

## SEMISIMPLE MODULES AND ALGEBRAS.

ANDREI YAFAEV

We start with some definitions.

**Definition 0.1.** A **ring** is a set  $R$  endowed with two operations : addition, denoted  $+$  and multiplication, denoted  $\cdot$  that satisfy the following conditions

- $a + b = b + a$  ( $+$  is commutative)
- $a + (b + c) = (b + a) + c$  ( $+$  is distributive)
- $(ab)c = a(bc)$  ( $\cdot$  is distributive)
- $a(b + c) = ab + ac$
- $(b + c)a = ba + ca$

In addition, there is an element  $0 \in R$  satisfying  $a + 0 = 0 + a = a$ . For each  $a \in R$ , there is an element  $-a$  such that  $a + (-a) = 0$  (note that this implies that  $(R, +)$  is an abelian group).

There is an element  $1$  in  $R$  such that  $1 \cdot a = a \cdot 1 = a$ .

Examples of rings include  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $F$  (field),  $F[X]$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $F[X]/I$  where  $I \subset F[X]$  is an ideal. These rings are commutative (i.e. multiplication is commutative).

In this course we will be mainly concerned with some non-commutative rings. An example of this is  $M_n(F)$  (matrices over a field  $F$ ). Another example is the set of upper triangular matrices. More generally, for any ring  $R$ , the set  $M_n(R)$  of matrices with entries in  $R$  is a ring.

A ring  $D$  is called a **division ring** if any  $a \in D$ ,  $a \neq 0$  has a two sided inverse i.e. there exists an  $a^{-1} \in D$  such that  $aa^{-1} = a^{-1}a = 1$ .

A field is of course a division ring.

We now define modules over rings.

**Definition 0.2.** A (left) module  $M$  over a ring  $R$  is an abelian group  $M$  with a map  $\phi$  from  $R \times M$  to  $M$  satisfying the following properties (we write  $rm$  for  $\phi(r, m)$ ):

- $1m = m$  for all  $m \in M$
- $r(m + n) = rm + rn$  for all  $r \in R$  and  $m, n \in M$
- $(r + s)m = rm + sm$  for all  $r, s \in R$  and  $m \in M$
- $r(sm) = (rs)m$  for all  $r, s \in R$  and  $m \in M$

We define the notion of *right*  $R$ -module in an exactly analogous way with multiplication by elements of  $R$  on the right.

Take *any* abelian group, then it is naturally a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module.

Let  $R$  be a field  $F$ . An  $F$ -module is a vector space over  $F$ .

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring. An ideal in  $R$  is an  $R$ -module.

Take any ring  $R$  and  $a \in R$ . Then the set  $Ra$  is a left  $R$ -module and  $aR$  a right  $R$ -module.

$M_n(F)$  is a module over both  $F$  (in which case it is simply viewed as a vector space of dimension  $n^2$ ) and the ring  $M_n(F)$ .

Let  $R$  be a ring, then  $R[X]$  is a module over  $R$ .

A module  $M$  is called *finitely generated* if there is a finite subset of  $M$  such that any element of  $M$  is a linear combination of elements of this set.

For example  $M_n(F)$  is finitely generated over  $F$  while  $F[X]$  is not.

**In this course we will mainly deal with finitely generated modules. Unless explicitly stated otherwise, the modules are assumed to be finitely generated.**

**Definition 0.3.** Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module and let  $N$  be a subgroup of  $M$ . We say that  $N$  is a (left)  $R$ -submodule of  $M$  (often simply submodule) if  $N$  is a subgroup of  $(M, +)$  and  $rn \in N$  for all  $r \in R$  and  $n \in N$ .

If  $M$  is an  $R$ -module,  $v \in M$ , then

$$Rv = \{av : a \in R\}$$

is a left submodule of  $M$ .

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring. Submodules of  $R$  are exactly the ideals. If  $R$  is non-commutative, left  $R$ -submodules of  $R$  are called left ideals, right submodules are called right ideals. Subgroups that are both right and left ideals are called two-sided ideals.

Consider the ring  $M_n(R)$  of  $n \times n$  matrices over a ring  $R$ . Fix  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Let  $I$  be the set of matrices with zeros outside the  $j$ th column. Then  $I$  is a left ideal (exercise).

Similarly, fix  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . The set of matrices with zeros outside of  $j$ th row is a right ideal.

Look now at two-sided ideals.

