MA3G6 Commutative algebra :: Lecture notes

Lecturer: Diane Maclagan

October 27, 2023

Contents

Week 1, lecture 1 starts here

What is this module about?

- Continuation of MA249,
- Back engine for algebraic geometry and (algebraic) number theory,
- Connection to other areas (combinatorics, applied maths, ...),
- Fun in its own right.

Recall

Definition 0.0.1. A *ring* $(R, +, \times)$ is a set R with binary operations $+ : R \times R \to R$, $\times : R \times R \to R$ such that

1. $(R, +)$ is an abelian group (identity denoted 0_R or given clear context simply 0),
2. $\times$ is associative and distributes over $+$,
3. $\exists 1_R \in R : 1_R \cdot a = a \cdot 1_R = a \ \forall a \in R$.

Within context of module, we always add a 4th axiom:

4. $ab = ba \ \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ commutativity

Example 0.0.2.

- $\mathbb{Z}$
- Polynomial ring
- $S = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $f \in S$, $f = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{N}^n} c_u x^u$, $c_u \in \mathbb{C}$, $x^u = x_1^{u_1} x_2^{u_2} \cdots x_n^{u_n}$ (this is called multiindex notation) and only finitely many $c_u \neq 0$. e.g. $x_1x_3 + 7x_2 \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ is written as $x^{(1,0,1)} + 7x^{(0,2,0)}$. One can also replace $\mathbb{C}$ with any field.

Definition 0.0.3. A *ring homomorphism* is a function $\varphi : R \to S$ where R, S rings that respects addition and multiplication: $\varphi(a + b) = \varphi(a) + \varphi(b)$, $\varphi(ab) = \varphi(a)\varphi(b)$ and $\varphi(1_R) = 1_S$.

The definition implies that homomorphisms preserve 0.

Definition 0.0.4. The *kernel* of a homomorphism φ is $\ker(\varphi) = \{a \in R : \varphi(a) = 0_S\}$.

Definition 0.0.5. A nonempty $I \subseteq R$ is an *ideal* if $a, b \in I \Rightarrow a + b \in I$ and $a \in I, r \in R \Rightarrow ra \in I$.

It immediately follows from the definition that kernel of $\varphi : R \to S$ is an ideal of R.

Example 0.0.6. $\varphi : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$ by $\varphi(n) = n \bmod 5$.

Definition 0.0.7. We say I is *generated* by $f_1, \dots, f_s \in R$ if

$$I = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{s} h_i f_i : h_i \in R \right\} =: \langle f_1, \dots, f_s \rangle$$

More generally, I is generated by $G \subseteq R$ if

$$I = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{s} h_i f_i : h_i \in R, f_i \in G, s \geq 0 \right\}.$$

This is closed under addition and multiplication by an element of R, hence an ideal.

Week 1, lecture 2 starts here

1 Gröbner basis

Example 1.0.1 (Motivating questions)**.** 1. Is $14 \in \langle 6, 26 \rangle \subseteq Z$? Yes, since $14 = -2 \times 6 + 26$. Do note that $\mathbb{Z}$ is a PID, and $\langle 6, 26 \rangle = \langle 2 \rangle$ where $2 = \gcd(6, 26)$.

2. Is $x + 7 \in \langle x^2 - 4x + 3, x^2 + x - 2 \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[x]$? No, since $x^2 - 4x + 3 = (x-1)(x-3)$ and $x^2 + x - 2 = (x-1)(x+2)$, and $x - 1 \nmid x + 7$.

3. Is $x + 3y - 2z \in \langle x + y - z, y - z \rangle$? No, since any linear combination of the two generators have same coefficients for y and z. In linear algebra jargon, $(1, 3, -2)$ is not in rowspace of $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.

We do have enough specific knowledge to solve these, but not their general forms.

Example 1.0.2. Is $xy^2 - x \in \langle xy + 1, y^2 - 1 \rangle$?

If we were not careful, we would try to divide $xy^2 - x$ by $xy + 1$ which leads to $xy^2 - x = y(xy + 1) + (-x - y)$, a dead end. But note that $xy^2 - x = x(y^2 - 1)$, which means it is in the ideal.

We now want to know how we can be 'careful'.

Definition 1.0.3. A *term order* (or monomial order) is a total order on monomials x^u in $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ (where K is a field) such that

1. $1 \prec x^u \ \forall u \neq 0$
2. $x^u \prec x^v \Rightarrow x^{u+w} \prec x^{v+w} \ \forall u, v, w, \in \mathbb{N}^n$

Example 1.0.4. 1. Lexicographic term order: $x^u \prec x^v$ if the first nonzero element of $v - u$ is positive.

e.g. $x_2^2 \prec x_2^{10} \prec x_1 x_3 \prec x_1^2$. We can write them in multiindex notation:

$$x^{(0,2,0)}, x^{(0,10,0)}, x^{(1,0,1)}, x^{(2,0,0)},$$

and the result is clear. This is analogous to how we order words in a dictionary.

2. Degree lexicographic order: $x^u \prec x^v$ if $\deg(x^u) < \deg(x^v) = v_1 + \ldots + v_n$, or if they are equal, $x^u \prec_{\text{lex}} x^v$. e.g. $x_2^2 \prec x_1x_3 \prec x_1^2 \prec x_2^{10}$.
3. (Degree) reverse lexicographic order (revlex): $x^u \prec x^v$ if $\deg(x^u) < \deg(x^v) = v_1 + \ldots + v_n$, or if they are equal, the last nonzero entry of $v - u$ is negative. e.g. $x_1x_3 \prec x_2^2 \prec x_1^2 \prec x_2^{10}$.

