

# Notes on the book: *Atiyah and Macdonald, Introduction to Commutative Algebra*

Meng-Gen Tsai  
plover@gmail.com

August 3, 2021

## Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Chapter 1: Rings and Ideals</b>     | <b>2</b>  |
| Exercise 1.1. . . . .                  | 2         |
| Exercise 1.2. . . . .                  | 2         |
| Exercise 1.3. . . . .                  | 5         |
| Exercise 1.4. . . . .                  | 6         |
| Exercise 1.5. . . . .                  | 6         |
| Supplement 1.5.1. . . . .              | 8         |
| Exercise 1.6. . . . .                  | 9         |
| Exercise 1.7. . . . .                  | 10        |
| Exercise 1.8. . . . .                  | 10        |
| Exercise 1.9. . . . .                  | 11        |
| Exercise 1.10. . . . .                 | 11        |
| The prime spectrum of a ring . . . . . | 12        |
| Exercise 1.15. . . . .                 | 12        |
| Exercise 1.17. . . . .                 | 14        |
| Exercise 1.19. . . . .                 | 18        |
| Exercise 1.20. . . . .                 | 18        |
| Supplement 1.20.1. . . . .             | 19        |
| <b>Chapter 2: Modules</b>              | <b>20</b> |
| Exercise 2.1. . . . .                  | 20        |
| Exercise 2.2. . . . .                  | 22        |
| Exercise 2.3. . . . .                  | 23        |
| Exercise 2.4. . . . .                  | 24        |
| Exercise 2.5. . . . .                  | 25        |
| Exercise 2.8. . . . .                  | 26        |
| Exercise 2.9. . . . .                  | 26        |

# Chapter 1: Rings and Ideals

## Exercise 1.1.

Let  $x$  be a nilpotent element of  $A$ . Show that  $1 + x$  is a unit of  $A$ . Deduce that the sum of a nilpotent element and a unit is a unit.

*Proof.*

- (1) Suppose  $x^m = 0$  for some odd integer  $m \geq 0$ . Then

$$1 = 1 + x^m = (1 + x)(1 - x + x^2 - \cdots + (-1)^{m-1}x^{m-1}),$$

or  $1 + x$  is a unit.

- (2) If  $u$  is any unit and  $x$  is any nilpotent,  $u + x = u \cdot (1 + u^{-1}x)$  is a product of two units (using that  $u^{-1}x$  is nilpotent and applying (1)) and hence a unit again.

□

*Proof (Proposition 1.9).*

- (1) *The nilradical is a subset of the Jacobson radical.*
- (a) The nilradical  $\mathfrak{N}$  of  $A$  is the intersection of all the prime ideals of  $A$  by Proposition 1.8.
  - (b) The Jacobson radical  $\mathfrak{J}$  of  $A$  is the intersection of all the maximal ideals of  $A$  by definition.
- (2) By Proposition 1.9,  $x \in \mathfrak{J}$  if and only if  $1 - xy$  is a unit in  $A$  for all  $y \in A$ . So  $1 + x = 1 - (-x) \cdot 1$  is a unit in  $A$  since  $x$  is a nilpotent and  $\mathfrak{J}$  is an ideal.

□

## Exercise 1.2.

Let  $A$  be a ring and let  $A[x]$  be the ring of polynomials in an indeterminate  $x$ , with coefficients in  $A$ . Let  $f = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n \in A[x]$ . Prove that

- (i)  $f$  is a unit in  $A[x]$  if and only if  $a_0$  is a unit in  $A$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent. (Hint: If  $b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m$  is the inverse of  $f$ , prove by induction on  $r$  that  $a_n^{r+1}b_{m-r} = 0$ . Hence show that  $a_n$  is nilpotent, and then use Exercise 1.1.)
- (ii)  $f$  is nilpotent if and only if  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent.

- (iii)  $f$  is a zero-divisor if and only if there exists  $a \neq 0$  such that  $af = 0$ . (Hint: Choose a polynomial  $g = b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m$  of least degree  $m$  such that  $fg = 0$ . Then  $a_nb_m = 0$ , hence  $a_ng = 0$  (because  $a_ng$  annihilates  $f$  and has degree  $< m$ ). Now show by induction that  $a_{n-r}g = 0$  ( $0 \leq r \leq n$ ).)
- (iv)  $f$  is said to be primitive if  $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n) = (1)$ . Prove that if  $f, g \in A[x]$ , then  $fg$  is primitive if and only if  $f$  and  $g$  are primitive.

*Proof of (i).*

- (1)  $(\Leftarrow)$  holds by Exercise 1.1.
- (2)  $(\Rightarrow)$  There exists the inverse  $g$  of  $f$ , say  $g = b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m$  satisfying  $1 = fg$ . Clearly,  $1 = a_0b_0$ , or  $a_0$  is a unit in  $A$ . Also,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a_nb_m, \\ 0 &= a_nb_{m-1} + a_{n-1}b_m, \\ 0 &= a_nb_{m-2} + a_{n-1}b_{m-1} + a_{n-2}b_m, \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

A direct computing shows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a_n^1b_m, \\ 0 &= a_n(a_nb_{m-1} + a_{n-1}b_m) \\ &= a_n^2b_{m-1} + a_{n-1}a_nb_m \\ &= a_n^2b_{m-1}, \\ 0 &= a_n^2(a_nb_{m-2} + a_{n-1}b_{m-1} + a_{n-2}b_m) \\ &= a_n^3b_{m-2} + a_{n-1}a_n^2b_{m-1} + a_{n-2}a_n^2b_m \\ &= a_n^3b_{m-2}, \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

So we might have  $a_n^{r+1}b_{m-r} = 0$  for  $r = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$ .

- (3) Show that  $a_n^{r+1}b_{m-r} = 0$  for  $r = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$  by induction on  $r$ .
- (a) As  $r = 0$ ,  $a_nb_m = 0$  by comparing the coefficient of  $fg = 1$  at  $x^{n+m}$ .
- (b) For any  $r > 0$ , comparing the coefficient of  $fg = 1$  at  $x^{n+m-r}$ ,

$$0 = a_nb_{m-r} + a_{n-1}b_{m-r+1} + \cdots + a_{n-r}b_m.$$

Multiplying by  $a_n^r$  on the both sides,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a_n^{r+1}b_{m-r} + a_{n-1}a_n^rb_{m-r+1} + \cdots + a_{n-r}a_n^rb_m \\ &= a_n^{r+1}b_{m-r}. \end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis.

- (4)  $a_n$  is a nilpotent. Putting  $r = m$  in  $a_n^{r+1}b_{m-r} = 0$  and get  $a_n^{m+1}b_0 = 0$ . Notice that  $b_0$  is a unit,  $a_n^{m+1} = 0$ , or  $a_n$  is a nilpotent.
- (5) Consider  $f - a_n x^n = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_{n-1} x^{n-1}$ , a polynomial  $\in A[x]$  of degree  $n-1$ . Note that  $f$  is a unit and  $a_n x^n$  is a nilpotent. By Exercise 1.1,  $f - a_n x^n$  is a unit too. Applying the (2)(3)(4) again,  $a_{n-1}$  is a nilpotent as  $n-1 > 0$ , that is, applying descending induction on  $n$  then yields the desired property.

