

ELEMENTARY ABELIAN P -GROUPS REVISITED

PAUL HOWARD AND JEAN E. RUBIN

For each prime p , a Fraenkel-Mostowski model is constructed in which there are two elementary Abelian p -groups with the same cardinality that are not isomorphic.

INTRODUCTION

In a paper published in 1977 Hickman [1] proves that for each prime $p \geq 5$ there is a Fraenkel-Mostowski (FM) model in which the statement,

$S(p)$: There exist two elementary Abelian p -groups with the same cardinality that are not isomorphic.

is true. Hickman says it is not known whether there exists such a model if $p = 2$ or 3 . (It is an easy exercise in ZFC to prove the negation of $S(p)$ for every prime p .) In this note, for each prime p , we show that there is an FM model in which $S(p)$ is true. Our result extends Hickman's to the primes 2 and 3, but since the construction is quite a bit different than Hickman's, we present the result here. It follows from the Jech-Sochor transfer results that the result is transferable to ZF, that is, for each prime p , $\text{Con}(\text{ZF} + S(p))$.

An elementary Abelian p -group is an Abelian group in which all non-identity elements have order p . First note that an elementary Abelian p -group is just a vector space over the p -element field $\{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$. Further, every vector space isomorphism is a group isomorphism and every group isomorphism is a vector space isomorphism.

THE MODEL

Let \mathcal{N} be a model of $\text{ZFU} + \text{AC}$ whose set of atoms A is written as a disjoint union $A = B \cup C \cup R \cup S \cup T$ and the sets B , C , R , S , and T are indexed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \{b_{n,\lambda} : n \in \omega \wedge \lambda < \aleph_1\}, \\ C &= \{c_{n,\lambda} : n \in \omega \wedge \lambda < \aleph_1\}, \\ R &= \{r_{n,\lambda} : n \in \omega \wedge \lambda < \aleph_1\}, \\ S &= \{s_{n,\lambda} : n \in \omega \wedge \lambda < \aleph_1\}, \\ T &= \{t_{n,\lambda} : n \in \omega \wedge \lambda < \aleph_1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Received 10th January, 1995

Copyright Clearance Centre, Inc. Serial-fee code: 0004-9729/95 \$A2.00+0.00.

For each $\lambda < \aleph_1$, we shall let $A_\lambda = B_\lambda \cup C_\lambda \cup R_\lambda \cup S_\lambda \cup T_\lambda$ where $B_\lambda = \{b_{n,\lambda} : n \in \omega\}$, $C_\lambda = \{c_{n,\lambda} : n \in \omega\}$ and so on. And let ϕ_λ be the permutation of A which is the product of the cycles $\phi_\lambda = \prod_{n \in \omega} (b_{n,\lambda}, c_{n,\lambda})(r_{n,\lambda}, s_{n,\lambda})$. (So that $\phi_\lambda(t_{n,\lambda}) = t_{n,\lambda}$ and ϕ_λ is the identity on $A - A_\lambda$.) We let G be the group generated by the permutations ϕ_λ for $\lambda < \aleph_1$, Γ the filter of subgroups of G determined by finite supports and \mathcal{M} the model determined by \mathcal{N} , G and Γ .

Note that for each $\lambda < \aleph_1$, if $\psi \in G$ fixes any element of $B_\lambda \cup C_\lambda \cup R_\lambda \cup S_\lambda$ then ψ fixes A_λ pointwise. Hence for each $x \in \mathcal{M}$, there is some finite set $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\} \subset \aleph_1$ such that $\text{fix}_G \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_{\lambda_i} \right) =_{\text{def}} \{ \phi \in G : \phi \text{ fixes } \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_{\lambda_i} \text{ pointwise} \}$ is in Γ and $\forall \phi \in \text{fix}_G \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n A_{\lambda_i} \right), \phi(x) = x$. For the rest of the argument we shall refer to $\{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$ as a support of x .

