# **FINITE GROUP THEORY: SOLUTIONS**

## TONY FENG

These are hints/solutions/commentary on the problems. They are not a model for what to actually write on the quals.

# 1. 2010 Fall Morning 5

(i) Note that *G* acts transitively on the set of  $\ell$ . Picking  $\ell = [1 : 0]$ , we see that the stabilizer of  $\ell$  is the upper-triangular Borel

$$\operatorname{Stab}_{G}(\ell) = \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ & * \end{pmatrix}$$

Since the stabilizer groups of all the  $\ell$  are conjugate (by transitivity), it suffices to prove that this particular one has a unique *p*-sylow. By counting its size, the *p*-Sylow has order  $q = p^n$ . By inspection, the 'unipotent radical"

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & * \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a *p*-Sylow in  $\text{Stab}_G(\ell)$ . Since all *p*-Sylows are conjugate, the statement that it is unique is equivalent to it being normal, which we check explicitly.

You should know how to do the computation

$$#G(\mathbf{F}_q) = (q^2 - 1)(q^2 - q).$$

In particular, the biggest power of p dividing this is  $q = p^n$ , so N is also a p-Sylow of G. Since all p-Sylows are conjugate, to count the total number of p-Sylows we just have to count the number of N. Alternatively, show that they are in bijection with  $\ell$ . To recover  $\ell$  from N, take the span of the fixed vector of N.

(ii) First assume  $\ell_1 = [0, 1]$  and  $\ell_3 = [1, 0]$ . Then we are asking for g fixing  $\ell_1, \ell_3$  and taking any  $\ell_2$  to [1, 1]. Note that we can express  $\ell_2 = [a, 1]$  with  $a \neq 0$ . Then take

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now for the general case. Argue that we can find any *g* taking  $\ell_1$  to [0, 1] and  $\ell_3$  to [1, 0]. Then *g* might not send  $\ell_2$  to [1, 1], but by the first special case there is an *h* sending  $g(\ell_2)$  to [1, 1] and fixing the other lines, so  $h \circ g$  does the trick.

(iii) We proved in (i) that  $P_i$  is the unique p-Sylow subgroup of  $\operatorname{Stab}_G(\ell_i)$  for some  $\ell_i$ , and  $Q_i$  is the unique p-Sylow subgroup of  $\operatorname{Stab}_G(\ell'_i)$ . By (b) there exists g such that  $g(\ell_i) = \ell'_i$ . Therefore  $g \operatorname{Stab}_G(\ell_i)g^{-1} = \operatorname{Stab}_G(g\ell_i)$ , and so the unique p-Sylow subgroups match.

# 2. 2011 Spring Morning 1

(a) Proceed by contradiction. We assume that

1

$$G = \bigcup_{g \in G} gHg^{-1}.$$
 (2.0.1)

Let's count how many distinct  $gHg^{-1}$  appear above. By orbit-stabilizer, it is  $G/N_G(H)$ . Now note that  $H \subset N_G(H)$ , so  $|G/N_G(H)| \leq |G/H|$ .

Each conjugate of *H* has |H| elements, and each contains the identity of *G*. So the total number of elements of *G* accounted for by the right side of (2.0.1) is

$$+|G/N_G(H)| \cdot (|H|-1) \le 1 + |G/H| \cdot (|H|-1) < |G|$$

if |H| < |G|.

(b) The stabilizers are all all conjugate. By (a), there is some  $g \in G$  not in any stabilizer.

## 3. 2013 FALL AFTERNOON 1

- (a) In this case  $gHg^{-1} \cap H$  are elements in *G* fixing both *x* and *gx*. If *G* is Frobenius then this has only the identity. Conversely, if *G* is not Frobenius then some  $g \in G$  lies in  $\operatorname{Stab}_G(kx)$  and  $\operatorname{Stab}_G(k'x)$ . Then  $kHk^{-1} \cap (k')H(k')^{-1}$  is non-trivial, so  $(k')^{-1}kHk^{-1}(k') \cap H$  is non-trivial.
- (b) Take  $S = \mathbf{F}_q$ , with *G* by affine transformations. Then *H* is the stabilizer of 0.

