

NPTEL

NPTEL ONLINE COURSE

Introduction to Abstract Group Theory

Module 05

Lecture 27 –“Symmetric groups II”

PROF. KRISHNA HANUMANTHU

CHENNAI MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE

I will do, hopefully the proof is clear, and I will do just couple of more examples.

(Refer Slide Time: 00:21)

You take  $S_5$ , so let us use this inefficient, but clear description of an element, let us say  $\sigma$  is, 1 goes to 2, 2 goes to 3, 3 goes to 4, 4 goes to 5, 5 goes to 1. So what is the cycle decomposition? So this is called cycle decomposition.

So as I said, start with 1, 1 goes to 2, 2 goes to 3, 3 goes to 4, 4 goes to 5, 5 goes to 1, so  $\sigma$  is a 5-cycle, so that is all, because you have exhausted all the indices, there is no further cycle, in general you will have a product of several cycles. In this example  $\sigma$  was an element of  $S_9$ , it is a product of 3 disjoint cycles. See when I say product I mean I have told you how to apply product of cycles earlier.

In this case, we start with 7 and see where it goes? It goes to 8. Because it is disjoint thing 8 will not appear again, so 7 goes to 8,

8 goes to 7, 5 goes to 6, 6 goes to 5, 4 goes to 1, 1 goes to 3, 3 goes to 2, and 9 is not represented here, because 9 goes to 9 itself. In this example, sigma is a 5-cycle, one more example, so let us take.

(Refer Slide Time: 1:57)

Let us take  $S_5$  again, let us take tau to be 1 goes to 1, 2 goes to 2, 3 goes to 4, 4 goes to 3, and 5 goes to 5. So what is the cycle decomposition of tau? So this is called tau. Tau is this, so you start with 1, 1 goes to 1, so you have, that is just a 1-cycle. 2 goes to 2 again it is a 1-cycle, 3, now you start with 3, which is an index not covered yet. 3 goes to 4 and 4 goes to 3. So you close the bracket and finally 5 goes to 5. So this is stopped.

But remember our convention, we don't write, because 1-cycle is unnecessary to write, there is so information you gain by writing 1, 2 and 5. So, see tau is just a 2-cycle. In this case tau is a 2-cycle. So now the general proposition is every element can be written like this. Every element has decomposition as a product of disjoint cycles. Another property of this, of disjoint cycles, which is also clear, another property of disjoint cycles is that if, sigma and tau are disjoint cycles, then sigma tau equals tau sigma, that is in words, sigma and tau commute with each other.

(Refer Slide Time: 04:00)

See, remember that in general symmetric group is not abelian,  $S_3$ , we have seen in example detailed description of  $S_3$  earlier, and we know that  $S_3$  is not commutative, so in general two elements of  $S_3$  do not commute with each other. For example, so recall, in fact

$S_n$  is not abelian, if  $n$  is greater than or equal to 3. So this is an exercise in fact.  $S_3$  and  $S_4$ ,  $S_5$  they are not abelian they cannot be abelian,  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are obviously abelian, because  $S_1$  is just a group with one element,  $S_2$  is a group with 2 elements, any group of order 5 or less we saw is abelian. So those are abelian and in fact without that exercise it is clear that a group of 1 and orders in that exercise also it was very easy to conclude that group of order 1 or 2 is abelian.

But  $S_n$  is not abelian, for example if you take  $(1,2)$  and  $(1,2,3)$ . What is this? If this is  $\sigma$  and this is  $\tau$ , so remember how do we multiply, we start on the right side cycle, 1 goes to 2 and 2 goes to 1. So 1 goes to 1 in this product, 2 goes to 3, and 3 goes to 3 under that, so 2 goes to 3, 3 goes to 1 and 1 goes to 2. So we close the bracket and again we don't write 1 cycle, so this  $(2,3)$ . On the other hand, what is  $\tau\sigma$ ?  $(1\ 2)\ 3$ ,  $(1\ 2)$ . So in this case 1 goes to 2 and 2 goes to 3, so 1 goes to 3. And 3 goes to 3 in this but 3 goes to 1 in this. So you stop there, 2 goes to 1, 1 goes to 2. So again we don't write the 1 cycle 2 consisting of 2 so we have  $(2, 3)$  and  $(1,3)$  and these are different.

