

Zeitschrift: Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Mathematische Gesellschaft
Band: 58 (1983)

Artikel: Lifting idempotents and Clifford theory.
Autor: Thévenaz, Jacques
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-44590>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 24.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Lifting idempotents and Clifford theory

JACQUES THÉVENAZ

Let N be a normal subgroup of a finite group G and let R be a noetherian complete local commutative ring. Clifford theory deals with the relationship between RG -modules and RN -modules, using induction from N to G or restriction from G to N . Since Clifford's 1937 paper [1], the theory is well understood for irreducible representations (see also [2, §11C]). For an indecomposable RN -module W , several authors have proved a going-up theorem describing how $\text{Ind}_N^G W$ decomposes (see [2, §19C]).

One purpose of this paper is to prove (in Section 2) a going-down theorem for indecomposable modules (analogous to Clifford's theorem), based on a refinement of the lifting idempotents theorem, presented in Section 1. The going-up and going-down theorems are actually equivalent in the sense that each can be derived as a corollary to the other one. One main assumption is necessary for the going-down theorem: the RG -module we start from must be projective relative to H . The whole procedure is presented in the more general context of Clifford systems. The paper concludes in Section 3 with another application of the lifting idempotents theorem, concerning the behaviour of indecomposable modules under ground ring extensions.

1. Lifting idempotents

THEOREM 1. *Let A be a ring and J a two-sided ideal contained in $\text{Rad } A$. Assume that A is complete in the J -adic topology (that is the natural map $A \rightarrow \varprojlim A/J^n$ is an isomorphism). Let Π be a finite group acting on A by automorphisms leaving J globally invariant. Let $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$ be a set of orthogonal idempotents of $\bar{A} = A/J$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^n \bar{e}_i = 1$. Assume the following three conditions:*

- a) *The induced action of Π on \bar{A} permutes the idempotents \bar{e}_i transitively.*
- b) *There exists $u \in A$ such that $\text{Tr}_\Omega(u) = 1$ where Ω is the stabilizer of \bar{e}_1 and $\text{Tr}_\Omega(u) = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \omega u$.*
- c) *\bar{u} commutes with each \bar{e}_i .*

Then $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$ lifts to a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ of orthogonal idempotents of A which are permuted by Π transitively and such that $\sum_{i=1}^n e_i = 1$.

Remarks. 1) If A is the ring of endomorphisms of a representation V , we shall see that the condition b) corresponds to a condition of relative projectivity for V .

2) There are two situations where c) is always satisfied: either the idempotents \bar{e}_i are central or the order $|\Omega|$ of Ω is invertible in A in which case one can choose u to be the central element $|\Omega|^{-1}$.

3) When Π acts regularly on the idempotents \bar{e}_i , that is when Ω is trivial, one can take $u = 1$ so that b) and c) are trivially satisfied. This special case appears already in [3].

Proof. It suffices to prove the theorem when J is nilpotent because, since $A \cong \varprojlim A/J^n$, the lifted idempotents are constructed as limits of idempotents of A/J^n for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For $\sigma \in \Pi$, write $\bar{e}_\sigma = \sigma \bar{e}_1$ so that $\bar{e}_\sigma = \bar{e}_\tau$ if and only if $\sigma\Omega = \tau\Omega$. Since Π acts transitively, every idempotent \bar{e}_i can be written in that form.

We proceed by induction on the nilpotent index n of J . There is nothing to prove if $n = 1$. If $n \geq 2$, let $I = J^{n-1}$ and write \tilde{a} for the image of $a \in A$ modulo I . By induction, there exist idempotents \tilde{e}_σ of A/I such that $\sigma \tilde{e}_\tau = \tilde{e}_{\sigma\tau}$ and $\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi/\Omega} \tilde{e}_\sigma = 1$. First lift arbitrarily the idempotents \tilde{e}_σ to get orthogonal idempotents e_σ of A satisfying $\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi/\Omega} e_\sigma = 1$. This is well known to be possible (see [2, §6A]). Of course the notation implies that we keep the convention:

$$e_\sigma = e_\tau \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sigma\Omega = \tau\Omega.$$

