

## ON THE PRIMITIVITY OF THE GROUP ALGEBRA

ALAN ROSENBERG

Let  $G$  be a group and  $F$  a field of arbitrary characteristic. In [4] Kaplansky asks under what conditions is  $F[G]$  primitive, where  $F[G]$  is the group algebra of  $G$  over  $F$ . We give some necessary conditions on  $G$  that  $F[G]$  be primitive and propose a conjecture.

*Definition.* A ring  $R$  is primitive if it has a faithful irreducible right module.

The above should really be considered as a definition of right primitive. One can analogously define left primitive and the two properties are not equivalent. For our purposes, the two concepts are equivalent, for the group algebra possesses a nice involution.

If we assume that  $F[G]$  is primitive, there are some immediate restrictions on  $G$ . First of all  $G$  cannot be Abelian since the only primitive commutative rings are fields. (I exclude of course the case when  $G$  consists of one element.) Secondly, the group  $G$  cannot be finite since in that case the Density Theorem [2, Theorem 2.12] would imply that  $F[G]$  be simple, but the augmentation ideal belies that. (Again I exclude the trivial case.) Our first goals will be to strengthen these two results.

It is well known that a primitive ring is prime and [1, Theorem 8] tells us that  $F[G]$  is prime if and only if it has no nontrivial finite normal subgroups. This shows that if  $P$  is any property of  $G$  that makes  $F[G]$  primitive, that property is lost upon taking the direct product with  $\mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$ .

By the Density Theorem we know that if  $F[G]$  is primitive, there is a division ring  $\Delta$  such that for every integer  $m$  there is a subring  $S_m \subset F[G]$  and an epimorphism  $\alpha_m$  of  $S_m$  onto  $\Delta_m$ , the ring of  $m \times m$  matrices over  $\Delta$ . But by [2, Lemma 6.3.1],  $\Delta_m$  does not satisfy a polynomial identity of degree less than  $2m$ . Since  $m$  is arbitrary and any polynomial identity satisfied by  $F[G]$  would also be satisfied by any subring, we see that  $F[G]$  satisfies no polynomial identity. But it is easy to show that if  $[G:Z(G)] = n$ , where  $Z(G)$  is the centre of the group  $G$ , then  $F[G]$  would satisfy a standard polynomial identity. One can also see this from a result in [7, p. 443] which says that if  $[G:Z(G)] = n$  then its commutator subgroup is finite. Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 strengthen this result in two directions.

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $F[G]$  is primitive, then  $G$  has no Abelian subgroup of finite index.*

---

Received October 15, 1970, in revised form November 23, 1970, and again in revised form, January 14, 1971. The author is deeply indebted to Dr. Martha Smith for a very enlightening correspondence.

*Proof.* If  $G$  did have an Abelian subgroup  $H$  of finite index then it would have a normal Abelian subgroup,  $K$ , of finite index. For  $H$  must only have a finite number of conjugates and so we need only let  $K$  be the intersection of those conjugates. But then [5, Theorem 1] tells us that  $G$  satisfies the  $P_n$  condition for some integer  $n$ , i.e., for any  $n$  elements  $g_1, \dots, g_n$  of  $G$ , the  $n!/2$  products  $g_{i_1}g_{i_2} \dots g_{i_n}$  obtained from all even permutations is identical with the  $n!/2$  products obtained from the odd permutations. But the fact that  $G$  has property  $P_n$  is equivalent to the group ring  $F[G]$  (for  $F$  of characteristic 0) satisfying the standard polynomial identity

$$[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] = 0$$

Passman has pointed out that if  $[G:H] = n$ , then  $F[G]$  can be embedded in  $E_n$  where  $E$  is the commutative ring  $F[H]$  and so  $K[G]$  satisfies a standard polynomial identity, regardless of the characteristic of  $F$ . This completes the proof.

Again let us assume that  $F[G]$  is primitive. Then as a consequence of the definition there exists a maximal right ideal,  $\rho$ , of  $F[G]$  such that

$$(\rho:R) \equiv \{r \in R | Rr \subset \rho\} = 0.$$

Note that  $(\rho:R)$  is the largest two sided ideal contained in  $\rho$ . Let

$$H = \{\sigma \in G | \sigma\rho \subset \rho\}.$$

**THEOREM 2.** *H is a subgroup of G and  $[G:H] = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* First we show that  $H$  is a subgroup. Clearly if  $\sigma, \tau \in H$ , then  $\sigma\tau \in H$ . Now suppose  $\sigma \in H$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma\rho &\subseteq \rho \\ \rho &\subseteq \sigma^{-1}\rho. \end{aligned}$$

But  $\sigma^{-1}\rho$  is a right ideal and thus  $\rho = \sigma^{-1}\rho$ , by maximality of  $\rho$ .

