

Section 4: Powers of an Element; Cyclic Groups

For elements of a semigroup $(S, *)$, the definition of positive integer exponents is clear: For x in S and n in \mathbb{Z}^+ , $x^n = x * x * \cdots * x$, where there are n “factors”, i.e., n x 's “starred together” — this n -fold “star” is meaningful because associativity says that, no matter how parentheses are put in to divide it into $n - 1$ 2-fold “stars”, the result will always be the same. In particular, $x^1 = x$. If the semigroup has a (two-sided) identity e , then you can probably guess what an exponent of 0 means: $x^0 = e$. If S is really a group, i.e., every element also has an inverse, then we can make sense of negative exponents; in fact, there are technically two reasonable definitions for x^{-n} when $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$: Is it the inverse of x^n , or the n -th power of x^{-1} — is x^{-n} equal to $(x^n)^{-1}$ or is it $(x^{-1})^n$?. Fortunately, these two results turn out to be equal [the text leaves this as an exercise for the student, and so will I].

Warnings: Fractional exponents are usually meaningless in the context of groups. Also, one of the familiar rules of exponents does not hold, unless the group is abelian: If we start with $(x * y)^2 = x^2 * y^2$ (for elements x, y of some group), i.e., $x * y * x * y = x * x * y * y$, then cancellation shows that $y * x = x * y$. So for a general, not-necessarily-abelian group we can only hope to prove the other two rules of exponents:

Prop: If $(G, *)$ is a group, then for all x in G and m, n in \mathbb{Z} , we have $x^m x^n = x^{m+n}$ and $(x^m)^n = x^{mn} = (x^n)^m$. If G is abelian, then for any x, y in G and n in \mathbb{Z} , we have $(x * y)^n = x^n * y^n$.

Pf: For $x^m * x^n = x^{m+n}$, suppose first that m, n are both positive. Then $x^m * x^n = (x * x * \cdots * x) * (x * x * \cdots * x)$ where the first set of parentheses has m x 's and the second has n of them, so the result is “starring together” a total of $m + n$ x 's, i.e., x^{m+n} . Suppose one of them is 0, say $m = 0$; then the equation to be proved is $x^0 * x^n = x^{0+n}$, but because $x^0 = e$ and $0 + n = n$ (no matter whether n is positive, 0 or negative), both sides are x^n and the result follows. The text does the case where both m, n are negative and where $m < 0$ and $n > 0$, so let's do the case where $m > 0$ and $n < 0$; so that $k = -n$ is a positive integer. Then $x^m * x^n = x^m * x^{-k} = x^m * (x^{-1})^k$, the value of which depends on the relative values of k, m , telescoping the “stars” $x * x^{-1}$ in the middle of the product:

- if $k < m$, then $x^m * (x^{-1})^k = x^{m-k} = x^{m+n}$;
- if $k = m$, then $x^m * (x^{-1})^k = e = x^0 = x^{m-k} = x^{m+n}$; and
- if $k > m$, then $x^m * (x^{-1})^k = (x^{-1})^{k-m} = x^{-(k-m)} = x^{m+n}$.

Thus, in all cases, $x^m * x^n = x^{m+n}$.

The proof that $(x^m)^n = x^{mn}$ is also an exercise for the student. (It is not necessary to break up in cases for m , only for n .) Because multiplication of integers is commutative, the equality $x^{mn} = (x^n)^m$ follows from the other one.

