

**Algebra- II**  
**Professor Amritanshu Prasad**  
**Mathematics**  
**Indian Institute of Mathematical Sciences**  
**Lecture 79**  
**Indecomposable Module**


(Refer Slide Time: 00:49)

Indecomposable Modules

$R$  any ring,  $M$  an  $R$ -module.

We say that  $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$  if

- $M_1, M_2$  are submodules of  $M$ .
- $M = M_1 + M_2$  ( $\forall m \in M \exists m_1 \in M_1, m_2 \in M_2$  such that  $m = m_1 + m_2$ )
- $M_1 \cap M_2 = (0)$  (the decomposition  $m = m_1 + m_2, m_1 \in M_1, m_2 \in M_2$  is unique:  $m_1 + m_2 = m'_1 + m'_2$   
 $\Rightarrow m_1 - m'_1 = m'_2 - m_2 \in M_1 \cap M_2 = (0)$   
 $\Rightarrow m_1 = m'_1$  and  $m_2 = m'_2$ )



When studied the Jordan-Holder decomposition, we saw how modules that satisfy the ascending chain condition and the descending chain condition are built up in a certain way of modules of a specific kind called simple modules. These are modules which do not admit non-trivial proper sub-modules.

There is another way of breaking up modules into building blocks. And that is into indecomposable modules. So, in this lecture, I am going to introduce you to you the notion of an indecomposable module. So, let  $R$  be any ring,  $M$  an  $R$  module. We say that  $M$  is equal to  $M_1$  direct sum  $M_2$ , if the following conditions are satisfied. Firstly,  $M_1, M_2$  are sub modules of  $M$ .

In other words, they are abelian subgroups of the additive group of  $M$  and they are closed under the operations from  $R$ . When I say  $R$  module here, I am talking about a left  $R$  module, then the second condition is that  $M$  is equal to  $M_1$  plus  $M_2$  has an abelian group. So, what this means is that, for every  $m$  in  $M$  there exist  $m_1$  in  $M_1, m_2$  in  $M_2$  such that  $m$  is equal to  $m_1$  plus  $m_2$  every element of  $m$  can be written as a sum of an element of  $M_1$  and an element of  $M_2$ .

And the third condition is that  $M_1 \cap M_2$  is a trivial module. And this is equivalent to saying that the decomposition  $m = m_1 + m_2$  is unique. Let me explain why since it is quite simple. Suppose, we have  $m_1 + m_2 = m_1' + m_2'$  then this implies that  $m_1 - m_1'$  is equal to  $m_2' - m_2$ .

Now, this is in  $M_1$  because  $M_1$  prime are in  $m_1$ , this is in  $M_2$  because  $m_2$  and  $M_2$  prime are in  $M_2$ . So, these both these things belong to  $M_1 \cap M_2$ , but that consists of only the element of 0, which means that  $m_1$  is equal to  $m_1'$  and  $m_2$  is equal to  $m_2'$ . So, this third condition means, that the decomposition of  $M$  as a sum of elements from  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  is unique.

(Refer Slide Time: 03:53)

$R$  any ring,  $M$  an  $R$ -module.  
 We say that  $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$  if

- $M_1, M_2$  are submodules of  $M$ .
- $M = M_1 + M_2$  ( $\forall m \in M \exists m_1 \in M_1, m_2 \in M_2$  such that  $m = m_1 + m_2$ )
- $M_1 \cap M_2 = (0)$  (the decomposition  $m = m_1 + m_2, m_1 \in M_1, m_2 \in M_2$  is unique:  $m_1 + m_2 = m_1' + m_2'$   
 $\Rightarrow m_1 - m_1' = m_2' - m_2 \in M_1 \cap M_2 = (0)$   
 $\Rightarrow m_1 = m_1'$  and  $m_2 = m_2'$ )

Defn:  $M$  is said to be indecomposable if whenever  $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ , then  $M_1 = (0)$  or  $M_2 = (0)$ .

Example: Every simple module is indecomposable.



And now, we can define an indecomposable module.  $M$  is said to be indecomposable, if, whenever,  $M$  is written as  $M_1$  direct sum  $M_2$ , then either  $M_1$  is 0 or  $M_2$  is 0. Every sub module can be written  $M$  can be written as 0 plus  $M$  or  $M$  plus 0. But an indecomposable module is one that cannot be broken up into two non-trivial summands.

