

# ZARISKI DENSE SURFACE SUBGROUPS IN $SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$ WITH ODD $n$

CARMEN GALAZ-GARCÍA

ABSTRACT. For odd  $n$  we construct a path  $\rho_t: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  of discrete, faithful and Zariski dense representations of a surface group such that  $\rho_t(\pi_1(S)) \subset SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

Constructing Zariski dense surface subgroups in  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  has attracted attention as a step to finding *thin groups*, these are infinite index subgroups of a lattice in  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  which are Zariski dense. Finding thin subgroups inside lattices in a variety of Lie groups has been a topic of significant interest in recent years, in part from the connections thin groups have to expanders and the affine sieve of Bourgain, Gamburd, and Sarnak [1][2].

Though thin subgroups are in a sense generic [3][4], finding particular specimens of thin surface subgroups in a given lattice remains a difficult task. In this direction Long, Reid and Thistlethwaite [5] produced in 2011 the first infinite family of nonconjugate thin surface groups in  $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ . Their approach relies on parametrizing a family of representations  $\rho_t$  of the triangle group  $\Delta(3, 3, 4)$  in the *Hitchin component*, so that for every  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$  the subgroup  $\rho_t(\Delta(3, 3, 4))$  is in  $SL(3, \mathbb{Q})$  and has integral traces. By results of Bass [6] these two properties together with  $\rho_t(\Delta(3, 3, 4))$  being non-solvable and finitely generated guarantee that it is conjugate to a subgroup of  $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ . In 2018 Long and Thistlethwaite [7] used a similar approach to obtain an infinite family of non-conjugate Zariski dense surface subgroups in  $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$  and  $SL(5, \mathbb{Z})$ .

Ballas and Long [8] in turn used the idea of "bending" a representation of the fundamental group of a hyperbolic  $n$ -manifold  $\pi_1(N)$  along an embedded totally geodesic and separating hypersurface to obtain thin groups in  $SL(n+1, \mathbb{R})$  which are isomorphic to  $\pi_1(N)$ . The goal of this article is to combine the aforementioned approaches to construct a family of Zariski dense rational surface group representations by bending orbifold representations. Our main result is the following:

**Theorem 1.** *For every surface  $S$  finitely covering the orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  and every odd  $n > 1$  there exists a path of discrete, faithful and irreducible representations  $\rho_t: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$ , so that*

- (1)  $\rho_0(\pi_1(S)) < SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ ,
- (2)  $\rho_t$  is Zariski dense for every  $t > 0$ , and
- (3)  $\rho_t(\pi_1(S)) < SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

Every representation  $\rho_t$  in theorem 1 is a surface Hitchin representation. Several of its properties are derived from the seminal work of Labourie [9] on Anosov representations, the classification of Zariski closures of surface Hitchin representations by Guichard [10] and the recent introduction of orbifold Hitchin representations by Alessandrini, Lee and Schaffhauser [11]. We provide an overview of these results in sections 1 and 2. At the end of section 2 we also prove the following criterion for Zariski density, which will be subsequently used to discard Zariski closures.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  be an orbifold Hitchin representation such that*

- *if  $n = 2k$  is even then  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}))$  is not conjugate to a subgroup of  $PSp(2k, \mathbb{R})$  or,*
- *if  $n = 2k + 1$  is odd then  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}))$  is not conjugate to a subgroup of  $PSO(k, k + 1)$ .*

*Then  $\rho(H)$  is Zariski dense in  $PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  for every finite index subgroup  $H$  of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$ .*

In section 3 we give a general construction to obtain a path of representations as in theorem 1. This is based on bending the fundamental group  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  of a hyperbolic 2-dimensional orbifold along a simple closed curve in  $\mathcal{O}$  with infinite order as an element of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$ . Theorem 1 then follows from applying the results in section 2 to a suitable representation of the fundamental group of the orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  whose underlying topological space is  $S^2$  and has four cone points of order 3. This final step is covered in section 4.

**Remark.** During the finalization of this project, Long and Thistlethwaite used bending to construct thin surface groups in  $SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$  for every odd  $n$  [12], the even case remains open.

## 1. HITCHIN REPRESENTATIONS

In this section we give a short overview of surface and orbifold Hitchin representations.

**1.1. Spaces of representations.** Let  $G$  be a Lie group and let  $\Gamma$  be a group with a finite presentation  $\langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \mid r_1, \dots, r_m \rangle$ . Then every relator  $r_i$  defines a map  $R_i: G^k \rightarrow G$ . If we let  $\text{Hom}(\Gamma, G) = \bigcap_{i=1}^m R_i^{-1}(Id)$ , then the map  $\phi \mapsto (\phi(\alpha_1), \dots, \phi(\alpha_k))$  is a bijection between the set of all group homomorphisms from  $\Gamma$  to  $G$  and  $\text{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$ . We will regard  $\text{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$  as having the subspace topology from  $G^k$ .

Let  $\text{Hom}^+(\Gamma, G)$  be the subset of representations in  $\text{Hom}(\Gamma, G)$  which decompose as a direct sum of irreducible representations and let  $\text{Rep}^+(\Gamma, G) = \text{Hom}^+(\Gamma, G)/G$  be the quotient space by the conjugation action. With the quotient topology  $\text{Rep}^+(\Gamma, G)$  has the structure of an algebraic variety ([13] sec. 5.2).