Finally, suppose G is abelian, $x, y \in G$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose first that n is positive. Then $(x * y)^n = x * y * x * y * \cdots * x * y$ is a “star” of n x 's and n y 's, and with the commutative property we can rearrange to put all the x 's first and all the y 's last, so that it becomes $x^n * y^n$. If $n = 0$, then $(x * y)^n = e$ and $x^n * y^n = e * e = e$, so they are equal. Finally, if n is negative, say $n = -k$, then $x^k * y^k = (x * y)^k$ so $e = x^{-k} * (x * y)^k * y^{-k} = x^{-k} * y^{-k} * (x * y)^k$, so $(x * y)^{-k} = x^{-k} * y^{-k}$, i.e., also in this case, $(x * y)^n = x^n * y^n$. //

Notation: From now on, a general operation will be denoted, not by $*$, but by juxtaposition, writing xy instead of $x * y$. Occasionally, if the operation is commutative, we will denote it by $+$; in this case the inverse of x is denoted by $-x$, and “powers” become multiples: $x + x + \cdots + x$ (with n terms) is denoted nx . So the rules of exponents become $(m + n)x = mx + nx$, $m(nx) =$

$(mn)x = n(mx)$, and because we are assuming commutativity, $n(x + y) = nx + ny$.

In our basic examples of operations, addition and multiplication in \mathbb{R} , most of the multiples nx and powers x^n (except for the identities, 0 and 1 respectively) get larger and larger as the n gets larger and larger. The counterexample is powers of -1 , which alternate between 1 and -1 . But in other groups, the powers (multiples) of elements can cycle through any number of other elements before repeating. For example, in (\mathbb{Z}_5, \oplus) , the multiples of 1 are

$$\begin{aligned} &1 \\ &1 + 1 = 2 \\ &1 + 1 + 1 = 3 \\ &1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 4 \\ &1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 0 \\ &1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 1 \\ &1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 2 \\ &\text{etc.} \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the powers of i in $(\mathbb{C} - \{0\}, \cdot)$ are

$$i, i^2 = -1, i^3 = -i, i^4 = 1, i^5 = i, i^6 = -1, \text{ etc.}$$

Terminology: Let S be a subset of a group G . We say that S is *closed under the operation* on G if, for all x, y in S , xy is also in S , i.e., the restriction of the operation on G to S is an operation on S . And S is *closed under inverses* if, for all x in S , x^{-1} is also in S . If a nonempty subset S of G is closed under the operation and inverses, then S is a group in its own right, called a *subgroup* of G . We'll study more general subgroups later, but for this section we are interested in a specific kind of subgroup:

Def and Prop: Let x be an element of a group G . The set $\langle x \rangle$ of all powers of x is closed under the operation on G and under inverses, so it is a subgroup of G , called the *cyclic subgroup* generated by x .

- (i) If there is no positive integer n for which $x^n = e$, then we say x has *infinite order*; in symbols, $o(x) = \infty$. In this case the function $\varphi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow G : n \mapsto x^n$ is a one-to-one function with range $\langle x \rangle$, and it shows that, as a group, $\langle x \rangle$ behaves just like \mathbb{Z} .
- (ii) If there is a positive integer n for which $x^n = e$, then the smallest such n is called the *order* of x , denoted $o(x)$. In this case, for $o(x) = n$, the function $\psi : \mathbb{Z}_n \rightarrow G : k \mapsto x^k$ is a one-to-one function with range $\langle x \rangle$, and it shows that, as a group, $\langle x \rangle$ behaves just like \mathbb{Z}_n .

Pf of whatever isn't a definition in this statement: The subset $\langle x \rangle$ is closed under the operation because $x^m x^n = x^{m+n}$; it is closed under inverses because $(x^n)^{-1} = x^{-n}$. So it is a subgroup of G . In the case where there is no positive power of x that is equal to e , it is clear that φ has range $\langle x \rangle$. to see it is one-to-one, suppose $x^m = x^n$ where $m \geq n$; then $x^{m-n} = e$, so we must have $m - n = 0$, i.e., $m = n$. In the case where $o(x) = n < \infty$, we want to show first that ψ has range all of $\langle x \rangle$, i.e., every power of x is equal to x^r for some r between 0 and $n-1$ (inclusive): Given the power x^m , long-divide m by n : $m = qn + r$ where $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq r < n$; then $x^m = x^{qn+r} = (x^n)^q x^r = e^q x^r = x^r$.

