

## More on Symmetric Groups and Direct Products

Ex: Find  $|((1, 2, 3), (1, 2))|$  in  $S_3 \times S_2$ .

*Solution.*  $|(1, 2, 3)| = 3$  in  $S_3$  and  $|(1, 2)| = 2$  in  $S_2$ , so  $|((1, 2, 3), (1, 2))| = \text{lcm}(3, 2) = 6$  in  $S_3 \times S_2$ .

This should feel very similar to our statement about the order of a product of disjoint cycles in  $S_n$ . Namely, the order of a product of disjoint cycles is the product of the lengths of the cycles. Considering the previous example, we see that  $|((1, 2, 3), (1, 2))|$  in  $S_3 \times S_2$  is the same as  $|(1, 2, 3)(4, 5)|$  in  $S_5$ . This isn't an accident.

Thm: Given  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $S_m \times S_n$  is isomorphic to a proper subgroup of  $S_{m+n}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  and for each pair  $(\sigma, \tau) \in S_m \times S_n$ , define  $\rho_{\sigma, \tau} : \{1, 2, \dots, m+n\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, m+n\}$  by

$$\rho_{\sigma, \tau}(k) = \begin{cases} \sigma(k) & \text{if } k \leq m \\ \tau(k-m) + m & \text{if } k > m \end{cases}$$

for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m+n$ . It is easily seen that  $\rho_{\sigma^{-1}, \tau^{-1}} \circ \rho_{\sigma, \tau} = \text{id} = \rho_{\sigma, \tau} \circ \rho_{\sigma^{-1}, \tau^{-1}}$ , so that  $\rho_{\sigma^{-1}, \tau^{-1}}$  is an inverse function for  $\rho_{\sigma, \tau}$ . This shows that  $\rho_{\sigma, \tau} \in S_{m+n}$ , so we henceforth suppress  $\circ$ .

Define  $\phi : S_m \times S_n \rightarrow S_{m+n}$  by  $\phi(\sigma, \tau) = \rho_{\sigma, \tau}$ . We claim that  $\phi$  is an injective map satisfying the homomorphism property. Indeed, if  $\phi(\sigma_1, \tau_1) = \phi(\sigma_2, \tau_2)$ , then  $\rho_{\sigma_1, \tau_1} = \rho_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}$ . But this implies  $\sigma_1(k) = \sigma_2(k)$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, m$  and  $\tau_1(k-m) + m = \tau_2(k-m) + m$  for  $k = m+1, m+2, \dots, m+n$ . It is easily seen that these yield  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2$  and  $\tau_1 = \tau_2$  and so  $(\sigma_1, \tau_1) = (\sigma_2, \tau_2)$ . Therefore  $\phi$  is injective. To see that  $\phi$  satisfies the homomorphism property, consider  $(\sigma_1, \tau_1), (\sigma_2, \tau_2) \in S_m \times S_n$ . Then  $\phi((\sigma_1, \tau_1)(\sigma_2, \tau_2)) = \phi(\sigma_1\sigma_2, \tau_1\tau_2) = \rho_{\sigma_1\sigma_2, \tau_1\tau_2}$  and  $\phi(\sigma_1, \tau_1)\phi(\sigma_2, \tau_2) = \rho_{\sigma_1, \tau_1}\rho_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}$ . Now, for  $1 \leq k \leq m$ , we have  $1 \leq \sigma_2(k) \leq m$  and so

$$\rho_{\sigma_1\sigma_2, \tau_1\tau_2}(k) = \sigma_1\sigma_2(k) = \rho_{\sigma_1, \tau_1}(\sigma_2(k)) = \rho_{\sigma_1, \tau_1}\rho_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}(k).$$

Similarly, if  $m+1 \leq k \leq m+n$ , then  $m+1 \leq \tau_2(k-m) + m \leq m+n$  and so

$$\rho_{\sigma_1\sigma_2, \tau_1\tau_2}(k) = \tau_1\tau_2(k-m) + m = \rho_{\sigma_1, \tau_1}(\tau_2(k-m) + m) = \rho_{\sigma_1, \tau_1}\rho_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}(k).$$

We have shown that  $\rho_{\sigma_1\sigma_2, \tau_1\tau_2} = \rho_{\sigma_1, \tau_1}\rho_{\sigma_2, \tau_2}$  and therefore  $\phi$  satisfies the homomorphism property.

We proved in class that the image of any injective map between groups which satisfies the homomorphism property is a subgroup of the codomain, isomorphic to the domain. Therefore  $\phi[S_m \times S_n]$  is a subgroup of  $S_{m+n}$ , isomorphic to  $S_m \times S_n$ .

To see that  $\phi[S_m \times S_n]$  is proper, consider the transposition  $(m, m+1) \in S_{m+n}$ . We claim that  $(m, m+1) \notin \phi[S_m \times S_n]$ . That is, there is no  $(\sigma, \tau) \in S_m \times S_n$  such that  $\rho_{\sigma, \tau} = \phi(\sigma, \tau) = (m, m+1)$ . To verify, note that, given  $(\sigma, \tau) \in S_m \times S_n$ , we have

$$\rho_{\sigma, \tau}(m) = \sigma(m) \leq m < m+1.$$

Therefore  $\rho_{\sigma, \tau} \neq (m, m+1)$  and we conclude that  $(m, m+1) \notin \phi[S_m \times S_n]$ . Therefore,  $\phi[S_m \times S_n]$  is a proper subgroup of  $S_{m+n}$ .  $\square$

We can upgrade the preceding theorem to more than one factor:

Thm: Given  $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ,  $S_{m_1} \times \dots \times S_{m_k}$  is isomorphic to a proper subgroup of  $S_{m_1 + \dots + m_k}$ .

However, this theorem doesn't really capture the whole story. Not every permutation can be written as a product of disjoint cycles with each cycle corresponding to consecutive integers. Consider the following example.

Ex:  $(1, 2, 3)(5, 9, 4)(6, 8, 7)$  is a permutation of  $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$  and there is no set of numbers  $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_k$  such that  $(1, 2, 3)(5, 9, 4)(6, 8, 7)$  is in the image of our  $\phi$  from the above proof (of course generalized to the more general theorem above). Instead we should view each cycle as a permutation of its orbit. Namely,

$$(1, 2, 3) \in S_{\{1,2,3\}}, \quad (5, 9, 4) \in S_{\{4,5,9\}}, \quad (6, 8, 7) \in S_{\{6,7,8\}}.$$

We can show that  $S_{\{1,2,3\}} \times S_{\{4,5,9\}} \times S_{\{6,7,8\}}$  is isomorphic to a subgroup of  $S_9$  containing  $(1, 2, 3)(5, 9, 4)(6, 8, 7)$ .

To handle cases such as the example presents, see the fourth additional exercise on your homework for this week (Homework 5).