

Atiyah-MacDonald Solutions

Vincent Tran

April 28, 2024

1 Chapter 2

In Chapter Exercises:

1. 2.2

(a) $\text{Ann}(M + N) = \text{Ann}(M) \cap \text{Ann}(N)$.

(b) $(N : P) = \text{Ann}((N + P)/N)$.

2. 2.15: Let A, B be rings, let M be an A -module, P a B -module and N an (A, B) -bimodule (that is, N is simultaneously an A -module and a B -module and the two structures are compatible in the sense that $a(xb) = (ax)b$ for all $a \in A, b \in B, x \in N$). Then $M \otimes_A N$ is naturally a B -module, $N \otimes_B P$ an A -module, and we have

$$(M \otimes_A N) \otimes_B P \cong M \otimes_A (N \otimes_B P).$$

Solution:

First we construct the B bilinear map

$$(M \otimes_A N) \times P \rightarrow M \otimes_A (N \otimes_B P)$$

that sends $(m \otimes n, p) \rightarrow m \otimes (n \otimes p)$. The B bilinearity comes from $(b(m \otimes n), p) = (m \otimes nb, p) \mapsto m \otimes (nb \otimes p) = b(m \otimes (n \otimes p)) = m \otimes (b \otimes bp)$, which is also the image of $(m \otimes n, bp)$. Hence this induces a unique B linear map

$$(M \otimes_A N) \otimes_B P \rightarrow M \otimes_A (N \otimes_B P).$$

By a symmetric argument, we have a unique A linear map from the other direction, giving us an isomorphism for by tracing where $(m \otimes n) \otimes p$ goes, it goes to $m \otimes (n \otimes p)$ and then to $(m \otimes n) \otimes p$.

3. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a ring homomorphism and M is a flat A -module, then $M_B = B \otimes_A M$ is a flat B -module.

Solution: The function f makes B an A -algebra. Consider $B \otimes_B N \cong N$ by Proposition 2.14. Obviously B has an (A, B) bimodule structure since B is an algebra.

Then given an exact sequence E , $E \otimes_A N = E \otimes_A (B \otimes_B N) = (E \otimes_A B) \otimes_B N$ by Exercise 2.15 in the Chapter. As B is flat as an A -module and N is flat as a B -module, we are done.

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

Solution: Take a bilinear map $f : (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \times (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$. Then by bilinearity, we have $f(mx, y) = f(0, y) + mf(x, y) = f(0, y)$ and $f(x, ny) = f(x, 0) + nf(x, y) = f(x, 0)$, which imply that $mf(x, y) = 0$ and $nf(x, y) = 0$. By Bezout's Lemma, we have that there exists a, b s.t. $am + bn = 1$ as m, n are coprime. Thus $f(x, y) = 0$.

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

Solution: By tensoring with the exact sequence $\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow A \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow 0$, we get

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \otimes_A M \rightarrow A \otimes_A M \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{a} \otimes M \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{Prop 2.8})$$

Then by Proposition 2.14, $A \otimes M \rightarrow M$ is an isomorphism by $a \otimes$, we have $\mathfrak{a} \otimes M \cong \mathfrak{a}M$ and $A \otimes M \cong M$. Hence by commutativity of

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{a} \otimes M & \longrightarrow & A \otimes M \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ \mathfrak{a}M & \longrightarrow & M \end{array},$$

(for the commutativity, the definitions of the maps down make it obvious) we have that $\text{Im}(\mathfrak{a}M \rightarrow M) = \ker(M \rightarrow M/\mathfrak{a}M) = \ker(A/\mathfrak{a} \otimes M)$.

So we have this diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & M/\mathfrak{a}M & & \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\ \mathfrak{a}M \longrightarrow M & & & & 0 \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & A/\mathfrak{a} \otimes M & & \end{array}$$

By some isomorphism theorem and surjectivity of the last maps, we have that $M/\mathfrak{a}M \cong A/\mathfrak{a} \otimes M$.

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 $N = 0$. [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. 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.]

Solution: We do as the hint suggests: Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal, $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$ the residue field and define $M_k = k \otimes_A M \cong M/\mathfrak{m}M$ by Exercise 2.

By Nakayama's lemma, $M_k = 0 \implies M = 0$ since $k \subseteq$ the Jacobson radical, $M_k = 0 \implies M = \mathfrak{m}M$, and M is finitely generated.

Then we have that $M \otimes_A N = 0 \implies (M \otimes_A N)_k = 0$ because

As the tensor product of vector spaces is just the direct sum, this implies that $0 = k \otimes k \otimes (M \otimes_A N) = M_k \otimes_k N_k = 0$ by commuting. As A bilinear maps on $M_k \times N_k$ are k linear maps on $M_k \times N_k$, we have $M_k \otimes_k N_k = 0$. Finally, this implies that $M_k = 0$ or $N_k = 0$, since M_k, N_k are vector spaces.

