

Direct Products

Definition. Let G and H be groups. The **direct product** $G \times H$ of G and H is the set of all ordered pairs $\{(g, h) \mid g \in G, h \in H\}$ with the operation

$$(g_1, h_1) \cdot (g_2, h_2) = (g_1 g_2, h_1 h_2).$$

Remarks. 1. In the definition, I've assumed that G and H are using multiplication notation. In general, the notation you use in $G \times H$ depends on the notation in the factors. Examples:

G	H	Product ($G \times H$)	Identity ($G \times H$)	Inverse ($G \times H$)
$g_1 \cdot g_2$	$h_1 \cdot h_2$	$(g_1, h_1)(g_2, h_2) = (g_1 g_2, h_1 h_2)$	$(1, 1)$	$(g, h)^{-1} = (g^{-1}, h^{-1})$
$g_1 + g_2$	$h_1 + h_2$	$(g_1, h_1) + (g_2, h_2) = (g_1 + g_2, h_1 + h_2)$	$(0, 0)$	$-(g, h) = (-g, -h)$
$g_1 \cdot g_2$	$h_1 + h_2$	$(g_1, h_1)(g_2, h_2) = (g_1 g_2, h_1 + h_2)$	$(1, 0)$	$(g, h)^{-1} = (g^{-1}, -h)$

2. You can construct products of more than two groups in the same way. For example, if G_1 , G_2 , and G_3 are groups, then

$$G_1 \times G_2 \times G_3 = \{(x, y, z) \mid x \in G_1, y \in G_2, z \in G_3\}.$$

Just as with the two-factor product, you multiply elements componentwise. \square

Example. (A product of cyclic groups which is cyclic) Show that $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ is cyclic.

Since $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_3 = \{0, 1, 2\}$,

$$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3 = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2), (1, 0), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}.$$

If you take successive multiples of $(1, 1)$, you get

$$(1, 1), \quad (0, 2), \quad (1, 0), \quad (0, 1), \quad (1, 2), \quad (0, 0).$$

Since you can get the whole group by taking multiples of $(1, 1)$, it follows that $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ is actually cyclic of order 6 — the same as \mathbb{Z}_6 . \square

Example. (A product of cyclic groups which is not cyclic) Show that $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ is not cyclic.

Since $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$,

$$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\}.$$

Here's the operation table:

	(0, 0)	(1, 0)	(0, 1)	(1, 1)
(0, 0)	(0, 0)	(1, 0)	(0, 1)	(1, 1)
(1, 0)	(1, 0)	(0, 0)	(1, 1)	(0, 1)
(0, 1)	(0, 1)	(1, 1)	(0, 0)	(1, 0)
(1, 1)	(1, 1)	(0, 1)	(1, 0)	(0, 0)

Note that this is not the same group as \mathbb{Z}_4 . Both groups have 4 elements, but \mathbb{Z}_4 is cyclic of order 4. In $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, all the elements have order 2, so no element generates the group.

$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ is the same as the **Klein 4-group** V , which has the following operation table:

	1	a	b	c
1	1	a	b	c
a	a	1	c	b
b	b	c	1	a
c	c	b	a	1

□

If G and H are finite, then $|G \times H| = |G||H|$. (This is true for *sets* G and H ; it has nothing to do with G and H being groups.) For example, $|\mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_6| = 30$.

Lemma. The product of abelian groups is abelian: If G and H are abelian, so is $G \times H$.

Proof. Suppose G and H are abelian. Let $(g, h), (g', h') \in G \times H$, where $g, g' \in G$ and $h, h' \in H$. I have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (g, h)(g', h') &= (gg', hh') && \text{(Definition of multiplication in a product)} \\
 &= (g'g, h'h) && \text{(} G \text{ and } H \text{ are abelian)} \\
 &= (g', h')(g, h) && \text{(Definition of multiplication in a product)}
 \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $G \times H$ is abelian. □

Remark. If either G or H is *not* abelian, then $G \times H$ is not abelian. Suppose, for instance, that G is not abelian. This means that there are elements $g_1, g_2 \in G$ such that

$$g_1g_2 \neq g_2g_1.$$

Then

$$(g_1, 1)(g_2, 1) = (g_1g_2, 1), \quad \text{while} \quad (g_2, 1)(g_1, 1) = (g_2g_1, 1).$$

Since $(g_1g_2, 1) \neq (g_2g_1, 1)$, it follows that $(g_1, 1)(g_2, 1) \neq (g_2, 1)(g_1, 1)$, so $G \times H$ is not abelian.

