

---

ALGEBRA IV NOTES

NICHOLAS HAYEK

*Lectures by Prof. Henri Darmon*

---

## CONTENTS

Galois Motivation	1
<b>I Representation Theory</b>	<b>1</b>

In Algebra III, we studied groups, rings (& fields), and modules (& vector spaces). In this class, we consider *composite* theories, i.e. interactions between these objects. We'll spend time on representation theory (groups  $\leftrightarrow$  vector spaces) and Galois theory (fields  $\leftrightarrow$  groups).

## GALOIS MOTIVATION

Consider  $ax^2 + bx + c = 0 : a, b, c \in \mathbb{F}$ . A solution is given by the quadratic equation, which contains the root of the discriminant, i.e.  $b^2 - 4ac$ . There are similar formulas for the general cubic and quadratic, which contain cube and square roots. Is there a general solution for a  $n^{\text{th}}$  order equation? This question motivates Galois theory. No.

Galois was able to associate every polynomial  $f(x) = a_n x^n + \dots + a_0 : a_i \in \mathbb{F}$  to a group, which encodes whether  $f(x)$  is solvable by radicals.

# I Representation Theory

We can understand a group  $G$  by seeing how it acts on various objects (e.g. a set).

A *linear representation* of a finite group  $G$  is a vector space  $V$  over a field  $\mathbb{F}$  equipped with a group action DEF 1.1

$$G \times V \rightarrow V$$

that respects the vector space, i.e.  $m_g : V \rightarrow V$  with  $m_g(v) = gv$  is a linear transformation. We make the following assumptions unless otherwise stated:

1.  $G$  is finite.
2.  $V$  is finite dimensional.
3.  $\mathbb{F}$  is algebraically closed and of characteristic 0 (e.g.  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ).

Since  $V$  is a  $G$ -set,  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$  which sends  $g \mapsto m_g$  is a homomorphism. Relatedly, if  $\dim(V) < \infty$ , then  $\rho : G \mapsto \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V) = \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{F})$ .

The *group ring*  $\mathbb{F}[G]$  is a (typically) non-commutative ring consisting of all linear combinations  $\{\sum_{g \in G} \lambda_g g : \lambda_g \in \mathbb{F}\}$ . It's endowed with the multiplication DEF 1.2

$$\left( \sum_{g \in G} \alpha_g g \right) \left( \sum_{h \in G} \beta_h h \right) = \sum_{g, h \in G \times G} \alpha_g \beta_h (gh)$$

where, in particular,  $(\sum \lambda_g) v = \sum \lambda_g (gv)$ .

A representation  $V$  of  $G$  is *irreducible* if there is no  $G$ -stable, non-trivial sub- DEF 1.3

By  $G$ -stable, we mean  $gw \in W \forall w \in W, g \in G$

space  $W \subsetneq V$ . This definition is somewhat analogous to transitive  $G$ -sets. Note, however, that  $V$  is never a transitive  $G$ -set, since  $g\vec{0} = \vec{0} \forall g$ .

E.G. 1.1

### ♠ Examples ♣

**Eg 1:** Let  $G = \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{1, \tau\} : \tau^2 = 1$ . If  $V$  is a representation of  $G$ , then  $V$  is determined by  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$ , i.e.  $\rho(\tau) \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$ . What are the eigenvalues of  $\rho(\tau)$ ? It's minimal polynomial must divide  $x^2 - 1 = (x - 1)(x + 1)$ .

Supposing  $2 \neq 0$  in  $\mathbb{F}$ , we have

$$V = V_+ \oplus V_- \quad V_+ = \{v \in V : \tau v = v\}, V_- = \{v \in V : \tau v = -v\}$$

$V$  is then irreducible  $\iff (\dim(V_+), \dim(V_-)) = (1, 0)$  or  $(0, 1)$ .

