

MIDTERM 2

COLTON GRAINGER (MATH 6130 ALGEBRA)

1. DUE 2018-11-16 AT 9:00AM

1.1. **Subgroups of a symmetric group.** Find explicit generators for subgroups of the symmetric group S_7 that are isomorphic to each of the groups (a) $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ (b) $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and (c) D_8 . Show also that S_7 has no subgroup isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$ or Q_8 .

Demonstration. By inspection:

- $C_2 \times C_4 \cong \langle (1\ 2), (3\ 4\ 5\ 6) \rangle$
- $C_2 \times C_2 \times C_2 \cong \langle (1\ 2), (3\ 4), (5\ 6) \rangle$
- $D_8 \cong \langle (1\ 2\ 3\ 4), (1\ 2)(3\ 4) \rangle$

The integer partitions of 7 correspond bijectively to the disjoint cycle types (i.e., conjugacy classes) of the $7!$ elements of S_7 . The order of an element of a given cycle type is the least common multiple of the disjoint cycle lengths. We list the integer partitions of 7 explicitly

integer partition	least common multiple
7	7
6, 1	6
5, 1, 1	5
5, 2	10
4, 1, 1, 1	4
4, 2, 1	4
4, 3	12
3, 1, 1, 1, 1	3
3, 2, 1, 1	6
3, 2, 2	6
3, 3, 1	3
2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1	2
2, 2, 1, 1, 1	2
2, 2, 2, 1	2
1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1	1

- Because S_7 has no element x of order 8, there cannot exist $H \leq S_7$ such that $H \cong C_8$.
- Q_8 has 3 normal subgroups of order 4 each pairwise incomparable under the relation “is a subgroup of”, i.e.. “ \leq ”. Since normal subgroups are unions of conjugacy classes, a subgroup H of S_7 could only have 2 normal subgroups of order 4 incomparable under the relation \leq . Should an isomorphism from $H \leq S_7$ to Q_8 exist, the lattice isomorphism theorem would produce a contradiction, as the relation \leq is preserved under isomorphism (as well as the order of subgroups and their embedded normality). \square

Date: 2018-11-15.

Compiled: 2018-11-16.

1.2. Transitive group actions. *Given.* Suppose G acts transitively on sets X and Y , where $1 < |X| < |Y| = p$ and p is prime.

To prove. G is not simple.

Proof. For contradiction, suppose G is a simple group. Since G acts transitively on X , where $|X| > 1$, there's a *nontrivial* permutation representation $\pi: G \rightarrow S_X \cong S_n$. Now $\ker \pi \triangleleft G$ is a *proper* normal subgroup of the simple group G , so we must have $\ker \pi = \{1\}$. Since π is injective, we identify G with its image as a permutation group:

$$G \leq S_n.$$

Let $y \in Y$. By orbit-stabilizer,

$$|G| = |G(y)| \cdot |\text{Stab}_G(y)|.$$

G acts transitively on Y , so $G(y) = Y$. Thus

$$|G| \text{ is divisible by } |Y|.$$

Whence the contradiction: $|Y| = p$ is a prime strictly greater than n , yet

$$G \leq S_n \text{ implies, by Lagrange, } p \mid n! \text{ and this is absurd.}$$

So G cannot be simple. \square

1.3. A homomorphism into a solvable group. *Given.* Let G be a finite group with a normal subgroup $N \triangleleft G$, and suppose $\theta: G \rightarrow H$ is a group homomorphism into a solvable group H . Suppose the commutator subgroup of G/N is itself.

To prove. $\theta(G) = \theta(N)$.

Proof. θ induces $\varphi: G/N \rightarrow \theta(G)\theta(N)$ such that

$$gN \mapsto \theta(g)\theta(N).$$

Observe:

- φ is well defined. Let $g, h \in G$. Say $gN = hN$. Then $h^{-1}g \in N$. Under the homomorphism θ , we see

$$\theta(h^{-1}g) \in \theta(N),$$

so $\theta(g) \in \theta(h)\theta(N)$. Thus

$$\theta(g)\theta(N) = \theta(h)\theta(N).$$

- φ is a homomorphism. For each $gN, hN \in G/N$, we have

$$\varphi(ghN) = \theta(gh)\theta(N) = \theta(g)\theta(N) \cdot \theta(h)\theta(N) = \varphi(gN)\varphi(hN).$$

- φ is surjective immediately from its definition.

Now $\theta(G) \leq H$ implies $\theta(G)$ is solvable (it's a subgroup of a solvable group). There's a natural epimorphism from $\theta(G)$ to $\theta(G)/\theta(N)$. So

$$\theta(G)/\theta(N) \text{ is solvable (it's homomorphic image of a solvable group).}$$

Under the hypothesis that $[G/N, G/N] = G/N$, we have

$$\theta(G)/\theta(N) = \varphi(G/N) = \varphi([G/N, G/N]) = [\varphi(G/N), \varphi(G/N)] = [\theta(G)/\theta(N), \theta(G)/\theta(N)].$$

Since $\theta(G)/\theta(N)$ is solvable, its derived series must stabilize at $\{1\}$. So $\theta(G)/\theta(N) = \{1\}$. Thus $\theta(G) = \theta(N)$.

□

1.4. **A semi-direct product.** *Given.* Let $G = H \ltimes U$ be a finite group for groups H and U . Let p be prime.

To prove.

- (a) If $\text{Syl}_p(G) \cap \text{Syl}_p(U) \neq \emptyset$, then $\text{Syl}_p(G) = \text{Syl}_p(U)$.
- (b) If $\text{Syl}_p(G) \cap \text{Syl}_p(U) \neq \emptyset$ and $\gcd(|H|, |U|) = 1$, then:

H acts transitively on $\text{Syl}_p(G)$ if and only if $Q \triangleleft U$ for some $Q \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$.

