

This is a repository copy of *Semisimplification for subgroups of reductive algebraic groups*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/163633/>

Version: Submitted Version

---

**Article:**

Bate, Michael [orcid.org/0000-0002-6513-2405](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6513-2405), Martin, Benjamin and Roehrl, Gerhard (2020) Semisimplification for subgroups of reductive algebraic groups. *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*. e43. ISSN 2050-5094

<https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2020.30>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

# SEMISIMPLIFICATION FOR SUBGROUPS OF REDUCTIVE ALGEBRAIC GROUPS

MICHAEL BATE, BENJAMIN MARTIN, AND GERHARD RÖHRLE

ABSTRACT. Let  $G$  be a reductive algebraic group—possibly non-connected—over a field  $k$  and let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . If  $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$  then there is a degeneration process for obtaining from  $H$  a completely reducible subgroup  $H'$  of  $G$ ; one takes a limit of  $H$  along a cocharacter of  $G$  in an appropriate sense. We generalise this idea to arbitrary reductive  $G$  using the notion of  $G$ -complete reducibility and results from geometric invariant theory over non-algebraically closed fields due to the authors and Herpel. Our construction produces a  $G$ -completely reducible subgroup  $H'$  of  $G$ , unique up to  $G(k)$ -conjugacy, which we call a  $k$ -*semisimplification* of  $H$ . This gives a single unifying construction which extends various special cases in the literature (in particular, it agrees with the usual notion for  $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$  and with Serre’s “ $G$ -analogue” of semisimplification for subgroups of  $G(k)$  from [21]). We also show that under some extra hypotheses, one can pick  $H'$  in a more canonical way using the Tits Centre Conjecture for spherical buildings and/or the theory of optimal destabilising cocharacters introduced by Hesselink, Kempf and Rousseau.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to present a construction of the *semisimplification* of a subgroup  $H$  of a (possibly non-connected) reductive linear algebraic group  $G$  over an arbitrary field  $k$ . This construction unifies and generalizes many concepts already in the literature within a single framework. For example, the semisimplification of a module for a group is a well-known construction in representation theory, corresponding in our case to the situation where  $H \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n(k)$ . Building on this idea, for  $G$  a connected reductive linear algebraic group over a field  $k$  and  $H$  a subgroup of  $G(k)$ , Serre introduced the concept of a “ $G$ -analogue” of semisimplification from representation theory in [21, §3.2.4]. This notion is also used for representations of various kinds of algebras, e.g., see [13], [8], [18], [25], and [26]. It is also an ingredient in work of Lawrence-Sawin on the Shafarevich Conjecture for abelian varieties [14] and work of Lawrence-Venkatesh on Mordell’s Conjecture [15], which involve Galois representations taking values in possibly non-connected reductive  $p$ -adic groups.

We begin by recalling how the most basic case works. Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(k)$ . There is an  $H$ -module filtration of  $k^n$  such that the successive quotients are irreducible, by the Jordan-Hölder Theorem. In terms of matrices, this implies that, by changing basis if necessary, we may assume that  $H$  is in upper block-triangular form, with the action of  $H$  on each quotient being represented by the corresponding block on the diagonal. Letting  $H'$  be the subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(k)$  consisting of the block diagonal matrices obtained by taking each element of  $H$  and replacing the entries above the block diagonal with 0s, we obtain a subgroup which acts semisimply on  $k^n$ —that is,  $H'$  is completely reducible. Since

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20G15 (14L24).

*Key words and phrases.* Semisimplification,  $G$ -complete reducibility, geometric invariant theory, rationality, cocharacter-closed orbits, degeneration of  $G$ -orbits.

this construction is independent of the choice of basis up to  $\mathrm{GL}_n(k)$ -conjugacy, again by the Jordan-Hölder Theorem, it is therefore reasonable to call  $H'$  the *semisimplification* of  $H$ .

We now explain some of the ingredients of our construction in the case that  $k$  is algebraically closed, which removes some technicalities. Recall [2], [21] that if  $G$  is connected and  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$  then  $H$  is  *$G$ -completely reducible* ( $G$ -cr for short) if for any parabolic subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  such that  $P$  contains  $H$ , there is a Levi subgroup  $L$  of  $P$  such that  $L$  contains  $H$ . If  $G = \mathrm{GL}_n$  then  $H$  is  $G$ -cr if and only if  $k^n$  is completely reducible as an  $H$ -module; this follows from the usual characterisation of parabolic subgroups of  $\mathrm{GL}_n$  as stabilizers of flags of subspaces. We make the same definition for arbitrary reductive  $G$ , replacing parabolic subgroups and Levi subgroups with R-parabolic subgroups and R-Levi subgroups instead (see Section 2 for details).

To perform our construction, we apply a characterisation of  $G$ -complete reducibility in terms of geometric invariant theory (GIT). We see this idea already in our original example: we can view  $H'$  as a degeneration of  $H$  in the following sense. Let the sizes of the blocks down the diagonal be  $n_1, \dots, n_r$ , and define a cocharacter  $\lambda: \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n$  by

$$\lambda(a) = \mathrm{diag}(a^r, \dots, a^r, \dots, a^1, \dots, a^1), \text{ with } n_i \text{ occurrences of } a^{r-i+1}, 1 \leq i \leq r.$$

For each  $a \in k^*$ , define  $H_a = \lambda(a)H\lambda(a)^{-1}$  for  $a \in k^*$ . Then  $H' = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} H_a$  in an appropriate sense.

Our definition of  $k$ -semisimplification (Definition 4.1) for arbitrary  $k$  is new, generalizes the one given by Serre in [21, §3.2.4], and is closely related to the definition given in [6] using optimal destabilising cocharacters; the two notions agree whenever the latter makes sense (cf. also [16, Sec. 4] for the algebraically closed case). We prove that the  $k$ -semisimplification of a subgroup  $H$  of  $G$  is unique up to conjugacy (Theorem 4.5), generalizing [21, Prop. 3.3(b)]. In Theorem 5.4 we show that a normal subgroup of a  $G$ -completely reducible subgroup  $H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible and that the process of  $k$ -semisimplification behaves well under passing to normal subgroups of  $H$ , if  $k$  is perfect or  $G$  is connected. The proof rests on deep results from the theory of spherical buildings and the Hesselink-Kempf-Rousseau theory of optimal destabilising cocharacters. We give a short and self-contained exposition, bringing together some results (such as Corollary 3.5) that follow from previous work but are not easily extracted from earlier papers.

