

1. (Jan-12.1) Let  $|G| = 4312 = 2^3 7^2 11$ .

- (a) Show that  $G$  has a subgroup of order 77.
- (b) Show that  $G$  has a subgroup of order 7 whose normalizer in  $G$  has index dividing 8.
- (c) Conclude that  $G$  is not simple.

**Solution:** By Sylow we have  $n_7 \in \{1, 8, 22\}$  and  $n_{11} \in \{1, 56\}$ .

- a) If  $n_{11} = 1$  then taking the product of a 7-Sylow subgroup with an 11-Sylow subgroup gives a subgroup of order  $7^2 11$ , and any group of this order is abelian (it must have unique 7-Sylow and 11-Sylow subgroups, each of which is abelian), so it has a subgroup of order 77. If  $n_{11} = 56$ , then the normalizer of an 11-Sylow has order 77.
- b) Let  $H$  be the subgroup of order 77 from part (a). Since groups of order 77 are abelian (indeed, cyclic), we see that its Sylow 7-subgroup  $H_7$  is centralized (hence in particular, normalized) by  $H$ . Furthermore, since groups of order 49 are abelian, any Sylow 7-subgroup containing  $H_7$  centralizes (hence normalizes)  $H_7$ . So we see that the normalizer  $N_G(H_7)$  contains a subgroup of order 77 and 49, so  $|N_G(H_7)|$  is divisible by  $7^2 11$  – meaning its index divides  $|G|/(7^2 11) = 8$ .
- c) If  $G$  were simple then the permutation representation of  $G$  on the cosets of the subgroup of index 8 from part (b) would give an injective homomorphism  $\phi : G \rightarrow S_8$ . But this is impossible, since  $S_8$  contains no element of order 11, and  $G$  does.

2. (Jan-89.5) Let  $G$  be a nonabelian finite simple group of order divisible by  $p$ . If  $G$  has no more than  $2p$  Sylow  $p$ -subgroups, determine the number of elements of  $G$  whose order is a power of  $p$ , in terms of  $p$ .

**Solution:** We have  $n_p \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ , it cannot be 1, and it is  $\leq 2p$ , so it must be  $p+1$ . Hence the normalizer  $H$  of a  $p$ -Sylow subgroup has index  $p+1$ , so we get an injective homomorphism  $\phi : G \rightarrow S_{p+1}$  from the action of  $G$  by left-multiplication on the cosets of  $H$ . So we see that the  $p$ -Sylow subgroups of  $G$  must have order  $p$ , since  $|S_{p+1}| = (p+1)!$  is divisible by  $p$  but not  $p^2$ . Hence any two distinct  $p$ -Sylow subgroups of  $G$  intersect in the identity, so since there are  $p+1$  of them each having  $p-1$  elements of order  $p$ , there are a total of  $(p+1)(p-1) + 1 = p^2$  elements of order a power of  $p$ .

**Remark** An example of such a group is  $A_5$ , which has 6 Sylow 5-subgroups. And indeed, it contains 24 elements of order 5 (the 5-cycles), along with the identity.

3. (Jan-14.3) Let  $G$  be a finite group.

- (a) If  $H$  is a proper subgroup of  $G$ , show that there is some element  $x \in G$  which is not contained in any subgroup conjugate to  $H$ .
- (b) Use part (a) to show that if all maximal subgroups of  $G$  are conjugate, then  $G$  is cyclic.

**Solution:**

- a) If  $H$  is trivial there is nothing to do (take any element in  $G$  that is not the identity). Otherwise, consider the conjugation action of elements of  $G$ , on  $H$ . All elements of  $H$  stabilize  $H$ , so by the orbit-stabilizer lemma, there are at most  $[G : H]$  conjugates of  $H$  in  $G$ . All of them contain the identity, so there are at most  $(|H| - 1) \cdot [G : H] + 1 = |G| - |H| + 1$  elements in the union of these conjugates. Since  $|H| > 1$  we see that some elements of  $G$  must therefore be missing.
- b) Let  $H$  be a maximal subgroup of  $G$ . By part (a), there exists some  $x \in G$  which is not contained in any conjugate of  $H$  – thus,  $x$  is not contained in any maximal subgroup. But then  $\langle x \rangle = G$ , so  $G$  is cyclic. (In fact, since  $G$  is therefore abelian, we see that  $G$  must have prime-power order, as otherwise it would have two subgroups of differing prime index.)