We now define elementary Abelian p -groups G_1 and G_2 (with $p = 2$) both of which are in \mathcal{M} with empty support: G_1 is the vector space over the two element field $\{0, 1\}$ with basis $B \cup C$ and G_2 is the vector space over the two element field with basis $R \cup S \cup T$. (More formally, we could define G_1 to be the set of all functions $v : B \cup C \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that $v^{-1}(1)$ is finite, together with the operation $+$ of coordinatewise addition mod 2, similarly for G_2 .) If $v \in G_2$ and $v = v_1 + \dots + v_n$ where $v_1, \dots, v_n \in R \cup S \cup T$, we shall say that v_1, \dots, v_n occur in v .

Since $\forall \gamma, \lambda < \aleph_1$ and $\forall n \in \omega, \phi_\gamma(t_{n,\lambda}) = t_{n,\lambda}$ (and since $t_{n,\lambda} + t_{n,\lambda} = 0$) we have:

LEMMA 1. For all $v \in G_2$, for all $\lambda, \gamma < \aleph_1$ and for all $n \in \omega, t_{n,\lambda}$ does not occur in $v + \phi_\gamma(v)$.

THEOREM 2. In $\mathcal{M}, |G_1| = |G_2|$.

PROOF: It is clear that the function $H_1^* : B \cup C \rightarrow R \cup S$ defined by $H_1^*(b_{n,\lambda}) = r_{n,\lambda}$ and $H_1^*(c_{n,\lambda}) = s_{n,\lambda}$ is in \mathcal{M} and has empty support. We note that H_1^* is a one to one function from a basis for G_1 onto an independent subset of G_2 and therefore can be extended uniquely to a one to one homomorphism H_1 from G_1 into G_2 . Similarly, if we define $H_2^* : R \cup S \cup T \rightarrow G_1$ by $H_2^*(r_{n,\lambda}) = b_{2n,\lambda}, H_2^*(s_{n,\lambda}) = c_{2n,\lambda}$ and $H_2^*(t_{n,\lambda}) = b_{2n+1,\lambda} + c_{2n+1,\lambda}$ then

- (1) H_2^* has empty support. (Note that $\phi_\lambda(t_{n,\lambda}) = t_{n,\lambda}$ and $\phi_\lambda(b_{2n+1,\lambda} + c_{2n+1,\lambda}) = c_{2n+1,\lambda} + b_{2n+1,\lambda} = b_{2n+1,\lambda} + c_{2n+1,\lambda}$)
- (2) H_2^* maps a basis for G_2 one to one onto an independent subset of G_1 .

Therefore, H_2^* has empty support and can be extended uniquely to a one to one homomorphism H_2 from G_2 into G_1 . Since $|G_1| \leq |G_2|$ and $|G_2| \leq |G_1|$ in \mathcal{M} , we conclude that $|G_1| = |G_2|$ in \mathcal{M} . □

THEOREM 3. *In \mathcal{M} , G_1 and G_2 are not isomorphic.*

PROOF: We argue by contradiction that there is no isomorphism in \mathcal{M} from G_1 onto G_2 . Suppose that H is such an isomorphism with support $E = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$. The set $X = \bigcup_{j=1}^n (B_{\lambda_j} \cup C_{\lambda_j})$ is countable and hence there exists $n_0 \in \omega$ and $\lambda_0 < \aleph_1$ such that t_{n_0, λ_0} occurs in no element of $H''X (= \{H(x) : x \in X\})$.

