t \in T} (t + U^q) \quad \text{and} \quad U^q = \bigcup_{s \in S} (s + U).$$

We assume that $0 \in T$. For $t \in T$, $s \in S$ and $u \in U$,

$$q(t + s + u, t + s + u) = q(t, t) + q(s, s) + 2q(t, s) + 2q(t, u),$$

as $q(u, u) = q(s, u) = 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_\lambda(q) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X|}} \sum_{t \in T} \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{u \in U} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(t, t) + \frac{1}{2}q(s, s) + q(t, s) + q(t, u)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X|}} \sum_{t \in T} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(t, t)\right) \sum_{s \in S} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(s, s)\right) \lambda(q(t, s)) \sum_{u \in U} \lambda(q(t, u)) \\ &= \frac{|U|}{\sqrt{|X|}} \sum_{s \in S} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(s, s)\right) = \gamma_\lambda(\tilde{q}).\end{aligned}$$

Here the third equality follows from $\sum_{u \in U} \lambda(q(t, u)) = 0$ unless $t \in U^q$, in which case the sum is $|U|$, and $t = 0$ by our assumption. The last equality follows from $|U||U^q| = |X|$ (Lemma 2.2). This shows (b), and (c) is a special case.

We have

$$|\gamma_\lambda(q)|^2 = \gamma_\lambda(q) \overline{\gamma_\lambda(q)} = \gamma_\lambda(q) \gamma_\lambda(-q) = \gamma_\lambda(q \oplus (-q)).$$

But $(X \oplus X, q \oplus (-q))$ has a Lagrangian submodule, namely $L = \{(x, x) \mid x \in X\}$. Thus (d) follows from (c). \square

We note in passing that (a) and (b) reduce the computation of γ_λ to the case where (X, q) is anisotropic and indecomposable. In this case, $F := R/\text{ann}_R(X)$ is a field and $\dim_F(X) \leq 1$.

Let $q: X \times X \rightarrow R$ be symmetric and non-degenerate as before. Following I. Schur [30], cf. [29], we consider the $X \times X$ -matrix

$$F_\lambda(q) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|X|}} \left(\lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(x, y)\right) \right)_{x, y \in X}.$$

Obviously, $\text{tr}(F_\lambda(q)) = \gamma_\lambda(q)$. Our proofs of the next results are straightforward generalizations of Schur's arguments.

9.2. Proposition.

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(a)} \quad \gamma_\lambda(q)^2 &= (-1)^{\binom{|X|-1}{2}} = \left(\frac{-1}{|X|} \right). \\ \text{(b)} \quad \gamma_\lambda(q) &= (-1)^{\binom{|X|^2-1}{8}} \det(F_\lambda(q)) = \left(\frac{2}{|X|} \right) \det(F_\lambda(q)).\end{aligned}$$

(Again, $\left(\frac{\cdot}{n}\right)$ denotes the Jacobi symbol.)

Proof. Write $F := F_\lambda(q)$ and $T = F^2$. Then the entry $t_{x, y}$ of T is

$$\begin{aligned}t_{x, y} &= \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{u \in X} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(x, u)\right) \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(u, y)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{u \in X} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}q(x + y, u)\right) = \delta_{x+y, 0}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $|X|$ is odd, we see that we can arrange the elements of X such that F^2 has the form

$$F^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & I \\ 0 & I & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It follows that $F^4 = I$.

It follows that the eigenvalues of F are from the set $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. Let m_k be the multiplicity of the eigenvalue i^k ($k = 0, 1, 2, 3$). Thus

$$G := \gamma_\lambda(q) = (m_0 - m_2) + (m_1 - m_3)i \quad \text{and} \quad \det(F) = i^{2m_2+m_1-m_3}.$$

From $|G| = 1$ we conclude that $G \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. By looking at the traces of F^k ($k = 0, 1, 2, 3$), we get the four equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \sum m_k &= |X|, & \sum m_k i^k &= G, \\ \sum m_k (-1)^k &= 1, & \sum m_k i^{-k} &= \overline{G}. \end{aligned}$$

(Recall that we have computed F^2 above.) Thus

$$4m_0 = |X| + 1 + G + \overline{G} \quad \text{and} \quad 4m_2 = |X| + 1 - (G + \overline{G}).$$

Since the right hand sides must be divisible by 4 and $G \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$, it follows that $G \in \{\pm 1\}$ when $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ and $G \in \{\pm i\}$ when $|X| \equiv -1 \pmod{4}$. This yields (a).

To see (b), assume first that $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, so $G = \pm 1$. Then we have

$$m_2 = \frac{|X| + 1 - 2G}{4} \quad \text{and} \quad \det(F) = (-1)^{m_2}.$$

It follows that $G = \det(F)$ when $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$, and $G = -\det(F)$ when $|X| \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$. Thus (b) holds for $|X| \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.

Now assume $|X| \equiv -1 \pmod{4}$, so $G = (m_1 - m_3)i = \pm i$. In this case we have

$$\det(F) = (-1)^{m_2} i^{m_1-m_3} = (-1)^{m_2} (m_1 - m_3)i = (-1)^{m_2} G.$$

Since now

$$m_2 = \frac{|X| + 1}{4},$$

we get that m_2 is even when $|X| \equiv -1 \pmod{8}$, and m_2 is odd when $|X| \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$, and (b) holds also in this case. \square

9.3. Corollary. *Suppose the symmetric, non-degenerate forms $q_1, q_2: X \times X \rightarrow R$ are related by $q_2(x, w) = q_1(x\sigma, w)$, where $\sigma: X \rightarrow X$. Then $\gamma_\lambda(q_2) = \text{sign}(\sigma)\gamma_\lambda(q_1)$.*

In the case where $X = (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^d$, this result dates back to H. Weber [41] (cf. C. Jordan [20]). Our proof is essentially the same as Schur's proof [30].

Proof. Notice that σ is necessarily invertible and thus induces a permutation of X . We have $F_\lambda(q_2) = P(\sigma)F_\lambda(q_1)$, where $P(\sigma)$ is the permutation matrix corresponding to σ . Thus $\det(F_\lambda(q_2)) = \text{sign}(\sigma) \det(F_\lambda(q_1))$. By [Proposition 9.2\(b\)](#), the quotient $\gamma_\lambda(q_i)/\det(F_\lambda(q_i))$ depends only on $|X|$, but not on the form q_i itself. The result follows. \square

9.4. Remark. We should mention here that the matrix $F_\lambda(q)$ can be interpreted as the image of a certain $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ under an explicit matrix version of the Weil representation (up to a scalar). Namely, let $V = X \oplus X$ with symplectic form $\omega((x, y), (z, w)) = \frac{1}{2}(q(x, w) - q(y, z))$, and let $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ be defined by $(x, y)g = (-y, x)$.

Let $L = X \oplus 0$ and $T = 0 \oplus X$ (Lagrangian submodules). In the proof of [Proposition 3.3](#), we constructed an explicit isomorphism between the symplectic algebra \mathcal{A} and $\mathbf{M}_X(\mathbb{K})$ associated to L and T . By a (tedious) calculation, one can show that under this isomorphism, $P(g)$ corresponds to $|X|\gamma_\lambda(-q)F_\lambda(q)$, where $P(g)$ is as in [Theorem 4.1](#).

