

Atiyah-MacDonald: Modules

James Pagan

January 2024

Contents

1	Modules	2
1.1	Definition	2
1.2	Examples of Modules	2
1.3	R-Module Homomorphisms	2
1.4	Submodules	3
2	Operations on Submodules	6
2.1	Sums, Intersections, Products	6
2.2	The Annihilator	6
2.3	Direct Sum and Product	7
2.4	Direct Sums on Rings	8
3	Finitely Generated Modules	8
3.1	Definition	8
3.2	Relation to the Jacobson Radical	10
3.3	Relation to Local Rings	11
4	Exact Sequences	12
4.1	Definition	12
4.2	Exact Sequences of Homomorphisms	12

1 Modules

1.1 Definition

An **R-module** over a commutative ring R is an abelian group M (with operation written additively) endowed with a mapping $\mu : R \times M \rightarrow M$ (written multiplicatively) such that the following axioms are satisfied for all $x, y \in M$ and $a, b \in R$:

1. $1x = x$;
2. $(ab)x = a(bx)$;
3. $a(x + y) = ax + ay$;
4. $(a + b)x = ax + bx$.

1.2 Examples of Modules

- If R is a ring, $R[x]$ is a module.
- All ideals $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq R$ are R -modules using the same additive and multiplicative operations as R — in particular R itself is an R -module.
- If R is a field, R -modules are R -vector spaces. In fact, the axioms above are identical to the vector axioms, defined over commutative rings instead of fields.
- Abelian groups G are precisely the modules over \mathbb{Z} .

1.3 R-Module Homomorphisms

A map $f : M \rightarrow N$ between two R -modules M and N is an **R-module homomorphism** (or is **R-linear**) if for all $a \in R$ and $x, y \in M$,

$$\begin{aligned}f(x + y) &= f(x) + f(y) \\f(ax) &= af(x).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, an R -module homomorphism f is a homomorphism of abelian groups that commutes with the action of each $a \in R$. If R is a field, an R -module homomorphism is a linear map. A bijective R -homomorphism is called an R -isomorphism.

The set $\text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ denotes the set of all R -module homomorphisms from M to N , and is a module if we define the following operations for $a \in R$ and $f, g \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$:

$$\begin{aligned}(f + g)(x) &= f(x) + g(x) \\ (af)(x) &= af(x).\end{aligned}$$

We denote $\text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ by $\text{Hom}(M, N)$ if the ring R is unambiguous.

Theorem 1. $\text{Hom}_R(R, M) \cong M$

Proof. The mapping $\phi : \text{Hom}_R(R, M) \rightarrow M$ defined by $\phi(f) = f(1)$ is a homomorphism, as verified by a routine computation: for all $f, g \in \text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ and $a \in R$,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(f + g) &= (f + g)(1) = f(1) + g(1) = \phi(f) + \phi(g) \\ \phi(af) &= (af)(1) = af(1) = a\phi(f),\end{aligned}$$

so ϕ is an R -homomorphism. This mapping is injective, since each f is uniquely determined by $f(1)$. It is also surjective; for each $m \in M$, set define a homomorphism by $h(1) = m$. Thus ϕ is the desired isomorphism. \square

Homomorphisms $u : M' \rightarrow M$ and $v : N \rightarrow N''$ induce mappings $\bar{u} : \text{Hom}(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M', N)$ and $\bar{v} : \text{Hom}(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, N'')$ defined for $f \in \text{Hom}(M, N)$ as follows

$$\bar{u}(f) = f \circ u \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{v}(f) = v \circ f.$$

I do not know why such a manipulation is noteworthy. The formulas above are quite easy to memorize if the time ever comes to invoke them.

1.4 Submodules

A **submodule** M' of M is an abelian subgroup of M closed under multiplication by elements of the commutative ring R .

Lemma 1. \mathfrak{a} is an ideal of R if and only if it is an R -submodule of R .

