Pacific Journal of Mathematics

COHOMOLOGY OF NONASSOCIATIVE ALGEBRAS

NEAL DAVID GLASSMAN

Vol. 33, No. 3 May 1970

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 33, No. 3, 1970

COHOMOLOGY OF NONASSOCIATIVE ALGEBRAS

NEAL D. GLASSMAN

A cohomology theory is constructed for an arbitrary nonassociative (not necessarily associative) algebra satisfying a set of identities, within which the associative and Lie theories are special cases.

1. Exactness of the fundamental sequence through H^3. Let T be a set of identities, $\mathscr{A}$ a T-algebra over a commutative ring K with unit, M a T-bimodule for $\mathscr{A}$. When T is clear we call M an $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule. Let $(U(\mathscr{A}), \lambda_{\mathscr{A}}, \rho_{\mathscr{A}})$ be the universal T-multiplication envelope of $\mathscr{A}$ with $\lambda_{\mathscr{A}}, \rho_{\mathscr{A}}$ the canonical maps. When $\lambda_{\mathscr{A}}, \rho_{\mathscr{A}}$ are obvious, we write $U(\mathscr{A})$. Let $D(\mathscr{A}, M)$ be the K-module (under pointwise addition and scalar multiplication) of derivations from $\mathscr{A}$ to M. $\nu \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(M_1, M_2)$ induces $D(\mathscr{A}, \nu) \in \mathrm{Hom}_K(D(\mathscr{A}, M_1), D(\mathscr{A}, M_2))$ in the obvious fashion. For further details of these objects see Jacobson [16].

Regarding $U(\mathscr{A})$ as the free $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule on one generator, we define, for $u \in U(\mathscr{A})$, $f_u: U(\mathscr{A}) \to U(\mathscr{A})$ such that $1_{U(\mathscr{A})}f_u = u$. $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$ is a left $U(\mathscr{A})$-module under the multiplication $ud = dD(\mathscr{A}, f_u)$.

DEFINITION. An *inner derivation functor* is an epimorphism preserving subfunctor of $D(\mathscr{A},\ )$.

For example, suppose $\mathscr{A}$ is Jordan. Define $J(\mathscr{A}, M)$ to be the K-module generated by all mappings of the form $\sum_i [R_{a_i}R_{m_i}]$ where $a_i \in \mathscr{A}$ and $m_i \in M$. Then $J(\mathscr{A}, M) \subseteqq D(\mathscr{A}, M)$ and J is an inner derivation functor.

THEOREM 1. *There is a one-to-one correspondance between the set of inner derivation functors and the set of left $U(\mathscr{A})$ submodules of $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$.*

Proof. If $J(\mathscr{A},\ ) \subseteqq D(\mathscr{A},\ )$ is an inner derivation functor, define $\theta(J) = J(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$. We need to define an inverse $\psi = \theta^{-1}$. Let $\Lambda \subseteqq D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$ be a sub-$U(\mathscr{A})$ module. If $M = \sum_{i \in \Gamma} \oplus U(\mathscr{A})$, define $J(\mathscr{A}, M) = \sum_{i \in \Gamma} \oplus \Lambda_i$, where $\Lambda_i \simeq \Lambda$ for all i. If M is any unital right $U(\mathscr{A})$-module, let X_M be the free unital right $U(\mathscr{A})$-module on the set M. Let Ω_M be the composite $\sum_{m \in M} \oplus \Lambda_m = J(\mathscr{A}, X_M) \xrightarrow{i} \sum_{m \in M} \oplus D(\mathscr{A}, X_m) = D(\mathscr{A}, X_M) \xrightarrow{D(\mathscr{A}, \Pi)} D(\mathscr{A}, M)$, where Π is the canonical projection $\Pi: X_M \to M$. Define $J(\mathscr{A}, M) = \text{image } \Omega_M$.

It is easy to see that the two definitions of J on free bimodules agree.

Let $\nu: M_1 \to M_2$ be a map of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules. ν induces $X_\nu: X_{M_1} \to X_{M_2}$ by applying ν to generators. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} J(\mathscr{A}, X_{M_1}) & \xrightarrow{J(\mathscr{A}, X_\nu)} & J(\mathscr{A}, X_{M_2}) \\ \downarrow i & & \downarrow i \\ D(\mathscr{A}, X_{M_1}) & \xrightarrow{D(\mathscr{A}, X_\nu)} & D(\mathscr{A}, X_{M_2}) \\ \downarrow D(\mathscr{A}, \Pi) & & \downarrow D(\mathscr{A}, \Pi) \\ D(\mathscr{A}, M_1) & \xrightarrow{D(\mathscr{A}, \nu)} & D(\mathscr{A}, M_2) \end{array}$$

where i is the inclusion. By restricting $D(\mathscr{A}, X_\nu)$ to Λ_m for each $m \in M_1$ we get $J(\mathscr{A}, X_\nu)$ making the entire diagram commutative.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} J(\mathscr{A}, \nu) &= D(\mathscr{A}, \nu)/\text{image } iD(\mathscr{A}, \Pi) \\ &= D(\mathscr{A}, \nu)/J(\mathscr{A}, M_1) \,. \end{aligned}$$

By commutativity, $J(\mathfrak{A}, \nu)$ takes on values in $J(\mathscr{A}, M_2)$ and is an epimorphism if ν is. Hence J is an inner derivation functor.

Finally, we show that θ and Ψ are inverses. Given $\Lambda \subseteqq D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$, $\theta\Psi(\Lambda) = \Psi(\Lambda)(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A})) = \Lambda$. Conversely, given an inner derivation functor J, $\theta(J) = J(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$, $\Psi(\theta(J))(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}) = J(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$. Hence, by definition of Ψ and additivity of J, $\Psi(\theta(J)(\mathscr{A}, X_M) = J(\mathscr{A}, X_M)$ for any $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule M. Then, since both $J, \Psi\theta(J)$ are subfunctors of $D(\mathscr{A},\ \ )$ preserving epimorphsims, they must agree on all bimodules M.

DEFINITION. Let J be an inner derivation functor. $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M) = D(\mathscr{A}, M)/J(\mathscr{A}, M)$. If $\alpha: M_1 \to M_2$, $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, \alpha)$ is the K-module homomorphism induced by $D(\mathscr{A}, \alpha)$. Clearly, this makes $H^1_J(\mathscr{A},\ \ )$ a functor from $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules to K-modules.

DEFINITION. Let $\{d_i\}_{i \in \Gamma} \subseteqq D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$. An inner derivation functor J is *generated by* $\{d_i\}_{i \in \Gamma}$ if J corresponds to the left $U(\mathscr{A})$-submodule of $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A})$ generated by $\{d_i\}_{i \in \Gamma}$. J is *finitely generated* if J is generated by some finite set $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^k \subseteqq D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$.

Let J be a finitely generated inner derivation functor, say by $\{d_i\}_1^k$. Let X_i be the free $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule on one generator x_i. Then there is a unique morphism of bimodules $\xi_i: U(\mathscr{A}) \to X_i$ such that $1_{U(\mathscr{A})}\xi_i = x_i$. We write $\bar{d}_i = d_i \circ \xi_i$, the composite. Note that $\bar{d}_i \in D(\mathscr{A}, X_i)$. Let Y be the $U(\mathscr{A})$-submodule of $\sum_1^k \oplus X_i$ generated by

$\{\mathscr{A}(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\}$. Let $C_{\{d_i\}} = \sum_1^k X_i/Y$.

DEFINITION. $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) = \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M)$. If $\alpha: M_1 \to M_2$, then $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, \alpha)$ is the K-module morphism induced by $\mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, \alpha)$.

These definitions clearly make $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A},\ \ )$ a functor from $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules to K-modules. For any short exact sequence of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$, the sequence $0 \to H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M') \to H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) \to H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'')$ is exact.

In the sequel, we use the notation $[x/x$ satisfies $P]$ to mean the submodule generated by the set of x satisfying P. If f and g are homomorphism, d a derivation, we write their composites as fg, $f \circ d$, $d \circ f$.

