

# Maths 721 Notes

2020

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Lecture 1</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Representations . . . . .	2
1.2	$FG$ -Modules . . . . .	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Lecture 2</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Module Reducibility . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Lecture 3</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Module and Representation Reducibility . . . . .	7
3.2	Group Algebras . . . . .	8
3.3	The Regular $FG$ -module, $FG$ . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Lecture 4</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Homomorphisms . . . . .	11
4.2	Sums . . . . .	13
<b>5</b>	<b>Lecture 5</b>	<b>15</b>
5.1	Schur's Lemma . . . . .	16
<b>6</b>	<b>Lecture 6</b>	<b>18</b>
6.1	Application of Schur's to $\mathbb{C}G$ . . . . .	19
6.2	The Group Algebra and Irreducible Modules . . . . .	19

---

# 1 Lecture 1

In the first half of this course we will cover three main topics:

- representations;
- modules;
- characters.

We will further see that representations and modules are essentially the same, and that modules and characters are essentially the same; and hence all three are essentially the same.

From now on  $G$  is a group.

## 1.1 Representations

**Definition 1.1.** A **representation** of a group  $G$  over a field  $F$  is a group homomorphism from  $G$  to  $\mathrm{GL}(n, F)$ , where  $n$  is the **degree** of the representation.

Explicitly, a representation is a function  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, F)$  such that for all  $g, h \in G$ ;

- (i)  $(gh)\rho = (g\rho)(h\rho)$ ,
- (ii)  $1_G\rho = I_n$ ,
- (iii)  $g^{-1}\rho = (g\rho)^{-1}$ .

Note the use of the (incredibly shit) postfix function notation.

**Example 1.2.** Take  $D_4$ , the Dihedral group of order 8. It has the following group presentations

$$\begin{aligned} D_4 &= \langle a, b \mid a^4 = 1, b^2 = 1, a^b = a^{-1} \rangle \\ &\cong \langle (1\ 2\ 3\ 4), (1\ 4)(2\ 3) \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where  $a^b = bab^{-1}$  is conjugation of  $a$  by  $b$ . By defining the matrix subgroup

$$H = \left\langle A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle$$

and defining  $\rho : D_4 \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, F)$  where  $F = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ , by  $a \mapsto A$  and  $b \mapsto B$ , and  $a^i b^j \mapsto A^i B^j$  for  $0 \leq i \leq 3$ , and  $0 \leq j \leq 1$ . Hence we have  $\rho$  is a representation of  $D_4$  over  $F$ . ◀

**Example 1.3.** Take  $\mathbb{Q}_8$  the Quaternion group of order 8, which has the following group presentations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_8 &= \langle a, b \mid a^4 = 1, a^2 = b^2, a^b = a^{-1} \rangle \\ &\cong \langle \bar{a} = (1\ 6\ 2\ 5)(3\ 8\ 4\ 7), \bar{b} = (1\ 4\ 2\ 3)(5\ 7\ 6\ 8) \rangle \end{aligned}$$

Define

$$H = \left\langle A = \begin{bmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & -i \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \subset \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{C}).$$

Then  $\rho : \mathbb{Q}_8 \rightarrow \text{GL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  defined by  $a^k b^\ell \mapsto A^k B^\ell$  is a group representation of  $\mathbb{Q}_8$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  of degree 2.  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $G$  be a group and define

$$\begin{aligned} \rho : G &\rightarrow \text{GL}(n, F) \\ g\rho &= I_n \end{aligned}$$

for all  $g \in G$ . Then  $\rho$  is a representation, called the **trivial representation** of arbitrary of degree.

It follows from the trivial representation that any group  $G$  has a representation of an arbitrary degree.

Let  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(n, F)$  be a group homomorphism, and take  $T \in \text{GL}(n, F)$ . Then

$$(T^{-1}AT)(T^{-1}BT) = T^{-1}(AB)T.$$

Thus, given  $\rho$  define  $\sigma$  such that

$$g\sigma = T^{-1}(g\rho)T$$

for all  $g \in G$ . As for all  $g, h \in G$ , one has

$$\begin{aligned} (gh)\sigma &= T^{-1}((gh)\rho)T \\ &= T^{-1}(g\rho)(h\rho)T \\ &= T^{-1}(g\rho)TT^{-1}(h\rho)T \\ &= (g\sigma)(h\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

and so  $\sigma$  is a group homomorphism; and hence a representation.

**Definition 1.5.** Define

$$\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(m, F), \quad \sigma : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(n, F)$$

to both be representation of  $G$  over  $F$ . We say that  $\rho$  is **equivalent to**  $\sigma$  if  $n = m$  and there exists  $T \in \text{GL}(n, F)$  such that  $g\sigma = T^{-1}(g\rho)T$ .

**Proposition 1.6.** *Equivalence of representations is an equivalence relation.*

*Proof.* Reflexivity is clear by taking  $T = I_n$ . For symmetry, take  $T$  to be its inverse. For transitivity, if

$$g\sigma = T^{-1}(g\rho)T, \quad g\rho = S^{-1}(g\eta)S,$$

then

$$g\sigma = (ST)^{-1}(g\eta)(ST).$$

□

**Definition 1.7.** Define the **kernel** of the representation  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(n, F)$  as  $\ker \rho = \{g \in G \mid g\rho = I_n\}$ .