These are different, so  $((1\ 2))$  times  $(12\ 3)$  is not same as  $((1\ 2)\ 3)$  times  $((1\ 2))$ . So in general  $S_n$  is not abelian, however what did I say here?

If they are disjoint cycles, they commute with each other. In this case they are not disjoint cycles,  $((1\ 2))$  and  $(123)$  are not disjoint. Because the index 1 appears in both the index 2 appears in both, so they are not disjoint cycles, however if they have the same, if they do not have any common indices, we must have that they commute with each other.

So now let me prove that, if  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are disjoint cycles, so however so in general they don't commute with each other, but if they are disjoint cycles, then  $\sigma\tau$  is  $\tau\sigma$ . So why is this?

If you think about it, it is clear, because when you try to write the product, what do we do? We first look at indices that are in  $\sigma$ , and you see where it goes, but we first see indices in  $\tau$  and see where it goes. Wherever it goes it won't appear in  $\sigma$  again, unlike in this example in this case 1 goes to 2, but 2 goes to 1, because 2 appears here, but if there is no index that is common to both  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , whatever happens in  $\sigma$  stays within  $\sigma$ .

So when we consider, the product  $\sigma\tau$  we look at indices in  $\tau$  first. Because they are not present in  $\sigma$ , because they are disjoint cycles, this is very important, because they are not present in  $\sigma$ , it does not matter whether we consider their images, we consider them first or after  $\sigma$ . This is just something that hopefully is very clear trying to write it, it may be necessary, but let us just illustrate this.

(Refer Slide Time: 09:13)

For example if you have  $(1\ 2)$  and  $(3\ 4)$ , this is  $\sigma$  and this is  $\tau$ . If you have  $(1\ 2)$  and  $(3\ 4)$ , what I am trying to indicate here is, so look at the indices in  $\tau$ , 3 is the first index, 3 goes to 4 but 4 is not present in  $(1\ 2)$ . So 3 goes to 4 under the product also, similarly 4 goes to 3 under  $\tau$  and 3 is not present in this. So 3 goes 4, 4 goes to 3. Similarly 1 goes to 2 under  $\sigma$  and it is not affected by what happens in  $\tau$  so 1 goes to 2 and 2 goes to 1, so we might as well write this as, which is  $\tau\sigma$ .

If the indices are disjoint they are unrelated they don't interfere with each other, so we have no problem and we can just multiply them in any order, so the cycle decomposition, this means in the cycle decomposition of a sigma, I have already told you that every element has a cycle decomposition. Now I am telling you that in the cycle decomposition of an element sigma the cycles can appear in any order.

In the example above, in  $S_N$  remember  $S_N$ , we discovered that it is  $(1, 3, 2, 4)$ , times  $(5, 6)$  times  $(7, 8)$ . But now I am saying that there is no problem if we write it like this.  $(5, 6) (1, 3, 2, 4) (7, 8)$  or  $(7, 8) (5, 6) (1, 3, 2, 4)$ ,  $(7, 8) (1, 3, 2, 4) (5, 6)$ , they are all same. That is because the indices are different, are disjoint, so whatever happens within  $(1, 3, 2, 4)$ , does not interfere with what happens with  $(5, 6)$ . And with what happens with  $(7, 8)$ . So I can blue in the order.

So the two important properties of cycle decomposition that we have learned so far is, every element of  $S_N$  has a cycle decomposition is, and the order in which cycle decomposition we write element is irrelevant. So order in which we write is not important, we can write it in any order. So some other properties of cycle decompositions.

