# Math 245A

#### Fall 2015

# Chapter 2

## 2.2 Groups

```
A group G is a 4-tuple G = (|G|, \mu, \iota, e) with
    underlying set |G|
   law of composition \mu
   inverse function \iota
   neutral element e
(Exercise 2.2:1) A homomorphism from a group G to a group H is a function \phi : G \to H
satisfying the following for a, b \in G:
    \phi(e_G) = e_H
    \phi(\iota_G(a)) = \iota_H(\phi(a))
    \phi(\mu_G(a,b)) = \mu_H(\phi(a),\phi(b))
A more common representation of a group uses symbols G = (|G|, \cdot, ^{-1}, e)
(2.2.1) The conditions for a 4-tuple to be a group are as follows
    (\forall x, y, z \in |G|) (x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)
    (\forall x \in |G|) e \cdot x = x = x \cdot e
    (\forall x \in |G|) \ x^{-1} \cdot x = e = x \cdot x^{-1}
(2.2.2) We may also say that a set |G| with a map |G| \times |G| \to |G| constitudes a group if
    (\forall x, y, z \in |G|) (x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z)
    there exists e \in |G| such that (\forall x)e \cdot x = x = x \cdot e and (\forall x \in |G|)(\exists y \in |G|)y \cdot x = e = x \cdot y
(2.2.1) consists of identities (universally quantified equations) and (2.2.2) does not
    note: universal quantification is a "for all" quantification
(Exercise 2.2:2)
    (i)
    (ii)
(Exercise 2.2:3)
```

#### 2.3 Indexed Sets

An *I-tuple* of elements of X,  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  is formally defined as an  $f: I \to X$ The set of all functions from I to X is denoted  $X^I$ 

## **2.4 Arity**

The arity of an operation is, e.g., 1 if unary, 2 if binary, etc.

An I-ary operation on S is a map  $S^I \rightarrow S$ 

Group: a set, a binary operation, a unary operation, and a distinguished element

Can think of the identity as a 0-ary/zeroary operation of the structure

 $S^0$  has exactly one map,  $\emptyset \to S$ , so a map  $S^0 \to S$  is determined by one element Note these are not strictly identical since one is a map and the other the element itself But they are in 1-to-1 correspondence and give equivalent information

## 2.5 Group-theoretic terms

A *group-theoretic relation* in  $(\eta_i)_I$  is an equation  $p(\eta_i) = q(\eta_i)$  holding in G p and q are are *group-theoretic terms* which we formally define

The terms in the elements of X under the formal group operations  $\mu, \iota, e$  form a set T:

given with functions  $symb_T: X \to T$ ,  $\mu_T: T^2 \to T$ ,  $\iota_T: T \to T$ , and  $e_T: T^0 \to T$ 

such that each map is one-to-one, its images disjoint, and T is the union of those images and T is generated by  $symb_T(X)$  under the aforementioned operations

that is, T has no proper subset containing  $symb_T(X)$  and closed under those operations. We can represent these terms, for groups, using strings of symbols

We need full parentheses notating order of operations to ensure disjoint images A set-theoretic approach dispenses with strings and allows for infinite arities

For the example of a group, we would have (using ordered pair, 3-tuple, etc.):

```
for x \in X, symb_T(x) := (*,x)
for s, t \in T, \mu_T(s,t) := (\cdot,s,t)
for s \in T, \iota_T(s) := (^{-1},s)
and e_T = (e)
```

and by set theory, no element can be written as such an n-tuple in more than one way

#### 2.6 Evaluation

```
Given a set map f: X \to |G| for a group G
Recursive evaluation of s_f \in |G| given an X-tuple of symbols s \in T = T_{X,\cdot,-1,e} if s = symb_T(x) for some x \in X, then s_f := f(x) s = \mu_T(t,u) \to s_f = \mu_G(t_f,u_f), assuming that given t,u \in T we know t_f,u_f \in |G| similarly, s = \iota_T(t) \to s_f = \iota_G(t_f), assuming we know t_f given t finally s = e_T \to s_f = e_G
Varying f in addition to T gives an evaluation map (T_{X,\cdot,^{-1},e}) \times |G|^X \to |G| Alternatively, fixing s \in T gives a map s_G : |G|^X \to |G| these represent substitution into s these s_G are the derived n-ary operations (aka term operations) of G distinct terms can induce the same derived operation e.g. (x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z) in general or others for certain groups
```

```
commutator [\xi, \eta] = \xi^{-1} \eta^{-1} \xi \eta (binary) squaring (unary) \delta (Exercise 2.2:2) \sigma (Exercise 2.2:3)
```

#### Class Question #1

end of Section 2.6: Unimportant

The last example of a derived operation on groups cited the trivial "second component" function,  $p_{3,2}(\xi,\eta,\zeta) = \eta$  induced by  $y \in T_{\{x,y,z\},^{-1},\cdot,e}$ . I wasn't entirely sure how this derived operation would be represented as an element of  $T_{\{x,y,z\},^{-1},\cdot,e}$ . Would  $p_{3,2}$  be the element (\*,y) (in the set-theoretic notation)?

## Terms in other families of operations

```
An \Omega-algebra is a system A=(|A|,(\alpha_A)_{\alpha\in |\Omega|}) here |A| is some set, and for each \alpha\in |\Omega|, \alpha_A:|A|^{ari(\alpha)}\to |A| note that often people will use n(\alpha) (rather than ari(\alpha)) for the arity of an operation \alpha e.g. for a group, |\Omega|=\{\mu,\iota,e\}, ari(\mu)=2, ari(\iota)=1, and ari(e)=0
```

#### Lecture 8/28

# Operations, terms, algebra

revisit the difficulty with distinguished elements as a zeroary operation when dealing with the empty set

the idea behind distinguishing between terms is e.g. to have distinct objects that we can compare

```
(x \cdot y) \cdot z \neq x \cdot (y \cdot z) as terms, allowing (x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z) to be a useful statement about groups set-theoretic approach, infinite arity (\mu, s, t) (\mu, (s, t)) \alpha_T : T^X \to T using (\alpha, (S_X)_{x \in X}) X here shall be some cardinal
```

## Next reading: free groups

```
x,y,z \in G and \xi,\eta,\zeta \in H when can we have a homomorphism G \to H if and only if the relations that hold in G hold in H for the corresponding elements
```

## Exercises in today's reading

2.7:3

can't have s(,,,,...) = s'(,,,,...) = s''(,,,,...) where the s" term is the same as the s term 2.2:2 and 2.2:3

```
\delta_G(x,y) = xy^{-1} and \sigma_G(x,y) = xy^{-1}x

G = \mathbb{Z} knowledge of the identity

x * +y = (x-1) + (y-1) + 1
```

# Chapter 3

#### Class Question #2

near 3.3.1 Important

The question concerns the set of all groups G (I'll call it X) whose underlying sets |G| are subsets of S, some countably infinite set. I wanted to clarify for myself why for any countable group H we can find an isomorphism from one of these groups to H. Is it sufficient to justify the statement by declaring that X contains all countable groups up to isomorphism and hence for some  $G' \in X$ , G' is isomorphic to H? For some reason this feels like incomplete justification to me, and there may be some set-theoretic considerations that may need to be explicated more clearly.

#### Lecture 8/31

# Free Groups: the motivation

factor-set: given a set and an equivalence relation, the set of equivalence classes

... as terms modulo necessary relations

... as subgroups of big products

If G generated by an X-tuple of elements then has cardinality  $\leq max(card(X), \aleph_0)$ 

... by normal forms

Next reading

**Exercises**