**Proposition 1.8.** *The kernel of a representation of  $G$  is a normal subgroup of  $G$ ; i.e.  $\ker \rho \triangleleft G$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $g \in \ker \rho$  and  $h \in G$  is arbitrary. Then

$$(hgh^{-1})\rho = (h\rho)(g\rho)(h^{-1}\rho) = (h\rho)I_n(h\rho)^{-1} = (h\rho)(h\rho)^{-1} = I_n,$$

and so  $hgh^{-1} \in \ker \rho$ . As  $\ker \rho$  is closed under conjugation, it is a normal subgroup of  $G$ .  $\square$

**Definition 1.9.** We say  $\rho$  is a **faithful** representation of  $G$  if  $\ker \rho = \{1_G\}$ .

**Example 1.10.** For the trivial representation  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(n, F)$  with  $g \mapsto I_n$  for all  $g \in G$ , we have  $\ker \rho = G$ . Hence the representation is not faithful.  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Lemma 1.11.** *Suppose  $G$  is a finite group, and  $\rho$  is a representation of  $G$  over  $F$ . Then  $\rho$  is faithful if, and only if,  $\text{im } \rho \cong G$ .*

*Proof.* Immediate from the first isomorphism theorem.  $\square$

## 1.2 FG-Modules

Suppose  $G$  is a group, and  $F = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ . Given  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(n, F)$ , with  $V = F^n$ , let  $v = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in V$  for  $\lambda_i \in F$  be a row vector. Moreover, note that  $g\rho$  is an  $n \times n$  matrix for all  $g \in G$ . Thus, we have  $v \cdot (g\rho) \in V$ , and satisfies the following properties:

- (i)  $v \cdot ((gh)\rho) = v \cdot (g\rho)(h\rho)$ ;
- (ii)  $v \cdot (1_G\rho) = v$ ;
- (iii)  $(\lambda v) \cdot (g\rho) = \lambda(v \cdot (g\rho))$ ;
- (iv)  $(u + v) \cdot (g\rho) = u \cdot (g\rho) + v \cdot (g\rho)$ .

We often will omitted the  $\cdot$  in the operation, and write  $v(a\rho)$  for  $v \cdot (a\rho)$ .

**Example 1.12.** Recall  $D_4$  and its given presentation from a previous example. We have

$$a\rho = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b\rho = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If  $v = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ , then we have

$$v(a\rho) = (-\lambda_2, \lambda_1), \quad v(b\rho) = (\lambda_1, -\lambda_2).$$

$\blacktriangleleft$

---

**Definition 1.13.** Let  $V$  a vector space over the field  $F = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ , and let  $G$  be a group. We say  $V$  is a  $FG$ -**module** if a multiplication  $v \cdot g$  for  $v \in V$ , and  $g \in G$  is defined such that:

- (i)  $v \cdot g \in V$ ;
- (ii)  $v \cdot (gh) = (v \cdot g) \cdot h$ ;
- (iii)  $v \cdot 1_G = v$ ;
- (iv)  $(\lambda v) \cdot g = \lambda(v \cdot g)$ ;
- (v)  $(u + v) \cdot g = u \cdot g + v \cdot g$ .

This generalises the previous discussion from a matrix group to an arbitrary group.

Note that properties (i), (iv), and (v) imply that the map  $v \mapsto v \cdot g$  is an endomorphism of  $V$  (a linear map from  $V$  to itself).

**Definition 1.14.** Suppose  $V$  is an  $FG$ -module and  $B$  is a basis for  $V$ . For  $g \in G$ , let  $[g]_B$  denote the matrix of the endomorphism  $v \mapsto v \cdot g$  of  $V$  relative to the basis  $B$ .

## 2 Lecture 2

**Theorem 2.1.** Let  $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(n, F)$  be a representation of  $G$  over  $F$ .

- (I) If  $V = F^n$  is an  $FG$  module and  $G$  acts on  $V$  by  $v \cdot g = v(g\rho)$  there exists a basis  $B$  of  $V$  such that  $g\rho = [g]_B$ .
- (II) The map  $g \mapsto [g]_B$  is a representation for  $G$  over  $F$ .

*Proof.* Choose the standard basis  $B = [e_1, \dots, e_n]$ .

Since  $V$  is an  $FG$ -module we have  $v(gh) = (vg)h$  for all  $g, h \in G$  and  $v \in V$ . Thus  $[gh]_B = [g]_B[h]_B$  so the map is a homomorphism. We now check that  $[g]_B$  is invertible for all  $g \in G$ . We know  $v \cdot 1_G = (vg)g^{-1}$  so  $I_n = [g]_B[g^{-1}]_B$  and thus  $[g]_B$  has an inverse.  $\square$

**Example 2.2.** Recall the representation of  $G = D_4$  from a previous example. Define an  $FG$ -module  $V = F^2$  with the action defined by taking  $vg$  to  $v(g\rho)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= (1, 0), & v_1 a &= v_2, & v_1 b &= v_1, \\ v_2 &= (0, 1), & v_1 a &= -v_1, & v_1 b &= -v_2. \end{aligned}$$

In this basis we recover our representation

$$a \mapsto [a]_B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad b \mapsto [b]_B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

◀

---

We now provide an equivalent basis-dependent definition for an  $FG$ -module.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $V$  a vector space over the field  $F = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$  with basis  $B = [v_1, \dots, v_n]$ , and let  $G$  be a group. If a multiplication  $v \cdot g$  for  $v \in B$ , and  $g \in G$  is defined such that:*

- (i)  $v \cdot g \in V$ ;
- (ii)  $v \cdot (gh) = (v \cdot g) \cdot h$ ;
- (iii)  $v \cdot 1_G = v$ ;
- (iv)  $(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i v_i) \cdot g = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i (v_i \cdot g)$  for all  $\lambda_i \in F$ ;

*then  $V$  is an  $FG$ -module.*

**Definition 2.4.** The trivial module of a group over  $F$  is a one dimensional vector space  $V$  over  $F$  such that  $vg = v$  for all  $v \in V$  and  $g \in G$ .

