

Title	On a generalization of the ring theory
Author(s)	Nobusawa, Nobuo
Citation	Osaka Journal of Mathematics. 1964, 1(1), p. 81-89
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/12354">https://doi.org/10.18910/12354</a>
rights	
Note	

*Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA*

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

## ON A GENERALIZATION OF THE RING THEORY

NOBUO NOBUSAWA

(Received May 20, 1964)

**1. Introduction.** A ring of endomorphisms of a module plays a very important role in many parts of mathematics; the property of a ring itself is also clarified when we consider it as a ring of endomorphisms of a module. As a generalization of this idea, we can consider a set of homomorphisms of a module to another module which is closed under the addition and subtraction defined naturally but has no more a structure of a ring since we can not define the product. However, suppose that we have an additive group  $M$  consisting of homomorphisms of a module  $A$  to a module  $B$  and that we have also an additive group  $N$  consisting of homomorphisms of  $B$  to  $A$ . In this case we can define the product of three elements  $f_1$ ,  $g$  and  $f_2$  where  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are elements of  $M$  and  $g$  is an element of  $N$ . If this product  $f_1 g f_2$  is also an element of  $M$  for every  $f_1$ ,  $g$  and  $f_2$ , we say that  $M$  is closed under the multiplication using  $N$  between. Similarly we can define that  $N$  is closed under the multiplication using  $M$  between. Take  $f_1$ ,  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  in  $M$  and  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  in  $N$  in the above case. Then we have

$$(f_1 g_1 f_2) g_2 f_3 = f_1 g_1 (f_2 g_2 f_3) = f_1 (g_1 f_2 g_2) f_3.$$

When we define this situation abstractly, we can get a new algebraic system.

**DEFINITION.** Let  $M$  be an additive group whose elements are denoted by  $a, b, c, \dots$ , and  $\Gamma$  another additive group whose elements are  $\gamma, \beta, \alpha, \dots$ . Suppose that  $a\gamma b$  is defined to be an element of  $M$  and that  $\gamma a \beta$  is defined to be an element of  $\Gamma$  for every  $a, b, \gamma$  and  $\beta$ . If the products satisfy the following three conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} & (a_1 + a_2)\gamma b = a_1\gamma b + a_2\gamma b, \\ 1) \quad & a(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)b = a\gamma_1 b + a\gamma_2 b, \\ & a\gamma(b_1 + b_2) = a\gamma b_1 + a\gamma b_2, \end{aligned}$$

$$2) \quad (a\gamma b)\beta c = a\gamma(b\beta c) = a(\gamma b\beta)c,$$

3) if  $a\gamma b=0$  for any  $a$  and  $b$  in  $M$ , then  $\gamma=0$ ,  
then  $M$  is called a  $\Gamma$ -ring

The purpose of this note is to determine the structure of  $\Gamma$ -rings under the following conditions which are called semi-simple and simple according to the usual ring theory.

DEFINITION. Let  $M$  be a  $\Gamma$ -ring as above. If for any non-zero element  $a$  of  $M$  there exists such an element  $\gamma$  (depending on  $a$ ) in  $\Gamma$  that  $a\gamma a \neq 0$ , we say that  $M$  is *semi-simple*. If for any non-zero elements  $a$  and  $b$  of  $M$  there exists  $\gamma$  (depending on  $a$  and  $b$ ) in  $\Gamma$  such that  $a\gamma b \neq 0$ , we say that  $M$  is *simple*.

The main result obtained in this note is that a simple  $\Gamma$ -ring which satisfies the chain condition for left and right ideals (defined in §3) is the set  $D_{n,m}$  of all rectangular matrices of type  $n \times m$  over some division ring  $D$  and  $\Gamma$  is  $D_{m,n}$  of type  $m \times n$ . The product  $a\gamma b$  is the same as the usual matrix product of elements  $a$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $b$  of  $D_{n,m}$ ,  $D_{m,n}$  and  $D_{n,m}$ . This is a generalization of the theorem of Wedderburn on simple rings. Subsequently, a semi-simple  $\Gamma$ -ring satisfying the chain condition for left and right ideals will be shown to be a direct sum of simple  $\Gamma_i$ -rings, where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \dots + \Gamma_n$  (direct).

