

CONJUGACY IN PERMUTATION REPRESENTATIONS OF THE SYMMETRIC GROUP

YONA CHERNIAVSKY AND MISHAEL SKLARZ

ABSTRACT. Although the conjugacy classes of the general linear group are known, it is not obvious (from the canonic form of matrices) that two permutation matrices are similar if and only if they are conjugate as permutations in the symmetric group, i.e. that conjugacy classes of S_n do not unite under the natural representation. We prove this fact, and give its application to the enumeration of fixed points under a natural action of $S_n \times S_n$. We also consider the permutation representations of S_n which arise from the action of S_n on ordered tuples and on unordered subsets, and classify which of them unite conjugacy classes and which do not.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the action of S_n on ordered k -tuples. Denote by $\rho_k^{\mathbb{F}}$ the corresponding permutation representation over an arbitrary field \mathbb{F} . The following problem was presented to us by A. Lubotzky and Y. Roichman.

Problem 1. *For which $1 \leq k \leq n$ does the following hold:*

For any two permutations $\pi, \sigma \in S_n$, $\rho_k^{\mathbb{F}}(\pi)$ is conjugate to $\rho_k^{\mathbb{F}}(\sigma)$ in $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$ if and only if π and σ are conjugate in S_n .

This problem arises in the enumeration of invertible matrices with respect to a certain natural action of $S_n \times S_n$, see [CB] and Section 4 below. Our Theorem 4.5 is used by C. de la Mora and P. Wojciechowski [MW] in enumerating of multiplicative bases of matrix algebras.

For $k = n$, a negative solution to Problem 1 was essentially given by Burnside [B]. In Section 2 it is shown that for $k = 1$ the answer is positive. A full solution is given in Section 3: We find that $\rho_1^{\mathbb{F}}$ and $\rho_2^{\mathbb{F}}$ do not unite any classes, that $\rho_3^{\mathbb{F}}$ unites classes only when n is even, and that $\rho_k^{\mathbb{F}}$ for $k \geq 4$ always unites some classes. In Subsection 3.2 we try to generalize these results to the permutation representations of S_n arising from the action of S_n on (unordered) k -subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$: it appears that the representation arising from the action of S_n on *all* subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ does not unite any classes (Theorem 3.12); when n is odd, the action of S_n on the set of even-sized subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ does not unite classes (Theorem 3.13) and finally, the action of S_n on the set of odd-sized subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ does not unite classes and this does not depend on n 's parity (Theorem 3.14). These results do not depend on the choice of the field \mathbb{F} . Finally, our results are applied in Section

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20C30; Secondary 05E15.

Key words and phrases. conjugacy classes, symmetric group, permutation representations, characters, fixed points.

Supported in part by a grant from the Israel Science Foundation.

4 to the enumeration of fixed points of a natural action of $S_n \times S_n$ on invertible matrices.

2. THE NATURAL REPRESENTATION OF S_n

There is an obvious embedding of S_n in $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$ where \mathbb{F} is any field. Consider a permutation $\pi \in S_n$ as an $n \times n$ matrix obtained from the identity matrix by permutations of the rows. More explicitly: for every permutation $\pi \in S_n$ we identify π with the matrix:

$$[\pi]_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & i = \pi(j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This representation can also be realized as the permutation representation which is obtained from the natural action of S_n on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ defined by $\pi \cdot i = \pi(i)$.

Our first result is that this representation does not unite conjugacy classes of S_n . We shall use the following well known fact:

Fact 2.1. *If σ is a cycle of length n , then σ^k consists of (n, k) cycles, each of length $n/(n, k)$.¹*

Theorem 2.2. *The conjugacy classes of S_n do not unite in $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$. In other words, if π and σ are permutations with similar matrices in $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$, then they are conjugate in S_n too.*

Proof. Let π and σ be permutations which are similar as matrices. First of all, we note that for any k , π^k and σ^k are also similar.

Case 1: $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 0$ or at least $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) > n$.

Each cycle of length k in π contributes the term $x^k - 1$ into the characteristic polynomial of the permutation matrix. Under the above restriction on $\text{char}(\mathbb{F})$ it seems reasonable that the cycle structure of a permutation can be recovered from the characteristic polynomial of the corresponding permutation matrix. However, our proof utilizes the trace of the permutation matrix and the traces of its powers.

Denote by $c_d(\pi)$ the number cycles with length equal to d in π . We shall use induction on d to prove that $c_d(\pi) = c_d(\sigma)$, for all d , and this will show that π and σ are conjugate.