In the following we will frequently use the representation

$$\tilde{\omega}_n: SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R}) \tag{1}$$

given by the action of  $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$  on the vector space  $\mathcal{P}$  of homogeneous polynomials in 2 variables of degree  $n - 1$ . If  $n = 2k$  is even, the image of  $\tilde{\omega}_n$  is contained in the symplectic group  $Sp(2k, \mathbb{R})$ , and if  $n = 2k + 1$  is odd, it is contained in a group isomorphic to  $SO(k, k + 1)$ .

It is well known that the representation  $\tilde{\omega}_n$  is absolutely irreducible and is, up to conjugation, the unique irreducible representation from  $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$  into  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$ . This representation induces a *projective representation*  $\omega_n: PSL(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  which is also irreducible and unique up to conjugation.

**1.2. Hitchin representations of surface groups.** Let  $S$  be a closed surface of genus  $g > 1$ . In 1988 Goldman proved that  $\text{Rep}^+(\pi_1(S), PSL(2, \mathbb{R}))$  has  $4g - 3$  connected components, two of which are diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^{6g-6}$  and called these *Teichmüller spaces* ([14] thm. A, see also note at end of thm. 10.2 in [15]). The two Teichmüller spaces  $\mathcal{T}^\pm(S)$  are precisely the sets of conjugacy classes by  $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$  of *Fuchsian representations*, which are discrete and faithful representations  $\rho: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow PSL(2, \mathbb{R}) \equiv \text{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^2)$ .

**Definition 3.** For  $n > 2$  a representation  $r: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is called *Fuchsian* if it can be decomposed as  $r = \omega_n \circ r_0$  where  $r_0: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$  is discrete and faithful, and

$\omega_n: PSL(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is the unique irreducible representation introduced in section 1.1.

**Definition 4.** The *Fuchsian locus* is the set of all  $PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  conjugacy classes of Fuchsian representations, namely the set  $\omega_n(\mathcal{T}^\pm(S))$ .

The space  $\text{Rep}^+(\pi_1(S), PSL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  has three topological connected components if  $n$  is odd and 6 if  $n$  is even ([15], thm. 10.2). The Fuchsian locus is contained in one component in the odd case and in two components in the even case. Each of these distinguished components, called *Hitchin components*, is diffeomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^{(1-n^2)(1-g)}$ . When  $n > 2$  is even, both Hitchin components are related by an inner automorphism of  $PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ . In the odd case, where there is only one component, we will denote the Hitchin component by  $\text{Hit}(\pi_1(S), PSL(n, \mathbb{R}))$ .

**Definition 5.** Let  $S$  be a closed surface of genus greater than one. A representation  $r: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is a *surface Hitchin representation* if its  $PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ -conjugacy class belongs to a Hitchin component of  $\text{Rep}^+(\pi_1(S), PSL(n, \mathbb{R}))$ .

In [9], Labourie introduces *Anosov representations* and proves that surface Hitchin representations are  $B$ -Anosov where  $B$  is any Borel subgroup of  $PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ . This gives surface Hitchin representations essential algebraic properties, out of which we will use theorem 7 below.

**Definition 6** ([16] sec. 2.2). A matrix  $A \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is *purely loxodromic* if it is diagonalizable over  $\mathbb{R}$  with eigenvalues of distinct modulus. If  $A \in PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  then we say  $A$  is *purely loxodromic* if any lift of  $A$  to an element of  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is purely loxodromic.

**Theorem 7** ([9] thm. 1.5, lemma 10.1). *A surface Hitchin representation  $r: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is discrete, faithful and strongly irreducible. Moreover, the image of every non-trivial element of  $\pi_1(S)$  under  $r$  is purely loxodromic.*

**1.3. Hitchin representations of orbifold groups.** Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a 2-dimensional closed orbifold of negative orbifold Euler characteristic  $\chi(\mathcal{O})$  and let  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  be its orbifold fundamental group. In [17] Thurston proves there is a connected component of the representation space  $\text{Rep}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(2, \mathbb{R}))$  that parametrizes hyperbolic structures on  $\mathcal{O}$ . This component is called the *Teichmüller space* of the orbifold  $\mathcal{O}$ , we will denote it by  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{O})$ . As with surfaces, the orbifold Teichmüller space consists of conjugacy classes of discrete and faithful representations of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  into  $PGL(2, \mathbb{R}) \equiv \text{Isom}(\mathbb{H}^2)$ , which we will call *Fuchsian representations* too. More recently, Alessandrini, Lee, and Schaffhauser used the irreducible representation  $\omega_n$  to define the *Hitchin component*  $\text{Hit}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  of  $\text{Rep}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  as the unique connected component in this representation space which contains the connected Fuchsian locus  $\omega_n(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{O}))$  ([11] def. 2.3) and prove  $\text{Hit}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  is homeomorphic to an open ball ([11] thm. 1.2).

**Definition 8** ([11] def. 2.4). Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a 2-dimensional connected closed orbifold with negative orbifold Euler characteristic. A representation  $r: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PGL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is an *orbifold Hitchin representation* if its  $PGL(n, \mathbb{R})$ -conjugacy class belongs to the Hitchin component  $\text{Hit}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  of  $\text{Rep}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$ .