□

*Proof of (ii).*

- (1)  $(\Leftarrow)$  holds since the nilradical of any ring is an ideal.
- (2)  $(\Rightarrow)$   $f^N = 0$  for some  $N > 0$ . So  $0 = f^N = a_0^N + \cdots + a_n^N x^{nN}$ . Compare the coefficient in the lowest term to get  $a_0^N = 0$ , or  $a_0$  is a nilpotent.
- (3) Note that  $f - a_0 = a_1 x + \cdots + a_n x^n \in A[x]$  is nilpotent since  $f$  and  $a_0$  are nilpotent.  $f - a_0$  is a nilpotent too. Continue the same argument in (2), the result is established.

□

*Proof of (iii).*

- (1)  $(\Leftarrow)$  holds trivially.
- (2)  $(\Rightarrow)$  Pick a polynomial  $g = b_0 + b_1 x + \cdots + b_m x^m$  of least degree  $m$  such that  $fg = 0$ . Especially,  $a_n b_m = 0$ .
- (3) Consider

$$\begin{aligned} a_n g &= a_n b_0 + \cdots + a_n b_{m-1} x^{m-1} + a_n b_m x^m \\ &= a_n b_0 + \cdots + a_n b_{m-1} x^{m-1} \end{aligned}$$

(since  $a_n b_m = 0$ ).  $a_n g$  is a polynomial over  $A$  of having degree strictly less than  $m$ . Notice that  $f \cdot (a_n g) = a_n \cdot (fg) = 0$ . By minimality of  $m$ ,  $a_n g = 0$ .

- (4) Induction on the degree  $n$  of  $f$ .
- (a) As  $n = 0$ ,  $f = a_0$ . There exists  $b_m \neq 0$  such that  $b_m f = b_m a_0 = 0$  by (2).
- (b) For any zero-divisor  $f$  of degree  $n$ , there is a polynomial  $g = b_0 + b_1 x + \cdots + b_m x^m$  of least degree  $m$  such that  $fg = 0$ . By (2)(3),

$$\begin{aligned} (f - a_n x^n) \cdot g &= fg - a_n x^n g \\ &= 0 - 0 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

That is,  $f - a_n x^n$  is a zero-divisor of degree  $n - 1$ . By the induction hypothesis, there exists  $b_m \neq 0$  such that  $b_m(f - a_n x^n) = 0$ . So  $b_m f = b_m(f - a_n x^n) + b_m a_n x^n = 0 + 0 = 0$ .

(c) By (a)(b),  $(\implies)$  holds by mathematical induction.

□

*Proof of (iv).* Note that

- (1)  $f \notin \mathfrak{m}[x]$  for any maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $A$  if and only if  $f$  is primitive.
- (2) For any maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $A$ ,  $A/\mathfrak{m}$  is a field (or an integral domain).
- (3)  $A[x]$  is an integral domain if  $A$  is an integral domain.
- (4)  $A[x]/\mathfrak{m}[x] \cong (A/\mathfrak{m})[x]$  as a ring isomorphism.

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
 f, g : \text{primitive} &\iff f, g \notin \mathfrak{m}[x] \text{ for any maximal ideal } \mathfrak{m} \\
 &\iff f, g \neq 0 \text{ in } (A/\mathfrak{m})[x] \text{ for any maximal ideal } \mathfrak{m} \\
 &\iff fg \neq 0 \text{ in } (A/\mathfrak{m})[x] \text{ for any maximal ideal } \mathfrak{m} \\
 &\iff fg \notin \mathfrak{m}[x] \text{ for any maximal ideal } \mathfrak{m} \\
 &\iff fg : \text{primitive}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

### Exercise 1.3.

Generalize the results of Exercise 1.2 to a polynomial ring  $A[x_1, \dots, x_r]$  in several indeterminates.

*Generalization.* Let

$$f = \sum_{(i)} a_{(i)} x^{(i)} \in A[x_1, \dots, x_r]$$

where  $\sum_{(i)}$  is the summation over  $(i) = (i_1, \dots, i_r)$  with  $i_1 + \dots + i_r = n$ . Then

- (i)  $f$  is a unit in  $A[x_1, \dots, x_r]$  if and only if  $a_{(0)}$  is a unit in  $A$  and all other  $a_{(i)}$  are nilpotent.
- (ii)  $f$  is nilpotent if and only if all  $a_{(i)}$  are nilpotent.
- (iii)  $f$  is a zero-divisor if and only if there exists  $a \neq 0$  such that  $af = 0$ .
- (iv) If  $f, g \in A[x_1, \dots, x_r]$ , then  $fg$  is primitive if and only if  $f$  and  $g$  are primitive.

*Proof.* Use the mathematical induction to prove (i)(ii)(iii) and apply the same argument in Exercise 1.2 (iv) to prove (iv).  $\square$

**Exercise 1.4.**

*In the ring  $A[x]$ , the Jacobson radical is equal to the nilradical.*

*Proof.*

- (1) The nilradical  $\mathfrak{N}$  is a subset of the Jacobson radical  $\mathfrak{J}$ . It suffices to show that  $\mathfrak{J} \subseteq \mathfrak{N}$ .

(2)

$$\begin{aligned}
 & f \in \mathfrak{J} \\
 \iff & 1 - fy \text{ is a unit in } A[x] \text{ for all } y \in A[x] && \text{(Proposition 1.9)} \\
 \implies & 1 - xf \text{ is a unit in } A[x] && (y = x) \\
 \implies & \text{All coefficients of } f \text{ are nilpotent} && \text{(Exercise 1.2 (i))} \\
 \implies & f \text{ is nilpotent} && \text{(Exercise 1.2 (ii))} \\
 \implies & f \in \mathfrak{N}.
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Exercise 1.5.**

*Let  $A$  be a ring and let  $A[[x]]$  be the ring of formal power series  $f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n$  with coefficients in  $A$ . Show that*

- (i)  *$f$  is a unit in  $A[[x]]$  if and only if  $a_0$  is a unit in  $A$ .*
- (ii) *If  $f$  is nilpotent, then  $a_n$  is nilpotent for all  $n \geq 0$ . Is converse true? (See Exercise 7.2.)*
- (iii)  *$f$  belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A[[x]]$  if and only if  $a_0$  belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A$ .*
- (iv) *The contraction of a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $A[[x]]$  is a maximal ideal of  $A$ , and  $\mathfrak{m}$  is generated by  $\mathfrak{m}^c$  and  $x$ .*
- (v) *Every prime ideal of  $A$  is the contraction of a prime ideal of  $A[[x]]$ .*

*Proof of (i).*

- (1) ( $\implies$ ) If  $g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$  is an inverse of  $f$ , then  $fg = 1$  implies that  $a_0 b_0 = 1$  so that  $a_0$  is a unit in  $A$ .
- (2) ( $\impliedby$ ) Our goal is to find  $g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$  such that the Cauchy product  $fg = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n x^n$  is equal to  $1 \in A[x]$ . Here  $c_n = \sum_{r=0}^n a_r b_{n-r}$ . By the assumption we have that  $c_0 = 1$  and  $c_1 = c_2 = \dots = 0$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} b_0 &= a_0^{-1} \\ b_1 &= -a_0^{-1} a_1 b_0 \\ &\dots \\ b_n &= a_0^{-1} \sum_{r=1}^n a_r b_{n-r} \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

by induction.