Since π and σ are similar as matrices, we have $\text{trace}(\pi) = \text{trace}(\sigma)$. However, the trace function counts the 1's on the diagonal (here we use the restriction on $\text{char}(\mathbb{F})$), and each such 1 corresponds to a fixed point of the permutation, so $\text{trace}(\pi) = c_1(\pi)$. Therefore, $c_1(\pi) = c_1(\sigma)$, i.e. π and σ have the same number of fixed points. This is the base of our induction.

Now let d be an arbitrary number, and suppose that $c_k(\pi) = c_k(\sigma)$ for all $k < d$. From Lemma 2.1 it follows that a k -cycle in π ends up as a product of k 1-cycles in π^d if and only if k divides d . Therefore, we can conclude that

$$\text{trace}(\pi^d) = \sum_{k|d} k \cdot c_k(\pi) = d \cdot c_d(\pi) + \sum_{k|d, k < d} k \cdot c_k(\pi).$$

Now, by our induction hypothesis, for all proper divisors $k \mid d$ we have $c_k(\pi) = c_k(\sigma)$. On the other hand, $\text{trace}(\pi^d) = \text{trace}(\sigma^d)$. This implies that $c_d(\pi) = c_d(\sigma)$, and completes the induction argument.

¹We use (n, k) to denote the greatest common divisor of n and k .

We have shown that π and σ have the same cycle structure, so they are conjugate as permutations.

Case 2: With no restriction on $\text{char}(\mathbb{F})$

In this case, the trace of a permutation matrix no longer gives the number of fixed points of the permutation, so a more devious route is necessary.

Note that in this case it is impossible to recover the cycle structure of a permutation from the characteristic polynomial of the corresponding permutation matrix: for example, if $\text{char}(\mathbb{F}) = 2$ we have $x^4 + 1 = (x^2 + 1)^2 = (x + 1)^4$, i.e. one cycle of length 4, two cycles of length 2 and four cycles of length 1 have the same characteristic polynomial.

Claim 2.3. *Denote by $m(\pi)$ the number of cycles in π . $m(\pi)$ is invariant for similar matrices, i.e., $m(\pi) = m(\sigma)$*

Proof. The number 1 is an eigenvalue of all permutation matrices, because $(1, 1, \dots, 1)^T$ is an eigenvector. Since π acts on vectors by permuting their coordinates, solving the equation $\pi \underline{x} = \underline{x}$ (which is the equation to find eigenvectors of the eigenvalue 1) we have the following: each cycle (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k) in π gives us k equations on corresponding entries of \underline{x}

$$x_{i_k} = x_{i_1}, x_{i_1} = x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_{k-1}} = x_{i_k}$$

which means that all these entries are equal. Thus we have that the number of free variables, which is the dimension of 1-eigenspace, equal to the number of cycles in π . Noting that the dimension of an eigenspace is invariant for similar matrices proves our point. \square

Claim 2.4. *Denote by $m_d(\pi)$ the number of cycles in π with length divisible by d . $m_d(\pi)$ is also invariant for similar matrices, i.e., $m_d(\pi) = m_d(\sigma)$*

Proof. First, take $d = 2$ as an example. Any even-length cycle in π splits into two cycles in π^2 , while the odd cycles stay unsplit. This means that $m_2(\pi) = m(\pi^2) - m(\pi) = m(\sigma^2) - m(\sigma) = m_2(\sigma)$. More generally, for any prime number p , the cycles of length divisible by p split into p separate cycles, while cycles of length non-divisible by p remain unsplit. Therefore,

$$m_p(\pi) = \frac{m(\pi^p) - m(\pi)}{p - 1},$$

which implies that $m_p(\pi) = m_p(\sigma)$ by Claim 2.3.

Now turn to the proof in general case.

We shall proceed by induction on the length of the prime decomposition of d . First, for $d = 1$, $m_d(\pi) = m(\pi)$, and our claim follows from Claim 2.3.

Suppose that $d = pt$, with p prime. An appeal to Lemma 2.1 shows that cycles in π of length divisible by pt split into p separate cycles in π^p , each of length divisible by t . The cycles in π whose length is non-divisible by pt either split into cycles of length non-divisible by t or don't split at all. Working backwards, a cycle in π^p of length divisible by t either comes from a cycle in π that was divisible by pt (in which case it will be one of p such cycles), or comes from a cycle in π of length divisible by t but *not* by p .