## 2. COCHARACTER-CLOSED ORBITS

Following [7] and our earlier work [6], [1], we regard an affine variety over a field  $k$  as a variety  $X$  over the algebraic closure  $\bar{k}$  together with a choice of  $k$ -structure. We denote the separable closure of  $k$  by  $k_s$ . We write  $X(k)$  for the set of  $k$ -points of  $X$  and  $X(\bar{k})$  (or just  $X$ ) for the set of  $\bar{k}$ -points of  $X$ . By a subvariety of  $X$  we mean a closed  $\bar{k}$ -subvariety of  $X$ ; a  $k$ -subvariety is a subvariety that is defined over  $k$ . We denote by  $M_n$  the associative algebra of  $n \times n$  matrices over  $k$ . Below  $G$  denotes a possibly non-connected reductive linear algebraic group over  $k$ . By a subgroup of  $G$  we mean a closed  $\bar{k}$ -subgroup and by a  $k$ -subgroup we mean a subgroup that is defined over  $k$ . (We note here that much of what follows works for non-closed subgroups—most of the important conditions hold for  $H$  if and only if they hold for the Zariski closure  $\bar{H}$ ; the details are left to the reader.) By  $G^0$  we denote the identity component of  $G$ , and likewise for subgroups of  $G$ .

We define  $Y_k(G)$  to be the set of  $k$ -defined cocharacters of  $G$  and  $Y(G) := Y_{\bar{k}}(G)$  to be the set of all cocharacters of  $G$ .

Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . Even if  $H$  is  $k$ -defined, the (set-theoretic) centralizer  $C_G(H)$  need not be  $k$ -defined in general. It is useful to have criteria to ensure that  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined (see Proposition 3.4 and Section 5). For instance, if  $k$  is perfect and  $H$  is  $k$ -defined then  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined. We say that  $H$  is *separable* if the scheme-theoretic centralizer  $\mathcal{C}_G(H)$  is smooth [2, Def. 3.27]; for instance, any subgroup of  $\mathrm{GL}_n$  is separable [2, Ex. 3.28] (see [5] for more examples of separable subgroups). If  $H$  is  $k$ -defined and separable then  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined (see [1, Prop. 7.4]).

Next we recall some basic notation and facts concerning parabolic subgroups in (non-connected) reductive groups  $G$  from [2, §6] and [6]. Given  $\lambda \in Y(G)$ , we define

$$P_\lambda = \{g \in G \mid \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \lambda(a)g\lambda(a)^{-1} \text{ exists}\}$$

and  $L_\lambda = C_G(\mathrm{Im}(\lambda))$  (for the definition of a limit, see [22, Sec. 3.2.13]). We call  $P_\lambda$  an *R-parabolic subgroup* of  $G$  and  $L_\lambda$  an *R-Levi subgroup* of  $P_\lambda$ ; they are subgroups of  $G$ . We have  $P_\lambda = L_\lambda = G$  if  $\mathrm{Im}(\lambda)$  belongs to the centre of  $G$ . For ease of reference, we record without proof some basic facts about these subgroups.

- Lemma 2.1.** (i) *If  $P$  is a  $k$ -defined R-parabolic subgroup then  $R_u(P)$  is  $k$ -defined.*  
(ii) *If  $P$  is a parabolic subgroup of  $G^0$  then the normalizer  $N_G(P)$  is an R-parabolic subgroup of  $G$ , and  $N_G(P)$  is  $k$ -defined if  $P$  is.*

If  $G$  is connected then every pair  $(P, L)$  consisting of a parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  and a Levi  $k$ -subgroup  $L$  of  $P$  is of the form  $(P, L) = (P_\lambda, L_\lambda)$  for some  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$ , and vice versa [22, Lem. 15.1.2(ii)]. In general, if  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  then  $P_\lambda$  and  $L_\lambda$  are  $k$ -defined [6, Lem. 2.5], but the converse is not so straightforward. If  $P$  is an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup and  $L$  is an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P$  then for any maximal  $k$ -torus  $T$  of  $L$ , there exists  $\lambda \in Y_{k_s}(T)$  such that  $P = P_\lambda$  and  $L = L_\lambda$ . However, it is possible that  $P$  is a  $k$ -defined R-parabolic subgroup and yet there does not exist any  $\mu \in Y_k(G)$  such that  $P = P_\mu$ , and similarly for R-Levi subgroups—see [6, Rem. 2.4]. This complicates some of the arguments below.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $P$  be an R-parabolic subgroup of  $G$  and  $L$  an R-Levi subgroup of  $P$ .*

- (i) *We have  $P \cong L \rtimes R_u(P)$ , and this is a  $k$ -isomorphism if  $P$  and  $L$  are  $k$ -defined.*  
(ii) *Any two R-Levi  $k$ -subgroups of an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P$  are  $R_u(P)(k)$ -conjugate.*

We denote the canonical projection from  $P$  to  $L$  by  $c_L$ ; this is  $k$ -defined if  $P$  and  $L$  are. If we are given  $\lambda \in Y(G)$  such that  $P = P_\lambda$  and  $L = L_\lambda$  then we often write  $c_\lambda$  instead of  $c_L$ . We have  $c_\lambda(g) = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \lambda(a)g\lambda(a)^{-1}$  for  $g \in P_\lambda$ ; the kernel of  $c_\lambda$  is the unipotent radical  $R_u(P_\lambda)$  and the set of fixed points of  $c_\lambda$  is  $L_\lambda$ .

Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Below we consider the action of  $G$  on  $G^m$  by simultaneous conjugation:  $g \cdot (g_1, \dots, g_m) = (gg_1g^{-1}, \dots, gg_mg^{-1})$ . Given  $\lambda \in Y(G)$ , we have a map  $P_\lambda^m \rightarrow L_\lambda^m$  given by  $\mathbf{g} \mapsto \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \lambda(a) \cdot \mathbf{g}$ ; we abuse notation slightly and also call this map  $c_\lambda$ . For any  $\mathbf{g} \in P_\lambda^m$ , there exists an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup  $L$  of  $P_\lambda$  with  $\mathbf{g} \in L^n$  if and only if  $c_\lambda(\mathbf{g}) = u \cdot \mathbf{g}$  for some  $u \in R_u(P_\lambda)(k)$ .

Our main tool from GIT is the notion of cocharacter-closure, introduced in [6] and [1].