And to see that ψ is one-to-one, suppose $x^r = x^s$ where $0 \leq r \leq s < n$; then $x^{s-r} = e$, but $0 \leq s-r < n$ and the choice of n means $s-r=0$, i.e., $r=s$. “Behaves just like” means that adding in \mathbb{Z} or \mathbb{Z}_n corresponds to multiplying in G : In the case of infinite order, we have $\varphi(n+m) = x^{n+m} = x^n x^m = \varphi(n)\varphi(m)$, so the operations in the groups $\langle x \rangle$ and \mathbb{Z} are essentially identical. And in the case of order n , let s, t be elements of \mathbb{Z}_n and long-divide the integer $s+t$ by n : $s+t = nq+r$. Then $s \oplus t = r$, and $\psi(s)\psi(t) = x^s x^t = x^{s+t} = x^{nq+r} = (x^n)^q x^r = x^r = \psi(s \oplus t)$. So the operations in the groups $\langle x \rangle$ and \mathbb{Z}_n are essentially identical. //

Here is a diagram of what “the operations are essentially identical” means in the infinite-order case:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbb{Z} & \times & \mathbb{Z} & \xrightarrow{+} & \mathbb{Z} \\ \downarrow \varphi & & \downarrow \varphi & & \downarrow \varphi \\ G & \times & G & \xrightarrow{\text{op}} & G \end{array}$$

If we start with any pair of integers in the upper left, going across and then going down gives the same result as going down (side-by-side) and then going across.

Ex: In the group $GL(3, \mathbb{R})$, let

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$A^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = I$$

so $\langle A \rangle = \{A, A^2, I\}$ behaves just like \mathbb{Z}_3 :

$$\varphi: \mathbb{Z}_3 \rightarrow \langle A \rangle: \quad 0 \mapsto I, \quad 1 \mapsto A, \quad 2 \mapsto A^2$$

$$\begin{array}{c|ccc} \oplus & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 2 & 0 & 1 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c|ccc} & I & A & A^2 \\ \hline I & I & A & A^2 \\ A & A & A^2 & I \\ A^2 & A^2 & I & A \end{array}$$

If $x^n = e$, then $(x^{-1})^n = (x^n)^{-1} = e^{-1} = e$, and vice versa, so $o(x)$, the smallest n for which $x^n = e$, is the same as $o(x^{-1})$, and if one is infinite, so is the other. We can say more when we are talking about finite orders, but the proofs suddenly involve a lot of Math 250 results. Before we give the proof, let’s take an example, looking at the orders of the elements of \mathbb{Z}_{12} :

- 0 has order 1 — the identity in any group is the only element of order 1.
- 1 has order 12: we need to add 12 copies of 1 to get 0.
- 2 has order 6: $2(2) = 4$, $3(2) = 6$, $4(2) = 8$, $5(2) = 10$, $6(2) = 0$.
- The idea that works for 2 also works for the other divisors of 12: 3 has order 4, 4 has order 3, 6 has order 2.
- How many copies of 5 will we need to add to get 0? I.e., in \mathbb{Z} , how many 5’s will we need to add to get a multiple of 12? Well, because 5 has no factor in common with 12, we only get $n(5) = m(12)$ if n is divisible by 12; so 5 has order 12. The same is true of the other numbers less than 12 and relatively prime to it: 7 and 11.

- $1(8) = 8, 2(8) = 4, 3(8) = 0$; i.e., in \mathbb{Z} , a multiple of 8, $n(8)$, is a multiple of 12 only if n makes up the factor 3 of 12 that is not in 8. In the equation $n(8) = m(12)$, divide both sides by the gcd of 12 and 8: $n(2) = m(3)$; because 3 is relatively prime to 2, it must divide n . So $o(8) = 3 = 12/4 = 12/\gcd(12, 8)$.
- And the same idea works for 9 and 10: In \mathbb{Z} , $1(9) = 9, 2(9) = 18, 3(9) = 27, 4(9) = 36$, a multiple of 12: $o(9) = 4 = 12/3 = 12/\gcd(12, 9)$; and $6(10) = 60$ is the smallest common multiple of 10 and 12: $o(10) = 6 = 12/2 = 12/\gcd(12, 10)$.