(Refer Slide Time: 11:35)

So consider a  $k$ -cycle, use  $S_N$ , let sigma be a  $k$ -cycle in  $S_N$ , so we can write, sigma as, remember sigma can be written as  $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$ . So I must stress here that not every element is a  $k$ -cycle by itself, for example this element of  $S_9$ , is not a cycle, it is a product of 3 cycles. So a cycle is just one cycle, so its cycle decomposition is itself, those are very special elements in  $S_N$ . Sigma is a  $k$ -cycle

means it is a single cycle, but in general elements of  $S_n$  can be products of more than 1 cycles, in this example  $\sigma$  is a product of 3 disjoint cycles.

Now I am considering a single  $k$ -cycle, I want to prove the proposition that the order of  $\sigma$ , in other words, order of a  $k$ -cycle is  $k$ . So recall what is an order of an element? In general order of  $\sigma$  would be by definition the smallest positive integer  $d$ , such that  $\sigma^d$  is identity element.

So we want to show that  $\sigma^k$  is identity, and  $\sigma^d$  for any smaller  $d$  is not identity. So in order to do, that let us find out what are the powers of  $\sigma$ . So  $\sigma$  is  $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k)$ . And recall what the meaning of this is? It sends  $i_1$  to  $i_2$ ,  $i_2$  to  $i_3$ , so on finally  $i_{k-1}$  to  $i_k$ . And what happens to an index that is not inside  $i_1$  to  $i_k$ , nothing happens, it is fixed by  $\sigma$ . If a  $j$  is different to  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k$  it sends  $j$  to  $j$ , so we don't need to worry about it,  $j$  goes to  $j$  for any  $j$  that is different from  $i_1$  to  $i_k$ .

So now what happens to  $\sigma^2$ , what is  $\sigma^2$ ? Remember  $\sigma^2$ , because the operation in the symmetric group is the composition, is  $\sigma$  composed with  $\sigma$ . Where does  $i_1$  go under this, so  $i_1$  goes to  $i_2$  under  $\sigma$  under another  $\sigma$  it goes to  $i_3$ . So  $i_1$  goes to  $i_3$  under  $\sigma^2$ , so I am going to keep track of the cycle of  $i_1$  under  $\sigma$ , so  $i_1$  goes to  $i_3$  so I write it like this so  $(i_1, i_3, i_1)$  next to  $i_3$ .

What happens to  $i_3$ , let us figure out what happens to  $i_3$ ? Under  $\sigma$   $i_3$  goes to  $i_4$ , and what happens to  $i_4$  under  $\sigma$  it goes to  $i_5$ , so  $i_3$  goes to  $i_5$ . Similarly  $i_5$  goes to  $i_6$  then  $i_6$ ,  $i_6$  goes to  $i_7$  under  $\sigma$  and under another application of  $\sigma$   $i_6$  goes to  $i_7$ .

So  $i_5$  goes to  $i_7$ . So it keeps on going like this, which element goes to  $i_1$ ? So of course here I should write  $i_k$  goes to  $i_1$ , under  $\sigma$   $i_{(k-1)}$  goes to  $i_k$  under  $\sigma$ ,  $i_k$  goes to  $i_1$  under  $\sigma$ , so you have  $i_{(k-1)}$  here.  $i_{(k-1)}$  goes to  $i_1$ . What happens to  $i_k$  it must appear in the previous place somewhere in the middle.

(Refer Slide Time: 16:07)

So what we have concluded is  $\sigma^2$  is another,  $k$ -cycle. Remember  $\sigma^2$  is an element of the symmetric group. So it has a cycle decomposition, in fact it is a  $k$ -cycle itself. Because where is  $i_k$  appearing here? See  $i_{(k-2)}$  goes to  $i_{(k-1)}$  under  $\sigma$  under again  $\sigma$  it will go to  $i_k$ . So  $i_k$  will appear here. So every element  $i_2$  will also appear,  $i_2$  will go, where does  $i_2$  go?  $i_k$  goes to  $i_1$  and  $i_1$  goes to  $i_2$ , so  $i_k$  goes to  $i_2$ . So they all appear here.

