

Algebra Homework #4

1. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be the polynomial ring over \mathbb{Z} , and let $I \trianglelefteq R$ be the ideal $(2, x)$. We will think of I as an R -module. Show that:

- Any subset of I of size ≤ 1 does not span I .
- Any subset of I of size ≥ 2 is not R -linearly independent.

Deduce that I is not a free R -module.

■

2. Let R be a commutative ring. Show that the following two conditions on an R -module M are equivalent:

- (a) every submodule of M is finitely generated;
- (b) M satisfies the ascending chain condition for submodules: if $N_1 \leq N_2 \leq N_3 \leq \dots$ is an increasing chain of submodules of M , then there exists some j such that $N_i = N_j$ for all $i \geq j$.

(A module M satisfying these conditions is said to be *Noetherian*. The ring R is Noetherian as a ring if and only if it is Noetherian as an R -module. We saw in class that finitely generated modules over Noetherian rings are Noetherian.)

First we show that (a) implies (b). First notice that if every submodule of M is finitely generated then in particular M is finitely generated. **note: at first I read (a) incorrectly as “ M is finitely generated” and so I wrote this part of the question under that assumption.** And so, let $\{e_i\}$ be a finite generating set for M with $\#\{e_i\} = n$. And let $N_1 \leq N_2 \leq N_3 \leq \dots$ be an ascending chain of M submodules.

Let us construct a new chain $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq A_3 \subseteq \dots$ where A_i is some minimal generating set of N_i . This is well defined since, as submodules of a finitely generated module, each N_i is also finitely generated. We claim that the chain $A_1 \subseteq A_2 \subseteq \dots$ stabilizes at some k . Notice that the finite set $\{e_i\}$ is maximal amongst the set of A_i . And so the chain of A_i 's must stabilize either at $\{e_i\}$ or at some subset $B \subseteq \{e_i\}$. Let k be the index where stabilization occurs for the A_i .

In the first case where $A_k = \{e_i\}$ it follows then that $N_k = M$, since A_k was defined to be a minimal generating set for N_k . It then follows that $N_i = N_k = M$ for all $i > k$. In the second case our chain of A_i 's stabilize with $A_k = B$. In this case we claim that our chain of N_i stabilizes at N_k also. Let $m \in N_i$ for some $i > k$. Since A_i is a generating set for N_i we have that m is some finite R -linear combination over A_i . However, $A_k = A_i$ and so the same finite R -linear combination is also contained in N_k . In other words $m \in N_k$. Hence $N_i \leq N_k$ and so $N_i = N_k$ for all $i > k$.

Now we show that (b) implies (a). Assume that M satisfies the ascending chain condition for modules and let $L \leq M$ be a submodule. Suppose, for contradiction, that L is not

finitely generated. That is, L has a minimal generating set $\{\ell_i\}$ with $\#\{\ell_i\} = \infty$. Suppose first that $\{\ell_i\}$ is countable just because i do not know the constructions that I am allowed to do in the uncountable case.

We construct an ascending chain $N_i := \{\sum_{k=1}^i r_k \ell_k : r_k \in R\}$, submodules generated by the first i generators of L . We claim that $N_1 \leq N_2 \leq \dots$ is an ascending chain which does not stabilize. Consider N_i for some i . Note that since $\{\ell_i\}$ is minimal, then there's some $k > i$ such that we cannot write ℓ_k as a finite R -linear combination of elements in $\{\ell_j\}_{j=1}^i$. That is, there exists some N_k which contains an element ℓ_k which cannot be written as a finite linear combination of elements in N_i . That is, we have found a $k > i$ such that $N_i \neq N_k$. Then our chain $N_1 \leq N_2 \leq \dots$ does not stabilize. However, this contradicts the submodule ascending chain condition on M . Thus, it must be that L is finitely generated.

■

3. In this problem, we will make good on our promise from class to show that the rank of a free module is well-defined (over a commutative ring!). Let R be a non-zero commutative ring. We are going to show that the R -modules R^n and R^m are non-isomorphic if $n \neq m$.