**Definition 2.5.** An  $FG$ -module is faithful if  $1_G$  is the only  $g \in G$  such that  $vg = v$  for all  $v \in V$ .

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $V$  be an  $FG$ -module with basis  $B$  and  $\rho$  a representation of group  $G$  over  $F$  defined by taking  $g \mapsto [g]_B$ .*

- (i) *If  $B'$  is another basis of  $V$  then the map  $g \mapsto [g]_{B'}$  is a representation of  $G$  equivalent to  $\rho$ .*
- (ii) *If representation  $\sigma$  is equivalent to  $\rho$  then there exists basis  $B''$  such that  $\sigma(g) = [g]_{B''}$  for all  $g \in G$ .*

*Proof.* Taking  $T$  to be the change of basis matrices, the two representations are equivalent.  $\square$

**Example 2.7.** Let  $G = C_3 = \langle a \mid a^3 = 1 \rangle$  and representation  $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(n, F)$  defined by

$$a \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We attempt to construct an  $FG$ -module with group action described by  $\rho$ . Take  $V = F^2$  with basis  $B = [v_1, v_2]$ . Define the action of  $G$  on  $V$  by

$$v_1 a = v_2, \quad v_2 a = -v_1 - v_2.$$

Let us now choose alternate basis  $B' = [u_1 = v_1, u_2 = v_1 + v_2]$ . The action of  $G$  on this basis is described by

$$u_1 a = -u_1 + u_2, \quad u_2 a = -u_1.$$

This gives us a representation

$$a \mapsto [a]_{B'} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

To verify this construction we write our change of basis matrix as

$$T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and verify that

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

◀

**Definition 2.8.** The permutation module of a group  $G \leq S_n$  is an  $n$ -dimensional vector space  $V$  with basis  $B = [v_1, \dots, v_n]$  and action by  $G$  defined by

$$v_i g = v_{ig}$$

for all  $g \in G$  where  $ig$  is the image of  $i$  under  $g \in S_n$ .

It follows from Cayley's theorem that every group has a faithful  $FG$ -module.

**Example 2.9.** Take  $G = S_4$  and pick  $g = (1\ 2)$  and  $h = (1\ 2\ 3\ 4)$ . We have representations

$$[g]_B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad [h]_B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

◀

## 2.1 Module Reducibility

**Definition 2.10.** Let  $V$  be an  $FG$ -module. We call  $W$  a submodule of  $V$  if  $W$  is a vector subspace of  $V$  and  $W$  is closed under the action of  $G$ . We then write  $W < V$ .

**Example 2.11.** Let  $G = C_3 = \langle (1\ 2\ 3) \rangle$  and  $V$  the permutation module of  $G$  with basis  $B = [v_1, v_2, v_3]$ . The subspace  $W = \langle v_1 + v_2 + v_3 \rangle$  is a submodule but the subspace  $U = \langle v_1 + v_2 \rangle$  is not.

For example, consider the action of  $g = (1\ 2\ 3)$  on  $v_1 + v_2 \in U$ .

$$(v_1 + v_2)g = v_{1g} + v_{2g} = v_2 + v_3 \notin U$$

whereas  $G$  acts on  $W$  trivially.

◀

## 3 Lecture 3

### 3.1 Module and Representation Reducibility

For any module, it is clear that we have two trivial submodules:  $0 < V$  and  $V < V$ . Where  $0 = \{0\} \subset V$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $V$  be an  $FG$ -module. We say that  $V$  is irreducible if the only submodules of  $V$  are  $V$  and  $0$ . Otherwise  $V$  is reducible

In 2.11 we showed that the permutation module of  $C_3$  is reducible.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(n, F)$  be a representation. We say that  $\rho$  is irreducible if the corresponding  $FG$ -module (as constructed in 2.1) is irreducible. Otherwise  $\rho$  is reducible.

If an  $FG$ -module,  $V$  is reducible, that is,  $0 < W < V$ ,  $0 \neq W \neq V$ . Let  $B_W$  be a basis for  $W$ . If we extend  $B_W$  to  $B$  a basis of  $V$ , then we get the following representation of  $G$ :

$$g \mapsto [g]_B = \begin{bmatrix} X_g & 0 \\ Y_g & Z_g \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

Where the matrices  $X_g, Y_g$  and  $Z_g$  are some block matrices and  $0$  is a block of zeros and  $X_g$  has the dimensions  $m \times m$  and, in this case,  $\dim(W) = m$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** A representation  $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(n, F)$  is reducible if and only if with respect to some basis,  $B$ , of  $F^n$ ,  $[g]_B$  has the form 3.1 for some  $0 < m < \dim(V)$  for all  $g \in G$ . Then the maps  $g \mapsto X_g$  and  $g \mapsto Z_g$  are both representations of  $G$ .

*Proof.* Suppose we have a presentation,  $\rho : G \rightarrow GL(n, F)$  and a basis  $B$  of  $V = F^n$  such that  $[g]_B$  has the form 3.1 for every  $g \in G$ . Then consider the subspace  $0 \subset W \subset V$  spanned by the first  $m$  elements of  $B$ . It is clear that  $v[g]_B \in W$  for all  $v \in W$ . Therefore the module induced by  $\rho$  is reducible, so  $\rho$  is reducible. Now, if we have a reducible representation, then the argument above this proposition shows that with respect to any basis extending  $B_W$ , the matrices  $[g]_B$  have the required form.