**Eg 2:** Let  $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_N\}$  be a finite abelian group. Let  $\mathbb{F}$  be algebraically closed with characteristic 0 (e.g.  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{C}$ ). If  $V$  is a representation of  $G$ , then  $T_1, \dots, T_N$  with  $T_i = \rho(g_i) \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$  commute with each other.

It's a fact that, if  $T_i$  commute with each other, then they have a simultaneous eigenvector  $v \in V$ . Hence, the scalar multiples of  $v$  comprise a  $G$ -stable subspace, so the representation  $V$  is irreducible if  $\dim(V) = 1$ .

By complex, we mean (a vector space over) an algebraically closed field with characteristic 0.

### 1.1 Finite Abelian Representation

If  $G$  is a finite abelian group, and  $V$  is irreducible representation of  $G$  over a complex field, then  $\dim(V) = 1$ .

PROOF.

$G = \{g_1, \dots, g_N\}$ . Then consider  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(V)$ , and let  $T_j : V \rightarrow V = \rho(g_j)$ . Then,  $T_j$  and  $T_i$  pairwise commute (since  $G$  is abelian).  $T_1, \dots, T_N$  have a simultaneous eigenvector  $v$  by Prop 1.1. Hence,  $\text{span}(\{v\})$  is a  $G$ -stable subspace. Since  $V$  is irreducible, we conclude  $V = \text{span}(\{v\})$ .  $\square$

PROP 1.1

If  $T_1, \dots, T_N$  is a collection of linear transformations on a complex vector space, then they have a simultaneous eigenvector, i.e.  $\exists v : T_j v = \lambda_j v \forall j$ .

PROOF.

By induction. Consider  $T_1$ . Since  $\mathbb{F}$  is complex, its minimal polynomial has a root  $\lambda$ , which is precisely an eigenvalue. Hence, an eigenvector exists.

$n \rightarrow n + 1$ . Let  $\lambda$  be an eigenvalue for  $T_{N+1}$ . Consider  $V_\lambda := \text{Eig}_{T_{N+1}}(\lambda)$ , the eigenvectors for  $\lambda$ . We claim that  $T_j$  maps  $V_\lambda \rightarrow V_\lambda$ , i.e.  $V_\lambda$  is  $T_j$ -stable. For this, we have  $T_{N+1} T_j v = T_j T_{N+1} v = \lambda T_j v$ , so  $T_j v \in V_\lambda$ .

By induction hypothesis, there is a simultaneous eigenvector  $v$  in  $V_\lambda$  for

$T_1, \dots, T_N$ . (Thinking of  $T_j$  as a linear transformation  $V_\lambda \rightarrow V_\lambda$  via its restriction).  $\square$

---

♠ Examples ♣

---

E.G. 1.2

**Eg 1:** Let  $G = S_3$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  be arbitrary with  $2 \neq 0$ . Then consider  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$ , an irreducible representation. What is  $T = \rho((23))$ ?  $T^2 = I$ , so  $T$  is diagonalizable with eigenvalues in  $\{1, -1\}$ .

*Case 1:*  $-1$  is the only eigenvalue of  $T$ . Then  $(23)$  acts as  $-I$ . Since  $(23)$  and  $(12), (13)$  are conjugate,  $(12), (13)$  act as  $-I$  as well (since  $-I, I$  commute with everything). What about  $\rho(123)$ ? This is  $\rho((13)(12)) = \rho(13)\rho(12) = (-I)^2 = I$ . Hence, all order 3 elements act as  $I$ .

We conclude that  $\rho(g) = \text{sgn}(g)$  (i.e. 0 for even, 1 for odd permutations).

*Case 2:* 1 is an eigenvalue of  $T = \rho(23)$ . Let  $e_1$  be a non-zero vector fixed by  $T$ , i.e.  $Te_1 = e_1$ . Then let  $e_2 = (123)e_1$  and  $e_3 = (123)^2e_1$ . Then  $\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$  is an  $S_3$ -stable subspace, so  $V = \text{span}(e_1, e_2, e_3)$ .