**Lemma 0.1.** Every two-sided ideal of  $M_n(R)$  is of the form  $M_n(I)$  for a two sided ideal  $I$  of  $R$ .

*Proof.* Let  $J \subset M_n(R)$  be an ideal. Let  $E_{i,j}$  be the matrix with 1 at the position  $(i, j)$  and zero elsewhere. Recall that matrices  $E_{i,j}$  satisfy the relation:

$$E_{i,j}E_{j,k} = E_{i,k}$$

and for a matrix  $A = (a_{i,j})$ , we have

$$E_{m,i}AE_{j,k} = a_{i,j}E_{m,k}$$

Let

$$I = \{r \in R : rE_{1,1} \in J\}$$

This is a two sided ideal of  $R$ . Indeed, let  $a$  be in  $R$  and  $r$  in  $I$ . We have  $(aE_{1,1})(rE_{1,1}) = arE_{1,1}$  hence  $ar \in I$ . Similarly,  $ra \in I$ .

For any matrix  $A$  in  $J$  we have

$$a_{i,j}E_{1,1} = E_{1,j}AE_{j,1}$$

As  $J$  is an ideal, the right-hand side belongs to  $J$  and hence  $a_{i,j} \in I$ . It follows that  $J \subset M_n(I)$ .

Furthermore, if  $r \in I$ , then  $E_{i,1}(rE_{1,1})E_{1,j} = rE_{i,j}$ . As  $rE_{1,1} \in J$  and  $J$  is a two-sided ideal, we see that  $rE_{i,j} \in J$  for all  $r \in I$ . As any element of  $M_n(I)$  is a sum of elements of the form  $rE_{i,j}$ ,  $r \in I$ , we see that  $M_n(I)$  is contained in  $J$ . We have shown that  $J = M_n(I)$ .  $\square$

A consequence of this lemma is the following. Suppose  $R = F$  is a field. The only ideals of  $F$  are  $\{0\}$  and  $F$  itself, hence the only two-sided ideals of  $M_n(F)$  are  $\{0\}$  and  $M_n(F)$ .

More generally, if  $D$  is a division ring, then the only two-sided ideals of  $M_n(D)$  are  $\{0\}$  and  $M_n(D)$ .

Let  $M$  be a module and  $N$  a submodule. As  $N$  is an abelian subgroup, one has a quotient  $M/N$  (as abelian groups) which is endowed with the structure of  $R$ -submodule by  $r(m + N) = rm + N$  for  $r \in R$  and  $m + N \in M/N$ .

Let  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  be two submodules of  $M$ . One defines the sum  $N_1 + N_2$  as

$$N_1 + N_2 = \{x + y : x \in N_1, y \in N_2\} \subset M$$

This is a submodule of  $M$ . The sum is *direct* (denoted  $N_1 \oplus N_2$ ) if  $N_1 \cap N_2 = \{0\}$ .

One says that a submodule  $N$  of  $M$  is a *direct summand* if there exists a submodule  $N'$  of  $M$  such that

$$M = N \oplus N'$$

An important example of a ring is the ring  $\mathbb{H}$  of quaternions. It is defined as follows :

$$\mathbb{H} = \{a \cdot 1 + b \cdot i + c \cdot j + d \cdot k : a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

where  $i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = -1$  and

$$ij = k, jk = i, ki = j$$

and

$$ji = -k, kj = -i, ik = -j$$

The ring  $\mathbb{H}$  is an  $\mathbb{R}$  module. It is also a  $\mathbb{C}$  module:

$$a \cdot 1 + b \cdot i + c \cdot j + d \cdot k = a + bi + (c + ib)j \quad (k = ij!)$$

Hence by setting  $\mathbb{C} = \{a + bi \in \mathbb{H}\}$ , we get  $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}j$ . Note that for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , we have  $zj = \bar{z}j$ ! This means that the structures of left and right  $\mathbb{C}$ -modules on  $\mathbb{H}$  differ.

The ring  $\mathbb{H}$  is a division ring (exercise).

**Definition 0.4.** Let  $M, N$  be two  $R$ -modules. A homomorphism  $\phi: M \rightarrow N$  is a group homomorphism satisfying

$$\phi(rm) = r\phi(m)$$

The kernel  $\ker(\phi)$  of  $\phi$  is the set of elements of  $M$  mapping to zero in  $N$ .

The kernel and the image of  $\phi$  are submodules of  $M$  and  $N$  respectively.