For example if I take  $\sigma$  to be  $(1\ 2)(5\ 7)$ , it is inside  $S_7$ . What is  $\sigma^2$ ?  $\sigma^2$  starts with 1 and I just skip one step, so 1 to 2 and then 5, so it is  $(1\ 5)$ . 5 goes to 7 under  $\sigma$  so 7 goes to 1 so this  $(1\ 2\ 5\ 7)$ , so 1 goes to 2 2 goes to 5, and 5 goes to 7, and 7 goes to 1, so 5 actually goes to 1.

2 goes to 5 and 5 goes to 7. So 2 goes to 7, so 7 goes to 1 and 1 goes to 2, so actually you can see in this example what I wrote here is just wrong. So  $\sigma^2$  is not in general a  $k$ -cycle, as this example shows.

I should have not written that, so  $\sigma^2$  is not in general a  $k$ -cycle, because may be not all indices are covered there, as this example shows, so  $\sigma$  is a 4-cycle, but  $\sigma^2$  is a product of two 2-cycles.  $\sigma$  is  $(1\ 2\ 5\ 7)$ ,  $\sigma^2$  is  $(1\ 5)$

(2 7). But doesn't matter, so  $\sigma^2$  sends in any case,  $\sigma^2$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_3$ .

What happens to  $\sigma^3$ ? So I am going to keep track of what happens to  $i_1$  under each successive power of  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_2$ , this is the first step,  $\sigma^2$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_3$ ,  $\sigma^3$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_4$ , remember the fact that we are saying  $\sigma$  is a  $k$ -cycle, implicitly means that if it is a  $k$ -cycle, it means that  $i_1, i_2$  and  $i_k$  are distinct indices.

(Refer Slide Time: 19:39)

Otherwise there will not be  $k$  of them so I won't call it a  $k$ -cycle, and more than that, in a cycle we are not allowed to repeat elements, this is not a cycle, because if 2 goes to 2, but 2 also goes to 1 under this, in a cycle we cannot have a repetition of an index, so if it is a  $k$ -cycle they are all distinct indices.

So now let us come back to this,  $\sigma$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_2$ ,  $\sigma^2$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_3$ ,  $\sigma^3$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_4$ . And you can see that  $\sigma^{k-1}$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_k$ ,  $i_2$  goes to  $i_3$ ,  $i_3$  goes to  $i_4$ ,  $i_4$  goes to  $i_k$ . And this is not surprising, so I have to repeat  $k-1$  times we apply this,  $i_1$  will go to the last index.

So since  $i_2, i_3$  up to  $i_k$  are all distinct from  $i_1$ , remember that that is the point of being a  $k$ -cycle, this is not  $i_1$ , this is not  $i_1$ , this is not  $i_1$ , this is not  $i_1$ , they are all not distinct. Because  $(i_1, i_2, i_3 \dots i_k)$  is a  $k$ -cycle, and  $\sigma$  can't be identity, because  $\sigma$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_2$  which is different from  $i_1$ , so  $\sigma$  cannot be identity. I don't care about what it does to other elements, it is a  $i_1$  to  $i_2$ , so identity element is supposed to send  $i_1$  to  $i_1$ , but  $\sigma$  sends  $i_1$  to  $i_2$ , so  $\sigma$  cannot be  $e$ .



Sigma square sends  $i_1$  to  $i_3$  so it cannot also be  $e$ . Because  $i_3$  is different from  $i_1$ . So identity element sends  $i_1$  to  $i_1$ , similarly sigma cubed can't be  $e$  and finally sigma  $k-1$  cannot be  $e$ . So sigma is not  $e$ , sigma squared is not  $e$ , sigma cubed is not  $e$ , sigma  $k-1$  is not  $e$ . So order of  $k$ , order of sigma, has to be at least  $k$ . So remember order of sigma is the least positive integer  $d$ , such that sigma power  $d$  is identity.

So here sigma is not identity sigma squared is not identity, sigma  $k-1$  is not identity. So the order has to be at least  $k$ . Is it  $k$ ? Let us find out what sigma  $k$  does. Under sigma  $k$ ,  $i_1$  goes to  $i_1$ , because under sigma  $k-1$ ,  $i_1$  goes to  $i_k$ , if you apply sigma again, it goes to  $i_1$ . So far so good, sigma  $k$  has the chance to become be the identity element, because  $i_1$  goes to  $i_1$ .

