

3

DF. 15.1.8: Show that an  $R$ -module  $M$  over a Noetherian ring  $R$  is Noetherian iff it is finitely generated.

Solution: First assume that  $M$  is Noetherian and assume to derive a contradiction that  $M$  is not finitely generated. Choose  $m_1 \in M$  s.t.  $m_1 \neq 0$ . Then  $\langle m_1 \rangle \neq M$  since  $M$  not f.g. So choose  $m_2 \in M \setminus \langle m_1 \rangle$  and so on. This gives an infinite chain of submodules.  $\nexists$

Conversely, if  $M$  is finitely generated then  $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}$  and a surjection of  $R$ -modules  $\phi: R^n \rightarrow M$ .

Since  $R$  is Noetherian, it is by definition Noetherian as an  $R$ -module and so is  $R^n$  (Prove this!). Hence  $M$  is Noetherian since the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker \phi \rightarrow R^n \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0 \text{ is exact}$$

and  $R^n$  is Noetherian.

5

DF. 15.1.24: Let  $V = Z(xy-z) \subset \mathbb{A}^3$ . Find an isomorphism  $e: Z(xy-z) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^2$  and the corresponding  $k$ -morphisms  $\bar{e}: k[\mathbb{A}^2] \rightarrow k[V]$ . Also give the inverses.

Is  $Z(xy-x^2)$  isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^2$ ?

Solution: we start with  $\bar{e}$  and get to  $e$  from there: clearly,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{e}: k[x,y] & \longrightarrow & k[x,y,z]/(xy-z) \\ x & \longmapsto & x \\ y & \longmapsto & y \end{array}$$

is a surjection since  $x, y, z$  is in the image. It is also injective since  $xy-z$  cannot divide any elem. in the image but 0. Hence  $\bar{e}$  is an iso. The morphism  $e$  is defined as

$$V = \text{Hom}_k(k[x,y,z]/(xy-z), k) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_k(k[x,y], k) = \mathbb{A}^2$$

$$p \longmapsto p \circ \bar{e}.$$

This takes a point  $(a,b,c) \in V$  to  $(a,b)$ .

That is  $e$  is just the projection onto the  $xy$ -plane. we have

$$\bar{e}^{-1}(z) = xy \quad \text{and}$$

$$e^{-1}(a,b) = (a,b,ab).$$

①

DF 15.1.7: Prove that submodules, quotient modules and finite direct sums of Noetherian modules are again Noetherian.

---

Solution: Using 15.1.6:

$$N \hookrightarrow M \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/N \rightarrow 0 \text{ exact}$$

$$M \xrightarrow{\phi} Q \Rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \ker \phi \rightarrow M \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0 \text{ ---}$$

$$M_1 \oplus M_2 \Rightarrow 0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_1 \oplus M_2 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow 0 \text{ ---}$$


---

④

DF 15.1.9: Let  $k$  be a field. Show that any subring of  $k[x]$  containing  $k$  is Noetherian. Give an example showing that such rings need not be UFD's. [HINT]

---

Solution: we follow the hint in DF:

Take  $R$  s.t.  $k \subset R \subseteq k[x]$  ( $R=k$  is trivial)

and pick  $y \in R \setminus k$ . Then  $y$  is a polynomial in  $x$  of degree say  $n$ . A polynomial  $g$  can be written as

$$g = a_{k,s} x^k y^s + a_{k+1,s} x^{k+1} y^s + \dots + a_{0,s} y^s + a_{k,s+1} x^k y^{s+1} + \dots + a_{0,s+1}$$

where  $k < n$  and  $k + sn = m$ . Hence  $k[x]$

is gen. as a  $k[y]$ -module by

$1, x, \dots, x^k$ , i.e.  $k[x]$  is a f.g.  $k[y]$ -mod.

By [DF, 15.1.8]  $k[x]$  is a Noetherian  $k[y]$ -mod.

By [DF, 15.1.7]  $R$  is Noetherian as a  $k[y]$ -module since it is a submodule of the Noetherian  $k[y]$ -mod.  $k[x]$ . But every chain of ideals in  $R$  is a chain of submodules of  $R$  and hence  $R$  is Noetherian as a ring.

For the second part, the subring  $k[x^2, x^3]$  is not a UFD since  $x^6$  may be factored either as  $(x^2)^3$  or as  $(x^3)^2$ .

---

6

DF 15.1.10: Show that the subring

$$k[x, x^2y, x^3y^2, \dots] \subset k[x, y]$$

is not Noetherian.

---

Solution: Consider the chain of ideals

$$(x) \subseteq (x, x^2y) \subseteq (x, x^2y, x^3y^2) \subseteq \dots$$

This chain doesn't stabilize since  $x^n y^{n-1} \notin (x, x^2y, \dots, x^{n-1}y^{n-2})$ . Indeed, the exponent of  $x$  in

$$x^{a_1}(x^2y)^{a_2} \dots (x^{n-1}y^{n-2})^{a_{n-1}}$$

is  $e_x := a_1 + 2a_2 + \dots + (n-1)a_{n-1}$  and the exponent of  $y$  is  $e_y := a_2 + 2a_3 + \dots + (n-2)a_{n-1}$  so if  $e_x = n$  then  $e_y = n - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{n-1})$  which

is  $n-1$  iff  $a_1 + \dots + a_{n-1} = 1$  but this is not possible since  $a_i \geq 0$  and at least two  $a_i$  must be non-zero since  $e_x = n$ .

---