- Suppose that $I \trianglelefteq R$ is an ideal of a commutative ring R and let M be an R -module. Let IM be the R -submodule of M spanned by all elements ax for $a \in I$ and $x \in M$. Show that the quotient M/IM has the structure of an R/I -module. When $M = R^n$, show that M/IM is isomorphic to $(R/I)^n$ as an R/I -module.
- Show that any R -linear isomorphism $R^n \xrightarrow{\sim} R^m$ induces an R/I -linear isomorphism $(R/I)^n \xrightarrow{\sim} (R/I)^m$.
- By taking I to be a maximal ideal, deduce that R^n and R^m are isomorphic if and only if $n = m$. (Standard linear algebra results may be used without proof.)

- To show that M/IM has the structure of an R/I -module, we must show that M/IM has an underlying abelian group structure with respect to addition, and that there is a well-defined R/I scalar multiplication on M/IM .

First, we show that M/IM has a well-defined abelian group structure with respect to addition. By definition M has an abelian group structure, and so IM is a normal subgroup of M . It follows that the quotient group M/IM is well-defined and moreover is also abelian. One way to see that the quotient group is abelian is to recall that the quotient map $\pi : M \rightarrow M/IM$ is a group homomorphism and so

$$\pi(x) + \pi(y) = \pi(x + y) = \pi(y + x) = \pi(y) + \pi(x),$$

for all $x, y \in M$.

Next, we propose an R/I scalar multiplication on M/IM . If $r + I \in R/I$ and $m + IM \in M/IM$. Then I claim that scalar multiplication given by $(r + I) \cdot (m + IM) := rm + IM$ is well defined. Let $r + I = r' + I$ be equivalent elements of R/I . Then we have that there's some $a \in I$ such that $r = r' + a$. Now let $m + IM \in M/IM$ and consider

$$rm + IM = (r' + a)m + IM = r'm + IM + am + IM = r'm + IM + 0 + IM = r'm + IM,$$

since $am \in IM$ by definition. That is, our proposed scalar multiplication maps $m \in M$ to the same class mod IM , regardless of choice of representative of $r + IM$. Hence our multiplication is well defined and we have found an R/I -module structure on M/IM .

- Suppose $\phi : R^n \rightarrow R^m$ is an R -linear isomorphism. Since R^n is a free R -module, it follows that ϕ is defined exactly by its action on the basis $\{e_i\}$ where $e_i = (0, \dots, 1, \dots, 0)$ with the 1 in the i th position.

Now notice that $\bar{e}_i := \pi(e_i)$ is an R/I -basis for $(R/I)^n$. And so maps out of $(R/I)^n$ can be defined by their action on \bar{e}_i . We define a map $\bar{\phi} : (R/I)^n \rightarrow (R/I)^m$ by $\bar{\phi}(\bar{e}_i) = (\pi \circ \phi)(e_i)$. This map is R/I linear by construction, we claim that it is also a bijection.

First we show surjectivity. Suppose $(\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \dots, \bar{b}_m) \in (R/I)^m$. Since $\pi : R \rightarrow R/I$ is a surjection, there is an element $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m) \in R^m$ such that $\pi(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m) = (\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \dots, \bar{b}_m)$. Moreover, ϕ is an isomorphism and so there also exists an element $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in R^n$ such that $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$. It then follows that $\bar{\phi}(\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \dots, \bar{a}_n) = (\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2, \dots, \bar{b}_m)$. Thus, $\bar{\phi}$ is surjective.

Now consider $0 \in (R/I)^m$. Tuples of the form $(b_1, \dots, b_m) \in R^m$ with $b_i \in I$ map to 0 under π . Since ϕ is an isomorphism from R to R , only elements $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in R^n$ with $a_i \in I$ satisfy $\phi(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (b_1, \dots, b_m)$ with $b_i \in I$. Then, only elements of the form $(\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \dots, \bar{a}_n) \in (R/I)^n$ map to $0 \in (R/I)^m$ under $\bar{\phi}$. However, since $a_i \in I$ we have $(\bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_n) = 0 \in (R/I)^n$. And so $\bar{\phi}$ is injective.

We have found a bijective R/I -linear map $\bar{\phi} : (R/I)^n \rightarrow (R/I)^m$ and so we have found an induced R/I -linear isomorphism $(R/I)^n \rightarrow (R/I)^m$.

- Suppose $n = m$, then $R^n = R^m$ and so $R^n \cong R^m$ as R -modules.