Proof. The proof evolves from a fundamental observation:

$$R\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a} \iff \text{scalar multiplication in the } R\text{-module } \mathfrak{a} \text{ is closed.}$$

The rest of the multiplicative module conditions follow from the ring axioms. \square

The following proof outlines the construction of **quotient modules**:

Theorem 2. *The abelian quotient group M / M' is an R -module under the operation $a(x + M') = ax + M'$.*

Proof. We must perform four rather routine calculations: for all $x, y \in M$ and $a, b \in R$,

1. **Identity:** $1(x + M') = 1x + M' = x + M'$.
2. **Compatibility:** $a(b(x + M')) = a(bx + M') = abx + M' = (ab)(x + M')$.
3. **Left Distributivity:** $(a + b)(x + M') = (a + b)x + M' = (ax + bx) + M' = (ax + M') + (bx + M') = a(x + M') + b(x + M')$.
4. **Right Distributivity:** $a((x + M') + (y + M')) = a((x + y) + M') = a(x + y) + M' = (ax + M') + (ay + M') = a(x + M') + a(y + M')$.

Therefore, M/M' is an R -module. Also, this operation is naturally well-defined. \square

R -module homomorphisms $f : M \rightarrow N$ induce three notable submodules:

1. **Kernel:** $\text{Ker } f = \{x \in M \mid f(x) = 0\}$, a submodule of M .
2. **Image:** $\text{Im } f = \{f(x) \mid x \in M\}$, a submodule of N .
3. **Cokernel:** $\text{Coker } f = N / \text{Im } f$, a quotient of N .

The cokernel is perhaps an unfamiliar face. Such a quotient is not possible for rings or groups; images of homomorphisms need not be ideals of R nor normal subgroups of G .

Theorem 3 (First Isomorphism Theorem). $N / \text{Ker } f \cong \text{Im } f$.

Proof. Let $K = \text{Ker } f$, and define a mapping $g : M / K \rightarrow \text{Im } f$ by $g(x + K) = f(x)$. We have for arbitrary $x, y \in M$ and $a \in R$ that

$$\begin{aligned} g(x + y + K) &= f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y) = g(x + K) + g(y + K). \\ g(ax + K) &= f(ax) = af(x) = ag(x + K). \end{aligned}$$

Hence g is a homomorphism. For injectivity, suppose that $g(x + K) = g(y + K)$ — that is, $f(x) = f(y)$. Then

$$f(y - x) = f(y) - f(x) = 0,$$

so $y - x \in K$. Thus $x + K = y + K$. Surjectivity is quite clear. We conclude that g is the desired isomorphism. \square

Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be an R -module homomorphism. Here are two special cases of the prior theorem:

1. If f is a monomorphism, then $M \cong \text{Im } f$.
2. If f is an epimorphism, then $M / \text{Ker } f \cong N$.

For a submodule $N' \subseteq \text{Im } f$, I call $M' = \{x \in M \mid f(x) \in N'\}$ the **contraction module**.

Theorem 4 (Correspondence Theorem). *Submodules of G which contain $\text{Ker } f$ correspond one-to-one with submodules of $\text{Im } f$.*

Proof. For each submodule $N' \subseteq \text{Im } f$ consider the contraction module $M' = \{x \mid f(x) \in N'\}$. Since this is an Abelian subgroup, we need only check for multiplicative closure: for all $x \in M'$ and $a \in R$, we have

$$f(ax) = af(x) \in N' \implies ax \in M'.$$

Hence M' is a submodule. It is clear that $\text{Ker } f \subseteq M'$, so the First Isomorphism Theorem yields that

$$N' / \text{Ker } f \cong M'.$$

Thus this construction is injective. It is surjective, since for each $\text{Ker} \subseteq N' \subseteq N$, the subgroup N' is contracted by $f(N')$. The correspondence is now established. \square

The Second Isomorphism Theorem utilizes the definitions of Section 2.1:

Theorem 5 (Second Isomorphism Theorem). *If $M_1, M_2 \subseteq M$ are submodules, then $(M_1 + M_2) / M_1 \cong M_2 / (M_1 \cap M_2)$.*