4. (Jan-01.1): Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be distinct subgroups of a finite group  $G$ . We say  $X$  and  $Y$  are a “weird pair” if  $|X| = |Y|$  and no other subgroups of  $G$  have this same order.

- (a) If  $G$  has a weird pair of subgroups, show that some subgroup of  $G$  has a weird pair of normal subgroups.
- (b) If  $G = A \times B$  is a direct product of solvable groups, show that  $A \times 1$  and  $1 \times B$  cannot be a weird pair.
- (c) Show that a solvable group cannot contain a weird pair of subgroups.

**Solution:**

- a) Clearly any subgroup of  $G$  containing both  $X$  and  $Y$  has a weird pair (namely,  $X$  and  $Y$ ), so we need only find one in which  $X$  and  $Y$  are normal, and if a subgroup has  $X$  and  $Y$  normal then any subgroup containing them both will also have  $X$  and  $Y$  normal: so, if the result is to hold, it must hold where  $H$  is equal to the subgroup generated by  $X$  and  $Y$ .

We claim that  $X$  and  $Y$  are indeed normal in  $H$ , if  $X$  and  $Y$  are a weird pair: clearly  $X$  normalizes itself, and then if  $y \in Y$ , we see that  $yXy^{-1}$  is either  $X$  or  $Y$  (they are the only subgroups of that size), but it cannot be  $Y$  because  $yXy^{-1} = Y$  implies  $y^{-1}Yy = X$ , which is not possible since  $y^{-1}Yy = Y$ . Hence  $Y$  also normalizes  $X$  in  $H$ , so  $X$  is normal in  $H$ . Similarly,  $Y$  is normal in  $H$ .

- b) If  $G$  is trivial the result obviously doesn't hold, so assume otherwise. If  $A \times 1$  and  $1 \times B$  are a weird pair, then clearly  $|A| = |B|$ ; we want to find another subgroup of  $G$  of the same order. If  $|A| = |B| = p$ , take the diagonal subgroup generated by  $(1, 1)$ . If  $|A| = p^d$  is a prime power with  $d > 1$ , then since  $p$ -groups have subgroups of any order, take  $P$  of order  $p^{d-1}$  in  $A$  and  $H$  of order  $p$  in  $B$ ; then  $|P \times H| = |A|$ . Now assume  $|A|$  is not a prime power. Hall's theorem on solvable groups says a group is solvable if and only if for each  $n$  dividing  $|G|$  with  $\gcd(n, |G|/n) = 1$ ,  $G$  has a subgroup of order  $n$ . Let  $p^d$  be the order of a  $p$ -Sylow subgroup of  $A$ : then the theorem implies that  $B$  has a subgroup  $H$  of order  $n = |A|/p^d$ . Then we clearly have  $|P \times H| = |A|$ , where  $P$  and  $H$  are both proper. (Note that this proof still works even if only one of  $A$  and  $B$  is solvable.)

- b-alt) As above we need only deal with the case where  $|A|$  is not a prime power. Since  $A$  is solvable, it has a subgroup  $A_1$  for which  $A/A_1$  is nontrivial and abelian. If  $p$  is any prime dividing  $[A : A_1]$  then since  $A/A_1$  has a subgroup of index  $p$  (abelian groups have subgroups of every order), we can lift to get a subgroup  $A'$  of index  $p$  in  $A$ . By Cauchy's theorem,  $B$  has an element  $b$  of order  $p$ ; then  $A' \times \langle b \rangle$  has order equal to  $|A|$  and is equal to neither  $A$  nor  $B$ .

- c) Suppose otherwise and let  $G$  be a solvable group with a weird pair of subgroups of minimal order. By part (a) since subgroups of solvable groups are solvable, it must be the case that  $G$  is generated by the normal subgroups  $X$  and  $Y$ , so that  $G = XY$ . Now  $X \cap Y$  is normal in  $G$  and  $|X : X \cap Y| = |Y : X \cap Y|$ , so  $G/(X \cap Y)$  is also solvable and has a weird pair of subgroups, so it must be the case that  $X \cap Y = 1$ . But now we have  $G = X \times Y$ , whereupon we get a contradiction from part (b).