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 \iff each M_i is flat.

Solution: Fix an exact sequence E .

We have that $E \otimes M = E \otimes (\bigoplus M_i) = \bigoplus (E \otimes M_i)$ because each direct sum is finite and hence belongs to a finite direct sum in which we can use Proposition 2.14. Then if $E \otimes M$ is exact, so is each coordinate, which gives us the individual M_i is exact. If each coordinate is exact then so is $E \otimes M$.

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. [Use Exercise 4.]

Solution: Clearly $A[x] = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} Ax^i$. So by the above exercise, it suffices to show that $x^i A$ is flat. Say we have a short exact sequence of A -modules

$$0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow D \rightarrow 0.$$

Then

$$0 \rightarrow B \otimes Ax^i \rightarrow C \otimes Ax^i \rightarrow D \otimes Ax^i \rightarrow 0$$

is exact because tensoring with Ax^i is the same as tensoring with A as bilinear maps $B \times Ax^i$ are bilinear on $B \times A$ and likewise for linear maps. So tensoring with Ax^i also induces unique linear maps that make the tensor universal diagram commute, so by uniqueness of the universal property, they are the same.

Finally tensoring with A is the same as the original module by Proposition 2.14. So Ax^i is flat and so is $A[x]$.

6. For any A -module, let $M[x]$ denote the set of all polynomials in x with coefficients in M , that is to say expressions of the form

$$m_0 + m_1x + \cdots + m_rx^r. \quad (m_i \in M)$$

Defining the product of an element of $A[x]$ and an element of $M[x]$ in the obvious way, show that $M[x]$ is an $A[x]$ -module.

Show that $M[x] \cong A[x] \otimes_A M$.

Solution: First, it is an abelian group by commuting and grouping together terms with the same power of x . Then for the properties of an $A[x]$ module: Distributivity holds by simply defining it as so.

$$\begin{aligned} (r+s)m &= (r_0 + \cdots + r_jx^j + s_0 + \cdots + s_kx^k)m \\ &= (r_0 + s_0 + \cdots + (r_{j+k} + s_{j+k})x^{j+k})m \\ &= (r_0 + s_0)m + (r_1 + s_1)mx + \cdots \\ &= rm + sm \\ r(sm) &= r(s_0m + s_1mx + \cdots + s_kmx^k) \\ &= r(s_0m) + \cdots + r(s_kmx^k) \\ &= rs_0m + \cdots + rs_kx^km \\ &= (rs_0 + \cdots + rs_kx^k)m \\ &= (rs)m \\ 1m &= m. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $M[x]$ is an $A[x]$ module.

We use the universal property. Say we have a bilinear map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A[x] \times M & \longrightarrow & M[x] \\ & \searrow f & \\ & & B \end{array}$$

where the top map takes $(a(x), m) \rightarrow a(x)m$. Then we have the unique linear map $\hat{f} : M[x] \rightarrow B$ that takes $m_0 + m_1x + \cdots + m_rx^r$ to $f(1, m_0) + f(x, m_1) + \cdots + f(x^r, m_r)$. This is linear because of linearity of f in M . It is unique because we have a basis that uniquely determines the map by linearity, and the bases have to be mapped to the things that generate this map.

Hence by the universal property, $M[x] \cong A[x] \otimes M$.

7. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal in A . Show that $\mathfrak{p}[x]$ is a prime ideal in $A[x]$. If \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal in A , is $\mathfrak{m}[x]$ a maximal ideal in $A[x]$?

Solution: It is clear that $A[x]/\mathfrak{p}[x] \cong (A/\mathfrak{p})[x]$. As A/\mathfrak{p} is an integral domain by primality of \mathfrak{p} , $(A/\mathfrak{p})[x]$ is an integral domain (look at leading coefficients) and thus $\mathfrak{p}[x]$ is prime.

Similarly with \mathfrak{m} , $A[x]/\mathfrak{m}[x] \cong (A/\mathfrak{m})[x]$. Then A/\mathfrak{m} is a field, and clearly $(A/\mathfrak{m})[x]$ is not a field.

8. (a) If M and N are flat A -modules, then so is $M \otimes_A N$.

Solution: Let E be an exact sequence. Then $E \otimes_A M$ is exact by M being flat, and hence $(E \otimes_A M) \otimes_A N$ is exact. By Proposition 2.14, this sequence equals $E \otimes_A (M \otimes_A N)$, so $M \otimes_A N$ is flat.

- (b) If B is a flat A -algebra and N is a flat B -module, then N is flat as an A -module.

Solution: Consider $B \otimes_B N \cong N$ by Proposition 2.14. Then N is flat as an A -module by Exercise 2.20 in the Chapter.

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 .

