

## Derivation and cohomology in simple and other rings. II

(A remark on the Kronecker product  $A \times_c A$ )

By

Tadasi NAKAYAMA

(Received Nov. 2, 1954)

---

In our first paper I<sup>1)</sup> we proved first that if  $A$  is a simple ring (having unit element 1 and satisfying minimum condition) and if  $C$  is a weakly normal simple subring of  $A$  (which contains 1 and over which  $A$  is assumed to be finite for the sake of simplicity), then the Kronecker product (or, direct product, as we called it in I)  $A \times_c A$  over  $C$  is completely reducible as  $A$ - $C$ -double-module, under ordinary operation.<sup>2)</sup> This we proved indeed by combining the following two facts, which were proved either in I or in a former paper of the writer: Under the same assumption, 1) the  $A$ - $C$ -module  $A$  is completely reducible; 2)  $A \times_c A$  is  $A$ -two-sided completely reducible and is a direct sum of minimal  $A$ -double-submodules which are  $A$ -left-semilinearly and  $A$ -right-linearly isomorphic to  $A$ . Thus arises our interest in investigating the relationship between the  $A$ -two-sided complete reducibility of  $A \times_c A$  and the  $A$ - $C$ -complete reducibility of  $A$  itself, where  $A$  is a ring with unit element 1 and  $C$  is a subring of  $A$  which contains 1. A typical case, where we have the latter but not the former, is the case of a field  $C$  and a non-separable semisimple algebra  $A$  over  $C$ . It is also clear that the former does not imply the latter in general. For instance, let  $A$  be the complete matrix ring  $\varepsilon_{11}\mathcal{Q} + \varepsilon_{12}\mathcal{Q} + \varepsilon_{21}\mathcal{Q} + \varepsilon_{22}\mathcal{Q}$  over a field  $\mathcal{Q}$  and  $C$  be its subring  $\mathcal{Q} + \varepsilon_{21}\mathcal{Q}$ ; observe that  $A$  has even an (independent) two-sided basis over  $C$ ,

1) Duke Math. J. 19 (1952), 51-63.

2) We proved the same also under Hochschild's cohomological operation. Further we considered Kronecker products  $A \times_c A \times_c \dots \times_c A$  with more factors than 2, and proved their  $A$ - $B$ -complete reducibility, where  $B$  is any (necessarily weakly normal) simple subring of  $A$  which contains  $C$ .

for example  $\{1, \varepsilon_{12}\}$ . Now, in the present short note we want to mention an easy condition under which the  $A$ -two-sided complete reducibility of  $A \times_c A$  implies the  $A$ - $C$ -complete reducibility of  $A$ . Thus,

**Proposition.** *Let  $A$  be a ring with unit element 1. Let  $C$  be a subring of  $A$  which contains 1, and let  $A$  satisfy the minimum condition for its  $A$ - $C$ -submodules. Suppose that  $A$  possesses an independent finite left (and in fact two-sided)  $C$ -basis, say  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ , satisfying<sup>3)</sup>*

$$(1) \quad Ca_i = a_i C \quad (i=1, 2, \dots, n).$$

If  $A \times_c A$  is, under ordinary operation,  $A$ -two-sided completely reducible, then  $A$  is completely reducible as  $A$ - $C$ -double-module.

*Proof.* For each  $i=1, 2, \dots, n$  and for each element  $c$  of  $C$ , there exist, because of the assumption (1), elements  $c^{\tau_i}, c^{\delta_i}$  of  $C$  such that

$$(2) \quad ca_i = a_i c^{\tau_i},$$

$$(3) \quad a_i c = c^{\delta_i} a_i.$$

Let  $M$  be the sum of all minimal  $A$ - $C$ -submodules of  $A$ . Then for each element  $x \neq 0$  of  $A$  we have  $AxC \cap M \neq 0$ . Now, consider the submodule  $M \times_c A$  of  $A \times_c A$ ; because of the existence of a left  $C$ -basis of  $A$ , the Kronecker product  $M \times_c A$  itself may be considered as a submodule of  $A \times_c A$ . Any element  $u$  of  $A \times_c A$  may be expressed, uniquely, in the form

$$(4) \quad u = x_1 \times a_1 + x_2 \times a_2 + \dots + x_n \times a_n \quad (x_i \in A).$$