**Remark** Given part (c), it is not easy to see that there are any groups at all with a “weird pair” of subgroups!

By the arguments above, we see that a minimal such example must be of the form  $A \times B$  where  $|A| = |B|$  and, for each  $n$  dividing  $|A|$ , there exists no subgroup of  $B$  of index  $n$ . These conditions are already rather restrictive: for example, by Sylow, we see that neither  $A$  nor  $B$  can contain any subgroups of prime-power index.

---

5. (Jan-11.1) Let  $G = H \times K$ . Suppose there exists a group  $X$  with surjective homomorphisms  $\theta : H \rightarrow X$  and  $\phi : K \rightarrow X$ , and define  $U = \{hk \in G : h \in H, k \in K, \theta(h) = \phi(k)\}$ .

- (a) Show that  $U$  is a subgroup of  $G$  with  $UH = G = UK$ ,  $U \cap H = \ker(\theta)$ , and  $U \cap K = \ker(\phi)$ .
- (b) If  $V$  is a subgroup of  $G$  with  $V \supseteq U$ , show that  $V \cap H$  and  $V \cap K$  are normal in  $G$ .
- (c) If  $X$  is simple, show that  $U$  is a maximal subgroup of  $G$  containing neither  $H$  nor  $K$ .

**Solution:**

- a) First,  $U$  is a subgroup since  $1 \in U$  and if  $(h_1, k_1)$  and  $(h_2, k_2) \in U$  then  $\theta(h_1 h_2^{-1}) = \theta(h_1) \theta(h_2^{-1}) = \phi(k_1) \phi(k_2^{-1}) = \phi(k_1 k_2^{-1})$ . Then for any  $g = (h, k) \in G$ , if  $k_1$  is any element of  $K$  with  $\phi(k_1) = \theta(h)$  (which exists since  $\phi$  is surjective) we can write  $g = (h, k_1) \cdot (1, k_1^{-1}k) \in UK$ . Hence  $G = UK$ , and by the same argument we see  $G = UH$ . Furthermore, if  $g = (h, 1) \in U \cap H$ , then we require  $\theta(g) = \phi(1)$  so  $g \in \ker(\theta)$ , and conversely if  $(h, 1) \in \ker(\theta)$  then clearly  $\theta(h) = \phi(1)$  so  $(h, 1) \in U$ , and clearly also  $(h, 1) \in H$  so  $(h, 1) \in U \cap H$ . Symmetrically, we see  $U \cap K = \ker(\phi)$ .
- b) By (a) we know that  $VH = G$  so we need only show that  $V \cap H$  is normalized by  $V$  and  $H$ , which (since  $G = H \times K$ ) is equivalent to showing merely that  $H$  normalizes  $V \cap H$ , since everything in the  $K$ -component can be ignored. Now let  $(h_1, 1) \in V \cap H$  and  $(h_2, 1) \in H$ : then since  $V$  contains  $U$  and  $\theta$  is surjective there exists  $(1, k) \in K$  with  $\theta(h_2) = \phi(k)$ : then  $(h_2^{-1}, k^{-1}) \cdot (h_1, 1) \cdot (h_2, k)$  is in  $V$  since  $(h_2, k) \in U$ , and multiplying out shows it is  $(h_2^{-1} h_1 h_2, 1)$  so we conclude  $(h_2^{-1} h_1 h_2, 1) \in V \cap H$ .
- c) First observe that  $U$  cannot contain all of  $H$  (or  $K$ ), since by (a)  $U \cap H = \ker(\theta)$  (or  $U \cap K = \ker(\phi)$ ), so  $\theta$  (or  $\phi$ ) would have to be the zero map hence  $X$  would have to be the trivial group; in particular, we see that  $U$  cannot be  $G$ . Now suppose  $V \supset U$  be a proper subgroup of  $G$  properly containing  $U$ . Then since  $UH = VH = G$  by (a), we see that  $H$  is not contained in  $V$  since  $V$  is not  $G$ . By part (b) we see that  $V \cap H$  is normal in  $G$  hence normal in  $H$ , and so since  $U \cap H = \ker(\theta)$  by part (a), and  $V \cap H$  is properly contained in  $H$ , we see that  $\theta(V \cap H)$  is a nontrivial proper normal subgroup of  $X$ , which is a contradiction. Hence we conclude that no such  $V$  can exist, so  $U$  is maximal.