So the idea seems to be that, in \mathbb{Z}_n , the order of an element k is $n/\gcd(n, k)$. If this is right, it should translate to any cyclic group $\langle x \rangle$ where $o(x) = n$.

We need two things from Math 250, i.e., from arithmetic in \mathbb{Z} : the idea of long division, and the fact that, if a divides a product bc and $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, then $a|c$. The text proves these in great detail, but because they are now done in Math 250, I will assume we know them.

Prop: Suppose the group element x has finite order n . Then:

- (i) For any integer m , $x^m = e$ if and only if $n|m$; and
- (ii) For any integer k , $o(x^k) = n/\gcd(n, k)$.

Pf: (i) Of course if $n|m$, say $m = nd$, then $x^m = (x^n)^d = e^d = e$. Conversely, suppose $x^m = e$, and long-divide m by n : $m = qn + r$ where $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $0 \leq r < n$. Then we have $e = x^m = x^{qn+r} = (x^n)^q x^r = e^q x^r = x^r$. But n was the smallest positive power of x that is e , so r , which is less than n , cannot be positive, i.e., it must be 0. Thus, n divides $m = qn$.

(ii) Because $\gcd(n, k)$ is a factor of k , $k/\gcd(n, k)$ is an integer, so $(x^k)^{n/\gcd(n, k)} = (x^n)^{k/\gcd(n, k)} = e^{k/\gcd(n, k)} = e$. So suppose there is an integer m for which $(x^k)^m = e$; in view of (i), it is enough to show that $n/\gcd(n, k)$ divides m : We know that $x^{km} = e$, so $n|km$, say $km = ns$ where $s \in \mathbb{Z}$. Dividing both sides by $\gcd(n, k)$ gives $(k/\gcd(n, k))m = (n/\gcd(n, k))s$. But $k/\gcd(n, k)$ and $n/\gcd(n, k)$ have no factors in common — we have divided out all the common factors — so they are relatively prime; so the fact that $n/\gcd(n, k)$ divides the product $(k/\gcd(n, k))m$ but is relatively prime to the first factor means that it must divide the second factor. Thus, $n/\gcd(n, k)$ divides m , as required.//

Def: If a group G includes an element x for which all the elements of G are powers of x , i.e., $\langle x \rangle = G$, then G is called a *cyclic group*, and x is called a *generator* of G .

If $o(x) = \infty$, we still call $\langle x \rangle$ a cyclic group, even though nothing is “cycling”. For any group G , the cardinality $|G|$ is called the *order*. If $G = \langle x \rangle$ is cyclic, then $|G| = o(x)$.

Because the powers of an element all commute with each other, a cyclic group is abelian. But there are abelian groups that are not cyclic: The text gives the examples of $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$ (assume x is a generator; then $x/2$ is in \mathbb{Q} , but it is not an integral multiple — power — of x , a contradiction) and the “Klein Four-Group” $V = \{e, a, b, c\}$ with the operation [inspired by \mathbb{Z}_2^2 under addition modulo 2]

	e	a	b	c			$(0, 0)$	$(1, 0)$	$(0, 1)$	$(1, 1)$	
e	e	a	b	c		$(0, 0)$	$(0, 0)$	$(1, 0)$	$(0, 1)$	$(1, 1)$	
a	a	e	c	b		$(1, 0)$	$(1, 0)$	$(0, 0)$	$(1, 1)$	$(0, 1)$	
b	b	c	e	a		$(0, 1)$	$(0, 1)$	$(1, 1)$	$(0, 0)$	$(1, 0)$	
c	c	b	a	e		$(1, 1)$	$(1, 1)$	$(0, 1)$	$(1, 0)$	$(0, 0)$	

Every element is its own inverse, so no element has order 4.