Let  $u \neq 0$ . We wish to prove that

$$AuC \cap (M \times_c A) \neq 0.$$

To do so let  $t$  be the youngest index such that  $x_t \neq 0$ . We take  $y_\mu \in A$  and  $c_\mu \in C$  so that we have

$$(5) \quad 0 \neq \sum_{\mu} y_\mu x_t c_\mu \in M.$$

Construct then the element

$$(6) \quad v = \sum_{\mu} y_\mu u c_\mu^{\tau_t}$$

of  $AuC$ . This element  $v$  is equal to

3) It seems, to the writer, to be indicated that some properties of algebras over a commutative ring could be extended to rings of our type.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} (x_t \times a_t + x_{t+1} \times a_{t+1} + \dots + x_n \times a_n) c_{\mu}^{\tau_t} \\
 &= \sum_{\mu} (y_{\mu} x_t \times a_t c_{\mu}^{\tau_t}) + \sum_{\mu} (y_{\mu} x_{t+1} \times a_{t+1} c_{\mu}^{\tau_t}) + \dots \\
 & \quad + \sum_{\mu} (y_{\mu} x_n \times a_n c_{\mu}^{\tau_t}) \\
 &= \sum_{\mu} (y_{\mu} x_t \times c_{\mu} a_t) + \sum_{\mu} (y_{\mu} x_{t+1} \times c_{\mu}^{\tau_t \delta_{t+1}} a_{t+1}) \\
 & \quad + \dots + \sum_{\mu} (y_{\mu} x_n \times c_{\mu}^{\tau_t \delta_n} a_n) \\
 &= (\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_t c_{\mu}) \times a_t + (\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_{t+1} c_{\mu}^{\tau_t \delta_{t+1}}) \times a_{t+1} \\
 & \quad + \dots + (\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_n c_{\mu}^{\tau_t \delta_n}) \times a_n .
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the first summand  $(\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_t c_{\mu}) \times a_t$  is, because of (5), a non-zero element of  $M \times_c A$ . Thus, if the remaining sum

$$(7) \quad w = (\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_{t+1} c_{\mu}^{\tau_t \delta_{t+1}}) \times a_{t+1} + \dots + (\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_n c_{\mu}^{\tau_t \delta_n}) \times a_n$$

is 0, then our element  $v$  of  $AuC$  is a non-zero element of  $M \times_c A$ , whence  $AuC \cap (M \times_c A) \cong 0$ . If however  $w$  is not 0, suppose that  $AwC \cap (M \times_c A) \neq 0$ , i.e. that there are  $z_v \in A$  and  $d_v \in C$  such that

$$(8) \quad 0 \cong \sum_v z_v w d_v \in M \times_c A.$$

We have

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_v z_v v d_v &= \sum_v (z_v (\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_t c_{\mu}) \times a_t d_v) \\ & \quad + \sum_v z_v w d_v \in M \times_c A. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, this element (9), which belongs to  $AuC$ , is not equal to 0, since  $\sum_v (z_v (\sum_{\mu} y_{\mu} x_t c_{\mu}) \times a_t d_v)$  is in  $A \times a_t$  (indeed in  $M \times a_t$ ) while  $\sum_v z_v w d_v$  is in  $A \times a_{t+1} + \dots + A \times a_n$  and  $(A \times a_t) \cap (A \times a_{t+1} + \dots + A \times a_n) = 0$ .

By an easy induction, on the number of non-zero coefficients  $x$  in (4), we see  $AuC \cap (M \times_c A) = 0$ , as is desired. Since this is the case for any non-zero element of  $A \times_c A$ , it follows that  $M \times_c A$  contains all minimal  $A$ - $C$ -submodules of  $A \times_c A$ . If  $A \times_c A$  is  $A$ -two-sided completely reducible, this implies  $M \times_c A = A \times_c A$ , whence  $M = A$ , or, what amounts to the same,  $A$  is completely reducible as  $A$ - $C$ -module. Our proposition is proved.

Our proposition thus proved is however of mere formal nature. A somewhat, if not much, deeper consideration on the complete reducibility of  $A \times_c A$ , particularly on its relationship with the complete reducibility of the Kronecker product  $A \times_c A \times_c \dots \times_c A$  with more factors than two, will be given in our third note III.

Paris, 17 October, 1954