

Recall

Def: (1) irreducible  
 a representation is called irreducible if it contains no proper subrep.

(2) completely reducible  
 It's called  $\downarrow$  if it decomposes as a direct sum of irreducible subrep.

Example: The left regular rep.  
 suppose  $G$  is a finite group,  $F$  is a field.  
 $F[G]$ : vector space of  $F$ -valued functions on  $G$ . it has vector space basis  $\{e_g : g \in G\}$ .  
 $e_g = e_g(h) = \begin{cases} 1 & h=g \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$   
 "delta function".

$G$  acts on basis by  
 $f(g) e_h = e_{gh}$ .  
 left translation by  $g$ .  
 extends by linearity to  $F[G]$   $h \in F$ .  
 $f(g) (\sum_{h \in G} \lambda_h e_h) = \sum_{h \in G} \lambda_h f(g) e_h = \sum_{h \in G} \lambda_h e_{gh}$   
 $F[G]$  is a rep of  $G$ , called the left regular rep.  
 right regular rep.  
 $f(g) (e_h) = e_{hg^{-1}}$

Example:  $G = \langle x \rangle = \{1, x\}$   
 $x^2 = 1$   
 $F = F_2 = \{0, 1\}$

$F[G]$  is not completely reducible.  
 Let  $w = e_1 + e_x$ ,  $W = \text{span}(w)$ .  
 $W$  is  $G$ -invariant.  
 $f(x)(e_1 + e_x) = (e_{x \cdot 1} + e_{x \cdot x}) = e_x + e_1 = e_1 + e_x$   
 check there is no other  $G$ -invariant subspaces  
 $\text{span}\{e_1, e_x\} = \{0, e_1, e_x, e_1 + e_x\}$

$F[G]$  is not completely reducible.

Exp 2:  
 $G = C_n$ ,  $F = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $V = \mathbb{C}[C_n]$  is completely reducible.  
 $\dim V = n$ .  
 Let  $\varphi = \exp(\frac{2\pi i}{n})$ .  
 define  $E_k = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi^{kj} e_{x^j} \in \mathbb{C}[G]$   
 $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ .  
 $f(x)(E_k) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi^{kj} e_{x \cdot x^j} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi^{k(j+1)} e_{x^{j+1}} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \varphi^{(j+1)k} e_{x^{j+1}} \cdot \varphi^{-k}$   
 $= E_k \cdot \varphi^{-k}$   
 $\Rightarrow E_k$  spans a 1-D subrep of  $\mathbb{C}[C_n]$   
 $\mathbb{C}[C_n] = \bigoplus_k \mathbb{C} E_k$   
 $\Rightarrow \mathbb{C}[C_n]$  is completely reducible.

$G$ -homo & Schur's Lemma.

Def: Let  $(V^1, \rho^1)$  and  $(V^2, \rho^2)$  be rep of  $G$  over  $F$ . A  $G$ -homomorphism from  $(V^1, \rho^1)$  to  $(V^2, \rho^2)$  is an  $F$ -linear mapping  $\phi: V^1 \rightarrow V^2$ , which intertwines the action of  $G$ .  
 i.e.  $\phi(\rho^1(g)v) = \rho^2(g)\phi(v)$  for all  $g \in G, v \in V^1$   
 the diagram commutes:  

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V^1 & \xrightarrow{\rho^1(g)} & V^1 \\ \phi \downarrow & & \downarrow \phi \\ V^2 & \xrightarrow{\rho^2(g)} & V^2 \end{array}$$

(1) Denote  $\text{Hom}_G(V^1, V^2) = \{\phi: V^1 \rightarrow V^2 : \phi \text{ is } G\text{-homo}\}$   
 $\text{End}_G(V^1) = \{\phi: V^1 \rightarrow V^1, \phi \text{ is } G\text{-homo}\}$

Remark:  
 (1). An invertible  $G$ -homomorphism is a  $G$ -isomorphism.  
 (2) usually we drop  $\rho^1$  and  $\rho^2$  from notation.  $\phi(gv) = g\phi(v)$

Lemma: Let  $\phi: V \rightarrow W$  be a  $G$ -homo.  
 (1)  $\ker \phi$  and  $\text{Im } \phi$  is a subrep of  $V$  and  $W$  respectively.