If t is prime to p , the number of cycles in π divisible by t but not by p is $(m_t(\pi) - m_{pt}(\pi))$, so we have $m_t(\pi^p) = p \cdot m_{pt}(\pi) + (m_t(\pi) - m_{pt}(\pi))$. On the

other hand, if t is divisible by p , there are no cycles divisible by t but not by p , so we have $m_{pt}(\pi) = p \cdot m_t(\pi^p)$. In summary, we have shown that

$$m_{pt}(\pi) = \begin{cases} \frac{m_t(\pi^p) - m_t(\pi)}{p-1} & (p, t) = 1 \\ \frac{m_t(\pi^p)}{p} & (p, t) > 1 \end{cases}$$

Now, t has a shorter prime decomposition, so by our induction hypothesis, m_t is invariant, so $m_t(\pi) = m_t(\sigma)$, and $m_t(\pi^p) = m_t(\sigma^p)$. This shows that $m_n(\pi) = m_n(\sigma)$, as was to be shown.

A short example is in place. Suppose π has cycle decomposition $[3^2, 6^2, 9, 12^2]$. Then π^2 has decomposition $[3^6, 6^4, 9]$, and π^3 decomposes as $[1^6, 2^6, 3^3, 4^6]$. On the one hand, we have

$$m_{12}(\pi) = m_{3 \cdot 4}(\pi) = (m_4(\pi^3) - m_4(\pi))/(3 - 1) = (6 - 2)/2 = 2.$$

On the other hand,

$$m_{12}(\pi) = m_{2 \cdot 6}(\pi) = m_6(\pi^2)/2 = 4/2 = 2,$$

and we see that both calculations give us the expected results. \square

Claim 2.5. $c_d(\pi)$ (the number of cycles of exact length d) is also invariant, so $c_d(\pi) = c_d(\sigma)$.

Proof. Fix some permutation π , and let I_d denote the set of cycles of length divisible by d in π . Evidently $m_d(\pi) = |I_d|$. Also, we have $I_d \cap I_k = I_{[d,k]}$, so $|I_d \cap I_k| = m_{[d,k]}(\pi)$. The same goes for intersections of more than two such sets. Now, it is also clear that $c_d(\pi) = |I_d - \cup_{k>1} I_{dk}| = |I_d| - |\cup_{k>1} I_{dk}|$. Using the inclusion-exclusion principal, we end up with a sum

$$c_d(\pi) = |I_d| - \sum_{k>1} |I_{dk}| + \sum_{k_1, k_2 > 1} |I_{dk_1} \cap I_{dk_2}| - \dots$$

and as we saw, all the summands are in fact of the form $m_k(\pi)$, for some k . In the previous claim we showed that all the m_k are invariant, so c_d is invariant too, and our claim is proved.

Again, a short example might clarify things. Using π from the example above, with cycle type $[3^2, 6^2, 9, 12^2]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_3(\pi) &= |I_3| - (|I_6| + |I_9| + |I_{12}|) + (|I_6 \cap I_9| + |I_6 \cap I_{12}| + |I_9 \cap I_{12}|) \\ &\quad - |I_6 \cap I_9 \cap I_{12}| \\ &= |I_3| - (|I_6| + |I_9| + |I_{12}|) + (|I_{18}| + |I_{12}| + |I_{36}|) - |I_{36}| \\ &= m_3 - (m_6 + m_9 + m_{12}) + (m_{18} + m_{12} + m_{36}) - m_{36} \\ &= 7 - (4 + 1 + 2) + (0 + 2 + 0) - 0 = 2 \end{aligned}$$

and that indeed is the correct result. \square

Summing up, Claim 2.5 means that permutation matrices π and σ which are similar as matrices have the same cycle structure, i.e. are conjugate in the symmetric group and thus the proof of Theorem 2.2 is completed. \square

3. OTHER PERMUTATION REPRESENTATIONS

As we mentioned above, the natural representation of S_n can be realized as the permutation representation obtained from the natural action of S_n on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, defined by $\pi \cdot i = \pi(i)$. We now consider the permutation representation $\rho_k^{\overline{\mathbb{R}}}$, which arise from the action of S_n on k -tuples, where the action is defined by $\pi \cdot (i_1, \dots, i_k) = (\pi(i_1), \dots, \pi(i_k))$. These representations form an interpolation between the natural representation (1-tuples) and the regular representation (n -tuples).

3.1. Representations Over the Complex Field. In Section 2 we proved that the natural representation of S_n does not unite conjugacy classes. On the other hand, it is well known [B] that the regular representation of S_n (indeed, of any group) unites all elements of equal order. The natural representation can be seen as the permutation representation obtained from the natural action of S_n on the set $\{(1), (2), \dots, (n)\}$ of 1-tuples. On the other hand, the regular representation can be seen as the permutation representation which arises from the action of S_n on all $n!$ ordered n -tuples of numbers from $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. In this section we wish to address the representations in between: the representation arising from the action of S_n on pairs, triplets, etc. and to see where the representations start uniting conjugacy classes.