6. (Jan-10.1)

- (a) Find the number of elements of order 7 in  $S_7$  and the order of the centralizer in  $S_7$  of one of these elements.
- (b) Find the order of the normalizer of a 7-Sylow subgroup in  $A_7$ .
- (c) Show that  $S_7$  does not contain a simple subgroup of order  $504 = 2^3 3^2 7$ .

**Solution:**

- a) An element has order 7 in  $S_7$  iff it is a 7-cycle, which can be written uniquely in the form  $(1bcdefg)$ . There are  $6!$  ways to order the numbers 2-7, so there are  $6!$  7-cycles. If we consider the conjugation action of  $G$  on the set of 7-cycles, since the action of  $G$  is transitive (since permutations are conjugate iff they have the same cycle type), the orbit-stabilizer lemma says that the size of the centralizer of any 7-cycle is  $|G|/6! = 7$ : thus the centralizer is simply the powers of the 7-cycle.
- b) The number of 7-Sylow subgroups is  $6!/6 = 5!$  since each of them is cyclic hence contains 6 nonidentity elements. Then the normalizer has order  $(7!/2)/5! = 21$ .

**Remark** In fact it is not hard to work out precisely what the normalizer is: for  $H = \langle (1234567) \rangle$ , the normalizer is generated by  $x = (1234567)$  and  $y = (235)(476)$ . (It is easy to see that  $xyx^{-1} = (1357246) = x^2$ .)

- c) Suppose otherwise: this subgroup  $G$  must then be inside  $A_7$  (else  $A_7 \cap G$  would be index-2 hence normal in  $G$ ). Now we have  $n_7 \in \{8, 36\}$ . If  $n_7 = 8$  then the normalizer of a 7-Sylow subgroup of  $G$  would have order  $3^2 7$ , but this is impossible because the order of the normalizer of any 7-Sylow subgroup of  $A_7$  is only 21 by part (b). If  $n_7 = 36$  then the normalizer of a 7-Sylow subgroup of  $G$  would have order 14, but this is also impossible because, by part (b) again, no element of order 2 normalizes a 7-cycle.

7. (Jan-09.1) Let  $G$  be a group of order  $p(p+1)$  where  $p$  is an odd prime, and assume that  $G$  does not have a normal  $p$ -Sylow subgroup.
- (a) Find the number of elements of order different from  $p$  in  $G$ .
  - (b) Show that each nonidentity conjugacy class of elements of order different from  $p$  has size at least  $p$ , and conclude there is precisely one such conjugacy class.
  - (c) Show that  $p+1$  is a power of 2.

**Solution:**

- a) We have  $n_p = p+1$ , and each  $p$ -Sylow subgroup contains  $p-1$  elements of order  $p$ . Since they are cyclic, they don't share any nonidentity elements, so there are  $(p+1)(p-1)$  elements of order  $p$  and hence  $p+1$  elements of order not equal to  $p$ .
  - b) The normalizer of a  $p$ -Sylow subgroup has index  $p+1$  hence order  $p$ , so every  $p$ -Sylow subgroup is self-normalizing hence self-centralizing. Thus, any element of order  $p$  does not commute with any element of order not 1 or  $p$ . Now consider any nonidentity conjugacy class and let  $g$  be an element of order  $p$  that acts on it by conjugation. If the size of the conjugacy class were  $k < p$ , then  $g^k$  would act as the identity on it. But this is impossible since  $g^k$  also has order  $p$ , so it cannot commute with any elements not of the form  $g^n$ . Finally, since there are only  $p$  elements to fit into conjugacy classes of size at least  $p$ , there is only 1 conjugacy class.
  - c) From part (b), the  $p$  elements not of order 1 or  $p$  are conjugate (by an element of order  $p$ ), hence they all have the same order, which must therefore be some prime  $q$ . But now there are  $k(q-1)$  nonidentity elements ( $k$  cyclic subgroups of order  $q$ ), so  $p = k(q-1)$ , whence  $q = 2$ . Then by Cauchy's theorem, the only prime divisors of  $p(p+1)$  are 2 and  $p$ , so we conclude  $p+1$  must be a power of 2. Alternatively, one could use Cauchy's theorem to see that  $p+1$  must be a power of  $q$ , and then observe that  $q^k - 1$  is never prime unless  $q = 2$ .
-