□

*Proof of (ii).*

- (1) The proof is the same as Exercise 1.2 (ii).
- (2) The converse is true if  $A$  is Noetherian (by Exercise 7.2).
- (3) The converse is not always true. Take

$$A = \mathbb{F}_2[t, t^{-2}, t^{-2^2}, \dots]/(t)$$

and

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t^{-2^n} x^n \in A[x].$$

Note that  $A$  is not Noetherian and all  $a_n$  are nilpotent in  $A$ . To show  $f$  is not nilpotent in  $A[x]$ , it suffices to show that  $f^{2^r}$  is not equal to zero for all positive integers  $r$ .

- (4) Note that  $\mathbb{F}_2$  is a field of characteristic 2. So

$$f^{2^r} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n^{2^r} x^n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} t^{2^{r-n}} x^n = \sum_{n=r+1}^{\infty} t^{2^{r-n}} x^n \neq 0$$

for all  $r$ .

□

*Proof of (iii).*

$$\begin{aligned}
& f \text{ in the Jacobson radical of } A[[x]] \\
& \iff 1 - fg \in A[[x]] \text{ is unit for all } g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n \in A[[x]] \quad (\text{Proposition 1.9}) \\
& \iff 1 - a_0 b_0 \in A \text{ is unit for all } b_0 \in A \quad ((i)) \\
& \iff a_0 \text{ belongs to the Jacobson radical of } A. \quad (\text{Proposition 1.9})
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of (iv).*

- (1) Note that  $x = 0 + x$  belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A[[x]]$  since 0 obviously belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A$  (by (iii)).
- (2) So  $x \in \mathfrak{m}$  or  $(x) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$  for any maximal ideal in  $A[[x]]$ . So it is clear that  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}^c + (x)$ .
- (3) Moreover,  $\mathfrak{m}^c$  is a maximal ideal since  $A/\mathfrak{m}^c \cong A[[x]]/\mathfrak{m}$  is a field.

□

*Proof of (v).*

- (1) Similar to (iv). Suppose  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a prime ideal of  $A$ . Let  $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p} + (x)$  be an ideal of  $A[[x]]$ .
- (2)  $\mathfrak{q}^c = \mathfrak{p}$  clearly. Besides,  $\mathfrak{q}^c$  is a prime ideal since

$$A[[x]]/\mathfrak{q}^c \cong A/\mathfrak{p}$$

is an integral domain.

□

### Supplement 1.5.1.

(Exercise II.1.2 in the textbook: Jrgen Neukirch, *Algebraic Number Theory*.) A  $p$ -adic integer  $a = a_0 + a_1 p + a_2 p^2 + \cdots$  is a unit in the ring  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  if and only if  $a_0 \neq 0$ .

*Proof.*

- (1) ( $\implies$ ) If  $b = b_0 + b_1 p + b_2 p^2 + \cdots$  is an inverse of  $a$ , then  $ab = 1$  implies that  $a_0 b_0 = 1$  so that  $a_0$  is a unit in  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  or  $a_0 \neq 0$ .



(2) ( $\Leftarrow$ ) Our goal is to find

$$b = b_0 + b_1p + b_2p^2 + \cdots \in \mathbb{Z}_p$$

such that the Cauchy product

$$ab = c_0 + c_1p + c_2p^2 + \cdots$$

is equal to  $1 \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ . Here  $c_n = \sum_{\nu=0}^n a_\nu b_{n-\nu}$ . By the assumption we have that  $c_0 = 1$  and  $c_1 = c_2 = \cdots = 0$ . Hence

$$b_0 = a_0^{-1}$$

$$b_1 = -a_0^{-1}a_1b_0$$

$$\dots$$

$$b_n = a_0^{-1} \sum_{\nu=1}^n a_\nu b_{n-\nu}$$

$$\dots$$

by induction.

□

### Exercise 1.6.

*A ring  $A$  is such that every ideal not contained in the nilradical contains a nonzero idempotent (that is, an element  $e$  such that  $e^2 = e \neq 0$ ). Prove that the nilradical and Jacobson radical of  $A$  are equal.*

*Proof.*

(1)  $\mathfrak{N} \subseteq \mathfrak{J}$  clearly.

(2) Since

$$\begin{aligned} a \notin \mathfrak{N} &\implies (a) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{N} \\ &\implies \text{there exists a nonzero idempotent } e \in (a) \\ &\implies e = ar \text{ for some } r \in A \\ &\implies 0 = e - e^2 = e(1 - e) = ar(1 - ar) \\ &\implies 1 - ar \text{ is a zero-divisor, not a unit} \\ &\implies a \notin \mathfrak{J}, \end{aligned} \tag{Proposition 1.9}$$

we have  $\mathfrak{J} \subseteq \mathfrak{N}$ .

□

**Exercise 1.7.**

Let  $A$  be a ring in which every element satisfies  $x^n = x$  for some  $n > 1$  (depending on  $x$ ). Show that every prime ideal in  $A$  is maximal.

*Proof.* It suffices to show that for any prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  in  $A$ ,  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is a field.

- (1) Take any  $0 \neq \bar{x} \in A/\mathfrak{p}$ , which is represented by  $x \in A - \mathfrak{p}$ . By assumption there exists  $n \geq 2$  such that  $x^n = x$ . So  $\bar{x}^n = \bar{x}$  or  $\bar{x}(\bar{x}^{n-1} - 1) = 0$ .
- (2) Since  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime,  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is an integral domain. That is,  $\bar{x} = 0$  (impossible) or  $\bar{x}^{n-1} - 1 = 0$ . Write  $\bar{x} \cdot \bar{x}^{n-2} = 1$  in  $A/\mathfrak{p}$ . So  $\bar{x}^{n-2}$  is an inverse of  $\bar{x} \neq 0$  in  $A/\mathfrak{p}$ , which implies that  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is a field (since  $\bar{x}$  is arbitrary).
- (3)  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is a field if and only if  $\mathfrak{p}$  is maximal.

□

**Exercise 1.8.**

Let  $A$  be a ring  $\neq 0$ . Show that the set of prime ideals of  $A$  has minimal elements with respect to inclusion.

Similar to Theorem 1.3.

*Proof (Zorn's Lemma).*

- (1) Let  $\Sigma$  be the set of all prime ideals of  $A$ .
- (2) Order  $\Sigma$  by  $\supseteq$ , that is,  $\mathfrak{p} \leq \mathfrak{q}$  if  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{q}$ .
- (3)  $\Sigma$  is not empty, since every ring  $A \neq 0$  has at least one maximal ideal (or prime ideal) (Theorem 1.3).
- (4) To apply Zorn's lemma we must show that every chain in  $\Sigma$  has a lower bound in  $\Sigma$ ; let then  $(\mathfrak{p}_\alpha)$  be a chain of prime ideals in  $\Sigma$ , so that for each pair of indices  $\alpha, \beta$  we have either  $\mathfrak{p}_\alpha \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_\beta$  or  $\mathfrak{p}_\beta \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_\alpha$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} = \bigcap_\alpha \mathfrak{p}_\alpha$ .
- (5) Show that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a prime ideal. Clearly  $\mathfrak{p}$  is an ideal. Given any  $xy \in \mathfrak{p}$  and  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$ . So  $xy$  is in all prime ideals  $\mathfrak{p}_\alpha$ . By assumption  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$ , there is some  $\beta$  such that  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}_\beta$ , or  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}_\alpha$  whenever  $\alpha \geq \beta$ . So  $y \in \mathfrak{p}_\alpha$  whenever  $\alpha \geq \beta$ . Since  $y \in \mathfrak{p}_\beta$ ,  $y \in \mathfrak{p}_\gamma$  whenever  $\beta \geq \gamma$ . Therefore,  $y \in \mathfrak{p}_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha$ , or  $y \in \mathfrak{p}$ , or  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime.