(Refer Slide Time: 23:12)

What about sigma  $k$   $i_2$ , so  $i_2$  remember, under sigma goes  $i_3$ , under again sigma it goes to  $i_4$  and if you keep applying this, at some point you will get  $i_k$  and then  $i_1$ , then  $i_2$ . So if you do  $k$  times, so sigma  $k$  of  $i_2$  also  $i_2$ . Because it is the same, it is a cycle, and as I said cycle can start with any of the indices in it, so the I said here with  $i_1$  but  $(i_1, i_2, i_k)$  can be written as  $(i_2, i_3, i_{k-1}, i_k, i_1)$ . And now  $i_2$  is the first one, in the previous calculation they also said the first one after  $k$  times we will reach the first one again.

So  $i_2$  after applying  $k$  times, we get to  $i_2$  again, so similarly, sigma  $k$  power  $i_3$ , any of them, so sigma is  $i_3$ , sigma  $k$  power  $i_4$  is  $i_4$ , and so on and finally sigma  $k$  power  $i_k$  is  $i_k$ . So we have sigma  $k$  is the identity element, right, because sigma  $k$  times  $i_1$  to  $i_1$ ,  $i_2$  to  $i_2$ ,  $i_3$

to  $i_3$ ,  $i_k$  to  $i_k$  but does it another indices which are not inside  $i_1$  through  $i_k$  to themselves? Of course it does, because  $\sigma$  itself sends any index that is not equal to  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k$  to itself, so  $j$  is not in  $i_1$  up to  $i_k$ ,  $\sigma$  of  $j$  is  $j$ , so  $\sigma^k$  of course will also send  $j$  to  $j$ , so in other words  $\sigma^k$  sends any index to itself. So  $\sigma^k$  is identity and  $\sigma$  any smaller power cannot be identity, so this proves the proposition.

So  $\sigma$  which is a  $k$ -cycle has order  $k$ , and so order of a  $k$ -cycle is  $k$ .

(Refer Slide Time: 25:44)

So for example the order of  $(1\ 2\ 3\ 5)$  is 4 because it is a 4-cycle. And it is a good exercise for you to check that in fact it is 4 by multiplying it out. So maybe I will just do quickly  $(1\ 2\ 3\ 5)$  squared, is  $1\ 3$ , 3 goes to 1, so that is  $(1\ 3)$ . And 2 goes to 3 and 3 goes to 5 so  $(2\ 5)$ . What is  $(1\ 2\ 3\ 5)$  cubed? So 1 goes to 5 and 5 goes to 3, and 3 goes to 2 and  $(1\ 2\ 3\ 5)$  to the 4th is identity. So this I will let you check, so check this, and of course the point of previous proposition is that you don't have to do this calculation every time.  $(1\ 2\ 3\ 5)$  you can immediately say, because it is a 4-cycle, it has order 4.

## **Online Editing and Post Production**

Karthick

Ravichandaran

Mohanarangan

Sribalaji

Komathi

Vignesh

Mahesh kumar

**Web Studio Team**

Anitha

Bharathi

Catherine

Clifford

Deepthi

Dhivya

Divya

Gayathri

Gokulsekhar

Halid

Hemavathy

Jagadeeshwaran

Jayanthi

Kamala

Lakshimipriya

Libin

Madhu

Maria Neeta

Mohana

Mohana Sundari

Muralikrishnan

Nivetha

Parkavi

Poonkuzhale

Poornika

Premkumar

Ragavi

Raja

Renuka

Saravanan

Sathya

Shirley

Sorna

Subash

Suriyaprakash

Vinothini

**Executive Producer**

Kannan Krishnamurty

NPTEL Co-ordinates

Prof. Andrew Thangaraj

Prof. Prathap Haridoss

**IIT Madras Production**

Funded by

Department of Higher Education

Ministry of Human Resource Development

Government of India

HYPERLINK "http://www.mptel.ac.in" [www.mptel.ac.in](http://www.mptel.ac.in)

Copyrights Reserved