Since $\sigma \tilde{e}_\tau = \tilde{e}_{\sigma\tau}$, we have:

$$\sigma e_\tau = e_{\sigma\tau} + r_{\sigma,\tau} \quad \text{for some} \quad r_{\sigma,\tau} \in I.$$

We list several properties of the elements $r_{\sigma,\tau}$:

$$(1) \quad \text{If } \omega \in \Omega, r_{\sigma,\tau\omega} = r_{\sigma,\tau}.$$

This follows from $e_{\eta\omega} = e_\eta$ for all $\eta \in \Pi$.

$$(2) \quad \sum_{\tau \in \Pi/\Omega} r_{\sigma,\tau} = 0.$$

This follows when σ is applied to $1 = \sum_{\tau \in \Pi/\Omega} e_\tau$.

$$(3) \quad \eta r_{\sigma,\tau} = r_{\eta\sigma,\tau} - r_{\eta,\sigma\tau}.$$

This is a consequence of $(\eta\sigma)e_\tau = \eta(\sigma e_\tau)$.

$$(4) \quad r_{\sigma,\tau} = e_{\sigma\tau} r_{\sigma,\tau} + r_{\sigma,\tau} e_{\sigma\tau}.$$

This follows from the equality $\sigma e_\tau = (\sigma e_\tau)^2$ using also $I^2 = 0$. Multiplying (4) by e_η on the right or e_λ on the left (or both in the first case below), we get:

$$(5) \quad e_\lambda r_{\sigma,\tau} e_\eta = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \lambda\Omega \neq \sigma\tau\Omega \neq \eta\Omega \\ r_{\sigma,\tau} e_\eta & \text{if } \lambda\Omega = \sigma\tau\Omega \neq \eta\Omega \\ e_\lambda r_{\sigma,\tau} & \text{if } \lambda\Omega \neq \sigma\tau\Omega = \eta\Omega \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda\Omega = \sigma\tau\Omega = \eta\Omega \end{cases}$$

(6) If $\lambda\Omega \neq \eta\Omega$, $e_{\mu\lambda} r_{\mu,\eta} + r_{\mu,\lambda} e_{\mu\eta} = 0$.

This is a consequence of $(\mu e_\lambda) \cdot (\mu e_\eta) = 0$ using again $I^2 = 0$.

Now define: $f_\sigma = e_\sigma + \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} r_{\lambda,\lambda^{-1}\sigma} \cdot e_\lambda \cdot \lambda u$ where $u \in A$ satisfies hypotheses b) and c). By (1), we have:

(7) $f_{\sigma\omega} = f_\sigma$ if $\omega \in \Omega$.

(8) $\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi/\Omega} f_\sigma = 1$.

For

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi/\Omega} f_\sigma &= \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi/\Omega} e_\sigma + \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi/\Omega} \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} r_{\lambda,\lambda^{-1}\sigma} \cdot e_\lambda \cdot \lambda u \\ &= 1 + \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} \left(\sum_{\sigma \in \Pi/\Omega} r_{\lambda,\lambda^{-1}\sigma} \right) e_\lambda \cdot \lambda u = 1 \quad \text{by (2).} \end{aligned}$$

(9) $f_\sigma f_\tau = 0$ if $\sigma\Omega \neq \tau\Omega$.

$$f_\sigma f_\tau = \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} e_\sigma r_{\lambda,\lambda^{-1}\tau} e_\lambda \cdot \lambda u + \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} r_{\lambda,\lambda^{-1}\sigma} e_\lambda \cdot \lambda u \cdot e_\tau.$$

By hypothesis c), $\lambda \bar{u} \cdot \bar{e}_\tau = \lambda(\bar{u} \cdot \bar{e}_{\lambda^{-1}\tau}) = \lambda(\bar{e}_{\lambda^{-1}\tau} \cdot \bar{u}) = \bar{e}_\tau \cdot \lambda \bar{u}$. Hence λu commutes with e_τ modulo J . Since $I \cdot J = J^{n-1} \cdot J = 0$, we have $r \cdot \lambda u \cdot e_\tau = r \cdot e_\tau \cdot \lambda u$ for all $r \in I$ and so we can permute λu and e_τ in the second sum. Therefore, the only non-zero terms appear for $\lambda \in \tau\Omega$. By (5), the same holds for the first sum. Consequently:

$$f_\sigma f_\tau = \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} (e_\sigma r_{\tau\omega,\omega^{-1}} + r_{\tau\omega,\omega^{-1}\tau^{-1}\sigma} e_{\tau\omega}) e_{\tau\omega} \cdot \tau\omega u.$$