THEOREM 2. *Let M be an $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule, $f_m \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(U(\mathscr{A}), M)$ such that $1_{U(\mathscr{A})} f_m = m \in M$. Then $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M)$ is isomorphic to the K-module of all k-tuples $(m_i)_1^k$ such that $\sum_1^k d_i \circ f_{m_i} = 0$.]*

Proof. This is immediate from the fact that $\sum_1^k d_i \circ f_{m_i} = \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i \circ \xi_i^{-1} f_{m_i} = (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i) \circ f_{m_1,\cdots m_k}$, where $f_{m_1,\cdots m_k}\ \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k X_i, M)$ such that $x_i f_{m_1,\cdots m_k} = m_i$. But by the definition of $C_{\{d_i\}}$ as $\sum_1^k \oplus X_i/[\mathscr{A} \sum \bar{d}_i]$, $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) = \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M) \simeq [f_{m_1,\cdots,m_k}/(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i) \circ f_{m_1,\cdots,m_k} = 0.]$

LEMMA 1. *$D(\mathscr{A},\ \ )$ is a left exact functor from $\mathscr{A}$-*bimodules *to K-modules.*

Proof. Form the right $U(\mathscr{A})$-module $\mathscr{A} \otimes_k U(\mathscr{A})$. Let P be the submodule generated by $\{a_1 \otimes a_2^\rho - a_1 a_2 \otimes 1 + a_2 \otimes a_1^\lambda / a_1, a_2 \in \mathscr{A}\}$. Then it is easily seen that $D(\mathscr{A}, M) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\mathscr{A} \otimes U(\mathscr{A})/P, M)$ for all M. But $\mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\mathscr{A} \otimes U(\mathscr{A})/P,\ \ )$ is left exact.

Let $0 \to M' \xrightarrow{\chi} M \xrightarrow{\sigma} M'' \to 0$ be an exact sequence of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules, J generated by $\{d_i\}_1^k$, $C_{\{d_i\}}$ defined as above. Let $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M'') = \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i/Y, M'')$. Lift f uniquely to $f_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M'')$ and choose $f_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M)$ so that $f_2\sigma = f_1$.

Since $\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i \in J(\mathscr{A}, \sum_1^k \oplus X_i)$, $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i) \circ f_2 \in J(\mathscr{A}, M) \subseteqq D(\mathscr{A}, M)$. Since $\mathscr{A} \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i \subseteqq Y$, $f_2\sigma = f_1$ and $f_1/Y = 0$, we have $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i) \circ f_2 \sigma = 0$. Hence $\mathscr{A}(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i) \circ f_2 \subseteqq M'\chi$ and, regarding M' as a submodule of M, $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i) \circ f_2$ can be considered as an element of $D(\mathscr{A}, M')$.

DEFINITION. $\delta^0_{\{d_i\}}: H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'') \to H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M')$ is defined by $f\delta^0_{\{d_i\}} = (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i) \circ f_2 + J(\mathscr{A}, M') \in D(\mathscr{A}, M')/J(\mathscr{A}, M')$.

LEMMA 2. *$\delta^0_{\{d_i\}}$ is well-defined and natural. Further, if $\{d'_i\}_1^{k'}$ is* *another finite generating set for J, there are K-module morphisms Φ, Ω, such that the square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'') & \xrightarrow{\delta^0_{\{d_i\}}} & H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M') \\ \Omega\downarrow\ \uparrow\Phi & & =\downarrow\ \uparrow= \\ H^0_{J,\{d'_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'') & \xrightarrow{\delta^0_{\{d'_i\}}} & H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M') \end{array}$$

commutes.

This is an easy exercise in diagram chasing.

By the last part of the preceeding lemma, we may drop the subscript on $\delta^0_{\{d_i\}} = \delta^0$. In order to begin the exactness proof, we need the following lemma.

LEMMA 3. *Let J be an inner derivation functor generated by $\{d_i\}_1^{k<\infty}$. Let $d \in J(\mathscr{A}, M)$. Then there exists an $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M)$ such that $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ f = d$.*

Proof. There is a $\gamma \in \sum_{m \in M} J(\mathscr{A}, X_m)$ such that $\gamma J(\mathscr{A}, \Pi_M) = d$. Write $\gamma = \sum_m \beta_m$, $\beta_m \in J(\mathscr{A}, X_m)$ and $\beta_m \neq 0$ only finitely many times. Each $\beta_m = \sum_i u_{i,m} d_{i,m}$, $u_{i,m} \in U(\mathscr{A})$ where the second subscript indicates that d belongs to the mth direct summand. Then, we easily see that $d = \gamma J(\mathscr{A}, \Pi_M) = (\sum_i \bar{d}_i)\circ f$ where $x_i f = \sum_m m u_{i,m}$.

LEMMA 4. *If $0 \longrightarrow M' \xrightarrow{\chi} M \xrightarrow{\sigma} M'' \longrightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules, J an inner derivation functor generated by $\{d_i\}_1^k$, then the sequence*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M') &\longrightarrow H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) \longrightarrow H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'') \\ \longrightarrow H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M') &\longrightarrow H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M) \longrightarrow H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M'') \end{aligned}$$

is exact.

Proof. We have already seen exactness through $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M)$.

Exactness at $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'')$.

Let $f \in H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) = \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M)$, $fH^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, \sigma) = f\sigma \in H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'')$. Then $(fH^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, \sigma))\delta^0 = (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ f + J(\mathscr{A}, M')$. But since $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M)$, $f/Y = 0$ and, therefore, $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ f = 0$. Then $H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)\delta^0 = 0$.

Next, let $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M'')$ and $f\delta^0 = 0$. This means that if $\bar{f} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M)$ is any lifting of f, as before, then

$(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ \bar{f} \in J(\mathscr{A}, M'\chi)$. Hence, there is $\tilde{f} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M')$ such that $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ \tilde{f}\chi = (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ \bar{f}$ by the previous lemma. Consider $\bar{f} - \tilde{f}\chi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M)$. We have $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ(\bar{f} - \tilde{f}\chi) = 0$; hence $Y(\bar{f} - \tilde{f}\chi) = 0$, and $(\bar{f} - \tilde{f}\chi) \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M) = H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M)$. Further $(\bar{f} - \tilde{f}\chi)H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, \sigma) = (\bar{f} - \tilde{f}\chi)\sigma = \bar{f}\sigma - \tilde{f}\chi\sigma = \bar{f}\sigma = f$. That is, $\bar{f} - \tilde{f}\chi$ is the required preimage.

Exactness at $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M')$.

Let $f \in H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'')$. Then $f\delta^0 \in D(\mathscr{A}, M')/J(\mathscr{A}, M')$ is gotten by restricting the image of some element of $J(\mathscr{A}, M)$ to M'. Hence $f\delta^0 H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, \chi) = 0$.

Let $d \in D(\mathscr{A}, M')$ be a representative of an element of $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M')$ with $(d + J(\mathscr{A}, M'))H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, \chi) = 0$. This means that $d\circ\chi \in J(\mathscr{A}, M)$. Hence, by the previous lemma, there exists $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M)$ such that $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ f = d\circ\chi$. Consider $f\sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M'')$. $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ f\sigma = d\circ\chi\sigma = 0$. Hence $Yf\sigma = 0$ and $f\sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_{\{d_i\}}, M'') = H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'')$. Clearly $(f\sigma)\delta^0 = d + J(\mathscr{A}, M')$.

Exactness at $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M)$.

Clearly $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, \chi)H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, \sigma) = 0$. Suppose $d \in D(\mathscr{A}, M)$ is a representative of an element of $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M)$ and $(d + J(\mathscr{A}, M'')H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, \sigma) = 0$. This means $d\circ\sigma \in J(\mathscr{A}, M'')$. Then there exists $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M'')$ such that $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ f = d\sigma$ and there exists $\bar{f} \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\sum_1^k \oplus X_i, M)$ such that $\bar{f}\sigma = f$. Consider $d - (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ\bar{f} \in D(\mathscr{A}, M)$. $(d - (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ\bar{f})D(\mathscr{A}, \sigma) = d\circ\sigma - (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ\bar{f}\sigma = d\sigma - (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ f = 0$. Hence $d - (\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ\bar{f}$ can be considered as an element of $D(\mathscr{A}, M')$ and, as such, $(d - \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i\circ\bar{f})D(\mathscr{A}, \chi) \in D(\mathscr{A}, M)$. But $(\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i)\circ\bar{f} \in J(\mathscr{A}, M)$ and so $(d - \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i\circ\bar{f})D(\mathscr{A}, \chi) = d(J(\mathscr{A}, M))$. That is, $(d - \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i\circ\bar{f}) + J(\mathscr{A}, M') \in H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M')$ is the required preimage.

