# Problem Set 1

D. Zack Garza

Sunday 6<sup>th</sup> September, 2020

Source: Section 1 of Gathmann

# 1 Exercises

Exercise 1.1 (Gathmann 1.19).

Prove that every affine variety  $X \subset \mathbb{A}^n/k$  consisting of only finitely many points can be written as the zero locus of n polynomials.

Hint: Use interpolation. It is useful to assume at first that all points in X have different  $x_1$ -coordinates.

#### Solution

Let  $X = \{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_d\} = \{\mathbf{p}_j\}_{j=1}^d$ , where each  $\mathbf{p}_j \in \mathbb{A}^n$  can be written in coordinates

$$\mathbf{p}_j \coloneqq \left[p_j^1, p_j^2, \cdots, p_j^n\right].$$

#### Remark

Proof idea: for some fixed k with  $2 \le k \le n$ , consider the pairs  $(p_j^1, p_j^k) \in \mathbb{A}^2$ . Letting j range over  $1 \le j \le d$  yields d points of the form  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{A}^2$ , so construct an interpolating polynomial such that f(x) = y for each tuple. Then f(x) - y vanishes at every such tuple.

Doing this for each k (keeping the first coordinate always of the form  $p_j^1$  and letting the second coordinate vary) yields n-1 polynomials in  $k[x_1,x_k] \subseteq k[x_1,\cdots,x_n]$ , then adding in the polynomial  $p(x) = \prod_j (x-p_j^1)$  yields a system the vanishes precisely on  $\{\mathbf{p}_j\}$ .

Claim: Without loss of generality, we can assume all of the first components  $\left\{p_j^1\right\}_{j=1}^d$  are distinct.

Todo: follows from "rotation of axes"?

We will use the following fact:

# Theorem 1.1(Lagrange).

Given a set of d points  $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^d$  with all  $x_i$  distinct, there exists a unique polynomial of degree d in  $f \in k[x]$  such that  $\tilde{f}(x_i) = y_i$  for every i.

This can be explicitly given by

$$\tilde{f}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} y_i \left( \prod_{\substack{0 \le m \le d \\ m \ne i}} \left( \frac{x - x_m}{x_i - x_m} \right) \right).$$

Equivalently, there is a polynomial f defined by  $f(x_i) = \tilde{f}(x_i) - y_i$  of degree d whose roots are precisely the  $x_i$ .

Using this theorem, we define a system of n polynomials in the following way:

• Define  $f_1 \in k[x_1] \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  by

$$f_1(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{d} (x - p_i^1).$$

Then the roots of  $f_1$  are precisely the first components of the points p.

• Define  $f_2 \in k[x_1, x_2] \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  by considering the ordered pairs

$$\{(x_1, x_2) = (p_j^1, p_j^2)\},\$$

then taking the unique Lagrange interpolating polynomial  $\tilde{f}_2$  satisfying  $\tilde{f}_2(p_j^1) = p_j^2$  for all  $1 \le j \le d$ . Then set  $f_2 := \tilde{f}_2(x_1) - x_2 \in k[x_1, x_2]$ .

• Define  $f_3 \in k[x_1, x_3] \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  by considering the ordered pairs

$$\{(x_1, x_3) = (p_j^1, p_j^3)\},\$$

then taking the unique Lagrange interpolating polynomial  $\tilde{f}_3$  satisfying  $\tilde{f}_2(p_j^1) = p_j^3$  for all  $1 \le j \le d$ . Then set  $f_3 := \tilde{f}_3(x_1) - x_3 \in k[x_1, x_3]$ .

• ...

Continuing in this way up to  $f_n \in k[x_1, x_n]$  yields a system of n polynomials.

## Proposition 1.2.

$$V(f_1,\cdots,f_n)=X.$$

Proof.

Claim:  $X \subseteq V(f_i)$ :

This is essentially by construction. Letting  $p_j \in X$  be arbitrary, we find that

$$f_1(p_j) = \prod_{i=1}^d (p_j^1 - p_i^1) = (p_j^1 - p_j^1) \prod_{\substack{i \le d \ i \ne j}} (p_j^1 - p_i^1) = 0.$$

Similarly, for  $2 \le k \le n$ ,

$$f_k(p_j) = \tilde{f}_k(p_j^1) - p_j^k = 0,$$

which follows from the fact that  $\tilde{f}_k(p_j^1) = p_j^k$  for every k and every j by the construction of  $\tilde{f}_k$ .

Claim:  $X^c \subseteq V(f_i)^c$ :

This follows from the fact the polynomials f given by Lagrange interpolation are unique, and thus the roots of  $\tilde{f}$  are unique. But if some other point was in  $V(f_i)$ , then one of its coordinates would be another root of some  $\tilde{f}$ .

Exercise 1.2 (Gathmann 1.21).

Determine  $\sqrt{I}$  for

$$I := \langle x_1^3 - x_2^6, x_1 x_2 - x_2^3 \rangle \le \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2].$$

Solution:

For notational purposes, let  $\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{V}$  denote the maps in Hilbert's Nullstellensatz, we then have

$$(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{V})(I) = \sqrt{I}.$$

So we consider  $\mathcal{V}(I) \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2/\mathbb{C}$ , the vanishing locus of these two polynomials, which yields the system

$$\begin{cases} x^3 - y^6 = 0 \\ xy - y^3 = 0. \end{cases}$$

In the second equation, we have  $(x - y^2)y = 0$ , and since  $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$  is an integral domain, one term must be zero.

