

1. Show that the converse of Schur's lemma does not hold.

**Solution.** Consider the additive group of  $\mathbb{Q}$  as a module over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $\mathbb{Q}$  is clearly not simple but  $\text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}$ , since each endomorphism  $\varphi$  is determined by the image  $\varphi(1) = \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$  and it is also clear that multiplication by  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$  gives an endomorphism.

2. Let  $V$  be a vector space over a field  $K$ . Show that  $R = \text{End}(V_K)$  is left primitive but not necessarily simple. Describe the ideal structure of  $R$ .

**Solution.** Clearly  $V$  as a left  $R$ -module is faithful and simple. Hence  $R$  is left primitive. If  $\dim_K V$  is finite, then  $R$  is simple, so let us consider the infinite dimensional case. It is easy to show that if  $\kappa$  is an arbitrary infinite cardinality then the endomorphisms of rank less than  $\kappa$  form an ideal  $I_\kappa$ . Furthermore if  $f \in R$  is of rank  $\lambda$  then any  $g \in R$  of rank not greater than  $\lambda$  will belong to the ideal generated by  $f$ . Hence the ideals are all of this form. Thus the ideals of  $R$  form a chain and they are in one-to-one correspondence with infinite cardinalities  $\kappa$  such that  $\kappa \leq (\dim V)^+$ , the correspondence being given by  $\kappa \mapsto I_\kappa$ .

3. Show that if  $R = \text{End}(V_K)$  as above then  $R$  has a minimal left ideal and conclude that every simple faithful left  $R$ -module is isomorphic to  ${}_R V$ .

**Solution.** Let  $\dim V = \kappa$  and  $\mathcal{B} = \{\mathbf{b}_\lambda \mid \lambda < \kappa\}$  be a basis for  $V$ . Then  $I = \text{Ann}_R \mathcal{B} \setminus \{\mathbf{b}_0\}$  is a left ideal in  $R$  and it is clearly minimal. Namely, let  $0 \neq f \in I$  and  $g \in I$  be arbitrary elements. Then  $f(\mathbf{b}_0) = \mathbf{v} \neq 0$ , hence there is  $r \in R$  for which  $r(\mathbf{v}) = g(\mathbf{b}_0)$ . With this  $r$  we have  $rf = g$ , hence  $Rf = I$ . This implies that  $I$  is minimal. Since any primitive ring is prime, a statement from the lecture implies that every faithful simple  $R$ -module is isomorphic, hence they must be isomorphic to  ${}_R V$  (which is faithful and simple).

4. Let  $R$  be a left primitive ring and  $0 \neq e \in R$  an idempotent element. Show that  $S = eRe$  is also left primitive.

**Solution.** Let  $V$  be a faithful simple  $R$ -module. We will show that  $U = eV$  is a faithful simple  $S$ -module. Clearly  $ere \cdot ev = erev \in U$ , hence we get an  $S$ -structure on  $U$ . Furthermore, if  $ereU = 0$  then  $erev = ereV = 0$ , hence  $ere$  annihilates  $V$ , implying that  $ere = 0$ . Finally, if  $u = ev \neq 0$  for some  $u \in U$ , then  $Ru = V$  by simplicity of  $V$ . But then  $Su = eReu = eReev = eRev = eRu = eV = U$  hence  $U$  is a simple  $S$ -module. Thus  $S$  is also left primitive.

5. Show that for  $K$  a field of characteristic 0 the Weyl-algebra  $A_1(K) = K\langle x, y \rangle / (xy - yx - 1)$  is left primitive.

**Solution.** Let  $V = K[t]$  and let us consider the ring homomorphism  $\Phi : K\langle x, y \rangle \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{Z}} V$  defined by  $x \mapsto (p(t) \mapsto p'(t))$  and  $y \mapsto (p(t) \mapsto tp(t))$ . Since  $K\langle x, y \rangle$  is freely generated by  $x$  and  $y$ , such a homomorphism exists. A straightforward calculation shows that  $\Phi(xy - yx)t^i = (i+1)t^i - it^i = t^i$ , thus  $\Phi(xy - yx - 1) = 0$ . Thus  $\Phi$  factors through  $A_1(K)$ , hence  $V$  becomes an  $A_1(K)$ -module. A relatively easy calculation shows that  $V$  is a simple  $A_1(K)$ -module. Namely, for arbitrary nonzero  $p(t) = a_0 + \dots + a_n t^n$  we have  $x^n \cdot p(t) = a_n n!$  and  $y^m x^n \cdot p(t) = a_n n! t^m$ . Thus since the characteristic of  $K$  is 0, for  $q(t) = b_0 + \dots + b_k t^k$  we define  $r_t = \frac{b_t}{a_n n!} y^t x^n$  and  $r = r_0 + \dots + r_k$ . Then  $rp(t) = q(t)$ , showing that  $V$  is simple as an  $A_1(K)$ -module. A somewhat lengthier calculation shows that  $V$  is faithful; the details are omitted. *Remark:* Basically we have shown that via the mapping  $\Phi$  the ring  $A_1(K)$  can be thought of as the ring of differential operators on  $K[t]$ , i.e.  $\{\sum_{i=0}^n p_i(t)D^i \mid p_i(t) \in K[t]\}$ , where  $D$  is the derivation on  $K[t]$ , and this ring acts densely on  $K[t]$ .