**2. Examples.** Suppose we have a right  $R$ -module  $M$  with an operator ring  $R$ . Take a submodule  $\Gamma$  of  $\text{Hom}_R(M, R)$ . Then  $M$  is a  $\Gamma$ -ring as follows: If  $a$  and  $b$  are elements of  $M$  and if  $\gamma$  is an element of  $\Gamma$ , then we define

$$a\gamma b = a \cdot \gamma(b),$$

where  $\gamma(b)$  is an image of  $b$  by  $\gamma$  and is an element of  $R$ . It is easy to verify that

$$(a\gamma b)\beta c = (a \cdot \gamma(b)) \cdot \beta(c) = a(\gamma(b)\beta(c)) = a \cdot \gamma(b \cdot \beta(c)) = a\gamma(b\beta c).$$

We also define that

$$\gamma b\beta = \beta \cdot \gamma(b)_l \quad (\beta \text{ operating first}),$$

where  $\gamma(b)_l$  means the left multiplication of  $\gamma(b)$ . Then

$$(a\gamma b)\beta c = a(\gamma(b)\beta(c)) = a(\gamma b\beta)c.$$

The conditions 1) and 3) hold naturally and  $M$  is a  $\Gamma$ -ring. But it will be shown in §3 that every  $\Gamma$ -ring is given in this way.

To illustrate further this new algebraic system, we introduce the

definition and examples of cubic rings.

DEFINITION. We call that  $M$  is a *cubic ring* when we can define the product of three elements of  $M$  which is an additive group such that it satisfies

- $$\begin{aligned} & (a_1 + a_2)bc = a_1bc + a_2bc, \\ 4) \quad & a(b_1 + b_2)c = ab_1c + ab_2c, \\ & ab(c_1 + c_2) = abc_1 + abc_2, \\ 5) \quad & ab(cde) = (abc)de, \\ 6) \quad & \text{if } abc=0 \text{ for all } a \text{ and } c, \text{ then } b=0. \end{aligned}$$

If we take the product in a cubic ring  $M$  as the product of two elements of  $M$  using one element of  $\Gamma=M$  between, then conditions 1) and 3) for a  $\Gamma$ -ring are satisfied. Also the first part of 2) is satisfied. Hence, in order that  $M$  is a  $\Gamma$ -ring, we must be able to define the product  $\Gamma \times M \times \Gamma$  such that the latter part of 2) holds. In the following examples, we can find it easily.

EXAMPLE 1. Let  $V_n(F)$  be a vector space of dim  $n$  over a field  $F$ . If  $a, b$  and  $c$  are vectors in it, we define  $abc=(a \cdot b)c$ , where  $(a \cdot b)$  is the inner product of  $a$  and  $b$ . It is easy to see that  $V_n(F)$  is a cubic ring. Now we define  $(bcd)'=b(c \cdot d)$ . Then  $ab(cde)=(a \cdot b)(c \cdot d)e=a(bcd)'e$ , i.e.,  $V_n(F)$  is a  $\Gamma$ -ring with  $\Gamma=V_n(F)$ .

EXAMPLE 2. Let  $D_{n,m}$  be the set of all rectangular matrices of type  $n \times m$  over a division ring  $D$ . If  $a, b$  and  $c$  are elements in it, we define  $abc=ab^t c$ , where  $b^t$  is the transpose of a matrix  $b$  and the above product is well-defined. Then  $D_{n,m}$  is clearly a cubic ring. Now we define  $(bcd)'=dc^t b$ . Then  $ab(cde)=ab^t cd^t e=a(bcd)'e$ , i.e.,  $D_{n,m}$  is a  $\Gamma$ -ring with  $\Gamma=D_{n,m}$ .