Solution: As the last map is surjective, the preimage of M'' is M , so the preimage of the generators of M'' and the kernel generate M . But the kernel is finitely generated as it is the image of M' , so M is finitely generated.

10. Let A be a ring, \mathfrak{a} an ideal contained in the Jacobson radical of A ; let M be an A -module and N a finitely generated A -module, and let $u : M \rightarrow N$ be a homomorphism. If the induced homomorphism $M/\mathfrak{a}M \rightarrow N/\mathfrak{a}N$ is surjective, then u is surjective.

Solution: It suffices to show that $N = \mathfrak{a}N + u(M)$ by Corollary 2.7. Clearly $\mathfrak{a}N + u(M) \subseteq N$ by definitions.

Let ϕ_N be the quotient map $N \rightarrow N/\mathfrak{a}N$ and ϕ_M be the map $M \rightarrow M/\mathfrak{a}M$. Then because \hat{u} is induced by $\phi \circ u$, $\phi_N \circ u = \hat{u} \phi_M$. As both \hat{u} and ϕ_M are surjective, the LHS is too. Hence for every element n of N , by the surjectivity of ϕ_N , there is an element in $u(M)$ s.t. ϕ_N of it equals n . Thus $u(M) + \ker \phi_N = u(M) + \mathfrak{a}N = N$.

11. Let A be a ring $\neq 0$. Show that $A^m \cong A^n \implies m = n$.

Solution: Let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of A and let $\phi : A^m \rightarrow A^n$ be an isomorphism. Then $1 \otimes \phi : A/\mathfrak{m} \otimes A^m \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{m} \otimes A^n$ is an isomorphism of vector space (Exercise 2 for modules over a field). But then these vector spaces have to have the same dimension over A/\mathfrak{m} , which are m and n respectively. So $m = n$.

- (a) If $\phi : A^m \rightarrow A^n$ is surjective, then $m \geq n$.

Solution: Let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of A and let $\phi : A^m \rightarrow A^n$ be a surjection. Then $1 \otimes \phi : A/\mathfrak{m} \otimes A^m \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{m} \otimes A^n$ is a surjection of vector space (Exercise 2) (surjectivity from right exactness of tensoring (Proposition 2.18)). Then note that their dimensions are m, n respectively. As this is a surjective vector space map, $m \geq n$.

- (b) If $\phi : A^m \rightarrow A^n$ is injective, is it always the case that $m \leq n$?

Solution: No. Consider $A = \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots]$. Then consider the map $A \times A \rightarrow A$ that maps $(f(x_1, \dots), g(x_1, \dots)) \rightarrow f(x_1, x_3, \dots) + g(x_2, x_4, \dots)$. Obviously they are injective as they are inclusions under relabelling. Clearly $2 \not\leq 1$.

12. Let M be a finitely generated A -module and $\phi : M \rightarrow A^n$ a surjective homomorphism. Show that $\ker \phi$ is finitely generated.

Solution: We can see that M is generated by picking a representative in the preimage of the basis of A^n and the kernel since the quotient is surjective, so every element in M is an element in A^n up to the kernel of the map. This then forms a basis because the preimage of the basis is a basis (otherwise push forward a relation), and the kernel and the basis have no relations because otherwise the basis would be in the kernel.

Hence $M = \ker \phi \oplus A^n$, which implies that $\ker \phi$ is finitely generated, otherwise M wouldn't be finitely generated.

13. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a ring homomorphism, and let N be a B -module. Regarding N as an A -module by restriction of scalars, form the B -module $N_B = B \otimes_A N$. Show that the homomorphism $g : N \rightarrow N_B$ which maps y to $1 \otimes y$ is injective and that $g(N)$ is a direct summand of N_B .

Solution: We can see that $p(g(n)) = n \forall n \in N$, which is injective. Hence g is.

To show that it is the direct sum, we do as the hint suggests and realize that $g \circ p$ is the identity map on elements not in $\ker p$ because B is generated as a B -module by 1, so we have generators of N_B being of the form $1 \otimes q$. It easily follows that $gp(1 \otimes q) = 1 \otimes q$, g is B linear.

Thus every element of N_B is either in the image of g or in the kernel of p . Then to show they are independent, suppose we have a non-trivial relation $\sum b_i \otimes y_i + 1 \otimes y \in \ker p + \text{Im } g$ equalling 0. Then $p(\sum b_i \otimes y_i + 1 \otimes y) = 0 + p(1 \otimes y) = y \neq 0$ otherwise it would be a trivial relation.

14. A partially ordered set I is said to be a directed set if for each pair i, j in I there exists $k \in I$ such that $i \leq k$ and $j \leq k$.

Let A be a ring, let I be a directed set and let $(M_i)_{i \in I}'$ be a family of A -modules indexed by I . For each pair i, j in I such that $i \leq j$, let $\mu_{ij} : M_i \rightarrow M_j$ be an A -homomorphism, and suppose that the following axioms are satisfied:

1. μ_{ii} is the identity mapping of M_i for all $i \in I$;

2. $\mu_{ik} = \mu_{jk} \circ \mu_{ij}$ whenever $i \leq j \leq k$.