6. Decide whether the following implications are true:

- a) A ring  $R$  is left primitive if and only if the full matrix ring  $M_n(R)$  is left primitive.
- b) A ring  $R$  is prime if and only if the full matrix ring  $M_n(R)$  is prime.

**Solution.** a) If  $M_n(R)$  is primitive then Problem 4 implies that  $E_{11}M_n(R)E_{11} \simeq R$  is also primitive. Conversely, assume that  $R$  is left primitive with  $V$  a simple faithful  $R$ -module. Then one can show that  $V^n$  as a set of column vectors is a faithful simple  $M_n(R)$ -module. b) Observe first that the ideals  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $M_n(R)$  are precisely the subsets of the form  $M_n(I)$  for some  $I \triangleleft R$ . A standard matrix multiplication argument shows that the projection  $\pi_{ij} : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow R$ , with  $\pi_{ij}(A) = A_{ij}$  maps  $\mathcal{I}$  onto the same ideal  $I \triangleleft R$  for all  $i, j$ , furthermore  $\mathcal{J}$  is the direct sum (as Abelian group) of these projections, hence it is of the form  $M_n(I)$ . Conversely, the sets  $M_n(I)$  are ideals in  $M_n(R)$ . Now, for ideals  $I_1, I_2 \triangleleft R$  and the corresponding ideals  $\mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2 \triangleleft M_n(R)$  we have that  $\mathcal{I}_1 \cdot \mathcal{I}_2 = 0$  if and only if  $I_1 \cdot I_2 = 0$ . Thus  $R$  is prime if and only if  $M_n(R)$  is prime.

7. a) Suppose the path algebra  $K\Gamma$  is finite dimensional. Give a precise condition for  $K\Gamma$  to be primitive (prime, resp.).  
b) Show that  $K\Gamma$  (without the assumption on the dimension) is prime if and only if for each pair of vertices  $i, j$  in  $\Gamma$  there is an (oriented) path from  $i$  to  $j$ .

**Solution.** a) If  $K\Gamma$  is primitive then it is prime. Thus we will show first that if  $K\Gamma$  is prime then  $\Gamma$  has one vertex and no arrows. Since  $K\Gamma$  is finite dimensional, the arrows generate a nilpotent ideal, contradicting the primeness of  $K\Gamma$ . Hence there are no arrows in  $K\Gamma$ . Next, if  $\Gamma$  contains at least two vertices then the ideals generated by the corresponding idempotents are disjoint hence their product is zero contradicting the primeness of  $K\Gamma$ . Thus  $\Gamma$  contains only one vertex. Conversely, if  $\Gamma$  has one vertex and no arrows then  $K\Gamma$  is a field and thus it is primitive and hence also prime. b) If  $K\Gamma$  is prime then  $e_i K\Gamma e_j \neq 0$ , hence there is an oriented path from  $i$  to  $j$  for any vertices  $i, j \in \Gamma$ . Conversely, suppose that the latter condition holds. We want to show that  $K\Gamma$  is prime, i.e. that  $aK\Gamma b \neq 0$  for any pair of elements  $a \neq 0 \neq b$  of  $K\Gamma$ . Multiplying  $a$  and  $b$  by suitable idempotents, we may assume that  $a$  is a linear combination of different paths  $a_\alpha$ , each starting at  $h$  and ending at  $i$ ; let  $a_{\alpha_0}$  be a path of maximal length among the summands. Similarly, we may assume that  $b$  is a linear combination of different paths  $b_\beta$ , each starting at  $j$  and ending at  $k$ ; let  $b_{\beta_0}$  be a path of maximal length among the summands. Let  $c$  be an oriented path from  $i$  to  $j$ . Then in the product  $acb$  there will be a summand  $a_{\alpha_0}cb_{\beta_0}$  different from all other summands. Thus the product cannot be zero. This shows that in this case  $K\Gamma$  is prime.