Now, using elementary block matrix multiplication, we get the following for  $g, h \in G$ :

$$\rho(g)\rho(h) = [g]_B[h]_B = \begin{bmatrix} X_g X_h & 0 \\ Y_g X_h + Z_g Y_h & Z_g Z_h \end{bmatrix} = [gh]_B = \rho(gh)$$

Therefore  $X_{gh} = X_g X_h$  and  $Z_{gh} = Z_g Z_h$ , so the maps  $g \mapsto X_g$  and  $g \mapsto Z_g$  are both representations of  $G$ .  $\square$

**Problem 1.** Prove that the example representation of  $D_8$  of degree 2 over  $\mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$  is irreducible.

## 3.2 Group Algebras

Recall that an algebra over a field  $F$  is a vector space over  $F$  equipped with a bilinear product  $A \times A \rightarrow A$  that is compatible with scalar multiplication.

**Definition 3.4.** The group algebra over a finite group  $G$  over a field  $F$  is an algebra<sup>1</sup> of dimension  $n = |G|$  over  $F = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$  called  $FG$ , with basis  $B = G = \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ .

<sup>1</sup>See Lemma 3.6



Where the algebra structure is given by the following for two arbitrary elements of  $FG$ ,  $u = \sum_{g \in G} \lambda_g g$ ,  $v = \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g g$ ,  $\lambda_g, \mu_g \in F$  and  $\nu \in F$ :

- (i)  $u + v = \sum_{i=1}^n (\lambda_i + \mu_i) g_i$
- (ii)  $\nu \cdot u = \sum_{i=1}^n (\nu \lambda_i) g_i$
- (iii)  $u \cdot v = \sum_{(h,g) \in G \times G} \lambda_g \mu_h (gh)$

This is clearly a vector space.

**Example 3.5.** Consider  $G = C_3 = \{e, a, a^2\} = \langle a | a^3 = e \rangle$  and  $F = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ . Then if we let  $u = e - a + 2a^2$ ,  $v = \frac{1}{2}e + 5a$ , then:

$$u + v = \frac{3}{2}e + 4a + 2a^2, \quad \frac{1}{3}u = \frac{1}{3}e - \frac{1}{3}a + \frac{2}{3}a^2, \quad uv = \frac{21}{2}e + \frac{9}{2}a - 4a^2$$

◀

**Lemma 3.6.** Given a group algebra  $FG$ ,  $r, s, t \in FG$ ,  $\lambda \in F$ :

- (I)  $rs \in FG$
- (II)  $(rs)t = r(st)$
- (III)  $1_G r = r 1_G = r$
- (IV)  $(\lambda r)s = \lambda(rs)$
- (V)  $(r + s)t = rt + st$
- (VI)  $r(s + t) = rs + rt$
- (VII)  $r0 = 0r = 0$

That is,  $FG$  is an associative algebra with unit

*Proof.* 1,3 and 7 are clear from the definition of  $FG$ , 4,5 and 6 follow from the distributive and associative laws of  $F$  and 2 follows from associativity in  $G$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 The Regular $FG$ -module, $FG$

**Problem 2.**  $V = FG$  is an  $FG$ -module with the group action defined by  $v \cdot g = vg$  for  $v \in FG$ ,  $g \in G \subset FG$ .

**Definition 3.7.** For a finite group  $G$  and  $F = \mathbb{R}$  or  $\mathbb{C}$ , the regular  $FG$ -module is  $FG$ . The associated module,  $g \mapsto [g]_B$  is called the regular representation.

**Lemma 3.8.**  $FG$  is a faithful module for  $G$  over  $F$

*Proof.* If  $vg = v$  for all  $v \in FG$ , then specifically,  $hg = h$  for all  $h \in G$ , so  $g = 1_G$ .  $\square$

**Example 3.9.** For  $C = C_3$ , over the basis  $B = G$ , we get:

$$[e]_B = I_3, \quad [a]_B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad [a^2]_B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

◀

Now, if we have an  $FG$ -module,  $V$ , then  $FG$  acts on  $V$  in the following way:

$$v \cdot r = v \cdot \left( \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g g \right) = \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g (v \cdot g)$$

**Lemma 3.10.** For  $u, v \in V$ ,  $\lambda \in F$ ,  $r, s \in FG$ :

- (I)  $vr \in FG$
- (II)  $(vr)s = v(rs)$
- (III)  $v1 = v$
- (IV)  $(\lambda v)r = \lambda(vr) = v(\lambda r)$
- (V)  $(r + s)v = rv + sv$
- (VI)  $r(u + v) = ru + rv$
- (VII)  $r0 = v0 = 0$

*Proof.* 1,3 and the first part of 7 follow from  $V$  being an  $FG$ -module, the second equality of 7 follows from scalar multiplication by 0 in  $V$ . The following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda v)r &= \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g ((\lambda v)g) \\ &= \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g (\lambda(vg)) \\ &= \sum_{g \in G} (\lambda \mu_g)(vg) = v(\lambda r) \\ &= \lambda \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g (vg) \\ &= \lambda(vg) \end{aligned}$$

