GENERALIZATION OF A THEOREM OF FITTING ON THE PRODUCT OF TWO NORMAL NILPOTENT SUBGROUPS OF A GROUP

by

RICHARD LLEWELLYN FRAY

Presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of
MAGISTER SCIENTIAE
in the
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
of the
UNIVERSITY OF THE WESTERN CAPE

DECEMBER 1977

To Daddy and Mummy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. I.J. Mohamed for suggesting this problem. The thesis was completed under his guidance and his advice on numerous aspects of this work, is much appreciated. His competence, willingness to help and instruct, enthusiasm and genuine interest are highly esteemed and appreciated.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. J. Vermeulen, my promoter, for his cooperation and assistance in completing the thesis in its final form.

My thanks are also due to Miss S.D. Paulse for typing the thesis and to the C.S.I.R. for financial assistance received.

It is difficult to express adequately my gratitude to my parents for their encouragement, unfading interest and affection.

SUMMARY

H. Fitting proved that the product of two normal nilpotent subgroups H and K of a group, is itself nilpotent.

Several authors have proved statements of the following type:

(A) If H and K are normal subgroups of a group G and if $H \in P$, $K \in P$ then $HK \in P$, where P is a group theoretical property.

We have considered the question of to what extent the requirement that H and K be normal can be relaxed in (A). This is done by replacing normal by subnormal or serial.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

FITTING'S THEOREM FOR NILPOTENT SUBGROUPS

§1.1 INTRODUCTION

H. Fitting proved that if H and K are normal nilpotent subgroups of G, then so is HK ([1]` Hilfssatz 10, p. 100). The question arises if this result could be generalized to other group theoretical properties.

If a group G has normal $\underline{E}$-groups (groups with property $\underline{E}$) H and K and if HK is also an $\underline{E}$-group then $\underline{E}$ is called a *multiproperty*. (1.1)

Theorems of this type have been proved by a number of authors. We have the well-known Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem (See [10] and [13]) that local nilpotence is a multiproperty. P. Hall ([6]) proved hypercentrality is a multiproperty. FC - nilpotency and FC - hypercentrality turn out to be multiproperties. This was shown by K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel ([9]). H. Heineken and I.J. Mohamed ([8]) proved that both the normalizer condition and the subnormality condition are not multiproperties.

The question we are to consider is whether the requirement that H and K be normal in (1.1) can be relaxed. This will be done by replacing normality by subnormality or serial in some of the results mentioned above.

§1.2 NOTATION

Let H and K be subgroups of a group G.

If there exists a series

$$H = H_0 \triangleleft H_1 \triangleleft H_2 \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft H_n = G$$

we say that H is *n-step subnormal* in G and follow the well-known notation due to P. Hall ([7]) by writing $H \triangleleft^n G$.

If there exists an ascending series of subgroups H_α linking H to G such that

$$H_\alpha \triangleleft H_{\alpha+1}$$

and

$$H_\alpha = \bigcup_{\gamma<\alpha} H_\gamma$$ for all limit ordinals α, we say that H is *serial* in G and following Gruenberg ([2]) write $H \infty\triangleleft G$.

For $x_1, x_2 \in G$ the *commutator* $x_1^{-1}x_2^{-1}x_1x_2$ would be denoted by $[x_1, x_2]$ and more generally for k>1

$$[x_1,\dots,x_{k+1}] = [[x_1,\dots,x_k], x_{k+1}].$$

The convention is adopted that for k=0, $[x_1,\dots,x_{k+1}] = x_1$.

The following well-known standard commutator identities ([4]) will often be referred to:

$$[xy,z] = [x,z]^y\,[y,z] \qquad (1.2)$$

$$[x,yz] = [x,z][x,y]^z \qquad (1.3)$$

$$[x^{-1},y] = [y,x]^{x^{-1}} \qquad (1.4)$$

$$[x,y^{-1}] = [y,x]^{y^{-1}} \qquad (1.5)$$

The *commutator group* $[H,K,K,\ldots,K]$ with n terms K, is written $[H,_nK]$ with the convention that $[H,_oK] = H$.

The notation $\gamma_m(H)$ denotes $[H,_{m-1}H]$, $m\geq 1$, the *terms of the lower central series* of H.

Thus H is *nilpotent* of class n if $\gamma_{n+1}(H) = 1 \neq \gamma_n(H)$.

As usual the *terms of the upper central series* of H shall be written $1 = Z_o(H)$, $Z_1(H),\ldots,$ $Z_i(H)$ or simply Z_i if H is understood, where

$$Z_1 = \text{the centre of } H.$$

$$\frac{Z_{i+1}}{Z_i} = \text{the centre of } \frac{H}{Z_i}$$

$$Z_\gamma = \bigcup_{\alpha<\gamma} Z_\alpha \text{ if } \gamma \text{ is a limit ordinal.}$$

A group G is a *ZA-group* if and only if its upper central chain, possibly continued transfinitely, leads to the group G.

The *normal closure* of H in G is the smallest normal subgroup of G which contains H and is denoted by H^G. Clearly $H^G = H[H,G]$.

A group G is *locally - nilpotent* if every finitely-generated subgroup of G is nilpotent.

Let G be a group:

$F_o(G) = 1$, the unit subgroup.

$F_1(G)$ is the set of elements of G which posses a finite number of conjugates.

$F_{\alpha+1}(G)$ is defined inductively to be the complete inverse image of $F_1\left(\frac{G}{F_\alpha(G)}\right)$, for all ordinals α.

$F_\alpha(G) = \cup\{F_\beta(G) : \beta<\alpha\}$, if α is a limit ordinal.

For all ordinals α, $F_\alpha(G)$ is a characteristic subgroup of G.

A group G is called *FC-nilpotent* of class n if there exists an integer n such that $F_{n-1}(G)\neq G$ and $F_n(G)=G$.

G is called *FC-hypercentral* of class α if there exists an ordinal α such that $F_\beta(G) \neq G$ for $\beta<\alpha$ and $F_\alpha(G) = G$.

§1.3 FITTING'S THEOREM

Fitting's Theorem that the product MN of normal nilpotent subgroups M and N of a group G is nilpotent, is well-known and easy proofs can be found in textbooks (see for example [4]).

The question, however, arises if it is possible to describe the lower central series (upper central series) of MN in terms of the lower central series (upper central series) of M and the lower central series (upper central series) of N. We give an inclusion relation for the lower central series in Theorem 1.4 below. To facilitate the proof of this, we give a set of generators for $\gamma_k(\langle M,N\rangle)$ for subgroups M and N of a group G in Lemma 1.1 and its corollaries.

Lemma 1.1

If M and N are subgroups of the group G, then
$\gamma_k(\langle M,N\rangle) = \langle [x_1,\ldots,x_k]^y : \forall y\in\langle M,N\rangle, \forall x_i \ni$ either $x_i\in M$ or $x_i\in N\rangle$.

Proof:

The proof is by induction on k. Clearly for k=1, the lemma is trivially true by definition of commutators. Assume the result is true for $1\leq r<k$. Then by the commutator identities in §1.2 $\gamma_k(\langle M,N\rangle)$ is generated by $[[x_1,\ldots,x_{k-1}],y]$ and all their conjugates in $\langle M,N\rangle$ for all x_i such that either $x_i\in M$ or $x_i\in N$ and $y\in\langle M,N\rangle$. By the commutator identities

$[x_1,\ldots,x_{k-1},y]$ is a product of commutators $[x_1,x_2,\ldots, x_{k-1},x_k]$ and their conjugates in $\langle M,N\rangle$, where either $x_k \in M$ or $x_k \in N$. This proves the lemma.□

The following two corollaries are but special cases of the lemma.

Corollary 1.2

If M and N are subgroups of G and if $N \triangleleft G$ then

$$\gamma_k(MN) = \langle [x_1,\ldots,x_k]^y : \forall y \in N, \text{ either } x_i \in M \text{ or } x_i \in N\rangle.$$

Corollary 1.3

If $M \triangleleft G$, $N \triangleleft G$ then

$$\gamma_k(MN) = \langle [x_1,\ldots,x_k] : \forall x_i \ni \text{ either } x_i \in M \text{ or } x_i \in N\rangle.$$

These corollaries follow since conjugation is a homomorphism.□

Theorem 1.4

If M and N are normal, nilpotent subgroups of G of nilpotency class m and n respectively, then

$$\gamma_k(MN) \leq \begin{cases} \gamma_k(M)\gamma_k(N) \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} \gamma_s(M)\cap\gamma_{k-s}(N) & \text{for } k>1 \\ \gamma_k(M)\gamma_k(N) & \text{for } k=1 \end{cases}$$

and MN is nilpotent of class at most m+n.

Proof:

The proof is by induction on k. The result is trivially true for k=1. Suppose true for k-1 (k>1).

By Corollary 1.3 of Lemma 1.1, $\gamma_k(MN)$ is generated by the commutators $[x_1,x_2,\ldots x_k]$ for all x_i such that either $x_i \in M$ or $x_i \in N$.

Consider the generator $[x_1,\ldots,x_k]$. If none of the x_i is an element of M, then $[x_1,\ldots,x_k] \in \gamma_k(N)$. On the other hand if none of the x_i is an element of N, then $[x_1,\ldots,x_k] \in \gamma_k(M)$.

