

## Contents

```
article
amsmath amssymb amsthm hyperref bookmark % fbb % newpx % liber-
tine % crimson % bm cochineal
% eulervm % math mathpazo % math
tikz-cd enumerate
definition remark
{ colorlinks=true, linkcolor=blue, urlcolor=cyan, citecolor=red }
```

# Lang's Algebra Chapter 3 Solutions

Amanuel Tewodros

July 13, 2025

[(1)]By the second isomorphism theorem, we have

$$\frac{U}{U \cap W} \cong \frac{U + W}{W}.$$

For two vector spaces,  $X \supseteq Y$  over a field  $K$ , we have  $\dim X/Y = \dim X - \dim Y$ . Thus  $\dim U - \dim U \cap W = \dim U + W - \dim W$ . Let  $M$  be a module over a commutative ring  $R$ . Let  $I$  be a maximal ideal of  $R$ . We first show that for any proper ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  of  $R$  and basis set  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ , of  $M$ ,

**2. Lemma 1**

$$\frac{M}{\mathfrak{a}M} \cong \bigoplus_i \frac{A}{\mathfrak{a}}(x_i + \mathfrak{a}x_i).$$

$\mathfrak{a}M$  is submodule of  $M$  because  $\mathfrak{a}M \subseteq M$  by  $R$ -closure property of  $\mathfrak{a}$ . It immediately follows that  $\mathfrak{a}M = \bigoplus_i \mathfrak{a}x_i$ . By linear independence of  $x_i$ ,  $(\sum_i r_i x_i) \bmod \mathfrak{a}x_j = (r_j \bmod \mathfrak{a})x_j + \sum_{i \neq j} r_i x_i$ . Therefore,  $M/\mathfrak{a}M = \bigoplus_i Ax_i/\mathfrak{a}x_i$ . By the isomorphism  $x_i \mapsto 1_A \mapsto (x_i + \mathfrak{a}x_i)$ ,  $Ax_i/\mathfrak{a}x_i \cong A/\mathfrak{a} \cong A/\mathfrak{a}(x_i + \mathfrak{a}x_i)$ .

Taking  $\mathfrak{a}$  as a maximal ideal of  $R$  in the above lemma, we see that  $M/\mathfrak{a}M$  is a direct product of vector spaces over the field  $A/\mathfrak{a}$  and thus admit a basis of the same cardinality as that of  $M$ . Because the dimension of a vector space is independent of the basis choice,  $M$  also has a fixed dimension.

3. Let  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  form the basis set of  $R$  over  $k$  and let  $1_R = k_1 x_1 + \dots + k_m x_m$  for  $k_i \in k$ . For any element  $a \in R$ , define the sequences  $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \subseteq k$ ,  $\{f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m\} \subseteq R$  as:

$$f_1 = a, \quad y_1 = w_{1,1}^{-1} k_1$$

$$f_{i+1} = f_i y_i - k_i x_i, \quad y_i = k_i w_{i,i}^{-1},$$

, where  $f_i = \sum_j w_{i,j} x_j$ . By construction,  $a^{-1} = \sum_i y_i x_i$ . Thus  $R$  is a field.

#### 4. Direct Sums

[(a)] First, we show the equivalence of the two statements of the theorem. Suppose there is  $\varphi$  such that  $g \circ \varphi = \text{id}$ . By the injectivity of the composition,  $\text{Im } \varphi \cap \ker g = \{0\}$ . But by exactness,  $\ker g = \text{Im } f$ . We can unambiguously define  $\psi(u)$  to be the inverse image of  $f^{-1}(u')$  where  $u' \equiv u \pmod{\text{Im } \varphi}$  and  $u' = f(x)$  for some  $x \in M'$  because if  $f(x) = f(y) \pmod{\text{Im } \varphi}$ ,  $f(x - y) \in \text{Im } \varphi$  and by injectivity of  $f$ ,  $x = y$ . Since  $M/\text{Im } f \cong M'' = \text{Im } \varphi$ ,  $\psi$  is defined in all of  $M$ . Similarly, if the second statement is true,  $\ker \psi \cap \text{Im } f = \{0\}$  because  $\psi \circ f$  is injective. By exactness,  $\text{Im } f = \ker g$ . We can then define  $\varphi(u) = u'$  where  $u' = y \pmod{\ker \psi}$  and  $g(y) = u$  for some  $y$ .  $\varphi$  is well-defined because if  $g(y_1) = g(y_2)$  for  $y_1 \neq y_2$ , then  $y_1 \neq y_2 \pmod{\ker \psi}$ .