Every module has at least two submodules, namely  $\{0\}$  and  $M$  itself. We now introduce a very important notion :

**Definition 0.5.** A non-zero module  $M$  is called simple (one also says irreducible) if the only submodules of  $M$  are  $0$  and  $M$ .

**Lemma 0.2.** Any simple  $R$ -module  $M$  is generated by any of its non-zero vectors i.e. for any  $v \in M$ ,  $v \neq 0$ ,  $M = Rv$ .

*Proof.* Let  $v \in M$  be a non-zero vector, then  $Rv$  is a non-zero submodule of  $M$ . As  $M$  is simple,  $Rv = M$ .  $\square$

A field  $F$  is simple, viewed as a module over itself.

The  $F$ -module  $F^n$  for  $n > 1$  is not simple, indeed any non-zero proper vector subspace is a non-trivial submodule.

It is *not* simple as  $F$ -module, indeed, as an  $F$ -module, it is isomorphic to  $F^n$ .

We prove the following important result.

**Lemma 0.3** (Shur's lemma). Any non-zero homomorphism between simple  $R$ -modules is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  and  $N$  be simple  $R$ -modules and let  $\phi: M \rightarrow N$  be an  $R$ -module homomorphism. As  $\ker(\phi)$  is a submodule of  $M$  and different from  $M$  (because  $\phi \neq 0!$ ), one has  $\ker(\phi) = \{0\}$ .

Similarly,  $\text{im}(\phi)$  is a non-zero submodule of  $N$  hence  $\text{im}(\phi) = N$ .

This shows that  $\phi$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

Let  $D$  be a division ring. The module  $M_n(D)$  is not simple as a left or a right module. Indeed, consider the subset  $C_j$  of  $M_n(D)$  consisting

of matrices which are zero everywhere outside of  $j$ th column. This is a left  $M_n(D)$  submodule of  $M_n(D)$ . This is easily checked by matrix multiplication. This module is in fact simple as  $M_n(D)$ -module. Let  $M$  be a non-trivial left submodule of  $C_j$ . It has a non-zero vector  $v$ . The vector  $v$  (viewed as a matrix in  $M_n(D)$ ) is of the form

$$v = \sum_{l=1}^n c_l E_{l,j}$$

One of the  $c_l$ s, say  $c_k$  is not zero. We have

$$c_k^{-1} E_{i,k} v = E_{i,j} \in M$$

And this for any  $i$ ! As the  $E_{i,j}$  generate  $C_j$ , we conclude that  $M = C_j$ . Notice that we used in an essential way that the matrices are over a *division ring* (we had to invert  $c_k$ ).

It is clear that all  $C_j$ s are isomorphic as  $M_n(D)$ -modules. In fact they are all isomorphic to the following module: consider  $D^n$  as the set of column vectors with entries in  $D$ . This is naturally a left  $M_n(D)$  module (multiplying a column vector on the left by a matrix).

This module is isomorphic to any of the  $C_j$ . More generally:

**Lemma 0.4.** *Any simple  $M_n(D)$  module is isomorphic to the module  $D^n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a simple  $M_n(D)$  module. Then by 0.2,  $M = M_n(D)v$  for a non-zero vector  $v \in M$ . We also have  $D^n = M_n(D)e_1$  where  $e_1$  is the first vector of the standard basis. The  $R$ -module homomorphism  $M \rightarrow D^n$  sending  $v$  to  $e_1$  is non-zero hence is an isomorphism.  $\square$

We will now give an alternative version of this lemma. To do this, one need to introduce yet another definition. Consider a module  $M$ . An  $R$ -module homomorphism  $M \rightarrow M$  is called an *endomorphism*. The set of all endomorphisms, denoted  $\text{End}_R(M)$  is a ring. This is an exercise: the multiplication being the composition of endomorphisms and the identity is naturally the identity endomorphism, sending  $x \in M$  to  $x$ .

**Lemma 0.5** (Shur, version 2). *Let  $M$  be a simple module, then  $\text{End}(M)$  is a division ring.*

If  $F$  is a field viewed as a module over itself, then  $\text{End}_F(F) = F$ .

