Commutative Algebra

Pete L. Clark

Contents

Introduction

1. What is Commutative Algebra?

Commutative algebra is the study of commutative rings and attendant structures, especially ideals and modules.

This is the only possible short answer I can think of, but it is not completely satisfying. We might as well say that *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* is about a fictional royal family in late medieval Denmark and especially about the title (crown) prince, whose father (i.e., the King) has recently died and whose father's brother has married his mother (i.e., the Queen). Informative, but not the whole story!

2. Why study Commutative Algebra?

What are the purely mathematical reasons for studying any subject of pure mathematics? I can think of two:

I. Commutative algebra is a necessary and/or useful prerequisite for the study of other fields of mathematics in which we are interested.

II. We find commutative algebra to be intrinsically interesting and we want to learn more. Perhaps we even wish to *discover* new results in this area.

Most beginning students of commutative algebra can relate to the first reason: they need, or are told they need, to learn some commutative algebra for their study of other subjects. Indeed, commutative algebra has come to occupy a remarkably central role in modern pure mathematics, perhaps second only to category theory in its ubiquitousness, but in a different way. Category theory provides a common language and builds bridges between different areas of mathematics: it is something like a circulatory system. Commutative algebra provides core results and structures that other results and structures draw upon are overlayed upon: it is something like a skeleton.

The branch of mathematics which most of all draws upon commutative algebra for its structural integrity is *algebraic geometry*, the study of geometric properties of manifolds and singular spaces which arise as solution sets to systems of polynomial equations. There is a hard lesson here: in the 19th century algebraic geometry split off from complex function theory and differential geometry as its own discipline and then burgeoned dramatically at the turn of the century and the years thereafter. But by 1920 or so the practitioners of the subject had found their way into territory in which "purely geometric" reasoning led to serious errors. In particular

they had been making arguments about how algebraic varieties behave *generically*, but they lacked the technology to even give a precise meaning to the term. Thus the subject eventually became invertebrate and began to collapse under its own weight. Then (starting in about 1930) came a heroic shoring up process in which the foundations of the subject were recast with commutative algebraic methods at the core. This was done several times over, in different ways, by Zariski, Weil, Serre and Grothendieck, among others. For the last 60 years it has been impossible to deeply study algebraic geometry without knowing commutative algebra – a lot of commutative algebra. (More than is contained in these notes!)

The other branch of mathematics which draws upon commutative algebra in an essential way is algebraic number theory. One sees this from the beginning in that the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic is the assertion that the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ is a unique factorization domain (UFD), a basic commutative algebraic concept. Moreover number theory was one of the historical sources of the subject. Notably the concept of Dedekind domain came from Dedekind's number-theoretic investigations. At the student level, algebraic number theory does not embrace commutative algebra as early or as thoroughly as algebraic geometry. This seems to me to be a pedagogical mistake: although one can do a good amount of algebraic number theory without explicit reliance on commutative algebra, this seems to come at the expense of not properly explaining what is going on. A modicum of commutative algebra greatly enriches the study of algebraic number theory: it clarifies it, generalizes it and (I believe) makes it more interesting.

The interplay among number theory, algebraic geometry and commutative algebra flows in all directions. What Grothendieck did in the 1960s (with important contributions from Chevalley, Serre and others) was to create a single field of mathematics that encompassed commutative algebra, classical algebraic geometry and algebraic number theory: the theory of schemes. As a result, most contemporary number theorists are also partly commutative algebraists and partly algebraic geometers: we call this cosmopolitan take on the subject **arithmetic geometry**.

There are other areas of mathematics that draw upon commutative algebra in important ways. To mention some which will show up in later in these notes:

- Differential topology: vector bundles on a compact base.
- General topology.
- Invariant theory.
- Order theory.

3. What distinguishes this text

The most straightforward *raison d'être* for a commutative algebra text would be to provide a foundation for the subjects of algebraic geometry, arithmetic geometry and algebraic number theory. The bad news is that this task – even, restricted to providing foundations for the single, seminal text of Hartshorne [**Ha**] – is dauntingly large. The good news is that this has nevertheless been achieved some time ago by David Eisenbud (a leading contemporary expert on the interface of commutative algebra and algebraic geometry) in his text [**Ei**]. This work is highly recommended.

It is 797 pages long, so contains enough material for many courses in the subject. It would be folly to try to improve upon (and terrible drudgery to successfully imitate) Eisenbud's work here, and I certainly have not tried.

The other standard commutative algebra texts are those by Atiyah-Macdonald [**AM**] and by Matsumura [**M**]. Any reader who is halfway serious in their study of commutative algebra should also have access to all of [**AM**], [**M**] and [**Ei**] and consult them frequently. While the current text does not rely on them in the logical sense, I am – at best – a part time commutative algebraist, and much of what I know comes from these texts. (Reading only "derivative" sources is rarely a good idea.) On the other hand, precisely because there are three standard excellent texts I have allowed my choice of topics to be, in places, much less standard.

The topics covered in Atiyah-Macdonald's text in particular have become a *de facto* standard for a first course in commutative algebra. Here are the chapter titles from [**AM**]: 1. Rings and Ideals 2. Modules 3. Rings and Modules of Fractions 4. Primary Decomposition 5. Integral Dependence and Valuations 6. Chain Conditions 7. Noetherian Rings 8. Artin Rings 9. Discrete Valuation Rings and Dedekind Domains 10. Completions 11. Dimension Theory. The entire text is 126 pages, and a distinctive feature is that a substantial portion of the text is devoted to exercises, making [**AM**] one of the most amenable to student study graduate level mathematics texts I have ever seen. The exercises are especially attractive: some of them are easy, some of them are very challenging, and they treat both core topics and interesting side attractions.

Much of the present text covers the material of **the first nine chapters** of [**AM**] but with a much more leisurely, detailed exposition. Many exercises in [**AM**] appear as proved results here. To give a specific example, Boolean rings appear in Exercises 1.11, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25, 3.28 of [**AM**], in which in particular proofs of the Stone Representation Theorem and Stone Duality Theorems are sketched. In this text §9 is devoted to Boolean rings, including proofs of these two results.

The failure to cover completions and basic dimension theory in this text would be unforgivable were it not the case that [AM] covers it so nicely.

Let us also compare to [**M**]. Here we treat the material of the first 12 sections of [**M**] except §8 (Completion and the Artin-Rees Lemma) as well as some material from §20 (UFDs). This is less than one third of the material covered in [**M**].

4. More on the contents

As mentioned above, one of the distinguishing features of this text – and one of the things which makes it much lengthier compared to the portions of [**AM**] and [**M**] that cover the same material – is that we digress to include many "applications" to other parts of mathematics. At one point I had the idea that every section of "core material" should be followed by a section giving applications. This conceit was not really feasible, but there are still some entire sections devoted to applications (generally characterized by making contact with topics outside of commutative algebra by their relative independence from the rest of the text):

- §2 on Galois connections.
- §6 on vector bundles and Swan's Theorem.
- §9 on Boolean rings, Boolean spaces and Stone Duality.

As for significant parts of sections, we have:

- §5.2 on rings of continuous functions.
- §5.3 on rings of holomorphic functions.
- §11.3 on the real Nullstellensatz.
- §11.4 on the combinatorial Nullstellensatz.
- §11.5 on the finite field Nullstellensatz.
- §11.6 on Terjanian's Nullstellensatz.
- §13.6 on Hochster's Theorem.
- §14.6 on invariant theory and the Shephard-Todd-Chevalley Theorem.

5. Acknowledgments

---

[1]Of which many, many remain: your name could go here!

CHAPTER 1

Commutative rings

1. Fixing terminology

We are interested in studying properties of **commutative rings with unity**.

By a **general algebra** R, we mean a triple $(R, +, \cdot)$ where R is a set endowed with a binary operation $+ : R \times R \to R$ – called **addition** – and a binary operation $\cdot : R \times R \to R$ – called **multiplication** – satisfying the following:

(CG) $(R, +)$ is a commutative group,

(D) For all $a, b, c \in R$, $(a + b) \cdot c = a \cdot c + b \cdot c$, $a \cdot (b + c) = a \cdot b + a \cdot c$.

For at least fifty years, there has been agreement that in order for an algebra to be a **ring**, it must satisfy the additional axiom of associativity of multiplication:

(AM) For all $a, b, c \in R$, $a \cdot (b \cdot c) = (a \cdot b) \cdot c$.

A general algebra which satisfies (AM) will be called simply an **algebra**. A similar convention that is prevalent in the literature is the use of the term **nonassociative algebra** to mean what we have called a general algebra: i.e., a not *necessarily* associative algebra.

A ring R is said to be **with unity** if there exists a multiplicative identity, i.e., an element e of R such that for all $a \in R$ we have $e \cdot a = a \cdot e = a$. If e and e' are two such elements, then $e = e \cdot e' = e'$. In other words, if a unity exists, it is unique, and we will denote it by 1.

A ring R is **commutative** if for all $x, \; y \in R, x \cdot y = y \cdot x$.

In these notes we will be (almost) always working in the category of commutative rings with unity. In a sense which will shortly be made precise, this means that the identity 1 is regarded as part of the structure of a ring and must therefore be *preserved* by all homomorphisms.

Probably it would be more natural to study the class of possibly non-commutative rings with unity, since, as we will see, many of the fundamental constructions of rings give rise, in general, to non-commutative rings. But if the restriction to commutative rings (with unity!) is an artifice, it is a very useful one, since two of the most fundamental notions in the theory, that of ideal and module, become

significantly different and more complicated in the non-commutative case. It is
nevertheless true that many individual results have simple analogues in the non-
commutative case. But it does not seem necessary to carry along the extra general-
ity of non-commutative rings; rather, when one is interested in the non-commutative
case, one can simply remark "Proposition X.Y holds for (left) R-modules over a
noncommutative ring R."

Notation: Generally we shall abbreviate $x \cdot y$ to xy. Moreover, we usually do
not use different symbols to denote the operations of addition and multiplication
in different rings: it will be seen that this leads to simplicity rather than confusion.

Group of units: Let R be a ring with unity. An element $x \in R$ is said to be a
unit if there exists an element y such that $xy = yx = 1$.

CONVENTION ON EXERCISES: Throughout the exercises, a "ring" means a com-
mutative ring unless explicit mention is made to the contrary. Some but not all of
the results in the exercises still hold for non-commutative rings, and it is left to the
interested reader to explore this.

EXERCISE 1.1.
   a) *Show: if x is a unit, the element y with $xy = yx = 1$ is unique, denoted*
      x^{-1}.
   b) *Show: if x is a unit, so is x^{-1}.*
   c) *Show that, for all $x, y \in R$, xy is a unit $\iff$ x and y are both units.*
   d) *Show: the units form a group, denoted $R^{\times}$, under multiplication.*

REMARK 1. *For elements x, y in a non-commutative ring R, if x and y are units
so is xy, but the converse need not hold. (Thus Exercise 1.1c) is an instance of a
result in which commutativity is essential.) Nevertheless this is enough to deduce
that in any ring the units $R^{\times}$ form a group...which is not necessarily commutative.*

EXAMPLE 1.1 (Zero ring). *Our rings come with two distinguished elements, the
additive identity 0 and the multiplicative identity 1. Suppose that $0 = 1$. Then for
$x \in R$, $x = 1 \cdot x = 0 \cdot x$, whereas in any ring $0 \cdot x = (0 + 0) \cdot x = 0 \cdot x + 0 \cdot x$, so
$0 \cdot x = 0$. In other words, if $0 = 1$, then this is the only element in the ring. It is
clear that for any one element set $R = \{0\}$, $0 + 0 = 0 \cdot 0 = 0$ endows R with the
structure of a ring. We call this ring the **zero ring**.*

The zero ring exhibits some strange behavior, such that it must be explicitly ex-
cluded in many results. For instance, the zero element is a unit in the zero ring,
which is obviously not the case in any nonzero ring. A nonzero ring in which every
nonzero element is a unit is called a **division ring**. A commutative division ring
is called a **field**.

Let R and S be rings. A **homomorphism** $f : R \to S$ is a function such that:

(HOM1) For all $x, y \in R$, $f(x + y) = f(x) + f(y)$.
(HOM2) For all $x, y \in R$, $f(xy) = f(x)f(y)$.
(HOM3) $f(1) = 1$.

We observe that (HOM1) implies $f(0) = f(0 + 0) = f(0) + f(0)$, so $f(0) = 0$.

Thus we do not need to explcitly include $f(0) = 0$ in the definition of a group homomorphism. For the multiplicative identity however, this argument only shows that if $f(1)$ is a unit, then $f(1) = 1$. Therefore, if we did not require (HOM3), then for instance the map $f : R \to R$, $f(x) = 0$ for all x, would be a homomorphism, and we do not want this.

EXERCISE 1.2. *Suppose R and S are rings, and let $f : R \to S$ be a map satisfying (HOM1) and (HOM2). Show that f is a homomorphism of rings (i.e., satisfies also $f(1) = 1$) iff $f(1) \in S^{\times}$.*

A homomorphism $f : R \to S$ is an **isomorphism** if there exists a homomorphism $g : S \to R$ such that: for all $x \in R$, $g(f(x)) = x$; and for all $y \in S$, $f(g(y)) = y$.

EXERCISE 1.3. *Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings. Show the following are equivalent:*
   (i) *f is a bijection.*
   (ii) *f is an isomorphism.*

In many algebra texts, an isomorphism of rings (or groups, etc.) is *defined* to be a bijective homomorphism, but this gives the wrong idea of what an isomorphism should be in other mathematical contexts (e.g. for topological spaces). Rather, having defined the notion of a morphism of any kind, one defines isomorphism in the way we have above.

EXERCISE 1.4.
   a) *Suppose R and S are both rings on a set containing exactly one element. Show that there is a unique ring isomorphism from R to S. (This is a triviality, but explains why are we able to speak of **the zero ring**, rather than simply the zero ring associated to one element set. We will therefore denote the zero ring just by 0.)*
   b) *Show that any ring R admits a unique homomorphism to the zero ring. One says that the zero ring is **the final object** in the category of rings.*

EXERCISE 1.5. *Show: for a not-necessarily-commutative-ring S there exists a unique homomorphism from the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers to S. (Thus $\mathbb{Z}$ is the **initial object** in the category of not-necessarily-commutative-rings. It follows immediately that it is also the initial object in the category of rings.)*

A **subring** R of a ring S is a subset R of S such that

(SR1) $1 \in R$.
(SR2) For all $r, s \in R$, $r + s \in R$, $r - s \in R$, and $rs \in R$.

Here (SR2) expresses that the subset R is an algebra under the operations of addition and multiplication defined on S. Working, as we are, with rings with unity, we have to be a bit more careful: in the presence of (SR2) but not (SR1) it is possible that R *either* does not have a multiplicative identity or, more subtly, that it has a multiplicative identity which is not the element $1 \in S$.

An example of the first phenomenon is $S = \mathbb{Z}$, $R = 2\mathbb{Z}$. An example of the second is $S = \mathbb{Z}$, $R = 0$. A more interesting example is $S = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ – i.e., the set of all ordered pairs (x, y), $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(x_1, y_1) + (x_2, y_2) = (x_1 + x_2, y_1 + y_2)$,

$(x_1, y_1) \cdot (x_2, y_2) = (x_1 x_2, y_1 y_2)$ – and $R = \{(0, y) \mid y \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Then with the induced addition and multiplication from S, R is isomorphic to the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ and the element $(0, 1)$ serves as a multiplicative identity on R which is different from the (always unique) multiplicative identity $1_S = (1, 1)$, so according to our conventions R is not a subring of S.

Notice that if R is a subring of S, the inclusion map $R \hookrightarrow S$ is an injective homomorphism of rings. Conversely, if $\iota : R \hookrightarrow S$ is an injective ring homomorphism, then $R \cong \iota(R)$ and $\iota(R)$ is a subring of S, so essentially we may use ι to view R as a subring of S. The only proviso here is that this certainly depends on ι: in general there may be other injective homomorphisms $\iota : R \hookrightarrow S$ which realize R as a different subset of S, hence a different subring.

2. Adjoining elements

Let $\iota : R \hookrightarrow S$ be an injective ring homomorphism. As above, let us use ι to view R as a subring of S; we also say that S is an **extension ring** of R and write S/R for this (note: this has nothing to do with cosets or quotients!) We wish now to consider rings T such that $R \subset T \subset S$; such a ring T might be called a **subextension** of S/R or an **intermediate ring**.

For $\iota : R \hookrightarrow S$ as above, let $X = \{x_i\}$ be a subset of S. Then the partially ordered set of all subrings of S containing R and X is nonempty (since S is in it) and contains a bottom element, given (as usual!) by taking the intersection of all of its elements. We call this the ring obtained by **adjoining** the elements of X to R. In the commutative case, we denote this ring by $R[\{x_i\}]$, for reasons that will become more clear when we discuss polynomial rings in §5.4.

EXAMPLE 1.2. *Take $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $S = \mathbb{C}$. Then $\mathbb{Z}[i] = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-1}]$ is the smallest subring of $\mathbb{C}$ containing ($\mathbb{Z}$ and) $\sqrt{-1}$.*

EXAMPLE 1.3. *Take $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $S = \mathbb{Q}$, let $\mathcal{P}$ be any set of prime numbers, and put $X = \{\frac{1}{p}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}$. Then there is a subring $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{P}} := \mathbb{Z}[\{\frac{1}{p}\}_{p \in \mathcal{P}}]$ of $\mathbb{Q}$.*

EXERCISE 1.6. *Let $\mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{Q}$ be two sets of prime numbers. Show the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{P}} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.
(ii) $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{Q}}$.
(iii) $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}$.

EXERCISE 1.7. *Show: every subring of $\mathbb{Q}$ is of the form $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{P}}$ for some $\mathcal{P}$.*

The adjunction process $R \mapsto R[X]$ is defined only relative to some extension ring S of R, although the notation hides this. In fact, one of the recurrent themes of the subject is the expression of the adjunction process in a way which depends only on R itself. In the first example, this is achieved by identifying $\sqrt{-1}$ with its minimal polynomial $t^2 + 1$ and replacing $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-1}]$ with the quotient ring $\mathbb{Z}[t]/(t^2 + 1)$. The second example will eventually be turned around: we will be able to give an independent definition of $\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{P}}$ as a certain "ring of fractions" formed from $\mathbb{Z}$ and then $\mathbb{Q}$ will be the ring of fractions obtained by taking $\mathcal{P}$ to be the set of all prime numbers.

Nevertheless, the existence of such turnabouts should not cause us to forget that

adjunction is relative to an extension; indeed forgetting this can lead to serious trouble. For instance, if $\sqrt[3]{2}$ is the unique real cube root of 2 and ζ_3 is a primitive cube root of unity, then the three complex numbers with cube 2 are $z_1 = \sqrt[3]{2}$, $z_2 = \sqrt[3]{2}\zeta_3$ and $z_3 = \sqrt[3]{2}\zeta_3^2$. Each of the rings $\mathbb{Q}[z_1]$, $\mathbb{Q}[z_2]$, $\mathbb{Q}[z_3]$ is isomorphic to the ring $\mathbb{Q}[t]/(t^3 - 2)$, so all three are isomorphic to each other. But they are not *the same* ring: on the one hand $\mathbb{Q}[z_1]$ is contained in $\mathbb{R}$ and the other two are not. More seriously $\mathbb{Q}[z_1, z_2, z_3] = \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt[3]{2}, \zeta_3]$, which strictly contains any one of $\mathbb{Q}[z_1]$, $\mathbb{Q}[z_2]$ and $\mathbb{Q}[z_3]$.

3. Ideals and quotient rings

Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings, and put

$$I = f^{-1}(0) = \{x \in R \mid f(x) = 0\}.$$

In particular f is a homomorphism of commutative groups $(R, +) \to (S, +)$, I is a subgroup of $(R, +)$. Moreover, it enjoys both of the following properties:

(LI) For all $j \in I$ and $x \in R$, $xj \in I$.
(RI) For all $i \in I$ and $y \in R$, $iy \in I$.

Indeed,

$$f(xj) = f(x)f(j) = f(x) \cdot 0 = 0 = 0 \cdot f(y) = f(i)f(y) = f(iy).$$

In general, let R be a ring. An **ideal** is a subset $I \subset R$ which is a subgroup of $(R, +)$ (in particular, $0 \in I$) and which satisfies (LI) and (RI).

THEOREM 1.4. *Let R be a ring, and let I be a subgroup of $(R, +)$. The following are equivalent:*
(i) I is an ideal of R.
(ii) There exists a ring structure on the quotient group R/I making the additive homomorphism $R \to R/I$ into a homomorphism of rings.
When these conditions hold, the ring structure on R/I in (ii) is unique, and R/I is called the quotient of R by the ideal I.

PROOF. Consider the group homomorphism $q : R \to R/I$. If we wish R/I to be a ring in such a way so that q is a ring homomorphism, we need

$$(x + I)(y + I) = q(x)q(y) = q(xy) = (xy + I).$$

This shows that there is only one possible ring structure, and the only question is whether it is well-defined. For this we need that for all $i, j \in I$, $(x+i)(y+j)-xy = xj+iy+ij \in I$. Evidently this holds for all x, y, i, j iff (LI) and (RI) both hold. $\square$

Remark: If R is commutative, then of course there is no difference between (LI) and (RI). For a non-commutative ring R, an additive subgroup I satisfying condition (LI) but not necessarily (RI) (resp. (RI) but not necessarily (LI)) is called a **left ideal** (resp. a **right ideal**). Often one says **two-sided ideal** to emphasize that (LI) and (RI) both hold. Much of the additional complexity of the non-commutative theory comes from the need to distinguish between left, right and two-sided ideals.

We do not wish to discuss such complexities here, so henceforth in this section we assume (except in exercises, when indicated) that our rings are commutative.

Example: In $R = \mathbb{Z}$, for any integer n, consider the subset $(n) = n\mathbb{Z} = \{nx \mid x \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of all multiples of n. This is easily seen to be an ideal.[1] The quotient $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is the ring of integers modulo n.

An ideal $I \subsetneq R$ is called **proper**.

EXERCISE 1.8. *Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R. Show the following are equivalent:*
(i) $I \cap R^\times \neq \emptyset$.
(ii) $I = R$.

EXERCISE 1.9. *a) Let R be a commutative ring. Show that R is a field iff R has exactly two ideals, 0 and R.*
b) Let R be a not necessarily commutative ring. Show the following are equivalent:
(i) The only one-sided ideals of R are 0 and R. (ii) R is a division ring.
c) For a field k and an integer $n > 1$, show that the matrix ring $M_n(k)$ has no two-sided ideals but is not a division ring.

EXERCISE 1.10. *Some contemporary undergraduate algebra texts define the finite ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ in a different and apparently simpler way: put $Z_n = \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. For any integer x, there is a unique integer k such that $x - kn \in Z_n$. Define a function $\mod n : \mathbb{Z} \to Z_n$ by $\mod n(x) := x - kn$. We then define $+$ and $\cdot$ on Z_n by $x + y := \mod n(x+y)$, $xy = \mod n(xy)$. Thus we have avoided any mention of ideals, equivalence classes, quotients, etc. Is this actually simpler? (Hint: how do we know that Z_n satisfies the ring axioms?)*

For any commutative ring R and any element $y \in R$, the subset $(y) = yR = \{xy \mid x \in R\}$ is an ideal of R. Such ideals are called **principal**. A **principal ideal ring** is a commutative ring in which each ideal is principal.

EXERCISE 1.11. *a) The intersection of any family of (left, right or two-sided) ideals in a not-necessarily-commutative-ring is a (left, right or two-sided) ideal.*
b) Let $\{I_i\}$ be a set of ideals in the commutative ring R. Show that $\bigcap_i I_i$ has the following property: for any ideal J of R such that $J \subset I_i$ for all i, $J \subset \bigcap_i I$.

Let R be a ring and S a subset of R. There is then a smallest ideal of R containing S, namely $\bigcap I_i$, where I_i are all the ideals of R containing S. We call this the ideal **generated** by S. This is a "top-down" description; as usual, there is a complementary "bottom-up" description which is not quite as clean but often more useful. Namely, put

$$\langle S \rangle := \{\sum r_i s_i \mid r_i \in R, s_i \in S\}$$

i.e., the set of all finite sums of an element of R times an element of S.

PROPOSITION 1.5. *For a subset S of a commutative ring R, $\langle S \rangle$ is an ideal, the intersection of all ideals containing S.*

EXERCISE 1.12. *Prove Proposition 1.5.*

When S is a subset of R such that $I = \langle S \rangle$, we say S is a **set of generators** for I. In general the same ideal will have many (most often infinitely many) sets of generators.

---

[1]If this is not known and/or obvious to the reader, these notes will probably be too brisk.

An ideal I is **principal** if it can be generated by a single element. In any ring, the zero ideal $0 = \langle 0 \rangle$ and the entire ring $R = \langle 1 \rangle$ are principal. For $x \in R$, we tend to denote the principal ideal generated by x as either Rx or (x) rather than $\langle x \rangle$.

An ideal I is **finitely generated** if...it admits a finite set of generators.[2]

Stop and think for a moment: do you know an example of an ideal which is *not* finitely generated? You may well find that you do not. It turns out that there is a very large class of rings – including most or all of the rings you are likely to meet in undergraduate algebra – for which every ideal is finitely generated. A ring R in which every ideal is finitely generated is called **Noetherian**. This is probably the single most important class of rings, as we will come to appreciate slowly but surely over the course of these notes.

EXERCISE 1.13. *Let R be a ring.*
a) For ideals I and J of R, define $I + J = \{i + j \mid i \in I, \ j \in J\}$. Show that $I + J = \langle I \cup J \rangle$ is the smallest ideal containing both I and J.
b) Extend part a) to any finite number of ideals $I_1, \ldots, I_n$.
c) Suppose $\{I_i\}$ is a set of ideals of I. Give an explicit description of the ideal $\langle I_i \rangle$.

The preceding considerations show that the collection of all ideals of a commutative ring R, partially ordered by inclusion, form a **complete lattice**.

If I is an ideal in the ring R, then there is a correspondence between ideals J of R containing I and ideals of the quotient ring R/I, exactly as in the case of a normal subgroup of a group:

THEOREM 1.6. *(Correspondence theorem) Let I be an ideal of a ring R, and denote the quotient map $R \to R/I$ by q. Let $\mathcal{I}(R)$ be the lattice of ideals of R, $\mathcal{I}_I(R)$ be the sublattice of ideals containing I and $\mathcal{I}(R/I)$ the lattice of ideals of the quotient ring R/I. Define maps*

$$\Phi : \mathcal{I}(R) \to \mathcal{I}(R/I), \ J \mapsto (I + J)/I,$$

$$\Psi : \mathcal{I}(R/I) \to \mathcal{I}(R), \ J \mapsto q^{-1}(J).$$

Then $\Psi \circ \Phi(J) = I + J$ and $\Phi \circ \Psi(J) = J$. In particular Ψ induces an isomorphism of lattices from $\mathcal{I}(R/I)$ to $\mathcal{I}_I(R)$.

PROOF. For all the abstraction, the proof is almost trivial. For $J \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, we check that $\Psi(\Phi(J)) = \Psi(J + I \pmod{I}) = \{x \in R \mid x + I \in J + I\} = J + I \in \mathcal{I}_I(R)$. Similarly, for $J \in \mathcal{I}(R/I)$, we have $\Phi(\Psi(J)) = J$. $\square$

Remark: In fancier language, the pair (Φ, Ψ) give an **isotone Galois connection** between the partially ordered sets $\mathcal{I}(R)$ and $\mathcal{I}(R/I)$. The associated closure operator $\Phi \circ \Psi$ on $\mathcal{I}(R/I)$ is the identity, whereas the closure operator $\Psi \circ \Phi$ on $\mathcal{I}(R)$ carries each ideal J to the smallest ideal containing both J and I.[3]

---

[2]Well, obviously. Nevertheless this definition is so critically important that it would have been a disservice to omit it.

[3]This point of view will be explored in more detail in §2.

The Correspondence Theorem will be our constant companion. As is common, we will often use the map Ψ to identify the sets $\mathcal{I}(R/I)$ and $\mathcal{I}_I(R)$.

EXERCISE 1.14. *Let I be an ideal of R and $\{J_i\}$ be a set of ideals of R. Show that Φ preserves suprema and Ψ preserves infima:*

$$\Phi(\langle J_i \rangle) = \langle \Phi(J_i) \rangle$$

and

$$\Psi(\bigcap J_i) = \bigcap \Psi(J_i).$$

4. The monoid of ideals of R

Let I and J be ideals of the ring R. The **product ideal** IJ is the least ideal containing all elements of the form xy for $x \in I$ and $y \in J$. (It is easy to see that $IJ = \{\sum x_i y_i \mid x_i \in I,\ y_i \in J\}$ is precisely the set of all finite sums of such products.) Recall that we have written $\mathcal{I}(R)$ for the lattice of all ideals of R. Then $(I, J) \mapsto IJ$ gives a binary operation on $\mathcal{I}(R)$, the **ideal product**.

EXERCISE 1.15. *Show that $\mathcal{I}(R)$ under the ideal product is a commutative monoid, with identity element R and absorbing element the (0) ideal of R.*[4]

If you are given a commutative monoid M, then invariably the property you are hoping it has is **cancellation**: for all $x, y, z \in M$, $xz = yz \implies x = y$.[5] For example, if R is a ring, then the set $R^\bullet$ of nonzero elements of R is cancellative iff R is a domain. In $(R, \cdot)$ 0 is an absorbing element, so we remove it to get a hope of cancellativity.

EXERCISE 1.16. *a) Let M be a cancellative monoid of cardinality greater than one. Show that M does not have any absorbing elements.*
b) Let R be a ring which is not the zero ring. Show that the monoid $\mathcal{I}(R)$ is not cancellative.

In light of the previous exercise, for a domain R we define $\mathcal{I}^\bullet(R)$ to be the monoid of *nonzero ideals* of R under multiplication.

Warning: Just because R is a domain, $\mathcal{I}^\bullet(R)$ need not be cancellative!

EXERCISE 1.17. *Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$, and let $\mathfrak{p}_2 = \langle 1 + \sqrt{-3}, 1 - \sqrt{-3} \rangle$ (i.e., the ideal generated by these two elements.*
a) Show that $\#R/(2) = 4$ and $R/\mathfrak{p}_2 \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.
b) Show that $\mathfrak{p}_2^2 = \mathfrak{p}_2 \cdot (2)$.
c) Conclude that $\mathcal{I}^\bullet(R)$ is not cancellative.

EXERCISE 1.18. *Let R be a PID. Show that $\mathcal{I}^\bullet(R)$ is cancellative.*

EXERCISE 1.19. *Show: for a commutative monoid M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is cancellative.
(ii) There exists a commutative group G and an injective monoid homomorphism $\iota : M \hookrightarrow G$.

---

[4]An element z of a monoid M is called **absorbing** if for all $x \in M$, $zx = xz = z$.
[5]Well, obviously this is an exaggeration, but you would be surprised how often it is true.

EXERCISE 1.20. *Let M be a commutative monoid. A **group completion** of M consists of a commutative group $G(M)$ and a monoid homomorphism $c : M \to G(M)$ that is* universal *for monoid homomorphisms into a commutative group. That is, for any commutative group G and monoid homomorphism $f : M \to G$, there is a unique homomorphism of groups $F : G(M) \to G$ such that $f = F \circ c$.*

    a) *Show that any two group completions are isomorphic.*
    b) *Show that any commutative monoid has a group completion.*
    c) *Show that a commutative monoid injects into its group completion if and only if it is cancellative.*

5. Pushing and pulling ideals

Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of commutative rings. We can use f to transport ideals from R to S and also to transport ideals from S to R.

More precisely, for I an ideal of R, consider $f(I)$ as a subset of S.

EXERCISE 1.21.

    a) *Give an example to show that $f(I)$ need not be an ideal of S.*
    b) *Suppose f is surjective. Show: $f(I)$ is an ideal of S.*

Nevertheless we can consider the ideal it generates: we define

$$f_*(I) = \langle f(I) \rangle,$$

and we call $f_*(I)$ the **pushforward of I to S**.

Similarly, let J be an ideal of S, and consider its complete preimage in R, i.e., $f^{-1}(J) = \{x \in R \mid f(x) \in J\}$. As you are probably already aware, preimages have much nicer algebraic properties than direct images, and indeed $f^{-1}(J)$ is necessarily an ideal of R. We denote it by $f^*(J)$ and call it the **pullback of J to R**.

Example: Suppose that I is an ideal of R, $S = R/I$ and $f : R \to R/I$ is the quotient map. In this case, pushforwards and pullbacks were studied in detail in Theorem 1.6. In this case $f^* : \mathcal{I}(S) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{I}(R)$ is an injection, which allows us to view the lattice of ideals of S as a sublattice of the lattice of ideals of R. Moreover we have a **push-pull formula**: for all ideals J of R,

$$f^* f_* J = J + I$$

and also a **pull-push formula**: for all ideals J of R/I,

$$f_* f^* J = J.$$

These formulas are extremely useful at all points in the study of ring theory. More generally, whenever one meets a homomorphism $f : R \to S$ of rings (or better, a certain class of homomorphisms), it is fruitful to ask about properties of f_* and f^*: in particular, is f^* necessarily injective, or surjective? Can we identify the composite maps $f^* f_*$ and/or $f_* f^*$?

    In these notes, the most satisfying and important answers will come for **localizations** and **integral extensions**.

6. Maximal and prime ideals

An ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R is **maximal** if it is proper and there is no proper ideal of R strictly containing $\mathfrak{m}$. An ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is **prime** if for all $x, y \in R$, $xy \in \mathfrak{p}$ implies $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ or $y \in \mathfrak{p}$ or both.

EXERCISE 1.22. *For an ideal I in a ring R, show: the following are equivalent:*
(i) I is maximal.
(ii) R/I is a field.

EXERCISE 1.23. *For an ideal I in a ring R, show: the following are equivalent:*
(i) I is prime.
(ii) $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a domain.

EXERCISE 1.24. *Show: maximal ideals are prime.*

EXERCISE 1.25. *Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings.*
a) Let I be a prime ideal of R. Show that $f_* I$ need not be a prime ideal of S.
b) Let J be a prime ideal of S. Show that $f^* J$ is a prime ideal of R.
c) Let J be a maximal ideal of S. Show that $f^* J$ need not be maximal in R.

If I and J are ideals of a ring R, we define the **colon ideal**[6]

$$(I : J) = \{x \in R \mid xJ \subset I\}.$$

EXERCISE 1.26. *Show: $(I : J)$ is indeed an ideal of R.*

7. Products of rings

Let R_1 and R_2 be rings. The Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2$ has the structure of a ring with "componentwise" addition and multiplication:

$$(r_1, r_2) + (s_1, s_2) := (r_1 + s_1, r_2 + s_2).$$
$$(r_1, r_2) \cdot (s_1, s_2) := (r_1 s_1, r_2 s_2).$$

EXERCISE 1.27. *a) Show that $R_1 \times R_2$ is commutative iff both R_1 and R_2 are commutative.*
b) $R_1 \times R_2$ has an identity iff both R_1 and R_2 do, in which case $e := (e_1, e_2)$ is the identity of $R_1 \times R_2$.

As for any Cartesian product, $R_1 \times R_2$ comes equipped with its projections

$$\pi_1 : R_1 \times R_2 \to R_1, \mid (r_1, r_2) \mapsto r_1$$

$$\pi_2 : R_1 \times R_2 \to R_2, \mid (r_1, r_2) \mapsto r_2.$$

The Cartesian product $X_1 \times X_2$ of sets X_1 and X_2 satisfies the following universal property: for any set Z and any maps $f_1 : Z \to X_1$, $f_2 : Z \to X_2$, there exists a unique map $f : Z \to X_1 \times X_2$ such that $f_1 = \pi_1 \circ f$, $f_2 = \pi_2 \circ f$. The Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2$ satisfies the analogous universal property in the category of rings.

EXERCISE 1.28. *For rings R_1, R_2, S and ring homomorphisms $f_i : S \to R_i$, there exists a unique homomorphism of rings $f : S \to R_1 \times R_2$ such that $f_i = \pi_i \circ f$.*

---

[6]The terminology is unpleasant and is generally avoided as much as possible. One should think of $(I : J)$ as being something like the "ideal quotient" I/J (which of course has no formal meaning). Its uses will gradually become clear.

So the Cartesian product of R_1 and R_2 is also the product in the categorical sense.

As with sets, we can equally well take the Cartesian product over an arbitrary indexed family of rings: if $\{R_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a family of rings, their Cartesian product $\prod_{i \in I} R_i$ becomes a ring under coordinatewise addition and multiplication, and satisfies the universal property of the product. Details are left to the reader.

It is natural to ask whether the category of rings has a direct sum as well. In other words, given rings R_1 and R_2 we are looking for a ring R together with ring homomorphisms $\iota_i : R_i \to R$ such that for any ring S and homomorphisms $f_i : R_i \to S$, there exists a unique homomorphism $f : R \to S$ such that $f_i = f \circ \iota_i$. We recall that in the category of commutative groups, the Cartesian product group $G_1 \times G_2$ also the categorical direct sum, with $\iota_1 : g \mapsto (g, 0)$ and $\iota_2 : g \mapsto (0, g)$. Since each ring has in particular the structure of a commutative group, it is natural to wonder whether the same might hold true for rings. However, the map $\iota_1 : R_1 \to R_1 \times R_2$ does not preserve the multiplicative identity (unless $R_2 = 0$), so is not a homomorphism of rings when identities are present. Moreover, even in the category of algebras, in order to satisfy the universal property on the underlying additive subgroups, the homomorphism f is uniquely determined to be $(r_1, r_2) \mapsto f_1(r_1) + f_2(r_2)$, and it is easily checked that this generally does not preserve the product.

(The category of rings *does* have direct sums in the categorical sense: the categorical direct sum of R_1 and R_2 is given by the tensor product $R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R_2$.)

Now returning to the case of commutative rings, let us consider the ideal structure of the product $R = R_1 \times R_2$. If I_1 is an ideal of R_1, then $I_1 \times \{0\} = \{(i, 0) \mid i \in I\}$ is an ideal of the product; moreover the quotient $R/(I_1 \times \{0\})$ is isomorphic to $R_1/I_1 \times R_2$. Similarly, if I_2 is an ideal, $\{0\} \times I_2$ is an ideal of R_2. Finally, if I_1 is an ideal of R_1 and I_2 is an ideal of R_2, then

$$I_1 \times I_2 := \{(i_1, i_2) \mid i_1 \in I_1, \; i_2 \in I_2\}$$

is an ideal of R. In fact we have already found all the ideals of the product ring:

PROPOSITION 1.7. *Let R_1 and R_2 be commutative rings, and let I be an ideal of $R := R_1 \times R_2$. For $i = 1, 2$, put $I_i := \pi_i(I)$. Then for $i = 1, 2$ we have that $\pi_i(I)$ is an ideal of R_i and $I = \pi_1(I) \times \pi_2(I)$. Then $I = I_1 \times I_2 = \{(i_1, i_2) \mid i_1 \in I_1, \; i_2 \in I_2\}$.*

PROOF. Since $\pi_i : R_1 \times R_2 \to R_i$ is a surjective ring homomorphism, by Exercise 1.21b) we have that $\pi_i(I)$ is an ideal of R_i, and thus $\pi_1(I) \times \pi_2(I)$ is an ideal of $R_1 \times R_2$.

For any subset S of a Cartesian product $X_1 \times X_2$ we have $S \subset \pi_1(S) \times \pi_2(S)$, so certainly

$$I \subset \pi_1(I) \times \pi_2(I).$$

The reverse inclusion certainly does not hold in general for subsets of Cartesian products, but it does hold here: if $x \in \pi_1(I)$ then there is $(x, y) \in I$ and then $(x, 0) = (x, y) \cdot (1, 0) \in I$. Similarly we get that if $y \in \pi_2(I)$ then $(0, y) \in I$, so $(x, y) = (x, 0) + (0, y) \in I + I = I$. $\qquad\square$

Another way to express the result is that, corresponding to a decomposition $R = R_1 \times R_2$, we get a decomposition $\mathcal{I}(R) = \mathcal{I}(R_1) \times \mathcal{I}(R_2)$.

Let us call a commutative ring R **disconnected** if there exists nonzero rings R_1, R_2 such that $R \cong R_1 \times R_2$, and **connected** otherwise.[7] If R is disconnected, then choosing such an isomorphism φ, we may put $I_1 = \varphi^{-1}(R_1 \times \{0\})$ and $I_2 = \varphi^{-1}(\{0\} \times R_2)$. Evidently I_1 and I_2 are ideals of R such that $I_1 \cap I_2 = \{0\}$ and $I_1 + I_2 = R$. Conversely, if in a ring R we can find a pair of ideals I_1, I_2 with these properties then it will follow from the Chinese Remainder Theorem (Theorem 4.21) that the natural map $\Phi : R \to R/I_2 \times R/I_1$, $r \mapsto (r + I_2, r + I_1)$ is an isomorphism.

Now Φ restricted to I_1 induces an isomorphism of groups onto R/I_2 (and similarly with the roles of I_1 and I_2 reversed). We therefore have a distinguished element of I_1, $e_1 := \Phi^{-1}(1)$. This element e_1 is an identity for the multiplication on R restricted to I_1; in particular $e_1^2 = e_1$; such an element is called an **idempotent**. In any ring the elements 0 and 1 are idempotents, called trivial; since $e_1 = \Phi^{-1}(1, 0)$ – and not the preimage of $(0, 0)$ or of $(1, 1)$ – e_1 is a **nontrivial idempotent**. Thus a nontrivial decomposition of a ring implies the presence of nontrivial idempotents.

The converse is also true:

PROPOSITION 1.8. *Suppose R is a ring and e is a nontrivial idempotent element of R: $e^2 = e$ but $e \neq 0, 1$. Put $I_1 = Re$ and $I_2 = R(1 - e)$. Then I_1 and I_2 are ideals of R such that $I_1 \cap I_2 = 0$ and $R = I_1 + I_2$, and therefore $R \cong R/I_1 \times R/I_2$ is a nontrivial decomposition of R.*

EXERCISE 1.29. *Prove Proposition 1.8.*

EXERCISE 1.30. *Generalize the preceding discussion to decompositions into a finite number of factors: $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n$.*

8. A cheatsheet

Let R be a commutative ring. Here are some terms that we will analyze in loving detail later, but would like to be able to mention in passing whenever necessary.

R is a **domain** if $xy = 0 \implies x = 0$ or $y = 0$.

An ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is **prime** if the quotient ring $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a domain. Equivalently, $\mathfrak{p}$ is an ideal such that $xy \in \mathfrak{p} \implies x \in \mathfrak{p}$ or $y \in \mathfrak{p}$.

An ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R is **maximal** if it is proper – i.e., not R itself – and not strictly contained in any larger proper ideal. Equivalently, $\mathfrak{m}$ is an ideal such that the quotient ring $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a field.

R is **Noetherian** if it satisfies any of the following equivalent conditions:[8]
(i) For any nonempty set S of ideals of R, there exists $I \in S$ which is not properly contained in any $J \in S$.

---

[7]We will see later that there is a topological space Spec R associated to every ring, and Spec R is a disconnected topological space iff R can be written as a nontrivial product of rings

[8]See Theorem 8.24 for a proof of their equivalence.

(ii) There is no infinite sequence of ideals $I_1 \subsetneq I_2 \subsetneq \ldots$ in R.
(iii) Every ideal of R is finitely generated.

R is **Artinian** (or sometimes, an **Artin ring**) if the partially ordered set of ideals of R satisfies the descending chain condition: there is no infinite sequence of ideals $I_1 \supsetneq I_2 \supsetneq \ldots$.

Let $R \subset S$ be an inclusion of rings. We say that $s \in S$ is **integral over R** if there are $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in R$ such that
$$s^n + a_{n-1}s^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1 s + a_0 = 0.$$
We say that **S is integral over R** if every element of S is integral over R. This is the appropriate generalization to rings of the notion of an algebraic field extension. We will study integral elements and extensions, um, extensively in § 14, but there is one easy result that we will need earlier, so we give it now.

PROPOSITION 1.9. *Let $R \subset S$ be an integral extension of domains. If S is a field then R is a field.*

PROOF. Let $\alpha \in R^{\bullet}$. Then α^{-1} is integral over R: there are $a_i \in R$ such that
$$\alpha^{-n} = a_{n-1}\alpha^{-n+1} + \ldots + a_1\alpha^{-1} + a_0.$$
Multiplying through by α^{n-1} gives
$$\alpha^{-1} = a_{n-1} + a_{n-2}\alpha + \ldots + a_1\alpha^{n-2} + a_0\alpha^{n-1} \in R. \qquad \square$$

CHAPTER 2

Galois Connections

1. The basic formalism

Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. We denote by $X^\vee$ the **order dual** of X: it has the same underlying set as X but the inverse order relation: $x \preceq y \iff y \leq x$.

Let $(X, \leq)$ and $(Y, \leq)$ be partially ordered sets. A map $f : X \to Y$ is **isotone** (or **order-preserving**) if for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, $x_1 \leq x_2 \implies f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$; f is **antitone** (or **order-reversing**) if for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, $x_1 \leq x_2 \implies f(x_1) \geq f(x_2)$.

EXERCISE 2.1. *Let X, Y, Z be partially ordered sets, and let $f : X \to Y$, $g : Y \to Z$ be functions. Show:*
a) If f and g are isotone, then $g \circ f$ is isotone.
b) If f and g are antitone, then $g \circ f$ is isotone.
c) If one of f and g is isotone and the other is antitone, then $g \circ f$ is antitone.

Let $(X, \leq)$ and $(Y, \leq)$ be partially ordered sets. An **antitone Galois connection between X and Y** is a pair of maps $\Phi : X \to Y$ and $\Psi : Y \to X$ such that:

(GC1) Φ and Ψ are both antitone maps, and
(GC2) For all $x \in X$ and all $y \in Y$, $x \leq \Psi(y) \iff y \leq \Phi(x)$.

There is a pleasant symmetry in the definition: if (Φ, Ψ) is a Galois connection between X and Y, then (Ψ, Φ) is a Galois connection between Y and X.

EXERCISE 2.2. *Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. Let $f : X \to X$ be an antitone map such that*
$$\forall x \in X, \ x \leq f(f(x)).$$
Show: (f, f) is a Galois connection between X and X.

If $(X, \leq)$ is a partially ordered set, then a mapping $f : X \to X$ is called a **closure operator** if it satisfies all of the following properties:

(C1) For all $x \in X$, $x \leq f(x)$.
(C2) For all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, $x_1 \leq x_2 \implies f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$.
(C3) For all $x \in X$, $f(f(x)) = f(x)$.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *The mapping $\Psi \circ \Phi$ is a closure operator on $(X, \leq)$ and the mapping $\Phi \circ \Psi$ is a closure operator on $(Y, \leq)$.*

PROOF. By symmetry, it is enough to consider the mapping $x \mapsto \Psi(\Phi(x))$ on X. If $x_1 \leq x_2$, then since both Φ and Ψ are antitone, we have $\Phi(x_1) \geq \Phi(x_2)$ and thus $\Psi(\Phi(x_1)) \leq \Psi(\Phi(x_1))$: (C2).

For $x \in X$, $\Phi(x) \geq \Phi(x)$, and by (GC2) this implies $x \leq \Psi(\Phi(x))$: (C1).
Finally, for $x \in X$, applying (C1) to the element $\Psi(\Phi(x))$ of X gives

$$\Psi(\Phi(x)) \leq \Psi(\Phi(\Psi(\Phi(x)))).$$

Conversely, we have

$$\Psi(\Phi(x)) \leq \Psi(\Phi(x)),$$

so by (GC2)

$$\Phi(\Psi(\Phi(x)) \geq \Phi(x),$$

and applying the order-reversing map Ψ gives

$$\Psi(\Phi(\Psi(\Phi(x)))) \leq \Psi(\Phi(x)).$$

Thus

$$\Psi(\Phi(x)) = \Psi(\Phi(\Psi(\Phi(x)))).$$

$\square$

COROLLARY 2.2. Φ and Ψ satisfy the following **tridempotence** properties:
  a) For all $x \in X$, $\Phi\Psi\Phi x = \Phi x$.
  b) For all $y \in X$, $\Psi\Phi\Psi y = \Psi y$.

PROOF. By symmetry, it suffices to prove a). Since $\Phi \circ \Psi$ is a closure operator,
$\Phi\Psi\Phi x \geq \Phi x$. Moreover, since $\Psi \circ \Phi$ is a closure operator, $\Psi\Phi x \geq x$, and since Φ is
antitone, $\Phi\Psi\Phi x \leq \Phi x$. So $\Phi\Psi\Phi x = \Phi x$. $\square$

PROPOSITION 2.3. Let (Φ, Ψ) be a Galois connection between partially ordered
sets X and Y. Let $\overline{X} = \Psi(\Phi(X))$ and $\overline{Y} = \Psi(\Phi(Y))$. Then:
  a) $\overline{X}$ and $\overline{Y}$ are precisely the subsets of closed elements of X and Y respec-
     tively.
  b) We have $\Phi(X) \subset \overline{Y}$ and $\Psi(Y) \subset \overline{X}$.
  c) $\Phi : \overline{X} \to \overline{Y}$ and $\Psi : \overline{Y} \to \overline{X}$ are mutually inverse bijections.

PROOF. a) If $x = \Psi(\Phi(x))$ then $x \in \overline{X}$. Conversely, if $x \in \overline{X}$, then $x = \Psi(\Phi(x'))$ for some $x' \in X$, so

$$\Psi(\Phi(x))) = \Psi(\Phi(\Psi(\Phi(x')))) = \Psi(\Phi(x')) = x,$$

so X is closed.
b) This is just a reformulation of Corollary 2.2.
c) If $x \in \overline{X}$ and $y \in \overline{Y}$, then $\Psi(\Phi(x)) = x$ and $\Psi(\Phi(y)) = y$. $\square$

We speak of the mutually inverse antitone bijections $\Phi : \overline{X} \to \overline{Y}$ and $\Psi : \overline{Y} \to \overline{X}$
as the **Galois correspondence** induced by the Galois connection (Φ, Ψ).

EXAMPLE 2.4. Let K/F be a field extension, and G a subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(K/F)$.
Then there is a Galois connection between the set of subextensions of K/F and the
set of subgroups of G, given by

$$\Phi : L \to G_L = \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma x = x \; \forall x \in L\},$$

$$\Psi : H \to K^H = \{x \in K \mid \sigma x = x \; \forall \sigma \in H\}.$$

Having established the basic results, we will now generally abbreviate the closure
operators $\Psi \circ \Phi$ and $\Phi \circ \Psi$ to $x \mapsto \overline{x}$ and $y \mapsto \overline{y}$.

2. Lattice properties

Recall that a partially ordered set X is a **lattice** if for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, there is a greatest lower bound $x_1 \wedge x_2$ and a least upper bound $x_1 \vee x_2$. A partially ordered set is a **complete lattice** if for every subset A of X, the greatest lower bound $\bigwedge A$ and the least upper bound $\bigvee A$ both exist.

LEMMA 2.5. *Let (X, Y, Φ, Ψ) be a Galois connection.*
  a) *If X and Y are both lattices, then for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, we have*
$$\Phi(x_1 \wedge x_2) = \Phi(x_1) \vee \Phi(x_2).$$
  b) *If X and Y are both complete lattices, then for all subsets $A \subset X$, we have*
$$\Phi\left(\bigwedge A\right) = \bigvee \Phi(A).$$

EXERCISE 2.3. *Prove Lemma 2.5.*

Unfortunately, in a Galois connection (X, Y, Φ, Ψ) in which X and Y are lattices, we need *not* have
$$\forall x_1, x_2 \in X, \ \Phi(x_1 \vee x_2) = \Phi(x_1) \wedge \Phi(x_2),$$
even if X and Y are complete lattices. The following counterexample was communicated anonymously [**msegc**].

EXAMPLE 2.6. *We consider a partially ordered set X with five elements, called $0, a, b, c, 1$. We define the partial ordering as follows: 0 is the bottom element (i.e., less than every other element) and 1 is the top element (i.e., greater than every other element); the ordering restricted to $\{a, b, c\}$ is given by $a, b \leq c$. This is a complete lattice. We define $f : X \to X$ by*
$$f(0) = 1, \ f(a) = b, \ f(b) = a, \ f(c) = f(1) = 0.$$
Using Exercise 2.2 it is almost immediate to see that (f, f) is a Galois connection from X to X. However, we have
$$f(a) \vee f(b) = b \vee a = c < 1 = f(0) = f(a \wedge b).$$

Complete lattices also intervene in this subject in the following way.

PROPOSITION 2.7. *Let A be a set and let $X = (2^A, \subset)$ be the power set of A, partially ordered by inclusion. Let $c : X \to X$ be a closure operator. Then the collection $c(X)$ of closed subsets of A forms a complete lattice, with $\bigwedge S = \bigcap_{B \in S} B$ and $\bigvee S = c(\bigcup_{B \in S} B)$.*

EXERCISE 2.4. *Prove Proposition 2.7.*

3. Examples of Antitone Galois Connections

Example (Indiscretion): Let $(X, \leq)$, $(Y, \leq)$ be partially ordered sets with top elements T_X, T_Y. Define $\Phi : X \to Y$, $x \mapsto T_Y$ and $\Psi : Y \to X$, $y \mapsto T_X$. Then (X, Y, Φ, Ψ) is a Galois connection. The induced closure operators are "indiscrete": they send every element of X (resp. Y) to the top element T_X (resp. T_Y).

Example (Perfection): Let $(X, \leq)$ and $(Y, \leq)$ be **anti-isomorphic partially ordered sets**, i.e., suppose that there exists a bijection $\Phi : X \to Y$ with $x_1 \leq x_2 \iff \Phi(x_2) \leq \Phi(x_1)$. Then the inverse map $\Psi : Y \to X$ satisfies $y_1 \leq y_2 \iff \Psi(y_2) \leq$

$\Psi(y_1)$. Moreover, for $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, $x \leq \Psi(y) \iff y = \Psi(\Phi(y)) \leq \Phi(x)$, so (X, Y, Φ, Ψ) is a Galois connection. Then $\overline{X} = X$ and $\overline{Y} = Y$. As we saw above, the converse also holds: if $\overline{X} = X$ and $\overline{Y} = Y$ then Φ and Ψ are mutually inverse bijections. Such a Galois connection is called **perfect**.[1]

The remaining examples of this section make use of some important ring-theoretic concepts which will be treated in detail later.

Example: Let R be a commutative ring. Let X be the set of all ideals of R and $Y = 2^{\operatorname{Spec} R}$ the power set of the set of prime ideals of R. For $I \in X$, put

$$\Phi(I) = V(I) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid I \subset \mathfrak{p}\}.$$

For $V \in Y$, put

$$\Psi(V) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in V} \mathfrak{p}.$$

The maps Φ and Ψ are antitone, and for $I \in \mathcal{X}$, $V \in \mathcal{Y}$,

$$(1) \qquad I \subset \Psi(V) \iff I \subset \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in V} \mathfrak{p} \iff \forall \mathfrak{p} \in V, I \subset \mathfrak{p} \iff V \subset \Phi(I),$$

so (Φ, Ψ) is a Galois connection. Then $\overline{X}$ consists of all ideals which can be written as the intersection of a family of prime ideals. For all $I \in X$,

$$\overline{I} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \supset I} \mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{rad} I = \{x \in R \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \ x^n \in I\};$$

that is, the induced closure operation on X takes any ideal to its **radical** $r(I)$. In particular $\overline{X}$ consists precisely of the radical ideals.

It is not so easy to describe the closure operator on Y or even the subset $\overline{Y}$ explicitly, but there is still something nice to say. Since:

$$(2) \qquad\qquad\qquad V((0)) = \operatorname{Spec} R, \ V(R) = \varnothing,$$

$$(3) \qquad\qquad\qquad V(I_1) \cup V(I_2) = V(I_1 I_2),$$

$$(4) \qquad\qquad\qquad \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} V(I_\alpha) = V\left(\sum_{\alpha \in A} I_\alpha\right),$$

the elements of $\overline{Y}$ are the closed subsets for a topology, the **Zariski topology**.

EXAMPLE 2.8. *Take R and X as above, but now let S be any set of ideals of R and put $Y = 2^S$. For $I \in X$, put*

$$\Phi(I) = V(I) = \{\mathfrak{s} \in S \mid I \subset \mathfrak{s}\}$$

and for $V \in \mathcal{Y}$, put

$$\Psi(V) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{s} \in V} \mathfrak{s}.$$

---

[1]There is a small paradox here: in purely order-theoretic terms this example is not any more interesting than the previous one. But in practice given two partially ordered sets it is infinitely more useful to have a pair of mutually inverse antitone maps running between them than the trivial operators of the previous example: Galois theory is a shining example! The paradox already shows up in the distinction between indiscrete spaces and discrete spaces: although neither topology looks more interesting than the other, the discrete topology is natural and useful (as we shall see...) whereas the indiscrete topology entirely deserves its alternate name "trivial".

Once again Φ and Ψ are antitone maps and (1) holds, so we get a Galois connection. The associated closure operation on X is

$$I \mapsto \overline{I} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{s} \in S} \mathfrak{s}.$$

*The relation (4) holds for any S, and the relation (2) holds so long as $R \notin S$. The verification of (3) for $R = \mathrm{Spec}\, R$ uses the fact that a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ contains $I_1 I_2$ iff it contains I_1 or I_2, so as long as $S \subset \mathrm{Spec}\, S$, $\overline{Y} = \{V(I) \mid I \in X\}$ are the closed subsets for a topology on S. This is indeed the topology S inherits as a subspace of $\mathrm{Spec}\, R$, so we call it the **(relative) Zariski topology**.*

    *Various particular choices of $S \subset \mathrm{Spec}\, R$ have been considered. Of these the most important is certainly $S = \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$, the set of all maximal ideals of R. In this case, $\overline{X}$ consists of all ideals which can be written as the intersection of some family of maximal ideals. Such ideals are necessarily radical, but in a general ring not all radical ideals are obtained in this way. Observe that in a general ring every radical ideal is the intersection of the maximal ideals containing it iff every prime ideal is the intersection of maximal ideals containing it; a ring satisfying these equivalent conditions is called a **Jacobson ring**.*

    EXAMPLE 2.9. *Let k be a field and put $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Then R is a Jacobson ring (Proposition 11.3).*

    *Suppose that k is algebraically closed. Then Zariski's Lemma assumes a stronger form: for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$, the k-algebra $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is equal to k. Let $q : R \to R/\mathfrak{m} = k$ be the quotient map, and for $1 \le i \le n$, put $x_i = q(t_i)$ and $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. It follows that $\mathfrak{m}$ contains the ideal $\mathfrak{m}_x = \langle t_1 - x_1, \ldots, t_n - x_n \rangle$, and since $\mathfrak{m}_x$ is maximal, $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_x$. This gives the following description of the Galois connection between the set X of ideals of R and $Y = 2^{\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R}$, **Hilbert's Nullstellensatz**:*
*(i) Maximal ideals of R are canonically in bijection with n-tuples of points of k, i.e., with points of **affine n-space** $\mathbb{A}^n_{/k}$.*
(ii) The closure operation on ideals takes I to its radical ideal $\mathrm{rad}\, I$.
(iii) The closure operation on subsets of $\mathbb{A}^n$ coincides with topological closure with respect to the Zariski topology, i.e., the topology on $\mathbb{A}^n$ for which the closed subsets are the intersections of the zero sets of polynomial functions.

    EXAMPLE 2.10. *Let K be a field, let $X = 2^K$, let $\mathrm{RSpec}\, K$ be the set of orderings on K, and let $Y = 2^{\mathrm{RSpec}\, K}$. Let $H : X \to Y$ by*

$$S \mapsto H(S) = \{P \in \mathrm{RSpec}\, K \mid \forall x \in S \ x >_P 0\}.$$

Let $\Psi : Y \to X$ by

$$T \mapsto \Psi(T) = \{x \in \mathrm{RSpec}\, K \mid \forall P \in T \ x >_P 0\}.$$

Then (X, Y, H, Ψ) is a Galois connection.

    *The set $\mathrm{RSpec}\, K$ carries a natural topology. Namely, we may view any ordering P as an element of $\{\pm 1\}^{K^\times}$: $P : x \in K^\times \mapsto +1$ if $P(x) > 0$ and -1 is $P(x) < 0$. Giving $\{\pm 1\}$ the discrete topology and $\{\pm 1\}^{K^\times}$, it is a compact (by Tychonoff's Theorem) zero-dimensional space, hence a **Boolean space** in the sense of §9.5. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{RSpec}\, K$ embeds in $\{\pm 1\}^{K^\times}$ as a closed subspace, and therefore $\mathrm{RSpec}\, K$ is itself a **Boolean space**.*

EXAMPLE 2.11. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a language, let X be the set of $\mathcal{L}$-theories, and let Y be the class of all classes $\mathcal{C}$ of $\mathcal{L}$-structures, partially ordered by inclusion.[2] For a theory $\mathcal{T}$, let $\Phi(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{T}$ be the class of all models of $\mathcal{T}$, whereas for a class $\mathcal{C}$, we define $\Psi(\mathcal{C})$ to be the collection of all sentences φ such that for all $X \in \mathcal{C}$, $X \models \varphi$.*

4. Antitone Galois Connections Decorticated: Relations

Example: Let S and T be sets, and let $R \subset S \times T$ be a **relation** between S and T. As is traditional, we use the notation xRy for $(x, y) \in R$. For $A \subset S$ and $y \in T$, we let us write ARy if xRy for all $x \in A$; and dually, for $x \in S$ and $B \subset T$, let us write xRB if xRy for all $y \in B$. Finally, for $A \subset S$, $B \subset T$, let us write ARB if xRy for all $x \in A$ and all $y \in B$.

Let $X = (2^S, \subset)$, $Y = (2^T, \subset)$. For $A \subset S$ and $B \subset T$, we put

$$\Phi_R(A) = \{y \in T \mid ARy\},$$

$$\Psi_R(B) = \{x \in S \mid xRB\}.$$

We claim that $\mathcal{G}_R = (X, Y, \Phi_R, \Psi_R)$ is a Galois connection. Indeed, it is immediate that Φ_R and Ψ_R are both antitone maps; moreover, for all $A \subset S$, $B \subset T$ we have

$$A \subset \Psi_R(B) \iff ARB \iff B \subset \Phi_R(A).$$

Remarkably, this example includes most of the Galois connections above. Indeed:

- In Example 2.2, take X to be 2^K and $Y = 2^{\mathrm{Aut}(K/F)}$. The induced Galois connection is the one associated to the relation $gx = x$ on $K \times \mathrm{Aut}(K/F)$.
- In Example 2.5, take X to be 2^R. The induced Galois connection is the one associated to the relation $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ on $R \times \mathrm{Spec}\, R$. Similarly for Examples 2.7 and 2.8.
- The Galois connection of Example 2.8 is the one associated to the relation $x \in P$ on $K \times \mathrm{RSpec}\, K$.
- The Galois connection of Example 2.9 is the one associated to the relation $X \models \varphi$.

THEOREM 2.12. *Let S and T be sets, let $X = (2^S, \subset)$, $Y = (2^S, \subset)$, and let $\mathcal{G} = (X, Y, \Phi, \Psi)$ be any Galois connection. Define a relation $R \subset S \times T$ by xRy if $y \in \Phi(\{x\})$. Then $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_R$.*

PROOF. Note first that X and Y are complete lattices, so Lemma 2.5b) applies. Indeed, for $A \subset S$, $A = \bigcup_{x \in A} \{x\} = \bigvee_{x \in A} \{x\}$, so

$$\Phi(A) = \bigcap_{x \in A} \Phi(\{x\}) = \bigcap_{x \in A} \{y \in T \mid xRy\} = \{y \in T \mid ARy\} = \Phi_R(A).$$

Moreover, since $\mathcal{G}$ is a Galois connection we have $\{x\} \subset \Psi(\{y\}) \iff \{y\} \subset \Phi(\{x\}) \iff xRy$. Thus for $B \subset T$, $B = \bigcup_{y \in B} \{y\} = \bigvee_{y \in B} \{y\}$, so

$$\Psi(B) = \bigcap_{y \in B} \Psi(\{y\}) = \bigcap_{y \in A} \{x \in S \mid xRy\} = \{x \in S \mid xRB\} = \Psi_R(B). \qquad \square$$

For any partially ordered set $(X, \leq)$, a **downset** is a subset $Y \subset X$ such that for all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, if $x_2 \in Y$ and $x_1 \leq x_2$ then $x_1 \in Y$. Let $D(X)$ be the collection of all downsets of X, viewed as a subset of $(2^X, \subset)$. To each $x \in X$ we may associate the **principal downset** $d(x) = \{y \in X \mid y \leq x\}$. The map $d : X \to D(X)$ is an

---

[2]Here we are cheating a bit by taking instead of a partially ordered set, a *partially ordered class.* We leave it to the interested reader to devise a remedy.

order embedding; composing this with the inclusion $D(X) \subset 2^X$ we see that every partially ordered set embeds into a power set lattice.

Let $\mathcal{G} = (X, Y, \Phi, \Psi)$ be a Galois connection with X and Y complete lattices. Then we may extend $\mathcal{G}$ to a Galois conection between 2^X and 2^Y as follows: for $A \subset X$, put $\Phi(A) = \bigwedge \{\Phi(x)\}_{x \in A}$, and simialrly for $B \subset Y$, put $\Psi(B) = \bigwedge \{\Psi(y)\}_{y \in B}$. Thus every Galois connection between complete lattices may be viewed as the Galois connection induced by a relation between sets.

5. Isotone Galois Connections

Let $(X, \leq)$ and $(Y, \leq)$ be partially ordered sets. An **isotone Galois connection between X and Y** is a pair of maps $\Phi : X \to Y$ and $\Psi : Y \to X$ such that:

(IGC1) Φ and Ψ are both isotone maps, and
(IGC2) For all $x \in X$ and all $y \in Y$, $\Phi(x) \leq y \iff x \leq \Psi(y)$.

In contrast to the antitone case, this time there is an *asymmetry* between Φ and Ψ. We call Φ the **lower adjoint** and Ψ the **upper adjoint**.

At the abstract level, the concepts of antitone and isotone Galois connection are manifestly equivalent.

EXERCISE 2.5. *Let X, Y be partially ordered sets, and let $\Phi : X \to Y$, $\Psi : Y \to X$ be functions.*
a) Show that (Φ, Ψ) is an antitone Galois connection between X and Y iff (Φ, Ψ) is an isotone Galois connection between $X^{\vee}$ and Y.
b) Show that (Φ, Ψ) is an antitone Galois connection between X and Y iff (Ψ, Φ) is an isotone Galois connection between $Y^{\vee}$ and X.

If $(X, \leq)$ is a partially ordered set, then a mapping $f : X \to X$ is called an **interior operator** if it satisfies all of the following properties:

(I1) For all $x \in X$, $x \geq f(x)$.
(C2) For all $x_1, x_2 \in X$, $x_1 \leq x_2 \implies f(x_1) \leq f(x_2)$.
(C3) For all $x \in X$, $f(f(x)) = f(x)$.

EXERCISE 2.6. *Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set, and let $f : X \to X$ be a function. Show: f is a closure operator iff $f : X^{\vee} \to X^{\vee}$ is an interior operator.*

PROPOSITION 2.13. *Let (Φ, Ψ) be an isotone Galois connection. Then $\Psi \circ \Phi$ is an interior operator on $(X, \leq)$, and $\Phi \circ \Psi$ is a closure operator on $(Y, \leq)$.*

PROOF. By Exercise 2.5, (Φ, Ψ) is an antitone Galois connection between $X^{\vee}$ and Y, so by Proposition 2.1, $\Phi \circ \Psi$ is a closure operator on Y and $\Psi \circ \Phi$ is a closure operator on $X^{\vee}$ and thus, by Exercise 2.5, an interior operator on X.   □

6. Examples of Isotone Galois Connections

Example (Galois connection of a function): Let $f : S \to T$ be a function. Let $X = (2^S, \subset)$ and $Y = (2^T, \subset)$. For $A \subset S$ and $B \subset T$, put

$$f_*(S) = f(S) = \{f(s) \mid s \in S\}, \ f^*(T) = f^{-1}(B) = \{s \in S \mid f(s) \in B\}.$$

EXERCISE 2.7. *a) Show: (f^*, f_*) is an isotone Galois connection between 2^T and 2^S.*

*b) Show that the interior operator $f_* \circ f^* : B \subset T \mapsto B \cap f(S)$. In particular the Galois connection is **left perfect** iff f is surjective.*

*c) Show that the Galois connection is **right perfect** – i.e., $f^* f_* A = A$ for all $A \subset S$ – iff f is injective.*

d) Interpret this isotone Galois connection in terms of the "universal" antitone Galois connection of §2.4.

EXAMPLE 2.14. *(Galois Connection of a Ring Homomorphism): Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings, and let $\mathcal{I}(R)$ and $\mathcal{I}(S)$ be the lattices of ideals of R and S. In §1.5 we defined a pushforward map*

$$f_* : \mathcal{I}(R) \to \mathcal{I}(S), \ f_*(I) = \langle f(I) \rangle$$

and a pullback map

$$f^* : \mathcal{I}(S) \to \mathcal{I}(R), \ f^*(J) = f^{-1}(J).$$

PROPOSITION 2.15. *The maps (f^*, f_*) give an isotone Galois connection between $\mathcal{I}(S)$ and $\mathcal{I}(T)$.*

EXERCISE 2.8. *Prove Proposition 2.15.*

Modules

1. Basic definitions

Suppose $(M, +)$ is a commutative group. For any $m \in M$ and any integer n, one can make sense of $n \bullet m$. If n is a positive integer, this means $m + \cdots + m$ (n times); if $n = 0$ it means 0, and if n is negative, then $n \bullet m = -(-n) \bullet m$. Thus we have defined a function $\bullet : \mathbb{Z} \times M \to M$ which enjoys the following properties: for all n, n_1, $n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, m, m_1, $m_2 \in M$, we have

(ZMOD1) $1 \bullet m = m$.
(ZMOD2) $n \bullet (m_1 + m_2) = n \bullet m_1 + n \bullet m_2$.
(ZMOD3) $(n_1 + n_2) \bullet m = n_1 \bullet m + n_2 \bullet m$.
(ZMOD4) $(n_1 n_2) \bullet m = n_1 \bullet (n_2 \bullet m)$

It should be clear that this is some kind of ring-theoretic analogue of a group action on a set. In fact, consider the slightly more general construction of a monoid $(M, \cdot)$ acting on a set S: that is, for all n_1, $n_2 \in M$ and $s \in S$, we require $1 \bullet s = s$ and $(n_1 n_2) \bullet s = n_1 \bullet (n_2 \bullet s)$.

For a group action G on S, each function $g \bullet : S \to S$ is a bijection. For monoidal actions, this need not hold for all elements: e.g. taking the natural multiplication action of $M = (\mathbb{Z}, \cdot)$ on $S = \mathbb{Z}$, we find that $0 \bullet : \mathbb{Z} \to \{0\}$ is neither injective nor surjective, $\pm 1 \bullet : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ is bijective, and for $|n| > 1$, $n \bullet : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ is injective but not surjective.

EXERCISE 3.1. *Let $\bullet : M \times S \to S$ be a monoidal action on a set. Show that for each unit $m \in M$ – i.e., an element for which there exists m' with $mm' = m'm = 1$ – $m \bullet : S \to S$ is a bijection.*

Then the above "action" of $\mathbb{Z}$ on a commutative group M is in particular a monoidal action of $(\mathbb{Z}, \cdot)$ on the set M. But it is more: M has an additive structure, and (ZMOD2) asserts that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \bullet$ respects this structure – i.e., is a homomorphism of groups; also (ZMOD3) is a compatibility between the additive structure on $\mathbb{Z}$ and the additive structure on M.

These axioms can be restated in a much more compact form. For a commutative group M, an **endomorphism** of M is just a group homomorphism from M to itself: $f : M \to M$. We write $\mathrm{End}(M)$ for the set of all endomorphisms of M. But $\mathrm{End}(M)$ has lots of additional structure: for $f, g \in \mathrm{End}(M)$ we define $f + g \in \mathrm{End}(M)$ by

$$(f + g)(m) := f(m) + g(m),$$

i.e., pointwise addition. We can also define $f \cdot g \in \mathrm{End}(M)$ by composition:

$$(f \cdot g)(m) := f(g(m)).$$

PROPOSITION 3.1. *For any commutative group M, the set $\mathrm{End}(M)$ of group endomorphisms of M, endowed with pointwise addition and multiplication by composition, has the structure of a ring.*

EXERCISE 3.2. *Prove Proposition 3.1.*

EXERCISE 3.3. *Show:* $\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$, *and for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,* $\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. *(More precisely, find canonical isomorphisms.)*

These simple examples are potentially misleading: we did not say that the multiplication was commutative, and of course there is no reason to expect composition of functions to be commutative.

EXERCISE 3.4.   a) *Show:* $\mathrm{End}(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) = M_2(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$, *the (noncommutative!) ring of 2×2 matrices with $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients.*
    b) *If M is a commutative group and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, show $\mathrm{End}(M^n) = M_n(\mathrm{End}(M))$.*

Now observe that the statement that the action of $\mathbb{Z}$ on M satisfes (ZMOD1) through (ZMOD4) is equivalent to the following much more succinct statement:

For any commutative group M, the map $n \in \mathbb{Z} \mapsto (n\bullet) : M \to M$ is a homomorphism of rings $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathrm{End}(M)$.

This generalizes very cleanly: if R is any ring (not necessarily commuative) and M is a commutative group, a homomorphism $\bullet : R \to \mathrm{End}(M)$ will satisfy: for all $r \in R$, $m, m_1, m_2 \in M$:

(LRMOD1) $1 \bullet m = m$.
(LRMOD2) $r \bullet (m_1 + m_2) = r \bullet m_1 + r \bullet m_2$.
(LRMOD3) $(r_1 + r_2) \bullet m = r_1 \bullet m + r_2 \bullet m$.
(LRMOD4) $(r_1 r_2) \bullet m = r_1 \bullet (r_2 \bullet m)$.

The terminology here is that such a homomorphism $r \mapsto (r\bullet)$ is a **left R-module structure** on the commutative group M.

What then is a **right R-module structure** on M? The pithy version is that it is a ring homomorphism from R^{op}, the opposite ring of R to $\mathrm{End}(M)$. This definition makes clear (only?) that if R is commutative, there is no difference between left and right R-module structures. Since our interest is in the commutative case, we may therefore not worry too much. But for the record:

EXERCISE 3.5. *Show: a homomorphism $R^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathrm{End}(M)$ is equivalent to a mapping $\bullet : M \times R \to M$ satisfying*

$$m \bullet 1 = m,$$

$$(m_1 + m_2) \bullet r = m_1 \bullet r + m_2 \bullet r,$$

$$m \bullet (r_1 + r_2) = m \bullet r_1 + m \bullet r_2,$$

$$m \bullet (r_1 r_2) = (m \bullet r_1) \bullet r_2.$$

As usual for multiplicative notation, we will generally suppress the bullet, writing rm for left R-modules and mr for right R-modules.

The calculus of left and right actions is at the same time confusing and somewhat miraculous: it is a somewhat disturbing example of a purely lexicographical convention that has – or looks like it has – actual mathematical content. Especially, suppose we have a commutative group M and two rings R and S, such that M simultaneously has the structure of a left R-module and a right S-module. Thus we wish to entertain expressions such as rms for $m \in M$, $r \in R$, $s \in S$. But as stands this expression is ambiguous: it could mean either

$$(r \bullet m) \bullet s$$

or

$$r \bullet (m \bullet s).$$

We say that M is an **R-S bimodule** if both of these expressions agree. Here is what is strange about this: lexicographically, it is an associativity condition. But "really" it is a commutativity condition: it expresses the fact that for all $r \in R$, $s \in S$, $(r\bullet) \circ (\bullet s) = (\bullet s) \circ (r\bullet)$: every endomorphism coming from an element of R commutes with every endomorphism coming from an element of S. Thus for instance:

EXERCISE 3.6. *Show: any ring R is naturally an $R - R$-bimodule.*

We will not deal with bimodules further in these notes. In fact, when we say R-module at all, it will be understood to mean a left R-module, and again, since we shall only be talking about commutative rings soon enough, the distinction between left and right need not be made at all.

Definition: For M a left R-module, we define its **annihilator**

$$\text{ann}(M) = \{r \in R \mid \forall m \in M, rm = 0\}.$$

Equivalently, $\text{ann}(M)$ is the set of all r such that $r\cdot = 0 \in \text{End}(M)$, so that it is precisely the kernel of the associated ring homomorphism $R \to \text{End}(M)$. It follows that $\text{ann}(M)$ is an ideal of R (note: two-sided, in the noncommutative case).

Definition: A left R-module M is **faithful** if $\text{ann}(M) = 0$. Explicitly, this means that for all $0 \neq r \in R$, there exists $m \in M$ such that $rm \neq 0$.

EXERCISE 3.7. *Let M be an R-module. Show that M has the natural structure of a faithful $R/\text{ann}(M)$-module.*

Definition: Let M be a left R-module. A **submodule** of M is a subgroup N of $(M, +)$ such that $RN \subset N$. The following result is extremely easy and all-important:

THEOREM 3.2. *Let R be a ring. The left R-submodules of R are precisely the left ideals of R.*

EXERCISE 3.8. *Prove Theorem 3.2.*

Definition: Let M and N be left R-modules. A **homomorphism** of R-modules is a homomorphism of commutative groups $f : M \to N$ such that for all $r \in R$, $m \in M$, $n \in N$, $f(rm) = rf(m)$.

EXERCISE 3.9. *a) Define an isomorphism of R-modules in the correct way, i.e., not as a bijective homomorphism of R-modules.*
b) Show that a homomorphism of R-modules is an isomorphism iff it is bijective.

If N is a submodule of a left R-module M, then the quotient group M/N has a natural R-module structure. More precisely, there is a unique left R-module structure on M/N such that the quotient map $M \to M/N$ is a homomorphism of R-modules. (Exercise!)

EXERCISE 3.10. *Let I be a two-sided ideal of the not-necessarily-commutative ring R, so the quotient ring R/I has the structure of a left R-module. Show:*
$$\operatorname{ann}(R/I) = I.$$
In particular, every two-sided ideal of R occurs as the annihilator of a left R-module.

EXERCISE 3.11. *a) Let R be a ring and $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ a family of R-modules. Consider the commutative group $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$. Show that putting $r(m_i) = (rm_i)$ makes R into an R-module. Show that the usual inclusion map $\iota_i : M_i \to M$ is a homomorphism of R-modules.*
b) Show that for any R-module N and R-module maps $f_i : M_i \to N$, there exists a unique R-module map $f : M \to N$ such that $f_i = f \circ \iota_i$ for all $i \in I$. Thus M satisfies the universal mapping property of the direct sum.

As a matter of notation, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $R^n := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} R$, $R^0 = 0$.

EXERCISE 3.12. *Work out the analogue of Exercise 3.11 for direct products.*

EXERCISE 3.13. *a) Suppose M is an R-module and S is a subset of M. Show that the intersection of all R-submodules of M containing S is an R-submodule, and is contained in every R-submodule that contains S. We call it the R-submodule* **generated** *by S and denote it by $\langle S \rangle$. If $S = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ is finite, we usually write $\langle x_1, ..., x_n \rangle$ instead of $\langle \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \rangle$.*
b) If $S = \{s_i\}_{i \in I}$, show that the R-module generated by S is the set of all sums $\sum_{i \in J} r_i s_i$, where J is a finite subset of S.

An R-module M is **cyclic** (or **monogenic**) if $M = \langle x \rangle$ for some $x \in X$.

EXERCISE 3.14. *Show: for an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $M \cong R/\operatorname{ann}(M)$.
(ii) M is cylic.

EXERCISE 3.15. *Suppose k is a field. Show: the terms "k-module" and "vector space over k" are synonymous.*

One can therefore view the theory of R-modules as a generalization of vector spaces to arbitrary rings. But really this is something like a zeroth order approximation of the truth: for a general ring R, the theory of R-modules is incomparably richer than the theory of vector spaces over a field. There are two explanations for this. First, even when working with very simple R-modules such as R^n, the usual linear algebra notions of linear independence, span and basis remain meaningful, but behave in unfamiliar ways:

Call a subset S of an R-module M **linearly independent** if for every finite subset $m_1, \ldots, m_n$ of S and any $r_1, \ldots, r_n \in R$, $r_1 m_1 + \ldots + r_n m_n = 0$ implies

$r_1 = \ldots = r_n = 0$. Say that S **spans** R if the R-submodule generated by S is R, and finally a **basis** for an R-module is a subset which is both linearly independent and spanning. For example, for any set I, the R-module $\bigoplus_i R$ has a basis e_i.

In linear algebra – i.e., when R is a field – every R-module has a basis.[1] However the situation is quite different over a general ring:

THEOREM 3.3. *a) Let M be an R-module. Suppose that $S \subset R$ is a basis. Then M is isomorphic as an R-module to $\bigoplus_{s \in S} R$.*
b) Let S be any set, and consider the R-module $R_S := \bigoplus_{s \in S} R$. For each $s \in S$, let $e_s \in \bigoplus_{s \in S} R$ be the element whose s-coordinate is 1 and all of whose other coordinates are 0. Then set $\{e_s\}_{s \in S}$ is a basis for R_S.

EXERCISE 3.16. *Prove Theorem 3.3.*

A module which has a basis – so, by the theorem, admits an isomorphism to $\bigoplus_{s \in S} R$ for some index set S – is called **free**.

EXERCISE 3.17. *Show: a nonzero free R-module is faithful.*

Let us examine the case of modules over $R = \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., of commutative groups. Here the term **free commutative group** is synonymous with "free $\mathbb{Z}$-module". Needless to say (right?), not all commutative groups are free: for any integer $n > 1$, $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is not free, since it has nonzero annihilator $n\mathbb{Z}$. Thus $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ does not have a basis as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, and indeed has no nonempty linearly independent subsets!

PROPOSITION 3.4. *For a commutative ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) Every R-module is free.
(ii) R is a field.

PROOF. As discussed above, (ii) $\implies$ (i) is a fundamental theorem of linear algebra, so we need only concern ourselves with the converse. But if R is not a field, then there exists a nonzero proper ideal I, and then R/I is a nontrivial R-module with $0 \neq I = \mathrm{ann}(R/I)$, so by Exercise 3.16 R/I is not free. $\qquad \square$

Remark: If R is a not-necessarily-commutative ring such that every left R-module is free, then the above argument shows R has no nonzero proper twosided ideals, so is what is called a **simple ring**. But a noncommutative simple ring may still admit a nonfree module. For instance, let k be a field and take $R = M_2(k)$, the 2×2 matrix ring over k. Then $k \oplus k$ is a left R-module which is not free. However, suppose R is a ring with no proper nontrivial one-sided ideals. Then R is a division ring – i.e., every nonzero element of R is a unit – and every R-module is free.

In linear algebra – i.e., when R is a field – every linearly independent subset of an R-module can be extended to a basis. Over a general ring this does not hold even for free R-modules. For instance, take $R = M = \mathbb{Z}$. A moment's thought reveals that the only two bases are $\{1\}$ and $\{-1\}$, whereas the linearly independent sets are precisely the singleton sets $\{n\}$ as n ranges over the nonzero integers.

Note well the form of Proposition 3.4: we assume that R is a commutative ring for

––––––––––
[1] This uses, and is in fact equivalent to, the Axiom of Choice, but the special case that any vector space with a finite spanning set has a basis does not.

which R-modules satisfy some nice property, and we deduce a result on the struc-
ture of R. Such "inverse problems" have a broad appeal throughout mathematics
and provide one of the major motivations for studying modules above and beyond
their linear algebraic origins. We will see other such characterizations later on.

2. Finitely presented modules

One of the major differences between commutative groups and noncommutative
groups is that a subgroup N of a finitely generated commutative group M remains
finitely generated, and indeed, the minimal number of generators of the subgroup
N cannot exceed the minimal number of generators of M, whereas this is not true
for nonabelian groups: e.g. the free group of rank 2 has as subgroups free groups
of every rank $0 \leq r \leq \aleph_0$. (For instance, the commutator subgroup is not finitely
generated.)

Since an commutative group is a $\mathbb{Z}$-module and every R-module has an underlying
commutative group structure, one might well expect the situation for R-modules to
be similar to that of commutative groups. We will see later that this is true in many
but not all cases: an R-module is called **Noetherian** if all of its submodules are
finitely generated. Certainly a Noetherian module is itself finitely generated. The
basic fact here – which we will prove in §8.7 – is a partial converse: if the ring R
is Noetherian, any finitely generated R-module is Noetherian. We can already see
that the Noetherianity of R is necessary: if R is not Noetherian, then by definition
there exists an ideal I of R which is not finitely generated, and this is nothing else
than a non-finitely generated R-submodule of R (which is itself generated by the
single element 1.) Thus the aforementioned fact about subgroups of finitely gener-
ated commutative groups being finitely generated holds because $\mathbb{Z}$ is a Noetherian
ring.

When R is not Noetherian, it becomes necessary to impose stronger conditions
than finite generation on modules. One such condition indeed comes from group
theory: recall that a group G is **finitely presented** if it is isomorphic to the quo-
tient of a finitely generated free group F by the least normal subgroup N generated
by a finite subset $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ of F.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *For a finitely generated R-module M, the following are
equivalent:*
(i) There exist non-negative integers m, n and an exact sequence

$$R^m \to R^n \to M \to 0.$$

*(ii) M is the quotient of a finitely generated free R-module by a finitely generated
submodule.*
*A module M satisfying these equivalent conditions is said to be **finitely presented**.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is immediate. Conversely, let $M = R^n/N$ where N is
finitely generated. Then there exists a surjection $R^m \to N$ and thus the sequence

$$R^m \to R^n \to M \to 0$$

is exact.   □

PROPOSITION 3.6. *Let*

$$0 \to K \overset{\psi}{\to} N \overset{\phi}{\to} M \to 0$$

be a short exact sequence of R-modules, with M finitely presented and N finitely generated. Then K is finitely generated.

PROOF. (Matsumura) By definition of finitely presented, we can place M in an exact sequence

(5) $$R^m \to R^n \overset{f}{\to} M \to 0$$

for some $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let e_i be the ith standard basis element of M, let $m_i = f(e_i)$ be the image in M, and choose $n_i \in N$ any element in $\phi^{-1}(m_i)$. Then there is a unique R-module homomorphism $\alpha : R^n \to N$ given by $\alpha(e_i) = n_i$, which restricts to an R-module homomorphism $\beta : B^m \to K$. Altogether we get a commutative diagram

$$R^m \longrightarrow R^n \overset{f}{\longrightarrow} M \longrightarrow 0$$

$$0 \longrightarrow K \overset{\psi}{\longrightarrow} N \overset{\phi}{\longrightarrow} M.$$

The rest of the proof is essentially a diagram chase. Suppose $N = \langle \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k \rangle_R$, and choose $v_1, \ldots, v_k \in R^n$ such that $\phi(\xi_i) = f(v_i)$. Put

$$\xi_i' = \xi_i - \alpha(v_i).$$

Then $\varphi(\xi_i') = 0$, so there exist unique $\eta_i \in K$ such that

$$\xi_i' = \psi(\eta_i).$$

We CLAIM that K is generated as an R-module by $\beta(R^m)$ and $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k$ and thus is finitely generated. Indeed, for $\eta \in K$, there are $r_1, \ldots, r_k \in R$ such that

$$\psi(\eta) = \sum_i r_i \xi_i.$$

Then

$$\psi(\eta - \sum_i r_i \eta_i) = \sum_i r_i(\xi_i - \xi_i') = \alpha(\sum_i r_i v_i).$$

Since

$$0 = \phi(\alpha(\sum_i r_i v_i)) = f(\sum_i r_i v_i),$$

we may write $\sum_i r_i v_i = g(u)$ with $u \in R^m$. Then

$$\psi(\beta(u)) = \alpha(g(u)) = \alpha(\sum_i r_i v_i) = \psi(\eta - \sum_i r_i \eta_i).$$

Since ψ is injective, we conclude

$$\eta = \beta(u) + \sum_i r_i \eta_i. \qquad \square$$

EXERCISE 3.18. *Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be a short exact sequence of R-modules.*
a) Show: if M' and M'' are both finitely presented, so is M.
b) Show": if M is finitely presented and M' is finitely generated, then M'' is finitely presented.

A stronger condition still is the following: an R-module M is **coherent** if it is finitely generated and every finitely generated submodule is finitely presented. Evidently coherent implies finitely presented implies finitely generated, and all three coincide over a Noetherian ring. The significance of coherence lies in the following:

THEOREM 3.7. *Let R be a not-necessarily-commutative ring.*
a) *The category of all left R-modules is an abelian category.*
b) *The category of all coherent left R-modules is an abelian category.*
c) *In particular, if R is left Noetherian, the category of all finitely generated left R-modules is an abelian category.*
d) *There exists a commutative ring R for which the category of all finitely generated (left) R-modules is **not** abelian.*

The proof of this result – and even an explanation of the term "abelian category" is beyond the scope of this text, so this is definitely an ancillary remark. Nevertheless we hope that it will be of some use to students of algebraic geometry: for instance, it explains the fact that Hartshorne only defines coherent sheaves of modules on a scheme X in the case that the scheme is Noetherian and suggests the correct (and more subtle) definition in the non-Noetherian case.

3. Torsion and torsionfree modules

Let R be a domain, and let M be an R-module. An element $x \in M$ is said to be **torsion** if there exists $0 \neq a \in R$ such that $ax = 0$. Equivalently, the annihilator $\text{ann}(x) = \{a \in R \mid ax = 0\}$ is a nonzero ideal of R. We define $M[\text{tors}]$ to be the set of all torsion elements of M. It is immediate to see that $M[\text{tors}]$ is a submodule of M. We say that M is a **torsion** R-module if $M = M[\text{tors}]$ and that M is **torsionfree** if $M[\text{tors}] = 0$.

EXERCISE 3.19. *Let $0 \to M_1 \to M \to M_2 \to 0$ be an exact sequence.*
a) *Show that if M is torsion, so are M_1 and M_2.*
b) *If M_1 and M_2 are torsion modules, must M be torsion?*
c) *Show that if M is torsionfree, show that so is M_1, but M_2 need not be.*
d) *If M_1 and M_2 are torsionfree, must M be torsionfree?*

PROPOSITION 3.8. *Let R be a domain and M an R-module.*
a) *The quotient $M/M[\text{tors}]$ is torsionfree.*
b) *If M is finitely generated, the following are equivalent:*
    (i) *M embeds in a finitely generated free R-module.*
    (ii) *M is torsionfree.*

PROOF. a) Put $N = M/M[\text{tors}]$, and let $\overline{x} \in N$ be such that there exists $0 \neq a \in R$ with $a\overline{x} = 0$. Let x be any lift of $\overline{x}$ to M; then there exists $t \in M[\text{tors}]$ such that $ax = t$. By definition of torsion, there exists $a' \in R$ such that $a't = 0$, so $a'ax = a't = 0$. Since R is a domain, $a'a$ is nonzero, so $x \in M[\text{tors}]$ and $\overline{x} = 0$.
b) (i) $\implies$ (ii) is very easy: free modules are torsionfree and submodules of torsionfree modules are torsionfree.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): We may assume $M \neq 0$. Let $M = \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$ with $r \geq 1$ and all the x_i are nonzero. Further, after reordering the x_i's if necessary, there exists a unique s, $1 \leq s \leq r$, such that $\{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$ is linearly independent over R but for all i with $s < i \leq r$, $\{x_1, \dots x_s, x_i\}$ is linearly dependent over R. Then $F = \langle x_1, \dots, x_s \rangle \cong R^s$,

so we are done if $s = r$. If $s < r$, then for each $i > s$ there exists $0 \neq a_i \in R$ such that $a_i x_i \in F$. Put $a = \prod_{s < i \leq r} a_i$: then $aM \subset F$. Let $[a] : M \to M$ denote multiplication by a. Since M is torsionfree, $[a]$ is injective hence gives an R-module isomorphism from M to a submodule of the finitely generated free module F. $\quad\square$

EXERCISE 3.20. *Show: the torsionfree $\mathbb{Z}$-module $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$ is not isomorphic to a submodule of any finitely generated free $\mathbb{Z}$-module.*
(Thus – even for very nice rings! – the hypothesis of finite generation is necessary in Proposition 3.8.)

4. Tensor and Hom

4.1. Tensor products.

We assume that the reader has some prior familiarity with tensor products, say of vector spaces and/or of abelian groups. The first is an instance of tensor products of k-modules, for some field k, and the second is an instance of tensor products of $\mathbb{Z}$-modules. We want to give a general definition of $M \otimes_R N$, where M and N are two R-modules.