Definition 1.0.5. Fix a term order $\prec$ on $K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. The *initial term* $\text{in}_\prec(f)$ of a polynomial $f = \sum c_u x^u$ is $c_v x^v$ if $x^v = \max_\prec\{x^u : c_u \neq 0\}$.

Example 1.0.6. Let $f = 3x^2 - 8xz^9 + 9y^{10}$. Then

- If $\prec =$ lex, $\text{in}_\prec(f) = 3x^2$
- If $\prec =$ deglex, $\text{in}_\prec(f) = -8xz^9$
- If $\prec =$ revlex, $\text{in}_\prec(f) = 9y^{10}$

Definition 1.0.7. Let $I \subseteq S$ be an ideal. The *initial ideal* of I is $\text{in}_\prec(I) := \langle \text{in}_\prec(f) : f \in I \rangle$.

Remark. If $I = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_s \rangle$ then $\langle \text{in}_\prec(f_1), \ldots, \text{in}_\prec(f_s) \rangle \subseteq \text{in}_\prec(I)$, but not necessarily equal.

Example 1.0.8. $I = \langle x+y+z, x+2y+3z \rangle$. Then $\text{in}_\prec(f_1) = \text{in}_\prec(f_2) = x$, so $\langle \text{in}_\prec(f_1)\text{in}_\prec(f_2) \rangle = \langle x \rangle$, but $y + 2z \in I$, $\text{in}_\prec(y + 2z) = y \notin \langle x \rangle$.

Definition 1.0.9. A set $\{g_1, \ldots, g_s\} \subseteq I$ is a *Gröbner basis* for I if $\text{in}_\prec(I) = \langle \text{in}_\prec(g_1), \ldots, \text{in}_\prec(g_s) \rangle$.

With this language, we can express Example 1.0.8 by saying '$\{x + y + z, x + 2y + 3z\}$ is not a Gröbner basis of the ideal'. We will see that every ideal in S has a Gröbner basis, and long division using a Gröbner basis solves the ideal membership problem ($f \in I$ iff the remainder on dividing by the Gröbner basis is 0).

Week 2, lecture 1 starts here

1.1 Division algorithm

Let $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$.

- Input: $f_1, \ldots, f_s, f \in S$ and $\prec$ the term order
- Output: an expression $f = \sum_{i=1}^s h_i f_i + r$, where
  1. $h_i, r \in S$, $r = \sum c_u x^u$
  2. If $c_u \neq 0$, then x^u is not divisible by any $\text{in}_\prec(f_i)$
  3. If $\text{in}_\prec(f) = c_u x^u$, $\text{in}_\prec(h_i f_i) = c_{v_i} x^{v_i}$ then $x^u \succeq x^{v_i}$ $\forall i$
- The algorithm:
  1. Initialize: $h_1, \ldots, h_s = 0$, $r = 0$, $p = f$, $f = p + \sum h_i f_i + r$.
  2. Loop: At each stage, if $\text{in}_\prec(p)$ is divisible by some $\text{in}_\prec(f_i)$, subtract $\frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_i)} f_i$ from p and add $\frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_i)}$ to h_i.
     If $\text{in}_\prec(p)$ is not divisible by any $\text{in}_\prec(f_i)$, subtract it from p and add it to r.
  3. Termination: stop when $p = 0$ and output $h_1, \ldots, h_s, r$.

Example 1.1.1. $f = \underline{x}+2y+3z,\ f_1 = \underline{x}+y+z,\ f_2 = \underline{5y}+3z$, term order is $\prec_{\text{lex}}$ and $x \succ y \succ z$.

1. Initialize: $h_1 = h_2 = r = 0,\ p = x + 2y + 3z$
2. 1st loop: The underlined are initial terms, and $\text{in}_\prec(p) = x$ is divisible by $\text{in}_\prec(f_1) = x$, so
$$p = p - \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_1)} f_1 = x + 2y + 3z - (x + y + z) = y + 2z$$
and $h_1 = 0 + \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_1)} = 1$.
3. 2nd loop: $\text{in}_\prec(p) = y$ is divisible by $\text{in}_\prec(f_2) = 5y$, so
$$p = p - \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_2)} f_2 = y + 2z - \frac{1}{5}(5y + 3z) = \frac{7}{5}z$$
and $h_2 = 0 + \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_2)} = \frac{1}{5}$.
4. Termination: $\text{in}_\prec(p) = \frac{7}{5}z$ is not divisible by any $\text{in}_\prec(f_i)$, so
$$p - \text{in}_\prec(p) = 0,\ r = \text{in}_\prec(p) = \frac{7}{5}z$$
and we have the expression
$$x + 2y + 3z = 1(x + y + z) + \frac{1}{5}(5y + 3z) + \frac{7}{5}z.$$

Example 1.1.2. Divide $f = x^2$ by $f_1 = x + y + z$ and $f_2 = y - z$ with $\prec_{\text{lex}}$ and $x \succ y \succ z$.