Suppose now that s, $(s<k)$, be the number of x_i which are elements of M. Then k-s of the x_i are elements of N and so clearly since $M \triangleleft G$, $N \triangleleft G$, $[x_1,\ldots,x_k] \in \gamma_s(M) \cap \gamma_{k-s}(N)$. Thus

$$\gamma_k(NM) \leq \gamma_k(M)\gamma_k(N) \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} \gamma_s(M) \cap \gamma_{k-s}(N).$$

If we put $k = m+n+1$ then

$$\gamma_{m+n+1}(MN) \leq \prod_{s=1}^{m+n} \gamma_s(M) \cap \gamma_{m+n+1-s}(N) = 1.$$

For if $s \geq m+1$ then $\gamma_s(M) \cap \gamma_{m+n+1-s}(N) = 1$ since M is nilpotent of class m, while if $s<m+1$ then $m+n+1-s \geq n+1$ and so again $\gamma_s(M) \cap \gamma_{m+n+1-s}(N) = 1$, since N is nilpotent of class n. Thus MN is nilpotent of class $\leq m+n$. □

It appears unlikely that the equality holds in the inclusion relations in Theorem 1.4 for $1<k<m+n+1$ and this question will not be considered any further. However, a few simple consequences of the theorem must be noted. These give some conditions under which the bound m+n for the nilpotency class of MN is not attained.

Corollary 1.5

If $\gamma_s(M) \cap \gamma_{k-s}(N) = 1$ for $1 \leq s \leq k-1$ then MN is nilpotent of class at most max (m,n).

This result is immediately clear if one notes that if $k = \max(m+1, n+1)$ then

$$\gamma_k(MN) \leq \prod_{s=1}^{k-1} \gamma_s(M) \cap \gamma_{k-s}(N). \quad \square$$

Corollary 1.6

If $\gamma_m(M) \cap \gamma_n(N) = 1$, then MN is nilpotent of class $< m+n$.

If we choose $k = m+n$ then

$$\gamma_{m+n}(MN) \leq \gamma_m(M) \cap \gamma_n(N). \quad \square$$

Corollary 1.7

If $M \cap \gamma_n(N) = 1$ and M is abelian or $\gamma_m(M) \cap N = 1$ and N is abelian then MN is nilpotent of class at most n or m.

In the first case chosing k=n+1

$$\gamma_{n+1}(MN) \leq M \cap \gamma_n(N)$$

while in the second case one chooses $k = m+1$ and

$$\gamma_{m+1}(MN) \leq \gamma_m(M) \cap N. \quad \square$$

The bound obtained in Theorem 1.4 is a least upper bound. As no example of this could be found in the literature, such an example will be given here. To do this the following result which is due to P. Hall ([5]), is needed.

Lemma 1.8 (P. Hall. [5]).

If V is a vector space over the prime field of p elements with basis (v_n), n=0, ± 1, ± 2,... and ξ and η are linear transformations of V defined by

$$v_n\xi = v_{n+1} \quad \text{for all } n$$

and

$$v_o\eta = v_o + v_1 \; ; \; v_n\eta = v_n \quad \text{if } n \neq 0$$

then the group $\tilde{G} = \langle \eta_1, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_{m+n} \rangle$ of linear transformations of V, where $\eta_i = \xi^{-i}\eta\xi^i$ and η, ξ are defined above, is nilpotent of class at least m+n.

Proof:

The first step is to show that

$$v_i\eta_i = v_i + v_{i+1}$$

and

$$v_j\eta_i = v_j \quad \text{if } j \neq i.$$

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_i\eta_i &= v_i(\xi^{-i}\eta\xi^i) \\ &= v_{i-i}(\eta\xi^i) \\ &= v_o(\eta\xi^i) \\ &= (v_o+v_1)\xi^i \\ &= v_i+v_{i+1} \end{aligned}$$

and
$$\begin{aligned} v_j\eta_i &= v_{j-i}(\eta\xi^i) \\ &= v_{j-i}(\xi^i) \\ &= v_{j-i+i} \\ &= v_j \end{aligned}$$

Next one has to show that $\eta_i^p = 1$, for each i.

Now
$$\begin{aligned} v_i\eta_i^p &= (v_i\eta_i)\eta_i^{p-1} \\ &= (v_i+v_{i+1})\eta_i^{p-1} \\ &= v_i+pv_{i+1} \\ &= v_i \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\eta_i^p = 1$, for each i.

An easy induction shows that

$$v_1[\eta_1,\ldots,\eta_{m+n}] = v_1+v_{m+n+1}.$$

It follows in the same way as above that

$$v_1[\eta_1,\ldots,\eta_m] = v_1+v_{m+1}$$

and

$$v_{m+1}\ [\eta_{m+1},\ldots,\ \eta_{m+n}] = v_{m+1}+v_{m+n+1}.$$

It can be shown that each η_j commutes with all its conjugates in $\tilde{G}$.

Let Y_i be the subgroup generated by the conjugates of η_i in $\tilde{G}$. Then $Y_i \triangleleft \tilde{G}$ for each i, and $\tilde{G} = Y_1Y_2\ldots Y_{m+n}$.

Since each η_i commutes with all its conjugates in $\tilde{G}$, the

Y_i are all abelian. By Fitting's Theorem $\tilde{G}$ is nilpotent of class at most m+n. But $[\eta_1,\ldots,\eta_{m+n}]$ maps v_1 onto v_1+v_{m+n+1} and so $\tilde{G}$ is of class at least m+n.

Let $A = Y_1Y_2\ldots Y_m$ and $B = Y_{m+1}\ldots Y_{m+n}$. By Fitting's Theorem, A is nilpotent of class at most m and B is nilpotent of class at most n. □

Theorem 1.9

There exists a group G with normal, nilpotent subgroups M and N of classes m and n respectively such that MN is nilpotent of class precisely m+n.

Proof:

Let G be the group generated by the elements $x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_{m+n}$ subject to the defining relations

$$x_i^p = 1,\ i = 1,2,\ldots,m+n,\ p \text{ a prime} \qquad (1.6)$$

and x_i commutes with all its conjugates in G for each $i = 1,2,\ldots,m+n$. (1.7)

Such a group G exists because x_i commutes with all its conjugates in G if and only if $[g, {}_2x_i] = 1\ \forall\ g \in G$ and so G is the group with defining relations

$$x_i^p = 1, \quad [g,{}_2x_i] = 1 \quad \forall \quad g \in G$$

and has factor group the elementary abelian group

$$\bar{G} = \langle x_i : x_i^p = 1 = [x_i,x_j]\rangle.$$

Let X_i be the subgroup generated by the conjugates of x_i

in G.

Then $X_i \triangleleft G$ for each i, and $G = X_1X_2\ldots X_{m+n}$.

By (1.7) the X_i are all abelian. Hence G is nilpotent of class at most m+n, by Fitting's Theorem.

Let $M = X_1X_2\ldots X_m$ and $N = X_{m+1}\ldots X_{m+n}$. By Fitting's Theorem M is nilpotent of class at most m and N is nilpotent of class at most n.

Let $\tilde{G}$, A and B be the groups defined in Lemma 1.8.

The mapping $\phi: x_i \to \eta_i$ $i=1,2,\ldots,m+n$ defines a homomorphism of G onto $\tilde{G}$. Consequently the nilpotency class of G cannot be less than m+n.

The mapping $\phi_1: x_i \to \eta_i$, $i=1,2,\ldots,m$ defines a homomorphism of M onto A. But $[\eta_1,\ldots,\eta_m]$ maps v_1 onto v_1+v_{m+1} and so A is of class at least m and consequently the class of M cannot be less than m.

Similarly the mapping $\phi_2 : x_i \to \eta_i$, $i=m+1,\ldots,m+n$ defines a homomorphism of N onto B. But $[\eta_{m+1},\ldots,\eta_{m+n}]$ maps v_{m+1} onto $v_{m+1} + v_{m+n+1}$ and so B is of class at least n. Consequently the class of N cannot be less than n.

Hence we have proved that the nilpotency classes of MN, M and N are precisely m+n, m and n respectively. This proves the theorem. □

ooOoo

CHAPTER 2

GENERALIZATION OF FITTING'S THEOREM FOR NILPOTENT GROUPS

Fitting's Theorem cannot be generalized by replacing $M \triangleleft G$ (or $N \triangleleft G$) by an arbitrary nilpotent subgroup M of G (or N of G). The symmetric group on three symbols shows this clearly since it can be generated by two cyclic subgroups, one of which is a normal subgroup.

In view of this example it seems natural to enquire if the conclusion of Fitting's Theorem remains true by replacing N and M normal subgroups of G by generalizations of normal subgroups. Thus we would like to consider replacing N and M normal by N and M subnormal or even serial. Robinson ([14]) proved that if M is subnormal in r steps in G and N normal in G then the conclusion of Fitting's Theorem still holds. An alternative proof of this result is given here.

Theorem 2.1

If $N \triangleleft G$, $M \triangleleft^r G$, $\gamma_{n+1}(N) = 1 = \gamma_{m+1}(M)$ then MN is nilpotent of class at most rn+m.

Proof:
The case r=1 is Fitting's Theorem and thus provides a basis for induction on r. Assume the result is true for all groups in which M is subnormal in fewer than r steps.