There are two ways to view the tensor product construction: as a solution to a universal mapping problem, and as a generators and relations construction. They are quite complementary, so it is a matter of taste as to which one takes as "the" definition. So we will follow our taste by introducing the mapping problem first:

Suppose M, N, P are R-modules. By an R-**bilinear** map $f : M \times N \to P$ we mean a function which is separately R-linear in each variable: for all $m \in M$, the mapping $n \mapsto f(m, n)$ is R-linear, and for each $n \in N$, the mapping $m \mapsto f(m, n)$ is R-linear. Now consider all pairs (T, ι), where T is an R-module and $\iota : M \times N \to T$ is an R-bilinear map. A morphism from (T, ι) to (T', ι') will be an R-module homomorphism $h : T \to T'$ such that $\iota' = h \circ \iota$. By definition, a tensor product $M \otimes_R N$ is an initial object in this category: i.e., it comes equipped with an R-bilinear map $M \times N \xrightarrow{} M \otimes_R N$ such that any R-bilinear map $f : M \times N \to P$ factors through it. As usual, the initial object of a category is unique up to unique isomorphism provided it exists.

As for the existence, we fall back on the generators and relations construction. Namely, we begin with the free R-module F whose basis is $M \times N$, and we write the basis elements (purely formally) as $m \otimes n$. We then take the quotient by the submodule generated by the following relations R:

$$(x + x') \otimes y - x \otimes y - x' \otimes y,$$
$$x \otimes (y + y') - x \otimes y - x \otimes y',$$
$$(ax) \otimes y - a(x \otimes y),$$
$$x \otimes (ay) - a(x \otimes y).$$

It is then easy to see that the quotient map $M \times N \to F/N$ satisfies all the properties of a tensor product (details left to the reader).

Note that the general element of $M \otimes_R N$ is not a single element of the form $x \otimes y$ but rather a finite sum of such elements. (Indeed, from the free R-module, every

element can be represented by a finite R-linear combination of elements of the form $x \otimes y$, but the last two defining relations in the tensor product allow us to change $r_i(x \otimes y)$ to either $(r_i x) \otimes y$ or $x \otimes (r_i y)$.) Of course, this representation of an element of the tensor product need not be (and will never be, except in trivial cases) unique.

One can also take the tensor product of R-algebras: if R is a (commutative!) ring and A and B are commutative R-algebras, then on the tensor product $A \otimes_R B$ we have a naturally defined product, induced by $(a_1 \otimes b_1) \cdot (a_2 \otimes b_2) := (a_1 a_2 \otimes b_1 b_2)$. We have to check that this is well-defined, a task which we leave to the reader (or see [**AM**, pp. 30-31])). The tensor product of algebras is a powerful tool – e.g. in the structure theory of finite-dimensional algebras over a field, or in the theory of linear disjointness of field extensions – and is given misleadingly short shrift in most elementary treatments.

Base change: Suppose that M is an R-module and $f : R \to S$ is a ring homomorphism. Then S is in particular an R-module, so that we can form the tensor product $S \otimes_R M$. This is still an R-module, but it is also an S-module in an evident way: $s \bullet (\sum_i s_i \otimes m_i) := \sum_i s s_i \otimes m_i$. This is process is variously called **scalar extension**, **base extension** or **base change**. Note that this process is functorial, in the following sense: if $f : M \to M'$ is an R-algebra homomorphism, then there exists an induced S-algebra homomorphism $S \otimes_R M \to S \otimes_R M'$, given by $s \otimes m \mapsto s \otimes f(m)$.

EXERCISE 3.21. *If M is a finitely generated R-module and $f : R \to S$ is a ring homomorphism, then $S \otimes_R M$ is a finitely generated S-module.*

EXERCISE 3.22. *Let A and B be rings, M an A-module, P a B-module, and N an (A, B)-bimodule. Then $M \otimes_A N$ is naturally a B-module, $N \otimes_B P$ is naturally an A-module, and*

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

EXERCISE 3.23. *Let R be a commutative ring, I an ideal of R and M an R-module.*
a) Show: there is a well-defined R-bilinear map $R/I \times M \to M/IM$ given by $(r + I, m) \mapsto rm + I$. Thus there is an induced homomorphism of R-modules

$$\varphi : R/I \otimes_R M \to M/IM.$$

b) Show: φ is an isomorphism of R-modules.

PROPOSITION 3.9. *Let R be a commutative ring, M an R-module and $\{N_i\}_{i \in I}$ a directed system of R-modules. Then the R-modules $\varinjlim (M \otimes N_i)$ and $M \otimes (\varinjlim N_i)$ are canonically isomorphic.*

EXERCISE 3.24. *Prove Proposition 3.24.*

EXERCISE 3.25. *Let M and N be R-modules.*
  a) *Show $\operatorname{ann} M \otimes N \supset \operatorname{ann} M + \operatorname{ann} N$.*
  b) *Suppose M and N are cyclic R-modules. Show: $M \otimes N$ is cyclic and $\operatorname{ann}(M \otimes N) = \operatorname{ann} M + \operatorname{ann} N$. Equivalently, show that for all ideals I, J of R we have*
$$R/I \otimes R/J = R/(I + J).$$

c) *Deduce: for all $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have*

$$\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}/\langle m, n \rangle \mathbb{Z}.$$

d) *Let[2] k be a field, let $R := k[t^2, t^3]$, $M := k[t]$, $I = t^2 R$, $N := R/I$. Show:*

$$t^3 \in \operatorname{ann}(M/IM) \setminus \operatorname{ann} M + I = I$$

and thus

$$\operatorname{ann}(M \otimes N) \supsetneq \operatorname{ann} M + \operatorname{ann} N.$$

5. Projective modules

5.1. Basic equivalences.

PROPOSITION 3.10. *For an R-module P, the following are equivalent:*
(i) There exists an R-module Q such that $P \oplus Q$ is a free R-module.
(ii) If $\pi : M \to N$ is a surjective R-module homomorphism and $\varphi : P \to N$ is a homomorphism, then there exists at least one R-module homomorphism $\Phi : P \to M$ such that $\varphi = \pi \circ \Phi$.
(iii) If $\pi : M \to N$ is a surjection, then the natural map $\operatorname{Hom}(P, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}(P, N)$ given by $\Phi \mapsto \pi \circ \Phi$ is surjective.
(iv) The functor $\operatorname{Hom}(P,\ )$ is exact.
(v) Any short exact sequence of R-modules

$$0 \to N \to M \xrightarrow{q} P \to 0$$

splits: there exists an R-module map $\sigma : P \to M$ such that $q \circ \sigma = 1_P$ and thus an internal direct sum decomposition $M = N \oplus \sigma(P)$.
*A module satisfying these equivalent conditions is called **projective**.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let $F \cong P \oplus Q$ be a free module. Let $\{f_i\}$ be a free basis for F and let $\{p_i\}$ be the corresponding generating set for P, where p_i is the image of f_i under the natural projection $P \oplus Q \to P$. Put $n_i = \varphi(p_i)$. By surjectivity of π, let $m_i \in \pi^{-1}(n_i)$. By the freeness of F, there is a unique R-module homomorphism $h : F \to M$ carrying each f_i to m_i. Pull h back to P via the natural inclusion $P \hookrightarrow F$. Then $h : P \to M$ is such that $\pi \circ f = \varphi$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): As for any R-module, there exists a free R-module F and a surjection $\pi : F \to P$. Applying (ii) with $N = p$ and $\varphi : P \to N$ the identity map, we get a homomorphism $\Phi : P \to F$ such that $\pi \circ \varphi = 1_P$. It follows that $F = \Phi(P) \oplus \ker(\pi)$ is an internal direct sum decomposition.
(ii) $\iff$ (iii): (iii) is nothing more than a restatement of (ii), as we leave it to the reader to check.
(iii) $\iff$ (iv): To spell out (iv), it says: if

$$0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$$

is a short exact sequence of R-modules, then the corresponding sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(P, M') \to \operatorname{Hom}(P, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}(P, M'') \to 0$$

is exact. Now for any R-module P, the sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(P, M') \to \operatorname{Hom}(P, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}(P, M'')$$

---

[2]This is taken from `https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/79538/`.

is exact – i.e., $\text{Hom}(P, \ )$ is left exact – so (iv) amounts to: for any surjection $M \to M''$, the corresponding map $\text{Hom}(P, M) \to \text{Hom}(P, M'')$ is surjective, and this is condition (iii).

(ii) $\implies$ (v): Given

$$0 \to N \to M \to P \xrightarrow{q} 0,$$

we apply (ii) to the identity map $1_P : P \to P$ and the surjection $q : M \to P$, getting a map $\sigma : P \to M$ such that $q \circ \sigma = 1_P$, so σ is a section as required.

(v) $\implies$ (i): Choosing a set of generators for P gives rise to a surjective homomorphism $q : F \to P$ from a free R-module F to P and thus a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \text{Ker}\, q \to F \xrightarrow{q} P \to 0.$$

By hypothesis, there exists a section $\sigma : P \to F$ and thus an internal direct sum decomposition $F \cong \text{Ker}(q) \oplus \sigma(P) \cong \text{Ker}(q) \oplus P$. $\qquad \square$

EXERCISE 3.26. *Give a direct proof that* (v) $\implies$ (ii) *in Proposition 3.10. (Suggestion: Given the surjection $q : M \to N$ and the map $\pi : P \to N$, form the short exact sequence $0 \to K \to M \to N \to 0$ and show that it is mapped to by a short exact sequence $0 \to K \to M \times_N P \to P \to 0$, where*

$$M \times_N P = \{(x, y) \in M \times P \mid q(x) = \pi(y)\}$$

*is the **fiber product** of M and P over N.)*

EXERCISE 3.27. *Use Proposition 3.10 to show, several times over, that a free R-module is projective.*

EXERCISE 3.28. *Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an index family of R-modules. Show that the direct sum $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ is projective iff each M_i is projective.*

EXERCISE 3.29. *a) Show: the tensor product of two free R-modules is free. b) Show: the tensor product of two projective R-modules is projective.*

EXERCISE 3.30. *Show: a finitely generated projective module is finitely presented. (Hint: the problem is that over a not-necessarily-Noetherian ring, a submodule of a finitely generated module need not be finitely generated. However, a direct summand of a finitely generated module is always finitely generated: why?)*

5.2. Linear algebraic characterization of projective modules.

Let R be a commutative ring, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let P be an element of the (non-commutative!) ring $M_n(R)$ of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in R such that $P^2 = P$. There are several names for such a matrix. The pure algebraist would call such a matrix **idempotent**, for that is the name of an element in any ring which is equal to its square. A geometrically minded algebraist however may call such a matrix a **projection**, the idea being that the corresponding R-module endomorphism of R^n "projects" R^n onto the submodule $P(R^n)$.

PROPOSITION 3.11. *An R-module M is finitely generated and projective iff it is, up to isomorphism, the image of a projection: i.e., iff there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and a matrix $P \in M_n(R)$ with $P = P^2$ such that $M \cong P(R^n)$.*

PROOF. Suppose first that M is a finitely generated projective R-module. Since M is finitely generated,, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and a surjective R-module homomorphism

$\pi : R^n \to M$. Since M is projective, this homomorphism has a section $\sigma : M \to R^n$, and we may thus write $R^n = \sigma(M) \oplus M'$. Put $P = \sigma \circ \pi \in \mathrm{End}_R(R^n)$. Then $P(R^n) = \sigma(\pi(R^n)) = \sigma(M) \cong M$ and

$$P^2 = \sigma \circ (\pi \circ \sigma) \circ \pi = \sigma \circ 1_M \circ \pi = \sigma \circ \pi = P.$$

Conversely, suppose that there exists $P \in \mathrm{End}_R(R^n)$ with $P^2 = P$ and let $M \cong P(R^n)$. Then – since $P(1-P) = 0 - R^n = P(R^n) \oplus (1-P)(R^n)$, exhibiting $P(R^n)$ as a direct summand of a free module.[3] $\square$

5.3. The Dual Basis Lemma.

PROPOSITION 3.12. *(Dual Basis Lemma) For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) There exists an index set I, elements $\{a_i\}_{i \in I}$ of M and homomorphisms $\{f_i : M \to R\}_{i \in I}$ such that for each $a \in M$, $\{i \in I \mid f_i(a) \neq 0\}$ is finite, and

$$a = \sum_{i \in I} f_i(a)a_i.$$

(ii) M is projective.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let F be the free R-module with basis elements $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$, and define $f : F \to M$ by $f(e_i) = a_i$. Then the map $\iota : M \to F$ given by $\iota(a) = \sum_{i \in I} f_i(a)e_i$ is a section of f, so M is a direct summand of F.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let $f : F = \bigoplus_{i \in I} R \to M$ be an epimorphism from a free R-module onto M. Since M is projective, there exists a section $\iota : M \hookrightarrow F$. If $\{e_i\}_{i \in I}$ is the standard basis of F, then for all $a \in M$, the expression

$$\iota(a) = \sum_{i \in I} f_i(a)e_i$$

defines the necessary family of functions $f_i : M \to R$. $\square$

EXERCISE 3.31. *Let P be a projective R-module. Show: one can can find a finite index set I satisfying condition (i) of the Dual Basis Lemma iff P is finitely generated.*

EXERCISE 3.32. *Let P be a finitely generated projective R-module, so that by Exercise 3.31 there are $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in P$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in P^\vee$ such that for all $a \in P$ we have $a = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(a)a_i$. Show: $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle = P^\vee$.*

EXERCISE 3.33. *For any R-module M we have a natural map*

$$\iota_M : M \to M^{\vee\vee}, (x, f) \in M \times M^\vee \mapsto f(x) \in R.$$

*We say that M is **torsionless** if ι_M is an injection and that M is **reflexive** if ι_M is an isomorphism.*
   a) *Show: a projective module is torsionless.*
   b) *Show: a submodule of a torsionless module is torsionless.*
   c) *Show: a finitely generated free module is reflexive.*
   d) *Show: a finitely generated projective module is reflexive.*

---

[3]This part of the proof redeems the pure algebraist: this the decomposition afforded by the pair of orthogonal idempotents $P, 1 - P$.

5.4. Projective versus free.

Having established some basic facts about projective modules, we should now seek examples in nature: which modules are projective? By Exercise 3.25 any free module is projective. But this surely counts as a not very interesting example! Indeed the following turns out to be one of the deepest questions of the subject.

QUESTION 1. *When is a projective module free?*

We want to give examples to show that the answer to Question 1 is *not* "always". But even by giving examples one wades into somewhat deep waters. The following is the one truly "easy" example of a non-free projective module I know.

Example: Suppose R_1 and R_2 are nontrivial rings. Then the product $R = R_1 \times R_2$ admits nonfree projective modules. Indeed, let P be the ideal $R_1 \times \{0\}$ and Q the ideal $\{0\} \times R_2$. Since $R = P \oplus Q$, P and Q are projective. On the other hand P cannot be free because taking $e := (0,1) \in R$, we have $eP = 0$, whereas $eF \neq 0$ for any nonzero free R-module F (and of course, Q is not free either for similar reasons).

Question 1 may be construed in various ways. One way is to ask for the class of rings over which every projective module is free, or over which every finitely generated projective module is free. I actually do not myself know a complete answer to this question, but there are many interesting and important special cases.

Recall the following result from undergraduate algebra.

THEOREM 3.13. *A finitely generated module over a PID is free if and only if it is torsionfree.*

(We will deduce this result as a consequence of other module-theoretic facts in Corollary 3.64.) Of course submodules of torsionfree modules are torsionfree, so projective implies torsionfree. We deduce:

COROLLARY 3.14. *A finitely generated projective module over a PID is free.*

Theorem 3.13 does not extend to all torsionfree modules: for instance, the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Q}$ is torsionfree but not free. However Corollary 3.14 *does* extend to all modules over a PID. The proof requires transfinite methods and is given in §3.10.

Recall that a ring R is local if it has a unique maximal ideal. It is convenient to reserve the notation $\mathfrak{m}$ for the unique maximal ideal of a local ring and speak of "the local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$". We want to show that every finitely generated projective module over a local ring is free. First a few preliminaries.

Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings. Then necessarily f induces a homomorphism $f^\times : R^\times \to S^\times$ on unit groups: if $xy = 1$, then $f(x)f(y) = f(1) = 1$, so units get mapped to units. But what about the converse: if $x \in R$ is such that $f(x)$ is a unit in S, must x be a unit in R?

It's a nice idea, but it's easy to see that this need not be the case. For instance, let $a > 1$ be any positive integer. Then a is not a unit of $\mathbb{Z}$, but for each prime $p > a$, the image of a in the quotient ring $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is a unit. Too bad! Let us not give

up so soon: a conjecture may fail, but a definition cannot: say a homomorphism $f : R \to S$ of rings is **unit-faithful** if for all $x \in R$, $f(x) \in S^\times \implies x \in R^\times$.

LEMMA 3.15. *If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring, the quotient map $q : R \to R/\mathfrak{m}$ is unit-faithful.*

PROOF. An element of any ring is a unit if and only if it is contained in no maximal ideal, so in a local ring we have $R^\times = R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$. Moreover, since $\mathfrak{m}$ is maximal, $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a field. Thus, for $x \in R$,

$$q(x) \in (R/\mathfrak{m})^\times \iff x \notin \mathfrak{m} \iff x \in R^\times. \qquad \square$$

Later we will see a generalization: if J is any ideal contained the *Jacobson radical* of R, then $q : R \to R/J$ is unit-faithful.

THEOREM 3.16. *A finitely generated projective module over a local ring is free.*

PROOF. Let P be a finitely generated projective module over the local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$. We may find Q and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $P \oplus Q = R^n$. Now tensor with $R/\mathfrak{m}$: we get a direct sum decomposition $P/\mathfrak{m}P \oplus Q/\mathfrak{m}Q = (R/\mathfrak{m})^n$. Since $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a field, all $R/\mathfrak{m}$-modules are free. Choose bases $\{\overline{p_i}\}$ for $P/\mathfrak{m}P$ and $\{\overline{q_j}\}$ for $Q/\mathfrak{m}Q$, and for all i, j, lift each $\overline{p_i}$ to an element p_i of P and each $\overline{q_j}$ to an element q_j of Q. Consider the $n \times n$ matrix A with coefficients in R whose columns are $p_1, \ldots, p_a, q_1, \ldots, q_b$. The reduction modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ of A is a matrix over the field $R/\mathfrak{m}$ whose columns form a basis for $(R/\mathfrak{m})^n$, so its determinant is a unit in $(R/\mathfrak{m})^\times$. Since $\det(M \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}) = \det(M) \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}$, Lemma 3.15 implies that $\det(M) \in R^\times$, i.e., M is invertible. But this means that its columns are linearly independent. By a consequence of Nakayama's Lemma (Corollary 3.44) we have that $p_1, \ldots, p_a$ spans P, so in fact it forms a basis for P. $\qquad \square$

Once again, in Section 3.9 this result will be improved upon: it is a celebrated theorem of Kaplansky that *any* projective module over a local ring is free.

Much more interesting is an example of a finitely generated projective, nonfree module over a domain. Probably the first such examples come from nonprincipal ideals in rings of integers of number fields with class number greater than 1. To give such an example with proof of its projectivity this early in the day, we require a little preparation.[4]

Two ideals I and J in a ring R are **comaximal** if $I + J = R$. More generally, a family $\{I_i\}$ of ideals in a ring is **pairwise comaximal** if for all $i \neq j$, $I + J = R$.

LEMMA 3.17. *Let I, J, $K_1, \ldots, K_n$ be ideals in the ring R.*
   a) *We have $(I + J)(I \cap J) \subset IJ$.*
   b) *If I and J are comaximal, $IJ = I \cap J$.*
   c) *If $I + K_i = R$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $I + K_1 \cdots K_n = R$.*

PROOF. a) $(I + J)(I \cap J) = I(I \cap J) + J(I \cap J) \subset IJ + IJ = IJ$.
b) If $I + J = R$, the identity of part a) becomes $I \cap J \subset IJ$. Since the converse inclusion is valid for all I and J, the conclusion follows. c) We go by induction on

---

[4]Here we wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to K. Conrad: we took our inspiration for Proposition 3.18 and the following Exercise from Example 3.1 of http://www.math.uconn.edu/~kconrad/blurbs/linmultialg/splittingmodules.pdf.

n, the case $n = 1$ being trivial. If $n = 2$, then for $i = 1, 2$, let $a_i \in I$ and $b_i \in K_i$ be such that $1 = a_i + b_i$. Then

$$1 = a_1 + a_2 - a_1 a_2 + b_1 b_2 \in I + K_1 K_2.$$

Now assume $n \geq 3$ and that the result holds for $n - 1$. By induction,

$$I + K_1 \cdots K_{n-1} = R.$$

and by hypothesis $I + K_n = R$, so by the $n = 2$ case we have

$$I + K_1 \cdots K_n = R. \qquad \square$$

PROPOSITION 3.18. *Let I and J be comaximal ideals in a domain R, and consider the R-module map $q : I \oplus J \to R$ given by $(x, y) \mapsto x + y$. Then:*
a) The map q is surjective.
b) $\mathrm{Ker}(q) = \{(x, -x) \mid x \in I \cap J\}$, hence is isomorphic as an R-module to $I \cap J$.
c) We have an isomorphism of R-modules

$$I \oplus J \cong IJ \oplus R.$$

d) Thus if IJ is a principal ideal, I and J are projective modules.

PROOF. It is clear that for any ideals I and J, the image of the map q is the ideal $I + J$, and we are assuming $I + J = R$, whence part a).
Part b) is essentially immediate: details are left to the reader.
Combining parts a) and b) we get a short exact sequence

$$0 \to I \cap J \to I \oplus J \to R \to 0.$$

But R is free, hence projective, and thus the sequence splits, giving part c). Finally, a nonzero principal ideal (x) in a domain R is isomorphic as an R-module to R itself: indeed, multiplication by x gives the isomorphism $R \to (x)$. So if IJ is principal, $I \oplus J \cong R^2$ and I and J are both direct summands of a free module. $\square$

In particular, if we can find in a domain R two comaximal nonprincipal ideals I and J with IJ principal, then I and J are finitely generated projective nonfree R-modules. The following exercise asks you to work through an example.

EXERCISE 3.34. *Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$, and put*

$$\mathfrak{p}_1 = \langle 3, 1 + \sqrt{-5} \rangle, \ \ \mathfrak{p}_2 = \langle 3, 1 - \sqrt{-5} \rangle.$$

a) *Show that $R/\mathfrak{p}_1 \cong R/\mathfrak{p}_2 \cong \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$, so $\mathfrak{p}_1$ and $\mathfrak{p}_2$ are maximal ideals of R.*
b) *Show that $\mathfrak{p}_1 + \mathfrak{p}_2 = R$ (or equivalently, that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \neq \mathfrak{p}_2$).*
c) *Show that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \mathfrak{p}_2 = (3)$.*
d) *Show that neither $\mathfrak{p}_1$ nor $\mathfrak{p}_2$ is principal.*
   (Suggestion: show that if $\mathfrak{p}_1 = (x + \sqrt{-5}y)$ then $\mathfrak{p}_2 = (x - \sqrt{-5}y)$ and thus there are integers x, y such that $x^2 + 5y^2 = \pm 3$.)
e) *Conclude that $\mathfrak{p}_1$ and $\mathfrak{p}_2$ are (in fact isomorphic) nonfree finitely generated projective modules over the domain R.*
f) *Show that $\mathfrak{p}^2$ is principal, and thus that the class of $\mathfrak{p}$ in $\widetilde{K_0(R)}$ is 2-torsion.*

This construction looks very specific, and the number-theoretically inclined reader is warmly invited to play around with other quadratic rings and more general rings of integers of number fields to try to figure out what is really going on. From our

perspective, we will (much later on) gain a deeper understanding of this in terms of the concepts of invertible ideals, the Picard group and Dedekind domains.

EXAMPLE 3.19. *Let X be a compact space, and let $C(X)$ be the ring of continuous real-valued functions on X. The basic structure of these rings is studied in §5.2. Let $E \to X$ be a real topological vector bundle over X. Then the group $\Gamma(E)$ of global sections is naturally a module over $C(X)$. In fact it is a finitely generated projective module, and all finitely generated projective $C(X)$-modules arise faithfully in this way: the global section functor gives a categorical equivalence between vector bundles on X and finitely generated projective modules over $C(X)$. This is a celebrated theorem of R.G. Swan, and Section X is devoted to giving a self-contained discussion of it, starting from the definition of a vector bundle. In particular, via Swan's Theorem basic results on the tangent bundles of compact manifolds translate into examples of finitely generated projective modules: for instance, an Euler characteristic argument shows that the tangent bundle of any even-dimensional sphere S^{2k} is nontrivial, and thus $\Gamma(TS^{2k})$ is a finitely generated nonfree $C(S^{2k})$-module! Following Swan, we will show that examples of nonfree projective modules over more traditional rings like finitely generated $\mathbb{R}$-algebras follow from examples like these.*

EXAMPLE 3.20. *Let k be a field and $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ be the polynomial ring over k in n indeterminates. When $n = 1$, R is a PID, so indeed every finitely generated R-module is projective. For $n > 1$, the situation is much less clear, but the problem of freeness of finitely generated projective R-modules can be stated geometrically as follows: is any algebraic vector bundle on affine n-space $\mathbb{A}^n_{/k}$ algebraically trivial? When $k = \mathbb{C}$, the space $\mathbb{A}^n_{/\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C}^n$ in its usual, Euclidean topology is contractible, which by basic topology implies that any continuous $\mathbb{C}$-vector bundle on $\mathbb{A}^n$ is (continuously) trivial. Moreover, relatively classical complex variable theory shows that any* holomorphic *vector bundle on $\mathbb{A}^n$ is (holomorphically) trivial. But asking the transition functions and the trivialization to be algebraic – i.e., polynomial functions – is a much more stringent problem. In his landmark 1955 paper FAC, J.-P. Serre noted that this natural problem remained open for algebraic vector bundles: he was able to prove only the weaker result that a finitely generated projective R-module M is* **stably free** *– i.e., there exists a finitely generated free module F such that $M \oplus F$ is free. This became known as* **Serre's Conjecture** *(to his dismay) and was finally resolved independently in 1976 by D. Quillen [**Qu76**] and A. Suslin [**Su76**]: indeed, every finitely generated projective R-module is free. Quillen received the Fields Medal in 1978. Fields Medals are not awarded for the solution of any single problem, but the prize committee writes an official document describing the work of each winner that they found particularly meritorious. In this case, it was made clear that Quillen's resolution of Serre's Conjecture was one of the reasons he received the prize. All this for modules over a polynomial ring!*

For more information on Serre's Conjecture, the reader can do no better than to consult a book of T.Y. Lam [**La06**].

EXERCISE 3.35. *($K_0(R)$): From a commutative ring R, we will construct another commutative ring $K_0(R)$ whose elements correspond to formal differences of finite rank projective modules. More precisely:*

    a) *Let $M_0(R)$ denote the set of all isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective modules. For finitely generated projective modules P and Q we*

define

$$[P] + [Q] = [P \oplus Q],$$

$$[P] \cdot [Q] = [P \otimes Q].$$

Check that this construction is well-defined on isomorphism classes and endows $M_0(R)$ with the structure of a commutative semiring with unity. What are the additive and mulitplicative identity elements?

b) *Define $K_0(R)$ as the Grothendieck group of $M_0(R)$, i.e., as the group completion of the commutative monoid $M_0(R)$. Convince yourself that $K_0(R)$ has the structure of a semiring. The elements are of the form $[P] - [Q]$, and we have $[P_1] - [Q_1] = [P_2] - [Q_2] \iff$ there exists a finitely generated projective R-module M with*

$$P_1 \oplus Q_2 \oplus M \cong P_2 \oplus Q_1 \oplus M.$$

*In particular, if P and Q are projective modules, then $[P] = [Q]$ in $K_0(R)$ if and only if $[P]$ and $[Q]$ are **stably isomorphic**, i.e., if and only if they become isomorphic after taking the direct sum with some other finitely generated projective module M. item[c)] Show: we also have $[P] = [Q]$ if and only if there exists a finitely generated free module R^n such that $P \oplus R^n \cong Q \oplus R^n$. In particular, $[P] = [0] = 0$ if and only if P is **stably free**: there exists a finitely generated free module F such that $P \oplus F$ is free.*

d) *Show that $M_0(R)$ is cancellative if and only if every stably free finitely generated projective module is free.*

e) *Find a ring R admitting a finitely generated projectve module which is stably free but not free.*

f) *Show that the mapping $R^n \mapsto [R^n]$ induces an injective homomorphism of rings $\mathbb{Z} \to K_0(R)$. Define $\tilde{K}_0(R)$ to be the quotient $K_0(R)/\mathbb{Z}$. Show that if R is a PID then $\tilde{K}_0(R) = 0$.*

6. Injective modules

6.1. Basic equivalences.

Although we will have no use for them in the sequel of these notes, in both commutative and (especially) homological algebra there is an important class of modules "dual" to the projective modules. They are characterized as follows.

PROPOSITION 3.21. *For a module E over a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(ii) If $\iota : M \to N$ is an injective R-module homomorphism and $\varphi : M \to E$ is any homomorphism, there exists at least one extension of φ to a homomorphism $\Phi : N \to E$.
(iii) If $M \hookrightarrow N$, the natural map $\mathrm{Hom}(N, E) \to \mathrm{Hom}(M, E)$ is surjective.
(iv) The (contravariant) functor $\mathrm{Hom}(\ , E)$ is exact.
(v) Any short exact sequence of R-modules

$$0 \to E \overset{\iota}{\to} M \to N \to 0$$

splits: there exists an R-module map $\pi : M \to E$ such that $\pi \circ \iota = 1_E$ and thus an internal direct sum decomposition $M = \iota(E) \oplus \ker(\pi) \cong E \oplus N$.
*A module satisfying these equivalent conditions is called **injective**.*

EXERCISE 3.36. *Prove Proposition 3.21.*

EXERCISE 3.37. *Show: an R-module E is injective if and only if whenever E is a submodule of a module M, E is a direct summand of M.*

Notice that the set of equivalent conditions starts with (ii)! This is to facilitate direct comparison to Proposition 3.10 on projective modules. Indeed, one should check that each of the properties (ii) through (v) are *duals* of the corresponding properties for projective modules: i.e., they are obtained by reversing all arrows. The difficulty here with property (i) is that if one literally reverses the arrows in the definition of free R-module to arrive at a "cofree" R-module, one gets a definition which is unhelpfully strong: the "cofree R-module on a set X" does not exist when $\#X > 1$! This can be remedied by giving a more refined definition of *cofree* module. For the sake of curiosity, we will give it later on in the exercises, but to the best of my knowledge, cofree R-modules by any definition do not play the fundamental role that free R-modules do.

EXERCISE 3.38. *Show: every module over a field is injective.*

EXERCISE 3.39. *Show: $\mathbb{Z}$ is* not *an injective $\mathbb{Z}$-module.*
(Injectivity is the most important property of modules that is not necessarily satisfied by free modules.)

EXERCISE 3.40. *Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be any family of R-modules and put $M = \prod_{i \in I} M_i$. Show that M is injective if and only if M_i is injective for all $i \in I$.*

EXERCISE 3.41. *For a ring R, show the following are equivalent:*
*(i) R is **absolutely projective**: every R-module is projective.*
*(ii) R is **absolutely injective**: every R-module is injective.*

6.2. Baer's Criterion.

THEOREM 3.22. *(Baer's Criterion [**Ba40**]) For a module E over a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) E is injective.
(ii) For every ideal nonzero I of R, every R-module map $\varphi : I \to E$ extends to an R-module map $\Phi : R \to E$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): this is a special case of condition (ii) of Proposition 3.21: take $M = I$, $N = R$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let M be an R-submodule of N and $\varphi : M \to E$ an R-module map. We need to show that φ may be extended to N. Now the set $\mathcal{P}$ of pairs (N', φ') with $M \subset N' \subset N$ and $\varphi : N' \to E$ a map extending φ is nonempty and has an evident partial ordering, with respect to which the union of any chain of elements in $\mathcal{P}$ is again an element of $\mathcal{P}$. So by Zorn's Lemma, there is a maximal element $\varphi' : N' \to E$. Our task is to show that $N' = N$.
    Assume not, and choose $x \in N \setminus N'$. Put

$$I = (N' : x) = \{r \in R \mid rx \subset N'\};$$

one checks immediately that I is an ideal of R (a generalization to modules of the *colon ideal* we have encountered before). Consider the composite map

$$I \xrightarrow{\cdot x} N' \xrightarrow{\varphi} E;$$

by our hypothesis, this extends to a map $\psi : R \to E$. Now put $N'' = \langle N', x \rangle$ and define[5] $\varphi'' : N'' \to E$ by

$$\varphi''(x' + rx) = \varphi'(x') + \psi(r).$$

Thus φ'' is an extension of φ' to a strictly larger submodule of N than N', contradicting maximality. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 3.42. *Verify that the map φ'' is well-defined.*

6.3. Divisible modules.

Recall that a module M over a domain R is **divisible** if for all $r \in R^\bullet$ the endomorphism $r\bullet : M \to M, x \mapsto rx$, is surjective. Further, we define M to be **uniquely divisible** if for all $r \in R^\bullet$, the endomorphism $r\bullet : M \to M$ is a bijection.

EXAMPLE 3.23. *The $\mathbb{Z}$-modules $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ are divisible. $\mathbb{Q}$ is moreover uniquely divisible but $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ is not.*

EXERCISE 3.43. *Show: a divisible module is uniquely divisible if and only if it is torsionfree.*

EXERCISE 3.44.
   a) *Show: a quotient of a divisible module is divisible.*
   b) *Show: arbitrary direct sums and direct products of divisible modules are divisible.*

EXERCISE 3.45. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K.*
   a) *Show: K is a uniquely divisible R-module.*
   b) *Let M be any R-module. Show that the natural map $M \to M \otimes_R K$ is injective if and only if M is torsionfree.*
   c) *Show: for any R-module M, $M \otimes_R K$ is uniquely divisible.*
   d) *Show: K/R is divisible but not uniquely divisible.*

EXERCISE 3.46. *a) Show: a $\mathbb{Z}$-module is uniquely divisible iff it can be endowed with the compatible structure of a $\mathbb{Q}$-module, and if so this $\mathbb{Q}$-module structure is unique.*
b) Show that a $\mathbb{Z}$-module M is a subgroup of a uniquely divisible divisible $\mathbb{Z}$-module iff it is torsionfree.

EXERCISE 3.47. *For a domain R, show that the following are equivalent:*
   (i) *There is a nonzero finitely generated divisible R-module.*
   (ii) *R is a field.*

PROPOSITION 3.24. *Let R be a domain and E an R-module.*
a) If E is injective, it is divisible.
b) If E is torsionfree and divisible, it is injective.
c) If R is a PID and E is divisible, it is injective.

PROOF. a) Let $r \in R^\bullet$. For $x \in E$, consider the R-module homomorphism $\varphi : rR \to E$ given by $r \mapsto x$. Since E is injective, this extends to an R-module map $\varphi : R \to E$. Then $r\varphi(1) = \varphi(r \cdot 1) = \varphi(r) = x$, so $r\bullet$ is surjective on E.

_____

[5]Since N'' need not be the direct sum of N' and $\langle x \rangle$, one does need to check that φ'' is well-defined; we ask the reader to do so in an exercise following the proof.

b) Let I be a nonzero ideal of R and $\varphi : I \to E$ be an R-module map. For each $a \in I^{\bullet}$, there is a unique $e_a \in E$ such that $\varphi(a) = ae_a$. For $b \in I^{\bullet}$, we have

$$bae_a = b\varphi(a) = \varphi(ba) = a\varphi(b) = abe_b;$$

since E is torsionfree we conclude $e_a = e_b = e$, say. Thus we may extend φ to a map $\Phi : R \to E$ by $\Phi(r) = re$. Thus E is injective by Baer's Criterion.

c) As above it is enough to show that given a nonzero ideal I of R, every homomorphism $\varphi : I \to E$ extends to a homomorphism $R \to E$. Since R is a PID, we may write $I = xR$ for $x \in R^{\bullet}$. Then, as in part a), one checks that φ extends to Φ iff multiplication by x is surjective on M, which it is since M is divisible. $\qquad\square$

By combining Proposition 3.24 with Exercise 3.42, we are able to show an important special case of the desired fact that every R-module can be realized as a submodule of an injective module. Namely, if M is a torsionfree module over a domain R, then M is a submodule of the uniquely divisible – hence injective – module $M \otimes_R K$.

EXERCISE 3.48. *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$.*
a) Show: as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is not divisible hence not injective.
b) Show: as a $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ module $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is divisible iff n is a prime number.
c) Show: $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is always injective as a $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$-module.

EXERCISE 3.49. *Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[t]$ and let K be its fraction field. Show: the R-module K/R is divisible but not injective.*

EXERCISE 3.50. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K.*
a) If $R = K$, show: all R-modules are both injective and projective.
b) If $R \neq K$, show: the only R-module that is both projective and injective is 0.

6.4. Enough injectives.

The idea of this section is to pursue the dual version of the statement "Every R-module is a quotient of a projective module": namely we wish to show that every R-module is a *submodule* of an injective module. This is a good example of a statement which remains true upon dualization but becomes more elaborate to show. The projective version is almost obvious: indeed, we have the stronger result that every module is a quotient of a *free* module, and – as we have seen – to realize M as a quotient of a free R-module is equivalent to simply choosing a set of generators for M. (But again, if we choose the most obvious definition of "cofree", then this statement will be false.)

Let k be a ring, R a k-algebra, M an R-module and N a k-module. Consider the commutative group $\operatorname{Hom}_k(M, N)$. We may endow it with the structure of an R-module as follows: for $r \in R$ and $f \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, N)$, $(rf)(x) := f(rx)$.

Consider the special case $k = \mathbb{Z}$ and $N = \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ of the above construction. It gives $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ the structure of an R-module, which we denote by M^* and call the **Pontrjagin dual** of M.[6] Because $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ is an injective $\mathbb{Z}$-module, the (contravariant) functor $M \mapsto M^*$ – or in other words $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\ , \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$ – is exact.[7] In

---

[6]Recall that the notation $M^{\vee}$ has already been taken: this is the *linear dual* $\operatorname{Hom}_R(M, R)$.
[7]Here we are using the (obvious) fact that a sequence of R-modules is exact iff it is exact when viewed merely as a sequence of $\mathbb{Z}$-modules.

particular, if $f : M \to N$ is an R-module map, then f injective implies f^* surjective and f surjective implies f^* injective.

As is often the case for "duals", we have a natural map $M \to M^{**}$: namely $x \mapsto (f \mapsto f(x))$.

LEMMA 3.25. *For any R-module M, the natural map $\Psi_M : M \to M^{**}$ is injective.*

PROOF. Seeking a contradiction, let $x \in M^\bullet$ be such that $\Psi(x) = 0$. Unpacking the definition, this means that for all $f \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(M, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})$, $f(x) = 0$. But since $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ is an injective $\mathbb{Z}$-module, it suffices to find a nontrivial homomorphism $\mathbb{Z}x \to \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, and this is easy: if x has finite order $n > 1$, we may map x to $\frac{1}{n}$, whereas if x has infinite order we may map it to any nonzero element of $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$. $\square$

LEMMA 3.26. *Every $\mathbb{Z}$-module M can be embedded into an injective $\mathbb{Z}$-module.*

PROOF. Let $I \subset M$ be a generating set and let $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z} \to M$ be the corresponding surjection, with kernel K, so $M \cong (\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z})/K$. The natural map $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Q}$ induces an injection $M \hookrightarrow (\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Q})/K$, and the latter $\mathbb{Z}$-module is divisible, hence injective since $\mathbb{Z}$ is a PID. $\square$

LEMMA 3.27. *(Injective Production Lemma) Let R be a k-algebra, E an injective k-module and F a free R-module. Then $\operatorname{Hom}_k(F, E)$ is an injective R-module.*

PROOF. We will show that the functor $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\,\,, \operatorname{Hom}_k(F, E))$ is exact. For any R-module M, the adjointness of $\otimes$ and Hom gives

$$\operatorname{Hom}_R(M, \operatorname{Hom}_k(F, E)) = \operatorname{Hom}_k(F \otimes_R M, E)$$

so we may look at the functor $M \mapsto \operatorname{Hom}_k(F \otimes_R M, E)$ instead. This is the composition of the functor $M \mapsto F \otimes_R M$ with the functor $N \mapsto \operatorname{Hom}_k(N, E)$. But both functors are exact – in the former case a moment's thought shows this to be true, and the latter case is one of our defining properties of injective modules. $\square$

Remark: Soon enough we will define a *flat* R-module to be an R-module N such that the functor $M \mapsto M \otimes_R N$ is exact. Then Lemma 3.27 can be rephrased with the hypothesis that F is a flat R-module, and (since as we have just seen, free R-modules are flat) this gives a somewhat more general result.

THEOREM 3.28. *Every R-module can be embedded into an injective R-module.*

PROOF. Let M be an R-module. Viewing M as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, by Lemma 3.26 there is an injective $\mathbb{Z}$-module E_1 and a $\mathbb{Z}$-module map $\varphi_1 : M \hookrightarrow E_1$. Further, by Lemma 3.27, $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(R, E_1)$ is an injective R-module. Now consider the R-module map

$$\varphi : M \to \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(R, E_1), \ x \mapsto (r \mapsto \varphi_1(rx)).$$

We claim that φ is a monomorphism into the injective R-module $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(R, E_1)$. Indeed, if $\varphi(x) = 0$ then for all $r \in R$, $\varphi_1(rx) = 0$. In particular $\varphi_1(x) = 0$, so since φ_1 is a monomorphism, we conclude $x = 0$. $\square$

EXERCISE 3.51. *We say a $\mathbb{Z}$-module is **cofree** if it is of the form F^* for a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module F. Then the proof of Lemma 3.26 gives the stronger statement that every $\mathbb{Z}$-module can be embedded into a cofree $\mathbb{Z}$-module. Formulate a definition of **cofree R-module** so that the proof of Theorem 3.28 gives the stronger statement*

that every R-module can be embedded into a cofree R-module. (Hint: remember to pay attention to the difference between direct sums and direct products.)

6.5. Essential extensions and injective envelopes.

The results of this section are all due to B. Eckmann and A. Schopf [**ES53**].

PROPOSITION 3.29. *For R modules $M \subset N$, the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *If X is any nonzero R-submodule of N, then $X \cap M$ is nonzero.*
  (ii) *If $x \in N^{\bullet}$, there exists $r \in R$ such that $rx \in M^{\bullet}$.*
  (iii) *If $\varphi : N \to Y$ is an R-module map, then φ is injective iff $\varphi|_M$ is injective.*
An extension $M \subset N$ satisfying these equivalent conditions is called **essential**.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Apply (i) with $X = \langle x \rangle$.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Assuming (ii), let $\varphi : N \to Y$ be a homomorphism with $\varphi|_M$ is injective. It is enough to show that φ is injective. Seeking a contradiction, let $x \in N^{\bullet}$ be such that $\varphi(x) = 0$. By (ii), there exists $r \in R$ such that $rx \in M^{\bullet}$. But then by assumption $r\varphi(x) = \varphi(rx) \neq 0$, so $\varphi(x) \neq 0$, contradiction.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): We go by contraposition. Suppose there exists a nonzero submodule X of N such that $X \cap M = 0$. Then the map $\varphi : N \to N/X$ is not an injection but its restriction to M is an injection. $\square$

PROPOSITION 3.30. *(Tower Property of Essential Extensions) Let $L \subset M \subset N$ be R-modules. Then $L \subset N$ is an essential extension if and only if $L \subset M$ and $M \subset N$ are both essential extensions.*

PROOF. Suppose first that $L \subset N$ is an essential extension. Then for any nonzero submodule X of N, we have $X \cap L \neq 0$. In particular this holds for $X \subset M$, so $L \subset M$ is essential. Moreover, since $L \subset M$, $X \cap L \neq 0$ implies $X \cap M \neq 0$, so $M \subset N$ is essential. Conversely, suppose $L \subset M$ and $M \subset N$ are both essential, and let X be a nonzero submodule of N. Then $X \cap M$ is a nonzero submodule of M and thus $(X \cap M) \cap L = X \cap L$ is a nonzero submodule of L. So $L \subset N$ is essential. $\square$

So why are we talking about essential extensions when we are supposed to be talking about injective modules? The following result explains the connection.

THEOREM 3.31. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *M is injective.*
  (ii) *M has no proper essential extensions: i.e., if $M \subset N$ is an essential extension, then $M = N$.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let M be injective and $M \subsetneq N$. Then M is a direct summand of N: there exists M' such that $M \oplus M' = N$. Thus M has zero intersection with M', and by criterion (ii) of Proposition 3.29, we must have $M' = 0$ and thus $M = N$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): It suffices to show: if N is an R-module and $M \subset N$, then M is a direct summand of N. Now consider the family of submodules M' of N with the property that $M \cap M' = 0$. This family is partially ordered by inclusion, nonempty, and closed under unions of chains, so by Zorn's Lemma there exists a maximal such element M'. Now consider the extension $M \hookrightarrow N/M'$: we claim it is essential. Indeed, if not, there exists $x \in N \setminus M'$ such that $\langle M', x \rangle \cap M = 0$, contradicting

maximality of M'. But by hypothesis, M has no proper essential extensions: thus $M = N/M'$, i.e., $M \oplus M' = N$ and M is a direct summand of N.   □

We say that an extension $M \subset N$ is **maximal essential** if it is essential and there is no proper extension N' of N such that $M \subset N'$ is essential. Combining Proposition 3.30 and Theorem 3.31 yields the following important result.

THEOREM 3.32. *For an essential extension $M \subset N$ of R-modules, the following are equivalent:*

(i) $M \subset N$ *is maximal essential.*
(ii) N *is injective.*

EXERCISE 3.52. *To be sure you're following along, prove Theorem 3.32.*

Once again we have a purpose in life – or at least, this subsection of it – we would like to show that every R-module admits a maximal essential extension and that such extensions are unique up to isomorphism over M. Moreover, a plausible strategy of proof is the following: let M be an R-module. By Theorem 3.28 there exists an extension $M \subset E$ with E injective. Certainly this extension need not be essential, but we may seek to construct within it a maximal essential subextension N and then hope to show that $M \subset E'$ is injective.

THEOREM 3.33. *Let M be an R-module and $M \subset E$ an extension with E injective. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all essential subextensions N of $M \subset E$. Then:*

a) $\mathcal{P}$ *contains at least one maximal element.*
b) *Every maximal element E' of $\mathcal{P}$ is injective.*

PROOF. The proof of part a) is the usual Zorn's Lemma argument: what we need to check is that the union N of any chain $\{N_i\}$ of essential subextensions is again an essential subextension. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a nonzero submodule X of N such that $X \cap M = 0$. Choose $x \in X^{\bullet}$ and put $X' = \langle x \rangle$. Then $X' \subset N_i$ for some i and $X' \cap M \subset X \cap M = 0$, contradicting the essentialness (?!) of the extension $M \subset N_i$.
Now let E' be a maximal essential *subextension* of $M \subset E$. We need to show that $M \subset E'$ is actually a maximal essential extension: so suppose there is an essential extension $E' \subset N$. Let $\iota : M \subset E' \subset N$ be the composite map. It is a monomorphism, so by the injectivity of E the injection $M \subset E$ extends to a homomorphism $\varphi : N \to E$. But $\varphi|_M$ is an injection and $M \subset N$ is an essential extension, so by condition (iii) of Proposition 3.29 this implies that φ itself is an injection. By maximality of E' among essential subextensions of $M \subset E$ we must have $E' = N$.   □

For an R-module M, we say that an extension $M \subset E$ is an **injective envelope** (other common name: **injective hull**) of M if $M \subset E$ is a maximal essential extension; equivalently, an essential extension with E injective. Thus Theorem 3.33 shows that any R-module admits an injective envelope.

PROPOSITION 3.34. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K. Then $R \subset K$ is an injective envelope of R.*

EXERCISE 3.53. *Prove Proposition 3.34.*
(Suggestion: use the relationship between injective modules and divisible modules.)

EXERCISE 3.54. *More generally, let M be a torsionfree module over a domain R. Show that $M \subset M \otimes_R K$ is an injective envelope of M.*

Let us touch up our characterization of injective envelopes a bit.

PROPOSITION 3.35. *(Equivalent Properties of an Injective Envelope) For an extension $M \subset E$ of R-modules, the following are equivalent:*

 (i) *$M \subset E$ is a maximal essential extension.*
 (ii) *$M \subset E$ is essential and E is injective.*
 (iii) *E is minimal injective over M: there does not exist any proper subextension $M \subset E' \subset E$ with E' injective.*

PROOF. We have already seen that (i) $\iff$ (ii).
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Assume that E is injective and E' is an injective subextension of $M \subset E$. Since E' is injective, there exists $N \subset E$ such that $E' \oplus N = E$. Moreover, $M \cap N \subset E' \cap N = 0$, so $M \cap N = 0$. Since $M \subset E$ is essential, we must have $N = 0$, i.e., $E' = E$.
(iii) $\implies$ (ii): Suppose that $M \subset E$ is minimal injective. The proof of Theorem 3.33 gives us a subextension E' of $M \subset E$ such that E' is injective and $M \subset E'$ is essential. Thus by minimality $E = E'$, i.e., $M \subset E$ is essential. $\square$

THEOREM 3.36. *(Uniqueness of Injective Envelopes) Let M be an R-module and let $\iota_1 : M \subset E_1$, $\iota_2 : M \subset E_2$ be two injective envelopes of M. Then E_1 and E_2 are isomorphic as R-module extensions of M: i.e., there exists an R-module isomorphism $\Phi : E_1 \to E_2$ such that $\Phi \circ \iota_1 = \iota_2$.*

PROOF. Since $\iota_1 : M \to E_1$ is a monomorphism and E_2 is injective, the map $\iota_2 : M \to E_2$ extends to a map $\Phi : E_1 \to E_2$ such that $\Phi \circ \iota_1 = \iota_2$. Since the restriction of Φ to the essential submodule M is a monomorphism, so is Φ. The image $\Phi(E_1)$ is an essential subextension of $M \subset E_2$, so by condition (iii) of Proposition 3.35 we must have $E_2 = \Phi(E_1)$. Thus $\Phi : E_1 \to E_2$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

In view of Theorem 3.36, it is reasonable to speak of "the" injective envelope of M and denote it by $M \to E(M)$. Reasonable, that is, but not ideal: it is not true that any two injective envelopes are canonically isomorphic.[8] Otherwise put, formation of the injective envelope is not functorial. For more on this in a more general category-theoretic context, see [**AHRT**].

EXERCISE 3.55. *Let M be a submodule of an injective module E. Show: E contains an isomorphic copy of the injective envelope $E(M)$.*

EXERCISE 3.56. *If $M \subset N$ is an essential extension of modules, then $E(M) = E(N)$.*

7. Flat modules

Suppose we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$$

---

[8]The situation here is the same as for "the" splitting field of an algebraic field extension or "the" algebraic closure of a field.

of R-modules. If N is any R-module, we can tensor each element of the sequence with N, getting maps

$$0 \to M' \otimes N \to M \otimes N \to M'' \otimes N \to 0.$$

Unfortunately this new sequence need not be exact. It is easy to see that it is **right exact**: that is, the piece of the sequence

$$M' \otimes N \to M \otimes N \to M'' \otimes N \to 0$$

remains exact. This follows because of the canonical "adjunction" isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}(M \otimes N, P) = \mathrm{Hom}(M, \mathrm{Hom}(N, P))$$

and the left-exactness of the sequence $\mathrm{Hom}(\ , Y)$ for all R-modules Y. However, tensoring an injection need not give an injection. Indeed, consider the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z} \overset{[2]}{\to} \mathbb{Z}.$$

If we tensor this with $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, we get a sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \overset{[2]}{\to} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

but now the map $\mathbb{Z} \otimes Z/2\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z} \otimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ takes $n \otimes i \to (2n \otimes i) = n \otimes 2i = 0$, so is not injective.

Definition: A module M over a ring R is **flat** if the functor $N \mapsto N \otimes_R M$ is exact. This means, equivalently, that if $M \hookrightarrow M'$ then $M \otimes N \hookrightarrow M' \otimes N$, or also that tensoring a short exact sequence with M gives a short exact sequence.

It will probably seem unlikely at first, but in fact this is one of the most important and useful properties of an R-module.

So, which R-modules are flat?

PROPOSITION 3.37. *Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of R-modules. The following are equivalent:*
(i) For all i, M_i is flat.
(ii) The direct sum $M = \bigoplus_i M_i$ is flat.

EXERCISE 3.57. *Prove Proposition 3.37.*

PROPOSITION 3.38. *Let R be a domain. Then flat R-modules are torsionfree.*

PROOF. We will prove the contrapositive. Suppose that $0 \neq m \in R[\mathrm{tors}]$, and let $0 \neq r \in R$ be such that $rm = 0$ Since R is a domain, we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \to R \overset{[r]}{\to} R \to R/rR \to 0$$

and tensoring it with M gives

$$0 \to M \overset{[r]}{\to} M \to M/rM \to 0,$$

but since $rm = 0$ the first map is not injective.   □

EXAMPLE 3.39. *Let k be a field, and let $R := k[x, y]$, the polynomial ring in two indeterminates over k. Let $I := \langle x, y \rangle$; then I is a maximal ideal such that $R/I = k$. Like every ideal of a domain, I is a torsionfree module. We claim that I is not flat.[9] It suffices to show that the map*

$$\varphi : I \otimes I \to I \otimes_R R = I$$

obtained by tensoring the injection $I \hookrightarrow R$ with I is not an injection. This map is nothing else than the induced map from the R-bilinear multiplication map $I \times I \to I$: it sends $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes b_i$ to $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i$. Evidently the element

$$\theta := x \otimes y - y \otimes x$$

lies in the kernel of φ; the crux of the matter is to show that $\theta \neq 0$. For this, let

$$D_x : k[x, y] \to k = k[x, y]/I$$

by taking the partial derivative with respect to x and then evaluating at $(0, 0)$ and let

$$D_y : k[x, y] \to k = k[x, y]/I$$

by taking the partial derivative with respect to y and then evaluating at $(0, 0)$. Finally, put

$$\mathbb{D} : I \times I \to k, \ (a, b) \mapsto D_x(a) D_y(b).$$

Then $\mathbb{D}$ is R-bilinear: e.g. for $a, b \in I = \langle x, y \rangle$ and $c, d \in k[x, y]$ we have

$$\mathbb{D}(ca, db) = D_x(ca) D_y(db) = \left(c \frac{\partial a}{\partial x} + a \frac{\partial c}{\partial x} \right) \left(d \frac{\partial b}{\partial y} + b \frac{\partial d}{\partial y} \right) + \langle x, y \rangle$$

$$= cd \frac{\partial a}{\partial x} \frac{\partial b}{\partial y} + \langle x, y \rangle.$$

So $\mathbb{D}$ factors through an R-linear map $D : I \otimes I \to k$. Since

$$D(\theta) = D(x \otimes y - y \otimes x) = \mathbb{D}((x, y)) - \mathbb{D}((y, x)) = 1 - 0 = 1,$$

it follows that $\theta \neq 0$.

PROPOSITION 3.40. *Projective R-modules are flat.*

PROOF. A projective R-module is a module P such that there exists P' with $P \oplus P' \cong F$ a free module. Therefore, by Proposition 3.37, it is enough to show that free modules are flat. By abuse of notation, we will abbreviate the infinite direct sum of d copies of R as R^d. Since for any R-module M we have $M \otimes_R R^d = M^d$, it follows that tensoring a short exact sequence

$$0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$$

with $F = R^d$ just yields

$$0 \to (M')^d \to (M)^d \to (M'')^d \to 0.$$

This is still exact. $\qquad\square$

---

[9]Much later we will learn that because I is a prime ideal of height greater than 1 in a Noetherian ring, it cannot be flat.

8. Nakayama's Lemma

8.1. Nakayama's Lemma.

PROPOSITION 3.41. *Let M be a finitely generated R-module, I an ideal of R, and φ be an R-endomorphism of M such that $\varphi(M) \subset IM$. Then φ satisfies an equation of the form*

$$\varphi^n + a_{n-1}\varphi^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1\varphi + a_0 = 0,$$

with $a_i \in I$.

PROOF. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be a set of generators for M as an R-module. Since each $\varphi(x_i) \in IM$, we may write $\varphi(x_i) = \sum_j a_{ij}x_j$, with $a_{ij} \in I$. Equivalently, for all i,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (\delta_{ij}\varphi - a_{ij})x_j = 0.$$

By multiplying on the left by the adjugate of the matrix $M = (\delta_{ij}\varphi - a_{ij})$, we get that $\det(\delta_{ij}\varphi - a_{ij})$ kills each x_i, hence is the zero endomorphism of M. Expanding out the determinant gives the desired polynomial relation satisfied by φ. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 3.58. *Some refer to Proposition 3.41 as the Cayley-Hamilton Theorem. Discuss.*

THEOREM 3.42 (Nakayama's Lemma). *Let R be a ring, J an ideal of R, and M a finitely generated R-module such that $JM = M$.*
   a) *There is $x \in R$ such that $x \equiv 1 \pmod{J}$ and $xM = \{0\}$.*
   b) *If moreover J is contained in every maximal ideal of R, then $M = \{0\}$.*

PROOF. Applying Proposition 3.41 to the identity endomorphism $\varphi = 1_M$ gives $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in J$ such that for $x := 1 + a_1 + \ldots + a_{n-1}$, we have $xM = \{0\}$ and $x \equiv 1 \pmod{J}$, proving part a). If moreover J lies in every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, then $x \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}$ for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$, hence x lies in no maximal ideal of R. Therefore x is a unit and multiplying $xM = \{0\}$ by x^{-1} gives $M = \{0\}$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 3.43. *Let R be a ring, J an ideal of R which is contained in every maximal ideal of R, M a finitely generated R-module and N a submodule of M such that $JM + N = M$. Then $M = N$.*

PROOF. We have $J(M/N) = (JM + N)/N = M/N$. Applying Nakayama's Lemma to M/N, we conclude $M/N = 0$, i.e., $N = M$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 3.44. *Let R be a ring, let J be an ideal of R which is contained in every maximal ideal of R, and let M be a finitely generated R-module. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in M$ be such that their images in M/JM span M/JM as an R/J-module. Then the x_i's span M.*

PROOF. Let $N = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle_R$, and apply Corollary 3.43. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 3.45. *Let R be a ring, and let J be an ideal that is contained in every maximal ideal of R. Let M and N be R-modules, with N finitely generated, and let $u : M \to N$ be an R-module map. Suppose that the map $u_J : M/JM \to N/JN$ is surjective. Then u is surjective.*

PROOF. Apply Nakayama's Lemma to J and N/M. $\qquad\square$

Recall that an element x in a ring R such that $x^2 = x$ is called **idempotent**. Similarly, an ideal I of R such that $I^2 = I$ is called **idempotent**.

EXERCISE 3.59. *Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R.*

  a) *Suppose $I = (e)$ for an idempotent element e. Show that I is idempotent.*
  b) *Give an example of a nonidempotent x such that (x) is idempotent.*
  c) *Is every idempotent ideal generated by some idempotent element?*

COROLLARY 3.46. *Let R be a ring, and let I be a finitely generated idempotent ideal of R. Then there is an idempotent $e \in R$ such that $I = (e)$. Thus in a Noetherian ring every idempotent ideal is generated by an idempotent element.*

EXERCISE 3.60. *Prove Corollary 3.46. (Hint: apply Theorem 3.42!)*

8.2. Hopfian modules.

A group G is **Hopfian** if every surjective group homomorphism $f : G \to G$ is an isomorphism – equivalently, G is not isomorphic to any of its proper quotients.

   This concept has some currency in combinatorial and geometric group theory. Clearly any finite group is Hopfian. A free group is Hopfian if and only if it is finitely generated, and more generally a finitely generated residually finite group is Hopfian. An obvious example of a non-Hopfian group is $\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} G$ for any nontrivial group G. A more interesting example is the **Baumslag-Solitar group**

$$B(2,3) = \langle x, y \mid y x^2 y^{-1} = x^3 \rangle.$$

More generally, let $\mathcal{C}$ be a concrete category: that is, $\mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$ is a class of sets and for all $X, Y \in \mathrm{Ob}\,\mathcal{C}$, $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y) \subset \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Set}}(X, Y)$, i.e., the morphisms between X and Y are certain functions from X to Y. We may define an object X in $\mathcal{C}$ to be **Hopfian** if every surjective endomorphism of X is an isomorphism.

EXERCISE 3.61.

  a) *(C. LaRue) Show: any finite object in a concrete category is Hopfian.*
  b) *In the category of sets, the Hopfian objects are precisely the finite sets.*

Remark: Our discussion of "Hopfian objects" in categories more general than R-Mod is not particularly serious or well thought out. So far as I know there is not a completely agreed upon definition of a Hopfian object, but Martin Brandenburg has suggested (instead) the following: $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is Hopfian if every **extremal epimorphism** $X \to X$ is an isomorphism.

THEOREM 3.47. *Let R be a ring and M a finitely generated R-module. Then M is a Hopfian object in the category of R-modules.*

PROOF. ([**M**, p. 9]) Let $f : M \to M$ be a surjective R-module map. We show f is injective.

   There is a unique $R[t]$-module structure on M extending the given R-module structure and such that for all $m \in M$, $tm = f(m)$. Let $I = tR[t]$. By hypothesis $IM = M$, so by Nakayama's Lemma there exists $P(t) \in R[t]$ such that

$$(1 + P(t)t)M = 0.$$

Let $y \in \ker f$. Then

$$0 = (1 + P(t)t)y = y + P(t)f(y) = y + P(t)0 = y.$$

So f is injective. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 3.62. *Show:* $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$ *is a Hopfian $\mathbb{Z}$-module which is not finitely generated.*

EXERCISE 3.63. *Do there exist Hopfian $\mathbb{Z}$-modules of all cardinalities? (An affirmative answer was claim in [**Ba62**], but it was announced in [**Ba63**] that the construction is not valid. So far as I know the problem remains open lo these many years later.)*

8.3. A variant.

The results of this section are taken from [**DM71**, §$I.1$].

THEOREM 3.48 (Nakayama's Lemma). *Let R be a ring, J an ideal of R and M a finitely generated R-module. the following are equivalent:*

(i) $J + \operatorname{ann} M = R$.

(ii) $JM = M$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): The annihilator of M/JM contains J and $\operatorname{ann} M$, so it contains $J + \operatorname{ann} M = R$. This means that $M/JM = 0$ and $JM = M$.

(ii) $\implies$ (i): Conversely, suppose $M = \langle m_1, \ldots, m_n \rangle$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, put $M_i = \langle m_i, \ldots, m_n \rangle$ and $M_{n+1} = 0$. We claim that for all $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ there exists $a_i \in J$ with $(1 - a_i)M \subset M_i$, and we will prove this by induction on n. We may take $a_1 = 0$. Having chosen $a_1, \ldots, a_i$, we have

$$(1 - a_i)M = (1 - a_i)JM = J(1 - a_i)M \subset M_i,$$

so there exist $a_{ij} \in J$ such that

$$(1 - a_i)m_j = \sum_{j=i}^{n} a_{ij} m_j,$$

or

$$(1 - a_i - a_{ii})m_i \in M_{i+1}.$$

Thus

$$\left(1 - (2a_i + a_{ii} - a_i^2 - a_i a_i i)\right) M = (1 - a_i)(1 - a_i - a_{ii})M \subset (1 - a_i - a_{ii})M_i \subset M_{i+1},$$

and we may take

$$a_{i+1} = 2a_i + a_{ii} - a_i^2 - a_i a_i i.$$

So there is $a_n \in J$ such that $1 - a_n \in \operatorname{ann} M$, and thus $1 \in J + \operatorname{ann} M$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 3.64. *Explain why Theorem 3.48 is an equivalent (but nicer?) reformulation of Theorem 3.42a).*

COROLLARY 3.49. *Let M be a finitely generated R-module such that $\mathfrak{m}M = M$ for all maximal ideals of R. Then $M = 0$.*

EXERCISE 3.65. *Prove Corollary 3.49.*

For an R-module M, we define its **trace ideal** to be the ideal $\mathcal{T}(M)$ of R generated by all the images $f(M)$ of R-module maps $f \in M^\vee = \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, R)$.

EXERCISE 3.66. *Let R be a ring.*

a) *Show:* $\mathcal{T}(R) = R$.

b) *Show:* $\mathcal{T}(M_1 \oplus M_2) = \langle \mathcal{T}(M_1), \mathcal{T}(M_2) \rangle$.

c) *Show: if M is an R-module such that $\mathcal{T}(M) = R$, then M is faithful.*

THEOREM 3.50. *Let P be a projective module, and let $\mathcal{T}(P)$ be its trace ideal.*
  a) *We have $\mathcal{T}(P)P = P$, $\mathcal{T}(P)^2 = \mathcal{T}(P)$ and $\operatorname{ann}\mathcal{T}(P) = \operatorname{ann} P$.*
  b) *Suppose that P is moreover finitely generated. Then $\mathcal{T}(P)$ is finitely generated, and R decomposes as a direct product of rings:*

$$R = \mathcal{T}(P) \times \operatorname{ann} P.$$

PROOF. a) Let $\{(a_i, f_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be as in the Dual Basis Lemma: for all $a \in P$ we have $a = \sum_{i \in I} f_i(a)a_i$. This shows that $\mathcal{T}(P)P = P$. For $f \in P^\vee$ we have

$$\forall a \in P, \ f(a) = \sum_{i \in I} f_i(a) f(a_i),$$

which shows that $\mathcal{T}(P)^2 = \mathcal{T}(P)$. If $s \in \operatorname{ann} P$ and $f \in P^\vee$ then for all $a \in P$ we have $sf(a) = f(sa) = 0$, so $s \in \operatorname{ann}\mathcal{T}(P)$. If $s \in \operatorname{ann}\mathcal{T}(P)$ and $a \in P$, then

$$sa = s\left(\sum_i f_i(a)a_i\right) = 0,$$

so $s \in \operatorname{ann} P$.
b) By Exercise 3.31 we may take the index set I to be $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. We claim that $\mathcal{T}(P)$ is generated by the set $\{f_j(a_i)\}$. By Exercise 3.32 we have $P^\vee = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle$, so for $f \in P^\vee$ there are $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R$ such that $f = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j f_j$, and then for any $a \in P$ we have

$$f(a) = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j f_j(a) = \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} x_j f_i(a) f_j(a_i).$$

Therefore $\mathcal{T}(P)$ is a finitely generated idempotent ideal, so by Corollary 3.46 it is principal and generated by an idempotent element, say e. As with any idempotent element, this gives us a direct product decomposition

$$R = eR \times (1-e)R = (e) \times \operatorname{ann}(e) = \mathcal{T}(P) \times \operatorname{ann}\mathcal{T}(P) = \mathcal{T}(P) \times \operatorname{ann} P. \quad \square$$

COROLLARY 3.51. *A nonzero finitely generated projective module over a connected ring R (i.e., without idempotents other than 0 and 1) is faithful.*

EXERCISE 3.67. *Prove Corollary 3.51.*

COROLLARY 3.52. *Let $R \subseteq S$ be an extension of rings.*
  a) *We have that R is a direct summand of the R-module S if and only if $\mathcal{T}(S) = R$.*
  b) *If S is finitely generated an projective as an R-module, then R is a direct summand of S.*

PROOF. a) First suppose that we have an R-module decomposition $S = R \oplus A$. Then by Exercise 3.66 we have $\mathcal{T}(S) \supseteq \mathcal{T}(R) = R$.
Now suppose that $\mathcal{T}(S) = R$, so there are elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in S$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in S^\vee$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i) = 1$. Define $\ell \in S^\vee$ by

$$\ell(s) := \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(sa_i).$$

Then for all $r \in R$ we have

$$\ell(r) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(ra_i) = r\left(\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(a_i)\right) = r,$$

so if $\iota : R \hookrightarrow S$ is the inclusion map we have $\ell \circ \iota = 1_R$ and thus $S = R \oplus \operatorname{Ker} \ell$.

b) By Theorem 3.50, we have $R = \mathcal{T}(S) \times \operatorname{ann} S$. Since R is a faithful R-module, so is the larger R-module S: $\operatorname{ann} S = (0)$. Thus $\mathcal{T}(S) = R$, so part a) applies. $\square$

Later on we will study Dedekind domains, and in particular characterize them as the Noetherian domains for which every finitely generated torsionfree module is projective. Thus Corollary 3.52 has the following application that is useful in number theory: let R be a Dedeknd domain, with fraction field K. Let V be a finite-dimensional K-vector space. An **R-order** in V is a ring $R \subseteq \mathcal{O} \subseteq V$ such that $\mathcal{O}$ is finitely generated as an R-module. Since $\mathcal{O}$ is torsionfree, it then follows that R is a direct summand of $\mathcal{O}$.

8.4. Applications to modules over local rings.

LEMMA 3.53. *Let R be a ring and J an ideal which is contained in every maximal ideal of R, and let M be a finitely presented R-module. Suppose that:*

(i) *M/JM is a free R/J-module, and*
(ii) *The canonical map $J \otimes_R M \to JM$ is injective.*

Then M is a free R-module.

PROOF. We may choose a family $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ of elements of M such that the images in M/JM give a R/J-basis. (Since M is finitely generated over R, M/JM is finitely generated over R/J, so the index set I is necessarily finite.) Consider the finitely generated free R-module $L = \bigoplus_{i \in I} R$, with canonical basis $\{e_i\}$. Let $u : L \to M$ be the unique R-linear mapping each e_i to x_i, and let $K = \ker(u)$. Since M is finitely *presented*, by Proposition 3.6 K is finitely generated. We have a commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$J \otimes K \to J \otimes L \to J \otimes M \to 0$$

$$0 \to K \to L \to M \to 0,$$

where each vertical map – $a : J \otimes K \to K$, $b : J \otimes L \to L$, $c : J \otimes M \to M$ – is the natural multiplication map. Our hypothesis is that the the map $J \otimes_R M \to JM$ is injective, so by the Snake Lemma we get an exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{coker}(a) \to \operatorname{coker}(b) \xrightarrow{\overline{u}} \operatorname{coker}(c).$$

Now observe that $\operatorname{coker}(b) = (R/J) \otimes_R L$ and $\operatorname{coker}(c) = (R/J) \otimes_R M$, and by definition the mapping $u : L \to M$ gives, upon passage to the quotient modulo J, a mapping from one R/J-module basis to another. So $\overline{u}$ is an isomorphism and thus $\operatorname{coker}(a) = 0$, i.e., $K/JK = 0$. By Nakayama's Lemma we conclude $K = 0$, i.e., u gives an isomorphism from the free module L to M, so M is free. $\square$

We can now prove the following result, which is one that we will build upon in our future studies of modules over commutative rings.

THEOREM 3.54. *Let R be a ring with a unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ – i.e., a* local ring. *For a finitely presented R-module M, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *M is free.*
(ii) *M is projective.*
(iii) *M is flat.*
(iv) *The natural map $\mathfrak{m} \otimes_R M \to \mathfrak{m}M$ is an injection.*

PROOF. Each of the implications (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii) $\implies$ (iv) is immediate. Assume (iv). Then, since $\mathfrak{m}$ is maximal, $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a field, so every $R/\mathfrak{m}$-module is free. Therefore Lemma 3.53 applies to complete the proof. $\qquad\square$

9. Ordinal Filtrations and Applications

9.1. The Transfinite Dévissage Lemma.

Let M be an R-module. By an **ordinal filtration** on M we mean an ordinal number α and for each $i \leq \alpha$ a submodule M_i of M satisfying all of the following:
(OF1) $M_0 = 0$, $M_\alpha = M$.
(OF2) For all $i, j \in \alpha + 1$, $i \leq j \implies M_i \subset M_j$.
(OF3) For all limit ordinals $i \leq \alpha$, $M_i = \bigcup_{j < i} M_j$.

So for instance, taking $\alpha = \omega = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$ the first infinite ordinal, we recover the usual notion of an exhaustive filtration by submodules M_n, with the additional convention that $M_\omega = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} M_n$.

For $i < \alpha$, we call M_{i+1}/M_i the **ith successive quotient**. If for a class $\mathcal{C}$ of R-modules each successive quotient lies in $\mathcal{C}$, we say the filtration is of **class $\mathcal{C}$**.

Define the **associated graded module** $\text{Gr}(M) = \bigoplus_{i < \alpha} M_{i+1}/M_i$.

LEMMA 3.55. *(Transfinite Dévissage Lemma) Let M be an R-module and $\{M_i\}_{i \leq \alpha}$ an ordinal filtration of M.*
a) Suppose we make the following hypothesis:
(DS) For all $i < \alpha$ the submodule M_i is a direct summand of M_{i+1}. Then

$$M \cong \text{Gr}(M) = \bigoplus_{i < \alpha} M_{i+1}/M_i.$$

b) Hypothesis (DS) holds if each successive quotient M_{i+1}/M_i is projective.
c) Hypothesis (DS) holds if each M_i is injective.

EXERCISE 3.68. *Prove Lemma 3.55. (Hint: use transfinite induction.)*

COROLLARY 3.56. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is free.
(ii) M admits an ordinal filtration with successive quotients isomorphic to R.
(iii) M admits an ordinal filtration with free successive quotients.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): If M is free, then $M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} R$. By the Well-Ordering Principle[10], I is in bijection with an ordinal α, so we may write $M \cong \bigoplus_{i < \alpha} R$, and put $M_i = \bigoplus_{j < i} R$.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii) is immediate.
(iii) $\implies$ (i) follows from Lemma 3.55 since free modules are projective. $\qquad\square$

---

[10]This set-theoretic axiom is equivalent to the Axiom of Choice and also to Zorn's Lemma. Our running convention in these notes is to freely use these axioms when necessary.

9.2. Hereditary and semihereditary rings.

An R-module is **hereditary** if every submodule is projective. (In particular a hereditary module is projective, and thus the property of being projective is "inherited" by its submodules.) We say that a ring R is **hereditary** if R is a hereditary R-module, or equivalently every ideal of R is projective as an R-module.

EXERCISE 3.69. *a) Show: every submodule of a hereditary module is hereditary.*
b) Show: the zero module is hereditary.
c) Show: there are nonzero rings R for which the only hereditary R-module is the zero module.

EXAMPLE 3.57. *A PID is a hereditary ring. Indeed, any nonzero ideal of a PID R is isomorphic as an R-module to R.*

THEOREM 3.58.
a) For $i \in I$, let M_i be a hereditary R-module, and let N be an R-submodule of $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$. Then there is for all $i \in I$ an R-submodule H_i of M_i such that $N \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} H_i$.
b) For R hereditary and M an R-module, the following are equivalent:
(i) M is isomorphic to to a direct sum of ideals of R.
(ii) M can be embedded in a free R-module.
(iii) M can be embedded in a projective R-module.

PROOF. a) Let $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I}$ be a direct sum of hereditary modules, and let N be an R-submodule of M. By the Well-Ordering Principle there is a bijection from I to some ordinal α, and without loss of generality we may assume $M = \bigoplus_{i \in \alpha} M_i$. For $j \in \alpha^+$, put $P_j = \bigoplus_{i < j^+} M_i$, so that $\{M_j\}$ is an ordinal-indexed chain of R-submodules of M with final element $P_\alpha = M$. For each $j \in \alpha^+$, put

$$N_j = N \cap P_j,$$

so $\{N_j\}$ is an ordinal filtration on N with $N_\alpha = N$. Moreover, for all $i \in \alpha$ we have $N_i = N_{i+1} \cap P_i$ and thus

$$N_{i+1}/N_i = N_i/(N_{i+1} \cap P_i) \cong (N_{i+1} + P_i)/P_i.$$

Thus N_{i+1}/N_i is isomorphic to a submodule H_i of $P_{i+1}/P_i \cong M_i$. For $i \in I$, since M_i is hereditary, so is $H_i \cong N_{i+1}/N_i$. In particular each N_{i+1}/N_i is projective, and the Transfinite Dévissage Lemma (Lemma 3.55) applies to show that

$$N \cong \operatorname{Gr} N = \bigoplus_{i < \alpha} N_{i+1}/N_i \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} H_i.$$

b) (i) $\implies$ (ii): Since an ideal is precisely an R-submodule of a free R-module of rank 1, this holds over any ring.
(ii) $\iff$ (iii): Since every projective module is a direct summand of a free R-module, this also holds over any ring.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): This follows from part a). $\qquad\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 3.59. *Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of R-modules. Then $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ is hereditary if and only if M_i is hereditary for all i.*

PROOF. Suppose each M_i is hereditary, and let N be a submodule of M. By Theorem 3.58a), there is for all $i \in I$ an R-submodule H_i of M_i such that

$N \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} H_i$. Each H_i, being a submodule of the hereditary module M_i, is itself hereditary, hence projective. Thus N is a direct sum of projective modules, hence projective. Conversely, if M is hereditary, so are all of its submodules M_i. $\square$

LEMMA 3.60. *a) (Checking Projectivity With Injectives) Let P be an R-module such that: for every injective module I, surjection $q : I \to Q$ and module map $f : P \to Q$, there is $F : P \to I$ such that $q \circ F = f$. Then P is projective.*
b) (Checking Injectivity With Projectives) Let I be an R-module such that: for every projective R-module P, injection $\iota : S \to P$ and module map $f : S \to I$, there is $F : P \to I$ such that $F \circ \iota = f$. Then I is injective.

PROOF. a) Let $0 \to A' \xrightarrow{\iota} A \xrightarrow{\tau} A'' \to 0$ be a short exact sequence of R-modules, and let $f : P \to A''$ be a module map. Let $\sigma : A \to I$ be an embedding into an injective module, and consider the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & A' & \xrightarrow{\iota} & A & \xrightarrow{\tau} & A'' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \| & & \downarrow{\sigma} & & & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & A' & \xrightarrow{\sigma \circ \iota} & I & \xrightarrow{q} & Q & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
$$

Step 1: We claim there is $\rho : A'' \to Q$ making the diagram commute.
Proof: This is a routine diagram chase: choose $y \in A''$, lift to x in A, and put $\rho(y) = (q \circ \sigma)(x)$. Let us check that this is well-defined: if we chose a different lift x' in A, then $x - x' \in A'$, so $(q \circ \sigma)(x - x') = 0$.
Step 2: By hypothesis, the map $\rho \circ f : P \to Q$ can be lifted to $G : P \to I$. To complete the proof it suffices to show $G(P) \subset \sigma(A)$. To see this, let $x \in P$ and choose $a \in A$ such that $\tau(a) = f(x)$. Then

$$ q(G(x)) = \rho(f(x)) = \rho(\tau(a)) = q(\sigma(a)), $$

so $G(x) - \sigma(a) \in \operatorname{Ker} q = \operatorname{Im}(\sigma \circ q)$. That is, there is $a' \in A'$ such that $\sigma(\iota(a')) = G(x) - \sigma(a)$, so

$$ G(x) = \sigma(\iota(a') + a) \in \sigma(A). $$

b) This is the dual version of part a), i.e., obtained by reversing all the arrows. The above proof also dualizes, as we leave it to the reader to check. $\square$

COROLLARY 3.61. *(Cartan-Eilenberg)*
For a ring R, the following are equivalent:

    (i) *R is hereditary.*
    (ii) *Every free R-module is hereditary.*
    (iii) *Every projective R-module is hereditary.*
    (iv) *Every quotient of an injective R-module is injective.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is immediate from Corollary 3.59.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Suppose that every free R-module is hereditary. Then if P is a projective R-module, P is a submodule of a free module, hence a submodule of a hereditary module, hence itself hereditary.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): R is a projective R-module.
(iv) $\iff$ (iii): Let P' be a submodule of a projective R-module P; call the inclusion j. We will use Lemma 3.60a) : let I be an injective module, $q : I \to I'$ a surjection, and $f : P' \to I'$ a module map. By assumption I' is injective, so there is $h : P \to I'$ such that $h \circ j = f$. Since P is projective, there is $k : P \to I$ such

that $q \circ k = h$. Then $F = k \circ j : P' \to I$ lifts f: $q \circ F = q \circ k \circ j = h \circ j = f$.

(iii) $\implies$ (iv): Using Lemma 3.60b) we may dualize the proof of (iv) $\implies$ (iii). $\square$

THEOREM 3.62. *Let R be a a PID and F a free R-module. Then any submodule M of F is again free, of rank less than or equal to the rank of F. In particular R is a hereditary ring.*

PROOF. Let N be a submodule of $F = \bigoplus_{i \in I} R$. By Theorem 3.58b) for all $i \in I$ there is an ideal J_i of R such that $N \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} J_i$. Since R is a PID, each J_i is is a free R-module of rank 0 or 1, so N is free of rank at most $\#I$. $\square$

COROLLARY 3.63. *A projective module over a PID is free.*

COROLLARY 3.64. *For a finitely generated module M over a PID R, the folowing are equivalent:*

(i) *M is free.*
(ii) *M is torsionfree.*

PROOF. (i) Over any domain R, a free R-module is torsionfree. (ii) $\implies$ (i): Let M be a finitely generated module over a PID. By Proposition 3.8b), M is a submodule of a finitely generated free R-module. Applying Theorem 3.62 we deduce that M is free. $\square$

EXERCISE 3.70. *Let R be a ring with the following property: every submodule of a finitely generated free R-module is free. Show that R is a principal ring (i.e., every ideal of R is principal).*

An R-module M is **semihereditary** if every finitely generated R-submodule N of M is projective. Thus a Noetherian semihereditary module is hereditary. A ring R is **semihereditary** if R is a semihereditary R-module, or equivalently every finitely generated ideal of R is projective as an R-module.

EXAMPLE 3.65. *A domain in which every finitely generated ideal is principal is semihereditary. These are called **Bézout domains** and will be studied later on.*

THEOREM 3.66. *Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ a family of semihereditary R-modules, and let N be a finitely generated R-submodule of $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$. Then for all $i \in I$ there is an R-submodule H_i of M_i such that $N \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} H_i$.*

PROOF. The proof of Theorem 3.58a) goes through verbatim. $\square$

THEOREM 3.67. *Let R be a domain in which every finitely generated ideal is principal, and let F be a free R-module. Then any finitely generated submodule N of F is free, of rank less than or equal to the rank of F.*

PROOF. One can adapt the proof of Theorem 3.63, using Theorem 3.66 in place of Theorem 3.58. $\square$

THEOREM 3.68. *Let R be a domain in which every finitely generated ideal is principal. Then every finitely generated torsionfree R-module is free.*

PROOF. The argument is the same as that of Proposition 3.64 (a special case), using Theorem 3.67 in place of Theorem 3.62. $\square$

THEOREM 3.69 (F. Albrecht). *Let R be a semihereditary ring, F a free R-module, and P a finitely generated submodule of F.*

a) P is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of finitely generated ideals of R.
b) In particular, P is a finitely generated projective module.
c) If R is a domain with fraction field K and F is free of finite rank n, then the rank of P – i.e., $\dim_K P \otimes_R K$ – is at most n.

EXERCISE 3.71. *Use Theorem 3.66 to prove Theorem 3.69.*

9.3. Big modules.

LEMMA 3.70. *(Kaplansky) Let R be a ring, and let F be an R-module which is a direct sum of countably generated submodules: say $F = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} E_\lambda$. Then every direct summand of F is again a direct sum of countably generated submodules.*

PROOF. We CLAIM that there is an ordinal filtration $\{F_i\}_{i \leq \alpha}$ on F satisfying all of the following properties. (i) For all $i < \alpha$, F_{i+1}/F_i is countably generated. (ii) If $M_i = F_i \cap M$, $N_i = F_i \cap N$, then $F_i = M_i \oplus N_i$.
(iii) For each i there is a subset Λ_i of Λ such that $F_i = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_i} \Lambda_i$.
SUFFICIENCY OF CLAIM: If so, $\{M_i\}_{i \leq \alpha}$ is an ordinal filtration on M. Moreover, since $M_i \subset M_{i+1}$ are both direct summands of F, M_i is a direct summand of M_{i+1}. The Transfinite Dévissage Lemma (Lemma 3.55) applies to give

$$M \cong \mathrm{Gr}(M) = \bigoplus_{i < \alpha} M_{i+1}/M_i.$$

Moreover, for all $i < \alpha$ we have

$$F_{i+1}/F_i = (M_{i+1} \oplus N_{i+1})/(M_i \oplus N_i) \cong M_{i+1}/M_i \oplus N_{i+1}/N_i,$$

which shows that each successive quotient M_{i+1}/M_i is countably generated. Therefore M is a direct sum of countably generated submodules.
PROOF OF CLAIM: We will construct the filtration by transfinite induction. The base case and the limit ordinal induction step are forced upon us by the definition of ordinal filtration: we must have $F_0 = \{0\}$, and for any limit ordinal $\beta \leq \alpha$, assuming we have defined F_i for all $i < \beta$ we must have $F_\beta = \bigcup_{i < \beta} F_i$.

So consider the case of a successor ordinal $\beta = \beta' + 1$. Let Q_1 be any E_λ which is not contained in $F_{\beta'}$. (Otherwise we have $F_{\beta'} = F$ and we may just define $F_i = F$ for all $\beta \leq i \leq \alpha$.) Let $x_{11}, x_{12}, \ldots$ be a sequence of generators of Q_1, and decompose x_{11} into its M- and N-components. Let Q_2 be the direct sum of the finitely many E_λ which are necessary to write both of these components, and let $x_{21}, x_{22}, \ldots$ be a sequence of generators for Q_2. Similarly decompose x_{12} into M and N components, and let Q_3 be the direct sum of the finitely many E_λ needed to write out these components, and let $x_{31}, x_{32}, \ldots$ be a sequence of generators of Q_3. We continue to carry out this procedure for all x_{ij}, proceeding according to a diagonal enumeration of $\mathbb{Z}^+ \times \mathbb{Z}^+$: i.e., $x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{21}, x_{13}, x_{22}, x_{31}, \ldots$. Put $F_\beta = \langle F_{\beta'}, \{x_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \rangle_R$. This works! $\square$

For a cardinal number κ, we say that a module is κ-**generated** if it admits a generating set of cardinality at most κ.

EXERCISE 3.72. *(Warfield) Let κ be an infinite cardinal. Formulate and prove a version of Lemma 3.70 in which "countably generated" is replaced by "κ-generated".*

THEOREM 3.71. *(Kaplansky) For a ring R, let $\mathcal{P}_c$ be the class of countably generated projective R-modules. For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
    (i) *M admits an ordinal filtration of class $\mathcal{P}_c$.*

(ii) *M is a direct sum of countably generated projective submodules.*

(iii) *M is projective.*

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii) follows immediately from Lemma 3.55.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii): any direct sum of projective modules is projective.

(iii) $\implies$ (ii): If M is projective, let F be a free R-module with $F = M \oplus N$. Certainly F is a direct sum of countably generated submodules (indeed, of singly generated submodules!), so by Lemma 3.70 M is a direct sum of a family of countably generated submodules, each of which must be projective. $\square$

While pondering the significance of this result, one naturally inquires:

QUESTION 2. *Is there a ring R and an R-module M which is* not *a direct sum of countably generated submodules?*

THEOREM 3.72. *(Cohen-Kaplansky [**CK51**], Griffith) For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*

(i) Every R-module is a direct sum of cyclic (i.e., singly generated) R-modules.

(ii) Every R-module is a direct sum of finitely generated submodules.

(iii) R is an Artinian principal ideal ring.

Building on these results as well as work of Faith and Walker [**FW67**], R.B. Warfield Jr. proved the following striking results.

THEOREM 3.73. *(Warfield [**Wa**]) Let R be a Noetherian ring which is not a principal Artinian ring. Then for any cardinal κ, there exists a module M with the following properties:*

(i) M is not κ-generated, and

(ii) Any decomposition of M into the direct sum of nonzero submodules has only finitely many direct summands.

The hypotheses of Theorem 3.73 apply for instance to the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers and yields, in particular, for any infinite cardinal κ a commutative group M which is not a direct sum of κ-generated submodules.

THEOREM 3.74. *(Warfield [**Wa**]) For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*

(i) Every R-module is a direct sum of cyclic submodules.

(ii) There exists a cardinal number κ such that every R-module is a direct sum of κ-generated submodules.

(iii) R is a principal Artinian ring.

It is natural to wonder whether Theorem 3.73 can be strengthened in the following way: an R-module M is **indecomposable** if it cannot be expressed as a direct sum of two nonzero submodules.

QUESTION 3. *For which rings R do there exist indecomposable R-modules of all infinite cardinalities?*

However, Question 3 has turned out to be bound up with sophisticated set-theoretic considerations. Namely, in a 1959 paper [**Fu59**], L. Fuchs claimed that there exist indecomposable commutative groups of all infinite cardinalties, thus giving an affirmative answer to Question 3 for the ring $R = \mathbb{Z}$. However, it was later observed (by A.L.S. Corner) that Fuchs' argument is valid only for cardinals κ less than the first **inaccessible cardinal**. Exactly what an inaccessible cardinal is we do not wish to

say, but we mention that the nonexistence of inaccessible cardinals is equiconsistent with the standard ZFC axioms of set theory (in other words, if the ZFC axioms are themselves consistent, then ZFC plus the additional axiom that there are no inaccessible cardinals remains consistent) but that nevertheless set theorists have reasons to believe in them. See also [**Fu74**] in which these issues are addressed and he proves that there is an indecomposable commutative group of any infinite **nonmeasurable** cardinality (note: accessible implies nonmeasurable).

QUESTION 4. *Is there a ring R and a projective R-module M which is* not *a direct sum of finitely generated submodules?*

Again the answer is *yes*. A very elegant example was given by Kaplansky (unpublished, apparently).[11] Namely that R be the ring of all real-valued continuous functions on the unit interval $[0, 1]$, and let I be the ideal of functions $f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ which vanish near zero: i.e., for which there exists $\epsilon = \epsilon(f) > 0$ such that $f|_{[0,\epsilon(f)]} = 0$.

EXERCISE 3.73. *Show the ideal I defined above gives a projective R-module which is not the direct sum of finitely generated submodules.*
(Suggestions: (i) to show that I is projective, use the Dual Basis Lemma. (ii) A slick proof of the fact that I is not a direct sum of finitely generated submodules can be given by Swan's Theorem using the contractibility of the unit interval.)

LEMMA 3.75. *Let M be a projective module over the local ring R, and let $x \in M$. There is a direct summand M' of M such that M' contains x and M' is free.*

PROOF. Let F be a free module with $F = M \oplus N$. Choose a basis $B = \{u_i\}_{i \in I}$ of F with respect to which the element x of M has the minimal possible number of nonzero coordinates. Write

$$x = r_1 u_1 + \ldots + r_n u_n, \ r_i \in R^\bullet.$$

Then for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $r_i \notin \sum_{j \neq i} R r_j$. Indeed, if say $r_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} s_i r_i$, then $x = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_i(u_i + s_i u_n)$, contradicting the minimality of the chosen basis.
Now write $u_i = y_i + z_i$ with $y_i \in M$, $z_i \in N$, so

$$(6) \qquad x = \sum_i r_i u_i = \sum_i r_i y_i.$$

We may write

$$(7) \qquad y_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ij} u_j + t_i,$$

with t_i a linear combination of elements of $B \setminus \{u_1, \ldots, u_n\}$. Substituting (7) into (6) and projecting onto M gives the relations

$$r_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_{ji} r_j,$$

or equivalently, for all i,

$$(1 - c_{ii}) r_i = \sum_{j \neq i} c_{ji} r_j.$$

If for any i and j, then one of the coefficients of r_j in the above equation is a unit of R, then dividing through by it expresses r_j as an R-linear combination of the

---
[11]Warm thanks to Gjergji Zaimi for bringing this important example to my attention.

other r_i's, which as above is impossible. Therefore, since R is local, each coefficient must lie in the maximal ideal of R:

$$\forall i, \ 1 - c_{ii} \in \mathfrak{m}, \quad \forall i \neq j, \ c_{ij} \in \mathfrak{m}.$$

It follows that the determinant of the matrix $C = (c_{ij})$ is congruent to 1 modulo $\mathfrak{m}$, hence invertible: if $x \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $1 + x$ is not invertible, then $1 + x = y$ for $y \in \mathfrak{m}$, so $1 = y - x \in \mathfrak{m}$, contradiction. Therefore replacing $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ in B with $y_1, \ldots, y_n$ still yields a basis of F. It follows that $M' = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_n \rangle_R$ is a direct summand of F hence also of M which is a free module containing x.   □

THEOREM 3.76. *(Kaplansky) Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring, and let P be any projective R-module. Then P is free.*

PROOF. Step 1: Since by Theorem 3.71 P is a direct sum of countably generated projective submodules, we may as well assume that P itself is countably generated.
Step 2: Suppose $M = \langle \{x_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \rangle_R$ is a countably generated projective module over the local ring R. By Lemma 3.75, $M = F_1 \oplus M_1$ with F_1 free containing x_1. Note that M_1 is again projective and is generated by the images $\{x_n'\}_{n=2}^{\infty}$ of the elements x_n under the natural projection map $M \to M_1$. So reasoning as above, we may write $M_2 = F_2 \oplus M_2$ with F_2 free containing x_2'. Continuing in this manner, we get

$$M = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} F_n,$$

so M is free.   □

EXERCISE 3.74. *Give an example of a (necessarily infinitely generated) module over a local PID which is flat but not free.*

10. Tor and Ext

10.1. Co/chain complexes.

Let R be a ring. A **chain complex** $C_\bullet$ of R-modules is a family $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of R-modules together with for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, an R-module map $d_n : C_n \to C_{n-1}$ such that for all n, $d_{n-1} \circ d_n = 0$. (It is often the case that $C_n = 0$ for all $n < 0$, but this is not a required part of the definition.)