Then the modules M_i and homomorphisms μ_{ij} are said to form a direct system $M = (M_i, \mu_{ij})$ over the directed set I .

We shall construct an A -module M called the **direct limit** of the direct system M . Let C be the direct sum of the M_i , and identify each module M_i with its canonical image in C . Let D be the submodule of C generated by all elements of the form $x_i - \mu_{ij}(x_i)$ where $i \leq j$ and $x_i \in M_i$. Let $M = C/D$, let $\mu : C \rightarrow M$ be the projection and let μ_i be the restriction of M_i .

The module M , or more correctly the pair consisting of M and the family of homomorphisms $\mu_i : M_i \rightarrow M$, is called the direct limit of the direct system M , and is written $\lim_{\rightarrow} M_i$. From the construction it is clear that $\mu_i = \mu_j \circ \mu_{ij}$ whenever $i \leq j$.

Solution: Let $Q = \{X_i - \mu_{ij}(X_i), X_i \in M_i, i \leq j\}$. We can see that from definition, for $x_i \in M_i$, $\mu_i(x_i) = x_i + Q = x_i - (x_i - \mu_{ij}(x_i)) + Q = \mu_j(\mu_{ij}(x_i))$.

15. In the situation of Exercise 14, show that every element of M can be written in the form $\mu_i(x_i)$ for some $i \in I$ and some $x_i \in M_i$.
Show also that if $\mu_i(x_i) = 0$ then there exists $j \geq i$ such that $\mu_{ij}(x_i) = 0$ in M_j .

Solution: It suffices to show that $x_j + x_k + Q$ for $x_j \in M_j, x_k \in M_k$ is of the desired form since M are quotient classes of a finite sum. We can see that $x_j + x_k + Q = \mu_{j\ell}(x_j) + \mu_{k\ell}(x_k) + Q$ for $j \leq \ell$ and $k \leq \ell$. Then because $\mu_{j\ell}(x_j) + \mu_{k\ell}(x_k) \in M_\ell$, $\mu_{j\ell}(x_j) + \mu_{k\ell}(x_k) + Q = \mu_\ell(\mu_{j\ell}(x_j) + \mu_{k\ell}(x_k))$. Since $Q = \mu_i(x_i) = x_i + Q$, there is some finite set of $j_\ell \geq i$ s.t. $x_i = \sum (x_{j_\ell} - \mu_{ij_\ell}(x_{j_\ell}))$, $x_{j_\ell} \in M_{j_\ell}$. Since the M_i, M_{j_ℓ} are distinct, $\sum \mu_{ij_\ell}(x_{j_\ell}) = 0$.

16. Show that the direct limit is characterized (up to isomorphism) by the following property. Let N be an A -module and for each $i \in I$, let $\alpha_i : M_i \rightarrow N$ be an A -module homomorphism such that $\alpha_i = \alpha_j \circ \mu_{ij}$ whenever $i \leq j$. Then there exists a unique homomorphism $\alpha : M \rightarrow N$ such that $\alpha_i = \alpha \circ \mu_i$ for all $i \in I$.

Solution: Simply define α to be $(\bigoplus x_i) + Q \mapsto \bigoplus \alpha_i(x_i)$. This is well-defined because for any $m_i - \mu_{ij}(m_i) \in Q$, this gets mapped to $\alpha_i(m_i) - \alpha_j(\mu_{ij}(m_i)) = \alpha_i(m_i) - \alpha_i(m_i) = 0$. Then this commutes properly because $\alpha(\mu_i(m_i)) = \alpha(m_i + Q) = \alpha_i(m_i)$. Finally, this is unique because given another α' with these properties and arbitrary $\bigoplus x_i + Q \in M$, $\alpha'(\bigoplus x_i + Q) = \alpha'(\mu_I(x_I))$ given by Exercise 15. Then by definition of α' , $\alpha'(\mu_I(x_I)) = \alpha_I(x_I) = \alpha(\mu_I(x_I)) = \alpha(\bigoplus x_i + Q)$. Hence $\alpha' = \alpha$ for all elements of M , and we are done. The characterizing up to isomorphism is just a classic universal property argument.

17. Let $(M_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of submodules of an A -module, such that for each pair of indices i, j in I , there exists $k \in I$ s.t. $M_i + M_j \subseteq M_k$. Define $i \leq j$ to mean $M_i \subseteq M_j$ and let $\mu_{ij} : M_i \rightarrow M_j$ be the embedding of M_i in M_j . Show that

$$\lim_{\rightarrow} M_i = \sum M_i = \cup M_i.$$

In particular, any A -module is the direct limit of its finitely generated submodules.

