

# MA557 Problem Set 1

Carlos Salinas

September 8, 2015



**Problem 1.1**

Show that  $\text{rad}(R[X]) = \text{nil}(R[X])$ .

*Proof.* We will first prove the following results (which can be found in Dummit and Foote, §7.3, p. 33):

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $f = a_n X^n + \dots + a_0 \in R[X]$ . Then*

- (a)  *$f$  is nilpotent in  $R[X]$  if and only if  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent elements of  $R$ ;*
- (b)  *$f$  is a unit in  $R[X]$  if and only if  $a_0$  is a unit and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent in  $R$ .*

*Proof of lemma.* (a)  $\Leftarrow$  : Suppose that  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent. Then  $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \text{nil}(R)$ , hence  $f \in \text{nil}(R) \subset \text{nil}(R[X])$ .  $\Rightarrow$  : Conversely, if  $f^k = 0$  for some positive integer  $k$ , then  $(a_n X^n)^k = 0$ , so  $a_n x^n \in \text{nil}(R[X])$  so  $f - a_n X^n \in \text{nil}(R[X])$ , in particular  $a_n \in \text{nil}(R[X])$ . By induction on  $n$ ,  $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \text{nil}(R[X])$ .

(b)  $\Leftarrow$  : Suppose  $a_0$  is unit and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent. Then, by (a),  $f - a_0 = a_n X^n + \dots + a_1 X$  is nilpotent so  $f - a_0 \in \text{rad}(R[X])$ . By Proposition 1.13,  $f$  is a unit.  $\Rightarrow$  : On the other hand, if  $f$  is a unit, there exist  $g = b_m X^m + \dots + b_0$  in  $R[X]$  with  $fg = 1$ . Now, let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be an arbitrary prime ideal. Since  $f$  is a unit in  $R[X]$ ,  $\bar{f} = \bar{a}_n X^n + \dots + \bar{a}_0$  is a unit in  $R[X]/\mathfrak{p}$ . But since  $R[X]/\mathfrak{p}$  is an integral domain and  $\bar{f}$  is a unit,  $\deg \bar{f} = 0$  so  $\bar{a}_i = 0$  for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{p}$  was chosen arbitrarily,  $\diamond$

By definition  $\text{rad}(R)$  is the intersection of every maximal (hence prime) ideal of  $R$  so, by Theorem 1.12,  $\text{rad}(R) \supset \text{nil}(R)$ . To see the reverse containment let  $f = a_n X^n + \dots + a_0$  be in  $\text{rad}(R[X])$ . By Proposition 1.13,  $1 + fg$  is a unit for every  $g \in R[X]$ . In particular,  $1 + fX$  is a unit, so by Lemma 1(b),  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent so  $f \in \text{nil}(R[X])$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Problem 1.2**

Let  $I$  and  $J$  be  $R$ -ideals. Show that

$$\sqrt{IJ} = \sqrt{I \cap J} = \sqrt{I} \cap \sqrt{J}.$$

*Proof.*  $\sqrt{IJ} = \sqrt{I \cap J}$ : By contradiction, suppose that there exists some prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \supset IJ$ , but  $\mathfrak{p} \not\supset I \cap J$ . Then there exists some element  $x \in I \cap J$  with  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$ . However,  $x^2 \in IJ$ . This contradicts the primality of  $\mathfrak{p}$ . Hence, if  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a prime ideal containing  $IJ$ , it must also contain  $I \cap J$  so  $\sqrt{IJ} = \sqrt{I \cap J}$ .

$\sqrt{IJ} = \sqrt{I} \cap \sqrt{J}$ : Let  $x \in \sqrt{I} \cap \sqrt{J}$ . Then  $x^n \in I$  for some  $n > 0$  and  $x^m \in J$  for some  $m > 0$ . Then  $x^{n+m} \in IJ$  so  $x \in \sqrt{IJ}$ . Hence  $\sqrt{IJ} \supset \sqrt{I} \cap \sqrt{J}$ . To see the reverse containment note that, by above, since  $\sqrt{IJ} = \sqrt{I \cap J}$ , then  $x \in \sqrt{IJ}$  implies  $x^n \in I$  and  $x^n \in J$  for some  $n > 0$ , hence  $x \in \sqrt{I} \cap \sqrt{J}$  so  $\sqrt{IJ} = \sqrt{I} \cap \sqrt{J}$ .

By transitivity of “=”, it follows that  $\sqrt{IJ} = \sqrt{I \cap J} = \sqrt{I} \cap \sqrt{J}$ . ■

**Problem 1.3**

Let  $S$  be a subset of a ring  $R$ . Show that the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $R \setminus S$  is a union of prime ideals.
- (ii)  $1 \in S$ , and for any elements  $x, y$  of  $R$ ,  $x \in S$  and  $y \in S$  if and only if  $xy \in S$ .

*Proof.* (ii)  $\implies$  (i): Suppose that  $S$  is a saturated multiplicative subset of  $R$ . Then  $S \supset R^\times$  so every element of  $R \setminus S$  is a non-unit. By Corollary 1.5, for every  $x \in R \setminus S$ , there exists a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m} \supset (x)$ . Hence

$$R \setminus S = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{m} \supset (x)} \mathfrak{m},$$

in particular  $R \setminus S$  is a union of prime ideals.