Proof. Define a mapping $f : M_2 \rightarrow (M_1 + M_2) / M_1$ by $\phi(m_2) = m_2 + M_1$. Clearly ϕ is well-defined; it is an R -module homomorphism, since $x_1, x_2 \in M_2$ and $a \in R$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_1 + x_2) &= x_1 + x_2 + M_1 = (x_1 + M_1) + (x_2 + M_1) = f(x_1) + f(x_2) \\ f(ax_1) &= ax_1 + M_1 = a(x_1 + M_1) = af(x_1). \end{aligned}$$

f is surjective, since for all $x_1 + M_1 \in (M_1 + M_2) / M_1$, we have $f(x_1) = x_1 + M_1$. The kernel of f is all $x \in M_2$ — namely, $M_1 \cap M_2$. We conclude by the First Isomorphism Theorem that

$$(M_1 + M_2) / M_1 = M_2 / (M_1 \cap M_2),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Theorem 6 (Third Isomorphism Theorem). *If $L \triangleleft M$ and $L \subseteq N \triangleleft M$, then $M / N = (M / L) / (N / L)$.*

Proof. Let $\phi : M \rightarrow M / L$ be the canonical epimorphism. Define $\psi : M \rightarrow \phi(M) / \phi(N)$ by the rule $\psi(a) = \phi(a)\phi(M)$. It is clear that ψ is well-defined and surjective; it is an R -module homomorphism since

$$\psi(ab) = \phi(ab)\phi(N) = (\phi(a)\phi(M))(\phi(b)\phi(M)) = \psi(a)\psi(b).$$

The kernel of ϕ is all $a \in N$. The First Isomorphism Theorem yields that

$$M / N \cong \phi(M) / \phi(N).$$

Since the kernel of ϕ is L , we have that $\phi(M) \cong M / L$ and $\phi(N) \cong N / L$; substituting yields the desired $M / N = (M / L) / (N / L)$. \square

2 Operations on Submodules

2.1 Sums, Intersections, Products

Let M be an R -module with submodules M_1, \dots, M_n . We can consider two crucial operations on these submodules:

1. **Sum:** The sum $M_1 + \dots + M_n$ is the set of all sums $m_1 + \dots + m_n$, where $m_i \in M_i$ ($i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$). It is the smallest submodule of M that contains all M_1, \dots, M_n .
2. **Intersection:** The intersection $M_1 \cap \dots \cap M_n$ is the largest submodule of M that is contained inside each M_1, \dots, M_n .

For an ideal \mathfrak{a} of R and an R -module M , we define the **product** $\mathfrak{a}M$ as all finite sums $a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n$ for $a_i \in \mathfrak{a}$ and $x_i \in M$ for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. It is a submodule of M .

2.2 The Annihilator

If N and P are R -submodules of M , we define $(N : P)$ to be the set of all $a \in R$ such that $aP \subseteq N$.

Theorem 7. $(N : P)$ is an ideal of R .

Proof. If $a, b \in (N : P)$, then $aP, bP \subseteq N$; we must have that $aP + bP \subseteq N$. Observe that $(N : P)$ is nonempty, as $0P = (0) \subseteq N$; and clearly if $aP \in N$, then $-aP \in N$ as N is an abelian group. $(N : P)$ satisfies the multiplicative condition too. \square

The **annihilator** of a module M is $(0 : M)$, the ideal of all a such that $aM = 0$, and is denoted $\text{Ann } M$. If $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \text{Ann } M$, we may regard M as an R/\mathfrak{a} -module. In particular, observe that if $\bar{a} \in R/\mathfrak{a}$, then $a_1, a_2 \in \bar{a}$ implies $a_1x = a_2x$ — so \bar{a} is well-defined.

An R -module is **faithful** if $\text{Ann } M = 0$. The annihilator of R may change depending on the ring — if $\text{Ann } M = \mathfrak{a}$, then M is faithful as an R/\mathfrak{a} module.

Theorem 8. If $M_1, M_2 \subseteq M$ are submodules, then $\text{Ann}(M_1 + M_2) = \text{Ann } M_1 \cap \text{Ann } M_2$.

Proof. Suppose $a \in \text{Ann } M_1 \cap \text{Ann } M_2$. Then a annihilates all $x_1 + x_2 \in M_1 + M_2$, so $a \in \text{Ann}(M_1 + M_2)$.