Now apply (6) with $\eta = 1$, $\mu = \tau\omega$ and $\lambda = \omega^{-1}\tau^{-1}\sigma$, using also (1). The condition $\lambda\Omega \neq \eta\Omega$ is equivalent to $\sigma\Omega \neq \tau\Omega$. We get $f_\sigma f_\tau = 0$, as required.

Clearly (8) and (9) imply that f_σ is idempotent. There remains to prove the additional property we are looking for:

(10) $\tau f_\sigma = f_{\tau\sigma}$.

By (3), we have:

$$\tau f_\sigma = e_{\tau\sigma} + r_{\tau,\sigma} + \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} (r_{\tau\lambda, \lambda^{-1}\sigma} - r_{\tau,\sigma}) \cdot (e_{\tau\lambda} + r_{\tau,\lambda}) \cdot \tau\lambda u.$$

Since $I^2 = 0$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau f_\sigma &= e_{\tau\sigma} + \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} r_{\tau\lambda, \lambda^{-1}\sigma} \cdot e_{\tau\lambda} \cdot \tau\lambda u + r_{\tau,\sigma} \left(1 - \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} e_{\tau\lambda} \cdot \tau\lambda u \right) \\ &= e_{\tau\sigma} + \sum_{\mu \in \Pi} r_{\mu, \mu^{-1}\tau\sigma} \cdot e_\mu \cdot \mu u + r_{\tau,\sigma} \left(1 - \sum_{\mu \in \Pi/\Omega} e_\mu \cdot \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \mu\omega u \right) \\ &= f_{\tau\sigma} + r_{\tau,\sigma} \left(1 - \sum_{\mu \in \Pi/\Omega} e_\mu \cdot \mu Tr_\Omega(u) \right) = f_{\tau\sigma}, \end{aligned}$$

using $Tr_\Omega(u) = 1$ and $\sum_{\mu \in \Pi/\Omega} e_\mu = 1$. ■

2. Clifford theory

Let N be a normal subgroup of a finite group G and $S = G/N$. Throughout this section, R denotes a noetherian local commutative ring which is complete in its natural topology of local ring. These assumptions are made in order to have the following properties:

(i) Every finitely generated RG -module is a direct sum of indecomposable submodules.

(ii) If M is an indecomposable RG -module, then $\text{End}_{RG} M$ is a local ring. Hence Krull-Schmidt theorem holds for RG -modules.

In order to study the restriction to N of an indecomposable RG -module, we consider the more general case of an S -graded Clifford system $A = \bigoplus_{s \in S} A_s$ over R , in the sense of [2, §11C]. The case of group algebras corresponds to $A = RG$ and $A_1 = RN$. Recall that there exist units $a_s \in A_s$ such that $A_s = a_s A_1 = A_1 a_s$. Also $a_s a_t a_{st}^{-1} \in A_1$ because $A_s A_t = A_{st}$.

For the rest of this paper, all modules will be finitely generated left modules. For an A_1 -module W , denote by W^A the induced module $\text{Ind}_{A_1}^A W = A \otimes_{A_1} W$, while for an A -module V , we denote by V_{A_1} the restriction $\text{Res}_{A_1}^A V$. If V is an A -module, then S acts on $\text{End}_{A_1} V$ by $sf = a_s f a_s^{-1}$ and the set of fixed points is exactly $\text{End}_A V$.

DEFINITIONS. 1) An A -module V is said to be *projective relative* to A_1 if V is a direct summand of a module induced from A_1 which actually can be chosen to

be $(V_{A_1})^A$. This is equivalent to the existence of an endomorphism $u \in \text{End}_{A_1} V$ such that $\text{Tr}_S(u) = 1$ where $\text{Tr}_S(u) = \sum_{s \in S} su$. The equivalence of these definitions is well known in the case of group algebras [2, §19A], but the proof can be carried over without change to the case of Clifford systems.