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $X$  be an affine  $G$ -variety and let  $x \in X$  (we do not require  $x$  to be a  $k$ -point). We say that the orbit  $G(k) \cdot x$  is *cocharacter-closed over  $k$*  if for all  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  such

that  $x' := \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \lambda(a) \cdot x$  exists,  $x'$  belongs to  $G(k) \cdot x$ . If  $k = \bar{k}$  then it follows from the Hilbert-Mumford Theorem that  $G(k) \cdot x$  is cocharacter-closed over  $k$  if and only if  $G(k) \cdot x$  is closed [12, Thm. 1.4]. If  $\mathcal{O}$  is a  $G(k)$ -orbit in  $X$  then we say that  $\mathcal{O}$  is *accessible from  $x$  over  $k$*  if there exists  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  such that  $x' := \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \lambda(a) \cdot x$  belongs to  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Example 2.4.** If  $X = G^m$ ,  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  and  $\mathbf{g} \in P_\lambda^m$  then  $G(k) \cdot c_\lambda(\mathbf{g})$  is accessible from  $\mathbf{g}$  over  $k$ .

The following result is [1, Thm. 1.3].

**Theorem 2.5** (Rational Hilbert-Mumford Theorem). *Let  $G, X, x$  be as above. Then there is a unique  $G(k)$ -orbit  $\mathcal{O}$  such that  $\mathcal{O}$  is cocharacter-closed over  $k$  and accessible from  $x$  over  $k$ .*

### 3. $G$ -COMPLETE REDUCIBILITY

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . We say that  $H$  is  *$G$ -completely reducible over  $k$*  ( $G$ -cr over  $k$ ) if for any R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  such that  $P$  contains  $H$ , there is an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup  $L$  of  $P$  such that  $L$  contains  $H$ . We say that  $H$  is  *$G$ -irreducible over  $k$*  ( $G$ -ir over  $k$ ) if  $H$  is not contained in any proper R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  at all.

*Remark 3.2.* We say that  $H$  is  $G$ -cr if  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $\bar{k}$ —cf. Section 1. More generally, if  $k'/k$  is an algebraic field extension then we may regard  $G$  as a  $k'$ -group and it makes sense to ask whether  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k'$ .

For more on  $G$ -complete reducibility, see [20], [21], [2].

Note that the definitions make sense even if  $H$  is not  $k$ -defined. It is immediate that  $G$ -irreducibility over  $k$  implies  $G$ -complete reducibility over  $k$ . We have  $P_{g \cdot \lambda} = gP_\lambda g^{-1}$  and  $L_{g \cdot \lambda} = gL_\lambda g^{-1}$  for any  $\lambda \in Y(G)$  and any  $g \in G$  (see, e.g., [2, §6]). It follows that if  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  (resp.,  $G$ -ir over  $k$ ) then so is any  $G(k)$ -conjugate of  $H$ . More generally, one can show that if  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  (resp.,  $G$ -ir over  $k$ ) then so is  $\phi(H)$ , for any  $k$ -defined automorphism  $\phi$  of  $G$ . If  $k = \bar{k}$  and  $H$  is  $G$ -cr then  $H$  is reductive [21, Prop. 4.1], [2, §2.4, §6.2]. It follows from Proposition 3.4 below that if  $H$  is  $k$ -defined,  $k$  is perfect and  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  then  $H$  is reductive. We see below (Corollary 3.5) that the converse holds in characteristic 0. On the other hand, the converse is false in general, as is shown by the example in [24, Proof of Prop. 1.10].

We now explain the link between  $G$ -complete reducibility and GIT. Fix a  $k$ -embedding  $\iota: G \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and let  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_m) \in H^m$ . We call  $\mathbf{h}$  a *generic tuple for  $H$  with respect to  $\iota$*  if  $h_1, \dots, h_m$  generates the subalgebra of  $M_n$  generated by  $H$  [6, Def. 5.4]. Note that we don't insist that  $\mathbf{h}$  is a  $k$ -point. Our constructions below do not depend on the choice of  $\iota$ , so we suppress the words “with respect to  $\iota$ ”. It is immediate that if  $\mathbf{h} \in H^m$  is a generic tuple for  $H$  and  $g \in G$  then  $g \cdot \mathbf{h}$  is a generic tuple for  $gHg^{-1}$ .

**Theorem 3.3** ([1, Thm. 9.3]). *Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$  and let  $\mathbf{h} \in H^m$  be a generic tuple for  $H$ . Then  $H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible over  $k$  if and only if  $G(k) \cdot \mathbf{h}$  is cocharacter-closed over  $k$ .*

Using this result one can derive many results on  $G$ -complete reducibility: for instance, see [2] for the algebraically closed case and [6], [1] for arbitrary  $k$ . Note that if  $\mathbf{h} \in H^m$  is a generic tuple for  $H$  then the centralizer  $C_G(H)$  coincides with the stabilizer  $G_{\mathbf{h}}$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $H$  be a  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$ . Suppose  $k$  is perfect. Then  $H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible over  $k$  if and only if  $H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible.*

*Proof.* If  $k$  is perfect then  $\bar{k}/k$  is separable and  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined. The result now follows from [1, Cor. 9.7(i)].  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *Suppose  $\text{char}(k) = 0$ . Let  $H$  be a  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$ . Then  $H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible over  $k$  if and only if  $H$  is reductive.*

*Proof.* If  $k = \bar{k}$  then this is well known (see [21, Prop. 4.2], [2, §2.2, §6.3], for example). The result for arbitrary  $k$  now follows from Proposition 3.4.  $\square$

Recall that if  $S$  is a  $k$ -split torus of  $G$ , then  $C_G(S)$  is an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  [1, Lem. 2.5]. Part (i) of the next result gives the converse, and part (ii) strengthens [1, Cor. 9.7(ii)]: we do not need the hypotheses that  $H$  and  $C_G(H)$  are  $k$ -defined. See also [21, Prop. 3.2].

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $L$  be an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  and let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $L$ .*

- (a) *There exists a  $k$ -split torus  $S$  in  $G$  such that  $L = C_G(S)$ .*
- (b)  *$H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible over  $k$  if and only if  $H$  is  $L$ -completely reducible over  $k$ .*

*Proof.* (a). We can choose  $\lambda \in Y_{k_s}(G)$  such that  $L = C_G(\text{Im}(\lambda))$ . Let  $\lambda = \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_r \in Y_{k_s}(G)$  be the  $\text{Gal}(k_s/k)$ -conjugates of  $\lambda$  and let  $S$  be the subtorus of  $Z(L)^0$  generated by the subtori  $\text{Im}(\lambda_i)$ . Then  $S$  is  $k$ -defined and  $L = C_G(S)$ . The product map  $\lambda_1 \times \dots \times \lambda_r$  gives an epimorphism from  $\bar{k}^* \times \dots \times \bar{k}^*$  onto  $S$ . But a quotient of a split  $k$ -torus is  $k$ -split [7, III.8.4 Cor.], so  $S$  is split.