We begin with a general result, which holds true for any representation of any finite group.

Theorem 3.1. *Let G be a group, and $\sigma, \tau \in G$. Let $T : G \rightarrow GL(d, \mathbb{C})$ a representation of G , with character χ . Then $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$ as matrices if and only if $\chi(\sigma^k) = \chi(\tau^k)$ for all k .*

Proof. Obviously, if $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$, then $T(\sigma^k) \sim T(\tau^k)$ for any k , so $\chi(\sigma^k) = \text{trace}(T(\sigma^k)) = \text{trace}(T(\tau^k)) = \chi(\tau^k)$.

Now suppose that $\chi(\sigma^k) = \chi(\tau^k)$ for all k . Denote $s = |\sigma|$ and $t = |\tau|$, and let $m = [s, t]$. Now consider $C = \langle x \rangle$, a cyclic group of order m , and define two representations of C : $T_\sigma(x) = T(\sigma)$ and $T_\tau(x) = T(\tau)$. It is easily seen that these are indeed well defined representations. The hypothesis now reads that these two representations have the same character, and so they must be similar [CR]. This implies that $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$. \square

Note that the fact that the regular representation unites all elements of equal order can be derived from this theorem: If χ is the character of the regular representation, then

$$\chi(\sigma^k) = \begin{cases} |G| & |\sigma| \mid k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

so obviously $\chi(\sigma^k) = \chi(\tau^k)$ for all k if and only if σ and τ have the same order.

We also note that representations which are not faithful trivially unite all the conjugacy classes in their kernel with 1. We may therefore omit them from our discussion from now on. Faithful representations can only unite two classes if their elements have the same order.

The criterion which we just presented is still rather complicated to use for general groups, but it can be simplified in our case, because of the following simple fact.

Fact 3.2. *Let $\sigma \in S_n$, with $|\sigma| = m$.*

- If k is relatively prime to m . Then $\sigma^k \sim \sigma$.
- For any k , $\sigma^k \sim \sigma^{(m,k)}$.

Claim 3.3. Let $T : S_n \rightarrow GL(d, \mathbb{C})$ be a representation of the symmetric group, with character χ , and $\sigma, \tau \in S_n$ elements of order m . Then $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$ if and only if $\chi(\sigma^k) = \chi(\tau^k)$ for $k \mid m$.

Proof. If $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$, then obviously $\chi(\sigma^k) = \chi(\tau^k)$ for any k , and in particular for divisors of m . On the other hand, suppose $\chi(\sigma^k) = \chi(\tau^k)$ for $k \mid m$. Now, for any k , $\sigma^k \sim \sigma^{(k,m)}$, and similarly for τ . Therefore, using the fact that $(k, m) \mid m$, $\chi(\sigma^k) = \chi(\sigma^{(k,m)}) = \chi(\sigma^{(k,m)}) = \chi(\tau^k)$. This holds for all k , and therefore, by Theorem 3.1, $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$. \square

Corrolary 3.4. If σ and τ are of prime order p , then $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$ if and only if $\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\tau)$.

Definition 3.5. Let $\sigma, \tau \in S_n$ be elements of equal order m , such that if $k \neq 1$ and $k \mid m$ then $\sigma^k \sim \tau^k$. Then directly from 3.3 it follows that $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$ if and only if $\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\tau)$. We call such elements *almost similar*. In fact, it is sufficient to require that $\sigma^p \sim \tau^p$ for all prime divisors of m .

We next show that almost similar elements are typical examples of elements that are united by representations, in the following sense:

Theorem 3.6. Let $T : S_n \rightarrow GL(d, \mathbb{C})$ be a representation. If T unites some two conjugacy classes, then there must exist a pair of almost similar elements which it unites.

Proof. Suppose that σ and τ are non-similar elements such that $T(\sigma) \sim T(\tau)$. Obviously $T(\sigma^k) \sim T(\tau^k)$, so it suffices to show that there exists some k for which σ^k and τ^k are almost similar but non-similar. We show this by induction on the number of primes in the prime decomposition of m , the order of σ and τ . If m is of length 1, i.e. m is prime, then σ and τ already are almost similar. In general, if $\sigma^p \sim \tau^p$ for all prime divisors $p \mid m$, then σ and τ are already almost similar. Otherwise, there exists some prime $p \mid m$ such that $\sigma^p \not\sim \tau^p$. The order of σ^p and τ^p is m/p , which has shorter prime decomposition than m , so by the induction hypothesis there exists some k for which σ^{pk} and τ^{pk} are almost similar. \square

Having proved this, we now have a criterion to check whether a representation unites classes: It is sufficient to show that all pairs of almost similar elements remain non united, i.e. that the character of the representation takes different values on them.