A similar argument works if H is not abelian. □

Example. (A product of an abelian and a nonabelian group) Construct the multiplication table for $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times D_3$. (Recall that D_3 is the group of symmetries of an equilateral triangle.) The number of elements is

$$|\mathbb{Z}_2 \times D_3| = |\mathbb{Z}_2| \cdot |D_3| = 2 \cdot 6 = 12.$$

Here's the multiplication table for $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times D_3$:

\cdot	(0, id)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)
(0, id)	(0, id)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)
(0, r_1)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)
(0, r_2)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)	(0, id)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)
(0, m_1)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)	(0, id)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)
(0, m_2)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)	(0, r_1)
(0, m_3)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)
(1, id)	(1, id)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)
(1, r_1)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)
(1, r_2)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)	(1, id)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)
(1, m_1)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)	(1, id)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)
(1, m_2)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)	(1, r_1)
(1, m_3)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)

\cdot	(1, id)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)
(0, id)	(1, id)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)
(0, r_1)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)
(0, r_2)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)	(1, id)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)
(0, m_1)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)	(1, id)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)
(0, m_2)	(1, m_2)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)	(1, r_1)
(0, m_3)	(1, m_3)	(1, m_1)	(1, m_2)	(1, r_1)	(1, r_2)	(1, id)
(1, id)	(0, id)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)
(1, r_1)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)
(1, r_2)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)	(0, id)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)
(1, m_1)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)	(0, id)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)
(1, m_2)	(0, m_2)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)	(0, r_1)
(1, m_3)	(0, m_3)	(0, m_1)	(0, m_2)	(0, r_1)	(0, r_2)	(0, id)

The operation in \mathbb{Z}_2 is *addition* mod 2, while the operation in D_3 is written using multiplicative notation. When you multiply two pairs, you *add* in \mathbb{Z}_2 in the first component and *multiply* in D_3 in the second component:

$$(1, r_2)(1, m_2) = (1 + 1, r_2 \cdot m_2) = (0, m_3).$$

The identity is (0, id), since 0 is the identity in \mathbb{Z}_2 , while id is the identity in D_3 .

$\mathbb{Z}_2 \times D_3$ is not abelian, since D_3 is not abelian. A particular example:

$$(1, m_2)(0, r_2) = (1, m_1), \quad \text{but} \quad (0, r_2)(1, m_2) = (1, m_3). \quad \square$$

Example. (Using products to construct groups) Use products to construct 3 different abelian groups of order 8. The groups $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, and \mathbb{Z}_8 are abelian, since each is a product of abelian groups.

\mathbb{Z}_8 is cyclic of order 8, $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ has an element of order 4 but is not cyclic, and $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ has only elements of order 2. It follows that these groups are distinct.

In fact, there are 5 distinct groups of order 8; the remaining two are nonabelian.

The group D_4 of symmetries of the square is a nonabelian group of order 8.

The fifth (and last) group of order 8 is the group Q of the **quaternions**.

D_4 or Q are *not* that same as $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, or \mathbb{Z}_8 , since $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$, and \mathbb{Z}_8 are abelian while D_4 or Q are not.

Finally, D_4 is not the same as Q . D_4 has 5 elements of order 2: The four reflections and rotation through 180° . Q has one element of order 2, namely -1 .

I've shown that these five groups of order 8 are distinct; it takes considerably more work to show that these are the *only* groups of order 8. \square

Definition. Let m and n be positive integers. The **least common multiple** $[m, n]$ of m and n is the smallest positive integer divisible by m and n .

Remark. Since mn is divisible by m and n , the set of positive multiples of m and n is nonempty. Hence, it has a smallest element, by well-ordering. It follows that the least common multiple of two positive integers is always defined. For example, $[18, 30] = 90$.

Lemma. If s is a common multiple of m and n , then $[m, n] \mid s$.

Proof. By the Division Algorithm,

$$s = q \cdot [m, n] + r, \quad \text{where } 0 \leq r < [m, n].$$

Thus, $r = s - q \cdot [m, n]$. Since $m \mid s$ and $m \mid [m, n]$, I have $m \mid r$. Since $n \mid s$ and $n \mid [m, n]$, I have $n \mid r$. Therefore, r is a common multiple of m and n . Since it's also less than the least common multiple $[m, n]$, it can't be positive. Therefore, $r = 0$, and $s = q \cdot [m, n]$, i.e. $[m, n] \mid s$. \square

Remark. The lemma shows that the least common multiple is not just "least" in terms of size. It's also "least" in the sense that it *divides* every other common multiple.

Theorem. Let m and n be positive integers. Then

$$mn = (m, n)[m, n].$$

Proof. I'll prove that each side is greater than or equal to the other side.

Note that $\frac{m}{(m, n)}$ and $\frac{n}{(m, n)}$ are integers. Thus,

$$\frac{mn}{(m, n)} = m \cdot \frac{n}{(m, n)} = \frac{m}{(m, n)} \cdot n.$$

This shows that $\frac{mn}{(m, n)}$ is a multiple of m and a multiple of n . Therefore, it's a common multiple of m and n , so it must be greater than or equal to the least common multiple. Hence,

$$\frac{mn}{(m, n)} \geq [m, n], \quad \text{and} \quad mn \geq (m, n)[m, n].$$

Next, $[m, n]$ is a multiple of n , so $[m, n] = sn$ for some s . Then

$$\frac{mn}{[m, n]} = \frac{mn}{sn} = \frac{m}{s} \mid m.$$

(Why is $\frac{mn}{[m, n]}$ an integer? Well, mn is a common multiple of m and n , so by the previous lemma $[m, n] \mid mn$.)

