

NO SUBGROUP OF A_4 HAS INDEX 2

KEITH CONRAD

Lagrange's theorem says that if H is a subgroup of a finite group G then the order of H divides the order of G . It is natural to ask about a converse: if G is a finite group and the integer $d \geq 1$ divides the order of G , must G contain a subgroup of order d ? The answer is no, and the first such example is the group A_4 : it has order 12 and it has subgroups of orders 1, 2, 3, 4, and 12, but A_4 has no subgroup of order 6, or equivalently no subgroup of index 2.¹ Here is a proof of that using left cosets.

Theorem 1. *There is no subgroup of index 2 in A_4 .*

Proof. Suppose a subgroup H of A_4 has index 2, so $|H| = 6$. We will show for each $g \in A_4$ that $g^2 \in H$.

If $g \in H$ then clearly $g^2 \in H$. If $g \notin H$ then gH is a left coset of H different from H (since $g \in gH$ and $g \notin H$), so from $[G : H] = 2$ the only left cosets of H are H and gH . Which one is g^2H ? If $g^2H = gH$ then $g^2 \in gH$, so $g^2 = gh$ for some $h \in H$, and that implies $g = h$, so $g \in H$, but that's a contradiction. Therefore $g^2H = H$, so $g^2 \in H$.

Every 3-cycle (abc) in A_4 is a square: (abc) has order 3, so $(abc) = (abc)^4 = ((abc)^2)^2$. Thus H contains all 3-cycles in A_4 . The 3-cycles are

$$(123), (132), (124), (142), (134), (143), (234), (243)$$

and that is too much since there are 8 of them while $|H| = 6$. Hence H does not exist. \square

We will now give four more proofs that there is no subgroup of index 2 in A_4 as corollaries of four different theorems from group theory.

Theorem 2. *If G is a finite group and $N \triangleleft G$ then every element of G with order relatively prime to $[G : N]$ lies in N . In particular, if N has index 2 then all elements of G with odd order lie in N .*

Proof. Let g be an element of G with order m , which is relatively prime to $[G : N]$. Reducing the equation $g^m = e$ modulo N gives $\bar{g}^m = \bar{e}$ in G/N . Also $\bar{g}^{[G:N]} = \bar{e}$, so the order of \bar{g} in G/N divides m and $[G : N]$. These numbers are relatively prime, so $\bar{g} = \bar{e}$, which means $g \in N$.

A subgroup with index 2 is normal, so this theorem says a subgroup of G with index 2 must contain all elements of G with odd order (that's an order relatively prime to 2). \square

Corollary 3. *There is no subgroup of index 2 in A_4 .*

Proof. If A_4 has a subgroup with index 2 then by Theorem 2, all elements of A_4 with odd order are in the subgroup. But A_4 contains 8 elements of order 3 (there are 8 different 3-cycles), and an index-2 subgroup of A_4 has size 6, so not all elements of odd order can lie in the subgroup. \square

That proof is very closely related to the first proof we gave.

¹The groups of order 12 not isomorphic to A_4 each have subgroups of orders 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 12.

Theorem 4. *If G is a finite group with a subgroup of index 2 then its commutator subgroup has even index.*

Proof. If $[G : H] = 2$ then $H \triangleleft G$, so G/H is a group of size 2 and thus is abelian. In an abelian group the only commutator is trivial, so the reduction homomorphism $G \rightarrow G/H$ sends every commutator in G to the identity of G/H . That means H contains every commutator of G , so H contains the commutator subgroup of G . The index in G of the commutator subgroup of G is therefore divisible by $[G : H] = 2$. \square

Corollary 5. *There is no subgroup of index 2 in A_4 .*

Proof. We will show the commutator subgroup of A_4 has odd index, so A_4 has no index-2 subgroup by Theorem 4. The subgroup

$$V = \{(1), (12)(34), (13)(24), (14)(23)\}$$

is normal in A_4 and A_4/V has size 3, hence is abelian, so the commutator subgroup of A_4 is inside V . Each element of V is a commutator (e.g., $(12)(34) = [(123), (124)]$), so V is the commutator subgroup of A_4 . It has index 3, which is odd. \square

Theorem 6. *Every group of size 6 is cyclic or isomorphic to S_3 .*

Proof. This is a special case of the classification of groups of order pq for distinct primes p and q , but we give a self-contained treatment in this special case using group actions.