1. $h_1 = h_2 = r = 0,\ p = f = x^2$
2. $p = p - \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_1)} f_1 = x^2 - \frac{x^2}{x}(x + y + z) = -xy - xz,\ h_1 = 0 + x = x$
3. $p = p - \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_1)} f_1 = -xy - xz - (-y)(x + y + z) = -xz + y^2 + yz,\ h_1 = h_1 - y = x - y$
4. $p = p - \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_1)} f_1 = -xz + y^2 + yz + z(x + y + z) = y^2 + 2yz + z^2,\ h_1 = h_1 - z = x - y - z$
5. $p = p - \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_2)} f_2 = y^2 + 2yz + z^2 - y(y - z) = 3yz + z^2,\ h_2 = 0 + y = y$
6. $p = p - \frac{\text{in}_\prec(p)}{\text{in}_\prec(f_2)} f_2 = 3yz + z^2 - 3z(y - z) = 4z^2,\ h_2 = h_2 + 3z = y + 3z$
7. $4z^2$ not divisible by any $\text{in}_\prec(f_i)$, so terminate. $p = p - \text{in}_\prec(p),\ r = \text{in}_\prec(p)$, output $h_1 = x - y - z,\ h_2 = y + 3z,\ r = 4z^2$, and check:
$$x^2 = (x - y - z)(x + y + z) + (y + 3z)(y - z) + 4z^2.$$

The coming punchline is that if f_i's are a Gröbner basis then remainder r is unique.

Lemma 1.1.3. Let $I = \langle x^u : u \in A \rangle$ for some $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}^n$, then

1. $x^v \in I$ iff $x^u \mid x^v$ for some $u \in A$
2. if $f = \sum c_v x^v \in I$, then each x^v is divisible by x^u for some $u \in A$

Proposition 1.1.4. If $\{g_1, \ldots, g_s\}$ is a Gröbner basis for I with respect to $\prec$, then $f \in I$ iff the division algorithm dividing f by $g_1, \ldots, g_s$ gives remainder 0.

Proof. $\Rightarrow$ Division algorithm writes $f = \sum h_i g_i + r$, so if $r = 0$ we have $f \in I$.

$\Leftarrow$ We prove the contrapositive: suppose $r \neq 0$. If $f \in I$ then $r \in I$, so $\text{in}_\prec(r) \in \text{in}_\prec(I)$. But by construction, $\text{in}_\prec(r)$ is not divisible by $\text{in}_\prec(g_i)$ for any i. This contradicts that $\text{in}_\prec(I) = \langle \text{in}_\prec(g_1), \ldots, \text{in}_\prec(g_s) \rangle$.

$\square$

Week 2, lecture 2 starts here (Chunyi Li)

2 Noetherian ring

Definition 2.0.1. A ring R is *Noetherian* if every ideal of R is finitely generated.

Example 2.0.2.

1. $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ are fields, so they only have two ideals $\langle 0 \rangle, \langle 1 \rangle$, so Noetherian.
2. $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{C}[x]$ are principal ideal domains, this implies they are Noetherian.
3. $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$ and $\mathbb{Z}[x]$?
4. $R := \{f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} : f \text{ continuous}\}$, probably not?
5. $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n, \ldots] = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, a polynomial ring which has infinite variables but finite nonzero terms.

Definition 2.0.3. A ring R satisfies *ascending chain condition* (ACC) if every chain of ideals $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq I_n \subseteq \cdots$ eventually stabilizes, i.e. $\exists n \in \mathbb{N} : I_m = I_n \ \forall m \geq n$, i.e. $\nexists$ strictly ascending chain of ideals $I_1 \subsetneqq I_2 \subsetneqq \cdots \subsetneqq I_n \subsetneqq \cdots$.

Proposition 2.0.4. R is Noetherian iff R satisfies ACC.

Proof. $\Rightarrow$ Let $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq I_n \subseteq \cdots \lhd R$ and consider $J = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$. Note $\forall r, s \in J,\ r \in I_j,\ s \in I_t$. WLOG assume $j \leq t$, then $r, s \in I_t$ and $r \pm s \in I_t \subset J$, and more generally $J \lhd R$. Since J is finitely generated, we write $J = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_m \rangle$. By definition $f_i \in I_{n_i}$, so $\exists N : f_i \in I_N \ \forall i$, implying $J \subseteq I_N$. But J is already the union of all ideals, so the chain must stabilize at I_N.

$\Leftarrow$ Let $I \lhd R$ and suppose I is not finitely generated. We know $\exists f_1 \neq 0 \in I$ and $I \neq \langle f_1 \rangle$, also $\exists f_2 \in I \backslash \langle f_1 \rangle$ and $I \neq \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$. We can keep doing this and in general

$$\exists f_{n+1} \subset I \backslash \langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle \Rightarrow I \neq \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{n+1} \rangle \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$$

This gives us a strictly ascending chain $\langle f_1 \rangle \subsetneqq \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle \subsetneqq \cdots \subsetneqq \langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle \subsetneqq \cdots$ which is a contradiction.

$\square$

Example 2.0.5.

1. We now know the 4th of Example 2.0.2 is not Noetherian, since

$$\langle \sin x \rangle \subsetneqq \left\langle \sin \frac{x}{2} \right\rangle \subsetneqq \left\langle \sin \frac{x}{4} \right\rangle \subsetneqq \cdots \subsetneqq \left\langle \sin \frac{x}{2^n} \right\rangle \subsetneqq \cdots$$

is a strictly ascending chain or ideals.

2. Also,
$$\langle x_1 \rangle \subsetneqq \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \subsetneqq \cdots \subsetneqq \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle \subsetneqq \cdots$$
so the 5th is also not Noetherian.

Theorem 2.0.6 (1st isomorphism theorem)**.** Let R, S be rings. If $\varphi : R \to S$ is a ring homomorphism then $\operatorname{im} \varphi \cong R/\ker \varphi$. If φ is surjective then $\operatorname{im} \varphi = S$ so we have $S \cong R/\ker \varphi$.

$\forall I \lhd R$, R/I is a ring, and there is a natural surjective homomorphism $\varphi : R \to R/I$ defined by $r \mapsto r + I$. Note that $I = \ker \varphi$, so this is a isomorphism.