- (b). Given (a), the result now follows from Theorem 3.3 together with [1, Thm. 5.4(ii)].  $\square$

We finish the section with some results involving non-connected reductive groups which are needed in the sequel. Note that if  $Q$  is an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  and  $M$  is an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $Q$  then  $Q^0$  is a parabolic  $k$ -subgroup of  $G^0$  and  $M^0$  is a Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $Q^0$ ; see [2, Sec. 6].

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $P$  be an R-parabolic subgroup of  $G$  and let  $T$  be a maximal torus of  $P$ . Then there is a unique R-Levi subgroup  $L$  of  $P$  such that  $T \subseteq L$ . If  $P$  and  $T$  are  $k$ -defined then  $L$  is  $k$ -defined.*

*Proof.* The first assertion is [2, Cor. 6.5]. For the second, suppose  $P$  and  $T$  are  $k$ -defined. Then the unique R-Levi subgroup  $L$  of  $P$  containing  $T$  must be Galois-stable and hence  $k$ -defined also.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.8.** (a) *Let  $Q$  be an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  and set  $P = Q^0$ . Then the R-Levi  $k$ -subgroups of  $Q$  are precisely the subgroups of the form  $N_Q(L)$  for  $L$  a Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P$ .*

- (b) *Let  $Q, P$  be as in (a) and let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $P$ . Then  $H$  is contained in an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $Q$  if and only if  $H$  is contained in a Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P$ . Moreover, if  $L$  is a Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P$  then  $c_{N_Q(L)}(H)$  is  $N_Q(L)$ -completely reducible over  $k$  if and only if  $c_L(H)$  is  $L$ -completely reducible over  $k$ .*

- (c) *Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G^0$ . Then  $H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible over  $k$  if and only if  $H$  is  $G^0$ -completely reducible over  $k$ .*

*Proof.* (a) As observed above, if  $M$  is an R-Levi subgroup of  $Q$  then  $M^0$  is a Levi subgroup of  $P$ , and  $N_Q(M^0)^0 = N_P(M^0)^0 = M^0$ . Let  $L$  be a Levi subgroup of  $P$  and let  $T$  be a maximal torus of  $L$ . By Lemma 3.7 there is a unique R-Levi subgroup  $M$  of  $Q$  such that  $T \subseteq M$ . The Levi subgroups  $M^0$  and  $L$  of  $P$  both contain  $T$ , so by Lemma 3.7 they are equal; in particular,  $M$  normalizes  $L$ . Now  $N_Q(T)$  normalizes  $L$  by Lemma 3.7, so  $N_Q(L)$  meets every component of  $Q$ . Since  $Q = M \rtimes R_u(Q)$ ,  $M$  also meets every component of  $Q$ . It follows that  $M = N_Q(L)$ . Finally,  $L$  contains a maximal  $k$ -torus of  $P$  if and only if  $N_Q(L)$  does, so  $L$  is  $k$ -defined if and only if  $N_Q(L)$  is, by Lemma 3.7.

(b) The first assertion follows immediately from (a), and part (c) now follows. For the second assertion of (b), note that the restriction of  $c_{N_Q(L)}(H)$  to  $P$  is  $c_L$ ; the desired result now follows from part (c) applied to the reductive  $k$ -group  $N_Q(L)$ .  $\square$

#### 4. $k$ -SEMISIMPLIFICATION

Now we come to our main definition.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . We say that a subgroup  $H'$  of  $G$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$  (for  $G$ ) if there exist an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  and an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup  $L$  of  $P$  such that  $H \subseteq P$ ,  $H' = c_L(H)$  and  $H'$  is  $G$ -completely reducible (or equivalently by Proposition 3.6(ii),  $L$ -completely reducible) over  $k$ . We say *the pair*  $(P, L)$  *yields*  $H'$ .

*Remarks 4.2.* (a) Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . If  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  then clearly  $H$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of itself, yielded by the pair  $(G, G)$ .

(b) Suppose  $(P, L)$  yields a  $k$ -semisimplification  $H'$  of  $H$ . Let  $L_1$  be another R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P$ . Then  $L_1 = uLu^{-1}$  for some  $u \in R_u(P)(k)$ , so  $c_{L_1}(H) = uc_L(H)u^{-1}$ . Hence  $(P, L_1)$  also yields a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . We say that  $P$  *yields a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$* .

(c) It is straightforward to check that if  $\phi$  is an automorphism of  $G$  (as a  $k$ -group),  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$  and  $(P, L)$  yields a  $k$ -semisimplification  $H'$  of  $H$  then  $\phi(H')$  is a  $k$ -simplification of  $\phi(H)$ , yielded by  $(\phi(P), \phi(L))$ .

(d) For  $G$  connected and  $H$  a subgroup of  $G(k)$ , Definition 4.1 recovers Serre's " $G$ -analogue" of a semisimplification from [21, §3.2.4]. For  $k = \bar{k}$ , Definition 4.1 generalizes the definition of  $\mathcal{D}(H)$  following [16, Lem. 4.1].

*Remark 4.3.* Let  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_m) \in H^m$  be a generic tuple for  $H$ . Note that  $c_\lambda$  extends in the obvious way to a homomorphism from a parabolic subalgebra  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$  of  $M_n$  onto a Levi subalgebra  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  of  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$ , and  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$  contains the subalgebra  $\mathcal{A}$  generated by  $H$ . Since the elements  $h_i$  generate  $\mathcal{A}$ , the elements  $c_\lambda(h_i)$  generate  $c_\lambda(\mathcal{A})$ . But  $c_\lambda(\mathcal{A})$  is the subalgebra of  $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$  generated by  $c_\lambda(H)$ , so we deduce that  $c_\lambda(\mathbf{h}) = (c_\lambda(h_1), \dots, c_\lambda(h_m))$  is a generic tuple for  $c_\lambda(H)$ . Hence by Theorem 3.3,  $c_\lambda(H)$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$  if and only if  $G(k) \cdot c_\lambda(\mathbf{h})$  is cocharacter-closed over  $k$ . It follows from Theorem 2.5 that  $H$  admits at least one  $k$ -semisimplification: for we can choose  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  such that  $G(k) \cdot c_\lambda(\mathbf{h})$  is cocharacter-closed over  $k$ , so  $c_\lambda(H)$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ , yielded by  $(P_\lambda, L_\lambda)$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that  $H'$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . Then there is  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  such that  $H'$  is yielded by the pair  $(P_\lambda, L_\lambda)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $H'$  is yielded by the pair  $(P, L)$ . By the discussion in Section 2, there exists a maximal  $k$ -torus  $T$  of  $L$  and  $\mu \in Y_{k_s}(T)$  such that  $P = P_\mu$  and  $L = L_\mu$ . Choose a finite Galois extension  $k'/k$  such that  $T$  splits over  $k'$ , and let  $\lambda = \sum_{\gamma \in \text{Gal}(k'/k)} \gamma \cdot \mu \in Y_k(T)$ . One checks easily that  $H \subseteq P_\lambda$  and  $c_\lambda|_H = c_\mu|_H$  (cf. the proof of [6, Lem. 2.5(ii)]). Hence  $(P_\lambda, L_\lambda)$  also yields  $H'$ .  $\square$