It is also well known that for $X = R = \mathbb{Z}/m$ and $q(a, b) = ab$, the matrix $F_\lambda(q)$ encodes the discrete Fourier transform [\[3, 16\]](#). (Usually, it is defined without the factor $\frac{1}{2}$, so that the case of even m is also covered.)

10. Factorization of a symplectic automorphism

Assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#). (The results in this section can be extended to more general situations, but to keep the notation simple, we do not assume this greater generality.) Recall that in [Lemma 2.4](#), we defined a non-degenerate bilinear form $B_g: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$ for any $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$, and that this form has the property

$$B_g(x, y) - B_g(y, x) = \omega(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in V(1 - g).$$

10.1. Proposition. [\[38, Theorem 1.1.1–2\]](#) [\[40, Theorem 3.5\]](#) *Let X be a submodule of V and $B: X \times X \rightarrow R$ a non-degenerate bilinear form with*

$$B(x, y) - B(y, x) = \omega(x, y) \quad \text{for all } x, y \in X. \tag{4}$$

Then there exists a unique $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ such that $X = V(1 - g)$ and $B = B_g$.

Proof. Define $\alpha: V \rightarrow X$ by requiring $\omega(v, x) = B(v\alpha, x)$ for all $x \in X$ and $v \in V$. This is possible since the non-degenerate form B induces an isomorphism from X to $\text{Hom}_R(X, R)$ ([Lemma 2.2](#)). Then α is R -linear with $\text{Ker } \alpha = X^\perp$ and $V\alpha \subseteq X$, so $V\alpha = X$.

Set $g = 1_V - \alpha$. This is the unique map $g: V \rightarrow V$ with $\omega(v, x) = B(v(1 - g), x)$ for all $v \in V$ and $x \in X$. It remains to show that g preserves the form ω :

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(vg, wg) &= \omega(v, w) - \omega(v, w\alpha) - \omega(v\alpha, w) + \omega(v\alpha, w\alpha) \\ &= \omega(v, w) - B(v\alpha, w\alpha) + B(w\alpha, v\alpha) + \omega(v\alpha, w\alpha) \\ &= \omega(v, w), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from [\(4\)](#). Thus $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ as claimed. \square

10.2. Lemma. *Let $h, k \in \text{Sp}(V)$ and assume that $V(1-h) \cap V(1-k) = \{0\}$. Then*

$$V(1-hk) = V(1-h) \oplus V(1-k) \quad \text{and} \quad B_{hk}(V(1-k), V(1-h)) = 0.$$

Proof. As $v(1-hk) = v(1-h) + vh(1-k)$, we always have $V(1-hk) \subseteq V(1-h) + V(1-k)$. From $V(1-h) \cap V(1-k) = \{0\}$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V = \{0\}^\perp &= (V(1-h) \cap V(1-k))^\perp \\ &= (V(1-h))^\perp + (V(1-k))^\perp && \text{(Lemma 2.2(c))} \\ &= \mathbf{C}_V(h) + \mathbf{C}_V(k), && \text{(Lemma 2.3)} \end{aligned}$$

and thus also

$$V = Vh^{-1} = \mathbf{C}_V(h) + \mathbf{C}_V(k)h^{-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V(1-h) &= \mathbf{C}_V(k)(1-h) = \mathbf{C}_V(k)h^{-1}(1-h) \\ \text{and } V(1-k) &= \mathbf{C}_V(h)(1-k). \end{aligned}$$

But for $d \in \mathbf{C}_V(k)h^{-1}$, we have $d(1-h) = d - dh = d - dhk = d(1-hk) \in V(1-hk)$, which shows $V(1-h) \subseteq V(1-hk)$. Similarly, $c(1-k) = c - ck = c - chk = c(1-hk)$ for $c \in \mathbf{C}_V(h)$, and so $V(1-k) \subseteq V(1-hk)$.

For $x \in V(1-h)$ and $y = c(1-k) \in V(1-k)$ with $c \in \mathbf{C}_V(h)$ we have

$$B_{hk}(c(1-k), x) = B_{hk}(c(1-hk), x) = \omega(c, x) = 0$$

as $\mathbf{C}_V(h) \perp V(1-h)$. □

10.3. Proposition. *Let $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ and suppose that $V(1-g) = X \oplus Y$ with $B_g(Y, X) = 0$. Then there exist $h, k \in \text{Sp}(V)$ with $X = V(1-h)$, $Y = V(1-k)$ and $B_h = (B_g)_{|X}$, $B_k = (B_g)_{|Y}$. For this h and k , we have $g = hk$.*

Proof. As $B_g(Y, X) = 0$, the restrictions $(B_g)_{|X}$ and $(B_g)_{|Y}$ are nondegenerate. By Proposition 10.1, there exist h and $k \in \text{Sp}(V)$ such that $V(1-h) = X$ and $V(1-k) = Y$, and $\omega(v, x) = B_g(v(1-h), x)$ and $\omega(v, y) = B_g(v(1-k), y)$ for all $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ and $v \in V$.

Let $\alpha = 1-h$ and $\beta = 1-k$. We want to show $g = hk$, which is equivalent to $1-g = \alpha + \beta - \alpha\beta$. Let $x \in X$, $v \in V$. Using $V\beta = Y$ and $B_g(Y, X) = 0$, we see that

$$B_g(v(\alpha + \beta - \alpha\beta), x) = B_g(v\alpha, x) = \omega(v, x) = B_g(v(1-g), x).$$

Next, let $y \in Y$, $v \in V$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} B_g(v(\alpha + \beta - \alpha\beta), y) &= B_g(v\alpha, y) + B_g(v(1-\alpha)\beta, y) \\ &= B_g(v\alpha, y) + \omega(v(1-\alpha), y). \end{aligned}$$

By [Lemma 2.4](#), we have $B_g(v\alpha, y) - B_g(y, v\alpha) = \omega(v\alpha, y)$. Together with $B_g(y, v\alpha) \in B_g(Y, X) = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} B_g(v(\alpha + \beta + \alpha\beta), y) &= \omega(v\alpha, y) + \omega(v(1 - \alpha), y) \\ &= \omega(v, y) = B_g(v(1 - g), y). \end{aligned}$$

We have now shown that

$$B_g(v(\alpha + \beta - \alpha\beta), z) = B_g(v(1 - g), z)$$

for all $z \in X \cup Y$ and $v \in V$. As B_g is nondegenerate on $V(1 - g) = X \oplus Y$, it follows that $1 - g = \alpha + \beta - \alpha\beta$ and thus $g = hk$. \square

11. Proofs of the main theorems

This section is devoted to the proofs of [Theorem C](#) and [Theorem B](#). Throughout, we assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#). We will need the following formulation of [Corollary 6.2](#) ([Theorem A](#)):

11.1. Corollary. *When $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ has odd order, then*

$$\psi(g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \gamma_\lambda(-Q_g),$$

where $Q_g(x, y) = (1/2)(B_g(x, y) + B_g(y, x)) = B_g(x \frac{1+g}{2}, y)$ as in [Lemma 2.5](#).

