

# AUTOMORPHISMS OF COUNTABLE PRIMARY ABELIAN GROUPS<sup>1</sup>

PAUL HILL

**ABSTRACT.** It is proved that the automorphism group  $A$  of a countable primary abelian group  $G$  is transitive on certain subsets of subgroups of  $G$ . One such subset of subgroups in case  $G$  is without elements of infinite height is the collection of all basic subgroups of  $G$  with a fixed corank, finite or infinite.

In 1928 Shoda [7] gave a fairly complete description of the automorphism group of a finite abelian group. Freedman studied the structure of the automorphism group of a countable primary abelian group in [1]; there is, of course, a quick reduction from torsion groups to primary groups. Unlike Freedman, we do not attempt here to describe the whole structure of the automorphism group, but have as our aim a much smaller goal concerning the analysis of automorphisms. We prove that the automorphism group  $A$  of a countable primary abelian group  $G$  is transitive on a certain subset of distinguished subgroups of  $G$ . Surprisingly enough, the basic techniques are very similar to those of Freedman.

If  $H$  and  $K$  are arbitrary subgroups of  $G$ , we say that they are *equivalent* subgroups of  $G$  if there is an automorphism of  $G$  that maps  $H$  onto  $K$ . For the enumeration of the nonequivalent subgroups of small abelian groups see [3].

Kulikov proved that every primary abelian group  $G$  has a basic subgroup and that any two basic subgroups of  $G$  are isomorphic; see, for example, [2]. However, two basic subgroups of a given group  $G$  do not have to be equivalent subgroups of  $G$ . Even though the subgroups are isomorphic, they may be positioned in  $G$  quite differently. Indeed, the corresponding quotient groups are often not isomorphic. Let  $G$  be an unbounded, reduced, countable primary group and let  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  be basic subgroups of  $G$  such that  $G/B_1 \cong G/B_2 \neq 0$ . It follows from a theorem of Leptin [5] that not every isomorphism from  $B_1$  onto  $B_2$  can be extended to an automorphism of  $G$ , but we merely want *one* to extend. Tarwater [8] has proved, for the case that  $G$  is without elements of infinite height, that if  $G/B_1$  has finite

---

Received by the editors October 10, 1969.

*AMS Subject Classifications.* Primary 2030.

*Key Words and Phrases.* Primary abelian group, basic subgroups, high subgroups, automorphism group, equivalent subgroups.

<sup>1</sup> This research was supported by NSF Grant GP-12318.

rank and  $G/B_1 \cong G/B_2$  then  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are equivalent subgroups of  $G$ . The following theorem puts Tarwater's result in a more general perspective.

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $G$  be a countable primary abelian group and let  $B$  be a basic subgroup of  $G$ . Then  $B$  is uniquely determined, up to equivalence, as a subgroup of  $G$  by the numerical invariant*

$$r = \text{rank}(G[p]/(B[p] + p^\alpha G[p])).$$

We can still prove a more general, if less dramatic, result. Terminology and notation are standard; we refer to [2] and [4].

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $G$  be a countable primary abelian group and let  $\lambda$  be an ordinal. Suppose that  $H$  and  $K$  are neat subgroups of  $G$  of length not exceeding  $\lambda$  such that  $G[p] = \{H[p], p^{\alpha+1}G[p]\} = \{K[p], p^{\alpha+1}G[p]\}$  for each  $\alpha < \lambda$ . Then there exists an automorphism of  $G$  that (leaves  $p^\lambda G$  fixed and) maps  $H$  onto  $K$  if and only if  $H \cong K$  and*

$$G[p]/(H[p] + p^\lambda G[p]) \cong G[p]/(K[p] + p^\lambda G[p]).$$

**PROOF.** Since  $p^\lambda G$  and  $G[p]$  are always invariant subgroups of  $G$ , the conditions  $H \cong K$  and

$$G[p]/(H[p] + p^\lambda G[p]) \cong G[p]/(K[p] + p^\lambda G[p])$$

are obviously necessary in order for an automorphism of  $G$  to map  $H$  onto  $K$ . Conversely, suppose that the conditions hold. We shall produce an automorphism of  $G$  that maps  $H$  onto  $K$ ; it will be built up in stages. At the outset, we mention that  $p^\alpha G \cap H = p^\alpha H$  and  $p^\alpha G \cap K = p^\alpha K$  for each  $\alpha \leq \lambda$  according to [6, Lemma 1]. Therefore, an element of  $H$  or  $K$  has the same height in  $H$  or  $K$  as it does in  $G$  since the length of  $H$  and  $K$  does not exceed  $\lambda$ .