An example of a chain complex of R-modules is any long exact sequence. However, from the perspective of homology theory this is a trivial example in the following precise sense: for any chain complex we may define its **homology modules**: for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we put

$$H_n(C) = \operatorname{Ker}(d_n) / \operatorname{Im}(d_{n+1}).$$

EXAMPLE 3.77. *Let X be any topological space. For any ring R, we have the **singular chain complex** $S(X)_\bullet$: $S(X)_n = 0$ for $n < 0$, and for $n \geq 0$, $S(X)_n$ is the free R-module with basis the set of all continuous maps $\Delta_n \to X$, where Δ_n is the standard n-dimensional simplex. A certain carefully defined alternating sum of restrictions to faces of Δ_n gives rise to a boundary map $d_n : S(X)_n \to S(X)_{n-1}$, and the indeed the homology groups of this complex are nothing else than the singular homology groups $H_n(X, R)$ with coefficients in R.*

If $C_\bullet$ and $D_\bullet$ are two chain complexes of R-modules, a **homomorphism** $\eta : C_\bullet \to D_\bullet$ is given by maps $\eta_n : C_n \to D_n$ for all n rendering the following infinite ladder commutative:

INSERT ME!.

In this way one has evident notions of a **monomorphism** and **epimorphisms** of chain complexes. In fact the chain complexes of R-modules form an abelian category and thus these notions have a general categorical meaning, but it turns out they are equivalent to the more concrete naive conditions: η is a monomorphism if and only if each η_n is injective and is an epiomorphism if and only if each η_n is surjective.

In particular we may consider a short exact sequence of chain complexes:

$$0 \longrightarrow A_\bullet \longrightarrow B_\bullet \longrightarrow C_\bullet \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here is the first basic theorem of homological algebra.

THEOREM 3.78. *Let*

$$0 \longrightarrow A_\bullet \xrightarrow{f} B_\bullet \xrightarrow{g} C_\bullet \longrightarrow 0$$

*be a short exact sequence of chain complexes of R-modules. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ there is a natural **connecting homomorphism** $\partial : H_n(C) \to H_{n-1}(A)$ such that*

$$\ldots \xrightarrow{g} H_{n+1}(C) \xrightarrow{\partial} H_n(A) \xrightarrow{f} H_n(B) \xrightarrow{g} H_n(C) \xrightarrow{\partial} H_{n-1}(A) \xrightarrow{f} \ldots$$

is exact.

PROOF. No way. See [**W**, Thm. 1.3.1]. $\square$

Moreover, the homology modules H_n are functors: if $f : C_\bullet \to D_\bullet$ is a morphism of chain complexes, there are induced maps on the homology groups

$$H_n(f) : H_n(C) \to H_n(D).$$

EXAMPLE 3.79. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a continuous map of topological spaces. Then for any basic n-chain $\Delta_n \to X$ in $S(X)_n$, composition with f gives a basic n-chain $\Delta_n \to Y$ in $S(Y)_n$ and thus a homomorphism of chain complexes $S(f) : S(X)_\bullet \to S(Y)_\bullet$. There are induced maps on homology, namely the usual maps*

$$H_n(f) : H_n(X, R) \to H_n(Y, R).$$

There is an entirely parallel story for **cochain complexes** of R-modules, which are exactly the same as chain complexes but with a different indexing convention: a cochain complex $C^\bullet$ consists of for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ an R-module C^n and a "coboundary map" $d^n : C^n \to C^{n+1}$. To any cochain complex we get **cohomology modules**: for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, put

$$H^n(C) = \operatorname{Ker}(d^n)/\operatorname{Im}(d^{n-1}).$$

The rest of the discussion proceeds in parallel to that of chain complexes (including the realization of singular cohomology as a special case of this construction).

10.2. Chain homotopies.

Let $C_\bullet, D_\bullet$ be two chain complexes, and let $f, g : C_\bullet \to D_\bullet$ be two homomorphisms between them. We say that f and g are **chain homotopic** if there exist for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ R-module maps $s_n : C_n \to D_{n+1}$ such that

$$f_n - g_n = d_{n+1}s_n + s_{n-1}d_n.$$

The sequence $\{s_n\}$ is called a **chain homotopy** from f to g.

EXERCISE 3.75. *Show: chain homotopy is an equivalence relation on morphisms from $C_\bullet$ to $D_\bullet$.*

What on earth is going on here? Again topology is a good motivating example: we say that two maps $f, g : X \to Y$ are **homotopic** if there exists a continuous map $F : X \times [0, 1] \to Y$ such that for all $x \in X$, $F(x, 0) = f(x)$ and $F(x, 1) = g(x)$. This is an equivalence relation and is generally denoted by $f \sim g$. We then define two topological spaces to be **homotopy equivalent** if there exist maps $\varphi : X \to Y$ and $\psi : Y \to X$ such that

$$\psi \circ \varphi \sim 1_X, \ \varphi \circ \psi \sim 1_Y.$$

(We say that $\varphi : X \to Y$ is a **homotopy equivalence** if there exists a map ψ as above.) E.g. a space is **contractible** if it is homotopy equivalent to a single point.

One of the basic tenets of algebraic topology is that it aspires to study topological spaces only up to homotopy equivalence. That is, all of the fundamental invariants of spaces should be the same on homotopy equivalent spaces and homomorphisms between these invariants induced by homotopic maps should be identical. Especially, if $f : X \to Y$ is a homotopy equivalence, the induced maps $H_n(f) : H_n(X) \to H_n(Y)$ should be isomorphisms. In fact, if $f, g : X \to Y$ are homotopic, the induced morphisms $S(f), S(g) : S(X)_\bullet \to S(Y)_\bullet$ are chain homotopic. So the following result ensures that the induced maps on homology are equal.

PROPOSITION 3.80. *If $f, g : C_\bullet \to D_\bullet$ are chain homotopic, then for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $H_n(f) = H_n(g)$.*

PROOF. Replacing f and g by $f - g$ and 0, it is enough to assume that there exists a chain homotopy s from f to the zero map – i.e., for all n $f_n = d_{n+1}s_n + s_{n-1}d_n$ – and show that f induces the zero map on homology. So take $x \in H_n(C)$. Then x is represented by an element of C_n lying in the kernel of d_n, so

$$f_n(x) = d_{n+1}s_n x + s_{n-1}d_n x = d_{n+1}s_n x + 0 = d_{n+1}s_n x.$$

Thus $f_n(x)$ lies in the image of $d_{n+1}D_{n+1} \to D_n$ so represents $0 \in H_n(D)$.   □

10.3. Resolutions.

Let M be an R-module. A **left resolution** of M is an infinite sequence $\{A_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ of R-modules, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ an R-module map $A_{n+1} \to A_n$ and an R-module map $A_0 \to M$ such that the sequence

$$\ldots \longrightarrow A_{n+1} \to A_n \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow A_1 \longrightarrow A_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. By abuse of notation, we often speak of "the resolution $A_\bullet$. Dually, a **right resolution** of M is an infinite sequence $\{B^i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ of R-modules, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

an R-module map $B^n \to B^{n+1}$ and an R-module map $M \to B^0$ such that the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow B^0 \longrightarrow B^1 \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow B^n \longrightarrow B^{n1} \ldots$$

is exact. We speak of "the resolution $B^{\bullet}$".

A **projective resolution** of M is a left resolution $A_{\bullet}$ such that each A_n is projective. A **injective resolution** of M is a right resolution $B^{\bullet}$ such that each B^n is injective. (Exactly why we are not interested in left injective resolutions and right projective resolutions will shortly become clear.)

THEOREM 3.81. *(Existence of resolutions) Let M be an R-module.*
a) Since every R-module is the quotient of a projective (indeed, of a free) module, M admits a projective resolution.
b) Since every R-module can be embedded in an injective module, M admits an injective resolution.

PROOF. a) Choose a projective module P_0, a surjection $\epsilon_0 : P_0 \to M$, and put $M_0 = \ker(\epsilon_0)$. Inductively, given M_{n-1}, we choose a projective module P_n, a surjection $\epsilon_n : P_n \to M_{n-1}$, and put $M_n = \ker(\epsilon_0)$. As our map $d_n : P_n \to P_{n-1}$ we take the composite

$$P_n \xrightarrow{\epsilon_n} M_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\ker(\epsilon_{n-1})} P_{n-1}.$$

We claim that the resulting sequence

$$\ldots \longrightarrow P_{n+1} \to P_n \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow P_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. It is certainly exact at M. If $x \in P_0$ and $\epsilon_0(x) = 0$, then $x_0 \in M_0$. Lifting x_0 via the surjection ϵ_1 to $x_1 \in P_1$, we find $d_1(x_1) = \epsilon_1(x_1) = x_0$, so $\ker(\epsilon_0) \subset \text{Im}(d_1)$. Conversely, since d_1 factors through $\ker(\epsilon_0)$, it is clear that $\text{Im}(d_1) \subset \ker(\epsilon_0)$. Exactly the same argument verifies exactness at P_n for each $n > 0$, so $P_{\bullet}$ is a projective resolution of M.
b) We leave the proof of this part to the reader as an exercise, with the following comforting remark: the notion of an injective module is obtained from the notion of a projective module by "reversing all the arrows", which is the same relationship that a left resolution bears to a right resolution. Therefore it should be possible to prove part b) simply by holding up the proof of part a) to a mirror. (And it is.) $\square$

THEOREM 3.82. *(Comparison theorem for resolutions)*
a) Let $P_{\bullet}$ be a projective resolution of the R-module M. Let N be another R-module and $f_{-1} : M \to N$ be an R-module map. Then for every left resolution $A_{\bullet}$ of N there exists a homomorphism η from the chain complex $P_{\bullet} \to M \to 0$ to the chain complex $A_{\bullet} \to N \to 0$. Moreover η is unique up to chain homotopy.
b) Let $E^{\bullet}$ be an injective resolution of the R-module N. Let M be another R-module and $f' : M \to N$ be an R-module map. Then for every right resolution $A^{\bullet}$ of M there exists a homomorphism η from the chain complex $0 \to M \to A^{\bullet}$ to the chain complex $0 \to N \to E^{\bullet}$. Moreover η is unique up to chain homotopy.

PROOF. No way. See [**W**, Thms. 2.2.6 and 2.3.7]. $\square$

EXERCISE 3.76. *Let F be a covariant additive functor on the category of R-modules. Let $C_{\bullet}$ and $D_{\bullet}$ be two chain complexes of R-modules and $f, g : C_{\bullet} \to D_{\bullet}$ be two homomorphisms between them.*

a) Show that $FC_\bullet$ and $FD_\bullet$ are chain complexes and there are induced chain homomorphisms Ff, $Fg : FC_\bullet \to FD_\bullet$.
b) Show that if f and g are chain homotopic, so are Ff and Fg.
(Suggestion: Show that it makes sense to apply F to a chain homotopy s.)

10.4. Derived functors.

Let us consider covariant, additive functors F from the category of R-modules to itself. (Recall that additive means that for any M, N, the induced map $\operatorname{Hom}(M, N) \to \operatorname{Hom}(F(M), F(N))$ is a homomorphism of commutative groups.)

EXERCISE 3.77. *For any additive functor F and any chain complex $C_\bullet$ of R-modules, $FC_\bullet$ is again a chain complex.*
(Hint: an additive functor takes the zero homomorphism to the zero homomorphism.)

Thus if

$$0 \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow M_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence of R-modules, then

$$0 \longrightarrow F(M_1) \longrightarrow F(M_2) \longrightarrow F(M_3) \longrightarrow 0$$

is necessarily a *complex* of modules but not necessarily exact: it may have nonzero homology.

EXAMPLE 3.83. *For any ring R, the functor $F(M) = M \oplus M$ is exact. For $R = \mathbb{Z}$ the functor $F(M) = M \otimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is not exact: for instance it takes the short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\cdot 2} \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow 0$$

to the complex

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\cdot 2} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow 0,$$

but multiplication by 2 on $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is not an injection.

Although an exact functor is a thing of beauty and usefulness to all, it turns out that from a homological algebraic point of view, it is the functors which are "half exact" which are more interesting: they give rise to co/homology theories.

An additive functor F is **right exact** if for any exact sequence of the form

$$M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow M_3 \longrightarrow 0,$$

the induced sequence

$$FM_1 \longrightarrow FM_2 \longrightarrow FM_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

is again exact. This much was true for the functor $F(M) = M \otimes \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, at least for the sequence we chose above. In fact this holds for all tensor products.

PROPOSITION 3.84. *For any ring R and any R-module N, the functor $F(M) = M \otimes_R N$ is right exact.*

EXERCISE 3.78. *Prove Proposition 3.84*

We have also the dual notion of an additive functor F being **left exact**: for any exact sequence of the form

$$0 \to M_1 \to M_2 \to M_3,$$

the induced sequence

$$0 \to FM_1 \to FM_2 \to FM_3$$

is again exact.

We now wish to press our luck a bit by extending this definition to contravariant functors. Here a little abstraction actually makes me less confused, so I will pass it along to you: we say that a contravariant functor F from the abelian category $\mathcal{C}$ to the abelian category $\mathcal{D}$ is left exact (resp. right exact) if the associated covariant functor $F^{\mathrm{opp}} : \mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{opp}} \to \mathcal{D}$ is left exact (resp. right exact). Concretely, a contravariant functor F from R-modules to R-modules is **left exact** if every exact sequence of the form

$$M_1 \to M_2 \to M_3 \to 0$$

is transformed to an exact sequence

$$0 \to FM_3 \to FM_2 \to FM_1.$$

(And similarly for right exact contravariant functors.)

PROPOSITION 3.85. *Let R be a ring and X be an R-module.*
a) The functor $M \mapsto \mathrm{Hom}(X, M)$ is covariant and left exact.
(Recall that it is exact if and only if X if projective.)
b) The functor $M \mapsto \mathrm{Hom}(M, X)$ is contravariant and left exact.
(Recall that it is exact if and only if X is injective.)

EXERCISE 3.79. *Prove Proposition 3.85.*

Let F be a right exact additive functor on the category of R-modules. We will define a sequence $\{L_n F\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of functors, with $L_0 F = F$, called the **left derived functors** of F. The idea here is that the left-derived functors quantify the failure of F to be exact.

Let M be an R-module. We define all the functors $L^n F$ at once, as follows: first we choose any projective resolution $P_\bullet \to M \to 0$ of M. Second we take away the M, getting a complex $P_\bullet$ which is exact except at P_0, i.e.,

$$H_0(P) = P_0 / \mathrm{Im}(P_1 \to P_0) = P_0 / \mathrm{Ker}(P_0 \to M) = M,$$

$$\forall n > 0, H_n(P) = 0.$$

Third we apply the functor F getting a new complex $FP_\bullet$. And finally, we take homology of this new complex, defining

$$(L_n F)(M) := H_n(FP_\bullet).$$

Now there is (exactly?) one thing which is relatively clear at this point.

PROPOSITION 3.86. *We have $(L_0 F)(M) = FM$.*

PROOF. Since $P_1 \to P_0 \to M \to 0$ is exact and F is right exact, $FP_1 \to FP_0 \to FM \to 0$ is exact, hence

$$\operatorname{Im}(FP_1 \to FP_0) = \operatorname{Ker}(FP_0 \to FM).$$

Thus

$$(L_0 F)(M) = H_0(FP_\bullet) = \operatorname{Ker}(FP_0 \to 0)/\operatorname{Im}(FP_1 \to FP_0)$$

$$= FP_0/\operatorname{Ker}(FP_0 \to FM) = FM.$$

$\square$

Before saying anything else about the left derived functors $L_n F$, there is an obvious point to be addressed: how do we know they are well-defined? On the face of it, they seem to depend upon the chosen projective resolution $P_\bullet$ of M, which is very far from being unique. To address this point we need to bring in the Comparison Theorem for Resolutions (Theorem 3.82). Namely, let $P'_\bullet \to M \to 0$ be any other projective resolution of M. By Theorem 3.82, there exists a homomorphism of chain complexes $\eta : P_\bullet \to P'_\bullet$ which is unique up to chain homotopy. Interchanging the roles of $P'_\bullet$ and $P_\bullet$, we get a homomorphism $\eta' : P'_\bullet \to P_\bullet$. Moreover, the composition $\eta' \circ \eta$ is a homomorphism from $P_\bullet$ to itself, so by the uniqueness $\eta' \circ \eta$ is chain homotopic to the identity map on $P_\bullet$. Similarly $\eta \circ \eta'$ is chain homotopic to the identity map on $P'_\bullet$, so that η is a chain homotopy equivalence. By Exercise 3.71, $F\eta : FP_\bullet \to FP'_\bullet$ is a chain homotopy equivalence, and therefore the induced maps on homology $H_n(F\eta) : H_n(FP_\bullet) \to H_n(FP'_\bullet)$ are isomorphisms. Thus we have shown that two different choices of projective resolutions for M lead to *canonically* isomorphic modules $(L_n F)(M)$.

EXERCISE 3.80. *Suppose M is projective. Show: for any right exact functor F and all $n > 0$, $(L_n F)(M) = 0$.*

The next important result shows that a short exact sequence of R-modules induces a long exact sequence involving the left-derived functors and certain connecting homomorphisms (which we have not defined and will not define here).

THEOREM 3.87. *Let*

$$(8) \qquad\qquad 0 \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow M_2 \longrightarrow M_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence of R-modules, and let F be any left exact functor on the category of R-modules. Then:
a) There is a long exact sequence
(9)
$$\ldots \to (L_2 F)(M_3) \xrightarrow{\partial} (L_1 F)(M_1) \to (L_1 F)(M_2) \to (L_1 F)(M_3) \xrightarrow{\partial} FM_1 \to FM_2 \to FM_3 \to 0.$$

b) The above construction is functorial in the following sense: if $0 \longrightarrow N_1 \longrightarrow N_2 \longrightarrow N_3 \longrightarrow 0$ is another short exact sequence of R-modules and we have maps $M_i \to N_i$ making a "short commutative ladder", then there is an induced "long commutative latter" with top row the long exact sequence associated to the first short exact sequence and the bottom row the long exact sequence associated to the second short exact sequence.

PROOF. No way. See [**W**, Thm. 2.4.6]. $\square$

Remark: One says that (9) is the **long exact homology sequence** associated to the short exact sequence (8).

Now, dually, if F is a right exact functor on the category of R-modules, we may define **right derived functors** $R^n F$. Namely, for an R-module M, first choose an injective resolution $0 \to M \to E^\bullet$, then take M away to get a cochain complex $E^\bullet$, then apply F to get a cochain complex $FE^\bullet$, and then finally define $(R^n F)(M) = H^n(FE^\bullet)$. In this case, a short exact sequence of modules (8) induces a **long exact cohomology sequence**

(10)

$$0 \to FM_1 \to FM_2 \to FM_3 \overset{\partial}{\to} (R^1 F)(M_1) \to (R^1 F)(M_2) \to (R^1 F)(M_3) \overset{\partial}{\to} (R^2 F)(M_1) \ldots$$

EXERCISE 3.81. *Suppose M is injective. Show: for any left exact functor F and all $n > 0$, we have $(R^n F)(M) = 0$.*

10.5. Tor.

Let M, N be R-modules, and let $F : N \to M \otimes_R N$ be the functor "tensor with M". Then F is right exact so has left derived functors $(L_n F)$. By definition, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathrm{Tor}_n(M, N) := (L_n F)(N).$$

Now un/fortunately the situation is even a little richer than the general case of left-derived functors discussed above. Namely, the tensor product is really a **bifunctor**: i.e., a functor in M as well as in N, additive and covariant in each variable separately. So suppose we took the right-derived functors of $M \mapsto M \otimes_R N$ and applied them to M: this would give us $\mathrm{Tor}_n(N, M)$. So it is natural to ask: how does $\mathrm{Tor}_n(M, N)$ compare to $\mathrm{Tor}_n(N, M)$? Since for $n = 0$ we have that $M \otimes_R N$ is canonically isomorphic to $N \otimes_R M$, it is natural to hope that the Tor functors are symmetric. And indeed this turns out to be the case.

THEOREM 3.88. *(Balancing Tor) For any R-modules M and N and all $n \geq 0$, there are natural isomorphisms $\mathrm{Tor}_n(M, N) = \mathrm{Tor}_n(N, M)$.*

PROOF. No way. See [**W**, Thm. 2.7.2]. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 3.82. *In order to use the Universal Coefficient Theorem (for homology) in algebraic topology, one needs to know the values of $\mathrm{Tor}_1(M, N)$ for any two finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-modules M and N.*
a) Show that for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\mathrm{Tor}_1(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/\gcd(m, n)\mathbb{Z}$.
b) Show that for all $\mathbb{Z}$-modules N, $\mathrm{Tor}_1(\mathbb{Z}, N) = 0$.
c) Explain how the structure theorem for finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-modules reduces the problem of computation of $\mathrm{Tor}_1(M, N)$ for any finitely generated M and N to the two special cases done in parts a) and b).

EXERCISE 3.83. *Show: the Tor functors commute with direct limits in the sense that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, any directed system $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ of R-modules M and any R-module N we have a canonical isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{Tor}_n(\varinjlim_i M_i, N) \to \varinjlim_i \mathrm{Tor}_n(M_i, N).$$

(Suggestion: the case $n = 0$ is Proposition 3.9. Use this to show the general case by brute force: i.e., take a projective resolution of N and track these isomorphisms through the definition of Tor_n.)

10.6. Ext.

Let M, N be R-modules, and let $F : N \to \mathrm{Hom}(M, N)$, so F is covariant and left exact. By definition, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathrm{Ext}^n(M, N) = (R^n F)(N).$$

But again, we have an embarrassment of riches: why didn't we define the Ext functors as the right-derived functors of the contravariant left exact functor $G : N \to \mathrm{Hom}(N, M)$? Again, we can do this.

THEOREM 3.89. *(Balancing Ext) Let M and N be R-modules. Define functors $F_M : N \to \mathrm{Hom}(M, N)$ and $G_N : M \to \mathrm{Hom}(M, N)$. Then for all $n \geq 0$,*

$$(R^n F_M)(N) = (R^n G_N)(M).$$

PROOF. No way. See [**W**, Thm. 2.7.6]. $\square$

EXERCISE 3.84. *In order to use the Universal Coefficient Theorem (for cohomology) in algebraic topology, one needs to know the values of $\mathrm{Ext}^1(M, N)$ for any two finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-modules M and N. Compute them.*

THEOREM 3.90.   a) *For an R-module P, the following are equivalent:*
      (i) *P is projective.*
      (ii) *$\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(P, B) = 0$ for all R-modules B.*
   b) *For an R-module E, the following are equivalent:*
      (i) *E is injective.*
      (ii) *$\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(A, E) = 0$ for all R-modules A.*

EXERCISE 3.85. *Prove Theorem 3.100.*

THEOREM 3.91.   a) *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
      (i) *R is hereditary.*
      (ii) *Every R-module M admits a projective resolution of the form $0 \to P_1 \to P_0 \to M \to 0$.*
      (iii) *For all R-modules M and N and all $n \geq 2$, we have $\mathrm{Ext}^n_R(M, N) = 0$.*
   b) *The conditions of part a) imply:*
      (iv) *For all R-modules M and N and all $n \geq 2$, $\mathrm{Tor}^n_R(M, N) = 0$.*
   c) *If R is Noetherian, then (iv) $\implies$ (i) and thus all are equivalent.*

EXERCISE 3.86. *Prove Theorem 3.101.*

THEOREM 3.92. *For R-modules A and C, the following are equivalent:*

   (i) *Every short exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to\to C \to 0$ splits.*
   (ii) *$\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(C, A) = 0$.*

PROOF. See e.g. [**Ro**, Thm. 7.31]. $\square$

11. More on flat modules

THEOREM 3.93. *(Tensorial Criterion for Flatness) For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is flat.
(ii) For every finitely generated ideal I of R the canonical map $I \otimes_R M \to IM$ is an isomorphism.

PROOF. Fist note that the canonical map $I \otimes_R M \to IM$ is always a surjection.
(i) $\implies$ (ii): if M is flat, then since $I \hookrightarrow R$, $I \otimes_R M \hookrightarrow R \otimes_R M = M$, so
$I \otimes_R M \xrightarrow{\sim} IM$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Every ideal of R is the direct limit of its finitely generated subideals,
so it follows from Proposition 3.9 and the exactness of direct limits that $I \otimes M \to M$
is injective for *all* ideals I. Moreover, if N is an R-module and $N' \subset N$ is an R-
submodule, then since N is the direct limit of submodule $N' + F$ with F finitely
generated, to show that $N' \otimes M \to N \otimes M$ is injective we may assume

$$N = N' + \langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n \rangle_R.$$

We now proceed by dévissage: putting $N_i = N' + \langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_i \rangle_R$, it is enough to
show injectivity at each step of the chain

$$N' \otimes M \to N_1 \otimes M \to \ldots \to N \otimes M,$$

and further simplifying, it is enough to show that if $N = N' + R\omega$, then $N' \otimes M \hookrightarrow
N \otimes M$. Let I be the "conductor ideal of N/N'", i.e., $I = \{ x \in R \mid x\omega \in N' \}$, so
that we get a short exact sequence of R-modules

$$0 \to N' \to N \to R/I \to 0$$

which gives rise to a long exact homology sequence

$$\ldots \to \mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I) \to N' \otimes M \to N \otimes M \to M/IM \to 0.$$

Thus it suffices to prove $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I) = 0$. For this we consider the homology
sequence associated to

$$0 \to I \to R \to R/I \to 0,$$

namely

$$\ldots \to \mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, R) = 0 \to \mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M/R/I) \to I \otimes M \to M \to \ldots,$$

and from the injectivity of $I \otimes M \to M$ we deduce $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I) = 0$. $\qquad \square$

THEOREM 3.94. *(Homological Criterion for Flatness) For an R-module M,
the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is flat.
(ii) For every R-module N all $i > 0$, $\mathrm{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$.
(ii') For every R-module N, $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, N) = 0$.
(iii) For every finitely generated ideal I of R, $\mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I) = 0$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): This is a statement about projective resolutions, but
given that it is just about the most basic possible one. Namely, let $L_\bullet \to N \to 0$
be a projective resolution of N. Then

$$\ldots \to L_n \otimes M \to L_{n-1} \otimes M \to \ldots \to L_0 \otimes M$$

is exact, so $\mathrm{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for all $i > 0$.
(ii) $\implies$ (ii') and (ii') $\implies$ (iii) are both immediate.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): For each finitely generated ideal I of R, the short exat sequence

$$0 \to I \to R \to R/I \to 0$$

of R-modules induces a long exact sequence in homology, which ends

$$\ldots \to \mathrm{Tor}_1^R(M, R/I) = 0 \to I \otimes M \to M \to M/IM \to 0,$$

i.e., the map $I \otimes M \to M$ is injective and thus induces an isomorphism $I \otimes M \xrightarrow{\sim} IM$. Using the Tensorial Criterion for Flatness (Theorem 3.93), we conclude M is flat. $\square$

COROLLARY 3.95. *(Direct limits preserve flatness) Let R be a ring and $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ a directed system of flat R-modules. Then $M = \varinjlim M_i$ is a flat R-module.*

PROOF. For every R-module N, we have

$$\operatorname{Tor}_1^R(\varinjlim M_i, N) \cong \operatorname{Tor}_1^R(N, \varinjlim M_i) = \varinjlim \operatorname{Tor}_1^R(N, M_i) \cong \varinjlim \operatorname{Tor}_1^R(M_i, N) = \varinjlim 0 = 0.$$

Now apply the Homological Criterion for Flatness. $\square$

COROLLARY 3.96. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *Every finitely generated torsionfree R-module is flat.*
  (ii) *Every torsionfree R-module is flat.*

PROOF. Every submodule of a torsionfree R-module is torsionfree, and every R-module is the direct limit of its finitely generated submodules. So the result follows immediately from Proposition 3.95. $\square$

COROLLARY 3.97. *Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be a short exact sequence of R-modules, with M'' flat. Then M' is flat if and only if M is flat.*

EXERCISE 3.87. *Use the Homological Criterion of Flatness to prove Corollary 3.97.*

EXERCISE 3.88. *In a short exact sequence of R-modules as in Corollary 3.97, if M' and M are flat, must M'' be flat?*

Now recall that a finitely generated torsion free module over a PID is free (Proposition 3.64). From this we deduce:

COROLLARY 3.98. *A module over a PID is flat if and only if it is torsionfree.*

EXERCISE 3.89. *Let R be a domain and M a torsion R-module. Show that for all R-modules N and all $n \geq 0$, $\operatorname{Tor}_n(M, N)$ is a torsion R-module.*

THEOREM 3.99. *Let R be a PID and let M, N be R-modules.*
  a) *For all $n \geq 2$, $\operatorname{Tor}_n(M, N) = 0$.*
  b) *$\operatorname{Tor}_1(M, N)$ is a torsion R-module.*

PROOF. a) Choose a free module F_0 and a surjection $d_0 : F_0 \to N$. We have that $F_1 = \operatorname{Ker}(d_0)$ is free, so we get a **finite free resolution of N**:

$$0 \to F_1 \to F_0 \to N \to 0.$$

Therefore we certainly have $\operatorname{Tor}_n(M, N)$ for all M and all $n \geq 2$.
b) Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be the direct system of all finitely generated submodules of M. As above, we have $M = \varinjlim M_i$, so

$$\operatorname{Tor}_1(M, N) = \operatorname{Tor}_1(\varinjlim M_i, N)) = \varinjlim \operatorname{Tor}_1(M_i, N).$$

By Corollary 3.98, each M_i which is torsionfree is flat, hence $\operatorname{Tor}_1(M_i, N) = 0$. Thus the only possible contribution to $\varinjlim \operatorname{Tor}_1(M_i, N)$ comes from torsion modules M_i, and by Exercise 3.83, M_i torsion implies $\operatorname{Tor}_1(M_i, N)$ torsion. Thus $\operatorname{Tor}_1(M, N)$ is a direct limit of torsion modules, hence itself a torsion module. $\square$

THEOREM 3.100. *(Equational Criterion for Flatness) Let M be an R-module.
a) Suppose M is flat, and that we are given $r, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, a matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_{r \times n}(R)$ and elements $x_1, ldots, x_n \in M$ such that*

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq r, \ \sum_j a_{ij} x_j = 0.$$

Then there are $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $b_{jk} \in R$ and $y_k \in M$ (for $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $1 \leq k \leq s$) such that

$$\forall i, k, \ \sum_j a_{ij} b_j = 0$$

and

$$\forall j, \ x_j = \sum_j b_{jk} y_k = 0.$$

*Thus the solutions in a flat module of a system of linear equations with R-coefficients can be expressed as a linear combination of solutions of the system in R.
b) Conversely, if the above conditions hold for a single equation (i.e., with $r = 1$), then M is a flat R-module.*

PROOF. a) Let $\varphi : R^n \to R^r$ be the linear map corresponding to multiplication by the matrix A and let $\varphi_M : M^n \to M^r$ be the same for M, so that $\varphi_M = \varphi \otimes 1_M$. Let $K = \operatorname{Ker} \varphi$. Since M is flat, tensoring with M preserves exact sequences, thus the sequence

$$K \otimes_R M \overset{\iota \otimes 1}{\to} M^n \overset{\varphi}{\to} M^r$$

is exact. By our hypothesis we have $\varphi_M(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$, so that we may write

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = (\iota \otimes 1) \left(\sum_{k=1}^s \beta_k \otimes y_k \right)$$

with $\beta_k \in K$ and $y_k \in M$. Writing out each β_k as an element $(b_{1k}, \ldots, b_{nk}) \in R^n$ gives the desired conclusion.
b) We will use the Tensorial Criterion for Flatness to show that M is flat. Let $I = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$ be a finitely generated ideal of R. We may write an arbitrary element z of $I \otimes M$ as $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \otimes m_i$ with $m_i \in M$. Let $\overline{z} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i m_i$ denote the image of z in $IM \subset M$. We want to show that $\overline{z} = 0$ implies $z = 0$, so suppose that $\sum_i a_i m_i = 0$. By hypothesis, there exist $b_{ij} \in R$ and $y_j \in M$ such that for all j, $\sum_i a_i b_{ij} = 0$ and for all i, $m_i = \sum_j b_{ij} y_j$. Thus

$$z = \sum_i a_i \otimes m_i = \sum_i \sum_j a_i b_{ij} \otimes y_j = \sum_j \left(\sum_i a_i b_{ij} \right) \otimes y_j = \sum_j 0 \otimes y_j = 0.$$

$\square$

As an application, we can now improve Theorem 3.54 by weakening the hypothesis of "finite presentation" to the simpler one of "finite generation".

THEOREM 3.101. *Let M be a finitely generated flat module over the local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are elements of M such that the images in $R/\mathfrak{m}$ are $R/\mathfrak{m}$-linearly independent, then $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are R-linearly independent.*

PROOF. We go by induction on n. Suppose first that $n = 1$, in which case it is sufficient to show that $a_1 \in R$, $a_1 x_1 \neq 0$ implies $a_1 = 0$. By the Equational Criterion for Flatness, there exist $b_1, \ldots, b_s \in R$ such that $ab_i = 0$ for all i and $x_1 \in \sum_i b_i M$. By assumption, x_1 does not lie in $\mathfrak{m}M$, so that for some i we must have $b_i \in R^\times$, and then $ab_i = 0$ implies $a = 0$.

Now suppose $n > 1$, and let $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in R$ are such that $a_1 x_1 + \ldots + a_n x_n = 0$. Again using the Equational Criterion for Flatness, there are $b_{ij} \in R$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_s \in M$ such that for all j, $\sum a_i b_{ij} = 0$ and $x_i = \sum b_{ij} y_j$. Since the set of generators is minimal, by Nakayama's Lemma their images in $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ must be $R/\mathfrak{m}$-linearly independent. In particular $x_n \notin \mathfrak{m}M$, so that at least one b_{nj} is a unit. It follows that there exist $c_1, \ldots, c_{n-1} \in R$ such that $a_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i c_i$. Therefore

$$a_1(x_1 + c_1 x_n) + \ldots + a_{n-1}(x_{n-1} + c_{n-1} x_n) = 0.$$

The images in $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ of the $n-1$ elements $x_1 + c_1 x_n, \ldots, x_{n-1} + c_{n-1} x_n$ are $R/\mathfrak{m}$-linearly independent, so by induction $a_1 = \ldots = a_{n-1} = 0$. Thus $a_n = 0$. $\square$

THEOREM 3.102. *For a finitely generated module M over a local ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is free.
(ii) M is projective.
(iii) M is flat.

PROOF. For any module over any ring we have (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii). So suppose that M is a finitely generated flat module over the local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$. Let $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a set of R-module generators for M of minimal cardinality. By Nakayama's Lemma the images of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in $R/\mathfrak{m}$ are $R/\mathfrak{m}$-linearly independent, and then Theorem 3.101 implies that $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is a basis for M as an R-module. $\square$

A ring R is called **absolutely flat** if every R-module is flat.

EXERCISE 3.90. *Show: a quotient of an absolutely flat ring is absolutely flat.*

PROPOSITION 3.103. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is absolutely flat.
(ii) For every principal ideal I of R, $I^2 = I$.
(iii) Every finitely generated ideal of R is a direct summand of R.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Assume R is absolutely flat, and let $I = (x)$ be a principal ideal. Tensoring the natural inclusion $(x) \to R$ with $R/(x)$, we get a an injection $(x) \otimes_R R/(x) \to R/(x)$. But this map sends $x \otimes r \mapsto xr + (x) = (x)$, so it is identically zero. Therefore its injectivity implies that $0 = (x) \otimes_R R/(x) \cong (x)/(x^2)$, so $(x) = (x^2)$.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Let $x \in R$. Then $x = ax^2$ for some $a \in R$, so putting $e = ax$ we have $e^2 = a^2 x^2 = a(ax^2) = ax = e$, so e is idempotent, and $(e) = (x)$. In general, for any two idempotents e, f, we have $\langle e, f \rangle = (e + f - ef)$. Hence every finitely generated ideal is principal, generated by an idempotent element, and thus a direct summand.

(iii) $\implies$ (i): Let M be an R-module, and let I be any finitely generated ideal of R. By assumption, we may choose J such that $R = I \oplus J$. Therefore J is projective, so $\mathrm{Tor}_1(R/I, M) = \mathrm{Tor}_1(J, M) = 0$. By the Homological Criterion for Flatness, M is flat. $\square$

EXERCISE 3.91. *Show: a (finite or infinite) product of absolutely flat rings is absolutely flat.*

The following striking result came relatively late in the game: it is due independently to Govorov [**Gov65**] and Lazard [**La64**].

THEOREM 3.104. *(Govorov-Lazard) For a module M over a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is flat.
(ii) There exists a directed family $\{F_i\}_{i \in I}$ of finitely generated free submodules of M such that $M = \varinjlim F_i$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Suppose $M = \varinjlim F_i$ is a direct limit of free modules. Then in particular M is a direct limit of flat modules, so by Corollary 3.95 M is flat.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): see [**Ei**, Thm. A6.6]. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

11.1. Flat Base Change.

PROPOSITION 3.105. *(Stability of flatness under base change) Let M be a flat R-module, and $f : R \to S$ a ring homomorphism. Then $S \otimes_R M$ is a flat S-module.*

EXERCISE 3.92. *Prove Proposition 3.105.*

EXERCISE 3.93. *Show: the tensor product of flat R-modules is a flat R-module.*

EXERCISE 3.94. *Let R be a nonzero commutative ring, and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.*
  a) *Show that $R^m \cong R^n$ if and only if $m = n$.*
  b) *Suppose that $\varphi : R^m \to R^n$ is a surjective R-module map. Show that $m \geq n$.*
  c) [12] *Suppose that $\varphi : R^m \to R^n$ is an injective R-module map. Show that $m \leq n$.*
  d) *Find a noncommutative ring R for which part a) fails.*

THEOREM 3.106. *(Hom commutes with flat base change) Let S be a flat R-algebra and M, N R-modules with M finitely presented. Then the canonical map*

$$\Phi_M : S \otimes_R \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N) \to \operatorname{Hom}_S(M \otimes_R S, N \otimes_R S)$$

induced by $(s, f) \mapsto (m \otimes t) \mapsto f(m) \otimes st$ is an isomorphism.

PROOF. (Hochster) It is immediate that Φ_R is an isomorphism and that $\Phi_{M_1 \oplus M_2} = \Phi_{M_1} \oplus \Phi_{M_2}$, and thus Φ_M is an isomorphism when M is finitely generated free. For finitely presented M, there is an exact sequence

$$H \to G \to M \to 0$$

with H and G finitely generated free modules. Now we have the following commutative diagram:

$$0 \longrightarrow 0$$
$$S \otimes_R \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N) \xrightarrow{\theta_M} \operatorname{Hom}_S(M \otimes_R S, N \otimes_R S)$$
$$S \otimes_R \operatorname{Hom}_R(G, N) \xrightarrow{\theta_G} \operatorname{Hom}_S(G \otimes_R S, N \otimes_R S)$$
$$S \otimes_R \operatorname{Hom}_R(H, N) \xrightarrow{\theta_H} \operatorname{Hom}_S(H \otimes_R S, N \otimes_R S).$$

_____

[12]This is actually quite challenging.

The right column is obtained by first applying the exact functor $A \mapsto A \otimes_R S$ and then applying the right exact cofunctor $U \mapsto \operatorname{Hom}_S(U, N \otimes_R S)$, so it is exact. Similarly, the left column is obtained by first applying the right exact cofunctor $A \mapsto \operatorname{Hom}_R(A, N)$ and then applying the exact (since R is flat) functor $A \mapsto A \otimes_R S$, so is exact. Since G and H are finitely generated free, θ_G and θ_H are isomorphisms, and a diagram chase shows that θ_M is an isomorphism. $\qquad \square$

12. Faithful flatness

PROPOSITION 3.107. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) For a sequence

$$(11) \qquad\qquad N_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} N_2 \xrightarrow{\beta} N_3$$

of left R-modules to be exact it is necessary and sufficient that

$$(12) \qquad\qquad M \otimes_R N_1 \xrightarrow{A} M \otimes_R N_2 \xrightarrow{B} M \otimes_R N_3$$

be exact.
(ii) M is flat and for all nonzero R-modules N, $M \otimes_R N \neq 0$.
(iii) M is flat and for all nonzero R-module maps $u : N \to N'$,

$$1_M \otimes u : M \otimes_R N \to M \otimes_R N' \text{ is not zero .}$$

(iv) M is flat and for every $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, $\mathfrak{m}M \subsetneq M$.
(v) M is flat and for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $\mathfrak{p}M \subsetneq M$.
*A module satisfying these equivalent conditions is **faithfully flat**.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Certainly (i) implies that M is flat. Moreover, if N is a nonzero R-module such that $M \otimes N = 0$, then $0 \to N \to 0$ is not exact but its tensor product with M is exact, contradicting (i).
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Let $I = \operatorname{Im}(u)$; then $M \otimes I = \operatorname{Im}(1_M \otimes u)$. So assuming (ii) and that $I \neq 0$, we conclude $\operatorname{Im}(1_M \otimes u) \neq 0$.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): Assume (iii). Then, since M is flat, if (11) is exact, so is (12). Conversely, suppose (12) is exact, and put $I = \operatorname{Im}(\alpha)$, $K = \ker(\beta)$. Then $B \circ A = 1_M \otimes (\beta \circ \alpha) = 0$, so $\beta \circ \alpha = 0$, or in other words, $I \subset K$. We may therefore form the exact sequence

$$0 \to I \to K \to K/I \to 0,$$

and tensoring with the flat module M gives an exact sequence

$$0 \to M \otimes I \to M \otimes K \to M \otimes K/I \to 0.$$

But $M \otimes K = M \otimes I$ by hypothesis, so $K/I = 0$ and $I = K$.
(ii) $\implies$ (iv): Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$. Then $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a nonzero R-module, so by (ii) so is $M \otimes R/\mathfrak{m} = M/\mathfrak{m}M$, i.e., $\mathfrak{m}M \subsetneq M$.
(iv) $\implies$ (ii): Assume (iv) holds. Then, since every proper ideal is contained in a maximal ideal, we have moreover that for all proper ideals I of R, $IM \subsetneq M$, or equivalently $M \otimes (R/I) \neq 0$. But the modules of the form R/I as I ranges over all proper ideals of R are precisely all the *cyclic* (a.k.a. monogenic) R-modules, up to isomorphism. Now if N is any nonzero R-module, choose $0 \neq x \in M$ and let $N' = \langle x \rangle$ by the cyclic submodule spanned by x. It follows that $M \otimes N' \neq 0$. Since M is flat, $N' \hookrightarrow N$ implies $M \otimes N' \hookrightarrow M \otimes N$, so $M \otimes N \neq 0$.
(iv) $\iff$ (v): this follows immediately from the proofs of the last two implications, as we leave it to the reader to check. $\qquad \square$

EXERCISE 3.95. *Show: (iv) $\iff$ (v) in Proposition 3.107.*

COROLLARY 3.108. *Let M be a faithfully flat and $u : N \to N'$ an R-module map. Then:*

  a) *u is injective if and only if $1_M \otimes u : M \otimes N \to M' \otimes N$ is injective.*
  b) *u is surjective if and only if $1_M \otimes u$ is surjective.*
  c) *u is an isomorphism if and only if $1_M \otimes u$ is an isomorphism.*

EXERCISE 3.96. *Deduce Corollary 3.108 from Proposition 3.107.*

EXERCISE 3.97. *Use each of the criteria of Proposition 3.107 to show that the (flat) $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Q}$ is not faithfully flat.*

EXERCISE 3.98. *Show: a faithfully flat module is faithful and flat, and that – unfortunately! – a flat, faithful module need not be faithfully flat.*

EXERCISE 3.99. *Show: a nonzero free module is faithfully flat but that a nonzero (even finitely generated) projective module need not be.*

EXERCISE 3.100. *Let $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of flat R-modules, and put $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$.*

  a) *Suppose that for some i, M_i is faithfully flat. Show that M is faithfully flat.*
  b) *Give an example where no M_i is faithfully flat yet M is faithfully flat.*

PROPOSITION 3.109. *Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be a short exact sequence of R-modules. Suppose M' and M'' are flat and that at least one is faithfully flat. Then M is faithfully flat.*

PROOF. By Proposition 3.97, M is flat. Now let N be any R-module. Since M'' is flat, $\text{Tor}_1(M'', N) = 0$ so

$$0 \to M' \otimes N \to M \otimes N \to M'' \otimes N \to 0$$

is exact. Thus if $M \otimes N = 0$ then $M' \otimes N = M'' \otimes N = 0$. Since one of M', M'' is faithfully flat, by criterion (ii) of Proposition 3.107 we have $N = 0$, and then that same criterion shows that M is faithfully flat. $\square$

By a **faithfully flat R-algebra**, we mean a ring S equipped with a ring homomorphism $R \to S$ making S into a faithfully flat R-module.

PROPOSITION 3.110. *Let $f : R \to S$ be a ring map and M an R-module. Then: M is faithfully flat if and only if $M \otimes_R S$ is faithfully flat.*

PROOF. The key fact is that for any S-module N, we have

$$(M \otimes_R S) \otimes_S N \cong_R M \otimes_R N.$$

With this, the proof becomes straightforward and is left to the reader. $\square$

EXERCISE 3.101. *Complete the proof of Proposition 3.110.*

THEOREM 3.111. *For a flat algebra $f : R \to S$, the following are equivalent:*
(i) S is faithfully flat over R.
(ii) $f^* : \text{MaxSpec}\, S \to \text{MaxSpec}\, R$ is surjective.
(iii) $f^* : \text{Spec}\, S \to \text{Spec}\, R$ is surjective.

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii): Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be any maximal ideal of R. Then $\mathfrak{m}S \subsetneq S$ holds if and only if there is a maximal ideal $\mathcal{M}$ of S containing $\mathfrak{m}S$ if and only if $f^*(\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{m}$. The equivalence now follows from criterion (iv) of Proposition 3.107. (i) $\implies$ (iii): Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, and let $k(\mathfrak{p})$ be the fraction field of the domain $R/\mathfrak{p}$. By faithful flatness, $S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p})$ is a nonzero $k(\mathfrak{p})$-algebra so has a prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$. Consider the composite map $h : R \xrightarrow{f} S \xrightarrow{g} S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p})$. We CLAIM that $g^* : \operatorname{Spec}(S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p})) \to \operatorname{Spec} R$ has image precisely $\{\mathfrak{p}\}$. The proof of this result, a spectral description of the **fiber of the morphism** $f : R \to S$ over $\mathfrak{p}$, will have to wait until we have developed the theory of localization in §7.3. Assuming it for now, we get that $g^*(\mathcal{P})$ is a prime ideal of $\operatorname{Spec} S$ such that $f^*g^*(\mathcal{P}) = (g \circ f)^*(\mathcal{P}) = \mathfrak{p}$, so $f^* : \operatorname{Spec} S \to \operatorname{Spec} R$ is surjective.
(iii) $\implies$ (ii): Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R \subset \operatorname{Spec} R$. By assumption, the set of prime ideals $\mathcal{P}$ of S such that $f^*\mathcal{P} = \mathfrak{m}$ is nonempty. Moreover the union of any chain of prime ideals pulling back to $\mathfrak{m}$ is again a prime ideal pulling back to $\mathfrak{p}$, so by Zorn's Lemma there exists an ideal $\mathcal{M}$ which is maximal with respect to the property that $f^*\mathcal{M} = \mathfrak{m}$. Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is not maximal and let $\mathcal{M}'$ be a maximal ideal properly containing $\mathcal{M}$. Then by construction $f^*(\mathcal{M}')$ properly contains the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, i.e., $f^*(\mathcal{M})') = R$, contradicting the fact that prime ideals pull back to prime ideals. So $\mathcal{M}$ is indeed maximal in S. $\square$

PROPOSITION 3.112. *Let $f : R \hookrightarrow S$ be a ring extension such that S is a faithfully flat R-module, and let M be an R-module. Then:*

   a) *M is finitely generated if and only if $M \otimes_R S$ is finitely generated.*
   b) *M is finitely presented if and only if $M \otimes_R S$ is finitely presented.*

PROOF. Note first that the properties of finite generation and finite presentation are preserved by arbitrary base change $f : R \to S$. So it suffices to prove that if $M \otimes_R S$ is finitely generated (resp. finitely presented), then M is finitely generated (resp. finitely presented).
a) Since $M \otimes_R S$ is finitely generated over S, it has a finite set of S-module generators of the form $x_i \otimes 1$. Let $N = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle_R$ and $\iota : N \hookrightarrow M$ the canonical injection. Then $\iota_S : N \otimes_R S \to M \otimes_R S$ is an isomorphism, so by faithful flatness ι was itself an isomorphism and thus $M = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$ is finitely generated.
b) By part a), M is finitely generated over R, so let $u : R^n \to M$ be a surjection. Since $M \otimes_R S$ is finitely presented, the kernel of $u_S : S^n \to M \otimes_R S$ is finitely generated over S. Since by flatness $\ker u_S = (\ker u)_S$, part a) shows that $\ker u$ is finitely generated and thus that M is finitely presented. $\square$

LEMMA 3.113. *Let $f : R \to S$ be a ring map, and let M, N be R-modules.*
a) There is a canonical S-module map

$$\omega : \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N) \otimes_R S \to \operatorname{Hom}_S(M \otimes_R S, N \otimes_R S)$$

such that for all $u \in \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N)$, $\omega(u \otimes 1) = u \otimes 1_B$.
b) If S is flat over R and M is finitely generated, then ω is injective.
c) If S is flat over R and M is finitely presented, then ω is an isomorphism.

EXERCISE 3.102. *Prove Lemma 3.113. (It is not difficult, really, but it is somewhat technical. Feel free to consult [**B**, p. 23] for the details.)*

THEOREM 3.114. *(Faithfully flat descent for projective modules)* *Let $f : R \hookrightarrow S$ be a faithfully flat ring extension, and let P be an R-module. Then P is finitely generated and projective if and only if $P \otimes_R S$ is finitely generated and projective.*

PROOF. Begin, once again the implication P finitely generated projective implies $P \otimes_R S$ is finitely generated projective holds for any base change. So suppose $P \otimes_R S$ is finitely generated projective. Then $P \otimes_R S$ is finitely presented, so by Proposition 3.112, M is finitely presented. It remains to show that M is projective.

Let $v : M \to N$ be a surjection of R-modules. We wish to show that the natural map $\mathrm{Hom}_R(P, M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(P, N)$ is surjective. Because of the faithful flatness of S/R, it is sufficient to show that $\mathrm{Hom}_R(P, M) \otimes_R S \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(P, N) \otimes_R S$ is surjective, and by Lemma 3.113 this holds if and only if

$$\mathrm{Hom}_S(P \otimes_R S, M \otimes_R S) \to \mathrm{Hom}_S(P \otimes_R S, N \otimes_R S)$$

is surjective. But this latter map is surjective because $M \otimes_R S \to N \otimes_R S$ is surjective and the S-module $P \otimes_R S$ is projective by assumption. $\qquad\square$

First Properties of Ideals in a Commutative Ring

1. Introducing maximal and prime ideals

Consider again the set $\mathcal{I}(R)$ of all ideals of R, partially ordered by inclusion. The maximal element is the ideal R itself, and the minimal element is the ideal (0).

In general our attitude to the ideal R of R is as follows: although we must grudgingly admit its existence – otherwise, given a subset S of R it would be in general a difficult question to tell whether the ideal $\langle S \rangle$ generated by S "exists" (i.e., is proper) or not – nevertheless we regard it as exceptional and try to ignore it as much as possible. Because of this we define an ideal I of R to be **maximal** if it is maximal among all *proper* ideals of R, i.e., $I \subsetneq R$ and there does not exist J such that $I \subsetneq J \subsetneq R$. That this is a more interesting concept than the literally maximal ideal R of R is indicated by the following result.

PROPOSITION 4.1. *For an ideal I of R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) I is maximal.
(ii) R/I is a field.

PROOF. Indeed, R/I is a field if and only if it has precisely two ideals, I and R, which by the Correspondence Theorem says precisely that there is no proper ideal strictly containing I. $\square$

EXAMPLE 4.2. *In $R = \mathbb{Z}$, the maximal ideals are those of the form (p) for p a prime number. The quotient $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is the finite field of order p.*

Does every ring have a maximal ideal? With a single (trivial) exception, the answer is yes, assuming – as we must, in order to develop the theory as it is used in other branches of mathematics – suitable transfinite tools.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Let R be a nonzero ring and I a proper ideal of R. Then there exists a maximal ideal of R containing I.*

PROOF. Consider the set S of all proper ideals of R containing I, partially ordered by inclusion. Since $I \in S$, S is nonempty. Moreover the union of a chain of ideals is an ideal, and the union of a chain of proper ideals is proper (for if 1 were in the union, it would have to lie in one of the ideals of the chain). Therefore by Zorn's Lemma we are entitled to a maximal element of S, which is indeed a maximal ideal of R that contains I. $\square$

COROLLARY 4.4. *A nonzero ring R contains at least one maximal ideal.*

PROOF. Apply Proposition 4.3 with $I = (0)$. $\square$

Remark: The zero ring has the disquieting property of having no maximal ideals.

Remark: The appeal to Zorn's Lemma cannot be avoided, in the sense that Corollary 4.4 implies the Axiom of Choice (AC). In fact, W. Hodges has shown that the axioms of ZF set theory together with the statement that every UFD (see §15) has a maximal ideal already implies AC [**Ho79**].

A proper ideal I of a ring R is **prime** if $xy \in I$ implies $x \in I$ or $y \in I$.

EXERCISE 4.1. *Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of R.*
a) Suppose $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are elements of R such that $x_1 \cdots x_n \in \mathfrak{p}$. Then $x_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for some at least one i.
b) In particular, for $x \in R$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ we have $x^n \in \mathfrak{p}$, then $x \in \mathfrak{p}$.

PROPOSITION 4.5. *Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings, and let J be an ideal of S.*
a) Put $f^*(J) := f^{-1}(J) = \{x \in R \mid f(x) \in J\}$. Then $f^*(J)$ is an ideal of R.
b) If J is a prime ideal, so is $f^*(J)$.

EXERCISE 4.2. *Prove Proposition 4.5.*

PROPOSITION 4.6. *For a commutative ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) If $x, y \in R$ are such that $xy = 0$, then $x = 0$ or $y = 0$.
(ii) If $0 \neq x \in R$ and $y, z \in R$ are such that $xy = xz$, then $y = z$.
*A ring satisfying either of these two properties is called a **domain**.*

PROOF. Assume (i), and consider $xy = xz$ with $x \neq 0$. We have $x(y - z) = 0$, and since $x \neq 0$, (i) implies $y - z = 0$, i.e., $y = z$. Assuming (ii) suppose $xy = 0$ with $x \neq 0$. Then $xy = 0 = x \cdot 0$, so applying cancellation we get $y = 0$. □

A **zero divisor** in a ring R is an element x such that there exists $0 \neq y \in R$ with $xy = 0$. (In particular 0 *is* a zero divisor, albeit not a very interesting one.) So property (i) expresses that there are no zero divisors other than 0 itself. Property (ii) makes sense in any commutative monoid and is called **cancellation**.

PROPOSITION 4.7. *For an ideal I in a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) I is prime.
(ii) R/I is a domain.

EXERCISE 4.3. *Prove Proposition 4.7.*

COROLLARY 4.8. *A maximal ideal is prime.*

PROOF. If I is maximal, R/I is a field, hence a domain, so I is prime. □

Corollary 4.8 is the first instance of a somewhat mysterious meta-principle in ideal theory: for some property P of ideals in a ring, it is very often the case that an ideal which is maximal with respect to the satisfaction of property P (i.e., is not strictly contained in any other ideal satisfying P) must be prime. In the above, we saw this with P = "proper". Here is another instance:

PROPOSITION 4.9. *(Multiplicative Avoidance) Let R be a ring and $S \subset R$. Suppose: 1 is in S; 0 is not in S; and S is closed under multiplication: $S \cdot S \subset S$. Let $\mathcal{I}_S$ be the set of ideals of R which are disjoint from S. Then:*
a) $\mathcal{I}_S$ is nonempty;.

b) Every element of $\mathcal{I}_S$ is contained in a maximal element of $\mathcal{I}_S$.
c) Every maximal element of $\mathcal{I}_S$ is prime.

PROOF. a) $(0) \in \mathcal{I}_S$. b) Let $I \in \mathcal{I}_S$. Consider the subset P_I of $\mathcal{I}_S$ consisting of ideals which contain I. Since $I \in P_I$, P_I is nonempty; moreover, any chain in P_I has an upper bound, namely the union of all of its elements. Therefore by Zorn's Lemma, P_I has a maximal element, which is clearly also a maximal element of $\mathcal{I}_S$. c) Let I be a maximal element of $\mathcal{I}_S$; suppose that $x, y \in R$ are such that $xy \in I$. If x is not in I, then $\langle I, x \rangle \supsetneq I$ and therefore contains an element s_1 of S, say

$$s_1 = i_1 + ax.$$

Similarly, if y is not in I, then we get an element s_2 of S of the form

$$s_2 = i_2 + by.$$

But then

$$s_1 s_2 = i_1 i_2 + (by)i_1 + (ax)i_2 + (ab)xy \in I \cap S,$$

a contradiction. $\square$

In fact Corollary 4.8 is precisely the special case $S = \{1\}$ of Proposition 4.9.

If I and J are ideals of R, we define the **product** IJ to be the ideal generated by all elements of the form xy with $x \in I, y \in J$. Every element of IJ is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$ with $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in I$, $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in J$.

The following simple result will be used many times in the sequel.

PROPOSITION 4.10. *Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal and $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ be ideals of a ring R. If $\mathfrak{p} \supset I_1 \cdots I_n$, then $\mathfrak{p} \supset I_i$ for at least one i.*

PROOF. An easy induction argument reduces us to the case of $n = 2$. So suppose for a contradiction that $\mathfrak{p} \supset I_1 I_2$ but there exists $x \in I_1 \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ and $y \in I_2 \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. Then $xy \in I_1 I_2 \subset \mathfrak{p}$; since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime we must have $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ or $y \in \mathfrak{p}$, contradiction. $\square$

EXERCISE 4.4. *Show: Proposition 4.10 characterizes prime ideals, in the sense that if $\mathfrak{p}$ is any ideal such that for all ideals I, J of R, $\mathfrak{p} \subset IJ$ implies $\mathfrak{p} \subset I$ or $\mathfrak{p} \subset JJ$, then $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal.*

For an ideal I and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we denote the n-fold product of I with itself by I^n.

COROLLARY 4.11. *If $\mathfrak{p}, I$ are ideals and $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, then $\mathfrak{p} \supset I^n \implies \mathfrak{p} \supset I$.*

2. Radicals

An element x of a ring R is **nilpotent** if $x^n = 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Obviously 0 is a nilpotent element; a ring in which 0 is the only nilpotent element is called **reduced**. An ideal I of R is **nil** if every element of I is nilpotent. An ideal I is **nilpotent** if there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $I^n = (0)$.

PROPOSITION 4.12. *Let I be an ideal of a ring R.*
a) If I is nilpotent, then I is a nil ideal.
b) If I is finitely generated and nil, then I is nilpotent.

PROOF. Part a) is immediate from the definition.

Suppose $I = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle_R$. Since I is nil, for each i, $1 \leq i \leq r$, there exists n_i such that $a_i^{n_i} = 0$. Let $N = n_1 + \ldots + n_r$. We claim $I^N = 0$. Indeed, an arbitrary element of I is of the form $x_1 a_1 + \ldots + x_n a_n$. Raising this element to the nth power yields a sum of monomials of the form $x_1^{j_1} \cdots x_r^{j_r} a_1^{j_1} \cdots a_r^{j_r}$, where $\sum_{i=1}^r j_i = N$. If we had for all i that $j_i < n_i$, then certainly $j_1 + \ldots + j_r < N$. So for at least one i we have $j_i \geq n_i$ and thus $x_i^{j_i} = 0$; so every monomial term equals zero. $\square$

EXERCISE 4.5. *The bound on the nilpotency index of $\langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$ we gave in the preceding argument is a bit lazy: we can do better.*

a) *Let $a_1, \ldots, a_r$ be elements of a ring and let $n_1, \ldots, n_r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ be such that $a_1^{n_1} = \ldots = a_r^{n_r} = 0$. Show:*

$$\langle a_1, \ldots, a_r \rangle^{n_1 + \ldots + n_r - (r-1)} = (0).$$

b) *Show that the bound of part a) is best possible for all positive integers $r, n_1, \ldots, n_r$.*
   (Suggestion: for a field k, consider $k[t_1, \ldots, t_r]/\langle t_1^{n_1}, \ldots, t_r^{n_r} \rangle$.)

EXERCISE 4.6. *Find a ring R and an ideal I of R which is nil but not nilpotent.*

The **nilradical** $\mathcal{N}$ of R is the set of all nilpotent elements of R.

PROPOSITION 4.13. *Let R be a ring.*
a) *The nilradical $\mathcal{N}$ is a nil ideal of R.*
b) *The quotient $R/\mathcal{N}$ is reduced.*
c) *The map $q : R \to R/\mathcal{N}$ is* universal *for maps from R into a reduced ring.*
d) *The nilradical is the intersection of all prime ideals of R.*

PROOF. a) It suffices to show that $\mathcal{N}$ is an ideal. The only part of this that is not absolutely immediate is closure under addition. But by Proposition 4.12 the ideal generated by two nilpotent elements is nilpotent, hence nil, hence consists of nilpotent elements, so in particular the sum of two nilpotent elements is nilpotent.
b) Let $r + \mathcal{N}$ be a nilpotent element of $R/\mathcal{N}$, so there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $r^n \in \mathcal{N}$. But this means there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $0 = (r^n)^m = r^{nm}$, and thus r itself is a nilpotent element.
c) In plainer terms: if S is a reduced ring and $f : R \to S$ is a ring homomorphism, then there exists a unique homomorphism $\overline{f} : R/\mathcal{N} \to S$ such that $f = \overline{f} \circ q$. Given this, the proof is straightforward, and we leave it to the reader.
d) Suppose x is a nilpotent element of R, i.e., $\exists n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $x^n = 0$. If $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal, then since $0 = x \cdots x \in \mathfrak{p}$, we conclude $x \in \mathfrak{p}$: this shows $\mathcal{N} \subset \bigcap \mathfrak{p}$. Conversely, suppose x is not nilpotent. Then the set $S_x := \{x^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ satisfies (i) and (ii) of Proposition 5.24, so we may apply that result to get a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ which is disjoint from S_x, hence not containing x. $\square$

EXERCISE 4.7. *Prove Proposition 4.13c).*

EXERCISE 4.8. *Let $f : R \to T$ be a ring homomorphism. Show:*

$$f_*(\mathrm{nil}\, R) \subset \mathrm{nil}\, T.$$

For a ring R, what are the units in the polynomial ring $R[t]$? If R is a domain, then the leading coefficient of any nonzero polynomial is nonzero hence not a zero-divisor. This implies that for nonzero $f, g \in R[t]$ we have $\deg(fg) = \deg(f) + \deg(g)$, from

which it follows that every unit has degree zero, i.e., is a constant polynomial and then that $R[t]^\times = R^\times$. The following result treats the general case by reduction to this case.

PROPOSITION 4.14. *Let R be a nonzero ring, and let $R[t]$ be the polynomial ring over R. Let f be a nonzero element of $R[t]$ and write*

$$f = a_n t^n + \ldots + a_1 t + a_0, \ a_n \neq 0.$$

Then $f \in R[t]^\times$ iff $a_0 \in R^\times$ and for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $a_i \in \operatorname{nil} R$.

PROOF. Put $g := a_n t^n + \ldots + a_1 t$.

First suppose that $a_0 \in R^\times$ and $a_i \in \operatorname{nil} R$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then is g nilpotent by Exercise 4.8, so $f = g + a_0$ is the sum of a nilpotent element and a unit. If $\mathfrak{m}$ is any maximal ideal of $R[t]$ then if $f \in \mathfrak{m}$ then $a_0 = f - g \in \mathfrak{m}$, contradiction. So f lies in no maximal ideal, hence is a unit of $R[t]$.

Now suppose that $f \in R[t]^\times$. For a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, let

$$q_{\mathfrak{p}} : R[t] \to R[t]/(\mathfrak{p}R[t]) \cong (R/\mathfrak{p})[t]$$

be the quotient map. Then $q_{\mathfrak{p}}(f)$ is a unit in $(R/\mathfrak{p})[t]$, which implies that $a_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Since this holds for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ we have $a_i \in \operatorname{nil} R$. Moreover $q_{\mathfrak{p}}(a_0) \in (R/\mathfrak{p})^\times$, hence $a_0 \notin \mathfrak{p}$. As above, this means that a_0 lies in no maximal ideal, hence $a_0 \in R^\times$. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 4.15. *(Lifting Idempotents Modulo a Nil Ideal) Let R be a ring, let N be a nil ideal of R, and let $\bar{e} = \bar{e}^2$ be an idempotent element of R/N. Then there is a unique idempotent e of R such that $e \pmod N = \bar{e}$.*

PROOF. (Jacobson [**J2**, Prop. 7.14])

Step 1: We will prove the existence of e.[1] First let $x \in R$ be such that $x \pmod N = \bar{e}$. Then $z = x - x^2$ is nilpotent: there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $z^n = 0$. Put $y = 1 - x$. Then

$$0 = z^n = (x(1-x))^n = x^n y^n,$$

so

$$1 = 1^{2n-1} = (x+y)^{2n-1} = e + f,$$

where e is a sum of terms $x^i y^{2n-1-i}$ with $n \leq i \leq 2n-1$ and f is a sum of the terms $x^i y^{2n-1-i}$ with $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Since $x^n y^n = 0$, any term in e annihilates any term in f. Hence $ef = 0 = fe$. Since $e + f = 1$, we have

$$e = e(e+f) = e^2 + ef = e^2, \ f = (e+f)f = ef + f^2 = f^2.$$

Every term in e except x^{2n-1} contains the factor $xy = z$, so $x^{2n-1} \equiv e \pmod N$. Since $x \equiv x^2 \equiv x^3 \equiv \ldots \equiv x^{2n-1} \pmod N$, we have $e \equiv x \equiv \bar{e} \pmod N$.

Step 2: Let $e, z \in R$ with e idempotent, z nilpotent and $e + z$ idempotent. Then

$$e + z = (e+z)^2 = e^2 + 2ez + z^2 = e + 2ez + z^2$$

so

$$z^2 = (1 - 2e)z.$$

It follows that

$$z^3 = (1-2e)z^2 = (1-2e)^2 z = (1 - 4e + 4e^2)z = (1 - 4e + 4e)z = z$$

---

[1]This step holds for not-necessarily-commutative rings.

and thus
$$z^{2k+1} = z \ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$
Since z is nilpotent, it follows that $z = 0$. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

An ideal I of a ring R is **radical** if for all $x \in R$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $x^n \in I$ implies $x \in I$.

EXERCISE 4.9.   a) *Show: a prime ideal is radical.*
   b) *Exhibit a radical ideal that is not prime.*
   c) *Find all radical ideals in $R = \mathbb{Z}$.*
   d) *Show: R is reduced iff (0) is a radical ideal.*
   e) *Let $\{I_i\}$ be a set of radical ideals in a ring R. Show $I = \bigcap_i I_i$ is a radical ideal.*

EXERCISE 4.10. *Let $\mathfrak{p}_1$ and $\mathfrak{p}_2$ be prime ideals of a ring R. By Exercise 4.9, we have $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \mathfrak{p}_2$ is a radical ideal.*
   a) *Show: if $\mathfrak{p}_1 + \mathfrak{p}_2 = R$ then $\mathfrak{p}_1 \mathfrak{p}_2$ is radical.*
   b) *Give an example in which $\mathfrak{p}_1 \neq \mathfrak{p}_2$ and $\mathfrak{p}_1 \mathfrak{p}_2$ is not radical.*

For any ideal I of R, we define the **radical** of I:
$$r(I) = \{x \in R \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \ x^n \in I\}.$$

PROPOSITION 4.16. *Let R be a commutative ring and I, J ideals of R.*
   a) *$r(I)$ is the intersection of all prime ideals containing I, and is a radical ideal.*
   b) *(i) $I \subset r(I)$; (ii) $r(r(I)) = r(I)$; (iii) $I \subset J \implies r(I) \subset r(J)$.*
   c) *$r(IJ) = r(I \cap J) = r(I) \cap r(J)$.*
   d) *$r(I + J) = r(r(I) + r(J))$.*
   e) *$r(I) = R \iff I = R$.*
   f) *For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $r(I^n) = r(I)$.*
   g) *If J is finitely generated and $r(I) \supset J$, then there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $I \supset J^n$.*

PROOF. Under the canonical homomorphism $q : R \to R/I$, $r(I) = q^{-1}(\mathcal{N}(R/I))$. By Proposition 4.5a), $r(I)$ is an ideal.
a) Since $\mathcal{N}$ is the intersection of all prime ideals of R/I, $r(I)$ is the intersection of all prime ideals containing I, which is, by Exericse 4.9e), a radical ideal.
b) (i) is immediate from the definition, and (ii) and (iii) follow from the characterization of $r(I)$ as the intersection of all radical ideals containing I.
c) Since $IJ \subset I \cap J$, $r(IJ) \subset r(I \cap J)$. If $x^n \in I \cap J$, then $x^{2n} = x^n x^n \in IJ$, so $x \in r(IJ)$; therefore $r(IJ) = r(I \cap J)$. Since $I \cap J$ is a subset of both I and J, $r(I \cap J) \subset r(I) \cap r(J)$. Conversely, if $x \in r(I) \cap r(J)$, then there exist m and n such that $x^m \in I$ and $x^n \in J$, so $x^{mn} \in I \cap J$ and $x \in r(I \cap J)$.
d) Since $I + J \subset r(I) + r(J)$, $r(I + J) \subset r(r(I) + r(J))$. A general element of $r(I) + r(J)$ is of the form $x + y$, where $x^m \in I$ and $y^n \in J$. Then $(x+y)^{m+n} \in I + J$, so $x + y \in r(I + J)$.
e) Evidently $r(R) = R$. Conversely, if $r(I) = R$, then there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $1 = 1^n \in I$.
f) By part a), $r(I^n)$ is the intersection of all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} \supset I^n$. But by Corollary 4.11, a prime contains I^n iff it contains I, so $r(I^n) = r(I)$.
g) Replacing R with R/I we may assume $I = 0$. Then J is a finitely generated nil ideal, so it is nilpotent. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Remark: Proposition 4.16b) asserts that the mapping $I \mapsto r(I)$ is a **closure operator** on the lattice $\mathcal{I}(R)$ of ideals of R.

An ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of a ring R is **primary** if every zero divisor of $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is nilpotent. Equivalently, $xy \in \mathfrak{p}$, $x \notin \mathfrak{p} \implies y^n \in \mathfrak{p}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. More on primary ideals in §10.3.

We also define the **Jacobson radical** $J(R)$ as the intersection of all maximal ideals of R. Evidently we have $\mathcal{N} \subset J(R)$.

PROPOSITION 4.17. *Let R be a ring. An element x of R lies in the Jacobson radical $J(R)$ iff $1 - xy \in R^\times$ for all $y \in R$.*

PROOF. Suppose x lies in every maximal ideal of R. If there is y such that $1 - xy \notin R^\times$, then $1 - xy$ lies in some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, and then $x \in \mathfrak{m}$ implies $xy \in \mathfrak{m}$ and then $1 = (1 - xy) + xy \in \mathfrak{m}$, a contradiction. Conversely, suppose that there is a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R which does not contain x. Then $\langle \mathfrak{m}, x \rangle = R$, so $1 = m + xy$ for some $m \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $y \in R$, and thus $1 - xy$ is not a unit. $\square$

PROPOSITION 4.18. *Let J be an ideal of R contained in the Jacobson radical, and let $\varphi : R \to R/J$ be the natural map.*
*a) For all $x \in R$, $x \in R^\times \iff \varphi(x) \in (R/J)^\times$: φ is **unit-faithful**.*
b) The map $\varphi^\times : R^\times \to (R/J)^\times$ is surjective.

PROOF. a) For any homomorphism of rings $\varphi : R \to S$, if $x \in R^\times$ then there is $y \in R$ with $xy = 1$, so $1 = \varphi(1) = \varphi(xy) = \varphi(x)\varphi(y)$, and thus $\varphi(x) \in S^\times$. For the converse we assume $S = R/J$ and let $x \in R$ be such that $\varphi(x) \in (R/J)^\times$. Then there is $y \in R$ such that $xy - 1 \in J$. Thus for each maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, $xy - 1 \in \mathfrak{m}$. It follows that $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$, for otherwise $xy \in \mathfrak{m}$ and thus $1 = xy - (xy - 1) \in \mathfrak{m}$. So x is not contained in any maximal ideal and thus $x \in R^\times$.
b) This is immediate from part a): in fact we've shown that *every* preimage under φ of a unit in R/J is a unit in R. $\square$

EXERCISE 4.11. *For a ring R, let $\iota : R \hookrightarrow R[t]$ be the inclusion into the polynomial ring $R[t]$.*
  a) *Show:*
$$J(R[t]) = \iota_*(\operatorname{nil} R).$$
  b) *Thus $J(R[t]) = (0)$ if R is a domain. Give a simpler direct proof of this.*

Remark: It is not yet clear why we have defined these two different notions of "radical." Neither is it so easy to explain in advance, but nevertheless let us make a few remarks. First, the Jacobson radical plays a very important role in the theory of noncommutative rings, especially that of finite dimensional algebras over a field. (Indeed, a finite dimensional k-algebra is semisimple – i.e., a direct product of algebras without nontrivial two-sided ideals – iff its Jacobson radical is zero. In the special case of commutative algebras this comes down to the simpler result that a finite dimensional commutative k-algebra is reduced iff it is a product of fields.) One important place in commutative algebra in which the Jacobson radical $J(R)$ appears – albeit not by name, because of the necessity of putting the results in a fixed linear order – is in the statement of Nakayama's Lemma. In general, the defining condition of $\operatorname{nil}(R)$ – i.e., as the intersection of all prime ideals of R – together with the fact that the radical of an arbitrary ideal I corresponds to the

nilradical of R/I, makes the nilradical more widely useful in commutative algebra (or so it seems to the author of these notes). It is also important to consider when the nil and Jacobson radicals of a ring coincide. A ring R for which every homomorphic image S has $\mathrm{nil}(S) = J(S)$ is called a **Jacobson ring**; such rings will be studied in detail in §12.

3. Comaximal ideals

Two ideals I and J in a ring R are **comaximal** if $I + J = R$. A family of ideals in R is **pairwise comaximal** if any two members of the family are comaximal.

EXERCISE 4.12. *Let $I_1, \dots, I_n$ be pairwise comaximal. Show: $\sum_{j=1}^{n} \prod_{i \neq j} I_i = R$.*

PROPOSITION 4.19. *Let I and J be ideals in R. If $r(I)$ and $r(J)$ are comaximal, so are I and J.*

PROOF. Apply Proposition 4.16d) and 4.16e) to $r(I) + r(J) = R$:

$$R = r(r(I) + r(J)) = r(I + J) = I + J. \qquad \square$$

An immediate corollary of Proposition 4.19 is that if $\{I_i\}$ are pairwise comaximal and $\{n_i\}$ are any positive integers, then $\{I_i^{n_i}\}$ are pairwise comaximal.

LEMMA 4.20. *Let $K_1, \dots, K_n$ be pairwise comaximal ideals in the ring R. Then $K_1 \cdots K_n = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} K_i$.*

PROOF. We go by induction on n: $n = 1$ is trivial and $n = 2$ is Lemma 3.17b). Suppose the theorem is true for any family of $n - 1$ pairwise comaximal ideals. Let $K' = \bigcap_{i=2}^{n} K_i$; by induction, $K' = K_2 \cdots K_n$. By Lemma 3.17c), $K_1 + K' = R$, so by the $n = 2$ case $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} K_i = K_1 \cap K' = K_1 K' = K_1 \cdots K_n$. $\qquad \square$

THEOREM 4.21. *(Chinese Remainder Theorem, or "CRT") Let R be a ring and $I_1, \dots, I_n$ a finite set of pairwise comaximal ideals. Consider the natural map*

$$\Phi : R \to \prod_{i=1}^{n} R/I_i,$$

$x \mapsto (x + I_i)_{i=1}^{n}$. Then Φ is surjective with kernel $I_1 \cdots I_n$, so that there is an induced isomorphism

$$(13) \qquad\qquad \Phi : R/(I_1 \cdots I_n) \xrightarrow{\sim} \prod_{i=1}^{n} R/I_i.$$

PROOF. The map Φ is well-defined and has kernel $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i$. Since the I_i's are pairwise comaximal, Lemma 4.20 gives $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i = I_1 \cdots I_n$. So it remains to show that Φ is surjective. We prove this by induction on n, the case $n = 1$ being trivial. So we may assume that the natural map $\Phi' : R \to R' := \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} R/I_i$ is surjective, with kernel $I' := I_1 \cdots I_{n-1}$. Let $(r', \overline{s})$ be any element of $R' \times R/I_n$. By assumption, there exists $r \in R$ such that $\Phi'(r + I') = r'$. Let s be any element of R mapping to $\overline{s} \in R/I_n$. By Lemma 3.17c) we have $I' + I_n = R$, so there exist $x \in I'$, $y \in I_n$ such that $s - r = x + y$. Then $\Phi'(r + x) = r'$, and $r + x \equiv r + x + y \equiv s \pmod{I_n}$, so $\Phi(r + x) = (r', \overline{s})$ and Φ is surjective. $\qquad \square$

In the classical case $R = \mathbb{Z}$, we can write $I_i = (n_i)$ and then we are trying to prove – under the assumption that the n_i's are coprime in pairs in the sense of elementary number theory – that the injective ring homomorphism $\mathbb{Z}/(n_1 \cdots n_n) \to \mathbb{Z}/n_1 \times \cdots \times \mathbb{Z}/n_n$ is an isomorphism. But both sides are finite rings of order $n_1 \cdots n_n$, so since the map is an injection it must be an isomorphism! Nevertheless the usual proof of CRT in elementary number theory is much closer to the one we gave in the general case: in particular, it is constructive.

EXERCISE 4.13 (Converse to CRT). *Let $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ be ideals in a ring R. Show: if $\prod_{i=1}^{n} R/I_i$ is a cyclic R-module, then $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ are pairwise comaximal.*

The following *modulization* of CRT is sometimes useful.

THEOREM 4.22. *(Module-theoretic CRT) Let R be a ring, $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ a finite set of pairwise comaximal ideals, and let M be an R-module. Then $(I_1 \cdots I_n)M = \bigcap_{i=1}^{r} I_i M$, and there is an induced R-module isomorphism*

$$(14) \qquad \Phi_M : M/(I_1 \cdots I_r)M \to \prod_{i=1}^{n} M/I_i M.$$

PROOF. Indeed $\Phi_M = \Phi \otimes_R M$, so it is an isomorphism. Thus

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{r} I_i M = \ker\left(M \to \prod_{i=1}^{n} M/I_i M \right) = (I_1 \cdots I_r)M. \qquad \square$$

EXERCISE 4.14. *Let R be a ring and $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ any finite sequence of ideals. Consider the map $\Phi : R \to \prod_{i=1}^{n} R/I_i$ as in CRT.*
   a) *Show that Φ is surjective only if the $\{I_i\}$ are pairwise comaximal.*
   b) *Show that Φ is injective if and onl if $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i = (0)$.*

EXERCISE 4.15.
   a) *Let G be a finite commutative group with exactly one element z of order 2. Show: $\sum_{x \in G} x = z$.*
   b) *Let G be a finite commutative group that does not have exactly one element of order 2. Show: $\sum_{x \in G} x = 0$.*
   c) *Prove the following result of Gauss (a generalization of **Wilson's Theorem**): let $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and put*

$$P(N) = \prod_{x \in (\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})^\times} x.$$

   Then: $P(N) = \pm 1$, and the minus sign holds if and only if $N = 4$ or is of the form p^m or $2p^m$ for an odd prime p and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.
   d) *For a generalization to the case of $(\mathbb{Z}_K/A)^\times$, where A is an ideal in the ring $\mathbb{Z}_K$ of integers of a number field K, see [**Da09**]. Can you extend Dalawat's results to the function field case?*

EXERCISE 4.16. *Let K be a field, and put $R = K[t]$.*
a) *Let $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ be a sequence of non-negative integers and $\{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ a k-element subset of K. For $1 \le i \le k$, let $c_{i0}, \ldots, c_{in_i}$ be a finite sequence of $n_i + 1$ elements of k (not necessarily distinct). By applying the Chinese Remainder Theorem, show that there is a polynomial $P(t)$ such that for $1 \le i \le k$ and $0 \le j \le n_i$ we have $P^{(j)}(x_i) = c_{ij}$, where $P^{(j)}(x_i)$ denotes the jth "formal" derivative of P*

evaluated at x_i. Indeed, find all such polynomials; what can be said about the least degree of such a polynomial?

b) Use the proof of the Chinese Remainder Theorem to give an explicit formula for such a polynomial P.

EXERCISE 4.17. *Let $(M, \cdot)$ be a monoid and k a field. A **character** on M with values in k is a homomorphism of monoids from M to the multiplicative group $k^\times$ of k. Each character lies in the k-vector space k^M of all functions from M to k.*

    a) *(Dedekind) Show: any finite set of characters is k-linearly independent.*

    b) *What does this have to do with CRT? Well, the wikipedia article on CRT[2] contains a proof of part a) using CRT. This is the proof I had in mind when I originally wrote this exercise. But it seems to me now that this argument requires M to be finite. Discuss.*

EXERCISE 4.18. *Show: for a ring R, the following are equivalent:*

    (i) *The ring R has finitely many maximal ideals.[3]*

    (ii) *The quotient of R by its Jacobson radical $J(R)$ is a finite product of fields.*

We now give a commutative algebraic version of Euclid's proof of the infinitude of prime numbers. A special case for domains appears in [**K**, § 1.1, Exc. 8]. The case in which R is infinite and $R^\times$ is finite has appeared on an algebra qualifying exam at UGA; the appearance of this unusually interesting and challenging problem on a qual was remarked to me by both D. Lorenzini and B. Cook. I learned the stronger version presented here from W.G. Dubuque.

THEOREM 4.23. *If R is infinite and $\#R > \#R^\times$, then* $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$ *is infinite.*

PROOF. Since R is not the zero ring, it has at least one maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_1$. We proceed by induction: given maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$, we construct another maximal ideal. Let $J := \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i$ be the Jacobson radical. By Proposition 4.17 we have $J + 1 \subset R^\times$, so

$$\#J = \#(J+1) \le \#R^\times < \#R.$$

Moreover, by Proposition 4.18, the map $R^\times \to (R/J)^\times$ is surjective. It follows that $\#(R/J)^\times \le \#R^\times < \#R$: by the Chinese remainder Theorem, $R/J \cong \prod_{i=1}^n R/\mathfrak{m}_i$, hence for all $1 \le i \le n$ there is an injection $(R/\mathfrak{m}_i)^\times \hookrightarrow (R/J)^\times$. Putting the last two sentences together we conclude that for all $1 \le i \le n$ we have $\#(R/\mathfrak{m}_i)^\times < \#R$, and since each $R/\mathfrak{m}_i$ is a field and R is infinite, we get

$$\#R/\mathfrak{m}_i = \#(R/\mathfrak{m}_i)^\times + 1 < \#R.$$

Finally this gives

$$\#R = \#J \cdot \#R/J = \#J \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \#R/\mathfrak{m}_i < (\#R)^{n+1} = \#R,$$

a contradiction. $\square$

In §15.11, following a discussion of factorization in domains, we will give a variant on this result that gives a sufficient condition for a domain R to have infinitely many pairwise nonassociate irreducible elements.

---

[2]https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese_remainder_theorem#Dedekind.27s_theorem

[3]Such rings are typically called **semilocal**. I am not a fan of the terminology – it seems to either suggest that R has one half a maximal ideal (whatever that could mean) or two maximal ideals. But it is well entrenched, and I will not campaign to change it.

4. Local rings

PROPOSITION 4.24. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) There is exactly one maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$.
(ii) The set $R \setminus R^{\times}$ of nonunits forms a subgroup of $(R, +)$.
(iii) The set $R \setminus R^{\times}$ is a maximal ideal.
*A ring satisfying these equivalent conditions is called a **local ring**.*

PROOF. Since $R^{\times} = R \setminus \bigcup_{\mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m}$, the union extending over all maximal ideals of R, it follows that if there is only one maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ then $\mathfrak{m} = R \setminus R^{\times}$. This shows (i) $\implies$ (iii) and certainly (iii) $\implies$ (ii). Conversely, since the set of nonunits of a ring is a union of ideals, it is closed under multiplication by all elements of the ring. Thus it is itself an ideal iff it is an additive subgroup: (ii) $\implies$ (iii). The implication (iii) implies (i) is very similar and left to the reader. $\square$

Warning: In many older texts, a ring with a unique maximal ideal is called "quasi-local" and a local ring is a Noetherian quasi-local ring. This is not our convention.

Local rings (especially Noetherian local rings) play a vital role in commutative algebra: the property of having a single maximal ideal simplifies many ideal-theoretic considerations, and many ring theoretic considerations can be reduced to the study of local rings (via a process called, logically enough, *localization*: see Chapter 7).

A field is certainly a local ring. The following simple result builds on this trivial observation to give some further examples of local rings:

PROPOSITION 4.25. *Let I be an ideal in the ring R.*
a) If $\mathrm{rad}(I)$ is maximal, then R/I is a local ring.
b) In particular, if $\mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$ then $R/\mathfrak{m}^{n}$ is a local ring.

PROOF. a) We know that $\mathrm{rad}(I) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \supset I} \mathfrak{p}$, so if $\mathrm{rad}(I) = \mathfrak{m}$ is maximal it must be the *only* prime ideal containing I. Therefore, by correspondence R/I is a local ring. (In fact it is a ring with a unique prime ideal.)
   b) By Proposition 4.16f), $r(\mathfrak{m}^{n}) = r(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m}$, so part a) applies. $\square$

So, for instance, for any prime number p, $\mathbb{Z}/(p^{k})$ is a local ring, whose maximal ideal is generated by p. It is easy to see (using, e.g. the Chinese Remainder Theorem) that conversely, if $\mathbb{Z}/(n)$ is a local ring then n is a prime power.

EXAMPLE 4.26. *The ring $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ of p-adic integers is a local ring. For any field k, the ring $k[[t]]$ of formal power series with coefficients in k is a local ring. Both of these rings are also PIDs. A ring which is a local PID is called a **discrete valuation ring**; these especially simple and important rings will be studied in detail later.*

EXERCISE 4.19. *Show: a local ring is connected, i.e., $e^{2} = e \implies e \in \{0, 1\}$.*

5. The Prime Ideal Principle of Lam and Reyes

A recurrent meta-principle in commutative algebra is that if $\mathcal{F}$ is a naturally given family of ideals in commutative ring R, then it is often the case that every maximal element of $\mathcal{F}$ is prime. In this section we review some known examples, give some further classical ones, and then discuss a beautiful theorem of T.-Y. Lam and M.

Reyes which gives a general criterion for this phemenon to occur.

Recall that for a ring R, $\mathcal{I}(R)$ is the monoid of ideals of R under multiplication. For any $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$, let $\operatorname{Max} \mathcal{F}$ denote the maximal elements of $\mathcal{F}$ (to be sure, this means the elements of $\mathcal{F}$ which are not properly contained in any other element of $\mathcal{F}$, not the elements of $\mathcal{F}$ which are not contained in any other proper ideal!). We say that $\mathcal{F}$ is an **MP family** if $\operatorname{Max} \mathcal{F} \subset \operatorname{Spec} R$.

EXAMPLE 4.27.   a) *Every maximal ideal is prime (Corollary 4.8), so the family of all proper ideals in a ring R is an MP family.*
b) *If $S \subset R$ is a multiplicative set, an ideal that is maximal with the property of being disjoint from S is prime (Proposition 5.24), so the family of all ideals in R that are disjoint from S is an MP family.*
c) *As we will see shortly, the family of all* non-*principal ideals in a ring R is an MP family. Thus if every prime ideal is principal, every ideal is principal: Theorem 4.30.*
d) *As we will see shortly, the family of all infinitely generated ideals in a ring R is an MP family. This implies a result of Cohen (Theorem 4.31): if every prime ideal is finitely generated, then R is Noetherian.*

The challenge is to come up with a common explanation and proof for all of these examples. One first observation is that there is a complementation phenomenon in play here: for $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$, put $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{I}(R) \setminus \mathcal{F}$. Then in each of the last three cases it is most natural to view the MP family as $\mathcal{F}'$ for a suitable $\mathcal{F}$: in the second case, $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of ideals meeting S; in the third case, $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of all principal ideals; in the fourth case $\mathcal{F}$ is the set of all finitely generated ideals.

Let us also recall that for $I, J \in \mathcal{I}(R)$,
$$(I : J) = \{x \in R \mid xJ \subset I\}.$$
For $a, b \in R$, we write $(I : b)$ for $(I : Rb)$ and $(a : J)$ for $(aR : J)$.

EXERCISE 4.20. *For ideals I, J in R, show that*
$$(15) \qquad (I : J)\langle I, J \rangle \subseteq I.$$

EXERCISE 4.21. *Let R be a PID, and let $a, b \in R^{\bullet}$. Then (a) and (b) can be factored into products of principal prime ideals, say*
$$(a) = (\pi_1^{a_1} \cdots (\pi_i^{a_r}), \ b = (\pi_1^{b_1}) \cdots (\pi_r^{b_r}), \ a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{N}.$$
a) *Show $\langle a, b \rangle = \langle \pi_1^{\min(a_1, b_1)} \cdots \pi_r^{\min(a_r, b_r)} \rangle$.*
b) *Show $(a : b) = \langle \pi_1^{\max(a_1 - b_1, 0)} \cdots \pi_r^{\max(a_r - b_r, 0)} \rangle$.*
c) *Show $\langle a \rangle \subset (a : b)$.*
d) *Show $(a : b)\langle a, b \rangle = \langle a \rangle$.*
e) *Suppose $\# \operatorname{MaxSpec} R \geq 2$. Find $a, b \in R^{\bullet}$ such that:*
  (i) $(a : b) \subset \langle a, b \rangle$.
  (ii) $\langle a, b \rangle \subset (a : b)$.
  (iii) Neither of $(a : b)$, $\langle a, b \rangle$ contains the other.

We say a partially ordered set $(X, \leq)$ has the **weak maximum** property if for every $x \in X$ there is a maximal element $m \in X$ with $x \leq m$. Zorn's Lemma implies that if every chain in X has an upper bound then X has the weak maximum property.

EXERCISE 4.22. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ be a family of finitely generated ideals of R. (This applies to all $\mathcal{F}$ iff R is Noetherian.) Show: $\mathcal{F}'$ has the weak maximum property.*

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is an **Oka family** if $R \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all $x \in R$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, if $\langle I, x \rangle$, $(I : x) \in \mathcal{F}$, then $I \in \mathcal{F}$.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is an **Ako family** if $R \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all $x_1, .x_2 \in R$ and $I \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, if $\langle I, x_1 \rangle$, $\langle I, x_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\langle I, x_1 x_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is **increasing** if for all $I, J \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, if $I \in \mathcal{F}$ and $J \supset I$ then $J \in \mathcal{F}$.

THEOREM 4.28. *(Prime Ideal Principle of Lam-Reyes [**LR08**]) Let R be a ring and let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ be a family of ideals that is either Oka or Ako.*
   a) *The complementary family $\mathcal{F}' := \mathcal{I}(R) \setminus \mathcal{F}$ is an MP family.*
   b) *Suppose moreover that $\mathcal{F}'$ has the weak maximum property. Then:*
      (i) *Let $\mathfrak{f} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ be an increasing family. If $\mathfrak{f} \cap \operatorname{Spec} R \subset \mathcal{F}$, then $\mathfrak{f} \subset \mathcal{F}$.*
      (ii) *Suppose that $I \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ is such that every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ that contains I (resp. properly contains I) lies in $\mathcal{F}$. Then every ideal that contains I (resp. properly contains I) lies in $\mathcal{F}$.*
      (iii) *If $\operatorname{Spec} R \subset \mathcal{F}$ then $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{I}(R)$.*

PROOF. a) We go by contraposition: let $I \in \operatorname{Max} \mathcal{F}'$ be an ideal which is not prime, so there are $a, b \in R \setminus I$ with $ab \in I$. Since $b \in (I : a)$, the ideals $\langle I, a \rangle, (I : a)$ each properly contain I, so by maximality of I we have $\langle I, a \rangle$, $\langle I, b \rangle$, $(I : a) \in \mathcal{F}$. Since $I = \langle I, ab \rangle \notin \mathcal{F}$, the family $\mathcal{F}$ is neither Oka nor Ako.
b) (i) Suppose there is $I \in \mathfrak{f} \setminus \mathcal{F}$. Since $\mathcal{F}'$ has the weak maximum property, I is contained in a maximal element $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathcal{F}'$, which by part a) is prime. Since $\mathfrak{f}$ is increasing, this gives $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{f} \cap \operatorname{Spec} R \subset \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction.
(ii) Apply (i) with $\mathfrak{f}$ the family of ideals containing (resp. properly containing) I.
(iii) Apply (i) with $\mathfrak{f} = \operatorname{Spec} R$. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 4.29. *Let R be a ring. Each of the following families $\mathcal{F}$ is Oka and the complementary family $\mathcal{F}'$ is closed under taking unions of chains hence satisfies the weak maximum property.*
(i) The set of all ideals meeting a multiplicatively closed subset $S \subset R$.
(ii) The set of all principal ideals.
(iii) The set of all finitely generated ideals.