Proof. Since $\omega(v, vg) = -\omega(v, v(1 - g)) = -B_g(x, x) = -Q_g(x, x)$ for $x = v(1 - g)$, this is just a rewording of the formula from [Corollary 6.2](#). \square

11.2. Theorem. *Assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#), and that R is a principal ideal ring. Let $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ and let $B_g: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$ be the form from [Lemma 2.4](#). Then there exists a non-degenerate, symmetric form $q: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$. For any such form q , we have*

$$\psi(g) = \sqrt{|C_V(g)|} \operatorname{sign}(q/B_g) \gamma_\lambda(-q), \quad (5)$$

where $\psi = \psi_{\omega, \lambda}$ is the Weil character associated to ω, λ .

Proof. We begin by noticing that the right hand side of Formula (5) is independent of the choice of q : If \tilde{q} is another non-degenerate, symmetric form on $V(1 - g)$, then $\operatorname{sign}(\tilde{q}/B_g) = \operatorname{sign}(q/B_g) \operatorname{sign}(\tilde{q}/q)$, and so $\operatorname{sign}(\tilde{q}/B_g) \gamma_\lambda(-\tilde{q}) = \operatorname{sign}(q/B_g) \gamma_\lambda(-q)$ by [Corollary 9.3](#).

We will show simultaneously that there is a non-degenerate symmetric form² q on $V(1 - g)$ with $\operatorname{sign}(q/B_g) = 1$ and $\psi(g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \gamma_\lambda(-q)$. (By the first paragraph, this

²It is of course easy to show directly that there are non-degenerate, symmetric, R -bilinear forms on $U = V(1 - g)$ (for example, from [Corollary 7.2](#)).

proves the theorem.) The proof will be by induction on $|V(1 - g)|$. Assume that g is a counterexample with $|V(1 - g)|$ of minimal possible order, and write $U = V(1 - g)$.

First, assume that $U = V(1 - g)$ is cyclic as R -module, that is, $U = Rx$ for some $x \in U$. As $B_g(rx, sx) = B_g(sx, rx)$ for all $r, s \in R$, the form B_g itself is symmetric and non-degenerate. Thus we can choose $q = B_g = Q_g$. Then clearly $\text{sign}(q/B_g) = 1$. As $Rx \subseteq x^\perp = (V(1 - g))^\perp = \mathbf{C}_V(g)$, it follows that $(g - 1)^2 = 0$ and thus the order of g divides $|Rx|$. In particular, g has odd order. Thus [Corollary 11.1](#) yields $\psi(g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \gamma_\lambda(-Q_g)$, and the theorem follows in this case. So in a counterexample, U can not be a cyclic R -module.

Next, suppose that $U = V(1 - g)$ has submodules X, Y such that

$$U = X \oplus Y \quad \text{with} \quad B_g(Y, X) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad X \neq 0 \neq Y. \quad (6)$$

Then by [Proposition 10.3](#), we can write $g = hk$ with $V(1 - h) = X$, $V(1 - k) = Y$ and $B_h = (B_g)|_X$, $B_k = (B_g)|_Y$. By minimality of U , there are non-degenerate symmetric forms q_h and q_k on X and Y with $\text{sign}(q_h/B_h) = \text{sign}(q_k/B_k) = 1$ and such that (5) holds for h, k . Set $q = q_h \oplus q_k$. By [Lemma 8.7](#), $\text{sign}(q/B_g) = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\psi(g)}{\sqrt{|V|}} &= \frac{\psi(h)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \cdot \frac{\psi(k)}{\sqrt{|V|}} && \text{(Proposition 5.2)} \\ &= \frac{\gamma_\lambda(-q_h)}{\sqrt{|V(1 - h)|}} \cdot \frac{\gamma_\lambda(-q_k)}{\sqrt{|V(1 - k)|}} && \text{(induction)} \\ &= \frac{\gamma_\lambda(-q)}{\sqrt{|V(1 - g)|}}. && \text{(Lemma 9.1 (a))} \end{aligned}$$

Thus g is not a counterexample, contradiction. Thus there is no decomposition as in (6).

Let $Q_g(x, y) = (1/2)(B_g(x, y) + B_g(y, x))$. By [Proposition 7.1](#), $I := B_g(U, U)$ and $Q_g(U, U)$ are ideals of R . We claim that $Q_g(U, U) < I$. By [Corollary 7.4](#), there is $x \in U$ with $Q_g(U, U) = RQ_g(x, x)$. If $Q_g(U, U) = I$, then $B_g(U, U) = I = RQ_g(x, x) = RB_g(x, x)$, and [Proposition 7.1](#) yields that $U = Rx \oplus {}^{B_g}x$. By definition, $B_g({}^{B_g}x, R_1x) = 0$. When ${}^{B_g}x \neq 0$, then we have a decomposition as in (6), which contradicts the previous paragraph. When ${}^{B_g}x = 0$, then $U = Rx$ is cyclic and g is not a counterexample at all. Thus in a counterexample with $|U|$ minimal, we must have $Q_g(U, U) < I$. (When R is a field, then it follows at this point that g is an involution ([Lemma 2.5](#)), and the proof can be finished by an appeal to [Corollary 5.6](#), as in Ward's proof [40]. We have to work a little bit harder here.)

As $Q_g(U, U) < I = B_g(U, U)$, we have that Q_g is degenerate. By [Lemma 2.5](#), $\text{Ker}(g + 1) \neq \{0\}$, and so g has even order. Thus $\langle g \rangle$ contains a unique involution t . Clearly, $\mathbf{C}_V(g) \leq \mathbf{C}_V(t)$ and thus (by [Lemma 2.3](#)) $V(1 - t) \leq V(1 - g) = U$. We have the decomposition $V = \mathbf{C}_V(t) \oplus V(1 - t)$ which is orthogonal with respect to ω . Intersecting with U gives $U = (U \cap \mathbf{C}_V(t)) \oplus V(1 - t)$. As $gt = tg$, we have $Ut = U$ and $B_g(xt, yt) = B_g(x, y)$ for $x, y \in U$. Therefore, $B_g(U \cap \mathbf{C}_V(t), V(1 - t)) = 0$. By non-existence of a decomposition (6), we have $U \cap \mathbf{C}_V(t) = \{0\}$ and thus $U = V(1 - t)$ and $\mathbf{C}_V(t) = \mathbf{C}_V(g)$.

Write $t = g^k$. Then $ut = -u$ for all $u \in U$. There is $u \neq 0$ in $U^{Q_g} = \text{Ker}(g + 1)$, that is, $ug = -u$. Then $-u = ut = ug^k = (-1)^k u$, so k is odd. Thus $g = th$ with h of odd order.

We now apply [Proposition 5.2](#) to $g = th$ and conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(g) &= \frac{\psi(t)\psi(h)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{u \in V(1-t) \cap V(1-h)} \lambda\left(\frac{1}{2}(B_t(u, u) + B_h(u, u))\right) \\ &= \frac{\psi(t)\psi(h)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sqrt{|V(1-h)|} \gamma_\lambda(Q_h) \end{aligned}$$

as $V(1-h) \subseteq V(1-g) = V(1-t) = U$ and $B_t = 0$. By [Corollary 5.6](#) and [Corollary 11.1](#), it follows

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(g) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(t)|} (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|U|}-1}{2}} \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(h)|} \gamma_\lambda(-Q_h) \sqrt{|V(1-h)|} \gamma_\lambda(Q_h) \\ &= \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(t)|} (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|U|}-1}{2}} = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|U|}-1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

To finish the proof, we have to show that there is a form q such that $\text{sign}(q/B_g) = 1$ and $\gamma_\lambda(-q) = (-1)^{(\sqrt{|U|}-1)/2}$. This will follow from the next lemma, which also contains the main work for the proof of [Theorem B](#):

11.3. Lemma. *In the situation of [Theorem 11.2](#), assume that $\mathbf{C}_V(g) \cap U = 0$, where $U = V(1-g)$. Then $(1-g)|_U$ is invertible and there is a symmetric form q such that*

$$\text{sign}(q/B_g) = \text{sign}_U(1-g) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_\lambda(-q) = (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|U|}-1}{2}}.$$

Proof. As $\mathbf{C}_V(g) = \text{Ker}(1-g)$, it is clear that $(1-g)|_U$ is invertible. As $\text{Ker}(1-g) = U^\perp$, we have that $V = \text{Ker}(1-g) \oplus U$ is an orthogonal sum with respect to the form ω , and thus $\omega: U \times U \rightarrow R$ is non-degenerate. (In particular, $|U|$ and $|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|$ are squares.)