- 1. If y = 0, then  $x^3 = 0 \implies x = 0$ , and thus  $(0,0) \in \mathcal{V}(I)$ , i.e. the origin is contained in this vanishing locus.
- 2. Otherwise, if  $x y^2 = 0$ , then  $x = y^2$ , with no further conditions coming from the first equation.

Combining these conditions,

$$P \coloneqq \left\{ (t^2, t) \mid t \in \mathbb{C} \right\} \subset \mathcal{V}(I).$$

where  $I = \langle x^3 - y^6, xy - y^3 \rangle$ .

We have  $P = \mathcal{V}(I)$ , and so taking the ideal generated by P yields

$$(\mathcal{I} \circ \mathcal{V})(I) = \mathcal{I}(P) = \langle y - x^2 \rangle \in \mathbb{C}[x, y]$$

and thus  $\sqrt{I} = \langle y - x^2 \rangle$ .

### Exercise 1.3 (Gathmann 1.22).

Let  $X \subset \mathbb{A}^3/k$  be the union of the three coordinate axes. Compute generators for the ideal I(X) and show that it can not be generated by fewer than 3 elements.

### Solution:

Claim:

$$I(X) = \langle x_1 x_2, x_1 x_3, x_2 x_3 \rangle.$$

#### Proposition 1.3.

In  $\mathbb{A}^n/k$ , letting  $X_i$  be the  $x_i$ -coordinate axis, we have

$$X_j = V\left(\prod_{i \neq j} x_i\right).$$

Proof

 $\subseteq$ : Let  $\mathbf{p} \in X_j$ , where  $\mathbf{p} = [p_1, \dots, p_n]$  in coordinates with  $p_i = 0$  for  $i \neq j$ .

Then if  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \left\langle \prod_{i \neq j} x_i \right\rangle$ , then f is of the form

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \prod_{i \neq j} x_i,$$

and thus

$$f(\mathbf{p}) = g(p_1, \cdots, p_n) \prod_{i \neq j} p_i,$$

which is necessarily zero because the product term is zero and kx is a domain.

We thus have  $X = X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3$ , where

- The  $x_1$ -axis is given by  $X_1 := V(x_2x_3)$ ,
- The  $x_2$ -axis is given by  $X_2 := V(x_1x_3)$ ,

• The  $x_3$ -axis is given by  $X_3 := V(x_1x_2)$ ,

Exercise 1.4 (Gathmann 1.23: Relative Nullstellensatz).

Let  $Y \subset \mathbb{A}^n/k$  be an affine variety and define A(Y) by the quotient

$$\pi: k[x_1, \cdots, x_n] \longrightarrow A(Y) := k[x_1, \cdots, x_n]/I(Y).$$

- a. Show that  $V_Y(J) = V(\pi^{-1}(J) \text{ for every } J \leq A(Y).$
- b. Show that  $\pi^{-1}(I_Y(X)) = I(X)$  for every affine subvariety  $X \subseteq Y$ .
- c. Using the fact that  $I(V(J)) \subset \sqrt{J}$  for every  $J \leq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , deduce that  $I_Y(V_Y(J)) \subset \sqrt{J}$  for every  $J \leq A(Y)$ .

Conclude that there is an inclusion-reversing bijection

Exercise 1.5 (Extra).

Let  $J \leq k[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$  be an ideal, and find a counterexample to  $I(V(J)) = \sqrt{J}$  when k is not algebraically closed.

Solution:

Take  $J = \langle x^2 + 1 \rangle \leq \mathbb{R}[x]$ , noting that J is nontrivial and proper but  $\mathbb{R}$  is not algebraically closed. Then  $V(J) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  is empty, and thus  $I(V(J)) = I(\emptyset)$ .

Claim:  $I(V(J)) = \mathbb{R}[x]$ .

Checking definitions, for any set  $X \subset \mathbb{A}^n/k$  we have

$$I(X) = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{R}[x] \mid \forall x \in X, f(x) = 0 \right\}$$

and so we vacuously have

$$I(\emptyset) = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{R}[x] \mid \forall x \in \emptyset, f(x) = 0 \right\} = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{R}[x] \right\} = \mathbb{R}[x].$$

Claim:  $\sqrt{J} \neq \mathbb{R}[x]$ .

This follows from the fact that maximal ideals are radical, and  $\mathbb{R}[x]/J \cong \mathbb{C}$  being a field implies that J is maximal. In this case  $\sqrt{J} = J \neq \mathbb{R}[x]$ .

That maximal ideals are radical follows from the fact that if  $J \subseteq R$  is maximal, we have  $J \subset \sqrt{J} \subset R$  which forces  $\sqrt{J} = J$  or  $\sqrt{J} = R$ .

But if  $\sqrt{J} = R$ , then

$$1 \in \sqrt{J} \implies 1^n \in J \text{ for some } n \implies 1 \in J \implies J = R,$$

contradicting the assumption that J is maximal and thus proper by definition.