Lemma 3.7. Let σ and τ be almost similar permutations in S_n , of order m .

- (1) If $\text{fix}(\sigma) = \text{fix}(\tau)$, then $\sigma \sim \tau$.
- (2) For any prime $p \mid m$, $p \mid (\text{fix}(\sigma) - \text{fix}(\tau))$.

Proof.

- (1) Suppose that $\text{fix}(\sigma) = \text{fix}(\tau)$. We shall show that $c_k(\sigma) = c_k(\tau)$, for all $k \mid m$, by induction on the length of k 's prime decomposition. We have $c_1(\sigma^k) = c_1(\tau^k)$. If k is prime, then $c_1(\sigma^k) = kc_k(\sigma) + c_1(\sigma)$, so after clearing sides, we have $c_k(\sigma) = c_k(\tau)$. In the general case, we have $c_1(\sigma^k) = kc_k(\sigma) + \sum_{t \mid k, t \neq k} tc_t(\sigma)$. By the induction hypothesis, the summands under

the summation sign are equal for σ and τ , and so is the left hand side. This implies that $c_k(\sigma) = c_k(\tau)$.

- (2) Let $p \mid m$. Then $c_1(\sigma^p) = c_1(\tau^p)$, so $pc_p(\sigma) + c_1(\sigma) = pc_p(\tau) + c_1(\tau)$. Clearing sides gives $c_1(\sigma) - c_1(\tau) = p(c_p(\tau) - c_p(\sigma))$.

□

We are now in a position to re-prove the theorem on the natural representation from Section 2 over \mathbb{C} :

Theorem 3.8. *The natural representation $\rho_1^{\mathbb{C}} : S_n \rightarrow GL(n, \mathbb{C})$ does not unite conjugacy classes.*

Proof. In this case $\chi(\sigma) = c_1(\sigma)$. Suppose σ and τ are almost similar and $\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\tau)$. This means that $c_1(\sigma) = c_1(\tau)$, and Lemma 3.7 implies that $\sigma \sim \tau$. □

Using a similar technique, we can go further:

Theorem 3.9. *The representation $\rho_2^{\mathbb{C}}$ of S_n on ordered pairs does not unite classes either.*

Proof. In this case $\chi(\sigma) = c_1(\sigma)(c_1(\sigma) - 1)$, because each fixed point of $T(\sigma)$ comes from an ordered pair of fixed points of σ . Suppose there exists a pair σ and τ of almost similar elements of order m which are united by T , i.e. $\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\tau)$. For convenience, denote $c_1(\sigma)$ by x and $c_1(\tau)$ by y , and assume that $x \geq y$. Using this terminology, we have $x(x - 1) = y(y - 1)$. This equality can hold for integers only if $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$, so $x - y < 2$. However we have $p \mid (x - y)$ for any prime $p \mid m$. Since $x - y < 2$, we must accept that $x = y$, and so, again by Lemma 3.7, $\sigma \sim \tau$. □

It's in generalizing to triplets that we first run into trouble.

Theorem 3.10. *The representation $\rho_3^{\mathbb{C}}$ of S_n on ordered triplets unites classes if and only if n is even.*

Proof. Here $\chi(\sigma) = c_1(\sigma)(c_1(\sigma) - 1)(c_1(\sigma) - 2)$, because each fixed point of $T(\sigma)$ comes from an ordered triplet of fixed points of σ . Let σ and τ be a pair of almost similar elements of order m which get united by the representation. Again, let $c_1(\sigma) = x$ and $c_1(\tau) = y$ and suppose $x \geq y$. We are facing $x(x - 1)(x - 2) = y(y - 1)(y - 2)$. This can hold for nonnegative integers only if $x, y \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, so $x - y < 3$.

If n is even, then consider the following elements: $\sigma = (1, 2)(3, 4) \cdots (n - 1, n)$ and $\tau = (1)(2)(3, 4) \cdots (n - 1, n)$. The orders are prime, so they are almost similar. Here $c_1(\sigma) = 0$ and $c_1(\tau) = 2$, so $\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\tau)$, and they unite under T .

However, if n is odd, we cannot find such an example.