EXAMPLE 3. Let  $I$  be the set of all purely imaginary complex numbers. Then it is a cubic ring with the usual multiplication. Also it is a  $\Gamma$ -ring with  $\Gamma=I$ . However, even with the same  $I$ , we can define another cubic ring. For example, if  $a, b$  and  $c$  are elements in  $I$ , we define the product of  $a, b$  and  $c$  as  $a\bar{b}c$  where  $\bar{b}$  is the conjugate of  $b$ , i.e.,  $-b$ . This product also satisfies 4), 5) and 6) of the definition of cubic rings. In this case, we put  $(bcd)'=-bcd$ .

**3. The operator rings and ideals.** Let  $M$  be a  $\Gamma$ -ring. Consider the additive group generated by pairs  $(\gamma, a)$ , where  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  and  $a \in M$  with defining relations  $(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2, a) = (\gamma_1, a) + (\gamma_2, a)$  and  $(\gamma, a_1 + a_2) = (\gamma, a_1) + (\gamma, a_2)$ . We define the multiplication of the elements of this additive group such that

$$(\gamma, a)(\beta, b) = (\gamma, a\beta b).$$

Using the condition 2), we can verify that

$$((\gamma, a)(\beta, b))(\alpha, c) = (\gamma, a)((\beta, b)(\alpha, c)).$$

Thus we get a ring which we denote by  $F$ . Now we can see that  $F$  is a right operator ring of  $M$  by the following definition:

$$a(\gamma, b) = a\gamma b,$$

for, we have

$$(a(\gamma, b))(\beta, c) = (a\gamma b)\beta c = a\gamma(b\beta c) = a(\gamma, b\beta c) = a((\gamma, b)(\beta, c)).$$

The set of all elements of  $F$  that annihilate  $M$  forms an ideal which we denote by  $A$ , and we denote  $F/A$  by  $R$  and call it *the right operator ring of  $M$* . We use  $\gamma a$  for an element of  $R$  which is gained from  $(\gamma, a)$ . Thus  $a\gamma b = a(\gamma b)$ . Then, take an element  $\gamma$  of  $\Gamma$ . It induces an  $R$ -homomorphism of  $M$  to  $R$  such that  $\gamma(a) = \gamma a$ . The condition 3) implies that  $\Gamma$  induces the zero homomorphism if and only if  $\gamma = 0$ . Thus  $\Gamma$  is considered to be a subset of the total set of  $R$ -homomorphisms of  $M$  to  $R$ ;  $\Gamma \subset \text{Hom}_R(M, R)$ .

Similarly we can define *the left operator ring  $L$  of  $M$* . We start with  $(a, \gamma)$  and define the product such that  $(a, \gamma)(b, \beta) = (a\gamma b, \beta)$ . Also we define the left operation such that  $(a, \gamma)b = a\gamma b$ , and so on.  $a\gamma$  is an element of  $L$  given from  $(a, \gamma)$  and  $a\gamma b = (a\gamma)b$ . And we can say that  $\Gamma \subset \text{Hom}_L(M, L)$ .

**DEFINITION.**  $R$ -submodules of  $M$  are called *right ideals* of  $M$ , and  $L$ -submodules of  $M$  are *left ideals*.

A right ideal  $\mathfrak{r}$  is nothing but a submodule of  $M$  such that  $\mathfrak{r}\Gamma M \subset \mathfrak{r}$ . A left ideal  $\mathfrak{l}$  is a submodule of  $M$  such that  $M\Gamma \mathfrak{l} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ .

