

## ON HASSE-SCHMIDT HIGHER DERIVATIONS

SADI ABU-SAYMEH

(Received March 19, 1985)

Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic zero and let  $A$  be a commutative  $k$ -algebra. A higher derivation  $D$  of  $A$  over  $k$  is a sequence

$$\underline{D} = \{D_0, D_1, D_2, \dots\}$$

of additive  $k$ -endomorphisms  $D_i$ 's such that  $D_0$  is the identity map of  $A$  and  $D_n(ab) = \sum_{m=0}^n D_m(a) D_{n-m}(b)$  for every  $a, b \in A$ . This interesting notion of higher derivations was introduced by H. Hasse and F.K. Schmidt in [1].

In this paper we shall prove that a higher derivation  $\underline{D}$  of  $A$  over  $k$  is represented uniquely by a certain sequence of derivations of  $A$  over  $k$ .

Let  $n, r$  be positive integers such that  $n \geq r$ . We shall denote by  $P_{n,r}$  the set of ordered partitions of  $n$  into  $r$ -positive integers, i.e.,

$$P_{n,r} = \{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \mid \sum_{i=1}^r n_i = n, n_i \in \mathbb{N}_+\}.$$

It is easily seen that the cardinality  $|P_{n,r}|$  of the set  $P_{n,r}$  is given by

$$|P_{n,r}| = \binom{n-1}{r-1}.$$

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $\underline{D} = (D_0, D_1, D_2, \dots)$  be a higher derivation on  $A$  and let  $\delta_n (n \geq 1)$  be defined by the equations*

$$\delta_n = \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{r+1}}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} D_{n_1} D_{n_2} \dots D_{n_r}.$$

Then we have

- (i)  $\delta_n (n = 1, 2, \dots)$  is a  $k$ -derivation,
- (ii)  $D_n = \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \delta_{n_1} \delta_{n_2} \dots \delta_{n_r}.$

Proof. (i) For  $n=1$  we have  $\delta_1 = D_1$  which is clearly  $k$ -derivation.

For  $n \geq 2$ , and  $a, b \in A$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n(ab) &= D_n(ab) + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{(-1)^{r+1}}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} D_{n_1} D_{n_2} \cdots D_{n_r}(ab) \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^n D_m(a) D_{n-m}(b) + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{(-1)^{r+1}}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \sum_{0 \leq m_i \leq n_i} \\ &\quad \cdot D_{m_1} D_{m_2} \cdots D_{m_r}(a) D_{n_1-m_1} D_{n_2-m_2} \cdots D_{n_r-m_r}(b) \\ &= a\delta_n(b) + \delta_n(a)b + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} D_m(a) D_{n-m}(b) \\ &\quad + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{(-1)^{r+1}}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_i \leq n_i \\ \text{and at least one } 0 < m_i < n_i}} \\ &\quad \cdot D_{m_1} D_{m_2} \cdots D_{m_r}(a) D_{n_1-m_1} D_{n_2-m_2} \cdots D_{n_r-m_r}(b). \end{aligned}$$

Hence to prove the assertion it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} D_m(a) D_{n-m}(b) + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{(-1)^{r+1}}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_i \leq n_i \\ \text{and at least one } 0 < m_i < n_i}} \\ \cdot D_{m_1} D_{m_2} \cdots D_{m_r}(a) D_{n_1-m_1} \cdots D_{n_r-m_r}(b) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let  $h(e, s)$  be the coefficients of  $D_{i_1} D_{k_2} \cdots D_{i_e}(a) D_{j_1} D_{j_2} \cdots D_{j_s}(b)$  in the reduced expression of the left hand side where  $l_i$ 's and  $j_i$ 's are positive integers such that  $l_1 + \cdots + l_e + j_1 + \cdots + j_s = n$ . Such a term can occur only if  $r = e, e+1, \dots, e+s$ . Hence if  $e \geq s \geq 1$  then it is seen without essential difficulty that we have

$$h(e, s) = \sum_{p=0}^s \frac{(-1)^{e+p+1}}{e+p} \binom{e+p}{e} \binom{e}{s-p}.$$

The sum correspond to the case  $r = e, \dots, r = e+s$  respectively and  $\binom{e+p}{e}$  is the number of times one can select  $e$  number of  $m_i$ 's to be equal to  $l_i$ 's and setting the other  $p$ -number of  $m_i$ 's to be zero, while  $\binom{e}{s-p}$  is the number of times one can select  $s-p$  numbers of  $(n_i - m_i)$ 's to be equal to the  $j$ 's. Since

$$\frac{1}{e+p} \binom{e+p}{p} = \frac{1}{e} \binom{e+p-1}{p}.$$

Then we get

$$h(e, s) = \frac{(-1)^{e+1}}{e} \sum_{p=0}^s (-1)^p \binom{e+p-1}{p} \binom{e}{s-p}.$$

Setting  $s-p=q$  we obtain

$$h(e, s) = \frac{(-1)^{e+s+1}}{e} \sum_{q=0}^s (-1)^q \binom{e+s-q-1}{s-q} \binom{e}{q}.$$

Hence  $h(e, s)=0$  by [2, identity (35) p. 41]. Similarly  $h(e, s)=0$  if  $s > e \geq 1$ . Hence  $\delta_n$  is a  $k$ -derivation.

