

## 10. PERMUTATION GROUPS

**Definition 10.1.** Let  $S$  be a set. A **permutation** of  $S$  is simply a bijection  $f: S \rightarrow S$ .

**Lemma 10.2.** Let  $S$  be a set.

- (1) Let  $f$  and  $g$  be two permutations of  $S$ . Then the composition of  $f$  and  $g$  is a permutation of  $S$ .
- (2) Let  $f$  be a permutation of  $S$ . Then the inverse of  $f$  is a permutation of  $S$ .

*Proof.* Well-known. □

**Lemma 10.3.** Let  $S$  be a set. The set of all permutations, under the operation of composition of permutations, forms a group  $A(S)$ .

*Proof.* (10.2) implies that the rule of multiplication is well-defined. We check the three axioms for a group.

We already proved that composition of functions is associative.

Let  $i: S \rightarrow S$  be the identity function from  $S$  to  $S$ . Let  $f$  be a permutation of  $S$ . Clearly  $f \circ i = i \circ f = f$ . Thus  $i$  acts as an identity.

Let  $f$  be a permutation of  $S$ . Then the inverse  $g$  of  $f$  is a permutation of  $S$  and  $f \circ g = g \circ f = i$ , by definition. Thus inverses exist and  $G$  is a group. □

**Lemma 10.4.** Let  $S$  be a finite set with  $n$  elements.  
Then  $A(S)$  has  $n!$  elements.

*Proof.* Well-known. □

**Definition 10.5.** The group  $S_n$  is the set of permutations of the first  $n$  natural numbers.

We want a convenient way to represent an element of  $S_n$ . The first way is to write an element  $\sigma$  of  $S_n$  as a matrix.

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 3 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \in S_5.$$

Thus, for example,  $\sigma(3) = 5$ . With this notation it is easy to write down products and inverses. For example suppose that

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 3 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \tau = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 4 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$\tau\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 1 & 4 & 5 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

On the other hand

$$\sigma\tau = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 4 & 5 & 3 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In particular  $S_5$  is not abelian.

The problem with this way of representing elements of  $S_n$  is that we don't see much of the structure of  $\tau$  this way. For example, it is very hard to figure out the order of  $\tau$  from this representation.

**Definition 10.6.** Let  $\tau$  be an element of  $S_n$ .

We say that  $\tau$  is a ***k*-cycle** if there are integers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k$  such that  $\tau(a_1) = a_2$ ,  $\tau(a_2) = a_3$ , and  $\tau(a_k) = a_1$  and  $\tau$  fixes every other integer.

More compactly

$$\tau(a_i) = \begin{cases} a_{i+1} & i < k \\ a_1 & i = k. \\ a_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For example

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a 4-cycle in  $S_4$  and

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 1 & 5 & 3 & 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

is a 3-cycle in  $S_5$ . Now given a  $k$ -cycle  $\tau$ , there is an obvious way to represent it, which is much more compact than the first notation.

$$\tau = (a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_k).$$

Thus the two examples above become,

$$(1, 2, 3, 4)$$

and

$$(2, 5, 4).$$

Note that there is some redundancy. For example, obviously

$$(2, 5, 4) = (5, 4, 2) = (4, 2, 5).$$

Note that a  $k$ -cycle has order  $k$ .

**Definition-Lemma 10.7.** Let  $\sigma$  be any element of  $S_n$ .

Then  $\sigma$  may be expressed as a product of disjoint cycles. This factorisation is unique, ignoring 1-cycles, up to order. The **cycle type** of  $\sigma$  is the lengths of the corresponding cycles.

*Proof.* We first prove the existence of such a decomposition. Let  $a_1 = 1$  and define  $a_k$  recursively by the formula

$$a_{i+1} = \sigma(a_i).$$

Consider the set

$$\{a_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

As there are only finitely many integers between 1 and  $n$ , we must have some repetitions, so that  $a_i = a_j$ , for some  $i < j$ . Pick the smallest  $i$  and  $j$  for which this happens. Suppose that  $i \neq 1$ . Then  $\sigma(a_{i-1}) = a_i = \sigma(a_{j-1})$ . As  $\sigma$  is injective,  $a_{i-1} = a_{j-1}$ . But this contradicts our choice of  $i$  and  $j$ . Let  $\tau$  be the  $j$ -cycle  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_j)$ . Then  $\rho = \sigma\tau^{-1}$  fixes each element of the set

$$\{a_i \mid i \leq j\}.$$

Thus by an obvious induction, we may assume that  $\rho$  is a product of  $k - 1$  disjoint cycles  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_{k-1}$  which fix this set.

But then

$$\sigma = \rho\tau = \tau_1\tau_2 \dots \tau_k,$$

where  $\tau = \tau_k$ .

