

# A CHARACTERIZATION OF A CLASS OF RIGID ALGEBRAS

BY  
DAVID W. KNUDSON<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

Let  $A$  be an algebra over a field  $k$ . One of the principal problems of the deformation theory for algebras is to obtain a manageable necessary and sufficient condition for  $A$  to have only trivial deformations. Such an algebra is said to be rigid. Since the vanishing of the second Hochschild cohomology group of  $A$ ,  $H^2(A, A)$ , is a sufficient condition for  $A$  to be a rigid  $k$ -algebra [7], it is of interest to determine when the converse is true. If  $A$  is an extension field of  $k$  or if  $A$  is a complete semi-local noetherian  $k$ -algebra such that  $A/m$  is a separable extension of  $k$  and  $\text{depth}(A_m) = 0$  for each maximal ideal  $m$  of  $A$ , we shall show that the following conditions are equivalent (Corollary 3.8):

- (1)  $H^2(A, A) = 0$ .
- (2)  $A$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra.
- (3)  $A \cong \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} K_i$  where each factor  $K_i$  is a separable extension field of  $k$  and  $[\Omega(K_i/k) : K_i] \leq 1$  where  $\Omega(K_i/k)$  is the module of  $k$ -differentials of  $K_i$ .

We show that a deformation of a product of algebras (with 1) is equivalent to a "product of deformations" of the factors (Proposition 2.3). It follows that a product of algebras is rigid if and only if each of the factors is rigid. Thus since a complete semi-local noetherian  $k$ -algebra is isomorphic to a product of local  $k$ -algebras, we may reduce the above problem to the local case. The separability hypothesis assures us that a complete noetherian local  $k$ -algebra is isomorphic as a  $k$ -algebra to the semi-direct product of the residue field and the maximal ideal of the local algebra.

*Notation.* All rings will be assumed to have an identity and a ring homomorphism will preserve the identity. The expression " $A$  is a  $k$ -algebra" will imply that  $k$  is a field.

## 1. Preliminary remarks

Let  $A$  be a  $k$ -algebra,  $M$  an  $A$ -bimodule, and  $C^n(A, M)$  the  $k$ -module of all  $n$ -linear maps over  $k$  of  $A$  into  $M$ . As usual [9], we define the coboundary operator  $\delta$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n f(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) \\ = a_1 f(a_2, \dots, a_{n+1}) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} (-1)^i f(a_1, \dots, a_i a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{n+1}) \\ + (-1)^{n+1} f(a_1, \dots, a_n) a_{n+1} \end{aligned}$$

---

Received February 2, 1968.

<sup>1</sup> This research was supported by a National Science Foundation grant.

where  $f \in C^n(A, M)$ . The  $n^{\text{th}}$  cohomology group of this complex is denoted by

$$H^n(A, M) = Z^n(A, M)/B^n(A, M)$$

and the elements of  $Z^n(A, M) = \ker(\delta_n)$  and  $B^n(A, M) = \text{im}(\delta_{n-1})$  are called  $n$ -cocycles and  $n$ -coboundaries respectively.

Let  $A[[t]]$  denote the formal power series ring in one variable over  $A$ . A *deformation* of the  $k$ -algebra  $A$  [7] is an associative  $k[[t]]$ -bilinear map  $f_t$  on  $A[[t]]$  which is expressible in the form

$$f_t(a, b) = ab + tf_1(a, b) + t^2f_2(a, b) + \dots$$

where “ $ab$ ” denotes the usual product in  $A[[t]]$  and where each  $f_i$  is a  $k$ -bilinear map on  $A$  extended in the natural manner to a  $k[[t]]$ -bilinear map on  $A[[t]]$ .