Here is our main result, which was proved in the special case  $k = \bar{k}$  in [6, Prop. 5.14(i)], cf. [21, Prop. 3.3(b)]. The uniqueness asserted in Theorem 4.5 is akin to the theorem of Jordan–Hölder.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . Then any two  $k$ -semisimplifications of  $H$  are  $G(k)$ -conjugate.*

*Proof.* Let  $H_1, H_2$  be  $k$ -semisimplifications of  $H$ . By Lemma 4.4, there exist  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in Y_k(G)$  such that  $(P_{\lambda_1}, L_{\lambda_1})$  realizes  $H_1$  and  $(P_{\lambda_2}, L_{\lambda_2})$  realizes  $H_2$ . Let  $\mathbf{h} \in H^m$  be a generic tuple for  $H$ . Then  $c_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{h})$  is a generic tuple for  $H_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and each orbit  $G(k) \cdot c_{\lambda_i}(\mathbf{h})$  is cocharacter-closed over  $k$  and accessible from  $\mathbf{h}$  over  $k$  (Example 2.4). It follows from the uniqueness result in Theorem 2.5 that the closed subset  $C_{\mathbf{h}} := \{g \in G \mid g \cdot c_{\lambda_1}(\mathbf{h}) = c_{\lambda_2}(\mathbf{h})\}$  contains a  $k$ -point.

Pick  $g \in C_{\mathbf{h}}$ . If  $H_2 = gH_1g^{-1}$  then we are done. Otherwise there exists  $h \in H$  such that  $gc_{\lambda_1}(h)g^{-1} \notin H_2$  or  $g^{-1}c_{\lambda_2}(h)g \notin H_1$ . Without loss assume the former. We can repeat the above argument, replacing  $\mathbf{h}$  with the generic tuple  $\mathbf{h}' := (\mathbf{h}, h) \in H^{m+1}$ ; note that  $C_{\mathbf{h}'}$  is properly contained in  $C_{\mathbf{h}}$ . The result now follows by a descending chain condition argument.  $\square$

**Definition 4.6.** We define  $\mathcal{D}_k(H)$  to be the set of  $G(k)$ -conjugates of any  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$  (cf. the discussion preceding [16, Thm. 1.4]). This is well-defined by Theorem 4.5.

**Example 4.7.** Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . As noted in Remark 4.2(a), if  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  then  $H$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of itself, yielded by the pair  $(G, G)$ . If  $H$  is a  $G$ -ir subgroup of  $G$ , then  $H$  is the only  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ : this shows that not every element of  $\mathcal{D}_k(H)$  need be a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . In a similar vein, if  $P$  and  $Q$  are arbitrary R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroups of  $G$  and  $Q \supseteq P$  then it is easily seen that  $Q$  yields a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $P$  if and only if  $P^0 = Q^0$ .

**Example 4.8.** Let  $H$  be a subgroup of  $G$  and let  $P$  be minimal among the R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroups that contain  $H$ . Let  $L$  be an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P$ . We claim that  $c_L(H)$  is  $L$ -ir over  $k$  (cf. [21, Prop. 3.3(a)] and [2, Sec. 3]); it then follows from Proposition 3.6(ii) that  $c_L(H)$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . Suppose  $c_L(H)$  is not  $L$ -ir: say,  $c_L(H) \subseteq Q$ , where  $Q$  is a proper R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup of  $L$ . There exist a maximal  $k$ -torus  $T$  of  $Q$  and cocharacters  $\lambda, \mu \in Y_{k_s}(T)$  such that  $P = P_\lambda$ ,  $L = L_\lambda$  and  $Q = P_\mu$ . Now  $H \subseteq QR_u(P) \subsetneq P$ , and clearly  $QR_u(P)$  is  $k$ -defined. But it is easily checked that  $QR_u(P) = P_{m\lambda+\mu}$  for suitably large  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  (cf. [2, Lem. 6.2(i)]), so  $QR_u(P)$  is an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$ , contradicting the minimality of  $P$ . Conversely, if  $P$  is an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup with R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup  $L$  such that  $P \supseteq H$  and  $c_L(H)$  is  $L$ -ir over  $k$  then a similar argument shows that  $P$  is minimal among the R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroups containing  $H$ . This proves the claim.

In particular, let  $G, H, \lambda$  and  $H'$  be as in the  $\text{GL}_n$  example in Section 1. Let  $P = P_\lambda$  be the parabolic subgroup of block upper triangular matrices with blocks of size  $n_1, \dots, n_r$  down the leading diagonal. Let  $L = L_\lambda$  be the subgroup of block diagonal matrices with blocks

of size  $n_1, \dots, n_r$  down the leading diagonal. Since each  $n_i \times n_i$  block yields an irreducible representation of  $H' := c_\lambda(H)$ ,  $H'$  is  $L$ -ir over  $k$ , so  $P$  is minimal among the R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroups of  $G$  containing  $H$ ; hence  $H'$  is the  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$  yielded by  $(P, L)$ .

**Example 4.9.** Suppose  $\text{char}(k) = 0$ . Let  $H$  be a  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  and let  $P$  be an R-parabolic subgroup of  $G$  with R-Levi subgroup  $L$  such that  $P \supseteq H$ . Then Corollary 3.5 implies that  $c_L(H)$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$  if and only if  $R_u(H) \subseteq R_u(P)$ .