For example, every simple module is indecomposable. Why is that? Well, if we write  $M$  as  $M_1$  direct sum  $M_2$ , where  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are both non trivial, then both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are non-trivial proper sub modules of  $M$ . And so  $M$  cannot be simple if it is not indecomposable. Now, there is a nice way of thinking about direct sum decompositions, which will be very useful in the next few lectures.

(Refer Slide Time: 05:40)

---


The calculus of projections:

Suppose.  $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$

Define  $p_i : M \rightarrow M$  by  $p_i(m) = m_i$ , where  $m = m_1 + m_2, m_1 \in M_1, m_2 \in M_2$ .

Have:

- $\text{id}_M = p_1 + p_2$
- $p_i^2 = p_i \quad i=1, 2.$
- $p_1 p_2 = p_2 p_1 = 0$
- $p_1, p_2 \in \text{End}_R M := \text{Hom}_R(M, M)$



So, let me introduce that and this is sort of the beginnings of the calculus of projections. So, now suppose, so maybe I will just call this the calculus of projections. So, suppose we have  $M$  equals  $M_1$  plus  $M_2$ , then what you do is define  $P_i$  from  $M$  to  $M$  as follows. So, if you have an element  $m$ , then you can write it as  $m_1$  plus  $m_2$  in a unique way, with  $m_1$  in  $M_1$   $m_2$  in  $M_2$ . And so you just take  $P_1$  of  $m$  to be  $m_1$  and  $P_2$  of  $m$  to be  $m_2$ , then what we have are the following properties of these things.

So, you have the identity map of  $M$ , it goes from  $M$  to  $M$ , this is equal to  $P_1$  plus  $P_2$ , that is easy to see, because  $m$  is  $m_1$  plus  $m_2$ . So,  $P_1 m$  plus  $P_2 m$  is actually equal to  $m$  which is the identity map applied to  $M$ . The second property is that  $P_i$  squared is equal to  $P_i$  for  $i$  equals 1, 2. Each of these  $P_i$ s is its own square, because once you apply  $P_1$  of  $m$  you already get  $m_1$  and then when you apply  $P_1$  of  $m$  to an element of  $m_1$  it will be written as  $m_1$  plus 0 and so, it is itself.

So, the point is that  $P_i$  of  $m$  is equal to  $m$  if  $m$  is already in  $M_i$  and because of that  $P_i$  squared is  $P_i$  and the third property is that  $P_1 P_2$  is equal to  $P_2 P_1$  is equal to 0. And this is because,  $P_1$  of  $m$  is equal to 0 if  $m$  belongs to  $M_2$  and  $P_2$  of  $m$  is equal to 0 if  $m$  belongs to  $M_1$ . So, both these are easy to check from the definition. And now, if you take  $P_2$ , you take any element  $M$  and then apply  $P_2$  to it, you end up in  $M_2$  and then when you apply  $P_1$  you will get 0.

And most importantly,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are  $R$  module endomorphism. What is the meaning of  $\text{End}_R M$ ? This is defined to be the set of all  $R$  module homomorphisms from  $M$  to  $M$ , this

$\text{End}RM$  itself forms a ring addition is point wise addition and multiplication in the string is composition of homomorphisms.

If you have two homomorphisms from  $M$  to  $M$ , you can compose them with each other in any order that you like. So, in some sense, all these things, which we have written are happening inside this ring  $\text{End}RM$ . Now the fact that  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are  $\text{End}RM$  a rest on the condition that  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are sub modules of  $M$ . I leave it as an exercise to you to check that because  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are sub modules of  $M$   $P_1$  and  $P_2$  are  $R$  module homomorphisms. As an example, as an application of this calculus of projections. Let me, show you an a module that is not simple but is indecomposable

(Refer Slide Time: 09:54)

Example:  $\mathbb{Z}$  (as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module) is not simple but indecomposable.