Let G have size 6 and assume G is not cyclic. We want to show $G \cong S_3$. By Cauchy's theorem, G contains elements a with order 2 and b with order 3. The subgroup $H = \{1, a\}$ has index 3, so the usual left multiplication action of G on the left coset space G/H is a homomorphism $G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G/H) \cong S_3$. If g is in the kernel then $gH = H$, so $g \in H$. Thus, if the kernel is nontrivial then it contains a . In particular, $abH = bH$. Since $bH = \{b, ba\}$ and $abH = \{ab, aba\}$, either $b = ab$ or $b = aba$. The first choice is impossible, so $b = aba$. Since a has order 2, $ab = ba^{-1} = ba$, which means a and b commute. Thus ab has order $2 \cdot 3 = 6$, so G is cyclic. We were assuming G is not cyclic, so the kernel of the map $G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(G/H)$ is trivial, hence this is an isomorphism. \square

Corollary 7. *There is no subgroup of index 2 in A_4 .*

Proof. If A_4 has an index-2 subgroup H , that subgroup has size 6 and therefore is isomorphic to either $\mathbf{Z}/(6)$ or S_3 . There are no elements in A_4 with order 6, so the first choice is impossible: H must be isomorphic to S_3 . In S_3 there are three elements of order 2 (the transpositions). The group A_4 also has only three elements of order 2 (the $(2, 2)$ -cycles $(12)(34), (13)(24), (14)(23)$), so all the elements of order 2 in A_4 must lie in H .

However, the elements of order 2 in S_3 don't commute with each other while the elements of order 2 in A_4 do commute with each other, so we have a contradiction from H being isomorphic to S_3 . Alternatively, in A_4 the identity and the three elements of order 2 are a group (namely the group V mentioned earlier), so H contains a subgroup of order 4, but by Lagrange's theorem a group of order 6 can't have a subgroup of order 4. Again we have a contradiction. \square

The next approach, which shares some features of the proof of Corollary 7, was suggested to me by Michiel Vermeulen and is based on the following theorem.

Theorem 8. *A group of even order contains an element of order 2.*

Proof. Let G be a group with even order. Pair together each $g \in G$ with its inverse g^{-1} . The set $\{g, g^{-1}\}$ has two elements unless $g = g^{-1}$, meaning $g^2 = e$. Therefore

$$|G| = 2|\{\text{pairs } \{g, g^{-1}\} : g \neq g^{-1}\}| + |\{g \in G : g = g^{-1}\}|.$$

The left side is even by hypothesis, and the first term on the right side is even from the factor of 2. Therefore $|\{g \in G : g^2 = e\}|$ is even. This count is positive, since $g = e$ is one possibility where $g^2 = e$. Since this count is even, there must be at least one more such g , so some $g \neq e$ in G satisfies $g^2 = e$, which implies g has order 2. \square

While Cauchy's theorem says more generally that for each prime p dividing the order of a finite group G there is an element of G with order p , that is more difficult to show than the special case $p = 2$.

Corollary 9. *There is no subgroup of index 2 in A_4 .*

Proof. Assume A_4 has a subgroup H with index 2. Then $|H| = 6$, so by Theorem 8 there is an $h \in H$ with order 2. In A_4 the elements of order 2 are the $(2,2)$ -cycles $(12)(34)$, $(13)(24)$, and $(14)(23)$, so H contains some $(2,2)$ -cycle. Since index 2 subgroups are normal and all $(2,2)$ -cycles in A_4 are conjugate in A_4 , H contains all the $(2,2)$ -cycles of A_4 . Then H contains $V = \{(1), (12)(34), (13)(24), (14)(23)\}$, a group of order 4. However, by Lagrange's theorem a group of order 6 can't contain a subgroup of order 4, so we have a contradiction. \square

For more proofs of this result, see [1].

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Brennan, D. Machale, Variations on a Theme: A_4 Definitely Has No Subgroup of Order Six!, *Math. Mag.* **73** (2000), 36–40. Online at <https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/269148715312.pdf>. [banned.pdf](#).