

# Homework 4

Andrew Tindall  
Algebra II

October 11, 2019

## 1 Problems

**Problem 1.** For each of the following, give specific rings  $R \subset S$  and explicit ideals in these rings that exhibit the specified relation:

- (a) An ideal  $I$  of  $R$  such that  $I \neq SI \cap R$  - so the contraction of the extension of an ideal  $I$  need not equal  $I$ .
- (b) A prime ideal  $P$  of  $R$  such that there is no prime ideal  $Q$  of  $S$  with  $P = Q \cap R$
- (c) A maximal ideal  $M$  of  $S$  such that  $M \cap R$  is not maximal in  $R$
- (d) A prime ideal  $P$  of  $R$  whose extension  $PS$  to  $S$  is not a prime ideal in  $S$
- (e) An ideal  $J$  of  $S$  such that  $J \neq (J \cap R)S$  - so the extension of the contraction of an ideal  $J$  need not equal  $J$ .

*Proof.* (a) Say  $R$  is any integral domain, and  $S$  is its field of fractions. Then  $R \subset S$ , and for any nontrivial ideal  $I \subset R$  (that is,  $I \neq \{0\}$  and  $I \neq R$ ), the extension  $IS$  is equal to  $S$ ; so  $IS \cap R = S \cap R = R$ . Specific examples abound: take  $R = \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $S = \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $I = 2\mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $IS \cap R = \mathbb{Z}$ .

- (b) By the above, say  $I$  is any nontrivial prime ideal in an integral domain  $R$ . Then  $I$  cannot be the contraction of any ideal in the field of fractions of  $R$ , because there are very few ideals in this field to begin with.

In fact, if  $R \subset S$ , and  $I \subset R$  is prime, then  $I$  is the contraction of a prime ideal  $J$  if and only if  $IS \cap R = I$ . (The proof I found of this theorem relies on some subtler facts about how localizations behave under homomorphisms).

For a specific example, again let  $R = \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $S = \mathbb{Q}$ , and  $I = 2\mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $I \neq J \cap R$  for any ideal  $J \subset S$ . In particular, no prime lies over  $I$ .

- (c) Once again, the inclusion of an integral domain into its field of fractions provides an example. If  $S$  is the field of fractions of a domain  $R$ , then  $0 \subset S$  is maximal, but  $0 \subset R$  is not necessarily so. (It is maximal if and only if  $R$  is itself a field). In particular,  $0$  is maximal in  $\mathbb{Q}$  but not in  $\mathbb{Z}$ .
- (d) Once again! Let  $R$  be any integral domain,  $S$  its field of fractions, and  $I$  a nonzero prime ideal of  $R$ . Then  $IS = S$ , which is not prime. In particular,  $2\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}$ .

- (e) Let  $R = k[x]$ ,  $S = k[x, y]$ , and  $J = (x, y)$ . Then the contraction of  $J$  is  $(x) \subset k[x]$ , and the extension of this ideal is  $(x) \subset k[x, y]$ , which is not equal to the original ideal  $(x, y)$ . Any polynomial in  $y$  alone, for instance, is in  $(x, y)$  but not in  $(x)$ .  $\square$

**Problem 2.** Prove that if  $s_1, \dots, s_n \in S$  are integral over  $R$ , then the ring  $R[s_1, \dots, s_n]$  is a finitely generated  $R$ -module.

*Proof.* We induct on  $n$  - looking at the chain of inclusions

$$R \hookrightarrow R[s_1] \hookrightarrow R[s_1, s_2] \hookrightarrow \dots \hookrightarrow R[s_1, \dots, s_n] \hookrightarrow S,$$

and the fact that if  $s_i$  is integral over  $R$  then it is integral over  $R[s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}]$ , we will see inductively that each  $R[s_1, \dots, s_i]$  is a finitely generated  $R[s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}]$  module. Then, applying a result from a previous homework, we see that  $R[s_1, \dots, s_n]$  must be a finitely generated  $R$ -module.

Now, the meat of this solution is that, if  $s_i \in S$  is integral over  $R' \subset S$ , then  $R'[s_i]$  is a finitely generated  $R'$ -module. Let  $s_i$  be a zero of the monic polynomial

$$f(x) = x^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} r_j x^j,$$

With coefficients  $r_i \in R'$ . Then  $s_i$  satisfies the relation

$$s_i^n = - \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} r_j s_i^j.$$

We show that the elements  $1, s_i, s_i^2, \dots, s_i^{n-1}$  generate  $R'[s_i]$  as an  $R'$ -module. Any element  $x$  of  $R'[s_i]$  may be written as a (possibly nonunique) finite sum  $x = \sum_{j=0}^m r_j s_i^j$ . If the highest term is  $s_i^m$ , with  $m \geq n$ , then we may rewrite this term as  $r_m (s_i^n) s_i^{m-n}$ , which, in the ring  $S$ , satisfies the relation

$$r_m (s_i^n) s_i^{m-n} = r_m \left( \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} r_j s_i^j \right) s_i^{m-n}.$$

The highest degree of  $s_i$  in this term is  $m-1$ , which is strictly less than  $m$ , so we have found a new representation of  $x$  as

$$x = \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} r_j s_i^j.$$

Repeating this process, we may continue until we have written  $x$  as a sum of terms  $r_j s_i^j$ , with  $j$  running from 0 to  $n-1$ . Thus,  $R'[s_i]$  is generated as an  $R'$ -module by  $\{1, s_i, \dots, s_i^{n-1}\}$ .

Now, each subring  $R[s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}, s_i]$  of  $S$  can be identified with  $(R[s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}])[s_i]$ . Since  $s_i$  is finitely generated over  $R$ , it is also finitely generated over  $R[s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}]$ , and by the above argument, it is finitely generated as an  $R[s_1, \dots, s_{i-1}]$ -algebra. Therefore we have a chain of subrings of  $S$ , each of which is finitely generated as a module over the last:

$$R \hookrightarrow R[s_i] \hookrightarrow R[s_1, s_2] \hookrightarrow \dots \hookrightarrow R[s_1, \dots, s_n].$$

By an argument in a previous homework assignment, this implies that  $R[s_1, \dots, s_n]$  is finitely generated as an  $R$ -module.  $\square$

## References