(i)  $\implies$  (ii): Suppose that  $R \setminus S$  is a union of prime ideals. Then, it is clear that  $R^\times \subset S$  so  $1 \in S$ . Now  $x, y \in S$  if and only if  $x, y \notin R \setminus S$  if and only if  $xy \notin \mathfrak{p}$  for some prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \subset R \setminus S$ . Hence,  $S$  is a saturated multiplicative subset of  $R$ , i.e., satisfies the conditions given in (ii). ■

**Problem 1.4**

Show that the set of all zero divisors in a ring is a union of prime ideals.

*Proof.* By Problem 1.3, it suffices to show that the complement of the set of all zero-divisors, call it  $Z$ , of a ring  $R$  is a saturated multiplicative subset. It is clear that  $R \setminus Z \supset R^\times$  (since, if  $u \in R^\times$ ,  $ub = 0$  if and only if  $b = 0$ :  $\implies$  is easily seen since  $u^{-1}ub = 1 \cdot b = 0$  so  $b = 0$ ; the converse is immediate). Now,  $xy$  in  $R$  is a zero-divisor if and only if  $x$  or  $y$  are zero-divisors, hence (by taking the negation of this statement)  $xy \in R \setminus Z$  implies  $x, y \in R \setminus Z$ . Thus,  $R \setminus Z$  is a saturated multiplicative subset of  $R$ . ■

**Problem 1.5**

Let  $\varphi: R \rightarrow S$  be a surjective homomorphism of rings.

- (a) Show that  $\varphi(\text{rad}(R)) \subset \text{rad}(S)$ , but that equality does not hold in general.
- (b) Show that  $\varphi(\text{rad}(R)) = \text{rad}(S)$  if  $R$  is semilocal.

*Proof.* (a) The containment  $\varphi(\text{rad}(R)) \subset \text{rad}(S)$  follows easily from Proposition 1.13:  $x \in \text{rad}(R)$  if and only if  $1 + xy$  is a unit for every  $y \in R$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(1 + xy) &= \varphi(1) + \varphi(xy) \\ &= \varphi(1) + \varphi(x)\varphi(y) \\ &= 1 + \varphi(x)\varphi(y).\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varphi$  is surjective,  $1 + \varphi(x)s$  is a unit for every  $s \in S$  so  $\varphi(x) \in \text{rad}(S)$ .

To see that equality does not, in general, hold take  $R$  and  $S$  to be the rings  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\mathbf{Z}/(pq)$  for  $p$  and  $q$  primes in  $\mathbf{Z}$ . Then, the canonical projection  $\pi: \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}/(pq)$  is a surjection. Since  $R$  is an integral domain,  $\text{rad}(R) = 0$ , but  $\text{rad}(S) = (p) \cap (q) = (pq) \neq \varphi(0) = 0$ .

(b)  $\varphi(\text{rad}(R)) \subset \text{rad}(S)$  by above. Suppose  $R$  is semilocal with maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ . Then, by Corollary 1.15,  $\text{rad}(R) = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_n$ . Now, by the Homeomorphism Theorem,  $S \cong R/\ker \varphi$  so, by Proposition 1.2, the maximal ideals of  $S$  are in 1-1 correspondence with the maximal ideals of  $R$  that contain  $\ker \varphi$ . Thus, it suffices to show that  $\mathfrak{m}_i \supset \ker \varphi$  for all  $i$ . We will proceed by contradiction. Without loss of generality, suppose that  $\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_m$ ,  $0 < m < n$ , do not contain  $\ker \varphi$ . Then,  $y \in \prod_{i=1}^m \varphi(\mathfrak{m}_i)$  so

$$y = \sum_i \varphi(x_{i1}) \cdots \varphi(x_{im}) = \varphi\left(\sum_i x_{i1} \cdots x_{im}\right)$$

for  $x_{ij} \in \varphi(\mathfrak{m}_j)$ . Now, for  $i > m$ ,  $\mathfrak{m}_i$  and  $\ker \varphi$  are comaximal so  $x + x_0 = 1$  for some  $x \in \mathfrak{m}_i$ ,  $x_0 \in \ker \varphi$ . ■

**Problem 1.6**

An element  $e \in R$  is called *idempotent* if  $e^2 = e$ . Show that in a local ring, 0 and 1 are the only idempotents.

*Proof.* Suppose  $R$  is a local ring with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Suppose, by contradiction, that there exists some  $e \in R$ ,  $e \neq 0$  or  $1$ , with  $e^2 = e$ . Then  $e^2 - e = e(e - 1) = 0$  so  $e$  and  $e - 1$  are zero-divisors, in particular,  $e$  and  $e - 1$  are non-units and hence contained in the maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ . But then  $e - (e - 1) = 1 \in \mathfrak{m}$ . This contradicts the maximality of  $\mathfrak{m}$ . ■



**Problem 1.7**

Let  $I$  be an  $R$ -ideal. Show that  $I$  is finitely generated and  $I^2 = I$  if and only if  $I = Re$  with  $e$  idempotent.

*Proof.*

■