- If m has some odd prime component p , then as above $p \mid (x - y)$. Since $x - y < 3$, we must accept that $x = y$, which implies (Lemma 3.7 again) that $\sigma \sim \tau$.
- If m is a power of 2. In this case both σ and τ must have at least one fixed point, i.e. $x, y \geq 1$, because in $n = c_1(\sigma^m) = \sum_{k \mid m, k \neq 1} kc_k(\sigma) + c_1(\sigma)$, the left hand side is odd, and all the summands under the summation sign are even. Also, we have $2 \mid x - y$. So, if $x - y \neq 0$, then $x - y \geq 2$. This implies that $x \geq 2 + y \geq 3$, contrary to our assumption about x and y . Therefore, we must agree that $x = y$, and so that $\sigma \sim \tau$.

□

Theorem 3.11. *The representation of S_n on k -tuples for $k \geq 4$ always unites some classes.*

Proof. If n is even, then $\sigma = (1, 2)(3, 4) \cdots (n-1, n)$ and $\tau = (1)(2)(3, 4) \cdots (n-1, n)$ furnish an example of elements that unite, because $c_1(\sigma) = 0$ and $c_1(\tau) = 2$, so $\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\tau)$. Similarly, when n is odd: $\sigma = (1, 2)(3, 4) \cdots (n-2, n-1)$ and $\tau = (1)(2)(3, 4) \cdots (n-2, n-1)$ are united, because $c_1(\sigma) = 1$ and $c_1(\tau) = 3$, so $\chi(\sigma) = \chi(\tau)$. \square

In summary, we have shown that the natural representation of S_n , i.e., the representation arising from the action of S_n on 1-tuples, does not unite classes. The same applies to the representation arising from the action on pairs. On triplets it works only when n is odd, and beyond that, all representations unite some classes.

3.2. Representations Arising from the Action of S_n on Subsets. The natural route to follow now would be to try and generalize these results to other permutation representations, and in particular to those arising from the action of S_n on k -subsets of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The general answer eludes us at present, and seems to be pretty unsatisfactory. However, we have managed to show that the representation arising from the action of S_n on *all* subsets of $[n]$ does in fact not unite any classes.

Theorem 3.12. *The action of S_n on the power set $2^{[n]}$ of $[n]$ does not unite classes.*

Proof. As we know, the key is working out the number of fixed points of a permutation σ on this large set. We note that a subset of $[n]$ is fixed by σ if and only if it is a union of cycles in σ 's cycle decomposition. This implies that the number of sets fixed by σ is precisely $2^{m(\sigma)}$, where $m(\sigma)$ is the number of cycles σ decomposes into. This implies that if σ and τ are united by this action, then $2^{m(\sigma)} = 2^{m(\tau)}$, so $m(\sigma) = m(\tau)$. Of course, the same holds for all powers of σ and τ . As we saw in the proof of Theorem 2.2, this implies that $\sigma \sim \tau$. \square

We can give a more detailed description: Let us denote by $\chi_k(\sigma)$ the number of k -subsets that σ fixes. Thus $\chi_k(\sigma)$ is the number of ways we can unite some of σ 's cycles into k -sets. In other words, it's the number of ways of partitioning k , when the available pieces are $c_1(\sigma)$ "copies" of 1, $c_2(\sigma)$ "copies" of 2 etc. This function can be written out explicitly, but it gets pretty complicated. For example, $\chi_2(\sigma) = c_2(\sigma) + \binom{c_1(\sigma)}{2}$, $\chi_3(\sigma) = c_3(\sigma) + c_2(\sigma)c_1(\sigma) + \binom{c_1(\sigma)}{3}$. In general,

$$\chi_k(\sigma) = \sum_{(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \vdash k} \prod_i \binom{c_i(\sigma)}{\lambda_i}.$$

We can write down the generating function $F_\sigma(t) = \sum \chi_k(\sigma)t^k$. It works out to be:

$$F_\sigma(t) = (1+t)^{c_1(\sigma)}(1+t^2)^{c_2(\sigma)} \cdots (1+t^n)^{c_n(\sigma)}.$$

For example, if $\sigma = (1, 2)(3)(4)$, then $F_\sigma(t) = (1+t)^2(1+t^2) = 1+2t+2t^2+2t^3+t^4$. This reads that σ fixes only 1 0-subset (hardly surprising...), 2 1-sets ($\{3\}, \{4\}$), 2 2-sets ($\{1, 2\}, \{3, 4\}$), etc...