Suppose $a \notin \text{Ann } M_1 \cap \text{Ann } M_2$. Then a must fail to annihilate an element in either M_1 or M_2 (or both) — without loss of generality, let there exist $x_1 \in M_1$ such that $ax_1 \neq 0$. Then as $ax_1 \in M_1 + M_2$, we find that $a \notin \text{Ann}(M_1 + M_2)$. This completes the proof. \square

2.3 Direct Sum and Product

If M and N are R -modules, their **direct sum** $M \oplus N$ is the set of all pairs (x, y) (with $x \in M$ and $y \in N$) endowed with the natural operations:

$$\begin{aligned}(x_1, y_1) + (x_2, y_2) &= (x_1 + x_2, y_1 + y_2) \\ a(x, y) &= (ax, ay)\end{aligned}$$

More generally, for a family of R -modules (M_α) , we define their **direct sum** $\bigoplus_\alpha M_\alpha$ as the families (x_α) such that $x_\alpha \in M_\alpha$ for each α with the restriction that only finitely many x_α are nonzero.

If we allow infinitely many x_α to be nonzero, we attain the family's **direct product** $\prod_\alpha M_\alpha$. Direct sums and direct products are equivalent if there are finitely many α , but not otherwise.

2.4 Direct Sums on Rings

Direct products of rings and direct sums of ideals are equivalent notions:

1. Suppose that $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n$. Then R has n ideals of the form $(\delta_{n,m})$ for each $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Viewing this relation in terms of modules,

$$R \cong \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{a}_n$$

by the isomorphism $f(r_1, \dots, r_n) = ((r_1, 0, \dots), \dots, (\dots, 0, r_n))$.

2. Suppose that $R = \mathfrak{a}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{a}_n$, where $\mathfrak{a}_i \subseteq R$ are ideals. Defining $\mathfrak{b}_i = \bigoplus_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{a}_j$ for each i , we find that

$$R \cong (R/\mathfrak{b}_1) \times \cdots \times (R/\mathfrak{b}_n)$$

by $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (a_1 + \mathfrak{b}_1, \dots, a_n + \mathfrak{b}_n)$. Each \mathfrak{a}_i is a ring isomorphic to R/\mathfrak{b}_i .

This illustrates how one may define a direct sum of ideals.

3 Finitely Generated Modules

3.1 Definition

An R -module M is said to be **finitely generated** if there exist a set of **generators** x_1, \dots, x_n such that $M = Rx_1 + \cdots + Rx_n$. The R -module $R \oplus \cdots \oplus R$ is denoted by R^n .

Theorem 9. *M is finitely-generated by n elements if and only if M is isomorphic to a quotient of R^n .*

Proof. Suppose M is finitely-generated by x_1, \dots, x_n . Define a mapping $f : R^n \rightarrow M$ by $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n$. Then for all $(a_1, \dots, a_n), (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in R^n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(a_1 + b_1, \dots, a_n + b_n) &= (a_1 + b_1)x_1 + \cdots + (a_n + b_n)x_n \\ &= (a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n) + (b_1x_1 + \cdots + b_nx_n) \\ &= f(a_1, \dots, a_n) + f(b_1, \dots, b_n), \end{aligned}$$

and for all $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in R^n$ and $b \in R$, we have

$$f(ba_1, \dots, ba_n) = ba_1x_1 + \cdots + ba_nx_n = b f(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

Thus f is an R -module homomorphism. Its surjectivity follows from the generation of M by x_1, \dots, x_n . Thus if we set $\text{Ker } f = \mathfrak{a}$, the First Isomorphism Theorem yields that

$$R^n / \mathfrak{a} \cong M.$$

Suppose that $R^n / \mathfrak{a} \cong M$ by an isomorphism f . Two definitions are in order:

1. Let $g : R^n \rightarrow R^n / \mathfrak{a}$ be the canonical epimorphism. Then the composition $f \circ g$ is a surjective R -module homomorphism.
2. For each $(\delta_{mi}) \in R^n$, Let $x_i = (f \circ g)(\delta_{mi})$ across each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. We claim that the x_i generate M .