2) If W is an A_1 -module, then $a_s \otimes W$ has a natural structure of A_1 -module and is called a *conjugate* of W .

3) Let $M = \bigoplus_{i,j} M_{ij}$ be a decomposition of a module M into indecomposable summands such that $M_{ij} \cong M_{ik}$ for all i, j, k and $M_{ij} \not\cong M_{km}$ if $i \neq k$. Then $M_i = \bigoplus_j M_{ij}$ is called a *homogeneous component* of M . Contrary to the case of semi-simple modules, note that in general M_i is not uniquely determined by M .

Now we can state the going-down theorem analogous to Clifford's theorem:

THEOREM 2. *Let A be an S -graded Clifford system over R and V an indecomposable A -module. Assume that V is projective relative to A_1 , that is there exists an indecomposable summand W of V_{A_1} such that V is a direct summand of W^A . Let $T = \{t \in S \mid a_t \otimes W \cong W\}$ be the inertial subgroup of W and let $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ be a set of coset representatives of T in S . Finally let $B = \bigoplus_{t \in T} A_t$ be the T -graded subalgebra of A . Then:*

- (i) V_{A_1} is isomorphic to a direct sum of conjugates of W .
- (ii) $\{a_{s_i} \otimes W \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is a complete set of non-isomorphic conjugates of W and each appears with the same multiplicity in a decomposition of V_{A_1} .
- (iii) There exists a decomposition $V_{A_1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n U_i$ into homogeneous components which are permuted transitively by $\{a_s \mid s \in S\}$ and such that $\{a_t \mid t \in T\}$ stabilizes U_1 .
- (iv) U_1 is an indecomposable B -module and V is isomorphic to U_1^A .

Beside Theorem 1, the main ingredient for the proof of Theorem 2 is the following:

PROPOSITION 3. *Let A be an R -algebra, finitely generated as R -module, and M an A -module. Denote by a bar the reduction modulo the radical of $\text{End}_A M$. Let $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_i$ (respectively $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M'_i$) be any decomposition of M corresponding to idempotents $e_1, \dots, e_n \in \text{End}_A M$ (respectively e'_1, \dots, e'_n).*

(i) *The modules M_i are homogeneous components of M if and only if $\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n$ are the primitive central idempotents of $\overline{\text{End}_A M}$.*

(ii) *Assume the modules M_i and M'_i are homogeneous components of M , labelled in order to have $M_i \cong M'_i$ for all i . Then there exists $f \in \text{Aut}_A M$ such that $f(M_i) = M'_i$ for all i and $\bar{f} = 1$.*

(iii) *Assume the modules M_i and M'_i are homogeneous components of M . Then $M_1 \cong M'_1$ if and only if $\bar{e}_1 = \bar{e}'_1$.*

Proof. (i) If the modules M_i are homogeneous components of M , write $M_i \cong m_i N_i$ with N_i indecomposable. Let $E_i = \text{End}_A N_i$ and $D_i = \overline{\text{End}_A N_i}$. By Fitting's theorem [2, §19C, lemma], there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & E = \text{End}_A M & \\ & \uparrow & \searrow \\ \prod_{i=1}^n M_{m_i}(E_i) \cong \prod_{i=1}^n \text{End}_A M_i & & \overline{\text{End}_A M} \cong \prod_{i=1}^n M_{m_i}(D_i) \end{array}$$

Since e_i is the unit matrix of $M_{m_i}(E_i)$ (with zeros in all other components), \bar{e}_i is the unit matrix of $M_{m_i}(D_i)$, i.e. \bar{e}_i is a primitive central idempotent of $\overline{\text{End}_A M}$.