Solution: Obviously this satisfies the conditions for the direct limit as the maps are just embeddings. To show the equality, we can realize $\cup M_i$ as having the properties of the direct limit: Say we have a family of maps α_i into an A -module N that respect the directed system's maps.

Then we have a map $\alpha : \cup M_i \rightarrow N$ defined by taking an element m , finding a M_i it is in, and mapping it to $\alpha_i(m)$. This is well-defined because α_i respects the directed system's maps, those being inclusions. Hence it is isomorphic to the direct limit by Exercise 16.

Since $\{M_i\}$ is a poset and we have that for every increasing chain, there is a maximal element (namely the union of all the modules in the chain), there is a maximal element M in this set. This equals $\cup M_i$, and hence $M \subseteq \sum M_i \subseteq M$.

18. Let $\mathbf{M} = (M_i, \mu_{ij}), \mathbf{N} = (N_i, \nu_{ij})$ be direct systems of A -modules over the same directed set. Let M, N be the direct limits and $\mu_i : M_i \rightarrow M, \nu_i : N_i \rightarrow N$ the associated homomorphisms. A homomorphism $\phi : \mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{N}$ is by definition a family of A -module homomorphisms $\phi_i : M_i \rightarrow N_i$ such that $\phi_j \circ \mu_{ij} = \nu_{ij} \circ \phi_i$ whenever $i \leq j$. Show that ϕ defines a unique homomorphism $\phi = \lim_{\rightarrow} \phi_i : M \rightarrow N$ such that $\phi \circ \mu_i = \nu_i \circ \phi_i$ for all $i \in I$.

Solution: We have maps $\psi_i : M_i \rightarrow N$ by doing the composition $\nu_i \circ \phi_i$, which commute with the system because $\psi_j(\mu_{ij}) = \nu_j \circ \nu_{ij} \circ \phi_i = \nu_i \circ \phi_i$. Hence there is a unique map $M \rightarrow N$ that commutes with the system by the characterizing property of the direct limit. Since this map commutes with the system, $\phi \circ \mu_i = \psi_i = \nu_i \circ \phi_i$.

19. A sequence of direct systems and homomorphisms

$$\mathbf{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{N} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}$$

is exact if the corresponding sequence of modules and module homomorphisms is exact for each $i \in I$. Show that the sequence $M \rightarrow N \rightarrow P$ of direct limits is then exact.

Solution: Let $\mu_{ij}, \nu_{ij}, \rho_{ij}$ be the maps in the systems, a_i, b_i be the maps $M_i \rightarrow N_i$ and $N_i \rightarrow P_i$, and let μ_M, ν_N be the maps from $M \rightarrow \cdot, N \rightarrow \cdot$ that are induced by the direct limit property (\cdot will be N or P).

Fix an element $x \in M$. By Exercise 15, $x = \mu_i(x_i)$ for some i . Then we can see that $\mu_{MP}\mu_i = \rho_i b_i a_i$ for all i by commuting properties of the direct limit. In particular, $\mu_{MP}(x) = \mu_{MP}\mu_i(x) = \rho_i b_i a_i = 0$ since a_i, b_i are in an exact sequence.

Finally, we can show that $\ker \nu_{NP} \subseteq \text{Im } \mu_{MN}$ by supposing $\nu_{NP}(x) = 0$ for $x \in N$. Then by Exercise 15, $x = \nu_i(x_i)$ for some i . By commuting properties, $\nu_{NP}\nu_i = \rho_i b_i$, so $\nu_{NP}(x) = \nu_{NP}\nu_i(x_i) = \rho_i b_i(x_i) = 0$. By exercise 15, if $\rho_i(b_i(x_i)) = 0$, there exists $j \geq i$ s.t. $\rho_{ij}(b_i(x_i)) = 0$. By commutativity of the diagram, this equals $b_j(\nu_{ij}(x_i)) = 0$, which by exactness gives us that $\nu_{ij}(x_i) \in \text{Im } a_j$. By applying ν_j to both sides, we can see that $\nu_i(x_i) \in \text{Im}(M_j \rightarrow N)$. Being in the image of $M_j \rightarrow N$ is in the image of μ_{MN} since, by being the direct limit, μ_{MN} factors through this map.

Hence $\ker \nu_{NP} = \text{Im } \mu_{MN}$.

To understand this proof clearly, let I just be the naturals and draw the commutative diagrams out.