The associativity condition on  $f_t$  is equivalent to the system of equations

$$(1) \quad \sum_{0 < p < n} f_p(f_{n-p}(a, b), c) - f_p(a, f_{n-p}(b, c)) = \delta f_n(a, b, c)$$

for all  $a, b, c \in A$  and each  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ . Following the notation of [5], we shall denote the 3-cochain on the left hand side of (1) by

$$\sum_{0 < p < n} f_p \circ f_{n-p}.$$

Hence if  $f$  is a 2-cocycle of  $A$  such that  $f \circ f = 0$ , then  $f_t(a, b) = ab + tf(a, b)$  is a deformation of  $A$ . We will say that such a deformation is a *linear deformation* of  $A$ .

Let  $f_t$  and  $g_t$  be deformations of  $A$ . We say that  $f_t$  is *equivalent* to  $g_t$  if there is a  $k[[t]]$ -linear automorphism  $\mu_t$  of  $A[[t]]$  of the form

$$\mu_t(a) = a + t\mu_1(a) + t^2\mu_2(a) + \dots$$

where each  $\mu_i$  is a  $k$ -linear map on  $A$  extended in the natural manner to a  $k[[t]]$ -linear map on  $A[[t]]$  such that

$$\mu_t(g_t(a, b)) = f_t(\mu_t(a), \mu_t(b)) \quad \text{for all } a, b \in A[[t]].$$

We may easily check that  $g_t = f_t + \delta\mu_t$  in this case. A deformation  $f_t$  of  $A$  is said to be *trivial* if  $f_t$  is equivalent to the deformation  $g_t$  of  $A$  defined  $g_t(a, b) = ab$ . Thus if the cocycle  $f_1$  of the deformation  $f_t$  is not a coboundary, it follows that  $f_t$  is a non-trivial deformation. If every deformation of  $A$  is trivial, we say that  $A$  is a *rigid*  $k$ -algebra. Gerstenhaber proved that if  $H^2(A, A) = 0$ , then  $A$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra [7, page 65]. In general, the converse is not known. We refer the reader to [7] for a detailed discussion of the deformation of an algebra.

## 2. Deformation of a product of algebras

We shall need the following lemma which is well known (see [6]) but a proof does not seem to be available.

LEMMA 2.1. *If  $f_t$  is a deformation of a  $k$ -algebra  $A$  (with 1), then the deformed*

algebra has an identity. Furthermore,  $f_t$  is equivalent to a deformation  $g_t$  such that 1 is the identity of the deformed algebra with multiplication  $g_t$ .

*Proof.* The second statement implies the first statement by the definition of the equivalence relation on the set of deformations of  $A$ .

We shall define a map

$$\pi_t : A[[t]] \rightarrow A[[t]]$$

of the form  $\pi_t(a) = a + t\pi_1(a) + \dots$  by

$$\pi_n(a) = \mu_n(a) + \sum_{I_2} \mu_{i_1} \mu_{i_2}(a) + \dots + \sum_{I_s} \mu_{i_1} \dots \mu_{i_s}(a)$$

where  $s$  is such that

$$n = s(s + 1)/2 \quad \text{or} \quad s(s + 1)/2 < n < (s + 1)(s + 2)/2$$

and

$$I_m = \{ (i_1, \dots, i_m) \mid i_1 > \dots > i_m > 0, i_1 + \dots + i_m = n \}.$$

The  $\mu_i$  are defined inductively as follows. Let  $\mu_1$  be such that

$$(f_1 + \delta\mu_1)(a, b) = 0$$

whenever  $a$  or  $b$  is 1.  $\mu_1$  always exists since  $f_1$  is a cocycle [9]. Let

$$M_i(a) = a + t^i \mu_i(a) \quad \text{and} \quad M^i(a) = M_i M_{i-1} \dots M_1(a).$$

Suppose we have chosen  $\mu_i, i < n$ , such that the deformation

$$(M^{n-1})^{-1} f_t (M^{n-1}(a), M^{n-1}(b)) = ab + tg_1(a, b) + \dots$$

has the property that  $g_i(a, b) = 0$  whenever  $a$  or  $b$  is 1 and  $i < n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta g_n(a, 1, 1) &= \sum_{i < n} g_i \circ g_{n-i}(a, 1, 1) = 0 \\ &= ag_n(1, 1) - g_n(a, 1) + g_n(a, 1) - g_n(a, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $ag_n(1, 1) = g_n(a, 1)$ . Similarly,  $g_n(1, 1)a = g_n(1, a)$ . Define  $\mu_n(a) = -ag_n(1, 1)$ . We may easily check that  $(g_n + \delta\mu_n)(a, b) = 0$  whenever  $a$  or  $b$  is 1. The deformation  $\pi_t^{-1} f_t(\pi_t(a), \pi_t(b))$  clearly has the desired property.