If conversely \bar{e}_i is primitive central, decompose it into primitive idempotents $\bar{e}_i = \bar{e}_{i1} + \cdots + \bar{e}_{im_i}$ and lift them to get $e_i = e_{i1} + \cdots + e_{im_i}$. Now $e_{ij}E \cong e_{ik}E$ because $\bar{e}_{ij}\bar{E} \cong \bar{e}_{ik}\bar{E}$. Therefore:

$$e_{ij}M \cong e_{ij}E \otimes_E M \cong e_{ik}E \otimes_E M \cong e_{ik}M.$$

So $e_i M = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{m_i} e_{ij}M$ is a homogeneous decomposition of $e_i M$ into indecomposable summands. If some indecomposable summand of $e_i M$ was isomorphic to a summand of $e_k M$ for $k \neq i$, there would be less than n homogeneous components in M and so, by the first part of the proof, less than n primitive central idempotents in \bar{E} .

(ii) Consider again the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \text{End}_A M & \\ & \uparrow j & \searrow q \\ \prod_{i=1}^n \text{End}_A M_i & & \overline{\text{End}_A M} \end{array}$$

We emphasize that not only q but also p is surjective. Choose an isomorphism $g_i : M_i \rightarrow M'_i$ for each i and define an automorphism g of M by $g|_{M_i} = g_i$. Since g is invertible, so is $q(g)$ and since p is onto, there exists $h \in \prod_{i=1}^n \text{End}_A M_i$ such that $p(h) = q(g)^{-1}$. Clearly $f = g \cdot j(h)$ satisfies $f(M_i) = M'_i$ and $\bar{f} = 1$.

(iii) By (ii), if $M_1 \cong M'_1$, there exists $f \in \text{Aut}_A M$ such that $f(M_1) = M'_1$, $f(\bigoplus_{i=2}^n M_i) = \bigoplus_{i=2}^n M'_i$ and $\bar{f} = 1$. It follows easily that $e'_1 = f e_1 f^{-1}$ and therefore $\bar{e}'_1 = \bar{e}_1$.

Conversely suppose $\bar{e}'_1 = \bar{e}_1$. By Krull–Schmidt theorem, $M'_1 \cong M_i$ for some i . By the first part of this proof, $\bar{e}'_1 = \bar{e}_i$. Hence $\bar{e}_i = \bar{e}_1$ and so $i = 1$. ■

Proof of Theorem 2. (i) Write $V_{A_1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r W_i$ with the W_i indecomposable. Since V is a direct summand of W^A , V_{A_1} is a summand of $(W^A)_{A_1} \cong \bigoplus_{s \in S} a_s \otimes W$. By Krull–Schmidt theorem, each W_i is isomorphic to some $a_s \otimes W$.

(ii) Changing notations write $V_{A_1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n m_i W_i$ where $m_i W_i$ denotes the direct sum of m_i copies of W_i and $W_i \not\cong W_j$ if $i \neq j$. By (i), $W_i \cong a_s \otimes W$ for some s . Applying a_s to V , we get:

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n m_i W_i \cong V_{A_1} = (a_s V)_{A_1} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n m_i (a_s \otimes W_i).$$

Comparing the multiplicities of W_i in both decompositions, we get $m_i = m_1$. The same argument applied with an arbitrary a_s shows that $a_s \otimes W$ must be isomorphic to some W_i . Therefore, by definition of T , $\{a_s \otimes W \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ is a complete set of non-isomorphic conjugates of W .

(iii) Let $E = \text{End}_{A_1} V$ and $\bar{E} = E/\text{rad}(E)$. The group S acts on E via $sf = a_s f a_s^{-1}$ and induces an action on \bar{E} which necessarily permutes the primitive central idempotents of \bar{E} .

Let $V_{A_1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n U_i$ be a decomposition of V_{A_1} into homogeneous components, corresponding to idempotents e_1, \dots, e_n . Assume W is a summand of U_1 . For $s \in S$, $V_{A_1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n a_s U_i$ is also a decomposition of V_{A_1} into homogeneous components, corresponding to idempotents $a_s e_i a_s^{-1} = s e_i$. By Proposition 3(i), $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$ are the primitive central idempotents of \bar{E} . Since $a_s U_1 \cong a_s \otimes U_1 \cong U_i$ for some i , we have $s \bar{e}_1 = \bar{e}_i$ by Proposition 3(iii). Moreover each U_i is isomorphic to some $a_s U_1$ by part (i) and (ii). This implies that S acts transitively on the set $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$. Since W is a summand of U_1 , T is the stabilizer of \bar{e}_1 (again by Proposition 3(iii)).

