

# Math 506 HW2

Rohan Mukherjee

April 9, 2024

1. We need only verify that  $\text{Hom}_R(M, M)$  has inverses. Let  $T \neq 0 \in \text{Hom}_R(M, M)$  be a linear map. Then  $\ker T$  is a submodule of  $M$ . Since  $M$  is irreducible, and  $T$  is nonzero, we must have  $\ker T = 0$ , and similarly  $\text{Im } T = M$ . Thus  $T$  has a two-sided inverse  $T^{-1}$  that is also a linear transformation, which shows that  $\text{Hom}_R(M, M)$  is a division ring.
2. We shall use the vertices  $\{-1, 1\}^2$  of the square. Recall that  $r \in D_8$  will result in a 90 degree rotation of the square, and  $s$  will result in a reflection about the  $x$ -axis. Thus, we calculate the image of  $r$  to be:

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

And similarly, flipping across the  $x$ -axis would be represented by:

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus we can define a (faithful) degree 2 representation of  $D_8$  by sending  $r \mapsto T$  and  $s \mapsto S$ .

3. Let  $T = \pi(x^2)$ . Since  $x$  has order 4 in  $Q_8$ , and  $\pi$  is an embedding, we have that  $T^2 - I = 0$ , meaning that the minimal polynomial of  $T$  divides  $x^2 - 1$ . It cannot be  $x - 1$  for obvious reasons, and we wish to show that it is  $x + 1$ , so suppose by contradiction that it were  $x^2 - 1$ . Then  $T$  is similar to the following matrix:

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Recall that  $Z(Q_8) = \langle x^2 \rangle$ . Let  $T = PDP^{-1}$ . Then  $\varphi = P\pi P^{-1}$  is another embedding of  $Q_8$  into  $GL_2(\mathbb{R})$ , and now we have  $\varphi(x^2) = D$ . Let  $\varphi(y) = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ . Then we have:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ -c & d \end{pmatrix} = \varphi(x^2)\varphi(y)\varphi(x^2) = \varphi(y) = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

This in particular shows that  $b = c = 0$ , hence  $\varphi(y)$  is diagonal. However, the condition that  $\varphi(y) \neq I$  and  $\varphi(y^4) = I$  would show that  $a \neq 1$  is a fourth root of 1, which is a contradiction. Thus the minimal polynomial of  $T$  is  $x + 1$ , and  $\varphi(x) = -I$ . In particular,  $\pi(x) = P^{-1}(-I)P = -I$  as well. Thus the minimal polynomial of  $\pi(x)$  is  $x^2 + 1 = 0$ , and it's rational canonical form is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Replacing  $\pi$  with a conjugate shows that  $\pi(x)$  is the above matrix. A quick calculation shows that if  $T^2 = -I$ , then  $T$  is of the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix}$$

So let  $\pi(y)$  equal the above matrix for a suitable choice of  $a, b, c, d$ . Rewriting the last relation for the quaternion group, we get  $y = x^{-1}yx^{-1}$ . Applying  $\pi$  from above gives us the following equation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ b & -a \end{pmatrix}$$

This of course tells us that  $b = c$ . Thus  $\pi(y^2)$  is just

$$(a^2 + b^2)I$$

We cannot possibly have  $a^2 + b^2 = -1$  when  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ , which completes the proof. I note that the above contradictions could easily be used to find a degree 2 representation  $\pi : Q_8 \rightarrow GL_2(\mathbb{C})$ .