Since for any two subgroups H and K of a group G, $[H,K] \lhd \langle H,K\rangle$, we have that

$$[N,_r M] \lhd [N,_{r-1} M] \lhd \ldots \lhd [N,M] \lhd \langle N,M\rangle$$

and therefore

$$M = M[N,_r M] \lhd M[N,_{r-1} M] \lhd \ldots \lhd M[N,M] \lhd \langle N,M\rangle$$

Thus M is subnormal in at most r-1 steps in M[N,M], while $[N,M] \lhd M[N,M]$. But M and [N,M] are nilpotent of classes m and n at most and so by the induction hypothesis the product M[N,M] is nilpotent of class (r-1)n+m at most. N and M[N,M] are normal nilpotent subgroups of $\langle N,M\rangle$ and so by Fitting's Theorem their product MN is nilpotent of class (r-1)n+m+n=rn+m at most. □

Theorem 2.1 suggests that the least upper bound of the nilpotency class of G = MN with $N \lhd G$, $M \lhd^r G$ is an increasing function of r (as well as of n and m). Thus it appears unlikely that the condition $M \lhd\lhd G$ can be relaxed to $M {}^\infty\!\lhd G$. The next example shows that the condition $M \lhd\lhd G$ cannot be relaxed to $M {}^\infty\!\lhd G$.

Theorem 2.2

There exists a non-nilpotent group G with abelian subgroups H and K, $H \lhd G$, $K {}^\infty\!\lhd G$ and G = HK.

Proof:

Let H be the free abelian group on an infinite set of generators a_0, a_1, a_2, ...

The map b which maps

$$a_j \to a_j a_{j-1}, \quad a_o \to a_o \quad j=1,2,\ldots$$

can be extended to a homomorphism of H. b maps the generators onto a set of generators.

Let b^{-1} denote the inverse of b then

$$b^{-1} : a_j \to a_j \prod_{i=1}^{j} a_{j-i}^{(-1)^i}, \quad j \geq 1$$

$$a_o \to a_o.$$

Hence b defines an automorphism of H. Denote the subgroup of Aut(H) generated by b by K. Let G be the holomorph of H with respect to K and identify H and K with their images in G. Then G = HK and satisfies the relations

$$[a_i,a_j] = 1, \; [a_i,b] = a_{i-1}, \; [a_o,b] = 1$$

Since

$$K\langle a_o,a_1,\ldots,a_n\rangle \lhd K\langle a_o,a_1,\ldots, a_{n+1}\rangle,$$
$$K\infty \lhd G.$$

Thus G is a product of the normal abelian group H and the serial abelian subgroup K but is not nilpotent since $\gamma_n(G) = H$ for $n>1$. □

Robinson's result proved in Theorem 2.1 can be stated in a more general form, namely:

Thoerem 2.3

If P is a multiproperty of groups and is also inherited by subgroups then if $N \triangleleft G$, $M \triangleleft\triangleleft G$ and $N \in P$, $M \in P$ then $MN \in P$.

Proof:

Suppose M is subnormal in r steps in G. For r=1 the theorem is true since P is a multiproperty. Assume the result is true for all groups in which M is subnormal in fewer than r steps.

Since for any two subgroups H and K of a group G, $[H,K] \triangleleft \langle H,K\rangle$, we have that

$$[N,_rM] \triangleleft [N,_{r-1}M] \triangleleft \ldots \triangleleft [N,M] \triangleleft \langle N,M\rangle$$

and therefore

$$M = M[N,_rM] \triangleleft M[N,_{r-1}M] \triangleleft \ldots \triangleleft M[N,M] \triangleleft \langle N,M\rangle$$

Thus M is subnormal in at most r-1 steps in M[N,M], while $[N,M] \triangleleft M[N,M]$. But $M \in P$ and $[N,M] \in P$ and so by the induction hypothesis the product $M[N,M] \in P$.

M[N,M] and N are normal subgroups of $\langle M,N\rangle$. Hence $MN = M[N,M]N \in P$ since P is a multiproperty. □

The conclusion of Fitting's Theorem, however, does not hold if one insists that both N and M are subnormal of indices of subnormality greater than one.

D.S. Robinson ([14] section 5; page 155) defines C to be the class of all groups in which each pair of subnormal subgroups generates a subnormal subgroup. He then constructs an example of a group which is not in the class C.

Robinson attributes this kind of construction to P. Hall. This example is to be used to establish the following result.

Theorem 2.4

There exists a non-nilpotent group G with abelian subgroups P and Q such that $P \triangleleft^2 G$ and $Q \triangleleft^2 G$ and $G = \langle P,Q \rangle$.

Proof:

Let Z denote the set of all integers and let S be the set of all subsets X of Z such that there exists integers $\ell = \ell(X)$ and $L = L(X)$, $\ell \leqslant L$, with the property that X contains all integers $\leqslant \ell$ and no integer $> L$. Roughly speaking, X contains all large negative integers but no large positive integers.

Let A and B be two elementary abelian 2-groups with sets of basis elements respectively

$$(a_X)_{X \in S} \text{ and } (b_X)_{X \in S}.$$

For each $n \in Z$ two maps of $M = A \times B$, u_n and v_n, are defined by the rules

$$[A,u_n] = 1 = [B,v_n] \qquad (2.1)$$

$$[b_X,u_n] = a_{X+n} \text{ and } [a_X,v_n] = b_{X+n} \qquad (2.2)$$

for each $X \in S$. Our notation here is as follows:

If $n_1,n_2, \ldots, n_r$ are integers, (r being finite), and

$X \in S$, $a_{X+n_1+n_2+\ldots+n_r}$ is to mean a_Y where $Y = X \cup (n_1) \cup (n_2) \ldots \cup (n_r)$ if the n_i's are all different and none of them belong to X; otherwise $a_{X+n_1+n_2+\ldots+n_r} = 1$.

Similar remarks apply to $b_{X+n_1+n_2+\ldots+n_r}$. Also $[b_X, u_n]$ is used to denote $b_X^{-1} b_X^{u_n}$.

The maps u_n and v_n can be extended to homomorphisms of M and they map the generators on to a set of generators.

The inverses of u_n and v_n exist

and

$$b_X^{u_n^{-1}} = b_X a_{X+n}$$

$$a_X^{v_n^{-1}} = a_X b_{X+n}$$

Thus the mappings u_n and v_n are automorphisms of M.
Denote the subgroup of Aut(M) generated by the u_n, by H and the subgroup of Aut(M) generated by the v_n, by K.
Let G be the split extension of M by the group of automorphisms $J = \langle H, K \rangle$.
H centralises the factors of the series

$$I \triangleleft A \triangleleft M = A \times B$$

and so H is abelian.
K centralises the factors of the series

$$I \triangleleft B \triangleleft M = A \times B$$

and so K is abelian.

It is immediately clear that

$$u_n^2 = 1 = v_m^2.$$

Let $z_{mn} = [u_m, v_n]$. It will now be shown that

$$[z_{mn}, a_X] = a_{X+m+n} \text{ and } [z_{mn}, b_X] = b_{X+m+n} \qquad (2.3)$$

$$[z_{mn}, a_X] = [u_m^{-1} v_n^{-1} u_m v_n, a_X]$$

$$= [u_m^{-1}, a_X]^{v_n^{-1} u_m v_n} [v_n^{-1}, a_X]^{u_m v_n} [u_m, a_X]^{v_n} [v_n, a_X]$$

$$= [a_X, u_m]^{z_{mn}} [a_X, v_n]^{v_n^{-1} u_m v_n} [u_m, a_X]^{v_n} [v_n, a_X]$$

$$= 1 \; . \; b_{X+n}^{v_n^{-1} u_m v_n} \; . \; 1 \; . \; b_{X+n}$$

$$= (b_{X+n} \; a_{X+m+n})^{v_n} \; . \; b_{X+n}$$

$$= b_{X+n}^2 \; a_{X+m+n}$$

$$= a_{X+m+n}.$$

Similarly $[z_{mn}, b_X] = b_{X+m+n}$.

Furthermore $z_{mn}^2 = 1$ since:

$$a_X^{z_{mn}} = a_X a_{X+m+n}$$

$$a_X^{z_{mn}^2} = (a_X^{z_{mn}})^{z_{mn}}$$

$$= (a_X a_{X+m+n})^{z_{mn}}$$

$$= a_X a_{X+m+n}^2$$

$$= a_X.$$

and

$$b_X^{z_{mn}^2} = (b_X b_{X+m+n})^{z_{mn}}$$

$$= b_X b_{X+m+n}^2$$

$$= b_X .$$

Therefore $z_{mn}^2 = 1$.

The next step is to show that

$$[z_{mn}, u_\ell] = 1 = [z_{mn}, v_\ell].$$

It is immediately clear that since z_{mn} maps $A \to A$ and u_ℓ acts as an identity on A, $[z_{mn}, u_\ell]$ acts like an identity on A.

So we need only consider $b_X^{[z_{mn}, u_\ell]}$.

Now

$$b_X^{z_{mn}^{-1} u_\ell^{-1} z_{mn} u_\ell}$$

$$= (b_X b_{X+m+n})^{u_\ell^{-1} z_{mn} u_\ell}$$

$$= (b_X a_{X+\ell} b_{X+m+n}\, a_{X+m+n+\ell})^{z_{mn} u_\ell}$$

$$= (b_X b_{X+m+n}\, a_{X+\ell}\, a_{X+m+n+\ell}\, b_{X+m+n}\, a_{X+m+n+\ell})^{u_\ell}$$

$$= (b_X\, a_{X+\ell})^{u_\ell}$$

$$= b_X\, a_{X+\ell}^2$$

$$= b_X .$$

Thus $[z_{mn}, u_\ell] = 1$.