PROOF. (i) Let $x \in R$, $I \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ be such that $\langle I, x \rangle, (I : x) \in \mathcal{F}$. Then there are $s_1, s_2 \in S$, $i_1, i_2 \in I$ and $a, b \in R$ such that

$$s_1 = ai_1 + bx, \ s_2 x = i_2.$$

Then

$$s_2 s_2 = as_2 i_1 + bs_2 x = as_2 i_1 + bi_2 \in S \cap I.$$

The union of a chain of ideals disjoint from S is an ideal disjoint from S.
(ii) Suppose $(I : x) = \langle a \rangle$ and $\langle I, x \rangle = \langle b \rangle$. Exercise 4.18d) gives us a useful hint: we will show $I = \langle ab \rangle$. Equation (15) gives the containment

$$\langle ab \rangle = \langle a \rangle \langle b \rangle (I : x) \langle I, x \rangle \subset I.$$

Conversely, let $i \in I$. Since $I \subset \langle I, x \rangle = \langle b \rangle$, we may write $i = \alpha b$ for some $\alpha \in R$. We have $\alpha(b) \subset I$ hence also $\alpha \langle x \rangle \subset I$ and thus $\alpha \in (I : x) = \langle a \rangle$. So

$$i = \alpha b \in \langle ab \rangle.$$

The union I of a chain $\{I_j\}$ of nonprincipal ideals must be nonprincipal: if $I = \langle a \rangle$ then $a \in I_j$ for some j and thus $\langle a \rangle \subset I_j \subset I = \langle a$, so $I_j = \langle a \rangle$ is principal.

(iii) Suppose $(I : x) = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_m \rangle$ and $\langle I, x \rangle = \langle i_1 + \alpha_1 x, \ldots, i_n + \alpha_n x \rangle$. Let $J = \langle i_1, \ldots, i_n, xa_1, \ldots, xa_m \rangle$. We will show $I = J$, hence I is finitely generated. It is immediate that $J \subset I$. Conversely $z \in I$; since $I \subset \langle I, x \rangle$, we may write

$$z = \beta_1(i_1 + \alpha_1 x) + \ldots + \beta_n(i_n + \alpha_n x) = (\beta_1 i_1 + \ldots + \beta_n i_n) + (\alpha_1 \beta_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n \beta_n)x.$$

Since z and $\beta_1 i_1 + \ldots + \beta_n i_n \in I$, so is $(\alpha_1 \beta_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n \beta_n)x$, i.e., $\alpha_1 \beta_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n \beta_n \in (I : x) = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_m \rangle$, so $(\alpha_1 \beta_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n \beta_n)x \in \langle xa_1, \ldots, xa_m \rangle$ and thus $z \in J$.

The union I of a chain $\{I_j\}$ of infinitely generated ideals must be infinitely generated: if $I = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$, then for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $x_i \in I_{j_i}$ for some index j_i. Then

$$\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle \subset I_{\max(j_1, \ldots, j_n)} \subset I = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle,$$

so $I_j = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$ is finitely generated. $\square$

Combining Proposition 4.33 and Theorem 4.28 we deduce a new proof of Multiplicative Avoidance as well as immediate proofs of the following results.

THEOREM 4.30. *If every prime ideal of R is principal, every ideal of R is principal.*

What about maximal ideals? Later we will encounter local rings with maximal principal ideals that are not principal ideal rings, but they will be non-Noetherian. Indeed they need to be: by a result of Kaplansky (Theorem 16.9), if in a Noetherian ring every maximal ideal is principal, then every ideal is principal. The proof will draw significantly on aspects of the structure theory of Noetherian rings.

THEOREM 4.31. *(Cohen [**Co50**]) If every prime ideal of R is finitely generated, then every ideal of R is finitely generated.*

EXERCISE 4.23. *By Exercise 4.18, for any infinite cardinal κ and any ring R, the family $\mathcal{I}_\kappa$ of ideals of R with fewer than κ generators is an Oka family. So it's tempting to generalize Theorem 4.31 to: for any infinite cardinal κ, if every prime ideal of a ring R can be generated by fewer than κ elements then every ideal of R can be generated by fewer than κ elements. Is this generalization true?*

Looking back at the above approach, the only cloud in the sky may be that directly checking whether a family is Oka or Ako is neither completely trivial nor especially enlightening. Following Lam-Reyes, we introduce some further conditions on a family that will allow us to prove more easily that it is either Oka or Ako.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is a **strongly Oka family** if $R \in \mathcal{F}$ and for $I, J \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, if $\langle I, J \rangle, (I : J) \in \mathcal{F}$, then $I \in \mathcal{F}$.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is a **strongly Ako family** if $R \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all $x \in R$ and $I, J \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, if $\langle I, x \rangle, \langle I, J \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\langle I, xJ \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is a **very strongly Ako family** if $R \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all $I,\ J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, if $\langle I, J_1 \rangle$, $\langle I, J_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$, then $\langle I, J_1 J_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$.

A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is a **filter** if $\mathcal{F}$ is increasing, $\mathcal{F}$ is closed under finite intersections and $R \in \mathcal{F}$.[4] A family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is **monoidal** if $R \in \mathcal{F}$ and for all $I, J \in \mathcal{F}$ we have $IJ \in \mathcal{F}$.

EXERCISE 4.24.   a) *Show: a monoidal increasing family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ is a monoidal filter.*

  b) *Let (P) be any of the following properties: Oka, Ako, strongly Oka, strongly Ako, monoidal filter. For each $i \in I$, let $\mathcal{F}_i$ be a family satisfying (P). Show that $\mathcal{F} := \bigcap_{i \in I}$ satsisfies property (P). Deduce: that for any family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ there is a unique minimal family $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ containing $\mathcal{F}$ and satisfying property (P).*

  c) *Let (P) be the property of being a monoidal filter, and let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ be any family of ideals. Show that $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ is the collection of ideals of R that contain a finite product $I_1 \cdots I_n$ with each $I_i \in \mathcal{F}$.*

PROPOSITION 4.32. *Let R be a ring, and let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{I}(R)$ be a family of ideals.*

  a) *Strongly Oka implies Oka, and very strongly Ako implies strongly Ako implies Ako.*
  b) *Monoidal filter implies very strongly Ako.*
  c) *Very strongly Ako implies strongly Oka.*
  d) *Strongly Ako implies Oka.*

PROOF. a) These implications are immediate from the definitions.
b) Let $I, J_1, J_2 \in \mathcal{I}(R)$. If $\langle I, J_1 \rangle$, $\langle I, J_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$, then since $\mathcal{F}$ is monoidal we have $\langle I, J_1 \rangle \langle I, J_2 \rangle = \langle I^2, IJ_1, IJ_2, J_1 J_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$. Since $\langle I^2, IJ_1, IJ_2, J_1 J_2 \rangle \subset \langle I, J_1 J_2 \rangle$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is monoidal, we get that $\langle I, J_1 J_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$, so $\mathcal{F}$ is very strongly Ako.
c) Let $\mathcal{F}$ be very strongly Ako. Let $I, J \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ be such that $\langle I, J \rangle$, $\langle I : J \rangle \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $(I : J) = \langle I, (I : J) \rangle$, and the very strong Ako condition gives

$$I = \langle I, J(I : J) \rangle \in \mathcal{F}.$$

d) Taking $J =]\langle x \rangle$ in the proof of part c) shows that strongly Ako implies Oka. $\square$

We now revisit some of the above examples with these further conditions in mind.

EXAMPLE 4.33.   a) *If $S \subset R$ is a multiplicative subset, the family $\mathcal{F}_S$ of all ideals in R that meet S is a monoidal filter, as is almost immediate to check. This is the strongest of the conditions we have introduced, so in particular $\mathcal{F}_S$ is both Oka and Ako.*

  b) *Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ be the family of all principal ideals of R. Except in the trivial case where every ideal of R is principal, $\mathcal{F}_1$ is not increasing, so is not a filter. However it is monoidal and strongly Oka: the former is immediate and the proof of Oka-ness given in Proposition adapts to show strong Oka-ness.*

  *In fact the family $\mathcal{F}_1$ need not be Ako. Let R be a ring admitting principal ideals $\langle a \rangle$, $\langle b \rangle$ whose intersection is not finitely generated (see [**LR08**, Remark 3.18]) and the references therein for a specific example).*

---

[4]This is the usual set-theoretic notion of a filter on 2^R each of whose elements is an ideal. To be slick about it, closure under finite intersections should include closure under the empty intersection which should itself imply that $R \in \mathcal{F}$.

*Then $\langle I, a \rangle = \langle a \rangle$, $\langle I, b \rangle = \langle b \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_1$ but $\langle I, ab \rangle = I \notin \mathcal{F}_1$. This also gives
a ring in which the family of finitely generated ideals is not Ako (but is
strongly Oka, as we will now see).*

c) *For an infinite cardinal κ, let $\mathcal{F}_{<\kappa}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_{\leq \kappa}$) be the family of ideals of R
that admit a generating set of cardinality less than α (resp. of cardinality
at most α). These families are monoidal: for $\mathcal{F}_{<\kappa}$ this is because if α, β, κ
are cardinals with κ infinite and $\alpha, \beta < \kappa$ then*

$$\alpha\beta \leq \max(\alpha, \beta)^2 < \kappa^2 = \kappa,$$

*and the case of $\mathcal{F}_{\leq \kappa}$ is because $\kappa^2 = \kappa$. They are also monoidal: we will
treat the slightly more difficult case of $\mathcal{F}_{<\kappa}$. For an ideal I of R, we write
$\mu(I)$ for its minimal number of generators. Let $I \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ and $x \in R$.
Then there are infinite cardinals $\alpha, \beta < \kappa$ such that $\mu(I, x) \leq \alpha < \kappa$ and
$\mu((I : x)) \leq \beta < \kappa$. Then there is an ideal $I_0 \subset I$ with $\mu(I_0) \leq \alpha$ and
$\langle I, x \rangle = \langle I_0, x \rangle$. We claim that*

$$I_0 + (I : x)\langle x \rangle = I.$$

*Indeed, both I_0 and $(I : x)\langle x \rangle$ are contained in I, so $I_0 + (I : x)\langle x \rangle \subset I$. If
$i \in I$ there is $i_0 \in I_0$ and $a \in R$ such that $i = i_0 + ax$; since $ax = i - i_0 \in I$,
we have $a \in (I : x)$, and thus $i \in I_0 + (I : x)\langle x \rangle$. Thus $\mu(I) \leq \alpha + \beta \leq
\max(\alpha, \beta) < \kappa$, so $I \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha$.*

EXERCISE 4.25. *Let κ be an infinite cardinal, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be either $\mathcal{F}_{<\kappa}$ or $\mathcal{F}_{\leq \kappa}$
as defined in Example 4.33c) above. We showed that $\operatorname{Max} \mathcal{F}' \subset \operatorname{Spec} \mathcal{F}$. Is it true
that if every prime ideal in R can be generated by fewer than κ elements (resp. by
at most κ elements) then every ideal in R can be generated be fewer than κ elements
(resp. by at most κ elements)?*

6. Minimal Primes

Let R be a ring. A **minimal prime** $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is just what it sounds like: a minimal
element of the set $\operatorname{Spec} R$ of prime ideals of R, partially ordered by inclusion.

EXERCISE 4.26. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a chain of prime ideals in a ring R. Show: $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{C}} \mathfrak{p}$ is
a prime ideal.*

PROPOSITION 4.34. *Let $I \subset \mathcal{P}$ be ideals of R, with $\mathcal{P}$ prime. Then the set $\mathcal{S}$ of
all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R with $I \subset \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{P}$ has a minimal element.*

PROOF. We partially order $\mathcal{S}$ by reverse inclusion i.e., $\mathfrak{p}_1 \leq \mathfrak{p}_2 \iff \mathfrak{p}_1 \supset \mathfrak{p}_2$.
Let C be any chain in $\mathcal{S}$. By Exercise 4.26, $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{C}} \mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal and thus it is
an upper bound for $\mathcal{C}$ in $\mathcal{S}$. By Zorn's Lemma, $\mathcal{S}$ contains a maximal element, i.e.,
a minimal element under ordinary containment.   □

COROLLARY 4.35. *Every nonzero ring has at least one minimal prime.*

EXERCISE 4.27. *Prove Corollary 4.35.*

We write $\operatorname{MinSpec} R$ for the set of all minimal primes of R and $\operatorname{ZD}(R)$ for the set
of all zerodivisors in R.

EXERCISE 4.28. *Show: in a ring R, $r(R) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MinSpec} R} \mathfrak{p}$.*

In order to prove the next result, it is convenient to use the theory of localization, which we will not develop until § 7. Nevertheless we have decided to place the proof here, as it fits thematically with the other results of the section.

THEOREM 4.36. *Let R be a ring.*
a) We have $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{MinSpec}\, R} \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathrm{ZD}(R)$.
b) If R is reduced, then equality holds:

$$(16) \qquad \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{MinSpec}\, R} \mathfrak{p} = \mathrm{ZD}(R).$$

PROOF. a) Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{MinSpec}\, R$ and let $x \in \mathfrak{p}$. Then $\mathfrak{p} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the unique prime ideal of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, so $x \in r(\mathfrak{p} A_{\mathfrak{p}})$ is nilpotent. By Exercise 7.4, this implies that there is $y \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $yx^n = 0$. Since $y \neq 0$, x^n – and thus also x – is a zero-divisor.
b) Suppose $a \in \mathrm{ZD}(R)$, so there is $b \in R^{\bullet}$ with $ab = 0$. Since $b \neq 0$ and R is reduced, by Exercise 4.28 we have

$$b \notin \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{MinSpec}\, R} \mathfrak{p},$$

so there is $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{MinSpec}\, R$ not containing b. Since $ab = 0 \in \mathfrak{p}$, we have $a \in \mathfrak{p}$. $\quad\square$

PROPOSITION 4.37. *Let $\mathcal{I} := \{I_j\}_{j \in J}$ be any family of ideals in a ring R, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of ideals that contain some finite product $I_{j_1} \cdots I_{j_n}$ (taking the empty product, we get that $R \in \mathcal{F}$). Let $\mathcal{F}'$ be the complementary family of ideals not containing any product of the I_j's.*

   a) *Any maximal element of $\mathcal{F}'$ is a prime ideal.*
   b) *Suppose moreover that each I_i is finitely generated and that every prime ideal of R contains some I_i. Then there are $j_1, \ldots, j_n \in J$ such that $I_{j_1} \cdots I_{j_n} = (0)$.*

PROOF. a) The family $\mathcal{F}$ is a monoidal filter: indeed, it is the monoidal filter generated by the family $\{I_j\}_{j \in I}$. By Theorem 4.28a), every maximal element of $\mathcal{F}'$ is prime.
b) Let $\{J_k\}$ be a chain in $\mathcal{F}'$, and let $J := \bigcup_k J_k$ be its union. If $J \supset I_{j_1} \cdots I_{j_n}$, then since each I_{j_i} is finitely generated, so is $I_{j_1} \cdots I_{j_n}$, and as we have seen before, if the union of a chain of ideals contains a finitely generated ideal, then so does some element of the chain. So by Zorn's Lemma $\mathcal{F}'$ has the weak maximum property, so by Theorem 4.28b)(iii) since every prime ideal of R lies in $\mathcal{F}$ we conclude that every ideal lies in $\mathcal{F}$. In particular the zero ideal lies in $\mathcal{F}$, giving the desired conclusion. $\quad\square$

COROLLARY 4.38 (Anderson).   a) *Suppose that in a ring R every minimal prime ideal is finitely generated. Then $\mathrm{MinSpec}\, R$ is finite.*
   b) *If R is Noetherian, then $\mathrm{MinSpec}\, R$ is finite.*

PROOF. a) We apply Proposition 4.38b) with $\mathcal{I} = \mathrm{MinSpec}\, R$. There are then distinct minimal prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\mathfrak{p}_1^{a_1} \cdots \mathfrak{p}_n^{a_n} = (0)$. If now $\mathfrak{q} \in \mathrm{MinSpec}\, R$ then $\mathfrak{q} \supset \mathfrak{p}_1^{a_1} \cdots \mathfrak{p}_n^{a_n}$ so $\mathfrak{q} \supset \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$. It follows that $\mathrm{MinSpec}\, R = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n\}$.
b) If R is Noetherian then every ideal is finitely generated, so part a) applies. $\quad\square$

7. An application to unit groups

The following useful generalization of Proposition 4.18 is due to MathOverflow user zcn: see http://mathoverflow.net/users/44201/zcn.

THEOREM 4.39. *Let $f : R \to S$ be a surjective ring homomorphism, with kernel I. Suppose that all but finitely many maximal ideals of R contain I. Then the induced group homomorphism on unit groups $f^\times : R^\times \to S^\times$ is surjective.*

PROOF. We may identify S with R/I. Let $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ be the maximal ideals of R that do not contain I. Then the ideals $I, \mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ are pairwise comaximal. Let $y \in S^\times$, and choose $x \in R$ such that $f(x) = y$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem there is $a \in I$ such that $a \equiv 1 - x \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then $f(x+a) = f(x) + f(a) = f(x) = y$. Moreover, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $x + a \notin \mathfrak{m}_i$. If $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R \setminus \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n\}$ then $\mathfrak{m} \supset I$, so if $x + a \in \mathfrak{m}$, then $x \in \mathfrak{m}$, so $y = f(x) \in \mathfrak{m}/I$, a proper ideal of R/I: contradiction. So $x + a \in R^\times$. $\square$

The hypothesis of Theorem 4.39 applies to every surjective homomorphism $f : R \to S$ when R is semilocal, so in particular when R is finite or – as we will see later in Theorem 8.37 – when R is Artinian.

CHAPTER 5

Examples of Rings

1. Rings of numbers

The most familiar examples of rings are probably rings of numbers, e.g.

$$\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Q} \subset \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{C}.$$

These are, respectively, the integers, the rational numbers, the real numbers and the complex numbers. For any positive integer N the ring integers modulo N, denoted $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$. We assume that the reader has seen all these rings before.

Historically, the concept of a ring as an abstract structure seems to have arisen as an attempt formalize common algebraic properties of number rings of various sorts. It is my understanding that the term "ring" comes from Hilbert's *Zahlring* ("Zahl" means "number" in German). Indeed, various sorts of extension rings of $\mathbb{C}$ – most famously Hamilton's quaternions $\mathbb{H}$ – have been referred to as systems of **hypercomplex numbers**. This terminology seems no longer to be widely used.

The adjunction process gives rise to many rings and fields of numbers, as already seen in §2.2. For instance, for a nonsquare integer D, let $\sqrt{D}$ be a complex number whose square is D: then $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}]$ is an interesting ring.

EXERCISE 5.1. *Show:* $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}] = \{a + b\sqrt{D} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

In particular, $(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}], +) \cong (\mathbb{Z}^2, +)$ as commutative groups, although not as rings, since $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}]$ is a domain and $\mathbb{Z}^2$ has nontrivial idempotents.

More generally, let K be any number field (a finite degree field extension of $\mathbb{Q}$), and let $\mathbb{Z}_K$ be the set of elements $x \in K$ which satisfy a monic polynomial with $\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients. It turns out that $\mathbb{Z}_K$ is a ring, the **ring of algebraic integers in K**. This is a special case of the theory of integral closure: see §14.

Algebraic number theory proper begins with the observation that in general the rings $\mathbb{Z}_K$ need not be UFDs but are otherwise as nice as possible from a commutative algebraic standpoint. That is, every ring $\mathbb{Z}_K$ is a **Dedekind domain**, which among many other characterizations, means that every nonzero ideal factors into a product of prime ideals. That the rings $\mathbb{Z}_K$ are Dedekind domains is an example of a *normalization theorem*, more specifically a very special case of the **Krull-Akizuki Theorem** of §18.

Let $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}$. (This is *not* a number field, being an infinite degree algebraic extension of $\mathbb{Q}$.) We may define $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ to be the set of all elements

of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ which satsify a monic polynomial with integer coefficients: this is **the ring of all algebraic integers**. In particular,

$$\overline{\mathbb{Z}} = \varinjlim \mathbb{Z}_K$$

is the direct limit of all rings of integers in fixed number fields.

EXERCISE 5.2. *Let $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the set of all algebraic integers.*
a) Taking as given that for any fixed number field K, the algebraic integers in K form a subring of K, show that $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a subring of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.
b) Show: $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a domain which is not *Noetherian. Hint: use the fact that the nth root of an algebraic integer is an algebraic integer to construct an infinite strictly ascending chain of principal ideals in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

THEOREM 5.1. *Every finitely generated ideal in the ring $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is principal.*

Thus, if only $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ were Noetherian, it would be a principal ideal domain! Later on we will prove a more general theorem, due to Kaplansky, in the context of limits of Dedekind domains with torsion Picard groups.

2. Rings of continuous functions

2.1. The ring of real-valued functions.

Let R be a ring, X a set, and consider the set R^X of all functions $f : X \to R$. We may endow R^X with the structure of a ring by defining addition and multiplication "pointwise", i.e.,

$$(f + g) : x \mapsto f(x) + g(x),$$
$$(fg) : x \mapsto f(x)g(x).$$

EXERCISE 5.3. *Show: this makes R^X into a ring with additive identity the constant function 0 and multiplicative identity the constant function 1.*

However, this is not really a "new" example of a ring.

EXERCISE 5.4. *Show: R^X is isomorphic as a ring, to $\prod_{x \in X} R$.*

Later on we will see this construction in the special case $R = \mathbb{F}_2$, in which case we get an important subclass of **Boolean rings**. However, in general R^X is quite a roomy ring. It contains many interesting subrings, some of which can be nicely consructed and analyzed using topological, geometric and analytic considerations.

2.2. Separation axioms and $C(X)$.

We specialize to the following situation: $R = \mathbb{R}$, X is a topological space, and instead of the ring $\mathbb{R}^X$ we look at the subring $C(X)$ of *continuous* $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$.

EXERCISE 5.5. *Show: for a topological space X, the following are equivalent:*
(i) For every $x, y \in X$ with $x \neq y$, there exists $f \in C(X)$ with $f(x) \neq f(y)$.
(ii) For every $x, y \in X$ with $x \neq y$ and every $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, there exists $f \in C(X)$ with $f(x) = \alpha$, $f(y) = \beta$.
(iii) For every finite subset S of X and any function $g : S \to \mathbb{R}$, there exists $f \in C(X)$ such that $f|_S = g$.
A space which satisfies these equivalent conditions is called ***C-separated***.[1]

---

[1]More standard terminology: "the continuous functions on X separate points".

Recall the following chains of implications from general topology:

LEMMA 5.2. *For any topological space, the following implications hold (and none of the arrows may be reversed)):*
a) X *compact* $\implies$ X *normal* $\implies$ X *Tychonoff* $\implies$ X *regular* $\implies$ X *Hausdorff* $\implies$ X *separated* $\implies$ X *Kolmogorov.*
b) X *locally compact* $\implies$ X *Tychonoff.*

EXERCISE 5.6. *a) Show: a Tychonoff space is C-separated.*
b) Show: a C-separated space is Hausdorff.
c)* Show: a regular space need not be C-separated.
*(Suggestion: see [**Ga71**].)*

For a topological space X, a **zero set** is a set of the form $f^{-1}(0)$ for some continuous function $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$. A **cozero set** is a complement of a zero set. The cozero sets in fact form a base for a topology on X; we call it the **Z-topology** and write X_Z for X endowed with the Z-topology. Since every cozero set is an open set in the given topology on X, X_Z is a coarser topology than the given topology on X. Of course we allow the possibility that the two topologies coincide. The following basic (but not so widely known) result gives a condition for this.

THEOREM 5.3.   a) *For a Hausdorff topological space X, the following are equivalent:*
   (i) $X_Z = X$: *every closed set is an intersection of zero sets of continuous functions.*
   (ii *) X is Tychonoff, i.e., if Y is a closed subset of X and $x \in X \setminus Y$, then there exists a continuous function $f : X \to [0, 1]$ with $f(x) = 0$, $f|_Y \equiv 1$.*
   b) *For any topological space X, the space X_Z is completely regular, and is the finest completely regular topology on the underlying set of X which is coarser than X.*

PROOF. [**GJ76**, p. 38]. $\qquad\square$

Let X be a topological space, and let $x \in X$ be any point. Consider the set

$$\mathfrak{m}_x = \{f \in C(X) \mid f(x) = 0\}.$$

Evidently $\mathfrak{m}_x$ is an ideal of $C(X)$. But more is true.

PROPOSITION 5.4. *Evaluation at x gives a canonical isomorphism $C(X)/\mathfrak{m}_x \overset{\sim}{\to} \mathbb{R}$. In particular, $\mathfrak{m}_x$ is a maximal ideal of $C(X)$.*

EXERCISE 5.7. *Prove Proposition 5.4.*

Thus $x \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_x$ gives a map of sets $\mathcal{M} : X \to M(X)$.

PROPOSITION 5.5. *The map $\mathcal{M} : X \to M(X)$ is injective iff X is C-separated.*

PROOF. Left to the reader as a routine parsing of the definitions. $\qquad\square$

2.3. Quasi-compactness and $C(X)$.

PROPOSITION 5.6. *If X is quasi-compact, then $\mathcal{M}$ is surjective, i.e., every maximal ideal of $C(X)$ is of the form $\mathfrak{m}_x$ for at least one point $x \in X$.*

PROOF. It suffices to show: let I be an ideal of $C(X)$ such that for no $x \in X$ do we have $I \subset \mathfrak{m}_x$. Then $I = C(X)$. By hypothesis, for every $x \in X$ there is $f_x \in I$ such that $f_x(x) \neq 0$. Since f_x is continuous, there is an open neighborhood U_x of x such f_x is nowhere vanishing on U_x. By quasi-compactness of X, there is a finite set $x_1, \ldots, x_N$ such $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{N} U_{x_i}$. Then the function $f = f_{x_1}^2 + \ldots + f_{x_n}^2$ is an element of $\mathfrak{m}$ which is positive at every $x \in X$. But then $\frac{1}{f}$ is also a continuous function on X, i.e., $f \in C(X)^\times$, so $I = R$. $\qquad\square$

A compact space is quasi-compact and C-separated. Thus previous results yield:

THEOREM 5.7. *If X is compact, then $\mathcal{M} : X \to M(X)$ is a bijection: every maximal ideal of $C(X)$ is of the form $\mathfrak{m}_x$ for a unique $x \in X$.*

There is a natural topology on $M(X)$, the **initial topology**: each $f \in C(X)$ induces a function $M_f : M(X) \to \mathbb{R}$, by mapping $\mathfrak{m}$ to the image of f in $C(X)/\mathfrak{m} = \mathbb{R}$. We endow $M(X)$ with the coarsest topology which makes each M_f continuous.

LEMMA 5.8. *For a compact space X, the initial topology on $M(X)$ is Hausdorff.*

PROOF. For distinct $x, x' \in X$, consider the maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_x, \mathfrak{m}_{x'}$. By C-separatedness, there exists $f \in C(X)$ with $f(x) = 0$, $f(x') \neq 0$. Thus choose disjoint neighborhoods V, V' of $f(x), f(x') \in \mathbb{R}$. The sets

$$U_{f,V} = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \in V\}, \ U_{f,V'} = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \in V'\}$$

are disjoint open neighborhoods of x and x'. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 5.9. *For a compact space X, let $M(X)$ be the set of maximal ideals of $C(X)$ endowed with the initial topology. Then $\mathcal{M} : X \to M(X)$, $x \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_x$ is a homeomorphism.*

PROOF. Step 1: We claim that $\mathcal{M}$ is continuous. But indeed, by the universal property of the initial topology, it is continuous iff for all $f \in C(X)$, the composite function $x \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_x \mapsto f(\mathfrak{m}_x)$ is continuous. But this is nothing else than the function $x \mapsto f(x)$, i.e., the continuous function f! So that was easy.
Step 2: We now know that $\mathcal{M}$ is a continuous bijection from a compact space to a Hausdorff space. Therefore it is a closed map: if Y is closed in X, then Y is compact, so $\mathcal{M}(Y)$ is compact, so $\mathcal{M}(Y)$ is closed. Therefore $\mathcal{M}^{-1}$ is continuous and thus $\mathcal{M}$ is a homeomorphism. $\qquad\square$

2.4. The (Stone-)Zariski topology on $C(X)$.

For any commutative ring R, we define $\mathrm{MaxSpec}(R)$ to be the maximal ideals and put a topology on it: for any ideal I of R, we define

$$V(I) = \{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R \mid I \subset \mathfrak{m}\}$$

The sets $V(I)$ are the closed sets for a unique topology on $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$, the **Zariski topology**. Another way to say it is that the closed sets in the Zariski topology are precisely all sets obtained by intersecting sets of the form

$$V(f) = \{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R \mid f \in \mathfrak{m}\}.$$

To see this, note first that for any ideal I of R,

$$V(I) = \bigcap_{f \in I} V(f)$$

and for any subset S of R,

$$\bigcap_{f \in S} V(f) = \bigcap_{f \in \langle S \rangle_R} V(f).$$

The Zariski topology on $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$ was first defined by M. Stone.

PROPOSITION 5.10. *Let X be any topological space. The map $\mathcal{M} : X \to \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$ is continuous when $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, X$ is given the Zariski topology.*

PROOF. As above, it is enough to show that for all $f \in C(X)$, the preimage $\mathcal{M}^{-1}(V(f))$ is closed in X. Unpacking the definitions, we find

$$\mathcal{M}^{-1}(V(f)) = f^{-1}(0),$$

thus the preimage is the zero set of the continuous function f, hence closed. $\square$

COROLLARY 5.11. *For a compact space X, the Zariski topology on $M(X) = \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$ coincides with the initial topology.*

PROOF. By Theorem 5.9, we may compare the *Zariski topology on X* – the topology obtained by pulling back the Zariski topology on $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$ via $\mathcal{M}$ – with the given topology on X. But the proof of Proposition 5.10 shows that the Zariski topology on X is precisely the Z-topology, i.e., the one in which the closed subsets are the intersections of zero sets. But X is compact hence quasi-Tychonoff, so by Theorem 5.3 the Z-topology on X coincides with the given topology on X. $\square$

Now let $\pi : X \to Y$ be a continuous map between compact spaces. There is an induced map $C(\pi) : C(Y) \to C(X)$: given $g : Y \to \mathbb{R}$, we pullback by π to get $g \circ \pi : X \to \mathbb{R}$. It is no problem to see that $C(\pi)$ is a homomorphism of rings. Now let $\mathfrak{m}_x \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$ be a maximal ideal and consider its pullback $C(\pi)^*(\mathfrak{m}_x)$ to an ideal of $C(Y)$: we find

$$C(\pi)^*(\mathfrak{m}_x) = \{g : Y \to \mathbb{R} \mid g(\pi(x)) = 0\} = \mathfrak{m}_{\pi(x)}.$$

Thus the pullback map carries maximal ideals to maximal ideals (recall this is certainly not true for all homomorphisms of rings!) and thus induces a map from X to Y which is indeed nothing else than the given map π.

All in all we see that the functors C and $\mathrm{MaxSpec}$ give a duality between the categories of compact spaces and rings of continuous $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions on compact spaces. In functional analysis this the first step in an important circle of ideas leading up to **Gelfand duality** for commutative Banach algebras.

2.5. Further results when X is not compact.

EXAMPLE 5.12. *Let X be an infinite discrete space, so $C(X) = \mathbb{R}^X$ is the ring of all functions from X to $\mathbb{R}$. Thus X is a noncompact Tychonoff space. So it follows from our work so far that $\mathcal{M}$ gives a continuous injection from $\mathcal{M}$ to the quasi-compact space $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$. In fact $\mathcal{M}$ is an embedding: for any subset $Y \subset X$, let I_Y be the ideal of functions vanishing identically on Y. Then the restriction of the closed subset $V(I)$ of $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$ to $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is precisely $\mathcal{M}(Y)$, so $\mathcal{M}(Y)$ is closed in $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$. Thus $\mathcal{M}(X)$ is discrete as a subspace of $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, C(X)$, and this implies that $\mathcal{M}$ is* not *surjective.*

THEOREM 5.13. *Let X be any topological space, let $\mathcal{M} : X \to \operatorname{MaxSpec} C(X)$, and let $X_T = \mathcal{M}(X)$, viewed as a subspace of $\operatorname{MaxSpec} C(X)$.*
a) X_T is a Tychonoff space.
b) The map $\mathcal{M} : X \to X_T$ is the Tychonoff completion of X: i.e., it is universal for continuous maps from X to a Tychonoff space.
c) The induced map $C(\mathcal{M}) : C(X_T) \to C(X)$ is an isomorphism of rings.

PROOF. See [**GJ76**, §3.9]. $\hspace{2cm}$ □

Thus the ring of continuous functions on an arbitrary space X "sees" precisely its Tychonoff completion X_T. Henceforth we restrict to Tychonoff spaces.

THEOREM 5.14. *Let X be a Tychonoff space. Then the map $\mathcal{M} : X \to \operatorname{MaxSpec} C(X)$ gives the Stone-Cech compactification of X.*

PROOF. See [**GJ76**, §7.11]. $\hspace{2cm}$ □

COROLLARY 5.15. *For any topological space X, $\operatorname{MaxSpec} C(X)$ is compact.*

REMARK 2. *We will see later that for any ring R, the Zariski topology on $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is quasi-compact. (In fact this is rather easy, and the interested reader may well try it now as an exercise.) Thus the content of Corollary 5.15 is that $\operatorname{MaxSpec} C(X)$ is Hausdorff. Later on we will characterize this class of rings and thereby obtain a different, more elementary proof of Corollary 5.15.*

EXERCISE 5.8. *a) Show: $C(X)$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{R}^X$.*
b) Show: $C(X)$ is reduced: it contains no nonzero nilpotent elements.
c) (T. Rzepecki) Show: for a topological space, the following are equivalent:
(i) The Tychonoff completion X_T of X is a one-point space.
(ii) $C(X) = \mathbb{R}$.
(iii) $C(X)$ is a domain.
(Suggestion: (ii) $\iff$ (i) $\implies$ (iii) are straightforward. For (iii) $\implies$ (ii), let $f \in C(X)$ be nonconstant, so $f(x) \neq f(y)$ for some $x, y \in X$. Show that for suitable real numbers C_1 and C_2 the functions $g_1 = \max(0, f_1 + C_1)$ and $g_2 = \max(0, -f_1 + C_2)$ give nonzero elements of $C(X)$ with $g_1 g_2 = 0$.)

EXERCISE 5.9. *Show $C(X)$ is connected in the algebraic sense – i.e., there are no idempotents other than 0 and 1 – iff the topological space X is connected.*

EXERCISE 5.10. *Show: there is an antitone Galois connection between 2^X and the set of ideals of $C(X)$, as follows:*
$S \subset X \mapsto I_S = \{ f \in C(X) \mid f|_S \equiv 0 \}$ and
$I \mapsto Y_I = \{ x \in X \mid \forall f \in I, f(x) = 0 \}$.

EXERCISE 5.11. *Let X be a Tychonoff space.*
a) Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of $C(X)$. Show that Y_I consists of at most one point.
b) Suppose X is moreover compact. Deduce:
(i) Y_I consists of exactly one point.
(ii) A prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $C(X)$ is closed in the sense of the Galois connection – i.e., $\mathfrak{p} = I_{Y_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ iff $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal.
(iii) Each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $C(X)$ is contained in a unique maximal ideal.

EXERCISE 5.12. *Let $X = [0, 1]$ with the standard Euclidean topology. Let $\mathfrak{r}_0$ be the ideal of all functions $f \in C(X)$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{x \to 0^+} \frac{f(x)}{x^k} = 0$.*

Equivalently $\mathfrak{r}_0$ is the ideal of all functions which are infinitely differentiable at 0 and have identically zero Taylor series at zero.
a) Show: $\mathfrak{r}_0$ is a radical ideal but not a prime ideal.
b) Show: the only maximal ideal containing $\mathfrak{r}_0$ is $\mathfrak{m}_0 = \{f \in C([0,1]) \mid f(0) = 0\}$.
c) Deduce that there are ideals of $C(X)$ which are prime but not maximal.

EXERCISE 5.13. *Let X be a C-separated topological space.*
a) Let $S \subset X$ with $\#S > 1$. Show: I_S is not maximal.
b) Suppose X is Tychonoff and $S, T \subset X$. Show: $I_S \subset I_T \iff \overline{T} \subset \overline{S}$.
c) Show: if X is Tychonoff, then for closed $S, T \subset X$, we have $I_S = I_T \iff S = T$.

EXERCISE 5.14. *Let $\varphi : X \to Y$ be a continuous function between topological spaces.*
a) Show: φ induces a ring homomorphism $C(\varphi) : C(Y) \to C(X)$ by $g \in C(Y) \mapsto \varphi^* g = g \circ \varphi$.
b) Suppose Y is normal, X is a closed subspace of X and $\varphi : X \to Y$ is the inclusion map. Show: $C(\varphi)$ is surjective.

EXERCISE 5.15. *Let X be a normal topological space. Show: the closure operator on subsets of X given by the Galois connection is the topological closure.*

EXERCISE 5.16. *Let $X = \{0\} \cup \{\frac{1}{n}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \subset \mathbb{R}$, and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of functions vanishing at 0. Fill in the details of the following proof that $\mathfrak{m}$ is* not *finitely generated.[2] Assume not: $\mathfrak{m} = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$. Then for all $g \in \mathfrak{m}$, $\lim_{x \to 0} \frac{g^2(x)}{|a_1(x)| + \ldots + |a_n(x)|} = 0$. (Show also that there is $\delta > 0$ such that the denominator is strictly positive on $(0, \delta)$.) Now choose $g \in \mathfrak{m}$ so as to get a contradiction.*

EXERCISE 5.17. *Let X be a normal space, and let $x \in X$.*
a) Show that the following are equivalent:
(i) The ideal I_x is finitely generated.
(ii) The ideal I_x is principal.
(iii) The point x is isolated in X (i.e., $\{x\}$ is open).
b) Suppose X is compact. Show that the following are equivalent:
(i) $C(X)$ is a Noetherian ring.
(ii) $C(X)$ is finite-dimensional as an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space.
(iii) X is finite.

EXERCISE 5.18. *Show: if we worked throughout with rings $C(X, \mathbb{C})$ of continuous $\mathbb{C}$-valued functions, then all of the above results continue to hold.*

EXERCISE 5.19. *Suppose we looked at rings of continuous functions from a topological space X to $\mathbb{Q}_p$. To what extent to the results of the section continue to hold?*

EXERCISE 5.20. *Let X be a compact smooth manifold and consider the ring $C^\infty(X)$ of smooth functions $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$.*
a) Show: for $x \in X$, $\{f \in C^\infty(X) \mid f(x) = 0\}$ is a finitely generated *maximal ideal.*
b) The phenomenon of part a) is in contrast to the case of maximal ideals in the ring $C([0,1])$, say. However, I believe that with this sole exception, all of the results of this section hold for the rings $C^\infty(X)$ just as for the rings $C(X)$. Try it and see.

---

[2]Or, if you like, give your own proof that $\mathfrak{m}$ is not finitely generated!

2.6. A theorem of B. Sury.

THEOREM 5.16. *(Sury) Let $c \in [0,1]$, and let $\mathfrak{m}_c = \{f \in C[0,1] \mid f(c) = 0\}$. Then $\mathfrak{m}_c$ admits no* countable *generating set.*

PROOF. Let $\{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a countably infinite subset of $\mathfrak{m}_c$, and let $J = \langle \{f_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \rangle$. It suffices to exhibit $f \in \mathfrak{m}_c \setminus J$. By rescaling, we may assume $||f_n|| \leq 1$ for all n. And we may assume $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n^{-1}(0) = \{c\}$: otherwise $x \mapsto |x - c|$ lies in $\mathfrak{m}_c \setminus J$. Put

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{|f_n(x)|}{2^n}}.$$

The series is uniformly convergent (by "Weierstrass's M-Test") and thus f, being the uniform limit of continuous functions, is itself continuous. Moreover $f^{-1}(0) = \{c\}$, and in particular $f \in \mathfrak{m}_c$. Seeking a contradiction, we suppose $f \in J$: then there is $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_r \in C([0,1])$ such that

$$f = \sum_{n=1}^{r} g_n f_n.$$

Let $M = \max_{1 \leq n \leq r} ||g_n||$, so $||f|| \leq M \sum_{n=1}^{r} ||f_n||$. Let U be a neighborhood of c such that $||\sqrt{f_n}||_U < \frac{1}{2^n M}$ for $1 \leq n \leq r$. Since $f = \sum_{n=1}^{r} g_n f_n$ vanishes only at c, for each $x \in U \setminus \{c\}$, there exists $1 \leq N \leq r$ such that $f_N(x) \neq 0$ and thus

$$|f_N(x)| < \frac{\sqrt{|f_N(x)|}}{2^N M}.$$

Hence

$$|f(x)| \leq M \sum_{n=1}^{r} |f_n(x)| < \sum_{n=1}^{r} \frac{\sqrt{|f_n(x)|}}{2^n} \leq |f(x)|,$$

a contradiction.   □

3. Rings of holomorphic functions

We have just seen that the ring of continuous functions on a topological space is very rarely a domain. A remedy for this is to consider more "rigid" collections of functions. Let U be an open subset of the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$, and let $\text{Hol}(U)$ be the set of holomorphic functions $f : U \to \mathbb{C}$. (A holomorphic function on U is one for which the complex derivative $f'(z)$ exists for each $z \in U$. Equivalently, for each $z \in U$ f admits a power series expansion with positive radius of convergence.) Then $\text{Hol}(U) \subset \mathbb{C}^U$, the ring of all $\mathbb{C}$-valued functions on U.

PROPOSITION 5.17. *For nonempty open $U \subset \mathbb{C}$, the following are equivalent:*
(i) U is connected.
(ii) $\text{Hol}(U)$ is a domain.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): For any $f \in C(U, \mathbb{C})$ let $Z(f) = \{z \in U \mid f(z) = 0\}$ be the zero set of f. Since f is continuous, $Z(f)$ is a closed subset of U. If f is moreover holomorphic, then $Z(f)$ has no accumulation point in U, i.e., $f \neq 0 \implies Z(f)$ is discrete – in particular $Z(f)$ is countable. Moreover, for any $f, g \in C(U, \mathbb{C})$ we have $Z(fg) = Z(f) \cup Z(g)$, so if $f, g \in \text{Hol}(U)^{\bullet}$ then $Z(fg)$ is at most countable, whereas U is uncountable, so $fg \neq 0$.
$\neg$ (i) $\implies$ $\neg$ (ii): If U is not connected, then $U = V_1 \cup V_2$ where V_1 and V_2 are disjoint

open subsets. Let χ_i be the characteristic function of V_i for $i = 1, 2$. Then each χ_i is locally constant on U – hence holomorphic, and nonzero, but $\chi_1 \chi_2 = 0$. $\square$

In complex function theory it is common to call a nonempty connected open $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ a **domain**. Henceforth we assume that U is a domain. For $z \in U$ there is a function $\mathrm{ord}_z : \mathrm{Hol}(U)^\bullet \to \mathbb{N}$, the **order of vanishing of f at z**: we expand f into a power series at z: $f(\zeta) = \sum_{n=0}^\infty a_n (\zeta - z)^n$ and let $\mathrm{ord}_z(f)$ be the least n for which $a_n \neq 0$. Compiling these we associate to each $f \in \mathrm{Hol}(U)^\bullet$ its **total order** $\mathrm{Ord}(f) : U \to \mathbb{N}$ given by $\mathrm{Ord}(f)(z) = \mathrm{ord}_z(f)$. Consider the set $\mathbb{N}^U$ of all functions from U to $\mathbb{N}$. For $O \in \mathbb{N}^U$, we define the **support** of O to be the set of $z \in U$ such that $O(z) > 0$.

A *meromorphic function* on U is a function which is holomorphic on U except for isolated finite order singularities. More precisely, a meromorphic function is a function which is holomorphic on $U \setminus Z$ for some discrete closed subset Z of U and such that for all $z_0 \in Z$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $(z - z_0)^n f(z)$ extends to a holomorphic function on a neighborhood of z. If the least n as above is positive, we say that f has a pole at z_0, and we employ the convention that $f(z_0) = \infty$. Let $\mathrm{Mer}(U)$ be the set of all meromorphic functions on U; it is a ring under pointwise addition and multiplication, under the conventions that for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$z + \infty = \infty + \infty = z \cdot \infty = \infty \cdot \infty = \infty.$$

THEOREM 5.18. *(Weierstrass + Mittag-Leffler) Let $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a domain.*
a) If $O \in \mathbb{N}^U$ has closed, discrete support, there is $f \in \mathrm{Hol}(U)^\bullet$ with $\mathrm{Ord}(f) = O$.
b) Let $Z \subset U$ be a closed subset without limit points. To each $z \in Z$ we associate $n_z \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w_{z,k} \in \mathbb{C}$ for all $0 \leq k \leq n_z$. Then there is $f \in \mathrm{Hol}(U)$ such that for all $z \in Z$ and $0 \leq k \leq n_z$, $f^{(k)}(z) = k! w_{z,k}$.

PROOF. Part a) is part of Weierstrass' Factorization Theory [**Ru87**, Thm. 15.11]. To get part b), combine part a) with Mittag-Leffler's result on the existence of meromorphic functions with prescribed principal parts [**Ru87**, Thm. 15.13]. $\square$

COROLLARY 5.19. *The ring $\mathrm{Mer}(U)$ of meromorphic functions on U is a field, and indeed is the field of fractions of $\mathrm{Hol}(U)$.*

EXERCISE 5.21. *Prove Proposition 5.19.*

EXERCISE 5.22. *Fix $z_0 \in U$. For $f \in \mathrm{Mer}(U)$, choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(z - z_0)^n f$ is holomorphic at z_0, and put $\mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(f) = \mathrm{ord}_{z_0}((z - z_0)^n f) - n$.*
a) Show that this gives a well-defined function $\mathrm{ord}_{z_0} : \mathrm{Mer}(U)^\bullet \to \mathbb{Z}$ (i.e., independent of the choice of n in the definition).
b) Show that for all $f, g \in \mathrm{Mer}(U)^\times$, $\mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(fg) = \mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(f) + \mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(g)$.
c) We formally extend ord_{z_0} to a function from $\mathrm{Mer}(U)$ to $\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ by setting $\mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(0) = \infty$. Show that, under the convention that $\infty + n = \infty + \infty = \infty$, we have for all $f, g \in \mathrm{Mer}(U)$ that $\mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(f + g) \geq \min \mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(f), \mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(g)$.
d) Show that if $\mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(f) \neq \mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(g)$ then $\mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(f + g) = \min \mathrm{ord}_{z_0} f, \mathrm{ord}_{z_0}(g)$.

Similarly we may extend Ord to a function from $\mathrm{Mer}(U)^\bullet$ to $\mathbb{Z}^U$.

LEMMA 5.20. *For $f, g \in \mathrm{Hol}(U)^\bullet$, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\mathrm{Ord}(f) = \mathrm{Ord}(g)$.
(ii) $f = ug$ for $u \in \mathrm{Hol}(U)^\times$.
(iii) $(f) = (g)$.

PROOF. (ii) $\iff$ (iii) for elements of any domain.

(ii) $\implies$ (i) is easy and left to the reader.

(i) $\implies$ (ii): The meromorphic function $\frac{f}{g}$ has identically zero order, hence is nowhere vanishing and is thus a unit u in $\text{Hol}(U)$. $\square$

THEOREM 5.21. *(Helmer [**He40**]) For a domain U in the complex plane, every finitely generated ideal of* $\text{Hol}(U)$ *is principal. More precisely, for any* $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in \text{Hol}(U)^\bullet$, *there exists* $f \in \text{Hol}(U)$ *such that* $\text{Ord}(f) = \min_i \text{Ord}(f_i)$, *unique up to associates, and then* $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle = \langle f \rangle$.

PROOF. Step 1: Suppose $f_1, f_2 \in \text{Hol}(U)^\bullet$ don't both vanish at any $z \in U$. Let Z be the zero set of f_1, so for all $z \in Z$, $f_2(z) \neq 0$. Theorem 5.18b) gives $g_2 \in \text{Hol}(U)$ such that for all $z \in Z$, $\text{ord}_z(1 - g_2 f_2) \geq \text{ord}_z(f_1)$. Thus $\text{Ord}(1 - g_2 f_2) \geq \text{Ord}(f_1)$, so $g_1 := \frac{1 - g_2 f_2}{f_1} \in \text{Hol}(U)$, $f_1 g_1 + f_2 g_2 = 1$ and $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \text{Hol}(U)$.

Step 2: Now let $f_1, f_2 \in \text{Hol}(U)^\bullet$ be arbitrary. By Theorem 5.18a), there exists $f \in \text{Hol}(U)$ with $\text{Ord}(f) = \min \text{Ord}(f_1), \text{Ord}(f_2)$. For $i = 1, 2$, put $g_i = \frac{f_i}{f}$. Then g_1 and g_2 are holomorphic and without a common zero, so by Step 1 $\langle g_1, g_2 \rangle = \text{Hol}(U)$. Multiplying through by f gives $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle = \langle f \rangle$.

Step 3: If in a ring every ideal of the form $\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ is principal, then every finitely generated ideal is principal. By Step 2, this applies in particular to $\text{Hol}(U)$. Moreover, if the ideal $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle = \langle f \rangle$, then we must have $\text{Ord} f = \min \text{Ord} f_i$. $\square$

EXERCISE 5.23. *Explain why in Step 1 above, Theorem 5.18b) implies that g_2 exists.*

The most familiar domains in which every finitely generated ideal is principal are those in which *every* ideal is principal: PIDs! But as the reader has probably already suspected, $\text{Hol}(U)$ is not a PID. One way to see this is to show that $\text{Hol}(U)$ is not even a UFD. Remarkably, this is a consequence of the Weierstrass Factorization Theory, which expresses every holomorphic function as a product of prime elements! The catch is that most holomorphic functions require *infinite* products, a phenomenon which is not countenanced in the algebraic theory of factorization.

EXERCISE 5.24. *Let $f \in \text{Hol}(U)^\bullet$.*

a) Show that f is an irreducible element of $\text{Hol}(U)$ – i.e., if $f = g_1 g_2$ then exactly one of g_1, g_2 is a unit – iff it has exactly one simple zero.

b) Suppose f is irreducible. Show $\text{Hol}(U)/(f) = \mathbb{C}$. In particular, (f) is prime.

c) Show that f admits a (finite!) factorization into irreducible elements iff it has only finitely many zeros. Conclude that $\text{Hol}(U)$ is not a UFD.

EXERCISE 5.25. *a) Show: all the results of this section extend to the ring of holomorphic functions on a noncompact Riemann surface.*

b) Investigate which of the results of this section hold for all Stein manifolds.[3]

4. Kapovich's Theorem

4.1. The cardinal Krull dimension of a partially ordered set.

Throughout, all rings are commutative and with multiplicative identity. For a ring R, $\text{Spec} R$ is the set of prime ideals of R, partially ordered under inclusion.

––––––––––

[3]Step 1: learn the definition of a Stein manifold!

A **chain** is a linearly ordered set; its **length** is its cardinality minus one. The **cardinal Krull dimension** carddim X of a partially ordered set X is the supremum of lengths of its chains. For a ring R we put carddim $R =$ carddim Spec R.

REMARK 3. *The prime spectrum* Spec R *of a ring is endowed with the Zariski topology, in which the closed sets are* $V(I) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R \mid \mathfrak{p} \supset I\}$ *as I ranges over all ideals of R. For* $\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}_2 \in \text{Spec } R$ *we have* $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_2 \iff \mathfrak{p}_2 \in \overline{\{\mathfrak{p}_1\}}$. *Thus* carddim R *is a topological invariant of* Spec R.

For a topological space X, define the cardinal Krull dimension carddim X *as the supremum of lengths of chains of closed irreducible subspaces of X. Since for a ring R the map* $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto V(\mathfrak{p})$ *gives an antitone bijection from* Spec R *to the set of closed irreducible subspaces of* Spec R, *we have* carddim $R =$ carddim Spec R.

Our use of the word "cardinal" is twofold: (i) it is common to say "dim R is infinite" if there are arbitrarily long finite chains in Spec R. For the class of rings considered here we will show the Krull dimension is zero or infinite, but we will not completely answer the more refined question of how infinite it is. (ii) There is also a notion of **ordinal Krull dimension** of rings [**GoRo**] that we do not discuss here.

REMARK 4.
a) Let X and Y bre partially ordered sets. If there is an injective isotone map $\iota : Y \to X$, then carddim $Y \leq$ carddim X.
b) If $f : R_1 \to R_2$ is surjective or a localization map, then $f^* :$ Spec $R_2 \to$ Spec R_1 is an injective isotone map, so carddim $R_2 \leq$ carddim R_1.

4.2. Holomorphic functions on a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold.

Let M be a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold. (Our definition includes that M is Hausdorff and second countable.) Let Hol(M) be the ring of global holomorphic functions $f : M \to \mathbb{C}$. We have $\mathbb{C} \hookrightarrow$ Hol(M) via the constant functions.

LEMMA 5.22. *The ring* Hol(M) *is a domain iff M is connected.*

PROOF. If $M = M_1 \coprod M_2$ with $M_1, M_2 \neq \varnothing$, let f_i be the characteristic function of M_i. Then $f_1, f_2 \in$ Hol$(M)^\bullet$ and $f_1 f_2 = 0$.

Conversely, let $f \in$ Hol$(M)^\bullet$, and let U be the set of $x \in M$ such that the power series expansion at x is zero (as a formal series: i.e., every term is zero). For all $x \in U$, f vanishes identically in some neighborhood of x, so U is open. If $x \in M \setminus U$, then some mixed partial derivative of f is nonvanishing at x. These mixed partials are continuous, so there is a neighborhood N_x of x on which this condition continues to hold, and thus $N_x \subset M \setminus U$ and U is closed. Since M is connected and $U \subsetneq M$, we have $U = \varnothing$. For $f, g \in$ Hol$(M)^\bullet$, let $x \in M$. The power series of f and g at x are each nonzero, hence the same holds for fg. So fg does not vanish identically on any neighborhood of x: thus $fg \neq 0$. $\square$

From now on we will assume that all our $\mathbb{C}$-manifolds are connected.

4.3. Kapovich's Theorems: Statements.

THEOREM 5.23. *(Kapovich) Let M be a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold. Then either* Hol$(M) = \mathbb{C}$ *or* carddim Hol$(M) \geq \mathfrak{c} = 2^{\aleph_0}$.

A **discrete valuation** on a ring R is a surjective function

$$v : R \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$$

such that
(DV0) For all $x \in R$, $v(x) = \infty \iff x = 0$.
(DV1) For all $x, y \in R$, $v(xy) = v(x) + v(y)$.
(DV2) For all $x, y \in R$, $v(x + y) \geq \min v(x), v(y)$.

Here we use some standard conventions on arithmetic in the extended real numbers: for all $x \in [0, \infty]$, $x + \infty = \infty$ and $\min(x, \infty) = x$. Conditions (DV0) and (DV1) ensure that a ring that admitting a discrete valuation is a domain.

A V_∞**-ring** is a ring R admitting a sequence $\{v_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ of discrete valuations such that for any sequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ of natural numbers there is $x \in R^\bullet$ such that $v_k(x) = n_k$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. The following results together imply Theorem 5.23.

THEOREM 5.24. *If R is a V_∞-ring, then* $\operatorname{carddim} R \geq \mathfrak{c}$.

THEOREM 5.25. *Let M be a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold. If M admits a nonconstant holomorphic function, then $\operatorname{Hol}(M)$ is a V_∞-ring.*

4.4. Preliminaries on ultralimits.

Let I be a set, let X be a topological space, and let $x_\bullet : I \to X$ be a function. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an ultrafilter on I. We say $x \in X$ is an **ultralimit** of $x_\bullet$ and write $\mathcal{F} \lim x_\bullet = x$ if $x_\bullet(\mathcal{F}) \to x$: that is, for every neighborhood U of $x \in X$, we have $x_\bullet^{-1}(U) \in \mathcal{F}$. From the general theory of filter convergence, we deduce: (i) If X is Hausdorff, then every I-indexed sequence $x_\bullet : I \to X$ has at most one ultralimit. (ii) If X is quasi-compact, then every I-indexed sequence has at least one ultralimit. Thus (iii) If X is compact, then every I-indexed sequence has a unique ultralimit. In our application we will have $I = \mathbb{N}$, ω a fixed nonprincipal ultrafilter and $X = [0, \infty]$. Thus we have an ordinary sequence $\{x_n\}$ in $[0, \infty]$, and $\omega \lim x_n = x$ means: for all $\epsilon > 0$, the set of $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|x_n - x| < \epsilon$ lies in ω. Because $[0, \infty]$ is compact, any sequence in $[0, \infty]$ has a unique ultralimit.

REMARK 5. *Let ω be a nonprincipal ultrafilter on $\mathbb{Z}^+$.*
a) Show: if $\lim_{k \to \infty} x_k = x$ in the usual sense, then also $\omega \lim_k x_k = x$.
b) Let $\{x_k\}$, $\{y_k\}$ be sequences in $[0, \infty]$. Show:
(i) $\omega \lim_k (x_k + y_k) = \omega \lim_k x_k + \omega \lim_k y_k$.
(ii) $\omega \lim_k \min(x_k, y_k) = \min(\omega \lim_k x_k, \omega \lim_k y_k)$.
(iii) $\omega \lim_k \max(x_k, y_k) = \max(\omega \lim_k x_k, \omega \lim_k y_k)$.

4.5. Proof of Theorem 5.24.

For $t \in (0, \infty)$, put

$$\mathfrak{p}_t = \{x \in R^\bullet \mid \omega \lim_k \frac{v_k(x)}{k^t} > 0\}.$$

Each $\mathfrak{p}_t$ is a prime ideal, and for all $t_1 \geq t_2$ we have $\mathfrak{p}_{t_1} \subset \mathfrak{p}_{t_2}$. Since R is a V_∞-ring, there is $x_t \in R^\bullet$ such that $v_k(x_t) = \lceil k^t \rceil$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and we have $x_t \in \mathfrak{p}_t$, $x_t \notin \mathfrak{p}_s$ for all $s > t$. So $\{\mathfrak{p}_t \mid t \in (0, \infty)\}$ is a chain of prime ideals of R of cardinality $\mathfrak{c}$.

4.6. Proof of Theorem 5.25.

Let $h : M \to \mathbb{C}$ be holomorphic and nonconstant. By the Open Mapping Theorem, $U = h(M)$ is a connected open subset of $\mathbb{C}$. In particular U is metrizable and not compact, so there is a sequence $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of distinct points of U with no accumulation point in U. We do not disturb the latter property by successively replacing each z_k with any point in a sufficiently small open ball, so by Sard's Theorem we may assume that each z_k is a regular value of h. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $p_k \in h^{-1}(z_k)$ and let $v_k : \mathrm{Hol}(M)^{\bullet} \to \mathbb{N}$ be the order of vanishing of h at p_k: that is, the least N such that there is a mixed partial derivative of order N which is nonvanishing at p_k. Then v_k is a discrete valuation. Let $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be as sequence of natural numbers. By the Weierstrass Factorization Theorem [**Ru87**, Thm. 15.11], there is $g \in \mathrm{Hol}(U)$ such that $\mathrm{ord}_{z_k}(g) = n_k$ and thus – since p_k is a regular value for h – for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ we have $v_k(g \circ h) = n_k$.

4.7. The cardinal Krull dimension of a Stein manifold.

We will now prove a stronger lower bound on the cardinal Krull dimension of $\mathrm{Hol}(M)$ for when M is a **Stein manifold**: a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold which admits a closed (equivalently proper) holomorphic embedding into $\mathbb{C}^N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Stein manifolds play the role in the biholomorphic category that affine varieties play in the algebraic category (of quasi-projective varieties $V_{/\mathbb{C}}$, say) – and a nonsingular affine variety over $\mathbb{C}$ is a Stein manifold – namely the $\mathbb{C}$-manifolds which have "enough" global holomorphic functions: in particular, for points $x \neq y$ on a Stein manifold M, there is $f \in \mathrm{Hol}(M)$ with $f(x) \neq f(y)$. At the other extreme lie the compact $\mathbb{C}$-manifolds, which play the role in the biholomorphic category that projective varieties play in the algebraic category – and a nonsingular projective variety over $\mathbb{C}$ is a compact $\mathbb{C}$-manifold). In dimension one this is a simple dichotomy: a Riemann surface is a Stein manifold iff it is noncompact [**GuRo**, p. 209].

THEOREM 5.26. *If S_1, S_2 are noncompact Riemann surfaces then*

$$\mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(S_1) = \mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(S_2) \geq 2^{\aleph_1}.$$

PROOF. Henriksen showed $\mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{C}) \geq 2^{\aleph_1}$ [**He53**]. For noncompact Riemann surfaces S and T, Alling showed $\mathrm{Spec}\,\mathrm{Hol}(S)$ and $\mathrm{Spec}\,\mathrm{Hol}(T)$ are homeomorphic [**Al63**]. By Remark 3 it follows that $\mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(S) = \mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{C}) \geq 2^{\aleph_1}$. □

LEMMA 5.27. *Let M_1, M_2 be $\mathbb{C}$-manifolds. Then*

$$\mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(M_1 \times M_2) \geq \mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(M_1).$$

PROOF. Fix $y_0 \in M_2$. Pulling back holomorphic functions via the embedding

$$\iota : M_1 \hookrightarrow M_1 \times M_2, \ x \mapsto (x, y_0)$$

gives a ring homomorphism $\iota^* : \mathrm{Hol}(M_1 \times M_2) \to \mathrm{Hol}(M_1)$. If $f \in \mathrm{Hol}(M_1)$ put

$$F : M_1 \times M_2 \to \mathbb{C}, \ (x, y) \mapsto f(x).$$

Then $F \in \mathrm{Hol}(M_1 \times M_2)$ and $\iota^*(F) = f$. So we may apply Remark 4b). □

THEOREM 5.28. *Let M be a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold of the form $V \times N$ for a Stein manifold V. Then* $\mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(M) \geq \mathrm{carddim}\,\mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{C}) \geq 2^{\aleph_1}$.

PROOF. Lemma 5.27 reduces us to the case in which M is a Stein manifold. If $f : M \to \mathbb{C}$ is a nonconstant holomorphic function, then a connected component M' of the preimage of a regular value is a closed submanifold with $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} M' = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} M - 1$. A closed $\mathbb{C}$-submanifold of a Stein manifold is a Stein manifold [**GuRo**, p. 210], so we may repeat the process, eventually obtaining a closed embedding $\iota : S \hookrightarrow M$ with S a connected, one-dimensional Stein manifold, hence a connected, noncompact Riemann surface. Now if Y is a closed $\mathbb{C}$-submanifold of a Stein manifold X then the map $\operatorname{Hol} X \to \operatorname{Hol} Y$ obtained by restricting holomorphic functions to Y is surjective [**GuRo**, Thm. VIII.18], so $\iota^* : \operatorname{Hol}(M) \to \operatorname{Hol}(S)$ is surjective. By Remark 4b) and Theorem 5.26 we have $\operatorname{carddim} M \geq \operatorname{carddim} S \geq 2^{\aleph_1}$.   □

4.8. Final Remarks.

A little set theory: For a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold M, the ring $\operatorname{Hol}(M)$ is a subring of the ring of all continuous $\mathbb{C}$-valued functions. For any separable topological space X, the set of continuous functions $f : X \to \mathbb{C}$ has cardinality at most $\mathfrak{c}^{\aleph_0} = (2^{\aleph_0})^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_0 \times \aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_0} = \mathfrak{c}$. Since $\mathbb{C} \subset \operatorname{Hol}(M)$ we have $\# \operatorname{Hol}(M) = \mathfrak{c}$. It follows that $\operatorname{Hol}(M)$ has at most $2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ ideals and thus $\operatorname{carddim} \operatorname{Hol}(M) \leq 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$. Moreover

$$\mathfrak{c} = 2^{\aleph_0} \leq 2^{\aleph_1} \leq 2^{\mathfrak{c}}.$$

Whether either inequality is strict is independent of the ZFC axioms, but e.g. the Continuum Hypothesis (CH) gives $\mathfrak{c} < 2^{\aleph_1} = 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$. Thus under CH we have $\operatorname{carddim} \operatorname{Hol}(M) = 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ for any Stein manifold M. It may well be the case that the determination of $\operatorname{carddim} \operatorname{Hol}(\mathbb{C})$ is independent of the ZFC axioms.

A little history: Theorem 5.23 is a result of M. Kapovich. It answers a question of G. Elencwajg: is there a $\mathbb{C}$-manifold M with $\operatorname{carddim} \operatorname{Hol}(M)$ finite and positive? Kapovich's construction draws from work of Henriksen [**He53**] and Sasane [**Sa08**]. Kapovich's first proof of Theorem 5.24 was closely modelled on a criterion of Sasane [**Sa08**, Thm. 2.2] which was used by Sasane to show that the Krull dimension of a noncompact Riemann surface is infinite (which had earlier been established by Alling). I believe Sasane's proof is faulty: [**Sa08**, (2.6)] assumes that the Multiplicative Avoidance Theorem gives a *unique* ideal. I corresponded with Kapovich, and he immediately replaced the limsup with an ultralimit.

The proof of Theorem 5.23 given here is directly inspired by Kapovich's proof. The proof of Theorem 5.25 is identical to Kapovich's, but the proof of Theorem 5.24 is a bit different. Kapovich uses hyperreals and hypernaturals, but in an earlier version he used ultralimits to show $\operatorname{carddim} \operatorname{Hol}(M) \geq 1 \implies \operatorname{carddim} \operatorname{Hol}(M) \geq \aleph_0$; we adapt this argument to show the stronger result by following a construction of Henriksen [**He53**]. Henriksen's proof is not couched in the language of ultralimits, but this is just an expository difference: crucially, it uses a nonprincipal ultrafilter on $\mathbb{Z}^+$. Our perspective is that ultrafilters are a nice way to package this argument, as it makes the bookkeeping virtually automatic. Kapovich uses Multiplicative Avoidance, a result which is equivalent in ZF Set Theory to the Boolean Prime Ideal Theorem. The existence of an ultrafilter on $\mathbb{Z}^+$ is a somewhat weaker set-theoretic axiom but still not a theorem in ZF. I wonder (idly and inexpertly) whether $\operatorname{carddim} \operatorname{Hol}(\mathbb{C}) \geq \aleph_0$ can be proved in ZF set theory alone.

5. Polynomial rings

Let R be a ring (possibly non-commutative, but – as ever – with identity). Then $R[t]$ denotes the ring of univariate polynomials with R-coefficients.

We assume the reader knows what this means in at least an informal sense: an element of R will be an expression of the form $a_n t^n + \ldots + a_1 t + a_0$, where n is some non-negative integer and $a_n, \ldots, a_0$ are in R. The degree of a polynomial is the supremum over all numbers n such that $a_n \neq 0$. We say "supremum" rather than "maximum" as an attempt to justify the convention that the degree of the 0 polynomial should be $-\infty$ (for that is the supremum of the empty set). A polynomial of degree 0 is called **constant**, and we can view R as a subset of $R[t]$ by mapping $a \in R$ to the constant polynomial a. As an commutative group, $R[t]$ is canonically isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{n=0}^\infty R$, the isomorphism being given by $\sum_n a_n t^n \mapsto (a_0, a_1, \ldots)$. (The key point here is that on both sides we have $a_n = 0$ for all sufficiently large n.) Multiplication of polynomials is obtained by applying the relations

$$t^0 = 1,$$

$$\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, \ t^{i+j} = t^i t^j,$$

$$\forall a \in R, \ at = ta$$

and distributivity, i.e.,

$$(a_n t^n + \ldots + a_n t^1 + a_0) \cdot (b_m t^m + \ldots + b_1 t + b_0) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n, \ 0 \leq j \leq m} a_i b_j t^{i+j}.$$

For any $P \in R[t]$, the identity $1 \in R$ has the property $1 \cdot P = P \cdot 1 = 1$.

Unfortunately there are some minor annoyances of rigor in the previous description. The first one – which a sufficiently experienced reader will immediately either dismiss as silly or know how to correct – is that it is not *set-theoretically correct*: technically speaking, we need to say what $R[t]$ is as a set and this involves saying what t "really is." It is common in abstract algebra to refer to t is an **indeterminate**, a practice which is remarkably useful despite being formally meaningless: essentially it means "Don't worry about what t is; it can be anything that is not an element of R. All we need to know about t is encapsulated in the multiplication rules $at = ta$, $t^0 = 1$, $t^i t^j = t^{i+j}$." In other words, t is what in the uncomplicated days of high school algebra was referred to as a **variable**.

If someone insists that $R[t]$ be some particular set – a rather unenlighened attitude that we will further combat later on – then the solution has already been given: we can take $R[t] = \bigoplus_{n=0}^\infty R$. (It is fair to assume that we already know what direct sums of commutative groups "really are", but in the next section we will give a particular construction which is in fact rather useful.) This disposes of the set-theoretic objections.

Not to be laughed away completely is the following point: we said $R[t]$ was a ring, but how do we know this? We did explain the group structure, defined a multiplication operation, and identified a multiplicative identity. It remains to verify the distributivity of multiplication over addition (special cases of which motivated our definition of multiplication, but nevertheless needs to be checked in general)

and also the *associativity* of multiplication.

Neither of these properties are at all difficult to verify. In fact:

> EXERCISE 5.26.
>   a) *Show: $R[t]$ is a ring.*
>   b) *Show: $R[t]$ is commutative if and only if R is commutative.*

Let us now attempt a "conceptual proof" of the associativity of polynomial multi-plication. For this we shall assume that R is commutative – this is the only case we will be exploring further anyway. Then we can, as the $P(t)$ notation suggests, view an element of $R[t]$ as a function from R to R. Namely, we just plug in values:

$$a \in R \mapsto P(a) \in R.$$

To be clear about things, let us denote this associated function from R to R by $\underline{P}$. As we saw above, the set of all functions R^R from R to R forms a commutative ring under pointwise addition and multiplication: $(f + g)(a) := f(a) + g(a)$, $(fg)(a) := f(a) \cdot g(a)$. In particular, it really is obvious that the multiplication of functions is associative. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be the subset of R^R of functions of the form $\underline{P}$ for some $P \in R[t]$. More concretely, we are mapping the constant elements of $R[t]$ to constant functions and mapping t to the identity function. This makes it clear that $\mathcal{P}$ is a subring of R^R: in fact it is the subring of R^R generated by the constant functions and the identity function.

So why don't we just define $R[t]$ to be $\mathcal{P}$, i.e., identify a polynomial with its asso-ciated function?

The problem is that the map $R[t] \to \mathcal{P}$ need not be an injection. Indeed, if R is finite (but not the zero ring), $\mathcal{P}$ is a subring of the finite ring R^R so is obviously finite, whereas $R[t]$ is just as obviously infinite. If R is a domain this turns out to be the only restriction.

> PROPOSITION 5.29. *Let R be a domain.*
>   a) *Suppose that R is infinite. Then the canonical mapping $R[t] \to \mathcal{P}$ is a bijection.*
>   b) *Suppose that R is finite, say of order q, and is therefore a field. Then the kernel of the canonical mapping $R[t] \to \mathcal{P}$ is the principal ideal generated by $t^q - t$.*

We leave the proof as a (nontrivial) exercise for the interested reader.

> EXERCISE 5.27. *Exhibit an infinite commutative ring R for which the map $R[t] \to \mathcal{P}$ is not injective. (Suggestion: find an infinite ring all of whose elements x satisfy $x^2 = x$.)*

> EXERCISE 5.28. *Show: the map $R[t] \to \mathcal{P}$ is a homomorphism of rings.*

So if we restrict to infinite domains, the map $R[t] \to \mathcal{P}$ is an isomorphism of rings. Thus we see, after the fact, that we could have defined the ring structure in terms of pointwise multiplication.

6. Semigroup algebras

A **semigroup** M is a set equipped with a single binary operation $\cdot$, which is required (only!) to be associative. A **monoid** is a semigroup with a two-sided identity.

EXERCISE 5.29. *Show: a semigroup has at most one two-sided identity, so it is unambiguous to speak of "the" identity element in a monoid. We will denote it by e (so as not to favor either addditive or multiplicative notation).*

EXAMPLE 5.30. *Let $(R, +, \cdot)$ be an algebra. Then $(R, \cdot)$ is a semigroup. If R is a ring (i.e., has an identity 1) then $(R, \cdot)$ is a monoid, with identity element 1.*

EXAMPLE 5.31. *Any group is a monoid. In fact a group is precisely a monoid in which each element has a two-sided inverse.*

EXAMPLE 5.32. *The structure $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ of natural numbers under addition is a monoid; the identity element is 0.*

EXAMPLE 5.33. *The structure $(\mathbb{Z}^+, \cdot)$ of positive integers under multiplication is a monoid; the identity element is 1.*

Let M and N be two semigroups. Then the Cartesian product $M \times N$ becomes a semigroup in an obvious way: $(m_1, n_1) \cdot (m_2, n_2) := (m_1 \cdot m_2, n_1 \cdot n_2)$. If M and N are monoids with identity elements e_M and e_N, then $M \times N$ is a monoid, with identity element (e_M, e_N). Exactly the same discussion holds for any finite set $M_1, \ldots, M_N$ of semigroups: we can form the direct sum $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_i$, i.e., the Cartesian product of sets with componentwise operations; if all the M_i's are monoids, so is M.

If we instead have an infinite family $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ of semigroups indexed by a set I, we can define a semigroup structure on the Cartesian product $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$ in the obvious way, and if each M_i is a monoid with identity e_i, then the product semigroup is a monoid with identity $(e_i)_{i \in I}$. If each M_i is a monoid, we can also define the **direct sum** $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$, which is the subset of the direct product $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$ consisting of all I-tuples $(m_i \in M_i)_{i \in I}$ such that $m_i = e_i$ for all but finitely many i. Then we have that $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ is a submonoid of the **direct product** monoid $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$.

If M and N are semigroups, then a map $f : M \to N$ is a homomorphism of semigroups if $f(m_1 \cdot m_2) = f(m_1) \cdot f(m_2)$ for all m_1, $m_2 \in M$. If M and N are monoids, a homomorphism of monoids is a homomorphism of semigroups such that moreover $f(e_M) = e_N$. A homomorphism $f : M \to N$ of semigroups (resp. of monoids) is an isomorphism iff there exists a homomorphism of semigroups (resp. monoids) $g : N \to M$ such that $g \circ f = \mathrm{Id}_M$, $f \circ g = \mathrm{Id}_N$.

EXERCISE 5.30. *a) Exhibit monoids M and N and a homomorphism of semigroups $f : M \to N$ which is not a homomorphism of monoids.*
b) Show that a homomorphism of semigroups $f : M \to N$ is an isomorphism iff it is bijective. Same for monoids.

EXERCISE 5.31. *Show: the monoid $(\mathbb{Z}^+, \cdot)$ of positive integers under multiplication is isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{N}, +)$, i.e., the direct sum of infinitely many copies of the natural numbers under addition. (Hint: a more natural indexing set for the direct sum is the set of all prime numbers.)*

Now let R be an algebra and M be a semigroup. We suppose first that M is finite. Denote by $R[M]$ the set of all functions $f : M \to R$.

As we saw, using the operations of pointwise addition and multiplication endow this set with the structure of an associative algebra (which has an identity iff M does). We are going to keep the pointwise addition but take a different binary operation $* : R[M] \times R[M] \to R[M]$.

Namely, for $f, g \in R[M]$, we define the **convolution product** $f * g$ as follows:

$$(f * g)(m) := \sum_{(a,b) \in M^2 \ | \ ab=m} f(a)g(b).$$

In other words, the sum extends over all ordered pairs (a, b) of elements of M whose product (in M, of course), is m.

PROPOSITION 5.34. *Let R be an associative algebra and M a finite semigroup. The structure $(R[M], +, *)$ whose underlying set is the set of all functions from M to R, and endowed with the binary operations of pointwise addititition and convolution product, is an associative algebra. If R is a ring and M is a monoid with identity e, then $R[M]$ is a ring with multiplicative identity the function I which takes e_M to 1_R and every other element of M to 0_R.*

PROOF. First, suppose that R is a ring and M is a monoid, then for any $f \in R[M]$ and $m \in M$, we have

$$(f*I)(m) = \sum_{(a,b) \in M^2 \ | \ ab=m} f(a)I(b) = f(m)I(1) = f(m) = I(1)f(m) = \ldots = (I*f)(m).$$

We still need to check the associativity of the convolution product and the distributivity of convolution over addition. We leave the latter to the reader but check the former: if $f, g, h \in R[M]$, then

$$((f * g) * h)(m) = \sum_{xc=m} (f * g)(x)h(c) = \sum_{xc=m} \sum_{ab=x} f(a)g(b)h(c)$$

$$= \sum_{abc=m} f(a)g(b)h(c)$$

$$= \sum_{ay=m} \sum_{bc=y} f(a)g(b)h(c) = \sum_{ay=m} f(a)(g * h)(y) = (f * (g * h))(m).$$

$\square$

A special case of this construction which is important in the representation theory of finite groups is the ring $k[G]$, where k is a field and G is a finite group.

Now suppose that M is an infinite semigroup. Unless we have some sort of extra structure on R which allows us to deal with convergence of sums – and, in this level of generality, we do not – the above definition of the convolution product $f * g$ is problematic because the sum might be infinite. For instance, if $M = G$ is any group, then our previous definition of $(f * g)(m)$ would come out to be $\sum_{x \in G} f(x)g(x^{-1}m)$, which is, if G is infinite, an infinite sum.

Our task therefore is to modify the construction of the convolution product so

as to give a meaningful answer when the semigroup M is infinite, but in such a way that agrees with the previous definition for finite M.

Taking our cue from the infinite direct sum, we restrict our domain: define $R[M]$ to be subset of all functions $f : M \to R$ such that $f(m) = 0$ except for finitely many m (or, for short, **finitely nonzero functions**). Restricting to such functions,

$$(f * g)(m) := \sum_{ab=m} f(a)g(b)$$

makes sense: although the sum is apparently infinite, all but finitely terms are zero.

PROPOSITION 5.35. *Let R be an associative algebra and M a semigroup. The structure $(R[M], +, *)$ whose underlying set is the set of all finitely nonzero functions from M to R, and endowed with the binary operations of pointwise addidition and convolution product, is an associative algebra. If R is a ring and M is a monoid with identity element e, then $R[M]$ is a ring with multiplicative identity the function I which takes e_M to 1_R and every other element of M to 0_R.*

EXERCISE 5.32. *Prove Proposition 5.35. More precisely, verify that the proof of Proposition 5.34 goes through unchanged.*

As a commutative group, $R[M]$ is naturally isomorphic to the direct sum $\bigoplus_{m \in M} R$, i.e., of copies of R indexed by M. One can therefore equally well view an element $R[M]$ as a formal finite expressions of the form $\sum_{m \in M} a_m m$, where $a_m \in R$ and all but finitely many are 0. Written in this form, there is a natural way to define the product

$$\left(\sum_{m \in M} a_m m \right) \left(\sum_{m \in M} b_m m \right)$$

of two elements f and g of $R[M]$: namely we apply distributivity, use the multiplication law in R to multiply the a_m's and the b_m's, use the operation in M to multiply the elements of M, and then finally use the addition law in R to rewrite the expression in the form $\sum_m c_m m$. But a moment's thought shows that c_m is nothing else than $(f * g)(m)$. On the one hand, this makes the convolution product look very natural. Conversely, it makes clear:

The polynomial ring $R[t]$ is canonically isomorphic to the monoid ring $R[\mathbb{N}]$. Indeed, the explict isomorphism is given by sending a polynomial $\sum_n a_n t^n$ to the function $n \mapsto a_n$.

This gives a new proof of the associativity of the product in the polynomial ring $R[t]$. We leave it to the reader to decide whether this proof is any easier than direct verification.. Rather the merit is that this associativity computation has been done once and for all in a very general context.

The semigroup algebra construction can be used to define several generalizations of the polynomial ring $R[t]$.

EXERCISE 5.33. *For a ring R, identify the monoid ring $R[\mathbb{Z}]$ with the ring $R[t, t^{-1}]$ of Laurent polynomials.*

First, let $T = \{t_i\}$ be a set. Let $FA(T) := \bigoplus_{i \in T}(\mathbb{N}, +)$ be the direct sum of a number of copies of $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ indexed by T. Let R be a ring, and consider the monoid ring $R[FA(T)]$. Let us write the composition law in $FA(T)$ multiplicatively; moreover, viewing an arbitrary element I of $FA(T)$ as a finitely nonzero function from T to $\mathbb{N}$, we use the notation t^I for $\prod_{t \in T} t^{I(t)}$. Then an arbitrary element of $R[FA(T)]$ is a finite sum of the form $\sum_{k=1}^{n} r_k t^{I_k}$, where $I_1, \ldots, I_k$ are elements of $FA(t)$. This representation of the elements should make clear that we can view $R[FA(T)]$ as a polynomial ring in the indeterminates $t \in T$: we use the alternate notation $R[\{t_i\}]$.

THEOREM 5.36. *Let R be a ring and G a group. Then the group ring $R[G]$ is a domain – i.e., a* commutative *ring without nonzero zero-divisors – iff R is a domain and G is commutative and torsionfree.*

PROOF. Step 1: The ring $R[G]$ is commutative iff both R and G are. Since R is a subring of $R[G]$, if $R[G]$ is a domain then so is R. If there is $g \in G$ and $n > 1$ such that $g^n = 1$, then $(g-1)(g^{n-1} + \ldots + g + 1) = 0$, so $R[G]$ is not a domain.
Step 2: Suppose R is a domain and G is torsionfree commutative. Let K be the fraction field of R. Then $R[G]$ is a subring of $K[G]$, so it is enough to show that $K[G]$ is a domain. Here is the key observation: for $x, y \in K[G]^{\bullet}$, there is a finitely generated subgroup H of G such that $x, y \in K[H]$. Since H is also torsion-free, we have $H \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ so $K[H]$ is isomorphic to the ring of Laurent polynomials $K[t_1, t_1^{-1}, \ldots, t_n, t_n^{-1}]$, which itself lies in function field $K(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ so is a domain.
Somewhere in here we must have used that $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is a domain, so that it has a field of fractions. This is no problem to establish directly: write $K[t_1, \ldots, t_n] = K[t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}][t_n]$ to reduce to the case of a polynomial ring in one variable over a domain. If $\deg(f) = d_1$ and $\deg(g) = d_2$, then $\deg(fg) = d_1 + d_2$.) $\square$

REMARK 6. *Our convention that a domain is a* commutative *ring saved us from considering the following question: if R is a ring without (nonzero) zero-divisors and G is a group without (nontrivial) elements of finite order, is $R[G]$ a ring without zero divisors? This question remains wide open even in the case when R is a field, in which case it is known as the* **Kaplansky Zero Divisor Conjecture.**

Let us go back to the monoid ring $R[\mathbb{N}]$, whose elements are finitely nonzero functions $f : R \to \mathbb{N}$. Notice that in this case the precaution of restricting finitely nonzero functions is not necessary: the monoid $(\mathbb{N}, +)$, although infinite, has the property that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, the set of all $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x + y = m$ is finite (indeed, of cardinality $m + 1$). Let us call an arbitrary monoid M **divisor-finite** if for each m in M, the set $\{(x, y) \in M^2 \mid xy = m\}$ is finite.

EXERCISE 5.34. *a) For a set T, $FA(T) = \bigoplus_{t \in T}(\mathbb{N}, +)$ is divisor-finite.*
b) A group is divisor-finite iff it is finite.

For a divisor-finite monoid M, and any ring R, we may define the **big monoid ring** $R[[M]]$ to be the collection of all functions $M \to R$, with pointwise addition and convolution product.

For example, if $M = (\mathbb{N}, +)$, then writing M multiplicatively with $n \in N \mapsto t^n$ for some formal generator t, an element of the ring $R[[M]]$ is an infinite formal sum

$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} r_n t^n$. Such sums are added coordinatewise and multiplied by distributivity:

$$(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} r_n t^n)(\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} s_n t^n) = r_0 s_0 + (r_0 s_1 + r_1 s_0)t + \ldots + (\sum_{k=0}^{n} r_k s_{n-k})t^n + \ldots.$$

This ring is denoted by $R[[t]]$ and called the **formal power series ring** over R.

EXERCISE 5.35. *Using Exercise 5.36, define, for any set $T = \{t_i\}$ and any ring R, a formal power series ring $R[[\{t_i\}]]$.*

Here is yet another variation on the construction: suppose M is a commutative, cancellative divisor-finite monoid endowed with a total order relation $\leq$. (Example: $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ or $FA(T)$ for any T.) There is then a group completion $G(M)$ together with an injective homomorphism of monoids $M \to G(M)$. If M is finite and cancellative, it is already a group. If M is infinite, then so is $G(M)$, so it cannot be divisor-finite. Nevertheless, the ordering $\leq$ extends uniquely to an ordering on $G(M)$, and we can define a ring $R((G(M))$ whose elements are the functions from $f : G(M) \to R$ such that $\{x \in G(M) \mid x < 0, \; f(x) \neq 0\}$ is finite, i.e., f is finitely nonzero on the negative values of $G(M)$.

EXERCISE 5.36. *a) Show: under the above hypotheses, the convolution product on $R((G(M))$ is well-defined, and endows $R((G(M))$ with the structure of a ring. b) When $M = (\mathbb{N}, +)$, identify $R((M))$ as $R((t))$, the ring of formal finite-tailed Laurent series with coefficients in R. Give a multi-variable analogue of this by taking $M = FA(T)$ for arbitrary T.*

EXERCISE 5.37. *Let R be a not-necessarily-commutative ring. Give a rigorous definition of the ring $R\langle t_1, t_2 \rangle$ of "noncommutative polynomials" – each t_i commutes with each element of R, but t_1 and t_2 do not commute – as an example of a small monoid ring $R[M]$ for a suitable monoid M. Same question but with an arbitrary set $T = \{t_i\}$ of noncommuting indeterminates.*

The universal property of semigroup rings: Fix a commutative ring R. Let B be a commutative R-algebra and M a commutative monoid. Let $f : R[M] \to B$ be an R-algebra homomorphism. Consider f restricted to M; it is a homomorphism of monoids $M \to (B, \cdot)$. Thus we have defined a mapping

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{R-alg}}(R[M], B) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Monoid}}(M, (B, \cdot)).$$

Interestingly, this map has an inverse. If $g : M \to B$ is any homomorphism satisfying $g(0) = 0$, $g(m_1 + m_2) = g(m_1) + g(m_2)$, then g extends to a unique R-algebra homomorphism $R[M] \to B$: $\sum_{m \in M} r_m m \mapsto \sum_m r_m g(m)$. The uniqueness of the extension is immediate, and that the extended map is indeed an R-algebra homomorphism can be checked directly (please do so).

In more categorical language, this canonical bijection shows that the functor $M \mapsto R[M]$ is the **left adjoint** to the forgetful functor $(S, +, \cdot) \mapsto (S, \cdot)$ from R-algebras to commutative monoids. Yet further terminology would express this by saying that $R[M]$ is a "free object" of a certain type.

THEOREM 5.37. *(Universal property of polynomial rings) Let $T = \{t_i\}$ be a set of indeterminates. Let R be a commutative ring, and S an R-algebra. Then each map of sets $T \mapsto S$ extends to a unique R-algebra homomorphism $R[T] \to S$.*

Proof: By the previous result, each monoid map from the free commutative monoid $\bigoplus_{t \in T} \mathbb{Z}$ to S extends to a unique R-algebra homomorhpism. So what is needed is the fact that every set map $T \to M$ to a commutative monoid extends uniquely to a homomorphism $\bigoplus_{t \in T} \mathbb{Z} \to M$ (in other words, we pass from the category of sets to the category of commutative R-algebras by passing through the category of commutative monoids, taking the free commutative monoid associated to a set and then the free R-algebra associated to the monoid). As before, the uniqueness of the extension is easy to verify.

EXERCISE 5.38. *a) Formulate analogous universal properties for Laurent polynomial rings, and non-commutative polynomial rings.*
b) Suppose M is a divisor-finite monoid. Is there an analogous extension property for the big monoid ring $R[[M]]$?

This result is of basic importance in the study of R-algebras. For instance, let S be an R-algebra. A generating set for S, as an R-algebra, consists of a subset T of S such that the least R-subalgebra of S containing T is S itself. This definition is not very concrete. Fortunately, it is equivalent to the following:

THEOREM 5.38. *Let R be a commutative ring, S a commutative R-algebra, and T a subset of S. the following are equivalent:*
(i) T generates S as an R-algebra.
(ii) The canonical homomorphism of R-algebras $R[T] \to S$ – i.e., the unique one sending $t \mapsto t$ – is a surjection.

EXERCISE 5.39. *Prove Theorem 5.38.*

In particular, a commutative R-algebra S is finitely generated iff it is a quotient ring of some polynomial ring $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$.

Another application is that every commutative ring whatsoever is a quotient of a polynomial ring (possibly in infinitely many indeterminates) over $\mathbb{Z}$. Indeed, for a ring R, there is an obvious surjective homomorphism from the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[R]$ – here R is being viewed as a set of indeterminates – to R, namely the one carrying $r \mapsto r$.

A ring R is said to be **absolutely finitely generated** if it is finitely generated as a $\mathbb{Z}$-algebra; equivalently, there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and an ideal I in $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ such that $\mathbb{Z}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is isomorphic to R.

EXERCISE 5.40. *a) Show: a finitely generated ring has finite or countably infinite cardinality.*
b) Find all fields which are finitely generated as rings.
(N.B.: In field theory there is a notion of absolute finite generation for a field. This a much weaker notation: e.g. $\mathbb{Q}(x)$ is absolutely finitely generated as a field but not as a ring.)

CHAPTER 6

Swan's Theorem

We now digress to discuss an important theorem of R.G. Swan on projective modules over rings of continuous functions.

Throughout this section K denotes either the field $\mathbb{R}$ or the field $\mathbb{C}$, each endowed with their standard Euclidean topology. For a topological space X, the set $C(X)$ of all continuous functions $f : X \to K$ forms a commutative ring under pointwise addition and multiplication.

1. Introduction to (topological) vector bundles

Recall[1] the notion of a **K-vector bundle** over a topological space X. This is given by a topological space E (the "total space"), a surjective continuous map $\pi : E \to X$ and on each fiber $E_x := \pi^{-1}(x)$ the structure of a finite-dimensional K-vector space satisfying the following local triviality property: for each $x \in X$, there exists an open neighborhood U containing x and a homeomorphism $f : \pi^{-1}U \to U \times K^n$ such that for all $y \in U$ f carries the fiber E_y over y to $\{y\} \times K^n$ and induces on these fibers an isomorphism of K-vector spaces. (Such an isomorphism is called a **local trivialization** at x.) As a matter of terminology we often speak of "the vector bundle E on X" although this omits mention of some of the structure.

On any K-vector bundle E over X we have a **rank function** $r : X \to \mathbb{N}$, namely we define $r(x)$ to be the dimension of the fiber E_x. We say that E is a **rank n** vector bundle if the rank function is constantly equal to n. The existence of local trivializations implies that the rank function is locally constant – or equivalently, continuous when $\mathbb{N}$ is given the discrete topology, so if the base space X is connected the rank function is constant.

As a basic and important example, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the **trivial rank n vector bundle** on X, with total space $X \times K^n$ and such that π is just projection onto the first factor.

If $\pi : E \to X$ and $\pi' : E' \to X$ are two vector bundles over X, a **morphism** of vector bundles $f : E \to E'$ is a continuous map of topological spaces from E to E' *over* X in the sense that $\pi = \pi' \circ f$ – equivalently f sends the fiber E_x to the fiber E'_x – and induces a K-linear map on each fiber. In this way we get a category $\text{Vec}(X)$ of K-vector bundles on X. If we restrict only to rank n vector bundles and morphisms between them we get a subcategory $\text{Vec}_n(X)$. A vector bundle E on X is said to be trivial (or, for emphasis, "globally trivial") if it is isomorphic to the

---

[1]from a previous life, if necessary

trivial rank n vector bundle for some n.

Many of the usual linear algebraic operations on vector spaces extend immediately to vector bundles. Most importantly of all, if E and E' are two vector bundles on X, we can define a direct sum $E \oplus E'$, whose definining property is that its fiber over each point $x \in X$ is isomorphic to $E_x \oplus E_{x'}$. This not being a topology/geometry course, we would like to evade the precise construction, but here is the idea: it is obvious how to define the direct sum of trivial bundles. So in the general case, we define the direct sum by first restricting to a covering family $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ of simultaneous local trivializations of E and E' and then *glue together* these vector bundles over the U_i's. In a similar way one can define the tensor product $E \otimes E'$ and the dual bundle $E^\vee$.