2. Exactness of the long sequence.

DEFINITION. For $n \geqq 2$, $\mathscr{A}$ a T-algebra, M a T-bimodule for $\mathscr{A}$, $H^n(\mathscr{A}, M)$ is the K-module of equivalence classes of singular extensions of length n of M by $\mathscr{A}$. Let

$$E = 0 \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{\chi} M_{n-2} \longrightarrow M_{n-3} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \mathscr{B} \longrightarrow \mathscr{A} \longrightarrow 0$$

be a representative of an element of $H^n(\mathscr{A}, M)$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(M, N)$. Then $EH^n(\mathscr{A}, \alpha) \in H^n(\mathscr{A}, N)$ is the equivalence class of the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow N_{n-2} \longrightarrow M_{n-3} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \mathscr{B} \longrightarrow \mathscr{A} \longrightarrow 0$$

where $N_{n-2} = R_1/R_2$; $R_1 = N \oplus M_{n-2}$, R_2 is the submodule of R_1 generated by $\{(-m\alpha, m\chi)/m \in M\}$. Under these definitions $H^n(\mathscr{A}, \ )$ is a functor form $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules to K-modules. For further details see Gerstenhaber or Maclane.

Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be exact. We now adapt a method of Barr [1] to define a connecting homomorphism $\delta^n: H^n(\mathscr{A}, M'') \to H^{n+1}(\mathscr{A}, M')$, $n \geqq 2$, and $\delta^1: D(\mathscr{A}, M'') \to H^2(\mathscr{A}, M')$ and to show that the long sequence $0 \to D(\mathscr{A}, M') \to D(\mathscr{A}, M) \to D(\mathscr{A}, M'') \to H^2(\mathscr{A}, M') \to \cdots \to H^n(\mathscr{A}, M) \to H^n(\mathscr{A}, M'') \to H^{n+1}(\mathscr{A}, M') \to \cdots$ is exact. Note that we have dropped the subscript J from H^n because, for $n \geqq 2$, $H^n(\mathscr{A}, M)$ is independent of the inner derivation functor chosen.

DEFINITION. A long T-singular extension is called *generic* if it admits a morphism to any long T-singular extension.

LEMMA 5. *Generic extensions exist.*

Proof. See Barr [1] or Gerstenhaber [5].

Briefly the construction of a T-generic extension for $\mathscr{A}$ is as follows. Let $\overline{\mathscr{F}}$ be the free T-algebra on the set $\mathscr{A}$, $\bar{N}$ the kernel of the canonical projection $\overline{\mathscr{F}} \to \mathscr{A}$. Letting $\mathscr{F} = \overline{\mathscr{F}}/\bar{N}^2$, the sequence $0 \to N \to \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{A} \to 0$ is universal (or generic) for short singular extensions of $\mathscr{A}$. Let $X_i \to N$ be an $\mathscr{A}$-projective resolution of N. Then $X_i \to \mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathscr{A} \to 0$ is a generic extension of $\mathscr{A}$.

DEFINITION. If M is an $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule, $E(\mathscr{A}, M)$ is the *split null extension* of M *by* $\mathscr{A}$. It is the algebra on the K module $\mathscr{A} \oplus M$ with multiplication $(a_1, m_1)(a_2, m_2) = (a_1a_2, a_1m_2 - m_1a_2)$. The equivalence class of the sequence $0 \to M \to E(\mathscr{A}, M) \to \mathscr{A} \to 0$ is the 0 element of $H^2(\mathscr{A}, M)$.

A morphism $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(M, N)$ induces $E(\mathscr{A}, \alpha) \in \mathrm{Hom}_T(E(\mathscr{A}, M), E(\mathscr{A}, N))$, the algebra homorphisms, in the obvious fashion.

LEMMA 6. *If $\mathscr{F}$ is generic for the algebra $\mathscr{A}$, then $D(\mathscr{F},\ )$ is exact on $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules (regarded as $\mathscr{F}$-bimodules by pullback along $\tau: \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{A}$).*

Proof. We need only show that if $M \xrightarrow{\sigma} M'' \to 0$ is exact then $D(\mathscr{F}, M) \to D(\mathscr{F}, M'') \to 0$ is exact. Let $\pi: \overline{\mathscr{F}} \to \mathscr{F}$ be the canonical projection, $d'' \in D(\mathscr{F}, M'')$.

We write $\mathrm{Hom}_T(\ ,\ )$ to mean algebra homomorphisms. d'' induces $\tilde{d}'' \in \mathrm{Hom}_T(\mathscr{F}, E(\mathscr{A}, M''))$ defined by $f\tilde{d}'' = (f\tau, fd'')$ for $f \in \mathscr{F}$; and $\tilde{d}''$ induces $\bar{d}'' \in \mathrm{Hom}_T(\overline{\mathscr{F}}, E(\mathscr{A}, M'')$ defined by $\bar{d}'' = \pi\tilde{d}''$.

We have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \overline{\mathscr{F}} \\ & \swarrow^{\bar{d}} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \bar{d}''} \\ E(\mathscr{A}, M) & \xrightarrow[E(\mathscr{A},\,\sigma)]{} & E(\mathscr{A}, M'') \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where $\bar{d} \in \mathrm{Hom}_T(\overline{\mathscr{F}}, E(\mathscr{A}, M))$ exists by freeness of $\overline{\mathscr{F}}$. Since $(a, m)E(\mathscr{A}, \sigma) = (a, m\sigma)$ we must have $\bar{d}$ of the form $\bar{f}\bar{d} = (\bar{f}\pi\tau, m)$ for some $m \in M$. This implies that $\bar{d}$ is induced by a derivation $\tilde{d}: \overline{\mathscr{F}} \to M$, where M is regarded as an $\overline{\mathscr{F}}$-bimodule by pullback along $\pi\tau$. Since $(\bar{n}_1\bar{n}_2)\tilde{d} = (\bar{n}_1\pi\tau)\bar{n}_2 + \bar{n}_1(\bar{n}_2\pi\tau) = 0\bar{n}_2 + \bar{n}_1 0 = 0$, $\bar{N}^2 d = 0$. Hence $\tilde{d}$ induces $d \in D(\mathscr{F}, M)$ which is clearly the required preimage.

Suppose we have an $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule M with the sequence $X \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathscr{A} \to 0$ exact and $d \in D(\mathscr{F}, M)$. It is easy to verify that $\varepsilon \circ d \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X, M)$.

LEMMA 7. *If* $0 \to N \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathscr{A} \to 0$ *is generic for short singular extensions of* $\mathscr{A}$, *then for any* $\mathscr{A}$*-bimodule* M, $H^2(\mathscr{A}, M) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(N, M)/D(\mathscr{F}, M)D(\beta, M)$.

Proof. The preceeding remark shows that $D(\mathscr{F}, M)D(\beta, M) \subseteq \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(N, M)$. Let $f_2 \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(N, M)$. Let $\mathscr{B}$ be the T-algebra $E(\mathscr{F}, M)/G$, where M is an $\mathscr{F}$-bimodule by pullback along τ, G the ideal consisting of the elements $\{(-n\beta, nf_2)/n \in N\}$. It is easy to see that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \xrightarrow{\beta} & \mathscr{F} & \xrightarrow{\tau} & \mathscr{A} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_1} & & \| & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow[\chi]{} & \mathscr{C} & \xrightarrow[\sigma]{} & \mathscr{A} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

is exact and commutative, where for $g \in \mathscr{F}$, $gf_1 = (g, 0) + G$; for $m \in M$, $m\chi = (0, m) + G$; for $(g, m) + G \in \mathscr{B}$, $((g, m) + G)\sigma = g\tau$.

Conversely, for any short singular extension $0 \to M \xrightarrow{\chi} \mathscr{B} \xrightarrow{\sigma} \mathscr{A} \to 0$, since $0 \to N \xrightarrow{\beta} \mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathscr{A} \to 0$ is generic, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{A} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_1} & & \| & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow[\chi]{} & \mathscr{B} & \xrightarrow[\sigma]{} & \mathscr{A} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where f_1 is an algebra morphism, f_2 is an $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule morphism.