Similarly for $[z_{mn}, v_\ell]$.

Let $P = \langle a_X, u_n : X \in S, n \in Z \rangle$

and

$$Q = \langle b_X, v_m : X \in S,\ m \in Z \rangle.$$

By the rules (2.1) and (2.2) P and Q are abelian.

It will be shown that $P \triangleleft^2 G$ and $Q \triangleleft^2 G$.

The normal closure of P in G is $P_1 = P[P,G]$.

$[P,G]$ is generated by $[a_X, v_n]$, $[b_X, u_n]$, $[u_m, v_n]$ and all their conjugates in G.

So P_1 is generated by a_X, u_n, $[a_X, v_n]^g$, $[b_X, u_n]^g$, z^g_{mn} where $g \in G$.

Thus P_1 is generated by a_X, u_n, z^g_{mn}, b^g_{X+n}, a^g_{X+n}

Define $P_2 = P^{P_1} = P[P, P_1]$.

Since $M \triangleleft G$ it follows that b^g_{X+n}, $a^g_{X+n} \in M$ and hence $[P, P_1]$ is generated by

$$[a_X, z^g_{mn}] \ , \ [u_n, z^g_{mn}] \ , \ [u_n, b^g_{X+m}] \ , \ [u_n, a^g_{X+m}]$$

and all their conjugates in P_1.

So P_2 is generated by

$$a_X,\ u_n,\ [a_X,\ z^g_{mn}]^{g_1} \ , \ [u_n,\ z^g_{mn}]^{g_1} \ , \ [u_n,\ b^g_{X+m}]^{g_1} \ , \ [u_n, a^g_{X+m}]^{g_1}$$

$\forall\ g \in G$, $\forall\ g_1 \in P_1$.

Now let $g \in G$ then $g = xy$ where $x \in M$ and $y \in J$.

x is a word in the $(a_X)_{X \in S}$ and $(b_Y)_{Y \in S}$

and

$$y = u_{q_1}^{\sigma_1} v_{\omega_1}^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots u_{q_r}^{\sigma_r} v_{\omega_r}^{\varepsilon_r}$$

where $\sigma_i = 0$ or 1, $\varepsilon_i = 0$ or 1.

Also
$$z_{mn}^{g} = z_{mn}\,[z_{mn},g]$$
$$= z_{mn}\,[z_{mn}.xy]$$
$$= z_{mn}\,[z_{mn},y]\,[z_{mn},x]^{y}$$

It was proved that z_{mn} commutes with all u_ℓ and v_ℓ and since y is a word in u_ℓ and v_ℓ, $[z_{mn},y] = 1$.
Also by (2.3), and since x is a word in $(a_X)_{X\in S}$ and $(b_Y)_{Y\in S}$, $[z_{mn},x]\in M$ and since $M \triangleleft G$, $[z_{mn},x]^y \in M$.

From what has just been proved it follows that $[a_X, z_{mn}^g]$, $[u_n, z_{mn}^g]$, $[u_n, b_{X+m}^g]$, $[u_n, a_{X+n}^g]$ all lie in $A \leqslant P$.

It is thus sufficient to show that
$$x_1^{g_1} \in P \quad \forall \quad x_1 \in A$$
where x_1 is a word in the a_X $(X\in S)$, $\forall$ $g_1 \in P_1$.

Let $g_1 = x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \ldots x_{i_s}$ where x_{i_j}, $j=1,2,\ldots,s$ is any one of the above generators of P_1 and these x_{i_r} are their own inverses.

Now
$$a_X^{x_{i_r}} = a_X \in A \quad \text{if} \quad x_{i_r} = a_Y \ (Y\in S)$$
$$= a_X \in A \quad \text{if} \quad x_{i_r} = u_m$$
$$= a_X \quad \text{if} \quad x_{i_r} = b_{X+m}^g \text{ or } a_{X+m}^g$$

$$= a_X a_{X+m+n} \quad \text{if} \quad x_{i_r} = z_{mn}[z_{mn}, g]$$

since $[z_{mn}, g] \in M$ and M is abelian.

So one can conclude that $P_2 \leq P$ and thus $P \triangleleft^2 G$.

By applying the same argument as above to Q, it can be shown that $Q \triangleleft^2 G$.

To see that G is not nilpotent one need only note that for any integer $n>0$

$$1 \neq [a_X, x_{s_2}, x_{s_3}, \ldots, x_{s_{n+1}}] \in \gamma_n(G)$$

where $s_i \in Z$, $i=2,3, \ldots ,n+1$ are all different and none of them belong to the set X and furthermore

$$x_{s_i} = v_{s_i} \quad \text{if } i \text{ is even}$$

and

$$x_{s_i} = u_{s_i} \quad \text{if } i \text{ is odd.} \square$$

Let G be a group generated by subnormal subgroups H and K. If a and b are non-negative integers then Roseblade ([15]) proved that there is an integer c such that

$$G^{(c)} \leq H^{(a)} K^{(b)}$$

where $G^{(c)}$ is the c-th term of the derived series of G.

No such relation exists between the terms of the lower central series of G, H and K. This is shown by theorem 2.4, since $Q \triangleleft^2 G$, $P \triangleleft^2 G$,

$$\gamma_2(Q) = 1 = \gamma_2(P) \text{ but } \gamma_3(G) = \gamma_\omega(G) = M \neq 1$$

and $G = \langle P,Q \rangle$.

However, there are circumstances under which such a relation exists. This is shown by the next theorem which is due to S.E. Stonehewer.

Theorem 2.5 (S.E. Stonehewer [16])

Suppose that the subgroups H, K are subnormal in their join G and that G = HK. Then given any positive integers c_1, c_2, there exists an integer d such that

$$\gamma_d(G) \leq \gamma_{c_1}(H)\,\gamma_{c_2}(K)$$

Proof:

Let $H \triangleleft^m G$ and proceed by induction on m. Thus suppose m=1, so that $H \triangleleft G$. Then $\gamma_{c_1}(H) \triangleleft G$ and hence without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gamma_{c_1}(H) = 1$.

Let

$$G = K_o \geq K_1 \geq \ldots \geq K_n = K$$

be the normal closure series of K in G that is, $K_{i+1} = K^{K_i}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$.

Suppose that for some i, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ there is an integer d_{i+1} such that

$$\gamma_{d_{i+1}}(K_{i+1}) \leq \gamma_{c_2}(K).$$

For example this is the case if i=n-1.

Let $Y = \gamma_{d_{i+1}}(K_{i+1})$. Then $Y \triangleleft K_i$.

Also since $G = HK_{i+1}$, we have

$$K_i = (H \cap K_i)\ K_{i+1}$$

with both factors normal in K_i. Moreover $H \cap K_i$, as a subgroup of H, is nilpotent; and $\frac{K_{i+1}}{Y}$ is nilpotent. Thus by Fitting's Theorem $\frac{K_i}{Y}$ is nilpotent. Therefore there is an integer d_i such that

$$\gamma_{d_i}(K_i) \leq Y \leq \gamma_{c_2}(K).$$

It follows, by induction on i decreasing, that there is an integer $d(=d_0)$ such that

$$\gamma_d(G) \leq \gamma_{c_2}(K) \quad \text{as required.}$$

Now suppose that $m \geq 2$ and that the theorem is true for smaller values of m.

Let $H_1 = H^G$ so that $H \triangleleft^{m-1} H_1$ and $H_1 = H(H_1 \cap K)$.

Then by induction on m, there is an integer c_3 such that

$$\gamma_{c_3}(H_1) \leq \gamma_{c_1}(H)\ \gamma_{c_2}(H_1 \cap K).$$

But $G = H_1K$ and hence by the case m=1, with H_1 replacing H, there is an integer d such that

$$\gamma_d(G) \leq \gamma_{c_3}(H_1)\ \gamma_{c_2}(K) \leq \gamma_{c_1}(H)\ \gamma_{c_2}(K). \quad \square$$

In conclusion it can be mentioned that D.S. Robinson ([14]) proved that if H and K are two subnormal subgroups of a group G and if J = <H,K> can be finitely generated then J is nilpotent. This result has also been proved by P. Hall ([5]).

It shall be shown in chapter 3 that this result is in fact an easy consequence of the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem.

ooOoo

CHAPTER 3

FITTING'S THEOREM FOR LOCALLY-NILPOTENT SUBGROUPS AND ZA-SUBGROUPS

§3.1 THE HIRSCH-PLOTKIN THEOREM

The Hirsch-Plotkin theorem states that the product MN of normal locally-nilpotent subgroups M and N of a group G is itself locally-nilpotent. The theorem was proved independently by K.A. Hirsch ([10]) and B. Plotkin ([13]) and is well-known. In this section the proof of K.A. Hirsch will be given. It is then shown that the theorem can be generalized by replacing normal by sub-normal and even serial.

Theorem 3.1 (K.A. Hirsch [10]).

> The group generated by two locally-nilpotent normal subgroups A and B of an arbitrary group G, is itself locally-nilpotent.

Proof:

Let

$$a_1 b^{(1)},\ a_2 b^{(2)},\ \ldots,\ a_n b^{(n)}$$

be any arbitrary finite system of elements in $\langle A,B\rangle$.