Now since V is projective relative to A_1 , there exists $v \in \text{End}_{A_1} V$ such that $\text{Tr}_S(v) = 1$. Let $u = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i v$ where r_1, \dots, r_n are representatives of the cosets Tr . Then $\text{Tr}_T(u) = \sum_{t \in T} tu = \text{Tr}_S(v) = 1$. Moreover \bar{u} commutes with \bar{e}_i for \bar{e}_i is central. Therefore the hypotheses of Theorem 1 are satisfied. It follows that there exist orthogonal idempotents f_1, \dots, f_n of E (lifting $\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n$) which are permuted transitively by S and such that T stabilizes f_1 .

By Proposition 3(i), the modules $f_i V_{A_1}$ are homogeneous components of V_{A_1} . The equation $f_i = s f_1 = a_s f_1 a_s^{-1}$ means exactly that $a_s (f_1 V_{A_1}) = f_i V_{A_1}$. This completes the proof of part (iii).

(iv) Since $\{a_t \mid t \in T\}$ stabilizes $U_1 = f_1 V_{A_1}$, U_1 is a B -module. Now $V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n a_s U_1$ which is the definition of an induced module. Finally U_1 is indecomposable otherwise V would be decomposable. ■

Counter-example. Without the assumption of relative projectivity for V , Theorem 2 does not hold any more. Take K a field of characteristic 2, $G = C_4$, $N = C_2$ and $V = K[X]/(X-1)^3$ (the generator of C_4 acting by multiplication by X). Then: $\text{Res}_N V = S_1 \oplus S_2$ where $S_i = K[Y]/(Y-1)^i$ (the generator of C_2

acting by multiplication by Y). Since S_1 and S_2 do not have the same dimension, they cannot be conjugate. In fact, the two primitive central idempotents of $\overline{\text{End}_{KN} V}$ are fixed under the action of $S = G/N$, and each of them can be lifted in four ways in $\text{End}_{KN} V$. But no idempotent of $\text{End}_{KN} V$ is fixed by S .

Now we can recall the going-up theorem, which we shall prove to be equivalent to Theorem 2.

THEOREM 4 (Conlon, Tucker, Ward [2, §19C]). *Let A be an S -graded Clifford system over R , W an indecomposable A_1 -module, T the inertial subgroup of W and $B = \bigoplus_{i \in T} A_i$. If $W^B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m Z_i$ is a decomposition of W^B into indecomposable B -modules, then each Z_i^A is an indecomposable A -module, that is $W^A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m Z_i^A$ gives a decomposition of W^A into indecomposable A -modules.*

Proof. The notation $X \mid Y$ will mean: X is a direct summand of Y . Let Z be an indecomposable summand of W^B . Since T is the inertial subgroup of W , $(W^B)_{A_1} = |T| \cdot W$ and so Z_{A_1} is a multiple of W . Since $Z \mid (Z^A)_B$, there exists an indecomposable summand V of Z^A such that $Z \mid V_B$. Then $V \mid W^A$ and $W \mid V_{A_1}$. By Theorem 2, there exists an indecomposable B -module U such that $V \cong U^A$ and U_{A_1} is a multiple of W . Now $U \mid (Z^A)_B$ because $V \mid Z^A$ and $U \mid (U^A)_B = V_B$. But Z is the only indecomposable summand of $(Z^A)_B$ whose restriction to A_1 is a multiple of W , for $(Z^A)_{A_1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n a_{s_i} \otimes Z_{A_1}$ (where $\{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ is a set of coset representatives of T in S) and $a_{s_i} \otimes Z_{A_1}$ is a proper conjugate of Z_{A_1} (a multiple of a proper conjugate of W). It follows that $U \cong Z$ and so $Z^A \cong U^A \cong V$ is indecomposable. ■