From the surjectivity of $f \circ g$, all $x \in M$, there exists $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n) \in R^n$ such that $(f \circ g)(r) = x$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} x &= (f \circ g)(r_1, \dots, r_n) \\ &= (f \circ g)(r_1 \delta_{m1}) + \dots + (f \circ g)(r_n \phi_{mn}) \\ &= r_1 (f \circ g)(\delta_{m1}) + \dots + r_n (f \circ g)(\delta_{mn}) \\ &= r_1 x_1 + \dots + r_n x_n. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that x_1, \dots, x_n generate M . □

The following proof is a transcription from Atiyah-MacDonald:

Theorem 10. *Let M be a finitely-generated R -module, let \mathfrak{a} be an ideal of R , and let $f : M \rightarrow M$ be an R -module endomorphism of M such that $f(M) \subset \mathfrak{a}M$. Then f satisfies an equation of the form*

$$f^n + a_{n-1}f^{n-1} + \dots + a_0f^0 = 0,$$

where each a_i lies in \mathfrak{a} .

Proof. Let x_1, \dots, x_n generate M . Then each $f(x_i) \in \mathfrak{a}M$, so we may define $a_{ij} \in \mathfrak{a}$ for $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ by $f(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}x_j$. This equation may be equivalently written for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ as

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\delta_{ij}f - a_{ij}f^0)x_j = 0,$$

By multiplying the left by the adjoint of the matrix $\delta_{ij}f - a_{ij}f^0$, it follows that the determinant of $\delta_{ij}f - a_{ij}f^0$ annihilates each x_{ij} — hence it is the zero endomorphism. Expanding out the determinant yields an equation of the required form. □

Corollary 1. *Let M be a finitely-generated R -module and let \mathfrak{a} be an ideal of R such that $\mathfrak{a}M = M$. Then there exists $a \in (1 + \mathfrak{a})$ such that $a \in \text{Ann } M$.*

Proof. Consider Theorem 7 under the identity transformation f . Then there exist $a_{n-1}, \dots, a_0 \in \mathfrak{a}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= f^n + a_{n-1}f^{n-1} + \dots + a_0f^0 \\ &= f + a_{n-1}f + \dots + a_0f \\ &= (1 + a_{n-1} + \dots + a_0)f. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $a = 1 + a_{n-1} + \dots + a_0$ yields that af is the zero endomorphism, so $af(x) = ax = 0$ for each $x \in M$. We conclude that $a \in \text{Ann } M$. \square

A **free R -module** M is a module such that $M \cong \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$, where $M_j \cong R$ for each $j \in J$. A finitely generated module M is therefore free if M is isomorphic to R^n itself.

3.2 Relation to the Jacobson Radical

The following lemma is called **Nakayama's Lemma** and has two proofs:

Lemma 2 (Nakayama's Lemma). *Let M be a finitely generated R -module and \mathfrak{a} an ideal of R contained in the Jacobson radical \mathfrak{J} of R . Then $\mathfrak{a}M = M$ implies $M = 0$.*

Proof. By Corollary 1, there exists $a \in (1 + \mathfrak{J})$ such that $a \in \text{Ann } M$. By the properties of the Jacobson radical, a is a unit. Hence,

$$M = (a^{-1}a)M = a^{-1}(aM) = a^{-1}(0) = 0,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that $\mathfrak{a}M = M$ and $M \neq 0$; let x_1, \dots, x_n be a set of generators of M of shortest length. Then $x_n \in \mathfrak{a}M$, so x_n satisfies an equation of the form

$$x_n = a_1x_1 + \dots + a_nx_n$$

for $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathfrak{a}$. Since none of these scalars are 1, we have

$$(1 - a_n)x_n = a_1x_1 + \dots + a_{n-1}x_{n-1}.$$

Since $a_n \in \mathfrak{J}$, the element $(1 - a_n)$ is a unit. Thus x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} generate M , which yields the desired contradiction. \square

Corollary 2. *Let M be a finitely-generated R -module, $N \subseteq M$ be a submodule, and $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{J}$ be an ideal of R in the Jacobson radical. Then $M = \mathfrak{a}M + N$ implies $M = N$.*

Proof. Suppose that $M = \mathfrak{a}M + N$. Then

$$\mathfrak{a}(M/N) = \mathfrak{a}M/N = (\mathfrak{a}M + N)/N = M/N.$$

Thus applying Nakayama's Lemma to M/N , we have $M/N = 0$; hence $M = N$. \square

3.3 Relation to Local Rings

Consider a finitely-generated module M over a local ring R with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} .