**4. Peirce decomposition in semi-simple  $\Gamma$ -rings.** Assume that  $M$  is semi-simple, and let  $\mathfrak{r}$  be a minimal right ideal. Then by semi-simplicity there exists an element  $\varepsilon$  in  $\Gamma$  such that  $a\varepsilon a \neq 0$  for a non-zero element  $a$  in  $\mathfrak{r}$ . Then  $0 \neq a\varepsilon \mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{r}$  and hence  $\mathfrak{r} = a\varepsilon \mathfrak{r}$ , for  $\mathfrak{r}$  is minimal. Therefore  $a = a\varepsilon e$  with some element  $e$  of  $\mathfrak{r}$ . Then  $e = e\varepsilon e$ , since from  $a = a\varepsilon e = (a\varepsilon e)\varepsilon e$

we have  $a\varepsilon(e - e\varepsilon e) = 0$  which means  $e - e\varepsilon e = 0$ , for a set  $\{c \mid a\varepsilon c = 0, c \in \mathfrak{r}\}$  is a right ideal contained in a minimal ideal  $\mathfrak{r}$  and is  $\{0\}$ . Since  $e \in \mathfrak{r}$ ,  $eR \subset \mathfrak{r}$ , i.e.,  $eR = \mathfrak{r}$ .  $\varepsilon M$  being a right ideal of  $R$ ,  $e\varepsilon M$  is a right ideal of  $M$  contained in  $\mathfrak{r}$ , and hence  $e\varepsilon M = \mathfrak{r}$ . Thus we get

**Lemma 1.** *If  $M$  is semi-simple and  $\mathfrak{r}$  is a minimal right ideal, then  $\mathfrak{r} = eR = e\varepsilon M$  with  $e \in \mathfrak{r}$  and  $\varepsilon \in \Gamma$ , where  $e\varepsilon e = e$ .*

Now we use the idea of Peirce decomposition of the ring theory. Suppose that we have a right ideal  $\mathfrak{r} = e\varepsilon M$  such that  $e\varepsilon e = e$ . Then

$$M = e\varepsilon M + M_1 \quad (\text{direct}),$$

where  $M_1 = \{b \mid e\varepsilon b = 0\}$ , since any element  $a$  of  $M$  is written

$$a = e\varepsilon a + (a - e\varepsilon a),$$

and  $e\varepsilon(a - e\varepsilon a) = 0$ .  $M_1$  is clearly a right ideal of  $M$ . Now we can get a decomposition theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *If  $M$  is semi-simple and satisfies the minimum condition for right ideals, then*

$$M = e_1R + e_2R + \dots + e_nR \quad (\text{direct}),$$

where  $e_iR$  are minimal right ideals and  $e_iR = e_i\varepsilon_iM$ , and  $e_i\varepsilon_i e_i = e_i$  and  $e_i\varepsilon_i e_j = 0$  if  $i \neq j$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that we have

$$M = e_1\varepsilon_1M + \dots + e_{k-1}\varepsilon_{k-1}M + M_{k-1} \quad (\text{direct})$$

such that  $e_i\varepsilon_iM$  are minimal right ideals and

$$e_i\varepsilon_i e_j = \begin{cases} e_i & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

and that  $e_i\varepsilon_i a = 0$  if  $a \in M_{k-1}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ . This is true for  $k=2$  as above. Apply the above discussion on  $M_{k-1}$ , and we get

$$M_{k-1} = e_k\varepsilon'_kM + M_k \quad (\text{direct})$$

as in the above. Here  $e_i\varepsilon_i e_k = 0$  if  $i < k$ , but we can not say that  $e_k\varepsilon'_k e_i = 0$ . So, we change  $\varepsilon'_k$  suitably. Put

$$\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon'_k - \varepsilon'_k(e_1\varepsilon_1 + \dots + e_{k-1}\varepsilon_{k-1}).$$

Then we can see that  $e_k\varepsilon_k e_k = e_k$  and  $e_k\varepsilon_k e_i = 0$ . Thus we have a decomposition for  $k$ . Since  $M$  satisfies the minimum condition for right ideals, we

can get the decomposition in Theorem 1.