# 4. 2012 Fall Afternoon 5

Note that  $\mathbf{F}_{p^3}$  as a 3-dimensional vector space over  $\mathbf{F}_p = \mathbf{Z}/p$ . Picking a basis for it, we can identify  $GL_3(\mathbf{Z}/p)$  with the group of  $\mathbf{F}_p$ -linear automorphisms on  $\mathbf{F}_{p^3}$ . The subgroup of  $\mathbf{F}_{p^3}$ -linear automorphisms gives an inclusion

$$\mathbf{F}_{p^3}^{\times} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbf{F}_p).$$

(i) First compute the size of  $SL_3(\mathbf{F}_p)$ :

$$\#SL_3(\mathbf{F}_p) = \frac{(p^3 - 1)(p^3 - p)(p^3 - p^2)}{(p-1)} = (p^2 + p + 1)^2(p-1)^2(p+1).$$

Check that if  $\ell \mid p^2 + p + 1$  then  $\ell \nmid p(p-1)(p+1)$ . The  $\ell$ -Sylow then comes from  $(\mathbf{F}_{p^3}^{\times})_{\mathrm{Nm}=1} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbf{F}_p)$ .

(ii) In this case the 3-Sylow is the semidirect product of the 3-Sylow in  $(\mathbf{F}_{p^3}^{\times})_{\mathrm{Nm}=1}$  with  $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbf{F}_{p^3}/\mathbf{F}_p)$ , which is not even commutative.

#### 5. 2014 Spring Morning 3

(i) Note that  $x y x^{-1} y^{-1}$  lies in  $P_2$ , since it can be written as

$$x \cdot (y x^{-1} y^{-1})$$

with both factors in  $P_2$  by normality. Similarly, it lies in  $P_7$ . But any element in the intersection of  $P_2$  and  $P_7$  has order simultaneously a power of 2 and of 7, so the

order must be 1.

- (ii) Let  $n_2$  denote the number of 2-Sylows and  $n_7$  denote the number of 7-sylows. By the Sylow theorems, we know:
  - $n_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  and  $n_2 \mid 7$ .
  - $n_7 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$  and  $n_7 \mid 8$ .

We want to show that  $n_2 = 1$  or  $n_7 = 1$ . If not, then by inspection we must have  $n_2 = 7$  and  $n_7 = 8$ . We'll show that there are not enough elements in the group to allow this to happen.

Any two Sylow 7-subgroups can intersect in only the identity element, since they are cyclic. So each Sylow 7-subgroup contributes 6 new elements of order 7, for a total of  $8 \times 6 = 48$  distinct non-identity elements in *G* of order 7.

Any two Sylow 2-subgroups can intersect in a group of size at most 4. Therefore, two distinct 2-Sylow subgroups contribute at least 8+4=12 elements not already accounted for by the above count of elements of order 7. But 12+48=60 already exceeds the size of *G*.

(iii) Make a non-split semi-direct product  $\mathbb{Z}/7 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/8$  by having  $\mathbb{Z}/8$  act through the non-trivial homomorphism  $\mathbb{Z}/8 \to (\mathbb{Z}/7)^* \cong \operatorname{Aut}(\mathbb{Z}/7)$ . (The non-normality follows from the fact that the two subgroups don't commute.)

Make a non-split semi-direct product  $(\mathbb{Z}/2)^3 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}/7$  by having  $\mathbb{Z}/7$  act through  $\mathbb{Z}/7 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{F}_8^{\times} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_3(\mathbb{Z}/2)$ .

# 6. 2015 Spring A2

(i) By assumption, we can find  $g \in G$  such that  $g x g^{-1} = y$ . We want to try to get  $g \in N$ , the normalizer of *P*. In other words, we want to choose *g* so that

$$gPg^{-1} = P.$$

We are free to translate *g* on the left by C(y) and on the right by C(x). If we can get  $gPg^{-1}$  to be in C(y), then by the Sylow theorems applied to C(y) we can left-translate by something in C(y) so that  $gPg^{-1} = P$ .

Is it the case that  $gPg^{-1} \subset C(y)$ ? This is asking if conjugation by y induces the identity on  $gPg^{-1}$ . In other words, does conjugation by  $g^{-1}yg$  induce the identity on P? But  $g^{-1}yg = x$ , which lies in C(P) by assumption!

(ii) The normalizer of N is the group of upper-triangular matrices. The matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}$$
 and  $\begin{pmatrix} b \\ a \end{pmatrix}$ 

and conjugate [why?] in G, but not in N.