Equivalence of Theorems 2 and 4. If Theorem 4 is proved independently (e.g. by the proof of [2, §19C]), then Theorem 2 can be derived as corollary in the following way: Let V be an indecomposable A -module which is a summand of W^A for some indecomposable summand W of V_{A_1} . Let T be the inertial subgroup of W . By Theorem 4, there exists an indecomposable summand U of W^B such that $V = U^A$. Now $U_{A_1} \cong mW$ for some m because $(W^B)_{A_1} \cong |T| W$. Then clearly $V \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n a_{s_i} \otimes U$ and $V_{A_1} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n m(a_{s_i} \otimes W)$ where s_1, \dots, s_n are coset representatives of T in S . This completes the proof of Theorem 2. ■

3. Ground field extensions

Let K be a field and A a finite dimensional K -algebra. Let F be a finite Galois extension of K , with Galois group Π , and consider the F -algebra $F \otimes A$ (note that throughout this section \otimes will always mean \otimes_K). Every element $\sigma \in \Pi$ induces a semi-linear automorphism $\sigma: F \otimes A \rightarrow F \otimes A$. If W is an $F \otimes A$ -module, one can define a new $F \otimes A$ -module structure on W by scalar extension via σ (or

equivalently restriction via σ^{-1}). Explicitly the new structure is given by $a \cdot w = \sigma^{-1}(a)w$, $a \in F \otimes A$, $w \in W$. This module is called a Galois conjugate of W .

Now if V is a finitely generated indecomposable A -module, then $F \otimes V$ has a natural structure of $F \otimes A$ -module. Moreover, Π acts on $F \otimes V$ via $\sigma(f \otimes v) = \sigma f \otimes v$, $\sigma \in \Pi$, $f \in F$, $v \in V$. This action is semi-linear with respect to $F \otimes A$, i.e. $\sigma(aw) = \sigma(a)\sigma(w)$, $\sigma \in \Pi$, $a \in F \otimes A$, $w \in F \otimes V$. If $F \otimes V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n W_i$ is a decomposition of $F \otimes V$ into homogeneous components, then so is $F \otimes V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \sigma W_i$. One can readily check that σW_i is a Galois conjugate of W_i . By Krull–Schmidt theorem, $\sigma W_i \cong W_j$ for some j . Moreover, it is easy to see that for given i and j , there exists $\sigma \in \Pi$ such that $\sigma W_i \cong W_j$. The purpose of this section is to derive from Theorem 1 a stronger result, namely that for a suitable choice of the submodules W_i , one can replace this isomorphism by an equality:

PROPOSITION 5. *In the above notations, there exists a decomposition $F \otimes V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n W_i$ of $F \otimes V$ into homogeneous components such that the modules W_i are permuted transitively under the natural action of Π on $F \otimes V$.*

Proof. Let $E = \text{End}_A V$ and $\bar{E} = E/\text{Rad } E$. Since V is indecomposable, \bar{E} is a division algebra containing K in its center. Now $F \otimes E = \text{End}_{F \otimes A}(F \otimes V)$ and let $\overline{F \otimes E} = F \otimes E/\text{Rad}(F \otimes E)$. Since F/K is separable, $\overline{F \otimes E} \cong F \otimes \bar{E}$. Let $F \otimes V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n W_i$ be a decomposition of $F \otimes V$ into homogeneous components corresponding to idempotents $e_1, \dots, e_n \in F \otimes E$. The decomposition $F \otimes V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \sigma W_i$ corresponds to the idempotents $\sigma e_1 \sigma^{-1}, \dots, \sigma e_n \sigma^{-1}$ (where σ is viewed as a semi-linear automorphism of $F \otimes V$).