Suppose $f_1': \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{B}$, $f_2': N \to M$ also yield a commutative diagram. Let $f = f_1 - f_1'$. Since $f_1\sigma = f_1'\sigma = \tau$, $f\sigma = 0$ and f is a K-linear map into M. Let $x_1, x_2 \in \mathscr{F}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(x_1x_2)f &= (x_1f_1)(x_2f_1) - (x_1f_1')(x_2f_1')\\ &= (x_1f_1)(x_2f_1) - (x_1f_1)(x_2f_1') + (x_1f_1)(x_2f_1') - (x_1f_1')(x_2f_1')\\ &= (x_1f_1)(x_2f) + (x_1f)(x_2f_1')\\ &= x_1(x_2f) + (x_1f)x_2\end{aligned}$$

regarding M as an $\mathscr{F}$-bimodule by pullback along τ. Hence $f = f_1 - f_1' \in D(\mathscr{F}, M)$ and so

$$H^2(\mathscr{A}, M) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(N, M)/D(\mathscr{F}, M)D(\beta, M) .$$

LEMMA 8. *If* $X \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathscr{A} \to 0$ *is exact, then* $\ker(D(\varepsilon, M)\colon D(\mathscr{F}, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X, M)) = D(\mathscr{A}, M)$.

Proof. We have $X \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathscr{A} \to 0$ with $\mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{d} M$, $d \in \ker(D\mathscr{F}, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X, M))$. Hence $\mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X, M)$ is 0. Then says (image ε) $d = 0$. By exactness $\ker(\tau)d = 0$. Then for $g \in \mathscr{F}$, $(g + \ker\tau)\,\bar{d} = gd$ is a well-defined derivation from $\mathscr{A}$ to M and is the required one.

Let $X_i \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathscr{F} \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathscr{A} \to 0$ be a generic resolution of $\mathscr{A}$. Define $\bar{H}^i(\mathscr{A}, M)$ to be the i-th cohomology module of the complex $0 \to D(\mathscr{A}, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_1, M) \to \cdots \to \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_k, M) \to$.

LEMMA 9. $\bar{H}^0(\mathscr{A}, M) \simeq D(\mathscr{A}, M)$; $\bar{H}^n(\mathscr{A}, M) \simeq H^{n+1}(\mathscr{A}, M)$, $n \geqq 1$.

Proof. $\bar{H}^0(\mathscr{A}, M) = \ker(D(\mathscr{F}, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_1, M)) \simeq D(\mathscr{A}, M)$ by Lemma 8. $\bar{H}^1(\mathscr{A}, M) = \ker(\mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_1, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_2, M))/D(\mathscr{F}, M)D(\varepsilon, M) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(N, M)/D(\mathscr{F}, M)D(\beta, M)$, since $X_2 \to X_1 \to N \to 0$ is exact and $\mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(\ \ , M)$ is left exact, $\simeq H^2(\mathscr{A}, M)$ by Lemma 7.

For $n \geqq 2$, let $0 \to M \to P_{n-1} \to \cdots \to P_1 \to \mathscr{B} \to \mathscr{A} \to 0$ be a singular extension of length $n + 1$ and let $C = \ker(\mathscr{B} \to \mathscr{A})$. Since $0 \to N \to \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{A} \to 0$ is generic, we can fill in

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{F} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{A} & \longrightarrow & 0\\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \bar{f}_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \bar{f}_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle =} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{B} & \longrightarrow & \mathscr{A} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

to a commutative diagram with $\bar{f}_1$ a morphism of algebras, $\bar{f}_2$ of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules; and, since $X_2 \to N \to 0$ is a projective resolution, we can fill in

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\partial} & X_n & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & X_1 & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} & N & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_n} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f_2} & & \\
 & 0 \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow & P_1 & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

to a commutative diagram with $0 = \partial f_n \colon X_{n+1} \to M$. Then f_n is a cocycle and the coset of f_n is in $H^n(\mathscr{A}, M)$. A straighforward application of the Chain Comparison Theorem shows that f_n is unique up to cohomology class.

LEMMA 10. *Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be exact. Then there are natural homomorphisms, δ^n, so that the long sequence*

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\longrightarrow D(\mathscr{A}, M') \longrightarrow D(\mathscr{A}, M) \longrightarrow D(\mathscr{A}, M'') \xrightarrow{\delta^1} H^2(\mathscr{A}, M') \\
&\longrightarrow H^2(\mathscr{A}, M) \longrightarrow H^2(\mathscr{A}, M'') \xrightarrow{\delta^2} H^3(\mathscr{A}, M') \longrightarrow \cdots \\
&\longrightarrow H^n(\mathscr{A}, M'') \xrightarrow{\delta^n} H^{n+1}(\mathscr{A}, M') \longrightarrow \cdots
\end{aligned}$$

is exact.

Proof. Taking a generic resolution $X_i \to \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{A} \to 0$, we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & D(\mathscr{F}, M') & \longrightarrow & D(\mathscr{F}, M) & \longrightarrow & D(\mathscr{F}, M'') & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & | & & | & & | & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_1, M') & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_1, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_1, M'') & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_n, M') & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_n, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X_n, M'') & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & &
\end{array}$$

where the second row is exact by Lemma 6, the others since the X_i are projective. By Lemma 9, the long exact sequence corresponding to this is as asserted.

THEOREM 3. *Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be exact, J an inner derivation functor generated by $\{d_i\}_1^{k<\infty}$. Then the long sequence*

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\longrightarrow H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M') \longrightarrow H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) \longrightarrow H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M'') \\
&\xrightarrow{\delta^0} H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M') \longrightarrow H^0_J(\mathscr{A}, M) \longrightarrow H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M'') \longrightarrow H^2(\mathscr{A}, M') \\
&\longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow H^n(\mathscr{A}, M'') \xrightarrow{\delta^n} H^{n+1}(\mathscr{A}, M') \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow
\end{aligned}$$

is exact.

Proof. We have already seen the exactness of $0 \to H^0_{J,\{d_i\}}(\mathscr{A}, M') \to \cdots \to H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M'')$. Note that the maps $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M') = D(\mathscr{A}, M')/J(\mathscr{A}, M') \to D(\mathscr{A}, M)/J(\mathscr{A}, M) = H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M)$, and $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M) \to H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M'')$ are induced by $D(\mathscr{A}, M') \to D(\mathscr{A}, M)$, $D(\mathscr{A}, M) \to D(\mathscr{A}, M'')$ respectively.

Since $J(\mathscr{A},\ )$ is epimorphism preserving, $J(\mathscr{A}, M'')$ is in image $(D(\mathscr{A}, M) \to D(\mathscr{A}, M''))$, and since $D(\mathscr{A}, M) \to D(\mathscr{A}, M'') \xrightarrow{\delta^1} H^2(\mathscr{A}, M)$ is exact, δ^1 induces δ^1: $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M'') = D(\mathscr{A}, M'')/J(\mathscr{A}, M'') \to H^2(\mathscr{A}, M)$, the kernel of which is image $(D(\mathscr{A}, M)/J(\mathscr{A}, M) \to D(\mathscr{A}, M'')/J(\mathscr{A}, M''))$. Combining, $0 \to \cdots \to H^1_J(A, M'')$ has been shown exact, $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M) \to H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M'') \xrightarrow{\delta^1} H^2(\mathscr{A}, M')$ is exact by the previous remarks, and $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M'') \xrightarrow{\delta^1} H^2(\mathscr{A}, M') \to H^2(\mathscr{A}, M) \to \cdots$ is exact by Lemma 10. This proves the theorem.

3. Extensions. We briefly indicate extensions of previous theory to other cases of interest. First the relative (K-split) theory. The zeroth and first cohomology modules are as before. $H^n(\mathscr{A}, M)$, $n \geqq 2$, is defined as the K-module of equivalence classes of K-split extensions of length n. Once we note that a split generic resolution always exists, the previous theorems are easily seen to hold with this new definition of the cohomology modules. For a T-algebra, let $\overline{\mathscr{F}_K}$ be a free T-algebra on the module $\mathscr{A}$ (rather than on the set $\mathscr{A}$), $\bar{N}_K$ the kernel of $\overline{\mathscr{F}_K} \to \mathscr{A} \to 0$, the canonical projection. Then, with $N_K = \bar{N}_K/\bar{N}^2_K$, $\mathscr{F}_k = \overline{\mathscr{F}_K}/\bar{N}^2_K$, $0 \to N_K \to \mathscr{F}_K \to \mathscr{A} \to 0$ is generic for short singular K-split extensions of $\mathscr{A}$.