Consider the module  $F^n$  viewed as a left  $M_n(F)$ -module. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{End}_{M_n(F)}(F^n) &= \{f \in \text{End}_F(F^n) = M_n(F) : f(\alpha x) = \alpha f(x), \forall \alpha \in M_n(F), x \in F^n\} \\ &= \{A \in M_n(F) : AB = BA, \forall B \in M_n(F)\} = \{\lambda I_n : \lambda \in F\} \cong F \end{aligned}$$

Hence we find that  $\text{End}_{M_n(F)}(F^n)$  is a division ring.

The converse does not hold:

Consider  $\mathbb{Q}$  as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. It is certainly not simple. Indeed it contains  $\mathbb{Z}$  as a proper submodule. However,  $\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}$ .

Indeed, let  $f$  be an endomorphism of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Then, for any  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $f(n) = nf(1)$  and for  $n \neq 0$ ,

$$f(1) = f\left(n \frac{1}{n}\right) = nf\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$$

hence  $f\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n}f(1)$ . It follows that  $f(a) = af(1)$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

The map  $\text{End}(\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  sending  $f$  to  $f(1)$  is an isomorphism.

Let's look at a few more examples of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules:

Every simple  $\mathbb{Z}$  module is finite. Indeed, let  $M$  be a simple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. Let  $v \in M$  be a non-zero vector. The map  $\phi: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow M$  from  $\mathbb{Z}$  to  $M$  is a non-zero morphism of modules. As  $M$  is simple,  $\phi$  surjective. The kernel of  $\phi$  is a proper submodule of  $\mathbb{Z}$  (it is not zero as otherwise  $\mathbb{Z} \cong M$  and  $\mathbb{Z}$  is not semi-simple, it is not  $\mathbb{Z}$  because  $\phi$  is non-zero). The kernel is  $n\mathbb{Z}$  and  $M$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  hence finite.

We claim that  $n$  has to be a prime number. If not, then two cases occur.

Case 1:

$n = n_1 n_2$  with  $n_1, n_2$  coprime and  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}/n_1\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/n_2\mathbb{Z}$  hence not simple.

Case 2:

$n$  is a power of a prime number, say  $n = p^n$  with  $n > 1$ . Then  $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$  contains a non-trivial submodule  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  hence is not simple.

**The only simple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules are the  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  where  $p$  is a prime**

Ex. Show that simple modules over  $F[x]$  are the  $F[x]/I$  where  $I$  is a prime ideal.

**Definition 0.6.** A module is called semisimple if it is a direct sum of simple modules.

Consider the example of  $M_n(F)$  viewed as a left module. This module is *not* simple. Indeed, we have seen that it contains submodules  $C_j$  (column) vectors. The modules  $C_j$  are simple and quite clearly

$$M_n(F) = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n C_j$$

The module  $M_n(F)$  is thus semi-simple. Recall from what preceded that the ring  $M_n(F)$  is simple.

We now prove the following characterisation of semisimple modules (at least the finitely generated ones):

**Proposition 0.6.** Let  $M$  be a finitely generated  $R$ -module. The following properties are equivalent.

- (1) Any submodule of  $M$  is a direct summand i.e, if  $W \subset M$  is a submodule, then there exists a submodule  $W'$  such that  $W \oplus W' = M$ .
- (2)  $M$  is a finite sum of simple submodules.

*Proof.* Let us first show that (2) implies (1).

We suppose that  $M$  is semisimple. By definition,

$$M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$$

where  $I$  is a certain finite set of integers and  $M_i$  are simple submodules of  $M$ .

Let  $W$  be a submodule of  $M$ . We can assume that  $W \neq M$  and that  $W \neq 0$  as otherwise there is nothing to prove.

Let  $J$  be the subset of  $I$  consisting of all  $i$ s such that  $W \cap M_i = \{0\}$ .

Notice that the complement of  $J$  in  $I$  consists of all  $i$ s such that  $M_i \subset W$ . Indeed, if  $i \notin J$ , then  $W \cap M_i$  is a non-zero submodule of  $M_i$  which is simple hence  $W \cap M_i = M_i$  i.e.  $M_i \subset W$ .

The sum  $W^* = W + \bigoplus_{i \in J} M_i$  is direct by definition of  $J$ .

Let us show that  $W^* = M$  which is equivalent to showing that  $M_i \subset W^*$  for any  $i \in I$ .

Let  $i \in I$ .

If  $M_i \cap W = \{0\}$  then  $i \in J$  and  $M_i \subset W^*$ . If  $M_i \cap W \neq \{0\}$  then, because  $M_i$  is simple,  $W \cap M_i = M_i$  i.e.  $M_i \subset W$ . Again  $M_i \subset W^*$ .