Now if  $H$  is of finite index, group theory tells us that there exists a  $K \subset H$  with  $K$  normal of finite index. Let  $\{\psi_i\}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , be a set of left coset representatives of  $K$ . They will also be right coset representatives since  $K$  is normal. Let

$$A = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \psi_i\rho\psi_i^{-1}$$

$A$  is clearly a right ideal contained in  $\rho$ . I claim that it is also a left ideal; for suppose  $a \in A$  and  $\sigma \in G$  is such that  $\sigma a \notin A$ . Then we can write  $\sigma = k\psi_i$ ,  $k \in K$ , and  $\sigma a \notin \psi_j\rho\psi_j^{-1}$ , for some  $i, j$ . Since  $a \in A$ , we can also write  $a = \psi_i^{-1}\psi_j\rho\psi_j^{-1}\psi_i$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma a &= k\psi_i\psi_i^{-1}\psi_j\rho\psi_j^{-1}\psi_i = k\psi_j\rho\psi_j^{-1}\psi_i \\ &= k\psi_j\rho\psi_j^{-1}\psi_i\psi_j\psi_j^{-1} = k\psi_j\rho'\psi_j^{-1} \\ &= \psi_jk'\rho'\psi_j^{-1} = \psi_j\rho''\psi_j^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad \begin{aligned} k, k' &\in K \\ \rho, \rho', \rho'' &\in \rho. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $\sigma a \in \psi_j \rho \psi_j^{-1}$ . If now we could show that  $A \neq (0)$ , we would have a contradiction and we would be through, but the following result on group algebras, the proof of which was suggested by D. Passman supplies that result.

LEMMA. *If  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n$  are maximal right ideals of the group algebra,  $F[G]$ , and  $G$  is infinite, then  $\bigcap_{i=1}^n \rho_i \neq (0)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $(0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \rho_i$ . Then as  $F[G]$  modules

$$F[G] \subseteq \bigoplus \sum_{i=1}^n F[G]/\rho_i.$$

Since the module on the right is completely reducible, this implies that  $F[G]$  is completely reducible and hence, by a corollary in [1],  $G$  is finite. This completes the proof of the lemma, and the proof of Theorem 2.

Note that if  $H$  is of finite index in  $G$  and  $F[H]$  is primitive, we cannot conclude that  $F[G]$  is primitive, because the group algebra of the trivial group is primitive, being a field, but the group algebra of any other finite group cannot be primitive as we have seen. Is this the only exception? Theorem 3 is a partial answer to this question. The following result is attributed to Higman and a full proof appears in [6].

LEMMA. *Let  $G$  be a group and  $H$  a subgroup of finite index. If an exact sequence of  $F[G]$  modules splits as a sequence of  $F[H]$  modules, then it also splits as a sequence of  $F[G]$  modules.*

*Sketch of proof.* Since  $H$  contains a normal subgroup of finite index we may assume without loss of generality that  $H$  is normal, and the result follows by the usual Maschke averaging process.

THEOREM 3. *If  $[G:H] < \infty$  and  $F[H]$  is primitive and  $G$  has no nontrivial finite normal subgroups then  $F[G]$  is primitive.*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a faithful irreducible right  $F[H]$  module. Consider the right  $F[G]$  module

$$W = M \otimes_{F[H]} F[G].$$

Let  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a set of right coset representatives of  $H$  in  $G$ . Now  $F[G]$  is a free left  $F[H]$  module with  $\{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n$  as a basis; so

$$W = \sum M \otimes \sigma_i.$$

Now  $M$  can be made into a left  $F[H]$  module by

$$km = mk^* \quad m \in M, k \in F[H]$$

where  $*$  indicates the standard involution in the group algebra. It is easy to see that  $M$  is also faithful and irreducible on the left. Hence  $M \otimes \sigma_i$  is a left  $F[H]$  module. I claim that it is irreducible; for if  $Z$  is a nontrivial submodule of  $M \otimes \sigma_i$ ,

$$\bar{Z} = \{m \in M \mid m \otimes \sigma_i \in Z\}$$

can be seen to be a nontrivial proper submodule of  $M$ .

Hence  $W$  is completely reducible as a  $F[H]$  module. Therefore, if  $U$  is a  $F[G]$  submodule of  $W$ , we know that the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow W \rightarrow W/U \rightarrow 0$$

splits as a sequence of  $F[H]$  modules. But now, by the above lemma, it splits as a sequence of  $F[G]$  modules. Thus the lattice of  $F[G]$  submodules of  $W$  is complemented, and so  $W$  is completely reducible as a  $F[G]$  module.

$W$  is also faithful as an  $F[G]$  module, for if  $\sum k_i \sigma_i$  annihilates  $W$ ,  $k_i \in F[H]$ , let  $m \neq 0 \in M$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (m \otimes 1) \sum k_i \sigma_i &= 0, \\ \sum mk_i \otimes \sigma_i &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

But this means that  $mk_i = 0$  for all  $i$ , which in turn implies that  $k_i = 0$  for all  $i$ , since  $m$  was arbitrary and  $M$  is faithful.