Theorem 11. *The elements of the R -module $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ and the (R/\mathfrak{m}) -module M are identical.*

Proof. It is relatively simple to verify that the function $f : M/\mathfrak{m}M \rightarrow M$ defined by

$$f(a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n + \mathfrak{m}M) = (a_1 + \mathfrak{m})x_1 + \cdots + (a_n + \mathfrak{m})x_n$$

is bijective. It further satisfies $f(x+y) = f(x) + f(y)$ and $f(ax) = bf(x)$, where b is the image of a under the canonical epimorphism $\phi : R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{m}$. \square

This realization arises naturally, as \mathfrak{m} annihilates the quotient module $M/\mathfrak{m}M$. Since R/\mathfrak{m} is a field, $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ is actually a vector space.

Theorem 12. *Let M be a module over a local ring. Then $x_1, \dots, x_n \in M$ generate M if and only if the images of x_1, \dots, x_n span the vector space $M/\mathfrak{m}M$.*

Proof. Let $f : M \rightarrow M/\mathfrak{m}M$ be the canonical epimorphism. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, \dots, x_n \text{ generate } M &\iff x_1, \dots, x_n \text{ generate } M/\mathfrak{m}M \\ &\iff x_1, \dots, x_n \text{ are a basis of } M/\mathfrak{m}M \text{ over } R/\mathfrak{m}. \end{aligned}$$

The omitted details are relatively simple to verify. \square

4 Exact Sequences

4.1 Definition

A sequence of R -modules and R -homomorphisms

$$\cdots \longrightarrow M_{i-1} \xrightarrow{f_i} M_i \xrightarrow{f_{i+1}} M_{i+1} \longrightarrow \cdots \quad (1)$$

is **exact** at M_i if $\text{Im } f_i = \text{Ker } f_{i+1}$. The sequence is **exact** if it is exact at each M_i . Such sequences induce a wealth of identities relating the modules and their images, kernels, and cokernels. Three examples of exact sequences are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow M' \xrightarrow{f} M \text{ is exact} &\iff f \text{ is injective, so } M' \cong \text{Im } f \\ M \xrightarrow{g} M'' \rightarrow 0 \text{ is exact} &\iff g \text{ is surjective, so } M / \text{Ker } g \cong M'. \\ 0 \rightarrow M' \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} M'' \rightarrow 0 \text{ is exact} &\iff f \text{ is injective, } g \text{ is surjective, and} \\ &\text{Coker } f = M / \text{Ker } g \cong M'. \end{aligned}$$

An exact sequence of this third type is called a **short exact sequence**. Any long exact sequence, like that in equation (1), can be broken into numerous short exact sequences:

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Coker } f_{i-1} \xrightarrow{f'_i} M_i \xrightarrow{f_{i+1}} \text{Im } f_{i+1} \longrightarrow 0,$$

where f'_i is defined as $f'_i(x + \text{Ker } f_i) = f_i(x)$. To save time, we will often write that $0 \rightarrow N_i \rightarrow M_i \rightarrow N_{i+1} \rightarrow 0$ for some modules N_i and N_{i+1} instead.

4.2 Exact Sequences of Homomorphisms

Theorem 13. *The sequence*

$$M' \xrightarrow{u} M \xrightarrow{v} M'' \longrightarrow 0 \quad (2)$$

of R -modules and R -module homomorphisms is exact if and only if for all R -modules N , the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(M'', N) \xrightarrow{\bar{v}} \text{Hom}(M, N) \xrightarrow{\bar{u}} \text{Hom}(M', N) \quad (3)$$

is exact, where \bar{u} and \bar{v} are as in Section 1.3.

Proof. The exactness of (2) is equivalent to $\text{Im } u = \text{Ker } v$ and the surjectivity of v , while the exactness of (3) is equivalent to the injectivity of \bar{v} and $\text{Im } \bar{v} = \text{Ker } \bar{u}$.