$\hookrightarrow$  *Case 2a:*  $w = e_1 + e_2 + e_3 \neq 0$ . Then  $S_3$  fixes  $w$ . One checks that  $\sigma(e_i + e_j + e_k) = e_{\sigma(i)} + e_{\sigma(j)} + e_{\sigma(k)}$ . Hence,  $\sigma w = w$ .

$\hookrightarrow$  *Case 2b:*  $e_1 + e_2 + e_3 = 0$ . Then  $V = \text{span}(e_1, e_2, e_3)$  as before.  $\dim(V) \leq 2$ , and  $e_1 \neq e_2 \neq e_3$ . Then  $(23)e_1 = e_1$  and  $(23)(e_2 - e_3) = e_3 - e_2 = -(e_2 - e_3)$ . Hence, we have two eigenvalues for  $\rho(23)$ , so  $\dim(V) \geq 2 \implies \dim(V) = 2$ .

Relative to the basis  $e_1, e_2$  for  $V$ , the representation of  $S_3$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & (12) &\leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & (13) &\leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & (23) &\leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \\ & & (123) &\leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} & (132) &\leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Conclusion: there are essentially 3 distinct, irreducible representations of  $S_3$ :

1.  $\text{sgn} : S_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$
2.  $\text{Id}$
3. A 2-dim representation

---

If  $V_1, V_2$  are two representations of a group  $G$ , a  $G$ -homomorphism from  $V_1$  to  $V_2$  is a linear map  $\varphi : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$  which is compatible with the action on  $G$ , i.e.  $\varphi(gv) = g\varphi(v) \forall g \in G, v \in V_1$ .

DEF 1.4

DEF 1.5

If a  $G$ -homomorphism  $\varphi$  is a vector space isomorphism, then  $V_1 \cong V_2$  as representations.

E.G. 1.3

---

♠ Examples ♣

---

Consider  $G = D_8$ , the symmetries of a square. We may label this group  $G = \{1, r, r^2, r^3, V, H, D_1, D_2\}$ . We want to think up some representation  $\rho : D_8 \rightarrow \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$ , where  $2 \neq 0$  by assumption.

Consider  $r^2$ . It commutes with everything. Then  $T = \rho(r^2) \in \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V)$  is an order 2 element, so  $T^2 = I$ . Since  $2 \neq 0$ ,  $V = V_+ \oplus V_-$ , where  $V_+ = \{v : Tv = v\}$  and  $V_- = \{v : Tv = -v\}$ .

We claim that  $V_+$  and  $V_-$  are both preserved by any  $g \in D_8$ . Take  $v \in V_+$ . Then  $Tgv = r^2gv = gr^2v = gTv = gv$ . The result follows similarly for  $v \in V_-$ . Hence, if  $V$  is an irreducible representation, then either  $V = V_+$  or  $V = V_-$ , i.e.  $\rho(r^2) = I$  or  $-I$ .

*Case 1:*  $\rho(r^2) = I$ , so  $\rho$  is not injective, and  $\ker(\rho) \subseteq \{1, r^2\}$ . We can write the following, then:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} D_8 & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \text{Aut}_{\mathbb{F}}(V) \\ & \searrow \pi & \nearrow \varphi \\ & K_4 & \end{array}$$

Since  $2\mathbb{Z} \times 2\mathbb{Z} = K_4$  is abelian, we have 4 1-dim irreducible representations  $\varphi$  into  $\text{Aut}(V)$ . Hence, we compose with  $\pi$  to yield these for  $D_8$ .

*Case 2:*  $\rho(r^2) = -I$ . We claim that  $\rho(H)$  has both eigenvalues  $-1$  and  $1$ . If  $\rho(H) = I$ , then  $\rho(V) = \rho(r^2H) = -I$ . But we also have  $V = rHr^{-1}$ , so  $\rho(rHr^{-1}) = \rho(r)\rho(H)\rho(r^{-1}) = I \implies \text{contradiction}$ . We draw a similar contradiction by taking  $\rho(H) = -I$ . Hence,  $H$  has both eigenvalues, so  $\dim(V) \geq 2$ .