(ii) We use induction on  $n$ . For  $n=1$  we have  $\delta_1=D_1$ . Since

$$D_n = \delta_n + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{(-1)^r}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} D_{n_1} D_{n_2} \cdots D_{n_r} \text{ for } n \geq 2,$$

and the induction assumption on  $n$  implies that

$$D_{n_i} = \sum_{s=1}^{n_i} \frac{1}{s!} \sum_{(n_{i1}, \dots, n_{is}) \in P_{n_i,s}} \delta_{n_{i1}} \delta_{n_{i2}} \cdots \delta_{n_{is}}$$

for every  $1 \leq n_i < n$ .

Hence after collecting similar terms we get

$$D_n = \delta_n + \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \left[ \sum_{p=2}^r \frac{(-1)^p}{p} \sum_{(m_1, \dots, m_p) \in P_{r,p}} \frac{1}{(m_1)! \cdots (m_p)!} \right] \delta_{n_1} \delta_{n_2} \cdots \delta_{n_r}.$$

On the other hand the coefficient of  $\chi^r$  (for every  $r \geq 2$ ) in the Taylor's series expansion of  $\chi = \ln[1+(e^x-1)]$  is

$$\frac{1}{r!} - \sum_{p=2}^r \frac{(-1)^p}{p} \sum_{(m_1, \dots, m_p) \in P_{r,p}} \frac{1}{(m_1)! \cdots (m_p)!} = 0.$$

Hence

$$D_n = \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \delta_{n_1} \delta_{n_2} \cdots \delta_{n_r}.$$

A higher derivation  $\underline{D} = \{D_n; n \geq 0\}$  is called iterative if it satisfies the condition

$$D_i D_j = \binom{i+j}{i} D_{i+j}$$

for any pair of integers  $(i, j)$ . Then we have the

**Corollary.** *Let  $\underline{D}$  be a higher derivation of  $A$  over  $k$  and  $\{\delta_n, n=1, 2, \dots\}$  be a corresponding sequence of derivations defined in Proposition 1. Then  $\underline{D}$  is*

iterative if and only if  $\delta_n=0$  for all  $n \geq 2$ .

**Proposition 2.** Let  $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots\}$  be a sequence of  $k$ -derivations on  $A$  and set

$$D_n = \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \delta_{n_1} \delta_{n_2} \dots \delta_{n_r} \quad (n \geq 1).$$

Then we have

(i)  $\underline{D} = \{D_0 = id, D_1, D_2, \dots\}$

is a higher derivation, and

(ii)  $\delta_n = \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{r+1}}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} D_{n_1} D_{n_2} \dots D_{n_r}.$

Proof. (i) The assertion is clear for  $n=1$ .

Next we show that  $D_n(ab) = \sum_{m=0}^n D_m(a) D_{n-m}(b)$  for every  $a, b \in A$  and  $n \geq 2$ .

For convenience let  $\delta_m^0$  stands for the identity mapping and  $\delta_m^1$  stands for  $\delta_m$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_n(ab) &= \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \delta_{n_1} \delta_{n_2} \dots \delta_{n_r}(ab) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \sum_{0 \leq e_i \leq 1} \delta_{n_1}^{e_1} \delta_{n_2}^{e_2} \dots \delta_{n_r}^{e_r}(a) \delta_{n_1}^{1-e_1} \delta_{n_2}^{1-e_2} \dots \delta_{n_r}^{1-e_r}(b) \\ &= aD_n(b) + D_n(a) \cdot b + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq e_i \leq 1 \\ \text{such that} \\ 1 \leq e_1 + \dots + e_r \leq r-1}} \delta_{n_1}^{e_1} \dots \delta_{n_r}^{e_r}(a) \cdot \delta_{n_1}^{1-e_1} \dots \delta_{n_r}^{1-e_r}(b) \\ &= aD_n(b) + D_n(a) \cdot b + \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{(t,s) \in P_{r,2}} \frac{1}{(t+s)!} \binom{t+s}{t} \\ &\quad \sum_{(m^1, \dots, m_t, l_1, \dots, l_s) \in P_{n,t+s}} \delta_{m^1} \delta_{m^2} \dots \delta_{m_t}(a) \cdot \delta_{l_1} \delta_{l_2} \dots \delta_{l_s}(b). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\binom{t+s}{t}$  is the number of ways of selecting  $t$  number of  $e_i$ 's equal to one in the expression

$$\delta_{n_1}^{e_1} \delta_{n_2}^{e_2} \dots \delta_{n_r}^{e_r}(a) \cdot \delta_{n_1}^{1-e_1} \delta_{n_2}^{1-e_2} \dots \delta_{n_r}^{1-e_r}(b) \quad \text{where } r=t+s.$$