Now suppose that $R^n \cong R^m$. Since R is a non-zero commutative ring we have (via the axiom of choice (or perhaps Zorn's lemma)) that there exists a maximal ideal $I \trianglelefteq R$. Now by part (b) we have an induced isomorphism on the R/I modules $(R/I)^n \cong (R/I)^m$. However, since I is maximal, it follows that R/I is a field and

so $(R/I)^n$ and $(R/I)^m$ are in fact R/I -vector spaces. Vector spaces are characterized by their dimension and so it follows that $(R/I)^n \cong (R/I)^m$ as R/I vector spaces implies $n = m$.

Hence the rank of a free module over a non-zero commutative ring is a well defined notion.

■

4. Prove the following identities for tensor products (where M, N, L are arbitrary R -modules):

- $M \otimes_R N \cong N \otimes_R M$ (“commutativity”)
- $R \otimes_R M \cong M$ (“identity”)
- $M \otimes_R (N \oplus L) \cong (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L)$ (“distributivity”)
- (harder) $M \otimes_R (N \otimes_R L) \cong (M \otimes_R N) \otimes_R L$ (“associativity”)

[Hint: the universal property of tensor products is a handy way of defining R -linear maps out of tensor products]

- Consider the map $M \times N \rightarrow N \otimes_R M$ given by $((m, n) \mapsto n \otimes m)$. Notice that this map is R -bilinear on $M \times N$ since $\otimes : M \times N \rightarrow M \otimes_R N$ is. Then by the universal property of tensor products we have a unique R -linear map $f : M \otimes_R N \rightarrow N \otimes_R M$ such that $f \circ \otimes = ((m, n) \mapsto n \otimes m)$. The same argument on the R -bilinear map $N \times M \rightarrow N \otimes_R M$ given by $((n, m) \mapsto m \otimes n)$ gives a unique R -linear map $\tilde{f} : N \otimes_R M \rightarrow M \otimes_R N$ such that¹ $\tilde{f} \circ \times = ((n, m) \mapsto m \otimes n)$.

Notice now that $f \circ \tilde{f} = id_{N \otimes_R M}$ and $\tilde{f} \circ f = id_{M \otimes_R N}$. Indeed $(f \circ \tilde{f})(m \otimes n) = f(n \otimes m) = m \otimes n$. And likewise for the other direction.

That is, we have found a bijective R -linear map $M \otimes_R N \rightarrow N \otimes_R M$ and so in fact $M \otimes_R N$ is isomorphic to $N \otimes_R M$.

- Consider the following map $M \times N \rightarrow M$ via $((r, m) \mapsto rm)$ given by the module structure on M . Notice that this map is bilinear **come back and write the computation out** And so by the universal property of tensor products we have a unique R -linear map $f : R \otimes_R M \rightarrow M$ such that $r \otimes n \mapsto rm$.

I claim that this map is bijective and so is an isomorphism of R -modules. First notice that f is surjective. Indeed, if $m \in M$ then $f(1 \otimes m) = 1 \cdot m = m$, so long as R is not the zero ring. If R is the zero ring, then M must be the zero module, and then our desired isomorphism trivially holds.

Next we show that f is injective. Suppose we have $r \cdot m' = m$ for some $m, m' \in M$

¹The “ \otimes ” in the following phrase now refers to the R -bilinear map $N \times M \rightarrow N \otimes_R M$, whereas earlier it referred to the R -bilinear map $M \times N \rightarrow M \otimes_R N$.

and $r \in R$. Then notice

$$r \otimes m' = 1 \cdot r \otimes m' = r \otimes r \cdot m' = 1 \otimes m,$$

And so $rm' = m$ implies $r \otimes m' = 1 \otimes m$. This suffices to show that f is injective because if generally we have $r_1m_1 = r_2m_2$ then by definition $r_1m_1 = m'$ for some $m' \in M$ and then we have $m' = r_2m_2$.

Overall we have a bijective R -linear map $R \otimes_R M \rightarrow M$, and so $R \otimes_R M \cong M$.

- First we acquire an R -linear map $M \otimes_R (N \oplus L) \rightarrow (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L)$ by leveraging the universal property of tensor products. And then we show that this map is in fact an isomorphism.

