

Algebra – II
Professor. Amritanshu Prasad
Department of Mathematics
The Institute of Mathematical Sciences
The Jordan-Holder Theorem

(Refer Slide Time: 00:14)


Jordan-Hölder theorem

Recall: A Jordan-Hölder-series for an R -module M is a composition series that is strict, and has no strict refinement other than itself.

$$M_0 \supsetneq M_1 \supsetneq M_2 \supsetneq \dots \supsetneq M_n = 0$$

↑ ↑ ↑
 cannot insert new term.

Equivalently: M_i/M_{i+1} is simple for $i=0, \dots, n-1$.



In this lecture, I am going to discuss the Jordan-Holder theorem. Recall that Jordan-Holder a series for an R -module M is composition series, that is strict and has no strict refinement other than itself. So, a Jordan-Holder a series looks something like M_0 contains M_1 contains M_2 . So, each submodule properly contains the next one, the last one is 1, and there is no way to insert, cannot insert new terms in between.

And more importantly, equivalently, we could say that $M_i \text{ mod } M_{i+1}$ is simple for i equals 0 to n minus 1. Now, we have seen some conditions, namely the ascending chain condition and the descending chain condition which ensure the existence of a Jordan-Holder series. But let us not worry about that right now. I will state the Jordan-Holder theorem in more general form, and it turns out to be a direct consequence of Schreier's theorem.

(Refer Slide Time: 02:36)

Theorem: Any two Jordan-Hölder series for an R -module M are equivalent.


Recall: $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^m$ $\{N_j\}_{j=0}^n$ are equivalent if

- ① $m=n$
- ② $\exists \sigma: \{0, \dots, m-1\} \xrightarrow{\text{bij}}$ $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$

Such that $\frac{M_i}{M_{i+1}} \cong \frac{N_{\sigma(i)}}{N_{\sigma(i)+1}}$.

Pf: Suppose $\Sigma_1 = \{M_i\}_{i=0}^m$ $\&$ $\Sigma_2 = \{N_j\}_{j=0}^n$ are Jordan-Hölder series for M .

Schreier's thm $\Rightarrow \exists$ refinements Σ_1' and Σ_2' of Σ_1 $\&$ Σ_2 respectively, that are equivalent.



So, let us state the theorem. A Jordan-Hölder, if let us just, yeah, I think the simplest statement would be any two Jordan-Hölder series for an R -module M are equivalent. So, let us just decode what this is. Firstly, I am not claiming that an R -module has a Jordan-Hölder series, I am just saying that if it has two Jordan-Hölder series, they must be equivalent. So, what this means.

Firstly, recall what this means. This means that if you have M_i , i equals 0 to n , N_j , j equals 0 let us say i equals 0 to m and j equals 0 to n are equivalent. If 1, M is equal to n , and 2, the exist σ from the set 0 to m minus 1 to 0 to n minus 1 of bijection, which kind of implies that M is equal to N such that M_i modulo M_{i+1} is isomorphic to $N_{\sigma(i)}$ modulo $N_{\sigma(i)+1}$. And this will follow directly from Schreier's theorem.

So, proof, suppose, M_i , i equals 0 to m and N_j , j equals 0 to n are Jordan-Hölder series. So, then Schreier's theorem says that, so let us call this σ_1 and let us call the σ_2 . There exist the refinements σ_1' and σ_2' of σ_1 and σ_2 respectively, that are equivalent. But now, σ_1 and σ_2 are already Jordan-Hölder series, they cannot be refined by strict series. So, the σ_1' and σ_2' will just be refinements of σ_1 and σ_2 , where you are adding more terms which are equal to the existing terms in the series.

(Refer Slide Time: 6:03)

respectively, that are equivalent.
If we remove the repetitions in Σ_1' it becomes Σ .
If we remove the repetitions in Σ_2' it becomes Σ .
repetitions correspond to quotients = 0.
So after removing repetition (which correspond to 0 quotients)
get Σ_1 and Σ_2 which have the same length.
because $\Sigma_1' \neq \Sigma_2'$ have the same no
of 0's for quotients.



So, what we are saying is that, if you have sigma 1 is something like this $M_0, M_1, M_2, \dots, M_n$ equals 0, then you will be adding terms in between which are either equal to, so you may be adding terms like this M_0, M_1, M_0, M_2 or many more terms are in between these two terms will be either equal to M_0 or to M_1 . So, there are no new terms that appear in sigma 1 prime and sigma 2 prime.

And so, once you take, so if you take, so if we remove the repetitions in sigma 1 prime it becomes sigma and if we remove the repetitions in sigma 2 prime it becomes sigma. But these repetitions are precisely those terms in the series where the quotients are 0's and because sigma 1 prime and sigma 2 prime are equivalent, they have the same number of 0 quotients.

(Refer Slide Time: 8:02)

repetitions correspond to quotients - ...
So after removing repetition (which correspond to 0 quotients)
get Σ_1 and Σ_2 have the same length.
because Σ_1' & Σ_2' have the same no
of quotients.
The remaining non-zero quotients still permute each other.
 $\therefore \Sigma_1$ and Σ_2 are equivalent.



So, after removing repetitions which correspond to 0 quotients σ_1 prime and σ_2 prime have the same length. So, since they have the same number of, well σ_1 prime and σ_2 prime have the same length. So, σ_1 and σ_2 have the same length. So, you get σ_1 and σ_2 which have the same length because σ_1 prime and σ_2 prime have the same number of 0 quotients. And the remaining quotients of course, they permute each other.