---

proves 4. 6 follows from the linearity of the action of  $G$  on  $V$ . 5 follows from distributivity of scalar multiplication in  $V$ . Finally, to prove 2:

$$\begin{aligned}
v(rs) &= \sum_{(g,h) \in G \times G} (\mu_g \lambda_h(v(gh))) \\
&= \sum_{h \in G} \lambda_h \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g(gv)h \\
&= \sum_{h \in G} \lambda_h \left( \sum_{g \in G} \mu_g(gv) \right) h \\
&= \sum_{h \in G} \lambda_h(vr)h = (vr)s
\end{aligned}$$

□

## 4 Lecture 4

### 4.1 Homomorphisms

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $V$  and  $W$  be  $FG$ -modules. A *homomorphism* of  $FG$ -modules is a map  $\sigma : V \rightarrow W$  which is a linear transformation and also satisfies  $(vg)\sigma = (v\sigma)g$  for all  $g \in G, v \in V$ . The *kernel* and *image* are defined in the obvious way

Equivalently, it is a homomorphism of modules over the ring  $FG$ . Indeed:

**Problem 3.** Suppose  $r \in FG$  is an element of the group algebra. Prove that  $(vr)\sigma = (v\sigma)r$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** Let  $\sigma : V \rightarrow W$  be a homomorphism of  $FG$ -algebras. Then the kernel and image of  $\sigma$  are submodules

*Proof.* This is a matter of simple checking, which will be left to the reader. □

**Example 4.3.** Take  $\sigma : V \rightarrow V$  to be  $v \mapsto \lambda v$  for some  $\lambda \in F^*$ . Then  $\ker \sigma = 0, \text{im } \sigma = V$ . ◀

**Example 4.4.** Let  $G = S_n$  and  $V = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$  be the permutation module for  $G$  over  $F$ , and let  $W = \langle w \rangle$  be the trivial module. Now define  $\sigma : V \rightarrow W$  by

$$\sum \lambda_i v_i \mapsto \sum \lambda_i w$$

Then  $\ker \sigma = \{ \sum \lambda_i v_i \mid \sum \lambda_i = 0 \}$  and  $\text{im } \sigma = W$ . ◀

**Definition 4.5.** A homomorphism of  $FG$ -modules is an *isomorphism* if it is bijective

**Remark 1.** In class we originally said "if the homomorphism has trivial kernel". However, this is definitely not correct because inclusions are always homomorphisms, but obviously not isomorphisms.  $\blacklozenge$

**Lemma 4.6.** *The inverse of an isomorphism is an isomorphism*

*Proof.* Once again, this is just an exercise in checking. The details will be left for the reader.  $\square$

Some rather obvious invariants of  $FG$ -modules (under isomorphism) are dimension and irreducibility.

**Lemma 4.7.**  *$V$  and  $W$  are isomorphic if and only if there exists bases  $\mathcal{B}_1$  of  $V$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2$  of  $W$  such that*

$$[g]_{\mathcal{B}_1} = [g]_{\mathcal{B}_2}$$

*for all  $g$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose firstly that  $V$  and  $W$  are isomorphic, and let  $\sigma : V \rightarrow W$  be one such isomorphism. Let  $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be a basis for  $V$ . In particular, it is linearly independent, and it is easy to see that  $\mathcal{B}_2 = \{v_1\sigma, \dots, v_n\sigma\}$  is also linearly independent. Since  $V$  and  $W$  are isomorphic, they have the same dimension, and thus  $\mathcal{B}_2$  is a basis for  $W$ . Since  $(vg)\sigma = (v\sigma)g$  for all  $g$  and  $v$ , the action of  $g$  on the basis vectors of both bases are the same, and thus we conclude  $[g]_{\mathcal{B}_1} = [g]_{\mathcal{B}_2}$ .

Conversely, suppose that the latter hypothesis is satisfied. Let  $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  be a basis for  $V$  and  $\{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$  be a basis for  $W$ . We define a bijective linear map  $\sigma : V \rightarrow W$  such that  $v_i\sigma = w_i$  for each  $i$ . Now observe that for each  $i$ , we have  $v_i g = \lambda_1 v_1 + \dots + \lambda_n v_n$  and  $w_i g = \lambda_1 w_1 + \dots + \lambda_n w_n$ , where  $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is the  $i$ -th row of  $[g]$ . This means that

$$(v_i g)\sigma = (\lambda_1 v_1 + \dots + \lambda_n v_n)\sigma = \lambda_1 v_1\sigma + \dots + \lambda_n v_n\sigma = \lambda_1 w_1 + \dots + \lambda_n w_n = w_i g = (v_i\sigma)g$$

and thus  $\sigma$  is a homomorphism of  $FG$ -modules. Since it is bijective, it is an isomorphism.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.8.** *Let  $V$  be an  $FG$ -module with basis  $\mathcal{B}_1$  and  $W$  an  $FG$ -module with basis  $\mathcal{B}_2$ . Then  $W \cong V$  if and only if  $g \mapsto [g]_{\mathcal{B}_1}$  and  $g \mapsto [g]_{\mathcal{B}_2}$  are equivalent.*

*Proof.* This follows from the previous Lemma and the fact that two matrices are conjugate ( $A$  and  $B$  are conjugate if  $A = P^{-1}BP$  for some  $P$ ) if and only if the linear transformations they define differ by a change of basis (that is they define the same transformation but with respect to different bases)  $\square$