Since H is an isomorphism, $H''(B \cup C)$ is a basis for G_2 and therefore,

$$(3) \quad t_{n_0, \lambda_0} = v_1 + \dots + v_k + u_1 + \dots + u_r$$

where $v_1, \dots, v_k \in H''((B \cup C) - X)$, $u_1, \dots, u_r \in H''X$ and the elements $v_1, \dots, v_k, u_1, \dots, u_r$ are pairwise distinct. Furthermore, except for the order in which the elements are written, this is the only way of writing t_{n_0, λ_0} as a sum of pairwise distinct elements from $H''(B \cup C)$. By our choice of t_{n_0, λ_0} , t_{n_0, λ_0} does not occur in $u_1 + \dots + u_r$ (and hence $k > 0$). We shall arrive at a contradiction (and hence complete the proof) by showing that t_{n_0, λ_0} does not occur in $v_1 + \dots + v_k$. \square

LEMMA 4. *Assume $1 \leq j \leq k$, then there is a λ not in E and an i with $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $i \neq j$ such that $\phi_\lambda(v_j) = v_i$.*

PROOF: Assume that $v_j = H(b_{n, \lambda})$ where $\lambda \notin E$. (The proof is similar if $v_j = H(c_{n, \lambda})$ where $\lambda \notin E$.) Since ϕ_λ fixes X pointwise, $\phi_\lambda(H) = H$. Further $\phi_\lambda(b_{n, \lambda}) = c_{n, \lambda}$ so

$$(4) \quad \phi_\lambda(v_j) = \phi_\lambda(H(b_{n, \lambda})) = H(\phi_\lambda(b_{n, \lambda})) = H(c_{n, \lambda}) \neq H(b_{n, \lambda}) = v_j$$

since H is one to one. Applying ϕ_λ to both sides of the equality (3) gives

$$(5) \quad t_{n_0, \lambda_0} = \phi_\lambda(v_1) + \dots + \phi_\lambda(v_k) + u_1 + \dots + u_r.$$

(ϕ_λ fixes t_{n_0, λ_0} and fixes X pointwise. Therefore, ϕ_λ fixes $H''X$ pointwise.)

Since $\phi_\lambda(B \cup C) = B \cup C$, we have $\phi_\lambda(H''(B \cup C)) = H''(B \cup C)$. Therefore (5) expresses t_{n_0, λ_0} as a sum of vectors from the basis $H''(B \cup C)$. Hence the right hand sides of (3) and (5) contain the same terms and so $\phi_\lambda(v_j) = v_i$ for some i such that $1 \leq i \leq k$. By (4), $\phi_\lambda(v_j) \neq v_j$, hence $i \neq j$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.

It follows that $v_1 + \dots + v_k$ can be written as a sum of vectors of the form $v_j + \phi_\lambda(v_j)$. Since (by Lemma 1) t_{n_0, λ_0} does not occur in $v_j + \phi_\lambda(v_j)$ it follows that t_{n_0, λ_0} does not occur in $v_1 + \dots + v_k$, which completes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

It is easy to see how the result can be generalised to any prime p . We shall indicate the construction for $p = 3$. Let $A = BUCUDURUSUTUW$. The group G is generated, by $\phi_\lambda = \prod_{n \in \omega} (a_{n, \lambda}, b_{n, \lambda}, c_{n, \lambda})(r_{n, \lambda}, s_{n, \lambda}, t_{n, \lambda})$, $\lambda < \aleph_1$, where $\phi_\lambda(w_{n, \lambda}) = w_{n, \lambda}$ for all

$n \in \omega$. Supports are again finite. The elementary Abelian p -groups, are defined so that G_1 is the vector space over the three element field $\{0, 1, 2\}$ with basis $B \cup C \cup D$ and G_2 is the vector space over the same three element field with basis $R \cup S \cup T \cup W$. The proofs of the lemmas are similar to that given above using the fact that for all $\mathbf{v} \in G_2$, $w_{n,\lambda}$ does not occur in $\mathbf{v} + \phi_\lambda(\mathbf{v}) + \phi_\lambda^2(\mathbf{v})$. The proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 are also similar to the proofs given above.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.S. Hickman, 'A remark on elementary Abelian groups', *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **16** (1977), 213–217.

Department of Mathematics
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti MI 48197
United States of America
e-mail: phoward@emunix.emich.edu

Department of Mathematics
Purdue University
West Lafayette IN 47907
United States of America
e-mail: jer@math.purdue.edu