The definition of Anosov representations has been generalized by Guichard and Wienhard ([18] def. 2.10) to include representations of word hyperbolic groups into semisimple Lie

groups. With this more general definition, and just as their surface counterparts, orbifold Hitchin representations are also  $B$ -Anosov where  $B$  is a Borel subgroup of  $PGL(n, \mathbb{R})$  ([11] prop. 2.16) and thus share some strong algebraic properties.

**Theorem 9** ([11] thm. 1.1). *An orbifold Hitchin representation  $r: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PGL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is discrete, faithful and strongly irreducible. Moreover, the image of every infinite order element of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  under  $r$  is purely loxodromic.*

## 2. ZARISKI DENSE HITCHIN REPRESENTATIONS

In this section we focus on Zariski density of Hitchin representations and prove corollary 15 which gives a criterion to determine when the image of a finite index subgroup of an orbifold group under a Hitchin representation is Zariski dense.

**2.1. Zariski closures of Hitchin representations.** Let  $G$  be an algebraic matrix Lie group, then  $G$  has both its standard topology as a subset of some  $\mathbb{R}^N$  and the Zariski topology. If  $X$  is a subset of  $G$  then its *Zariski closure* is the closure of  $X$  in  $G$  with respect to the Zariski topology. We say a subgroup  $H < G$  is *Zariski dense* in  $G$  if its Zariski closure equals  $G$ . A representation  $r: \Gamma \rightarrow G$  is *Zariski dense* if  $r(\Gamma)$  is Zariski dense in  $G$ .

The image of the irreducible representation  $\omega_n: PSL(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is contained, if  $n$  is even, in a conjugate of  $PSp(n, \mathbb{R})$ , which is the projectivization of the symplectic group  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$ . If  $n = 2k + 1$  is odd, the image of  $\omega_n$  is contained in a conjugate of the orthogonal group  $SO(k, k+1) = PSO(k, k+1)$ . This implies that the images of Fuchsian representations are contained in (a conjugate of)  $PSp(n, \mathbb{R})$  or in  $SO(k, k+1)$  and, in particular, they are not Zariski dense. More generally, for surface Hitchin representations Guichard [10] has announced a classification of Zariski closures of their lifts. An alternative proof of this result has been given recently by Sambarino ([19] cor. 1.5). The version of this result we cite here comes from theorem 11.7 in [20].

**Theorem 10** ([10], [19]). *If  $r: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is the lift of a surface Hitchin representation and  $H$  is the Zariski closure of  $r(\pi_1(S))$ , then*

- *If  $n = 2k$  is even,  $H$  is conjugate to either  $\omega_n(SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ ,  $Sp(2k, \mathbb{R})$  or  $SL(2k, \mathbb{R})$ .*
- *If  $n = 2k + 1$  is odd and  $n \neq 7$ , then  $H$  is conjugate to either  $\omega_n(SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ ,  $SO(k, k+1)$  or  $SL(2k+1, \mathbb{R})$ .*
- *If  $n = 7$ , then  $H$  is conjugate to either  $\omega_7(SL(2, \mathbb{R}))$ ,  $G_2$ ,  $SO(3, 4)$  or  $SL(7, \mathbb{R})$ .*

**2.2. A criterion for Zariski density.** Here we prove proposition 2 which gives us a criterion to find Zariski dense Hitchin representations.

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  with  $n$  even be an orbifold Hitchin representation. Then for every  $[\alpha] \in \pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  of infinite order there is a lift  $A \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  of  $\rho([\alpha])$  which has  $n$  positive distinct eigenvalues.*

*Proof.* First consider a Fuchsian representation  $\sigma: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$  and  $[\alpha]$  an infinite order element of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$ . Since  $\mathcal{O}$  is a hyperbolic orbifold,  $\sigma([\alpha])$  is conjugate to a hyperbolic element  $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\lambda} \end{bmatrix} \in PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ . We can lift this element to a matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\lambda} \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{R})$  with  $\lambda > 0$ . Let  $\tilde{\omega}_n: SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  be the unique irreducible representation in (1), then

$\tilde{\omega}_n \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\lambda} \end{pmatrix} \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  has  $n$  distinct positive eigenvalues  $\lambda^{n-1}, \lambda^{n-3}, \dots, \lambda^{-(n-3)}, \lambda^{-(n-1)}$  and is a lift of  $\omega_n \circ \sigma([\alpha]) \in PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ .

Now consider a Hitchin representation  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ . Let  $\rho_t$  be a path of Hitchin representations such that  $\rho_0$  is Fuchsian and  $\rho_1 = \rho$ . This induces a path  $\rho_t([\alpha]) \subset PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ . By the previous argument we may lift  $\rho_t([\alpha])$  to a path  $\tilde{A}_t \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\tilde{A}_0$  has  $n$  distinct positive eigenvalues. Since each eigenvalue of  $\tilde{A}_t$  varies continuously and  $\det \tilde{A}_t \neq 0$ , all eigenvalues of  $\tilde{A}_t$  are positive. Moreover, by theorem 9 the absolute values of the eigenvalues of  $\rho_t([\alpha])$  are distinct. This in turn implies all the eigenvalues of  $\tilde{A}_t$  are distinct. Therefore  $\tilde{A}_1 \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is a lift of  $\rho([\alpha])$  with  $n$  positive distinct eigenvalues.  $\square$

To prove our criterion for Zariski density (propositions 13 and 14) we will make use of the following theorem by Culver.