20. Keeping the same notation as in Exercise 14, let N be any A -module. Then $(M_i \otimes N, \mu_{ij} \otimes 1)$ is a direct system; let $P = \lim_{\rightarrow} (M_i \otimes N)$ be its direct limit. For each $i \in I$, we have a homomorphism $\mu_i \otimes 1 : M_i \otimes N \rightarrow M \otimes N$, hence by Exercise 16 a homomorphism $\psi : P \rightarrow M \otimes N$. Show that ψ is an isomorphism, so that

$$\lim_{\rightarrow} (M_i \otimes N) \cong (\lim_{\rightarrow} M_i) \otimes N.$$

Solution: We show that $M \otimes N$ satisfies the universal property for direct limits. Suppose we have maps $\{f_i : M_i \otimes N \rightarrow Q\}$. Then these lead to bilinear maps $\hat{f}_i : M_i \times N \rightarrow Q$. By direct limit properties, we then have a map $M \times N \rightarrow Q$. This is bilinear because it commutes with bilinear maps. This bilinear map then induces a unique linear map $M \otimes N \rightarrow Q$. This is the universal property of direct limits, so $M \otimes N \cong \lim_{\rightarrow} (M_i \otimes N)$.

21. Let $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of rings indexed by a directed set I , and for each pair $i \leq j$ in I , let $\alpha_{ij} : A_i \rightarrow A_j$ be a ring homomorphism, satisfying conditions (1) and (2) of Exercise 14. Regarding each A_i as a \mathbb{Z} -module, we can then form the direct limit $A = \lim_{\rightarrow} A_i$. Show that A inherits a ring structure from the A_i so that the mappings $A_i \rightarrow A$ are ring homomorphisms. The ring A is the direct limit of the system (A_i, α_{ij}) .
If $A = 0$ prove that $A_i = 0$ for some $i \in I$.

Solution: For $a, a' \in \text{limit } A$, define $a \cdot a'$ as $\mu_k(\mu_{ik}(a_i)\mu_{jk}(a_j))$ where $a = \mu_i(a_i)$, $a' = \mu_j(a_j)$ and $k \geq i, j$, which is well-defined because for other $k' \geq i, j$, we can find a k'' s.t. $\mu_{k'}(\mu_{ik'}(a_i)\mu_{jk'}(a_j)) = \mu_{k''}(\mu_{k'k''}(\mu_{ik'}(a_i)\mu_{jk'}(a_j))) = \mu_{k''}(\mu_{k'k''}(\mu_{ik'}(a_i))\mu_{k'k''}(\mu_{jk'}(a_j))) = \mu_{k''}(\mu_{ik''}(a_i)\mu_{jk''}(a_j)) = \mu_{k''}(\mu_{kk''}(\mu_{ik}(a_i)\mu_{jk}(a_j))) = \mu_k(\mu_{ik}(a_i)\mu_{jk}(a_j))$. This is obviously commutative and has identity over multiplication because it has the domain of a commutative ring and $\mu_{\cdot, \cdot}$ are homomorphisms.

Next is associativity: Let $a = \mu_i(a_i)$, $b = \mu_j(b_j)$, $c = \mu_k(c_k)$ and $\ell \geq i, j, k$.

$$\begin{aligned} (a \cdot b) \cdot c &= (\mu_{\ell}(\mu_{i\ell}(a_i)\mu_{j\ell}(b_j))) \cdot \mu_k(c_k) \\ &\iff \\ \mu_{\ell}((\mu_{i\ell}(a_i)\mu_{j\ell}(b_j))\mu_{k\ell}(c_k)) &= a \cdot (b \cdot c). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, distributivity: Let $a = \mu_i(a_i)$, $b = \mu_j(b_j)$, $c = \mu_k(c_k)$ and $\ell \geq i, j, k$.

$$a(b + c) = \mu_i(a_i)(\mu_j(b_j) + \mu_k(c_k)) = \mu_i(a_i)(\mu_{\ell}(\mu_{j\ell}(b_j) + \mu_{k\ell}(c_k))) = \mu_{\ell}(\mu_{i\ell}(a_i)(\mu_{j\ell}(b_j) + \mu_{k\ell}(c_k))) = \mu_{\ell}(\mu_{i\ell}(a_i)\mu_{j\ell}(b_j) + \mu_{i\ell}(a_i)\mu_{k\ell}(c_k))$$

If $A = 0$, then $\mu_i(1) = 0 \implies \mu_{ij}(1) = 0$ by Exercise 15. But a ring homomorphism that sends 1 to 0 implies that the ring is 0, so $A_j = 0$.

22. Let (A_i, α_{ij}) be a direct system of rings and let \mathfrak{R}_i be the nilradical of A_i . Show that $\lim_{\rightarrow} \mathfrak{R}_i$ is the nilradical of $\lim_{\rightarrow} A_i$.
If each A_i is an integral domain, then $\lim_{\rightarrow} A_i$ is an integral domain.

Solution: We have the obvious inclusions $\mathfrak{R}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}(\lim_{\rightarrow} A_i)$ since $A_i \rightarrow \text{limit } A$ is a ring homomorphism ($a^n = 0$ in A_i gets mapped to $a^n = 0$ in limit A).