**DEFINITION 2.2.** Let  $A = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} A_i$  be a  $k$ -algebra and let  $f_t$  be a deformation of  $A$ . We say that  $f_t$  is a *product of deformations* of the factors  $A_i$  if  $f_n(a, b) = 0$  for each  $n \geq 0$  whenever  $a \in A_i$  and  $b \in A_j$  with  $i \neq j$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.3.** If  $f_t$  is a deformation of the  $k$ -algebra  $A = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} A_i$ , then  $f_t$  is equivalent to a deformation  $g_t$  which is a product of deformations of the  $A_i$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that  $n = 2$ . We will use the notation " $a_i$ " to indicate the  $i^{\text{th}}$  component of  $a \in A$  except that we set  $1 = (e_1, e_2)$ . We shall define a map  $\pi_t : A[[t]] \rightarrow A[[t]]$  by the same formula as in the proof of Lemma 2.1 where the  $\mu_i$  are now defined inductively as follows.

By Lemma 2 of [9], there is a 1-cochain  $\mu_1$  such that

$$(f_1 + \delta\mu_1)(a, b) = 0$$

whenever  $a$  or  $b$  is  $e_1$  or  $e_2$ . Thus suppose we have chosen  $\mu_i$ ,  $i < n$ , such that

$$(M^{n-1})^{-1}f_i(M^{n-1}(a), M^{n-1}(b)) = ab + tg_1(a, b) + \dots$$

where  $g_i(a, b) = 0$  whenever  $a$  or  $b$  is  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  for  $i < n$ . For then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta g_m(a_i, e_i, b_j) &= \sum_{0 < p < m} g_p \circ g_{m-p}(a_i, e_i, b_j) = 0 \\ &= a_i g_m(e_i, b_j) - g_m(a_i, b_j) + 0 - g_m(a_i, e_i)b_j \end{aligned}$$

if  $i \neq j$  and  $m \leq n$ . Hence  $g_m(a_i, b_j) = 0$  if  $i \neq j$  and  $m < n$ . Thus it will suffice to define  $\mu_n : A \rightarrow A$  such that

$$(g_n + \delta\mu_n)(a, b) = 0$$

whenever  $a$  or  $b$  is  $e_1$  or  $e_2$ . We may assume that  $g_n(a, b) = 0$  whenever  $a$  or  $b$  is 1 by Lemma 2.1 and so we need only consider  $e_1$ .

Define  $\alpha : A \rightarrow A$  by

$$\alpha(a) = -(a_1 g_n(e_1, e_1), a_2 g_n(e_2, e_2)).$$

As in the proof of Proposition 2, by considering  $g_n + \delta\alpha$  we may assume that  $e_i g_n(e_i, b_i) = 0$  (consider the cochain  $e_i g_n : A_i \times A_i \rightarrow A_i$ ). Hence we may assume that  $e_i g_n(e_j, b_i) = 0$  since  $e_i g_n(1, b_i) = 0$ . Similarly,  $e_i g_n(b_i, e_j) = 0$ . Thus using this reduction, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} g_n(e_1, b) &= (e_1 g_n(e_1, b_2), e_2 g_n(e_1, b_1)), \\ \delta g_n(e_1, b_1, e_1) &= \sum_{0 < p < n} g_p \circ g_{n-p}(e_1, b_1, e_1) = 0 \\ &= e_1 g_n(b_1, e_1) - g_n(b_1, e_1) + g_n(e_1, b_1) - g_n(e_1, b_1)e_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $g_n(e_1, b_1) = g_n(b_1, e_1)$ . Similarly,  $g_n(e_2, b_2) = g_n(b_2, e_2)$  and so  $g_n(e_i, b_j) = g_n(b_j, e_i)$ . Thus