**Theorem 12** ([21] thm. 2). *Let  $C$  be a real square matrix. Then the equation  $C = \exp(X)$  has a unique real solution  $X$  if and only if all the eigenvalues of  $C$  are positive real and no elementary divisor (Jordan block) of  $C$  belonging to any eigenvalue appears more than once.*

**Proposition 13.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  with  $n$  even be an orbifold Hitchin representation so that  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}))$  is not conjugate to a subgroup of  $PSp(n, \mathbb{R})$ . If  $S$  is a surface finitely covering  $\mathcal{O}$  then  $\rho(\pi_1(S))$  is Zariski dense.*

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be a surface finitely covering  $\mathcal{O}$  and suppose that  $\rho(\pi_1(S))$  is conjugate to a subgroup of  $PSp(n, \mathbb{R})$ . Then there exists an alternating form  $\Omega \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $Sp(\Omega) = \{g \in SL(n, \mathbb{R}) \mid g^T \Omega g = \Omega\}$  and  $\rho(\pi_1(S)) \subset PSp(\Omega) = Sp(\Omega) / \pm I$ .

Let  $[\alpha] \in \pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  be an infinite order element. By lemma 11 we can lift  $\rho([\alpha]) \in PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  to a matrix  $A \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  with  $n$  positive distinct eigenvalues. Since  $\pi_1(S)$  has finite index in  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  there exists a  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\rho([\alpha])^k \in \rho(\pi_1(S))$ . Then  $A^k$  is a lift of  $\rho([\alpha])^k$  and  $A^k \in Sp(\Omega)$ . Given that  $A$  has  $n$  positive distinct eigenvalues, by theorem 12 there is a unique  $X \in M_{n \times n}(\mathbb{R})$  such that  $\exp(X) = A$ . Then using that  $\exp(kX) = A^k$  preserves  $\Omega$  we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(kX)^T \Omega \exp(kX) = \Omega &\Rightarrow \Omega^{-1} \exp(kX)^T \Omega = \exp(kX)^{-1} \\ &\Rightarrow \exp(\Omega^{-1}(kX)^T \Omega) = \Omega^{-1} \exp(kX)^T \Omega = \exp(-kX). \end{aligned}$$

Applying theorem 12 now to  $\Omega^{-1} \exp(kX)^T \Omega$  we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{-1}(kX)^T \Omega = -kX &\Rightarrow -\Omega(kX)^T \Omega = -kX \\ &\Rightarrow \Omega(kX)^T \Omega = kX. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $kX \in \mathfrak{sp}(\Omega)$  and thus  $A = \exp(X) \in Sp(\Omega)$ . Given that  $A$  is a lift of  $\rho([\alpha])$ , we have that  $\rho([\alpha]) \in PSp(\Omega)$ . Since  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  is generated by its infinite order elements we get that  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset PSp(\Omega)$ , a contradiction. So it cannot be that  $\rho(\pi_1(S))$  is conjugate to a subgroup of  $PSp(n, \mathbb{R})$ . In particular, if  $r$  is a lift of the Hitchin surface representation  $\rho|_{\pi_1(S)}$  then the Zariski closure of  $r(\pi_1(S))$  cannot be conjugate to a subgroup of  $Sp(n, \mathbb{R})$ . By theorem 10 it must be that the Zariski closure of  $r(\pi_1(S))$  is  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$ . Therefore the Zariski closure of  $\rho(\pi_1(S))$  is  $PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ .  $\square$

In the case when  $n = 2k + 1$  is odd, by theorem 10 the Zariski closure of  $\rho(\pi_1(S))$  where  $\rho$  is a surface Hitchin representation is either conjugate to a subgroup of  $SO(k, k + 1)$  or equals  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$ . By assuming there exists a symmetric bilinear form  $J$  such that  $\rho(\pi_1(S)) \subset SO(J)$  we have an analogous proof to that of 13 to get a criterion for Zariski density of surface Hitchin representations in the odd case.

**Proposition 14.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  with  $n$  odd be an orbifold Hitchin representation such that there is no real quadratic form  $J$  for which  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset SO(J)$ . If  $S$  is a surface finitely covering  $\mathcal{O}$  then  $\rho(\pi_1(S))$  is Zariski dense.*

Given that any finite index subgroup of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  contains a surface subgroup which has finite index in  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  we obtain the following result.

**Proposition 15.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$  be an orbifold Hitchin representation such that*

- *if  $n = 2k$  is even then  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}))$  is not conjugate to a subgroup of  $PSp(2k, \mathbb{R})$  or,*
- *if  $n = 2k + 1$  is odd then  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}))$  is not conjugate to a subgroup of  $PSO(k, k + 1)$ .*

*Then for every finite index subgroup  $H$  of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$  the image  $\rho(H)$  is Zariski dense in  $PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ .*

### 3. BENDING REPRESENTATIONS OF ORBIFOLD GROUPS

Theorem 19 in this section gives a general construction of a path  $\rho_t$  of Zariski dense Hitchin surface representations into  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  for odd  $n$ . By requiring that the initial representation  $\rho_0$  has image inside  $SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  we obtain corollary 20, in which every representation  $\rho_t$  with  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$  also has image in  $SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$ .