*Remark 4.10.* Given a reductive  $k$ -group  $G$  and a subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ , we may (as in Remark 3.2) regard  $G$  as a  $\bar{k}$ -group by forgetting the  $k$ -structure, so it makes sense to consider the semisimplification (i.e., the  $\bar{k}$ -semisimplification) of  $H$ . The reader is warned that it can happen that  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  but not  $G$ -cr, or vice versa (see [2, Ex. 5.11] and [5, Ex. 7.22]), so there is no direct relation between the notions of  $k$ -semisimplification and semisimplification.

## 5. OPTIMALITY AND NORMAL SUBGROUPS

In Example 4.7 we observed that not every element of  $\mathcal{D}_k(H)$  need be a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . On the other hand, it can happen that  $H$  is contained in many different R-parabolic subgroups of  $G$ , and there may exist many conjugate, but different,  $k$ -semisimplifications. We now recall two constructions that give under some extra hypotheses a more canonical choice of R-parabolic subgroup yielding a  $k$ -semisimplification. They apply in particular when  $G = \text{GL}_n$  (see Example 5.6); this does not seem to be well known even when  $k = \bar{k}$ .

**First construction:** Suppose  $G$  is connected,  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$  and  $H$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$ . We use the theory of spherical buildings (see [20], [21]) and the argument of [3, Proof of Thm. 1.1]. Recall that the spherical building  $\Delta_k(G)$  of  $G$  is a simplicial complex whose simplices are the parabolic  $k$ -subgroups of  $G$ , ordered by reverse inclusion (the proper  $k$ -parabolic subgroups correspond to the non-empty simplices). The apartments of  $\Delta_k(G)$  are the sets of all  $k$ -parabolic subgroups of  $G$  that contain a fixed maximal split  $k$ -torus  $S$  of  $G$ . The set  $\Sigma$  of parabolic  $k$ -subgroups  $P$  of  $G$  such that  $P \supseteq H$  is a convex subcomplex of  $\Delta_k(G)$ , and  $\Sigma$  is not completely reducible in the sense of [21, §2.2] because  $H$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$  (see [21, §3.2.1]). By the Tits Centre Conjecture—see, e.g., [4, §2.6], and [21, §2.4] and the references therein— $\Sigma$  has a so-called “centre”: a proper parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P_c \in \Sigma$  such that  $P_c$  is fixed by any building automorphism of  $\Delta_k(G)$  that stabilizes  $\Sigma$ . In particular,  $P_c$  is stabilized by any  $k$ -automorphism of  $G$  that stabilizes  $H$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $G$ ,  $H$  and  $\Sigma$  be as above. Let  $P_c$  be a centre for  $\Sigma$  such that  $P_c$  is not properly contained in any other centre for  $\Sigma$ . Then  $P_c$  yields a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda$  be the set of  $k$ -parabolic subgroups  $Q$  of  $G$  such that  $Q \subseteq P_c$ . Fix a Levi  $k$ -subgroup  $L$  of  $P_c$ . We have an inclusion-preserving bijection  $\psi$  from  $\Lambda$  to  $\Delta_k(L)$  given by  $Q \mapsto Q \cap L$ , with inverse given by  $R \mapsto RR_u(P_c)$ . Let  $\Sigma_L$  be the subset of  $\Delta_k(L)$  consisting of all the  $k$ -parabolic subgroups of  $L$  that contain  $c_L(H)$ . It is clear that  $\psi(\Sigma \cap \Lambda) = \Sigma_L$ . If  $\phi$  is a building automorphism of  $\Delta_k(G)$  that fixes  $P_c$  then  $\phi$  stabilizes  $\Lambda$ , and we get an automorphism  $\phi_L$  of  $\Delta_k(L)$  (as a simplicial complex) given by  $\phi_L(Q \cap L) = \phi(Q) \cap L$ ; moreover, if  $\phi$  stabilizes  $\Sigma$  then  $\phi_L$  stabilizes  $\Sigma_L$ .

We claim that  $\phi_L$  is a building automorphism of  $\Delta_k(L)$ . It is enough to show that  $\phi_L$  maps apartments to apartments. Let  $S$  be a maximal split  $k$ -torus of  $L$  (and hence of  $G$ ).

Since  $\phi$  is a building automorphism, there is a maximal split  $k$ -torus  $S'$  of  $G$  such that for every  $k$ -parabolic subgroup  $Q$  of  $G$  that contains  $S$ ,  $\phi(Q)$  contains  $S'$ . In particular,  $S' \subseteq P_c$  since  $\phi(P_c) = P_c$ . By Lemma 3.7 there is a  $k$ -Levi subgroup  $L'$  of  $P_c$  such that  $S' \subseteq L'$ . By Lemma 2.2(ii) there exists  $u \in R_u(P_c)(k)$  such that  $uS'u^{-1} \subseteq L$ . Let  $R \in \Delta_k(L)$  such that  $S \subseteq R$ : say,  $R = Q \cap L$  for  $Q \in \Lambda$ . Then  $S' \subseteq \phi(Q)$ . Since  $\phi(Q) \subseteq P_c$ ,  $R_u(\phi(Q))$  contains  $R_u(P_c)$ , so  $uS'u^{-1} \subseteq \phi(Q)$ . Hence  $uS'u^{-1} \subseteq \phi(Q) \cap L = \phi_L(R)$ . This proves the claim.

Now suppose  $P_c$  does not yield a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . Then  $c_L(H)$  is not  $L$ -cr over  $k$ . By the discussion before the lemma,  $\Sigma_L$  has a centre  $R \subsetneq L$ . We have  $R = Q \cap L$  for some  $Q \in \Lambda$  with  $Q \subsetneq P_c$ . But the results in the previous paragraph imply that  $Q$  is a centre for  $\Sigma$ , contradicting the minimality of  $P_c$ .  $\square$

**Second construction:** We allow  $G$  to be non-connected again. Suppose the following property holds for a subgroup  $H$  of  $G$ :

(\*) there exists an R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  such that  $H \subseteq P$  but  $H$  is not contained in any R-Levi subgroup—i.e., any R-Levi  $\bar{k}$ -subgroup—of  $P$ .

This hypothesis implies in particular that  $H$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$ . The construction in [6, §5] then yields a canonical so-called “optimal destabilising” R-parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P_{\text{opt}}$  of  $G$  such that  $H \subseteq P_{\text{opt}}$  but  $H$  is not contained in any R-Levi subgroup of  $P_{\text{opt}}$ . If  $L$  is an R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P_{\text{opt}}$  then  $c_L(H)$  is  $G$ -cr by [6, Prop. 4.15], so  $(P_{\text{opt}}, L)$  yields a  $\bar{k}$ -semisimplification  $H'$  of  $H$ ; if  $H'$  is also  $G$ -cr over  $k$  then  $H'$  is a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . Moreover,  $P_{\text{opt}}$  is stabilized by any  $k$ -automorphism of  $G$  that stabilizes  $H$ ; in particular, if  $M$  is a  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  that normalizes  $H$  then  $M(k)$  normalizes  $P_{\text{opt}}$ . See [6, Sec. 5.2] for details.