Consider now the action of S_n on *even* sized subsets of $[n]$. If n is even, then this action unites some classes. For example, $(1, 2)(3, 4) \cdots (n-1, n)$ and $(1)(2)(3, 4) \cdots (n-1, n)$ get united. (They are almost similar and both fix $2^{n/2}$ sets.)

However, if n is odd, then this representation does not unite classes.

Theorem 3.13. *Let n be odd. The action of S_n on the set of even-sized subsets of $[n]$ does not unite classes.*

Proof. Let σ and τ be permutations. The cycles of σ and τ cannot all be of even length, because they add up to n , and n is odd. Now plug -1 into the generating function above. On the one hand, the result is 0 because there is an odd length cycle. On the other hand, it's equal to $\sum_{\text{even } k} \chi_k(\sigma) - \sum_{\text{odd } k} \chi_k(\sigma)$. Thus $\sum_{\text{even } k} \chi_k(\sigma) = \sum_{\text{odd } k} \chi_k(\sigma) = 2^{m(\sigma)-1}$. So, if σ and τ are united by the representation, we have $m(\sigma) = m(\tau)$. The same holds for σ^k and τ^k . As we have already observed, this implies that $\sigma \sim \tau$. \square

Finally, we conclude this section by exploring the behavior of the representation arising from the action of S_n on odd sized subsets of $[n]$.

Theorem 3.14. *The action of S_n on the set of odd-sized subsets of $[n]$ does not unite classes. This does not depend on n 's parity.*

Proof. Using the same reasoning from the previous theorem, we have that the number of odd-sized subsets of $[n]$ which are fixed by σ is $2^{m(\sigma)-1}$ when σ has odd length cycles. On the other hand, if all σ 's cycles have even length, then obviously σ cannot fix any odd-sized subset.

Now, let σ and τ be almost similar permutations, and suppose that they are united by our representation. This implies that they fix the same number of odd subsets, and so either both have some odd cycles, or both have only even sized ones. In the latter case, they have the same number of 1-cycles, and so by lemma they are similar. In the former case, we have $2^{m(\sigma)-1} = 2^{m(\tau)-1}$, so $m(\sigma) = m(\tau)$, and as before, this implies that $\sigma \sim \tau$. \square

3.3. General Fields. The proofs in the previous section apply only to the complex field \mathbb{C} , (in fact, to all fields with characteristic 0.) We shall now show that the same applies to any field. We shall base ourselves on Theorem 2.2 from Section 2, where we proved that the natural representation does not unite classes, regardless the base field.

Lemma 3.15. *Let $f : G \rightarrow H$ and $g : H \rightarrow K$ be group homomorphisms.*

- (1) *If f and g both do not unite classes, then also gf does not unite them.*
- (2) *If gf does not unite classes, then neither does f .*

Proof.

- (1) Suppose that $gf(\sigma) \sim gf(\tau)$. This implies that $f(\sigma) \sim f(\tau)$, because g does not unite classes. This in turn implies that $\sigma \sim \tau$.
- (2) Suppose that $f(\sigma) \sim f(\tau)$. So obviously $gf(\sigma) \sim gf(\tau)$, and since gf does not unite classes, we conclude that $\sigma \sim \tau$.

\square

Theorem 3.16. *Let T be any permutation representation of S_n . If T does not unite classes when considered a representation into $GL(m, \mathbb{C})$, then it does not unite classes when considered as a representation into $GL(m, \mathbb{F})$, for any field \mathbb{F} .*

Proof. Any permutation representation can be factored into $S_n \rightarrow S_m \rightarrow GL(m, \mathbb{C})$, where the first homomorphism is the permutation representation and the second is the natural representation. Now, suppose T does not unite classes. By Lemma

3.15, neither does the permutation representation $S_n \rightarrow S_m$. We already know that the natural representation does not unite classes, whatever the field. Tacking these two homomorphisms together gives us the representation in any field, and another appeal to Lemma 3.15 proves that it still doesn't unite any classes. \square

4. THE ACTION OF $S_n \times S_n$ ON INVERTIBLE MATRICES

In this section we present an application of Theorem 2.2.

Definition 4.1. Let \mathbb{F} be any field. We define an action of $S_n \times S_n$ on the group $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$ by

$$(\pi, \sigma) \bullet A = \pi A \sigma^{-1} \quad \text{where } (\pi, \sigma) \in S_n \times S_n \text{ and } A \in GL(n, \mathbb{F}) \quad (1)$$

It is a group action since:

$$(e, e) \bullet A = e A e = A$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\pi_1, \sigma_1) \bullet \left((\pi_2, \sigma_2) \bullet A \right) &= (\pi_1, \sigma_1) \bullet (\pi_2 A \sigma_2^{-1}) = \\ \pi_1 \pi_2 A \sigma_2^{-1} \sigma_1^{-1} &= (\pi_1 \pi_2, \sigma_1 \sigma_2) \bullet A = \left((\pi_1, \sigma_1) (\pi_2, \sigma_2) \right) \bullet A \end{aligned}$$

Definition 4.2. Let M be a finite subset of $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$, invariant under the action of $S_n \times S_n$ defined above. We denote by α_M the permutation representation of $S_n \times S_n$ obtained from the action (1). In the sequel we identify the action (1) with the permutation representation α_M associated with it.