Similarly, $[m, n]$ is a multiple of m , so $[m, n] = tm$ for some t . Then

$$\frac{mn}{[m, n]} = \frac{mn}{tm} = \frac{n}{t} \mid n.$$

In other words, $\frac{mn}{[m, n]}$ is a common divisor of m and n . Therefore, it must be less than the greatest common divisor:

$$\frac{mn}{[m, n]} \leq (m, n), \quad \text{and} \quad mn \leq (m, n)[m, n].$$

The two inequalities I've proved show that $mn = (m, n)[m, n]$. \square

Example. Verify that $mn = (m, n)[m, n]$ if $m = 54$ and $n = 72$.

$$(54, 72) = 18, \quad [54, 72] = 216, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(54, 72)[54, 72] = 18 \cdot 216 = 3888 = 54 \cdot 72. \quad \square$$

Proposition. The element $(1, 1)$ has order $[m, n]$ in $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$.

Proof.

$$[m, n](1, 1) = ([m, n], [m, n]).$$

The first component is 0, since it's divisible by m ; the second component is 0, since it's divisible by n . Hence, $[m, n](1, 1) = (0, 0)$.

Next, I must show that $[m, n]$ is the smallest positive multiple of $(1, 1)$ which equals the identity. Suppose $k(1, 1) = (0, 0)$, so $(k, k) = (0, 0)$. Consider the first components. $k = 0$ in \mathbb{Z}_m means that $m \mid k$; likewise, the second components show that $n \mid k$. Since k is a common multiple of m and n , it must be greater than or equal to the least common multiple $[m, n]$: that is, $k \geq [m, n]$. This proves that $[m, n]$ is the order of $(1, 1)$. \square

Example. Find the order of $(1, 1)$ in $\mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_6$. Find the order of $(1, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_6$.

The element $(1, 1)$ has order $[4, 6] = 12$.

On the other hand, the element $(1, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_6$ has order $[5, 6] = 30$. Since $\mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_6$ has order 30, the group is cyclic; in fact, $\mathbb{Z}_5 \times \mathbb{Z}_6 \approx \mathbb{Z}_{30}$. \square

Remark. More generally, consider $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$, and suppose x_i has order r_i in G_i . (The G_i 's need not be cyclic.) Then (x_1, \dots, x_n) has order $[r_1, \dots, r_n]$. \square

Corollary. $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ is cyclic of order mn if and only if $(m, n) = 1$.

Note: In the next proof, “ (a, b) ” may mean either the *ordered pair* (a, b) or the *greatest common divisor* of a and b . You'll have to read carefully and determine the meaning from the context.

Proof. If $(m, n) = 1$, then $[m, n] = mn$. Thus, the order of $(1, 1)$ is $[m, n] = mn$. But $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ has order mn , so $(1, 1)$ generates the group. Hence, $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ is cyclic.

Suppose on the other hand that $(m, n) \neq 1$. Since $(m, n)[m, n] = mn$, it follows that $[m, n] \neq mn$. Since mn is a common multiple of m and n and since $[m, n]$ is the *least* common multiple, it follows that $[m, n] < mn$.

Now consider an element $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$. Let p be the order of a in \mathbb{Z}_m and let q be the order of b in \mathbb{Z}_n .

Since $p \mid m \mid [m, n]$, I may write $pj = [m, n]$ for some j . Since $q \mid n \mid [m, n]$, I may write $qk = [m, n]$ for some k . Then

$$[m, n](a, b) = ([m, n]a, [m, n]b) = (j(pa), k(qb)) = (j \cdot 0, k \cdot 0) = (0, 0).$$

Hence, the order of (a, b) is less than or equal to $[m, n]$. But $[m, n] < mn$, so the order of (a, b) is less than (and *not* equal to) mn .

Since (a, b) was an arbitrary element of $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$, it follows that no element of $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ has order mn . Therefore, $\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$ can't be cyclic of order mn , since a generator *would* have order mn . \square

Remark. More generally, if m_1, \dots, m_k are pairwise relatively prime, then $\mathbb{Z}_{m_1} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}_{m_k}$ is cyclic of order $m_1 \cdots m_k$. \square

Example. (Orders of elements in products) Find the order of $(2, 4, 4) \in \mathbb{Z}_4 \times \mathbb{Z}_{12} \times \mathbb{Z}_6$.

2 has order 2 in \mathbb{Z}_4 , 4 has order 3 in \mathbb{Z}_{12} , and 4 has order 3 in \mathbb{Z}_6 . Hence, the order of $(2, 4, 4)$ is $[2, 3, 3] = 6$. \square

Example. (A product of cyclic groups which is not cyclic) Prove directly that $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ is not cyclic of order 8.

If $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$, then

$$4(a, b) = (4a, 4b) = (0, 0).$$

Thus, every element of $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_4$ has order less than or equal to 4. In particular, there can be no elements of order 8, i.e. no cyclic generators. \square