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=0}^n D_m(a) D_{n-m}(b) &= aD_n(b) + D_n(a)b \\ &+ \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=1}^m \frac{1}{t!} \sum_{(m_1, \dots, m_t) \in P_{m,t}} \delta_{m_1} \delta_{m_2} \dots \delta_{m_t}(a) \right) \right. \\ &\left. \left( \sum_{s=1}^{n-m} \frac{1}{s!} \sum_{(l_1, \dots, l_s) \in P_{n-m,s}} \delta_{l_1} \delta_{l_2} \dots \delta_{l_s}(b) \right) \right] \\ &= aD_n(b) + D_n(a) \cdot b + \sum_{r=2}^n \sum_{(t,s) \in P_{r,2}} \frac{1}{t!s!} \\ &\sum_{(m_1, \dots, m_t, l_1, \dots, l_s) \in P_{n,t+s}} \delta_{m_1} \delta_{m_2} \dots \delta_{m_t}(a) \cdot \delta_{l_1} \delta_{l_2} \dots \delta_{l_s}(b). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\frac{1}{(t+s)!} \binom{t+s}{t} = \frac{1}{t!s!}$  we have  $D_n(ab) = \sum_{m=0}^n D_m(a) D_{n-m}(b)$

(ii) Since  $\underline{D} = \{D_0, D_1, D_2, \dots\}$  is a higher derivation we can associate to  $\underline{D}$  a sequence of derivations  $\{\delta'_1, \delta'_2, \dots\}$  by Proposition 1(i). From Proposition 1(ii) it follows that

$$D_n = \delta'_n + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \delta'_{n_1} \delta'_{n_2} \dots \delta'_{n_r}.$$

On the other hand

$$D_n = \delta_n + \sum_{r=2}^n \frac{1}{r!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} \delta_{n_1} \delta_{n_2} \dots \delta_{n_r}$$

by definition of  $D_n$ . Since  $\delta_1 = D_1 = \delta'_1$  we get easily  $\delta_n = \delta'_n$  by induction on  $n$ .

The following theorem follows from Propositions 1 and 2.

**Theorem.** *There is a one to one correspondence between the set of ordered sequences of  $k$ -derivations on  $A$  and the set of higher derivations on  $A$  in such a way if  $\{\delta_n: n \geq 0, \delta_0 \text{ identity, } \delta_n \text{ is a } k\text{-derivation}\}$  and the higher derivation  $\underline{D} = \{D_n: n \geq 0\}$  correspond, then*

$$D_n = \sum_{p=1}^n \frac{1}{p!} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_p) \in P_{n,p}} \delta_{n_1} \delta_{n_2} \dots \delta_{n_p}$$

and

$$\delta_n = \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{(-1)^{r+1}}{r} \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_r) \in P_{n,r}} D_{n_1} D_{n_2} \dots D_{n_r}$$

for every  $n \geq 1$  and  $D_0 = \delta_0$ .

**Corollary.** *Let  $D_{A/k}$  be the set of all higher derivations on  $A$ . Let  $\underline{D}, \underline{E} \in$*

$D_{A/k}$  correspond respectively to the sequences  $\{\delta_{1,n}: n \geq 0\}$  and  $\{\delta_{2,n}: n \geq 0\}$  of  $k$ -derivations on  $A$ . Then  $D_{A/k}$  is a Lie algebra with respect to the operations  $\alpha D + \underline{E} = \underline{L}$  and  $[\underline{D}, \underline{E}] = \underline{G}$  where  $\alpha \in k$  and  $\underline{L}$  is the higher derivation corresponding to the sequence  $\{\delta_0, \alpha\delta_{1,n} + \delta_{2,n}: n \geq 1\}$  and  $\underline{G}$  is the higher derivation corresponding to the sequence  $\{\delta_0, [\delta_{1,n}, \delta_{2,n}] = \delta_{1,n}\delta_{2,n} - \delta_{2,n}\delta_{1,n}: n \geq 1\}$  respectively.

Proof. It follows easily from the fact that the set of  $k$ -derivations on  $A$  is a Lie algebra.

---

#### References

- [1] H. Hasse and F.K. Schmidt: *Noch eine Begründung der Theorie der höheren Differentialquotienten in einem algebraischen Funktionenkörper einer Unbestimmten*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **177** (1937), 215–237.
- [2] N. Vilenkin: *Combinatorics*, Academic Press, New York, 1971.

Department of Mathematics  
Yarmouk University  
Irbid, Jordan