Theorem 2.0.7 (4th isomorphism theorem)**.** For the same φ as above, there is a 1-1 correspondence
$$\varphi^{-1} : \{J \lhd R/I\} \to \{\tilde{J} \lhd R : J \supseteq I \lhd R\}.$$

Proposition 2.0.8. If R is Noetherian then R/I is Noetherian $\forall I \lhd R$.

Week 2, lecture 3 starts here

Proof. Suppose $\exists J_1 \subsetneqq \cdots \subsetneqq J_n \subsetneqq \cdots \lhd R/I$. Then by 4th isomorphism theorem,
$$\exists \varphi^{-1}(J_1) \subsetneqq \cdots \subsetneqq \varphi^{-1}(J_n) \subsetneqq \cdots \lhd R,$$
a contradiction. □

Theorem 2.0.9 (Hilbert basis theorem)**.** If R is Noetherian then $R[x]$ is Noetherian.

Proof (nonexaminable). Let $I \lhd R[x]$. Suppose I is not finitely generated. $\exists f_1 \in I$ with the minimal degree such that $I \neq \langle f_1 \rangle$. Now choose $f_2 \in I \backslash \langle f_1 \rangle$ with the minimal degree so that $I \neq \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$. We proceed inductively and have
$$\exists f_{n+1} \in I \backslash \langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle \text{ with minimal degree so that } I \neq \langle f_1, \ldots, f_{n+1} \rangle.$$
For every f_i we can write $f_i = r_i x^{n_i}$+lower degree terms and $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots n_m \leq \cdots$. We now claim that
$$\langle r_1 \rangle \subsetneqq \langle r_1, r_2 \rangle \subsetneqq \cdots \subsetneqq \langle r_1, \ldots, r_m \rangle \subsetneqq \cdots$$
is a strictly ascending chain of ideals in R, which gives a contradiction. To see this, suppose $r_{m+1} \in \langle r_1, \ldots, r_m \rangle$, i.e.
$$r_{m+1} = s_1 r_1 + \cdots + s_m r_m \quad \text{for some } s_1, \ldots, s_m \in R,$$
Now consider
$$\tilde{f}_{m+1}(x) := f_{m+1}(x) - s_1 x^{n_{m+1}-n_1} f_1(x) - s_2 x^{n_{m+1}-n_2} f_2(x) - \cdots - s_m x^{n_{m+1}-n_m} f_m(x),$$
whose leading terms cancel and $\deg \tilde{f}_{m+1} < \deg f_{m+1}$. But $\tilde{f}_{m+1}$ still satisfies that it's not in $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_m \rangle$, contradicting the minimality of $\deg f_{m+1}$. □

Corollary 2.0.10. If R is Noetherian then $R[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is Noetherian.

Proof. One knows $R[x]$ is Noetherian. Now assume $R[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ is Noetherian. Then
$$R[x_1, \ldots, x_{m+1}] = (R[x_1, \ldots, x_m])[x_{m+1}]$$
is Noetherian, so by induction one has what's desired. □

Example 2.0.11.
1. $\mathbb{Z}$ is a PID, so Noetherian, so $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ is Noetherian.
2. $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}] \cong \mathbb{Z}[x]/\langle x^2 - 5\rangle$ is Noetherian.
3. $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}, \sqrt[4]{7}] \cong \mathbb{Z}[x, y]/\langle x^2 - 5, x^4 - 7\rangle$ is Noetherian.
4. We have already seen that all fields are Noetherian, and any ring is a subring of its field of fractions. So it's not true that a subring of a Noetherian ring is Noetherian.

Definition 2.0.12. An ideal $I \lhd R$ is *prime* if

1. $I \neq R$
2. $\forall fg \in I,\ f$ or $g \in I$

Example 2.0.13. In $\mathbb{Z}$, $\langle p\rangle$ where p prime is a prime ideal by Euclid's lemma. Also $\langle 0\rangle$ is prime, but $\langle 1\rangle$ is not since it's the whole ring.

Week 3, lecture 1 starts here

2.1 Every ideal I in $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ has a finite Gröbner basis

Proof of Lemma 1.1.3. Note that 1 is a special case of 2, so it suffices to prove the latter.
If $f \in I$ write $f = \sum c_v x^v = \sum_{u\in A} h_u x^u$ with only finitely many $h_u \neq 0$. We expand the RHS as a sum of monomials, each monomial is divisible by some x^u with $u \in A$. Hence the same is true for x^v with $c_v \neq 0$ since these are terms remaining after cancellation. ☐

Theorem 2.1.1 (Dickson's lemma)**.** Let $I = \langle x^u : u \in A\rangle \subseteq S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ for some $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}^n$. Then $\exists a_1, \ldots, a_s \in A$ with $I = \langle x^{a_1}, \ldots, x^{a_s}\rangle$.

Before diving into the proof let's think about two special cases.

$n = 1$ Consider $I = \langle x_1^3, x_1^7, x_1^{70000}, x_1^{1234}, \ldots\rangle$. One can see that x_1^3 is sufficient to generate the whole I.

$n = 2$ Consider $u, v \in \mathbb{N}^2$ as points on a lattice grid. Then x^u is divisible by x^v if it's top right of it, so we can get rid of unnecessary ones in a similar fashion.

Now let's turn these intuitions into a general proof.