Similarly we can get

**Theorem 1'.** *If  $M$  is semi-simple and satisfies the minimum condition for left ideals, then*

$$M = Ld_1 + Ld_2 + \cdots + Ld_m \quad (\text{direct}),$$

where  $Ld_i$  are minimal left ideals and  $Ld_i = M\delta_i d_i$ , and  $d_i \delta_i d_i = d_i$  and  $d_j \delta_i d_i = 0$  if  $i \neq j$ .

**5. Simple  $\Gamma$ -rings.** Assume  $M$  is simple and satisfies the minimum condition for right and left ideals in this section. First we want to show that  $e_i R$  and  $e_j R$  are isomorphic as  $R$ -modules.  $M$  being simple, we can find an element  $\gamma$  in  $\Gamma$  such that  $e_i \gamma e_j \neq 0$ . Then  $e_i \gamma r_j = r_i$  where  $r_i$  and  $r_j$  are  $e_i R$  and  $e_j R$ . By a correspondence:

$$(r_j \ni) x \longrightarrow e_i \gamma x (\in r_i)$$

we have a one-one mapping of  $r_j$  onto  $r_i$ . If  $x \neq 0$ ,  $e_i \gamma x \neq 0$ , because  $\{c | e_i \gamma c = 0, c \in r_j\}$  is a right ideal contained in  $r_j$  and is  $\{0\}$  as  $r_j$  is minimal. This mapping is "onto" because  $r_i$  is minimal. Since  $x(\beta c) = x\beta c$  corresponds to  $e_i \gamma (x\beta c) = (e_i \gamma x)(\beta c)$ , this mapping is an  $R$ -homomorphism, i.e., an  $R$ -isomorphism. Similarly  $Ld_i \cong Ld_j$  ( $L$ -isomorphic). Next, we want to show that all  $L$ -endomorphisms of  $M$  are given by the right multiplication of  $R$ . Let  $\phi$  be an  $L$ -endomorphism of  $M$  and put  $\phi(d_i) = u_i$ . Since  $d_i = d_i \delta_i d_i$ ,  $u_i = d_i \delta_i u_i$ . Therefore,  $u_i = d_i (\sum_j \delta_j d_j \delta_j u_j)$  where  $\sum_j \delta_j d_j \delta_j u_j$  is an element of  $R$ . On the other hand, by the definition of the right operator ring,  $R$  is considered to be the set of all  $L$ -endomorphisms of  $M$ . Then the ring theory shows us that the latter ring is a matrix ring  $D_m$  over a division ring  $D$ , where  $D_m$  is  $D_{m,m}$ . Matrix units  $E_{r,s}$  of  $D_m$  map  $d_r$  to  $d_s$  and  $d_t$  to 0 if  $t \neq r$ .

Now we can determine  $M$  with respect to  $R$  which is identified with  $D_m$  as above. Since minimal right ideals of  $D_m$  are  $E_{r,r} D_m$ ,  $e_i D_m (= e_i R$  in Theorem 2)  $= e_i E_{r,r} D_m$  with some  $r$ . Then put  $e_i E_{r,s} = e_{i,s}$ . We get  $e_{i,s}$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ ;  $s=1, 2, \dots, m$ ) such that

$$e_{i,s} E_{r,t} = \begin{cases} e_{i,t} & s = r, \\ 0 & s \neq r. \end{cases}$$

Thus we can say that  $M = \sum_{i,s} e_{i,s} D$ , i.e.,  $e_{i,s}$  are matrix units of  $D_{n,m}$  and  $M$  is (isomorphic to)  $D_{n,m}$  as a right  $D_m$ -module.