The group

$$\bar{G} = \langle a_1 b^{(1)},\ a_2 b^{(2)},\ \ldots,\ a_n b^{(n)}\rangle$$

will be nilpotent if one can embed it in a nilpotent subgroup of $\langle A,B\rangle$.

Let

$$A_o = \langle a_1, \dots a_n\rangle$$

and

$$B^* = \langle b^{(1)}, \dots, b^{(n)}\rangle.$$

Since B^* is a finitely generated subgroup of B, it is nilpotent and therefore satisfies the maximal condition for subgroups.

Therefore B^* has a principal series

$$1 = B_o < B_1 < B_2 < \dots < B_k = B^* \qquad (3.1)$$

where the groups B_i $(i = 1,2,\dots k)$ are all normal subgroups of B^* and the factor groups $\frac{B_{i+1}}{B_i}$ are cyclic (of finite or infinite order).

Let b_j be a generating element of $\frac{B_j}{B_{j-1}}$, $j=1,2,\dots,k$, so that in particular

$$B_j = \langle b_1, b_2, \dots, b_j\rangle.$$

For each j $(j=1,2\dots,k)$ construct a group A_j which satisfies the following conditions:

(1) A_j is a finitely-generated subgroup of A which contains A_o

(2) In the ascending chain

$$A_j \triangleleft \langle A_j, B_1\rangle \triangleleft \langle A_j, B_2\rangle \triangleleft \dots \triangleleft \langle A_j, B_j\rangle \qquad (3.2)$$

all members are nilpotent.

Begin by putting j=1.

Form repeated commutators of b_1 with all the generating elements of A_o.

We get

$$a_1,\ a_1^{(1)},\ a_1^{(2)},\ \ldots;$$
$$a_2,\ a_2^{(1)},\ a_2^{(2)},\ \ldots;$$
$$\vdots$$
$$a_n,\ a_n^{(1)},\ a_n^{(2)},\ \ldots,$$

where

$$a_j^{(i)} = [a_j^{(i-1)}, b_1] \quad j=1,2,\ldots,n$$
$$a_j^{o} = a_j \qquad (3.3)$$

There are only finitely many elements

$$a_i,\ a_i^{(1)},\ a_i^{(2)},\ \ldots,\ a_i^{(k)},\ i=1,2,\ldots,n$$

since $a_i^{(N)} = 1$ for some $N = N(i)$.

This is so since $B \triangleleft G$ and B is locally-nilpotent.

Let A_1 be the group generated by

$$a_i,\ a_i^{(1)},\ a_i^{(2)},\ \ldots,\ a_i^{(k)},\ \ldots \quad i=1,2,\ldots,n$$

Furthermore $A_1 \triangleleft \langle A_1,B_1\rangle$ since for each element a_m, m=1,2,...,n we have

$$b_1^{-1}\ a_m^{(j)}\ b_1 = a_m^{(j)}\ a_m^{(j+1)} \in A_1 \qquad (3.4)$$

One now has to show that $\langle A_1, B_1 \rangle$ is nilpotent. Since A_1 is nilpotent, it has a non-trivial centre, $Z(A_1)$. If $1 \neq z \in Z(A_1)$ then as above, form repeated commutators of b_1 with z, giving z, $z^{(1)}$, $z^{(2)}$, ... and after a finite number of steps one obtains

$$z^{(n)} = [z^{(n-1)}, b_1] = 1$$

Thus $z^{(n-1)} \in Z(\langle A_1, B_1 \rangle)$

Assume that

$$z^{(n-i-1)} \in Z_{i+1} (\langle A_1, B_1 \rangle)$$

then

$$[z^{(n-i-1)}, b_1] = z^{(n-i)} \in Z_i (\langle A_1, B_1 \rangle)$$

$$z^{(o)} = z.$$

Therefore

$$z \in Z_n (\langle A_1, B_1 \rangle)$$

and hence

$$Z(A_1) \leq Z_n(\langle A_1, B_1 \rangle),$$ since $Z(A_1)$ is finitely generated.

Let $$Q = \langle A_1, B_1 \rangle = A_1 B_1$$

and assume that

$$Z_i (A_1) \leq Z_{m_1} (Q).$$

Letting bars denote cosets modulo $Z_i(A_1)$ (which is normal in Q), we have by the argument above that $Z(\bar{A}_1) \leqslant Z_{n_2}(\bar{Q})$ for some integer n_2. Then by the induction hypothesis

$$Z_{n_2}(\bar{Q}) \subseteq Z_{n_2}\left(\frac{Q}{Z_{m_1}(Q)}\right)$$

so $Z_{i+1}(A_1) \subseteq Z_{n_2+m_1}(Q) = Z_{m_2}(Q)$ say.

Since A_1 is nilpotent, it follows by induction that

$$A_1 \leqslant Z_{m_r}(Q).$$

Therefore

$$\frac{Z_{m_r+1}(Q)}{A_1} = Z\left(\frac{Q}{A_1}\right).$$

But $\frac{Q}{A_1}$ is cyclic and so $Z\left(\frac{Q}{A_1}\right) = \frac{Q}{A_1}$ and $A_1 \leqslant Z_{m_r}(Q)$.

It follows that

$$Z_{m_r+1}(Q) = Q.$$

Hence Q is nilpotent.

In the general case A_i is taken to be the group generated by the a_m $(m = 1,2,\ldots,n)$ and all commutators of the form

$$a = [a_m, b_{\alpha_1}, b_{\alpha_2}, \ldots, b_{\alpha_s}] \qquad (3.5)$$

where $i \geqslant \alpha_1 \geqslant \alpha_2 \geqslant \ldots \geqslant \alpha_s \geqslant 1$.

There are in fact finitely many different commutators of this type so that condition (1) is satisfied for A_i.

In exactly the same way as above it can be shown that A_i is normal in $<A_i, B_1>$ and that $<A_i, B_1>$ is nilpotent. Assume that condition (2) in the chain (3.2) is satisfied up to $<A_i, B_{j-1}>$. One has to prove that

$$<A_i, B_{j-1}> \triangleleft <A_i, B_j> = <A_i, B_{j-1}, b_j>.$$

Since $B_{j-1} \triangleleft B_j$, it will be sufficient to prove that for each commutator (3.5)

$$b_j^{-1} a b_j \in <A_i, B_{j-1}>. \qquad (3.6)$$

Choose r such that $\alpha_r \geq j > \alpha_{r+1}$.

Put

$$[a_m, b_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, b_{\alpha_r}] = \bar{a}$$

where $\bar{a}$ is a generating element of A_i.

Thus

$$b_j^{-1} a b_j = b_j^{-1} [\bar{a}, b_{\alpha_{r+1}}, \ldots, b_{\alpha_s}] \; b_j$$

$$= [b_j^{-1} \bar{a} b_j, \; b_j^{-1} \; b_{\alpha_{r+1}} \; b_j, \ldots, b_j^{-1} b_{\alpha_s} \; b_j]$$

Here $b_j^{-1} \; \bar{a} b_j = \bar{a} \; [\bar{a}, b_j]$ is a product of two generators of A_i and all other elements, that is, $b_j^{-1} \; b_{\alpha_i} \; b_j$ $(i=r+1,\ldots,s)$ are in B_{j-1} since $\alpha_{r+1} \leq j-1$ and $B_{j-1} \triangleleft B_j$ and this proves (3.6).

In a similar way it follows that $<A_i, B_j>$ is nilpotent.

Thus a nilpotent group $\langle A_k, B_k\rangle = \langle A_k, B^*\rangle$ has been found which contains the subgroup $\langle A_o, B^*\rangle$ and hence $\langle a_1b^{(1)}, a_2b^{(2)}, \ldots, a_nb^{(n)}\rangle$. This proves the theorem. □

Corollary 3.2

In any group G, the join of all normal locally-nilpotent subgroups of G is itself locally-nilpotent. □

The question arises whether the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem remains true by replacing M and N normal subgroups of G by generalizations of normal subgroups. One way would be to consider replacing M and N normal by M and N subnormal or even serial. The conclusion of the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem remains true if one replaces $M \triangleleft G$ by $M \triangleleft\triangleleft G$. This is what the next theorem states:

Theorem 3.3

If M and N are locally-nilpotent subgroups of a group G and if $N \triangleleft G$, $M \triangleleft\triangleleft G$, then MN is locally-nilpotent.

Proof:

The theorem follows from the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem and Theorem 2.3. □

P. Hall ([5]) proved that the conclusion of the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem holds if one insists that both M and N are subnormal of indices of subnormality greater than one. The condition $M \lhd\lhd G$ and $N \lhd\lhd G$ can be relaxed even further to $M \infty\lhd G$ and $N \infty\lhd G$. The proof of this result will be a consequence of Lemma 3.5 which is due to K.W. Gruenberg ([2]). Before proceding with the proof of Lemma 3.5 the definition of a σ-local property is needed.

Definition 3.4

If P is a given group property and G has a local system all of whose members have property P, then G iscalled locally P. If it should happen that all the subgroups of the local system are also serial in G, then G is said to be σ-locally P. The property P is called σ-local if σ-locally P is the same as P.

Lemma 3.5 (K.W. Gruenberg [2]).

If P is a multi - and a σ-local property and K is a serial subgroup of G possessing P, then $\bar{K}$, the normal closure of K in G, also possesses P.