## 7. 2011 Fall Morning 1

(i) Arbitrary (entry-wise) choices of lift will lie in  $GL_3(\mathbb{Z}/p^5)$ , because the determinant commutes with reduction. The kernel is in bijection with  $3 \times 3$  matrices with entries modulo  $p^4$ , hence has size  $p^{36}$ .

#### TONY FENG

(ii)  $#G = p^{36}(p^3-1)(p^3-p)(p^3-p^2)$ . An explicit *p*-Sylow is the pre-image of the unipotent radical.

## 8. 2012 FALL MORNING 2

(i) We claim that the "unipotent group"

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & * & * & \cdots \\ & 1 & * & \cdots \\ & & \ddots & * \\ & & & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a Sylow subgroup. This has size  $p^{n(n-1)/2}$ . To check that it works, we compute the size of  $SL_n(\mathbf{F}_p)$ :

$$\frac{(p^n-1)(p^n-p)\dots(p^n-p^{n-1})}{p-1}.$$

The power of *p* is  $1 + 2 + ... + n - 1 = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ .

(ii) Lots of possibilities here, e.g. let  $P_i$  be the subgroup of matrices supported above the "*i*th superdiagonal." Alternatively, you could take matrices supported "after the *i*th column".

## 9. 2013 Spring Morning 3

(i) Use the exact sequence

$$0 \to K \to \operatorname{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/9) \to \operatorname{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/3) \to 0.$$

You should be know how to compute  $\#GL_2(\mathbb{Z}/p)$  for any prime p; for p = 3 it's  $(3^2 - 1)(3^2 - 3)$ . It remains to compute #K. This kernel is the group of matrices with entries in  $\mathbb{Z}/9$ , congruent to 1 modulo 3. Show that any such matrix is of the form Id+3M. Note that this only depends on the entries of M modulo 3, and any M is possible. Therefore, K is in bijection with  $Mat_{3\times 3}(\mathbb{Z}/3)$ , which has size  $3^4$ .

- (ii) If *g* has 3-power order in *G*, then its image in  $GL_2(\mathbb{Z}/3)$  does as well. If the converse is true, then some 3-power exponent of *g* lies in *K*. Argue that the bijection  $K \simeq Mat_{3\times 3}(\mathbb{Z}/3)$  is in fact a group homomorphism, so that *K* has 3-power order. (Alternatively, this can be seen by pure counting.)
- (iii) Any Sylow 2-subgroup of *G* maps isomorphically onto its image in  $GL_2(\mathbb{Z}/3)$ , because the kernel has to have a power of 3, since it lies in *K*. Therefore, it suffices to show the same result for *G* replaced by  $GL_2(\mathbb{Z}/3)$ . By counting sizes, check that a Sylow 2-subgroup has size 16. We can view  $GL_2(\mathbb{Z}/3) = GL_2(\mathbb{F}_3)$  as the group of linear automorphisms of  $\mathbb{F}_9$  viewed as a 2-dimensional  $\mathbb{F}_3$ -vector space (picking a basis for  $\mathbb{F}_9$  over  $\mathbb{F}_3$ ). Then the inclusion of the subgroup of automorphisms which are moreover  $\mathbb{F}_9$ -linear corresponds to an embedding

$$\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{q}}^{\times} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/3).$$

4

Additionally, the Galois action of  $\text{Gal}(\mathbf{F}_9/\mathbf{F}_3)$  is  $\mathbf{F}_3$ -linear and gives an embedding  $\mathbf{Z}/2 \hookrightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Z}/3)$ , which preserves the subgroup  $\mathbf{F}_9^{\times}$ , with the generator acting as  $x \mapsto x^3$  by the Galois theory of finite fields.

# 10. 2010 Fall Afternoon 1

- (i) Applying the inductive hypothesis to  $G/G \cap N \hookrightarrow H/N$ , we find that  $G/G \cap N = H/N$ . This implies that  $G \cdot N = H$ .
- (ii) First, use the usual argument that  $Z \neq 0$  (orbit-stabilizer for the conjugation action of *H* on itself). If  $G \cdot Z = H$  and  $G \cap Z = 0$ , then  $H = G \times Z$ , but then *G* would not surject onto H/[H, H].