First define a map $h : M \times (N \oplus L) \rightarrow (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L)$ by $h(m, (n, l)) = (m \otimes n, m \otimes l)$. Note that in R -Mod finite coproducts are also products, and so the domain of the function h is the R -module $M \oplus N \oplus L$. We claim that this map is R -bilinear. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} h(r_1m_1 + r_2m_2, (n, l)) &= ((r_1m_1 + r_2m_2) \otimes n, (r_1m_1 + r_2m_2) \otimes l) \\ &= (r_1(m_1 \otimes n) + r_2(m_1 \otimes n), r_1(m \otimes l) + r_2(m_2 \otimes n)) \\ &= r_1(m_1 \otimes n, m_1 \otimes l_1) + r_2(m_2 \otimes n, m_2 \otimes l). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of the tensor product relations, and of the R -module structure on the direct sum of two R -modules. In other words, we have shown that h is R -linear in the first argument. Now consider the second argument

$$\begin{aligned} h(m, r_1(n_1, l_1) + r_2(n_2, l_2)) &= (m \otimes r_1n_1 + r_2n_2, m \otimes r_1l_1 + r_2l_2) \\ &= (r_1(m \otimes n_1) + r_2(m \otimes n_2), r_1(m \otimes l_1) + r_2(m \otimes l_2)) \\ &= r_1(m \otimes n_1, m \otimes l_1) + r_2(m \otimes n_2, m \otimes l_2), \end{aligned}$$

using the bilinearity of the tensor product, and by using the definition of the R -module structure on the direct sum of R -modules. That is, we've shown h is R -linear in the second argument also. And so h is an R -bilinear map.

We are now free to use the universal property of tensor products to acquire a new R -linear map $\phi : M \otimes_R (N \oplus L) \rightarrow (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L)$. where $\phi(m \otimes (n, l)) = (m \otimes n, m \otimes l)$.

Next, we will construct an R -linear map $\psi : (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L) \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$ using the universal property of coproducts. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 M \times N & \xrightarrow{f_1} & M \otimes_R (N \oplus L) & \xleftarrow{f_2} & M \times L \\
 \otimes \downarrow & \nearrow \psi_1 & \uparrow \psi & \nwarrow \psi_2 & \downarrow \otimes \\
 M \otimes_R N & \hookrightarrow & (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L) & \longleftarrow & M \otimes_R L
 \end{array}$$

where the maps ψ_1, ψ_2 will be built out of the universal property of tensor products, and the desired map ψ will consequently be determined by the universal property of corproduct in R -mod. First, we must specify bilinear maps $f_1 : M \times N \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$ and $f_2 : M \times L \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$.

I claim that the map $f_1(m, n) = m \otimes (n, 0)$ is bilinear. If n is fixed then for each $r_1, r_2 \in R$ and $m_1, m_2 \in M$ we have $f_1(r_1 m_1 + r_2 m_2, n) = (r_1 m_1 + r_2 m_2) \otimes (n, 0) = r_1(m_1 \otimes (n, 0)) + r_2(m_2 \otimes (n, 0)) = r_1 f_1(m_1, n) + r_2 f_1(m_2, n)$, by the bilinearity of tensor product. I.e. f_1 is R -linear in its first argument. Moreover, if we fix $m \in M$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_1(m, r_1 n_1 + r_2 n_2) &= m \otimes (r_1 n_1 + r_2 n_2, 0) \\
 &= m \otimes [r_1(n_1, 0) + r_2(n_2, 0)] \\
 &= r_1(m \otimes (n_1, 0)) + r_2(m \otimes (n_2, 0)) = r_1 f_1(m, n_1) + r_2 f_1(m, n_2).
 \end{aligned}$$

And so, f_1 is R -linear in its second argument. Hence, $f_1 : M \times N \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$ is R -bilinear. A very similar calculation will show that $f_2 : M \times L \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$ is also R -bilinear.

Then, by the universal property of tensor products, we have R -linear maps $\psi_1 : M \otimes_R N \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$ and $\psi_2 : M \otimes_R L \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$ with $\psi_1(m \otimes n) = m \otimes (n, 0)$ and $\psi_2(m \otimes l) = m \otimes (0, l)$. Then by the universal property of coproducts, we have an R -linear map $\psi : (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L) \rightarrow M \otimes_R (N \oplus L)$ where $\psi(m_1 \otimes n, m_2 \otimes$

$l) = m_1 \otimes (n, 0) + m_2 \otimes (0, l)$. We claim that ψ is an \mathbb{R} linear map which is inverse to ϕ . If we show that it will then follow that ϕ is in fact an isomorphism $M \otimes_R (N \oplus L) \rightarrow (M \otimes_R N) \oplus (M \otimes_R L)$.

come back and show that they are inverse

■

5. Compute the following tensor products:

(a) $\mathbb{R}^2 \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^2$

(b) $\mathbb{R}^3 \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}^5$

(c) $(\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z})$

(d) $(\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})$

(e) $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$

■

6. Suppose that $f: M \rightarrow M'$ and $g: N \rightarrow N'$ are homomorphisms of R -modules. Use f and g to define a homomorphism

$$M \otimes_R N \rightarrow M' \otimes_R N'.$$

(This homomorphism is usually denoted by $f \otimes g$.)