Proof by induction. Straightforwardly, when $n = 1$, $I = \langle x_1^{\alpha_1}\rangle$ for $\alpha = \min\{j : x_j^I\}$. Now assume $n > 1$ and the theorem is true for $n - 1$.
Write the variables in S as $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}, y$ and let I be an ideal in S. Let $J = \langle x^u : x^u y^c \in I$ for some $c \geq 0\rangle \subseteq K[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$. By inductive hypothesis, J is finitely generated, so write $J = \langle x^{a_{m_1}}, \ldots, x^{a_{m_r}}\rangle$ for $x^{a_{m_i}} y^{m_i} \in I$.
Let $m = \max\{m_i\}$. For $0 \leq l \leq m - 1$, let $J_l = \langle x^u : x^u y^l \in I\rangle \subseteq K[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$. Again J_l is finitely generated and write $J_l = \langle x^{a_{j_1}}, \ldots, x^{a_{j_{r_l}}}\rangle$. We claim that I is generated by $\{x^{a_{m_i}} y^{m_i} : 1 \leq i \leq r\} \cup \{x^{a_{j_i}} y^j : 1 \leq j \leq m - 1,\ 1 \leq i \leq r_j\}$. Indeed, if $x^u y^j \in I$ then either

1. $j < m$, so $x^u \in J_j$, so $x^{j_i} \mid x^u$ for some i, and so $x^{a_{j_i}} y^j \mid x^u y^j$.
2. $j \geq m$, so $x^u \in J$, so $x^{a_{m_i}} \mid x^u$ for some i, and so since $m_i \leq m$, $x^{a_{m_i}} y^{m_i} \mid x^u y^j$.

So every monomial in I is a multiple of one of the claimed generators.

If any of these generators is not in our original set A, we can replace it by a monomial with exponent in A, and by Lemma 1.1.3 if they generate all monomials then they generate the whole I. $\square$

Week 3, lecture 2 starts here

Corollary 2.1.2. Every ideal in $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ has a finite Gröbner basis with respect to a term order.

Proof. The initial ideal in $\mathrm{in}_\prec(I) = \langle \mathrm{in}_\prec(f) : f \in I \rangle$ is a monomial ideal (using that coefficients can be omitted since we are in a field). By Dickson's lemma, there are $g_1, \ldots, g_s \in I$ with $\langle \mathrm{in}_\prec(g_1), \ldots, \mathrm{in}_\prec(g_s) \rangle = \mathrm{in}_\prec(I)$. Thus $\{g_1, \ldots, g_s\}$ is a Gröbner basis for I by definition. $\square$

Proposition 2.1.3. If $\{g_1, \ldots, g_2\}$ is a Gröbner basis for I with respect to $\prec$, then $I = \langle g_1, \ldots, g_2 \rangle$.

Proof. By division algorithm, any $f \in I$ can be written as $f = \sum h_i g_i$ with remainder 0 since $f \in I$. It follows that $f \in \langle g_1, \ldots, g_s \rangle$, which gives the desired since f is arbitrary. $\square$

Corollary 2.1.4 (Special case of Hilbert basis theorem)**.** Every ideal in $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is finitely generated.

Proof. Immediate from previous two results. $\square$

Exercise 2.1.5. Claim: $y = \left\{ \underline{x_2^2} - x_1x_3, \underline{x_2x_3} - x_1x_4, \underline{x_3^2} - x_2x_4 \right\}$ is a Gröbner basis with respect to revlex. Find the remainder on dividing $x_2^2x_3^2$ by y.

$$\begin{aligned}
f_1 :& x_2^2x_3^2 \xrightarrow{f_1} x_1x_3 \xrightarrow{f_3} x_1x_2x_3x_4 \xrightarrow{f_2} x_1^2x_4^2 \\
f_2 :& x_2^2x_3^2 \xrightarrow{f_2} x_1x_2x_3x_4 \xrightarrow{f_2} x_1^2x_4^2 \\
f_3 :& x_2^2x_3^2 \xrightarrow{f_3} x_2^3x_4 \xrightarrow{f_1} x_1x_2x_3x_4 \xrightarrow{f_2} x_1^2x_4^2
\end{aligned}$$

The remainders are the same: this shouldn't surprise us. But we haven't proved it, so why did this work?

3 General commutative ring

Definition 3.0.1. An ideal $I \subseteq R$ is *prime* if it's proper and $f, g \in I \Rightarrow f$ or $g \in I$.

Notation. $\mathrm{Spec}(R) := \{\text{prime ideals in } R\}$.

Example 3.0.2. $R = \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathrm{Spec}(R) = \{\langle 2 \rangle, \langle 3 \rangle\}$. Note that although 5 is prime but $\langle 5 \rangle$ is not a prime ideal since $5^2 = 1$ in $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ so it's not proper.

Lemma 3.0.3. An ideal $P \subseteq R$ is prime iff R/P is a domain.

Proof. P is prime iff
$$fg \in P \Rightarrow f \text{ or } g \in P. \tag{$*$}$$
R/P is a domain iff $fg + P = 0 + P \Rightarrow f + P$ or $g + P = 0 + P$, which is equivalent to $(*)$. $\square$

Definition 3.0.4. An ideal $I \subseteq R$ is *maximal* if it's proper and there is no ideal $J : I \subsetneqq J \subsetneqq R$.

Do maximal ideals always exist? Yes, if we assume axiom of choice.

Recall: a *partially ordered* set is a set S with transitive, reflexive binary relation $\leq$ (e.g. $\leq$ on $\mathbb{R}$ or power set (inclusion)). Given a subset $U \subseteq S$, an *upper bound* for U is $s \in S$ with $u \leq s \ \forall u \in U$. An element $m \in S$ is *maximal* if $\nexists s \in S$ with $s > m$.

Axiom 3.0.5 (Zorn's lemma)**.** Let S be a nonempty partially ordered set with the property that any totally ordered subset $U \subseteq S$ (a 'chain') has an upper bound. Then S has a maximal element.

This is equivalent to:

1. The axiom of choice: every product $\prod_{a \in A} S_a$ of nonempty sets is nonempty.
2. Well-ordering principle: every set can be well-ordered.