Proof.

- (a) Say $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G) \cap \text{Syl}_p(U)$. Now G acts transitively on its Sylow p -subgroups by conjugation, so

$$\text{Syl}_p(G) = \{gPg^{-1} : g \in G\}.$$

To argue $\text{Syl}_p(G) \subset \text{Syl}_p(U)$. As $U \triangleleft G$, we know for all $g \in G$ that $gPg^{-1} \cap U \in \text{Syl}_p(U)$. Being conjugates in U , and considering finite order,

$$|gPg^{-1}| = |P| = |gPg^{-1} \cap U|.$$

It follows that $gPg^{-1} \cap U = gPg^{-1}$, hence $\text{Syl}_p(G) \subset \text{Syl}_p(U)$. The other inclusion is obvious by recognizing that if $|P| = p^k$, then each $P_i \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$ also has order p^k , and is thus in $\text{Syl}_p(G)$.

- (b) (\Leftarrow) If $Q \triangleleft U$, then $1 = n_p(U) = n_p(G)$. We see H acts transitively (trivially) on the singleton set $\text{Syl}_p(G)$.
- (\Rightarrow) Say that H acts transitively on $\text{Syl}_p(G)$. It's true as well that U acts transitively on $\text{Syl}_p(U)$ (which is identically $\text{Syl}_p(U)$).

Let $Q \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. We compute the cardinal number of the orbit of Q under the action of H and U respectively:

$$n_p(G) = \frac{|H|}{|N_H(Q)|} \quad \text{and} \quad n_p(G) = \frac{|U|}{|N_U(Q)|}.$$

So the cardinal number of the orbit of Q (which is the number of Sylow p -subgroups of both U and G) divides both $|H|$ and $|U|$. Since $\gcd(|H|, |U|) = 1$, it must be that Q is the only Sylow p -subgroup in U (and, also, the only one in G). We conclude $Q \triangleleft U$. \square

1.5. **No simple group of order 120.** *Given.* Suppose G is a group of order 120.

To prove. G cannot be simple.

Proof. Suppose for contradiction G is simple. As $|G| = 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$, by Sylow we have:

- The minimal permissible index of a proper subgroup of G is 5,
 - that is, $5 = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} : |G| \mid k!\}$;
- The number of Sylow p -groups must be
 - $n_5 = 6$,
 - $n_3 \in \{10, 40\}$,
 - $n_2 \in \{5, 15\}$.

We consider $n_5 = 6$ to obtain a contradiction. Let $H_5 \in \text{Syl}_5(G)$. Then G acts transitively by conjugation on $G/N_G(H_5)$. I assert

$$G \leq S_6$$

by identifying G with its image in S_6 afforded by the (necessarily injective) permutation representation $G \rightarrow S_6$. As G has no subgroup of index 2, $G \not\leq A_6$. Since $|A_6| = 6!/2$, it's the case that Sylow 5-subgroups of G coincide with Sylow 5-subgroups of A_6 . It follows that

$$N_{A_6}(H_5) \geq N_{A_6}(H_5) \cap G = N_G(H_5).$$

Now, the number of Sylow 5-subgroups of S_6 is given by the number of 5-cycles divided by the number of p -cycles in a Sylow p -subgroup. In particular,

$$|N_{A_6}(H_5)| = \frac{1}{2} |N_{S_6}(H_5)| = 10.$$

Yet also $n_5(G) = 6$ is the index of the normalizer of H_5 in G , hence

$$|N_G(H_5)| = 20.$$

But $N_G(H_5)$ of order 20 cannot be contained in a group of order 10—the desired contradiction.

We conclude n_5 cannot be 6 for a simple group G of order 120. So no such simple group G exists. \square

1.6. **Comaximal Ideals.** *Given.* Let $R = I + J$ be a commutative ring with identity where I and J are two ideals.

To prove.

- (a) $IJ = I \cap J$.
- (b) There are instances where $I + J \neq R$ and $IJ \neq I \cap J$.

Proof.

- (a) To verify IJ is an ideal contained in $I \cup J$.

- IJ is nonempty and closed under addition, following immediately from IJ 's definition.
- IJ is closed under multiplication, for let $\sum_1^n x_i y_i \in IJ$ and $r \in R$.
 - Then $r \sum_1^n x_i y_i = \sum_1^n \underbrace{(rx_i)}_{\in I} y_i \in IJ$.
- So IJ is an ideal.
- As I, J are ideals, we have $\sum_1^n \underbrace{x_i y_i}_{\in I \cap J} \in I \cap J$.
- Thus $IJ \subset I \cap J$.

To verify that $I \cap J = IJ$, we require the hypotheses that R is a commutative unital ring with comaximal ideals I and J .

- Let $z \in I \cap J$.
 - As $I + J = R$, we may find $e_I \in I$ and $e_J \in J$ such that $e_I + e_J = 1$.
 - Since $I + J$ contains IJ , $z \in I + J$.
 - Then $z = z \cdot 1 = ze_I + e_J z \in IJ$.
 - So $I \cap J \subset IJ$.
- (b) Consider $R = \mathbf{Z}$ and $I = J = n\mathbf{Z}$ for $n \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 2}$. Since $\gcd(n, n) = n$, we have $n\mathbf{Z} + n\mathbf{Z} = n\mathbf{Z} \neq \mathbf{Z}$. Furthermore $IJ = n^2\mathbf{Z}$, yet $I \cap J = n\mathbf{Z}$. \square