We next consider unital cohomology. Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a T-algebra with unit $1_{\mathscr{A}}$. The algebra $U_1(\mathscr{A}) = U(\mathscr{A})/[1^\lambda_{\mathscr{A}} - 1_{U(\mathscr{A})}, 1^\rho_{\mathscr{A}} - 1_{U(\mathscr{A})}]$ is the unital universal T-multiplication envelope for $\mathscr{A}$. It has the property that any unital T-bimodule for $\mathscr{A}$, M, is a unital right $U_1(\mathscr{A})$ module and conversely. Then instead of working in the category of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules, we may work in the category of unital $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules. After showing a correspondance between inner derivation functors in this category and left $U_1(\mathscr{A})$-submodules of $D(\mathscr{A}, U_1(\mathscr{A}))$, all of the previous constructions and results go through without change.

The following discussion of cohomology of algebras with involution will find application in Glassman [7], in the cohomology of Jordan algebras. If $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ is a T-algebra with involution (automorphism of period 2), then (M, σ) is an $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ bimodule if $E(\mathscr{A}, M)$ is an algebra with involution (automorphism of period 2) under the map $(a, 0)\sigma = (a\sigma, 0)$, $(0, m)\sigma = (0, m\sigma)$. Morphisms of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules with involution are just morphisms of $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules which, in addition, commute with the involution.

The universal envelope with involution (automorphism of period

2) for $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ is the associative algebra $U(\mathscr{A}) \oplus U(\mathscr{A})\bar{\sigma}$ with multiplication $\bar{\sigma}^2 = 1$, $\bar{\sigma}a^\lambda = (a\sigma)^\rho\bar{\sigma}$, $\bar{\sigma}a^\rho = (a\sigma)^\lambda\bar{\sigma}$ $(\bar{\sigma}a^\lambda = (a\sigma)^\lambda\bar{\sigma}$, $\bar{\sigma}a^\rho = (\bar{\sigma}a)^\rho\bar{\sigma})$. $U(\mathscr{A}) \oplus U(\mathscr{A})\bar{\sigma} = (U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ has the property that any $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule with involution (automorphism of period 2), (M, σ), is a right unital $(U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$-module and conversely; and $(U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ is the free $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$-bimodule with involution (automorphism of period 2) on one generator. We define $D((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma)) = [d \in D(\mathscr{A}, M)/\sigma \circ d = d \circ \sigma]$. We define an inner derivation functor as an epimorphism preserving subfunctor of $D((\mathscr{A}, \sigma),\ \ )$ and, again, show correspondance between inner derivation functors and right $U(\mathscr{A}, \bar{\sigma})$ submodules of $D((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma}))$.

The previous constructions and theorems follow without change, now working in the category of modules with involution (automorphism of period 2). However, the involution (automorphism of period 2) allows a refinement in the choice of H^0 which we will now describe.

Write $(X(x), \bar{\sigma})$, the free bimodule with involution on one generator. By X we will mean $(X, \bar{\sigma})$ considered without its involution. X is free on two generators, x and $x\bar{\sigma}$. Suppose that J is an inner derivation functor with the property $[\mathscr{A} J((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (X, \bar{\sigma}))] \subseteqq F \subseteqq X$. Here J is generated by $\{d_i\}_1^k$, $[\mathscr{A} J((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (X, \bar{\sigma})]$ is the submodule generated by the image of $\mathscr{A}$ under all inner derivations, F is a free $U(\mathscr{A})$ submodule of X on one generator which is closed under $\bar{\sigma}/F$. Then letting $[\mathscr{A} \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i, \bar{\sigma}]$ be the submodule with involution (automorphism of period 2) generated by $\mathscr{A} \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i$, we define $C^F_{J,\{d_i\}} = \sum_1^k \oplus (F, \bar{\sigma}/F)/[\mathscr{A} \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i, \bar{\sigma}]$ and get a long exact sequence as before.

Of particular interest are the cases where F is generated by $x - x\bar{\sigma}$, or $x + x\bar{\sigma}$. Consider the former. $\mathrm{Hom}_{(U(\mathscr{A}),\bar{\sigma})}((C^F_{J,\{d_i\}}, \bar{\sigma}), (M, \sigma)) = \mathrm{Hom}_{(U(\mathscr{A}),\bar{\sigma})}(\sum_1^k \oplus (F, \bar{\sigma}/F)/[(\mathscr{A} \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i, \bar{\sigma}), (M, \sigma)) \simeq \{(m_1, \cdots, m_k)/m_i \in M$, m_i skew and $\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i \circ \tilde{f}_{m_i} = 0\}$, where $(x - x\bar{\sigma})\tilde{f}_{m_i} = m_i$, $\simeq \{m_1 - m_1\sigma, \cdots, m_k - m_k\sigma)/m_i \in M, \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i \circ \tilde{f}_{m_i - m_i}\sigma = 0\}$. On the other hand $\mathrm{Hom}_{(U(\mathscr{A}),\bar{\sigma})}(C_{J,\{d_i\}}, (M, \sigma)) \simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{(U(\mathscr{A}),\bar{\sigma})}(\sum_1^k \oplus (X, \bar{\sigma})/[(\mathscr{A} \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i, \bar{\sigma}), (M, \sigma)) \simeq \{m_1, \cdots, m_k)/ \sum_1^k \bar{d}_i \circ f_{m_i} = 0\}$, where $x_i f_{m_i} = m_i$, $\simeq \{(m_1, \cdots, m_k)/\sum_1^k \bar{d}_i \circ \tilde{f}_{m_i - m_i}\sigma = 0\}$.

Thus, by using $C^{[x - x\bar{\sigma}]}$ we have limited consideration to the skew elements of M. In the general case, F will be generated by an element y such that $y\bar{\sigma} = yu$, $u \in U(\mathscr{A})$ invertible. So, by using $C^{[y]}$, we will limit consideration to k-tuples (m_i) where $m_i\sigma = m_i u$.

4. Comparison with known theories.

Maximal and minimal inner derivation functor. Let J be the inner derivation functor corresponding to the 0 submodule of $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$. It is clear that $J(\mathscr{A}, M) = 0$ for all $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules M. Since ϕ, the empty set, generates J, we have $C_\phi = 0$ and $H^0_{J,\phi}(\mathscr{A}, M) = \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(C_\phi, M) = 0$. Also $H^1_J(\mathscr{A}, M) = D(\mathscr{A}, M)/J(\mathscr{A}, M) = D(\mathscr{A}, M)$. Then, given an exact sequence $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$, the sequence of cohomology modules is $0 \to D(\mathscr{A}, M') \to D(\mathscr{A}, M) \to D(\mathscr{A}, M'') \to H^2(\mathscr{A}, M') \to \cdots \to$. This is the minimal inner derivation functor and has been discussed, for the commutative associative case, by Barr [1].

If J corresponds to the submodule $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$ of $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$, we call J the maximal inner derivation functor.

The classical inner derivation functor.

DEFINITION. If $\mathscr{A}$ is a T-algebra, the *Lie transformation algebra of* $\mathscr{A}$ is the Lie algebra generated by $\{a_R, a_L / a \in \mathscr{A}\}$, the collection of right and left multiplications of $\mathscr{A}$ by elements of $\mathscr{A}$. We denote this $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{A})$.

Write $X(x) = U(\mathscr{A})$, the free right $U(\mathscr{A})$ module on one generator. Then, as elements of $E(\mathscr{A}, X)$, the product of two elements of X is 0. Thus, we see that a non-zero element of $\mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, X))$ mapping $\mathscr{A} \to X$ must have the form $\sum_i p_i$ where p_i is of the form $[a_{1_{s_1}}[\cdots[a_{r_{s_r}}(xu)_s]\cdots]$. Here $a_j \in \mathscr{A}$, $u \in U(\mathscr{A})$, s_j, $s = L$ or R. If $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X, X)$ $[a_{1_{s_1}}[\cdots[a_{r_{s_r}}(xu)_s]\circ f = [a_{1_{s_1}}[\cdots[a_{r_{s_r}}(xfu)_s]\cdots]$. Hence $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A})) \cap \mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A})))$ is a left sub-$U(\mathscr{A})$-module of $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A}))$.