Now we define a generalization of the conjugacy representation of S_n

We present a conjugacy representation of S_n on a subset M of $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$.

Definition 4.3. Denote by β the permutation representation of S_n obtained by the following action on M .

$$\pi \circ A = (\pi, \pi) \bullet A = \pi A \pi^{-1} \quad (2)$$

The connection between α_M and β_M is given by the following easily seen claim:

Claim 4.4. Consider the diagonal embedding of S_n into $S_n \times S_n$. Then

$$\beta_M = \alpha_M \downarrow_{S_n \times S_n}^{S_n} . \quad \square$$

Theorem 4.5. For every finite set $M \subseteq GL(n, \mathbb{F})$ invariant under the action (1) of $S_n \times S_n$ defined above:

If π and σ are conjugate in S_n then

$$\chi_{\alpha_M}((\pi, \sigma)) = \chi_{\alpha_M}((\pi, \pi)) = \chi_{\beta_M}(\pi) = \#\{A \in M \mid \pi A = A \pi\} .$$

If π is not conjugate to σ in S_n then

$$\chi_{\alpha_M}((\pi, \sigma)) = 0 .$$

Proof. If π and σ are conjugate in S_n then (π, σ) is conjugate to (π, π) in $S_n \times S_n$. Since the character is a class function, we have:

$$\chi_{\alpha_M}(\pi, \sigma) = \chi_{\alpha_M}(\pi, \pi) = \#\{A \in M \mid \pi A \pi^{-1} = A\} = \#\{A \in M \mid \pi A = A \pi\}$$

i.e. the value of the character of α_M calculated on the element (π, σ) with π conjugate to σ in S_n is equal to the number of matrices in M which commute with the permutation matrix π .

Now, we know that the character of a permutation representation counts the number of fixed points, so:

$$\chi_{\alpha_M}(\pi, \sigma) = \#\{A \in M \mid \pi A \sigma^{-1} = A\} = \#\{A \in M \mid \pi = A \sigma A^{-1}\}.$$

Note that $\pi = A \sigma A^{-1}$ means that π and σ are similar as invertible matrices. Thus, by Theorem 2.2, if π and σ are not conjugate in S_n they can not be conjugate in $GL(n, \mathbb{F})$ and we have:

$$\{A \in M \mid \pi = A \sigma A^{-1}\} = \emptyset$$

and so

$$\chi_{\alpha_M}(\pi, \sigma) = 0$$

if π and σ are not conjugate in S_n . □

This result is applied in [CB] and [MW].

Acknowledgments. This paper expands upon the authors theses, and in particular, the second author's thesis, which was supervised by Yuval Roichman and Ron Adin. Both authors are very grateful to them. Also the authors are grateful to Alex Lubotzky, Eli Bagno, Uzi Vishne and Boris Kunyavskii for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- [B] William Burnside, *Theory of Groups of Finite Order*. University Press, Cambridge 1897.
- [CB] Y. Cherniavsky and E. Bagno, *Permutation representations on invertible matrices*. Linear Algebra and its Applications 419 (2006) 494-518; preprint available on Arxiv, reference math.RT/0411556
- [CR] Charles Curtis and Irving Reiner, *Representation Theory of Finite Groups and Associative Algebras*. John Wiley and Sons, New York 1962.
- [FH] William Fulton and Joe Harris, *Representation Theory, a First Course*. Springer, New York 1991
- [MW] C. De La Mora and P. J. Wojciechowski, *Multiplicative bases in matrix algebras*. Linear Algebra and its Applications 419 (2006) 287-298
- [S] Bruce Sagan, *The Symmetric Group. Representations, Combinatorial Algorithms, and Symmetric Functions*. Springer, New York 2001
- [Se] Jean-Pierre Serre, *Linear Representations of Finite Groups*. Springer, New York 1977

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BAR ILAN UNIVERSITY, RAMAT GAN 52900, ISRAEL
E-mail address: `cherniy@math.biu.ac.il` , `chrnvs@gmail.com`