Next we must determine  $\Gamma$ . An element  $\gamma$  of  $\Gamma$  is considered to

induce a mapping from  $M$  to  $R$  as in § 3, and  $\Gamma$  is considered to be a subset of the set of all  $R$ -homomorphisms of  $M=D_{n,m}$  to  $R=D_m$ . On the other hand,  $D_m$ -homomorphisms of  $D_{n,m}$  to  $D_m$  are induced by the left multiplications of elements of  $D_{m,n}$ . In fact, suppose  $\phi$  is a  $D_m$ -homomorphism of  $D_{n,m}$  to  $D_m$  such that

$$\phi(e_{i,s}) = \sum_{p,q} E_{p,q} T_{p,q}(i, s)$$

with  $T_{p,q}(i, s)$  in  $D$ . Multiply  $E_{s,s}$ , and we can see  $T_{p,q}(i, s)=0$  if  $q \neq s$ . Multiply  $E_{s,t}$ , and we can see  $T_{p,s}(i, s)=T_{p,t}(i, t)$ . Putting  $T_{p,s}(i, s)=T_p(i)$ , we have

$$\phi(e_{i,s}) = \sum_p E_{p,s} T_p(i) = (\sum_{p,j} e'_{p,j} T_p(j)) e_{i,s},$$

where  $e'_{p,i}$  are matrix units of  $D_{m,n}$  such that

$$e'_{p,j} e_{i,s} = \begin{cases} E_{p,s} & \text{if } j = i, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq i. \end{cases}$$

Hence  $\phi$  is induced by the left multiplication of an element  $A = \sum e'_{p,j} T_p(j)$  of  $D_{m,n}$ . Identifying  $\gamma$  which induces  $\phi$  and  $A$  which corresponds to  $\phi$ , we can say that  $\Gamma \subset D_{m,n}$ . What we want to show is that  $\Gamma = D_{m,n}$ . But  $\Gamma$  is a two sided  $D_m$ - $D_n$  module and must be identical with  $D_{m,n}$ . Summarizing all the discussions, we get the main theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *If  $M$  is a simple  $\Gamma$ -ring satisfying the minimum condition for left and right ideals, then  $M$  is  $D_{n,m}$  and  $\Gamma$  is  $D_{m,n}$ . The product  $ayb$  is the usual matrix product of three elements  $a$ ,  $\gamma$  and  $b$  of  $D_{n,m}$ ,  $D_{m,n}$  and  $D_{n,m}$ .*

**6. Semi-simple  $\Gamma$ -rings.** Let  $M$  be a semi-simple  $\Gamma$ -ring which satisfies the minimum condition for left and right ideals in this section. Arranging suitably, we can see that  $M$  is expressed as follows:

$$M = Ld_1^{(1)} + \dots + Ld_{m(1)}^{(1)} + Ld_1^{(2)} + \dots + Ld_{m(2)}^{(2)} + \dots + Ld_1^{(q)} + \dots + Ld_{m(q)}^{(q)},$$

where  $d_i^{(j)}$  are some  $d_k$  of Theorem 1'. Moreover we take the order such that in the above  $Ld_i^{(j)} \cong Ld_k^{(j)}$  ( $L$ -isomorphic) and  $Ld_i^{(j)} \not\cong Ld_k^{(j')}$  if  $j \neq j'$ . Then,  $R$  is, as the right multiplication ring of the  $L$ -module  $M$ , equal to a direct ring sum  $\sum_j D_{m(j)}^{(j)}$ , where  $D_{m(j)}^{(j)}$  are matrix rings over division rings  $D^{(j)}$  of type  $m(j) \times m(j)$ . Furthermore  $D_{m(j)}^{(j)}$  operate on  $Ld_i^{(j)}$  as usual and are zero on  $Ld_i^{(j')}$  if  $j \neq j'$ . On the other hand, we have in Theorem 1



$$M = e_1R + e_2R + \dots + e_nR.$$

$e_iR$  being minimal,  $e_iR = e_i D_{m(j)}^{(j)}$  with some  $j$ . Rearranging the order suitably, we have

$$M = e_1^{(1)}R + \dots + e_{n(1)}^{(1)}R + e_1^{(2)}R + \dots + e_{n(2)}^{(2)}R + \dots + e_1^{(q)}R + \dots + e_{n(q)}^{(q)}R,$$