□

**Exercise 1.9.**

Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be an ideal  $\neq (1)$  in a ring  $A$ . Show that  $\mathfrak{a} = r(\mathfrak{a}) \iff \mathfrak{a}$  is an intersection of prime ideals.

*Proof.*

- (1)  $(\implies)$ . By Proposition 1.14,  $\mathfrak{a} = r(\mathfrak{a})$  is the intersection of the prime ideals which contain  $\mathfrak{a}$ .
- (2)  $(\impliedby)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{a} &= \bigcap \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{some subset of } \text{Spec}(A)\} \\
 &= \bigcap \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{some subset of } \text{Spec}(A) : \mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\} \\
 &\supseteq \bigcap \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A) : \mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\} \\
 &= r(\mathfrak{a}) \\
 &\supseteq \mathfrak{a}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

**Exercise 1.10.**

Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\mathfrak{N}$  its nilradical. Show the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $A$  has exactly one prime ideal;
- (ii) every element of  $A$  is either a unit or nilpotent;
- (iii)  $A/\mathfrak{N}$  is a field.

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}
 &A/\mathfrak{N} \text{ is a field} \\
 \implies &\mathfrak{N} \text{ is a maximal ideal} \\
 \implies &\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{N} \text{ for every prime ideal } \mathfrak{p} && (\text{Proposition 1.8}) \\
 \implies &A \text{ has exactly one prime ideal } \mathfrak{p} \\
 \implies &\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{N} \\
 \implies &A \text{ has exactly one maximal ideal } \mathfrak{p} \\
 \implies &\text{Given any } a \in A, a \text{ is a unit or } a \in \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{N}. && (\text{Corollary 1.5}) \\
 \implies &A/\mathfrak{N} \text{ is a field.}
 \end{aligned}$$

□

## The prime spectrum of a ring

### Exercise 1.15.

Let  $A$  be a ring and let  $X$  be the set of all prime ideals of  $A$ . For each subset  $E$  of  $A$ , let  $V(E)$  denote the set of all prime ideals of  $A$  which contain  $E$ . Prove that

- (i) if  $\mathfrak{a}$  is the ideal generated by  $E$ , then  $V(E) = V(\mathfrak{a}) = V(r(\mathfrak{a}))$ .
- (ii)  $V(0) = X$ ,  $V(1) = \emptyset$ .
- (iii) if  $(E_i)_{i \in I}$  is any family of subsets of  $A$ , then

$$V\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} E_i\right) = \bigcap_{i \in I} V(E_i).$$

- (iv)  $V(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}) = V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}) = V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$  for any ideals  $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$  of  $A$ .

The results show that the sets  $V(E)$  satisfy the axioms for closed sets in a topological space. The resulting topology is called the Zariski topology. The topological space  $X$  is called the prime spectrum of  $A$ , and is written  $\text{Spec}(A)$ .

Note that if  $E_1 \subseteq E_2$ , then  $V(E_1) \supseteq V(E_2)$ .

*Proof of (i).*

- (1) Show that  $V(E) = V(\mathfrak{a})$ .
  - (a) Show that  $V(E) \subseteq V(\mathfrak{a})$ . Given any  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(E)$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq E$ . For any  $a \in \mathfrak{a}$ , since  $\mathfrak{a}$  is generated by  $E$ , we can write  $a$  as a finite sum  $a = \sum \alpha\beta$  where  $\alpha \in A$  and  $\beta \in E$ . Since  $E \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ , all  $\beta \in \mathfrak{p}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{p}$  is an ideal,  $a = \sum \alpha\beta \in \mathfrak{p}$ . That is,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$ , or  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a})$ .
  - (b)  $V(E) \supseteq V(\mathfrak{a})$  since  $\mathfrak{a} \supseteq E$ .
- (2) Show that  $V(\mathfrak{a}) = V(r(\mathfrak{a}))$ .

- (a) Show that  $V(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq V(r(\mathfrak{a}))$ . Given any  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}) &\implies \mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a} \\ &\implies \mathfrak{p} \supseteq \text{the intersection of the prime ideals } \mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a} \\ &\implies \mathfrak{p} \supseteq r(\mathfrak{a}) \text{ (by Proposition 1.14)} \\ &\implies \mathfrak{p} \in V(r(\mathfrak{a})). \end{aligned}$$

- (b)  $V(\mathfrak{a}) \supseteq V(r(\mathfrak{a}))$  since  $r(\mathfrak{a}) \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$ .

□

*Proof of (ii).*

- (1)  $V(1) = \emptyset$  since no prime ideal contains 1 by definition.
- (2)  $V(0) = X$  since 0 is in every ideal (especially in every prime ideal).

□

*Proof of (iii).*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{p} \in V\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} E_i\right) &\iff \mathfrak{p} \supseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} E_i \\
 &\iff \mathfrak{p} \supseteq E_i \text{ for all } i \in I \\
 &\iff \mathfrak{p} \in V(E_i) \text{ for all } i \in I \\
 &\iff \mathfrak{p} \in \bigcap_{i \in I} V(E_i).
 \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma.** *For any  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$  or  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ .*

*Proof of Lemma.*

- (1) If  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$ . We are done.
- (2) If  $\mathfrak{p} \not\supseteq \mathfrak{a}$ , there exists  $a \in \mathfrak{a} - \mathfrak{p}$ . So for any  $b \in \mathfrak{b}$ ,  $b \in \mathfrak{p}$  since  $ab \in \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a prime ideal, that is,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ .

By (1)(2),  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$  or  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ . □

*Proof of (iv).*

- (1) *Show that  $V(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}) = V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$ .*
  - (a)  $V(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}) \subseteq V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$  since  $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}$ .
  - (b) *Show that  $V(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}) \supseteq V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$ .* Given any  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$ . By Lemma,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$  or  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ . Notice that  $\mathfrak{a} \supseteq \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}$  and  $\mathfrak{b} \supseteq \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}$ . In any case,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b})$ .
- (2) *Show that  $V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}) = V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$ .*
  - (a) *Show that  $V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$ .* Given any  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$ . By Lemma,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$  or  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a})$  or  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{b})$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$ .
  - (b) *Show that  $V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}) \supseteq V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$ .* Given any  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a})$  or  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{b})$ ,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$  or  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$ . Notice that  $\mathfrak{a} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$  and  $\mathfrak{b} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$ . In any cases,  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$ , or  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$ .

□

**Exercise 1.17.**

For each  $f \in A$ , let  $X_f$  denote the complement of  $V(f)$  in  $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ . The sets  $X_f$  are open. Show that they form a basis of open sets for the Zariski topology, and that

- (i)  $X_f \cap X_g = X_{fg}$ .
- (ii)  $X_f = \emptyset \iff f$  is nilpotent.
- (iii)  $X_f = X \iff f$  is a unit.
- (iv)  $X_f = X_g \iff r((f)) = r((g))$ .
- (v)  $X$  is quasi-compact (compact), that is, every open covering of  $X$  has a finite subcovering.
- (vi) More generally, each  $X_f$  is quasi-compact.
- (vii) An open subset of  $X$  is quasi-compact if and only if it is a finite union of sets  $X_f$ .