Week 3, lecture 3 starts here

Proposition 3.0.6. Let R be a ring and let I be a proper ideal of R. Then there is a maximal ideal M containing I.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the set of proper ideals in R containing I, ordered by inclusion ($J_1 \leq J_2$ if $J_1 \subseteq J_2$). Note that if $\{J_\alpha : \alpha \in A\}$ is a totally ordered (any two are comparable) subset of $\mathcal{I}$ then $J = \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} J_\alpha$ is an ideal. [$\lightning$ this uses the total order, e.g. in $K[x, y]$, $\langle x \rangle \cup \langle y \rangle$ is not an ideal since $x + y$ is not in there.] Since $J_\alpha \subseteq J \ \forall \alpha$ and $I \subseteq J$, one has $J \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence J is an upper bound for $\{J_\alpha\}$. Thus by Zorn's lemma, $\mathcal{I}$ has a maximal element. $\square$

Lemma 3.0.7. $I \subseteq R$ is maximal iff R/I is a field.

Proof. Exercise (see Algebra II notes). $\square$

Corollary 3.0.8. Maximal ideals are prime.

Proof. If I is maximal then R/I is a field, and in particular a domain. $\square$

3.1 Localisation

Definition 3.1.1. A ring R is *local* if it has a unique maximal ideal M.

Example 3.1.2. Every field is local. $\mathbb{Z}$ is not local since $\langle 2 \rangle, \langle 3 \rangle$ are both maximal.

Consider
$$\mathbb{Z}_{\langle 2 \rangle} := \left\{ \frac{a}{b} \in \mathbb{Q} : a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, \ 2 \nmid b \right\}.$$
This is a subring of $\mathbb{Q}$. Note that proper ideals are those generated by even integers, but $\langle 6 \rangle = \langle 2 \rangle$ since $\frac{1}{3} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\langle 2 \rangle}$. So in fact they are all generated by powers of 2, and $\langle 2 \rangle$ is maximal, so $\mathbb{Z}_{\langle 2 \rangle}$ is local.

$\mathbb{C}[x]$ is not local, since we can build (at least two) quotient rings which is a field by first isomorphism theorem, e.g. $\varphi_1 : x \to 1$ and $\varphi_2 : x \to i$.

Now consider
$$\mathbb{C}[x]_{\langle x \rangle} := \left\{ \frac{f}{g} : f, g \in \mathbb{C}[x], \ x \nmid g \right\}.$$
This is analogous to $\mathbb{Z}_{\langle} x \rangle$ and its proper ideals are of the form $\langle x^j \rangle$ with $\langle x \rangle$ being maximal.

Definition 3.1.3. A set $U \subseteq R$ is *multiplicatively closed* if $1 \in U$ and $f, g \in U \Rightarrow fg \in U$.

Example 3.1.4. In any R with $f \in R$, $U = \left\{1, f, f^2, \ldots\right\}$ is multiplicatively closed.
Suppose $P \subseteq R$ is prime. Then $1 \notin P$, i.e. $1 \in R \backslash P$, and $fg \in P \Rightarrow f$ or $g \in P$, so $f, g \in R \backslash P \Rightarrow fg \in R \backslash P$. By definition this means R/P is multiplicatively closed.
$U = \{r \in R : \exists s \in R : rs = 1\} = \{\text{units of } R\}$ is multiplicatively closed. In particular, if R is a domain then $U = R \backslash \{0\}$ is.

Definition 3.1.5. Let R be a ring and let $U \subseteq R$ be multiplicatively closed. Then

$$R\left[U^{-1}\right] := \left\{\frac{r}{u} : r \in R, u \in U\right\}$$

modulo the equivalence relation $\sim$

$$\frac{r}{u} \sim \frac{r'}{u'} \quad \text{if} \quad \exists \tilde{u} \in U : \tilde{u}(ru' - r'u) = 0.$$

Example 3.1.6. $R = \mathbb{Z},\ U = \mathbb{Z} \backslash \{0\}$. Then $\mathbb{R}\left[U^{-1}\right] = \mathbb{Q}$. We don't have to worry about the $\tilde{u}$ condition since $\mathbb{Z}$ is a domain.
$R = \mathbb{Z},\ U = \mathbb{Z} \backslash \langle 2 \rangle$. Then $R[U^{-1}] = \mathbb{Z}_{\langle 2 \rangle}$.
$R = \mathbb{C}[x],\ U = \mathbb{C}[x] \backslash \langle x \rangle$. Then $R[U^{-1}] = \mathbb{C}[x]_{\langle x \rangle}$.

Week 4, lecture 1 starts here

Lemma 3.1.7.

1. The $\sim$ in Definition 3.0.13 is indeed an equivalence relation.
2. $R[U^{-1}]$ is a ring with addition and multiplication defined

$$\frac{r}{u} + \frac{r'}{u'} := \frac{ru' + r'u}{uu'}, \qquad \left(\frac{r}{u}\right)\left(\frac{r'}{u'}\right) := \frac{rr'}{uu'}$$

3. The map $\varphi : R \to R[U^{-1}]$ given by $r \mapsto \frac{r}{1}$ is a ring homomorphism.

Proof.

1. It's reflexive since $1(ru - ru) = 0$. It's symmetric since $\tilde{u}(ru' - r'u) = 0 \Rightarrow -1\tilde{u}(r'u - ru') = 0$ and $-1\tilde{u} \in U$ by multiplicative closedness.