For our purposes though the direct sum construction is the most important. It gives $\mathrm{Vec}(X)$ the structure of an additive category: in addition to the existence of direct sums, this means that each of the sets $\mathrm{Hom}(E, E')$ of morphisms from E to E' form a commutative group. (In fact $\mathrm{Hom}(E, E')$ naturally has the structure of a K-vector space.) Decategorifying, the set of all isomorphism classes of vector bundles on X naturally forms a commutative monoid under direct sum (the identity is the trivial vector bundle $X \to X$ where each one point fiber is identified – uniquely! – with the zero vector space). The Grothendieck group of this monoid is $K(X)$: this is the beginning of **topological K-theory**.

2. Swan's Theorem

But we digress from our digression. A **(global) section** of a vector bundle $\pi : E \to X$ is indeed a continuous section σ of the map π, i.e., a continuous map $\sigma : X \to E$ such that $\pi \circ \sigma = 1_X$. The collection of all sections to E will be denoted $\Gamma(E)$. Again this is a commutative group and indeed a K-vector space, since we can add two sections and scale by elements of K.

But in fact more is true. The global sections form a module over the ring $C(X)$ of continuous K-valued functions, in a very natural way: given a section $\sigma : X \to E$ and $f : X \to K$, we simply define $f\sigma : X \to E$ by $x \mapsto f(x)\sigma(x)$. Thus $\Gamma : E \to \Gamma(E)$ gives a map from vector bundles over X to $C(X)$-modules.

In fancier language, Γ gives an additive functor from the category of vector bundles on X to the category of $C(X)$-modules; let us call it the **global section functor**. (Indeed, if we have a section $\sigma : E \to X$ of E and a morphism of vector bundles $f : E \to E'$, $f(\sigma) = f \circ \sigma$ is a section of E'. No big deal!)

THEOREM 6.1. *(Swan [**Sw62**]) Let X be a compact space. Then the global section functor Γ gives an equivalence of categories from $\mathrm{Vec}(X)$ to the category of finitely generated projective $C(X)$-modules.*

In other words, at least for this very topologically influenced class of rings $C(X)$, we may entirely identify finitely generated projective bundles with a basic and important class of geometric objects, namely vector bundles.

There is a special case of this result which is almost immediately evident. Namely, suppose that E is a trivial vector bundle on X, i.e., up to isomorphism E is simply $X \times K^n$ with $\pi = \pi_1$. Thus a section σ is nothing else than a continuous function

$\sigma : X \to K^n$, which in turn is nothing else than an n-tuple $(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$ of elements of $C(X)$. Thus if we define $\sigma_i \in \Gamma(E)$ simply to be the section which takes each point to the ith standard basis vector e_i of K^n, we see immediately that $(\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)$ is a basis for $\Gamma(E)$, i.e., $\Gamma(E)$ is a free $C(X)$-module of rank n. Moreover, we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}(X \times K^n, X \times K^m) \cong \mathrm{Map}(X, \mathrm{Hom}_K(K^n, K^m))$$

$$\cong C(X) \otimes_K \mathrm{Hom}(K^n, K^w) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{C(X)}(\Gamma(X \times K^n), \Gamma(X \times K^m)).$$

Thus we have established that Γ gives an additive equivalence from the category of trivial vector bundles on X to the category of finitely generated free $C(X)$-modules. We wish to promote this to an equivalence from locally trivial vector bundles (i.e., all vector bundles) to finitely generated projective modules. Oh, if only we had some nice "geometric" characterization of finitely generated projective modules!

But we do: namely Proposition 3.11 characterizes finitely generated projective modules over any commutative ring R as being precisely the images of projection operators on finitely generated free modules. Thus the essence of what we want to show is that for any vector bundle E over X (a compact space), there exists a trivial vector bundle T and a projection $P : T \to T$ – i.e., an element of $\mathrm{Hom}(T, T)$ with $P^2 = P$ such that the image of P is a vector bundle isomorphic to E. Indeed, if we can establish this, then just as in the proof of 3.11 we get an internal direct sum decomposition $T = P(T) \oplus (1 - P)(T)$ and an isomorphism $P(T) \cong E$, and applying the additive functor Γ this gives us that $\Gamma(E)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of the finitely generated free $C(X)$-module $\Gamma(T)$. A little thought shows that in fact this proves the entire result, because we have characterized $\mathrm{Vec}(X)$ as the "projection category" of the additive category trivial vector bundles, so it must be equivalent to the "projection category" of the equivalent additive category of finitely generated free $C(X)$-modules. So from this point on we can forget about projective modules and concentrate on proving this purely topological statement about vector bundles on a compact space.[2]

3. Proof of Swan's Theorem

Unfortunately the category of vector bundles over X is not an abelian category. In particular, it can happen that a morphism of vector bundles does not have either a kernel or image. Swan gives the following simple example: let $X = [0, 1]$, $E = X \times K$ the trivial bundle, and $f : E \to E$ be the map given by $f(x, y) = (x, xy)$. Then the image of f has rank one at every $x \neq 0$ but has rank 0 at $x = 0$. Since X is connected, a vector bundle over X should have constant rank function. Exactly the same considerations show that the kernel of f is not a vector bundle. However, nothing other than this can go wrong, in the following sense:

PROPOSITION 6.2. *For a morphism $f : E \to E'$ of vector bundles over X, the following are equivalent:*
(i) The image of f is a subbundle of E'.
(ii) The kernel of f is a subbundle of E.

---

[2]We note that [**Sw62**] takes a more direct approach, for instance proving by hand that the global section functor Γ is fully faithful. In our use of projection operators and projection categories to prove Swan's theorem we follow Atiyah [**At89**, §1.4]. Aside from being a bit shorter and slicker, this approach really brings life to Proposition 3.11 and thus seems thematic in a commutative algebra course. But it is not really more than a repackaging of Swan's proof.

(iii) The function $x \mapsto \dim_K (\operatorname{Im} f)_x$ is locally constant.
(iv) The function $x \mapsto \dim_K (\operatorname{Ker} f)_x$ is locally constant.

PROOF. Step 1: We first wish to prove a special case: namely that if $f : E \to E'$ is a monomorphism of vector bundles (i.e., it induces an injection on all fibers) then $(\operatorname{Im} f)$ is a subbundle of E' and $f : E \to (\operatorname{Im} f)$ is an isomorphism. The issues of whether $\operatorname{Im} f$ is a vector bundle and f is an isomorphism are both local ones, so it suffices to treat the case where E and E' are trivial bundles. Suppose $E' = X \times V$, and let $x \in X$. Choose $W_x \subset V$ a subspace complementary to $(\operatorname{Im} f)_x$. Then $G := X \times W_x$ is a sub-bundle of E; let $\iota : G \to E$ be the inclusion map. Define $\theta : E \oplus G \to E'$ by $\theta((a,b)) = f(a) + \iota(b)$. Then θ_x is an isomorphism, so there exists an open neighborhood U of x such that $\theta|_U$ is an isomorphism. Since E is a subbundle of $E \oplus G$, $\theta(E) = f(E)$ is a subbundle of $\theta(E \oplus G) = E'$ on U.
Step 2: Since the rank function on a vector bundle is locally constant, (i) $\implies$ (iii), (ii) $\implies$ (iv), and (by simple linear algebra!) (iii) $\iff$ (iv).
(iv) $\implies$ (i): Again the issue of whether $\operatorname{Im} f$ is a vector bundle is a local one, so we may assume that $E = X \times V$ is a trivial bundle. For $x \in X$, let $W_x \subset V$ be a complementary subspace to $(\operatorname{Ker} f)_x$. Let $G = X \times W_x$, so that f induces a homomorphism $\psi : G \to E'$ whose fiber at x is a monomorphism. Thus ψ is a monomorphism on some neighborhood U of x, so $\psi(G)|_U$ is a subbundle of $E'|_U$. However $\Psi(G) \subset f(E)$, and since $f(E)$ has constant rank, and

$$\dim \psi(G)_y = \dim \psi(G)_x = \dim f(E)_x = \dim f(E)_y$$

for all $y \in U$, $\psi(G)|_U = f(E)|_U$. so $f(E)$ is a subbundle of E'.
(iv) $\implies$ (ii): here we exploit dual bundles. The hypothesis implies that the kernel of $f^\vee : (E')^\vee \to E^\vee$ has constant rank function. Since $E^\vee \to \operatorname{Coker} f^\vee$ is an epimorphism, $(\operatorname{Coker} f^\vee)^\vee \to E^{\vee\vee}$ is a monomorphism: by Step 1, its image is a subbundle. But the natural map $E \to E^{\vee\vee}$ is an isomorphism, the restriction of which to $\operatorname{Ker} f$ gives an isomorphism to the vector bundle $(\operatorname{Coker} f^\vee)^\vee$. So $\operatorname{Ker} f$ is a vector bundle. $\qquad\square$

The proof yields the following additional information.

COROLLARY 6.3. *For any morphism of vector bundles, the rank function of the image is upper semi-continuous: that is, for any $x \in X$, there exists a neighborhood U of x such that for all $y \in U$, $\dim_K (\operatorname{Im} f)_y \geq \dim_K (\operatorname{Im} f)_x$.*

EXERCISE 6.1. *Prove Corollary 6.3.*

PROPOSITION 6.4. *Let E be a vector bundle over X, and let $P \in \operatorname{End}(E) = \operatorname{Hom}(E, E)$ be a projection, i.e., $P^2 = P$. Then:*
a) We have $\operatorname{Ker}(P) = \operatorname{Im}(1 - P)$.
b) $\operatorname{Im} P$ and $\operatorname{Im}(1 - P)$ are both subbundles of E.
c) There is an internal direct sum decomposition $E = \operatorname{Im} P \oplus \operatorname{Im}(1 - P)$.

PROOF. a) For all $x \in X$ linear algebra gives us an equality of fibers $\operatorname{Ker}(P)_x = \operatorname{Im}(1 - P)_x$. This suffices!
b) From part a) we deduce an equality of rank functions

$$r_{\operatorname{Im} P} + r_{\operatorname{Im}(1-P)} = r_E.$$

By Corollary 6.3, for all $x \in X$, there is a neighborhood U of x on which $r_{\operatorname{Im} P}$ is at least as large as $r_{\operatorname{Im} P}(x)$, $r_{\operatorname{Im}(1-P)}$ is at least as large as $r_{\operatorname{Im}(1-P)}(x)$ and r_E is

constantly equal to $r_E(x)$. On this neighborhood the ranks of $\operatorname{Im} P$ and $\operatorname{Im}(1 - P)$ must be constant, and therefore by Proposition 6.2 $\operatorname{Im} P$ and $\operatorname{Im}(1 - P)$ are both subbundles.

c) Again it is enough to check this fiber by fiber, which is simple linear algebra. $\square$

An inner product on a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-vector space V is, as usual, a symmetric $\mathbb{R}$-bilinear form $\langle , \rangle : V \times V \to \mathbb{R}$ which is positive definite in the sense that for all $x \in V \setminus \{0\}$, $\langle x, x \rangle = 0$. An inner product on a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-vector space V is a positive definite sesquilinear form: i.e., it is $\mathbb{C}$-linear in the first variable, conjugate-linear in the second variable and again we have $\langle x, x \rangle > 0$ for all $x \in V \setminus \{0\}$.

Now let E be a K-vector bundle on X. An **inner product** on E is a collection of inner products $\langle , \rangle_x : E_x \times E_x \to K$ on each of the fibers which vary continuously in x. Formally this means the following: let $E \times_X E$ be the subset of $(e_1, e_2) \in E \times E$ such that $\pi(e_1) = \pi(e_2)$; then such a fiberwise family of inner products defines a function from $E \times_X E$ to K, and this function is required to be continuous.

Let us say that a **metrized vector bundle** E on X is a vector bundle together with an inner product. (Again, this is an abuse of terminology: we do not speak of the inner product by name.)

> PROPOSITION 6.5. *Let E be a metrized line bundle on X.*
> a) *If E' is a subbundle of E, fiberwise orthogonal projection onto E' defines a projection operator $P \in \operatorname{End}(E)$ with image E'.*
> b) *All short exact sequences $0 \to E' \to E \to E'' \to 0$ of vector bundles are split.*
> c) *If M is another vector bundle on X and there exists an epimorphism of bundles $q : E \to M$, then M is isomorphic to the image of a projection operator on E.*

PROOF. a) This is mostly a matter of understanding and unwinding the definitions, and we leave it to the reader.

b) Let P be orthogonal projection onto E'. The restriction of the map $E \to E''$ to $\operatorname{Ker} P$ is an isomorphism of vector bundles. The inverse of this isomorphism gives a splitting of the sequence.

c) By Proposition 6.2, since $\operatorname{Im} q = M$ is a vector bundle, so is $\operatorname{Ker} q$, whence a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker} q \to E \to M \to 0.$$

By part b), there exists a splitting $\sigma : M \to E$ of this sequence. Then, as usual, $P = \sigma \circ q$ is a projection operator on E and $q|_{\operatorname{Im} P} : \operatorname{Im} P \xrightarrow{\sim} M$. $\square$

> PROPOSITION 6.6. *If X is a paracompact topological space, then every vector bundle over X admits an inner product.*

PROOF. This is a rather standard topological argument which we just sketch here. Let M be a vector bundle on X, and let $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an open covering of X such that the restriction of M to each U_i is a trivial bundle. On a trivial bundle there is an obvious inner product, say $\langle , \rangle_x$. Now, since X is paracompact, there exists a partition of unity $\{\varphi_i\}_{i \in I}$ subordinate to the open covering $\{U_x\}$: that is,

• each $\varphi_i : X \to [0, 1]$ is continuous,

• for all $x \in X$ we have $\mathrm{supp}(\varphi_i) \subset U_i$

• for all $x \in X$ there exists an open neighborhood V of x on which all but finitely many φ_i's vanish identically, and

• for all $x \in X$, $\sum_{i \in I} \varphi_i(x) = 1$.[3]

Then, for $x \in X$ and $e_1, e_2 \in M_x$, define

$$\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle_x := \sum_i \varphi_i(x) \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle_i;$$

the sum extends over all $i \in I$ such that $x \in U_i$. This is an inner product on M. □

To complete the proof of Swan's Theorem, it suffices to show that if X is compact, every vector bundle M on X is the epimorphic image of a trivial bundle. In particular, Proposition 6.5 then shows that M is a direct summand of a trivial vector bundle T and thus $\Gamma(M)$ is a direct summand of the finitely generated free $C(X)$-module $\Gamma(T)$, hence is finitely generated projective.

PROPOSITION 6.7. *Let X be a compact space and M a vector bundle on X. Then there exists an epimorphism of bundles from a trivial vector bundle $X \times V$ to M.*

PROOF. Step 1: We CLAIM that for each $x \in X$, there exists a neighborhood U_x of x and finite set of global sections $S_x = \{s_{x,1}, \ldots, s_{x,k_x}\}$ of M such that for all $y \in U$, $s_{x,1}(y), \ldots, s_{x,k_x}(y)$ is a K-basis for M_y.

PROOF OF CLAIM: Let U be an open neighborhood of x on which M is a trivial bundle. Certainly then there exist finitely many sections $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ of M over U which when evaluated at any $y \in U$ give a basis of M_y. We need to show that there exists an open set W with $x \in W \subset U$ and global sections $s'_1, \ldots, s'_n$ such that for all i, $s'_i|_W = s_i|_W$. For this it suffices to work one section at a time: let s be a section of M over U. Since X is paracompact, it is normal, so there exist open neighborhoods W and V of x with $\overline{W} \subset V$, $\overline{V} \subset U$. By Urysohn's Lemma, there is a continuous function $\omega : X \to [0, 1]$ such that $\omega|_{\overline{W}} \equiv 1$ and $\omega|_{X \setminus V} \equiv 0$. If we then define $s' : X \to M$ by $s'(y) = \omega(y)s(y)$ for $y \in U$ and $s'(y) = 0$ for $y \in X \setminus U$, then this s does the job.

Step 2: By compactness of X, there exists a finite subset I of X such that $\{U_x\}_{x \in I}$ covers X. So $S = \bigcup_{i \in I} S_x$ is a finite set of global sections of M which when evaluated at any $x \in X$, span the fiber M_x. So the K-subspace V of $\Gamma(M)$ spanned by S is finite-dimensional. We define a map $q : X \times V \to M$ by $q(x, s) = s(x)$. This is a surjective bundle map from a trivial vector bundle to M! □

Remark: In the above proof the paracompactness of X seems to have been fully exploited, but the need for compactness is less clear. In fact, at the end of [**Sw62**], Swan remarks that if you replace the last step of the proof by an argument from Milnor's 1958 lecture notes *Differential Topology*, one gets a categorical equivalence between vector bundles *with bounded rank function* on a paracompact space X and finitely generated projective $C(X)$-modules.

Remark: A more straightforward variant of Swan's theorem concerns the case where X is a compact differentiable manifold (say of class C^∞). In this case the equivalence is between differentiable K-vector bundles on X and modules over the ring of

---

[3]See e.g. Exercise 5 in §4.5 of Munkres' *Topology: a first course* for a proof of this fact.

K-valued C^∞-functions. Looking over the proof, one sees that the only part that needs additional attention is the existence of differentiable partitions of unity. Such things indeed exist and are constructed in many of the standard texts on geometry and analysis on manifolds. We recommend [**We80**], which has a particularly clear and complete discussion.

4. Applications of Swan's Theorem

4.1. Vector bundles and homotopy.

Vector bundles on a space are of interest not only to differential topologists and geometers but also to algebraic geometers. This is because pullback of vector bundles behaves well under homotopy.

First, suppose that $f : X \to Y$ is a continuous map of topological spaces and $\pi : E \to Y$ is a vector bundle on Y. We may **pullback** π to a vector bundle $\pi_X : E \times_Y X \to X$ just by taking $E \times_Y X$ to be the fiber product of the maps f and π, namely the subspace of $X \times E$ consisting of all pairs (x, v) such that $f(x) = \pi(v) \in Y$. The map $\pi_X : E \times_Y X \to X$ is just restriction of the projection map: $(x, v) \mapsto x$.

EXERCISE 6.2. *Show: $\pi_X : E \times_Y X \to X$ is indeed a vector bundle on X. We abbreviate it by either $f^*\pi$ or (more abusively) f^*E.*

EXERCISE 6.3. *Show: the pullback of a trivial bundle is a trivial bundle.*

THEOREM 6.8. *(Covering Homotopy Theorem) Let X and Y be topological spaces with X paracompact. Let $\pi : E \to Y$ be a vector bundle on Y, and let $f, g : X \to Y$ be homotopic maps. Then the pullbacks $f^*\pi$ and $g^*\pi$ are isomorphic vector bundles on X.*

PROOF. See for instance [**Hs66**, Thm. 4.7]. $\qquad\square$

For our applications, it is enough to know that compact spaces are paracompact. But for culture we also remark that any regular σ-compact space is paracompact, e.g. any CW-complex with only finitely many cells of any given dimension.

COROLLARY 6.9. *If X is a contractible paracompact space, then every vector bundle on X is trivial.*

PROOF. Choose any point $x_0 \in X$, let $f : X \to X$ be the map which sends every point of X to x_0, and let $g : X \to X$ be the identity map. If $\pi : E \to X$ is any vector bundle on X, then by Theorem 6.8 we have $f^*\pi = g^*\pi$. Since g is the identity map, $g^*\pi = \pi$. On the other hand, tracking through the definitions shows $f^*\pi = X \times \pi^{-1}(x_0)$, a trivial bundle. So π is trivial. $\qquad\square$

5. Stably free modules

Recall that an R-module M is **stably free** if there is a finitely generated free module F such that $M \oplus F$ is free. This definition is natural from the perspective of K-theory: the class $[P]$ in $\widetilde{K_0(R)}$ of a finitely generated projective module P is trivial iff P is stably free.

EXERCISE 6.4. *Let* $0 \to A \to B \to P \to 0$ *be a short exact sequence of R-modules, with P stably free. Show: A is stably free* $\iff$ *B is stably free.*

Certainly we have

$$\text{free} \implies \text{ stably free } \implies \text{ projective} .$$

Asking to what extent these implications can be reversed brings us quickly to some deep and beautiful mathematics.

5.1. Finite Generation.

We begin by addressing finite generation conditions.

EXERCISE 6.5. (**Eilenberg Swindle**): *Let us say that a projective module P is* **weakly stably free** *if there exists a not necessarily finitely generated free module F such that* $P \oplus F$ *is free. Show that every projective module is weakly stably free. (Hint: if* $P \oplus Q$ *is free, take* $F = P \oplus Q \oplus P \oplus Q \oplus \ldots$*.)*

EXERCISE 6.6. *Show: for a finitely generated projective module P, the following are equivalent:*
(i) P is stably free.
(ii) P admits a **finite free resolution**: *for some* $n \in \mathbb{N}$ *there is an exact sequence*

$$0 \to F_n \to \ldots \to F_0 \to P \to 0,$$

with each F_i *a finitely generated free module.*

This explains why the free module we take the direct sum with in the definition of stably free is required to be finitely generated. What happens if we take the module P to be infinitely generated? Here let us be sure that by an **infinitely generated R-module**, we mean an R-module which is *not* finitely generated.[4]

THEOREM 6.10. *(Gabel) Each infinitely generated stably free module is free.*

PROOF. Let M be infinitely generated and stably free. Choose $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $F = M \oplus R^a$ is free. Let $\{a_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a basis for F. Since F has an infinitely generated homomorphic image, I is infinite. Let $p : F \to R^a$ be the natural projection map $(x, y) \mapsto y$. For each standard basis element e_k of R^a lift it to $\widetilde{e_k}$ in F and let J_k be the "support" of $\widetilde{e_k}$, i.e., the set of indices i such that the coefficient of a_i in $\widetilde{e_k}$ is nonzero. Then $J = \bigcup_{k=1}^{a} J_k$ is finite. Let $F' = \langle a_i \rangle_{i \in J}$, so that F' is free of finite rank and F/F' is free of infinite rank. By construction $q(F') = R^a$; it follows that

$$F = F' + M.$$

Put $N = M \cap F'$, so

$$F'/N \cong R^a.$$

Since R^a is projective, the sequence

$$0 \to N \to F' \to R^a \to 0$$

splits, giving

$$F' \cong N \oplus R^a.$$

---

[4]*A priori* it would be reasonable to take "infinitely generated R-module" to mean a module which possesses an infinite generating set, but a moment's thought shows that an R-module has this property iff it is infinite, so it is more useful to define "infinitely generated" as we have.

Further
$$F/F' \cong M/N,$$
so M/N is infinitely generated free: $M/N \cong R^a \oplus F''$ for a free module F''. In particular M/N is projective, so the sequence
$$0 \to N \to M \to M/N \to 0$$
splits. Putting all this together we get
$$M \cong N \oplus M/N \cong N \oplus R^a \oplus F'' \cong F' \oplus F''. \qquad \square$$

The following result – which we will not prove here – shows that for a large class of "reasonable rings" infinitely generated projective modules are much less interesting objects than finitely generated projectives, and thus gives further motivation to our restriction to the finitely generated case.

THEOREM 6.11. *(Bass* [**Ba63**]*) Let R be a connected Noetherian ring. Then any infinitely generated projective R-module is free.*

However, we can use Swan's Theorem to exhibit a nonfree infinitely generated projective module. Let $[0,1]$ be the closed unit interval with its topology: a compact, contractible space. By Corollary 6.9, every vector bundle over $[0,1]$ is trivial. By Swan's Theorem, this implies that every finitely generated projective module over the ring $R = C([0,1])$ of continuous functions $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is free.

But now – as in §3.9 – consider the ideal I of all functions $f \in R$ which vanish *near zero*, i.e., for which there exists $\epsilon(f) > 0$ such that $f|_{[0,\epsilon(f)]} \equiv 0$. Exercise 3.73 tells us that I is a projective R-module. Moreover, I is not a free R-module: indeed, any $f \in I$ is annihilated by any continuous function with support lying in $[0, \epsilon(f)]$, and nonzero such functions clearly exist. On the other hand, any nonzero free module has elements with zero annihilator: take any basis element.

Thus $C([0,1])$ is a connected ring over which every finitely generated projective module is free, but the infinitely generated projective module I is not free. (Theorem 6.11 says that no such modules exist over connected *Noetherian* rings.) Moreover I is therefore clearly not a direct sum of finitely generated modules, since by what we have established any such module over $C([0,1])$ would be free!

EXERCISE 6.7. *Use Corollary 3.51 to give a purely algebraic proof that I is not a direct sum of finitely generated submodules.*

EXERCISE 6.8. *Find necessary and sufficient conditions on a compact, contractible space X for there to exist a nonfree projective module.*

5.2. Ranks.

Later we will attach to a finitely generated projective module over any ring R a rank *function* (on $\mathrm{Spec}\, R$). However, for a stably free module we can – as for free modules – simply assign a rank. Namely, if we put rank $P = b - a$.

EXERCISE 6.9. *Show: the rank of a finitely generated stably free module is well-defined.*

EXERCISE 6.10. *Show: for an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *M is stably free of rank zero.*
(ii) *M = 0.*

Comment: This will be quite routine once we have the theory of localization. If you have trouble with the general case now, just show that $M \oplus R \cong R \implies M = 0$, which is easier: every cyclic module is isomorphic to R/I for some ideal I of R; now consider annihilators.

5.3. The least number of generators.

For a finitely generated R-module M we denote by $\operatorname{mg} M$ the minimal number of generators of M, i.e., the least n such that $R^n \twoheadrightarrow M$.

From a naive perspective this is perhaps the most natural numerical invariant associated to a finitely generated R-module. But in fact it behaves badly. Essentially its only good property is the obvious one: if $M_1 \twoheadrightarrow M_2$, then $\operatorname{mg}(M_2) \leq \operatorname{mg}(M_1)$. However, if $M_1 \hookrightarrow M_2$, then we certainly *need not have* $\operatorname{mg}(M_1) \leq \operatorname{mg}(M_2)$: let I be a finitely generated but nonprincipal ideal, and let $M_1 = I$, $M_2 = R$. One may momentarily hope that for finitely generated R-modules M_1 and M_2 we at least have $\operatorname{mg}(M_1 \oplus M_2) = \operatorname{mg}(M_1) + \operatorname{mg}(M_2)$ but in fact this is false even over the simplest rings: take $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $M_1 = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, $M_2 = \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$. But it gets even worse:

EXERCISE 6.11. *Let R be a ring and M_1, M_2 be finitely generated R-modules.*
a) Suppose R is local. Show: $\operatorname{mg}(M_1 \oplus M_2) = \operatorname{mg}(M_1) + \operatorname{mg}(M_2)$. In fact, show that if $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ is a short exact sequence of finitely generated R-modules then $\operatorname{mg}(M) = \operatorname{mg}(M') + \operatorname{mg}(M'')$.
b) Suppose R is a PID. Show: $\operatorname{mg}(M_1 \oplus M_1) = 2\operatorname{mg}(M_1)$.
c) Suppose R is a Dedekind domain,[5] and l I is a nonzero proper ideal of R. Show:
(i) • If I is principal, $\operatorname{mg}(I) = 1$.
• If I is not principal, $\operatorname{mg}(I) = 2$.
(ii) • If I^2 is principal, $\operatorname{mg}(I \oplus I) = 2$.
(iii) • If I^2 is not principal, $\operatorname{mg}(I \oplus I) = 3$.
d) Deduce: For a nonprincipal ideal I in a Dedekind domain R, $\operatorname{mg}(I \oplus I) < 2\operatorname{mg}(I)$.

Later we will see "better" invariants for certain subclasses of finitely generated R-modules, namely the rank for projective modules and the length for...finite length modules. Over a Dedekind domain every finitely generated module can be decomposed into the direct sum of a projective module and a finite length module. This does not hold over more general rings, e.g. the $\mathbb{C}[x, y]$-module $\mathbb{C}[x]$ is a torsion module of infinite length so cannot be so expressed.

PROPOSITION 6.12. *A rank one stably free module is free.*

We will come back to prove this later once we have developed localization.

5.4. Around Hermite's Lemma.

In number theory and related branches of mathematics one studies sublattices Λ of the standard integral lattice $\mathbb{Z}^n$, i.e., rank n $\mathbb{Z}$-submodules of $\mathbb{Z}^n$. Their structure

---

[5]This exercise is stated now for continuity purposes, but to solve it you will probably want to use the theory of finitely generated modules over a Dedekind domain detailed in § 20.6.

is surprisingly rich – for instance, the function $L_n(k)$ which counts the number of index k sublattices of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ is arithmetically interesting and nontrivial. In particular, one question that comes up in the study of integer lattices is: which vectors $v \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ can be part of a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}^n$? Unlike the answer for modules over a field (all nonzero vectors), there is an obvious obstruction: for instance there is no basis (v_1, v_2) of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with $v_1 = (2, 0)$. For if so, the linear transformation $T : \mathbb{Z}^2 \to \mathbb{Z}^2$ given by $T((1, 0)) = (2, 0)$, $T((0, 1)) = v_2 = (a, b)$ has determinant $2b$. Since this is not a unit in $\mathbb{Z}$, T is not invertible, which is a contradiction (make sure you see why, e.g. by using the universal property of free modules).

This observation can be vastly generalized, as follows: for a domain R and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we say $v = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in R^n$ is **a primitive vector** if $v \neq 0$ and $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle = R$.

EXERCISE 6.12. *Let K be the fraction field of R. Show that $v \in (R^n)^{\bullet}$ is primitive iff $Kv \cap R^n = Rv$.*

EXERCISE 6.13. *Let R be a domain, and let $(b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ be a basis for R^n. Show that each b_i is a primitive vector.*

In 1850 Hermite proved that for integer lattices this is the only obstruction.

PROPOSITION 6.13. *(Classical Hermite Lemma) For a vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, the following are equivalent:*
(i) There is $M \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with $M(e_1) = v$, i.e., the first column of M is v.
(ii) There is a basis for $\mathbb{Z}^n$ containing v.
(iii) v is a primitive vector.

For a proof of Proposition 6.13 in the classical style, see [**GoN**, § 1.3.3]. In fact the methods of module theory allow for a slicker proof of a more general result.

PROPOSITION 6.14.
Let R be a PID. For a vector $v \in R^n$, the following are equivalent:

    (i) *There is $M \in \mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ with $M(e_1) = v$, i.e., the first column of M is v.*
    (ii) *There is a basis for R^n containing v.*
    (iii) *v is a primitive vector.*

PROOF. Any two bases of R^n are equivalent under $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$. So (i) $\iff$ (ii). (ii) $\implies$ (iii): If $v, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ is a basis for R^n and v were not primitive, then we would have $v = \alpha w$ for some $\alpha \in R^{\bullet} \setminus R^{\times}$. Then $w = \frac{1}{\alpha} v$ expresses w as a K-linear combination of the basis vectors with a nonintegral coefficient: contradiction. (iii) $\implies$ (ii): Step 1: For a domain R and $v \in (R^n)^{\bullet}$, we claim that v is a primitive vector iff $R^n / \langle v \rangle$ is torsionfree.
Proof: Suppose v is not primitive: $v = \alpha v'$ for some $\alpha \in R^{\bullet} \setminus R^{\times}$. Then v' is a torsion element of $R^n / \langle v \rangle$. Conversely, suppose v is primitive. If $n = 1$ then $\langle v \rangle = R$ and the result holds trivially, so assume $n \geq 2$. Suppose there is $w \in R^n$ and $\alpha \in R^{\bullet}$ such that $\alpha w = \beta v$ for some $\beta \in R$. Thus $w = \frac{\beta}{\alpha} v$. Since v is primitive, $\alpha \mid \beta$ and the image of w in $R^n / \langle v \rangle$ is zero.
Step 2: Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \langle v \rangle \to R^n \to M \to 0,$$

with $M = R^n / \langle v \rangle$. By Step 1, M is a finitely generated torsionfree module over a PID, so it is free: indeed, tensoring to K and applying linear algebra we see that

$M \cong R^{n-1}$. Thus the sequence splits: $R^n = \langle v \rangle \oplus M'$, with $M' \cong R^{n-1}$. Thus if $v_2, \ldots, v_n$ is an R-basis for M', $v, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ is an R-basis for R^n.   □

PROPOSITION 6.15. *Let R be a commutative ring, and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. the following are equivalent:*
(i) If for an R-module M we have $M \oplus R \cong R^n$ then M is free.
(ii) Every primitive vector $v \in R^n$ is part of a basis for R^n.

PROOF. We follow a treatment of K. Conrad [**Cd-SF**]. First we observe that when $n = 1$ both (i) and (ii) hold for all R-modules M: indeed, by Exercise 6.10, if $M \oplus R \cong R$ then $M = 0$, whereas (ii) is completely vacuous in this case.
(i) $\implies$ (ii): Assume (i). For $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_n) \in R^n$, let $\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i w_i$. Let $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in R^n$ be a primitive vector. Observe that this is equivalent to the existence of $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in R^n$ with $\mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathfrak{b} = 1$ and fix such a $\mathfrak{b}$. Consider the R-linear functional $f : R^n \to R$ given by $\mathbf{v} \mapsto \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathfrak{b}$. Since $f(\mathfrak{a}) = 1$ it is nonzero and thus there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ker} f \to R^n \xrightarrow{f} R \to 0.$$

Since R is projective, this sequence splits, giving $R^n \cong \operatorname{Ker} f \oplus R$. More concretely a splitting is given by a section $\sigma : R \to R^n$ of f which is determined by mapping $1 \in R$ to any $v \in R^n$ with $f(v) = 1$. Thus $1 \mapsto \mathfrak{a}$ gives an internal direct sum decomposition

$$R^n = \operatorname{Ker} f \oplus \langle \mathfrak{a} \rangle \cong \operatorname{Ker} f \oplus R.$$

By our hypothesis (i), $\operatorname{Ker} f$ is free, and if $\mathfrak{b}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{b}_n$ is a basis for $\operatorname{Ker} f$ then $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{b}_n$ is a basis for R^n containing $\mathfrak{a}$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let $g : M \oplus R \xrightarrow{\sim} R^n$ be an R-module isomorphism. Put $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) = g(0, 1)$. We claim that $\mathfrak{a}$ is a primitive vector. If not, there is a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ such that $\langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle \subset \mathfrak{m}$. But

$$g|_{\mathfrak{m}(M \oplus R^n)} : \mathfrak{m}M \oplus \mathfrak{m} \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathfrak{m}R)^n,$$

and $g(0, 1) = \mathfrak{a} \in (\mathfrak{m}R)^n$, so $(0, 1) \in \mathfrak{m}M \oplus (\mathfrak{m}R)^n$, a contradiction. Thus by (ii) there is a basis $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{b}_n$ of R^n, so that $g^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}), g^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}_2), \ldots, g^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}_n)$ is a basis of $M \oplus R$. For $2 \leq i \leq n$ we write $g^{-1}(\mathfrak{b}_i) = (x_i, c_i)$. Subtracting off from each of these vectors a suitable scalar multiple of $g^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}) = (0, 1)$ we get a new basis $(0, 1), (x_2, 0), \ldots, (x_n, 0)$ of $M \oplus R$. Then $x_2, \ldots, x_n$ is a basis for M.   □

THEOREM 6.16. *For a commutative ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) For all R-modules M, if $M \oplus R$ is free, then M is free.
(ii) For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, every primitive vector $v \in R^n$ is part of a basis of R^n.
(iii) Every stably free R-module M is free.
*A ring satisfying these equivalent conditions will be called an **L-Hermite ring**.*

PROOF. Since an infinitely generated stably free module is free (Theorem 6.10), in parts (i) and (iii) we may – and shall – assume M is finitely generated. Then:
(i) $\iff$ (ii) is immediate from Proposition 6.15.
(i) $\implies$ (iii): It suffices to show that for all finitely generated modules M and all $a \in \mathbb{N}$, if $M \oplus R^a$ is free then M is free. We go by induction on n, the case $n = 0$ being trivial. Suppose the result holds for $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $M \oplus R^{a+1} \cong (M \oplus R^a) \oplus R$ is free, so by (i) $M \oplus R^a$ is free, and then by induction M is free.
(iii) $\implies$ (i) is immediate.   □

5.5. Swan's Construction.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let
$$R_n = \mathbb{R}[t_0, \ldots, t_n]/\langle t_0^2 + \ldots + t_n^2 - 1 \rangle.$$

EXERCISE 6.14. *Show: R_n is a domain iff $n \geq 1$.*

Consider the map $H : R_n^{n+1} \to R_n$ obtained by taking the dot product of $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_{n+1})$ with $\mathbf{t} = (t_0, \ldots, t_n)$. For $0 \leq i \leq n$, let e_i be the ith standard basis vector of R_n^{n+1}; then $H(e_i) = t_i$, so the image of H contains $\langle t_0, \ldots, t_n \rangle = R_n$: H is surjective. Let $P_n = \operatorname{Ker} H$, so we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \to P_n \to R_n^{n+1} \overset{H}{\to} R_n \to 0.$$

As above, this sequence splits and since $\mathbf{t} \cdot \mathbf{t} = 1$, a canonical section is given by mapping $1 \in R_n$ to $\mathbf{t}$. In particular

$$P_n \oplus R_n \cong R_n^{n+1}$$

so P_n is stably free. When is it free?

THEOREM 6.17. *(Swan) The stably free R_n-module P_n is free iff $n = 0, 1, 3$ or 7.*

PROOF. Step 0: Since $P_0 = 0$, it is free. Moreover P_1 has rank 1 so is free by general principles (Proposition 6.12). But this is overkill: in fact one sees that $-t_1 e_0 + t_0 e_1$ is a basis for P_1. Similarly one can simply write down bases for P_3 and P_7 in a concrete manner: we leave this as an exercise for the reader.

Step 1: Suppose $n \notin \{0, 1, 3, 7\}$. We wish to show that P_n is *not* free. The key observation is that it is enough to do so after any base change: that is, if $R_n \to S$ is a ring map and M is an R-module such that $M \otimes_{R_n} S$ is not a free S-module, then M is not a free R-module. What is the natural base change to make?

Notice that R_n is nothing else than the ring of polynomial functions on the unit sphere $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. For those unitiated in the above jargon we spell it out more explicitly: every $f \in \mathbb{R}[t_0, \ldots, t_{n+1}]$ induces a function from $\mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ and thus by restriction a function $S^n \to \mathbb{R}$. We wish to identify polynomials which define the same function on S^n, and to do so we should at least impose the relation $t_0^2 + \ldots + t_n^2 - 1 = 0$ since this function vanishes identically on S^n. As we will see later when we study the Nullstellensatz, since by Exercise 6.14 the ideal $I = \langle t_0^2 + \ldots + t_n^2 - 1 \rangle$ is prime, it is radical and thus the relation $I(V(I)) = I$ tells us that the only polynomials which vanish identically on S^n are those in I.

Since every polynomial function is a continuous function for the Euclidean topology on S^n, we get an extension of rings $R_n \to C(S^n)$. So our bright idea is to show insteaad that the finitely generated projective $C(S^n)$-module

$$T_n = P_n \otimes_{R_n} C(S^n)$$

is not free. By Swan's Theorem, T_n corresponds to a vector bundle on S^n and it is equivalent to show that this vector bundle is nontrivial. [6]

Step 3: We claim that in fact T_n is nothing else but the tangent bundle of S^n. Indeed, we have $S^n \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. The tangent bundle to $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is trivial, hence so is its

---

[6]Thus in summary we have just accomplished the following exciting maneuver: using basic affine algebraic geometry, we have completely transferred our problem from the domain of commutative algebra to that of differential topology!

pullback to S^n, say F^{n+1}. Further, there is a surjective bundle map from F^{n+1} to the rank one trivial bundle F^1: at every point of S^n we orthogonally project to the outward normal vector. The kernel of this bundle map is $T(S^n)$. Thus we have a short exact sequence of vector bundles

$$0 \to TS^n \to F^{n+1} \to F \to 0.$$

We claim that under the Swan's Theorem equivalence of categories, this split exact sequence corresponds to the split exact sequence

$$0 \to T_n \to C(S^n)^{n+1} \xrightarrow{H} C(S^n) \to 0$$

which is the base change to $C(S^n)$ of the defining short exact sequence of S^n. We leave it to the interested reader to piece this together from our consruction of P_n.
Step 4: By a classical theorem of Bott and Milnor [**BM58**], the tangent bundle of S^n is trivial iff $n \in \{0, 1, 3, 7\}$.   □

EXERCISE 6.15. *Show: P_n is free for $n = 3$ and $n = 7$.*

EXERCISE 6.16. *Find stably free but not free modules of ranks 3 and 7.*

The Bott-Milnor Theorem is a deep and celebrated result. Their original proof used the recently developed tools of midcentury differential topology: Stiefel-Whitney and Pontrjagin classes, cohomology operations, and so forth. In 1962 J.F. Adams determined for each n the largest rank of a trivial subbundle of $T(S^n)$ [**Ad62**]. The K-theory developed in the 1960's gave more graceful proofs: we recommend that the interested reader consult, for instance, [**Ka**, § V.2].

If one merely wants *some* values of n for which P_n is not free, one can use much lower technology. for instance, the Poincaré-Hopf Theorem [**Mi**, p. 35] implies that a closed n-manifold which admits a nowhere vanishing vector field (equivalently a trivial rank one subbundle of its tangent bundle; this is much weaker than the tangent bundle being trivial) must have zero Euler characteristic. The Euler characteristic of S^n is $1 + (-1)^n$, so it is nonzero for all even n.

CHAPTER 7

Localization

1. Definition and first properties

As we have seen, one way to "simplify" the study of ideals in a ring R is to pass to a quotient ring R/I: as we have seen, this has the (often useful) effect of "cutting off the bottom" of the ideal lattice by keeping only ideals $J \supset I$. There is another procedure, **localization**, which effects the opposite kind of simplification: given a **prime** ideal P of R, there is a ring R_P together with a canonical map $\iota : R \to R_P$ such that $\iota^* : \mathcal{I}(R_P) \to \mathcal{I}(R)$ is an injection whose image is precisely the ideals $J \subset P$. As usual, ι^* carries prime ideals to prime ideals. In particular, assuming only that P is prime, we get a corresponding ideal – rather inelegantly but standardly denoted PR_P – which is the **unique maximal** ideal of R_P. If we can take $P = (0)$ – i.e., if R is a domain – this means that PR_P is the only ideal of R_P, which is therefore a field. In fact it is nothing else than the quotient field of the domain R, and – with one exception – all the secrets of localization are already present in this very familiar special case.

In fact the localization construction is a bit more general than this: given an arbitrary ring R (of course commutative with unity!) and an arbitrary **multiplicative subset** S of R – this just means that $1 \in S$ and $SS \subset S$ – we will define a new ring R_S together with a canonical homomorphism $\iota : R \to R_S$ (for which ι^* will still be an injection with explicitly given image). Just as in the case of quotients, ι satisfies a certain universal mapping property, but let us sacrifice some elegance for intelligibility by working our way up to this crisp definition.

Indeed, first consider the special case in which R is a domain, with fraction field F. Then R_S will be an extension ring of R, still with fraction field F, which is obtained by adjoining to R all elements $\frac{1}{s}$ for $s \in S$.

EXAMPLE 7.1. *Suppose $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $S = \{2^n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. Then $R_S = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}]$. Indeed we see that for any nonzero element f, we can take S to be the multiplicative set consisting of the powers of f, and then the localization is just $R[\frac{1}{f}]$.*

What if in the example above, instead of taking the multiplicative subset generated by 2, we took the multiplicative subset generated by 2^2, or 2^{127}? Clearly it wouldn't matter: if we have $\frac{1}{2^k}$ for any k in our subring of $\mathbb{Q}$, we also have $\frac{2^{k-1}}{2^k} = \frac{1}{2}$. To generalize this idea, define the **saturation** $\mathbb{S}$ of a multiplicatively closed subset S of a domain R to be the set $\{a \in R \mid \exists b \in R \mid ab \in S\}$, i.e., the set of all divisors of elements of S. The same observation as above shows that $R_S = R_{\mathbb{S}}$, so if we like we can restrict to consideration of saturated multiplicatively closed subsets.

Example, continued: The saturated, multiplicatively closed subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ correspond to (arbitrary) subsets $\mathcal{P}$ of the prime numbers (exercise!). In particular $\mathbb{Z}$ itself corresponds to $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$, $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ corresponds to $\mathcal{P} = \{p\}$, $\mathbb{Q}$ corresponds to the set of all primes. Most interestingly, fix any prime p and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all primes **except** p: then the corresponding ring, which is confusingly denoted $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ is the set of all rational numbers of the form $\frac{x}{y}$ where p does not divide y. Notice that such rings are the maximal subrings of $\mathbb{Q}$ which are not fields. Moreover, the units of $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ are precisely the elements of the form $\frac{x}{y}$ with $(p,x) = 1$. The nonunits a are all of the form pa' for $a' \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$, so therefore the unique maximal ideal is the principal ideal $(p) = p\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$.

EXERCISE 7.1. *Show: the only ideals in $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ are those of the form $(p)^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Now let R be any ring and S a multiplicatively closed subset of R. We would still like to define a ring $S^{-1}R$ which is, roughly speaking, obtained by adjoining to R all inverses of elements of S. We can still define $S^{-1}R$ in terms of formal quotients, i.e., as equivalence classes of elements (a,b) with $a \in R$, $b \in S$. However, if we define $(a,b) \sim (c,d)$ to be $ad = bc$, then unfortunately we find that this need not be an equivalence relation! Indeed:

EXERCISE 7.2. *Let R be a nonzero ring that is not a domain: thus there are $a, b \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such that $ab = 0$. Let $S = \{a^n \mid a \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Show that the relation $\sim$ on $R \times S$ defined by*

$$(r_1, s_1) \sim (r_2, s_2) \text{ if } s_1 r_2 = s_2 r_1$$

is not *transitive.*

Therefore we need to enlarge the relation a bit: we put $(a,b) \sim (c,d)$ iff there exists $s \in S$ such that $sad = sbc$. We then define

$$\frac{a}{s} + \frac{b}{t} := \frac{at + bs}{st},$$

$$\frac{a}{s} \cdot \frac{b}{t} := \frac{ab}{st}.$$

We must check that these operations are well-defined on equivalence classes; this is left as a (perhaps somewhat tedious, but not difficult) exercise for the reader.

EXERCISE 7.3. *Let R be a ring, and let $S \subseteq R$ be a multiplicative subset. We wish to consider three relations on $R \times S$: the first relation $\sim_1$ i the "wrong" relation considered above:*

$$(r_1, s_1) \sim_1 (r_2, s_2) \text{ if } s_1 r_2 = s_2 r_1.$$

By Exercise 7.2, the relation $\sim_1$ can fail to be transitive when R is not a domain. So we define the relation $\sim_2$ to be the transitive closure of $\sim_1$, i.e., the smallest transitive relation on $R \times S$ that contains $\sim_1$. We define $\sim_3$ to be the "right relation":

$$(r_1, s_1) \sim (r_2, s_2) \text{ if there is } s \in S \text{ such that } ss_1 r_2 = ss_2 r_1.$$

    a) *Show: $\sim_1$ is reflexive and symmetric, and deduce that $\sim_2$ is an equivalence relation.*

    b) *Show: $\sim_2 = \sim_3$. Deduce: the "right relation" $\sim_3$ is the equivalence relation generated by (i.e., the smallest equivalence relation containing) the "wrong relation" $\sim_1$.*

EXERCISE 7.4. *Indeed, check that $S^{-1}R$ is a ring and that $x \mapsto \frac{x}{1}$ defines a homomorphism of rings $R \to S^{-1}R$. Thus $S^{-1}R$ is an R-algebra, and in particular an R-module.*

EXERCISE 7.5. *Let R be a domain and $S = R^{\bullet} = R \setminus \{0\}$. Show: $S^{-1}R$ is indeed the fraction field of R.*

When $f \in R$, we denote the localization of R at the multiplicative subset generated by f as R_f.

EXAMPLE 7.2. *Suppose $f \in R$ is a nilpotent element: $f^n = 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then $1 = \frac{f^{n-1}}{f^{n-1}}$ whereas $0 = \frac{0}{f}$. Since $(f^{n-1} \cdot f - f^{n-1} \cdot 0) = 0$, we have that $1 = 0$, i.e., R_f is the zero ring. Conversely, if $1 = 0$ in R_f, then there is $s \in \{f^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $0 = s \cdot 1 = s$, so f is nilpotent. The same argument shows that for any multiplicative subset S, we have that $S^{-1}R$ is the zero ring if and only if $0 \in S$.*

EXERCISE 7.6.
  a) *Show: the kernel of the natural map $R \to S^{-1}(R)$ is the set of all $r \in R$ such that for some $s \in S$, $sr = 0$.*
  b) *The map $R \to S^{-1}(R)$ is injective if and only if S has no zerodivisors.*
  c) *Show that the subset Q of all nonzerodivisors of a ring R is multiplicatively closed. The localization $Q^{-1}R$ is called the **total fraction ring** of R. Show that $Q^{-1}(R)$ is a field if and only if R is a domain.*

EXERCISE 7.7. *Show: the homomorphism $R \to S^{-1}R$ is universal for homomorphisms $R \to T$ with $f(S) \subset T^{\times}$.*

EXERCISE 7.8. *A multiplicatively closed subset S of a ring R is **saturated** if for all $s \in S$ and all $t \in R$, if $t \mid s$ then $t \in S$.*
  a) *For a multiplicatively closed subset $S \subset R$, define its **saturation** $\mathbf{S} = \{t \in R \mid t \mid s \text{ for some } s \in S\}$. Show that $\mathbf{S}$ contains S, is multiplicatively closed and saturated, and is minimal with these properties: if $T \supset S$ is saturated and multiplicatively closed, then $T \supset \mathbf{S}$.*
  b) *Show: the rings $\mathbf{S}^{-1}R$ and $S^{-1}R$ are canonically isomorphic.*
  c) *Let I be an ideal of R. Show that the following are equivalent:*
     (i) *$R \setminus I$ is multiplicatively closed.*
     (ii) *$R \setminus I$ is multiplicatively closed and saturated.*
     (iii) *I is a prime ideal.*
  d) *Let $\mathbf{S} \subset R$ be a saturated multiplicatively closed subset. Show: there is a subset $Y \subset \operatorname{Spec} R$ such that $\mathbf{S} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in Y}(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$.*
     (Hint: use Multiplicative Avoidance.)

2. Pushing and pulling via a localization map

Let R be a ring and S a multiplicatively closed subset. Let $\iota : R \to S^{-1}R$ be the natural map. As for any homomorphism of rings, ι induces maps between the sets of ideals of R and the set of ideals of $S^{-1}R$, in both directions:

$$\iota_* : \mathcal{I}_R \to \mathcal{I}_{S^{-1}R}, \ I \mapsto IS^{-1}R,$$

$$\iota^* : \mathcal{I}_{S^{-1}R} \to \mathcal{I}_R, \ J \mapsto \iota^{-1}(J).$$

LEMMA 7.3. *Let $\iota : R \to S^{-1}R$ be as above. For an ideal I of R, we have*

$$\iota_*(I) = \{\frac{x}{s} \in S^{-1}R \mid x \in I, \ s \in S\}.$$

PROOF. Let us temporarily write

$$\mathcal{I} = \{\frac{x}{s} \in S^{-1}R \mid x \in I, \ s \in S\}.$$

We want to show that $\mathcal{I} = \iota_*(I) = \langle \iota(I) \rangle_{S^{-1}R}$. It is clear that $\iota(I) \subset \mathcal{I} \subset \iota_*(I)$, so it is enough to show that $\mathcal{I}$ is itself an ideal of $S^{-1}R$. No problem: if $\frac{x_1}{s_1}, \ \frac{x_2}{s_2} \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\frac{x_1}{s_1} + \frac{x_2}{s_2} = \frac{x_1 s_2 + x_2 s_1}{s_1 s_2} \in \mathcal{I},$$

and if $\frac{y}{s} \in S^{-1}R$, then

$$\frac{y}{s}\frac{x_1}{s_1} = \frac{x_1 y}{s s_1} \in \mathcal{I}. \qquad \square$$

Like quotient maps, any localization map has the **pull-push property**.

PROPOSITION 7.4. *Let $\iota : R \to S^{-1}R$ be as above. For an ideal J of $S^{-1}R$, we have*

$$J = \iota_* \iota^* J.$$

PROOF. We have seen before that for any homomorphism $\iota : R \to R'$ of rings and any ideal J of R' we have

$$\overline{J} := \iota_* \iota^* J \subset J.$$

Thus it is enough to show the reverse containment. For this, consider an arbitrary element $\frac{x}{s} \in J$. Then $x = s\frac{x}{s} \in J$ hence also $x \in \iota^*(J)$, so $\iota(x) \in \overline{J}$. But since $\overline{J}$ is an ideal and s is a unit in $S^{-1}R$, we then also have $\frac{1}{s}x = \frac{x}{s} \in \overline{J}$. $\qquad \square$

LEMMA 7.5. *Let $\iota : R \to S^{-1}R$ be as above and I an ideal of R. The following are equivalent:*
(i) $I \cap S \neq \emptyset$.
(ii) $\iota_*(I) = S^{-1}R$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): If $s \in S \cap I$, then $s \in IS^{-1}R$, so $1 = \frac{s}{s} \in \iota_*(I)$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Suppose $1 \in \iota_*(I)$. By Lemma 7.3, $\frac{1}{1} = \frac{x}{s}$ for some $x \in I$ and $s \in S$. Clearing denominators, there is $s' \in S$ such that $ss' = s'x$ and thus $ss' \in I \cap S$. $\quad \square$

PROPOSITION 7.6. *Let $\iota : R \to S^{-1}R$ be a localization homomorphism.*
a) For a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, the following are equivalent:
(i) The pushforward $\iota_* \mathfrak{p}$ is prime in $S^{-1}R$.
(ii) The pushforward $\iota_* \mathfrak{p}$ is proper in $S^{-1}R$.
(iii) We have $\mathfrak{p} \cap S = \emptyset$.
b) If $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime and disjoint from S, then $\iota^*(\iota_* \mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p}$.

PROOF. a) (i) $\implies$ (ii) since prime ideals are proper.
(ii) $\iff$ (iii) for all ideals of R by Lemma 7.5.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): Suppose $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of R, and suppose we have $\frac{a_1}{s_1}, \ \frac{a_2}{s_2} \in S^{-1}R$ with $\frac{a_1}{s_1}\frac{a_2}{s_2} = \frac{x}{s} \in \iota_*(\mathfrak{p})$. Clearing denominators, there is $s' \in S$ such that

$$ss'a_1 a_2 = s's_1 s_2 x \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

Since $S \cap \mathfrak{p} = \emptyset$, $(ss') \notin \mathfrak{p}$, and since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, we conclude that $a_1 a_2 \in \mathfrak{p}$ and then that $a_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for some i, hence $\frac{a_i}{s_i} \in \iota_* \mathfrak{p}$ for some i and $\iota_*(\mathfrak{p})$ is prime. This

completes the proof of part a).

b) Recall: for any homomorphism $\iota : R \to R'$ and any ideal I of R we have

$$\iota^*(\iota_*(I)) \supset I,$$

so taking $I = \mathfrak{p}$ to be prime it suffices to show the inverse inclusion. Suppose $x \in \iota^*\iota_*\mathfrak{p}$, i.e., there exist $a \in \mathfrak{p}$, $s \in S$ such that $\iota(x) = \frac{x}{1} = \frac{a}{s}$. By definition, this means that there exists some $s' \in S$ such that $s'sx = s'a \in \mathfrak{p}$. Therefore either $s's \in \mathfrak{p}$ or $x \in \mathfrak{p}$, but since $s's \in S$ and S is disjoint from $\mathfrak{p}$, we must have $x \in \mathfrak{p}$. $\square$

COROLLARY 7.7. *The maps ι^* and ι_* give mutually inverse bijections from the set of prime ideals of $S^{-1}R$ to the set of prime ideals of R that are disjoint from S.*

Therefore we may – and shall – view $\operatorname{Spec} S^{-1}R$ as a subset of $\operatorname{Spec} R$.

EXERCISE 7.9. *a) Show: the results of Proposition 7.6 extend to all* primary *ideals of R.*[1]
b) Let I be any *ideal of R. Show that*

$$\iota^*\iota_* I = \{x \in R \mid \exists s \in S \text{ such that } sx \in I\}.$$

c) Exhibit a map $\iota : R \to S^{-1}R$ and a (nonprimary) ideal I of R such that $\iota^*\iota_* I \supsetneq I$.

3. The fibers of a morphism

Let $f : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings, and let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$. Consider the "fiber of $f^* : \operatorname{Spec} S \to \operatorname{Spec} R$ over $\mathfrak{p}$", i.e.,

$$f_{\mathfrak{p}} = (f^*)^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}) = \{\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{Spec} S \mid f^*(\mathcal{P}) = \mathfrak{p}\}.$$

We claim that $f_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is canonically isomorphic to the spectrum of a certain ring. Namely, let $k(\mathfrak{p})$ be the fraction field of the domain $R/\mathfrak{p}$. Then we wish to identify $f_{\mathfrak{p}}$ with $\operatorname{Spec}(S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p}))$.

Let $\iota_1 : S \to S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p})$ and $\iota_2 : k(\mathfrak{p}) \to S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p})$ be the canonical maps. The tensor product of R-algebras fits into a commutative square (INSERT) and is indeed the categorical **pushout**: in other words, given any ring A and homomorphisms $\varphi_1 : A \to S$ $\varphi_2 : A \to k(\mathfrak{p})$ such that the composite homomorphisms $\iota_1 \circ \varphi_1 = \iota_2 \circ \varphi_2$ are equal, there exists a unique homomorphism $\Phi : A \to R$ such that $f \circ \Phi = \varphi_1$ and $q \circ \Phi = \varphi_2$, where $q : R \to R/\mathfrak{p}$ is the quotient map.

On the spectral side, all the arrows reverse, and the corresponding diagram is (INSERT), which expresses $\operatorname{Spec}(S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p}))$ as the fiber product of $\operatorname{Spec} S$ and $\operatorname{Spec} k(\mathfrak{p})$ over $\operatorname{Spec} R$.

Observe that the map $\iota_1 : S \to S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p})$ is the composite of the surjective map $q_1 : S \to S \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{p}$ with the map $\ell_2 : S \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{p} \to (S \otimes_R R/\mathfrak{p}) \otimes_{R/\mathfrak{p}} k(\mathfrak{p})$, the latter map being localization with respect to the multiplicatively closed subset $q_1(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})$. Both q_1^* and ℓ_2^* are injections, and therefore $\iota_{1*} = q_1^* \circ \ell_2^*$ is injective. Similarly $\operatorname{Spec} k(\mathfrak{p}) \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Spec} R$ (this is just the special case of the above with $R = S$). It follows that the above diagram identifies $\operatorname{Spec} S \otimes_R k(\mathfrak{p})$ with the prime ideals $\mathcal{P}$ of $\operatorname{Spec} S$ such that $f^*\mathcal{P} = \mathfrak{p}$.

---

[1]Recall $\mathfrak{p}$ is primary if for $a, b \in R$ such that $ab \in \mathfrak{p}$, either $a \in \mathfrak{p}$ or $b^n \in \mathfrak{p}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We have not yet done much with this concept, and will not really address it squarely until the section on primary decomposition.

4. Commutativity of localization and passage to a quotient

LEMMA 7.8. *Let R be a ring, $S \subset R$ a multiplicatively closed subset, and I an ideal of R. Write $q : R \to R/I$ for the quotient map and put $\overline{S} := q(S)$. Then there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$S^{-1}R/IS^{-1}R \cong \overline{S}^{-1}(R/I).$$

PROOF. Explicitly, we send $\frac{a}{s}$ $(\mathrm{mod}\ I)S^{-1}R$ to $\frac{\overline{a}}{\overline{s}}$, where $\overline{a} = a + I$, $\overline{s} = s + I$. It is straightforward to check that this an isomorphism.   □

Matsumura makes the following nice comment: both sides satisfy the universal property for homomorphisms $f : R \to R'$ such that $f(S) \subset (R')^{\times}$ and $f(I) = 0$. Therefore they must be canonically isomorphic.

5. Localization at a prime ideal

An extremely important example of a multiplicative subset of R is the complement $R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ of a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. As a matter of notation, we write $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for $(R \setminus \mathfrak{p})^{-1}R$.[2]

PROPOSITION 7.9. *If $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of R, then the localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a local ring with unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.*

PROOF. We know that the primes of the localized ring are precisely the pushforwards of the prime ideals of R which are disjoint from the muliplicatively closed set. Here $S = R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, so being disjoint from S is equivalent to being contained in $\mathfrak{p}$. Thus the unique maximal such element is indeed $\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.   □

Remark: We will simply write $\mathfrak{p}$ for the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Proposition 7.9, simple though it is, is of inestimable importance. It shows that the effect of localization at a prime ideal on the lattice of ideals is dual to that of passage to the quotient: if we mod out by a prime $\mathfrak{p}$, we get a ring $R/\mathfrak{p}$ whose ideals are precisely the ideals of R containing $\mathfrak{p}$. However, if we localize at $R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, we get a ring whose ideals are precisely the ideals of R contained in $\mathfrak{p}$. In particular, this construction motivates us to develop an especially detailed theory of local rings, by assuring us that such a theory could be put to good use in the general case.

EXERCISE 7.10. *True or false: If $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring and $S \subset R^{\bullet}$ is a multiplicatively closed set, then $S^{-1}R$ is a local ring (or the zero ring).*

6. Localization of modules

If S is any multiplicative subset and M is any R-module, we can also construct a localized R-module $S^{-1}M$. One the one hand, we can construct this exactly as we did $S^{-1}R$, by considering the appropriate equivalence relation on pairs $(m, s) \in M \times S$. On the other hand, we can just take the base extension $S^{-1}R \otimes M$. We are left with the task of showing that these two constructions are "the same".

---

[2]This is inevitably a bit confusing at first, but our choice of notation for a loacalization is designed to make this less confusing. The other common notation for the localization, R_S, creates a notational nightmare. As a mnemonic, remember that we gain nothing by localizing at a subset S containing 0, since the corresponding localization is the trivial ring.

EXERCISE 7.11. *Formulate a universal mapping property for the localization morphism $M \to S^{-1}M$. Check that both of the above constructions satisfy this universal mapping property, and deduce that they are canonically isomorphic.*

EXERCISE 7.12.

a) *Show: the kernel of $M \to S^{-1}M$ is the set of $m \in M$ such that $\operatorname{ann}(m) \cap S \neq \emptyset$.*

b) *Let R be a domain with fraction field K. Let M be an R-module. Show:*

$$\operatorname{Ker}(M \to M \otimes K) = M[\text{tors}].$$

c) *Use part b) to give a new proof of Proposition 3.8b).*

EXERCISE 7.13. *Let N be any $S^{-1}R$-module. Show that there exists an R-module M such that $N \cong S^{-1}R \otimes_R M$.*

Generally speaking, thinking of $S^{-1}M$ as $S^{-1}R \otimes_R M$ is more convenient for proving results, because it allows us to employ the theory of tensor products of modules. For example:

PROPOSITION 7.10. *For any ring R and multiplicatively closed subset S of R, $S^{-1}R$ is a flat R-module. Equivalently, if*

$$0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$$

is a short exact sequence of R-modules, then

$$0 \to S^{-1}M' \to S^{-1}M \to S^{-1}M'' \to 0$$

is a short exact sequence of R-modules (or equivalently, of $S^{-1}R$-modules).

PROOF. Tensor products are always right exact, so we need only show $S^{-1}M' \hookrightarrow S^{-1}M$. Suppose not: then there exists $m' \in M'$ and $s \in S$ such that $\frac{m'}{s} = 0 \in M$. Thus there is $g \in S$ such that $gm' = 0$, but if so, then $\frac{m'}{s} = 0$ in M'.[3] □

COROLLARY 7.11. *Let N and P be submodules of an R-module M. Then:*
a) $S^{-1}(N + P) = S^{-1}N + S^{-1}P$.
b) $S^{-1}(N \cap P) = S^{-1}N \cap S^{-1}P$.
c) $S^{-1}(M/N) \cong_{S^{-1}R} S^{-1}M/S^{-1}N$.

EXERCISE 7.14. *Prove Corollary 7.11.*

PROPOSITION 7.12. *Let M and N be R-modules and S a multiplicatively closed subset of R. Then the mapping*

$$\frac{m}{s} \otimes \frac{n}{t} \mapsto \frac{m \otimes n}{st}$$

induces an isomorphism of $S^{-1}(R)$-modules

$$S^{-1}M \otimes_{S^{-1}R} S^{-1}N \xrightarrow{\sim} S^{-1}(M \otimes_R N).$$

In particular, for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, we have

$$M_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} N_{\mathfrak{p}} \xrightarrow{\sim} (M \otimes_R N)_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

---

[3] Note also that the exactness of a sequence of R-modules does not depend on the R-module structure but only on the underlying commutative group structure. Thus if we have a sequence of commutative groups which can be viewed as a sequence of R-modules and also as a sequence of R'-modules, then exactness as R-modules is equivalent to exactness as R'-modules.

EXERCISE 7.15. *Prove Proposition 7.12.*

EXERCISE 7.16. *Let R be a ring, $S \subset R$ multiplicative, and M an R-module.*
a) *If M is finitely generated, then $S^{-1}M$ is a finitely generated $S^{-1}R$-module.*
b) *If M is finitely presented, then $S^{-1}M$ is a finitely presented $S^{-1}R$-module.*[4]

Recall that if M_1 and M_2 are R-submodules of an R-module M, then

$$(M_1 : M_2) = \{x \in R \mid xM_2 \subset M_1\}$$

and thus

$$(M_1 : M_2) = \operatorname{ann}((M_1 + M_2)/M_1).$$

PROPOSITION 7.13. *Let $S \subset R$ be a multiplicatively closed subset.*
a) *Let M be a finitely generated R-module. Then*

$$S^{-1} \operatorname{ann} M = \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}M.$$

b) *If M_1, M_2 are submodules of an R-module M and M_2 is finitely generated, then*

$$S^{-1}(M_1 : M_2) = (S^{-1}M_1 : S^{-1}M_2).$$

PROOF. a) We go by induction on the number n of generators of M.
Base Case: If $n = 1$ then $M \cong R/I$ for some ideal I, so

$$S^{-1} \operatorname{ann} M = S^{-1}I = \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}R/S^{-1}I = \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}M.$$

Induction Step: Suppose $n \geq 2$ and that the result holds for all modules that can be generated by n elements. Write $M = M_1 + M_2$ with M_1 generated by n elements and M_2 generated by 1 element. Then

$$S^{-1} \operatorname{ann} M = S^{-1} \operatorname{ann}(M_1 + M_2) = S^{-1}(\operatorname{ann} M_1 \cap \operatorname{ann} M_2) = S^{-1} \operatorname{ann} M_1 \cap S^{-1} \operatorname{ann} M_2$$

$$= \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}M_1 \cap \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}M_2 = \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}M_1 + S^{-1}M_2 = \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}M.$$

b) Put $M := (M_1 + M_2)/M_1$. Then M is a quotient of M_2 hence finitely generated, so by part a) we have

$$S^{-1}(M_1 : M_2) = S^{-1} \operatorname{ann}(M_1 + M_2)/M_1 = \operatorname{ann} S^{-1}(M_1 + M_2)/M_1$$

$$= \operatorname{ann}(S^{-1}(M_1 + M_2)/S^{-1}M_1) = (S^{-1}M_1 : S^{-1}M_2). \qquad \square$$

7. Local properties

We say that a property P of a ring R is **localizable** if whenever R satisfies property P, so does $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R. We say that a property P is **local-to-global** if whenever $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ has property P for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, then R has that property. Finally, we say a property is **local** if it is both localizable and local-to-global. There are similar definitions for properties of R-modules.

EXERCISE 7.17.
a) *Show the following properties of rings are localizable: being a field, having characteristic 0, having prime characteristic p, being a domain, being reduced.*
b) *Show that the following properties of modules are localizable: freeness, projectivity, flatness, cyclicity, finite generation, finite presentation.*

---

[4]Actually both parts hold for any base change $R \to R'$! We record it in this form since it will be used later.

EXERCISE 7.18. *Insert your own exercise here.*

For a property P of rings, we say that a ring R is **locally P** if for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $R_\mathfrak{p}$ has the property P. Similarly, if Q is a property of modules, we say that an R-module M is **locally P** if for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $M_\mathfrak{p}$ has property Q.

Warning: It would also be reasonable to define "locally P" to mean that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, there is $f \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that R_f (or M_f) has property P. In the case of rings, as we shall see later this latter definition means that $\operatorname{Spec} R$ has property P locally with respect to the Zariski topology. We will consider this property as well, but we call it **Z-locally P** instead.

EXERCISE 7.19. *Let P be a property of rings (or modules). Show: "locally P" is a local property.*

One of the most important themes in commutative algebra is the recognition of the importance of local properties for rings and modules.

Remark: Very often it is true that if P is a local property, then R has property P iff $R_\mathfrak{m}$ has property P for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R. We will not introduce terminology for this, but watch for it in the upcoming results.

First of all, for an R-module, **being zero** is a local property.

PROPOSITION 7.14. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $M = 0$.
(ii) $M_\mathfrak{p} = 0$ for all primes $\mathfrak{p}$ of R.
(iii) $M_\mathfrak{m} = 0$ for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R.

PROOF. Clearly (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii), so asume that $M_\mathfrak{m} = 0$ for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R. Suppose there exists $0 \neq x \in M$, and let I be the annihilator of x, so that I is a proper ideal of R and thus contained in some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Then x is not killed by any element of the multiplicative subset $R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ and therefore maps to a nonzero element of $M_\mathfrak{m}$: contradiction. $\square$

PROPOSITION 7.15. *Let $f : M \to N$ be an R-module homomorphism.*
a) The following are equivalent:
(i) f is injective.
(ii) For all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, $f_\mathfrak{p} : M_\mathfrak{p} \to N_\mathfrak{p}$ is injective.
(iii) For all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, $f_\mathfrak{m} : M_\mathfrak{m} \to N_\mathfrak{m}$ is injective.
b) Part a) holds with "injective" replaced everywhere by "surjective", and thus also if "injective" is replaced everywhere by "is an isomorphism."

PROOF. a) (i) $\implies$ (ii) by the exactness of localization, and obviously (ii) $\implies$ (iii). Assume (iii), and let $M' = \operatorname{Ker}(f)$. Then $0 \to M' \to M \to N$ is exact, hence for all $\mathfrak{m}$ we have $0 \to M'_\mathfrak{m} \to M_\mathfrak{m} \to N_\mathfrak{m}$ is exact. So, by our assumption, $M'_\mathfrak{m} = 0$ for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$, and thus by Proposition 7.14 we have $M' = 0$. The proof of part b) is virtually identical and left to the reader. $\square$

Warning: Proposition 7.15 **does not say**: if M and N are R-modules such that $M_\mathfrak{p} \cong N_\mathfrak{p}$ as $R_\mathfrak{p}$ modules for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, then $M \cong N$. This is being asserted only when there is a map $f : M \to N$ inducing all the isomorphisms between localized modules.

EXERCISE 7.20. *Exhibit finitely generated R-modules M and N which are "locally isomorphic" – i.e., $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \cong N_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ – but are not isomorphic.*[5]

COROLLARY 7.16. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K. Then we have*

$$\bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} R_{\mathfrak{m}} = R.$$

PROOF. Certainly $R \hookrightarrow \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} R_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Conversely, if $x \in K \setminus R$ then

$$I := (R : Rx)$$

is a proper ideal, hence contained in some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Because Rx is a finitely generated R-module, by Proposition 7.13 we have

$$(R_{\mathfrak{m}} : R_{\mathfrak{m}}x) = I_{\mathfrak{m}} \subsetneq R_{\mathfrak{m}}.$$

Thus $x \notin R_{\mathfrak{m}}$. $\square$

Let R be a domain with fraction field K, and let V be a finite-dimensional K-vector space. An **R-lattice in V** is a finitely generated R-submodule Λ of V such that $\langle \Lambda \rangle_K = V$. Since K is a torsionfree R-module, every R-lattice in K is a finitely generated, torsionfree R-module. Convesrsely, if Λ is a finitely generated torsionfree R-module, let $V := \Lambda \otimes_R K$. Then by Exercise 3.45 the natural R-module map $\Lambda \hookrightarrow \Lambda \otimes_R K$ is injective and makes Λ into an R-lattice in the finite-dimensional K-vector space $\Lambda \otimes_R K$. Such lattices are ubiquitous in algebra and number theory.

Corollary 7.16 extends to a **local-global principle for lattices**.

THEOREM 7.17. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K, let V be a finite-dimensional K-vector space, and let Λ be a finitely generated R-submodule of K. Then, inside V we have*

$$\bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}} = \Lambda.$$

PROOF. Put $L := \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Clearly $\Lambda \hookrightarrow L$. Seeking a contradiction, suppose there is $x \in L \setminus \Lambda$, and put $\tilde{\Lambda} = \langle \Lambda, x \rangle$. Then

$$I := (\Lambda : \tilde{\Lambda})$$

is a proper ideal of R, hence contained in a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Since Λ is finitely generated, so is $\tilde{\Lambda}$, so by Proposition 7.13 we have

$$(\Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}} : \tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}}) = I_{\mathfrak{m}} \subsetneq R_{\mathfrak{m}}.$$

It follows that $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{m}} = \langle \Lambda, x \rangle_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}} \supsetneq \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ so $x \notin \Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$, hence $x \notin L$: contradiction. $\square$

We give an application in the theory of stably free modules.

PROPOSITION 7.18. *A stably free module of rank one is free.*

PROOF. The natural proof uses exterior products of modules, which we have unfortunately not defined in these notes. For the basics here see BOURBAKI or [**Ei**, Appendix A2]. Especially, all the properties of exterior powers that we use appear in [**Ei**, Prop. A2.2].

---

[5]In mantra form: "being isomorphic" is not a local property, but "being an isomorphism" is.

Now suppose P is such that $P \oplus R^{n-1} \cong R^n$. Taking top exterior powers we get

$$R \cong \bigwedge^n R^n \cong \bigwedge^n (P \oplus R^{n-1}) \cong \bigoplus_{i+j=n} \bigwedge^i P \otimes \bigwedge^j R^{n-1}$$

$$\cong M \oplus \left(\bigwedge^2 M \otimes \bigwedge^{n-2} R^{n-1} \right) \oplus \dots .$$

For any $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $M_\mathfrak{p}$ is free of rank one over $R_\mathfrak{p}$. Thus $\bigwedge^i M_\mathfrak{p} = (\bigwedge^i M)_\mathfrak{p} = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$. By Proposition 7.14, $\bigwedge^i M = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$, so $R \cong M$. $\square$

One of the most important local properties of an R-module M is the condition of being **locally free**: for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} M$, $M_\mathfrak{p}$ is free. We had better repeat the previous warning in this special case: some people say that M is locally free iff for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ there is $f \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that M_f is free. This is in general a stronger property, which we call **Z-locally free**.

In light of the fact the being projective is a localizable property, Theorem 3.76 can be rephrased as follows.

THEOREM 7.19. *(Kaplansky) A projective module is locally free.*

From our study of vector bundles it is natural to wonder about the converse: must a finitely generated locally free module be projective? In complete generality the answer is negative (we will meet counterexamples later on), but morally it is right: cf. Theorem 7.30.

7.1. Rank Functions.

Let M be a finitely generated module. There is an associated **rank function** $\operatorname{rank}_M : \operatorname{Spec} R \to \mathbb{N}$, given by

$$\operatorname{rank}_M(\mathfrak{p}) = \dim_{k(\mathfrak{p})} M \otimes k(\mathfrak{p}).$$

Here $k(\mathfrak{p})$ is the fraction field of the domain $R/\mathfrak{p}$, and since M is a finitely generated R-module, $M \otimes k(\mathfrak{p})$ is a finite-dimensional $k(\mathfrak{p})$-vector space.

EXERCISE 7.21. *a) Show: for finitely generated R-modules M and N, we have*

$$\operatorname{rank}_{M \oplus N} = \operatorname{rank}_M + \operatorname{rank}_N$$

and

$$\operatorname{rank}_{M \otimes_R N} = \operatorname{rank}_M \cdot \operatorname{rank}_N .$$

b) Compute the rank function on the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.
c) Compute the rank function on any finitely generated module over a PID.

EXERCISE 7.22. *Let M be a finitely generated R-module.*
a) Show: if M is locally free, then for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $M_\mathfrak{p} \cong R_\mathfrak{p}^{\operatorname{rank}_M(\mathfrak{p})}$.
b) Suppose M is stably free of rank n: i.e., there are $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M \oplus R^m \cong R^{m+n}$. Show: for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, we have $\operatorname{rank}_M(\mathfrak{p}) = n$.

We will mostly be interested in the rank function on a finitely generated projective module. As in §6, we view a finitely generated projective module as being analogous to a vector bundle, and then the rank at $\mathfrak{p}$ plays the role of the dimension of the fiber at $\mathfrak{p}$. In the case of a vector bundle on a topological space X, the rank function is locally constant, hence constant if X is connected. Once we study the Zariski topology on $\operatorname{Spec} R$ in earnest, we can and will prove the analogous statement: the rank function on a finitely generated projective module M is locally constant. Its failure to be constant is somehow the coarsest possible obstruction to M being free: if the rank function is not constant, then M cannot even be stably free: equivalently, its class in the reduced K-group $\widetilde{K_0(R)}$ is nontrivial.

Here is a (not so deep) criterion for a projective module to be free.

PROPOSITION 7.20. *Let M be a projective R-module of constant rank n. Then M is free iff M can be generated by n elements.*

PROOF. If M is free then $M \cong R^n$. Conversely, that M can be generated by n elements means there is a surjective R-module map $\varphi : R^n \to M$. Let $K = \ker \varphi$; since M is projective, we have

$$R^n \cong K \oplus M.$$

Thus K is also finitely generated projective, so for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ we have

$$R_{\mathfrak{p}}^n \cong K_{\mathfrak{p}} \oplus M_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

with $K_{\mathfrak{p}} \cong R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{r(\mathfrak{p})}$ and $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \cong R_{\mathfrak{p}}^n$. It follows (by tensoring to $k(\mathfrak{p})$) that $K_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$. Being zero is a local property, so $K = 0$ and $\varphi : R^n \to M$ is an isomorphism. $\square$

We can now give a situation in which our coarsest possible obstruction to freeness is the only one.

LEMMA 7.21. *Let M be a finitely generated projective R-module, and let I be an ideal contained in the Jacobson radical. If M/IM is free, then so is M.*

PROOF. If $M/IM \cong (R/I)^n$, then by Nakayama's Lemma n is the least number of generators of M. Moreover, for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, since the map $M \to M/\mathfrak{m}M$ factors through M/IM we have $\operatorname{rank}_M(\mathfrak{m}) = n$. Now observe that if $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_2 \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, then

$$R_{\mathfrak{p}_1}^{\operatorname{rk}_M(\mathfrak{p}_1)} \cong M_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \cong M_{\mathfrak{p}_2} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}_2}} R_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \cong R_{\mathfrak{p}_2}^{\operatorname{rk}_M(\mathfrak{p}_2)} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}_2}} R_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \cong R_{\mathfrak{p}_1}^{\operatorname{rk}_M(\mathfrak{p}_2)},$$

so $\operatorname{rk}_M(\mathfrak{p}_1) = \operatorname{rk}_M(\mathfrak{p}_2)$. It follows that M has constant rank n and can be generated by n elements, so by Proposition 7.20 we have that M is free. $\square$

EXERCISE 7.23. *Let $I \subset J(R)$ be an ideal of R. Let P_1, P_2 be two finitely generated projective R-modules. Show: if $P_1/IP_1 \cong_{R/I} P_2/IP_2$ then $P_1 \cong P_2$. (Hint: use the projectivity of P_1 to factor the map $P_1 \to P_1/IP_1 \overset{\sim}{\to} P_2/IP_2$ through P_2.)*

COROLLARY 7.22. *Let R be a semilocal ring ($\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is finite). Let M be a finitely generated projective R-module. Then M is free iff it has constant rank.*

PROOF. We know that free modules have constant rank. Conversely, suppose M is projective of constant rank n, and let $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_N$ be the distinct maximal

ideals of R, so $J(R) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_i = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_i$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem for modules we have

$$M/J(R) \cong \prod_{i=1}^{N} M/\mathfrak{m}_i M.$$

Since M has constant rank n, we have $\dim_{R/\mathfrak{m}_i} M\mathfrak{m}_i M = n$ for all i, so $M/J(R)M$ is a free $R/J(R)$-module of rank n. Apply Lemma 7.21. $\qquad\square$

The topological analogue of Corollary 7.22 is, roughly, that a vector bundle on a discrete space is trivial iff it has constant rank. (However that is a triviality whereas Corollary 7.22 is actually rather useful.)

7.2. Local nature of flatness.

PROPOSITION 7.23. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is flat.
(ii) For all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is flat.
(iii) For all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is flat.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is a special case of Proposition 7.10; (ii) $\implies$ (iii) is immediate. So assume (iii), and let $N \hookrightarrow P$ be any injective R-module homomorphism. Then, by exactness of localization, for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ we have $N_{\mathfrak{m}} \hookrightarrow P_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Since $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is assumed to be flat, we have $(N \otimes_R M)_{\mathfrak{m}} = N_{\mathfrak{m}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}} M_{\mathfrak{m}} \hookrightarrow P_{\mathfrak{m}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}} M_{\mathfrak{m}} = (P \otimes_R M)_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Applying Proposition 7.15 we conclude that $N \otimes_R M \to P \otimes_R P$ is injective, and therefore M is flat over R. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 7.24. *Let R be a ring, $S \subset R$ a multiplicative subset. If M is a flat R-module, then $S^{-1}M$ is a flat $S^{-1}R$-module.*

PROOF. If M is flat, so is $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of M, but since the primes of $S^{-1}R$ are a subset of the primes of R, this implies that $S^{-1}M$ is flat. $\qquad\square$

When a property P of rings or modules is *not* local, it is often of interest to study also its "localized version": we say that an R-module M is **locally P** if for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ has property $\mathfrak{p}$ (and similarly for rings).

7.3. Absolute flatness revisited.

LEMMA 7.25. *Suppose an absolutely flat ring R is either local or a domain. Then R is a field.*

PROOF. Suppose R is not a field, and let $x \in R$ be a nonzero, nonunit. Then $(0) \subsetneq (x) \subsetneq R$. Proposition 3.103 gives $R \cong (x) \oplus J$: contradiction. $\qquad\square$

LEMMA 7.26. *Let R be a ring.*
a) If R is absolutely flat and $S \subset R$ is any multiplicative subset, then $S^{-1}R$ is absolutely flat.
b) R is absolutely flat iff for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a field.

PROOF. a) By Exercise 7.13 every $S^{-1}R$-module is of the form $S^{-1}R \otimes_R M$ for some R-module M. By hypothesis M is flat, so by Corollary 7.24, so is $S^{-1}M$. b) If R is absolutely flat, and $\mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal of R, then by part a) $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is absolutely flat. On the other hand it is a local ring, so by Lemma 7.25, $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a field. Conversely, assume that each $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a field, and let M be an R-module. Then for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a flat $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$-module, so M is a flat R-module. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 7.27. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $R/\operatorname{nil} R$ is absolutely flat, i.e., every $R/\operatorname{nil} R$-module is flat.
(ii) Every prime ideal of R is maximal.

PROOF. Since the prime ideals of R are the same as those of $R/\operatorname{nil} R$, it is equivalent to prove the following simpler assertion: if R is reduced, it is absolutely flat if and only if every prime ideal of R is maximal. Suppose R is absolutely flat and $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$. Then $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is an absolutely flat domain, hence a field by Lemma 7.25, hence $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal of R. Then $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a reduced local ring, hence a field. By Lemma 7.26, R is absolutely flat. $\square$

8. Local characterization of finitely generated projective modules

Let us call a family of $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ of elements of R a **Z-family** if $\langle f_i \rangle = 1$. Clearly for every Z-family there is a finite subset $J \subset I$ such that $\{f_i\}_{i \in J}$ is also a Z-family. (Later on, this trivial observation will be dressed up in rather fancy attire: this gives the quasi-compactness of the Zariski topology on $\operatorname{Spec} R$.)

A property P of rings or modules will be said to be **Z-local** if it holds over R iff it holds over all R_{f_i} for some Z-family $\{f_i\}$ of R.

PROPOSITION 7.28.
Let $u : M \to N$ be a homomorphism of R-modules, and let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$.
a) If N is finitely generated and $u_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is surjective, there exists $f \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $u_f : M_f \to N_f$ is surjective.
b) The surjectivity of u is a Z-local property.
c) If M is finitely generated, N is finitely presented and $u_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism, then there exists $f \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $u_f : M_f \to N_f$ is an isomorphism.
d) If M is finitely generated and N is finitely presented, then the bijectivity of u is a Z-local property.

PROOF. Write out the exact sequence

$$0 \to \ker u \to M \xrightarrow{u} N \to \operatorname{coker} u \to 0.$$

By the flatness of localization, this sequence remains exact upon being tensored with R_f for any $f \in R$ or with $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for any $\mathfrak{p} \in R$. It follows that passage to the kernel and cokernel commutes with localization.
a) We're assuming $0 = \operatorname{coker}(u_{\mathfrak{p}}) = (\operatorname{coker} u)_{\mathfrak{p}}$, i.e., for each $x \in \operatorname{coker} u$ there exists $f_x \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $f_x x = 0$. Since $\operatorname{coker} u$ is a quotient of the finitely generated module N, it is finitely generated, say by $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Then $f = f_{x_1} \cdots f_{x_n} \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ is such that $f \operatorname{coker} u = 0$, so $0 = (\operatorname{coker} u)_f = \operatorname{coker}(u_f)$ and u_f is surjective.
b) It is clear that if u is surjective, then for any $f \in R$, u_f is surjective. Conversely, let $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a Z-family such that u_{f_i} is surjective for all i. Then for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ there exists $i \in I$ such that $f_i \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, so that $u_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a further localization of u_{f_i} and thus the surjectivity of u_{f_i} implies that of $u_{\mathfrak{p}}$. By Proposition 7.15, u is surjective.
c) By part a), there exists $f_1 \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $\operatorname{coker} u_{f_1} = 0$, and thus we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to (\ker u)_{f_1} \to M_{f_1} \to N_{f_1} \to 0.$$

Since N is finitely presented over R, N_{f_1} is finitely presented over R_{f_1} and thus $(\ker u)_{f_1}$ is finitely generated. Arguing as in part b), we get $f_2 \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that

$f_1 f_2 \ker u = 0$. Taking $f = f_1 f_2$ we get $u_f : M_f \xrightarrow{\sim} N_f$.

d) This is proved analogously to part b) and is left to the reader. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 7.29. *For a finitely presented R-module M, the following are equivalent:*

(i) There is a Z-family $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ of R such that for all $i \in I$, M_{f_i} is a free R_{f_i}-module.

(ii) M is locally free: for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a free $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$-module.

(ii$'$) For every $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a free $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$-module.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): For each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ there exists at least one i such that $f_i \notin \mathfrak{p}$; equivalently, the multiplicative subset generated by f_i is contained in $R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. Thus $M_{\mathfrak{p}} = M_{f_i} \otimes_{R_{f_i}} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and since M_{f_i} is free, so is $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

(ii) $\implies$ (i): It is enough to find for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ an element $f_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $M_{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is free: for if so, then $\{f_{\mathfrak{p}}\}_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R}$ is a Z-family. Choose $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in M$ whose images in $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ give an $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$-basis, and define $u : R^n \to M$ via $e_i \mapsto x_i$. Then $u_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism, so by Proposition 7.28c) we may choose $f_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $u_{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is an isomorphism and thus $M_{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is free.

(ii) $\iff$ (ii$'$): Since freeness is localizable, this follows from Exercise 7.18. $\qquad\square$

REMARK 7. *(M. Brandenburg) The proof of (ii) $\implies$ (i) shows something a bit stronger: if M is a finitely presented module over a ring R and for some $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ we have that $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is free, then there is $f_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R$ such that $M_{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is free.*

EXERCISE 7.24. *For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let M_i be a finitely generated proejctive R_i-module. Show: $\prod_{i=1}^{n} M_i$ is a finitely generated projective $\prod_{i=1}^{n} R_i$-module.*

We can now prove one of the major results of this text.

THEOREM 7.30. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*

(i) M is finitely generated and projective.

(ii) M is finitely presented *and locally free.*

(iii) For every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, there exists $f \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ such that M_f is a locally free R_f-module of finite rank.

(iv) There exists a finite Z-family $\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\}$ of R such that $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle = R$ and for all i, M_{f_i} is a finitely generated free R_{f_i}-module.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let M be finitely generated and projective. There exists a finitely generated free module F and a surjection $q : F \to M$. Since M is projective, q splits and $\operatorname{Ker}(q)$ is not just a submodule of F but also a quotient and thus finitely generated. So M is finitely presented. Since projectivity is preserved by base change and any finitely generated projective module over a local ring is free (Theorem 3.16), for all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is free.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii): this follows immediately from Corollary 7.29.

(iii) $\implies$ (iv): For each $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, choose $f_{\mathfrak{m}} \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ such that $M_{f_{\mathfrak{m}}}$ is a finitely generated free $R_{f_{\mathfrak{m}}}$-module. Then $\{f_{\mathfrak{m}}\}_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R}$ is a Z-family of R, and as remarked above, every Z-family contains a finite subfamily.

(iv) $\implies$ (i): Put $S = \prod_{i=1}^{n} R_{f_i}$ and let $f : R \to S$ be the natural map.

Step 1: First note that

$$\ker f = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \ker(R \to R_{f_i}) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{ann}(f_i) = f \operatorname{ann}\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle = \operatorname{ann} R = 0,$$

so f is injective, and thus S is an extension ring of R.

Step 2: We CLAIM $f : R \hookrightarrow S$ is a faithfully flat extension. Since localizations are flat and direct sums of flat algebras are flat, S/R is a flat extension. So by Theorem 3.111, it is enough to show that $f^* : \operatorname{Spec} S \to \operatorname{Spec} R$ is surjective. But $\operatorname{Spec} S = \coprod_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Spec} R_{f_i}$ and $f^*(\operatorname{Spec} R_{f_i})$ is the subset of $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ such that $f_i \notin \mathfrak{p}$. Since $\{f_1, \ldots, f_n\}$ forms a Z-family, no proper ideal can contain all the f_i's, and therefore $\mathfrak{p}$ lies in at least one $f^*(\operatorname{Spec} R_{f_i})$.

Step 3: We have a faithfully flat ring extension $f : R \hookrightarrow S$ and an R-module M such that $M \otimes_R S = \prod_{i=1}^{n} M_{f_i}$ is a finitely generated projective $S = \prod_{i=1}^{n} R_{f_i}$-module (Exercise 7.24). By Theorem 3.114, M is finitely generated and projective!   □

COROLLARY 7.31. *Every finitely presented flat R-module is projective.*

PROOF. Let M be a finitely presented, flat R-module. For each maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a finitely presented flat module over the local ring $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$, hence is free by Theorem 3.54. Therefore by criterion (iii) of Theorem 7.30, M is projective.   □

COROLLARY 7.32. *Let R be a Noetherian ring, and let M be a finitely generated R-module. The following are equivalent:*
(i) M is projective.
(ii) M is locally free.
(iii) M is flat.

EXERCISE 7.25. *Prove Corollary 7.32.*

THEOREM 7.33. *For an R-module A, the following are equivalent:*
(i) A is finitely generated projective.
(ii) For all R-modules B, the natural map

$$\Phi : A^\vee \otimes_R B \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(A, B)$$

induced by $(f, b) \mapsto (a \mapsto f(a)b)$ is an isomorphism.
(iii) The map $\Phi : A^\vee \otimes_R A \to \operatorname{Hom}_R(A, A)$ is an isomorphism.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): It is enough to show that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $\Phi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism. Since A is finitely generated projective, it is finitely presented; moreover $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a flat R-module, so by Theorem 3.106 we have a canonical isomorphism $\operatorname{Hom}_R(A, N) \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}} = \operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, N_{\mathfrak{p}})$. Also tensor products commute with base change, so it is enough to show

$$\Phi_{\mathfrak{p}} : A_{\mathfrak{p}}^\vee \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} B_{\mathfrak{p}} \to \operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, B_{\mathfrak{p}})$$

is an isomorphism. Since A is finitely generated projective, $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is finitely generated and free. We are thus essentially reduced to a familiar fact from linear algebra, namely the canonical isomorphism $V^\vee \otimes W \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Hom}(V, W)$ for vector spaces over a field, with V finite-dimensional. We leave the details to the reader as an exercise.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii): This is immediate.

(iii) $\implies$ (i): Let $\Phi^{-1}(1_A) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} f_i \otimes a_i$. Then we have that for all $a \in A$, $a = \sum_{i=1}^{m} f_i(a) a_i$. By the Dual Basis Lemma, A is finitely generated projective.   □

We end by showing that without the Noetherian hypothesis, a finitely generated locally free module need not be projective.