By [Corollary 7.5](#), we can write $U = Re_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Re_k \oplus Rf_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Rf_k$, where $\omega(e_i, f_j) = \delta_{ij}d_i$ and $\omega(e_i, e_j) = \omega(f_i, f_j) = 0$ for all i, j , and $Rd_1 \geq Rd_2 \geq \cdots \geq Rd_k$. Notice that for i fixed and $r \in R$, we have $re_i = 0 \iff rf_i = 0 \iff rd_i = 0$. Thus we can define a non-degenerate, symmetric form q on U by requiring $q(e_i, e_j) = q(f_i, f_j) = \delta_{ij}d_i$ and $q(e_i, f_j) = 0$ for all i, j .

There is a unique automorphism $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_R(U)$ such that $e_i\alpha = f_i$, $f_i\alpha = -e_i$ for all i . For this α , we have $\omega(x, y) = q(x\alpha, y)$. Since $(1-g)|_U$ is invertible, we have for $x, y \in U$:

$$B_g(x, y) = \omega(x(1-g)^{-1}, y) = q(x(1-g)^{-1}\alpha, y).$$

Thus $\text{sign}(q/B_g) = \text{sign}_U((1-g)^{-1}\alpha) = \text{sign}_U(1-g) \text{sign}_U(\alpha)$.

We claim that $\text{sign}_U(\alpha) = 1$. As $\alpha^2 = -1$, only $v = 0$ is fixed by α^2 . Thus the cycle decomposition of α as permutation on U consists of $(|U|-1)/4$ cycles of length 4. As $|U|$ is a square, $(|U|-1)/4$ is even and the claim follows. It follows that $\text{sign}(q/B_g) = \text{sign}_U(1-g)$.

To compute $\gamma_\lambda(-q)$, we observe that $(U, -q) \cong (L, -q_L) \oplus (L, -q_L)$, where $L = Re_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Re_k \cong Rf_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Rf_k$ and q_L is the restriction of q to L . It follows from [Lemma 9.1\(a\)](#) and [Proposition 9.2\(a\)](#) that

$$\gamma_\lambda(-q) = \gamma_\lambda(-q_L)^2 = (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|U|}-1}{2}}.$$

Now the result follows. \square

Proof of [Theorem 11.2](#), continued. We are in the situation where $g = th$ with $t^2 = 1$ and h of odd order, and $V(1 - g) = V(1 - t) = U$. We claim that $\text{sign}_U(1 - g) = 1$ in this situation. On U , the element t acts as -1 . Thus $0 < \text{Ker}(1 + g) = \text{Ker}(1 + th) \cap U = \text{Ker}(1 - h) \cap U$. It follows $V(1 - h) < V(1 - g) = U$. Thus by induction, [Theorem 11.2](#) holds for h . By comparison with [Corollary 11.1](#), we must have $\text{sign}_{V(1-h)}\left(\frac{1+h}{2}\right) = 1$. On $U/V(1-h)$, the element $\frac{1+h}{2} = \frac{h-1}{2} + 1$ acts as identity. So by [Lemma 8.2](#), $\text{sign}_U\left(\frac{1+h}{2}\right) = 1$. Together with $h|_U = -g|_U$, it follows $\text{sign}_U\left(\frac{1-g}{2}\right) = 1$. As $|U|$ is a square, we have $\text{sign}_U(1/2) = 1$ and thus $\text{sign}_U(1 - g) = 1$ as claimed.

Together with [Lemma 11.3](#), it follows that g is not a counterexample either. This is the final contradiction that finishes the proof of [Theorem 11.2](#). \square

Now suppose that R is as in [Basic Setup 2.1](#), but not necessarily a PIR. I do not know whether one can always find a non-degenerate symmetric form $q: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$ in this case. (Notice that we are given the non-degenerate, but in general non-symmetric form B_g on $V(1 - g)$.) Thus we assume the existence of q in the next result, which is [Theorem C](#) from the introduction:

11.4. Corollary. *Assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#). Let $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ and let $B_g: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$ be the form from [Lemma 2.4](#). If $q: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$ is a non-degenerate, symmetric form, then*

$$\psi(g) = \sqrt{|C_V(g)|} \text{sign}(q/B_g) \gamma_\lambda(-q).$$

Proof. Let m be the order of λ . By [Remark 4.4](#), we can replace the data (V, R, ω, λ) by the data $(V, R' = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}, \kappa \circ \omega, \lambda')$, where $\kappa: R \rightarrow R'$ and $\lambda': R' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ are such that $\lambda = \lambda' \circ \kappa$, without changing $\psi(g)$. The form $\kappa \circ B_g$ is the form belonging to g with respect to $\kappa \circ \omega$. When $q(x, y) = B_g(x\alpha, y)$ for $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_R(V)$, then also $\kappa(q(x, y)) = \kappa(B_g(x\alpha, y))$ and thus $\text{sign}(\kappa \circ q / \kappa \circ B_g) = \text{sign}(q/B_g)$. Clearly, $\gamma_\lambda(-q) = \gamma_{\lambda'}(-(\kappa \circ q))$. As R' is a principal ideal ring, the result follows from [Theorem 11.2](#). \square

When we can not find a symmetric, non-degenerate form $q: V(1 - g) \times V(1 - g) \rightarrow R$, then we can always replace R by $R' = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ as in the above proof, and find a form q with values in R' , so that we can evaluate the formula from [Theorem 11.2](#).

Finally, the next corollary contains [Theorem B](#), which is the case $\mathbf{C}_V(g) = \text{Ker}(1 - g) = \{0\}$.

11.5. Corollary. *Let $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ and set $U = V(1 - g)$. Assume that $\mathbf{C}_V(g) \cap U = 0$. Then $(1 - g)|_U$ is invertible and*

$$\psi(g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|U|}-1}{2}} \mathrm{sign}_U(1 - g).$$

When R is a field, or more generally, when $U \cong R^{2k}$, then $\mathrm{sign}_U(1 - g) = \mathrm{sign}_R(\det(1 - g)|_U)$ by [Lemma 8.4](#). Thus this corollary generalizes a result of Gurevich and Hadani [15].

Proof of Corollary 11.5. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $R = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ for some odd integer m . The result follows then from [Theorem 11.2](#) and [Lemma 11.3](#). \square

12. Corollaries and Examples

We assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#). As before, ψ denotes the character of the canonical Weil representation.