   Now suppose

$$\frac{r}{u} \sim \frac{r'}{u'}, \quad \frac{r'}{u'} \sim \frac{r''}{u''},$$

   then $\exists \tilde{u} \in U : \tilde{u}(ru' - r'u) = 0$ and $\exists \tilde{u}' \in U : \tilde{u}'(r'u'' - r''u') = 0$. So

$$\tilde{u}'u''(\tilde{u}(ru' - r'u)) + \tilde{u}u(\tilde{u}'(r'u'' - r''u')) = 0.$$

   which is equal to

$$\tilde{u}\tilde{u}'(ru'u'' - r'uu'' + r'uu'' - r''uu') = \tilde{u}\tilde{u}'u'(ru'' - r''u)$$

   where $\tilde{u}\tilde{u}'u' \in U$. Therefore it's transitive.

2. (Exercise) One needs to check:
   - The two operations are well-defined, i.e. they don't depend on choice of representatives

- Ring axioms, in particular $\frac{0}{1}$ is additive identity and $\frac{1}{1}$ is multiplicative identity

3. One has $\varphi(r+r') = \frac{r+r'}{1} = \frac{r}{1} + \frac{r'}{1} = \varphi(r)+\varphi(r')$ and $\varphi(rr') = \frac{rr'}{1} = \left(\frac{r}{1}\right)\left(\frac{r'}{1}\right) = \varphi(r)\varphi(r')$. □

Remark. 1. If U contains 0 then it's very boring: $R[U^{-1}] = 0$ iff $0 \in U$. Indeed, for $R[U^{-1}] = 0$ one needs $\exists u \in U : u \cdot 1 = 0$, and the only such u is 0, and if $0 \in U$ then $0(r \cdot 1 - 0 \cdot 1) = 0r = 0\ \forall r$ hence $\frac{r}{1} \sim \frac{0}{1}\ \forall r$.

2. φ is not always injective, e.g. $R = \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$, $U = \{1, 3, 5\}$. Then $\varphi(2) = \frac{2}{1}$ but $\frac{2}{1} \sim \frac{0}{1}$ since $3(2 \times 1 - 0 \times 1) = 0$. Furthermore, $\ker \varphi = \left\{r \in R : \frac{r}{1} \sim \frac{0}{1}\right\} = \{r \in R : \exists u \in U : ur = 0\}$.

Notation (Important special case)**.** In the case of $U = R \backslash P$ where P is prime, we write R_P for $R[(R\backslash P)^{-1}]$. An example would be, again, $\mathbb{Z}_{\langle 2\rangle}$.

Why is this important?

Proposition 3.1.8. The set $P_P := \left\{\frac{r}{u} \in R_P : r \in P\right\}$ is an ideal of R_P and is the unique maximal ideal.

Proof. If $\frac{r}{u} \notin P_P$ then $r \notin P$, so $\frac{u}{r} \in R_P$ and hence $\frac{r}{u}$ is a unit. Now suppose there is a maximal ideal I and in particular $\exists \frac{r}{u} \in I \backslash P_P$. But then I would be the whole ring R_P since it contains a unit. This argument also justifies that P_P is maximal itself. □

Corollary 3.1.9 (A fortunate byproduct of the proof)**.** $I \subsetneq R$ is the unique maximal ideal iff every $r \notin I$ is a unit.

Week 4, lecture 2 starts here

3.1.1 Effect of localisation on ideals

We want to investigate the relationship between $\operatorname{Spec}(R)$ and $\operatorname{Spec}(R[U^{-1}])$.

We have the ring homomorphism φ, but $I \mapsto \varphi(I) := \{\varphi(r) : r \in I\}$ is not good enough, since if $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $U = \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ then $R[U^{-1}] = \mathbb{Q}$ is a field, so it has only two ideals, and $\varphi(I) = \left\{\frac{n}{1} : n \text{ even}\right\}$ obviously is not one of them. Rather we need $I \mapsto \varphi(I)R[U^{-1}] := \langle\varphi(r) : r \in I\rangle$. In the above case, $\varphi(I)R[U^{-1}] = \mathbb{Q}$.

For the other way, we can simply consider $J \mapsto \varphi^{-1}(J)$ as a map without the 'generated by'.

Lemma 3.1.10. There is a bijection between ideals $J \subseteq R[U^{-1}]$ and ideals $I \subseteq R$ with property

$$ru \in I \text{ for some } u \in U \Rightarrow r \in I. \qquad (\star)$$

Example 3.1.11. In the above example, $\langle 6\rangle$ is not such ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ since $6 = 6 \times 1 \in \langle 6\rangle$, $6 \in U$ but $1 \notin \langle 6\rangle$. Note that this argument works for any $\langle n\rangle$ where $n > 1$. In fact, the only two ideals that satisfy this are $\langle 0\rangle, \langle 1\rangle$ which indeed have a natural bijection to ideals in $\mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. To show $J \mapsto \varphi^{-1}(J)$ is injective, we show $\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(J))R[U^{-1}] = J$.

$\subseteq$ is clear: $\varphi^{-1}(J) = \left\{r : \frac{r}{1} \in J\right\}$, so $\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(J)) = \left\{\frac{r}{1} : \frac{r}{1} \in J\right\}$, and if you take the ideal generated by a subset of J of course you get something contained in J.

To see $\supseteq$, note that

$$\frac{r}{u} \in J \Rightarrow \frac{u}{1}\frac{r}{u} = \frac{r}{1} \in J,$$

so $r \in \varphi^{-1}(J)$ and $\frac{r}{1} \in \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(J))R[U^{-1}]$ and furthermore for any

$$u \in U, \quad \frac{1}{u}\frac{r}{1} = \frac{r}{u} \in \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(J))R[U^{-1}].$$

To show $J \mapsto \varphi^{-1}(J)$ is surjective, fix $I \subseteq R$ satisfying $\star$ and let $J = \varphi(I)R[U^{-1}]$. The proof is then complete if we show $I = \varphi^{-1}(J)$.