Pf: it suffices to show  $\ker \phi$  and  $\text{Im } \phi$  are  $G$ -invariant.

(1) if  $k \in \ker \phi, g \in G$ ,  
 $\phi(\rho(g)(k)) = \rho(g)\phi(k) = \rho(g)(0) = 0$ .  
 $\phi$  is  $G$ -homo. by linearity.  
 $\Rightarrow \rho(g)(k) \in \ker \phi$ .  
 $\Rightarrow \ker \phi$  is  $G$ -invariant.  
 (2) if  $l \in \text{Im } \phi, \Rightarrow \exists k$  s.t.  
 $l = \phi(k)$   
 $\rho(g)(l) = \rho(g)(\phi(k)) = \phi(\rho(g)(k))$   
 $\Rightarrow \rho(g)(l) \in \text{Im } \phi$ .  
 $\Rightarrow \text{Im } \phi$  is  $G$ -invariant.

Lemma: (Schur's Lemma)  
 Assume the field  $F$  is algebraically closed,  $G$  is a finite group. Let  $\varphi, \rho$  be two irreducible rep of  $G$ , and  $T \in \text{Hom}_G(\varphi, \rho)$ , then either  $T$  is 0 or  $T$  is invertible.

So, (1). If  $\varphi$  is not isomorphic to  $\rho$ , then  $\text{Hom}_G(\varphi, \rho) = 0$ .

(2). if  $\varphi = \rho$ , then  $T = \lambda I$  with  $\lambda \in F$ .

Pf:  $\varphi: G \rightarrow GL(V)$   $\rho: G \rightarrow GL(W)$   
 $T: V \rightarrow W$ ,  
 if  $T \neq 0$ , then, by last lemma,  $\ker T$  and  $\text{Im } T$  are irreducible,  
 $\Rightarrow \ker T$  is either 0 or  $V$ ,  
 $\text{Im } T$  is either 0 or  $W$ .  
 since  $T$  is not 0,  $\ker T \neq V$ ,  
 $T$  is an isomorphism  $\Leftrightarrow \text{Im } T \neq 0$ .  
 $\ker T$  is 0,  $\text{Im } T = W$ .

(2): since  $F$  is algebraically closed, there  $\exists$  a  $\lambda \in F$  s.t.  $Tv = \lambda v$ .  
 $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue.  $\Rightarrow \lambda I - T$  is in  $\text{Hom}_G(\varphi, \rho)$   
 since  $\lambda I - T$  is not invertible,  
 $(\lambda I - T)g = 0$ .  $\ker(\lambda I - T) \neq 0$ .  
 $(\lambda I - T)0 = 0$ .  
 $\Rightarrow \lambda I - T = 0$ .  
 $T = \lambda I$ .

Cor let  $G$  be an abelian group,  
 then any irreducible rep of  $G$  has degree one.

Let  $\varphi: G \rightarrow GL(V)$ , be an irreducible rep,  
 pick a  $h \in G$ , we can set  $T = \varphi_h$ ,  
 for any  $g \in G$ ,

$T\varphi_g = \varphi_h \cdot \varphi_g = \varphi_{hg} = \varphi_{gh} = \varphi_g \cdot \varphi_h = \varphi_g T$ .  
 By Schur's Lemma,  $T = \varphi_h = \lambda_h \cdot I$ .  
 Let  $v$  be a non-zero vector in  $V$ ,  $k \in F$ ,  
 $\varphi_h(kv) = \lambda_h kv \in F[v]$   
 $\Rightarrow F[v]$  is  $G$ -invariant subspace,  
 since  $T = \varphi_h$  is irreducible  
 $V = Fv \Rightarrow \dim V = 1$ .