We define the desired map by using the universal property of tensor products. Consider the following composition

$$M \oplus N \xrightarrow{(f,g)} M' \oplus N' \xrightarrow{\otimes} M' \otimes_R N',$$

via

$$(m, n) \mapsto (f(m), g(n)) \mapsto f(m) \otimes g(n).$$

We claim that this composition $\phi: M \oplus N \rightarrow M \otimes_R N$ is R -bilinear. Indeed, first let $n \in N$ be fixed and then consider

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(r_1 m_1 + r_2 m_2, n) &= (r_1 f(m_1) + r_2 f(m_2)) \otimes g(n) \\ &= (r_1 f(m_1)) \otimes g(n) + (r_2 f(m_2)) \otimes g(n) \\ &= r_1 (f(m_1) \otimes g(n)) + r_2 (f(m_2) \otimes g(n)) \\ &= r_1 \phi(m_1, n) + r_2 \phi(m_2, n), \end{aligned}$$

by the relations on the elements of the tensor product. In other words, we have shown that $\phi(-, n)$ is R -linear for each $n \in N$. A very similar calculation will show that $\phi(m, -)$ is R -linear for each $m \in M$. That is, ϕ is R -bilinear.

By the universal property of the tensor product we then have an R -linear map $\psi: M \otimes_R N \rightarrow M' \otimes_R N$ given by $m \otimes n \mapsto f(m) \otimes g(n)$, as desired.

■

7. Let V be an \mathbb{R} -vector space of dimension n . Recall from class that the tensor product $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ can be viewed as a \mathbb{C} -vector space in a natural way. In this question, we are going to show that the dimension of $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ (as a \mathbb{C} -vector space) is equal to n (the dimension of V as an \mathbb{R} -vector space).

- Suppose that e_1, \dots, e_n is an \mathbb{R} -linear basis of V . Write down n elements of $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ which could plausibly be a \mathbb{C} -linear basis.
- Suppose that $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n: V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the dual basis to e_1, \dots, e_n . Write down n \mathbb{C} -linear maps $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which could plausibly be a \mathbb{C} -linear basis of the dual space $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V, \mathbb{C})$. [Hint: $\mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}$, so the previous part gives you a way of constructing a homomorphism.]
- Show that the elements you defined in the previous two parts are dual bases of the \mathbb{C} -vector space $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$, and hence that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V) = n$.

- I claim that $1 \otimes e_1, 1 \otimes e_2, \dots, 1 \otimes e_n \in \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ is a basis. First we show that these tensors span $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$. First let $\alpha \otimes v \in \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ be a pure tensor. Then, since $\{e_i\}$ is a basis for V we have $v = \lambda_1 e_1 + \dots + \lambda_n e_n$ for $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Now notice

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \lambda_1 (1 \otimes e_1) + \alpha \lambda_2 (1 \otimes e_2) + \dots + \alpha \lambda_n (1 \otimes e_n) &= \alpha [1 \otimes \lambda_1 e_1 + 1 \otimes \lambda_2 e_2 + \dots + 1 \otimes \lambda_n e_n] \\ &= \alpha \otimes (\lambda_1 e_1 + \dots + \lambda_n e_n) \\ &= \alpha \otimes v. \end{aligned}$$

That is, every pure tensor in $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ is a finite \mathbb{C} -linear combination of the $1 \otimes e_i$. It then follows that every element of $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$, which is a finite \mathbb{C} -linear combination of pure tensors, is also a finite \mathbb{C} -linear combination of the $1 \otimes e_i$. Thus, the $1 \otimes e_i$ span $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ over \mathbb{C} .