**Example 4.9.** Let  $G = C_3 = \{e, a, a^2\}$ . Let  $V$  be the regular representation, that is the natural representation induced by the module  $FG = \langle e, a, a^2 \rangle$ . Write  $B := \{e, a, a^2\}$  as a basis for  $FG$ . Then

$$[a]_B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Now let  $W$  be the permutation module where  $a = (1, 2, 3)$  and  $C_3$  is considered a subgroup of  $S_3$ . Write  $B' = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$  for the basis of  $W$ . Then

$$[a]_{B'} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Note that these two modules are isomorphic. ◀

**Example 4.10.** Let  $G = D_4 = \langle a, b \mid a^4 = b^2 = 1, a^b = a^{-1} \rangle$ . Now we can act on either  $F^4$  or  $F^8$ . On  $F^4$ , we have the representation described in Example 1.2. On  $W$ , we have the regular representation. Clearly are not isomorphic. ◀

## 4.2 Sums

We now consider how modules behave with respect to direct sums. Let  $V$  be an  $FG$ -module and suppose  $V = U \oplus W$ , where  $U$  and  $W$  are submodules. Let  $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{u_1, \dots, u_n\}$  be a basis for  $U$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2 = \{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$  one for  $W$ , so that  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \cup \mathcal{B}_2$  is a basis for  $V$ . Then

$$[g]_{\mathcal{B}} = \begin{pmatrix} [g]_{\mathcal{B}_1} & 0 \\ 0 & [g]_{\mathcal{B}_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

**Lemma 4.11.** *Let  $V$  be an  $FG$ -module such that we have the decomposition*

$$V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n U_i$$

*Define the projection map  $\pi_i : u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_n \mapsto u_i$ . Then*

- (I)  $\pi_i$  is a homomorphism
- (II)  $\pi_i \circ \pi_i = \pi_i$

*Proof.* Trivial □

**Lemma 4.12.** *Suppose we have a finite decomposition*

$$V = \sum U_i$$

*where the  $U_i$  are irreducible. Then  $V$  is the direct sum of the subset of the  $U_i$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from the fact that the intersection of two distinct irreducible modules is trivial (again, simple checking).  $\square$

We will now present an important result

**Theorem 4.13** (Maschke's Theorem). *Let  $G$  be a finite group,  $F$  a field of characteristic 0,  $V$  an  $FG$ -module and  $U$  a submodule. Then there exists some  $W$  such that  $V = U \oplus W$ .*

*Proof.* We first choose some  $W_1$  such that  $V = U \oplus W_1$  as vector spaces. Note that each  $v \in V$  can be uniquely decomposed as  $v = u + w$ , where  $u \in U, w \in W_1$ . Now define the canonical projection  $\sigma : V \rightarrow U$  where  $v \mapsto u$ . Clearly  $\ker \sigma = W_1$  and  $\text{im } \sigma = U$ . However, we note that  $\sigma$  is NOT necessarily a homomorphism of  $FG$ -modules. We modify it as follows: Define  $\varphi : V \rightarrow V$  by

$$v \mapsto \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} v g \sigma g^{-1}$$

We claim that  $\varphi$  IS a homomorphism. Indeed, suppose  $x \in G, v \in V$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (xv)\varphi &= \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} (vx) g \sigma g^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{h \in G} v h \sigma h^{-1} x \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{h \in G} v h \sigma h^{-1} \right) x = (v\varphi)x \end{aligned}$$

where the equality

$$\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} (vx) g \sigma g^{-1} = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{h \in G} v h \sigma h^{-1} x$$

follows from the change of variables  $h = xg$ . Clearly  $\varphi$  maps into  $U$ , and we now check it is a projection. Indeed, supposing  $u \in U$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} (u)\varphi &= \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} u g \sigma g^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} u \sigma g g^{-1} \\ &= \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} u \\ &= u \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

---

Now clearly  $U = \text{im } \varphi$  and we define  $W := \ker \varphi$ . Then for each  $v \in V$ , write  $u := v\varphi \in U$  and  $w := v - u \in W$  so that  $v = u + w$ . It only remains to check that this is unique. To see this, suppose  $u' + w' = v = u + w$ . Then

$$u' = \varphi(u') = \varphi(v) = \varphi(u) = u$$

which implies the result.  $\square$

## 5 Lecture 5

We begin with consequences of Maschke's theorem.

**Example 5.1.** Let  $G = S_3$ , and  $V = \langle v_1, v_2, v_3 \rangle$  is the permutation module. Let  $U$  be the submodule of  $V$  defined as  $U = \langle v_1 + v_2 + v_3 \rangle < V$ . Suppose  $W_0 = \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle$ , so that  $V = U \oplus W_0$  as subspaces. Define a projection  $\phi : V \rightarrow U$  by  $v_1 \mapsto 0$ ,  $v_2 \mapsto 0$ , and  $v_3 \mapsto v_1 + v_2 + v_3$ . Further, define  $\theta : V \rightarrow V$ , as in proof of Maschke's theorem, so that

$$v\theta = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} vg\theta g^{-1} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{g \in S_3} vg\theta g^{-1}.$$

Consider the action of  $\theta$  on the basis elements  $v_i$ , then a short computation shows that

$$v_i\theta = \frac{1}{3}(v_1 + v_2 + v_3), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\ker \theta = \{v \in V : v\theta = 0\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i v_i : \sum_{i=1}^3 \lambda_i = 0 \right\}.$$

Hence  $V = U \oplus \ker \theta$ , is a direct summand of submodules. Moreover, if  $\mathcal{B} = [v_1 + v_2 + v_3, v_1, v_2]$  is a basis for  $V$ , and  $\mathcal{B}' = [v_1 + v_2 + v_3, v_1 - v_2, v_2 - v_3]$  is another, one has

$$[g]_{\mathcal{B}} = \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & * \\ * & * & * \end{pmatrix}, \quad [g]_{\mathcal{B}'} = \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

◀

In fact, it follows from Maschke's theorem that if we choose a basis  $\mathcal{B}$  for  $V$  such that

$$[g]_{\mathcal{B}} = \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 \\ * & * \end{pmatrix},$$

then there exists a basis  $\mathcal{B}'$  for  $V$  such that

$$[g]_{\mathcal{B}'} = \begin{pmatrix} * & 0 \\ 0 & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Definition 5.2.** Let  $V$  be a  $FG$ -module,  $V$  is said to be **completely reducible** if  $V = U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_r$  with each  $U_i$  an irreducible  $FG$ -module.