**3.1. Bending representations.** Let  $\mathcal{O}$  be a 2-dimensional orientable connected closed orbifold of negative orbifold Euler characteristic and  $\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_R$  be open connected suborbifolds with connected intersection  $\mathcal{O}_L \cap \mathcal{O}_R$ . Given a representation  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow G$  there is a standard way of "bending"  $\rho$  by an element  $\delta$  of the centralizer in  $G$  of  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L \cap \mathcal{O}_R))$  to obtain a representation  $\rho_\delta: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L) *_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L \cap \mathcal{O}_R)} \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R) \rightarrow G$  so that  $\rho_\delta(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) = \langle \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)), \delta \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)) \delta^{-1} \rangle$  (see for example [22] sec. 5).

From now onwards we will consider the case where there is a simple closed curve  $\gamma \subset \mathcal{O}$ , not parallel to a cone point, that divides  $\mathcal{O}$  into two orbifolds  $\mathcal{O}_L$  and  $\mathcal{O}_R$  which share  $\gamma$  as their common boundary, so that  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L) *_{\langle [\gamma] \rangle} \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)$ .

**Proposition 16.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L) *_{\langle [\gamma] \rangle} \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  be a representation for which  $\rho(\langle [\gamma] \rangle)$  has  $n$  distinct positive eigenvalues. Then there exists a path of representations  $\rho_t: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  with  $t \geq 0$  such that*

- (1)  $\rho_0 = \rho$ ,
- (2)  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) = \langle \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)), \delta_t \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)) \delta_t^{-1} \rangle$  for some  $\delta_t \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  which commutes with  $\rho(\langle [\gamma] \rangle)$ , and
- (3)  $\rho_t$  has image in  $SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

*Proof.* The matrix  $\rho(\langle [\gamma] \rangle)$  is conjugate to a diagonal matrix  $D$  with entries  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n > 0$  along its diagonal. Now for every  $t > 0$  define

$$\delta_t = (t\rho(\langle [\gamma] \rangle) + I) \det(t\rho(\langle [\gamma] \rangle) + I)^{-\frac{1}{n}} \tag{2}$$

Notice that  $\det(t\rho([\gamma]) + I) = \det(tD + I) = \prod_{k=1}^n (t\lambda_k + 1) > 0$ , so  $t\rho([\gamma]) + I$  is invertible for all  $t$ . Then each  $\delta_t$  is in  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  and we can check that  $\delta_t$  commutes with  $\rho([\gamma])$ . Since  $\rho$  is a rational representation, whenever  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$  the matrix  $t\rho([\gamma]) + I$  has rational entries and non-zero determinant.

Let  $\rho_t: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  be the representation such that  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) = \langle \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)), \delta_t \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)) \delta_t^{-1} \rangle$ . Notice that  $\rho_0 = \rho$  and that for every  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$  the representation  $\rho_t$  has image in  $SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$ . □

**3.2. Discarding Zariski closures.** For the rest of section 3 we focus on the case where  $n = 2k + 1$  is odd. Recall that in this case  $SL(n, \mathbb{R}) \cong PSL(n, \mathbb{R})$ .

**Lemma 17.** *Let  $\rho: \Gamma \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  be an irreducible representation and suppose there is a quadratic form  $J$  such that  $\rho(\Gamma) \subset SO(J)$ . Then  $J$  is unique up to scaling.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $\rho(\Gamma) \subset SO(J_1) \cap SO(J_2)$ . Then for any  $\rho(\gamma) \in \rho(\Gamma)$  we have that

$$J_1^{-1} \rho(\gamma) J_1 = \rho(\gamma)^{-T} = J_2^{-1} \rho(\gamma) J_2,$$

which implies that  $\rho(\gamma) J_1 J_2^{-1} = J_1 J_2^{-1} \rho(\gamma)$ . Since  $n$  is odd,  $J_1 J_2^{-1}$  has a real eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Then  $\text{Ker}(J_1 J_2^{-1} - \lambda I)$  is a non-zero invariant subspace for the irreducible representation  $\rho$ , which implies  $J_1 = \lambda J_2$ . □

**Proposition 18.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L) *_{\langle [\gamma] \rangle} \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  be a representation in which the restrictions  $\rho|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)}$  and  $\rho|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)}$  are irreducible and  $\rho([\gamma])$  has  $n$  positive distinct eigenvalues. Suppose there is a quadratic form  $J$  such that  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset SO(J)$ . Then there exists a path of representations  $\rho_t: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  such that*

- (1)  $\rho_0 = \rho$  and
- (2) for each  $t > 0$  there is no quadratic form  $\tilde{J}$  such that  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset SO(\tilde{J})$ .

*Proof.* By proposition 16 there are  $\delta_t \in SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  that commute with  $\rho([\gamma])$ , with which we can construct a path of representations  $\rho_t: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\rho_0 = \rho$  and  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) = \langle \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)), \delta_t \rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)) \delta_t^{-1} \rangle$ .