PROPOSITION 7.34. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is absolutely flat.
(ii) Every R-module is locally free.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): By Lemma 7.26, for $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$, $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a field, so every $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$-module is free. By Theorem 7.27 every prime ideal of R is maximal, so every R-module is locally free.

(ii) $\implies$ (i): Applying Lemma 7.26 again, if R is *not* absolutely flat, there is $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$ such that $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is not a field, and thus there exists a nonfree $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$-module $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$. By Exercise 7.13 there is an R-module M such that $M \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and thus M is not locally free. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 7.26. *(G. Elencwajg)*

a) *Let I be an ideal of the ring R. Show: if R/I is projective, then I is principal.*

b) *Let R be a ring that is absolutely flat and not Noetherian (e.g. an infinite product of fields). Let I be an ideal which is not finitely generated. Show: R/I is finitely generated, flat,* not *projective, locally free and* not *Z-locally free.*

CHAPTER 8

Noetherian rings

We have already encountered the notion of a Noetherian ring, i.e., a ring in which each ideal is finitely generated; or equivalently, a ring which satisfies the ascending chain condition (ACC) on ideals. Our results so far have given little clue as to the importance of this notion. But in fact, as Emmy Noether showed, consideration of rings satisfying (ACC) is a major unifying force in commutative algebra.

In this section we begin to see why this is the case. After giving an introductory examination of chain conditions on rings and modules, we are able to make the key definitions of *height* of a prime ideal and *dimension* of a ring, which we will slowly but surely work towards understanding throughout the rest of these notes. Indeed we begin by giving a reasonably complete analysis of the structure theory of Artinian rings, which, as we will show, really is our first order of business in attempting the systematic study of Noetherian rings, since according to the Akizuki-Hopkins theorem the Artinian rings are precisely the Noetherian rings of dimension zero. We are then able to state and prove three of the most important and useful theorems in the entire subject. Whereas the first theorem, the Hilbert basis theorem, gives us a large supply of Noetherian rings, the latter two theorems, Krull's intersection theorem and Krull's principal ideal theorem, are basic results about the structure theory of Noetherian rings.

1. Chain conditions on partially ordered sets

PROPOSITION 8.1.
For a partially ordered set $(S, \leq)$, the following are equivalent:
*(i) S satisfies the **Ascending Chain Condition** (ACC): there is no infinite sequence $\{x_i\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of elements of S with $x_n < x_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.*
(ii) Every nonempty subset $T \subset S$ has a maximal element.
*A partially ordered set satisfying these equivalent conditions is called **Noetherian**.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let T be a nonempty subset of S without a maximal element. Since T is nonempty, choose $x_1 \in T$. Since T has no maximal elements, choose $x_2 > x_1$. Since T has no maximal elements, choose $x_3 > x_2$. And so on: we get an infinite strictly ascending chain in S.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Indeed, an infinite strictly ascending chain is a nonempty subset without a maximal element. $\qquad\square$

Similarly, we say that a partially ordered set satisfies the **Descending Chain Condition** (DCC) –if there is no infinite sequence $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of elements of S such that $y_j > y_{j+1}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. As above, this holds iff every nonempty subset of S has a minimal element, and a partially ordered set satisfying these equivalent conditions is called **Artinian**.

Every partially ordered set $(S, \leq)$ has an **order dual** $S^\vee$: the underlying set is S, and we put $x \leq_\vee y \iff y \leq x$. Clearly S is Noetherian (resp. Artinian) iff $S^\vee$ is Artinian (resp. Noetherian). Thus at this level of abstraction we really have one notion here, not two. Nevertheless in our applications to rings and modules the two conditions remain quite distinct.

Examples: If S is finite it satisfies both ACC and DCC. With the usual orderings, the positive integers $\mathbb{Z}^+$ satisfy DCC but not ACC, the negative integers $\mathbb{Z}^-$ (or equivalently, $\mathbb{Z}^+$ with the opposite ordering) satisfy ACC but not DCC, and the integers $\mathbb{Z}$ satisfy neither.

EXERCISE 8.1. *Let S be a partially ordered set.*
a) Show that S satisfies (ACC) (resp. (DCC)) iff there is no order embedding $\mathbb{Z}^+ \hookrightarrow S$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}^- \hookrightarrow S$).
b) Suppose S is totally ordered. Show that S satisfies (DCC) iff it is well-ordered: i.e., every nonempty subset has a minimal element.

2. Chain conditions on modules

Let R be a ring, and M a (left) R-module. It makes sense to speak of the (ACC) and (DCC) for R-submodules of M. Indeed, we will call M a **Noetherian module** if it satisfies (ACC) and an **Artinian module** if it satisfies (DCC).

EXERCISE 8.2. *Show: an R-module M is Noetherian iff every R-submodule M' of M is finitely generated.*

EXAMPLE 8.2. *As a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, the integers $\mathbb{Z}$ are Noetherian but not Artinian.*

EXAMPLE 8.3. *As a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, the group of all p-power roots of unity in the complex numbers – in other words, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_{p^n}$ – is Artinian but not Noetherian.*

Every ring R is naturally an R-module, and the R-submodules of R are precisely the ideals. Thus it makes sense to say whether R is a Noetherian or Artinian R-module, and – thank goodness – this is visibly consistent with the previous terminology.

EXERCISE 8.3. *Let $M' \subset M$ be R-modules, and $\varphi : M \to M/M'$ be the quotient map. If N_1 and N_2 are submodules of M such that $N_1 \subset N_2$, $N_1 \cap M' = N_2 \cap M'$ and $\varphi(N_1) = \varphi(N_2)$, show that $N_1 = N_2$.*

THEOREM 8.4. *Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be a short exact sequence of R-modules. Then M is Noetherian (resp. Artinian) iff both M' and M'' are Noetherian (resp. Artinian).*

PROOF. We do the Noetherian case, leaving the similar Artinian case as an exercise for the reader. First, since an infinite ascending chain in a submodule or quotient module of M gives rise to an infinite ascending chain in M, if M is Noetherian, both M' and M'' are. Conversely, suppose $N_1 \subsetneq N_2 \subsetneq \ldots$ is an infinite ascending chain of submodules of M. Consider the chain $(N_i + M')/M'$ in $M'' = M/M'$. By hypothesis, this chain eventually stabilizes, i.e., for sufficiently large i and j, $N_i + M' = N_j + M'$. Similarly, by intersecting with M' we get that for sufficiently large i and j $N_i \cap M' = N_j \cap M'$. Applying Exercise 8.3 we conclude $N_i = N_j$ for all sufficiently large i, j.   □

A ring R is **Noetherian** if R is a Noetherian R-module. A ring R is **Artinian** if R is an Artinian R-module.

EXERCISE 8.4. *Let R be a ring.*
a) Show that R is Noetherian iff every finitely generated R-module is Noetherian.
b) Show that R is Artinian iff every finitely generated R-module is Artinian.
c) Exhibit a ring R which is Noetherian but not Artinian.
d) Can you find a ring R which is Artinian but not Noetherian?[1]

3. Semisimple modules and rings

In this section we allow *not necessarily commutative rings R*. By a "module over R" we mean a *left R-module* unless otherwise indicated.

A module M is **simple** if it is nonzero and has no proper, nonzero submodules.

This definition is of course made in analogy to that of a *simple group*, namely a nontrivial group possessing no nontrivial proper normal subgroups. And indeed many of the results in this and subsequent sections were first proved in the context of groups. It is even possible to work in a single context that simultaneously generalizes the case of groups and modules (over a not necessarily commutative ring), the key concept being that of **groups with operators**. For more on this perspective we invite the reader to consult any sufficiently thick all-purpose graduate level algebra text, the gold standard here being [**J1**], [**J2**].

EXERCISE 8.5. *(**Schur's Lemma**): Let M be a simple R-module. Show: $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ is a division ring.*

THEOREM 8.5. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is a direct sum of simple submodules.
(ii) Every submodule of M is a direct summand.
(iii) M is a sum of simple submodules.
*A modules satisfying these equivalent conditions is called **semisimple**.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Suppose $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} S_i$, with each S_i a simple submodule. For each $J \subset I$, put $M_J = \bigoplus_{i \in J} S_i$. Now let N be an R-submodule of M. An easy Zorn's Lemma argument gives us a maximal subset $J \subset I$ such that $N \cap M_J = 0$. For $i \notin J$ we have $(M_J \oplus S_i) \cap N \neq 0$, so choose $0 \neq x = y + z$, $x \in N$, $y \in M_J$, $z \in S_i$. Then $z = x - y \in (M_j + N) \cap S_i$, and if $z = 0$, then $x = y \in N \cap M_j = 0$, contradiction. So $(M_J \oplus N) \cap S_i \neq 0$. Since S_i is simple, this forces $S_i \subset M_J \oplus N$. It follows that $M = M_J \oplus N$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): First observe that the hypothesis on M necessarily passes to all submodules of M. Next we CLAIM that every nonzero submodule $C \subset M$ contains a simple module.
PROOF OF CLAIM: Choose $0 \neq c \in C$, and let D be a submodule of C which is maximal with respect to not containing c. By the observation of the previous paragraph, we may write $C = D \oplus E$. Then E is simple. Indeed, suppose not and let $0 \subsetneq F \subsetneq E$. Then $E = F \oplus G$ so $C = D \oplus F \oplus G$. If both $D \oplus F$ and $D \oplus G$ contained c, then $c \in (D \oplus F) \cap (D \oplus G) = D$, contradiction. So either $D \oplus F$ or $D \oplus G$ is a strictly larger submodule of C than D which does not contain c,

---

[1]More on this later!

contradiction. So E is simple, establishing our claim.

Now let $N \subset M$ be maximal with respect to being a direct sum of simple submodules, and write $M = N \oplus C$. If $C \neq 0$, then by the claim C contains a nonzero simple submodule, contradicting the maximality of N. Thus $C = 0$ and M is a direct sum of simple submodules.

(i) $\implies$ (iii) is immediate.

(iii) $\implies$ (i): as above, by Zorn's Lemma there exists a submodule N of M which is maximal with respect to being a direct sum of simple submodules. We must show $N = M$. If not, since M is assumed to be generated by its simple submodules, there exists a simple submodule $S \subset M$ which is not contained in N. But since S is simple, it follows that $S \cap N = 0$ and thus $N \oplus S$ is a strictly larger direct sum of simple submodules: contradiction. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 8.6. *An R-module M has a unique maximal semisimple submodule, called the **socle of M** and written $\operatorname{Soc} M$. Thus M is semisimple iff $M = \operatorname{Soc} M$.*

EXERCISE 8.6. *Prove Corollary 8.6.*

EXERCISE 8.7. *Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Compute the socle of the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$. Show in particular that $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ is semisimple iff N is squarefree.*

A not-necessarily-commutative ring R is **left semisimple** if R is semisimple as a left R-module.

THEOREM 8.7. *For a nonzero not necessarily commutative ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is left semisimple.
(ii) Every left ideal of R is a direct summand.
(iii) Every left ideal of R is an injective module.
(iv) All left R-modules are semisimple.
(v) All short exact sequences of left R-modules split.
(vi) All left R-modules are projective.
(vii) All left R-modules are injective.

PROOF. We will show (i) $\iff$ (ii), (iv) $\iff$ (v) $\iff$ (vi) $\iff$ (vii) and (ii) $\implies$ (vii) $\implies$ (iii) $\implies$ (ii), which suffices.

(i) $\implies$ (ii) follows immediately from Theorem 8.5.

(iv) $\iff$ (v) follows immediately from Theorem 8.5.

(v) $\iff$ (vi) and (v) $\iff$ (vii) are immediate from the definitions of projective and injective modules.

(ii) $\implies$ (vii): Let I be a left ideal of R and $f : I \to M$ an R-module map. By hypothesis, there exists J such that $I \oplus J = R$, so f extends to $F : R = I \oplus J \xrightarrow{\pi_1} I \to M$. By Baer's Criterion, M is injective.

(vii) $\implies$ (iii) is immediate.

(iii) $\implies$ (ii) is immediate from the definition of injective modules. $\qquad\square$

LEMMA 8.8. *Let R be a ring and $\{M_j\}_{j \in J}$ be an indexed family of nonzero R-modules. The following are equivalent:*
(i) I is finite and each M_j is finitely generated.
(ii) $M = \bigoplus_{j \in J} M_j$ is finitely generated.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is left to the reader as an easy exercise.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Each M_j is isomorphic to a quotient of M, so if M is finitely generated, so is M_j. Now let $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ be a finite generating set for M, and for each $1 \le 1 \le n$, let x_{ij} be the j-component of x_i, so $x_i = \sum_{j \in J} x_{ij}$. This sum is of course finite, and therefore the set $J' \subset J$ of indices j such that $x_{ij} \ne 0$ for some $1 \le i \le n$ is finite. It follows that $\langle X \rangle \subset \bigoplus_{j \in J'} M_j \subsetneq M$, contradiction. $\square$

LEMMA 8.9. *Let $R_1, \ldots, R_n$ be finitely many not necessarily commutative rings, and put $R = \prod_{i=1}^n R_i$. Then R is semisimple iff R_i is semisimple for all $1 \le i \le n$.*

EXERCISE 8.8. *Prove Lemma 8.9.*

We now quote the following basic result from noncommutative algebra.

THEOREM 8.10. *(Wedderburn-Artin) For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is semisimple as a left R-module (left semisimple).
(ii) R is semisimple as a right R-module (right semisimple).
(iii) There are $N, n_1, \ldots, n_N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and division rings $D_1, \ldots, D_N$ such that

$$R \cong \prod_{i=1}^N M_{n_i}(D_i).$$

Combining Theorems 8.7 and 8.10 gives us a tremendous amount of information. First of all, a ring is left semisimple iff it is right semisimple, so we may as well speak of **semisimple rings**. A ring is semisimple iff it is **absolutely projective** iff it is **absolutely injective**.

Coming back to the commutative case, the Wedderburn-Artin theorem tells us that the class of semisimple / absolutely projective / absolutely injective rings is extremely restricted.

COROLLARY 8.11. *A commutative ring is semisimple iff it is a finite product of fields.*

However it is significantly easier to give a proof of Wedderburn-Artin in the commutative case, so we will give a direct proof of Corollary 8.11

PROOF. Step -1: Officially speaking the theorem holds for the zero ring because it is an empty product of fields. In any event, we may and shall assume henceforth that our semisimple ring is nonzero.
Step 0: A field is a semisimple ring: e.g. every module over a field is free, hence projective. By Lemma 8.9, a finite direct product of fields is therefore semisimple.
Step 1: Let R be a semisimple ring, and let $R = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ be a direct sum decomposition into simple R-modules. R is a finitely generated R-module, by Lemma 8.8 I is finite, and we may identify it with $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$: $R = M_1 \oplus \ldots \oplus M_n$.
Step 2: We may uniquely write $1 = e_1 + \ldots + e_n$ with $e_i \in M_i$. Then for all $i \ne j$, $e_i e_j = 0$, and this together with the identity $1 \cdot 1 = 1$ implies that $e_i^2 = e_i$ for all i. As usual for idempotent decompositions, this expresses R as a direct product of the subrings $R_i = M_i = e_i R$. Moreover, since M_i is a simple R-module, R_i has no proper nonzero ideals, and thus it is a field, say k_i. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.9. *Exhibit an absolutely flat commutative ring that is not semisimple.*

4. Normal Series

If M is an R-module a **normal series** is a finite ascending chain of R-submodules $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq M_n = M$. We say that n is the **length** of the series. (The terminology is borrowed from group theory, in which one wants a finite ascending chain of subgroups with each normal in the next. Of course there is no notion of "normal submodule", but we keep the group-theoretic terminology.)

There is an evident partial ordering on the set of normal series of a fixed R-module M: one normal series $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^n$ is less than another normal series $\{M_j'\}_{j=0}^{n'}$ if for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, M_i is equal to M_j' for some (necessarily unique) j. Rather than saying that $\{M_i\} \leq \{M_j'\}$, it is traditional to say that the larger series $\{M_j'\}$ **refines** the smaller series $\{M_i\}$.

Given any normal series $\{M_i\}$ we may form the associated **factor sequence** $M_1/M_0 = M_1, M_2/M_1, \ldots, M_n/M_{n-1} = M/M_{n-1}$. Two normal series $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^n, \{M_j'\}_{j=0}^{n'}$ are **equivalent** if $n = n'$ and there is a permutation σ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, the factors M_i/M_{i-1} and $M_{\sigma(i)}'/M_{\sigma(i)-1}'$ are isomorphic. In other words, if we think of the factor sequence of a normal series as a **multiset** of isomorphism classes of modules, then two normal series are equivalent if the associated multisets of factors are equal.

EXERCISE 8.10. *Show: refinement descends to a partial ordering on equivalence classes of normal series of a fixed R-module M.*

The following theorem is the basic result in this area.

THEOREM 8.12. *(Schreier Refinement) For any R-module M, the partially ordered set of equivalence classes of normal series of submodules of M is* directed: *that is, any two normal series admit equivalent refinements.*

PROOF. For a proof in a context which simultaneously generalizes that of modules and groups, see e.g. [**J2**, p. 106]. $\qquad\square$

For an R-module M, a **composition series** is a maximal element in the partially ordered set of normal series: that is, a composition series which admits no proper refinement.

EXERCISE 8.11. *Show: a normal series $\{M_i\}_{i=0}^n$ for an R-module M is a composition series iff for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, the factor module M_i/M_{i-1} is simple.*

THEOREM 8.13. *(Jordan-Hölder) Let M be an R-module. Then any two composition series for M are* equivalent: *up to a permutation, their associated factor series are term-by-term isomorphic.*

PROOF. This is an immediate consequence of Schreier Refinement: any two normal series admit equivalent refinements, but no composition series admits a proper refinement, so any two composition series must already be equivalent. $\quad\square$

Thus for a module M which admits a composition series, we may define the **length** $\ell(M)$ of M to be the length of any composition series. One also speaks of the **Jordan-Hölder factors of M** or the **composition factors of M**, i.e., the unique multiset of isomorphism classes of simple R-modules which must appear as the successive quotients of any composition series for M.

If a module does not admit a composition series, we say that it has infinite length.

And now a basic question: which R-modules admit a composition series?

EXERCISE 8.12. *a) Show: any finite[2] module admits a composition series.*
b) Show that if a module M admits a composition series, it is finitely generated.
c) Show that a $\mathbb{Z}$-module M admits a composition series iff it is finite.
d) Let k be a field. Show that a k-module admits a composition series iff it is finitely generated (i.e., iff it is finite-dimensional).

EXERCISE 8.13. *An R-module M admits a composition series iff there exists $L \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that every normal series in M has length at most L.*

THEOREM 8.14. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is both Noetherian and Artinian.
(ii) M admits a composition series.

PROOF. Assume (i). Since M satisfies (DCC), there is a minimal nonzero submodule, say M_1. If M_1 is a maximal proper submodule, we have a composition series. Otherwise among all proper R-submodules strictly containing M_1, by (DCC) we can choose a minimal one M_2. We continue in this way: since M also satisfies (ACC) the process must eventually terminate, yielding a composition series.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): This follows easily from Exercise 8.13.   □

EXERCISE 8.14. *Exercise 8.13 makes use of Schreier Refinement. Give a proof that (ii) $\implies$ (i) in Theorem 8.14 which is independent of Schreier Refinement. (Suggestion: try induction on the length of a composition series.)*

PROPOSITION 8.15. *Let $0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0$ be a short exact sequence of R-modules. Then:*
a) M admits a composition series iff both M' and M'' admit composition series.
b) If M admits a composition series, then

$$\ell(M) = \ell(M') + \ell(M'').$$

EXERCISE 8.15. *Prove Proposition 8.15.*

Although it will not play a prominent role in our course, the length of an R-module M is an extremely important invariant, especially in algebraic geometry: it is is used, among other things, to keep track of intersection multiplicities and to quantitatively measure the degree of singularity of a point.

5. The Krull-Schmidt Theorem

The material in this section follows [**J2**, §3.4] very closely. In particular, very exceptionally for us – but as in *loc. cit.* – in this section we work with left modules over a *possibly noncommutative ring R*. The reason: not only does the desired result carry over verbatim to the noncommutative case (this is not in itself a good enough reason, as the same holds for a positive proportion of the results in these notes) but the proof requires us to consider noncommutative rings!

---

[2]Recall that by a "finite module" we mean a module whose underlying set is finite!

A module M is **decomposable** if there are nonzero submodules $M_1, M_2 \subset M$ such that $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$; otherwise M is **indecomposable**.

THEOREM 8.16. *(Krull-Schmidt) Let M be an R-module of finite length. Then:*
a) There are indecomposable submodules $M_1, \ldots, M_m$ such that $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_i$.
b) If there are indecomposable submodules $N_1, \ldots, N_n$ such that $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} N_i$, then $m = n$ and there exists a bijection σ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that for all i, $M_i \cong N_{\sigma(i)}$.

The *Proof* of Theorem 8.16a) is easy, and we give it now. If M is a finite length module and we write $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ then $0 < \ell(M_1), \ell(M_2) < \ell(M)$. Thus an evident induction argument shows that any sequence of moves, each one of which splits a direct summand of M into two nontrivial direct subsummands of M, must terminate after finitely many steps, leaving us with a decomposition of M into a finite direct sum of indecomposable submodules. $\square$

As one might suspect, the second part of Theorem 8.16 concerning the uniqueness of the indecomposable decomposition is more subtle. Indeed, before giving the proof we need some preparatory considerations on endomorphism rings of modules.

PROPOSITION 8.17. *For an R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is decomposable.
(ii) The (possibly noncommutative, even if R is commutative) ring $\mathrm{End}_R(M) = \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, M)$ has a nontrivial idempotent, i.e., an element $e \neq 0, 1$ with $e^2 = e$.

EXERCISE 8.16. *Prove Proposition 8.17.*

A not-necessarily-commutative ring R is **local** if the set of nonunits $R \setminus R^\times$ forms a two-sided ideal of R.

EXERCISE 8.17. *Let R be a local, not necessarily commutative ring.*
a) Show that $R \neq 0$.
b) Show that R has no nontrivial idempotents.

An R-module M is **strongly indecomposable** if $\mathrm{End}_R(M)$ is local. Thus it follows from Proposition 8.17 and Exercise 8.17 that a strongly indecomposable module is indecomposable.

EXAMPLE 8.18. *The $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Z}$ is indecomposable: any two nonzero submodules (a) and (b) have a nontrivial intersection (ab). On the other hand $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$ is not a local ring, so $\mathbb{Z}$ is not strongly indecomposable.*

Thus "strongly indecomposable" is, in general, a stronger concept than merely "indecomposable". Notice though that the Krull-Schmidt theorem applies only to finite length modules – equivalently to modules which are both Noetherian and Artinian – and $\mathbb{Z}$ is not an Artinian $\mathbb{Z}$-module. In fact, it shall turn out that any finite length indecomposable module is strongly indecomposable, and this will be a major step towards the proof of the Krull-Schmidt Theorem.

But we are not quite ready to prove this either! First some Fitting theory.

For an R-module M and $f \in \mathrm{End}_R(M)$, we put

$$f^\infty(M) = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} f^n(M).$$

The set $f^\infty(M)$ is the intersection of a descending chain

$$M \supset f(M) \supset f^2(M) \supset \ldots \supset f^n(M) \supset \ldots$$

of submodules of M, and is thus an f-stable submodule of M. The restriction of f to $f^\infty(M)$ is surjective. Moreover, if M is an Artinian module, there exists $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $f^s(M) = f^{s+1}(M) = \ldots$.

EXERCISE 8.18. *Find a commutative ring R, an R-module M and $f \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$ such that for no $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is the submodule $f^n(M)$ f-stable.*

Similarly, for M and f as above, we put

$$f_{-\infty}(0) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \ker f^n.$$

Here each $\ker f^n$ is an f-stable submodule of M on which f is *nilpotent*. The set $f_{-\infty}(0)$ is the union of an ascending chain of submodules

$$0 \subset \ker f \subset \ker f^2 \subset \ldots \subset \ker f^n \subset \ldots$$

of M and is thus an f-stable submodule of M on which f acts as a *nil* endomorphism: i.e., every element of M is killed by some power of f. Moreover, if M is a Noetherian module, there exists $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\ker f^t = \ker f^{t+1} = \ldots$ and thus f is a nilpotent endomorphism of $f_{-\infty}(0)$.

EXERCISE 8.19. *Find a commutative ring R, an R-module M and $f \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$ such that f is* not *a nilpotent endomorphism of $f_{-\infty}(0)$.*

THEOREM 8.19. *(Fitting's Lemma) Let M be a finite length module over the not necessarily commutative ring R, and let $f \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$.*
*a) There exists a **Fitting Decomposition***

(17) $$M = f^\infty(M) \oplus f^{-\infty}(0).$$

b) $f|_{f^\infty(M)}$ is an isomorphism and $f|_{f_{-\infty}(0)}$ is nilpotent.

PROOF. Since M has finite length it is both Noetherian and Artinian. Thus there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that

$$f^r(M) = f^{r+1}(M) = \ldots = f^\infty(M)$$

and

$$\ker f^r = \ker f^{r+1} = \ldots = f_{-\infty}(0).$$

Let $x \in f^\infty(M) \cap f_{-\infty}(0)$. Then there is $y \in M$ such that $x = f^r(y)$; moreover $0 = f^r(x) = f^{2r}(y)$. But $f^{2r}(y) = 0$ implies $x = f^r(y) = 0$, so $f^\infty(M) \cap f_{-\infty}(0) = 0$.
Let $x \in M$. Then $f^r(x) \in f^r(M) = f^{2r}(M)$, so there exists $y \in M$ with $f^r(x) = f^{2r}(y)$ and thus $f^r(x - f^r(y)) = 0$. so

$$x = f^r(y) + (x - f^r(y)) \in f^\infty(M) + f^{-\infty}(0),$$

completing the proof of part a). As for part b), we saw above that the restriction of f to $f^\infty(M)$ is surjective. It must also be injective since every element of the kernel lies in $f^{-\infty}(0)$. Thus $f|_{f^\infty(M)}$ is an isomorphism. Finally, as observed above, since $f_{-\infty}(0) = \ker f^r$, $f|_{f_{-\infty}(0)}$ is nilpotent. $\square$

COROLLARY 8.20. *Let M be a finite length indecomposable R-module. Then every $f \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$ is either an automorphism or nilpotent. Moreover M is strongly indecomposable.*

PROOF. Since M is indecomposable, Fitting's Lemma implies that for $f \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$ we must have either $M = f^\infty(M)$ – in which case f is an automorphism – or $M = f^{-\infty}(0)$ – in which case f is nilpotent. We must show that

$$I := \operatorname{End}_R(M) \setminus \operatorname{End}_R(M)^\times$$

is a two-sided ideal of $\operatorname{End}_R(M)$. We observe that I consists precisely of the nilpotent elements of $\operatorname{End}_R(M)$.

For $f \in I$ and $g \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$, since f is neither injective nor surjective, we have gf is not injective and fg is not surjective, hence fg, $gf \in I$.

Let $f_1, f_2 \in I$, and seeking a contradiction we suppose that $f_1 + f_2 \notin I$, so $u := f_1 + f_2 \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)^\times$. For $i = 1, 2$, we put $h_i = f_i u^{-1}$, so $h_1 + h_2 = 1$. Then h_2 is non-invertible hence nilpotent: we have $h_2^n = 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and thus

$$(1 - h_2)(1 + h_2 + \ldots + h_2^{n-1}) = 1 = (1 + h_2 + \ldots + h_2^{n-1})(1 - h_2),$$

contradicting that $h_1 = 1 - h_2 \in I$ $\square$

LEMMA 8.21. *Let M be a nonzero R-module and N an indecomposable R-module. Suppose we have homomorphisms $f : M \to N$, $g : N \to M$ such that gf is an automorphism of M. Then both f and g are isomorphisms.*

PROOF. Let $h = (gf)^{-1}$, $l = hg : N \to M$ and $e = fl : N \to N$. Then $lf = hgf = 1_M$ and $e^2 = flfl = f1_M l = fl = e$. Since M is indecomposable, either $e = 1$ or $e = 0$, and the latter implies $1_M = 1_M^2 = lflf = lef = 0$, i.e., $M = 0$. So $fl = e = 1_N$, so f is an isomorphism and thus so too is $(f(gf)^{-1})^{-1} = g$. $\square$

THEOREM 8.22. *Let $M \cong N$ be isomorphic modules, and let $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^m M_i$ and $N = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n N_i'$ with each M_i strongly indecomposable and each N_i indecomposable. Then $m = n$ and there is a bijection σ of $\{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that for all i, $M_i \cong N_{\sigma(i)}$.*

PROOF. By induction on m: $m = 1$ is clear. Suppose the result holds for all direct sums of fewer than m strongly indecomposable submodules.
Step 1: Let $e_1, \ldots, e_m \in \operatorname{End}_R(M)$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in \operatorname{End}_R(N)$ be the idempotent elements corresponding to the given direct sum decompositions (i.e., projection onto the corresponding factor). Let $g : M \overset{\sim}{\to} N$, and put

$$h_j := f_j g e_1 \in \operatorname{Hom}_R(M, N), \ k_j = e_1 g^{-1} f_j \in \operatorname{Hom}_R(N, M), \ 1 \le j \le n.$$

Then

$$\sum_{j=1}^n k_j h_j = \sum_j e_1 g^{-1} f_j g e_1 = e_1 g^{-1} \sum_j f_j g e_1 = e_1 g^{-1} 1_N g e_1 = e_1.$$

The restrictions of e_1 and $k_j h_j$ to M_1 stabilize M_1 so may be regarded as endomorphisms of M_1, say e_1' and $(k_j h_j)'$, and we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n (k_j h_j)' = e_1' = 1_{M_1}.$$

By assumption $\operatorname{End}_R M_1$ is local, so for at least one j, $(k_j h_j)'$ is a unit, i.e., an automorphism of M_1. By reordering the N_j's we may assume that $j = 1$, so $(k_1 h_1)' \in \operatorname{Aut}_R M_1$. We may regard the restriction h_1' of h_1 to M_1 as a homomorphism from M_1 to N_1 and similarly the restriction k_1' of k_1 to N_1 as a homomorphism from N_1 to M_1, and then $k_1' h_1' = (k_1 h_1)'$ is an automorphism. By Lemma 8.21,

$h_1' = (f_1 g e_1') : M_1 \overset{\sim}{\to} N_1$ and $k_1' = (e_1 g^{-1} f_1)' : N_1 \overset{\sim}{\to} M_1$.
Step 2: We claim that

$$\tag{18} M = g^{-1}(N_1) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=2}^{m} M_i.$$

To see this, let $x \in g^{-1}N_1 \cap (\bigoplus_{i=2}^{m} M_i)$, so $x = g^{-1}y$ for some $y \in N_1$. Because $x \in \bigoplus_{i=2}^{m} M_i$, $e_1 x = 0$. Thus

$$0 = e_1 x = e_1 g^{-1} y = e_1 g^{-1} f_1 y = k_1 y = k_1' y.$$

Since k_1' is an isomorphism, $y = 0$ and thus $x = 0$, so the sum in (18) is direct. Now put $M' = g^{-1}(N_1) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=2}^{m} M_i$, so we wish to show $M' = M$. Let $x \in g^{-1}N_1$. Then $x, e_2 x, \ldots, e_m x \in M'$, so $e_1 x = (1 - e_2 - \ldots - e_m)x \in M'$. So

$$M' \supset e_1 g^{-1} N_1 = e_1 g^{-1} f_1 N_1 = k_1 N_1 = k_1' N_1 = M_1$$

and thus $M' \supset \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} M_i = M$.
Step 3: The isomorphism $g : M \overset{\sim}{\to} N$ carries $g^{-1}N_1$ onto N_1 hence induces an isomorphism $\frac{M}{g^{-1}N_1} \overset{sim}{\to} N/N_1$. Using Step 2, we have

$$\bigoplus_{j=2}^{n} N_i = \frac{N}{N_1} \cong \frac{M}{g^{-1}N_1} \cong \bigoplus_{i=2}^{m} M_i.$$

We are done by induction. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.20. *Please confirm that we have proved the Krull-Schmidt Theorem!*

EXERCISE 8.21. *Let M and N be R-modules such that $M \times M \cong N \times N$.*
a) If M and N are both of finite length, show that $M \cong N$.
b) Must we have $M \cong N$ in general?

Part b) is far from easy! If you give up, see [**Co64**].

6. Some important terminology

All we aspire to do in this section is to introduce some terminology, but it is so important that we have isolated it for future reference.

Let R be a ring and $\mathfrak{p}$ a prime ideal of R. The **height** of $\mathfrak{p}$ is the supremum of all lengths of finite chains of prime ideals of the form $\mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_n = \mathfrak{p}$ (the length of the indicated chain being n; i.e., it is the number of $\subsetneq$'s appearing, which is one less than the number of elements). Thus the height is either a non-negative integer or ∞; the latter transpires iff there exist arbitrarily long finite chains of prime ideals descending from $\mathfrak{p}$ (and of course, this need not imply the existence of an infinite chain of prime ideals descending from $\mathfrak{p}$).

A prime ideal of height 0 is called a **minimal prime**. In a domain R, the unique minimal prime is (0), so the concept is of interest only for rings which are not domains. If I is a proper ideal of R, we also speak of a **minimal prime over I**, which means a prime $\mathfrak{p} \supset I$ such that there is no prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ with $I \subsetneq \mathfrak{q} \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}$. Note that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime over I iff $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime in the quotient ring R/I. This remark simultaneously explains the terminology "minimal over" and gives a

hint why it is useful to study minimal prime ideals even if one is ultimately most interested in domains.

The **dimension** of a ring R is the supremum of all the heights of its prime ideals. The full proper name here is **Krull dimension** of R, which is of course useful when one has other notions of dimension at hand. Such things certainly do exist but will not be considered here. Moreover, as will shortly become apparent, the need to include Krull's name here so as to ensure that he gets proper recognition for his seminal work in this area is less than pressing. Therefore we use the full name "Krull dimension" only rarely as a sort of rhetorical flourish.

One also often speaks of the **codimension** of a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, which is the dimension of R minus the height of $\mathfrak{p}$. This is especially natural in applications to algebraic geometry, of which the present notes allude to only in passing. Note that this is *not* necessarily equal to the Krull dimension of $R/\mathfrak{p}$ – or what is the same as that, the maximal length of a finite chain of prime ideals ascending from $\mathfrak{p}$ – although in reasonable applications, and especially in geometry, one is certainly entitled to hope (and often, to prove) that this is the case.

Remark: All of these definitions would make perfect sense for arbitrary partially ordered sets and their elements, but the terminology is not completely consistent with order theory. Namely, the height of an element in an arbitrary partially ordered set *is* defined as the supremum of lengths of chains descending from that element, but the order theorists would cringe to hear the supremum of all heights of elements called the "dimension" of the partially ordered set. They would call that quantity the height of the partially ordered set, and would reserve dimension for any of several more interesting invariants. (Roughly, the idea is that a chain of any finite length is one-dimensional, whereas a product of d chains should have dimension d.)

7. Introducing Noetherian rings

The following is probably the most important single definition in all of ring theory.

A ring R is said to be **Noetherian** if the partially ordered set $\mathcal{I}(R)$ of all ideals of R satisfies the ascending chain condition.

EXERCISE 8.22. *Insert exercise here.*

THEOREM 8.23. *A finitely generated module over a Noetherian ring is Noetherian.*

PROOF. If M is a finitely generated module over R, then we may represent it as R^n/K for some submodule K of R^n. An immediate corollary of the preceding theorem is that finite direct sums of Noetherian modules are Noetherian, and by assumption R itself is a Noetherian R-module, hence so is R^n and hence so is the quotient $R^n/K = M$.   □

Thus so long as we restrict to Noetherian rings, submodules of finitely generated modules remain finitely generated. This is extremely useful even in the case of $R = \mathbb{Z}$: a subgroup of a finitely generated commutative group remains finitely

generated. Needless(?) to say, this does not hold for all noncommutative groups, e.g. not for a finitely generated free group of rank greater than 1.

THEOREM 8.24. *(Characterization of Noetherian rings) For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) Every nonempty set of ideals of R has a maximal element.
(ii) There are no infinite ascending chains

$$I_1 \subsetneq I_2 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq I_n \subsetneq \ldots$$

of ideals of R.
(iii) Every ideal of R is finitely generated.
(iv) Every prime ideal of R is finitely generated.

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii) is a special case of Proposition 8.1.
(ii) $\iff$ (iii) is a special case of Exercise 8.2.
(iii) $\iff$ (iv) is Cohen's Theorem (Theorem 4.31). $\square$

EXERCISE 8.23. *Suppose a ring R satisfies the ascending chain condition on prime ideals. Must R be Noetherian?*

PROPOSITION 8.25. *Let R be a Noetherian ring.*
a) If I is any ideal of R, the quotient R/I is Noetherian.
b) If $S \subset R$ is any multiplicative subset, the localization $S^{-1}R$ is Noetherian.

PROOF. Any ideal of R/I is of the form J/I for some ideal $J \supset I$ of R. By assumption J is finitely generated, hence J/I is finitely generated, so R/I is Noetherian. A similar argument holds for the localization; details are left to the reader. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.24. *Let k be a field, let S be an infinite set, and put $R = \prod_{s \in S} k$, i.e., the infinite product of $\#S$ copies of k. Show that R is not Noetherian, but the localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ at each prime ideal is Noetherian.*

Thus Noetherianity is a localizable property but not a local property.

8. Theorems of Eakin-Nagata, Formanek and Jothilingam

In 1968, P.M. Eakin, Jr. [**Ea68**] and M. Nagata [**Na68**] independently showed that if a ring R admits an extension ring S which is Noetherian and finitely generated as an R-module, then R is Noetherian.

Several years later, E. Formanek [**Fo73**] gave a stronger result. His improvement is a nice instance of the philosophy of "modulization": where possible one should replace theorems about rings with theorems about modules over rings. He writes: "The object of this paper is to present a simple and elementary proof of the Eakin-Nagata theorem which generalizes the original version in a new direction. The proof is essentially a contraction of Eakin's proof as presented by Kaplansky in [**K**, Exc. 14-15, p. 54] based on the observation that much of the proof disappears if one is not 'handicapped' by the hypothesis that T is a ring."

More recently, P. Jothilingam [**Jo00**] gave a result which simultaneously generalizes Formanek's Theorem and Cohen's Theorem that a ring in which all prime ideals are finitely generated is Noetherian. Finally(?), several years ago A. Naghipour [**Na05**] found a significantly shorter, simpler proof of Jothilingam's Theorem, which we will present here. All in all, this provides a nice case study of how even very

basic results get improved and simplified as time passes.

Having told the story in correct chronological order, we now reverse it: we will prove Jothilingam's Theorem and swiftly deduce the earlier results as corollaries. First a couple of easy preliminaries.

LEMMA 8.26 (Kaplansky). *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is Noetherian.
(ii) R admits a faithful Noetherian module.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): If R is Noetherian, then R is a faithful Noetherian R-module.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let M be a faithful Noetherian R-module. In particular M is finitely generated, say by $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Let $\varphi : R \to M^n$ by $r \mapsto (rx_1, \ldots, rx_n)$. Since M is Noetherian, so is M^n, and since M is faithful, φ is injective, and thus R is isomorphic to a submodule of a Noetherian module, hence Noetherian. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.25. *a) Show: any ring R admits a Noetherian module.*
b) Show: if M is a Noetherian R-module, $R/\operatorname{ann} M$ is Noetherian.

Let M be an R-module. An R-submodule of M is **extended** if it is of the form IM for some ideal I of R. This is a generalization of a previous use of the term: if $\iota : R \to T$ is a map of rings, then the *extended ideals* of T are those of the form $\iota_* I = IT$ for an ideal I of R.

PROPOSITION 8.27. *For a finitely generated R-module M, let $\mathcal{E}_M$ be the family of extended submodules of M, partially ordered under inclusion. the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\mathcal{E}_M$ is Noetherian: i.e., extended submodules satisfy (ACC).
(ii) Every extended submodule of M is finitely generated.

PROOF. $\neg$ (ii) $\implies$ $\neg$ (i): Let I be an ideal of R such that IM is not finitely generated. Let $a_1 \in I$. Then, since M is finitely generated, $a_1 M$ is a finitely generated submodule of IM, hence proper: there exists $a_2 \in I$ such that $a_1 M \subsetneq \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle M$. Again, $\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle M$ is finitely generated, so is proper in IM. Continuing in this way we get a sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in I such that

$$a_1 M \subsetneq \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle M \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle M \subsetneq \ldots,$$

so $\mathcal{E}_M$ is not Noetherian.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let $I_1 M \subseteq I_2 M \subseteq \ldots \subseteq I_n M \subseteq \ldots$ be an ascending chain in $\mathcal{E}_M$. Let $N = \sum_n I_n M$ and $I = \sum_n I_n$, so $N = IM \in \mathcal{E}_M$. By assumption, N is finite generated, so there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $N = I_1 M + \ldots + I_n M$. Since $I_k M \subset I_{k+1} M$ for all k, $N = I_n M$ and thus $I_n M = I_{n+k} M$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$: the chain stabilizes at n. $\square$

THEOREM 8.28 (Jothilingam). *For a finitely generated R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is Noetherian.
(ii) For every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, the submodule $\mathfrak{p}M$ is finitely generated.

PROOF. We follow [**Na05**].
(i) $\implies$ (ii): If M is Noetherian, then every submodule of M is finitely generated.
$\neg$ (i) $\implies$ $\neg$ (ii): Suppose M is not Noetherian: we will find a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R such that $\mathfrak{p}M$ is infinitely generated.
Step 0: Since the union of a chain of infinitely generated submodules of M is

an infinitely generated submodule of M, by Zorn's Lemma there is a submodule $N \subset M$ maximal with respect to being infinitely generated.

Step 1: Let $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann}(M/N) = \{x \in R \mid xM \subset N\}$. We will show that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal: indeed, seeking a contradiction suppose there are $a, b \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $ab \in \mathfrak{p}$. Then $N + aM, B + bM \supsetneq N$ so are both finitely generated: write $N + aM = \langle n_1 + am_1, \ldots, n_\ell + am_\ell \rangle$ with $n_i \in N$, $m_i \in M$. Put

$$L = \{m \in M : am \in N\};$$

then L is an R-submodule of M containing N and bM and hence also $N + bM \supsetneq N$, so L is finitely generated. We CLAIM

$$N = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} Rn_i + aL.$$

If so, then N is finitely generated, a contradiction, and thus $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime. Since $abM \subset N$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} Rn_i + aL \subset N$. Conversely, let $y \in N$. Since $y \in N + aM$, there are $b_1, \ldots, b_\ell \in R$ such that

$$y = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} b_i(n_i + am_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} b_i n_i + a \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} b_i m_i.$$

Thus

$$a \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} b_i m_i = y - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} b_i n_i \in N,$$

so $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} b_i m_i \in L$ and $y \in \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} Rn_i + aL$.

Step 2: For $x \in M$, write $\overline{x}$ for the canonical image of x in M/N. Now we use that M is finitely generated: write $M = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle_R$, so $M/N = \langle \overline{x_1}, \ldots, \overline{x_n} \rangle_R$, so $\mathfrak{p} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{ann} R\overline{x_i}$. Because $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, we must have $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann} R\overline{x_j}$ for some j. Since $N + Rx_i \supsetneq N$, $N + Rx_i$ is finitely generated, say by $y_1 + r_1 x_j, \ldots, y_k + r_k x_j$, with $y_i \in N$, $r_i \in R$. Arguing as in Step 1 we get

$$N = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Ry_i + \mathfrak{p}x_j.$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}M \subset N$, we have

$$N = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Ry_i + \mathfrak{p}x_j \subset \sum_{i=1}^{k} Ry_i + \mathfrak{p}M \subset \sum_{i=1}^{k} Ry_i + N \subset N,$$

and thus

(19) $$N = \sum_{i=1}^{k} Ry_i + \mathfrak{p}M.$$

Since N is infinitely generated, (19) implies $\mathfrak{p}M$ is infinitely generated. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 8.29. *(Formanek's Theorem) Let R be a ring, and let $M = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$ be a faithful finitely generated R-module. Suppose M satisfies (ACC) on "extended submodules" – i.e., submodules of the form IM for I an ideal of R. Then M is Noetherian, hence so is R.*

PROOF. By Proposition 8.27, all extended submodules are finitely generated, hence *a fortiori* all submodules of the form $\mathfrak{p}M$ for $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ are finitely generated. By Theorem 8.28, M is Noetherian, and then by Lemma 8.26, R is Noetherian. $\square$

COROLLARY 8.30. *(Eakin-Nagata Theorem) Let $R \subset S$ be an ring extension, with S finitely generated as an R-module. Then R is Noetherian iff S is Noetherian.*

PROOF. $\implies$ If R is Noetherian, then S is a finitely generated module over a Noetherian ring so S is a Noetherian R-module. That is, (ACC) holds on R-submodules of S, hence *a fortiori* it holds on S-submodules of S.
$\Leftarrow$ Apply Formanek's Theorem with $M = S$. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.26. *Investigate the possibility of proving Jothilingam's Theorem using the Prime Ideal Principle of §4.5.*

9. The Bass-Papp Theorem

We now present a beautiful characterization of Noetherian rings in terms of properties of injective modules, due independently to Z. Papp [**Pa59**] and H. Bass [**Ba59**].

THEOREM 8.31. *(Bass-Papp) For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) A direct limit of injective modules is injective.
(ii) A direct sum of injective modules is injective.
(iii) A countable direct sum of injective modules is injective.
(iv) R is Noetherian.

PROOF.
(i) $\implies$ (ii): A direct sum is a kind of direct limit.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii) is immediate.
(iii) $\implies$ (iv): Let $I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \ldots \subset I_n \subset \ldots$ be an infinite ascending chain of ideals of R, and let $I = \bigcup_n I_n$. We define

$$E = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} E(R/I_n).$$

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $f_n : I \to E(R/I_n)$ be the composite map $I \to R \to R/I_n \to E(R/I_n)$. There is then a unique map $\prod f : I \to \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} E(R/I_n)$. But indeed, for each fixed $x \in I$, x lies in I_n for sufficiently large n and thus $f_n(x) = 0$. It follows that $\prod f$ actually lands in the direct sum, and we have thus defined a map

$$f : I \to E.$$

By hypothesis, E is a countable direct sum of injective modules and therefore injective, so f extends to an R-module map with domain all of R and is thus of the form $f(x) = xf(1) = xe$ for some fixed $e \in E$. Let N be sufficiently large so that for $n \geq N$, the nth component e_n of e is zero. Then for all $x \in I$,

$$0 = xe_n = f_n(x) = x + I_n \in R/I_n,$$

and thus $x \in I_n$. That is, for all $n \geq N$, $I_n = I$.
(iv) $\implies$ (i): let $\{E_\alpha\}$ be a directed system of injective modules with direct limit E. For $\alpha \leq \beta$ we denote the transition map from E_α to E_β by $\iota_{\alpha\beta}$ and the natural map from E_α to E by ι_α. We will show E is injective by Baer's Criterion (Theorem 3.22), so let I be any ideal of R and consider an R-module map $f : I \to E$. Since R is Noetherian, I is finitely generated, and it follows that there exists an index

α such that $f(I) \subset \iota_\alpha(E_\alpha)$. Let M be a finitely generated submodule of E_α such that $f(I) \subset \iota_\alpha(M)$. Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \to K \to M \overset{\iota_\alpha}{\to} f(I) \to 0.$$

Since M is finitely generated and R is Noetherian, K is finitely generated. Moreover K maps to 0 in the direct limit, so there exists $\beta \geq \alpha$ such that $\iota_{\alpha\beta}K = 0$. Let $M' = \iota_{\alpha\beta}M$, so by construction

$$\iota_\beta : M' \overset{\sim}{\to} f(I).$$

Taking $g = \iota_\beta|_{M'}^{-1} \circ f$ we get a map $g : I \to E_\beta$ such that $f = \iota_\beta \circ g$. Since E_β is injective, g extends to a map $G : R \to E_\beta$ and thus $F = \iota_\beta \circ G$ extends f to R. $\quad\square$

10. Artinian rings: structure theory

A ring R which satisfies the descending chain condition (DCC) on ideals is called **Artinian** (or sometimes, "an Artin ring").

EXERCISE 8.27. *a) Show: a ring with only finitely many ideals is Artinian.*
b) Show: the ring of integers $\mathbb{Z}$ is not *Artinian.*
c) Show: a quotient of an Artinian ring is Artinian.
d) Show: a localization of an Artinian ring is Artinian.

Obviously any finite ring has only finitely many ideals and is Artinian. It is not difficult to give examples of infinite rings with finitely many ideals. For instance, let k be a field and let $0 \neq f \in k[t]$. Then $R = k[t]/(f)$ has only finitely many ideals. Indeed, if we factor $f = f_1^{a_1} \cdots f_r^{a_r}$ into irreducible factors, then the Chinese Remainder Theorem gives

$$k[t]/(f) \cong k[t]/(f_1^{a_1}) \times \ldots \times k[t]/(f_r^{a_r}).$$

Each factor ring $k[t]/(f_i^{a_i})$ is a local ring with maximal ideal (f_1), and the ideals are precisely

$$(0) \subsetneq (f_i)^{a_i-1} \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq f_i.$$

Since every ideal in a product is a direct sum of ideals of the factors, there are then precisely $\prod_{i=1}^r (a_i + 1)$ ideals of R.

A bit of reflection reveals that – notwithstanding their very similar definitions – requiring (DCC) on ideals of a ring is considerably more restrictive than the (ACC) condition. For instance:

PROPOSITION 8.32. *A domain R is Artinian iff it is a field.*

PROOF. Obviously a field satisfies (DCC) on ideals. Conversely, if R is a domain and not a field, there exists a nonzero nonunit element a, and then we have $(a) \supsetneq (a^2) \supsetneq (a^3) \supsetneq \ldots$. Indeed, if $(a^k) = (a^l)$, suppose $k \leq l$ and write $l = k + n$, and then we have $ua^k = a^k a^n$ for some $u \in A^\times$, and then by cancellation we get $a^n = u$, so a^n is unit and thus a is a unit, contradiction. $\quad\square$

The result collects several simple but important properties of Artinian rings.

THEOREM 8.33. *Let R be an Artinian ring.*
a) R has dimension zero: prime ideals are maximal.
b) Therefore the Jacobson radical of R coincides with its nilradical.
c) R has only finitely many maximal ideals, say $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$.

d) Let $\mathcal{N} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{m}_i$ be the nilradical. Then it is a nilpotent ideal: there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\mathcal{N}^k = 0$.

PROOF. a) If $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of A, then $A/\mathfrak{p}$ is an Artinian domain, which by Proposition 8.32 is a field, so $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal.

b) By definition, the Jacobson radical is the intersection of all maximal ideals and the nilradical is the intersection of all prime ideals. Thus the result is immediate from part a).

c) Suppose $\mathfrak{m}_i$ is an infinite sequence of maximal ideals. Then

$$R \supsetneq \mathfrak{m}_1 \supsetneq \mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \mathfrak{m}_2 \cdots$$

is an infinite descending chain. Indeed, equality at any step would mean $\mathfrak{m}_{N+1} \supset \bigcap_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_i = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_i$, and then since $\mathfrak{m}_{N+1}$ is prime it contains $\mathfrak{m}_i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq N$, contradiction.

d) By DCC, it must be the case that there exists some k with $\mathcal{N}^k = \mathcal{N}^{k+n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Put $I = \mathcal{N}^k$. Suppose $I \neq 0$, and let Σ be the set of ideals J such that $IJ \neq 0$. Evidently $\Sigma \neq \emptyset$, for $I \in \Sigma$. By DCC we are entitled to a minimal element J of Σ. There exists $0 \neq x \in J$ such that $xI \neq 0$. For such an x, we have $(x) \in \Sigma$ and by minimality we must have $J = (x)$. But $(xI)I = xI \neq 0$, so $xI \subset (x)$ and thus $xI = (x)$ by minimality. So there exists $y \in I$ with $xy = x$ and thus we have

$$(20) \qquad\qquad x = xy = xy^2 = \ldots = xy^k = \ldots.$$

But $y \in I \subset \mathcal{N}$, so y is nilpotent and (20) gives $x = 0$, a contradiction. $\square$

LEMMA 8.34. *Suppose that in a ring R there exists a finite sequence $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ of maximal ideals such that $0 = \prod_i \mathfrak{m}_i$. Then R is Noetherian iff it is Artinian.*

PROOF. Recall from §8.4 that an R-module M is Noetherian and Artinian iff it has finite length. Consider

$$0 = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_n \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_{n-1} \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}_1 \subsetneq R.$$

For R to have finite length, it is necessary and sufficient that each quotient

$$Q_i = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_{i-1}/\mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_i$$

be a finite length R-module. (Since we do not assume that the $\mathfrak{m}_i$'s are distinct, it is possible – and harmless – that some Q_i's may be zero.) But each Q_i is canonically a module over the *field* $R/\mathfrak{m}_i$, i.e., a vector space, so it has finite length iff it is finite-dimensional. So we win: R is Noetherian iff each Q_i is iff each Q_i is finite-dimensional iff each Q_i is Artinian iff R is Artinian. $\square$

THEOREM 8.35. *(Akizuki-Hopkins) For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is Artinian.
(ii) R is Noetherian, and prime ideals are maximal.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Suppose R is Artinian. By Theorem 8.33, prime ideals in R are maximal, so it suffices to show that R is Noetherian. Let $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ be the distinct maximal ideals of R. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ we have (using CRT) $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{m}_i^k = (\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{m}_i)^k$. Applying Theorem 8.33d), this shows that for sufficiently large k we have $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{m}_i^k = 0$. We can now apply Lemma 8.34 to conclude that R is Artinian.

(ii) $\implies$ (i): Suppose R is Noetherian and zero-dimensional. A bit later on (sorry!) we will see that any Noetherian ring has only finitely many minimal prime ideals (Theorem 10.13 and again in Corollary 13.19), so R has only finitely many

minimal prime ideals, each of which is maximal by zero-dimensionality. Therefore $\mathcal{N} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i$ is the nilradical of a Noetherian ring, hence a nilpotent ideal by Proposition 4.12. As above, we deduce that $\prod_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i^k = 0$ for sufficiently large k. By Lemma 8.34, R is Artinian. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.28. *Consider the ring $R = \mathbb{C}[x,y]/(x^2, xy, y^2) = \mathbb{C}[x,y]/I$.*
a) Show that $\dim_\mathbb{C} R = 3$ and that a $\mathbb{C}$-basis is given by $1 + I$, $x + I$, $y + I$.
b) Deduce that R is Artinian.
c) Show that the proper ideals of R are precisely the $\mathbb{C}$-subspaces of $\langle x + I, y + I \rangle_\mathbb{C}$.
d) Deduce that R has infinitely many ideals.

EXERCISE 8.29. *Let k be a field and $A = k[\{x_i\}_{i=1}^\infty]$ a polynomial ring over k in a countable infinite number of indeterminates. Let $\mathfrak{m} = (\{x_i\})$ be the ideal of all polynomials with zero constant term, and put $R = A/\mathfrak{m}^2$. Show that R is a ring with a unique prime ideal which is not Noetherian (so also not Artinian).*

EXERCISE 8.30. *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Suppose R is a Noetherian domain with exactly n prime ideals. Must R be Artinian?*

PROPOSITION 8.36. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring.*
a) Either:
(i) $\mathfrak{m}^k \neq \mathfrak{m}^{k+1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, or
(ii) $\mathfrak{m}^k = 0$ for some k.
b) Moreover, condition (ii) holds iff R is Artinian.

PROOF. a) Suppose there exists k such that $\mathfrak{m}^k = \mathfrak{m}^{k+1}$. By Nakayama's Lemma, we have $\mathfrak{m}^k = 0$. If $\mathfrak{p}$ is any prime ideal of R, then $\mathfrak{m}^k \subset \mathfrak{p}$, and taking radicals we have $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}$ and R is a Noetherian ring with a unique prime ideal, hence an Artinian local ring. b) If R is Artinian, then (i) cannot hold, so (ii) must hold. Conversely, if (ii) holds then $\mathfrak{m}$ is a nil ideal, hence contained in the intersection of all prime ideals of R, which implies that $\mathfrak{m}$ is the only prime ideal of R, and R is Artinian by the Akizuki-Hopkins theorem. $\square$

THEOREM 8.37. *Let R be an Artinian ring.*
a) There are $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and local Artinian rings $R_1, \ldots, R_n$ such that $R \cong \prod_{i=1}^n R_i$.
b) Moreover, the decomposition is unique in the sense that if $R \cong \prod_{j=1}^m S_j$ is another decomposition, then $n = m$ and there exists a permutation σ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $R_i \cong S_{\sigma(i)}$ for all i.

PROOF. a) Let $(\mathfrak{m}_i)_{i=1}^n$ be the distinct maximal ideals of R. We have seen that there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\prod_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i^k = 0$. By Proposition 4.19, the ideals $\mathfrak{m}_i^k$ are pairwise comaximal, so so $\bigcap_i \mathfrak{m}_i^k = \prod_i \mathfrak{m}_i^k$. Therefore by CRT the natural mapping

$$R \to \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{R}{\mathfrak{m}_i^k}$$

is an isomorphism. Each $\frac{R}{\mathfrak{m}_i^k}$ is local Artinian, so this gives part a).
b) The proof requires **primary decomposition**, so must be deferred to §10.5. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.31. *Let R be an Artinian ring.*
a) Show: every element of R is either a unit or a zero divisor.
b) Show: R is its own total fraction ring.

EXERCISE 8.32. *Let R be a ring, and let $J(R)$ be its Jacobson radical. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *R is semilocal, i.e., $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is finite.*
(ii) *The ring $R/J(R)$ is a finite product of fields.*
(iii) *The ring $R/J(R)$ has only finitely many ideals.*
(iv) *The ring $R/J(R)$ is Artinian.*

11. The Hilbert Basis Theorem

The following result shows in one fell swoop that the majority of the rings that one encounters in classical algebraic geometry and number theory are Noetherian.

THEOREM 8.38. *(Hilbert Basis Theorem) If R is Noetherian, so is $R[t]$.*

PROOF. Seeking a contradiction, suppose J is an ideal of $R[t]$ which is not finitely generated. We inductively construct a sequence $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_n, \ldots$ of elements of J and a sequence of ideals $J_n = \langle f_0, \ldots, f_n \rangle$ of $R[t]$ as follows: $f_0 = 0$, and for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, f_{i+1} is an element of minimal degree in $J \setminus J_i$. Thus for all positive integers i we have $\deg f_i \leq \deg f_{i+1}$. Moreover, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ let a_i be the leading coefficient of f_i, and let I be the ideal $\langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_N, \ldots \rangle$ of R. However, R is Noetherian, so there exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $I = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_N \rangle$. In particular, there are $u_1, \ldots, u_N \in R$ such that $a_{N+1} = u_1 a_1 + \ldots + u_N a_N$. Define

$$g = \sum_{i=1}^{N} u_i f_i t^{\deg f_{N+1} - \deg f_i}.$$

Since $g \in J_N$ and $f_{N+1} \in J \setminus J_N$, we have $f_{N+1} - g \in J \setminus J_N$. Moreover g and f_{N+1} have the same degree and the same leading term, so $\deg f_{N+1} - g < \deg f_{N+1}$, hence f_{N+1} does not have minimal degree among polynomials in $J \setminus J_N$, contradiction. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.33. *Prove the converse of the Hilbert Basis Theorem: if R is a ring such that either $R[t]$ or $R[[t]]$ is Noetherian, then R is Noetherian.*

COROLLARY 8.39. *A finitely generated algebra over a Noetherian ring is Noetherian.*

PROOF. Let R be Noetherian and S a finitely generated R-algebra, $S \cong R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and some ideal I. By induction on the Hilbert Basis Theorem, the ring $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is Noetherian, hence so is its quotient ring S. $\square$

THEOREM 8.40. *Let R be a ring, let $\mathcal{P}$ be a prime ideal of $R[[t]]$, and let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the set of constant coefficients of elements of $\mathcal{P}$.*
a) Suppose that for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{p}$ can be generated by k elements. Then $\mathcal{P}$ can be generated by $k+1$ elements. Moreover, if $t \notin \mathcal{P}$, $\mathcal{P}$ can be generated by k elements.
b) If R is Noetherian, then so is $R[[t]]$.

PROOF. Let $q : R[[t]] \to R[[t]]/(t) = R$ be the quotient map, so $\mathfrak{p} = q_* \mathcal{P}$.
a) Suppose $\mathfrak{p} = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_k \rangle$, and let I be the ideal $\langle a_1, \ldots, a_k, t \rangle$ of $R[[t]]$.
Case 1: If $t \in \mathcal{P}$, we claim $I = \mathcal{P}$, which suffices. That $I \subset \mathcal{P}$ is clear; conversely, writing $f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t^n \in \mathcal{P}$ as $a_0 + t(a_1 + a_2 t + \ldots)$ shows $f \in I$.
Case 2: Suppose $t \notin \mathcal{P}$. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_k \in \mathcal{P}$ with constant terms $a_1, \ldots, a_k$, respectively. We CLAIM $\mathcal{P} = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_k \rangle$. To see this, let $g_1 = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n t^n \in \mathcal{P}$. Since $b_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$, there are $r_{1,1}, \ldots, r_{k,1} \in R$ with

$$b_0 = r_{1,1} a_1 + \ldots + r_{k,1} a_k,$$

and thus

$$g_1 - (r_{1,1}f_1 + \ldots + r_{k,1}f_k) = tg_2$$

for some $g_2 \in R[[t]]$. Since $\mathcal{P}$ is prime, $tg_2 \in \mathcal{P}$ and $t \notin \mathcal{P}$, we must have $g_2 \in \mathcal{P}$. Applying the above argument to g_2 we find $r_{1,2}, \ldots, r_{k,2} \in R$ and $g_3 \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $g_2 - (r_{1,2}f_1 + \ldots + r_{1,k}f_k) = tg_3$. Continuing in this way, we generate, for $1 \le i \le k$, a power series $h_i = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_{i,n}t^n$, such that

$$g = h_1 f_1 + \ldots + h_k f_k,$$

establishing the claim.

b) If R is Noetherian, then by part a) every prime ideal of $R[[t]]$ is finitely generated. By Cohen's Theorem (Theorem 4.31), $R[[t]]$ is Noetherian. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 8.34. *Show: for a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is Noetherian.
(ii) For all $n \ge 1$, $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is Noetherian.
(iii) For all $n \ge 1$, $R[[t_1, \ldots, t_n]]$ is Noetherian.

EXERCISE 8.35. *Let k be a field, and consider the subring $R = k[y, xy, x^2y, \ldots]$ of $k[x, y]$. Show that R is not Noetherian.*

Therefore, a subring of a Noetherian ring need not be Noetherian. Thinking that this ought to be the case is one of the classic "rookie mistakes" in commutative algebra. In general though, it is the exception rather than the rule that a nice property of a ring R is inherited by all subrings of R, and one gets used to this.

12. Monomial Ideals

Let k be a field, and let $R := k[t_1, \ldots, t_N]$.

Let $\mathrm{Mon}(R)$ denote the set of monomials $t_1^{n_1} \cdots t_N^{n_N}$ of R. There is a natural bijection from $\mathrm{Mon}(R)$ to the commutative monoid $\mathbb{N}^N$: $t_1^{n_1} \cdots t_N^{n_N} \mapsto (n_1, \ldots, n_N)$. The set $\mathbb{N}^N$ has a natural, product partial ordering, in which $(m_1, \ldots, m_N) \le (n_1, \ldots, n_N)$ if and only if $m_i \le n_i$ for all $1 \le i \le N$. This is a total ordering if and only if $N = 1$. By transport of structure, we get a natural partial ordering on $\mathrm{Mon}(R)$ that is nothing else than the divisibility relation restricted to monomials.

For $f \in R$, we define the **support** $\mathrm{supp}(f) \subseteq \mathrm{Mon}(R)$ to be the set of monomials appearing in f with nonzero coefficient. For an ideal I of R, let

$$\mathcal{M}(I) := \mathrm{Mon}(R) \cap I$$

be the set of monomials that lie in I. With respect to the aforementioned partial ordering on $\mathrm{Mon}(R)$, the subset $\mathcal{M}(I)$ is an **up-set**: that is, for monomials $m_1 \le m_2$, if $m_1 \in \mathcal{M}(I)$, then also $m_2 \in \mathcal{M}(I)$: this is just because if $m_1 \le m_2$ then $m_2 = m_1 f$ for some $f \in R$.

An ideal I of R is a **monomial ideal** if it can be generated by monomials: that is, if there is $S \subseteq \mathrm{Mon}(R)$ such that $I = \langle S \rangle$. Notice that by the Hilbert Basis Theorem, I has a finite set of generators, but the definition of a monomial ideal allows the set of monomial generators to be infinite, and it is not immediately clear from the definition that a monomial ideal is always generated by a finite set of monomials. But the following result implies that this is the case.

PROPOSITION 8.41. *Let I be a monomial ideal of $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_N]$, and let $f \in R$. Then $f \in I$ if and only if $m \in I$ for each monomial $m \in \mathrm{supp}(f)$.*

PROOF. If every monomial in the support of a polynomial f lies in *any* ideal J of R, then evidently f lies in J. Conversely, suppose that $f \in I$. Since I is a monomial ideal there are $m_1, \ldots, m_k \in \mathcal{M}(I)$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_k \in R$ such that

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_i m_i.$$

We have

$$\mathrm{supp}(f) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \mathrm{supp}(g_i m_i).$$

Because $m_i \in \mathcal{M}(I)$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and all $u \in \mathrm{supp}(g_i m_i)$ we have $m_i \leq u$, so $u \in \mathcal{M}(I)$. It follows that $\mathrm{supp}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{M}(I)$, which is what we wanted to show. $\square$

LEMMA 8.42. *Let $\{m_x\}_{x \in X}$ be a set of monomials in $R = k[t_1 \ldots, t_N]$, and let m be a monomial in R. Then m lies in $I := \langle m_x \mid x \in X \rangle$ if and only if $m_x \mid m$ for some $x \in X$.*

PROOF. Clearly if $m_x \mid m$ for some $x \in X$, then $m \in I$. Conversely, suppose $m \in I$. Then there are $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in X$ and $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in R$ such that $m = g_1 m_{x_1} + \ldots + g_n m_{x_n}$. Multiplying out the right hand side, we see that every monomial term that appears is divisible by some m_{x_i}, hence the same is true for the left hand side, which is m. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.36. *Let I be an ideal of $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_N]$ with the property of Proposition 8.41: for all $f \in R$, we have $f \in I$ if and only if $m \in I$ for each monomial $m \in \mathrm{supp}(f)$. Show: I is a monomial ideal.*

EXERCISE 8.37. *Let I be a monomial ideal of $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_N]$. Show: $\mathcal{M}(I)$ is a k-basis for I.*

COROLLARY 8.43. *For a subset $M \subseteq \mathrm{Mon}(R)$, let*

$$M^{\uparrow} := \{u \in \mathrm{Mon}(R) \mid m \leq u \text{ for some } m \in M\};$$

this is the smallest up-set of $\mathrm{Mon}(R)$ containing M. Then

$$\mathcal{M}(\langle M \rangle) = M^{\uparrow}.$$

PROOF. Since $\mathcal{M}(\langle M \rangle)$ is an up-set in $\mathrm{Mon}(R)$ containing M, it must also contain $M^{\uparrow}$. The proof of the converse is very similar to that of Proposition 8.41 indeed, let m be a monomial in $\langle M \rangle$. We may write

$$m = \sum_{i=1}^{k} g_i m_i$$

with $m_1, \ldots, _k \in M$, which shows that $\{m\} = \mathrm{supp}(m) \subseteq M^{\uparrow}$, so $m \in M^{\uparrow}$. $\square$

For each element $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_N) \in \mathbb{N}^N$, the principal downset

$$\mathbf{n}^{\downarrow} := \{(m_1, \ldots, m_N) \in \mathbb{N}^N \mid m_i \leq n_i \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq N\}$$

is finite: indeed, it has size $\prod_{i=1}^{N}(n_i + 1)$. In particular, the partially ordered set $\mathbb{N}^N$ is **Artinian**: that is, it has no infinite descending chains. For $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}^N$, let $\min(S)$

be the set of minimal elements of S: i.e., elements that are not strictly smaller than any other element of S.

LEMMA 8.44. *Let $(X, \leq)$ be an Artinian partially ordered set, and let $S, T \subseteq X$.*
   b) *We have $S^\uparrow = (\min S)^\uparrow$.*
   b) *If $S^\uparrow = T^\uparrow$, then $\min(S) = \min(T)$.*
   c) *We have $\min(S^\uparrow) = \min(S)$.*

PROOF. a) For subsets $S \subseteq T \subset X$ of any partially ordered set, we have $S^\uparrow \subseteq T^\uparrow$. If $x \in S^\uparrow$ there is $s \in S$ with $s \leq x$. Since X is Artinian, there is some $m \in \min(S)$ with $m \leq s$. Then $m \leq x$, so $x \in (\min S)^\uparrow$.
b) By symmetry, it suffices to show that every $s \in \min(S)$ is also a minimal element of T. Since $s \in T^\uparrow = (\min T)^\uparrow$, there is $t \in \min T$ with $t \leq s$. Since $T = S^\uparrow$ there is $s' \in S$ with $s' \leq t \leq s$. Since $s \in \min(S)$ we have $s' = t = s$ and thus $s \in \min T$.
c) For instance, we can apply part b) with $T = S^\uparrow$, since $(S^\uparrow)^\uparrow = S^\uparrow$. $\square$

Now let $M \subseteq \mathrm{Mon}(R)$, and let $I := \langle M \rangle$ be the associated monomial ideal. If M' is another set of monomial generators for I, then by Corollary 8.43 we have $M^\uparrow = (M')^\uparrow$, so by Lemma 8.44 we have $\min(M) = \min(M')$ and $I = \langle \min(M) \rangle$. Thus every monomial ideal has a *unique minimal* set of monomial generators, which is precisely the set of minimal elements of any monomial generating set. Moreover, by the Hilbert Basis Theorem we have $I = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_k \rangle$, so by Proposition 8.41, if $M' = \bigcup_{i=1}^k \mathrm{supp}(f_i)$, then $M' \subset I$ and thus $I = \langle M' \rangle$. So as promised earlier, every monomial ideal has a finite set of monomial generators that is easily determined from any finite set of generators: write out the monomials appearing in the support of the generators in a finite list, and proceeding from left to right, cross out monomials that are multiples of monomials appearing earlier in the list.

This discussion has an important purely order-theoretic consequence:

COROLLARY 8.45 (Dickson's Lemma). *Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Each subset of $\mathbb{N}^N$ has finitely many minimal elements.*

PROOF. Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}^N$, and let $M_S \subseteq \mathrm{Mon}(R)$ be the corresponding set of monomials. As explained above, the set $\min(M_S)$ is the unique, minimal set of monomial generators for $\langle M_S \rangle$, and it is finite. Our canonical bijection between $\mathbb{N}^N$ and $\mathrm{Mon}(R)$ identifies $\min(S)$ with $\min(M_S)$, so $\min(S)$ is finite. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.38. *A partially ordered set $(X, \leq)$ is a **well partial ordering** if it is Artinian and has no infinite antichains: that is, for any infinite subset $Y \subseteq X$ there are elements $y_1, y_2 \in Y$ with $y_1 < y_2$. Show that Dickson's Lemma is equivalent to the assertion that for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the product ordering on $\mathbb{N}^N$ is a well partial ordering.*

We have made very little use of k being a field: indeed, Proposition 8.41 and Corollary 8.43 manifestly hold verbatim with k any ring. In order to show that the unique minimal monomial generating set of a monomial ideal was finite, we appealed to the Hilbert Basis Theorem, for which k should be a Noetherian ring. However, after applying this to the case of k a field we got Dickson's Lemma, which we can then turn around and apply to monomial ideals over any coefficient ring k to see that the unique minimal monomial generating set of any monomial ideal is finite.

We will end our discussion of monomial ideals here: in fact it was included mostly as another instance of the interaction between commutative algebra and order theory. But it is no exaggeration to say that the importance of monomial ideals in contemporary commutative algebra is such that one could write an entire book on them. Indeed this has already been done at least twice: [**HH**] and [**MRSW**].

EXERCISE 8.39. *Let k be a field, and let $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_N]$.*

a) *Show that there is exactly one monomial ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$.*
b) *Show that there are precisely 2^N monomial ideals $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ (and find them all).*

EXERCISE 8.40. *Let k be a field, and let $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_N]$. For a monomial $u = t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_n^{a_n}$, put $\operatorname{rad}(u) := \prod_{i \mid a_i > 0} t_i$.*

a) *Show: for all $u \in \operatorname{Mon}(R)$, we have $\operatorname{rad}(u) = (\operatorname{rad}(u))$.*
b) *For any subset $S \subseteq \operatorname{Mon}(R)$, show: $\operatorname{rad}\langle S \rangle = \langle \operatorname{rad}(u) \mid u \in S \rangle$.*
c) *Deduce: the radical of a monomial ideal is again a monomial ideal.*
d) *Deduce: there are only finitely many radical monomial ideals. Can you determine the number in terms of N?*

13. The Krull Intersection Theorem

13.1. Preliminaries on Graded Rings.

In the proof of the theorem of this section we will need a little fact about homogeneous polynomials. So here we discuss some rudiments of this theory by embedding it into its natural context: **graded rings**. The notion of graded ring is of the utmost importance in various applications of algebra, from algebraic geometry to algebraic topology and beyond. It would certainly be nice to give a comprehensive exposition of graded algebra but at the moment this is beyond the ambition of these notes, so we content ourselves with the bare minimum needed for our work in the next section.

Let R be a ring, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and denote by $R[t] = R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ the polynomial ring in n indeterminates over R. For a polynomial $P = P(t)$ in several variables, we have the notion of the **degree of P** with respect to the variable t_i: thinking of P as an element of $R[t_1, \ldots, t_{i-1}, t_{i+1}, \ldots, t_n][t_i]$ it is just the largest m such that the coefficient of t_i^m is nonzero, as usual. For any monomial term $c_I t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_n^{i_n}$ we define the **total degree** to be $d = i_1 + \ldots + i_n$.

A nonzero polynomial $P = \sum_I c_I t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_n^{i_n}$ is **homogeneous** if all of its monomial terms have the same total degree, and this common number is called the **degree of the homogeneous polynomial** P. By convention the zero polynomial is regarded as being homogeneous total degree d for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

A general polynomial $P \in R[t]$ can be written as a sum of homogeneous polynomials $P = \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} P_d(t)$ with each P_d homogeneous of degree d (and of course $P_d = 0$ for all sufficiently large d). This sum is *unique*. One way to see this is to establish the following more structural fact: for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$, let $P[t]_d$ be the set of all polynomials which are homogeneous of degree d. Then each $P[t]_d$ is an

R-submodule of $P[t]$ and we have a direct sum decomposition

$$(21) \qquad\qquad P[t] = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{\infty} P[t]_d.$$

Moreover, for all $d_1, d_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$(22) \qquad\qquad P[t]_{d_1} \cdot P[t]_{d_2} \subset P[t]_{d_1 + d_2}.$$

In general, if R is a ring and S is an algebra admitting an R-module direct sum decomposition $S = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{\infty} S_d$ satisfying $S_{d_1} \cdot S_{d_2} \subset S_{d_1 + d_2}$, then we say that S is an ($\mathbb{N}$)-**graded R-algebra**. Taking $R = \mathbb{Z}$ we get the notion of a **graded ring**.

EXERCISE 8.41. *Let $S = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{\infty} S_d$ be a graded R-algebra. Show: the R-submodule S_0 is in fact an R-algebra.*

Let $S = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{\infty} S_d$ be a graded ring. We say that $x \in S$ is **homogeneous of degree d** if $x \in S_d$. An ideal I of S is **homogeneous** if it has a generating set $I = \langle x_i \rangle$ with each x_i a homogeneous element.

EXERCISE 8.42. *Let S be a graded R-algebra and let I be a homogeneous ideal of S. Show:*

$$S/I = \bigoplus_{d=0}^{\infty} (S_d + I)/I$$

and thus S/I is a graded R-algebra.

Now back to the case of polynomial rings.

LEMMA 8.46. *Let S be a graded ring, let $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ be homogeneous elements of S, and put $I = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle$. Let $f \in I$ be homogeneous. Then there are homogeneous elements $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in R$ such that*

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i f_i$$

and for all $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\deg g_i = \deg f - \deg f_i.$$

PROOF. Since $f \in I$, there exist $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in S$ such that

$$f = X_1 f_1 + \ldots + X_n f_n.$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $X_i = \sum_j x_{i,j}$ with $\deg x_{i,j} = j$ be the canonical decomposition of X_i into a sum of homogeneous elements: i.e., $\deg x_{i,j} = j$. Then

$$(23) \qquad\qquad f = \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i, d - \deg f_i} f_i.$$

Since f is homogeneous of degree $\deg(f)$, only the $d = \deg(f)$ in the right hand side of (23) is nonzero, so

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{i, \deg f - \deg f_i} f_i. \qquad\qquad \square$$

13.2. The Krull Intersection Theorem.

THEOREM 8.47. *Let R be a Noetherian ring, and I an ideal of R. Suppose there is an element x of R such that $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n$. Then $x \in xI$.*

PROOF. The following miraculously short proof is due to H. Perdry [**Pe04**]. Suppose $I = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_r \rangle$. For each $n \geq 1$, since $x \in I^n$ there is a homogeneous degree n polynomial $P_n(t_1, \ldots, t_r) \in R[t_1, \ldots, t_r]$ such that

$$x = P_n(a_1, \ldots, a_r).$$

By the Hilbert Basis Theorem (Theorem 8.38), the ring $R[t_1, \ldots, t_r]$ is Noetherian. Therefore, defining $J_n = \langle P_1, \ldots, P_n \rangle$, there exists N such that $J_N = J_{N+1}$. By Lemma 8.46 we may write

$$P_{N+1} = Q_N P_1 + \ldots + Q_1 P_N,$$

with Q_i homogeneous of degree $i > 0$. Plugging in $t_i = a_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, we get

$$x = P_{N+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_r) = x \left(Q_1(a_1, \ldots, a_r) + \ldots + Q_N(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \right).$$

Since each Q_i is homogeneous of positive degree, we have $Q_i(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \in I$. □

COROLLARY 8.48. *Let I be an ideal in a Noetherian ring R. Suppose* either

  (i) *R is a domain and I is a proper ideal;* or
  (ii) *I is contained in the Jacobson radical $J(R)$ of R.*

Then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n = 0$.

PROOF. Either way, let $x \in \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n$ and apply Theorem 8.47 to obtain an element $a \in I$ such that $x = xa$. Thus $(a-1)x = 0$. Under assumption (i), we obtain either $a = 1$ – so $I = R$, contradicting the properness of I – or $x = 0$. Under assumption (ii), $a \in J(R)$ implies $a - 1 \in R^{\times}$, so that we may multiply through by $(a-1)^{-1}$, again getting $x = 0$.F   □

EXERCISE 8.43. *(Suárez-Alvarez) Exhibit an ideal I in a Noetherian ring such that $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n \supsetneq \{0\}$. (Hint: idempotents!)*

EXERCISE 8.44. *Let R be the ring of all C^{∞} functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Let $\mathfrak{m} = \{f \in R \mid f(0) = 0\}$.*

  a) *Show that $\mathfrak{m} = xR$ is a maximal ideal of R.*
  b) *Show that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\mathfrak{m}^n = \{f \in R \mid f(0) = f'(0) = \ldots = f^{(n-1)}(0)\}$.*
  c) *Deduce that $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}^n$ is the ideal of all smooth functions with identically zero Taylor series expansion at $x = 0$. Conclude that $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}^n \neq 0$.*
  d) *Let $f(x) = e^{\frac{-1}{x^2}}$ for $x \neq 0$ and 0 for $x = 0$. Show that $f \notin f\mathfrak{m}$.*
  e) *Deduce that R is not Noetherian.*

EXERCISE 8.45. *Let $R = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{C}[[t^{\frac{1}{n}}]]$ be the Puiseux series ring. Show that R is a domain with a unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ and that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\mathfrak{m}^n = \mathfrak{m}$. Deduce from the Krull Intersection Theorem that R is not Noetherian.*

The preceding exercise will become much more routine when we study valuation rings in §17. In that language, one can show that if R is a valuation ring with divisible value group, then $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local domain and $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}^n = \mathfrak{m}$.

EXERCISE 8.46 (Kearnes-Oman [**KeOm10**]). *Let I be an ideal in a Noetherian ring R, and suppose that either R is a domain and I is proper or I is contained in the Jacobson radical of R. Show: $\#R \leq (\#R/I)^{\aleph_0}$.*
(Suggestion: Show $\# \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} R/I^n \leq (\#R/I)^{\aleph_0}$ and apply Krull Intersection.)

The following exercise was conveyed to me by J.H. Silverman.

EXERCISE 8.47. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring with residue field $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ be indivisible by the characteristic of k (i.e., $n \cdot 1$ is a unit in k), and let*

$$\mu_n(R) := \{x \in R \mid x^n = 1\}$$

be the group of nth roots of unity in R.

a) *Show:*

$$\mu_n(R) \cap (1 + \mathfrak{m}) \subseteq \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}^l.$$

   (Hint: Let $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let $y \in \mathfrak{m}^r$ be such that $(1 + y)^n = 1$. Show: $y \in \mathfrak{m}^{2r}$.)
b) *Deduce: if R is Noetherian, then $\mu_n(R) \cap (1 + \mathfrak{m}) = \{1\}$.*
c) *Exhibit a Noetherian local ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ of residue characteristic $p > 0$ such that $\mu_p(R) \cap (1 + \mathfrak{m}) \supsetneq \{1\}$.*
d) *(Open) Must we have $\mu_n(R) \cap (1 + \mathfrak{m}) = \{1\}$ if R is not Noetherian?*

14. Krull's Principal Ideal Theorem

THEOREM 8.49. *(The Principal Ideal Theorem, a.k.a. Krull's Hauptidealsatz) Let x be a nonunit in a Noetherian ring R, and let $\mathfrak{p}$ be minimal among prime ideals containing x. Then $\mathfrak{p}$ has height at most one.*

Remark: A prime $\mathfrak{p}$ which is minimal among primes containing x will be called a **minimal prime over x**. Note that an equivalent condition is that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime in the quotient ring $R/(x)$. Note also that if x is nilpotent, every prime of $\mathfrak{p}$ contains x so the height of any minimal prime is 0.

Our strategy of proof follows Kaplansky, who follows D. Rees. We need a preliminary result:

LEMMA 8.50. *Let u and y be nonzero elements in a domain R. Then:*
a) The R-modules $\langle u, y \rangle / (u)$ and $\langle u^2, uy \rangle / (u^2)$ are isomorphic.
b) If we assume further that for all $t \in R$, $tu^2 \in (y)$ implies $tu \in (y)$, then the R-modules $(u)/(u^2)$ and $\langle u^2, y \rangle / \langle u^2, uy \rangle$ are isomorphic.

PROOF. a) The isomorphism is simply induced by multiplication by u.
b) The module $(u)/(u^2)$ is cyclic with annihilator (u), and conversely any such module is isomorphic to $R/(u)$. Moreover $M := \langle u^2, y \rangle / \langle u^2, uy \rangle$ is also cyclic, being generated simply by y. Certainly u annihilates M, so it suffices to show that the annihilator is exactly (u). More concretely, given $ky = au^2 + buy$, we must deduce that $k \in (u)$. But we certainly have $au^2 \in (y)$, so by hypothesis $au \in (y)$, say $au = cy$. Then $ky = cuy + buy$. Since $0 \neq y$ in our domain R, we may cancel y to get $k = (c + b)u \in (u)$. $\square$

Proof of Krull's Hauptidealsatz: Under the given hypotheses, assume for a contradiction that we have

$$\mathfrak{p}_2 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}.$$

Note first that we can safely pass to the quotient $R/\mathfrak{p}_2$ and thus assume that R is a domain. Dually, it does not hurt any to localize at $\mathfrak{p}$. Therefore we may assume that we have a Noetherian local domain R with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, an element $x \in \mathfrak{m}$, and a nonzero prime ideal, say $\mathfrak{p}$, with $x \in \mathfrak{p} \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}$, and our task is now to show that this setup is impossible. Now for the clever part: let $0 \neq y$ be any element of $\mathfrak{p}$, and for $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let I_k denote the ideal of all elements t with $tx^k \in (y)$. Then $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is an ascending chain of ideals in the Noetherian ring R so must stabilize, say at $k = n$. In particular, $tx^{2n} \in (y)$ implies $tx^n \in (y)$. Putting $u = x^n$, we have $tu^2 \in (y)$ implies $(tu) \in (y)$.

Since $\mathfrak{m}$ is a minimal prime over (x), the quotient ring $T = R/(u^2)$ has exactly one prime ideal, $\mathfrak{m}$, and is therefore, by the Akizuki-Hopkins Theorem, an Artinian ring, so that any finitely generated T-module has finite length. In particular, $M := \langle u, y \rangle/(u^2)$, which can naturally be viewed as a T-module, has finite length, and hence so does its T-submodule $M' := \langle u^2, y \rangle/(u^2)$. Put $N = \langle u^2, y \rangle \langle u^2, uy \rangle$. Then

$$\ell(M') = \ell(N) + \ell(\langle u^2, uy/(u^2)) = \ell((u)/(u^2)) + \ell(\langle u, y \rangle/(u)) = \ell(M);$$

in the second equality we have used Lemma 8.50. The only way that M could have the same length as its submodule M' is if $\langle u, y \rangle = \langle u^2, y \rangle$, i.e., if there exist $c, d \in R$ such that $u = cu^2 + dy$, or $u(1 - cu) = -dy$. Since u lies in the maximal ideal of the local ring R, $1 - cu \in R^{\times}$, and thus $u \in (y) \subset \mathfrak{p}$. But $\mathfrak{m}$ is minimal over x and hence, being prime, also minimal over $u = x^n$, contradiction! $\square$

COROLLARY 8.51. *With hypotheses as in Theorem 8.49, suppose that x is not a zero-divisor. Then any prime $\mathfrak{p}$ which is minimal over x has height one.*

EXERCISE 8.48. *Use the Akizuki-Hopkins theorem and Proposition 8.36 to give a proof of Corollary 8.51.*

Again we need a small preliminary result.

LEMMA 8.52. *(Prime Avoidance) Let R be a ring, and $I_1, \ldots, I_n, J$ be ideals of R. Suppose that all but at most two of the I_i's are prime and that $J \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} I_i$. Then $J \subset I_i$ for some i.*

PROOF. We go by induction on n, the case $n = 1$ being trivial.
$n = 2$: Seeking a contradiction, suppose there is $x_1 \in J \setminus I_2$ and $x_2 \in J \setminus I_1$. Since $J \subset I_1 \cup I_2$ we must have $x_1 \in I_1$ and $x_2 \in I_2$. Then $x_1 + x_2 \in J \subset I_1 \cup I_2$. If $x_1 + x_2 \in I_1$, then since $x_1 + x_2, x_1 \in I_1$, so is x_2, contradiction; whereas if $x_1 + x_2 \in I_2$, then since $x_1 + x_2, x_2 \in I_1$, so is x_1.[3]
$n \geq 3$: We may suppose that I_n is prime and also that for all proper subsets $S \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $J \not\subset \bigcup_{i \in S} I_i$; otherwise we would be done by induction. So for $1 \leq i \leq n$, there is $x_i \in J \setminus \bigcup_{j \neq i} I_j$, and then $x_i \in I_i$. Consider $x = x_1 \cdots x_{n-1} + x_n$. Then $x \in J$, so $x \in I_i$ for some i.
Case 1: $x \in I_n$. Then since $x_n \in I_n$, $x_1 \cdots x_{n-1} \in I_n$, and since I_n is prime $x_i \in I_n$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, contradiction.
Case 2: $x \in I_j$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$. Then $x_1 \cdots x_{n-1} \in I_j$, so $x_n \in I_j$, contradiction. $\square$

---

[3]In fact this works for any subgroups I_1, I_2, J of a group G with $J \subset I_1 \cup I_2$.

EXERCISE 8.49. ([**CDVM13**, Prop. 2.2]) *Let R be a UFD and not a field. Suppose $R^\times$ is finite. Show: R has infinitely many principal prime ideals.*
(HINT: *Suppose R has finitely many principal nonzero principal prime ideals, say $(\pi_1), \ldots, (\pi_n)$. Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$. By choosing $x \in \mathfrak{m}^\bullet$ and applying unique factorization, show $\mathfrak{m} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n (\pi_i)$. Apply Prime Avoidance and then Theorem 4.23.*)

We can now give a striking structural result about primes in a Noetherian ring. First a piece of notation: for any elements x, y in a partially ordered set S we define the "interval" (x, y) to be the set of all $z \in S$ such that $x < z < y$. For prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$, we denote by $(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q})$ the set of all prime ideals $\mathcal{P}$ with $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{P} \subset \mathfrak{q}$.

COROLLARY 8.53. *Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ be prime ideals in a Noetherian ring R. Then the interval $(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q})$ is either empty or infinite.*

PROOF. As usual, by correspondence we may pass to $R/\mathfrak{p}$ and therefore assume that $\mathfrak{p} = 0$. Suppose that for some $n \geq 1$ we have $(0, \mathfrak{q}) = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n\}$. By Prime Avoidance (Lemma 8.52) we cannot then have $\mathfrak{q} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i$, so choose $x \in \mathfrak{q} \backslash \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i$. Then $\mathfrak{q}$ is a prime of R, of height at least 2, which is minimal over (x), contradicting Theorem 8.49. $\qquad\square$

In particular, if R is Noetherian and $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is finite, then $\dim R \leq 1$.

THEOREM 8.54. *(Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem) Let R be a Noetherian ring, and let $I = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$ be a proper ideal of R. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a minimal element of the set of all prime ideals containing I. Then $\mathfrak{p}$ has height at most n.*

PROOF. As usual, we may localize at $\mathfrak{p}$ and suppose that R is local with $\mathfrak{p}$ as its maximal ideal. Suppose to the contrary that there exists a chain $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_0 \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \supsetneq \ldots \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_{n+1}$. Because R is Noetherian, we may arrange for $(\mathfrak{p}_1, \mathfrak{p}) = \emptyset$. Because $\mathfrak{p}$ is minimal over I, I cannot be contained in $\mathfrak{p}_1$; without loss of generality we may suppose that a_1 is not in $\mathfrak{p}_1$. Put $J := \langle \mathfrak{p}_1, a_1 \rangle$; then J strictly contains $\mathfrak{p}_1$ so $\mathfrak{p}$ is the unique prime of R containing J. So the ring R/J is an Artin local ring, and then by Proposition 8.36 for sufficiently large k we have $\mathfrak{p}^k \subset J$. Then by taking t to be sufficiently large we can write, for $2 \leq i \leq n$,

$$a_i^t = c_i a_1 + b_i, \ c_i \in R, b_i \in \mathfrak{p}_1.$$

Put $K = \langle b_2, \ldots, b_n \rangle \subset \mathfrak{p}_1$. Since the height of $\mathfrak{p}_1$ exceeds $n - 1$, by induction on n we may assume that $\mathfrak{p}_1$ properly contains a prime ideal Q which contains J. The ideal $Q' := \langle a_1, Q \rangle$ contains some power of each a_i and therefore $\mathfrak{p}$ is the unique prime ideal containing Q'. So in the quotient R/Q, the prime $\mathfrak{p}/Q$ is minimal over the principal ideal Q'/Q. By Krull's Hauptidealsatz (Theorem 8.49) $\mathfrak{p}/Q$ has height 1. On the other hand, we have $\mathfrak{p}/Q \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1/Q \supsetneq 0$, a contradiction. $\qquad\square$

It follows that every prime ideal in a Noetherian ring has finite height. In fact, we can be more precise:

COROLLARY 8.55. *Let R be a Noetherian ring, and let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ be a non-minimal prime ideal. Then the height of $\mathfrak{p}$ is the least $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that there are $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathfrak{p}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime over the ideal $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$.*

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ have height $m \geq 1$, and let n be the least positive integer such that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime over an ideal with n generators. By Theorem 8.54 we have

$m \leq n$. Conversely, we will prove that $n \leq m$ by induction on m: suppose the claim holds for every prime ideal in a Noetherian ring of height less than m. By Corollary 4.38b), the set of minimal primes of R is finite, so by Prime Avoidance (Lemma 8.52) there is an element x_1 that lies in $\mathfrak{p}$ and does not lie in any minimal prime of R, so any prime ideal containing x_1 has positive height, so any finite chain of prime ideals in R with smallest element $\mathfrak{p}$ can be extended in length by adjoining a minimal prime contained in $\mathfrak{p}$ (which always exists by Proposition 4.34). It follows that the ideal $\mathfrak{p}/\langle x_1 \rangle$ of $R/\langle x_1 \rangle$ has height at most $m-1$. By induction, there are $\overline{x_2}, \ldots, \overline{x_m} \in \mathfrak{p}/\langle x_1 \rangle$ such that $\mathfrak{p}/\langle x_1 \rangle$ is a minimal prime over $\langle \overline{x_2}, \ldots, \overline{x_m} \rangle$ in $R/\langle x_1 \rangle$. For $2 \leq i \leq m$, lifting each $\overline{x_j}$ to $x_j \in \mathfrak{p}$, we get that $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime over $\langle x_1, \ldots, x_m \rangle$ in R. $\square$

EXERCISE 8.50. *Let R be a Noetherian ring.*

  a) *Suppose R is semilocal. Show: $\dim R$ is finite.*
  b) *Suppose R is local, with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Show: $\dim R$ is the least $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that that there are $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ with $\mathrm{rad}\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle = \mathfrak{m}$.*

EXERCISE 8.51. *Let k be a field. Let $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n, \ldots]$ be a polynomial ring over k in a countably infinite set of indeterminates. Find a prime ideal of R of infinite height.*

However, it does not follow from Theorem 8.54 that a Notherian ring necessarily has finite Krull dimension, and in fact this is false: the first counterexample was constructed by Nagata in 1962.