The sets  $X_f$  are called basic open sets of  $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ .

(Hint: To prove (v), remark that it is enough to consider a covering of  $X$  by basic open sets  $X_{f_i}$  ( $i \in I$ ). Show that the  $f_i$  generate the unit ideal and hence that there is an equation of the form

$$1 = \sum_{i \in J} g_i f_i \quad (g_i \in A)$$

where  $J$  is some finite subset of  $I$ . Then the  $X_{f_i}$  ( $i \in J$ ) cover  $X$ .)

*Proof of basis.* It is equivalent to Exercise 1.15 (iii). Given any open set  $O$  in  $X$ . Write  $O = X - V(\mathfrak{a})$  for some ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  of  $A$ . Since

$$V(\mathfrak{a}) = V\left(\bigcup_{f \in \mathfrak{a}} (f)\right) = \bigcap_{f \in \mathfrak{a}} V(f),$$

we have

$$O = X - V(\mathfrak{a}) = X - \bigcap_{f \in \mathfrak{a}} V(f) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathfrak{a}} (X - V(f)) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathfrak{a}} X_f,$$

or any open set is a union of basic open sets. □

*Proof of (i).*  $X_f \cap X_g = X_{fg} \iff V(f) \cup V(g) = V(fg)$  holds by Exercise 1.15 (iv).  $\square$

*Proof of (ii).*

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_f = \emptyset &\iff V(f) = X \\
 &\iff f \in \mathfrak{p} \text{ for all prime ideal } \mathfrak{p} \text{ of } A \\
 &\iff f \in \mathfrak{N}, \text{ the nilradical of } A \text{ (Proposition 1.8)} \\
 &\iff f \text{ is nilpotent (Proposition 1.7)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Proof of (ii)(Using (iv)).*

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_f = \emptyset &\iff X_f = X_0 && \text{(Exercise 15(ii))} \\
 &\iff r(f) = r(0) && \text{((iv))} \\
 &\iff f \in r(f) = r(0) \\
 &\iff f^m = 0 \text{ for some } m > 0 \\
 &\iff f \text{ is nilpotent}
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Proof of (iii).*

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_f = X &\iff V(f) = \emptyset \\
 &\iff f \notin \mathfrak{p} \text{ for all prime ideal } \mathfrak{p} \text{ of } A \\
 &\iff f \text{ is unit (Corollary 1.5)}
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Proof of (iii)(Using (iv)).*

$$\begin{aligned}
 X_f = X &\iff X_f = X_1 && \text{(Exercise 15(ii))} \\
 &\iff r(f) = r(1) && \text{((iv))} \\
 &\iff f \in r(f) = r(1) \\
 &\iff f^m = 1 \text{ for some } m > 0 \\
 &\iff f \text{ is unit}
 \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Proof of (iv).*

(1) Show that  $X_f \subseteq X_g \iff r((f)) \subseteq r((g))$ . Actually,

$$\begin{aligned}
X_f \subseteq X_g &\implies V(f) \supseteq V(g) \\
&\implies \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A) : \mathfrak{p} \supseteq (f)\} \supseteq \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A) : \mathfrak{p} \supseteq (g)\} \\
&\implies \bigcap_{(f) \subseteq \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)} \mathfrak{p} \subseteq \bigcap_{(g) \subseteq \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)} \mathfrak{p} \\
&\stackrel{1.14}{\implies} r(f) \subseteq r(g) \\
&\implies V(r(f)) \supseteq V(r(g)) \\
&\implies V(f) \supseteq V(g) \\
&\implies X_f \subseteq X_g.
\end{aligned}$$

(2) By (1),

$$\begin{aligned}
X_f \subseteq X_g &\iff r((f)) \subseteq r((g)), \\
X_f \supseteq X_g &\iff r((f)) \supseteq r((g)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$X_f = X_g \iff r((f)) = r((g)).$$

□

*Proof of (v).* Notice that it is enough to consider a covering of  $X$  by basic open sets  $X_{f_i} (i \in I)$ .

(1) Since  $X$  is covered by  $X_{f_i} (i \in I)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_{f_i} &\implies X - V(1) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (X - V(f_i)) \\
&\implies V(1) = \bigcap_{i \in I} V(f_i) \\
&\implies V(1) = V\left(\sum_{i \in I} f_i\right) \\
&\implies r(1) = r\left(\sum_{i \in I} f_i\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $1 \in r(1) = r\left(\sum_{i \in I} f_i\right)$  can be expressed as

$$1 = 1^m = \sum_{j \in J} g_j f_j$$

where  $J$  is a finite subset of  $I$  and  $g_j \in A$ . That is,  $(1) = \sum_{j \in J} f_j$ .

(2) Hence,  $V(1) = V\left(\sum_{j \in J} f_j\right)$ . Therefore,  $X$  is covered by finite subcovering  $\{X_{f_j}\} (j \in J)$ .



□

*Proof of (v)(Using (vi)).* Since  $X = X_1$ ,  $X$  is quasi-compact by (vi). □

*Proof of (vi).* Notice that it is enough to consider a covering of  $X_f$  by basic open sets  $X_{f_i}$  ( $i \in I$ ).

(1) Since  $X_f$  is covered by  $X_{f_i}$  ( $i \in I$ ),

$$\begin{aligned} X_f = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_{f_i} &\implies X - V(f) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (X - V(f_i)) \\ &\implies V(f) = \bigcap_{i \in I} V(f_i) \\ &\implies V(f) = V\left(\sum_{i \in I} f_i\right) \\ &\implies r(f) = r\left(\sum_{i \in I} f_i\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $f \in r(f) = r\left(\sum_{i \in I} f_i\right)$  can be expressed as

$$f^m = \sum_{j \in J} g_j f_j$$

where  $J$  is a finite subset of  $I$  and  $g_j \in A$ . That is,  $f^m \in \sum_{j \in J} f_j$ .

(2) Show that  $V\left(\sum_{j \in J} f_j\right) = V(f)$ .

(a) ( $\subseteq$ ) For any prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \sum_{j \in J} f_j$ ,  $f^m \in \mathfrak{p}$  or  $f \in \mathfrak{p}$  (since  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime). So  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq (f)$ , or  $V\left(\sum_{j \in J} f_j\right) \subseteq V(f)$ .

(b) ( $\supseteq$ )

$$\sum_{j \in J} f_j \subseteq \sum_{i \in I} f_i \implies V\left(\sum_{j \in J} f_j\right) \supseteq V\left(\sum_{i \in I} f_i\right) = V(f).$$

(3) Therefore,  $X_f$  is covered by finite subcovering  $\{X_{f_j}\}(j \in J)$ .

□

*Proof of (vi)(Using (v)).* Exercise 3.21 (i) shows that  $X_f$  is the spectrum of  $A_f$ . By (v),  $X_f$  is quasi-compact. □

*Proof of (vii).*

- (1) ( $\implies$ ) Given an open subset  $O$ . Since  $X_f$  form a basis of open sets,

$$O = \bigcup_{f \in \mathfrak{a}} X_f \text{ for some ideal } \mathfrak{a} \text{ of } A$$

Especially,  $\{X_f\}_{f \in \mathfrak{a}}$  is an open covering of  $O$ . Since  $O$  is quasi-compact, there exists a finite subcovering  $\{X_f\}_{f \in J}$  of  $O$ , where  $J$  is a finite subset of  $\mathfrak{a}$  (as a set). That is,  $O = \bigcup_{f \in J} X_f$  is a finite union of sets  $X_f$ .