$\frac{r}{1} \in \varphi(I)R[U^{-1}]$ means

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{r}{1} &= \sum \frac{h_i}{u_i}\frac{r_i}{1} \text{ where } r_i \in I,\ h_i \in R,\ u_i \in U \\ &= \frac{\tilde{r}}{u} \text{ for some } \tilde{r} \in I,\ u \in U. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, this implies $\exists \tilde{u} \in U : \tilde{u}(ur - \tilde{r}) = 0$, i.e. $(\tilde{u}u)r = \tilde{u}\tilde{r} \in I$ since $\tilde{r} \in I$. By assumption, $r \in I$. This shows $\varphi^{-1}(J) \subseteq I$, and since $\frac{r}{1} \in J\ \forall r \in I,\ I \subseteq \varphi^{-1}(J)$. □

Exercise 3.1.12 (*). What ideals $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy $\star$ when $U = \{\text{odd numbers}\}$ and when $U = \{1, 2, 4, 8, \ldots\}$?

For $U = \{\text{odd numbers}\}$, recall Example 3.1.2. $U = \mathbb{Z}\backslash\langle 2\rangle$, so ideals $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ satisfy $\star$ corresponds to ideals of $\mathbb{Z}_{\langle 2\rangle}$, which are generated by powers of 2 (and also the 0 ideal).

Corollary 3.1.13. $J \mapsto \varphi^{-1}(J)$ maps $\mathrm{Spec}(R[U^{-1}])$ to $\{P \in \mathrm{Spec}(R) : P \cap U = \varnothing\}$.

Proof. In Homework 2 it will be proved that for any ring homomorphism $\varphi : R \to S$, if $P \subseteq S$ is prime then $\varphi^{-1}(P) \subseteq R$ is prime. Now if a prime $P \subseteq R$ satisfies $P \cap U = \varnothing$ and if $ru \in P$ for some $u \in U$, then $r \in P$ since P is prime and $u \notin P$, so it's indeed the image. Conversely, if $\star$ holds then $P \cap U = \varnothing$ since if $u \in P \cap U,\ u = u \cdot 1 \in P$ but $1 \notin P$, a contradiction. □

Week 4, lecture 3 starts here

4 Module

Definition 4.0.1. Let R be a ring. An *R-module* is an abelian group M with multiplication $R \times M \to M$ (sometimes called R-action) satisfying

1. $r(m+n) = rm + rn$
2. $(r + r')m = rm + r'm$
3. $(rr')m = r(r'm)$
4. $1_R m = m$

$\forall r, r' \in R,\ m, n \in M$.

Example 4.0.2. If $R = K$ is a field then M is a K-vector space. In fact, the definition should remind you of that of vector spaces.

If $R = \mathbb{Z}$ then R-modules are abelian groups with $R \times M \to M$ given by $n \times g := \underbrace{g + \cdots + g}_{n \text{ times}}$.

One is forced to define multiplication like this by definition.

If R is an arbitrary ring and I is an ideal in R, then R itself is a R-module with multiplication the same as ring multiplication in R, and $I,\ R/I$ are also R-modules.

Remark. Much of commutative algebra is generalising linear algebra to modules, and every theorem you see about modules, ask what it says for vector spaces/abelian groups.

Definition 4.0.3. A subset $N \subseteq M$ is a *submodule* if

1. $m, n \in N \Rightarrow m + n \in N$ and
2. $m \in N,\ r \in R \Rightarrow rm \in N$.

Example 4.0.4. A submodule of the R-module R is precisely an ideal.

Like any other algebraic objects, it's important to understand functions between modules. We want a definition that can be generalised to group homomorphisms since modules are abelian groups, and can be specified to linear maps since vector spaces are modules.

Definition 4.0.5. A function $\varphi : M \to N$ where M, N are R-modules is an *R-module homomorphism* if

1. φ is a group homomorphism and
2. $\varphi(rm) = r\varphi(m)$.

Example 4.0.6. As expected, if R is a field then an R-module homomorphism is a linear map, and if $R = \mathbb{Z}$ then it's a group homomorphism. Also $R \to R/I$ and $I \to R$ for I an ideal given by $r \mapsto r$ are R-module homomorphisms.

Definition 4.0.7. The *kernel* of an R-module homomorphism $\varphi : M \to N$ is

$$\ker \varphi := \{m \in M : \varphi(m) = 0_N\},$$

and the *image* of φ is

$$\text{im } \varphi = \{\varphi(m) : m \in M\}.$$

Exercise 4.0.8. Show that these are both submodules of M and N respectively.

Definition 4.0.9. If N is a submodule of an R-module M, then it is also a subgroup of the abelian group M, so we can construct quotient group M/N. This is an R-module with $r(m+N) = rm + N$ and called a *quotient module*.

Theorem 4.0.10 (Isomorphism theorems).
1. If $\varphi : M \to N$ is an R-module homomorphism then $M/\ker\varphi \cong \text{im } \varphi$. (The morally equivalence of this in linear algebra is the rank–nullity theorem.)
2. If $L \subseteq M \subseteq N$ with L a submodule of M and M a submodule of N, then $N/M \cong (N/L)/(M/L)$.
3. If L, M are submodules of N then $(L + M)/L \cong M/(M \cap L)$ where $L + M := \{l + m : l \in L, m \in M\}$. (This is a generalisation of the proposition about dimensions of subspaces in linear algebra.)

Week 5, lecture 1 starts here