15. The Dimension Theorem, following [BMRH]

The following is a very basic theorem about Noetherian rings:

THEOREM 8.56. *(Dimension Theorem) Let R be a Noetherian ring.*

  a) *We have $\dim R[t] = \dim R + 1$.*
  b) *We have $\dim R[[t]] = \dim R + 1$.*

Remark: For a non-Noetherian ring R, one has the inequalities

$$\dim R + 1 \leq \dim R[t] \leq 2 \dim R[t] + 1,$$

and indeed there are rings for which $\dim R[t] = 2 \dim R + 1$.

Of course, an immediate induction argument gives:

COROLLARY 8.57. *Let k be a field. Then*

$$\dim k[t_1, \ldots, t_n] = \dim k[[t_1, \ldots, t_n]] = n.$$

Traditional proofs of the Dimension Theorem require significant development of the dimension *theory* of commutative rings, a topic which is not covered here. Happily, a striking alternate approach to the Dimension Theorem was given by Brewer, Heinzer, Montgomery and Rutter in [**BMRH**]. We follow their treatment here.

COMPLETE ME! ♣

16. The Artin-Tate Lemma

THEOREM 8.58. *(Artin-Tate [**AT51**]) Let $R \subset T \subset S$ be a tower of rings with:*
(i) R Noetherian,
(ii) S finitely generated as an R-algebra, and
(iii) S finitely generated as a T-module.
Then T is finitely generated as an R-algebra.

PROOF. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be a set of generators for S as an R-algebra, and let $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m$ be a set of generators for S as a T-module. For all $1 \leq i \leq n$, we may write

$$(24) \qquad x_i = \sum_j a_{ij}\omega_j, \ a_{ij} \in T.$$

Similarly, for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$, we may write

$$(25) \qquad \omega_i\omega_j = \sum_{i,j,k} b_{ijk}\omega_k, \ b_{ijk} \in T.$$

Let T_0 be the R-subalgebra of T generated by the a_{ij} and b_{ijk}. Since T_0 is a finitely generated algebra over the Noetherian ring R, the ring T_0 is Noetherian by the Hilbert Basis Theorem. Each element of S may be expressed as a polynomial in the x_i's with R-coefficients. Making substitutions using (24) and then (25), we see S is generated as a T_0-module by $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m$, and in particular that S is a finitely generated T_0-module. Since T_0 is Noetherian, the submodule T is also finitely generated as a T_0-module. This immediately implies that T is finitely generated as a T_0-algebra and then in turn that T is finitely generated as an R-algebra. $\qquad\square$

CHAPTER 9

Boolean rings

1. First Properties

Let R be a not-necessarily-commutative-ring with the property that $x^2 = x$ for all $x \in R$. Then $(1+1) = (1+1)^2 = 1+1+1+1$, so $1+1 = 0$. It follows that $-x = x$ for all $x \in R$. Moreover for any $x, y \in R$, $(x+y) = (x+y)^2 = x^2 + xy + yx + y^2 = x + y + xy + yx$, so $xy + yx = 0$ or $xy = yx$. Therefore R is commutative.

We define a **Boolean ring** to be a ring R such that $x^2 = x$ for all $x \in R$. That is, a ring is Boolean iff all of its elements are idempotents.

EXERCISE 9.1. *Show: the group of units of a Boolean ring is trivial.*

EXERCISE 9.2. *a) Show: a quotient of a Boolean ring is Boolean.*
b) Show: a subring of a Boolean ring is Boolean.

EXERCISE 9.3. *Show: a Boolean ring is absolutely flat.*

2. Boolean Algebras

A Boolean ring is an object of commutative algebra. It turns out that there is a completely equivalent class of structures of an order-theoretic nature, called **Boolean algebras**. In some ways the concept of a Boolean algebra is more intuitive and transparent – e.g., starting directly from the definition, it is perhaps easier to give examples of Boolean algebras. Moreover it is not at all difficult to see how to pass from a Boolean ring to a Boolean algebra and conversely.

A **Boolean algebra** is a certain very nice partially ordered set $(B, \leq)$. Recall that for any partially orderet set B and any subset S, we have the notion of the **supremum** $\sup S$ and the **infimum** $\inf S$. To define these it is convenient to extend the inequality notation as follows: if S, T are subsets of B, we write

$$S < T$$

to mean that for all $s \in S$ and $t \in T$, $s < t$, and similarly

$$S \leq T$$

to mean that for all $s \in S$ and $t \in T$, $s \leq t$.
Then we say that $z = \sup S$ if $S \leq z$ and if w is any element of B with $S \leq w$, then $z \leq w$. Similarly $z = \inf S$ if $z \leq S$ and if w is any element of B with $w \leq S$ then $w \leq Z$. For a given subset S, neither $\sup S$ nor $\inf S$ need exist, but if either exists it it is plainly unique. In particular if $\sup \varnothing$ exists, it is necessarily a bottom element, called 0, and if $\inf \varnothing$ exists, it is necessarily a top element called 0.

A partially ordered set $(L, \leq)$ is called a **lattice** if for all $x, y \in L$, $\sup\{x, y\}$ and $\inf\{x, y\}$ both exist. We give new notation for this: we write

$$x \vee y := \sup\{x, y\},$$

the **join** of x and y and

$$x \wedge y := \inf\{x, y\},$$

the **meet** of x and y.

A lattice is said to be **bounded** if it contains a bottom element 0 and a top element 1: equivalently, $\sup S$ and $\inf S$ exist for every finite subset S.

EXERCISE 9.4. *Let L be a lattice containing 0 and 1, and let $x \in L$. Then:*
a) $x \vee 1 = 1$,
b) $x \wedge 1 = x$,
c) $x \vee 0 = x$,
d) $x \wedge 0 = 0$.

A lattice L is **complemented** if it has a bottom element 0, a top element 1, and for each $x \in L$ there exists $y \in L$ such that $x \vee y = 1$, $x \wedge y = 0$.

A lattice is **distributive** if $\forall x, y, z \in L$,

$$(x \vee y) \wedge z = (x \wedge z) \vee (y \wedge z),$$
$$(x \wedge y) \vee z = (x \vee z) \wedge (y \vee z).$$

PROPOSITION 9.1. *Let L be a distributive complemented lattice. Then for all $x \in L$, the complement of x is unique.*

PROOF. Suppose that y_1 and y_2 are both complements to x, so

$$x \vee y_1 = x \vee y_2 = 1, \ \ x \wedge y_1 = x \wedge y_2 = 0.$$

Then

$$y_2 = 1 \wedge y_2 = (x \vee y_1) \wedge y_2 = (x \wedge y_2) \vee (y_1 \wedge y_2) = 0 \vee (y_1 \wedge y_2) = y_1 \wedge y_2,$$

so $y_2 \leq y_1$. Reasoning similarly, we get $y_1 \leq y_2$, so $y_1 = y_2$. $\qquad\square$

By virtue of Proposition 9.1 we denote the complement of an element x in a distributive complemented lattice as x^*.

EXERCISE 9.5. *Show: for every element x of a distributive complemented lattice we have $(x^*)^* = x$.*

A **Boolean algebra** is a complemented distributive lattice with $0 \neq 1$.

EXERCISE 9.6. *Show: **DeMorgan's Laws** hold in any Boolean algebra B: for all $x, y \in B$, we have*
a) $(x \wedge y)^* = x^* \vee y^*$ *and*
b) $(x \vee y)^* = x^* \wedge y^*$.

The shining example of a Boolean algebra is the powerset algebra 2^S for a nonempty set S. In the special case in which $|S| = 1$, we denote the corresponding Boolean algebra (the unique totally ordered set on two elements) simply as 2.

Not every Boolean algebra is isomorphic to a power set Boolean algebra.

Example: Let S be a set, and let $Z(S) \subset 2^S$ be the collection of all finite and cofinite subsets of S. It is easily checked that $(Z(S), \subset) \subset (2^S, \subset)$ is a sub-Boolean algebra. However, $|Z(S)| = |S|$, so if $|S| = \aleph_0$, then $Z(S)$ is not isomorphic to any power set Boolean algebra.

Boolean algebras form a full subcategory of the category of partially ordered sets. In other words, we define a morphism $f : B \to B'$ of Boolean algebras simply to be an isotone (or order-preserving) map: $\forall x, y \in B, x \leq y \implies f(x) \leq f(y)$. One can (and sometimes does, e.g. for model-theoretic purposes) also axiomatize Boolean algebras as a structure $(B, \vee, \wedge, *, 0, 1)$, the point being that $x \leq y$ iff $x \vee y = y$ iff $x \wedge y = x$, so the partial ordering can be recovered from the wedge or the join.

PROPOSITION 9.2. *The category of Boolean rings is equivalent to the category of Boolean algebras.*

In other words, we can define a functor F from Boolean rings to Boolean algebras and a functor G from Boolean algebras to Boolean rings such that for every Boolean ring R, R is naturally isomorphic to $G(F(R))$ and for every Boolean algebra B, B is naturally isomorphic to $F(G(B))$.

Let us sketch the basic construction, leaving the details to the reader. Suppose first that R is a Boolean ring. Then we associate a Boolean algebra $F(R)$ with the same underlying set as R, endowed with the following operations: $\forall x, y \in R$,

$$x \wedge y = xy,$$

$$x^* = 1 - x.$$

The join operation is then forced on us by DeMorgan's Laws:

$$x \vee y = (x^* \wedge y^*)^* = x + y - xy.$$

EXERCISE 9.7. *Check that $(F(R), \wedge, \vee, *)$ is indeed a Boolean algebra, and that the bottom element 0 in $F(R)$ (resp. the top element 1) is indeed the additive identity 0 (resp. the multiplicative identity 1).*

Conversely, suppose that we have a Boolean algebra $(B, \wedge, \vee, *)$. Then we define a Boolean ring $G(B)$ on the same underlying set B, by taking

$$x + y := (x \wedge y^*) \vee (y \wedge x^*)$$

$$xy := x \wedge y.$$

The addition operation corresponds to the Boolean operation "exclusive or" or, in more set-theoretic language, **symmetric difference** $x \Delta y$.

EXERCISE 9.8. *Check that $(G(B), +, \cdot)$ is indeed a Boolean ring with additive identity the bottom element 0 of B and multiplicative identity the top element 1 of B.*

EXERCISE 9.9. *a) Let R be a Boolean ring. Show: the identity map 1_R on R is an isomorphism of Boolean rings $R \to G(F(R))$.*
b) Let B be a Boolean algebra. Show that the identity map 1_B on B is an isomorphism of Boolean algebras $B \to G(F(B))$.

EXERCISE 9.10. *Let X be a nonempty set, let B_X be the Boolean algebra of subsets of X, partially ordered by inclusion. Show: the corresponding Boolean ring may be identified with the ring 2^X of all functions from X to $\mathbb{F}_2$ under pointwise addition and multiplication.*

EXERCISE 9.11. *Show: every finite Boolean algebra is isomorphic to a powerset algebra. Deduce: every finite Boolean ring R is isomorphic to the ring of binary functions on a finite set of cardinality $\log_2(\#R)$. In fact, try to show this both on the Boolean algebra side and on the Boolean ring side. (Hint for the Boolean ring side: use the decomposition into a direct product afforded by an idempotent element.)*

EXERCISE 9.12. *Show: an arbitrary direct product of Boolean algebras (or, equivalently, Boolean rings) is a Boolean algebra (or...).*

As we saw above, cardinality considerations already show that not every Boolean algebra is the power set Boolean algebra, and hence not every Boolean ring is the full ring of binary functions on some set X. However, in view of results like Cayley's theorem in basic group theory, it is a reasonable guess that every Boolean algebra is *an* algebra of sets, i.e., is a sub-Boolean algebra of a power set algebra. We proceed to prove this important result on the Boolean ring side.

3. Ideal Theory in Boolean Rings

PROPOSITION 9.3. *Let R be a Boolean ring.*
a) For all $x \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $n \geq 2$, $x^n = x$.
b) A Boolean ring is reduced, i.e., has no nonzero nilpotent elements.
c) Every ideal in a Boolean ring is a radical ideal.

PROOF. a) The case $n = 2$ is the definition of a Boolean ring, so we may assume $n \geq 3$. Assume the result holds for all $x \in R$ and all $2 \leq k < n$. Then $x^n = x^{n-1}x = x \cdot x = x$.
b) If $x \in R$ is such that $x^n = 0$ for some positive integer n, then either $n = 1$ or $n \geq 2$ and $x^n = x$; either way $x = 0$.
c) Let I be an ideal in the Boolean ring R. Then $I = \mathrm{rad}(I)$ iff R/I is reduced, but R/I is again a Boolean ring and part b) applies. $\qquad\square$

The ring $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is of course a Boolean ring. It is also a field, hence certainly a local ring and a domain. We will shortly see that it is unique among Boolean rings in possessing *either* of the latter two properties.

PROPOSITION 9.4.   a) *The only Boolean domain is $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.*
    b) *Every prime ideal in a Boolean ring is maximal.*

PROOF. a) Let R be a Boolean domain, and let x be an element of R. Then $x(x-1) = 0$, so in a domain R this implies $x = 0$ or $x = 1$, so that $R \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.
b) If $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal in the Boolean ring R, then $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a Boolean domain, hence – by part a) – is simply $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. But this ring is a field, so $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal. $\quad\square$

PROPOSITION 9.5. *Let R be a local Boolean ring. Then $R \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.*

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the unique maximal ideal of R. By Proposition 9.4, $\mathfrak{m}$ is moreover the unique prime ideal of R. It follows from Proposition 4.13d) that $\mathfrak{m} = \mathrm{nil}\, R$ is the set of all nilpotent elements, so by Proposition 9.3b) $\mathfrak{m} = 0$. Thus R is a field and thus, by Proposition 9.4 must be $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 9.13. *Let R be a Boolean ring, let I be an ideal of R.*

    a) *Show that $x, y \in I \implies x \vee y \in I$.*
    b) *Show in fact that $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle x \vee y \rangle$.*
    c) *Deduce that any finitely generated ideal of R is principal.*

PROPOSITION 9.6.   a) *For a Boolean ring R, the following are equivalent:*
    (i) *R is finite.*
    (ii) *R is Noetherian.*
    (iii) *R has finitely many maximal ideals.*
    b) *If these equivalent conditions hold, then $R \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^n$.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is clear.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Since R is Noetherian and prime ideals are maximal, by the Akizuki-Hopkins Theorem (Theorem 8.35) R is Artinian, and then Theorem 8.37 gives that R is a finite product of local Boolean rings.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): If $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is finite, then by Exercise 8.32 the ring $R/J(R)$ is a finite product of fields $\prod_{i=1}^n k_i$. In a Boolean ring the Jacobson radical is the intersection of all maximal ideals, which is the intersection of all prime ideals, which is the set of nilpotent elements, which is (0). So $J(R) = 0$ and $R \cong \prod_{i=1}^n k_i$. Each k_i is a quotient of R, hence Boolean, so $k_i \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. So R is finite.
In the course of proving the equivalence of the conditions we also showed that they imply $R \cong \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. $\qquad\square$

LEMMA 9.7. *For an ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ in a Boolean ring R, the following are equivalent:*

    (i) *$\mathfrak{m}$ is maximal.*
    (ii) *For all $x \in R$, either $x \in R$ or $1 - x \in R$ (and not both!).*

PROOF. $(i) \implies (ii)$: Of course no proper ideal in any ring can contain both x and $1 - x$ for then it would contain 1. To see that at least one must lie in $\mathfrak{m}$, it is certainly no loss to assume that x is neither 0 nor 1, hence $R = xR \times (1-x)R$. Recall that in a product $R_1 \times R_2$ of rings, every ideal I is itself a product $I_1 \times I_2$, where I_i is an ideal of R_i. Then $R/I \cong R_1/I_1 \times R_2/I_2$. So I is prime iff R/I is a domain iff either (i) I_1 is prime in R_1 and $I_2 = R_2$ or (ii) $I_1 = R_1$ and I_2 is prime in R_2. In particular, every maximal ideal of $R_1 \times R_2$ contains either R_1 or R_2: done.
$(i) \implies (ii)$:[1] We prove the contrapositive: if $\mathfrak{m}$ is not maximal, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{M}$ properly containing $\mathfrak{m}$. Let $x \in \mathfrak{M} \setminus \mathfrak{m}$. Since $\mathfrak{M}$ is proper, it does not also contain $1 - x$, hence neither does the smaller ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 9.14. *(Kernel of a homomorphism) Let $f : R \to \mathbb{F}_2$ be a homomorphism of Boolean rings.*
a) Show that $\operatorname{Ker} f$ is $\vee$-closed: if $x, y \in \operatorname{Ker} f$, then $x \vee y \in \operatorname{Ker} f$.
b) Show that $\operatorname{Ker} f$ is downward-closed: if $x \in \operatorname{Ker} f$ and $y \leq x$, then $y \in \operatorname{Ker} f$.
c) Explain why parts a) and b) are equivalent to showing that $\operatorname{Ker} f$ is an ideal of the Boolean ring R.
d) Show that $\operatorname{Ker} f$ is in fact a maximal ideal of R.
e) Conversely, for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, show that $R/\mathfrak{m} = \mathbb{F}_2$ and thus the quotient map $q : R \to R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a homomorphism from R to $\mathbb{F}_2$.

---

[1]This direction holds in any ring.

EXERCISE 9.15. *(Shell of a homomorphism) Let $f : R \to \mathbb{F}_2$ be a homomorphism of Boolean rings. Define the **shell** $\operatorname{Sh} f$ to be $f^{-1}(1)$.*
a) Show that $\operatorname{Sh} f$ is wedge-closed: if $x, y \in \operatorname{Sh} f$, so is $x \wedge y$.
b) Show that $\operatorname{Sh} f$ is upward-closed: if $x \in \operatorname{Sh} f$ and $x \leq y$, then $y \in \operatorname{Sh} f$.
*c) A nonempty, proper subset of a Boolean algebra which is wedge-closed and upward-closed is called a **filter**, so by parts a) and b) $\operatorname{Sh} f$ is a filter on B. Show that in fact it is an **ultrafilter** on B, i.e., that it is not properly contained in any other filter. (Suggestion: use Lemma 9.7.)*
d) Show that every ultrafilter on B is the shell of a unique homomorphism of Boolean algebras $f : B \to \mathbb{F}_2$.

4. The Stone Representation Theorem

Let R be a Boolean ring. We would like to find an embedding of R into a Boolean ring of the form 2^X. The key point of course, is to conjure up a suitable set X. Can we find any clues in our prior work on Boolean rings?
indent Well, finite Boolean rings we understand: the proof of Proposition 9.6 gives us that every finite Boolean ring is of the form $\bigoplus_{i \in X} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, where the elements of X correspond to the maximal ideals of R. The isomorphism $\bigoplus_{i \in X} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \cong 2^X$ amounts to taking each element x of R and recording which of the maximal ideals it lies in: namely, x lies in the ith maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_i$ of all elements having a zero in the ith coordinate iff its image in the quotient $R/\mathfrak{m}_i = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is equal to 0.

This motivates the following construction. For any Boolean ring, let $M(R)$ be the set of all maximal ideals of R, and define a map $E : R \to M(R)$ by letting $E(x)$ be the set of maximal ideals of R which *do not* contain x. This turns out to be very fruitful:

THEOREM 9.8. *(Stone Representation Theorem) Let R be a Boolean ring and $M(R)$ the set of maximal ideals. The map $E : R \to 2^{M(R)}$ which sends an element x of R to the collection of all maximal ideals of R which* do not *contain x is an injective homomorphism of Boolean rings. Therefore R is isomorphic to the Boolean ring associated to the algebra of sets $E(R) \subset 2^{M(R)}$.*

In particular this shows that every Boolean algebra is an algebra of sets.

PROOF. Step 1: We check that the map E is a homomorphism of Boolean algebras. Above we saw $E(0) = \emptyset$; also $E(1) = M(R)$. Also, for $x, y \in R$, $E(xy)$ is the set of maximal ideals which do not contain xy; since maximal ideals are prime this is the set of maximal ideals which contain neither x nor y, i.e., $E(x) \cap E(y) = E(x) \cdot E(y)$. Finally, $E(x) + E(y) = E(x) \Delta E(y)$ is the set of maximal ideals which contain exactly one of x and y, whereas $E(x + y)$ is the set of maximal ideals not containing $x + y$. For $\mathfrak{m} \in M(R)$, consider the following cases:
(i) $x, y \in \mathfrak{m}$. Then $\mathfrak{m}$ is not in $E(x) \Delta E(y)$. On the other hand $x + y \in \mathfrak{m}$, so $\mathfrak{m}$ is not in $E(x + y)$.
(ii) Neither x nor y is in $\mathfrak{m}$. Certainly then $\mathfrak{m}$ is not in $E(x) \Delta E(y)$. On the other hand, remembering that $R/\mathfrak{m} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, both x and y map to 1 in the quotient, so $x + y$ maps to $1 + 1 = 0$, i.e., $x + y \in \mathfrak{m}$, so $\mathfrak{m}$ is not in $E(x + y)$.
(iii) Exactly one of x and y lies in $\mathfrak{m}$. Then $\mathfrak{m} \in E(x) \Delta E(y)$ and as above, $x + y$ maps to 1 in $R/\mathfrak{m}$, so $x + y$ is not in $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{m} \in E(x + y)$.
Step 2: We show that the map E is injective. In other words, suppose we have two

elements x and y of R such that a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R contains x iff it contains y. Then

$$(x) = \operatorname{rad}(x) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in M(R) \ | \ x \in \ \mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in M(R) \ | \ y \in \ \mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m} = \operatorname{rad}(y) = (y).$$

So there are $a, b \in R$ with $y = ax$, $x = by$, and then

$$x = by = by^2 = xy = ax^2 = ax = y. \qquad \square$$

Let us comment a bit on the proof. Although Step 1 is longer, it is rather routine. They key is that E gives an embedding, which as we saw is equivalent to the much gutsier statement that an element of a Boolean ring is entirely determined by the family of maximal ideals containing it. From the standpoint of the more "conventional" rings one encounters in number theory and algebraic geometry, this is a very strange phenomenon. First of all, it can only be true in a ring R which has trivial unit group, since if u is a nontrivial unit of course we will not be able to distinguish 1 and u using ideals! Moreover it implies that every principal ideal is radical, which does not hold in any domain which is not a field. Finally it implies that every radical ideal is the intersection of the maximal ideals which contain it, a property which we *will* meet later on: these are the **Jacobson rings**.

5. Boolean Spaces

We will now digress a bit to talk (not for the first or last time!) about topological spaces. Following Bourbaki, for us **compact** means quasi-compact and Hausdorff. Further a **locally compact space** is a Hausdorff space in which each point admits a local base of compact neighborhoods. A subset of a topological space is **clopen** if it is both closed and open.

A topological space X is **totally disconnected** if the only connected subsets of X are the singleton sets $\{x\}$.[2] A totally disconnected space is necessarily **separated** (older terminology that I am not fond of: T_1): i.e., singleton sets are closed. Indeed, the closure of every connected set is connected, so the closure of a non-closed point would give a connected set which is larger than a point. On the other hand a space X is **zero-dimensional** if it admits a base of clopen sets.

PROPOSITION 9.9. *Let X be a locally compact space. Then X is totally disconnected iff it is zero-dimensional.*

PROOF. It is an exercise to show that every zero-dimensional Hausdorff space is totally disconnected. For a proof that every locally compact totally disconnected space is zero-dimensional, see e.g. [**Cl-GT**, Thm. 5.48]. $\qquad \square$

A space X is called **Boolean**[3] if it is compact and zero-dimensional; in particular a Boolean space admits a base for the topology consisting of *compact open* sets.

EXERCISE 9.16. *a) A finite space is Boolean iff it is discrete.*
b) A Boolean space is discrete iff it is finite.
c) An arbitrary direct product of Boolean spaces is Boolean.
d) The usual Cantor space is homeomorphic to a countably infinite direct product of copes of a discrete, two-point space and thus is a Boolean space.

---

[2]Following Qiaochu Yuan, we take the convention that the empty space is *not* connected: it has zero connected components, not one!

[3]There are many synonyms: e.g. **Stone space**, **profinite space**.

EXERCISE 9.17. *Show: a topological space is Boolean iff it is homeomorphic to an inverse limit of finite, discrete spaces.*

To every topological space X we may associate a Boolean algebra: namely, the subalgebra of 2^X consisting of compact open subsets. Thus in particular we may associate a Boolean ring, say $\mathcal{C}(X)$, the **characteristic ring** of X. (We allow ourselves to pass between $\mathcal{C}(X)$ and the associated Boolean algebra on the same set and call the latter the **characteristic algebra**.)

EXERCISE 9.18. *Show: the assignment $X \mapsto \mathcal{C}$ extends to a contravariant functor from the category of topological spaces to the category of Boolean rings.*
(In other words, show that a continuous map $f : X \to Y$ of topological spaces induces a "pullback" ring homomorphism $\mathcal{C}(f) : \mathcal{C}(Y) \to \mathcal{C}(X)$.)

If X is itself a Boolean space, then the characteristic algebra $\mathcal{C}(X)$ is indeed *characteristic* of X in the following sense.

PROPOSITION 9.10. *Let X be a Boolean space, and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a Boolean algebra of subsets of X which is also a base for the topology of X. Then $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}(X)$.*

PROOF. By hypothesis the elements of $\mathcal{A}$ are open sets in X. Moreover, since $\mathcal{A}$ is closed under complementation, the elements are also closed. Thus $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{C}(X)$.

Conversely, suppose $Y \in \mathcal{C}(X)$. Since Y is open and $\mathcal{A}$ is a base for the topology on X, for each $y \in Y$ there is $A_y \in \mathcal{A}$ with $y \in A_y \subset Y$. Thus $\{A_y\}_{y \in Y}$ is an open cover for Y. But Y is also closed in a compact space hence itself compact, so we may extract a finite subcover, say $Y = \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_{y_i}$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a subalgebra, it is closed under finite unions, so $Y \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus $\mathcal{C}(X) \subset \mathcal{A}$. $\square$

To every Boolean ring R we may associate a Boolean space: namely there is a natural topology on $M(R)$, the set of maximal ideals of R, with respect to which $M(R)$ is a Boolean space. This topology can be described in many ways.

First Approach: by the Stone Representation Theorem we have an embedding $R \hookrightarrow 2^{M(R)}$ and thus every element $x \in R$ determines a function $x : M(R) \to \mathbb{F}_2$. We may endow $\mathbb{F}_2$ with the discrete topology (what else?) and then give $M(R)$ the **initial topology** for the family of maps $\{x : M(R) \to \mathbb{F}_2\}_{x \in R}$: the coarsest topology which makes each of these maps continuous.

Here is a more concrete description of this initial topology: for each $x \in R$, put

$$U_x = \{\mathfrak{m} \in M(R) \mid x \notin \mathfrak{m}\}$$

$$V_x = \{\mathfrak{m} \in M(R) \mid x \in \mathfrak{m}\}.$$

Then the topology in question is the one generated by $\{U_x, V_x\}_{x \in X}$.

Second Approach: for any Boolean ring R, to give a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R is equivalent to giving a homomorphism of Boolean rings $f : R \to \mathbb{F}_2$. Namely, to a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ we associate the quotient map, and to $f : R \to \mathbb{F}_2$ we associate the kernel $f^{-1}(0)$. In this way we get an embedding $\iota : M(R) \hookrightarrow 2^R$. Now we endow each copy of $\mathbb{F}_2$ with the discrete topology and 2^R with the product topology: this makes it into a Boolean space.

LEMMA 9.11. *The image $\iota(M(R))$ of ι is a closed subspace of 2^R.*

EXERCISE 9.19. *Prove Lemma 9.11.*

Thus if we endow $M(R)$ with the topology it inherits via the embedding ι, it is itself a Boolean space.

EXERCISE 9.20. *Show: the topology on $M(R)$ defined via Lemma 9.11 coincides with the initial topology on $M(R)$ defined above.*

It turns out to be important to consider a distinguished base for the topology on $M(R)$, which we now define. Since for a prime ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ we have $xy \notin \mathfrak{m} \iff x \notin \mathfrak{m}$ and $y \notin \mathfrak{m}$, we have for all $x, y \in R$ that

$$U_x \cap U_y = U_{xy}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 9.7, $M(R) \setminus V_x = U_x$. It follows that the $\{U_x\}_{x \in X}$ form a base of clopen sets for the topology on $M(R)$.

To show the utility of this base, let us use it to show directly that $M(R)$ is a Boolean space.

Hausdorff: Let $\mathfrak{m}_1$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2$ be distinct maximal ideals of R. Choose $x \in \mathfrak{m}_2 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_1$, so by Lemma 9.7 $1 - x \in \mathfrak{m}_1 \setminus \mathfrak{m}_2$. Thus $\mathfrak{m}_1 \in U_x$ $\mathfrak{m}_2 \in U_{1-x}$ and

$$U_x \cap U_{1-x} = U_{x(1-x)} = U_0 = \varnothing,$$

so we have separated $\mathfrak{m}_1$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2$ by open sets.

Quasi-compact: As is well-known, it is enough to check quasi-compactness of a space using covers by elements of any fixed base. We certainly have a preferred base here, namely $\{U_x\}_{x \in X}$, so let's use it: suppose that we have a collection $\{x_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that $\bigcup_{i \in I} U_{x_i} = M(R)$. Now again (and not for the last...) we exploit the power of DeMorgan:

$$M(R) = \bigcup_i U_{x_i} = \bigcup_i (M(R) \setminus V_{x_i}) = M(R) \setminus \bigcap_i V_{x_i},$$

so that $\bigcap_i V_{x_i} = \varnothing$. This means that there is no maximal ideal containing every x_i. But *that* means that the ideal generated by the x_i's contains 1: there exists a finite subset $J \subset I$ and $a_j \in R$ such that $\sum_j a_j x_j = 1$, and thus $\bigcap_{j \in J} V_{x_j} = \varnothing$: equivalently $\bigcup_{j \in J} U_{x_j} = M(R)$.

Thus we have shown that the correspondence $R \mapsto M(R)$ associates to every Boolean ring a Boolean topological space, its **Stone space**.

EXERCISE 9.21. *Show: the assignment $R \mapsto M(R)$ extends to a functor from the category of Boolean rings to the category of Boolean spaces.*

6. Stone Duality

THEOREM 9.12. *(Stone Duality) The functors $\mathcal{C}$ and M give a duality between the category of Boolean spaces and the category of Boolean algebras. That is:*
a) For every Boolean algebra B, the map $B \to \mathcal{C}(M(B))$ given by $x \in B \mapsto U_x$ is an isomorphism of Boolean algebras.
b) For every Boolean space X, the map $m : X \to M(\mathcal{C}(X))$ given by $x \in X \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_x := \{U \in \mathcal{C}(X) \mid x \notin U\}$ is a homeomorphism of Boolean spaces.

PROOF. a) The map $e : x \in B \mapsto U_x \in 2^{M(B)}$ is the embedding e of the Stone Representation Theorem. In particular it is an embedding of Boolean algebras. Its image $e(B)$ is a subalgebra of the characteristic algebra of the Boolean space $M(B)$ which is, by definition, a base for the topology of $M(B)$. By Proposition 9.10 we have $e(B) = \mathcal{C}(M(B))$ so e is an isomorphism of Boolean algebras.

b) First we need to show that $\mathfrak{m}_x$ is a maximal ideal in the characteristic ring $\mathcal{C}(X)$. It seems more natural to show this on the Boolean algebra side, i.e., to show that $\mathfrak{m}_x$ is downward closed and union-closed. Indeed, $U \in \mathfrak{m}_x$ means $x \notin U$, so if $V \subset X$ then certainly $x \notin V$, i.e., $V \in \mathfrak{m}_x$; moreover, $U, V \in \mathfrak{m}_x \iff x \notin U$ and $x \notin V \iff x \notin U \cup V \iff U \cup V \in \mathfrak{m}_x$. Thus $\mathfrak{m}_x$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{C}(X)$. Applying Lemma 9.7, one easily sees that is maximal, so the map m is well-defined.

indent The injectivity of m follows immediately from the Hausdorff property of X.

Surjectivity: Let $\mathfrak{m} \in M(\mathcal{C}(X))$. We may identify $\mathfrak{m}$ with a homomorphism of Boolean algebras $f_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathcal{C}(X) \to \mathbb{F}_2$. Let $\mathcal{F} = f_{\mathfrak{m}}^{-1}(1)$ be the shell of $f_{\mathfrak{m}}$, an ultrafilter on the Boolean algebra of sets $\mathcal{C}(X)$. In particular $\mathcal{F}$ is wedge-closed, i.e., it is a family of clopen subsets of the compact space X satisfying the finite intersection property. Therefore there exists $x \in \bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{F}} U$. On the other hand, the collection $\mathcal{F}_x$ of all clopen sets in X containing x is also a filter on $\mathcal{C}(X)$ with $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_x$. But since $\mathcal{F}$ is an *ultra*filter – i.e., a maximal filter – we have $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_x$. Thus $\mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathcal{F}_x$ are respectively the kernel and shell of the homomorphism $f : \mathcal{C}(X) \to \mathbb{F}_2$, so

$$\mathfrak{m} = \mathcal{C}(X) \setminus \mathcal{F}_x = \{U \in \mathcal{C}(X) \mid x \notin U\} = m(x).$$

Finally, since m is surjective, we have that for each $A \in \mathcal{C}(X)$,

$$\{U \in M(\mathcal{C}(X)) \mid A \in U\} = \{m(x) \mid x \in A\},$$

so that m maps the base $\mathcal{C}(X)$ for the topology on X onto the base $\mathcal{C}(M(\mathcal{C}(X)))$. $\square$

EXERCISE 9.22. *Let X be a topological space, and let $C(X, 2)$ be the ring of all continuous functions $f : X \to \mathbb{F}_2$ ($\mathbb{F}_2$ being given the discrete topology).*
a) Show: $C(X, 2)$ is a Boolean ring.
b) Suppose $X = M(R)$ is the maximal ideal space of the Boolean ring R. Show: $C(X, 2)$ is canonically isomorphic to R itself. Thus every Boolean ring is *the ring of continuous Boolean-valued functions on its Stone space of maximal ideals.*

EXERCISE 9.23. *Let S be a nonempty set and consider $R = 2^S = \prod_{s \in S} \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.*
a) Show that there is a natural bijective correspondence between elements of S and principal maximal ideals of R.
b) Deduce that there is an embedding $\iota : S \hookrightarrow M(R)$ such that the induced topology on S is discrete.
c) Show that $\iota(S)$ is dense in $M(R)$. (Hint: R is atomic.)
d) Show that ι is a homeomorphism iff S is finite.
e) Show that ι is the **Stone-Cech compactification** of the discrete space S.*

CHAPTER 10

Associated Primes and Primary Decomposition

1. Associated Primes

Let M be an R-module. A prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is an **associated prime** of M if there is $m \in M$ with $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann} m = \{x \in R \mid xm = 0\}$. The set of associated primes of M is denoted (unfortunately) by $\operatorname{Ass} M$.

Thus when R is a domain and M is torsionfree, (0) is the only associated prime of M. In particular this holds for ideals of R. We hope this motivates the following definition: for an ideal I of a ring R, the associated primes of the ideal I are the associated primes of the module R/I.

PROPOSITION 10.1.
For an R-module M and $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, the following are equivalent:
(i) $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M$.
(ii) There is an injection of R-modules $R/\mathfrak{p} \hookrightarrow M$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M$, and let $m \in M$ with $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann} m$. Define $\iota : R \to M$ by $x \mapsto xm$. Then $\operatorname{Ker} \iota = \mathfrak{p}$, so ι gives an injection from $R/\mathfrak{p}$ to M.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): If $\iota : R/\mathfrak{p} \hookrightarrow M$, let $m = \iota(1 + \mathfrak{p})$. Then $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann} m$. $\qquad \square$

We immediately deduce:

COROLLARY 10.2. *If $N \subset M$ are R-modules, then $\operatorname{Ass} N \subset \operatorname{Ass} M$.*

PROPOSITION 10.3. *For a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, $\operatorname{Ass} R/\mathfrak{p} = \{\mathfrak{p}\}$.*

PROOF. Proposition 10.1 gives $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} R/\mathfrak{p}$. Conversely, let $x \in R$ be such that $\operatorname{ann}(x+\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{q}$ is a prime ideal. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, $y \in \mathfrak{q} \iff yx \in \mathfrak{p} \iff y \in \mathfrak{p}$. $\qquad \square$

For an R-module M, a **zero divisor** of M is an element $x \in R$ such that $xm = 0$ for some $m \in M^\bullet$. We write $ZD(M)$ for the set of all zero divisors of M.

PROPOSITION 10.4. *For a nonzero R-module M, let $\mathcal{F} = \{\operatorname{ann} m \mid m \in M^\bullet\}$.*
a) Every maximal element of $\mathcal{F}$ is a prime ideal.
b) If R is Noetherian, then $\operatorname{Ass} M \neq \varnothing$.

PROOF. a) Let I be an ideal of R of the form $\operatorname{ann} m$ for some $x \in M^\bullet$ and not properly contained in $\operatorname{ann} x'$ for any $x' \in M^\bullet$. Let $a, b \in R$ be such that $ab \in I$ but $b \notin I$. Then $bx \in M^\bullet$. Since $0 = abx = a(bx)$, $a \in \operatorname{ann}(bx)$. But clearly $I = \operatorname{ann} x \subset \operatorname{ann}(bx)$, so by maximality of I we have $I = \operatorname{ann}(bx)$ and thus $a \in I$.
b) If $M \neq 0$, then $\mathcal{F}$ is a nonempty family of ideals in a Noetherian ring so has a maximal element. Apply part a). $\qquad \square$

EXERCISE 10.1. *Let M be a nonzero R-module, and let $S \subset R$ be a multiplicative subset. Following [**LR08**, Prop. 3.5], we consider the family $\mathcal{F}$ of ideals I of R with the following propery: for all $m \in M$, if $Im = 0$ then $sm = 0$ for some $s \in S$.*

a) *Show: $\mathcal{F}$ is increasing and strongly Ako.*

b) *Show: an ideal I of R is maximal with respect to being disjoint from S and of the form $\operatorname{ann}(m)$ for some nonzero element $m \in M$ iff it is a maximal element of $\mathcal{F}'$.*

c) *(Herstein) Show: an ideal that is maximal among annihilators of nonzero points of M is prime.*

d) *Suppose that either R or M is Noetherian. Show: $\mathcal{F}$ is a monoidal filter.*

PROPOSITION 10.5. *Let M be an R-module.*
a) We have $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M} \mathfrak{p} \subset ZD(M)$.
b) If R is Noetherian, then $\bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M} \mathfrak{p} = ZD(M)$.

PROOF. a) If $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann} m$, then $xm = 0$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathfrak{p} \subset ZD(M)$.
b) Let $x \in ZD(M)$, so that there is $m \in M^{\bullet}$ with $xm = 0$. By Proposition 10.4 applied to $N = \langle m \rangle$, there is $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} N$, i.e., there is $y \in R$ such that $ym \neq 0$ and $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann} ym$. Since $xm = 0$, $xym = 0$ and $x \in \mathfrak{p}$. By Proposition 10.2 $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M$ and thus $x \in \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M} \mathfrak{p}$. $\square$

PROPOSITION 10.6. *Let $N \subset M$ be R-modules. Then:*
a) $\operatorname{Ass} M \subset \operatorname{Ass} N \cup \operatorname{Ass} M/N$.
b) $\operatorname{Ass} \left(\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i \right) = \bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{Ass} M_i$.

PROOF. a) For $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M$, let $\iota : R/\mathfrak{p} \subset M$ be an R-module monomorphism. Put $H = \iota(R/\mathfrak{p})$ and $L = H \cap N$.
Case 1: Suppose $L = 0$. Then the natural map $\alpha : H \to M/N$ is a monomorphism, so $\alpha \circ \iota : R/\mathfrak{p} \to M/N$ is a monomorphism and $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M/N$.
Case 2: Let $x \in L^{\bullet}$. Then $x \in H^{\bullet} \cong (R/\mathfrak{p})^{\bullet}$, so $\operatorname{ann} x = \mathfrak{p}$. Since $x \in N$, $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} N$.
b) Put $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$. Since each M_i is a submodule of $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$, $\bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{Ass} M_i \subset \operatorname{Ass} M$ follows from Proposition 10.2. The containment $\operatorname{Ass} M \subset \bigcup_{i \in I} \operatorname{Ass} M_i$ follows from part a) when I is finite. In the general case, let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M$. Then there is an R-module monomorphism $\iota : R/\mathfrak{p} \hookrightarrow M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$. The image $\iota(R/\mathfrak{p})$ lies in the submodule generated by $\iota(1 + \mathfrak{p})$, hence lies in $\bigoplus_{i \in J} M_i$ for some finite subset $J \subset I$. This reduces us to the finite case. $\square$

THEOREM 10.7. *Let R be a Noetherian ring, and let M be a nonzero, finitely generated R-module.*

a) *There is a chain of submodules*

$$0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq M_n = M$$

such that for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ there is a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}_i$ of R with $M_{i+1}/M_i \cong \mathfrak{p}_i$.

b) *For any such chain, we have $\operatorname{Ass} M \subset \{\mathfrak{p}_0, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_{n-1}\}$.*

c) *In particular, $\operatorname{Ass} M$ is finite.*

PROOF. a) By Proposition 10.5 M has an associated prime $\mathfrak{p}_1 = \operatorname{ann} m_1$. Put $M_0 = \{0\}$ and $M_1 = \langle m_1 \rangle$; note $M_1/M_0 = M_1 \cong R/\mathfrak{p}_1$. If $M_1 = M$ we're done; if not, M/M_1 is finitely generated and nonzero so has an associated prime $\mathfrak{p}_2 = \operatorname{ann}(m_2 + M_1)$. Put $M_2 = \langle m_1, m_2 \rangle$, so that $M_2/M_1 \cong R/\mathfrak{p}_2$. We continue in this way, getting an increasing chain of submodules M_i in M. Since M is Noetherian, we must have $M_n = M$ for some m.
b) By Proposition 10.3, for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ we have

$$\operatorname{Ass} M_{i+1}/M_i = \operatorname{Ass} R/\mathfrak{p}_i = \{\mathfrak{p}_i\}.$$

By Proposition 10.6 we have for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\operatorname{Ass} M_{i+1} \subset \operatorname{Ass} M_i \cup \{\mathfrak{p}_{i+1}\}$, and from this $\operatorname{Ass} M = \operatorname{Ass} M_n \subset \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n\}$ follows.
c) This follows immediately. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 10.8. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local ring. If $\mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$ consists entirely of zero-divisors, then there is $x \in R^\bullet$ with $x\mathfrak{m} = 0$.*

PROOF. If $\mathfrak{m} = 0$ we may take $x = 1$. Henceforth we assume $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$, so by Nakayama's Lemma there is $a \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$. By Theorem 10.7 and Proposition 10.5, $\operatorname{Ass} R = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n\}$ is finite and $\operatorname{ZD}(R) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i$. Thus by hypothesis

$$\mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2 \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i.$$

For $y \in \mathfrak{m}^2$ and $p \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $a + y^p \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$, so by the Pigeonhole Principle there are $1 \leq p < q \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $a + y^p, a + y^q \in \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i. Then $y^p(1 - y^{q-p}) \in \mathfrak{p}_i$; since $y^{q-p} \in \mathfrak{m}$ and R is local, $1 - y^{q-p} \in R^\times$; thus $y^p \in \mathfrak{p}_i$ and, since $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is prime, $y \in \mathfrak{p}_i$. This shows

$$\mathfrak{m} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i.$$

By Prime Avoidance (Lemma 8.52), there is at least one i such that $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{p}_i$. By definition $\mathfrak{p}_i = \operatorname{ann} x$ for some $x \in R^\bullet$: we're done. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 10.9. *Let $S \subset R$ be multiplicatively closed.*
a) If M is an $S^{-1}R$-module, then $\operatorname{Ass}_R M = \operatorname{Ass}_{S^{-1}R} M$.
b) If M is an R-module, then

$$\operatorname{Ass}_R M \cap \operatorname{Spec} S^{-1}R \subset \operatorname{Ass}_{S^{-1}R} S^{-1}M.$$

c) If R is Noetherian and M is an R-module, then

$$\operatorname{Ass}_R M \cap \operatorname{Spec} S^{-1}R = \operatorname{Ass}_{S^{-1}R} S^{-1}M.$$

Let M be an R-module. A **weakly associated prime of M** is a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R such that there is $x \in M$ with $\mathfrak{p} = r(\operatorname{ann} x)$. Thus the definition differs from the usual one in that we are permitted to pass from $\operatorname{ann} x$ to its radical. We denote by $\operatorname{weakAss} M$ the set of weakly associated primes of M.

EXERCISE 10.2. *Show: for an R-module M and $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *$\mathfrak{p}$ is weakly associated to M.*
(ii) *There is an ideal I of R with $r(I) = \mathfrak{p}$ and an R-module injection $R/I \hookrightarrow M$.*

EXERCISE 10.3. *Show: parts a) and b) of Proposition 10.9b) hold if we replace Ass by $\operatorname{weakAss}$ throughout.*

PROPOSITION 10.10. *Let M be an R-module.*
a) We have $\operatorname{Ass} M \subset \operatorname{weakAss} M$.
b) If R is Noetherian, then $\operatorname{Ass} M = \operatorname{weakAss} M$.

PROOF. a) As the terminology suggests, this is immediate: if $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{ann} x$, then $\operatorname{ann} x$ is prime, hence radical, so $\mathfrak{p} = r(\operatorname{ann} x)$.
b) By Proposition 10.9 it is enough to show that $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}_{R_\mathfrak{p}} M_\mathfrak{p}$: replacing R by $R_\mathfrak{p}$

we may assume R is Noetherian local with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. Since $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{weakAss} M$, there is $x \in M$ with $r(\operatorname{ann} x) = \mathfrak{p}$. Since R is Noetherian, by Proposition 4.16g) we have that $\mathfrak{p}^n \subset \operatorname{ann} x$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Again using the Noetherian hypothesis, the set $\{\operatorname{ann} y \mid y \in R \text{ is such that } \operatorname{ann} y \supset \operatorname{ann} x\}$ has a maximal element $\operatorname{ann} y$, and by Proposition 10.4, $\mathfrak{q} = \operatorname{ann} y$ is prime. Then we have $\mathfrak{p}^n \subset \operatorname{ann} x \subset \mathfrak{q}$, and since $\mathfrak{q}$ is prime and $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal, we have $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}$ and thus $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M$. $\square$

EXERCISE 10.4. *Let k be a field and $R = k[t_1, t_2, \ldots]$ be the polynomial ring in a countably infinite set of indeterminates over k. Let $I = \langle t_1^2, t_2^2, \ldots \rangle$, and let $\mathfrak{p} = r(I) = \langle t_1, t_2, \ldots \rangle$. Show: $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{weakAss} R/I \setminus \operatorname{Ass} R/I$.*

2. The support of a module

For a module M over a ring R, we define its **support**

$$\operatorname{supp} M = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid M_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0\}.$$

PROPOSITION 10.11. *For a finitely generated R-module M,*

$$\operatorname{supp} M = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid \mathfrak{p} \supset \operatorname{ann} M\}.$$

PROOF. Write $M = \langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n \rangle_R$. For $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, we have $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{supp} M$ iff $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0$ iff for some $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $\operatorname{ann}(\omega_i) \subset \mathfrak{p}$. If these conditions hold then

$$\operatorname{ann} M = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{ann}(\omega_i) \subset \mathfrak{p}.$$

Conversely, if $\mathfrak{p}$ contains $\operatorname{ann}(M) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{ann}(\omega_i)$ then $\mathfrak{p}$ contains $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{ann}(\omega_i)$ hence it contains $\operatorname{ann}(\omega_i)$ for some i, so $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{supp} M$. $\square$

THEOREM 10.12. *Let M be an R-module.*
  a) *We have $\operatorname{weakAss} M \subset \operatorname{supp} M$.*
  b) *If R is Noetherian, the minimal elements of $\operatorname{Ass} M$ are precisely the minimal elements of $\operatorname{supp} M$.*
  c) *The minimal associated primes of R are precisely the minimal primes of R.*

PROOF. a) Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{weakAss} M$. By Exercise 10.2, there is an ideal I of R with $r(I) = \mathfrak{p}$ and an R-module embedding $R/I \hookrightarrow M$. Tensoring with the flat R-module $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ gives an injection $R_{\mathfrak{p}}/IR_{\mathfrak{p}} \hookrightarrow M_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Since $r(I) = \mathfrak{p}$, $I \subset \mathfrak{p}$ and thus $IR_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset \mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}} \subsetneq R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \supset R_{\mathfrak{p}}/IR_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0$.
b) Recall that under the Noetherian assumption $\operatorname{weakAss} M = \operatorname{Ass} M$.
Step 1: Each $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{supp} M$ contains an element of $\operatorname{Ass} M$: indeed, let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{supp} M$, so $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0$. Since $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is Noetherian, Propositions 10.4b) and 10.9c) give

$$\varnothing \neq \operatorname{Ass}_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} M_{\mathfrak{p}} = \operatorname{Ass}_R M \cap \operatorname{Spec} R_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

and an element of the latter set is precisely an associated prime $\mathfrak{q}$ of M with $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{p}$.
Step 2: Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass} M$ be minimal, so by part a) $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{supp} M$. If there were $\mathfrak{p}' \in \operatorname{supp} M$ with $\mathfrak{p}' \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}$ then there is no element in $\operatorname{Ass} M$ which is contained in $\mathfrak{p}'$, contradicting Step 1.
Step 3: Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{supp} M$ be minimal. By Step 1, $\mathfrak{p}$ contains an element $\mathfrak{p}'$ of $\operatorname{Ass} M$, but since $\operatorname{Ass} M \subset \operatorname{supp} M$ and $\mathfrak{p}$ is minimal we must have $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}'$.
c) Apply part b) to $M = R$. $\square$

THEOREM 10.13. *If R is Noetherian, $\operatorname{MinSpec} R$ is finite.*

PROOF. Combine Theorem 10.7c) and Theorem 10.12c).   □

Later we will give a *topological* proof of Theorem 10.13!

3. Primary Ideals

A proper ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of a ring R is **primary** if for all $x, y \in R$, $xy \in \mathfrak{q}$ implies $x \in \mathfrak{q}$ or $y^n \in \mathfrak{q}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

EXERCISE 10.5. *a) Show: a prime ideal is primary. (Trivial but important!)*
b) Show: an ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of R is primary iff every zero-divisor in $R/\mathfrak{q}$ is nilpotent.

Neither the definition or primary ideal nor the characterization given in the above exercise is particularly enlightening, so one natural question is: which ideals are primary? (And, of course, another natural question is: what's the significance of a primary ideal?) Here are some simple results which give some information on primary ideals, sufficient to determine all the primary ideals in some simple rings.

PROPOSITION 10.14. *Let $\mathfrak{q}$ be an ideal in a ring R. If $r(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal, then $\mathfrak{q}$ is primary. In particular, any power of a maximal ideal is primary.*

PROOF. Since $r(\mathfrak{q})$ is the intersection of all prime ideals containing $\mathfrak{q}$, if this intersection is a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, then $\mathfrak{m}$ is the unique prime ideal containing $\mathfrak{q}$ and $R/\mathfrak{q}$ is a local ring with $\mathrm{nil}(R/\mathfrak{q}) = J(R/\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{q}$. In such a ring an element is a zero-divisor iff it is a nonunit iff it is nilpotent, so $\mathfrak{q}$ is primary. The "in particular" follows since by Proposition 4.16f), $r(\mathfrak{m}^n) = r(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m}$.   □

PROPOSITION 10.15. *If $\mathfrak{q}$ is a primary ideal, then its radical $r(\mathfrak{q})$ is a prime ideal, the smallest prime ideal containing $\mathfrak{q}$.*

PROOF. Let $xy \in r(\mathfrak{q})$, so that $(xy)^m = x^m y^m \in \mathfrak{p}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. If x^m is in $\mathfrak{q}$ then $x \in r(\mathfrak{q})$, so assume that x^m is not in $\mathfrak{q}$. Then y^m is a zero divisor in $R/\mathfrak{q}$, so by definition of primary there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $(y^m)^n \in \mathfrak{q}$, and then $y \in r(\mathfrak{q})$. The second statement holds for any ideal I whose radical is prime, since $r(I)$ is the intersection of all prime ideals containing I.   □

A primary ideal is said to be $\mathfrak{p}$-**primary** if its radical is the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$.

LEMMA 10.16. *If $\mathfrak{q}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{q}_n$ are $\mathfrak{p}$-primary ideals, then $\mathfrak{q} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{q}_i$ is $\mathfrak{p}$-primary.*

PROOF. Let x, y be elements of the ring R such that $xy \in \mathfrak{q}$ and $x \in R \setminus \mathfrak{q}$. Then for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, since $xy \in \mathfrak{q}_i$ there is $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $y^{a_i} \in \mathfrak{q}_i$, and then $y^{a_1 + \ldots + a_n} \in \mathfrak{q}$, so $\mathfrak{q}$ is primary. Moreover, by Proposition 4.16b) we have

$$r(\mathfrak{q}) = r(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{q}_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} r(\mathfrak{q}_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}.$$ □

EXERCISE 10.6. *Give an example of primary ideals $\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{q}'$ such that $\mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{q}'$ is not primary.*

PROPOSITION 10.17. *If $\mathfrak{q}$ is a primary ideal, the quotient ring $R/\mathfrak{q}$ is connected.*

PROOF. Indeed, a ring is disconnected if and only if it has an idempotent element e different from 0 or 1. Such an element is certainly not nilpotent $e^n = e$ for all n – but is a zero-divisor, since $e(1 - e) = e - e^2 = 0$.   □

EXERCISE 10.7. *Let k be a field, let $R = k[x, y]$ and put $I = (xy)$. Show: I is not primary but "nevertheless" R/I is connected.*

EXAMPLE 10.18. *We will find all primary ideals in the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers. Evidently (0) is prime and hence primary. If $\mathfrak{q}$ is any nonzero primary ideal, then its radical $\mathfrak{p} = r(\mathfrak{q})$ is a nonzero prime ideal, hence maximal. So, combining Propositions 10.14 and 10.15 we find that a nonzero ideal in $\mathbb{Z}$ is primary if and only if its radical is maximal. Moreover, for any prime power (p^n), $r((p^n)) = r((p)) = (p)$ is maximal – we use here the elementary and (we hope) familiar fact that if p is a prime number, (p) is a prime ideal (Euclid's Lemma); such matters will be studied in more generality in Chapter 15 – so (p^n) is a primary ideal. Conversely, if n is divisible by more than one prime power, then applying the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we get that $\mathbb{Z}/n$ is disconnected.*

EXERCISE 10.8.
  a) *Let R be an domain for which each nonzero ideal is a (finite, of course) product of maximal ideals. Use the above argument to show that an ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of R is primary iff it is a prime power.*
  b) *(For those who know something about PIDs) Deduce in particular that primary = prime power in any principal ideal domain.*

Consider the following property of an domain:

(DD) Every ideal can be expressed as a product of prime ideals.

This is *a priori* weaker than the hypothesis of Exericse 10.8a). Later we will devote quite a lot of attention to the class of domains satisfying (DD), the **Dedekind domains**. Among their many properties is that a Dedekind domain is (either a field or) a domain in which each nonzero prime ideal is maximal. Thus in fact the hypothesis of Exercise 10.8a) is equivalent to assuming that R is a Dedekind domain.

Remark(ably): Another characterization theorem says that any Noetherian domain in which each primary ideal is a prime power is a Dedekind domain. In particular, any polynomial ring $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ in $2 \leq n < \infty$ variables over a field admits primary ideals which are not prime powers.

EXERCISE 10.9. *Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[t]/(t^2 + 3)$ (or, equivalently, $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$). Let $\mathfrak{q} = (2)$.*
a) *Show that there is a unique ideal $\mathfrak{p}_2$ with $R/\mathfrak{p}_2 = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Evidently $\mathfrak{p}_2$ is maximal.*
b) *Show that $r(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{p}_2$, and deduce that I is primary.*
c) *Show that $\mathfrak{q}$ is not a prime power, and indeed, cannot be expressed as a product of prime ideals.*

The ring R of Exercise 10.9 is a good one to keep in mind: it is simple enough to be easy to calculate with, but it already displays some interesting general phenomena. It is a Noetherian domain in which every nonzero prime ideal is maximal. It is therefore "close" to being a Dedekind domain but it does not satisfy one other property ("integral closure") which will be studied later. It will turn out to be an immediate consequence of the main result of this section that, notwithstanding the fact that there are ideals which do not factor into a product of primes, nevertheless every proper ideal in $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$ can be written as a product of *primary* ideals. This, finally, is some clue that the notion of a primary ideal is a fruitful concept.

The following exercise gives an even simpler (and more explicit) example of a ring R and a primary ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ of R which is not a prime power.

Having seen examples of a primary ideals which are not prime powers, what about the converse? Is it at any rate the case that any prime power is a primary ideal? We know that this is indeed the case for powers of a maximal ideal. However, the answer is again negative in general:

Example (Atiyah-MacDonald, p. 51): Let k be a field; put $R = k[x, y, z]/(xy - z^2)$. Denote by $\overline{x}$, $\overline{y}$, and $\overline{z}$ the images of x, y, z in R. Put $\mathfrak{p} = \langle \overline{x}, \overline{z} \rangle$. Since $R/\mathfrak{p} = k[x, y, z]/(x, z, xy - z^2) = k[y]$ is a domain, $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal. Now consider the ideal $\mathfrak{p}^2$: we have $\overline{xy} = \overline{z}^2 \in \mathfrak{p}^2$, but $\overline{x} \notin \mathfrak{p}^2$ and $\overline{y} \notin \mathfrak{p} = r(\mathfrak{p}^2)$, so $\mathfrak{p}^2$ is not primary.

4. Primary Decomposition, Lasker and Noether

Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R. A **primary decomposition** of I is an expression of I as a finite intersection of primary ideals, say $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{q}_i$.

An ideal that admits at least one primary decomposition is said to be **decomposable**. This is not a piece of terminology that we will use often, but the reader should be aware of its existence.

For any ring R, let us either agree that R itself admits the "empty" primary decomposition or that R has no primary decomposition (i.e., it doesn't matter either way) and thereafter restrict our attention to proper ideals.

It may not be too surprising that not every ideal in every ring admits a primary decomposition. Indeed, we will see later that if R is a ring for which (0) admits a primary decomposition, then the ring R has finitely many minimal primes.

The first important result in this area was proved by Emanuel Lasker in 1905, roughly in the middle of his 27 year reign as world chess champion. Here it is.

THEOREM 10.19. *(Lasker [**La05**]) Let R be a polynomial ring in finitely many variables over a field. Every proper ideal I of R admits a primary decomposition.*

Lasker's proof of this theorem was a long and intricate calculation. As we will shortly see, a broader perspective yields considerably more for considerably less effort. In Lasker's honor a ring R in which every proper ideal admits a primary decomposition is called a **Laskerian ring**.

EXERCISE 10.10. *If R is Laskerian and I is an ideal of R, then R/I is Laskerian.*

Combining Lasker's theorem with this exercise, we get that every finitely generated algebra over a field admits a primary decomposition. This result is of fundamental (indeed, foundational) importance in algebraic geometry.

However, in 1921 Lasker's triumph was undeniably trumped by Emmy Noether. To see how, we need one further concept. An ideal I is **irreducible** if whenever I is written as an intersection of two ideals – i.e., $I = J \cap K$ – then $I = J$ or $I = K$.

EXERCISE 10.11. *Let I be a proper ideal in a principal ideal domain R. Show: the following are equivalent:*
(i) I is primary.
(ii) I is irreducible.
(iii) I is a prime power: there exists a in R and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that (a) is prime and $I = (a)^n = (a^n)$.

PROPOSITION 10.20. *a) A prime ideal is irreducible.*
b) An irreducible ideal in a Noetherian ring is primary.

PROOF. a) Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal, and write $\mathfrak{p} = I \cap J$. Since then $\mathfrak{p} \supset IJ$, by Proposition 4.10 we have $\mathfrak{p} \supset I$ or $\mathfrak{p} \supset J$; WLOG say $\mathfrak{p} \supset I$. Then $\mathfrak{p} = I \cap J \subset I \subset \mathfrak{p}$, so that we must have $I = \mathfrak{p}$.

b) By passage to the quotient, we may assume that (0) is irreducible and show that it is primary. So suppose $xy = 0$ and $x \neq 0$. Consider the chain of ideals

$$\operatorname{ann}(y) \subset \operatorname{ann}(y^2) \subset \ldots \subset \operatorname{ann}(y^n) \subset \ldots.$$

Since R is Noetherian, this chain stabilizes: there exists n such that $\operatorname{ann}(y^n) = \operatorname{ann}(y^{n+k})$ for all k. We claim that $(x) \cap (y^n) = 0$. Indeed, if $a \in (x)$ then $ay = 0$, and if $a \in (y^n)$ then $a = by^n$ for some $b \in R$, hence $by^{n+1} = ay = 0$, so $b \in \operatorname{ann}(y^{n+1}) = \operatorname{ann}(y^n)$, hence $a = by^n = 0$. Since the (0) ideal is irreducible, we must then have $y^n = 0$, and this shows that (0) is primary. □

EXERCISE 10.12. *This exercise is taken from a post of E. Merkulova on http://math.stackexchange.com/questions/28620. Let k be a field, $R = k[x, y]$ and $I = \langle x^2, xy, y^2 \rangle$.*
a) Show: I is primary. (Hint: use Proposition 10.14.)
b) Show: $I = \langle x, y^2 \rangle \cap \langle x^2, y \rangle$.
c) Deduce: I is an ideal in a (very nice) Noetherian domain which is primary but not irreducible.

THEOREM 10.21. *(Noether) Any proper ideal in a Noetherian ring admits a primary decomposition.*

PROOF. Let I be a proper ideal in the Noetherian ring R. We claim I is a finite intersection of *irreducible* ideals; in view of Proposition 10.20 this gives the desired result. To see this: suppose that the set of proper ideals which cannot be written as a finite intersection of irreducible ideals is nonempty, and choose a maximal element I. Then I is reducible, so we may write $I = J \cap K$ where each of J and K is strictly larger than I. But being strictly larger than I each of J and K can be written as a finite intersection of irreducible ideals, and hence so can I. Contradiction! □

In other words, a Noetherian ring is Laskerian. Therefore Lasker's Theorem is an immediate consequence of Noether's Theorem together with the Hilbert Basis Theorem, which we recall, was proved in 1888 and whose remarkably short and simple – but nonconstructive – proof engendered first controversy and later deep admiration. The same is true for Noether's theorem: it is from this theorem, and the ridiculous simplicity of its proof, that Noetherian rings get their name.

EXERCISE 10.13. *Let R be a Noetherian ring, with minimal primes $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r$. Show: there is $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $(0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{r} \mathfrak{p}_i^N$. (Hint: use Proposition 4.16g).)*

5. Irredundant primary decompositions

If an ideal can be expressed as a product of prime ideals, that product is in fact unique. We would like to have similar results for primary decomposition. Unfortunately such a uniqueness result is clearly impossible. Indeed, if $I = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \ldots \cap \mathfrak{q}_n$ is a primary decomposition of I and $\mathfrak{p}$ is any prime containing I, then $\mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \ldots \cap \mathfrak{q}_n \cap \mathfrak{p}$ is also a primary decomposition, and clearly a different one if $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{q}_i$ for any i. A proper ideal I may well be contained in infinitely many primes – e.g. this occurs with $I = (0)$ for any Noetherian domain of dimension at least 2 – so there may well be infinitely many different primary decompositions.

But of course throwing in extra primes is both frivolous and wasteful. The following definition formalizes the idea of a primary decomposition which is "frugal" in two reasonable ways.

A primary decomposition is said to be **irredundant**[1] (or **minimal**, or **reduced**) if both of the following properties hold:

(IPD1) For all $i \neq j$, $r(\mathfrak{q}_i) \neq r(\mathfrak{q}_j)$.
(IPD2) For all i, $\mathfrak{q}_i$ does not contain $\bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{q}_j$.

If wastefulness succeeds, so does frugality:

LEMMA 10.22. *An ideal that admits a primary decomposition admits an irredundant primary decomposition.*

PROOF. By Lemma 10.16, we may replace any collection of primary ideals $\mathfrak{q}_i$ with a common radical with their intersection and still have a primary ideal, thus satisfying (IPD1). Then if (IPD2) is not satisfied, there is some $\mathfrak{q}_i$ which contains the intersection of all the other $\mathfrak{q}_j$'s, hence it can be removed to obtain a primary decomposition satisfying (IPD1) and with a smaller number of primary ideals. Proceeding in this way we eventually arrive at an irredundant primary decomposition. $\square$

The question is now to what extent an irredundant primary decomposition is unique. The situation here is significantly better: although the primary decomposition is not in all cases unique, it turns out that there are some important quantities which are defined in terms of a primary decomposition and which can be shown to be independent of the choice of irredundant decomposition, i.e., are invariants of the ideal. Such uniqueness results are pursued in the next section.

6. Uniqueness properties of primary decomposition

Recall that for ideals I and J of a ring R, $(I : J) = \{x \in R \mid xJ \subset I\}$, which is also an ideal of R. We abbreviate $(I : (x))$ to $(I : x)$ and $((x) : J)$ to $(x : J)$.

EXERCISE 10.14. *Show: for ideals I and J, $I \subset (I : J)$.*

LEMMA 10.23. *Let $\mathfrak{q}$ be a $\mathfrak{p}$-primary ideal and $x \in R$.*
a) If $x \in \mathfrak{q}$ then $(\mathfrak{q} : x) = R$.

---

[1] It is amusing to note that most dictionaries do not recognize "irredundant" as an English word, but mathematicians have been using it in this and other contexts for many years.

b) If $x \notin \mathfrak{q}$ then $(\mathfrak{q} : x)$ is $\mathfrak{p}$-primary.
c) If $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$ then $(\mathfrak{q} : x) = \mathfrak{q}$.

PROOF. a) If $x \in \mathfrak{q}$ then $1(x) = x \subset \mathfrak{q}$, so $1 \in (\mathfrak{q} : x)$.
b) If $y \in (\mathfrak{q} : x)$, then $xy \in \mathfrak{q}$; by assumption $x \notin \mathfrak{q}$, so $y^n \in \mathfrak{q}$ for some n and thus $y \in r(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{p}$. So $\mathfrak{q} \subset (\mathfrak{q} : x) \subset \mathfrak{p}$; taking radicals we get $r((\mathfrak{q} : x)) = \mathfrak{p}$. Moreover, if $yz \in (\mathfrak{q} : x)$ with $y \notin (\mathfrak{q} : x)$, then $xyz = y(xz) \in \mathfrak{q}$, so $(xz)^n = x^n z^n \in \mathfrak{q}$ for some n, and $x^n \notin \mathfrak{q} \implies (z^m)^n \in \mathfrak{q}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, thus $z^{mn} \in \mathfrak{q} \subset (\mathfrak{q} : x)$.
c) We have in all cases that $\mathfrak{q} \subset (\mathfrak{q} : x)$. If $x \notin \mathfrak{p} = r(\mathfrak{q})$ and $y \in (\mathfrak{q} : x)$, then $xy \in \mathfrak{q}$; since no power of x is $\mathfrak{q}$, we must have $y \in \mathfrak{q}$. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 10.24. *(First Uniqueness Theorem) Let $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{q}_i$ be any irredundant primary decomposition of the ideal I. Let $\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i)$. Then the $\mathfrak{p}_i$'s are precisely the prime ideals of the form $r((I : x))$ as x ranges through elements of R. In particular, they are independent of the choice of irredundant primary decomposition.*

PROOF. For $x \in R$ we have $(I : x) = (\bigcap_i \mathfrak{q}_i : x) = \bigcap_i (\mathfrak{q}_i : x)$, so

$$r((I : x)) = \bigcap_i r((q_i : x)) = \bigcap_{x \notin \mathfrak{q}_j} \mathfrak{p}_j$$

by Lemma 10.23. If $r(I : x)$ is prime, then $r(I : x) = p_j$ for some j. Conversely, for each i, by irredundancy of the decomposition there exists $x_i \in \bigcap_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{q}_j \setminus \mathfrak{q}_i$ and then the Lemma implies $r(I : x_i) = \mathfrak{p}_i$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 10.25. *Let R be Noetherian, and let $I \subsetneq R$ be a proper ideal. Let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r$ be the radicals of the primary ideals in an(y) irredundant primary decomposition of I. Then*

$$\{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r\} = \operatorname{Ass} R/I.$$

PROOF. By Theorem 10.24 the $\mathfrak{p}_i$'s are precisely the elements of weakAss R/I. Since R is Noetherian, so is R/I and thus by Proposition 10.10b) weakAss $R/I = $ Ass R/I. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 10.26. *Let $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{q}_i$ be a primary decomposition of an ideal I, with $\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i)$. Then any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ containing I contains $\mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i.*

PROOF. If $\mathfrak{p} \supset I = \bigcap_i \mathfrak{q}_i$, then

$$\mathfrak{p} = r(\mathfrak{p}) \supset \bigcap_i r(\mathfrak{q}_i) = \bigcap_i \mathfrak{p}_i.$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 10.15. *Show: an infinite Boolean ring is not Laskerian.*

PROPOSITION 10.27. *Let $I \subset R$ be a decomposable ideal, $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{q}_i$ an irredundant primary decomposition, and $\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i)$. Then*

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{p}_i = \{x \in R : (I : x) \neq I\}.$$

In particular, if the zero ideal is decomposable, then the set of zero divisors of R is the union of the minimal associated primes of R.

PROOF. By passage to the quotient ring R/I, we may assume that $I = 0$. Let $0 = \bigcap_{i=1}^{r} \mathfrak{q}_i$ be a primary decomposition, with $\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i)$. For $x \in R$, $((0) : x) \neq (0)$ iff x is a zero-divisor, so it suffices to show the last statement of the proposition, that the union of the minimal primes is the set of all zero-divisors. Let D be the set of all zero divisors, so from Exercise 3.X and the proof of Theorem 10.24 we have

$$D = r(D) = \bigcup_{0 \neq x} r((0 : x)) = \bigcup_{0 \neq x} \bigcap_{x \notin \mathfrak{q}_j} \mathfrak{p}_j \subset \bigcup_j \mathfrak{p}_j.$$

Conversely, by Theorem 10.24 each $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is of the form $r((0 : x))$ for some $x \in R$. □

THEOREM 10.28. *(Second Uniqueness Theorem) Let I be an ideal of R, and let*

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{q}_i = I = \bigcap_{j=1}^{m} \mathfrak{r}_j$$

be two irredundant primary decompositions for an ideal I. By Theorem 10.24 we know that $m = n$ and that there is a reordering $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_n$ of the $\mathfrak{r}_j$'s such that for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $r(\mathfrak{q}_i) = \mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{r}_i)$. Moreover, if $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is minimal, then $\mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{r}_j$.

In other words, the primary ideals corresponding to the minimal primes are independent of the primary decomposition.

We will use the technique of localization to prove this result, so first we need some preliminaries on the effect of localization on a primary decomposition.

PROPOSITION 10.29. *Let R be a ring, $S \subset R$ a multiplicatively closed set, and $\mathfrak{q}$ be a $\mathfrak{p}$-primary ideal. Write $\iota : R \to S^{-1}R$ for the localization map.*
a) If $S \cap \mathfrak{p} \neq \emptyset$, then $\iota_*(\mathfrak{q}) = S^{-1}R$.
b) If $S \cap \mathfrak{p} = \emptyset$, then $\iota_*(\mathfrak{q})$ is $\iota_*(\mathfrak{p})$-primary, and $\iota^*(\iota_*(\mathfrak{q})) = \mathfrak{q}$.

PROOF. a) If $x \in S \cap \mathfrak{p}$, then for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $x^n \in S \cap \mathfrak{q}$, so $\iota_*(\mathfrak{q})$ contains a unit of $S^{-1}R$ and is therefore $S^{-1}R$. Part b) follows immediately from Proposition 7.4 and Proposition 7.6a). □

PROPOSITION 10.30. *Let $S \subset R$ be a multiplicatively closed set, and let $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{q}_i$ be an irredundant primary decomposition of an ideal I. Put $\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i)$ and suppose that the numbering is such that $S \cap \mathfrak{p}_i = \emptyset$ for $i \leq m$ and $S \cap \mathfrak{p}_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i > m$. Then:*

$$\iota_*(I) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{m} \iota_*(\mathfrak{q}_i),$$

$$\iota^* \iota_*(I) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{m} \mathfrak{q}_i,$$

and both of these are irredundant primary decompositions.

EXERCISE 10.16. *Prove Proposition 10.30.*

Proof of Theorem 10.28: let $\mathfrak{p}_i$ be a minimal associated prime, and put $S = R \setminus \mathfrak{p}_i$. Certainly S is a multiplicatively closed set, and moreover by minimality $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is the

unique associated prime which is disjoint from S. Applying Proposition 10.30 to both primary decompositions gives

$$\mathfrak{q}_i = \iota^* \iota_* (I) = \mathfrak{r}_i.$$

$\square$

7. Applications in dimension zero

We now give the proof of the uniqueness portion of Theorem 8.37. Let $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$ be the distinct maximal ideals of the Artinian ring R. As in the proof of Theorem 8.37a) there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\prod_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i^k = \cap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i^k = 0$. For each i, the radical $r(\mathfrak{m}_i^k)$ is the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_i$, so by Proposition 10.14 each $\mathfrak{m}_i^k$ is an $\mathfrak{m}_i$-primary ideal. Thus $0 = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{m}_i^k$ is a primary decomposition of the zero ideal which is moreover immediately seen to be irredundant. Since all the primes $\mathfrak{m}_i$ are maximal, the desired uniqueness statement of Theorem 8.37b) follows from the Second Uniqueness Theorem (Theorem 10.28) for primary decompositions.

8. Applications in dimension one

Let R be a one-dimensional Noetherian domain, and I a nonzero ideal. Then by Theorem 10.21, I has a primary decomposition: $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{q}_i$, where $\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i) \supset \mathfrak{q}_i \supset I$ is a nonzero prime ideal. But therefore each $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is maximal, so that the $\mathfrak{p}_i$'s are pairwise comaximal. By Proposition 4.19, so too are the $\mathfrak{q}_i$'s, so the Chinese Remainder Theorem applies to give

$$I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{q}_i = \prod_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{q}_i,$$

and

$$R/I \cong \prod_{i=1}^n R/\mathfrak{q}_i.$$

Thus in this case we can decompose any proper ideal as a finite *product* of primary ideals and not just a finite intersection. Moreover, for $I \neq 0$, all the associated primes are minimal over I, so the Uniqueness Theorems (Theorems 10.24 and 10.28) simply assert that the ideals $\mathfrak{q}_i$ are unique. This observation will be very useful in our later study of ideal theory in one dimensional Noetherian domains.

CHAPTER 11

Nullstellensätze

Let k be a field. By an **affine algebra over k** we simply mean a finitely generated k-algebra. Of all the various and sundry classes of commutative rings we have met and will meet later in these notes, affine algebras are probably the most important and most heavily studied, because of their connection to algebraic geometry.

1. Zariski's Lemma

In 1947 Oscar Zariski published a short note [**Za47**] proving the following result.

THEOREM 11.1. *(Zariski's Lemma)* *Let k be a field, A a finitely generated k-algebra, and $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} A$. Then $A/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite degree field extension of k.*

EXERCISE 11.1. *Show: the following is an equivalent restatement of Zariski's Lemma: let K/k be a field extension such that K is finitely generated as a k-algebra. Then K/k is an algebraic field extension.*

Notwithstanding its innocuous appearance, Zariski's Lemma is a useful result on affine algebras over any field. Further, when k is algebraically closed, it carries all of the content of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz, the main theorem of this section.

So how do we prove Zariski's Lemma?

Oh, let us count the ways! The literature contains many interesting proofs, employing an impressively wide range of ideas and prior technology. We will in fact give several different proofs during the course of these notes. Of course some pride of place goes to the *first proof* that we give, so after much thought (and after changing our mind at least once!) we have decided on the following.

1.1. Proof of Zariski's Lemma via the Artin-Tate Lemma.

As in Exercise 11.1, it suffices to prove the following: let K/k be a field extension that is finitely generated as a k-algebra. We claim K/k is algebraic.

Indeed, if not, let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be a transcendence basis for K/k ($n \geq 1$ since K/k is transcendental), put $k(x) = k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and consider the tower of rings

(26) $$k \subset k(x) \subset K.$$

To be sure, we recall the definition of a transcendence basis: the elements x_i are algebraically independent over k and $K/k(x)$ is algebraic. But since K is a finitely generated k-algebra, it is certainly a finitely generated $k(x)$-algebra and thus $K/k(x)$ is a finite degree field extension. Thus the Artin-Tate Lemma applies to (26): we conclude that $k(x)/k$ is a finitely generated k-algebra. But this is absurd. It implies the much weaker statement that $k(x) = k(x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1})(x_n)$ is finitely generated

as a $k(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})[x_n]$-algebra, or weaker yet, that there exists some field F such that $F(t)$ is finitely generated as an $F[t]$-algebra: i.e., there exist finitely many rational functions $\{r_i(t) = \frac{p_i(t)}{q_i(t)}\}_{i=1}^N$ such that every rational function is a polynomial in the r_i's with k-coefficients. But $F[t]$ is a PID with infinitely many nonassociate nonzero prime elements q (e.g. adapt Euclid's argument of the infinitude of the primes), so we may choose a nonzero prime element q which does not divide $q_i(t)$ for any i. It is then clear that $\frac{1}{q}$ cannot be a polynomial in the $r_i(t)$'s: for instance, evaluation at a root of q in $\overline{F}$ leads to a contradiction. $\square$

Remark: The phenomenon encountered in the endgame of the preceding proof will be studied in great detail in §12. What we are actually showing is that for any field F, the polynomial ring $F[t]$ is not a **Goldman domain**, and indeed this is closely related to the fact that $\operatorname{Spec} F[t]$ is infinite. More on this later.

1.2. McCabe's Proof of Zariski's Lemma.

We will give one further proof of Zariski's Lemma now (and more later...), an extremely elegant and simple one due to J. McCabe [**McC76**].

Let K/k be a field extension that is finitely generated as a k-algebra, say by $x_1, \dots, x_n$. Reorder the x_i's so that $x_1, \dots, x_t$ are algebraically independent over k and $x_{t+1}, \dots, x_n$ are algebraic over $k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. We may assume $t \geq 1$, for otherwise K/k is finitely generated algebraic field extension, hence of finite degree.

 Let $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_t]$, so S is a polynomial ring and *is not* a field. There is $y \in S^{\bullet}$ such that $yx_{t+1}, \dots, yx_n$ are all integral over $S[\frac{1}{y}]$. We have $k \subset S[\frac{1}{y}]$ and $x_1, \dots, x_t \in S[\frac{1}{y}]$, so $K = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is integral over $S[\frac{1}{y}]$. Since K is a field, by Proposition 1.9 so is $S[\frac{1}{y}]$.

 Let $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} S$. Since $t \geq 1$, $\mathfrak{m} \neq (0)$, so let $f \in \mathfrak{m}^{\bullet}$. Then f is invertible in the field $S[\frac{1}{y}]$ so there is $g \in S$ and $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\frac{1}{f} = \frac{g}{y^N}$ and thus $y^N = fg$. Since $f \in \mathfrak{m}$ and maximal ideals are prime, $y \in \mathfrak{m}$. It follows that y lies in every maximal ideal of S, hence $1 + y$ lies in no maximal ideal and is thus a unit in S. But $S^{\times} = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^{\times} = k^{\times}$, so $1 + y \in k^{\times}$ and $y \in k^{\bullet}$. Thus $k[x_1, \dots, x_t] = k[x_1, \dots, x_t, \frac{1}{y}] = S[\frac{1}{y}]$ is a field: contradiction!

2. Hilbert's Nullstellensatz

Let k be a field, let $R_n = k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$, and write $\mathbb{A}^n$ for k^n. We introduce an antitone Galois connection (V, I) between subsets of R_n and subsets of $\mathbb{A}^n$. Namely:

For $S \subset \mathbb{A}^n$, we put

$$I(S) = \{f \in R_n \mid \forall x \in S, \ f(x) = 0\}.$$

In other words, $I(S)$ is the set of polynomials which vanish at every element of S. Conversely, for $J \subset R_n$, we put

$$V(J) = \{x \in \mathbb{A}^n \mid \forall f \in J, \ f(x) = 0\}.$$

This is nothing else than the Galois relation associated to the relation $f(x) = 0$ on the Cartesian product $R_n \times \mathbb{A}^n$.

As usual, we would like to say something about the induced closure operators on R_n and $\mathbb{A}^n$. First, for any subset S of $\mathbb{A}^n$, $I(S)$ is not just a subset but an ideal of R_n. In fact $I(S)$ is a radical ideal: indeed, if $f^n \in I(S)$ then f^n vanishes on every point of S, so f vanishes at every point of S.

This little bit of structure pulled from thin air will quicken the heart of any Bourbakiste. But beyond the formalism, the key question is: exactly which sets are closed? Without knowing this, we haven't proved the Nullstellensatz any more than the analogous formalities between sets and groups of automorphisms prove the Galois correspondence for Galois field extensions.

Indeed, an ideal I is radical if $f^n \in I$ implies $f \in I$. But if f^n vanishes identically on S, then so does f.

The closed subsets of $\mathbb{A}^n$ are closed under arbitrary intersections (including the "empty intersection": $\mathbb{A}^n = V((0))$ and under finite unions (including the "empty union": $\emptyset = V(\{1\}) = V(R_n)$, and therefore form the closed sets for a unique topology on $\mathbb{A}^n$, the **Zariski topology**.

EXERCISE 11.2. *a) Prove these facts.*
b) Show that the Zariski topology on $\mathbb{A}^n_{/k}$ coincides with the topology it inherits as a subset of $\mathbb{A}^n_{/\overline{k}}$.
c) Show that the Zariski topology is T_1: i.e., singleton subsets are closed.
d) Show that when $n = 1$, the Zariski topology is the coarsest T_1 topology on k: namely, the topology in which a proper subset is closed iff it is finite.
e) For any $n \geq 1$, show that the Zariski topology on k^n is discrete iff k is finite.
f) For any infinite field and $m, n \geq 1$, show that the Zariski topology on k^{m+n} is strictly finer than the product of the Zariski topologies on k^m and k^n.

Remark: It is often lamented that the Zariski topology (especially when $k = \mathbb{C}$) is so "coarse". It is true that it is much coarser than the "analytic topology" on k^n when k is a topological field (i.e., the product topology from the topology on k). But from an algebraic perspective the Zariski topology is if anything too fine: we will see why later on when we extend the topology to all prime ideals on an affine algebra. Moreover, the fact that the Zariski topology on $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ is discrete creates many geometric problems.

EXERCISE 11.3. *Let k be a field and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ as above. Explicitly compute the ideal $I(k^n)$, i.e., the set of all polynomials which vanish at* every *point of k^n. Do we necessarily have $I(k^n) = \{0\}$?*

LEMMA 11.2. *For $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in k^n$, put $\mathfrak{m}_a = \langle x_1 - a_1, \ldots, x_n - a_n \rangle$. Then:*
a) We have $R_n/\mathfrak{m}_a = k$. In particular $\mathfrak{m}_a$ is maximal.
b) $\mathfrak{m}_a = I(\{a\})$ is the ideal of all functions vanishing at a.
c) The assignment $a \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_a$ is a bijection from k^n to the set of all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R_n such that $R_n/\mathfrak{m} = k$.

PROOF. Part a) is obvious (but important).
b) Certainly each $x_i - a_i$ vanishes at a, so $\mathfrak{m}_a \subset I(\{a\})$. But by part a) $\mathfrak{m}_a$ is a maximal ideal, whereas $1 \notin I(\{a\})$, so we must have $\mathfrak{m}_a = I(\{a\})$.

c) The mapping $a \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_a$ is an injection from k^n to the set of maximal ideals with residue field k. Conversely, let $\mathfrak{m}$ be an ideal of R_n with $R_n/\mathfrak{m} = k$. For $1 \le i \le n$ let a_i be the image of x_i in $R_n/\mathfrak{m} = k$. Then $\mathfrak{m} \supset \mathfrak{m}_a$ so we must have equality. $\square$

We now pause for a very important definition. A ring R is a **Jacobson ring** if it is "sufficiently many maximal ideals": more precisely, such that every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is the intersection of the maximal ideals that contain it.

EXERCISE 11.4. *a) Show: a ring R is a Jacobson ring iff for every ideal I, the intersection of all maximal ideals containing I is* $\mathrm{rad}(I)$.
b) Show: every homomorphic image of a Jacobson ring is Jacobson.

PROPOSITION 11.3. *(Rabinowitsch Trick [**Ra30**]) Let k be a field and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.*
a) The ring $R = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a Jacobson ring.
b) It follows that any affine k-algebra is a Jacobson ring.

PROOF. a) It is sufficient to show that for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R and $a \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ containing $\mathfrak{p}$ and not containing a.

To show this, put $R_a := R[\frac{1}{a}]$, and let $\mathfrak{p}_a = \mathfrak{p}R_a$ be the pushed forward ideal. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ does not meet the multiplicative set generated by a, $\mathfrak{p}_a$ is still prime in R_a. Let $\mathfrak{m}_a$ be any maximal ideal of R_a containing $\mathfrak{p}_a$, and let $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_a \cap R$ be its contraction to R: *a priori*, this is a prime ideal. There is an induced k-algebra embedding $R/\mathfrak{m} \hookrightarrow R_a/\mathfrak{m}_a$. But R_a is still a finitely generated algebra so by Zariski's Lemma (Theorem 11.1) $R_a/\mathfrak{m}_a$ is finite dimensional as a k-vector space, hence so is the subspace $R/\mathfrak{m}$. Thus the domain $R/\mathfrak{m}$ must be a field: let $x \in (R/\mathfrak{m})^\bullet$, and write out a linear dependence relation of minimal degree among the powers of x:

$$x^n + c_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \ldots + c_1 x + c_0, \ c_i \in k, \ c_0 \neq 0.$$

Thus

$$x\left(x^{n-1} + c_{n-1}x^{n-2} + \ldots + c_1\right) = \frac{-1}{c_0},$$

so x is invertible. Thus $\mathfrak{m}$ is the desired maximal ideal.
b) This follows immediately from Exercise 11.4. $\square$

Remark: It seems that the author "J.L. Rabinowitsch," the author of [**Ra30**] is in fact *George Yuri Rainich*, a distinguished Russian-American mathematician.

We prove one last fact before imposing the hypothesis that k is algebraically closed.

PROPOSITION 11.4. *Let k be any field and J an ideal of $k[x] = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Then:*
a) $V(J) = V(\mathrm{rad}\, J)$.
b) For any subset $S \subset k^n$, $I(S)$ is a radical ideal.
v) $I(V(J))$ *is a radical ideal containing* $\mathrm{rad}\, J$.

PROOF. The underlying mechanism here is the following truly basic observation: for $f \in k[x]$, $P \in k^n$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have

$$f(P) = 0 \iff f^m(P) = 0.$$

a) Since $J \subset \mathrm{rad}\, J$ we have $V(J) \supset V(\mathrm{rad}\, J)$. Conversely, let $P \in V(J)$ and $f \in \mathrm{rad}\, J$. Then there is $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $f^m \in J$, so $f^m(P) = 0$ and thus $f(P) = 0$. It follows that $P \in V(\mathrm{rad}\, J)$.

b) Similarly, for any $f \in k[x]$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, if $f^m \in I(S)$, then for all $P \in S$, $f^m(P) = 0$. But this implies $f(P) = 0$ for all $P \in S$ and thus $f \in I(S)$.
c) This follows immediately from parts a) and b) and the tautological fact that for any ideal J of $k[x]$, $I(V(J)) \supset J$. □

Finally we specialize to the case in which the field k is algebraically closed. We have done almost all the work necessary to establish the following fundamental result.

THEOREM 11.5. *(Hilbert's Nullstellensatz) Let k be an algebraically closed field, let $k[x] = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Then:*
a) I induces a bijective correspondence between the singleton sets of k^n and the maximal ideals: $a \in k^n \mapsto \mathfrak{m}_a = \langle x_1 - a_1, \ldots, x_n - a_n \rangle$.
b) For any Zariski-closed subset $S \subset k^n$, $V(I(S)) = S$.
c) For any ideal J of R_n, $I(V(J)) = \mathrm{rad}(J)$.
Thus there is an inclusion-reversing, bijective correspondence between Zariski-closed subsets of k^n and ***radical*** *ideals of $k[x]$.*

PROOF. a) Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal of $k[x]$. By Theorem 11.1, the residue field $k[x]/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite degree extension of k. Since k is algebraically closed, this forces $k[x]/\mathfrak{m} = k$, and now Lemma 11.2 applies.
b) There is no content here: it is part of the formalism of Galois connections.
c) By Proposition 11.4, it is no loss of generality to assume that J is a radical ideal. Further, by Proposition 11.3, $k[x]$ is a Jacobson ring, so any radical ideal J is the intersection of the maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ containing it. This is true over any field k. But combining with part a), we get that J is an intersection of maximal ideals of the form $\mathfrak{m}_a$ for certain points $a \in k^n$. Since $\mathfrak{m}_a = I(\{a\})$, $J \subset \mathfrak{m}_a$ iff every element of J vanishes at a, in other words iff $a \in V(J)$. Thus J is equal to the set of all polynomials $f \in R_n$ which vanish at every point of $V(J)$: $J = I(V(J))$! □

EXERCISE 11.5. *Let k be any field. Show that if either part a) or part c) of Theorem 11.5 holds for the rings $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, then k is algebraically closed. (Hint: in fact both parts fail for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, including $n = 1$.)*

EXERCISE 11.6. *Show: Zariski's Lemma in the case that k is algebraically closed is equivalent to the following statement: let $J = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_m \rangle$ be an ideal in $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Then either there exists a simultaneous zero a of $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ or there exist polynomials $g_1, \ldots, g_m$ such that $g_1 f_1 + \ldots + g_m f_m = 1$.*

2.1. The Semirational Nullstellensatz.

LEMMA 11.6. *(Lang's Lemma) Let k be a field, L an algebraically closed field, $\varphi : k \to L$ a field embedding, and R a finitely generated k-algebra. Then there is a homomorphism $\Phi : R \to L$ extending φ.*

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal of k. By Zariski's Lemma, $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite degree field extension of k, so by basic field theory it embeds as a k-algebra into any algebraically closed field containing k. □

Remark: In [**Lg02**, § IX.1], Lang gives a direct proof of Lemma 11.6. It is easy to see that Lemma 11.6 implies Zariski's Lemma, so this gives another way to proceed.

COROLLARY 11.7. *Let k be a field, and let R be a domain that is finitely generated as a k-algebra. For any $y_1, \ldots, y_n \in R^\bullet$, there is a homomorphism $\psi : R \to \overline{k}$ such that $\psi(y_i) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

PROOF. Apply Lang's Lemma to the ring $R[\frac{1}{y_1}, \ldots, \frac{1}{y_n}]$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 11.8. *Let J be a proper ideal of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Then there is $x \in \overline{k}^n$ such that for all $f \in J$, $f(x) = 0$.*

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal containing J. Zariski's Lemma gives a k-algebra embedding $\psi : k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m} \hookrightarrow \overline{k}$. Let $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = (\psi(t_1), \ldots, \psi(t_n))$.
$\qquad\square$

For an ideal J of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$, let $V^a(J)$ be the set of $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \overline{k}^n$ with $g(x) = 0$ for all $g \in J$. For $S \subset \overline{k}^n$, let $I(S)$ be the set of $g \in k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ such that $g(x) = 0$ for all $x \in S$. (Notice that we are extending to the algebraic closure on the affine space side but not on the ring side, hence the term "semirational".)