4. Assume by contradiction that  $V$  was decomposable, i.e.  $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$  for some nonzero

submodules  $V_1, V_2$ . Let  $S = \text{span} \{ v_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z} \}$ . Define the following projection:

$$\pi : V \rightarrow S \quad \text{by} \quad v_i \mapsto v_i, w_i \mapsto 0$$

And let  $\sum b_i v_i \in \pi(V_1) \cap \pi(V_2)$ . Finding  $\sum a_i v_i + \sum c_i w_i \in V_1$  and  $\sum a'_i v'_i + \sum c'_i w'_i \in V_2$  with the above image, by applying our projection we see that

$$\sum b_i v_i = \sum a_i v_i = \sum a'_i v'_i$$

Which shows that terms of each sum is equal by linear independence of the  $v_i$ . Since  $V_1 + V_2 = V$ , it must be that  $\sum b_i v_i \in V_1$  or  $V_2$ , so suppose without loss of generality it is the first case. Then we have the updated set of equations:

$$\sum b_i v_i = \pi\left(\sum b_i v_i\right) = \pi\left(\sum b_i v_i + \sum c'_i w'_i\right)$$

Where  $\sum b_i v_i \in V_1$  and  $\sum b_i v_i + \sum c'_i w'_i \in V_2$ . Once again, if  $\sum c'_i w'_i \in V_1$ , we get a contradiction since then  $\sum b_i v_i + \sum c'_i w'_i \in V_1 \cap V_2$ , where the sum would be nonzero since  $\sum b_i v_i \neq 0$  and the  $v_i, w_i$  are linearly independent. Similarly if  $\sum c'_i w'_i \in V_2$ , we get a contradiction. Thus we have verified that  $S = P_1 \oplus P_2$ .

Now note that  $x - 1, y - 1 \neq 0$ , so it acts as an invertible linear transformation. In particular,  $(x - 1)P_1 \cap (x - 1)P_2 = (x - 1)(P_1 \cap P_2) = (y - 1)P_1 \cap (y - 1)P_2 = 0$  by injectivity. Also note that for each  $w_i \in T$ ,  $w_i$  is the image of  $(x - 1)v_{i-1}$  and  $(y - 1)v_i$  per a simple calculation. These facts together show that  $T = (x - 1)P_1 \oplus (x - 1)P_2 = (y - 1)P_1 \oplus (y - 1)P_2$ .

Now take  $\sum a_i w_i \in (x - 1)P_1 \cap (y - 1)P_2$ , and suppose that (WLOG)  $\sum a_i w_i \in V_1$ . Then  $\sum a_i w_i = (x - 1) \sum a_i v_{i-1}$  where  $\sum a_i v_{i-1} \in P_1$ , and  $\sum a_i w_i = (y - 1) \sum a_i v_i$  where  $\sum a_i v_i \in P_2$ . Since the projections trivially intersect, it must be that  $\sum a_i v_{i-1} \in V_1$  and similarly  $\sum a_i v_i \in V_2$ . Since  $V_1, V_2$  are  $K$ -stable,  $(y - 1) \sum a_i v_i \in V_2$  and not in  $V_1$ , showing that  $\sum a_i w_i = 0$ . Then  $(x - 1)P_1 = T \cap (x - 1)P_1 = (y - 1)P_1 \cap (x - 1)P_1$ , showing that  $(x - 1)P_1 \subset (y - 1)P_1$ . Applying this logic in reverse shows that  $(x - 1)P_1 = (y - 1)P_1$  and that  $(x - 1)P_2 = (y - 1)P_2$ .

Since  $P_1 \oplus P_2 = S$ , suppose WLOG that  $v_0 \in P_1$ . By the above equality, we have that  $(x - 1)v_0 = w_1 \in (y - 1)P_1$ . Thus  $(y - 1)^{-1}w_1 = v_1 \in P_1$ . Similarly,  $(y - 1)v_0 = w_0 \in (x - 1)P_1$ , showing that  $(x - 1)^{-1}w_0 = v_{-1} \in P_1$ . By induction  $v_i \in P_1$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , which shows that  $P_1 = S$ . At last, if any of the  $v_i \in V_2$ , then  $v_i \in P_1 \cap P_2$  a contradiction, so  $V$  contains all the  $v_i$ . Since  $V$  is  $K$ -stable,  $(y - 1)v_i = w_i \in V_1$  for all  $i$ , which shows that  $V_1 = V$ , a contradiction. Thus  $V$  is indecomposable.