Hence  $W^* = M$ . We take  $W' = \bigoplus_{i \in J} M_i$ . This finishes the proof of (2) implies (1).

**Remark 0.7.** Notice that as a subproduct of this proof we proved that a submodule and a quotient of a semisimple module is semisimple.

Indeed, let  $M$  be a semisimple module,  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ . Let  $W$  be a submodule and  $J \subset I$  as in the proof. We showed that

$$M = W \oplus W'$$

where  $W = \bigoplus_{i: M_i \subset W} M_i$  hence  $W$  is semisimple. We also showed that  $W' = \bigoplus_{i: M_i \cap W = \{0\}} M_i$ . As  $M/W \cong W'$ , it is semisimple.

Let us do (1) implies (2). We suppose that every submodule of  $M$  admits a direct summand.

We need an intermediate lemma:

**Lemma 0.8.** Every non-zero module satisfying the assumption (1) contains a simple module.

*Proof.* Before giving a proof, let us introduce the following definitions.

**Definition 0.7.** A submodule  $N \subset M$  is called maximal if for any submodule  $K \subset M$  such that  $N \subset K \subset M$ , then either  $K = N$  or  $K = M$ .

In particular a (left) ideal in  $R$  is called maximal if and only if  $A \neq R$  and for any left ideal  $B$  with  $A \subset B \subset R$ , either  $A = B$  or  $B = R$ .

Clearly a submodule  $N \subset M$  is maximal if and only if  $M/N$  is simple.

We use without proof the following proposition:

**Proposition 0.9.** Any proper submodule of a finitely generated module is contained in a maximal submodule.

Let  $V$  be a non-zero  $R$ -module satisfying the assumption (1). Let  $v \in V$  a non-zero element. Consider the submodule  $Rv$  and a homomorphism  $\phi: R \rightarrow Rv$ . The kernel  $L$  of  $\phi$  is a left ideal in  $R$ , different from  $R$ . It is contained in a maximal ideal  $M \neq R$ . Then  $M/L$  is a maximal submodule of  $R/L$ . It follows that  $Mv$  is a maximal submodule of  $Rv$  (recall that  $R/\ker(\phi) = R/L$  is isomorphic to  $\text{im}(\phi) = Rv$ ), hence  $M/L$  is isomorphic to  $Mv$ . As  $V$  satisfies the assumption (1), we have

$$V = Mv \oplus M'$$

for some submodule  $M'$ . When we intersect with  $Rv$ , we get

$$Rv = Mv \oplus (M' \cap Rv)$$

(simply write that any element of  $x \in Rv$  decomposes uniquely as  $x = \alpha v + x'$  with  $x' \in M'$ ). The module  $M' \cap Rv$  is simple as it is isomorphic to  $Rv/Mv$  which is simple because  $Mv$  is maximal.  $\square$

Now, let  $M_0 \subset M$  be the sum of all simple submodules of  $M$ . If  $M_0 \neq M$ , then we write

$$M = M_0 \oplus W$$

with  $W \neq \{0\}$ . As  $W$  is not zero, there exists a simple submodule of  $W$ , thus contradicting the definition of  $M_0$ . Therefore  $W = \{0\}$  and  $M$  is the sum of all its distinct simple submodules  $M_i$ . This sum is automatically direct, as for  $i \neq j$ ,  $M_i \cap M_j$  is either  $\{0\}$  or  $M_i$ . In the latter case,  $M_i = M_j$  contradicting the fact that the  $M_i$  are distinct. We obtain that  $M$  is direct sum of simple submodules. The sum is finite because  $M$  is finitely generated.  $\square$

This proposition for example shows that  $\mathbb{Z}$  is not semisimple as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module. We have seen that the only simple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules are the  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  with  $p$  prime and  $\mathbb{Z}$  is clearly not a sum of a finite number of such modules:  $\mathbb{Z}$  is torsion free while such a sum certainly isn't.



By Chinese remainder theorem, semisimple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules are precisely the  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  where  $n$  is a square-free integer.

If  $F$  is a field, then  $F^n$  is certainly semisimple as an  $F$ -module. In fact any semisimple  $F$ -module is isomorphic to  $F^n$  for some  $n$  i.e. it is a finite dimensional vector space.

We now define the notion of an Algebra over a field.