Let  $v_1, v_2 \in V$  be such that  $Hv_1 = v_1$  and  $v_2 = rv_1$ . We claim that  $\text{span}(v_1, v_2)$  is preserved by  $D_8$ , and hence  $\text{span}(v_1, v_2) = V$ .

Consider  $r \in D_8$ . We know  $rv_1 = v_2$  and  $rv_2 = r^2v_1 = -v_1$ , so  $\{1, r, r^2, r^3\}$  preserve  $\text{span}(v_1, v_2)$ .

Consider  $H \in D_8$ .  $Hv_1 = v_1$  by construction. Also,  $Hv_2 = Hrv_1 = r^{-1}Hv_1 = r^{-1}v_1 = r^3v_1 = r^2v_2 = -v_2$ . Hence,  $H$  composed with  $\{1, r, r^2, r^3\}$ , i.e. the whole group  $D_8$  preserve  $\text{span}(v_1, v_2)$ , as desired.

$$H \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad r \leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{the rest follow by composition})$$

---

Some questions to consider:

1. Can we describe *all* irreducible representations of  $G$  up to isomorphism?
2. How is a general representation of  $G$  made up of irreducible representations?

If  $V_1, V_2$  are representations of  $G$ , then  $V_1 \oplus V_2$  is also a representation of  $G$ , with  $g(v_1, v_2) = (gv_1, gv_2)$ . PROP 1.2

### 1.2 Maschke's Theorem

Any representation of a finite group  $G$  over a complex field can be expressed as a direct sum of irreducible representations.

Let  $V$  be a representation of  $G$ . Let  $W$  be a proper sub-representation of  $G$  in  $V$ . Let  $W'$  be the complementary subspace such that  $V = W \oplus W'$ , as in Prop 1.3. Then  $\dim(W), \dim(W') < n$ . We proceed by induction, relying on this lessening of dimension. PROOF.

Remark 1: this is analogous to "every  $G$ -set is a disjoint union of transitive  $G$ -sets." However, this is a trivial result, but Maschke's is not.

Remark 2: the assumption  $|G| < \infty$  is essential. As a counterexample, take  $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$  and  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{C}) = \rho(n) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , i.e.  $ne_1 = e_1$  and  $ne_2 = ne_1 + e_2$ . Note that the line  $\text{span}(e_1)$  is a  $G$ -stable subspace, i.e. an irreducible sub-representation of  $V$ . Are there any other invariant lines? Take  $ae_1 + be_2$ . WLOG assume  $b = 1$ . Consider  $W = G(ae_1 + e_2)$ . Then  $1 \cdot (ae_1 + e_2) = (1 + a)e_1 + e_2 \in W$ , so  $e_1 \in W$ .

Remark 3:  $\mathbb{C}$  is necessary. Let  $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $G = S_3$ . Then let  $V = \mathbb{F}e_1 + \mathbb{F}e_2 + \mathbb{F}e_3$ .  $\mathbb{F}(e_1 + e_2 + e_3)$  is an irreducible representation. Let  $W$  be any  $G$ -stable subspace of  $V$ . Then  $\exists a, b, c$ , not all equal, with  $ae_1 + be_2 + ce_3 \in W$ . Multiplying by  $(123)$ ,  $ce_1 + ae_2 + be_3 \in W$ , and once more by  $(132)$  yields  $be_1 + ce_2 + ae_3 \in W$ . Hence,  $(a + b + c)(e_1 + e_2 + e_3) \in W$ .

We have, then, that  $(a - b)(e_1 - e_2), (b - c)(e_2 - e_3), (a - c)(e_1 - e_3) \in W$ . At least one of these must be non-zero, WLOG take  $a - b \neq 0$ . Then  $e_1 - e_2, e_2 - e_3, e_3 - e_1 \in W$ .