Now we prove uniqueness. Suppose that  $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2 \dots \sigma_k$  and  $\tau = \tau_1\tau_2 \dots \tau_l$  are two factorisations of  $\sigma$  into disjoint cycles. Suppose that  $\sigma_1(i) = j$ . Then for some  $p$ ,  $\tau_p(i) \neq i$ . By disjointness, in fact  $\tau_p(i) = j$ . Now consider  $\sigma_1(j)$ . By the same reasoning,  $\tau_p(j) = \sigma_1(j)$ . Continuing in this way, we get  $\sigma_1 = \tau_p$ . But then just cancel these terms from both sides and continue by induction.  $\square$

**Example 10.8.** *Let*

$$\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 3 & 4 & 1 & 5 & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Look at 1. 1 is sent to 3. But 3 is sent back to 1. Thus part of the cycle decomposition is given by the transposition  $(1, 3)$ . Now look at what is left  $\{2, 4, 5\}$ . Look at 2. Then 2 is sent to 4. Now 4 is sent to 5. Finally 5 is sent to 2. So another part of the cycle type is given by the 3-cycle  $(2, 4, 5)$ .*

*I claim then that*

$$\sigma = (1, 3)(2, 4, 5) = (2, 4, 5)(1, 3).$$

*This is easy to check. The cycle type is  $(2, 3)$ .*

As promised, it is easy to compute the order of a permutation, given its cycle type.

**Lemma 10.9.** *Let  $\sigma \in S_n$  be a permutation, with cycle type  $(k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l)$ . The order of  $\sigma$  is the least common multiple  $m$  of  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $k$  be the order of  $\sigma$  and let  $\sigma = \tau_1\tau_2 \dots \tau_l$  be the decomposition of  $\sigma$  into disjoint cycles of length  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l$ .

Pick any integer  $h$ . As  $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_l$  are disjoint, it follows that

$$\sigma^h = \tau_1^h \tau_2^h \dots \tau_l^h.$$

Moreover the RHS is equal to the identity, if and only if each individual term is equal to the identity.

It follows that

$$\tau_i^k = e.$$

In particular  $k_i$  divides  $k$ . Thus the least common multiple,  $m$  of  $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_l$  divides  $k$ . But  $\sigma^m = \tau_1^m \tau_2^m \tau_3^m \dots \tau_l^m = e$ . Thus  $m$  divides  $k$  and so  $k = m$ .  $\square$

Note that (10.7) implies that the cycles generate  $S_n$ . It is a natural question to ask if there is a smaller subset which generates  $S_n$ . In fact the 2-cycles generate.

**Lemma 10.10.** *The transpositions generate  $S_n$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that every permutation is a product of transpositions.

We give two proofs of this fact.

Here is the first proof. As every permutation  $\sigma$  is a product of cycles, it suffices to check that every cycle is a product of transpositions.

Consider the  $k$ -cycle  $\sigma = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$ . I claim that this is equal to

$$\sigma = (a_1, a_k)(a_1, a_{k-1})(a_1, a_{k-2}) \dots (a_1, a_2).$$

It suffices to check that they have the same effect on every integer  $j$  between 1 and  $n$ . Now if  $j$  is not equal to any of the  $a_i$ , there is nothing to check as both sides fix  $j$ . Suppose that  $j = a_i$ . Then  $\sigma(j) = a_{i+1}$ . On the other hand the transposition  $(a_1, a_i)$  sends  $j$  to  $a_1$  and the next transposition then send  $a_1$  to  $a_{i+1}$ . No other of the remaining transpositions have any effect on  $a_{i+1}$ . The the RHS also sends  $j = a_i$  to  $a_{i+1}$ . As both sides have the same effect on  $j$ , they are equal. This completes the first proof.

To see how the second proof goes, think of a permutation as just being a rearrangement of the  $n$  numbers (like a deck of cards). If we can find a product of transpositions, that sends this rearrangement back to the trivial one, then we have shown that the inverse of the corresponding permutation is a product of transpositions. Since a transposition is its own inverse, it follows that the original permutation is a product

of transpositions (in fact the same product, but in the opposite order). In other words if

$$\tau_k \dots \tau_3 \cdot \tau_2 \cdot \tau_1 \cdot \sigma = e,$$

then multiplying on the right by  $\tau_i$ , in the opposite order, we get

$$\sigma = \tau_1 \cdot \tau_2 \cdot \tau_3 \cdot \dots \cdot \tau_k.$$

The idea is to put back the cards into the correct position, one at a time. Suppose that the first  $i - 1$  cards are in the correct position. Suppose that the  $i$ th card is in position  $j$ . As the first  $i - 1$  cards are in the correct position,  $j \geq i$ . We may assume that  $j > i$ , otherwise there is nothing to do. Now look at the transposition  $(i, j)$ . This puts the  $i$ th card into the correct position. Thus we are done by induction on  $i$ .  $\square$