8. Show that the fact that  $R \subseteq \text{End}(V_D)$  is 1-transitive does not imply that  $R$  is dense in  $\text{End}(V_D)$  (although it follows that  $V$  is a simple faithful  $R$ -module). (*Hint*: Construct an example where  $\text{End}_R(V)$  is strictly larger than  $D$ .)

**Solution.** Take  $\mathbb{C}$  as an  $\mathbb{R}$ -vector-space. Clearly,  $\mathbb{C}$  acts on  $\mathbb{C}$  faithfully and transitively, on the other hand the action of  $\mathbb{C}$  on  $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbb{R}}$  is not 2-transitive. (Note that this does not contradict the density theorem since  $\text{End}_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C} \supset \mathbb{R}$ .)

9. Prove that if  $R$  is primitive then the centre  $Z(R)$  is an integral domain. Conversely, show that for any integral domain  $S$  there is a primitive ring  $R$  with  $Z(R) \simeq S$ .

**Solution.** If  $a, b \in Z(R)$  would be nonzero elements for which  $ab = 0$ , then for the nonzero ideals  $A = Ra$  and  $B = Rb$  and the faithful simple  $R$ -module  $S$  we would get  $RaS = S$  and  $RbS = S$  but then  $0 = abS = abRRS = RaRbS = RaS = S$ , a contradiction. Hence  $ab \neq 0$ . For the converse let  $S$  be an integral domain and  $Q$  the field of quotients of  $S$ . Let  $V$  be an infinite dimensional vector space over  $Q$  and define  $R$  to be the subring of  $\text{End}(V_Q)$  as follows:

$$R = \{f = g + s \cdot \text{id}_V \in \text{End}(V_Q) \mid g \text{ is of finite rank, } s \in S\}$$

Then one can check easily that  $R$  is dense in  $\text{End}(V_Q)$ , moreover  $Z(R) \simeq S$ .

10. Show that in Wedderburn's theorem (which states that a simple left artinian left primitive ring is isomorphic to  $M_n(D)$  for some division ring  $D$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) the division ring  $D$  and the positive integer  $n$  are uniquely determined by  $R$ .

**Solution.** We have to show that if  $M_n(D) \simeq M_k(\Delta)$  then  $D \simeq \Delta$  and  $n = k$ . Suppose  $\varphi$  gives an isomorphism between the two matrix rings and let  $e = E_{11} \in M_n(D)$  be the idempotent element containing 1 in the upper left corner and 0's elsewhere. Then  $e$  generates a minimal left ideal in  $M_n(D)$ , hence  $f = \varphi(e)$  must be an idempotent, generating a minimal left ideal in  $M_k(\Delta)$ . By a change of basis, i.e. an inner automorphism of  $M_k(\Delta)$ , if necessary, we may assume that  $f$  is an element where in the upper left corner we have an identity matrix of rank  $r$  and 0's elsewhere. By the minimality of  $M_k(\Delta)f$ , we get that  $r = 1$ . Thus  $D \simeq eM_n(D)e \simeq fM_k(\Delta)f \simeq \Delta$ . A dimension argument shows that  $n = k$ .

11. Observe the following chain of implications:

$$R \text{ is simple} \Rightarrow R \text{ is primitive} \Rightarrow R \text{ is prime}$$

Show that none of the implications can be reversed but if we assume that  $R$  is left Artinian then both implications can be replaced by equivalences.

**Solution.**  $\mathbb{Z}$  is prime but not primitive and  $\text{End}_K V$  is primitive but it is not simple if  $V$  is infinite dimensional. Hence the reverse implications are false. On the other hand if  $R$  is left artinian and prime then it contains a minimal left ideal hence it is primitive by a theorem proved in class. Furthermore, if  $R$  is primitive and left Artinian then we have seen that  $A \simeq M_n(D)$  for some division ring  $D$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , hence it is simple.

12. Suppose  $R \subseteq \text{End}(V_D)$  is a dense subring. Show that the socle of  $R$  as a left module (i.e. the left ideal generated by all minimal left ideals) consists of all elements of  $R$  which have finite rank.