Observe now that  $(e_1 - e_2) + (e_2 - e_3) - (e_3 - e_1) = 2e_1 - \text{BLAH}$ . it works out. Show that  $e_1 + e_2 + e_3 \in W \implies W \subseteq \mathbb{F}(e_1 + e_2 + e_3)$ .

### 1.3 Semi-Simplicity of Representations

Let  $V$  be a representation of a finite group  $G$  above a complex field. Let  $W \subseteq V$  be a sub-representation. Then  $W$  has a  $G$ -stable complement  $W'$  such that  $V = W \oplus W'$ .

PROOF.

Consider a projection  $\pi_0 : V \rightarrow W$  with  $\pi_0^2 = \pi_0$ ,  $\text{Im}(\pi_0) = W$ . Let  $\ker(\pi) = W'_0$ . Then we can write  $V = W \oplus W'_0$ . However, we have no guarantee that  $W'_0$  is  $G$ -stable.

We alter  $\pi$  by replacing it with

$$\pi = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} \rho(g) \circ \pi_0 \circ \rho(g)^{-1}$$

Some properties of  $\pi$ :

1.  $\pi \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(V)$ .
2.  $\pi$  is a projection onto  $W$ . See that

$$\pi^2 = \left( \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} g \pi_0 g^{-1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{h \in G} h \pi_0 h^{-1} \right) = \frac{1}{\#G^2} \sum_{g, h \in G} g \pi_0 g^{-1} h \pi_0 h^{-1}$$

where, by writing  $g$  (or  $h$ ), we mean its linear representation in  $V$ . Note that  $\pi_0 h^{-1}$  sends any  $v \in V$  to a vector in  $W$ . Since  $W$  is  $G$ -invariant,  $g^{-1} h \pi_0 h^{-1}$  also sends  $v$  to  $W$ . But now the next  $\pi_0$  acts as the identity (since we're already in  $W$ ). Hence, the above summand reduces to  $h \pi_0 h^{-1}$ , and we may write

$$\pi^2 = \frac{1}{\#G^2} \sum_{g, h \in G} h \pi_0 h^{-1} = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{h \in G} h \pi_0 h^{-1} = \pi$$

3.  $\text{Im}(\pi) = W$ .  $\text{Im}(\pi) \subseteq W$ . But let  $w \in W$ . Then  $\pi(w) = w$  (check it).
4.  $\pi(hv) = h\pi(v) \forall h \in G$ . See that

$$\pi(hv) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} g \pi g^{-1} hv = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} g \pi (h^{-1} g)^{-1} v$$

Now, let  $\tilde{g} = h^{-1} g$ . Then  $g = h \tilde{g}$ , and we write

$$= \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\tilde{g} \in G} h \tilde{g} \pi \tilde{g} v = h \pi(v)$$

We can now take  $W' = \ker(\pi)$  and write  $V = W \oplus W'$ . We have that  $W'$  is  $G$ -stable, now, since  $w \in W' \implies \pi(gw) = g\pi(w) = g0 = 0 \implies gw \in W'$ .  $\square$

We'll now give a second proof of Thm 1.2. Consider



A Hermitian inner product of  $V$  is a Hermitian, bilinear mapping

DEF 1.6

$$V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

satisfying  $\langle v_1 + v_2, w \rangle = \langle v_1, w \rangle + \langle v_2, w \rangle$  and  $\langle \lambda v, w \rangle = \lambda \langle v, w \rangle$ . On the second coordinate, we have  $\langle v, w_1 + w_2 \rangle = \langle v, w_1 \rangle + \langle v, w_2 \rangle$  and  $\langle v, \lambda w \rangle = \bar{\lambda} \langle v, w \rangle$ . This "skew linearity" in the second argument allows us to impose  $\langle v, v \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\langle v, v \rangle = 0 \iff v = 0$ .