- (2) ( $\impliedby$ ) Since  $X_f$  is quasi-compact, any finite union of quasi-compact sets is quasi-compact again.

□

**Exercise 1.19.**

A topological space  $X$  is said to be irreducible if  $X \neq \emptyset$  and if every pair of non-empty open sets in  $X$  intersect, or equivalently if every non-empty open set is dense in  $X$ . Show that  $\text{Spec}(A)$  is irreducible if and only if the nilradical of  $A$  is a prime ideal.

*Proof.* Use the notations in Proposition 1.7 and Exercise 1.17.

$\text{Spec}(A)$  is irreducible

$$\iff X_f \cap X_g \neq \emptyset \text{ for any nonempty } X_f, X_g \in \text{Spec}(A)$$

$$\iff X_{fg} \neq \emptyset \text{ for any nonempty } X_f, X_g \in \text{Spec}(A) \quad (\text{Exercise 1.17 (i)})$$

$$\iff fg \notin \mathfrak{N} \text{ for any } f, g \notin \mathfrak{N} \quad (\text{Exercise 1.17 (ii)})$$

$$\iff \mathfrak{N} \text{ is prime.}$$

□

**Exercise 1.20.**

Let  $X$  be a topological space.

- (i) If  $Y$  is an irreducible subspace of  $X$ , then the closure  $\overline{Y}$  of  $Y$  in  $X$  is irreducible.

*Proof of (i).*

- (1)  $Y$  is irreducible if and only if  $Y$  cannot be represented as the union of two

proper closed subspaces.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \forall \text{ nonempty open sets } U_1 \text{ and } U_2, U_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset \\
& \iff \forall \text{ nonempty open sets } U_1 \text{ and } U_2, X - (U_1 \cap U_2) \neq X \\
& \iff \forall \text{ nonempty open sets } U_1 \text{ and } U_2, (X - U_1) \cup (X - U_2) \neq X \\
& \iff \forall \text{ proper closed sets } Y_1 \text{ and } Y_2, Y_1 \cup Y_2 \neq X \\
& \iff \nexists \text{ proper closed sets } Y_1 \text{ and } Y_2, Y_1 \cup Y_2 = X.
\end{aligned}$$

(2) If  $\overline{Y}$  were reducible, there are two closed set  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  such that

$$\overline{Y} \subseteq Y_1 \cup Y_2, \overline{Y} \not\subseteq Y_i (i = 1, 2).$$

- (a)  $Y \subseteq \overline{Y} \subseteq Y_1 \cup Y_2$ .
- (b)  $Y \not\subseteq Y_i (i = 1, 2)$ . If not,  $Y \subseteq Y_i$  for some  $i$ . Take closure to get  $\overline{Y} \subseteq \overline{Y_i} = Y_i$  (since  $Y_i$  is closed), contrary to the assumption.

By (a)(b),  $Y$  is reducible, which is absurd.

□

### Supplement 1.20.1.

(Exercise I.1.6 in the textbook: Robin Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*.) Any nonempty open subset of an irreducible topological space is dense and irreducible. If  $Y$  is a subset of a topological space  $X$ , which is irreducible in its induced topology, then the closure  $\overline{Y}$  is also irreducible.

Here we use the definition of irreducibility given by Hartshorne.

*Definition.* A nonempty subset  $Y$  of a topological space  $X$  is irreducible if it cannot be expressed as the union  $Y = Y_1 \cup Y_2$  of two proper subsets, each one of which is closed in  $Y$ . The empty set is not considered to be irreducible.

The proof is the same as Exercise 1.20(i) except that any nonempty open subset of an irreducible topological space is irreducible.

*Proof (Irreducibility of open subsets).* Given any open subset  $U$  of an irreducible topological space  $X$ . Write  $U \subseteq Y_1 \cup Y_2$  where  $Y_1$  and  $Y_2$  are closed in  $X$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
U \subseteq Y_1 \cup Y_2 & \implies \overline{U} \subseteq \overline{Y_1 \cup Y_2} \\
& \implies X \subseteq Y_1 \cup Y_2 & (U \text{ is dense, } Y_1 \cup Y_2 \text{ is closed}) \\
& \implies Y_1 = X \supseteq U \text{ or } Y_2 = X \supseteq U & (X \text{ is irreducible}) \\
& \implies U \text{ is irreducible.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

## Chapter 2: Modules

### Exercise 2.1.

Show that  $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) = 0$  if  $m, n$  are coprime.

It suffices to show that

$$(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$$

where  $d$  is the greatest common divisor of  $m$  and  $n$ .

*Outlines.*

- (1) Define  $\tilde{\varphi}$  by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\varphi}: & (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) & \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z} \\ & \Downarrow & \Downarrow \\ & (x + m\mathbb{Z}, y + n\mathbb{Z}) & \longmapsto xy + d\mathbb{Z}. \end{array}$$

$\tilde{\varphi}$  is well-defined and  $\mathbb{Z}$ -bilinear.

- (2) By the universal property,  $\tilde{\varphi}$  factors through a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -bilinear map

$$\varphi: (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$$

(such that  $\varphi(x \otimes y) = \tilde{\varphi}(x, y)$ ).

- (3) To show that  $\varphi$  is isomorphic, might find the inverse map  $\psi: \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$  of  $\varphi$ . Define  $\psi$  by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \psi: & \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z} & \longrightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \\ & \Downarrow & \Downarrow \\ & z + d\mathbb{Z} & \longmapsto (z + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}). \end{array}$$

$\psi$  is well-defined and  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear.

- (4)  $\psi \circ \varphi = \text{id}$ .

- (5)  $\varphi \circ \psi = \text{id}$ .

*Proof of (1).*

- (a)  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is well-defined. Say  $x' = x + am$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $y' = y + bn$  for some  $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $x'y' - xy = yam + xbn + abmn \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ . That is,  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is independent of coset representative.

(b)  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -bilinear.

(i) For any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda x, y) = \tilde{\varphi}(x, \lambda y) = \lambda \tilde{\varphi}(x, y)$ . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\varphi}(\lambda(x + m\mathbb{Z}), y + n\mathbb{Z}) &= \tilde{\varphi}(\lambda x + m\mathbb{Z}, y + n\mathbb{Z}) = \lambda xy + d\mathbb{Z}, \\ \tilde{\varphi}(x + m\mathbb{Z}, \lambda(y + n\mathbb{Z})) &= \tilde{\varphi}(x + m\mathbb{Z}, \lambda y + n\mathbb{Z}) = \lambda xy + d\mathbb{Z}, \\ \tilde{\varphi}(x_1 + m\mathbb{Z}, y + n\mathbb{Z}) &= \lambda(xy + d\mathbb{Z}) = \lambda xy + d\mathbb{Z}.\end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\tilde{\varphi}(x_1 + x_2, y) = \tilde{\varphi}(x_1, y) + \tilde{\varphi}(x_2, y)$ . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\varphi}((x_1 + x_2) + m\mathbb{Z}, y + n\mathbb{Z}) &= (x_1 + x_2)y + d\mathbb{Z}, \\ \tilde{\varphi}(x_1 + m\mathbb{Z}, y + n\mathbb{Z}) + \tilde{\varphi}(x_2 + m\mathbb{Z}, y + n\mathbb{Z}) &= (x_1 y + d\mathbb{Z}) + (x_2 y + d\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= (x_1 + x_2)y + d\mathbb{Z}.\end{aligned}$$

(iii)  $\tilde{\varphi}(x, y_1 + y_2) = \tilde{\varphi}(x, y_1) + \tilde{\varphi}(x, y_2)$ . Similar to (ii).