$\delta g_n(e_1, b_1, e_1) = e_1 g_n(b, e_1) - g_n(b_1, e_1) + g_n(e_1, b_1) - g_n(e_1, b)e_1 = 0$  implies that  $e_1 g_n(b, e_1) = e_1 g_n(e_1, b)$ . Similarly  $e_2 g_n(b, e_2) = e_2 g_n(e_2, b)$  and so  $g_n(e_1, b) = g_n(b, e_1)$  since  $g_n(1, b) = 0 = g_n(b, 1)$ .

Define  $\mu_n : A \rightarrow A$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_n(a) &= -e_1 g_n(e_1, a_2) + e_2 g_n(e_1, a_1). \\ \delta\mu_n(a, b) &= -a_1 g_n(e_1, b_2) + a_2 g_n(e_1, b_1) + e_1 g_n(e_1, a_2 b_2) - e_2 g_n(e_1, a_1 b_1) \\ &\quad - g_n(e_1, a_2)b_1 + g_n(e_1, a_1)b_2 \\ \delta\mu_n(e_1, b) &= -e_1 g_n(e_1 g_n(e_1, b_2) - e_2 g_n(e_1, b_1)) \\ &= -g_n(e_1, b) \\ \delta\mu_n(a, e_1) &= -e_2 g_n(e_1, a_1) - e_1 g_n(e_1, a_2) \\ &= -e_1 g_n(a_2, e_1) - e_2 g_n(a_1, e_1) \\ &= -g_n(a, e_1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\mu_n$  is the required cochain.

**COROLLARY 2.4.** *The  $k$ -algebra  $A = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} A_i$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra if and only if each factor  $A_i$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra.*

*Proof.* Let  $f_i$  be a deformation of  $A$ . We may assume that  $f_i$  is a product of deformations of the  $A_i$ . It is clear that a product of deformations is trivial if and only if each of the deformations of the product is trivial.

### 3. Deformation of semi-local algebras

Let  $M$  be a module over a commutative ring  $A$  and let  $T_A(M)$  and  $\Lambda_A(M)$  denote the tensor algebra and the exterior algebra on  $M$  respectively. We recall that  $\Lambda_A(M) \cong T_A(M)/I_A(M)$  where  $I_A(M)$  is the ideal generated by elements of the form  $a \otimes a$  where  $a \in M$  [4]. We refer the reader to [1] for the elementary properties of the direct limit of modules.

**LEMMA 3.1.** *Let  $\{(A_\alpha), (M_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in S}$  be a filtered direct system of modules over a filtered direct system of commutative rings. If  $A = \text{inj lim } A_\alpha$  and  $M = \text{inj lim } M_\alpha$ , then  $\Lambda_A(M) \cong \text{inj lim } \Lambda_{A_\alpha}(M_\alpha)$ .*

*Proof.* We have that  $T_A(M) \cong \text{inj lim } T_{A_\alpha}(M_\alpha)$  since the corresponding statement for the direct limit of tensor products of modules is true.

Let  $\Lambda = \Lambda_A(M) \cong T_A(M)/I_A(M) = T/I$  and similarly for the pair  $(A_\alpha, M_\alpha)$ . Thus we have the following commutative diagram with exact rows and columns since  $\text{inj lim}$  is an exact functor.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & 0 & & 0 & \\
 & & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & I & \longrightarrow & T & \longrightarrow & \Lambda \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \uparrow \omega & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{inj lim } I_\alpha & \longrightarrow & \text{inj lim } T_\alpha & \longrightarrow & \text{inj lim } \Lambda_\alpha \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 
 \end{array}$$

It will suffice to show that  $\omega$  is surjective. But since  $T \cong \text{inj lim } T_\alpha$ , every element of  $T$  can be represented in the direct limit by an element of  $T_\beta$  for some  $\beta \in S$ . It follows immediately that  $\omega$  is surjective.