One can think of  $\langle v, v \rangle$  as the square of the "length" of  $v$ .

#### 1.4 Hermitian Pairing on Representation

If  $V$  is a complex representation of a finite group  $G$ , then there is a Hermitian inner product on  $V$  such that

$$\langle gv, gw \rangle = \langle v, w \rangle \quad \forall g \in G, v, w \in V$$

Let  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_0$  be an arbitrary Hermitian inner product on  $V$ . To do so, choose a basis  $(e_1, \dots, e_n)$  be a complex basis for  $V$ , and define

PROOF.

$$\langle e_i, e_j \rangle_0 = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j, 1 \text{ o.w.}$$

Then  $\left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha e_i, \sum_{i=1}^n \beta e_i \right\rangle = \alpha_1 \bar{\beta}_1 + \dots + \alpha_n \bar{\beta}_n \in \mathbb{C}$ . Similar to the proof for Prop 1.3, we will take an average. Consider another inner product

$$\langle v, w \rangle = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} \langle gv, gw \rangle_0$$

This has some nice properties. In particular,  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is Hermitian linear, positive definite, and  $G$ -equivalent.

We'll verify positiveness:

$$\langle v, v \rangle = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} \underbrace{\langle gv, gv \rangle_0}_{\geq 0} \geq 0$$

Suppose  $\langle v, v \rangle = 0$ . Then  $\sum_{g \in G} \langle gv, gv \rangle_0 = 0$ , so  $\langle gv, gv \rangle_0 = 0 \quad \forall g \in G$ . In particular, for  $g = 1$ ,  $\langle v, v \rangle_0 = 0 \iff v = 0$ .

And to verify  $G$ -equivariant, we have  $\langle hv, hw \rangle = \langle v, w \rangle$ . □

Let  $G = S_3$ . We saw there is a unique 2-dim representation of  $S_3$ , where we construct  $e_1, e_2, e_3 \in V$  with  $e_1 + e_2 + e_3 = 0$  such that  $\sigma$  simply permutes the vectors. However, they are not necessarily the same "length."

PROOF OF 1.2

Now, to Thm 1.2, if  $W$  is a sub-representation, let  $W^\perp = \{v \in V : \langle v, w \rangle = 0\}$  over the Hermitian inner product outlined in Thm 1.4.

Then we may write  $V = W \oplus W^\perp$ . The  $G$ -stability of  $W^\perp$  follows from equivariance of the inner product.  $v \in W^\perp \implies \langle gv, w \rangle = \langle v, g^{-1}w \rangle = 0 \implies gv \in W^\perp$ .

This "semi-simple" structure of representations is a rare sight: abelian groups, and especially groups generally, are not necessarily made of irreducible components.

We ask the following 2 questions:

1. Given  $G$ , produce the complete list of irreducible representations up to isomorphism.
2. Given a general, finite dimensional representation  $V$  of  $G$ , generate

$$V = V_1^{m_1} \oplus V_2^{m_2} \oplus \dots \oplus V_t^{m_t} \quad V_i \text{ irreducible}$$

If  $V$  and  $W$  are two  $G$ -representations, we may investigate  $\text{Hom}_G(V, W) = \{T : T \rightarrow W : T \text{ linear s.t. } T(gv) = gT(v)\}$ . Note that  $\text{Hom}_G(V, W)$  is a  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space.

### 1.5 Schur's Lemma

Let  $V, W$  be irreducible representations of  $G$ . Then

$$\text{Hom}_G(V, W) = \begin{cases} 0 & V \not\cong W \\ \mathbb{C} & V \cong W \end{cases}$$

PROOF.