**Definition 0.8.** *Let  $F$  be a field. An algebra  $A$  over  $F$  is a ring which has a structure of a  $F$ -vector space which is compatible with the ring multiplication in the following sense:*

$$(\lambda a)b = \lambda(ab) = a(\lambda b)$$

for all  $\lambda \in F$  and  $a, b \in A$ .

*An algebra is finite dimensional (one also says of finite rank) if its dimension as  $F$ -vector space is finite.*

*A homomorphism of algebras is naturally a ring homomorphism which is also a linear transformation.*

For example :  $F$ ,  $F[X]$ ,  $F[X]/I$  ( $I$  ideal),  $M_n(F)$  are all algebras...

The algebra  $F[X]$  is not finite dimensional.

**In what follows we will implicitly assume that our algebras are finite dimensional.**

The quaternion algebra is an algebra over the reals, however it is not an algebra over the complexes (recall that  $zj = j\bar{z}$  !).

As an algebra is a ring, we can look at modules over it, which will be automatically endowed with the structure of an  $F$ -vector space. In particular :

**Definition 0.9.** *An algebra  $A$  is called semisimple if all non-zero  $A$ -modules are semisimple.*

And we immediately prove the following result which characterises semisimple algebras:

**Proposition 0.10.** *An algebra  $A$  is semisimple if and only if the  $A$ -module  $A$  is semisimple.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $A$  to be semisimple as  $A$ -module. Let  $M$  be an  $A$ -module and choose a set  $\{m_1, \dots, m_r\}$  of generators for  $M$ . Let  $A^r$  be the direct sum of  $r$  copies of  $A$ . This is clearly a semisimple  $A$ -module (write  $A = \bigoplus A_i$  with  $A_i$  simple  $A$ -modules, then  $A^r = \bigoplus A_i^r \dots$ ). Define a map

$$\phi: A^r \longrightarrow M$$

Clearly  $\phi$  is a surjective morphism hence  $M$  is isomorphic to a quotient of a semisimple module  $A^r$ . From the previous proposition, it follows that  $M$  is semi-simple.

The converse is trivial.  $\square$

**Proposition 0.11.** *Let  $A$  be a semisimple algebra. Suppose that, as an  $A$ -module,  $A$  is a sum*

$$A = A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_r$$

*of simple  $A$ -modules  $A_i$ .*

*Then any simple  $A$ -module is isomorphic to one of the  $A_i$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be a simple  $A$ -module and fix  $s \in S$ ,  $s \neq 0$ . Then  $As$  is a submodule of  $S$  and consider the epimorphism

$$\phi: A \longrightarrow As$$

sending  $a$  to  $as$ . As  $S$  is simple, we have  $As = S$ . Let  $\phi_i$  be the restriction of  $\phi$  to  $A_i$ . If  $\phi_i = 0$  for all  $i$ , then  $\phi = 0$  which is not the case, hence there exists an  $i$  such that  $\phi_i \neq 0$ . By **Shur's lemma**,  $\phi_i$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

**Proposition 0.12.** *Suppose that  $A$  is semisimple algebra and let  $A_i$  be the collection of simple distinct  $A$ -submodules of  $A$ .*

*Let  $M$  be an  $A$ -module (automatically semisimple). There is a unique set of integers  $n_i$  such that*

$$M = A_1^{n_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus A_r^{n_r}$$

Only the uniqueness needs proving. This will follow from the definition and a theorem stated below.

**Definition 0.10.** *Let  $M$  be a module over a ring  $R$ . A composition series of  $M$  is a finite sequence of submodules  $N_i \subset M$  such that*

$$M = N_r \supset N_{r-1} \supset \cdots \supset N_0 = \{0\}$$

*and*

$$N_i/N_{i-1}$$

*is a simple module.*

A module may or may not have a composition series. For example,  $\mathbb{Z}$  viewed as a module over itself does not have a composition series. Indeed, if there was one, then  $N_1 = n\mathbb{Z}$  for some integer  $n \neq 0$ , but then  $N_1/N_0 = n\mathbb{Z}$  which is not a simple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module (we have seen that simple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules are finite).

A semisimple module always has a composition series: if  $M = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_r$  with  $M_i$ s simple, one can set  $N_i = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_i$ .

Two composition series  $N_i$  ( $i = 0, \dots, r$ ) and  $N'_i$  ( $i = 0, \dots, s$ ) are equivalent if  $r = s$  and after permutation  $N_i/N_{i-1} \cong N'_i/N'_{i-1}$ .