DEFINITION. The *classical inner derivation functor I* is the inner derivation functor corresponding to $D(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A})) \cap \mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, U(\mathscr{A})))$.

a. *Classical unital associative cohomology.* Let $\mathscr{A}$ be associative with unit, $U_1(\mathscr{A}) = \mathscr{A} \otimes \mathscr{A}^0$, the unital universal enveloping algebra. Schafer has shown that a derivation $d: \mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{A}$ is in $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{A})$ if and only if it has the form $a_R - a_L$, $a \in \mathscr{A}$. From this it is clear that if M is an $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule, a derivation from $\mathscr{A}$ to M is in $\mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, M))$ if and only if it has the form $m_R - m_L$, $m \in M$.

Writing $X(x) = U_1(\mathscr{A})$, the free unital $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule on one generator, $d \in I(\mathscr{A}, X)$ if and only if $d = (xu)_R - (xu)_L$, $u \in U_1(\mathscr{A})$. But then $d = (x_R - x_L)\circ f_u$, where $f_u \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U_1(\mathscr{A})}(X, X)$ takes $x \to xu$. Thus, the set $\{x_R - x_L\}$ generates I. If Y is the $U_1(\mathscr{A})$-submodule of X generated by $\mathscr{A}(x_R - x_L) = \{ax - xa / a \in \mathscr{A}\}$, then $C_{\{x_R - x_L\}} = X/Y = X/[ax - xa] \simeq \mathscr{A}$ (as $\mathscr{A}$-bimodules) under the map $axb \to ab$. So we have $H^0_{I,\{x_R - x_L\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) = \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathscr{A}\otimes\mathscr{A}^0}(\mathscr{A}, M)$ and $H^0_{I,\{x_R - x_L\}}(\mathscr{A}, M) = [m \in M / am - ma = 0 \text{ for all } a \in \mathscr{A}\}]$.

The Hochschild relative cohomology groups for an associative algebra with 1 are defined by $\tilde{H}^n(\mathscr{A}, M) = \mathrm{Ext}^n_{(\mathscr{A}\otimes\mathscr{A}^0, K)}(\mathscr{A}, M)$. It is well-known that $\tilde{H}^0(\mathscr{A}, M) \cong [m \in M / am - ma = 0 \text{ for all } a \in \mathscr{A}] = H^0_{I,\{x_R - x_L\}}(\mathscr{A}, M)$; $\tilde{H}^1(\mathscr{A}, M) = D(\mathscr{A}, M)/I(\mathscr{A}, M) = H^1(\mathscr{A}, M)$; $H^2(\mathscr{A}, M) =$ the K module of equivalence classes of split short singular extensions of M by $\mathscr{A} = H_K^2(\mathscr{A}, M)$. Since $\tilde{H}^n$ and H^n both vanish on relative injectives for $n \geqq 2$, we have

THEOREM 4. *If $\mathscr{A}$ is associative with* 1, *Hochschild cohomology agrees with unital classical split cohomology.*

b. *Classical unital associative cohomology with involution.* Let $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ be an associative algebra with unit and involution over a commutative ring K with unit and 2^{-1}, $(U_1(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ the universal unital enveloping algebra with involution for $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$, $(X(x), \bar{\sigma}) \simeq (U_1(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ the free unital $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule with involution on one generator.

Let (M, σ) be a bimodule with involution for $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$. We have defined $D((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma)) = \{d \in D(\mathscr{A}, M)/\sigma \circ d = d \circ \sigma\}$ and have noted that $d \in I(\mathscr{A}, M) = D(\mathscr{A}, M) \cap \mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, M))$ if and only if $d = m_R - m_L$, $m \in M$.

LEMMA 11. *$d \in I(\mathscr{A}, M)$ satisfies $\sigma \circ d = d \circ \sigma$ if and* only if $d = m_R - m_L$ with m skew in M.

Proof. Suppose $m \in M$, $m\sigma = -m$. Let $a \in \mathscr{A}$. Then $(am - ma)\sigma = m\sigma(a\sigma) - a\sigma(m\sigma) = -m(a\sigma) + (a\sigma)m = (a\sigma)m - m(a\sigma)$. Conversely, suppose $m \in M$, and $m_R - m_L$ commutes with σ. This is equivalent to the operator identity $\sigma m_R - \sigma m_L = \sigma(m\sigma)_L - \sigma(m\sigma)_R$. Since σ is onto, we may rewrite this $(m_R + m\sigma_R) = (m_L + m\sigma_L)$ or $(m + m\sigma)_R = (m + m\sigma)_L$. Writing $m = \frac{1}{2}(m + m\sigma) + \frac{1}{2}(m - m\sigma)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_R - m_L &= \tfrac{1}{2}(m + m\sigma)_R - \tfrac{1}{2}(m + m\sigma)_L + \tfrac{1}{2}(m - m\sigma)_R - \tfrac{1}{2}(m - m\sigma)_L \\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}(m - m\sigma)_R - \tfrac{1}{2}(m - m\sigma)_L \,. \end{aligned}$$

But $m - m\sigma$ is skew.

With $(X(x), \bar{\sigma}) \simeq (U_1(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$, the free unital bimodule with involution on one generator, we define the classical inner derivation functor $I((\mathscr{A}, \sigma),\ )$ to be the one generated by $D((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (X, \bar{\sigma})) \cap \mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, X))$. From the previous lemma we see that $d \in I((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (X, \bar{\sigma}))$ if and only if $d = (xu - (xu)\bar{\sigma})_R - (xu - (xu)\bar{\sigma})_L$, $u \in (U_1(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$. But then $d = ((x - x\bar{\sigma})_R - (x - x\bar{\sigma}_L) \circ f_u$, where $f_u \in \mathrm{Hom}_{(U_1(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})}((X, \bar{\sigma}), X, \bar{\sigma}))$ takes $x \to xu$.

Writing $x = x - \bar{\sigma}$, I is generated by $\tilde{x}_R - \tilde{x}_L$. Noting that $\tilde{x}$ generates a free submodule F of X and recalling the previous discussion of cohomology of algebras with involution, we define $(C^F_{I, \{x_R - x_L\}}, \bar{\sigma}) = (F, \bar{\sigma}/F)/[\mathscr{A}(x_R - x_L), \bar{\sigma}]$ and find $\mathrm{Hom}_{(U_1(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})}((C^F_{I, \{x_R - x_L\}}, \bar{\sigma}), (M, \sigma)) = [m \in M/m$ skew and $am - ma = 0$ for all $a \in \mathscr{A}]$.

We note that $(\mathscr{A}, -\sigma)$ is also a bimodule (but not an algebra) with involution. The map taking $\tilde{x} - 1_{\mathscr{A}}$ defines an isomorphism

$(C^F_{I,\{x_R - x_L\}}, \bar{\sigma}) \simeq (\mathscr{A}, \text{-}\sigma)$. Harris [8] has constructed an explicit $(U_1(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ K-split projective resolution of $(\mathscr{A}, -\sigma)$, $X_n \rightarrow (\mathscr{A}, -\sigma)$. He has shown that $\mathrm{Hom}_{(U_1(\mathscr{A}),\bar{\sigma})}((X_n, M, \sigma))$ is isomorphic to the space of n-linear functions $g\colon \mathscr{A} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathscr{A} \rightarrow M$ such that $(a_1, \cdots, a_n)g\sigma = \omega_n(a_n\sigma, \cdots, a_1\sigma)g$, $\omega_n = (-1)^{1/2}(n-1)(n-1)(n-2)$. We have already seen that $\mathrm{Hom}_{(U_1(\mathscr{A}),\bar{\sigma})}((\mathscr{A}, -\sigma), (M, \sigma)) \cong [m \in M/am - ma = 0$ for all $a \in \mathscr{A}$, m skew$]$. We will now show correspondances between certain linear maps and cocycles and coboundaries. Following standard notation, we write these on the left. Harris shows that 1-cocycles are linear functions $g\colon \mathscr{A} \rightarrow M$ such that $g(ab) = ag(b) + g(a)b$ and $g(a\sigma) = g(a)\sigma$ for all a, b in $\mathscr{A}$; i.e., these are derivations commuting with involution. 1-coboundaries are functions $g\colon a \rightarrow am - ma$ such that $g \circ \sigma = \sigma \circ g$. By Lemma 11, these are just $\{m_R - m_L/m$ skew in $M\}$. Hence $\mathrm{Ext}^1_{(U_1\mathscr{A}),\bar{\sigma})}((\mathscr{A}, -\sigma), (M, \sigma)) = D((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma))/I((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma)) = H^1_I((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma))$.