**DEFINITION 3.2.** Let  $A$  be a commutative  $k$ -algebra ( $k$  need not be a field). The *module of  $k$ -differentials* of  $A$  is an  $A$ -module  $\Omega(A/k)$  and a  $k$ -derivation  $d: A \rightarrow \Omega(A/k)$  which is universal with respect to  $k$ -derivations of  $A$  into  $A$ -modules. Hence we have a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_A(\Omega(A/k), M) \cong \text{Der}_k(A, M)$$

where  $M$  is an  $A$ -module [8].

**DEFINITION 3.3.** An extension field  $L$  of  $k$  is said to be a *separable extension* if every finitely generated subfield of  $L$  is separable generated over  $k$ . We refer the reader to [3] for the properties of separable extensions. One may show that an extension field  $L$  of  $k$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra in the commutative deformation theory if and only if  $L$  is a separable extension of  $k$  [12].

The following lemma removes the finite generation hypothesis of [10, Theorem 5.3].

**LEMMA 3.4.** *If  $A$  is a separable extension field of  $k$  and if  $M$  is an  $A$ -module, then*

$$H^*(A, M) \cong \text{Hom}_A(\Lambda_A(\Omega(A/k)), M).$$

*Proof.* We recall that  $H^*(A, M) \cong \text{Hom}_A(\text{Tor}_*^{A^\circ}(A, A), M)$  [10, Lemma 4.1]. By [10],  $\text{Tor}_*^{L^\circ}(L, L) \cong \Lambda_L(\Omega(L/k))$  if  $L$  is a finitely generated separable extension of  $k$ . Since  $A$  is the direct limit of such subfields  $L$ , we may apply Lemma 3.1 since  $\Omega(A/k) \cong \text{inj lim } \Omega(L/k)$  [8].

**Remark 3.5.** Let  $A$  be a commutative  $k$ -algebra with two distinct commuting  $k$ -derivations  $D$  and  $E$ . If  $\text{char}(k) = 0$ , Gerstenhaber has shown that the  $k[[t]]$ -bilinear map  $f_t$  on  $A[[t]]$  defined by

$$f_t(a, b) = ab + tD(a)E(b) + t^2D^2(a)E^2(b)/2! + \dots$$

is a non-trivial deformation of  $A$  [6]. If  $\text{char}(k) = p \neq 0$  and if in addition  $D^p = 0 = E^p$ , then the map  $g_t$  defined by

$$g_t(a, b) = ab + tD(a)E(b) + \dots + t^{p-1}D^{p-1}(a)E^{p-1}(b)/(p-1)!$$

is a non-trivial deformation of  $A$  [6].

If  $\Omega(A/k)$  is a free  $A$ -module such that  $[\Omega(A/k):A] > 1$ , then such derivations always exist. We recall that if  $A$  is an extension field of  $k$  with  $\text{char}(k) = 0$ , then the cardinality of a transcendence base for  $A$  over  $k$  is  $[\Omega(A/k):A]$ . If  $\text{char}(k) = p \neq 0$ , then the cardinality of a  $p$ -basis for  $A$  over  $k$  is  $[\Omega(A/k):A]$ .

**DEFINITION 3.6.** Let  $A$  be a noetherian local ring with maximal ideal  $m$ . We say that  $A$  has *depth*  $n$ ,  $\text{depth}(A) = n$ , if there is an  $A$ -sequence of elements of  $m$  of length  $n$  but no such sequence of length  $n + 1$ . For details, we refer the reader to [8, 16.4].

Note that  $\text{depth}(A) = 0$  if and only if  $m$  consists only of zero divisors. We may also show that  $\text{depth}(A) = 0$  if and only if the annihilator of  $m$  is non-zero [11, page 21].