We use the following

**Theorem 0.13** (Jordan-Holder). *Let  $M$  be a finitely generated  $R$  module having a composition series. Any two composition series are equivalent.*

The uniqueness of the  $n_i$ s follows immediately from this theorem.

Recall that our aim is to classify semisimple algebras. We now start working towards it.

Let  $D$  be a finite-dimensional  $F$ -algebra. For any  $n$ , let  $M_n(D)$  be set of  $n \times n$ -matrices with entries in  $D$ . This is an  $F$ -algebra of dimension  $n^2 \dim_F(D)$ .

We say that  $D$  is a **division algebra** if  $D$  is a division ring - any non-zero element has a multiplicative inverse. For example any field is a division algebra,  $\mathbb{H}$  is a division algebra...

The algebra  $M_n(F)$  is not a division algebra if  $n > 1$ , a product  $D_1 \times D_2$  of division algebras is not a division algebra (it contains non-zero elements such as  $(a, 0)$ ).

The following theorem of Frobenius classifies all finite dimensional division algebras over the reals:

**Theorem 0.14.** *The only finite dimensional division algebras over  $\mathbb{R}$  are  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\mathbb{H}$ .*

They have dimensions one, two and four respectively.

The aim of this part of the course is to show that any semisimple algebra is isomorphic to a direct sum of algebras of the form  $M_n(D)$  where  $D$  is a division algebra.

We define the notion of *opposite algebra*. Let  $B$  be an algebra. The algebra  $B^{op}$  is the set  $B$  with the same addition and scalar multiplication but with multiplication defined as

$$a * b = ba$$

The following properties are obvious:

- (1)  $B^{opop} = B$
- (2)  $B$  is a division algebra if and only if  $B^{op}$  is
- (3)  $(B_1 \oplus B_2)^{op} = B_1^{op} \oplus B_2^{op}$

We also have:

**Lemma 0.15.** *Let  $B$  an algebra. Then  $M_n(B)^{op} \cong M_n(B^{op})$  for any  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Define

$$\psi: M_n(B)^{op} \longrightarrow M_n(B^{op})$$

by setting  $\psi(X) = X^t$ . Obviously it is bijective. It is an exercise in matrix multiplication to show that

$$\psi(X * Y) = \psi(X)\psi(Y)$$

□

We prove the following:

**Lemma 0.16.** *Let  $B$  an algebra. Then*

$$B^{op} \cong \text{End}_B(B)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\phi \in \text{End}_B(B)$  and let  $a = \phi(1)$ . Then for any  $b$  in  $B$ , we have

$$\phi(b) = b\phi(1) = ba$$

Hence  $\phi = \rho_a$ , endomorphism given by right multiplication by  $a$ . Therefore

$$\text{End}_B(B) = \{\rho_a : a \in B\}$$

hence there is a bijection between  $B$  and  $\text{End}_B(B)$ . We need to show that

$$\rho_a \rho_b = \rho_{a*b}$$

Let  $a, b, x \in B$ . We have

$$(\rho_a \rho_b)(x) = xba = \rho_{ba}(x) = \rho_{a*b}(x)$$

□

**Lemma 0.17.** *If  $S$  is a simple  $A$ -module, then for any  $n$ , we have*

$$\text{End}_A(S^n) = M_n(\text{End}(S))$$

*Proof.* Regard elements of  $S^n$  as column vectors. Let  $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n(\text{End}(S))$  and define  $\Gamma(A): S^n \longrightarrow S^n$  by

$$\Gamma(A) \begin{pmatrix} s_1 \\ \vdots \\ s_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{1n} & \cdots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s_1 \\ \vdots \\ s_n \end{pmatrix}$$

One sees that

$$\Gamma(A)(as + t) = a\Gamma(A)s + \Gamma(A)t$$

(because  $a_{ij}$  are  $A$ -module homomorphisms). It follows that  $\Gamma(A) \in \text{End}(S^n)$ .

Ex. Check that  $\Gamma: M_n(\text{End}(S)) \longrightarrow \text{End}(S^n)$  is an algebra monomorphism.