2-cocycles are bilinear functions $g\colon \mathscr{A} \otimes \mathscr{A} \rightarrow M$ with $a_1g(a_2, a_3) - g(a_1a_2, a_3) + g(a_1, a_2a_3) - g(a_1, a_2)a_3 = 0$ for all $a_i \in \mathscr{A}$, and $g(a_1, a_2)\sigma = g(a_2\sigma, a_1\sigma)$.

Now let K be a field characteristic $\neq 2$,

$$0 \longrightarrow (M, \sigma) \longrightarrow (\mathscr{B}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\ \tau\ } (\mathscr{A}, \sigma) \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short singular extension of associative algebras with involution. We can choose a linear splitting δ for $(\mathscr{B}, \sigma) \xrightarrow{\ \tau\ } (\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ that respects involution. For this, choose a basis for $\mathscr{A}$, say $\{a_1, \cdots, a_n\}$. Choose $b_1 \in \mathscr{B}$ such that $b_1\tau = a_1$. Define

$$a_1\delta = \begin{cases} b_1 \text{ if } a_1 \notin Ka_1 \\ \left(\dfrac{1}{k+1}\right)(b_1 + kb_1\sigma) \text{ if } a_1\sigma = ka_1, \text{ and } -1 \neq k \in K \\ \frac{1}{2}(b_1 - b_1\sigma) \text{ if } a_1\sigma = -a_1 \,. \end{cases}$$

Since $k^2 = 1$, we can define $a_1\sigma\delta = a_1\delta\sigma$.

Suppose $a_1\delta, \cdots, a_r\delta, a_1\sigma\delta, \cdots, a_r\sigma\delta$ have been defined so that δ commutes with involution on $[a_1, \cdots, a_r, a_1\sigma, \cdots, a_r\sigma]$. Suppose a_{r+1} is the first $a_i \notin [a_1, \cdots, a_r\sigma]$. Then we can choose as above and continue inductively.

Let δ be so chosen and write $h(a, b) = a\delta b\delta - (ab)\delta \in M$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} h(a, b)\sigma &= ((a\delta b\delta) - (ab)\delta)\sigma \\ &= b\delta\sigma a\delta\sigma - (ab)\delta\sigma = b\sigma\delta a\sigma\delta - (ab)\sigma\delta \\ &= b\sigma\delta a\sigma\delta - (b\sigma a\sigma)\delta = h(h\sigma, a\sigma) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we can associate a 2-cocycle to each singular extension of M by $\mathscr{A}$. Suppose we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & (M, \sigma) & \longrightarrow & (\mathscr{B}, \sigma) & \longrightarrow & (\mathscr{A}, \sigma) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \| & & \downarrow & & \| & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & (M, \sigma) & \longrightarrow & (\mathscr{B}, \sigma) & \longrightarrow & (\mathscr{A}, \sigma) & \longrightarrow & 0 \, .
\end{array}$$

Then $(m, a)\alpha = (m + h(a), a)$ where h is a 2-coboundary. But since α commutes with involution $(m, a)\alpha\sigma = (m+h(a), a)\sigma = (m\sigma + h(a)\sigma, a\sigma)$. Also $(m, a)\alpha\sigma = (m\sigma, a\sigma)\alpha = (m\sigma + h(a\sigma), a\sigma)$. Hence $h(a)\sigma = h(a\sigma)$. Since Harris's cohomology modules clearly vanish on relative injectives for $n \geqq 2$ as do the classical ones we have

THEOREM 5. *If $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ is associative with unit over a commutative ring with 2^{-1}, then Harris's 0-th and 1-st cohomology modules are classical; if K is a field of characteristic $\neq 2$, $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ an algebra over K, Harris's modules are classical for all $n \geqq 0$.*

c. *Classical Lie cohomology.* Let $\mathscr{A}$ be a Lie algebra over a commutative ring with unit K, M a Lie bimodule for $\mathscr{A}$. We denote multiplication in $\mathscr{A}$ by brackets and multiplication of M by $\mathscr{A}$ by juxtaposition. Schafer has shown that a derivation from $\mathscr{A} \to \mathscr{A}$ is in $\mathscr{L}(\mathscr{A})$ if and only if it is of the form a_L, $a \in \mathscr{A}$. From this it is clear that a derivation from $\mathscr{A}$ to M is in $\mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, M))$ if and only if it has the form m_L, $m \in M$.

Writing $X(x) \simeq U(\mathscr{A})$, the free $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule on one generator, $d \in I(\mathscr{A}, X)$ if and only if $d = (xu)_L$, $u \in U(\mathscr{A})$. But then $d = x_L \circ f_u$, where $f_u \in \mathrm{Hom}_{U(\mathscr{A})}(X, X)$ takes $x \to xu$. Thus the set $\{x_L\}$ generates I. If Y is the $U(\mathscr{A})$ submodule of X generated by $\mathscr{A} x_L$, then $C_{I, \{x_L\}} = X/Y$. Even over a ring, the Poincare-Birkhoff-Witt theorem shows that $U(\mathscr{A})$ is linearly generated by monomials in the generators for $\mathscr{A}$ and $1_{U(\mathscr{A})}$, and that there is an augmentation $U(\mathscr{A}) \,\varepsilon\, K 1_{U(\mathscr{A})}$. Then $X/Y \simeq K$, K regarded as an $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule by pullback along ε.

To compute the modules $\mathrm{Ext}^n_{(U(\mathscr{A}), K)}(K, M)$, the Koszul resolution may be used, and as was the case for associative algebras, we have

THEOREM 6. *If $\mathscr{A}$ is Lie, $H^n_K(\mathscr{A}, M) \simeq \mathrm{Ext}^n_{(U(\mathscr{A}), K)}(K, M)$ for all $n \geqq 0$.*

d. *Classical Lie cohomology with automorphism of period* 2. In a later paper, this case will be used to discuss cohomology of Jordan algebras.

Let $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$ be a Lie algebra with automorphism of period 2 over a commutative ring K with unit and 2^{-1}, $(U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ the universal enveloping algebra with automorphism of period 2 for $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$, $(X(x), \bar{\sigma}) \simeq (U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ the free $\mathscr{A}$-bimodule with automorphism of period 2 on one generator x. Let (M, σ) be a bimodule with automorphism of period 2 for $(\mathscr{A}, \sigma)$. We have defined $D((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma)) = [d \in D(\mathscr{A}, M)/\sigma \circ d = d \circ \sigma]$ and have noted that $d \in I(\mathscr{A}, M) = D(\mathscr{A}, M) \cap \mathscr{L}(E(\mathscr{A}, M))$ if and only if $d = m_L$, $m \in M$.

LEMMA 12. *$d \in I(\mathscr{A}, M)$ satisfies $\sigma \circ d = d \circ \sigma$ if and only if $d = m_L$ with m symmetric in M.*

Proof. Suppose $m \in M$, $m\sigma = m$. Let $a \in \mathscr{A}$. Then $(ma)\sigma = m\sigma a\sigma = m(a\sigma)$. Conversely, suppose $m \in M$ is such that m_L commutes with σ. This is equivalent to the operator identity $\sigma(m\sigma)_L = \sigma(m_L)$. Since σ is onto, we may write this $(m\sigma)_L = m_L$. Writing $m = \frac{1}{2}(m + m\sigma) + \frac{1}{2}(m - m\sigma)$, $m_L = \frac{1}{2}(m+m\sigma)_L + \frac{1}{2}(m - m\sigma)_L = \frac{1}{2}(m + m\sigma)_L$. But $\frac{1}{2}(m + m\sigma)_L$ is symmetric.