**THEOREM 3.7.** *Let  $A$  be a noetherian local  $k$ -algebra such that  $\text{depth}(A) = 0$ . Assume that  $A$  is  $k$ -isomorphic to the semi-direct product  $A/m \oplus m$  where  $m$  is the maximal ideal of  $A$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $H^2(A, A) = 0$ .
- (ii)  $A$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra.
- (iii)  $A$  is a separable extension of  $k$  and  $[\Omega(A/k) : A] \leq 1$ .

*Proof.* By [7], (i) implies (ii), and (iii) implies (i) by Lemma 3.4. Thus assume that  $A$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra. We first show that  $m$  must be zero.

If  $m$  is generated by one element, then  $A$  is a local complete intersection. By applying the results of [12], we see that  $A$  is not rigid since  $A$  is not a regular local ring if  $m \neq 0$ . Thus we may assume that there are at least two elements in a minimal set of generators for  $m$ . We shall construct a  $k$ -bilinear map  $f$  on  $A$  such that the  $k[[t]]$ -bilinear map  $f_t$  on  $A[[t]]$  defined by  $f_t(a, b) = ab + tf(a, b)$  is a nontrivial linear deformation of  $A$ . Thus we must show that  $f \circ f = 0$ ,  $\delta f = 0$ , and  $f \neq \delta g$  where  $g$  is a  $k$ -linear map on  $A$ . It will clearly suffice to define  $f$  on a basis for the  $L$ -module  $L \oplus m$ .

Let  $(0:m) = \{a \in A \mid am = 0\}$  be the annihilator of  $m$  and assume that  $m^2 \neq 0$ . Let  $X = (x_i)_{i \in I}$  be a basis for the  $L$ -module  $L \oplus m$  such that

$$1 \in X, \quad x_\alpha \in (0:m) \cap m^2 \quad \text{and} \quad x_\beta, x_\lambda \in m - m^2.$$

Assume that the remaining elements of  $X$  belong to  $m$ . Define  $f(x_\beta, x_\lambda) = x_\alpha$  and  $f(x_i, x_j) = 0$  if  $(x_i, x_j) \neq (x_\beta, x_\lambda)$ .

We first show that

$$f \circ f(x_i, x_j, x_k) = f(f(x_i, x_j), x_k) - f(x_i, f(x_j, x_k)) = 0.$$

Since  $f$  vanishes on the element  $x_\alpha$ , we certainly have that  $f \circ f = 0$ . Since  $f(x_\beta, x_\lambda) \neq f(x_\lambda, x_\beta)$ ,  $f$  is not a coboundary. We now consider

$$\delta f(x_i, x_j, x_k) = x_i f(x_j, x_k) - f(x_i, x_j) x_k + f(x_i, x_j) x_k - f(x_i, x_j) x_k.$$

If  $x_i, x_j$  or  $x_k$  is 1, we certainly obtain 0 for this expression. Hence we may assume that the basis elements belong to  $m$ . But  $f$  vanishes on elements in  $m^2$  and takes values in  $(0:m)$  and so we easily check that  $\delta f = 0$ .

Thus we are reduced to the case  $m^2 = 0$ . We now let  $X$  be a basis for the  $L$ -module  $L \oplus m$  such that  $1 \in X$  and such that the remaining elements of  $X$  belong to  $m$ . Let  $x_\alpha \in X \cap m$ . Define  $f(x_\alpha, x_\alpha) = x_\alpha$  and  $f(x_i, x_j) = 0$  if  $(x_i, x_j) \neq (x_\alpha, x_\alpha)$ . The same reasoning as above shows that  $\delta f = 0$  and that  $f \circ f = 0$ .