Suppose that  $\pi: A \rightarrow B$  is an isomorphism from the subgroup  $A$  of  $G$  onto the subgroup  $B$  such that

(1)  $\pi$  preserves heights (computed in  $G$ ),

and

(2)  $\pi(A \cap H) = B \cap K$ .

For the proper choice of  $A$  and  $B$ , we plan to show that  $\pi$  can be extended in such a way that conditions (1) and (2) continue to hold if  $\pi$  continues to denote the extension and  $A$  and  $B$  continue to denote the domain and image of the extended map.

We now define the initial choices of  $A$  and  $B$ . Their definitions hinge on whether  $G[p]/(H[p] + p^\lambda G[p]) \cong G[p]/(K[p] + p^\lambda G[p])$  has

finite or infinite rank. In case the rank is infinite, define  $A = p^\lambda G = B$  and define  $\pi: A \rightarrow B$  to be the identity map. In case the rank is finite, let

$$G[p] = S + H[p] + p^\lambda G[p] \quad \text{and} \quad G[p] = T + K[p] + p^\lambda G[p].$$

Define  $A = S + p^\lambda G$  and  $B = T + p^\lambda G$ . We want an isomorphism  $\pi: A \rightarrow B$  that extends the identity on  $p^\lambda G$  and preserves heights (computed in  $G$ ). By hypothesis,  $S$  and  $T$  are isomorphic, but we need a height-preserving isomorphism from  $S$  onto  $T$ . It is clear that such does not exist for arbitrary choices of  $S$  and  $T$ . However, we claim that  $S$  and  $T$  can be chosen such that there is a height-preserving isomorphism between them. First, consider the case that  $\lambda - 1$  exists. Then

$$G[p] = H[p] + p^\lambda G[p] = K[p] + p^\lambda G[p]$$

and  $S = 0 = T$ , so there is no problem. Thus we may assume that  $\lambda$  is a limit ordinal. We distinguish two cases. First, suppose that  $H$  and  $K$  have length  $\mu < \lambda$ . Under the hypothesis of the theorem, it follows that  $S$  and  $T$  can be chosen such that every nonzero element has height in  $G$  less than  $\lambda$  but greater than  $\mu$ . With  $S$  and  $T$  chosen this way, clearly there is a height-preserving isomorphism between them because

$$p^\mu G[p] = S + p^\lambda G[p] = T + p^\lambda G[p].$$

The case where the length of  $H$  and  $K$  is  $\lambda$  is only slightly more complicated. Let  $\text{rank}(S) = n = \text{rank}(T)$ . Choose a subgroup  $H_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \{x_i\}$  of  $H[p]$  such that the height in  $H$  of  $x_i$  is  $\alpha_i$  for  $i \leq n$  and such that  $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_n < \lambda$ ; this is possible for any  $n$  since  $H$  has length  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda$  is a limit ordinal. Since  $H \cong K$ , there exists a subgroup  $K_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n \{y_i\}$  of  $K[p]$  such that the height in  $K$  of  $y_i$  is also  $\alpha_i$ . As we mentioned in the beginning of the proof, the height of an element in  $H$  is the same whether computed in  $H$  or  $G$ , and the same is true for  $K$ . Hence  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  have height exactly  $\alpha_i$  in  $G$ . Choose  $\beta < \lambda$  such that  $\beta > \lambda_i$  for each  $i \leq n$ . We can write, for any choice of  $S$  and  $T$ ,  $S = \sum_{i=1}^n \{s_i\}$  and  $T = \sum_{i=1}^n \{t_i\}$  and we know that we can choose  $S$  and  $T$  contained in  $p^\beta G$ . Letting  $s_i + x_i$  and  $t_i + y_i$  replace  $s_i$  and  $t_i$ , we have the desired choice of  $S$  and  $T$ ,  $S = \sum_{i=1}^n \{s_i + x_i\}$  and  $T = \sum_{i=1}^n \{t_i + y_i\}$ . There is a height-preserving isomorphism between  $S$  and  $T$  now because  $s_i + x_i$  and  $t_i + y_i$  both have height  $\alpha_i$ .

We have defined the initial choices of  $A$  and  $B$  and an isomorphism  $\pi: A \rightarrow B$  that satisfies conditions (1) and (2); condition (2) is trivially satisfied because  $A \cap H = 0 = B \cap K$ . We now move to the