Hence  $W = \bigoplus V_j$ , where the  $V_j$  are irreducible  $F[G]$  modules. Let  $A_j = \text{Ann } V_j$ . Then the  $A_j$  are two-sided ideals of  $F[G]$  and  $\bigcap A_j = (0)$ , since  $W$  is faithful. But since we are assuming that  $G$  has no nontrivial normal subgroups we must have that  $F[G]$  is prime. But then  $\bigcap A_j = (0)$  implies that some  $A_j = (0)$ . But then  $V_j$  would be a faithful irreducible  $F[G]$  module and so  $F[G]$  would be primitive. This completes the proof.

Again suppose that  $R = F[G]$  is primitive and let  $\rho$  be a maximal right ideal containing no nontrivial two-sided ideals. Let  $M = R/\rho$ . By Schur's Lemma,  $\Delta = \text{End}_R(M)$  is a division ring and we can consider  $M$  as a right vector space over  $\Delta$ . The Density Theorem tells us that  $R$  is a dense ring of  $\text{End}_\Delta(M)$ . [3, Theorem I, p. 25] tells us what  $\Delta$  looks like. Let  $S = \{r \in R \mid r\rho \subseteq \rho\}$ . Note that  $\rho \subset S$ . Define a map from  $S$  into  $\Delta$  by sending  $s \in S$  into left multiplication by  $s$ . This is easily seen to be a homomorphism with kernel  $\rho$ . We will show that it is onto.

Suppose  $\delta \in \Delta$  and let  $(\bar{1})\delta = \bar{a}$ . (Henceforth  $\bar{\phantom{x}}$  will denote congruence class modulo  $\rho$ ). Then if  $\bar{x} \in M$

$$(\bar{x})\delta = (\bar{1}x)\delta = (\bar{1})\delta x = \bar{a}x.$$

I claim that  $a \in S$ ; for let  $p \in \rho$ . Since  $\delta$  is linear,

$$\bar{0} = (\bar{p})\delta = (\bar{1})\delta p = \bar{a}p = \bar{a}\bar{p}.$$

That is,  $a\rho \subseteq \rho$  and so

$$(\bar{x})\delta = \bar{a}x = a\bar{x}.$$

Let  $H$  be as in Theorem 2, with  $\{\psi_i\}$  a set of right coset representatives of  $H$  in  $G$ . The following is an interesting result.

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $e$  be the identity element of  $G$ . If  $\sum_{i=1}^n h_i \psi_i \in S$ ,  $h_i \in F[H]$ , then either*

- (i)  $h_i \in \rho$ , for all  $i$ , or  
 (ii)  $\{\bar{e}, \bar{\psi}_1, \dots, \bar{\psi}_n\}$  are linearly dependent over  $\Delta$ .

*Proof.* This is an easy consequence of the Density Theorem. If (ii) does not hold, the Density Theorem tells us that for any  $x_i \in R$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , there exists an  $r \in R$  such that

- (1)  $er - 0 \in \rho$ ,  
 (2)  $\psi_i r - x_i \in \rho$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

From (2) it follows that

- (3)  $\sum h_i \psi_i r - \sum h_i x_i \in \rho$ .

But since  $\sum h_i \psi_i \in S$ , (1) and (3) allow us to conclude that

$$\sum h_i x_i \in \rho.$$

Appropriate choices for  $x_i$  now give us (i). This completes the proof.

It is a long standing conjecture, and a widely believed one, too, that the Jacobson radical of  $F[G]$  is trivial for all  $G$ . This in turn would imply that we can always express  $F[G]$  as a subdirect sum of primitive rings. This makes the following conjecture which the author proposes a somewhat surprising one.

*Conjecture.*  $F[G]$  is never primitive if  $G$  is nontrivial.

#### REFERENCES

1. I. Connell, *On the group ring*, Can. J. Math. 15 (1963), 650–685.
2. I. N. Herstein, *Noncommutative rings* (Carus Monograph No. 15, MAA, 1968).
3. N. Jacobson, *Structure of rings* (Amer. Math. Soc. Coll., vol. 37, rev. ed., 1964).
4. I. Kaplansky, *Problems in the theory of rings revisited*, Amer. Math. Monthly 77 (1970), 445–454.
5. ———, *Groups with representation of bounded degree*, Can. J. Math. 1 (1949), 105–112.
6. A. E. Rosenberg, *On the semisimplicity of the group algebra* (Thesis, Brown University, Providence, R.I., 1969).
7. W. R. Scott, *Group theory* (Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1964).

Wesleyan University,  
 Middletown, Connecticut