Suppose that  $f = \delta g$  where  $g$  is a  $k$ -linear map on  $A$ . Then  $f(x_\alpha, x_\alpha) = x_\alpha = \delta g(x_\alpha, x_\alpha) = 2x_\alpha g(x_\alpha)$  since  $x_\alpha^2 = 0$ . We may assume that  $\text{char}(k) \neq 2$ . It will suffice to show that  $g(x_\alpha) \in m$ . Let  $x_\beta \in X \cap m$  with  $x_\beta \neq x_\alpha$ . Then

$$f(x_\beta, x_\beta) = 0 = \delta g(x_\beta, x_\beta) = 2x_\beta g(x_\beta)$$

and so  $g(x_\beta) \in m$ . But then

$$f(x_\alpha, x_\beta) = 0 = \delta g(x_\alpha, x_\beta) = x_\alpha g(x_\beta) + x_\beta g(x_\alpha) = x_\beta g(x_\alpha).$$

Hence  $g(x_\alpha) \in m$  and so  $f \neq \delta g$ .

Thus assume that  $A$  is a field which is a rigid  $k$ -algebra. Since  $A$  is rigid in the commutative deformation theory, we have that  $A$  is a separable extension of  $k$  [12]. Suppose that  $[\Omega(A/k):A] > 1$ . By Remark 3.5, we see that  $A$  has a non-trivial deformation and so we must have  $[\Omega(A/k):A] \leq 1$ .

**COROLLARY 3.8.** *Let  $A$  be a complete noetherian semi-local  $k$ -algebra such that  $A/m$  is a separable extension of  $k$  and  $\text{depth}(A_m) = 0$  for each maximal ideal  $m$  of  $A$ . The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $H^2(A, A) = 0$ .
- (ii)  $A$  is a rigid  $k$ -algebra
- (iii)  $A \cong \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} K_i$  where each factor  $K_i$  is an extension field of  $k$  (necessarily separable) such that  $[\Omega(K_i/k):K_i] \leq 1$ .

*Proof.* It will suffice to show that (ii) implies (iii). Since  $A$  is complete,  $A \cong \prod_m A_m$  where the product is over the set of maximal ideals  $m$  of  $A$ . Thus by Corollary 2.4, we may assume that  $A$  is local. Since  $A/m$  is a separable extension of  $k$ ,  $A$  is  $k$ -isomorphic to the semi-direct product  $A/m \oplus m$  and so we may apply Theorem 3.7.

The reader should note that the hypotheses of Corollary 3.8 are satisfied if  $A$  is a commutative artinian  $k$ -algebra with  $k$  a perfect field.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. N. BOURBAKI, *Algèbre, Éléments de Mathématique, Livre 2*, Hermann, Paris, 1962.
2. H. CARTAN AND S. EILENBERG, *Homological algebra*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1956.
3. P. CARTIER, *Dérivations dans les corps*, Séminaire H. Cartan et C. Chevalley, 8e année, 1955–1956, exposé 13.
4. C. CHEVELLEY, *Fundamental concepts of algebra*, Academic Press, New York, 1956.
5. M. GERSTENHABER, *On the cohomology structure of an associative ring*, Ann. of Math., vol. 78 (1963), pp. 267–288.
6. ———, *On the construction of division rings by the deformation of fields*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., vol. 55 (1966), pp. 690–692.
7. ———, *On the deformation of rings and algebras*, Ann. of Math., vol. 79 (1964), pp. 59–103.
8. A. GROTHENDIECK, *Éléments de Géométrie Algébrique, Chap. IV (Première Partie)*, Publ. Math., vol. 20, l'I. H.E.S., France, 1964.
9. G. HOCHSCHILD, *On the cohomology theory for associative algebras*, Ann. of Math., vol. 47 (1946), pp. 568–579.
10. G. HOCHSCHILD, B. KOSTANT, AND A. ROSENBERG, *Differential forms on regular affine algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 102 (1962), pp. 383–408.
11. I. KAPLANSKY, *Commutative rings*, Queen Mary Mathematics Notes, London, 1966.
12. D. KNUDSON, *On the deformation of commutative algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 140 (1969), pp. 622–652.
13. A. NIJENHUIS, *Graded Lie algebras and their applications*, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Mimeographed notes, 1964.
14. J. P. SERRE, *Algebre locale-multiplicités*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 11, Springer, Berlin, 1965.