I will show some approximation of the $1 \otimes e_i$ being \mathbb{C} -linearly independent. Suppose we have $a_1(1 \otimes e_1) + \dots + a_n(1 \otimes e_n) = 0$ for some $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a_1(1 \otimes e_1) + a_2(1 \otimes e_2) + \dots + a_n(1 \otimes e_n) \\ &= 1 \otimes (a_1 e_1 + a_2 e_2 + \dots + a_n e_n) = 0 \\ &\implies a_1 e_1 + a_2 e_2 + \dots + a_n e_n = 0 \\ &\implies a_i = 0 \text{ for all } i, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows since the e_i are an \mathbb{R} -linear basis for V , and so are \mathbb{R} -linearly independent. The second to last line follows since $1 \neq 0 \in \mathbb{C}$. This shows

that the elements $1 \otimes e_i$ are \mathbb{R} -linearly independent. This argument does not work for $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$, because we are unable to “bring the coefficients into the second ‘coordinate’ of the pure tensors.” That is, we do not have a \mathbb{C} -vector space structure on V exactly.

However, recalling generally that $M \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} N$ is an \mathbb{R} -vector space for any \mathbb{R} -vector spaces M, N , we expect to be able to find some basis for $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$. The argument above gives that the \mathbb{R} -vector space $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ has a basis $1 \otimes e_1$.

- We want to study the \mathbb{C} -linear maps $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V \rightarrow \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}$. We first consider maps which descend from bilinear maps $\mathbb{C} \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}$ induced by $f \in V^*$. First, fix a map $f \in V^*$. And then we define a map $\phi_f : \mathbb{C} \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}$ via $\phi_f(\alpha, v) = \alpha \otimes f(v)$. First notice that this map is \mathbb{R} -linear in the second coordinate: if we fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and let $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ indeed, we have

$$\phi_f(\alpha, a_1 v_1 + a_2 v_2) = \alpha \otimes f(a_1 v_1 + a_2 v_2) = \alpha \otimes (a_1 f(v_1) + a_2 f(v_2)) = a_1(\alpha \otimes f(v_1)) + a_2(\alpha \otimes f(v_2)).$$

Since f is an \mathbb{R} -linear map and by the bilinearity of the tensor product. A similar calculation shows that ϕ_f is \mathbb{C} -linear in the first coordinate.

Now, since $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ is a basis for V^* then we can represent $f(v) = a_1 \delta_1(v) + a_2 \delta_2(v) + \dots + a_n \delta_n(v)$ for $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$. Then we can represent

$$\phi_f(\alpha, v) = \alpha \otimes (a_1 \delta_1(v) + \dots + a_n \delta_n(v)) = \alpha a_1 (1 \otimes \delta_1(v)) + \alpha a_2 (1 \otimes \delta_2(v)) + \dots + \alpha a_n (1 \otimes \delta_n(v)),$$

Note that the a_i in the computation above depends only on the map $f \in V^*$. This suggests that a plausible basis for $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V, \mathbb{C})$ could be the maps $1 \otimes \delta_i \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V, \mathbb{C})$.

is there more that we can show?

- See the previous parts to see some partial arguments that the elements given are \mathbb{R} -linear bases for their corresponding spaces. I need to show more to show that they are in fact \mathbb{C} -linear bases for their corresponding spaces.

I will, however, show that $\{1 \otimes e_i\} \subseteq \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V$ and $\{1 \otimes \delta_i\} \subseteq \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} V, \mathbb{C})$ are

dual to each other. Consider

$$(1 \otimes \delta_i)(1 \otimes e_i) = 1 \otimes \delta_i(e_i) = 1 \otimes 1 = 1 \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Whereas, for $i \neq j$

$$(1 \otimes \delta_i)(1 \otimes e_j) = 1 \otimes \delta_i(e_j) = 1 \otimes 0 = 0 \in \mathbb{C}.$$

This shows that $\{1 \otimes \delta_i\}$ and $\{1 \otimes e_i\}$ are dual and in fact orthonormal.

■

8. *Let M be an abelian group. Show that the set $\text{End}(M)$ of homomorphisms $f: M \rightarrow M$ has the structure of a ring (not necessarily commutative), where addition is pointwise addition of homomorphisms, and multiplication is composition of homomorphisms. Show moreover that giving M the structure of a left R -module is equivalent to specifying a ring homomorphism $\phi: R \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$.

(This parallels the way that giving a set X a left action of a group G is equivalent to specifying a group homomorphism $\phi: G \rightarrow \text{Sym}(X)$.)

■