

Last time let  $X$  be a set.

A permutation  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(X)$  is a cycle of length  $r$  if

there exist  $x_1, \dots, x_r \in X$ , all distinct, so that

$$\sigma(x_1) = x_2, \sigma(x_2) = x_3, \dots, \sigma(x_r) = x_1$$

and  $\sigma(x) = x$  for  $x \neq x_1, \dots, x_r$ .

Two permutations  $\sigma, \tau \in \text{Sym}(X)$  are disjoint if for any  $x \in X$  (if  $\sigma(x) \neq x$  then  $\tau(x) = x$ ) and (if  $\tau(x) \neq x$  then  $\sigma(x) = x$ )

Remark It may happen that  $\tau(x) = x = \sigma(x)$  for some  $x \in X$ .

What's not allowed is: ( $\tau(x) \neq x$  and  $\sigma(x) \neq x$ ).

We've proved:

Lemma 3.1 If  $\sigma, \tau \in \text{Sym}(X)$  are disjoint then

$$\sigma \circ \tau = \tau \circ \sigma.$$

Thm 3.2 Any  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}(X)$ ,  $X$  a finite set, can be written uniquely (up to order) as a product (ie composition) of disjoint cycles (same as Goodman, 1.5.3).

Proof 1. (existence of the decomposition). Induction on  $|X|$ .

• If  $|X| = 1$ ,  $\text{Sym}(X) = \{\text{id}_X\}$ , so true.

• Suppose for any set  $Y$  with  $|Y| \leq n$  any  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(Y)$

can be written as a product of disjoint cycles,  $|X| = n+1$

and  $\pi \in \text{Sym}(X)$ . If  $\pi = \text{id}_X$ , nothing to prove.

Suppose  $\pi \neq \text{id}_X$ . Then  $\exists x_0 \in X$  s.t.  $x_1 = \pi(x_0) \neq x_0$ .

Now let  $x_2 = \pi(x_1)$ ,  $x_3 = \pi(x_2)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $x_i = \pi(x_{i-1})$ .

Since  $X$  is finite not all  $x_i$ 's are distinct.

let  $k =$  largest integer so that  $x_0, \dots, x_k$  are all distinct.

Claim  $\pi(x_k) = x_0$ .

Aside Recall:  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is 1-1 if  $\forall b \in B$  the equation  $b = f(x)$  has at most one solution. 4.2

[ Thus if  $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ , we must have  $x_1 = x_2$  ]

Proof of claim. Since  $k$  is the largest integer so that  $x_0, \dots, x_k$  are distinct,  $x_0, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1} = \pi(x_k)$  are not all distinct. So  $x_{k+1} = x_i$  for some  $i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq k$ .

If  $x_{k+1} \neq x_0$ , then  $x_{k+1} = x_i$  for some  $i > 0$ .  $\Rightarrow$

$$\pi(x_k) = x_{k+1} = x_i = \pi(x_{i-1})$$

But  $\pi$  is 1-1.  $\Rightarrow x_k = x_{i-1}$  and  $0 \leq i-1 < k$

This contradicts that  $x_0, \dots, x_k$  are all distinct.

Conclusion  $\pi(x_k) = x_0$

Now let  $X_1 = \{x_0, \dots, x_k\}$   $Y = \{x \in X \mid x \neq x_0, \dots, x_k\}$ .

Then  $\pi$  sends  $x_0$  to  $x_1$ ,  $x_1$  to  $x_2$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $x_{k-1}$  to  $x_k$ ,  $x_k$  to  $x_0$

$$\Rightarrow \pi(X_1) = X_1.$$

Since  $\pi$  is 1-1 and  $\pi(X_1) = X_1$ , if  $y \notin X_1$ , then  $\pi(y) \notin X_1$

$$\Rightarrow \pi(Y) \subseteq Y.$$

Now set

$$\pi_1(x) = \begin{cases} \pi(x) & \text{if } x \in X_1 \\ x & \text{if } x \notin X_1 \end{cases} \quad \pi_2(x) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \in X_1 \\ \pi(x) & \text{if } x \notin X_1 \end{cases}$$

Then  $\pi_1, \pi_2$  are disjoint permutations and

$$\pi = \pi_1 \circ \pi_2$$

Moreover  $\pi_2|_Y : Y \rightarrow Y$  is a permutation of  $Y$ .