Proof:

Let

$$K = K_0 \lhd K_1 \lhd \ldots \lhd K_\alpha = G$$

be a series from K to G and for each λ define H_λ to be the normal closure of K in K_λ, that is, $H_\lambda = K^{K_\lambda} = K[K,K_\lambda]$.

Thus

$$H_o = K^{K_o} = K^K = K$$

$$H_1 = K^{K_1} = K[K,K_1] = K$$

$$H_\alpha = K^{K_\alpha} = K[K,G] = K^G = \bar{K}.$$

We show that $H_\lambda \triangleleft H_{\lambda+1}$:

Let

$$k_1^{k_{\lambda+1}} \in H_{\lambda+1}$$

and

$$k_2^{k_\lambda} \in H_\lambda .$$

Then

$$(k_{\lambda+1}^{-1}\ k_1\ k_{\lambda+1})^{-1}\ (k_\lambda^{-1}\ k_2\ k_\lambda)\ (k_{\lambda+1}^{-1}\ k_1 k_{\lambda+1})$$

$$= (k_\lambda')^{-1} (k_\lambda^{-1}\ k_2\ k_\lambda)\ (k_\lambda')$$

$$= (k_\lambda k_\lambda')^{-1}\ k_2\ (k_\lambda\ k_\lambda')$$

$$= k_2^{k_\lambda k_\lambda'} \in K^{K_\lambda} = H_\lambda .$$

Hence it follows that $H_\lambda \triangleleft H_{\lambda+1}$. For each limit ordinal λ, $H_\lambda = \bigcup_{\mu<\lambda} H\mu$.

Hence

$$K = H_1 \leq H_2 \leq \ldots \leq H_\alpha = \bar{K} \triangleleft G$$

is a series, and so H_λ is serial in G. The lemma is proved by induction on λ. Suppose that H_μ has property P for all $\mu<\lambda$.

If λ is a limit ordinal then the set of all H_μ with $\mu<\lambda$ provides a σ-local system of H_λ all of whose members have P. Thus H_λ is σ-locally P and hence is P. If however, λ is not a limit ordinal then it is clear that

$$x^{-1} H_{\lambda-1} x \lhd K_{\lambda-1} \quad \forall \quad x \in K_\lambda .$$

Since

$$K \leqslant H_{\lambda-1}$$

and

$$K^x \leqslant H^x_{\lambda-1}$$

it follows that

$$H_\lambda = \langle K^x : \forall \; x \in K_\lambda \rangle \leqslant \langle H^x_{\lambda-1} : \forall \; x \in K_\lambda \rangle .$$

Conversely

$$H_{\lambda-1} \leqslant H_\lambda$$

and so

$$(K^{K_{\lambda-1}})^x \leqslant (K^{K_\lambda})^x = K^{K_\lambda}$$

Therefore

$$H_\lambda = \langle H^x_{\lambda-1} : \forall \; x \in K_\lambda \rangle = \prod_{x \in K_\lambda} H^x_{\lambda-1}$$

The product of any finite number of conjugates of $H_{\lambda-1}$ by elements in K_λ again has P since P is a multi-property

and also of course, is a normal subgroup of H_λ.
Thus the set of all such products is a σ-local system of H_λ whose elements all have P, and so H_λ is σ-locally P. Thus, whatever the nature of λ, H_λ is P, and the induction is complete. □

The following corollaries are consequences of Lemma 3.5 and the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem.

Corollary 3.6

If $M \infty\triangleleft G$, $N \infty\triangleleft G$, M and N are both locally-nilpotent subgroups of G, then $\langle M,N \rangle$ is also locally-nilpotent.

Proof:

The corollary is an immediate consequence of Lemma 3.5 and the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem since $\langle M,N \rangle \leq \bar{M}\bar{N}$ and the normal closures $\bar{M}$ and $\bar{N}$ of M and N respectively are locally-nilpotent. □

Corollary 3.7

Let H and K be two subnormal nilpotent subgroups of a group G and suppose $J = \langle H,K \rangle$ can be finitely generated. Then J is nilpotent.

Proof:

Since J is finitely generated, it can be generated by two finitely generated subgroups, one contained in H and

the other in K. Now any subgroup of H or K is subnormal in G and nilpotent, so one may assume that H and K are finitely generated. By Lemma 3.5 the normal closure of K in G is locally-nilpotent. Similarly the normal closure of H in G is locally nilpotent. Hence $\bar{H}\bar{K} \geq \langle H,K \rangle$ is locally nilpotent by the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem, where $\bar{H}$ is the normal closure of H in G and $\bar{K}$ is the normal closure of K in G.
But $J = \langle H,K \rangle$ is finitely generated. Hence J is nilpotent and this completes the proof. □

§3.2 FITTING'S THEOREM FOR ZA-SUBGROUPS

The question arises if Fitting's Theorem could be generalized to other group theoretical properties. P. Hall ([6]) proved that hypercentrality is a property E which satisfies (1.1). The proof of his result is given here.

Theorem 3.8 (P. Hall [6])

If $H \triangleleft G$, $K \triangleleft G$ and H and K are both ZA-groups, then HK is a ZA-group.

Proof:
We may suppose $H \neq 1$, then $Z(H) \neq 1$ where Z(H) denotes the centre of H and $Z(H) \triangleleft G$.

If

$$Z(H) \cap K = 1$$

then

$$[Z(H),K] \leq Z(H) \cap K = 1.$$

Therefore

$$Z(H) \leq Z(HK).$$

However if

$$Z(H) \cap K \neq 1$$

then there exists a first term Y_μ such that $Z(H) \cap Y_\mu \neq 1$. Then μ is not a limit ordinal number, say $\mu = \lambda+1$, and

$$\begin{aligned}[Z(H) \cap Y_\mu, K] &\leq Z(H) \cap [Y_\mu, K] \\ &\leq Z(H) \cap Y_\lambda = 1\end{aligned}$$

since $\lambda<\mu$ and hence the centre of HK contains $Z(H) \cap Y_\mu$ and is therefore non-trivial.

Let

$$1 \leq Z_1 \leq \ldots \leq Z_\alpha \leq \ldots \leq L$$

be the upper central chain of HK.

Then

$$L = \bigcup_{\alpha \geq 1} Z_\alpha .$$

As a homomorphic image of HK, the group

$$\frac{HK}{L} = \frac{LH}{L} \cdot \frac{LK}{L} ,$$

which is a product of two normal ZA-groups, the images of H and K.

By the above $\frac{HK}{L}$ has a non-trivial centre, but $\frac{L}{L}$, the centre of $\frac{HK}{L}$, by definition, is trivial. This is a contradiction and it follows that HK = L. Thus HK is a ZA-group. □

The symmetric group on three symbols shows that the above theorem cannot be generalized by replacing $H \lhd G$ ($K \lhd G$) by an arbitrary ZA-subgroup H of G (or K of G) since it can be generated by two cyclic subgroups one of which is a normal subgroup.

The question then arises whether the conclusion of P. Hall's Theorem remains true if we replace K normal in G by K subnormal in G. The next theorem shows that this is indeed the case.

Theorem 3.9

If H and K are ZA-subgroups of a group G and if $H \lhd G$, $K \lhd\lhd G$, then HK is a ZA-group.

Proof:

The theorem follows from P. Hall's Theorem and Theorem 2.3. □

The conclusion of Theorem 3.8 does not hold if one insists that both H and K are subnormal of indices of subnormality greater than one. The next theorem shows this.

Theorem 3.10

There exists a group G which is not hypercentral with hypercentral subgroups P and Q and $P \triangleleft^2 G$, $Q \triangleleft^2 G$ and $G = \langle P,Q \rangle$.

Proof:

The example used in Theorem 2.4 is also used to prove Theorem 3.10. It should only be noted that $Z(G) = 1$. □

ooOoo

CHAPTER 4

FITTING'S THEOREM FOR FC-NILPOTENT AND FC-HYPERCENTRAL GROUPS.

§4.1 THE PRODUCT OF TWO NORMAL FC-NILPOTENT SUBGROUPS OF A GROUP.

Fitting's Theorem can be generalized to FC-nilpotence. In a paper by K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel ([9]) the authors prove that the product of two normal FC-nilpotent subgroups of a group, is itself FC-nilpotent. It should be observed that for finite groups FC-nilpotence and nilpotence means the same thing. To establish the above mentioned result due to K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel, some preliminary results are stated as lemmas. The proof of Lemma 4.1, which is due to F. Haimo ([3]), will not be given here.

Lemma 4.1 (F. Haimo [3]).

Let N be a normal subgroup of a group G such that

(a) $N \subset F_m(G)$ and

(b) there exists a positive integer k for which $\frac{G}{N}$ is FC-nilpotent of FC-class k.

Then G is FC-nilpotent of FC-class $\leq$ m+k. □

Lemma 4.2 (K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel [9]).

Let $L \lhd G$, $M \lhd G$. Suppose $L \subseteq M$ and $L \subseteq F_\gamma(G)$, some ordinal γ. Then $M \subseteq F_{\gamma+1}(G)$ if $\frac{M}{L} \subseteq F_1\left(\frac{G}{L}\right)$.

Proof:

If $\frac{M}{L} \subseteq F_1\left(\frac{G}{L}\right)$, then for $m \in M$ the index of the centralizer of mL in $\frac{G}{L}$ is finite.