This construction rests on the notion of an “optimal destabilising cocharacter” due to work of Hesselink [11], Kempf [12] and Rousseau [19]. Roughly speaking, the idea is as follows. Take a generic tuple  $\mathbf{h} \in H^m$  for  $H$ . There is a unique closed  $G(\bar{k})$ -orbit  $\mathcal{O}$  that is accessible from  $\mathbf{h}$  via a  $k$ -defined cocharacter. We define  $\lambda_{\text{opt}} \in Y_k(G)$  to be the cocharacter that takes  $\mathbf{h}$  into  $\mathcal{O}$  as quickly as possible (in an appropriate sense), and we define  $P_{\text{opt}}$  to be  $P_{\lambda_{\text{opt}}}$ . (In fact, we need a slight variation—due to Hesselink—on this construction: rather than taking a single generic tuple  $\mathbf{h}$ , one considers the action of a cocharacter  $\lambda$  on all elements of  $H$  at once.) Note that  $P_{\text{opt}}$  is not uniquely determined (see [6, Rem. 5.22]).

Now suppose that  $H$  is a subgroup of  $G$  such that  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined. One can show that if  $H$  is  $G$ -cr then  $H$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  (as previously noted, the converse is false). In fact, we prove a slightly stronger result: if  $H$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$  then hypothesis (\*) holds. To see this, choose a generic tuple  $\mathbf{h} \in H^m$ . We can find  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  such that  $(P_\lambda, L_\lambda)$  yields a semisimplification  $H'$  of  $H$ ; so  $G(k) \cdot c_\lambda(\mathbf{h})$  is cocharacter-closed over  $k$  but  $G(k) \cdot \mathbf{h}$  is not. If  $H$  is contained in an R-Levi  $\bar{k}$ -subgroup  $L$  of  $P_\lambda$  then  $c_\lambda(\mathbf{h}) = u \cdot \mathbf{h}$  for some  $u \in R_u(P_\lambda)$ . But then [1, Thm. 7.1] implies that  $c_\lambda(\mathbf{h}) = u_1 \cdot \mathbf{h}$  for some  $u_1 \in R_u(P_\lambda)(k)$ , so  $G(k) \cdot c_\lambda(\mathbf{h}) = G(k) \cdot \mathbf{h}$ , a contradiction.

In particular, if  $k$  is perfect,  $H$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$  and  $H$  is  $k$ -defined, then  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined, so we obtain a  $\bar{k}$ -semisimplification  $H'$  of  $H$  from  $P_{\text{opt}}$ , as described above. But  $H'$  is also  $k$ -defined, so  $C_G(H')$  is  $k$ -defined, and we deduce from the preceding paragraph that  $H'$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$ ; hence  $H'$  is also a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ .

*Remark 5.2.* Let  $M$  be a  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  such that  $M$  normalizes  $H$ , and let  $P$  be the R-parabolic subgroup of  $G$  obtained from one of the constructions above. Then it is automatic that  $M(k)$  normalizes  $P$ . However, under the extra hypothesis that  $H$  is  $k$ -defined, we can in fact show that  $M \subseteq N_G(P)$ . To see this, one can first extend the field from  $k$  to  $k_s$  and then show that the R-parabolic subgroup obtained from either of the constructions is  $k$ -defined (cf. [3, Proof of Thm. 1.1] and [12, Sec. 4]), and hence coincides with  $P$ —this implies that  $M(k_s)$ , and hence  $M$ , normalizes  $P$ .

*Remark 5.3.* There are some limitations on the constructions given above. First, without the hypothesis that  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined, it can happen that the  $\bar{k}$ -semisimplification  $H'$  yielded by  $P_{\text{opt}}$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$ . Second, as yet there is no theory of optimal destabilising subgroups that holds for arbitrary fields—this means that we do not know how to define a version of  $P_{\text{opt}}$  for a subgroup  $H$  that is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$  if  $(*)$  does not hold. See [6, Sec. 1 and Ex. 5.21] for further discussion of this latter point.

By combining the two constructions above we obtain the following ‘‘Clifford theory’’ result, exploring the link between the semisimplification of a group and a normal subgroup. In the case  $k$  is algebraically closed, part (a) is [2, Thm. 3.10].

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let  $M$  be a  $k$ -subgroup of  $G$  and let  $H$  be a normal  $k$ -subgroup of  $M$ . Suppose at least one of the following holds:*

- (i)  $k$  is perfect.
- (ii)  $G$  is connected.

*Then:*

- (a) *If  $M$  is  $G$ -completely reducible over  $k$  then  $H$  is  $G$ -completely reducible over  $k$ .*
- (b) *There is an R-parabolic subgroup  $P$  of  $G$  such that  $M \subseteq P$  and  $P$  yields both a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $M$  and a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . In particular, there exist  $k$ -semisimplifications  $M'$  (resp.,  $H'$ ) of  $M$  (resp., of  $H$ ) such that  $H'$  is normal in  $M'$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $H$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$ . Choose  $P = P_{\text{opt}}$  in case (i) and  $P = P_c$  in case (ii). Then  $M \subseteq N_G(P)$  by Remark 5.2. Since  $H$  is not contained in any R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $P$ ,  $H$  is not contained in any R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $N_G(P)$  (Lemma 3.8). Hence  $M$  is not contained in any R-Levi  $k$ -subgroup of  $N_G(P)$ . It follows that  $M$  is not  $G$ -cr over  $k$ . This proves part (a).

For (b), pick  $\lambda \in Y_k(G)$  such that  $(P_\lambda, L_\lambda)$  yields a semisimplification  $M' := c_\lambda(M)$  of  $M$ . Then  $c_\lambda(M)$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  and  $c_\lambda(H)$  is normal in  $c_\lambda(M)$ . Now  $c_\lambda(M)$  and  $c_\lambda(H)$  satisfy the hypotheses of the theorem, so  $c_\lambda(H)$  is  $G$ -cr over  $k$  by (a). Hence  $(P_\lambda, L_\lambda)$  yields a semisimplification  $H' := c_\lambda(H)$  of  $H$  as well, and  $H'$  is normal in  $M'$ .  $\square$

*Remark 5.5.* The hypothesis in part (ii) can be weakened: one only needs to assume that  $H \subseteq G^0$ . In order to make the proof go through, one needs to verify that the first construction above extends to this situation.