**Solution.** Let  $I$  be the set of all endomorphisms in  $R$  which are of finite rank. It is clear that  $I$  is an ideal in  $\text{End}(V_D)$ . We will show first that  $I \subseteq \text{Soc}(R)$ , the socle of  $R$ . We claim that if  $\text{rank}(r) = 1$  for an element  $r \in R$ , then  $Rr$  is a minimal left ideal in  $R$ . To this end we have to show that if  $sr \neq 0$  for some  $s \in R$ , then  $Rsr = Rr$ , i.e. that  $r \in Rsr$ . But  $sr \neq 0$  implies that there is an element  $v \in V$  such that  $sr(v) \neq 0$ . Then the density of  $R$  implies that there is  $t \in R$  such that  $tsr(v) = r(v)$ . We claim that  $tsr = r$ , i.e.  $tsr(w) = r(w)$  for any  $w \in V$ . But if  $r(w) \neq 0$  then  $r(w) = r(v)\lambda$  for some  $\lambda \in D$  hence  $tsr(w) = tsr(v)\lambda = r(v)\lambda = r(w)$ . This implies that  $Rr$  is a minimal left ideal in  $R$ , hence  $Rr \subseteq \text{Soc } R$ . Now let us take an  $r \in I$  with  $\text{rank}(r) = k$ . This means that  $r(V) = \langle v_1, \dots, v_k \rangle$  for some  $D$ -independent elements. The density of  $R$  implies that there are elements  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in R$  such that  $a_i(v_j) = \delta_{ij}v_j$ . This implies that  $r = (\sum_{i=1}^k a_i)r = \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i r)$  and  $\text{rank}(a_i r) = 1$ . Hence  $r$  is a sum of rank 1 elements in  $R$ , thus it is in  $\text{Soc } R$ . We have shown that  $I \subseteq \text{Soc } R$ . To prove the opposite direction, i.e. that  $\text{Soc } R \subseteq I$ , it is enough to show that any minimal left ideal  $0 \neq L = Rr$  is generated by an element of rank 1. Suppose  $\text{rank } r \geq 2$ . This means that we can find elements  $v_1, v_2 \in V$  for which  $r(v_1)$  and  $r(v_2)$  are  $D$ -independent. Density of  $R$  implies that there is an element  $t \in R$  for which  $tr(v_1) \neq 0$  and  $tr(v_2) = 0$ . But in this case  $tr \in Rr$  for which all elements of  $Rtr$  will contain  $v_2$  in their kernels, implying that  $r \notin Rtr$ . This contradicts the minimality of  $Rr$ . Thus  $\text{Soc } R \subseteq I$ , as required.

13. a) Show that if  $R$  is a prime ring and  $L \leq {}_R R$  is a minimal left ideal then  $L$  is generated by an idempotent element.  
b) Show that the left and right socle of a prime ring coincide.

**Solution.** a) Let  $R$  be a prime ring and  $0 \neq L = Rr$  be a minimal left ideal. Since  $R$  is prime,  $L^2 \neq 0$ , hence  $La \neq 0$  for some  $a \in L$ . Since  $La$  is a left ideal, the minimality of  $L$  implies that  $La = L$ . Thus there is an element  $e \in L$  such that  $ea = a$ . Hence  $(e^2 - e)a = 0$ . But the annihilator of  $a$  in  $L$  is a left ideal of  $R$ , strictly contained in  $L$  (because  $ea \neq 0$ ). Hence this annihilator is 0, thus  $e^2 = e$ . So we get an idempotent element in  $L = Rr$  and by minimality of  $L$  we get that  $Rr = Re$  and thus  $r = re$ . (Observe that  $\text{End}_R(Re) \simeq eRe$  and by Schur's lemma  $eRe$  is a division ring.) b) We want to show that if  $Rr$  is a minimal left ideal in a prime ring  $R$  then  $rR$  is also a minimal right ideal in  $R$ . Thus let  $0 \neq s \in rR$ ; we need to show that  $r \in sR$ . But  $s \in rR$  means  $s = rt$  for some  $t \in R$ . Hence  $s = rt = ret$ . Note that  $R$  being a prime ring implies that  $sRs \neq 0$  so there is an element  $u \in R$  such that  $sus = returets \neq 0$ . But the  $returets \neq 0$ , and since  $eRe$  is a division ring, there exists an element  $q \in R$  such that  $etureeqe = e$ . Thus  $r = re = retureqe = sureqe \in sR$ . This proves that the left and right socle of a prime ring coincide.