Now since $\frac{F_\gamma(G)}{L} \lhd \frac{G}{L}$ there exists a homomorphism τ such that

$$\tau : \frac{G}{L} \to \frac{\frac{G}{L}}{\frac{F_\gamma(G)}{L}} \simeq \frac{G}{F_\gamma(G)}$$

So the centralizer of $mF_\gamma(G)$ has finite index in $\frac{G}{F_\gamma(G)}$.

So $mF_\gamma(G) \in F_1\left(\frac{G}{F_\gamma(G)}\right) = \frac{F_{\gamma+1}(G)}{F_\gamma(G)}$.

Therefore $M \subseteq F_{\gamma+1}(G)$. □

Lemma 4.3 (K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel [9]).

Let H and K be normal subgroups of a group G. For any pair of non-negative integers (i,j) define a subgroup by

$$G(i,j) = F_i(H) \cap F_j(K).$$

Then

$$G(i,j) \subseteq F_{i+j-1}(HK).$$

Proof:

Let F(k) denote $F_k(HK)$. Since $F_i(H)$ is a characteristic subgroup H and $H \lhd G$, $F_i(H) \lhd G$.

Similarly $F_j(K) \triangleleft G$ so $G(i,j) \triangleleft G$. Put $s = i+j$. The result is proved by induction on s. If $s = 1$, the result is clear. Assume the statement is true for all $s \leq t$.

If $i = 0$, then $G(0,j) = 1$.

If $j = 0$, then $G(i,0) = 1$.

Thus it is assumed that $i \neq 0 \neq j$.

$$G(i-1,j) \subseteq F_{i+j-2}(HK)$$

and

$$G(i,j-1) \subseteq F_{i+j-2}(HK)$$

by the induction hypothesis.

Let

$$L = G(i-1,j)\ G(i,j-1) \subseteq F_{i+j-2}(HK)$$

and let

$$x \in G(i,j).$$

The number of conjugates $\left(xF_{i-1}(H)\right)^h$, $h \in H$, is finite. Thus x has a finite number of conjugates mod $F_{i-1}(H)$.

Hence x has a finite number of conjugates mod $F_{i-1}(H) \cap F_j(K)$ and so x has a finite number of conjugates mod L.

Let

$$\mathrm{Con}(x,H) = \{x^h : h \in H\},$$

then Con(x,H) has a finite number of members mod L. Similarly, the number of conjugates $\left(x\,F_{j-1}(K)\right)^k$, $k \in K$, is finite.

Thus x has a finite number of conjugates mod $F_{j-1}(K)$. Hence x has a finite number of conjugates mod $F_i(H) \cap F_{j-1}(K)$ and so x has a finite number of conjugates mod L.

Let

$$\mathrm{Con}(x,K) = \{x^k : k \in K\},$$

then Con(x,K) has a finite number of members mod L. Therefore $\mathrm{Con}\left(\mathrm{Con}(x,H),K\right)$ has a finite number of members mod L and so

$$xL \in F_1\left(\frac{HK}{L}\right).$$

Hence

$$\frac{G(i,j)}{L} \subseteq F_1\left(\frac{HK}{L}\right)$$

By Lemma 4.2

$$G(i,j) \subseteq F_{i+j-1}(HK)$$

and this completes the induction. □

Theorem 4.4 (K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel [9]).

If H and K are normal subgroups of G and if H and K are FC-nilpotent of FC-class n and m respectively, with $n \geq m$, then HK is FC-nilpotent of FC-class at most $2n+m-1$.

Proof:

Lemma 4.3 shows that

$$H \cap K = G(n,m) \subseteq F_{n+m-1}(HK).$$

As the FC-class of $\frac{HK}{H \cap K} \leq n$, the FC-class of HK is $\leq n+(n+m-1) = 2n+m-1$ by Lemma 4.1. □

The next theorem proves that this last result still holds if K normal in G is replaced by K subnormal in G.

Theorem 4.5

If $H \triangleleft G$, $K \triangleleft\triangleleft G$ and if H and K are both FC-nilpotent then HK is FC-nilpotent.

Proof:

The theorem follows from Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 2.3. □

The question arises whether the conclusion of Theorem 4.4 remains true if it required that $K \infty\triangleleft G$. This means that one would like to know whether the condition $K \triangleleft\triangleleft G$ can be relaxed to $K \infty\triangleleft G$. The next theorem shows that this cannot be done.

Theorem 4.6

There exists a non-FC-nilpotent group G with FC-nilpotent subgroups H and K, $H \triangleleft G$, $K \infty\triangleleft G$ such that $G = HK$.

Proof:

Let G be the group defined in Theorem 2.2.
Thus G is a product of the normal FC-nilpotent subgroup H and the serial FC-nilpotent subgroup K. It only remains to show that G is non-FC-nilpotent.

It is clear that $a_o \in F_1(G)$. We want to show that $F_1(G) = \langle a_o \rangle$.

Let

$$1 \neq x \in G,$$

then

$$x = a_{r_1}^{n_1} a_{r_2}^{n_2} \ldots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^k$$

and it is assumed that none of the $a_{r_i} = a_o$ and $k \neq 0$.
We show that the element x does not have a finite number of conjugates.

Now

$$a_\ell^{-1}(a_{r_1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^k)a_\ell$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} a_\ell^{-1} b^k a_\ell$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (a_\ell^{-1} b a_\ell)^k$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (ba_{\ell-1}^{-1})^k.$$

We show by induction on k that

$$a_{r_1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (ba_{\ell-1}^{-1})^k$$

$$= b^k \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{\binom{k}{1}n_i} \dots a_{r_i-k}^{\binom{k}{k}n_i} a_{\ell-1}^{-\binom{k}{1}} \dots a_{\ell-k}^{-\binom{k}{k}}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\binom{k}{r} = \frac{k!}{r!\,(k-r)!}$.

This statement is true for k = 1 since

$$a_{r_1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} ba_{\ell-1}^{-1}$$

$$= bb^{-1}a_{r_1}^{n_1}b \dots bb^{-1}a_{r_m}^{n_m} ba_{\ell-1}^{-1} \tag{4.2}$$

$$= ba_{r_1}^{n_1} a_{r_1-1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} a_{r_m-1}^{n_m} a_{\ell-1}^{-1}$$

$$= b \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{n_i} a_{\ell-1}^{-1}.$$

Now

$$a_{r_1}^{n_1} \dots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (ba_{\ell-1}^{-1})^{k+1}$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (ba_{\ell-1}^{-1})^k \, ba_{\ell-1}^{-1}$$

$$= b^k \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{\binom{k}{1}n_i} \cdots a_{r_i-k}^{\binom{k}{k}n_i} a_{\ell-1}^{-\binom{k}{1}} \cdots a_{\ell-k}^{-\binom{k}{k}} ba_{\ell-1}^{-1}.$$

As in (4.2) and by applying the identity

$$\binom{k}{r-1} + \binom{k}{r} = \binom{k+1}{r}$$

we get

$$a_\ell^{-1}(a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^{k+1})a_\ell$$

$$= b^{k+1} \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{\binom{k+1}{1}n_i} \cdots a_{r_i-k-1}^{\binom{k+1}{k+1}n_i} a_{\ell-1}^{-\binom{k+1}{1}} \cdots a_{\ell-k-1}^{-\binom{k+1}{k+1}}$$

and our assertion is proved by induction.

Also

$$a_\ell a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^k a_\ell^{-1}$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} a_\ell \, b^k a_\ell^{-1}$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (a_\ell \, ba_\ell^{-1})^k$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (ba_{\ell-1})^k$$

and by repeating the above argument we arrive at

$$a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} (ba_{\ell-1})^k$$

$$= b^{k} \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{\binom{k}{1}n_i} \cdots a_{r_i-k}^{\binom{k}{k}n_i} a_{\ell-1}^{\binom{k}{1}} \cdots a_{\ell-k}^{\binom{k}{k}}. \tag{4.3}$$

Next we consider the case where $k = 0$. We show by induction on t that

$$b^{-t} a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^{t}$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{\binom{t}{1}n_i} \cdots a_{r_i-t}^{\binom{t}{t}n_i} . \tag{4.4}$$

This is true for $t = 1$ since

$$b^{-1} a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b$$

$$= b^{-1} a_{r_1}^{n_1} b b^{-1} a_{r_2}^{n_2} b \cdots b b^{-1} a_{r_m}^{n_m} b \tag{4.5}$$

$$= a_{r_1}^{n_1} a_{r_1-1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} a_{r_m-1}^{n_m}$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{n_i}.$$

Then

$$b^{-(t+1)} a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^{t+1}$$

$$= b^{-1}(b^{-t} a_{r_1}^{n_1} \cdots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^{t})b$$

$$= b^{-1}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} a_{r_i-1}^{\binom{t}{1}n_i} \cdots a_{r_i-t}^{\binom{t}{t}n_i}\right)b$$

As in (4.5) and by applying the identity

$$\binom{t}{r-1} + \binom{t}{r} = \binom{t+1}{r}$$

we get

$$b^{-(t+1)} \; a_{r_1}^{n_1} \; \ldots \; a_{r_m}^{n_m} \; b^{t+1}$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{m} a_{r_i}^{n_i} \; a_{r_i-1}^{\binom{t+1}{1}n_i} \; \ldots \; a_{r_i-t-1}^{\binom{t+1}{t+1}n_i}$$

and our assertion is proved by induction. By (4.1), (4.3) and (4.4) it is clear that $x = a_{r_1}^{n_1} \ldots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^k \in G$ does not have a finite number of conjugates. Hence we conclude that $F_1(G) = \langle a_o \rangle$.