Now suppose  $x \in M$ .  $x - \varphi(u) \in \text{Im } f$  for exactly one  $u$  by the argument mentioned previously. Thus we can express  $x = r + s$  where  $r = \varphi(u) \in \text{Im } \varphi$  and  $s = x - \varphi(u) \in \text{Im } f$ . This implies  $M = \text{Im } f \oplus \text{Im } \varphi$ . By bijectivity of  $g \circ \varphi$ ,  $\text{Im } \varphi \cong M''$ . By contrast, if  $M = \text{Im } f \oplus N$  for some  $N$ , with isomorphism  $t : N \rightarrow M''$ . We can define  $g : M \rightarrow M''$  as  $g(u) = u'$  such that there is  $u = y \pmod{N}$  and  $t^{-1}(u') = y$ . This definition is unambiguous because  $N \cap \text{Im } f = \{0\}$ . Since  $g \circ t^{-1} = \text{id}$ , the sequence splits.

Finally, we complete the details of proposition 3.2. We have just shown  $M = \text{Im } f \oplus \text{Im } \varphi$ . By exactness,  $\text{Im } f = \ker g$ . Also,  $\text{Im } f \cong M'$  and  $\text{Im } \varphi \cong M''$  by injectivity of  $f$  and  $\varphi$  resp. This proves  $M \cong M' \oplus M''$ . We can write  $x \in M$  as  $f(u) + x - f(u)$  where  $x - f(u) \in \ker \psi$ .  $u$  is then uniquely determined by  $x$  as  $\ker \psi \cap \text{Im } f = \{0\}$  by bijectivity of  $\psi \circ f$ . This shows  $M = \text{Im } f \oplus \ker \psi$ . First, we note that  $\varphi_i$  is injective because otherwise the composition  $\psi_i \circ \varphi_i$  wouldn't be injective, a contradiction. This implies, for every valid  $i$ , there is a submodule  $E'_i = \text{Im } \varphi_i$  of  $E$  that is isomorphic to  $E_i$ . Moreover, if  $c \in \text{Im } \varphi_i \cap \text{Im } \varphi_j$  for  $i \neq j$ , then  $\psi_i(c) = \psi_j(c) = 0$ , forcing  $c$  to

be 0. These statements prove

$$\bigoplus_{i=1}^n E'_i \subseteq E.$$

The inverse inclusion follows as follows. Let  $x \in E$ , then  $x = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_i(\psi_i(x))$ , but  $\varphi_i(\psi_i(x)) \in E'_i$ . Therefore  $x \in \bigoplus_i E'_i$ . Let  $x = x_1 + \cdots + x_m$  where  $x_i \in E'_i$ . The map defined by  $x \mapsto (\psi x_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$  is therefore an isomorphism and the inverse map is given by  $(\psi x_i)_i \mapsto \sum_i x_i$ .

- (5) Let  $v'_m = a_1 v_1 + \cdots + a_m v_m$ . Since  $a_m \neq 0$ ,  $v'_m$ , and by the assumption that  $\{v_i\}$  is linearly independent over  $\mathbb{R}$ , the set  $\{v_1, \dots, v_{m-1}, v'_m\}$  is linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . We also note that,  $v'_m - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} a_i v_i \in A$ , thus we can safely assume  $a_1 = \cdots = a_{m-1} = 0$ .

To show, the set spans  $A$ , we consider  $A/A_0$ . Suppose, there is  $av_m \in A/A_0$  such that  $av_m \neq nv'_m$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $r, s$  be two integers such that  $|ra_m + sa| < a_m$ . Since contradicts minimality of  $a_m$ , it must be the case that  $a_m \mid a$ . Therefore  $A/A_0 = \mathbb{Z}v'_m$ .

6. hello