12.1. Example. Let $R = \mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field. Then the symmetric forms q_g on $V(1 - g)$ with $\mathrm{sign}(q_g/B_g) = 1$ are exactly the symmetric forms on $V(1 - g)$ with the same discriminant as B_g . We get the formulas

$$\psi(g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \gamma_\lambda(-q_g) = \sqrt{|\mathbf{C}_V(g)|} \gamma_\lambda(-1)^{\dim V(1-g)} \mathrm{sign}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(\mathrm{disc} B_g).$$

(These are essentially the formulas obtained by T. Thomas [36, 37]. Recall that $B_g = -\sigma_g$, with σ_g as in [36, 37].)

Proof. By [Lemma 8.6](#), $\mathrm{sign}(q_g/B_g) = 1$ if and only if $\mathrm{disc} q_g = \mathrm{disc} B_g$.

Let $\mathrm{disc} B_g = d(\mathbb{F}_q)^2$, say. A possible choice for q_g is the diagonal form $\langle 1, 1, \dots, 1, d \rangle$. Then

$$\gamma_\lambda(-q_g) = \gamma_\lambda(-1)^{\dim V(1-g)-1} \gamma_\lambda(-d) = \gamma_\lambda(-1)^{\dim V(1-g)} \mathrm{sign}_{\mathbb{F}_q}(d)$$

by [Lemma 9.1](#) and [Corollary 9.3](#). \square

The following observation, already used in the last step of the proof of [Theorem 11.2](#), seems a little bit curious:

12.2. Corollary. *Suppose $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ has odd order. Then $\mathrm{sign}_V(1 + g) = 1$.*

Proof. By [Proposition 6.1](#), $\psi(-g) = \psi(-1) = (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|V|}-1}{2}}$. By [Corollary 11.5](#) or [Theorem B](#) applied to $-g$, we have $\psi(-g) = (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|V|}-1}{2}} \mathrm{sign}_V(1 + g)$. Thus the result. \square

When $V(1 - g) \subseteq \mathbf{C}_V(g)$, then $\mathrm{sign}_V(1 + g) = 1$ is trivial. But I do not see how to prove this directly in more general situations.

When g has even order, then $1 + g$ may not be invertible. Even when $\mathrm{Ker}(1 + g) = \{0\}$, then in general $\mathrm{sign}_V(1 + g) \neq 1$. An example is $g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{Sp}(2, \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})$, where ω is the standard symplectic form on $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^2$ (with Gram matrix again g), and $m \equiv \pm 3 \pmod{8}$. Then $\mathrm{sign}_V(1 + g) = \left(\frac{2}{m}\right) = -1$. The same g also shows that the formula from [Corollary 6.2](#) does not hold for g of even order, even when $\mathrm{Ker}(1 + g) = \{0\}$.

12.3. Remark. Suppose that $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ with $V_1^\perp = V_2$. Then ω is non-degenerate on V_1 and V_2 . Let ψ_i be the Weil character of $\mathrm{Sp}(V_i)$ and $g_i \in \mathrm{Sp}(V_i)$. Then $g = (g_1, g_2) \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ via $(v_1 + v_2)(g_1, g_2) = v_1 g_1 + v_2 g_2$, and $\psi(g) = \psi_1(g_1)\psi_2(g_2)$.

Proof. We have $V(1 - g) = V_1(1 - g_1) \oplus V_2(1 - g_2)$ and $B_g = B_{g_1} \oplus B_{g_2}$, and thus from the formula in [Theorem 11.2](#), we see $\psi(g) = \psi_1(g_1)\psi_2(g_2)$. \square

Of course, this is well known and with just a little bit more effort, we could have proved this remark in [Section 4](#). It is also well known that studying the Weil representation over a finite ring can be reduced to studying the Weil representation over a finite, *local* ring, as follows:

12.4. Corollary. *The finite ring R can be written as the direct product of finite local rings, say $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_\ell$. Then there is an orthogonal decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_\ell$, where each V_i is a module over R_i , and $\mathrm{Sp}_R(V) \cong \mathrm{Sp}_{R_1}(V_1) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{Sp}_{R_\ell}(V_\ell)$. Moreover, $\psi = \psi_1 \times \cdots \times \psi_\ell$, where ψ_i is the Weil character of type $\lambda_i := \lambda|_{R_i}$ associated to V_i , $\omega: V_i \times V_i \rightarrow R_i$.*

Proof. This is fairly standard. The product decomposition of R is a standard result from commutative ring theory [[1](#), Theorem 8.7]. Let e_i be the identity of R_i . Then $e_i e_j = \delta_{ij} e_i$ and $1_R = e_1 + \cdots + e_\ell$. Set $V_i = e_i V$. Then $\omega(V_i, V_j) \subseteq e_i e_j R = \delta_{ij} R_i$, so that the above decomposition of V is orthogonal. Each V_i is invariant under $\mathrm{Sp}_R(V)$. Thus

$$\mathrm{Sp}_R(V) \ni g \mapsto g|_{V_1} \times \cdots \times g|_{V_\ell} \in \mathrm{Sp}_{R_1}(V_1) \times \cdots \times \mathrm{Sp}_{R_\ell}(V_\ell)$$

defines an isomorphism. The claim on the Weil character follows from [Remark 12.3](#). \square

12.5. Corollary. *For $g \in \mathrm{Sp}(V)$, the character value $\psi(g)$ is rational if and only if $|V(1 - g)|$ is a square.*

Proof. $|V(1 - g)|$ is a square if and only if $|\mathbf{C}_V(g)| = \psi(1)^2 / |V(1 - g)|$ is a square. “Only if” follows already from [Proposition 5.3](#). Conversely, when $|V(1 - g)|$ is a square, then by [Proposition 9.2 \(a\)](#), $\gamma_\lambda(-g) = \pm 1$ for any non-degenerate, symmetric form q on $V(1 - g)$. Thus $\psi(g) \in \mathbb{Q}$. \square

When $(V, R, \omega', \lambda')$ is another data satisfying [Basic Setup 2.1](#), we have Weil characters $\psi_{\omega, \lambda}$ and $\psi_{\omega', \lambda'}$ associated to this data.

12.6. Proposition (Changing ω). *Suppose that $\omega': V \times V \rightarrow R$ is another non-degenerate, alternating form, and that $g \in \mathrm{Sp}_R(V, \omega) \cap \mathrm{Sp}_R(V, \omega')$. Then there is a $a \in \mathrm{GL}_R(V)$ such that $\omega'(v, w) = \omega(va, w)$ for all $v, w \in V$. For this a , we have $ag = ga$ and*

$$\psi_{\omega', \lambda}(g) = \mathrm{sign}_{V(1-g)}(a) \psi_{\omega, \lambda}(g).$$

Proof. Since ω' and ω both induce isomorphisms $V \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(V, R)$, there is some $a \in \text{GL}_R(V)$ such that $\omega'(v, w) = \omega(va, w)$ for all $v, w \in V$. From $g \in \text{Sp}_R(V, \omega) \cap \text{Sp}_R(V, \omega')$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\omega'(v, w) &= \omega'(vg, wg) = \omega(vga, wg) \quad \text{and} \\ \omega'(v, w) &= \omega(va, w) = \omega(vag, wg)\end{aligned}$$

for all $v, w \in V$, and thus $vag = vga$. In particular, $V(1 - g)$ is a -invariant and $\text{sign}_{V(1-g)}(a)$ is defined.