induction step. Assume that the current  $A$  and  $B$  are finite extensions of the initial choices and that  $\pi: A \twoheadrightarrow B$  is an isomorphism still satisfying conditions (1) and (2). In order to show that  $\pi$  can be extended further such that (1) and (2) continue to hold, six cases are distinguished. Common to all cases, are the following assumptions. We assume that  $x$  is an element outside of  $A$  but  $px$  is contained in  $A$ . Since  $A$  is a finite extension of  $p^\lambda G$ , there is an element  $a \in A$  such that  $x+a$  has maximum height in  $G$  among the elements of the coset  $x+A$ . Such an element is called proper with respect to  $A$ . There is no loss of generality in assuming that  $x$  itself is proper, and we shall do this. Let  $h(x)$  denote the height of  $x$ ; all heights from now on are computed with respect to  $G$ . Simplifying further, let  $h(x) = \alpha$ . Note that  $\alpha < \lambda$ . If  $h(p(x+a)) > \alpha + 1$  for some  $a \in A \cap p^\alpha G$ , we can replace  $x$  by  $x+a$  and still have a proper element. Thus we shall assume that  $h(px) > \alpha + 1$  if  $h(p(x+a)) > \alpha + 1$  for some  $a \in A \cap p^\alpha G$ . With this assumption, there are two major cases.

Case 1.  $h(px) = \alpha + 1$ .

Case 2.  $h(px) > \alpha + 1$ .

Each of the above cases is divided into three subcases; subcase  $n$  of Case  $m$  is denoted by Case  $m \cdot n$ ,  $m \leq 2$  and  $n \leq 3$ . We mention in the beginning that each subcase of Case 1 is simpler to handle than the corresponding subcase of Case 2. We shall do the easy part first.

Case 1.1.  $x \in H$ . It follows that  $px \in p^{\alpha+1}H = p^{\alpha+1}G \cap H$  and that  $\pi(px) \in p^{\alpha+1}K = p^{\alpha+1}G \cap K$  in view of conditions (1) and (2). Thus  $\pi(px) = py$  where  $y \in p^\alpha K$ . Extend  $\pi$  by mapping  $x$  onto  $y$ .

Case 1.2.  $x+a \in H$  for some  $a \in A$ ,  $x \notin H$ . Choose  $y_0 \in p^\alpha G$  such that  $py_0 = \pi(px)$ . If  $y_0 + \pi(a) \in K$ , let  $y = y_0$ . If  $y_0 + \pi(a) \notin K$ , consider  $p(y_0 + \pi(a)) = \pi(p(x+a)) \in pK$ . Letting  $p(y_0 + \pi(a)) = pk_0$  with  $k_0 \in K$ , we have

$$y_0 + \pi(a) = k_0 + t, \quad \text{where } pt = 0.$$

We can write  $t = k_1 + z$  where  $k_1 \in K[p]$  and  $z \in p^{\alpha+1}G$ . Set  $y = y_0 - z$ . Then  $y + \pi(a) \in K$ . Extend  $\pi$  by mapping  $x$  onto  $y$ .

Case 1.3.  $x+a \notin H$  for all  $a \in A$ . Choose  $y_0 \in p^\alpha G$  such that  $py_0 = \pi(px)$ . If  $y_0 + b \in K$  for all  $b \in B$ , let  $y = y_0$ . If  $y_0 + b \in K$  for some  $b \in B$ , let  $b = \pi(a)$  and consider  $p(x+a)$ .  $\pi$  maps  $p(x+a)$  onto  $p(y_0 + b) \in pK$ . Therefore,  $p(x+a) \in pG \cap H = pH$ . Write

$$x + a = h_0 + s, \quad \text{where } h_0 \in H \text{ and } ps = 0.$$

Now  $s \notin \{A, H\}$  (for Case 1.3), so in the decomposition  $G[p] = S + H[p] + p^\lambda G[p]$  it follows that  $S$  is infinite. Otherwise,  $A \supseteq S + p^\lambda G$ , which is impossible. We know therefore that  $T$  is infinite where

$G[p] = T + K[p] + p^\lambda G[p]$  and that  $B$  is a finite extension of  $p^\lambda G$ . Hence there exists  $t \in T$  such that  $t + b \notin K$  for any  $b \in B$ . Choose  $k \in K[p]$  such that  $t + k \in p^{\alpha+1}G[p]$ . Defining  $y = y_0 + t + k$ , we have  $y + b \notin K$  for all  $b \in B$ . Extend  $\pi$  by mapping  $x$  onto  $y$ .

*Case 2.1.*  $x \in H$ . In this case,  $px \in p^{\alpha+2}G \cap H = p^{\alpha+2}H$ . Let  $px = ph$  where  $h \in p^{\alpha+1}H$ . Then  $x - h \in G[p]$ , has height exactly  $\alpha$ , and is proper with respect to  $A$ . Since  $\pi(A \cap H) = B \cap K$ , since  $A \cap H$  is finite, since  $H \cong K$ , and since  $\pi$  preserves heights not only in  $G$  but from  $H$  to  $K$ , we conclude that there must exist an element  $z \in K[p]$  that is proper with respect to  $B$  and, like  $x - h$ , has height exactly  $\alpha$ . Choose  $w$  in  $p^{\alpha+1}K$  such that  $pw = \pi(px)$  and set  $y = w + z$ . Extend  $\pi$  by mapping  $x$  onto  $y$ .