□

*Proof of (3).*

(a)  $\psi$  is well-defined. Say  $z' = z + cd$  for some  $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Note that  $d = \alpha m + \beta n$  for some  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(z' + d\mathbb{Z}) &= \psi(z + cd + d\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= \psi(z + c(\alpha m + \beta n) + d\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= (z + c(\alpha m + \beta n) + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= (z + c\beta n + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= (z + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}) + (c\beta n + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= \psi(z + d\mathbb{Z}) + (1 + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (c\beta n + n\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= \psi(z + d\mathbb{Z}).\end{aligned}$$

(b)  $\psi$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear.

(i) For any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\psi(\lambda z) = \lambda \psi(z)$ . In fact,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\lambda(z + d\mathbb{Z})) &= \psi(\lambda z + d\mathbb{Z}) = (\lambda z + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}), \\ \lambda \psi(z + d\mathbb{Z}) &= \lambda((z + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z})) = (\lambda z + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}).\end{aligned}$$

(ii)  $\psi(z_1 + z_2) = \psi(z_1) + \psi(z_2)$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\psi((z_1 + z_2) + d\mathbb{Z}) &= (z_1 + z_2 + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}), \\ \psi(z_1 + d\mathbb{Z}) + \psi(z_2 + d\mathbb{Z}) &= (z_1 + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}) + (z_2 + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= (z_1 + z_2 + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}).\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of (4).* For any  $(x + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (y + n\mathbb{Z}) \in (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(\varphi((x + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (y + n\mathbb{Z}))) &= \psi(xy + d\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= (xy + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z}) \\ &= (x + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (y + n\mathbb{Z}).\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of (5).* For any  $z + d\mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\psi(z + d\mathbb{Z})) &= \varphi((z + m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes (1 + n\mathbb{Z})) \\ &= z + d\mathbb{Z}.\end{aligned}$$

□

### Exercise 2.2.

Let  $A$  be a ring,  $\mathfrak{a}$  an ideal,  $M$  an  $A$ -module. Show that  $(A/\mathfrak{a}) \otimes_A M$  is isomorphic to  $M/\mathfrak{a}M$ . (Hint: Tensor the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow A \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow 0$  with  $M$ .)

*Proof (Hint).* There is a natural exact sequence  $E$ :

$$E : 0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{i} A \xrightarrow{\pi} A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow 0$$

where  $i$  is the inclusion map (and  $\pi$  is the projection map). Tensor  $E$  with  $M$ :

$$E' : \mathfrak{a} \otimes_A M \xrightarrow{i \otimes 1} A \otimes_A M \xrightarrow{\pi \otimes 1} (A/\mathfrak{a}) \otimes_A M \rightarrow 0$$

is exact, or

$$(A/\mathfrak{a}) \otimes_A M \cong A \otimes_A M / \text{im}(i \otimes 1).$$

By Proposition 2.14, There is an unique isomorphism  $A \otimes_A M \rightarrow M$  defined by  $a \otimes x \mapsto ax$ . This isomorphism sends  $\text{im}(i \otimes 1)$  to  $\mathfrak{a}M$ . Therefore,

$$(A/\mathfrak{a}) \otimes_A M \cong M/\mathfrak{a}M.$$

□

*Proof (Brute-force).*

(1) Define  $\tilde{\varphi}$  by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{\varphi}: & A/\mathfrak{a} \times M & \longrightarrow M/\mathfrak{a}M \\ & \Downarrow & \Downarrow \\ & (a + \mathfrak{a}, x) & \longmapsto ax + \mathfrak{a}M. \end{array}$$

$\tilde{\varphi}$  is well-defined and  $A$ -bilinear.

- (2) By the universal property,  $\tilde{\varphi}$  factors through a  $A$ -bilinear map

$$\varphi: A/\mathfrak{a} \otimes_A M \rightarrow M/\mathfrak{a}M$$

(such that  $\varphi(a \otimes x) = \tilde{\varphi}(a, x)$ ).

- (3) To show that  $\varphi$  is isomorphic, might find the inverse map  $\psi: M/\mathfrak{a}M \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{a} \otimes_A M$  of  $\varphi$ . Define  $\psi$  by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \psi: & M/\mathfrak{a}M & \longrightarrow A/\mathfrak{a} \otimes_A M \\ & \Downarrow & \Downarrow \\ & x + \mathfrak{a}M & \longmapsto (1 + \mathfrak{a}) \otimes x. \end{array}$$

$\psi$  is well-defined and  $A$ -linear.

- (4)  $\psi \circ \varphi = \text{id}$ .

- (5)  $\varphi \circ \psi = \text{id}$ .

□

### Exercise 2.3.

Let  $A$  be a local ring,  $M$  and  $N$  finitely generated  $A$ -modules. Prove that if  $M \otimes_A N = 0$ , then  $M = 0$  or  $N = 0$ . (Hint: Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be the maximal ideal,  $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$  the residue field. Let  $M_k = k \otimes_A M \cong M/\mathfrak{m}M$  by Exercise 2.2. By Nakayama's lemma,  $M_k = 0 \implies M = 0$ . But  $M \otimes_A N = 0 \implies (M \otimes_A N)_k = 0 \implies M_k \otimes_k N_k = 0 \implies M_k = 0$  or  $N_k = 0$  since  $M_k, N_k$  are vector spaces over a field.)

The conclusion might be false if  $A$  is not local. For example, Exercise 2.1.

*Proof (Hint).* Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be the maximal ideal,  $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$  the residue field. Let  $M_k = k \otimes_A M$ .

- (1) (*Base extension*) Show that  $(M \otimes_A N)_k = M_k \otimes_k N_k$ . In fact, by Proposition 2.14

$$\begin{aligned}
 (M \otimes_A N)_k &= k \otimes_A (M \otimes_A N) \\
 &= (k \otimes_A M) \otimes_A N \\
 &= M_k \otimes_A N \\
 &= (M_k \otimes_k k) \otimes_A N \\
 &= M_k \otimes_k (k \otimes_A N) \\
 &= M_k \otimes_k N_k.
 \end{aligned}$$

(2)

$$\begin{aligned}
 M \otimes_A N = 0 &\implies (M \otimes_A N)_k = 0 \\
 &\implies M_k \otimes_k N_k = 0 && ((1)) \\
 &\implies M_k = 0 \text{ or } N_k = 0 && (M_k, N_k: \text{ vector spaces}) \\
 &\implies M/\mathfrak{m}M = 0 \text{ or } M/\mathfrak{m}M = 0 && (\text{Exercise 2.2}) \\
 &\implies M = 0 \text{ or } N = 0. && (\text{Nakayama's lemma})
 \end{aligned}$$

□

#### Exercise 2.4.

Let  $M_i$  ( $i \in I$ ) be any family of  $A$ -modules, and let  $M$  be their direct sum. Prove that  $M$  is flat  $\Leftrightarrow$  each  $M_i$  is flat.