Let B_g and B'_g be the forms associated to ω and ω' , respectively. Then $B'_g(x, y) = B_g(xa, y)$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that there is a non-degenerate, symmetric form q on $V(1 - g)$ (if necessary, replace R by $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$). Then $\text{sign}(q/B'_g) = \text{sign}(q/B_g) \text{sign}_{V(1-g)}(a)$, and the result follows from [Theorem 11.2](#). \square

For $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ an additive character and $s \in R$, define $\lambda s: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ by $(\lambda s)(r) = \lambda(sr)$. When λ is primitive, then $\lambda s = 1 \iff s = 0$ and thus every character of R has the form λs . The character λs is again primitive if and only if s is a unit in R [[17](#), § 3].

12.7. Corollary (Changing λ). *Let $\lambda' = \lambda s: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ be another primitive character of R . Then*

$$\psi_{\omega, \lambda'}(g) = \text{sign}_{V(1-g)}(s) \psi_{\omega, \lambda}(g) \quad \text{for all } g \in \text{Sp}_R(V, \omega),$$

where $\text{sign}_{V(1-g)}(s)$ is the sign of the permutation on $V(1 - g)$ induced by multiplication with the unit s .

Proof. We have $(\lambda s) \circ \omega = \lambda \circ (s\omega)$, where $(s\omega)(v, w) = s\omega(v, w) = \omega(vs, w)$, and $\text{Sp}_R(V, \omega) = \text{Sp}_R(V, s\omega)$, so this follows from [Proposition 12.6](#). \square

Notice that $\psi_{\omega, \lambda}$ and $\psi_{\omega, \lambda'}$ are not necessarily algebraic conjugates (for example, when R is a field of square order, or a local ring where the residue field has square order). In general, [Corollary 12.7](#) does not hold for $g \in \text{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}}(V, \lambda \circ \omega)$, because in general, $\text{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}}(V, \lambda \circ \omega) \neq \text{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}}(V, \lambda' \circ \omega)$. (These groups are isomorphic and in fact conjugate in $\text{Aut}_{\mathbb{Z}}(V)$.) On the other hand, when $\text{Ker } \lambda = \text{Ker } \lambda'$, then $\text{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}}(V, \lambda \circ \omega) = \text{Sp}_{\mathbb{Z}}(V, \lambda' \circ \omega)$ and $\lambda' = \lambda s = \lambda^s$ for $s \in (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^*$, and the corresponding Weil characters are algebraic conjugates.

In the following, we write $\psi_{\lambda} := \psi_{\omega, \lambda}$, as ω will be fixed.

12.8. Corollary. *Assume [Basic Setup 2.1](#).*

- (a) *Let $s \in R^*$. Then $\psi_{\lambda} = \psi_{\lambda s}$ as characters on $\text{Sp}_R(V, \omega)$ if and only if s is a square in $R/\text{ann}_R(V)$.*
- (b) *Let $g \in \text{Sp}_R(V, \omega)$. Then $\psi_{\lambda}(g) = \psi_{\lambda s}(g)$ for all $s \in R^*$ if and only if every simple R -module occurs with even multiplicity in any composition series of $V(1 - g)$. (In the case of a local ring R , this means that $V(1 - g)$ has even length.)*

Proof. In view of [Corollary 12.4](#), both assertions reduce easily to the case where R is local, so we assume this. Let J be the unique maximal ideal of R .

When s is a square in $R/\text{ann}_R(V)$, then $\text{sign}_X(s) = 1$ for any R -submodule X of V and thus $\psi_\lambda = \psi_{\lambda s}$.

Now assume that s is not a square in $R/\text{ann}_R(V)$. The unit group of the finite local ring R has the structure $R^* = (R/J)^* \times (1 + J)$. As $|R|$ is odd, also $|1 + J| = |J|$ is odd and thus every element in $1 + J$ is a square in $1 + J$. Therefore, s is not a square in the field R/J . Let $0 < U \leq V$ be a minimal submodule. Then $U \cong R/J$, and we have $\text{sign}_U(s) = -1$. It follows from [Proposition 10.1](#) that there is an element $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$ with $V(1 - g) = U$. (We have $U = Ru$ and there are nonzero symmetric forms $U \times U \rightarrow I \subseteq R$, where $I = \text{ann}_R(J)$.) For such g , we have $\psi_\lambda(g) = -\psi_{\lambda s}(g)$. This shows (a).

Now fix $g \in \text{Sp}(V)$, and let $0 = U_0 < U_1 < \dots < U_\ell = V(1 - g)$ be a composition series of $V(1 - g)$. Every composition factor is isomorphic to the unique simple R -module R/J . Thus $\text{sign}_{V(1-g)}(s) = [\text{sign}_{R/J}(s)]^\ell$ for any $s \in R^*$ by [Lemma 8.2](#). When $s \in R^*$ is such that $s + J$ is not a square in R/J , then $\text{sign}_{R/J}(s) = -1$. Thus (b) follows from [Corollary 12.7](#). \square

As another application, we reprove a result of R. Guralnick, K. Magaard and P. H. Tiep [[14](#), Theorem 1.2], and extend it from finite fields to finite rings. We begin with a lemma:

12.9. Lemma. *Let $g \in \text{Sp}_R(V, \omega)$. Then $\psi_\lambda(-g^2)$ is independent of the primitive character $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.*

Proof. By [Corollary 12.4](#), we may assume that R is local, with maximal ideal J . By [Corollary 12.8](#), we need to show that $V(1 + g^2)$ has even length. Equivalently, we can show that $\text{Ker}(1 + g^2)$ has even length. Set $q := |R/J|$ and let ℓ be the length of $\text{Ker}(1 + g^2)$. Then $|\text{Ker}(1 + g^2)| = q^\ell$. For $v \in \text{Ker}(1 + g^2)$, we have $vg^2 = -v$. Thus the $\langle g \rangle$ -orbit of any $v \in \text{Ker}(1 + g^2)$ has 4 elements, except for $v = 0$. Thus $q^\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. It follows that when $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then ℓ is even as claimed. Suppose $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Then -1 is a square in R/J , and thus also in R , say $-1 = i^2$ with $i \in R$. We have $1 + g^2 = (g + i)(g - i)$. For $v \in \text{Ker}(1 + g^2)$, we can write

$$v = \frac{1}{2}v(1 + ig) + \frac{1}{2}v(1 - ig) \in \text{Ker}(g + i) + \text{Ker}(g - i).$$

Thus

$$\text{Ker}(1 + g^2) = \text{Ker}(g + i) \oplus \text{Ker}(g - i).$$

By [Lemma 2.3](#), $\text{Ker}(g + i) = V(g - i)^\perp$. Thus

$$|\text{Ker}(g + i)| = |V(g - i)^\perp| = |V|/|V(g - i)| = |\text{Ker}(g - i)|,$$

and thus $\text{Ker}(1 + g^2)$ has even length as claimed. \square

12.10. Corollary. *For $g \in \text{Sp}_R(V)$ and $\lambda: R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ primitive, we have*

$$\psi_\lambda(g)\psi_\lambda(-g) = (-1)^{\frac{\sqrt{|V|}-1}{2}}\psi_{\lambda^2}(g^2).$$

Notice that $\psi_\lambda = \psi_{\lambda^2}$ on $\mathrm{Sp}_R(V, \omega)$ if and only if 2 is a square in R . When R is local with residue field R/J of order q , then 2 is a square in R if and only if $q \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$. In particular, [Corollary 12.10](#) for a finite field is a result by Guralnick, Magaard and Tiep [[14](#), Theorem 1.2].