Let

$$\alpha : G \to \frac{G}{\langle a_o \rangle}$$

be a mapping defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha : a_o &\to a_1 \langle a_o \rangle \\ a_1 &\to a_2 \langle a_o \rangle \\ &\vdots \\ a_i &\to a_{i+1} \langle a_o \rangle \\ &\vdots \\ b &\to b \langle a_o \rangle . \end{aligned}$$

The mapping α can be extended to a homomorphism of G. The element $(a_{r_1}^{n_1} \ldots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^k) \langle a_o \rangle$ is the image of $a_{r_1-1}^{n_1} \, a_{r_2-1}^{n_2} \ldots a_{r_m-1}^{n_m} \, b^k$ under α.

Furthermore $a_{r_1}^{n_1} \ldots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^k \in \ker \alpha$

$$\Longleftrightarrow \quad (a_{r_1}^{n_1} \ldots a_{r_m}^{n_m} b^k)^\alpha = \langle a_o \rangle$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow \quad a_{r_1+1}^{n_1} \ldots a_{r_m+1}^{n_m} b^k \langle a_o \rangle = \langle a_o \rangle$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow \quad a_{r_1+1}^{n_1} \ldots a_{r_m+1}^{n_m} b^k \in \langle a_o \rangle$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow \quad n_1 = n_2 = \ldots = n_m = k = 0.$$

So α is an isomorphism.

Since

$$G \simeq \frac{G}{\langle a_o \rangle},$$

it follows that

$$F_1\left(\frac{G}{\langle a_o \rangle}\right) = \frac{\langle a_1 \rangle \langle a_o \rangle}{\langle a_o \rangle}$$

and so

$$F_2(G) = \langle a_o, a_1 \rangle$$

and in general

$$F_n(G) = \langle a_o, a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle.$$

Therefore G is not FC-nilpotent. □

§4.2 THE PRODUCT OF TWO NORMAL FC-HYPERCENTRAL SUBGROUPS OF A GROUP

Fitting's Theorem can be generalized to FC-hypercentrality. K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel ([9]) proved that the product of two normal FC-hypercentral subgroups of a group, is itself FC-hypercentral. Results which are required to establish this, are stated as lemmas. The proof of Lemma 4.7, which is due to J.H. Hoelzer ([11]), is not given here.

Lemma 4.7 (J.H. Hoelzer [11])

If H is a non-trivial normal subgroup of an FC-hypercentral group G, then $H \cap F_1(G) \neq E$. □

Lemma 4.8 (K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel [9]).

If H and K are normal subgroups of a group G and if H and K are FC-hypercentral groups and $HK \neq E$, then, $F_1(HK) \neq E$.

Proof:

If $H \cap K = E$, then $HK = HXK$

and

$$F_1(HXK) = F_1(H) \times F_1(K) \neq E.$$

If $H \cap K \neq E$, then $H \cap K$ is a non-trivial normal subgroup of H. By Lemma 4.7

$$L = (H \cap K) \cap F_1(H) \neq E$$

and $L \triangleleft G$ since $F_1(H)$ is a characteristic subgroup of H and $H \triangleleft G$.

Now

$$L \cap F_1(K) \neq E$$

since L is a non-trivial normal subgroup of K.

But

$$L \cap F_1(K) = [(H \cap K) \cap F_1(H)] \cap F_1(K)$$
$$= F_1(H) \cap F_1(K)$$
$$= M,$$

which is normal in G.

Let $x \in M-E$. Consider the set

$$A = \{x^{hk} : h \in H \text{ and } k \in K\}.$$

Then A is a subset of M. As h ranges over H, x^h takes on a finite number of values, say $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$, all of which lie in M. As $x_i \in F_1(K)$, x_i^k takes on a finite number of values as k ranges over K for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Thus $x \in F_1(HK)$, and so $F_1(HK) \neq E$. □

Theorem 4.9 (K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel [9]).

Let H and K be non-trivial normal subgroups of a group G such that G = HK. If H and K are FC-hypercentral, then G is FC-hypercentral.

Proof:

Suppose the theorem is not true. By Lemma 4.8, $F_1(HK) \neq E$.
Suppose that there exists an ordinal α such that
$F_\alpha(G) = F_{\alpha+1}(G) \neq G$.
Then

$$\bar{G} = \frac{G}{F_\alpha(G)} = \frac{[HF_\alpha(G)]}{F_\alpha(G)} \cdot \frac{[KF_\alpha(G)]}{F_\alpha(G)}.$$

Now $\bar{G}$ is a product of two normal FC-hypercentral groups and $\bar{G} \neq E$. By Lemma 4.8 $F_1(\bar{G}) \neq E$. Therefore $F_{\alpha+1}(G)$, which is the complete inverse image of $F_1(\bar{G})$, is strictly greater than $F_\alpha(G)$. This is a contradiction. □

The conclusion of Theorem 4.9 still holds if K normal in G is replaced by K subnormal in G. This is shown by the next theorem.

Theorem 4.10

If $H \triangleleft G$, $K \triangleleft\triangleleft G$ and H is FC-hypercentral and K is FC-hypercentral, then HK is FC-hypercentral.

Proof:

The theorem follows from Theorem 4.9 and Theorem 2.3. □

ooOoo

REFERENCES

[1] FITTING, H. : Beiträge Zur Theorie der Gruppen von Endlicher Ordnung, Jber. Deutsch Math. Verin., 48 (1938): 77-141.

[2] GRUENBERG, K.W. : The Engel elements of a soluble group, Illinois J. Math. 3 (1959): 151-168.

[3] HAIMO, F. : The FC-chain of a group, Canadian J. Math. 5 (1953): 498-511.

[4] HALL, M. : The Theory of groups, Macmillan New York (1961).

[5] HALL, P. : Some sufficient conditions for a group to be nilpotent, Illinois J. Math. 2 (1958): 787-801.

[6] HALL, P. : The Frattini subgroups of finitely generated subgroups, Proc. London Math. Soc. 11 3 (1961): 327-352.

[7] HALL, P. : On non-strictly simple groups, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. 59 (1963): 531-553.

[8] HEINEKEN, H. AND I.J. MOHAMED : A group with trivial centre satisfying the normalizer condition, J. of Algebra 10 3 (1968): 368-376.

[9] HICKIN, K.K. AND J.A. WENZEL : On the normal product of FC-nilpotent and FC-hypercentral groups, Acta. Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. Tomus 22 3-4 (1971): 355-358.

[10] HIRSCH, K.A. : Über lokal-nilpotent gruppen, Math. Zeit. 63 (1955): 290-294.

[11] HOELZER, J.H. : On the FC-normalizer of a subgroup and the FC-norm of a group, Dissertation Abstracts 28 (1967-1968) 2938B.

[12] KUROSH, A.G. : The Theory of groups, 2 New York (1955, 1956)

[13] PLOTKIN, B.I. : On some criteria of locally nilpotent groups, Uspehi Mat. Nauk (N.S) 9, No. 3 (61) (1954): 181-186.

[14] ROBINSON, D.S. : Joins of subnormal subgroups, Illinois J. Math. 9 (1965): 144-168.

[15] ROSEBLADE, J.E. : The derived series of a join of subnormal subgroups, Math. Z. 117 (1970): 57-69.

[16] STONEHEWER, S.E. : Nilpotent Residuals of subnormal subgroups, Math. Z. 139 (1974): 45-54.

ABSTRACT

H. Fitting proved that the product of two normal nilpotent subgroups H and K of a group, is itself nilpotent.

Several authors have proved statements of the following type:

(A) If H and K are normal subgroups of a group G and if $H \in P$, $K \in P$ then $HK \in P$, where P is a group theoretical property.

We have considered the question of to what extent the requirement that H and K be normal can be relaxed in (A). This is done by replacing normal by subnormal or serial.

In Chapter I Fitting's Theorem is proved and a few simple consequences of the theorem are stated as corollaries. The bound attained in Fitting's Theorem for the nilpotency class of the product of two normal nilpotent subgroups of a group, turns out to be a least upper bound.

In Chapter 2 we are concerned with the generalization of Fitting's Theorem in the case of nilpotent subgroups H and K. If we replace K normal in G by K subnormal in G, the conclusion of Fitting's Theorem still holds. However this is not the case if we replace K normal in G by K serial in G. This is shown by an example. If we insist that the indices of subnormality of both H and K are greater than one, then Fitting's Theorem does not remain true.

Chapter 3 deals with the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem. It is shown that the conclusion of the Hirsch-Plotkin Theorem still holds if H and K are serial in G.

K.K. Hickin and J.A. Wenzel proved that the product of two normal FC-nilpotent subgroups H and K of a group G, is itself FC-nilpotent. They also proved that the product of two normal FC-hypercentral subgroups H and K of a group G, is itself FC-hypercentral. In Chapter 4 it is shown that the result remains true if $K \triangleleft G$ is replaced by $K \triangleleft\triangleleft G$. An example is produced to show that $K \triangleleft\triangleleft G$ cannot be relaxed to $K \infty\triangleleft G$ in the case of FC-nilpotence.