where  $e_i^{(j)}R = e_i^{(j)} D_{m(j)}^{(j)}$  and  $e_i^{(j)}$  are some  $e_n$ . Hence  $n = \sum_j n(j)$ . With the same discussion as in §5, we can say that

$$\begin{aligned} e_1^{(1)}R + \dots + e_{n(1)}^{(1)}R &= D_{n(1), m(1)}^{(1)}, \\ e_1^{(2)}R + \dots + e_{n(2)}^{(2)}R &= D_{n(2), m(2)}, \\ &\dots\dots\dots \\ e_1^{(q)}R + \dots + e_{n(q)}^{(q)}R &= D_{n(q), m(q)}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$M = D_{n(1), m(1)}^{(1)} + \dots + D_{n(q), m(q)}^{(q)},$$

where  $D_{n(j), m(j)}^{(j)}$  are matrix rings over division rings  $D^{(j)}$  of type  $n(j) \times m(j)$ . Naturally  $D_{m(j)}^{(j)}$  operate on  $D_{n(j), m(j)}^{(j)}$  as usual and are zero on  $D_{n(j'), m(j')}^{(j')}$  if  $j \neq j'$ .  $\Gamma$  is then a set of  $R$ -homomorphisms of  $M$  to  $R$  and is contained in  $\sum_j D_{m(j), n(j)}^{(j)}$ . Here the product of elements of  $D_{m(j), n(j)}^{(j)}$  and of  $D_{n(j'), m(j')}^{(j')}$  is performed as usual if  $j = j'$  and is 0 if  $j \neq j'$ . On the other hand, the condition of semi-simplicity means that for any non-zero element  $a$  of  $D_{n(j), m(j)}^{(j)}$  there exists  $\gamma$  in  $\Gamma$  such that  $a\gamma a \neq 0$ . Now we want to show that each  $D_{n(j), m(j)}^{(j)}$  is a simple  $\Gamma_j$ -ring. Let  $V$  and  $V'$  be left  $D^{(j)}$ -modules of dim  $n(j)$  and of dim  $m(j)$ .  $D_{n(j), m(j)}^{(j)}$  and  $D_{m(j), n(j)}^{(j)}$  are considered to be the sets of all  $D^{(j)}$ -homomorphisms of  $V$  to  $V'$  and of  $V'$  to  $V$ . When we notice that  $D_{m(j'), n(j')}^{(j')}$  induce zero mapping on  $V'$  if  $j \neq j'$ , we can say that elements of  $\Gamma$  induce mappings of  $V'$  to  $V$ . In this case we can show that  $X\Gamma = V$  for any subspace  $X$  of dim 1 of  $V'$ . For, suppose that  $X\Gamma \subsetneq V$ . Then we can find an element  $a$  in  $D_{n(j), m(j)}^{(j)}$  such that  $Va = X$  and  $(X\Gamma)a = 0$ . Then  $a\gamma a = 0$  for every  $\gamma$  in  $\Gamma$ , which is a contradiction. Now this fact implies the existence of  $\gamma$  such that  $a\gamma b \neq 0$  for any non-zero  $a$  and  $b$ , for we can take a subspace of  $Va$  as  $X$  and take  $\gamma$  such that  $(X\gamma)b \neq 0$ . Thus we can conclude that  $\Gamma = \sum_j D_{m(j), n(j)}^{(j)}$ . Now put  $\Gamma_j = D_{m(j), n(j)}^{(j)}$ .

**Theorem 3.** *If  $M$  is a semi-simple  $\Gamma$ -ring satisfying the minimum condition for left and right ideals, then  $M$  is a direct sum of simple  $\Gamma_i$ -rings where  $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \dots + \Gamma_q$  (direct):*

$$M = M_1 + M_2 + \cdots + M_q \quad (\text{direct}),$$

where  $M_i$  are simple  $\Gamma_i$ -rings and  $M_i\Gamma_j = 0$  if  $i \neq j$ , and  $M_i\Gamma_j M_i = 0$  if  $i \neq j$ .

OSAKA UNIVERSITY and UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