Proof of [Corollary 12.10](#). We want to apply the convolution formula from [Proposition 5.2](#) to $-g^2 = g \cdot (-g)$. From $v = (1/2)(v(1+g) + v(1-g))$ we see that $\mathrm{Ker}(1-g^2) = \mathrm{Ker}(1-g) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}(1+g)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V(1-g^2) &= \mathrm{Ker}(1-g^2)^\perp = \mathrm{Ker}(1-g)^\perp \cap \mathrm{Ker}(1+g)^\perp \\ &= V(1-g) \cap V(1+g). \end{aligned}$$

Next, for $x = v(1-g^2) \in V(1-g) \cap V(1+g)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_g(x, x) + B_{-g}(x, x) &= \omega(v(1+g), v(1-g^2)) + \omega(v(1-g), v(1-g^2)) \\ &= 2\omega(v, v(1-g^2)) = 2B_{g^2}(x, x). \end{aligned}$$

The convolution formula yields

$$\psi_\lambda(-g^2) = \frac{\psi_\lambda(g)\psi_\lambda(-g)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{x \in V(1-g^2)} \lambda(B_{g^2}(x, x)).$$

The convolution formula applied to ψ_{λ^2} and $-g^2 = -1 \cdot g^2$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\lambda^2}(-g^2) &= \frac{\psi_{\lambda^2}(-1)\psi_{\lambda^2}(g^2)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{x \in V(1-(-1)) \cap V(1-g^2)} \lambda^2\left(\frac{1}{2} \underbrace{(B_{-1}(x, x) + B_{g^2}(x, x))}_{=0}\right) \\ &= (-1)^{(\sqrt{|V|}-1)/2} \frac{\psi_{\lambda^2}(g^2)}{\sqrt{|V|}} \sum_{x \in V(1-g^2)} \lambda(B_{g^2}(x, x)). \end{aligned}$$

But by [Lemma 12.9](#), $\psi_\lambda(-g^2) = \psi_{\lambda^2}(-g^2)$. Cancelling the common factors from the two expressions, we get the result. \square

References

1. M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald. *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass., 1969. [MR0242802](#), Zbl. [0175.03601](#) (cit. on pp. [16](#), [18](#), [30](#)).
2. Anne-Marie Aubert and Tomasz Przebinda. A reverse engineering approach to the Weil representation. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.* **12**, no. 10 (2014), pp. 1500–1585. DOI: [10.2478/s11533-014-0428-8](#). [MR3224014](#), Zbl. [1297.22008](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
3. L. Auslander and R. Tolimieri. Is computing with the finite Fourier transform pure or applied mathematics? *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **1**, no. 6 (1979), pp. 847–897. DOI: [10.1090/S0273-0979-1979-14686-X](#). [MR546312](#), Zbl. [0475.42014](#) (cit. on p. [23](#)).
4. Beverley Bolt, T. G. Room, and G. E. Wall. On the Clifford collineation, transform and similarity groups. I. *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **2** (1961), pp. 60–79. DOI: [10.1017/S1446788700026379](#). [MR0125874](#), Zbl. [0097.01702](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).

5. Adrian Brunyate and Pete L. Clark. Extending the Zolotarev-Frobenius approach to quadratic reciprocity. *Ramanujan J.* **37**, no. 1 (2015), pp. 25–50. DOI: [10.1007/s11139-014-9635-y](#). MR3338036, Zbl. [1395.11013](#) (cit. on pp. [17](#), [18](#)).
6. P. Cartier. Sur une généralisation des symboles de Legendre-Jacobi. *Enseign. Math. (2)* **16** (1970), pp. 31–48. DOI: [10.5169/seals-43850](#). Zbl. [0195.05802](#) (cit. on pp. [17](#), [18](#)).
7. Gerald Cliff, David McNeilly, and Fernando Szechtman. Weil representations of symplectic groups over rings. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **62**, no. 2 (2000), pp. 423–436. DOI: [10.1112/S0024610700001381](#). MR1783635(2001i:20088), Zbl. [1037.20044](#) (cit. on pp. [4](#), [10](#), [11](#)).
8. J. Cruickshank, L. Gutiérrez Frez, and F. Szechtman. Weil representations via abstract data and Heisenberg groups: a comparison. *J. Algebra* **547** (2020), pp. 129–161. DOI: [10.1016/j.jalgebra.2019.11.030](#). MR4039424, Zbl. [1456.20002](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
9. Kunal Dutta and Amritanshu Prasad. Combinatorics of finite abelian groups and Weil representations. *Pacific J. Math.* **275**, no. 2 (2015), pp. 295–324. DOI: [10.2140/pjm.2015.275.295](#). MR3347372, Zbl. [1314.05218](#) (cit. on pp. [4](#), [11](#)).
10. Pierre-Yves Gaillard. PID. (unpublished note pid-110807e from author’s website, no longer online). 2011 (cit. on p. [15](#)).
11. Paul Gérardin. Weil representations associated to finite fields. *J. Algebra* **46**, no. 1 (1977), pp. 54–101. DOI: [10.1016/0021-8693\(77\)90394-5](#). MR0460477(57#470), Zbl. [0359.20008](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
12. Larry J. Gerstein. *Basic Quadratic Forms*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics 90. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008. DOI: [10.1090/gsm/090](#). MR2396246, Zbl. [1147.11002](#) (cit. on p. [17](#)).
13. Roderick Gow and Fernando Szechtman. The Weil character of the unitary group associated to a finite local ring. *Canad. J. Math.* **54**, no. 6 (2002), pp. 1229–1253. DOI: [10.4153/CJM-2002-047-5](#). MR1940237, Zbl. [1041.20031](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
14. Robert M. Guralnick, Kay Magaard, and Pham Huu Tiep. Symmetric and alternating powers of Weil representations of finite symplectic groups. *Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sin. (N.S.)* **13**, no. 4 (2018), pp. 443–461. DOI: [10.21915/BIMAS.2018405](#). MR3888881, Zbl. [1483.20029](#) (cit. on pp. [3](#), [32](#), [33](#)).
15. Shamgar Gurevich and Ronny Hadani. The geometric Weil representation. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **13**, no. 3 (2007), pp. 465–481. DOI: [10.1007/s00029-007-0047-3](#). MR2383602(2009e:11078), Zbl. [1163.22004](#) (cit. on pp. [2](#), [4](#), [29](#)).
16. Shamgar Gurevich and Ronny Hadani. On the diagonalization of the discrete Fourier transform. *Appl. Comput. Harmon. Anal.* **27**, no. 1 (2009), pp. 87–99. DOI: [10.1016/j.acha.2008.11.003](#). MR2526889, Zbl. [1165.65089](#) (cit. on p. [23](#)).
17. Thomas Honold. Characterization of finite Frobenius rings. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **76**, no. 6 (2001), pp. 406–415. DOI: [10.1007/PL00000451](#). MR1831096, Zbl. [0984.16017](#) (cit. on pp. [5](#), [31](#)).
18. Roger E. Howe. On the character of Weil’s representation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **177** (1973), pp. 287–298. DOI: [10.1090/S0002-9947-1973-0316633-5](#), JSTOR: [1996597](#). MR0316633(47#5180), Zbl. [0263.22014](#) (cit. on pp. [4](#), [12](#)).
19. I. Martin Isaacs. Characters of solvable and symplectic groups. *Amer. J. Math.* **95**, no. 3 (1973), pp. 594–635. DOI: [10.2307/2373731](#), JSTOR: [2373731](#). MR0332945(48#11270), Zbl. [0277.20008](#) (cit. on pp. [2](#), [4](#), [10](#), [12](#), [14](#), [15](#)).