*Proof.* Given any  $A$ -module homomorphism  $f : N' \rightarrow N$ .

- (1) Similar to Proposition 2.14(iii), we have two isomorphisms

(a)

$$\varphi : \bigoplus_{i \in I} (N' \otimes M_i) \cong N' \otimes_A \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$$

defined by

$$\varphi((x \otimes m_i)_{i \in I}) = x \otimes (m_i)_{i \in I}$$

where  $x \in N'$ ,  $m_i \in M_i$  ( $i \in I$ ).

(b)

$$\psi : N \otimes_A \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} (N \otimes M_i)$$

defined by

$$\psi(y \otimes (m_i)_{i \in I}) = (y \otimes m_i)_{i \in I}$$

where  $y \in N$ ,  $m_i \in M_i$  ( $i \in I$ ).



(2)  $f : N' \rightarrow N$  induces an  $A$ -module homomorphism

$$f \otimes \text{id}_M : N' \otimes_A M \rightarrow N \otimes_A M.$$

(3)  $\psi \circ f \otimes \text{id}_M \circ \varphi$  defines an  $A$ -module homomorphism

$$\psi \circ f \otimes \text{id}_M \circ \varphi : \bigoplus_{i \in I} (N' \otimes M_i) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} (N \otimes M_i)$$

which sends  $(x \otimes m_i)_{i \in I}$  to  $(f(x) \otimes m_i)_{i \in I}$ . That is,

$$\psi \circ f \otimes \text{id}_M \circ \varphi = \bigoplus_{i \in I} f \otimes \text{id}_{M_i}$$

(4) Show that  $M$  is flat if and only if each  $M_i$  is flat. Suppose  $f$  is injective.

$$\begin{aligned} & M_i \text{ is flat } \forall i \in I \\ \iff & f \otimes \text{id}_{M_i} \text{ is injective } \forall i \in I \\ \iff & \bigoplus_{i \in I} f \otimes \text{id}_{M_i} \text{ is injective} && \text{(Injectivity)} \\ \iff & \psi \circ f \otimes \text{id}_M \circ \varphi \text{ is injective} && ((3)) \\ \iff & f \otimes \text{id}_M \text{ is injective} && (\varphi, \psi \text{ are isomorphic}) \\ \iff & M \text{ is flat.} \end{aligned}$$

□

### Exercise 2.5.

Let  $A[x]$  be the ring of polynomials in one indeterminate over a ring  $A$ . Prove that  $A[x]$  is a flat  $A$ -algebra. (Hint: Use Exercise 2.4.)

*Proof (Hint).*

(1)  $A$  is a flat  $A$ -module by Proposition 2.14(iv).

(2) As an  $A$ -module,

$$A[x] \cong \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} Ax^n \cong \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} A$$

(since  $Ax^n \cong A$ ).

(3) By Exercise 2.4,  $A[x] \cong \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} A$  is flat.

□

**Exercise 2.8.**

- (i) If  $M$  and  $N$  are flat  $A$ -modules, then so is  $M \otimes_A N$ .
- (ii) If  $B$  is a flat  $A$ -algebra and  $N$  is a flat  $B$ -module, then  $N$  is flat as  $A$ -module.

*Proof of (i).* Given any exact sequence of  $A$ -modules  $0 \rightarrow N_1 \rightarrow N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $M$  is flat,

$$0 \rightarrow N_1 \otimes_A M \rightarrow N_2 \otimes_A M \rightarrow N_3 \otimes_A M \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Since  $N$  is flat,

$$0 \rightarrow (N_1 \otimes_A M) \otimes_A N \rightarrow (N_2 \otimes_A M) \otimes_A N \rightarrow (N_3 \otimes_A M) \otimes_A N \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. By Proposition 2.14 (ii),

$$0 \rightarrow N_1 \otimes_A (M \otimes_A N) \rightarrow N_2 \otimes_A (M \otimes_A N) \rightarrow N_3 \otimes_A (M \otimes_A N) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact, or  $M \otimes_A N$  is flat.  $\square$

*Proof of (ii).* Given any exact sequence of  $A$ -modules  $0 \rightarrow N_1 \rightarrow N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $B$  is a flat  $A$ -algebra ( $A$ -module),

$$0 \rightarrow N_1 \otimes_A B \rightarrow N_2 \otimes_A B \rightarrow N_3 \otimes_A B \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Since  $N$  is a flat  $B$ -module,

$$0 \rightarrow (N_1 \otimes_A B) \otimes_B N \rightarrow (N_2 \otimes_A B) \otimes_B N \rightarrow (N_3 \otimes_A B) \otimes_B N \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. By “Exercise 2.15” on page 27,

$$0 \rightarrow N_1 \otimes_A (B \otimes_B N) \rightarrow N_2 \otimes_A (B \otimes_B N) \rightarrow N_3 \otimes_A (B \otimes_B N) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. By Proposition 2.14 (iv),

$$0 \rightarrow N_1 \otimes_A N \rightarrow N_2 \otimes_A N \rightarrow N_3 \otimes_A N \rightarrow 0$$

is exact, or  $N$  is flat.  $\square$

**Exercise 2.9.**

Let  $0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence of  $A$ -modules. If  $M'$  and  $M''$  are finitely generated, then so is  $M$ .

*Proof.*

(1) Write

$$0 \rightarrow M' \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} M'' \rightarrow 0.$$

Also write

$$\begin{aligned} x_1, \dots, x_n &\text{ as generators of } M', \\ z_1, \dots, z_m &\text{ as generators of } M'' \end{aligned}$$

(since  $M'$  and  $M''$  are finitely generated).

(2) Since the map  $g : M \rightarrow M''$  is surjective, there exists  $y_j \in M$  such that  $g(y_j) = z_j$  for  $j = 1, \dots, m$ .

(3) Show that  $M$  is generated by

$$f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n), y_1, \dots, y_m.$$

Given any  $y \in M$ .

$$\begin{aligned} y \in M &\implies g(y) \in M'' \\ &\implies g(y) = \sum_{j=1}^m s_j z_j \text{ where } s_j \in A \\ &\implies g(y) = \sum_{j=1}^m s_j g(y_j) \\ &\implies g(y) = g\left(\sum_{j=1}^m s_j y_j\right) \\ &\implies y - \sum_{j=1}^m s_j y_j \in \ker(g) = \operatorname{im}(f) \\ &\implies \exists x \in M' \text{ such that } f(x) = y - \sum_{j=1}^m s_j y_j \end{aligned}$$

Write  $x = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i x_i$  where  $r_i \in A$ . So,

$$\begin{aligned} y \in M &\implies f\left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i x_i\right) = y - \sum_{j=1}^m s_j y_j \\ &\implies \sum_{i=1}^n r_i f(x_i) = y - \sum_{j=1}^m s_j y_j \\ &\implies y = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i f(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^m s_j y_j. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, every  $y \in M$  is a linear combination of  $f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n), y_1, \dots, y_m$ , or  $M$  is finitely generated (by  $f(x_1), \dots, f(x_n), y_1, \dots, y_m$ ).

□