Conversely, let  $\psi \in \text{End}(S^n)$ . Define  $\psi_{ij} \in \text{End}(S)$  by

$$\psi \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ s \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{1j}(s) \\ \psi_{2j}(s) \\ \vdots \\ \psi_{jj}(s) \\ \vdots \\ \psi_{n-1,j}(s) \\ \psi_{n,j}(s) \end{pmatrix}$$

The matrix  $\Psi = (\psi_{ij}) \in M_n(\text{End}(S))$  is such that  $\Gamma(\Psi) = \psi$  which shows that  $\Gamma$  is surjective.  $\square$

We also have the following:

**Proposition 0.18.** *Let  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  be two submodules of an  $R$ -module such that  $U_1 \cap U_2 = \{0\}$ . Then*

$$\text{End}(U_1 \oplus U_2) = \text{End}(U_1) \oplus \text{End}(U_2)$$

*Proof.* Exercise  $\square$

Next we prove the following lemma which is of independent interest:

**Lemma 0.19.** *Let  $D$  be a finite dimensional division algebra over an algebraically closed field  $F$ . Then*

$$D \cong F$$

*Proof.* Let  $a \in D$ ,  $a \neq 0$ . As  $D$  is finite dimensional, the powers  $1, a, \dots, a^k, \dots$  are linearly dependent over  $F$ . Therefore there is a relation:

$$a^n + c_1 a^{n-1} + \dots + c_0 = 0$$

where we choose  $n$  to be the smallest possible.

Consider  $f(x) = x^n + c_1 x^{n-1} + \dots + c_0$ . As  $F$  is algebraically closed,  $f$  has a root  $\lambda$  in  $F$  i.e

$$f(x) = (x - \lambda)g(x)$$

with  $\deg(g) = \deg(f) - 1$ . Evaluating at  $a$  we get

$$(a - \lambda)g(a) = 0$$

As  $f$  was chosen to be of smallest degree,  $g(a) \neq 0$  hence is invertible ( $D$  is a division algebra). It follows that  $a = \lambda \in F$ , hence  $D = F$ .  $\square$

The immediate consequence of this lemma and of Shur's lemma is the following:

**Lemma 0.20** (Burnside). *Suppose  $F$  is algebraically closed and let  $S$  be a simple  $A$ -module. Then*

$$\text{End}_A(S) = F$$

One can also give a direct proof of the last theorem as follows: Let  $\phi \in \text{End}_A(S)$  and view it as an  $F$ -linear map of the  $F$ -vector space  $S$ . Furthermore,  $\phi$  is invertible (by Shur). Since  $F$  is algebraically closed,  $\phi$  has an eigenvalue  $\lambda$  and we get  $\phi - \lambda I \in \text{End}_A(S)$  which is not invertible. By Shur, it is zero and hence  $\phi = \lambda I$ . The map  $\phi \mapsto \lambda$  is an isomorphism  $\text{End}_A(S) \cong F$ .

We now prove the main theorem.

**Theorem 0.21** (Artin-Wedderburn). *An algebra  $A$  over a field  $F$  is semisimple if and only if  $A$  is isomorphic to a direct sum of matrix algebras over division algebras i.e. there exist integers  $n_i$  and division algebras  $D_i$  such that*

$$A \cong M_{n_1}(D_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{n_r}(D_r)$$

*Proof.* The converse is already established.

Suppose that  $A$  is semisimple. Let  $A_i$ s be the non pairwise isomorphic simple submodules of  $A$ .

Write  $A = U_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus U_r$  where  $U_i = A_i^{n_i}$  for some  $n_i \geq 1$ .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} A^{op} &\cong \text{End}_A(A) \cong \text{End}_A(U_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus \text{End}_A(U_r) \\ &\cong \text{End}(A_1^{n_1}) \oplus \cdots \oplus \text{End}_A(A_r^{n_r}) \\ &\cong M_{n_1}(\text{End}(A_1)) \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{n_r}(\text{End}(A_r)) \end{aligned}$$

By taking opposites, we find that

$$A^{op} \cong M_{n_1}(\text{End}(A_1)^{op}) \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{n_r}(\text{End}(A_r)^{op})$$

By Shur all the  $D_i = \text{End}(A_i)$ s are division algebras.

By taking the opposite we find:

$$A = A^{opop} \cong M_{n_1}(D_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus M_{n_r}(D_r)$$

This finishes the proof. □

The following corollary will be relevant to representation theory:

**Corollary 0.22.** *Suppose that  $F$  is algebraically closed. Then any semisimple algebra is isomorphic to a direct sum of matrix algebras over  $F$ .*