*Case 2.2.*  $x + a \in H$  for some  $a \in A$ ,  $x \notin H$ . Choose  $w \in p^{\alpha+1}G$  such that  $pw = \pi(px)$ . There exists  $z \in G[p]$  such that  $z$  is proper with respect to  $B$  and has height exactly  $\alpha$ . Set  $y_0 = w + z$ . If  $y_0 + \pi(a) \in K$ , let  $y = y_0$ . If  $y_0 + \pi(a) \notin K$ , we have to modify the definition of  $y$ . Observe that  $p(y_0 + \pi(a)) = \pi(p(x + a)) \in pK$ , so  $y_0 + \pi(a) = k_0 + t$  where  $k_0 \in K$  and  $pt = 0$ . Moreover, we can write  $t = k_1 + v$  where  $k_1 \in K[p]$  and  $v \in p^{\alpha+1}G[p]$ . Define  $y = y_0 - v$  and note that  $y + \pi(a) \in K$ . Extend  $\pi$  by mapping  $x$  onto  $y$ .

*Case 2.3.*  $x + a \notin H$  for all  $a \in A$ . As before, choose  $w \in p^{\alpha+1}G$  such that  $pw = \pi(px)$ . Choose  $z \in G[p]$  such that  $z$  is proper with respect to  $B$  and has height exactly  $\alpha$ . Set  $y_0 = w + z$ . If  $y_0 + b \notin K$  for all  $b \in B$ , let  $y = y_0$ . If  $y_0 + b \in K$  for some  $b \in B$ , again we need to modify the definition of  $y$ . Suppose  $y_0 + b \in K$  where  $b \in B$  and let  $\pi(a) = b$ . Then  $p(x + a) \in pH$  and

$$x + a = h_0 + s, \quad \text{where } h_0 \in H \text{ and } ps = 0.$$

Now  $s \in \{A, H\}$  since  $x \notin \{A, H\}$ . By the same argument as that used in Case 1.3, there exists  $t \in T$  such that  $t \notin \{B, K\}$ . Choose  $k \in K[p]$  such that  $t + k \in p^{\alpha+1}G[p]$ . Define  $y = y_0 + t + k$  and observe that  $y \in \{B, K\}$ . Extend  $\pi$  by mapping  $x$  onto  $y$ .

In each of the above cases, we claim that the extension of  $\pi$  is a height-preserving isomorphism from  $\{A, x\}$  onto  $\{B, y\}$  and that

$$\pi(\{A, x\} \cap H) = \{B, y\} \cap K;$$

details are left to the reader. Since  $G$  is countable and since  $H$  and  $K$ , as well as  $A$  and  $B$ , are symmetrical with respect to the hypothesis,  $\pi$  can be extended to an automorphism of  $G$  that maps  $H$  onto  $K$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Theorem 1 can be obtained at once from Theorem 2 with  $\lambda = \omega$ . Theorem 2 also encompasses the following.

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $G$  be a countable torsion abelian group and let  $\lambda$  be an ordinal. If each of  $H$  and  $K$  is maximal in  $G$  with respect to having trivial intersection with  $p^\lambda G$ , then there is an automorphism of  $G$  that maps  $H$  onto  $K$ .*

**COROLLARY.** *All high subgroups of a countable torsion group are equivalent.*

The preceding corollary suggests the following problem.

**PROBLEM.** Characterize those groups whose high subgroups are all equivalent.

Finally, we remark that Theorem 2 can be interpreted as a partial solution to Problem 52 in [2].

#### REFERENCES

1. H. Freedman, *The automorphisms of countable primary reduced Abelian groups*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **12** (1962), 77–99. MR **24** #A3215.
2. L. Fuchs, *Abelian groups*, Internat. Series of Monographs on Pure and Appl. Math. Pergamon Press, New York, 1960, MR **22** #2644.
3. P. Hill, *Enumeration of subgroups of small abelian groups*, (to appear).
4. I. Kaplansky, *Infinite abelian groups*, Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1954. MR **16**, 444.
5. H. Leptin, *Zur theorie der überabzählbaren abelschen  $p$ -gruppen*, Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg **24** (1960), 79–90. MR **23** #A207.
6. C. Megibben, *On mixed groups of torsion-free rank one*, Illinois J. Math. **11** (1967), 134–144. MR **34** #2691.
7. K. Shoda, *Über die automorphismen einer endlichen abelschen gruppe*, Math. Ann. **100** (1928), 674–686.
8. D. Tarwater, *Orbits of basic subgroups of primary abelian groups under automorphisms*, (to appear).

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32306