This shows that $d \in I((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (X, \bar{\sigma}))$ if and only if $d = (xu + (xu)\bar{\sigma})_L$, $u \in (U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$. But then $d = (x + x\bar{\sigma})_L \circ f_u$ where $f_u \in \mathrm{Hom}_{(U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})}((X, \bar{\sigma}), (X, \bar{\sigma}))$ takes $x \to xu$. Thus, with $\tilde{x} = x + x\bar{\sigma}$, I is generated by $\{\tilde{x}_L\}$. Noting that x generates a free submodule F of X, F closed under $\bar{\sigma}$, we define $(C^F_{I,\{\tilde{x}_L\}}, \bar{\sigma}) = (F, \bar{\sigma}/F)/[\mathscr{A}(\tilde{x}_L), \bar{\sigma}]$ and find that $\mathrm{Hom}_{(U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})}((C^F_{I,\{\tilde{x}_L\}}, \bar{\sigma}), (M, \sigma)) = [m \in M/m$ symmetric and $ma = 0$ for all $a \in \mathscr{A}\}$. It is easy to see, as was done for $X/Y \simeq K$, that $C^F_{I,\{\tilde{x}_L\}}$ is isomorphic to $(K, 1)$, 1 denoting the identity automorphism, under the map $\tilde{x} \to 1$.

For K a field of characteristic $\neq 2$, Harris [9] has constructed a projective $(U(\mathscr{A}), \bar{\sigma})$ resolution of $(K, 1)$. Defining $\tilde{H}^n((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma))$ as the n-th cohomology of this complex. Harris has shown that $H^0((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma)) \cong [m \in M/m$ symmetric and $ma = 0$ for all $a \in \mathscr{A}] \simeq H^0_{I,\{\tilde{x}_L\}}((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma))$; $H^1((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma)) \cong$ the K-module generated by those derivations f from $\mathscr{A}$ to M such that $f(x\sigma) = f(x)\sigma$ modulo inner derivations of the form $f(a) = ma$ with m symmetric $\simeq H^1_I((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), M, \sigma))$; $H^2((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma)) \cong$ the K-module generated by those Lie 2-cocycles g such that $g(a\sigma, b\sigma) = g(a, b)\sigma$ for all a, b in $\mathscr{A}$ modulo those 2-coboundaries given by linear maps commuting with the automorphism σ, $\simeq H^2((\mathscr{A}, \sigma), (M, \sigma))$.

THEOREM 7. *If $\mathscr{A}$ is a Lie algebra over a field of characteristic $\neq 2$, $\mathscr{A}$ with automorphism of period 2, then its cohomology modules as defined by Harris are classical.*

e. *Classical unital commutative associative cohomology.* If $\mathscr{A}$ is commutative associative with 1, $U_1(\mathscr{A}) \simeq \mathscr{A}$ with $\lambda = \rho = 1: \mathscr{A} \to U_1(\mathscr{A})$. If M is a unital commutative associative bimodule for the associative algebra $\mathscr{A}$, $I(\mathscr{A}, M) = [m_R - m_L/m \in M]$. But since M is commutative $am = ma$ for all $a \in \mathscr{A}$, and $I(\mathscr{A}, M) = 0$. Thus, in this case, classical cohomology is minimal.

If K is a field, F a field extension of K regarded as a commutative associative algebra over K, then Gerstenhaber has shown that $H^2(F, F) = 0$ if and only if F is separable extension. But since F is certainly an injective F-bimodule, the case F not separable provides as example for which $H^2(F, \ )$ does not vanish on injectives.

THEOREM 5. *If $\mathscr{A}$ is a commutative associative algebra with* 1, *classical unital cohomology is minimal. If $F \supsetneqq K$ is a nonseparable field extension, there is no inner derivation functor J, no module C_J for which the right derived functors of* $\mathrm{Hom}_F(C_J, \ )$ *are* $\{H_J^n(F, \ )\}$.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. M. Barr, *A cohomology theory for commutative algebras*, I. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (1965), 1379-1384, II. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (1965), 1385-1391.
2. M. Barr and G. S. Rinehart, *Cohomology as the derived functor of derivations* (to appear)
3. H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg, *Homological algebra*, Princeton University Press, 1956.
4. J. Dixmier, *Homologie des anneaux de Lie*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm Sup. **74** (1957), 25-83.
5. M. Gerstenhaber, *A Uniform cohomology theory for algebras*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **52** (1964), 626-629.
6. ———, *On the deformations of rings and algebras*, Ann. of Math. **79** (1964), 59-103.
7. N. Glassman, *Cohomology of non-associative algebras II* (to appear, J. of Algebra).
8. B. Harris, *Derivations of Jordan algebras*, Pacific J. Math. **9** (1959), 495-512.
9. ———, *Cohomology of Lie triple systems and Lie algebras with involution*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **98** (1961), 148-162.
10. G. Hochschild, *Cohomology of restricted Lie algebras*, Amer. J. Math. **76** (1954), 555-580.
11. ———, *On the cohomology groups of an associative algebra*, Amer. J. Math. **46** (1945), 58-67.
12. ———, *On the cohomology theory for associative algebras*, Ann. of Math. **47** (1946), 568-579.
13. ———, *Cohomology and representations of associative algebras*, Duke Math. J. **14** (1947), 921-948.
14. ———, *Semi-simple algebras and generalized derivations*, Amer. J. Math. **64** (1942), 677-694.
15. N. Jacobson, *Lie algebras*, Interscience, 1962.
16. ———, *Jordan algebras* (to appear)
17. ———, *Derivation algebras and multiplication algebras of semisimple Jordan algebras*, Ann. of Math. **50**. (1949), 866-874.
18. A. Knopfmacher, *Universal envelopes for non-associative algebras*, Quart. J. Math., Oxford Ser. (12) **13** (1962), 264-282.
19. M. Koecher, *Embeddings of Jordan algebras in Lie algebras*, Yale Notes, 1966.
20. S. Maclane, Homology, Academic Press, 1963.
21. J. P. May, *The cohomology of restricted Lie algebras and of Hopf algebras*, J. of Algebra. **3** (1966), 123-146.
22. B. Mitchell, *The theory of categories*, Academic Press, 1965.

23. R. Schafer, *An introduction to non-associative algebras*, Academic Press, 1966.
24. ———, *Inner derivations of non-associative algebras*, Bull. Amer, Math, Soc. **55** (1949), 769-776.
25. U. Shukla, *Cohomologie des algebras associatives*, Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup. **78** (1961), 163-209.
26. C. Watts, *A characterization of additive functors*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **11** (1960), 5-11.

Received March 17, 1969.

YALE UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. The editorial "we" must not be used in the synopsis, and items of the bibliography should not be cited there unless absolutely necessary, in which case they must be identified by author and Journal, rather than by item number. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. **36**, 1539-1546. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints are provided free for each article; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is $8.00; single issues, $3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: $4.00 per volume; single issues $1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 7-17, Fujimi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

Vol. 33, No. 3 May, 1970

Charles A. Akemann, *Approximate units and maximal abelian C^*-subalgebras* 543
Gail Atneosen, *Wild points of cellular arcs in 2-complexes in E^3 and cellular hulls* 551
John Logan Bryant and De Witt Sumners, *On embeddings of 1-dimensional compacta in a hyperplane in E^4* 555
H. P. Dikshit, *On a class of Nörlund means and Fourier series* 559
Nancy Dykes, *Generalizations of realcompact spaces* 571
Hector O. Fattorini, *Extension and behavior at infinity of solutions of certain linear operational differential equations* 583
Neal David Glassman, *Cohomology of nonassociative algebras* 617
Neal Hart, *Ulm's theorem for Abelian groups modulo bounded groups* 635
Don Barker Hinton, *Continuous spectra of second-order differential operators* 641
Donald Gordon James, *On Witt's theorem for unimodular quadratic forms. II* 645
Melvin F. Janowitz, *Principal multiplicative lattices* 653
James Edgar Keesling, *On the equivalence of normality and compactness in hyperspaces* 657
Adalbert Kerber, *Zu einer Arbeit von J. L. Berggren über ambivalente Gruppen* 669
Keizō Kikuchi, *Various m-representative domains in several complex variables* 677
Jack W. Macki and James Stephen Muldowney, *The asymptotic behaviour of solutions to linear systems of ordinary differential equations* 693
Andy R. Magid, *Locally Galois algebras* 707
T. S. Ravisankar, *On differentiably simple algebras* 725
Joseph Gail Stampfli, *The norm of a derivation* 737
Francis C.Y. Tang, *On uniqueness of central decompositions of groups* 749
Robert Charles Thompson, *Some matrix factorization theorems. I* 763
Robert Charles Thompson, *Some matrix factorization theorems. II* 811