$$\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z} \cong \mathbb{Z}$$

$$\text{If } \mathbb{Z} = M_1 \oplus M_2, \text{ then}$$

$$1 = p_1 + p_2$$

$$\text{where } p_1^2 = 1, p_2^2 = 1, p_1 p_2 = 0, p_2 p_1 = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \{p_1, p_2\} = \{1, 0\}$$

$$\text{So } M_1 = (0) \text{ or } M_2 = (0)$$

$$\therefore \mathbb{Z} \text{ is indecomposable.}$$



$\mathbb{Z}$  as a  $\mathbb{Z}$  module is not simple. We know that, there are lots of sub modules of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . For example, multiples of any integer  $N$  form a sub module of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , but it is indecomposable. And one way to see this is to use the calculus of projections. So, firstly, let us compute  $\text{End}\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}$ . Well, it turns out that if you have  $\mathbb{Z}$  module homomorphism from  $\mathbb{Z}$  to  $\mathbb{Z}$  it is completely determined by the image of the unit of  $\mathbb{Z}$  namely the integer 1. If you know where 1 goes, then you know where everyone else goes. And so this, but 1 can go to any integer and so and so  $\text{End}\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

And further, you can check that the operation of composition corresponds to multiplication of integers. And the operation of point wise addition, well, that is more obvious, corresponds to addition of integers. So, as the ring  $\text{End}\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Z}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . So, if we had, if  $\mathbb{Z}$  is  $M_1$  plus  $M_2$ , then what we would have is 1 in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , that is the identity map from  $\mathbb{Z}$  to  $\mathbb{Z}$  would be equal to  $P_1$  plus  $P_2$ .

Where  $P_1^2 = 1$ ,  $P_2^2 = 1$ ,  $P_1 P_2 = 0$ ,  $P_2 P_1 = 0$ , of course this follows because  $Z$  here is a commutative ring. But these equations only mean that one of the  $P_i$  is 1 and the other is 0. So, the set  $P_1, P_2$  is equal to the set  $1, 0$ . Which means that either  $M_1$  is 0 or  $M_2$  is 0. Which is the definition of indecomposable.

(Refer Slide Time: 12:44)

Example:  $\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}$  is an indecomposable  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module.

$$\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z} \cong \mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}.$$

$$\text{If } \mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z} = M_1 \oplus M_2,$$

$$1 = P_1 + P_2 \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}.$$

$$P_1^2 = P_1, P_2^2 = P_2.$$

$$\Rightarrow \{P_1, P_2\} = \{0, 1\}$$

so either  $M_1 = 0$  or  $M_2 = 0$ .

$$\overline{\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{\text{CRT}}{=} \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}.$$



1 / p^k

$$1 = P_1 + P_2 \text{ in } \mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z}.$$

$$P_1^2 = P_1, P_2^2 = P_2.$$

$$\Rightarrow \{P_1, P_2\} = \{0, 1\}$$

so either  $M_1 = 0$  or  $M_2 = 0$ .

$$\overline{\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}} \stackrel{\text{CRT}}{=} \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}.$$

In general:  $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$  is indecomposable if and only if  $N$  is a prime power.



Let us, look at another example.  $\mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } P$  to the  $k \mathbb{Z}$  is an indecomposable  $\mathbb{Z}$  module. So, again, you show just as before, that the endomorphism ring of  $\mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } P$  to the  $k \mathbb{Z}$  is isomorphic as a ring to  $\mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } P$  to the  $k \mathbb{Z}$ . And so if  $\mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } P$  to the  $k \mathbb{Z}$  were had a decomposition  $M_1$  plus  $M_2$  and we call  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  the corresponding projection operators, then we would have  $1$  equals  $P_1$  plus  $P_2$  in  $\mathbb{Z} \text{ mod } P$  to  $k \mathbb{Z}$ . Where  $P_1$  square is equal to  $P_1$

and  $P^2$  square is equal to  $P$ . Again, you can check that the only elements in  $\mathbb{Z} \bmod P^2$  the  $k\mathbb{Z}$  that are equal to their squares are 1 and 0. Just as before, this needs a little check.

And so either  $M_1$  equals 0 or  $M_2$  equal 0. And so  $\mathbb{Z} \bmod P$  to the  $k\mathbb{Z}$  is indecomposable. However, if you take for example,  $\mathbb{Z} \bmod 6\mathbb{Z}$ , then this by the Chinese remainder theorem is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z} \bmod 3\mathbb{Z}$  direct sum  $\mathbb{Z} \bmod 2\mathbb{Z}$  as a  $\mathbb{Z}$  module, and therefore it is not indecomposable. In fact, in general,  $\mathbb{Z} \bmod N\mathbb{Z}$  is indecomposable if and only if  $N$  is a prime power.