Claim 1. *v is surjective if and only if \bar{v} is injective.*

Proof. Suppose that v is surjective, and suppose $f \in \text{Ker } \bar{v}$ for any N . Then f is in $\text{Hom}(M, M'')$ and

$$\bar{v}(f) = f \circ v = 0.$$

Since v is surjective, f must map the entirety of M to zero; thus $f = 0$, and \bar{v} is injective.

Now, suppose that v is not surjective. Then set $N = M'' / \text{Im } v$ and let $f \in \text{Hom}(M'', N)$ be the canonical epimorphism; both are nonzero. Then

$$\bar{v}(f)(M) = (f \circ v)(M) = f(\text{Im } v) = 0.$$

Then f is a nonzero element of $\text{Ker } \bar{v}$, so \bar{v} is not surjective.

The second claimed biconditional relation requires proof of the following claim.

Claim 2. *$\text{Im } u = \text{Ker } v$ for surjective v implies that $\text{Im } \bar{v} = \text{Ker } \bar{u}$.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{Im } u = \text{Ker } v$, so $v \circ u = 0$. Let $f \in \text{Im } \bar{v}$; then there exists g such that $\bar{v}(g) = g \circ v = f$. We conclude that

$$\bar{u}(f) = f \circ u = g \circ v \circ u = g \circ 0 = 0,$$

so $f \in \text{Ker } \bar{u}$. Now, suppose $f \in \text{Ker } \bar{u}$, so $\bar{u}(f) = f \circ u = 0$. Since v is surjective, $m'' \in M''$ implies the existence of $m \in M$ such that $v(m) = m''$. Then define $g \in \text{Hom}(M'', N)$ such that $g(m'') = f(m)$; it is relatively easy to demonstrate that g is well-defined and a homomorphism. Thus, $f = g(u) = \bar{u}(g)$, so $f \in \text{Im } \bar{v}$, so $\text{Im } \bar{v} = \text{Ker } \bar{u}$.

If we suppose $\text{Im } \bar{v} = \text{Ker } \bar{u}$, then $\bar{u} \circ \bar{v} = 0$ — that is, $v \circ u \circ f = 0$ for all $f \in \text{Hom}(M'', N)$. This is equivalent to $\text{Im } u = \text{Ker } v$ in the start of Claim 2, with some added work to demonstrate that $\text{Im } u \supseteq \text{Ker } v$. \square

Really, the natural language for these proofs is Homosexual Algebra and Abelian categories. Thus we will state the lemmas from this chapter without proof.

The following theorem is asserted without proof, because I value my sanity.

Theorem 14. *The sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow N' \xrightarrow{u} N \xrightarrow{v} N''$$

of R -modules and R -module homomorphisms is exact if and only if for all R -modules M , the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(M, N') \xrightarrow{\bar{u}} \text{Hom}(M, N) \xrightarrow{\bar{v}} \text{Hom}(M, N'')$$

is exact, where \bar{u} and \bar{v} are as in Section 1.3.

The following theorem is called the Snake Lemma, a special case of exact homology sequences in Homosexual Algebra:

Theorem 15 (Snake Lemma). *Suppose that*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M' & \xrightarrow{u} & M & \xrightarrow{v} & M'' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow f' & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow f'' & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N' & \xrightarrow{u'} & N & \xrightarrow{v'} & N'' & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

is a commutative diagram of R -modules and homomorphisms, with the rows exact. Then there exists an exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Ker}(f') & \xrightarrow{\bar{u}} & \text{Ker}(f) & \xrightarrow{\bar{v}} & \text{Ker}(f'') \\ & & & & \searrow d & & \\ & & \text{Coker}(f') & \xrightarrow{\bar{u}'} & \text{Coker}(f) & \xrightarrow{\bar{v}'} & \text{Coker}(f'') \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

*in which \bar{u} and \bar{v} are restrictions of u and v , and in which \bar{u}' and \bar{v}' induced by u' and v' . The **boundary homomorphism** d is defined in Atiyah-MacDonald page 23.*

We encourage the reader to adopt these results on faith. Homosexual Algebra is a complex subject of math that deserves its own set of notes.