20. Camille Jordan. Sur les sommes de Gauss à plusieurs variables. *C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris* **73** (1871), pp. 1316–1319. URL: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k3030d.f1316>. JFM [03.0211.02](#) (cit. on p. [22](#)).
21. Norbert Kaiblinger and Markus Neuhauser. Metaplectic operators for finite abelian groups and \mathbb{R}^d . *Indag. Math. (N.S.)* **20**, no. 2 (2009), pp. 233–246. DOI: [10.1016/S0019-3577\(09\)80011-6](#). MR[2599814](#), Zbl. [1214.43012](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
22. Wilhelm Klingenberg. Symplectic groups over local rings. *Amer. J. Math.* **85** (1963), pp. 232–240. DOI: [10.2307/2373212](#). MR[153749](#), Zbl. [0117.27201](#) (cit. on p. [13](#)).
23. Frieder Ladisch. *Character Correspondences in Finite Groups*. Dissertation. Universität Rostock, 2009. DOI: [10.18453/rosdok_id00000491](#). Zbl. [1360.20001](#) (cit. on p. [2](#)).
24. T[sit] Y[uen] Lam. *Lectures on Modules and Rings*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 189. Springer, New York, Berlin, and Heidelberg, 1999. DOI: [10.1007/978-1-4612-0525-8](#). MR[1653294\(99i:16001\)](#), Zbl. [0911.16001](#) (cit. on p. [8](#)).
25. Serge Lang. *Algebra*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1965. MR[0197234\(33#5416\)](#), Zbl. [0193.34701](#) (cit. on p. [12](#)).
26. Markus Neuhauser. An explicit construction of the metaplectic representation over a finite field. *J. Lie Theory* **12**, no. 1 (2002), pp. 15–30. URL: https://www.emis.de/journals/JLT/vol.12_no.1/2.html. MR[1885034](#), Zbl. [1026.22018](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
27. Patrice Perrin. Représentations de Schrödinger, indice de Maslov et groupe metaplectique. In: *Non-Commutative Harmonic Analysis and Lie Groups* (Marseille-Luminy, 1980). Lecture Notes in Math. 880. Springer, Berlin, New York, 1981, pp. 370–407. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0090417](#). MR[644841](#), Zbl. [0462.22008](#) (cit. on p. [3](#)).
28. Amritanshu Prasad. On character values and decomposition of the Weil representation associated to a finite abelian group. *J. Analysis* **17** (2009), pp. 73–85. arXiv: [0903.1486 \[math.RT\]](#). MR[2722604\(2012a:11053\)](#), Zbl. [1291.11084](#) (cit. on pp. [4](#), [7](#), [10–12](#)).
29. M. Ram Murty and Siddhi Pathak. Evaluation of the quadratic Gauss sum. *Math. Student* **86**, no. 1-2 (2017), pp. 139–150. MR[3699589](#) (cit. on p. [21](#)).
30. I[ssai] Schur. Über die Gaußschen Summen. *Nachr. K. Ges. Wiss. Gött., Math.-Phys. Kl.* (1921), pp. 147–153. URL: <http://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?GDZPPN002505932>. JFM [48.0130.07](#) (cit. on pp. [18](#), [21](#), [22](#)).
31. Ken-ichi Shinoda. The characters of Weil representations associated to finite fields. *J. Algebra* **66**, no. 1 (1980), pp. 251–280. DOI: [10.1016/0021-8693\(80\)90123-4](#). MR[591256\(81k:20017\)](#), Zbl. [0444.20034](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
32. Fernando Szechtman. *Weil Representations of Finite Symplectic Groups*. (Canadiana: [002057328](#), ISBN: 0-612-39598-7). PhD thesis. University of Alberta, 1999. MR[2699530](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
33. Fernando Szechtman. Weil representations of symplectic groups over non-principal rings. *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* **35**, no. 1 (2005), pp. 309–329. DOI: [10.1216/rmjm/1181069783](#). MR[2117610](#), Zbl. [1088.20023](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
34. Shun'ichi Tanaka. Construction and classification of irreducible representations of special linear group of the second order over a finite field. *Osaka J. Math.* **4** (1967), pp. 65–84. URL: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.ojm/1200691815>. MR[219635](#), Zbl. [0245.20039](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).

35. Shun'ichi Tanaka. Irreducible representations of the binary modular congruence groups mod p^λ . *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.* **7** (1967), pp. 123–132. DOI: [10.1215/kjm/1250524272](#). MR229737, Zbl. [0219.20005](#) (cit. on p. [4](#)).
36. Teruji Thomas. The character of the Weil representation. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **77**, no. 1 (2008), pp. 221–239. DOI: [10.1112/jlms/jdm098](#). MR2389926(2008k:11049), Zbl. [1195.11058](#) (cit. on pp. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [20](#), [29](#)).
37. Teruji Thomas. Weil representation and transfer factor. *Algebra Number Theory* **7**, no. 7 (2013), pp. 1535–1570. DOI: [10.2140/ant.2013.7.1535](#). MR3117500, Zbl. [1300.11039](#) (cit. on pp. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#), [7](#), [29](#)).
38. G. E. Wall. On the conjugacy classes in the unitary, symplectic and orthogonal groups. (English). *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* **3** (1963), pp. 1–62. DOI: [10.1017/S1446788700027622](#). MR0150210, Zbl. [0122.28102](#) (cit. on pp. [6](#), [23](#)).
39. Harold N. Ward. Representations of symplectic groups. *J. Algebra* **20** (1972), pp. 182–195. DOI: [10.1016/0021-8693\(72\)90098-1](#). MR0286909(44#4116), Zbl. [0239.20013](#) (cit. on pp. [2](#), [5](#), [7–9](#)).
40. Harold N. Ward. Matrices for the Weil representation (May 25, 2017). arXiv: [1705.09138v1 \[math.RT\]](#) (cit. on pp. [2](#), [4–7](#), [23](#), [26](#)).
41. Heinrich Weber. Ueber die mehrfachen Gaussischen Summen. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **74** (1872), pp. 14–56. URL: <http://www.digizeitschriften.de/dms/resolveppn/?PPN=GDZPPN002154854>. JFM [03.0211.01](#) (cit. on p. [22](#)).
42. André Weil. Sur certains groupes d'opérateurs unitaires. *Acta Math.* **111** (1964), pp. 143–211. DOI: [10.1007/BF02391012](#). MR0165033(29#2324), Zbl. [0203.03305](#) (cit. on pp. [2–4](#), [20](#)).

Frieder Ladisch
 Universität Rostock
 Institut für Mathematik
 18051 Rostock
 Germany
e-mail: frieder.ladisch@uni-rostock.de