Next we can map $\mathfrak{R}(\lim_{\rightarrow} A_i)$ to $\lim_{\rightarrow} \mathfrak{R}_i$ as so: For any $a^n = 0 \in \text{limit } A$, $a = \mu_i(a_i)$ by Exercise 15, which then gives us $\mu_i(a_i^n) = 0$. By Exercise 15, we then have $\mu_{ij}(a_i^n) = 0$ in A_j . Then $\mu_{ij}(a_i)^n = 0$, giving us an element $\mu_{ij}(a_i)$, which we then map into $\lim_{\rightarrow} \mathfrak{R}_i$.

This is well-defined because we can always commute any choices to the same, largest index ring. Next this is a homomorphism because given $a = \mu_k(\mu_{ik}(a_i))$, $b = \mu_k(\mu_{jk}(b_j))$, $a + b = \mu_k(\mu_{ik}(a_i) + \mu_{jk}(b_j)) \rightarrow \mu_{k\ell}(\mu_{ik}(a_i) + \mu_{jk}(b_j)) \rightarrow \mu_{k\ell}(\mu_{ik}(a_i) + \mu_{jk}(b_j)) = \mu_{i\ell}(a_i) + \mu_{j\ell}(b_j)$, which is what a, b would be mapped to. This is just the identity.

Since there is a homomorphism and an inverse, it is an isomorphism.

If each A_i is an integral domain, then suppose FTSOC that there is $ab = 0$ in $\lim_{\rightarrow} A_i$, $a, b \neq 0$. Then by Exercise 15, we have $a = \mu_i(a_i)$, $b = \mu_j(b_j)$. Hence $\mu_i(a_i)\mu_j(b_j) = 0 = \mu_k(\mu_{ik}(a_i)\mu_{jk}(b_j))$ for $k \geq i, j$. Then by Exercise 15, there is $\ell \geq k$ s.t. $\mu_{k\ell}(\mu_{ik}(a_i)\mu_{jk}(b_j)) = 0 = \mu_{i\ell}(a_i)\mu_{j\ell}(b_j)$. But then A_j wouldn't be an integral domain (note that $\mu_{\ell}(\cdot) \neq 0$ because if otherwise, then $\mu_{\ell}(\mu_{\ell}(\cdot)) = \mu_{\ell}(\cdot) = 0$, contradicting a, b being non-zero).

23. Let $(B_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ be a family of A -algebras. For each finite subset of Λ , let B_J denote the tensor product (over A) of the B_λ for each $\lambda \in J$. If J' is another finite subset of Λ and $J \subseteq J'$, there is a canonical A -algebra homomorphism $B_J \rightarrow B_{J'}$. Let B denote the direct limit of the rings B_J as J runs through all finite subsets of Λ . The ring B has a natural A -algebra structure for which the homomorphisms $B_J \rightarrow B$ are A -algebra homomorphisms. The A -algebra B is the tensor product of the family $(B_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$.

Solution: The canonical A -algebra homomorphism sends $b \in B_J$ to $b \otimes 1 \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots$ ($|J'| - |J|$ times). As A -algebras are also rings, the ring B exists by Exercise 21. Ring homomorphisms that preserve A -module structure are A -algebra homomorphisms.

24. In these Exercises it will be assumed that the reader is familiar with the definition and basic properties of the Tor functor.

If M is an A -module, the following are equivalent:

1. M is flat;
2. $\text{Tor}_n^A(M, N) = 0$ for all $n > 0$ and all A -modules N ;
3. $\text{Tor}_1^A(M, N) = 0$ for all A -modules N .

Solution: (i) \implies (ii): We do as the hint suggests: take a free resolution of N . Tensor this with M . As M is flat, this sequence is then exact, so the homology groups are 0.

Obviously (ii) \implies (iii).

(iii) \implies (i): Take an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N'' \rightarrow 0$. Then $\text{Tor}_1^A(M, N'') \rightarrow M \otimes N' \rightarrow M \otimes N \rightarrow M \otimes N'' \rightarrow 0$ is exact. As $\text{Tor}_1^A(M, N'') = 0$, M is flat.

25. Let $0 \rightarrow N' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N'' \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence with N'' flat. Then N' is flat $\iff N$ is flat.

Solution: By the Tor exact sequence, we have

$$\text{Tor}_2^A(M, N'') \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^A(M, N') \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^A(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^A(M, N'') \rightarrow M \otimes N' \rightarrow M \otimes N \rightarrow M \otimes N'' \rightarrow 0.$$

As $\text{Tor}_2^A(M, N'') = \text{Tor}_1^A(M, N'') = 0$ by flatness of N'' and Exercise 24, $\text{Tor}_1^A(M, N') = \text{Tor}_1^A(M, N)$. By Exercise 24, this means that N is flat iff N' is flat.

26. Let N be an A -module. Then N is flat $\iff \text{Tor}_1(A/\mathfrak{a}, N) = 0$ for all finitely generated ideals \mathfrak{a} in A .