Now fix  $t > 0$ . Suppose there exists a quadratic form  $\tilde{J}$  such that  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset SO(\tilde{J})$ . Since  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset SO(J)$ , in particular  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)) = \rho_0(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)) \subset SO(J) \cap SO(\tilde{J})$ . The restriction  $\rho_t|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)}$  is irreducible, so by lemma 17  $J$  is a real multiple of  $\tilde{J}$ . Similarly, by construction  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)) \subset SO(\delta_t J \delta_t^T) \cap SO(\tilde{J})$  and  $\rho_t|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)}$  is irreducible too. Thus  $\delta_t J \delta_t^T$  is also a multiple of  $\tilde{J}$ . This implies there is a  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\lambda J = \delta_t J \delta_t^T$  and then  $\lambda^n = \det(\delta_t)^2 = 1$ . Since  $n$  is odd it must be that  $\lambda = 1$  and we obtain  $\delta_t \in SO(J)$ . Given that

$$(t\rho([\gamma]) + I)J(t\rho([\gamma])^T + I) = t^2 J + tJ(\rho([\gamma])^T)^{-1} + tJ\rho([\gamma])^T + J,$$

having  $J = \delta_t J \delta_t^T$  would imply that  $\mu I = \rho([\gamma])^{-1} + \rho([\gamma])$  for some  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ . Recall that  $\rho([\gamma])$  is conjugate to a diagonal matrix  $D$  whose eigenvalues are all distinct. If  $\mu I = \rho([\gamma])^{-1} + \rho([\gamma])$  then by conjugating we would obtain that  $\mu I = D^{-1} + D$ , which is not the case given that  $n > 2$ . □

**3.3. Representations of surface groups.** Recall we are assuming that  $\mathcal{O}$  is a 2-dimensional orientable connected closed orbifold of negative orbifold Euler characteristic. Such orbifolds are always finitely covered by a surface  $S$  of genus greater than one, so  $\pi_1(S)$  is a finite index subgroup of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$ . Given a representation  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow G$  we will denote the restriction of  $\rho$  to  $\pi_1(S)$  by  $\rho^S$ .

**Theorem 19.** *Suppose  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L) *_{\langle[\gamma]\rangle} \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)$  with  $[\gamma]$  an infinite order element. Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  be an orbifold Fuchsian representation such that the restrictions  $\rho|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)}$  and  $\rho|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)}$  are irreducible. If  $S$  is a surface finitely covering  $\mathcal{O}$  then there exists a path of representations  $\rho_t^S: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\rho_0^S = \rho^S$  and  $\rho_t^S$  is a Zariski dense surface Hitchin representation for each  $t > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is an orbifold Hitchin representation with odd  $n = 2k+1$  and  $[\gamma]$  has infinite order, then  $\rho([\gamma])$  has  $n$  positive distinct real eigenvalues. Moreover, since  $\rho$  is Fuchsian its image is contained in a conjugate of  $SO(k, k+1)$ . Using proposition 18 we obtain a path of representations  $\rho_t: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\rho_0 = \rho$  and for each  $t > 0$  there is no real quadratic form  $J$  such that  $\rho_t(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset SO(J)$ . By proposition 14 each  $\rho_t(\pi_1(S))$  is Zariski dense in  $SL(n, \mathbb{R})$ .

Now consider the continuous path  $[\rho_t] \in \text{Rep}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  for  $t \geq 0$ . Its image is connected so all  $PGL(n, \mathbb{R})$ -conjugacy classes  $[\rho_t]$  are contained in the same connected component of  $\text{Rep}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$ . Because the representation  $\rho_0 = \rho$  is Fuchsian,  $[\rho_0]$  is in the Hitchin component  $\text{Hit}(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}), PGL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  and so is every  $[\rho_t]$ . Thus, by theorem 9, each  $\rho_t$  is discrete, faithful and strongly irreducible. Since  $\pi_1(S)$  has finite index in  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O})$ , each restriction  $\rho_t^S: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  is irreducible. In particular  $\rho_0^S$  is a surface Fuchsian representation. Then  $[\rho_t^S]$  is a continuous path in  $\text{Rep}^+(\pi_1(S), SL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  with  $[\rho_0^S] \in \text{Hit}(\pi_1(S), SL(n, \mathbb{R}))$ . Since the Hitchin component is path connected  $[\rho_t^S] \in \text{Hit}(\pi_1(S), SL(n, \mathbb{R}))$  for all  $t \geq 0$ . □

To finish this section notice that the construction of the path of Zariski dense representations in the previous theorem is based on proposition 16, so we may add the assumption of  $\rho(\pi_1(\mathcal{O})) \subset SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  to obtain that the image of every  $\rho_t$  is in  $SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

**Corollary 20.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}) \rightarrow PSL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  be a representation satisfying the assumptions of theorem 19. If  $S$  is a surface finitely covering  $\mathcal{O}$  then there exists a path  $\rho_t^S: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{R})$  of Hitchin representations such that  $\rho_0^S = \rho^S$ ,  $\rho_t^S$  is Zariski dense for each  $t > 0$  and  $\rho_t^S$  has image in  $SL(n, \mathbb{Q})$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ .*

#### 4. REPRESENTATIONS OF $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3})$

In this section we look at the orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  and find a Fuchsian representation  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \rightarrow SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$  satisfying the assumptions of corollary 20.