And the remaining non-zero quotients still permute each other. So, we have a bijection between the 0 quotients, after we remove them, we will still have a bijection between the non-zero quotients. And so, these two Jordan-Holder series σ_1 and σ_2 have to be equivalent. So, we have not assumed here that M satisfies the ascending chain condition or the descending chain condition, we just assumed that M has Jordan-Holder series.

We have not assumed that M satisfies the ascending chain condition or the descending chain condition. But just with the assumption that M admits at least one Jordan-Holder series, we can do.

(Refer Slide Time: 10:37)

Corollary (of Schreier's thm): If M has a Jordan-Hölder series $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^n$ (length n), then M cannot have a composition series of length more than n .

Pf. Suppose $\{N_j\}_{j=0}^k$ is a composition series. $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^n$ and $\{N_j\}_{j=0}^k$ admit refinements Σ'_1 & Σ'_2 respectively that are equivalent. Since Σ'_1 & Σ'_2 are equiv, they have the same no. of non-zero quotients.



So, here is a corollary, and there is not a corollary of the Jordan-Hölder theorem, as stated, per se, it is a corollary of Schreier's theorem, which says that if M has a Jordan-Hölder series of length l . And so let us say M_i , i goes from 0 to n . So, that means length l , I call that length n , then M cannot have a strict composition series of length more than n . So, every composition series of M will have length less than or equal to n .

And the proof is this, suppose, $\{N_j\}_{j=0}^k$ is a composition series then $\{N_j\}$ and $\{M_i\}$, so let us call this. So, so, $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^n$ and $\{N_j\}_{j=0}^k$ admit the refinements Σ'_1 and Σ'_2 respectively. So, Σ'_1 is a refinement of this Jordan-Hölder series $\{M_i\}$ and Σ'_2 is a refinement of this composition series $\{N_j\}$ that are equivalent.

Since they are equivalent, they have the same number of non-zero quotients. Moreover, the number of non-zero quotients of a refinement would be at least as large as the number of non-zero quotients of a composition series.

(Refer Slide Time: 13:27)

Since σ_1 is a composition series of M ,
non-zero quotients.
 $n = \text{no. of non-zero quotients of } \sigma_1$
 $= \text{no. of non-zero quotients of } \sigma_2 \geq k$ BED.
Corollary: If M has a Jordan-Holder series, then it satisfies
the ACC and the DCC.



So, now what we have is n is the length of the composition series M_i . So, it is the number of non-zero quotients of σ_1 prime and that is equal to the number of non-zero quotients of σ_2 prime. But that has to be greater than or equal to k because a σ_2 prime is a refinement of N_j and so k has to be less than or equal to m . So, you cannot have any strict composition series of length greater than the length of a composition series, of a Jordan-Holder series.

Corollary: If M has a Jordan-Holder series then it satisfies the ACC and the DCC. Because if you have an increasing chain, it has to stabilize at some point because you cannot have a strict increasing chain of length more than the length of the Jordan-Holder series, and the same applies for decreasing chains. And also, the Jordan-Holder theorem gives us a set of invariants for a module.

(Refer Slide Time: 15:22)

Invariants for a module:

Let M be an R -module with Jordan-Hölder series

$$M_0 \supset M_1 \supset \dots \supset M_n = 0$$

$\mu(M) :=$ the multiset $\left\{ \frac{M_0}{M_1}, \frac{M_1}{M_2}, \dots, \frac{M_{n-1}}{M_n} \right\}$


(multiset of quotient)

is independent of the Jordan-Hölder series.

Example: $M = \mathbb{Z}/12\mathbb{Z}$

$$M \supset 2M \supset 4M \supset 0$$

2 2 3



So, here is how we compute this. So, let M be an R -module with Jordan-Hölder series, M_0 contains M_1 contains M_n equals 0. So, this is going to be strict as the quotients are going to be simple, the simple modules. So, we will call this μ of M , define μ of M to be the multiset $M_0 \text{ mod } M_1, M_1 \text{ mod } M_2, \dots, M_{n-1} \text{ mod } M_n$. So, we remember the multiplicities with which the different quotients arise. So, this is the multiset of quotients.

This is independent of the Jordan-Hölder series, this is what equivalence means. For example, we had looked inside $\mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } 12\mathbb{Z}$. So, let us call this M , this is the \mathbb{Z} module and this had submodules for example, we have a Jordan-Hölder series which is M well contains $2M$ contains $4M$ contains 0, and the quotients here are $\mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } 2, \mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } 2, \mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } 3$.

(Refer Slide Time: 18:01)

Example: $M = \mathbb{Z}/12\mathbb{Z}$ $\text{len}(\mathbb{Z}/12\mathbb{Z}) = 3$

$$M \supset 2M \supset 4M \supset 0$$


2 2 3

$\mu(M) = \left\{ \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \right\}$ (multiset).

If $M \cong N$, then $\mu(M) = \mu(N)$.

Defn: $\text{len}(M) :=$ length of any Jordan-Hölder series of M .

i.e., if $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^n$ is a Jordan-Hölder series, then $\text{len}(M) = n$.



So, μ of M is, $\mu \mathbb{Z} \bmod 2 \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z} \bmod 2 \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z} \bmod 3 \mathbb{Z}$, a multiset. This does not depend on the composition series. And if you have two isomorphic modules, then these multisets are equal. The size of this multiset is called the length of the module. So, definition, length of M is defined to be the length of any Jordan-Holder series of M . Just to be doubly clear, if M_i goes from M_0 to n is a Jordan-Holder series, then we will say that length of M is equal to n . So, what we have in this example is that the length of $\mathbb{Z} \bmod 12 \mathbb{Z}$ is equal to 3.