(Recall if  $f: A \rightarrow B$  is a function and  $C \subseteq A$ ,  $f|_C : C \rightarrow B$  is defined by  $(f|_C)(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in C$ )

By inductive assumption  $\pi_2|_Y$  is a product of disjoint cycles. We can view each of these cycles as a permutation of  $X$ . By construction  $\pi_1 : X \rightarrow X$  is a cycle.

$$\Rightarrow \pi = \pi_1 \circ \pi_2$$

is a product of disjoint cycles.

(Uniqueness) Suppose  $\pi \in \text{Sym}(X)$ ,

$$\pi = \tau_1 \circ \dots \circ \tau_r = \sigma_1 \circ \dots \circ \sigma_\ell$$

$\tau_i$ 's are disjoint cycles,  $\sigma_j$ 's are disjoint cycles.

Then  $\tau_1 = (x_0 \dots x_k)$  for some  $x_0 \in X$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$

with  $x_1 = \pi(x_0)$ ,  $x_2 = \pi(x_1)$ , ... etc.

Since  $x_1 \neq \pi(x_0)$ ,  $\exists \sigma_j$  s.t.  $\sigma_j(x_0) \neq x_0$ .

No loss of generality to assume:  $\sigma_1(x_0) \neq x_0$ .

Then  $\sigma_j(x_0) = x_0$  for  $j > 1$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow x_1 = \pi(x_0) &= (\sigma_1 \circ \dots \circ \sigma_\ell)(x_0) = \sigma_1(\sigma_2(\dots(\sigma_\ell(x_0))\dots)) \\ &= \sigma_1(x_0) \quad (\text{since } \sigma_j(x_0) = x_0 \text{ for all } j > 1) \end{aligned}$$

Since  $x_0 \neq x_1$ , and  $\tau_1$  is  $k$ -1,  $x_1 = \sigma_1(x_0) \neq \sigma_1(x_1)$

$\Rightarrow \tau_1$  moves  $x_1$ ,  $\Rightarrow \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_\ell$  fix  $x_1$ .

$$\Rightarrow x_2 = \pi(x_1) = (\sigma_1 \circ \dots \circ \sigma_\ell)(x_1) = \sigma_1(x_1)$$

Continue arguing this way (this is really an induction on  $k$ , the length of the cycle  $\tau_1$ )

We see that

$$\tau_1 = (x_0 \dots x_k)$$

$$\Rightarrow \tau_2 \circ \dots \circ \tau_r, \sigma_2 \circ \dots \circ \sigma_\ell \text{ map } Y = X \setminus \{x_0, \dots, x_k\} \\ = \{x \in X \mid x \neq x_0, \dots, x_k\}$$

to itself. and  $\tau_2 \circ \dots \circ \tau_r = \sigma_2 \circ \dots \circ \sigma_\ell$  in  $\text{Sym}(Y)$

We want to show:  $r = \ell$  and,  $\tau_1 = \sigma_1, \tau_2 = \sigma_2, \dots, \tau_r = \sigma_r$  perhaps after reordering.

We induct on  $r$ .

By inductive assumption,  $r-1 = \ell-1$ , and, after

$$\text{reordering } \sigma_j \text{'s, } \tau_2 = \sigma_2, \tau_3 = \sigma_3, \dots, \tau_r = \sigma_r.$$

□

Next topic Divisibility of integers (1.6 in Goodman)

Def An integer  $a$  divides an integer  $b$  if  $\exists q \in \mathbb{Z}$  so that  
$$b = qa$$

We write  $a|b$ .

We write  $a \nmid b$  if no such  $q$  exist.

Ex  $3|6$   $(-3)|6$ ,  $3 \nmid 7$ .

Note For any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , (i)  $a|a$  since  $a = 1 \cdot a$   
(ii)  $a|0$  since  $0 = 0 \cdot a$ .

Definition  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  is prime if

- 1)  $p \geq 2$  and
- 2) if  $d|p$  and  $d > 0$ , then  $d = 1$  or  $p$ .

Note By definition  $1$  is not a prime

We will prove:

Prop 1.6.4 Every integer  $n \geq 2$  is a prime or a product of primes

Thm 1.6.8 Factorization into primes is unique (up to an order of factors)

We will need:

Well-ordering principle Every nonempty set of non-negative integers has the smallest element.

Remark Well-ordering principle  $\iff$   
the principle of mathematical induction.

We won't prove this, but it's not hard.