**4.1. The orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$ .** In what follows we focus on the triangle group  $\Delta(3, 4, 4) \subset PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ . If we let  $T$  be the hyperbolic triangle with angles  $\{\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}\}$ , then the generators of  $\Delta(3, 4, 4)$  are the rotations  $x$  and  $y$  by  $\frac{2\pi}{3}$  and  $\frac{\pi}{2}$  around the corresponding vertices of  $T$ . This group has presentation

$$\Delta(3, 4, 4) = \langle x, y \mid x^3 = y^4 = (xy)^4 = 1 \rangle. \tag{3}$$

The fundamental domain for the action of  $\Delta(3, 4, 4)$  on  $\mathbb{H}^2$  is a quadrilateral with angles  $\{\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{3}\}$ . The quotient  $\mathbb{H}^2/\Delta(3, 4, 4)$  is homeomorphic to the orbifold  $S^2(3, 4, 4)$  whose underlying topological space is  $S^2$  and has three cone points of orders 3, 4 and 4. This defines, up to conjugation, an isomorphism  $\pi_1(S^2(3, 4, 4)) \rightarrow \Delta(3, 4, 4) \subset PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$ .




FIGURE 1. Orbifold  $S^2(3, 4, 4)$

Let  $\theta_1 = x$  and  $\theta_i = y\theta_{i-1}y^{-1}$  for  $i = 2, 3, 4$ , then  $\langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_4 \rangle$  the quotient of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  by the action of  $\langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_4 \rangle$  is homeomorphic to the orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  with underlying topological space  $S^2$  and 4 cone points of order 3. By construction, we obtain that  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  is an index four orbifold covering of  $S^2(3, 4, 4)$ . If  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4$  are loops around the cone points of  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$ , then the orbifold fundamental group has the presentation

$$\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_4 \mid \gamma_1^3 = \dots = \gamma_4^3 = \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4 = 1 \rangle.$$

Identifying each  $\gamma_i$  with the rotation  $\theta_i$  gives an isomorphism  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \cong \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_4 \rangle$  which defines (up to conjugation) a discrete and faithful representation

$$\sigma: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \rightarrow \Delta(3, 4, 4) < PSL(2, \mathbb{R}). \quad (4)$$

**Lemma 21.** *The representation  $\sigma: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \rightarrow PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$  defined in (4) is Zariski dense.*

*Proof.* We will check that the group  $\sigma(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3})) = \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_4 \rangle < \Delta(3, 4, 4)$  is Zariski dense. Hyperbolic triangles with the same angles are isometric, so we can fix the hyperbolic triangle with angles  $\{\frac{\pi}{3}, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4}\}$  by placing it symmetrically along the  $y$ -axis in the upper-half plane. By having the generators  $x, y$  of  $\Delta(3, 4, 4)$  defined in (3) in rational canonical form we obtain that:

$$x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 - \sqrt{2} \\ -1 + \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

This choice of generators fixes a representative in the conjugacy class of the representation  $\sigma$ . Notice that  $\theta_2\theta_1 = yxy^{-1}x$  is an infinite order element in  $\Delta(3, 4, 4)$  and is therefore hyperbolic. By using the matrices in (5) we can explicitly find  $P, D \in PGL(n, \mathbb{R})$  with  $D$  diagonal so that  $P^{-1}(\theta_2\theta_1)P = D$ . It suffices then to see that the conjugated representation  $P^{-1}\sigma P$  is Zariski dense. Let  $H$  be the Zariski closure of  $P^{-1}\sigma(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}))P$  in  $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathfrak{h}$  its Lie algebra. First notice that the Zariski closure of  $\langle D \rangle$  is the algebraic torus

whose Lie algebra is the span of  $X_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ . Taking  $X_2 = \text{Ad}_{P^{-1}\theta_1\theta_2P}(X_1)$  and  $X_3 = \text{Ad}_{P^{-1}\theta_1^2\theta_2P}(X_1)$  we obtain three linearly independent vectors in  $\mathfrak{h}$ . Then  $\dim(\mathfrak{h}) = 3 = \dim(\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}))$  so the two algebras must coincide and so  $H = \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ .  $\square$

**4.2. Rational representations of  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3})$ .** We will now focus on the case  $n = 2k+1$  and the representation  $\omega_n \circ \sigma: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \rightarrow \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ , where  $\sigma$  is the representation defined in (4) and  $\omega_n: \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{PSL}(n, \mathbb{R}) = \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$  the irreducible representation introduced in 2.1. Since  $\omega_n \circ \sigma$  is an orbifold Fuchsian representation, it is irreducible. The following result implies that we can conjugate  $\omega_n \circ \sigma$  to obtain an integral representation

$$\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \rightarrow \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) < \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}). \quad (6)$$

**Proposition 22** ([12] thm. 2.1). *Let  $\omega_n: \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{PSL}(n, \mathbb{R})$  be the unique irreducible representation between these groups. Then for every odd  $n$  the restriction  $\phi_n = \omega_n|_{\Delta(3,4,4)}$  is conjugate to a representation  $\rho_n: \Delta(3, 4, 4) \rightarrow \text{PSL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ .*

Now let  $\gamma \subset \mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  be a simple closed loop dividing  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  into two orbifolds  $\mathcal{O}_L$  and  $\mathcal{O}_R$  which share  $\gamma$  as their common boundary and have two cone points of order 3 each. Then  $[\gamma] \in \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3})$  is an infinite order element and  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L) *_{\langle [\gamma] \rangle} \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)$ .

