

## The Banach–Tarski paradox for the hyperbolic plane (II)

by

Jan Mycielski (Boulder, CO) and Grzegorz Tomkowicz (Bytom)

**Abstract.** The second author found a gap in the proof of the main theorem in [J. Mycielski, *Fund. Math.* 132 (1989), 143–149]. Here we fill that gap and add some remarks about the geometry of the hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}^2$ .

In order to prove the Banach–Tarski paradox for the hyperbolic plane  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , in Section 3 of [1], a free group  $F$  of piecewise isometries of a certain bounded set  $B \subset \mathbb{H}^2$  is defined, and it is assumed that

(A) *Each transformation of  $F$  other than the identity has at most countably many fixed points.*

But the argument of Section 3 in [1] fails to prove (A), and without (A) Lemma 2.4 cannot be applied, whence the proof of the main result is incomplete. Here follows a proof much simpler than the vagaries in Section 3 of [1] of the following statement slightly stronger than (A):

(B) *Each element of  $F \setminus \{e\}$  has finitely many fixed points.*

*Proof.* As in [1], all isometries considered here are assumed to be sense preserving. Let the set  $B$  and the piecewise isometries  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  be defined as in Section 3 of [1]. Hence  $\varphi$  preserves the real axis and  $\psi$  preserves the imaginary axis. Furthermore,  $\varphi$  consists of three disjoint pieces of three isometries of  $\mathbb{H}^2$ . The first of these isometries is of the form  $\varphi_1\varphi_2$ , the second is  $\varphi_1$  and the third is  $\varphi_2$ , where each  $\varphi_i$  preserves the real axis. It follows that the  $\varphi_i$  commute and for every integer  $n > 0$  and every  $z \in B$  there exist two integers  $n_1(z) \geq 0$  and  $n_2(z) \geq 0$ , with  $n \leq n_1(z) + n_2(z) \leq 2n$ , such that  $\varphi^n(z) = \varphi^{n_1(z)}\varphi^{n_2(z)}(z)$  (see [1, Lemma 3.1]). Mutatis mutandis, the same is true for  $\psi$  and certain isometries  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  preserving the imaginary axis. Moreover the parameters defining the  $\varphi_i$  and  $\psi_i$  can be chosen such

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 03E05, 20E05, 51M10; Secondary 20E06.

*Key words and phrases*: free group, Hausdorff–Banach–Tarski paradox, paradoxical set.

that the group  $G$  which they generate is a free product (non-abelian) of the abelian groups  $\langle \varphi_1, \varphi_2 \rangle$  and  $\langle \psi_1, \psi_2 \rangle$  and the latter are free abelian of rank 2 (see [1, Lemma 2.2]). Therefore every  $\xi \in F \setminus \{e\}$  is a transformation of  $B$  which splits into a disjoint union of finitely many pieces of isometries in  $G \setminus \{e\}$ . Since every isometry of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  other than  $e$  has at most one fixed point,  $\xi$  has only finitely many fixed points. This concludes the proof of (B) and fills the gap in [1]. ■

REMARKS. 1. The above proof is very similar to the proof in [3] of a conjecture (C) stated in [2] on page 155.

2. Our construction of  $F \setminus \{e\}$  does not guarantee that its transformations are fixed-point-free. Let  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  be two distinct, small translations of  $\mathbb{H}^2$  along perpendicular axes  $k$  and  $l$ , respectively. Then the commutator  $\alpha\beta\alpha^{-1}\beta^{-1}$  has a fixed point in  $\mathbb{H}^2$ , i.e., is a rotation of  $\mathbb{H}^2$ .

Indeed, we can choose two straight lines  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  on opposite sides of  $l$  both perpendicular to  $k$  and both at the same distance to  $l$  such that  $\beta(l_1) = l_2$ , and a similar pair of lines  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  perpendicular to  $l$ , at the same distance to  $k$ , such that  $\alpha(k_1) = k_2$ . These lines  $k_i$  and  $l_i$  form a quadrilateral whose corners can be labeled  $a, b, c$  and  $d$ , such that  $\beta^{-1}(a) = b$ ,  $\alpha^{-1}(b) = c$ ,  $\beta(c) = d$  and  $\alpha(d) = a$ . Hence  $\alpha\beta\alpha^{-1}\beta^{-1}(a) = a$ .

3. We do not know if  $B$  admits a free non-abelian group of piecewise isometries whose elements other than  $e$  have no fixed points. Without such a group we have no tool to construct, say, a decomposition of  $B$  into three disjoint sets  $X, Y, Z$  such that  $X \equiv Y \equiv Z \equiv X \cup Y \equiv X \cup Z \equiv Y \cup Z$ , where  $\equiv$  denotes equivalence of sets by finite decomposition. Such decompositions of the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$  exist if sense reversing isometries are allowed (see [4, Th. 4.16]).

## References

- [1] J. Mycielski, *The Banach–Tarski paradox for the hyperbolic plane*, Fund. Math. 132 (1989), 143–149.
- [2] J. Mycielski, *Non-amenable groups with amenable action and some paradoxical decompositions in the plane*, Colloq. Math. 75 (1998), 149–157.
- [3] G. Tomkowicz, *A free group of piecewise linear transformations*, Colloq. Math. 125 (2011), 141–146.
- [4] S. Wagon, *The Banach–Tarski Paradox*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.

Jan Mycielski  
 Department of Mathematics  
 University of Colorado  
 Boulder, CO 80309-0395, U.S.A.  
 E-mail: jmyciel@euclid.colorado.edu

Grzegorz Tomkowicz  
 Centrum Edukacji G<sup>2</sup>  
 Moniuszki 9  
 41-902 Bytom, Poland  
 E-mail: gtomko@vp.pl

*Received 9 October 2012;  
 in revised form 4 July 2013*