Suppose that  $V \not\cong W$ , and let  $T \in \text{Hom}_G(V, W)$ .  $\ker(T) \subseteq V$  is a sub-representation of  $G$ , since  $v \in \ker(T) \implies T(gv) = gT(v) = 0$ . Hence, since  $V$  is irreducible,  $\ker(T)$  may be trivial or  $V$  itself. If it were trivial, then  $\text{Im}(T) \cong V$ . But  $\text{Im}(T) \subseteq W$ , so by irreducibility of  $W$  we yield a contradiction. Hence,  $\ker(T) = V$ , so  $T = 0$ .

Suppose that  $V \cong W$ . Let  $T \in \text{Hom}_G(V, W) = \text{End}_G(V)$ . Since  $\mathbb{C}$  is algebraically closed,  $T$  has an eigenvalue  $\lambda$ . Then  $T - \lambda I \in \text{End}_G(V)$ .  $\ker(T - \lambda I)$  is a non-trivial sub-representation of  $V$ , and hence  $\ker(T - \lambda I) = V \implies T = \lambda I$ .  $\square$

Recall question (2) from above. As a corollary of Schur's Lemma, we see that  $m_j = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Hom}_G(V_j, V)$ .

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_G(V_j, V) &= \text{Hom}_G(V_j, V_1 \oplus \dots \oplus V_{t'}) = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}(V_j, V_i) : V_i \cong V_j \ \forall i \in I \\ &= \underbrace{\mathbb{C} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{C}}_{|I|=m_j \text{ times}} \implies \dim \text{Hom}_G(V_j, V) = m_j \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

For an endomorphism  $T : V \rightarrow V$ , the *trace*  $\text{tr}(T) = \text{tr}([T]_\beta)$ , where  $\beta$  is some basis. This is well-defined, since basis representations  $[T]_\alpha, [T]_\beta$  are conjugate, and  $\text{tr}(AB) = \text{tr}(BA) \implies \text{tr}$  is conjugate-invariant.

DEF 1.7

Let  $W \subseteq V$  be a subspace and  $\pi$  be a function  $V \rightarrow W$  such that  $\pi^2 = \pi$  and  $\text{Im}(\pi) = W$ . Then  $\text{tr}(\pi) = \dim(W)$ .

PROP 1.3

Let  $v_1, \dots, v_d$  be a basis for  $W$  and  $v_{d+1}, \dots, v_n$  be a basis for  $\ker(\pi)$ . Then, since we can write  $V = W \oplus \ker(\pi)$  (recall projection properties),  $\beta = d_1, \dots, d_n$  is a basis for  $V$ . In this basis,  $\pi(v_i) = v_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq d$ . Hence

PROOF.

$$[\pi]_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & 0 & 0 & & & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & & & \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & & & \\ \hline & & & d & & \\ & & & \vdots & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \end{array} & \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

As for the rest of the matrix,  $\pi(v_i)$  for  $i > d$  will be mapped to a linear combination of basis vectors  $v_i : i \leq d$ , so, in particular, they will not have diagonal 1 entries. Since  $d = \dim(W)$ , we conclude  $\text{tr}(\pi) = \dim(W)$ .  $\square$

Let  $V_1 = \mathbb{C}$  have the trivial action of  $G$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_G(V_1, V) = V^G = \{v \in V : gv = v \forall g \in G\}$ .

DEF 1.8

### 1.6 "Burnside"

If  $V$  is any representation of  $G$ , then

$$\dim(V^G) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{g \in G} \text{tr}(\rho(g))$$

Thm 1.6  $\implies$  Burnside's Lemma.

PROP 1.4

PROOF.

Given a  $G$ -set  $X$ , we can consider  $V = \mathbb{C}^X$ , the set of scalar functions on  $X$ . Then  $V^G = \{f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : gf = f\}$ . Then  $f \in V^G \implies gf(x) = f(g^{-1}(x))$ . Hence,  $f(x) = f(g^{-1}x)$ .  $\dim(V^G) = \#$  of orbits of  $G$  on  $X$ . Similarly,  $\text{tr}(g \circ V) = \# \text{FP}_X(g)$ .  $\square$