**Theorem 5.3.** Suppose  $G$  is a finite group, and  $F = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ . Then every  $FG$ -module is completely reducible

*Proof.* Induction using Maschke's theorem.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.4.** Suppose  $G$  is a finite group,  $F = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$ , and  $V$  a  $FG$ -module. If  $U$  is a  $FG$ -submodule, then there exists a surjective  $FG$ -homomorphism from  $V$  onto  $U$ .

*Proof.* By Maschke's theorem, there exists a complementary submodule  $W$  to  $U$  such that  $V = U \oplus W$ . Thus, defining  $\pi : V \rightarrow U$  by  $u + w \mapsto u$  gives the result.  $\square$

**Example 5.5.** Take

$$G = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ n & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mid n \in \mathbb{Z} \right\rangle$$

and  $V = \mathbb{C}^2$ . Then  $V$  is not completely reducible.  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Example 5.6.** Let  $G = C_p = \langle a \mid a^p = 1 \rangle$  where  $p$  is prime, and take the representation

$$a^j \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & j \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq j \leq p-1$$

over the finite field  $F = \mathbb{Z}_p$ . If  $V = \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle$  is the  $FG$ -module of the representation and  $U = \langle v_2 \rangle$ , then there does not exist a submodule  $W < V$  such that  $V = U \oplus W$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

The previous two examples show that the assumptions of Maschke's theorem are required, and cannot be relaxed.

## 5.1 Schur's Lemma

**Theorem 5.7** (Schur's lemma). Suppose  $V$  and  $W$  are irreducible  $\mathbb{C}G$ -modules.

- (I) If  $\theta : V \rightarrow W$  is a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -homomorphism, then  $\theta$  is either a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -isomorphism or the zero homomorphism.
- (II) If  $\theta : V \rightarrow V$  is a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -isomorphism, then  $\theta$  is scalar multiple of the identity endomorphism of  $V$ .

*Proof.* (I): Suppose that  $v\theta \neq 0$  for some  $v \in V$ , then the image of  $\theta$  is not trivial,  $\text{im } \theta \neq \{0\}$ . However,  $\text{im } \theta$  is a submodule of  $W$ , and so the irreducibility of  $W$  forces  $\text{im } \theta = W$ . Likewise, as the kernel of  $\theta$  is a submodule of  $V$ , but not all of  $V$ , we have  $\ker \theta = \{0\}$  as  $V$  is irreducible. Therefore,  $\theta$  is a bijective  $\mathbb{C}G$ -homomorphism, and so it is a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -isomorphism.



(II): Suppose  $\theta$  is a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -isomorphism. Then as  $\mathbb{C}$  is algebraically closed,  $\theta$  has an eigenvalue  $\lambda_v \in \mathbb{C}$  with  $v\theta = \lambda_v v$  for some  $v \in V$ . Now, as  $\ker(\theta - \lambda_v 1_V) \neq \{0\}$  is a submodule of  $V$ ,  $V$  being irreducible implies that  $\ker(\theta - \lambda_v 1_V) = V$ . Therefore,  $w(\theta - \lambda_v 1_V) = 0$  for all  $w \in V$ , and so  $\theta = \lambda 1_V$  as required.  $\square$

Further, we actually have a converse to the second statement of Schur's lemma.

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let  $V$  be a nontrivial  $\mathbb{C}G$ -module, and suppose that every  $\mathbb{C}G$ -homomorphism from  $V$  to  $V$  is a scalar multiple of the identity endomorphism of  $V$ . Then  $V$  is irreducible.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $V$  is reducible. Then there exists a nontrivial submodule  $U$  of  $V$  such that, by Maschke's theorem,  $V = U \oplus W$  with  $W$  also a submodule of  $V$ . Defining  $\pi : V \rightarrow V$  by  $u + w \mapsto u$  gives a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -homomorphism that is not a multiple of the identity endomorphism. A contradiction.  $\square$

We now interpret Schur's lemma as representation statement.