**Example 5.6.** Let  $H$  be a  $k$ -subgroup of  $G = \text{GL}_n$  such that  $H$  is not completely reducible over  $k$ . Since  $H$  is separable,  $C_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined, so  $H$  is not  $G$ -completely reducible; we obtain a parabolic  $k$ -subgroup  $P_{\text{opt}}$  as above which yields a subgroup  $H'$  that is both a  $\bar{k}$ -semisimplification of  $H$  and a  $k$ -semisimplification of  $H$ . The parabolic subgroup  $P_{\text{opt}}$  is the stabilizer of some flag  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $k$ -defined subspaces of  $\bar{k}^n$ , and  $\mathcal{F}$  does not admit a complementary

$H$ -stable flag of subspaces of  $\overline{k}^n$ . By Remark 5.2,  $C_G(H)$  is a subgroup of  $P_{\text{opt}}$ —that is,  $C_G(H)$  stabilizes  $\mathcal{F}$ —and likewise the normalizer  $N_G(H)$  stabilizes  $\mathcal{F}$  if  $N_G(H)$  is  $k$ -defined. If  $k$  is perfect then  $N_G(H)$  is automatically  $k$ -defined but it need not be  $k$ -defined in general; see [10] for further discussion.

*Remark 5.7.* Hesselink gives an example [11, (8.5) Ex.] of a subgroup  $H$  of an almost simple group  $G$  of type  $C_2$  such that  $P_{\text{opt}}$  is not a minimal centre for  $\Sigma$ , the subcomplex of the building  $\Delta_k(G)$  of  $G$  consisting of all parabolic subgroups of  $G$  that contain  $H$ . This shows that the two constructions above can yield different  $R$ -parabolic subgroups. Nevertheless, the corresponding  $k$ -semisimplifications of  $H$  are  $G(k)$ -conjugate, thanks to Theorem 4.5.

### Acknowledgements:

We are grateful to Brian Lawrence for his questions, which motivated this paper, and for his comments on an earlier draft. We thank the referee for their comments.

### REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bate, S. Herpel, B. Martin, G. Röhrle, *Cocharacter-closure and the rational Hilbert-Mumford theorem*, Math. Z. **287** (2017), no. 1–2, 39–72.
- [2] M. Bate, B. Martin, G. Röhrle, *A geometric approach to complete reducibility*, Invent. Math. **161**, no. 1 (2005), 177–218.
- [3] ———, *Complete reducibility and separable field extensions*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math. **348** (2010), 495–497.
- [4] ———, *The strong Centre Conjecture: an invariant theory approach*, J. Algebra **372** (2012), 505–530.
- [5] M. Bate, B. Martin, G. Röhrle, R. Tange, *Complete reducibility and separability*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **362** (2010), no. 8, 4283–4311.
- [6] ———, *Closed orbits and uniform  $S$ -instability in geometric invariant theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **365** (2013), no. 7, 3643–3673.
- [7] A. Borel, *Linear algebraic groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **126**, Springer-Verlag 1991.
- [8] T. Brüstle, L. Hille, G. Röhrle, G. Zwara, *The Bruhat-Chevalley order of parabolic group actions in general linear groups and degeneration for  $\Delta$ -filtered modules*, Adv. Math. **148** (1999), no. 2, 203–242.
- [9] C. Chevalley. *Classification des groupes algébriques semi-simples*. Collected works. Vol. 3. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [10] S. Herpel, D.I. Stewart, *On the smoothness of normalisers, the subalgebra structure of modular Lie algebras, and the cohomology of small representations*. Doc. Math. **21** (2016), 1–37.
- [11] W.H. Hesselink, *Uniform instability in reductive groups*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **303/304** (1978), 74–96.
- [12] G.R. Kempf, *Instability in invariant theory*, Ann. Math. **108** (1978), 299–316.
- [13] H. Kraft, *Geometric Methods in Representation Theory*. Representations of algebras (Puebla, 1980), pp. 180–258, Lecture Notes in Math. **944**, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1982.
- [14] B. Lawrence, W. Sawin, *The Shafarevich conjecture for hypersurfaces in abelian varieties*, preprint (2020), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.09046>.
- [15] B. Lawrence, A. Venkatesh, *Diophantine problems and  $p$ -adic period mappings*, Invent. Math. (2020), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-020-00966-7>.
- [16] B. Martin, *Generic stabilisers for actions of reductive groups*, Pacific J. Math. **279** (2015), 397–422.
- [17] R.W. Richardson, *On orbits of algebraic groups and Lie groups*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **25** (1982), no. 1, 1–28.
- [18] C. Riedtmann, *Degenerations for representations of quivers with relations*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **19** (1986), no. 2, 275–301.
- [19] G. Rousseau, *Immeubles sphériques et théorie des invariants*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A–B **286** (1978), no. 5, A247–A250.
- [20] J.-P. Serre, *La notion de complète réductibilité dans les immeubles sphériques et les groupes réductifs*, Séminaire au Collège de France, résumé dans [23, pp. 93–98.] (1997).

- [21] ———, *Complète réductibilité*, Séminaire Bourbaki, 56ème année, 2003–2004, n° 932.
- [22] T.A. Springer, *Linear algebraic groups*, Second edition. Progress in Mathematics, 9. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1998.
- [23] J. Tits, *Théorie des groupe*, Résumé des Cours et Travaux, Annuaire du Collège de France, 97e année, (1996–1997), 89–102.
- [24] T. Uchiyama, *Complete reducibility of subgroups of reductive algebraic groups over nonperfect fields I*, J. Algebra **463** (2016), 168–187.
- [25] G. Zwara, *Degenerations for modules over representation-finite algebras*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1999), 1313–1322.
- [26] ———, *Degenerations of finite-dimensional modules are given by extensions*. Compositio Math. 121 (2000), no. 2, 205–218.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF YORK, YORK YO10 5DD, UNITED KINGDOM

*Email address:* michael.bate@york.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN, KING'S COLLEGE, FRASER NOBLE BUILDING, ABERDEEN AB24 3UE, UNITED KINGDOM

*Email address:* b.martin@abdn.ac.uk

FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK, RUHR-UNIVERSITÄT BOCHUM, D-44780 BOCHUM, GERMANY

*Email address:* gerhard.roehrle@rub.de