Solution: \implies) is obvious by Exercise 24.

\Leftarrow):

Lemma 1. Assuming the RHS, then $\text{Tor}(A/\mathfrak{a}, N) = 0$ for all \mathfrak{b} .

Proof. □

First we can note that N is flat if $\text{Tor}_1(M, N) = 0$ for all finitely generated A -modules M by Proposition 2.19. Then fix a finitely generated M generated by x_i and define $M_i = \{x_1, \dots, x_i\}$. Also define the map $f_i : A \rightarrow M_i/M_{i-1}$ by sending $a \in A$ to $ax_i + M_{i-1}$. This is surjective as M_i is generated by x_1, \dots, x_i . As such, $\ker f_i$ is an ideal of A . Hence $M_i/M_{i-1} \cong$ Next we show that if $\text{Tor}_1(M, N) = 0$ for all cyclic A -modules M , then N is flat:

27. A ring A is absolutely flat if every A -module is flat. Prove that the following are equivalent:

1. A is absolutely flat.
2. Every principal ideal is idempotent.
3. Every finitely generated ideal is a direct summand of A .

Solution: (i) \implies (ii): Since $A/(x)$ is an A -module, it is flat. Thus the injectivity of $(x) \rightarrow A$ makes the map $(x) \otimes A/(x) \rightarrow A \otimes A/(x) \cong A/(x)$ injective. This map takes $x \otimes [a] \mapsto x \otimes [a] \mapsto [xa] = 0$ (middle map is due to Proposition 2.19). As it is an injective zero map, $(x) \otimes A/(x) = 0$, and by Exercise 2, $(x) \otimes A/(x) \cong (x)/(x)^2$. Thus $(x) = (x)^2$.

(ii) \implies (iii): As the hint does: Let $x \in A$. Then $x = ax^2$ for some $a \in A$, hence $e = ax$ is idempotent and we have $(e) = (x)$. For idempotents e, f , $(e, f) = (e + f - ef)$ because $e(e + f - ef) = e + ef - ef = e$ and $f(e + f - ef) = ef + f - ef = f$. Thus every finitely generated ideal is principal by finding idempotents for every generator in the ideal and then reducing them pairwise as so. As such, $A = (e) \oplus (1 - e)$ (note that $(1 - e)^2 = (1 - e)$, so they are independent).

(iii) \implies (i): It suffices to satisfy the conditions in Exercise 26 for all N . Take an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N'' \rightarrow 0$. Then we have the sequence

$$\mathrm{Tor}_1(A/\mathfrak{a}, N'') \rightarrow N' \otimes A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow N \otimes A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow N'' \otimes A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow 0.$$

By Exercise 2, $N' \otimes A/\mathfrak{a} \cong N'/\mathfrak{a}N' \cong \mathfrak{b}N'$ as we assume that A is a direct sum of f.g. ideals (namely let $A = \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{b}$). Then the map $N' \otimes A/\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow N \otimes A/\mathfrak{a}$ is the map $\mathfrak{b}N' \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}N$, which is injective as they are simply restrictions of the injective map $N' \rightarrow N$. Thus $\mathrm{Tor}_1(A/\mathfrak{a}, N'') = 0$. As we can always realize N as the tail of an exact sequence (simply take $0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$), we are done.

28. A Boolean ring is absolutely flat. The ring of Chapter 1, Exercise 7 is absolutely flat. Every homomorphic image of an absolutely flat ring is absolutely flat. If a local ring is absolutely flat, then it is a field. If A is absolutely flat, every non-unit in A is a zero-divisor.

Solution: By definition, all principal ideals are idempotent in a Boolean ring, so by Exercise 27 we are done.

The ring in Chapter 1 Exercise 7 is absolutely flat because all principal ideals are idempotent: $(x)^2 = (x^2) = (x)$ because $x^{2^n} = x \in (x^2)$.

Say we have f a homomorphism from an absolutely flat ring R . Then every principal ideal in the image is generated by $f(a)$, and $(a^2) = (a)$ by Exercise 27. Hence $(f(a))^2 = (f(a)^2) = (f(a^2)) = (f(a))$.

Fix an absolutely flat local ring R . By Exercise 27, every principal ideal of R is idempotent, so $(x^2) = (x) \forall x \in R$. Hence $x = rx^2, r \in R$. Thus $rx = r^2x^2 = (rx)^2 \implies rx$ is idempotent. But by Exercise 12 of Chapter 1, $rx = 0$ or 1 . Thus $(x) = 0$ or 1 , which implies that it is a field.

If A is absolutely flat, then take a non-unit x . We have that $(x)^2 = (x)$, so $x \in (x^2) \implies rx^2 = x$ for some r . Thus $x(rx - 1) = 0 \implies x$ is a zero-divisor.