**Lemma 5.9.** *Let  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$  be a representation. Then  $\rho$  is irreducible if, and only if, every  $n \times n$  matrix  $A$  which satisfies  $(g\rho)A = A(g\rho)$  for all  $g \in G$ , has the form  $A = \lambda I_n$ .*

*Proof.* Result follows from Schur's lemma and its partial converse.  $\square$

**Example 5.10.** Suppose  $G = C_3 = \langle a \mid a^3 = 1 \rangle$ , and  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  is the representation defined by

$$a\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

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

Then it is clear that  $A(g\rho) = (g\rho)A$  for all  $g \in G$ . As  $A$  is not a scalar multiple of the identity, the representation is reducible.  $\blacktriangleleft$

**Example 5.11.** Suppose  $G = D_5 = \langle a, b \mid a^5 = 1, b^2 = 1, a^b = a^{-1} \rangle$ . Set  $\omega = e^{2\pi i/5}$ . Let  $\rho : G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(2, \mathbb{C})$  be the representation defined by

$$a \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad b \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

If

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix}$$

---

commutes with  $a\rho$  and  $b\rho$ ; one calculates that

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha \end{pmatrix} = \alpha I_n,$$

and so the representation is irreducible. ◀

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group. Then every irreducible  $\mathbb{C}G$ -module has dimension 1.*

*Proof.* Choose  $x \in G$ , then  $v(gx) = v(xg)$  for all  $g \in G$ , and so  $v \mapsto vx$  is a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -homomorphism. It is actually an isomorphism with inverse  $v \mapsto vx^{-1}$ . Hence by Schur this isomorphism is a scalar multiple of the identity, say  $\lambda_x 1_V$ . Thus  $vx = \lambda_x 1_V$  for all  $v \in V$  and the group action by  $G$  is just usual scalar multiplication. This means that every subspace is a submodule. However,  $V$  is irreducible and so has no non-trivial submodules; which forces  $\dim V = 1$ . ◻

## 6 Lecture 6

We continue our discussion of the representations of abelian groups.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $G$  be a finite abelian group. Every irreducible  $\mathbb{C}G$ -module has dimension 1.*

Instead we prove a stronger theorem in which we construct these representations by mapping group elements to roots of unity. But first recall the Fundamental Theorem of Abelian Groups which states that any finite abelian group  $G$  is isomorphic to the direct sum of cyclic groups

$$G \simeq C_{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus C_{n_r}$$

where  $n_i \mid n_{i+1}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq r-1$ . Note that if  $C_i = \langle g_i \rangle$  then we can write  $G = \langle g_1, \dots, g_r \rangle$  and  $g_i$  has order  $n_i$ .

We define a homomorphism  $\rho$  from  $G$  to  $\mathbb{C}$  by taking  $g_i \mapsto \lambda_i$  where  $\lambda_i$  is the  $n_i$ -th root of unity. This defines a representation and is specified by roots of unity  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$ . Thus for the representation  $\rho$  defined by roots of unity  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$  we write  $\rho = \rho_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r}$ .

**Theorem 6.2.** *Suppose  $G \simeq C_{n_1} \times \cdots \times C_{n_r}$  for cyclic groups  $C_{n_i}$  of order  $n_i$ . The representation  $\rho_{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r}$  of  $G$  is irreducible of degree 1. There are  $|G|$  many such representations and every irreducible representation of  $G$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  is equivalent to one of these.*

**Example 6.3.** Take  $G = \langle a \mid a^n = 1 \rangle$  and  $\omega = e^{2\pi i/n}$ . The irreducible representations of  $G$  are  $\rho_{\omega^j}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq n-1$  defined by

$$a^k \rho_{\omega^j} = \omega^{jk}, \quad 0 \leq k \leq n-1.$$

◀

## 6.1 Application of Schur's to $\mathbb{C}G$

**Definition 6.4.** If  $G$  is a finite group then we define the center of the group algebra  $Z(\mathbb{C}G)$  by

$$Z(\mathbb{C}G) = \{z \in \mathbb{C}G \mid zr = rz \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{C}G\}.$$

1.  $Z(\mathbb{C}G)$  is a subspace of  $\mathbb{C}G$ .
2. If  $G$  is abelian then  $Z(\mathbb{C}G) = \mathbb{C}Z(G)$ .
3. If  $H$  is a normal subgroup of  $G$  then  $\sum_{h \in H} h \in Z(\mathbb{C}G)$ .

We provide a simple proof for the last statement.

*Proof.* Take  $z = \sum_{h \in H} h$  and  $g \in G$ . We then have

$$z^g = \sum_{h \in H} h^g = z.$$

because  $H$  is normal and hence fixed by conjugation of elements in  $G$ . □

**Example 6.5.** Take  $G = S_3 = \langle a = (1\ 2\ 3), b = (1\ 2) \rangle$ . Then  $\sum_{g \in G} g \in \mathbb{C}G$ . ◀

**Lemma 6.6.** Let  $V$  be an irreducible  $\mathbb{C}G$ -module and let  $z \in Z(\mathbb{C}G)$ . There exists  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $vz = \lambda v$  for all  $v \in V$ .

**Remark 2.** Note that  $\mathbb{C}G$  is a faithful module. ♦

**Lemma 6.7.** If there exists a faithful, irreducible  $\mathbb{C}G$ -module then  $Z(G)$  is cyclic.

**Example 6.8.**  $\mathbb{Z}_4$  has a faithful, irreducible representation by taking 1 to the 4-th root of unity. However  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$  has no faithful irreducible representation as its center is not cyclic. ◀

**Remark 3.** Note that the converse is not true in general. There exists groups with cyclic centers but no faithful, irreducible representations. See Frobenius Groups. ♦

**Lemma 6.9.** Suppose  $G$  finite and every irreducible  $\mathbb{C}G$ -module has dimension 1. Then  $G$  is abelian.

## 6.2 The Group Algebra and Irreducible Modules

**Lemma 6.10.** Let  $V, W$  be  $\mathbb{C}G$ -modules and  $\theta : V \rightarrow W$  is a  $\mathbb{C}G$ -homomorphism. There exists a submodule  $U < V$  such that  $V = \ker \theta \oplus U$  and  $U \simeq \text{im } \theta$