**Proposition 23.** *Let  $\rho: \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}) \simeq \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L) *_{\langle [\gamma] \rangle} \pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R) \rightarrow \text{PSL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$  be the representation defined in (6). Then the restrictions of  $\rho$  to  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)$  and  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)$  are irreducible.*

*Proof.* To see that  $\rho|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)}$  is irreducible it suffices to see that the restriction of  $\omega_n \circ \sigma$  to  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)$  is irreducible. By the proof of lemma 21 we have that  $\sigma(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L))$  is Zariski dense in  $\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ . To see that the representation  $\omega_n: \sigma(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L)) \rightarrow \text{PSL}(n, \mathbb{R})$  is irreducible, it is enough to check that the Zariski closure of its image is irreducible. This holds since  $\omega_n: \text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \text{PSL}(n, \mathbb{R})$  is an irreducible representation and a morphism of algebraic groups, so  $\omega_n(\text{PSL}(2, \mathbb{R})) = \omega_n(\overline{\sigma(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L))} \subseteq \overline{\omega_n \circ \sigma(\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_L))}$ .

To see  $\rho|_{\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)}$  is irreducible it is enough to notice that the proof of 21 also holds for  $\pi_1(\mathcal{O}_R)$  by using the generators  $\theta_3$  and  $\theta_3$  instead of  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$ .  $\square$

Knowing that  $\rho$  is an integral orbifold Fuchsian representation, the previous proposition shows  $\rho$  satisfies the assumptions of theorem 19. Thus we obtain the following application of corollary 20.

**Theorem 24.** *For every surface  $S$  finitely covering the orbifold  $\mathcal{O}_{3,3,3,3}$  and every odd  $n > 1$  there exists a path of Hitchin representations  $\rho_t: \pi_1(S) \rightarrow \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ , so that*

- (1)  $\rho_0(\pi_1(S)) \subset \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ ,
- (2)  $\rho_t$  is Zariski dense for every  $t > 0$  and
- (3)  $\rho_t(\pi_1(S)) \subset \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$  for every  $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Bourgain, A. Gamburd, and P. Sarnak, “Affine linear sieve, expanders, and sum-product,” *Inventiones mathematicae*, vol. 179, no. 3, pp. 559–644, 2010.
- [2] P. Sarnak, “Notes on thin matrix groups,” *Thin groups and superstrong approximation*, vol. 61, pp. 343–362, 2014.

- [3] E. Fuchs, “The ubiquity of thin groups,” *Thin groups and superstrong approximation*, vol. 61, pp. 73–92, 2014.
- [4] E. Fuchs and I. Rivin, “Generic thinness in finitely generated subgroups of  $sl$ ,” *International Mathematics Research Notices*, vol. 2017, no. 17, pp. 5385–5414, 2017.
- [5] D. D. Long, A. W. Reid, and M. Thistlethwaite, “Zariski dense surface subgroups in  $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ ,” *Geometry and Topology*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2011.
- [6] H. Bass, “Groups of integral representation type,” *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 15–51, 1980.
- [7] D. D. Long and M. Thistlethwaite, “Zariski dense surface subgroups in  $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$ ,” *Experimental Mathematics*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 82–92, 2018.
- [8] S. Ballas and D. Long, “Constructing thin subgroups of  $SL(n + 1, \mathbb{R})$  via bending,” *To appear Algebraic and Geometric Topology*, 2018.
- [9] F. Labourie, “Anosov flows, surface groups and curves in projective space,” *Inventiones mathematicae*, vol. 165, no. 1, pp. 51–114, 2006.
- [10] O. Guichard, “Zariski closure of positive and maximal representations,” *In preparation*.
- [11] D. Alessandrini, G. Lee, and F. Schaffhauser, “Hitchin components for orbifolds,” *arXiv:1811.05366 [math.GT]*, 2019.
- [12] D. Long and M. Thistlethwaite, “Zariski dense surface groups in  $SL(2k + 1, \mathbb{Z})$ ,” *Preprint*, 2020.
- [13] S. Bradlow, O. García-Prada, W. Goldman, and A. Wienhard, “Representations of surface groups: Background material for aim workshop,” 2007.
- [14] W. M. Goldman, “Topological components of spaces of representations,” *Inventiones mathematicae*, vol. 93, no. 3, pp. 557–607, 1988.
- [15] N. J. Hitchin, “Lie groups and teichmüller space,” *Topology*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 449–473, 1992.
- [16] M. Bridgeman, R. Canary, and F. Labourie, “Simple length rigidity for hitchin representations,” *Advances in Mathematics*, vol. 360, p. 106901, 2020.
- [17] W. Thurston, “The geometry and topology of 3-manifolds,” *Lecture notes*, 1978.
- [18] O. Guichard and A. Wienhard, “Anosov representations: domains of discontinuity and applications,” *Inventiones mathematicae*, vol. 190, no. 2, pp. 357–438, 2012.
- [19] A. Sambarino, “Infinitesimal zariski closures of positive representations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.10276*, 2020.
- [20] M. Bridgeman, R. Canary, F. Labourie, and A. Sambarino, “The pressure metric for anosov representations,” *Geometric and Functional Analysis*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 1089–1179, 2015.
- [21] W. J. Culver, “On the existence and uniqueness of the real logarithm of a matrix,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1146–1151, 1966.
- [22] W. Goldman, “Geometric structures on manifolds and varieties of representations, the geometry of group representations,” *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. Summer Conference 1987, Boulder, Colorado.*, vol. 74, pp. 169–198, 1987.