Now Π acts on $F \otimes E$ via $\sigma \cdot (f \otimes e) = \sigma f \otimes e$, $\sigma \in \Pi$, $f \in F$, $e \in E$. We claim that $\sigma z \sigma^{-1} = \sigma \cdot z$ for all $z \in F \otimes E$. Indeed, if $z = f \otimes e$, $f \in F$, $e \in E$, and if $g \otimes v \in F \otimes V$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} (\sigma z \sigma^{-1})(g \otimes v) &= \sigma(f \otimes e)(\sigma^{-1} g \otimes v) = \sigma(f \cdot \sigma^{-1} g) \otimes ev = \sigma f \cdot g \otimes ev \\ &= (\sigma f \otimes e)(g \otimes v) = (\sigma \cdot z)(g \otimes v). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\{\sigma \cdot e_1, \dots, \sigma \cdot e_n\}$ are the idempotents corresponding to the decomposition $F \otimes V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \sigma W_i$. By Proposition 3(i), $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\} = \overline{\{\sigma \cdot e_1, \dots, \sigma \cdot e_n\}}$ is the set of primitive central idempotents of $F \otimes \bar{E}$. Now Π acts transitively on $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$ for if $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_k\}$ is a Π -orbit, then $\bar{e} = \sum_{i=1}^k \bar{e}_i$ is an idempotent, invariant under Π , hence lies in $K \otimes \bar{E} = \bar{E}$. Since 1 is the only idempotent of \bar{E} , we get $\bar{e} = 1$ and so $k = n$.

Since F/K is separable, $\text{Tr}_{F/K}$ is surjective. Therefore there exists $x \in F$ such that $\text{Tr}_{F/K}(x) = \sum_{\sigma \in \Pi} \sigma x = 1$. In particular, if Ω denotes the stabilizer of \bar{e}_1 and $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ are coset representatives of Ω in Π , then $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i x$ satisfies $\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \omega u = 1$. Also $u \otimes \bar{1} \in F \otimes \bar{E}$ commutes with every \bar{e}_i . Therefore $u \otimes 1 \in F \otimes E$

satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 1. Consequently $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$ lifts to a set of orthogonal idempotents f_1, \dots, f_n of $F \otimes E$ which are permuted transitively by Π and such that $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i = 1$. By Proposition 3(i), the modules $W'_i = f_i(F \otimes V)$ are homogeneous components of $F \otimes V$. Finally, since $\sigma f_i = f_j$ for some j , we have:

$$\sigma W'_i = \sigma(f_i(F \otimes V)) = (\sigma f_i \sigma^{-1})(F \otimes V) = (\sigma \cdot f_i)(F \otimes V) = f_j(F \otimes V) = W'_j. \quad \blacksquare$$

Remarks. 1) If one replace homogeneous components of $F \otimes V$ by indecomposable summands, then one must consider sets of primitive idempotents $\{\bar{e}_1, \dots, \bar{e}_n\}$ of \bar{E} instead of primitive central idempotents of \bar{E} . If one can show that there exists such a set which is stable under the action of Π (this happens quite often), then the whole proof works without change, so that there exists a decomposition $F \otimes V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n W_i$ into *indecomposable submodules* such that the modules W_i are permuted transitively under the natural action of Π on $F \otimes V$.

2) Proposition 5 holds more generally if one replaces the field K by a complete discrete valuation ring R and the extension F by an unramified Galois extension S (so that the Galois group of S/R is isomorphic to the Galois group of the residue field extension). Moreover, A must be an R -algebra which is finitely generated as R -module.

3) The similarity between restriction to a normal subgroup (Theorem 2) and ground field Galois extension (Proposition 5) extends a little further. If Ω denotes the stabilizer of the homogeneous component W_1 of $F \otimes V$ and if L is the fixed field of Ω , then W_1 is realizable over L , that is there exists an $L \otimes_K A$ -module U such that $F \otimes_L U = W_1$. Moreover, by analogy with part (iv) of Theorem 2 (replacing group induction by scalar restriction), one can easily show that $V \cong \text{Res}_K U$.

REFERENCES

- [1] CLIFFORD, A. H., *Representations induced in an invariant subgroup*, Ann. Math. 38 (1937), 533–550.
- [2] CURTIS, C. W. and REINER, I., *Methods of Representation Theory*, Vol. I, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1981.
- [3] THÉVENAZ, J., *Extensions of group representations from a normal subgroup*, Comm. in Algebra, to appear.

Institut de Mathématiques
Université de Lausanne
CH-1015 Lausanne-Dorigny
Switzerland

Received May 3, 1982