THEOREM 11.9. *(Semirational Nullstellensatz) For all ideals J of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$, we have $I(V^a(J)) = \operatorname{rad} J$.*

PROOF. It is easy to see that $I(V^a(J))$ is a radical ideal containing J and thus $I(V^a(J)) \supset \operatorname{rad} J$. Conversely, let $f \in I(V^a(J))$. We must show that there is $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $f^m \in J$. We may assume $f \neq 0$. We introduce a new indeterminate t_{n+1} and let J' be the ideal $\langle J, 1 - t_{n+1} f \rangle$ of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n, t_{n+1}]$. Let $Z \subset \overline{k}^n$ be the zero set of J, so $f|_Z \equiv 0$. Let $(x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1}) \in \overline{k}^{n+1}$. If $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \notin Z$, then there is $g \in J \subset J'$ such that $g(x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1}) \neq 0$. If $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in Z$, then $1 - x_{n+1} f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 1 \neq 0$. By Corollary 11.8, $J' = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n, t_{n+1}]$, so there are $g_i \in k[t_1, \ldots, t_n, t_{n+1}]$ and $h_i \in J$ such that

$$1 = g_0(1 - t_{n+1}f) + g_1 h_1 + \ldots + g_r h_r.$$

Now substitute $t_{n+1} = f^{-1}$ and multiply by an appropriate power f^N of f to clear denominators: we get $f^N \in J$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 11.7. *The argument used in the proof of Theorem 11.9 is also called the **Rabinowitsch Trick**. Explain its relation to the proof of Proposition 11.3.*

EXERCISE 11.8. *Can you deduce Theorem 11.9 from Hilbert's Nullstellensatz?*

EXERCISE 11.9. *Let R be a subring of an algebraically closed field k, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_r \in R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Show that exactly one of the following holds:*
  (i) *There is $x \in k^n$ such that $f_1(x) = \ldots = f_r(x) = 0$.*
  (ii) *There are $g_1, \ldots, g_r \in R[t_1, ..., t_n]$ and $a \in R^\bullet$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^r g_i f_i = a$.*

In the case of $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $k = \mathbb{C}$, Exercise 11.9 is often called the "Arithmetic Nullstellensatz." A more interesting version of it would ask in Case (ii) for explicit upper bounds on the degrees of the polynomials g_j.

3. The Real Nullstellensatz

Recall that a field k is **formally real** if it is *not* possible to express -1 as a sum of (any finite number of) squares in k.

EXERCISE 11.10. *Let k be a formally real field.*
a) Show that k is not algebraically closed.
b) Show that any subfield of k is formally real.

A field k is **real closed** if it is formally real and admits no proper formally real algebraic extension. So e.g. $\mathbb{R}$ is real closed and $\mathbb{Q}$ is formally real but not real closed.

As we saw, even the weak Nullstellensatz fails for polynomial rings over any non-algebraically closed field k. However, when k is formally real one can find counterexamples to the Nullstellensatz of a particular form, and when k is real closed one can show that these counterexamples are in a certain precise sense the only ones, leading to an identification of the closure operation $J \mapsto I(V(J))$ in this case.

In any commutative ring R, an ideal I is **real** if for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R$, $x_1^2 + \ldots + x_n^2 \in I$ implies $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in I$.

A domain R is **real** if the zero ideal is real.

   EXERCISE 11.11. *a) Show: a domain is real iff its fraction field is formally real.*
b) Let R be a ring. Show that $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ is real iff the fraction field of $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is formally real.

   EXERCISE 11.12. *Show: any real ideal is a radical ideal.*

So what? The following result gives the connection to the closure operator on ideals in $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$.

   PROPOSITION 11.10. *Let k be a formally real field and $k[x] = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. For any ideal J of $k[x]$, its closure $\overline{J} = I(V(J))$ is a real ideal.*

   PROOF. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in k[x]$ be such that $f_1^2 + \ldots + f_m^2 \in \overline{J}$. Then for any $P \in V(J)$, we have $f_1(P)^2 + \ldots + f_m(P)^2 = 0$. Since k is formally real, this implies $f_1(P) = \ldots = f_m(P) = 0$, and thus $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in I(V(J)) = \overline{J}$. $\square$

   EXERCISE 11.13. *Find a real prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ which is not closed.*

For an ideal I of a ring R, define the **real radical**

$$\mathbb{R}\operatorname{ad}(I) = \{ x \in R \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \; \exists b_1, \ldots, b_m \in R \mid x^{2n} + b_1^2 + \ldots + b_m^2 \in I \}.$$

   PROPOSITION 11.11. [**BCR**, Prop. 4.1.7] *Let I be an ideal in a ring R.*
a) A real ideal J contains I iff $J \supset \mathbb{R}\operatorname{ad}(I)$ i.e., $\mathbb{R}\operatorname{ad}(I)$ is the unique minimal real ideal containing I.
b) $\mathbb{R}\operatorname{ad}(I)$ is equal to the intersection of all real prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} \supset I$.
c) It follows that every real ideal is equal to the intersection of all the real prime ideals containing it.

Remark: If there are no real prime ideals containing I, then the intersection over this empty set is taken to be R.

   PROOF. Step 1: we show that $\mathbb{R}\operatorname{ad}(I)$ is an ideal. The only nonobvious part of this is closure under addition. Suppose that

$$a^{2n} + b_1^2 + \ldots + b_m^2, \; A^{2N} + B_1^2 + \ldots + B_M^2 \in I.$$

We may write

$$(a + A)^{2(n+N)} + (a - A)^{2(n+N)} = a^{2m}c + A^{2M}C,$$

with c, C sums of squares in R. Then

$$(a + A)^{2(n+N)} + (a - A)^{2(n+N)} + c(b_1^2 + \ldots + b_m^2) + C(B_1^2 + \ldots + B_M^2) \in I,$$

so $a + A \in \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(I)$.

Step 2: $\mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(I)$ is a real ideal. Indeed, if $x_1^2 + \ldots + x_k^2 \in \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(I)$, then there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_m \in R$ such that

$$(x_1^2 + \ldots + x_k^2)^{2m} + b_1^2 + \ldots + b_m^2 \in I;$$

for each $1 \le i \le k$, we may rewrite this as $x_i^{4m} + B_1^2 + \ldots + B_N^2$, so $x_i \in \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(I)$.

Step 3: Since every real ideal is radical, it is clear that any real ideal containing I also contains $\mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(I)$.

Step 4: Let $a \in R \setminus \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(I)$. By Zorn's Lemma, the set of real ideals containing I but not a has a maximal element, say J. We claim that J is prime. If not, there exist $b, b' \in R \setminus J$ such that $bb' \in J$. Then $a \in \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(J + bR)$ and $a \in \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(J + b'R)$, hence there are $j, j' \in J$ such that

$$a^{2m} + c_1^2 + \ldots + c_q^2 = j + bd, \ a^{2m'} + c_1'^2 + \ldots + c_q'^2 = j' + b'd'.$$

It follows that

$$a^{2(m+m')} + \text{ a sum of squares } = jj' + jb'd' + j'bd + bb'dd' \in J,$$

and thus $a \in \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(J) = J$, contradiction. Thus $\mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(I)$ is the intersection of all real prime ideals containing I. $\qquad \square$

THEOREM 11.12. *(Artin-Lang Homomorphism Theorem)*
a) Let $k \hookrightarrow L$ be a map of real-closed fields, and let R be a finitely generated k-algebra. If there is a k-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : R \to L$, then there is a k-algebra homomorphism $\psi : R \to k$.
b) Let k be a real-closed field, and let R be a domain which is a finitely generated k-algebra. If R is real, there is a k-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : R \to k$.

PROOF. a) For a proof using model-theoretic methods, see e.g. [**BCR**, Thm. 4.1.2].
b) The fraction field K of R is formally real: let L be a real closure of K. Apply part a) to the composite k-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : R \to K \to L$. $\qquad \square$

Remark: For a direct algebraic proof of Theorem 11.12b), see e.g. [**S**, § 3.3].

EXERCISE 11.14. *Let $R = \mathbb{R}[x, y]/(x^2 + y^2)$.*
a) Show that R is a domain.
b) Show that R is not real.
c) Show that there is a (unique!) $\mathbb{R}$-algebra homomorphism $\varphi : R \to \mathbb{R}$.
(Thus the converse of Theorem 11.12b) does not hold.)

In [**Lg53**], Lang actually proved the following stronger result than Theorem 11.12b), which we state in more geometric language: the domain R above corresponds to an integral affine variety V over the real closed field k, and Lang showed that the function field $k(V)$ is formally real iff V has a *nonsingular* k-rational point.

THEOREM 11.13. *(The Nullstellensatz for Real-Closed Fields) Let k be a real-closed field, and J an ideal in $k[t] = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Then $\overline{J} = \mathbb{R} \operatorname{ad}(J)$.*

PROOF. Step 1: Suppose J is a real prime ideal. Let $R = k[t]/J$, and let K be the fraction field of R; by Exercise 11.X, K is formally real; let L be a real closure of K. For $f \in R \setminus J$, let S be the localization $R[\frac{1}{q(f)}]$, so $S \subset L$. By Theorem 11.12a) there is a k-algebra homomorphism $\psi : S \to k$; let $x = (\psi(\overline{t_1}), \dots, \psi(\overline{t_n}))$. Then $x \in V(J)$ and $f(x) \neq 0$, so $f \notin I(V(J))$. It follows that $\overline{J} = I(V(J)) = J$. Step 2: Suppose J is a real ideal, and let X_J be the set of all real prime ideals containing J. By Proposition 11.11c), $J = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X_J} \mathfrak{p}$, and thus

$$\overline{J} = I(V(J)) = I(V(\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X_J} \mathfrak{p})) = I(\bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in X_J} V(\mathfrak{p})) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X_J} I(V(\mathfrak{p})) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in X_J} \mathfrak{p} = J.$$

Step 3: Now let J be arbitrary. By Proposition 11.10, $\overline{J}$ is a real ideal containing J, so by Proposition 11.11a), $\mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{ad}(J) \subset \overline{J}$. On the other hand, part b) gives

$$\overline{J} \subset \overline{\mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{ad}(J)} = \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{ad}(J),$$

so $\overline{J} = \mathbb{R}\,\mathrm{ad}(J)$. $\qquad\square$

4. The Combinatorial Nullstellensatz

In this section we describe one of the most recent Nullstellensätze, a celebrated result of Noga Alon that has served as a powerful technical tool and organizing principle in combinatorics and additive number theory (!).

LEMMA 11.14. *(Alon-Tarsi) Let k be a field, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and $f(t) \in k[t] = k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$; for $1 \leq i \leq n$, let d_i be the t_i-degree of f, let S_i be a subset of k with $\#S_i > d_i$, and let $S = \prod_{i=1}^n S_i$. If $f(x) = 0$ for all $x \in S$, then $f = 0$.*

PROOF. We go by induction on n. The case $n = 1$ is truly basic: a nonzero univariate polynomial over a field has no more roots than its degree. Now suppose $n \geq 2$ and that the result holds for polynomials in $n-1$ variables. The basic idea is the identity $k[t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}, t_n] = k[t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}][t_n]$: thus we write

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{t_n} f_i(t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})t_n^i$$

with $f_i \in k[t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}]$. If $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in k^{n-1}$, the polynomial $f(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, t_n) \in k[t_n]$ vanishes for all $\#S_n > d_n$ elements $x_n \in S_n$ and thus is identically zero, i.e., $f_i(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq t_n$. By induction, each $f_i(t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})$ is the zero polynomial and thus f is the zero polynomial. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 11.15. *(Combinatorial Nullstellensatz [**Al99**]) Let k be a field, $S_1, \dots, S_n$ be nonempty finite subsets of k, and put $S = \prod_{i=1}^n S_i$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, put*

$$g_i(t_i) = \prod_{s_i \in S_i} (t_i - s_i) \in k[t_i] \subset k[t] = k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$$

and

$$\mathfrak{g} = \langle g_1(t_1), \dots, g_n(t_n) \rangle.$$

Then

$$S = V(\mathfrak{g})$$

and

$$\overline{\mathfrak{g}} = I(V(\mathfrak{g})) = \mathfrak{g}.$$

PROOF. That $S = V(\mathfrak{g})$ is immediate, as is $\mathfrak{g} \subset \overline{\mathfrak{g}}$. Conversely, suppose $f \in \overline{\mathfrak{g}} = I(S)$, i.e., $f(s) = 0$ for all $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in S$. We must show that there are polynomials $h_1(t), \ldots, h_n(t)$ such that $f(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(t) g_i(t)$.

For $1 \le i \le n$, put $d_i = \#S_i - 1$; we may write

$$g_i(t_i) = t_i^{d_i+1} - \sum_{j=0}^{d_i} g_{ij} t_i^j.$$

Observe that if $s_i \in S_i$, then $g_i(x_i) = 0$, i.e.,

$$(27) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad x_i^{d_i+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{d_i} g_{ij} x_i^j.$$

Let $\overline{f}$ be the polynomial obtained from f by writing f as a sum of monomials and repeatedly substituting each instance of $t_i^{e_i}$ with $e_i > d_i$ with a k-linear combination of smaller powers of t_i using (27). Then $\overline{f}$ has degree at most d_i in t_i and $f - \overline{f}$ is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^n h_i g_i$. Further, for all $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in S$, $\overline{f}(s) = f(s) = 0$. Thus Lemma 11.14 applies to give $\overline{f} = 0$ and thus $f = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i g_i$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 11.15. *a) Show: in the notation of the proof of Theorem 11.13, the polynomials $h_1, \ldots, h_n$ satisfy $\deg h_i \le \deg f - \deg g_i$ for all $1 \le i \le n$.*
b) Show: the coefficients of $h_1, \ldots, h_n$ lie in the subring of k generated by the coefficients of $f, g_1, \ldots, g_n$.

COROLLARY 11.16. *(Polynomial Method) Let k be a field, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $f \in k[t] = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. We suppose:*
(i) $\deg f = a_1 + \ldots + a_n$.
(ii) The coefficient of $t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_n^{a_n}$ in f is nonzero.
Then, for any subsets $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ of k with $\#S_i > a_i$ for $1 \le i \le n$, there is $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in S = \prod_{i=1}^n S_i$ such that $f(s) \ne 0$.

PROOF. It is no loss of generality to assume that $\#S_i = a_i + 1$ for all i, and we do so. We will show that if (i) holds and $f|_S \equiv 0$, then (ii) does *not* hold, i.e., the coefficient of $t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_n^{a_n}$ in f is 0.

Define, for all $1 \le i \le n$, $g_i(t_i) = \prod_{s_i \in S_i} t_i - s_i$. By Theorem 11.13 and the preceding exercise, there are $h_1, \ldots, h_n \in k[t]$ such that

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i g_i$$

and

$$\deg h_i \le (a_1 + \ldots + a_n) - \deg g_i, \ \forall 1 \le i \le n,$$

so

$$(28) \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \deg h_i g_i \le \deg f.$$

Thus if $h_i g_i$ contains any monomial of degree $\deg f$, such a monomial would be of maximal degree in $h_i g_i = h_i \prod_{s_i \in S_i} (t_i - s_i)$ and thus be divisible by $t_i^{a_i+1}$. It follows that for all i, the coefficient of $t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_n^{a_n}$ in $h_i g_i$ is zero, hence the coefficient of $t_1^{a_1} \cdots t_n^{a_n}$ in f is zero. $\qquad\square$

5. The Finite Field Nullstellensatz

For a prime power q, let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field of cardinality q. We will characterize the closure operation $J \mapsto \overline{J} = I(V(J))$ for ideals in $\mathbb{F}_q[t] = \mathbb{F}_q[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$.

Let $I_0 = \langle t_1^q - t_1, \ldots, t_n^q - t_n \rangle$. Then the key observation is that for any ideal J of $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$, $\overline{J} \supset I_0$. Indeed, since $x^q = x$ for all $x \in \mathbb{F}_q$, the polynomials $t_1^q - t_1, \ldots, t_n^q - t_n$ each vanish at every point of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$, so $\overline{J} = I(V(J)) \supset I(\mathbb{F}_q^n) \supset I_0$. Since of course $\overline{J} \supset J$, it follows that for all ideals J of $k[t]$ we have

$$(29) \qquad \overline{J} \supset J + I_0.$$

PROPOSITION 11.17. *(Finite Field Weak Nullstellensatz) Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field, and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $g_i = t_i^q - t_i \in \mathbb{F}_q[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$, and put $I_0 = \langle g_1, \ldots, g_n \rangle$. Then $I_0 = I(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$ is the ideal of all functions vanishing at every point of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$.*

EXERCISE 11.16. *Deduce Proposition 11.17 from the Combinatorial Nullstellensatz.*

Proposition 11.17 asserts that the containment of (29) is an equality when $J = (0)$. In fact, this holds in all cases.

LEMMA 11.18. *Let J be an ideal of $\mathbb{F}_q[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. If J contains the ideal $I_0 = \langle t_1^q - t_1, \ldots, t_n^q - t_n \rangle$, then $\operatorname{rad} J = J$.*

PROOF. Suppose that for $x \in R$, there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $x^n \in J$. Then also $x^{q^n} = (x^{q^{n-1}})^q \in J$. By Corollary 11.17, for all $x \in R$, $f^q - f \in I_0 \subset J$: applying this with $f = x^{q^{n-1}}$, we find that $x^{q^n} - x \in I$ and thus $x^{q^n} - (x^{q^n} - x) = x \in J$. $\square$

THEOREM 11.19. *(Finite Field Nullstellensatz) For any ideal J of $R = \mathbb{F}_q[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$,*

$$\overline{J} = I(V(J)) = J + I_0 = \langle J, t_1^q - t_1, \ldots, t_n^q - t_n \rangle.$$

We will give two proofs: one using the Semirational Nullstellensatz, and one using the Finite Field Weak Nullstellensatz.

PROOF. By the Semirational Nullstellensatz (Theorem 11.9) and Lemma 11.18,

$$I(V^a(J + I_0)) = \operatorname{rad}(J + I_0) = J + I_0.$$

Since $V^a(I_0) = \mathbb{F}_q^n$, we have

$$I(V(J)) = I(V^a(J) \cap \mathbb{F}_q^n) = I(V^a(J) \cap V^a(I_0)) = I(V^a(J + I_0)) = J + I_0.$$

$\square$

PROOF. By (29) $\overline{J} \supset J + I_0$, it suffices to show that for all $J \supseteq I_0$, $J = \overline{J}$.
By Proposition 11.17, $I_0 = I(\mathbb{F}_q^n)$. For $P = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$, let

$$\mathfrak{m}_P = I(\{P\}) = \langle t_1 - x_1, \ldots, t_n - x_n \rangle.$$

Thus $\{\mathfrak{m}_P\}_{P \in \mathbb{F}_q^n}$ are finitely many pairwise comaximal ideals with $I_0 = \bigcap_{P \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} \mathfrak{m}_P$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem,

$$(30) \qquad R/I_0 = R/\bigcap_{P \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} \mathfrak{m}_P \cong \prod_{P \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} R/\mathfrak{m}_P \cong k^{\#\mathbb{F}_q^n}.$$

The Correspondence Theorem now gives us canonical bijections between the set of ideals containing I_0 and the set of subsets of $\mathbb{F}_q^n$. Since every subset of the finite set $\mathbb{F}_q^n$ is Zariski closed, there are precisely $2^{\#\mathbb{F}_q^n}$ Zariski-closed subsets and therefore precisely $2^{\#\mathbb{F}_q^n}$ ideals J with $J = \overline{J}$. By (30) there are precisely $2^{\#\mathbb{F}_q^n}$ ideals J containing I_0, so we must have $J = \overline{J}$ for all such ideals. $\qquad\square$

Remark: It seems that Theorem 11.19 was first stated and proved (as in the first proof above) in a 1991 technical report of R. Germundsson [**Ge91**].

6. Terjanian's Homogeneous p-Nullstellensatz

THEOREM 11.20. *Let k be an algebraically closed field, let $1 \leq m < n$ be integers, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Put*

$$V := V(f_1, \ldots, f_m) = \{x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in k^n \mid f_1(x) = \ldots = f_m(x) = 0\}.$$

Then V is either empty or infinite.

PROOF. Put $I := \langle f_1, \ldots, f_m \rangle$. Seeking a contradiction, we suppose that $V = \{p_1, \ldots, p_N\}$ is nonempty and finite. For $x \in k^n$ we have $x \in V$ iff I is contained in the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_x$ of polynomials that vanish at x, so the maximal ideals contaning I are precisely $\mathfrak{m}_{p_1}, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_{p_N}$. Since $k[t_1, ..., t_n]$ is Jacobson, we have

$$\operatorname{rad} I = \bigcap_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_{p_i} = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_{p_i}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a minimal prime ideal over I. Then $\mathfrak{p} \supset \operatorname{rad} I = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_{p_i}$, so $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}_x$ for some $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in k^n$. Applying the Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem to $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}_x$ we get that $\operatorname{ht} \mathfrak{m}_{x_i} \leq m < n$. But

$$(0) \subsetneq \langle t_1 - x_1 \rangle \subsetneq \langle t_1 - x_1, t_2 - x_2 \rangle \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \langle t_1 - x_1, \ldots, t_n - x_n \rangle = \mathfrak{m}_x$$

shows that $\mathfrak{m}_x$ has height at least n, a contradiction. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 11.17. *For which fields k does the conclusion of Theorem 11.20 hold? Evidently not when k is finite!*
   a) *Let $f = t_1^2 + t_2^2 \in \mathbb{R}[t_1, t_2]$. Show: $V(f) = \{(0,0)\}$ is nonempty and finite.*
   b) *Show: if k is not algebraically closed, there is $f \in k[t_1, t_2]$ such that $V(f) = \{(0,0)\}$.*

COROLLARY 11.21 (Homogeneous Nullstellensatz). *Let k be an algebraically closed field, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in k[t_0, \ldots, t_n]$ be homogeneous polynomials of positive degree. If $m \leq n$, then there is $0 \neq x \in k^{n+1}$ such that*

$$f_1(x) = \ldots = f_n(x) = 0.$$

PROOF. Let V be as in Theorem 11.20. Since each f_i is homogeneous we have $0 \in V$, and thus by Theorem 11.20 the set V is infinite. $\qquad\square$

While Theorem 11.21 is a very classical result – it was used (not necessarily with proper justification) by 19th century mathematicians studying varieties in projective space – the following generalization is a 1972 theorem of G. Terjanian.

Let p be a prime number. We say that a field k is a **p-field** if every every finite extension l/k has degree a power of p.

Examples: a) Every separably closed field is a p-field.
b) Every real-closed field is a 2-field.
c) A perfect field k is a p-field iff $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{k}/k)$ is a pro-p-group.

THEOREM 11.22. *(Terjanian's Homogeneous p-Nullstellensatz) Let k be a p-field, and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For $1 \le i \le n$, let $f_i \in k[t_0, \ldots, t_n]$ be homogeneous of degree d_i indivisible by p. Then there is $0 \ne x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in k^n$ such that*

$$f_1(x) = \ldots = f_n(x) = 0.$$

The proof given in [**Te72**] was rather involved; a significantly simpler proof is given in [**P**], but even this involves more graded algebra than we wish to discuss here. However, following Arason and Pfister [**AP82**] we will now deduce some striking consequences of the Homogeneous 2-Nullstellensatz for real-closed fields.

EXERCISE 11.18. *Let k be a field of characteristic different from 2, and let $f \in k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. We say that f is an **odd polynomial** if $f(-t) = -f(t)$. Show: an odd polynomial is a sum of monomials each of odd total degree.*

THEOREM 11.23. *(Algebraic Borsuk-Ulam) Let k be a real closed field, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and for $1 \le i \le n$, let $f_i \in k[t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}]$ be an odd polynomial: $f_i(-t) = -f_i(t)$. Then there is $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in k^{n+1}$ such that*

$$x_1^2 + \ldots + x_{n+1}^2 = 1, \ f_1(x) = \ldots = f_n(x) = 0.$$

PROOF. So as to be able to apply Terjanian's Homogeneous p-Nullstellensatz, we homogenize: let t_0 be an additional indeterminate and let $\tilde{f}_i \in k[t_0, \ldots, t_{n+1}]$ be the unique homogeneous polynomial such that $\tilde{f}_i(1, t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}) = f_i$, of degree $d_i = \deg f_i$. Being an odd polynomial, each f_i only contains monomials of odd degree; thus each d_i is odd and t_0 occurs in $\tilde{f}_i$ to even powers only. Thus we may make the change of variables $t_0^2 \mapsto t_1^2 + \ldots + t_{n+1}^2$ in each $\tilde{f}_i$, leading to homogeneous polynomials $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in k[t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}]$ of odd degrees $d_1, \ldots, d_n$. Applying Theorem 11.22 with $p = 2$, we get $0 \ne a \in k^{n+1}$ such that $g_1(a) = \ldots = g_n(a) = 0$. Since the g_i's are homogeneous, we may scale by $\left(a_1^2 + \ldots + a_{n+1}^2\right)^{-1}$ to get an a such that $a_1^2 + \ldots + a_{n+1}^2 = 1$ and $g_1(a) = \ldots = g_n(a) = 0$. Thus $f_i(a) = \tilde{f}_i(1, a) = g_i(a) = 0$ for all i, and we're done. $\square$

We now revert to the case of $k = \mathbb{R}$. As usual, for $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we put

$$||x|| = \sqrt{x_1^2 + \ldots + x_n^2}\};$$

for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we put

$$d(x, y) = ||x - y||,$$

and we define the **unit sphere**

$$S^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid ||x|| = 1\}$$

and the **unit disk**

$$D^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid ||x|| \le 1\}.$$

A subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is **symmetric** if $x \in S \implies -x \in S$. If $S \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ and $T \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ are symmetric subsets, then $f : S \to T$ is **odd** if for all $x \in S$, $f(-x) = -f(x)$. For $x \in S^n$, x and $-x$ are **antipodal**, and $\{x, -x\}$ is called an **antipodal pair**.

COROLLARY 11.24. *(Topological Borsuk-Ulam)*
Let $f : S^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous, odd map. Then there is $x \in S^n$ with $f(x) = 0$.

PROOF. Write $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n)$, for $f_i : S^n \to \mathbb{R}$ an odd continuous map. Seeking a contradiction, we suppose f has no zero. Since S^n is compact, there is $\delta > 0$ such that for all $x \in S^n$, $\max_i |f_i(x)| \geq \delta$. Choose $0 < \epsilon < \delta$ and apply the Weierstrass Approximation Theorem to the continuous functions $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ on the compact space S^n: there are $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in \mathbb{R}[t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}]$ such that $|f_i(x) - p_i(x)| < \epsilon$ for all i and all $x \in S^n$. Put $q_i(t) = \frac{1}{2}(p_i(t) - p_i(-t))$; then for $x \in S^n$,

$$|f_i(x) - q_i(x)| = \frac{|f_i(x) - f_i(-x) - p_i(x) + p_i(-x)|}{2}$$

$$\leq \frac{|f_i(x) - p_i(x)| + |f_i(-x) - p_i(-x)|}{2} < \epsilon.$$

It follows that for all $x \in S^n$, $\max_i |q_i(x)| \geq \delta - \epsilon > 0$, so the q_i's have no simultaneous zero on S^n, contradicting Theorem 11.23. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 11.25.
The following statements are equivalent – and hence, by Corollary 11.24, all true.
(i) Every continuous, odd map $f : S^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ has a zero.
(ii) There is no continuous, odd map $g : S^n \to S^{n-1}$.
(iii) Every continuous map $f : S^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ identifies an antipodal pair.
(iv) (Lusternik-Schnirelmann-Borsuk) Let $\{F_1, \ldots, F_{n+1}\}$ be a covering family of closed subsets of S^n. Then some member of the family contains an antipodal pair.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let $\iota : S^{n-1} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the natural inclusion. If $g : S^n \to S^{n-1}$ is continuous and odd, $\iota \circ g : S^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is continuous and odd with no zero.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): If f identifies no antipodal pair, then $g : S^n \to S^{n-1}$ by $x \mapsto \frac{f(x) - f(-x)}{||f(x) - f(-x)||}$ is continuous and odd.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to S^n$ be odd. By assumption, there is $x \in S^n$ such that $f(x) = f(-x)$, but since also $f(x) = -f(-x)$, we conclude $f(x) = 0$.
(iii) $\implies$ (iv): Let $F_1, \ldots, F_{n+1}$ be closed subsets of S^n such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n+1} F_i = S^n$; suppose that none of the sets $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ contains an antipodal pair: equivalently, putting $E_i = -F_i$, we have that $E_i \cap F_i = \varnothing$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. For a point x and a subset Y of S^n, put $d(x, Y) = \inf\{d(x, y) \mid y \in Y\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq n+1$, define $f_i : S^n \to \mathbb{R}$ by $f_i(x) = d(x, E_i) - d(x, F_i)$. Observe that

$$x \in F_i \implies f_i(-x) < 0 < f_i(x),$$

$$x \in E_i \implies f_i(x) < 0 < f_i(-x).$$

Applying condition (iii) to $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_n) : S^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, we get $x_0 \in S^n$ such that $f(-x_0) = f(x_0)$. Thus neither x_0 nor $-x_0$ lies in any F_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, hence both x_0 and $-x_0$ must lie in F_{n+1}.
(iv) $\implies$ (ii): Let $f : S^n \to S^{n-1}$ be continuous. Observe the following "converse" to Lusternik-Schnirelmann-Borsuk: there is a covering family $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ of closed subsets of S^{n-1}, each of diameter less than 2. (We leave the verification of this as an exercise.) For $1 \leq i \leq n+1$, put $F_i = f^{-1}(E_i)$. Thus $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ is a covering of S^n by closed subsets, so by condition (iv) for some $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ and $x_0 \in S^n$ we have $x_0, -x_0 \in F_i$, i.e., $f(x_0), f(-x_0) \in E_i$. Since E_i has diameter less than 2, it contains no antipodal pair, and thus f cannot be odd, for otherwirse $f(x_0), -f(x_0) \in E_i$. $\quad\square$

EXERCISE 11.19. *Verify: for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, S^n can be covered by $n + 2$ closed subsets each of diameter less than 2.*
(Suggestion: take a regular simplex inscribed in D^n and consider the projections of its faces onto S^n.)

For a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, let us put

$$f^+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) > 0\},$$

$$f^0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) = 0\},$$

$$f^- = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid f(x) < 0\}.$$

For a Lebesgue measurable subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote its measure by $\mathrm{Vol}(S)$.

The following result is due to Stone and Tukey [**ST42**].

COROLLARY 11.26. *(Polynomial Ham Sandwich Theorem) Let $d, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and put $N = \binom{n+d}{d} - 1$. Let $U_1, \ldots, U_N \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be measurable, finite volume subsets. There is a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{R}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ of degree at most d which **bisects** each U_i:*

$$\forall 1 \leq i \leq N, \ \mathrm{Vol}(U_i \cap P^+) = \mathrm{Vol}(U_i \cap P^-).$$

PROOF. Let $V_d \subset \mathbb{R}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ be the $\mathbb{R}$-subspace of polynomials of total degree at most d, so $\dim V_d = N + 1$. Endow V_d with a norm $|| \cdot ||$ (all norms on a finite-dimensional real vector space are *equivalent*, so we need not be more specific than this). Let S^N be the unit sphere in V_d. We define a function

$$f = (f_1, \ldots, f_N) : S^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$$

by

$$f_i(P) = \mathrm{Vol}(U_i \cap P^+) - \mathrm{Vol}(U_i \cap P^-).$$

Step 1: We CLAIM that f is continous.
PROOF OF CLAIM: One easily reduces to the claim that for any measurable, finite volume subset $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the mapping

$$M : P \in V_d^\bullet \mapsto \mathrm{Vol}(U \cap P^+)$$

is continuous. For this, let $\{P_n\}$ be a sequence in V_d such that $P_n \to P$ with respect to $|| \cdot ||$. It follows that $P_n \to P$ pointwise on ($\mathbb{R}^n$ hence in particular on) U. Since $\mathrm{Vol}(U) < \infty$, we may apply Egorov's Theorem: for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is a measurable subset $E \subset U$ with $\mathrm{Vol}(E) < \epsilon$ and such that $P_n \to P$ uniformly on $U \setminus E$. Since $\mathrm{Vol}(P^0) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Vol}(U) < \infty$, there is $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{Vol}(\{x \in U \mid |P(x)| < \delta\}) < \epsilon.$$

Take $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that for all $n \geq N$, $|P_n(x) - P(x)| < \delta$ for all $x \in U \setminus E$. Then

$$|\mathrm{Vol}(U \cap P_n^+) - \mathrm{Vol}(U \cap P^+)| < 2\epsilon.$$

Step 2: It is immediate that f is odd. By Corollary 11.24, there is $P \in S^N$ such that $f(P) = 0$, and such a P bisects each U_i. □

COROLLARY 11.27. *(No Retraction Theorem) There is no **retraction** from D^n to S^{n-1}, i.e., no continuous map $r : D^n \to S^{n-1}$ such that $r|_{S^{n-1}} = 1_{S^{n-1}}$.*

PROOF. Let $\pi : \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $(x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1}) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, and let $H_n^+ = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in S^n \mid x_{n+1} \geq 0\}$, $H_n^- = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}) \in S^n \mid x_{n+1} \leq 0\}$. Suppose $r : D^n \to S^{n-1}$ is a retraction, and define $g : S^n \to S^{n-1}$ by

$$g(x) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} r(-\pi(x)), \ x \in H_n^+, \\ -r(\pi(x)), \ x \in H_n^- \end{array} \right.$$

Then g is well-defined, continuous and odd, contradicting Corollary 11.25b). $\qquad \square$

COROLLARY 11.28. *(Brouwer Fixed Point Theorem) Each continuous function* $f : D^n \to D^n$ *has a fixed point.*

PROOF. Suppose $f : D^n \to D^n$ is continuous with $f(x) \neq x$ for all $x \in D^n$. For $x \in D^n$, consider the ray $\mathfrak{r}_x$ with initial point $f(x)$ and lying on the line determined by $f(x)$ and x. Then $\mathfrak{r}_x$ intersects S^{n-1} at a unique point, say $r(x)$, and $x \mapsto r(x)$ defines a retraction $r : D^n \to S^{n-1}$, contradicting Corollary 11.27. $\qquad \square$

CHAPTER 12

Goldman domains and Hilbert-Jacobson rings

1. Goldman domains

LEMMA 12.1.
For a domain R with fraction field K, the following are equivalent:
(i) K is finitely generated as an R-algebra.
(ii) There exists $f \in K$ such that $K = R[f]$.

PROOF. Of course (ii) $\implies$ (i). Conversely, if $K = R[f_1, \ldots, f_n]$, then write $f_i = \frac{p_i}{q_i}$, and then $K = R[\frac{1}{q_1 \cdots q_n}]$. $\square$

A ring satisfying the conditions of Lemma 12.1 will be called a **Goldman domain**.

EXERCISE 12.1. *Show: an overring[1] of a Goldman domain is a Goldman domain.*

LEMMA 12.2. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K, and $0 \neq x \in R$. the following are equivalent:*
(i) Any nonzero prime ideal of R contains x.
(ii) Any nonzero ideal contains a power of x.
(iii) $K = R[x^{-1}]$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): let I be a nonzero ideal. If I is disjoint from $\{x^n\}$, then by Multiplicative Avoidance (5.24), I can be extended to a prime ideal disjoint from $\{x^n\}$, contradicting (i).
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Let $0 \neq y \in R$. By (ii), we have (y) contains some power of x, say $x^k = yz$. But this implies that y is a unit in $R[x^{-1}]$.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): The prime ideals killed in the localization map $R \mapsto R[x^{-1}]$ are precisely those which meet the multiplicatively closed set $\{x^k\}$, i.e., contain x. $\square$

COROLLARY 12.3. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Goldman domain.
(ii) The intersection of all nonzero prime ideals of R is nonzero.

EXERCISE 12.2. *Prove Corollary 12.3.*

Easy examples of Goldman domains: a field, $k[[t]]$, $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. In fact we have developed enough technology to give a remarkably clean characterization of Noetherian Goldman domains.

THEOREM 12.4. *Let R be a domain.*
a) If R has only finitely many primes, then R is a Goldman domain.
b) If R is a Noetherian Goldman domain, then R has finitely many primes.
c) A Noetherian Goldman domain is either a field or a one-dimensional domain.

---

[1]An overring of a domain R is a ring intermediate between R and its fraction field K.

PROOF. Throughout we may – and shall – assume that R is not a field.

a) Suppose that R has only finitely many primes, and let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n$ be the nonzero prime ideals of R. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $0 \neq x_i \in \mathfrak{p}_i$, and put $x = x_1 \cdots x_n$. Then the multiplicative set S generated by x meets every nonzero prime of R, so that $S^{-1}R$ has only the zero ideal. In other words, $R[\frac{1}{x}]$ is the fraction field of R, so R is a Goldman domain. (Alternately, this follows quickly from Corollary 12.3.)

b) Similarly, for a Goldman domain R we can write $K = R[\frac{1}{x}]$ for $x \in R$ and then every nonzero prime of R contains x. Suppose first that (x) itself is prime, necessarily of height one by the Hauptidealsatz (Theorem 8.49), hence if R has any primes other than (0) and (x) – especially, if it has infinitely many primes – then it has a height two prime $\mathfrak{q}$. But by Corollary 8.53 a Noetherian ring cannot have a height two prime unless it has infinitely many height one primes, a contradiction. So we may assume that (x) is not prime, and then the minimal primes of the Noetherian ring $R/(x)$ are finite in number – say $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n$ – and correspond to the primes of R which are minimal over x, so again by the Hauptidealsatz they all have height one. Similarly, if R has infinitely many primes there would be, for at least one i (say $i = 1$), a height two prime $\mathfrak{q} \supset \mathfrak{p}_1$. But then by Corollary 8.53 the "interval" $(0, \mathfrak{q})$ is infinite. Each element of this set is a height one prime ideal containing (x), i.e., is one of the $\mathfrak{p}_i$'s, a contradiction. Part c) follows by again applying Corollary 8.53: a Noetherian ring of dimension at least two must have infinitely many primes. $\qquad \square$

Remark: a non-Noetherian Goldman domain can have infinitely many primes and/or primes of arbitrarily large height.

PROPOSITION 12.5. *Let R be a domain. Then the polynomial ring $R[t]$ is not a Goldman domain.*

PROOF. Let K be the fraction field of R. If $R[t]$ is a Goldman domain, then by Exercise 12.1, so is $K[t]$. But $K[t]$ is a Noetherian domain with infinitely many primes – e.g., Euclid's proof of the infinitude of primes in $\mathbb{Z}$ carries over verbatim to $K[t]$ – so Theorem 12.4 applies to show that $K[t]$ is not a Goldman domain. $\quad \square$

PROPOSITION 12.6. *Let R be a domain, and $T \supset R$ an extension domain which is algebraic and finitely generated as an R-algebra. Then R is a Goldman domain iff T is a Goldman domain.*

PROOF. Let K and L be the fraction fields of R and T, respectively. Suppose first that R is a Goldman domain: say $K = R[\frac{1}{u}]$. Then $T[\frac{1}{u}]$ is algebraic over the field K, so is a field, hence we have $L = T[\frac{1}{u}]$. Conversely, suppose that T is a Goldman domain: say $L = T[\frac{1}{v}]$; also write $T = R[x_1, \ldots, x_k]$. The elements $v^{-1}, x_1, \ldots, x_k$ are algebraic over R hence satisfy polynomial equations with coefficients in R. Let a be the leading coefficient of a polynomial equation for v^{-1} and $b_1, \ldots, b_k$ be the leading coefficients of polynomial equations for $x_1, \ldots, x_k$. Let $R_1 := R[a^{-1}, b_1^{-1}, \ldots, b_k^{-1}]$. Now L is generated over R_1 by $x_1, \ldots, x_k, v^{-1}$, all of which are integral over R_1, so L is integral over R_1. Since L is a field, it follows that R_1 is a field, necessarily equal to K, and this shows R is a Goldman domain. $\quad \square$

COROLLARY 12.7. *Let $R \subset S$ be an inclusion of domains, with R a Goldman domain. Suppose that $u \in S$ is such that $R[u]$ is a Goldman domain. Then u is algebraic over R, and R is a Goldman domain.*

THEOREM 12.8. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Goldman domain.
(ii) There exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of $R[t]$ such that $\mathfrak{m} \cap R = (0)$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): We may assume WLOG that R is not a field. Write $K = R[\frac{1}{u}]$. Define a homomorphism $\varphi : R[t] \to K$ by sending $t \mapsto \frac{1}{u}$. Evidently φ is surjective, so its kernel $\mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal, and clearly we have $\mathfrak{m} \cap R = 0$.

(ii) $\implies$ (i): Suppose $\mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal of $R[t]$ such that $\mathfrak{m} \cap R = (0)$. Let v be the image of t under the natural homomorphism $R[t] \to R[t]/\mathfrak{m}$. Then $R[v]$ is a field, so by Corollary 12.7, R is a Goldman domain. $\square$

We define a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of a ring R to be a **Goldman ideal** if $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a Goldman domain. Write $G \operatorname{Spec} R$ for the set of all Goldman ideals. Thus a Goldman ideal is more general than a maximal ideal but much more special than a prime ideal.

PROPOSITION 12.9. *Let R be a ring and I an ideal of R.*
a) The nilradical of R is the intersection of all Goldman ideals of R.
b) The radical of I is the intersection of all Goldman ideals containing I.

PROOF. a) We know that $N = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R} \mathfrak{p}$, so certainly $N \subset \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in G \operatorname{Spec} R} \mathfrak{p}$. Conversely, suppose $x \in R \setminus N$. The ideal (0) is then disjoint from the multiplicative set $S = \{x^n\}$. By multiplicative avoidance, we can extend (0) to an ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ maximal with respect to disjointness from S. We showed earlier that $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime; we now claim that it is a Goldman ideal. Indeed, let $\overline{x}$ denote the image of x in $\overline{R} = R/\mathfrak{p}$. By maximality of $\mathfrak{p}$, every nonzero prime of $\overline{R}$ contains $\overline{x}$. By Lemma 12.2, this implies $\overline{R}[\overline{x}^{-1}]$ is a field, thus $\overline{R}$ is a Goldman domain, and therefore $\mathfrak{p}$ is a Goldman ideal which does not contain x. Part b) follows by correspondence, as usual. $\square$

The following result may seem completely abstruse at the moment, but soon enough it will turn out to be the key:

COROLLARY 12.10. *An ideal I in a ring R is a Goldman ideal iff it is the contraction of a maximal ideal in the polynomial ring $R[t]$.*

PROOF. This follows from Theorem 12.8 by applying the correspondence principle to the quotient ring R/I. $\square$

THEOREM 12.11. *a) Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a maximal ideal in $R[t]$, and **suppose** that its contraction $\mathfrak{m} = \mathcal{M} \cap R$ is maximal in R. Then $\mathcal{M}$ can be generated by $\mathfrak{m}$ and by one additional element f, which can be taken to be a monic polynomial which maps modulo $\mathfrak{m}$ to an irreducible polynomial in $R/\mathfrak{m}[t]$.*
b) If, moreover, we suppose that $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is algebraically closed, then $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathfrak{m}, t - a \rangle$ for some $a \in R$.

PROOF. a) Since $\mathcal{M}$ contains $\mathfrak{m}$, by correspondence $\mathcal{M}$ may be viewed as a maximal ideal of $R[t]/\mathfrak{m}R[t] \cong (R/\mathfrak{m})[t]$, a PID, so corresponds to an irreducible polynomial $\overline{f} \in R/\mathfrak{m}[t]$. If f is any lift of f to $R[t]$, then $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathfrak{m}, f \rangle$. Part b) follows immediately from the observation that an irreducible univariate polynomial over an algebraically closed field is linear. $\square$

The following more elementary result covers the other extreme.

THEOREM 12.12. *Let R be a domain, with fraction field K. Let $\iota : R[t] \to K[t]$ be the natural inclusion. Then ι_* induces a bijection between the prime ideals $\mathcal{P}$ of $R[t]$ such that $\mathcal{P} \cap R = \{0\}$ and the prime ideals of $K[t]$.*

Proof. Let $S = R \setminus \{0\}$. The key observation is that $S^{-1}R[t] = K[t]$. Recall (Proposition 7.6) that in any localization map $R \mapsto S^{-1}R$, the prime ideals which push forward to the unit ideal are precisely those which meet S, whereas the localization map restricted to all other prime ideals is a bijection onto the set of prime ideals of $S^{-1}R$. Applying that in this case gives the desired result immediately!   □

2. Hilbert rings

To put Theorem 12.11 to good use, we need to have a class of rings for which the contraction of a maximal ideal from a polynomial ring is again a maximal ideal. It turns out that the following is the right class of rings:

Definition: A **Hilbert ring** is a ring in which every Goldman ideal is maximal.

Proposition 12.13. *Any quotient ring of a Hilbert ring is a Hilbert ring.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the correspondence between ideals of R/I and ideals of R containing I.   □

A direct consequence of the definition and Proposition 12.9 is the following:

Proposition 12.14. *Let I be an ideal in a Hilbert ring R. Then the intersection $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \sup I} \mathfrak{m}$ of all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ containing I is $\mathrm{rad}(I)$.*

Examples: Any zero dimensional ring is a Hilbert ring. Especially, a field is a Hilbert ring, as is any Artinian ring or any Boolean ring.

Exercise 12.3. *a) Let R be a one-dimensional Noetherian domain. the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Hilbert ring.
(ii) The Jacobson radical of R is 0.
(iii) R has infinitely many prime ideals.
(iv) R is not a Goldman domain.
b) Deduce: the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers is a Hilbert domain.

Theorem 12.15. *Let R be a Hilbert ring, and S a finitely generated R-algebra. Then:*
a) S is also a Hilbert ring.
b) For every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{P}$ of S, $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{P} \cap R$ is a maximal ideal of R.
c) The degree $[S/\mathfrak{P} : R/\mathfrak{p}]$ is finite.

Proof. a) It suffices to show that R is a Hilbert ring iff $R[t]$ is a Hilbert ring, for then, if R is a Hilbert ring, by induction any polynomial ring $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is a Hilbert ring, and any finitely generated R-algebra is a quotient of $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ and thus a Hilbert ring. Note also that since R is a homomorphic image of $R[t]$, if $R[t]$ is a Hilbert domain, then so also is R.

So suppose R is a Hilbert ring, and let $\mathfrak{q}$ be a Goldman ideal in $R[t]$; we must show $\mathfrak{q}$ is maximal. Put $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q} \cap R$. As above, we can reduce to the case $\mathfrak{p} = 0$, so in particular R is a domain. Let a be the image of t in the natural homomorphism $R[t] \to R[t]/\mathfrak{q}$. Then $R[a]$ is a Goldman domain. By Corollary 12.7, a is algebraic over R, and R is a Goldman domain. But since we assumed that R was a Hilbert ring, this means that R is a field, and thus $R[a] = R[t]/\mathfrak{q}$ is a field, so $\mathfrak{q}$ is maximal.

b) We may write $S = R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$. A maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of S is just a maximal

ideal of $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ containing I. By Corollary 12.10, the contraction $\mathfrak{m}'$ of $\mathfrak{m}$ to $R[t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}]$ is a Goldman ideal of the Hilbert ring $R[t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}]$, so is therefore maximal. Moreover, by Theorem 12.11, $\mathfrak{m}$ is generated by $\mathfrak{m}'$ and an irreducible polynomial in $R/\mathfrak{m}'[t]$, so that the residual extension $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m}$ has finite degree over $R[t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1}]/\mathfrak{m}'$. Again, induction gives the full result. $\qquad\square$

Applying Theorem 12.15c) in the case $R = k$ is a field, we deduce our second proof of **Zariski's Lemma** (Lemma 11.1).

THEOREM 12.16. *Let R be a Noetherian Hilbert ring. Then*

$$\dim(R[t]) = \dim R + 1.$$

PROOF. Let $0 = \mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_d$ be a chain of prime ideals in R. Then, with $\iota : R \hookrightarrow R[t]$ the natural inclusion,

$$\iota_* \mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \iota_* \mathfrak{p}_n \subsetneq \langle \iota_*(\mathfrak{p}_n), t \rangle$$

is a chain of prime ideals of $R[t]$ of length $d + 1$, hence for any ring R we have $\dim R[t] \geq \dim R + 1$. Conversely, it suffices to show that the height of any maximal ideal $\mathcal{P}$ of $R[t]$ is at most $d + 1$. For this, put $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} \cap R$. By Theorem 12.15, $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal in R, so Theorem 12.11 tells us that there exists $f \in R[t]$ such that $\mathcal{P} = \langle \iota_* \mathfrak{p}, f \rangle$. Applying Krull's Hauptidealsatz (Theorem 8.49) in the quotient ring $R[t]/\iota_* \mathfrak{p}$, we get that the height of $\mathcal{P}$ is at most one more than the height of $\mathfrak{p}$. $\quad\square$

COROLLARY 12.17. *Let k be a field, and put $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$.*
a) Then every maximal ideal of R has height n and can be generated by n elements (and no fewer, by Theorem 8.54).
b) In particular, $\dim R = n$.

EXERCISE 12.4. *Prove Corollary 12.17.*

3. Jacobson Rings

THEOREM 12.18. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) For all $I \in \mathcal{I}(R)$, $r(I)$ is the intersection of all maximal *ideals containing I.*
(i') In every quotient ring of R, the nilradical equals the Jacobson radical.
(ii) Every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is the intersection of all maximal ideals containing $\mathfrak{p}$.
*(iii) Every non*maximal prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is equal to the intersection of all prime ideals strictly containing $\mathfrak{p}$.*
*If R satisfies these equivalent properties it is called a **Jacobson ring**.*

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (i') is immediate from the Correspondence Theorem.
(i) $\implies$ (ii): If (i) holds, then in particular for any radical ideal I, $I = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \supset I} \mathfrak{m}$, and prime ideals are radical.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): for any ideal I of R,

$$\operatorname{rad} I = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \supset I} \mathfrak{p} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \supset I} \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \supset \mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{m} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \supset I} \mathfrak{m}.$$

(ii) $\implies$ (iii): If $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime but not maximal, then $\mathfrak{p} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \supset \mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{m}$ and all the maximal ideals containing $\mathfrak{p}$ strictly contain $\mathfrak{p}$.
$\neg$ (ii) $\implies$ $\neg$ (iii): Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime which is *not* the intersection of the maximal ideals containing it. Replacing R with $R/\mathfrak{p}$, we may assume R is a domain with nonzero Jacobson radical $J(R)$. Let $x \in J(R) \setminus \{0\}$, and choose, by Multiplicative

Avoidance, an ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ which is maximal with respect to the property that $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$. Since $x \notin J(R) \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, $\mathfrak{p}$ is not maximal; since x lies in every ideal properly containing $\mathfrak{p}$, $\mathfrak{p}$ is not equal to the intersection of prime ideals strictly containing it. $\square$

COROLLARY 12.19. *Every quotient ring of a Jacobson ring is Jacobson.*

PROOF. This is immediate from condition (i$'$) of Theorem 12.18. $\square$

4. Hilbert-Jacobson Rings

PROPOSITION 12.20. *Suppose R is both a Goldman domain and a Jacobson ring. Then R is a field.*

PROOF. Let K be the fraction field of R, and suppose for a conradiction that $R \neq K$. Then there is a nonzero nonunit $f \in R$ such that K is the localization of R at the multiplicative subset $S = \{f, f^2, \ldots\}$. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal of R. Since R is not a field, $\mathfrak{m}$ is not zero, and thus the pushforward of R to $S^{-1}R$ is the unit ideal. By Proposition 7.6, $\mathfrak{m}$ meets S. Since $\mathfrak{m}$ is prime, we conclude $f \in \mathfrak{m}$. It follows that the Jacobson radical of R contains f is accordingly nonzero. On the other hand R, being a domain, has zero nilradical. Thus R is not Jacobson. $\square$

THEOREM 12.21. *For a commutative ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Hilbert ring.
(ii) R is a Jacobson ring.
(iii) For all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of $R[t]$, $\mathfrak{m} \cap R$ is a maximal ideal of R.
(iv) (Zariski's Lemma) Let K be a field that is finitely generated as an R-algebra. Then K is finitely generated as a R-module.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) by Proposition 12.14.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Suppose R is Jacobson and $\mathfrak{p}$ is a Goldman ideal of R. Then $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a Goldman domain (by definition of Goldman ideal) and a Jacobson ring (by Corollary 12.19), hence a field (by Proposition 12.20), so $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii) is Theorem 12.15b).
(iii) $\implies$ (i): Suppose R is a ring such that every maximal ideal of $R[t]$ contracts to a maximal ideal of R, and let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a Goldman ideal of R. By Corollary 12.10, $\mathfrak{p}$ is the contraction of a maximal ideal of $R[t]$, hence by assumption $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal.
(i) $\implies$ (iv) by Theorem 12.15c).
(iv) $\implies$ (ii): By Theorem 12.18, it suffices to show that every nonmaximal prime $\mathfrak{p}$ is the intersection of the prime ideals strictly containing it. That is, let $x \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$: we will find a prime ideal $\mathfrak{q} \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}$ such that $x \notin \mathfrak{q}$. Let B be the domain $R/\mathfrak{p}$, so the image of x in B (which we continue to denote by x) is nonzero. Then $B' = B[\frac{1}{x}]$ is a finitely generated R-algebra. If B' is a field, then by hypothesis B' is finitely generated as an R-module and thus, equivalently, finitely generated as a B-module. But this implies that B is a field, a basic fact about integral extensions which will be proved later on in the notes (Theorem 14.1, Propostion 14.8a)) and thus $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal, contradiction. So B' is not a field and thus it contains a nonzero maximal ideal, whose pullback to B is a prime ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{q}}$ not containing x. The ideal $\bar{\mathfrak{q}}$ corresponds to a prime ideal $\mathfrak{q} \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}$ of R not containing x. $\square$

In the sequel we will use the consolidated terminology **Hilbert-Jacobson ring** for a ring satisfying the equivalent conditions of Theorem 12.21.

5. Application: Zero-Dimensional Ideals in Polynomial Rings

Let k be a field with algebraic closure $\overline{k}$, and let I be an ideal of the polynomial ring $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Recall (from §11.2.1) that $V^a(I)$ denotes the set of simultaneous zeros of I in $\overline{k}^n$.

THEOREM 12.22. *For an ideal I of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\dim_k k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ is finite.
(ii) The ring $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ is Artinian.
(iii) The ring $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ has Krull dimension 0.
(iv) The ring $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ has only finitely many prime ideals.
(v) The ring $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ has only finitely many maximal ideals.
(vi) The set $V^a(I)$ is finite.
*An ideal satisfying these conditions is called **zero-dimensional**.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): A finite dimensional k-algebra A has no infinite descending chains of k-submodules, let alone A-submodules.
(ii) $\iff$ (iii): By the Hilbert Basis Theorem the ring $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is Noetherian hence so is its quotient $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. A ring is Artinian iff it is Noetherian of Krull dimension zero.
(ii) $\implies$ (iv): An Artinian ring has finitely many prime ideals, all of which are maximal.
(iv) $\implies$ (v) is immediate.
(v) $\implies$ (vi): We have $V^a(I) = V^a(\operatorname{rad} I)$. Since $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is a Hilbert-Jacobson ring, $\operatorname{rad} I$ is the intersection of all maximal ideals containing I, so I satisfies condition (v) iff $\operatorname{rad} I$ does and we may assume that I is a radical ideal. Because there are finitely many maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_N$, we have $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_i$, so

$$V^a(I) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V^a(\mathfrak{m}_i),$$

so it suffices to show that $V^a(\mathfrak{m})$ is finite for a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. By Zariski's Lemma, $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite-degree field extension of k, so there are only finitely many k-algebra homomorphisms $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m} \hookrightarrow \overline{k}^n$. However, if $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in V^a(\mathfrak{m})$ then the k-algebra homomorphism $E_x : k[t_1, \ldots, t_n] \to \overline{k}$ that maps each t_i to x_i has $\mathfrak{m}$ in its kernel, hence induces a k-algebra homomorphism $E_x : k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m} \to \overline{k}$, and the association $x \in V^a(\mathfrak{m}) \mapsto E_x$ is injective since $x = (E_x(t_1), \ldots, E_x(t_n))$. Thus $V^a(\mathfrak{m})$ is finite.
(vi) $\implies$ (i): Let $\overline{I} = I\overline{k}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Then $V^a(I) = V(\overline{I})$ and

$$\overline{k}[t_1, \ldots_n]/\overline{I} = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I \otimes_k \overline{k}$$

and thus $\dim_k k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ is finite iff $\dim_{\overline{k}} \overline{k}[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\overline{I}$ is finite. So we may assume that k is algebraically closed, and thus the points x of $V(I)$ correspond precisely to the maximal ideals of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ containing I, so we are assuming that I is contained in only finitely many maximal ideals, say $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_N$. Thus

$$k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\operatorname{rad} I \cong k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m}_1 \times \ldots \times k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m}_N,$$

so $\dim_k k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\operatorname{rad} I$ is finite by Zariski's Lemma. In particular $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\operatorname{rad} I$ has Krull dimension zero, hence so does $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$, hence it is Artinian. By

Theorem 8.37, for all sufficiently large a we have

$$k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I \cong \prod_{i=1}^{n} k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m}_i^a.$$

For each $0 \leq j \leq a - 1$, $\mathfrak{m}_i^j/\mathfrak{m}_i^{j+1}$ is finitely generated over $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\mathfrak{m}_i$, hence finite-dimensional over k, and thus $\dim_k k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ is finite. $\qquad \square$

EXERCISE 12.5. *Let I be an ideal of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$.*
a) Show: I is zero-dimensional iff $\operatorname{rad} I$ is zero-dimensional.
b) Show: if $S \subset \overline{k}^n$ is finite, then $I(S)$ is a radical zero-dimensional ideal.
c) Show: every radical zero-dimensional ideal of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ is of the form $I(S)$ iff k is algebraically closed.

EXERCISE 12.6. *a) Let I be an ideal of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Show: I is zero-dimensional radical iff $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/I$ is a finite product of fields (equivalently, is semisimple).*
b) Let $I \subset J$ be ideals of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Show: if I is zero-dimensional, so is J. If I is zero-dimensional radical, so is J.

According to Corollary 12.17, every maximal ideal of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ can be generated by n elements. In general, if $I_1, \ldots, I_N$ are ideals and for each $1 \leq j \leq N$, S_j is a finite set of generators of I_j, then $\{f_1 \cdots f_n \mid f_j \in S_j\}$ is a finite set of generators of $I_1 \cdots I_N$. Thus a radical zero-dimensional ideal I of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ that is contained in N maximal ideals has a generating set of cardinality n^N. But actually we can do much better than this.

THEOREM 12.23. *Let I be a radical zero-dimensional ideal of $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Then I can be generated by n elements.*

PROOF. (Vasconcelos) Let $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_i$ with $\mathfrak{m}_i$ maximal ideals of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$. Consider the ideal $I \cap k[t_1] = \bigcap_{I=1}^{N} \mathfrak{m}_i \cap k[t_1]$. By Theorem 12.15, each $\mathfrak{m}_i \cap k[t_1]$ is a maximal ideal of $k[t_1]$, so $I \cap k[t_1]$ is a radical ideal of the PID $k[t_1]$, so it is generated by a product of nonassociate irreducible polynomials, say

$$f(t_1) = g_1(t_1) \cdots g_s(t_1).$$

For $1 \leq i \leq s$, let $l_i = k[t_1]/g_i$, a finite degree field extension of k. By CRT, we have

$$R/(fR) = k[t_1]/(f)[t_2, \ldots, t_n] \cong \prod_{i=1}^{s} l_i[t_2, \ldots, t_n].$$

For $1 \leq i \leq s$, let $I_i := IR/g_iR = Il_i[t_2, \ldots, t_n]$. Since $(R/g_iR)/I_i = R/\langle I, g_i \rangle$, by Exercise 12.6 each I_i is a radical zero-dimensional ideal of $l_i[t_2, \ldots, t_n]$, so by induction there are $f_{i,1}, \ldots, f_{i,n-1} \in I$ such that $\langle f_{i,1}, \ldots, f_{i,n-1} \rangle R/g_iR = I_i$.

For $1 \leq i \leq n$, put

$$G_i(t_1) := \prod_{j \neq i} g_j(t_1),$$

and for $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ put

$$H_k = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq s} G_j(t_1) f_{j,k}.$$

We claim that

$$I = \langle f(t_1), H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1} \rangle.$$

Certainly we have
$$\langle f(t_1) \rangle \subset \langle f(t_1), G_1, \ldots, G_{n-1} \rangle \subset I,$$
so passing to $R/(f(t_1))$ it is enough to show equality after localizating at each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ containing $f(t_1)$. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be such a prime ideal. Then $\mathfrak{p}$ contains $g_i(t_1)$ for some j, and since the g_j's are pairwise comaximal, for all $j \neq i$, we have that $g_j(t_1)$ is a unit modulo $\mathfrak{p}$, hence $G_i(t_1)$ is a unit modulo $\mathfrak{p}$, whereas $G_j(t_1) \in (g_i)$ for all $j \neq i$. Therefore
$$\langle f(t_1), H_1, \ldots, H_{n-1} \rangle_{\mathfrak{p}} = \langle g_i(t_1), f_{i,1}, \ldots, f_{i,n-1} \rangle_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Since $f_{i,1}, \ldots, f_{i,n-1}$ generate I modulo (g_i), they generate I modulo $\mathfrak{p}$ and thus $I_{\mathfrak{p}}$ modulo $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, so by Nakayama's Lemma they generate $I_{\mathfrak{p}}$, completing the proof. $\square$

In particular, if $S \subset k^n$ is any finite subset, there are polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ such that
$$\{x \in k^n \mid f_1(x) = \ldots = f_n(x) = 0\} = S.$$

EXERCISE 12.7. *Let* $I = \langle t_1, t_2 \rangle^2 = \langle t_1^2, t_1 t_2, t_2^2 \rangle$ *in* $k[t_1, t_2]$. *Show: I is zero-dimensional and cannot be generated by 2 elements. (Thus the word "radical" in the statement of Theorem 12.23 is essential.)*

$\operatorname{Spec} R$ as a topological space

1. The Prime Spectrum

For a ring R, we denote the set of all prime ideals of R by $\operatorname{Spec} R$. Moreover, we refer to $\operatorname{Spec} R$ as the **Zariski spectrum** – or **prime spectrum** – of R.

It is important to notice that $\operatorname{Spec} R$ comes with additional structure. First, it has a natural partial ordering, in which the maximal elements are the maximal ideals, and the minimal elements are (by definition) the **minimal primes**. Also, as O. Zariski first observed, $\operatorname{Spec} R$ can be endowed with a **topology**. To see this, for any ideal I of R, put $V(I) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid \mathfrak{p} \supset I\}$.

PROPOSITION 13.1. *For ideals I, J of R, we have $V(I) = V(J)$ iff $\operatorname{rad} I = \operatorname{rad} J$.*

PROOF. For any ideal I and any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$, $\mathfrak{p} \supset I$ iff $\mathfrak{p} \supset \operatorname{rad} I$, and therefore $V(I) = V(\operatorname{rad} I)$. Conversely, if $V(I) = V(J)$, then the set of prime ideals containing I is the same as the set of prime ideals containing J. So

$$\operatorname{rad} I = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \supset I} \mathfrak{p} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \supset J} \mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{rad} J. \qquad \square$$

EXERCISE 13.1. *Show: we have $V(I) \subset V(J)$ iff $\operatorname{rad} I \supset \operatorname{rad} J$.*

Now we claim that the family of subsets $V(I)$ of $\operatorname{Spec} R$ has the following properties:

(ZT1) $\emptyset = V(R)$, $\operatorname{Spec} R = V((0))$.
(ZT2) If $\{I_i\}$ is any collection of ideals of R, then $\bigcap_i V(I_i) = V(\langle I_i \rangle)$.
(ZT3) If $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ are ideals of R, then $\bigcup_{i=1}^n V(I_i) = V(I_1 \cdots I_n) = V(\bigcap_{i=1}^n I_i)$.

(ZT1) is obvious. As for (ZT2), let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of R. Then $\mathfrak{p} \in \bigcap_i V(I_i)$ for all i iff $\mathfrak{p} \supset I_i$ for all i iff $\mathfrak{p}$ contains the ideal generated by all I_i. As for (ZT3), $\mathfrak{p}$ contains a product of ideals iff it contains one of the ideals of the product.

Therefore there is a unique topology on $\operatorname{Spec} R$ in which the closed sets are precisely those of the form $V(I)$. This is called the **Zariski topology**.

It is of course natural to ask for a characterization of the open sets. Recall that a **base** for the open sets of a topology is a collection $\{B_i\}$ of open sets such that:

(BT1) for any point $x \in B_i \cap B_j$, there exists a k such that $x \in B_k \subset B_i \cap B_j$;
(BT2) every open set is a union of the B_i's contained in it.

For $f \in R$, we define $U(f) := \operatorname{Spec} R \setminus V((f))$. In other words, $U(f)$ is the collection of all prime ideals which *do not* contain the element f. For $f, g \in R$, $U(f) \cap U(g)$ is the set of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ containing neither f nor g; since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, this is equivalent to $\mathfrak{p}$ not containing fg, thus

$$U(f) \cap U(g) = U(fg),$$

which is a stronger property than (BT1). Moreover, any open set U is of the form $\operatorname{Spec} R \setminus V(I)$. Each ideal I is the union of all of its elements f_i, so $V(I) = \bigcap_i V(f_i)$, so that

$$U = \operatorname{Spec} R \setminus V(I) = \operatorname{Spec} R \setminus \bigcap_i V(f_i) = \bigcup_i (\operatorname{Spec} R \setminus V(f_i)) = \bigcup_i U(f_i).$$

PROPOSITION 13.2. *Let R be any ring, and consider the canonical homomorphism $f : R \to R^{\mathrm{red}} = R/\operatorname{nil}(R)$. Then $f^{-1} : \operatorname{Spec} R^{\mathrm{red}} \to \operatorname{Spec} R$ is a homeomorphism.*

EXERCISE 13.2. *Prove Proposition 13.2.*

EXERCISE 13.3. *Let $R_1, \ldots, R_n$ be finitely many rings. Show: $\operatorname{Spec}(R_1 \times \ldots \times R_n)$ is canonically homeomorphic to the topological space $\coprod_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Spec} R_i$.*

EXERCISE 13.4. *Let R be a Boolean ring. Earlier we defined a topology on the set "$M(R)$" of all maximal ideals of R. But, as we know, a Boolean ring all prime ideals are maximal, so as sets $M(R) = \operatorname{Spec} R$. Show that moreover the topology we defined on $M(R)$ is the Zariski topology on $\operatorname{Spec} R$.*

2. Properties of the spectrum: quasi-compactness

More than sixty years ago now, N. Bourbaki introduced the term **quasi-compact** for a topological space X for which any open covering has a finite subcovering. The point of this terminology is to reserve **compact** for a space which is both quasi-compact and Hausdorff, and thus emphasize that most of the nice properties of compact spaces in classical topology do rely on the Hausdorff axiom. Nowhere is this terminology more appropriate than in the class of spectral spaces, which as we have seen above, are only Hausdorff in the comparatively trivial case of a zero-dimensional ring. On the other hand:

PROPOSITION 13.3. *For any commutative ring R, $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is quasi-compact.*

PROOF. Let $\{U_i\}$ be any open covering of $\operatorname{Spec} R$. For each $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, there exists an element U of the cover containing $\mathfrak{p}$, and thus a principal open set $X(f)$ containing $\mathfrak{p}$ and contained in U. Therefore there is a refinement of the cover consisting of principal open subsets, and if this refinement has a finite cover, then the original cover certainly does as well. Thus it suffices to assume that the U_i's are basic open sets.[1] So now suppose that $\operatorname{Spec} R = \bigcup_i U(f_i)$. Then we have

$$\operatorname{Spec} R = \bigcup_i U(f_i) = \bigcup_i (\operatorname{Spec} R \setminus V(f_i)) = \operatorname{Spec} R \setminus \bigcap_i V(f_i),$$

---

[1]This is just the familiar, and easy, fact that it suffices to verify quasi-compactness on any base for the topology. It is also true, but deeper, that one can verify quasi-compactness on any subbase: Alexander's Subbase Theorem.

so that $\emptyset = \bigcap_i V(f_i) = V(\langle f_i \rangle)$. Therefore the ideal $I = \langle f_i \rangle$ contains 1, and this means that there is some finite subset $f_1, \ldots, f_n$ of I such that $\langle f_1, \ldots, f_n \rangle = R$. Thus $\bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i) = \emptyset$, or equivalently, $\operatorname{Spec} R = \bigcup_{i=1}^n U(f_i)$. $\qquad\qquad\square$

3. Properties of the spectrum: connectedness

LEMMA 13.4. *Let $\mathcal{E}(R)$ be the set of idempotents in a ring R. Then:*

a) *If $e, f \in \mathcal{E}(R)$, then*
   (i) *$e^* := 1 - e \in \mathcal{E}(R)$;*
   (ii) *$e \wedge f = ef \in \mathcal{E}(R)$;*
   (iii) *$e \vee f = (e^* \wedge f^*)^* = e + f - ef \in \mathcal{E}(R)$.*
b) *$(\mathcal{E}, \wedge, \vee, *)$ is a Boolean algebra.*

EXERCISE 13.5. *Prove it.*

EXERCISE 13.6. *For a topological space X, let $\operatorname{Clopen}(X)$ be the family of clopen subsets of X.*
a) Show: $\operatorname{Clopen}(X)$ is a Boolean subalgebra of 2^X.
b) Show: if X is compact, then $\operatorname{Clopen}(X)$ is the characteristic algebra of X.

THEOREM 13.5. *Let R be a ring.*
a) If $e \in \mathcal{E}(R)$ is an idempotent, then $U(e)$ is a clopen subset of $\operatorname{Spec} R$.
b) The map $\mathcal{E}(R) \to \operatorname{Clopen}(\operatorname{Spec} R)$ given by

$$e \mapsto U(e)$$

is an isomorphism of Boolean algebras.

PROOF. a) If e is idempotent then $e(1 - e) = 0$, so every $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ contains exactly one of e and $1 - e$ and it follows that

$$U(e) = V(1 - e), \ U(1 - e) = V(e).$$

Thus $U(e)$ is clopen.
Jacobson, p. 406. $\qquad\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 13.6. *For a nonzero ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is connected: $\mathcal{E}(R) = \{0, 1\}$.
(ii) $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is connected.

EXERCISE 13.7. *Prove it.*

For the zero ring, we take the convention that it is not connected. This is compatible with the convention that the empty topological space is not connected.

4. Properties of the spectrum: separation and specialization

For the reader's convenience we briefly recall the "lower" separation axioms:

A topological space X is **Kolmogorov** – or T_0 – if for any distinct points $x, y \in X$, the **system of neighborhoods** $\mathcal{N}_x$ and $\mathcal{N}_y$ do not coincide. In plainer language, either there exists an open set U containing x and not containing y, or conversely.

A topological space X is **separated** – or T_1 – if for any distinct points $x, y \in X$, there exists both an open set U containing x and not y and an open set V containing y and not x. A space is separated iff all singleton sets $\{x\}$ are closed iff for all

$x \in X$, $\bigcap_{U \in \mathcal{N}_x} U = \{x\}$.

A topological space X is **Hausdorff** – or T_2 – if for any distinct points $x, y \in X$, there exist open neighborhoods U of x and V of y with $U \cap V = \emptyset$. A space is Hausdorff iff for all $x \in X$, the intersection of all closed neighborhoods of x is $\{x\}$.

Easily Hausdorff implies separated implies Kolmogorov. In a general topology course one learns that neither of the converse implications holds in general. On the other hand most of the spaces one encounters in analysis and geometry are Hausdorff, and certainly are if they are Kolmogorov. We are about to see that yet a third state of affairs transpires when we restrict attention to spectra of rings.

Let X be a topological space. We define a relation $\mapsto$ on X by decreeing that for $x, y \in X$, $x \mapsto y$ iff y lies in the closure of the singleton set $\{x\}$. This relation is called **specialization**, and we read $x \mapsto y$ as "x specializes to y".

The reader who is familiar with topology but has not seen the specialization relation before will find an explanation in part f) of the following exercise.

EXERCISE 13.8. *a) Show: $x \mapsto y$ iff $\mathcal{N}_x \subset \mathcal{N}_y$.*
b) Show that specialization satisfies the following properties:
(i) reflexivity: $x \mapsto x$; (ii) transitivity $x \mapsto y$, $y \mapsto z \implies x \mapsto z$.
*A relation R with these properties is called **quasi-ordering**. A partial ordering is a quasi-ordering with the additional axiom of anti-symmetry: xRy, $yRx \implies x = y$.*
c) Show that specialization is a partial ordering on X iff X is Kolmogorov.
d) Show that a point y is closed[2] iff $y \mapsto x \implies x = y$.
*e) A point x for which $x \mapsto y$ holds for all $y \in X$ is called **generic**. Give an example of a topological space in which every point is generic.*
f) Show that X is separated iff $x \mapsto y \implies x = y$.

EXERCISE 13.9. *Let X be a set endowed with a quasi-ordering R. Define a new relation $x \equiv y$ if $x R y$ and $y R x$.*
a) Show: $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on X.
b) Write X' for the set of $\equiv$ equivalence classes, and let $q : X \to X'$ be the natural map – i.e., $x \mapsto \{y \in X \mid y \equiv x\}$. Show that the relation R descends to a relation $\leq$ on X': i.e., for s_1, $s_2 \in X'$, then by choosing $x_1 \in s_1, x_2 \in s_2$ and putting

$$s_1 \leq s_2 \iff x_1 \ R \ x_2,$$

the relation $\leq$ is well-defined independent of the choices of x_1 and x_2. Show that moreover $\leq$ is a partial ordering on X'.
*c) Let X be a topological space and R be the specialization relation. Endowing X' with the quotient topology via q, show that the induced relation $\leq$ on X' is the specialization relation on X', and accordingly by the previous exercise X' is a Kolmogorov space. If it pleases you, show that $q : X \to X'$ is **universal** for maps from X into a Kolmogorov space Y, hence X' (or rather, $q : X \to X'$) can be regarded as the **Kolmogorov quotient** of X.*

---

[2]Strictly speaking we mean $\{y\}$ is closed, but this terminology is common and convenient.

EXERCISE 13.10. *Let (X, μ) be a measure space, and let $\mathcal{L}^1$ be the space of all measurable functions $f : X \to \mathbb{R}$ with $\int_X |f| d\mu < \infty$. For $f \in \mathcal{L}^1$, define $||f|| := \int_X |f| d\mu$, and for $\epsilon > 0$, put $B(f, \epsilon) = \{g \in \mathcal{L}^1 \mid ||g - f|| < \epsilon\}$. Show that the $B(f, \epsilon)$'s form a base for a topology on $\mathcal{L}^1$, but that this topology is, in general, not Kolmogorov. Show that the Kolmogorov quotient is precisely the usual Lebesgue space L^1, whose elements are not functions but classes of functions modulo μ a.e. equivalence.*

PROPOSITION 13.7. *For any ring R, the spectrum $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a Kolmogorov space. Indeed, for $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ we have $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto \mathfrak{q}$ iff $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q}$.*

PROOF. For prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ we have

$$\mathfrak{p} \mapsto \mathfrak{q} \iff \mathfrak{q} \in \overline{\{\mathfrak{p}\}} = \{\mathfrak{f} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid \mathfrak{f} \supset \mathfrak{p}\} \iff \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q}.$$

Thus the specialization relation is just containment of ideals, which certainly satisfies antisymmetry: $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q}$, $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q} \implies \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}$. Now apply Exercise 13.9c). $\square$

THEOREM 13.8. *For a commutative ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $R/\operatorname{nil} R$ is absolutely flat, i.e., every $R/\operatorname{nil} R$-module is flat.
(ii) R has Krull dimension zero.
(iii) $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a separated space.
(iv) $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a Hausdorff space.
(v) $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a Boolean space.

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii) This is Theorem 7.27.
(ii) $\iff$ (iii): A space is separated iff all of its singleton sets are closed. But if $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, $V(\mathfrak{p})$ consists of all primes containing $\mathfrak{p}$, so $V(\mathfrak{p}) = \{\mathfrak{p}\}$ iff $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal. Certainly (v) $\implies$ (iv) $\implies$ (iii).
(i) $\implies$ (v): Since $\operatorname{Spec} R = \operatorname{Spec}(R/\operatorname{nil} R)$, we may well assume that R itself is absolutely flat. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ be distinct prime ideals; since both are maximal, there exists an element $f \in \mathfrak{p} \setminus \mathfrak{q}$. By Proposition 3.103, there is an idempotent e with $(e) = (f)$, and therefore $e \in \mathfrak{p} \setminus \mathfrak{q}$. Then $D(1 - e)$, $D(e)$ is a separation of $\operatorname{Spec} R$. More precisely, $D(e) \cap D(1 - e) = D(e(1 - e)) = D(e - e^2) = D(0) = \emptyset$, whereas for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$, since $0 = e(1 - e) \in \mathfrak{p}$, we must have $e \in \mathfrak{p}$ or $1 - e \in \mathfrak{p}$. By construction, $\mathfrak{p} \in D(1 - e)$, $\mathfrak{q} \in D(e)$. This shows $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is Hausdorff, and more: given points $P \neq Q$ of X, we found a separation $X = U \coprod V$ with $P \in U$, $Q \in V$, so X is zero-dimensional. By Proposition 13.3, every ring has quasi-compact spectrum, so $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is Hausdorff, zero-dimensional and quasi-compact, i.e., Boolean. $\square$

EXERCISE 13.11. *a) Let R be a product of fields. Show: $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a Boolean space.*
b) Let $\{R_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of rings, each of which has Krull dimension 0, and put $R = \prod_i R_i$. Must $\operatorname{Spec} R$ be Boolean?

4.1. Gelfand Rings.

THEOREM 13.9. *a) For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) Every prime ideal of R is contained in a unique maximal ideal.
(ii) For all $x \in R$, there are $r, s \in R$ such that $(1 + rx)(1 + s(1 - x)) = 0$.
(iii) $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is quasi-normal: two disjoint closed sets can be separated by two disjoint open sets.
*(iv) $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is a retract of $\operatorname{Spec} R$. A ring satisfying these equivalent conditions is called a **Gelfand ring**.*

PROOF. COMPLETE ME!   □

EXERCISE 13.12. *Show: the class of Gelfand rings is closed under quotients, localizations and direct products.*

EXERCISE 13.13. *(E. Wofsey[3]) Show: if R is a Gelfand ring, then* MaxSpec R *is a deformation retract of* Spec R. *In particular, the two spaces are homotopy equivalent.*

THEOREM 13.10. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $R/J(R)$ is Gelfand.
(ii) MaxSpec R *is compact.*
(iii) MaxSpec R *is Hausdorff.*

PROOF. COMPLETE ME!   □

A **clean ring** (also called an **exchange ring**) is a ring in R in which for all $x \in R$ there is an idempotent $e \in R$ such that $x + e \in R^\times$.

EXERCISE 13.14. *a) Show: every Boolean ring is a clean ring.*
b) Show: every clean ring is a Gelfand ring. (Hint: for $x \in R$, let e be an idempotent such that $e - x \in R^\times$. Show: $\left(1 + \frac{x}{e-x}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1-x}{e-x}\right) = 0$.)
c) Show: every local ring is a clean ring. If Spec R *is connected, then R is clean iff it is local. d) Show: a Gelfand domain must be local.*

EXERCISE 13.15. *a) Show: for a topological space X, $C(X)$ is a Gelfand ring. (Hint: for $f \in C(X)$, $\max(f, 1-f) \in C(X)^\times$.)*
b) Prove Corollary 5.15.
c) Show: $C(X)$ need not be clean, but if X is Boolean (i.e., compact and totally disconnected) then $C(X)$ is clean.

5. Irreducible spaces

A topological space is **irreducible** if it is nonempty and if it cannot be expressed as the union of two proper closed subsets.

EXERCISE 13.16. *Show: for a Hausdorff topological space X, the following are equivalent:*
(i) X is irreducible.
(ii) $\#X = 1$.

PROPOSITION 13.11. *For a topological space X, the following are equivalent:*
(i) X is irreducible.
(ii) Every finite intersection of nonempty open subsets (including the empty intersection!) is nonempty.
(iii) Every nonempty open subset of X is dense.
(iv) Every open subset of X is connected.

EXERCISE 13.17. *Prove Proposition 13.11.*

PROPOSITION 13.12. *Let X be a nonempty topological space.*
a) If X is irreducible, every nonempty open subset of X is irreducible.
b) If a subset Y of X is irreducible, so is its closure $\overline{Y}$.

---

[3]Cf. http://math.stackexchange.com/questions/1586745

c) If $\{U_i\}$ is an open covering of X such that $U_i \cap U_j \neq \emptyset$ for all i, j and each U_i is irreducible, then X is irreducible.

d) If $f : X \to Y$ is continuous and X is irreducible, then $f(X)$ is irreducible in Y.

PROOF. a) Let U be a nonempty open subset of X. By Proposition 13.11, it suffices to show that any nonempty open subset V of U is dense. But V is also a nonempty open subset of the irreducible space X.

b) Suppose $\overline{Y} = A \cup B$ where A and B are each proper closed subsets of $\overline{Y}$; since $\overline{Y}$ is itself closed, A and B are closed in X, and then $Y = (Y \cap A) \cup (Y \cap B)$. If $Y \cap A = Y$ then $Y \subset A$ and hence $\overline{Y} \subset \overline{A} = A$, contradiction. So A is proper in Y and similarly so is B, thus Y is not irreducible.

c) Let V be a nonempty open subset of X. Since the U_i's are a covering of X, there exists at least one i such that $V \cap U_i \neq \emptyset$, and thus by irreducibility $V \cap U_i$ is a dense open subset of U_i. Therefore, for any index j, $V \cap U_i$ intersects the nonempty open subset $U_j \cap U_i$, so in particular V intersects every element U_j of the covering. Thus for all sets U_i in an open covering, $V \cap U_i$ is dense in U_i, so V is dense in X.

d) If $f(X)$ is not irreducible, there exist closed subsets A and B of Y such that $A \cap f(X)$ and $B \cap f(X)$ are both proper subsets of $f(X)$ and $f(X) \subset A \cup B$. Then $f^{-1}(A)$ and $f^{-1}(B)$ are proper closed subsets of X whose union is all of X. $\square$

PROPOSITION 13.13. *Let R be a ring. Let $V \subset \operatorname{Spec} R$ be a Zariski-closed subset, so $V = V(I)$ for a unique radical ideal I. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *The subspace $V(I)$ is irreducible.*

(ii) *The ideal I is prime.*

PROOF. $\neg$ (ii) $\implies$ $\neg$ (i): Let $a, b \in R$ such that $ab \in R$ and $a, b \in R \setminus I$. Then I contains neither $\operatorname{rad}(a)$ nor $\operatorname{rad}(b)$, so $V(I)$ is contained in neither $V(a)$ nor $V(b)$, but $V(a) \cup V(b) = V(ab) \supset V(I)$. Thus $V(a) \cap V(I)$ and $V(b) \cap V(I)$ are two proper closed subsets whose union is $V(I)$, so $V(I)$ is reducible.

(ii) $\implies$ (i): Suppose $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal. We claim that $V(\mathfrak{p})$ is irreducible. If not, there are ideals I and J such that $V(I)$ and $V(J)$ are both proper subsets of $V(\mathfrak{p})$ and $V(\mathfrak{p}) = V(I) \cup V(J) = V(IJ)$. But then $\mathfrak{p} = \operatorname{rad}(IJ) \supset IJ$ and since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime this implies $\mathfrak{p} \supset I$ or $\mathfrak{p} \supset J$. WLOG, suppose $\mathfrak{p} \supset I$; then $V(\mathfrak{p}) \subset V(I)$, so that $V(I)$ is not proper in $V(\mathfrak{p})$, contradiction. $\square$

Let x be a point of a topological space, and consider the set of all irreducible subspaces of X containing x. (Since $\{x\}$ itself is irreducible, this set is nonempty.) The union of a chain of irreducible subspaces being irreducible, Zorn's Lemma says that there exists at least one maximal irreducible subset containing x. A maximal irreducible subset (which, by the above, is necessarily closed) is called an **irreducible component** of X. Since irreducible subsets are connected, each irreducible component lies in a unique connected component. It is *not* true in general that the connected component of x is the union of the irreducible components containing x: the way that irreducible components are combined to form connected components is slightly more complicated and explored in Exercise 13.22.

However, unlike connected components, it is possible for a given point to lie in more than one irreducible component. We will see examples shortly.

In the case of the Zariski topology on $\operatorname{Spec} R$, it follows from Proposition 13.13

that the irreducible components of Spec R are the subsets $V(\mathfrak{p})$ for a minimal prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. Above we showed that every nonempty topological space has at least one irreducible component, so this argument shows that every nonzero ring admits minimal primes. Thus we have deduced a commutative algebraic result as a consequence of a topological result. However we showed this earlier in Proposition 4.34 and the two proofs are essentially the same Zorn's Lemma argument. A more interesting topological argument is coming up soon.

6. Noetherianity

6.1. Noetherian topological spaces. We now introduce a property of topological spaces which, from the standpoint of conventional geometry, looks completely bizarre:

PROPOSITION 13.14. *For a topological space X, the following are equivalent:*

  (i) *Every ascending chain of open subsets is eventually constant.*
 (ibis) *Every descending chain of closed subsets is eventually constant.*
 (ii) *Every nonempty family of open subsets has a maximal element.*
 (iibis) *Every nonempty family of closed subsets has a minimal element.*
 (iii) *Every open subset is quasi-compact.*
 (iv) *Every subset is quasi-compact.*

*A space satisfying any (and hence all) of these conditions is called **Noetherian**.*

PROOF. The equivalence of (i) and (ibis), and of (ii) and (iibis) is immediate from taking complements. The equivalence of (i) and (ii) is a general property of partially ordered sets.

(i) $\iff$ (iii): Assume (i), let U be any open set in X and let $\{V_j\}$ be an open covering of U. We assume for a contradiction that there is no finite subcovering. Choose any j_1 and put $U_1 := V_{j_1}$. Since $U_1 \neq U$, there exists j_2 such that U_1 does not contain V_{j_2}, and put $U_2 = U_1 \cup V_{j_2}$. Again our assumpion implies that $U_2 \supsetneq U$, and continuing in this fashion we will construct an infinite properly ascending chain of open subsets of X, contradiction. Conversely, assume (iii) and let $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be an infinite properly ascending chain of subsets. Then $U = \bigcup_i U_i$ is not quasi-compact.

Obviously (iv) $\implies$ (iii), so finally we will show that (iii) $\implies$ (iv). Suppose that $Y \subset X$ is not quasi-compact, and let $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a covering of Y by relatively open subsets without a finite subcover. We may write each V_i as $U_i \cap Y$ with U_i open in Y. Put $U = \bigcup_i U_i$. Then, since U is quasi-compact, there exists a finite subset $J \subset I$ such that $U = \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j$, and then $Y = U \cap Y = \bigcup_{j \in J} U_j \cap Y = \bigcup_{j \in J} V_j$. $\square$

COROLLARY 13.15. *A Noetherian Hausdorff space is finite.*

PROOF. In a Hausdorff space every quasi-compact subset is closed. Therefore, using the equivalence (i) $\iff$ (iv) in Proposition 13.14, in a Noetherian Hausdorff space every subset is closed, so such a space is discrete. But it is also quasi-compact, so it is finite. $\square$

PROPOSITION 13.16. *Let X be a topological space.*

  a) *The following are equivalent:*
    (i) *There is a finite partition of X into connected clopen subsets.*
    (ii) *The space X has finitely many connected components.*
    (iii) *The space X has finitely many clopen subsets.*

b) *The equivalent conditions of part a) hold when X is Noetherian.*

PROOF. a) (i) $\implies$ (ii): Whenever a topological space admits a partition into connected clopen subsets, these subsets are the connected components of X.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): In any topological space, each connected component is closed. If there are only finitely many connected components then the complement of each component is a finite union of closed sets, so each connected component is clopen.
(i) $\implies$ (iii): Intersecting any clopen set with a connected component $C(x)$ gives either the empty set or $C(x)$, and the result follows easily from this.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): A partition of X into clopen sets is maximal iff each clopen set in the partition is connected, so in any nonmaximal partition we can partition one of the clopen sets in the partition into two clopen subsets, increasing the number of clopen sets in the partition by 1. So if X has finitely many clopen subsets then this process, starting with $\{X\}$, must terminate after finitely many steps, yielding a finite partition into connected clopen subsets.
b) Suppose X is Noetherian, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be the family of closed subsets of X which have infinitely many connected components. If $\mathcal{F}$ is nonempty, then by since X is Noetherian $\mathcal{F}$ has a minimal element Y. Then Y is nonempty and disconnected, so $Y = Y_1 \coprod Y_2$ with Y_1, Y_2 nonempty. By minimality of Y, the proper closed subsets Y_1 and Y_2 each have finitely many connected components, hence so does Y: contradiction. Applying this to X itself, we get that X has finitely many connected components. $\square$

Just to be sure: if a topological space X has infinitely many connected components, it may or may not admit a partition into clopen subsets. This does hold if X is a paracompact topological manifold. Notice though that this holds for a totally disconnected space iff the space is discrete, and there are many totally disconnected spaces that are not discrete, e.g. any infinite boolean space or the rational numbers as a subspace of the real numbers.

PROPOSITION 13.17. *Let X be a Noetherian topological space.*
a) There are finitely many closed irreducible subsets $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n A_i$.
b) Starting with any finite family $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as in part a) and eliminating all redundant sets – i.e., all A_i such that $A_i \subset A_j$ for some $j \neq i$ – we arrive at the set of irreducible components of X. In particular, the irreducible components of a Noetherian space are finite in number.

PROOF. a) Let X be a Noetherian topological space. We first claim that X can be expressed as a finite union of irreducible closed subsets. Indeed, consider the collection of closed subsets of X which cannot be expressed as a finite union of irreducible closed subsets. If this collection is nonempty, then by Proposition 13.14 there exists a minimal element Y. Certainly Y is not itself irreducible, so is the union of two strictly smaller closed subsets Z_1 and Z_2. But Z_1 and Z_2, being strictly smaller than Y, must therefore be expressible as finite unions of irreducible closed subsets and therefore so also can Y be so expressed, contradiction.
b) So write

$$X = A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_n$$

where each A_i is closed and irreducible. If for some $i \neq j$ we have $A_i \subset A_j$, then we call A_i **redundant** and remove it from our list. After a finite number of such removals, we may assume that the above finite covering of X by closed irreducibles is

irredundant in the sense that there are no containment relations between distinct A_i's. Now let Z be any irreducible closed subset. Since $Z = \bigcup_{i=1}^n (Z \cap A_i)$ and Z is irreducible, we must have $Z = Z \cap A_i$ for some i, i.e., $Z \subset A_i$. It follows that the "irredundant" A_i's are precisely the maximal irreducible closed subsets, i.e., the irreducible components.   □

6.2. Applications to Noetherian rings.

PROPOSITION 13.18. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *R satisfies the ascending chain condition on radical ideals.*

(ii) *$\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a Noetherian space.*

In particular if R – or even $R^{\mathrm{red}} = R/\operatorname{nil}(R)$ – is a Noetherian ring, then $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a Noetherian space.

PROOF. Since $I \mapsto V(I)$ gives a bijection between radical ideals and Zariski closed subsets, (ACC) on radical ideals is equivalent to (DCC) on closed subsets. Evidently these conditions occur if R is itself Noetherian, or, since $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is canonically homeomorphic to $\operatorname{Spec} R^{\mathrm{red}}$, if R^{red} is Noetherian.   □

COROLLARY 13.19. *Let I be a proper ideal in a Noetherian ring R. The set of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ which are minimal over I (i.e., minimal among all prime ideals containing I) is finite and nonempty.*

EXERCISE 13.18. *Prove Corollary 13.19.*

EXERCISE 13.19. *Let I be an infinite set, and for all $i \in I$, let $\mathfrak{r}_i$ be a nonzero ring. Show: the ring $\prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{r}_i$ is not Noetherian.*

The following result shows that every Noetherian ring is a finite product of connected Noetherian rings in an essentially unique way.

THEOREM 13.20. *Let R be a nonzero Noetherian ring.*

a) *There is a unique $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ for which there are $I_1, \ldots, I_n \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ such that:*

(i) *For all $1 \le i \le n$ the ring R/I_i is connected.*

(ii) *For all $1 \le i \le n$ there is an idempotent $e_i \in R$ such that $I_i = \langle e_i \rangle$.*

(iii) *We have $\bigcap_{i=1}^n I_i = (0)$ and $I_i + I_j = Rf$ or all $1 \le i \ne j \le n$. Thus we have a canonical isomorphism*

(31) $$R \xrightarrow{\sim} \prod_{i=1}^n R/I_i.$$

b) *Let $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and let $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_N$ be nonzero rings such that $R \cong \prod_{i=1}^N \mathfrak{r}_i$. Then $N \le n$. Moreover, if each $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is connected, then we have $N = n$ and after reordering the $\mathfrak{r}_i$'s we have for all $1 \le i \le n$ an R-algebra isomorphsim $\mathfrak{r}_i \cong R/I_i$.*

PROOF. a) By Proposition 13.16 there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\operatorname{Spec} R = \coprod_{i=1}^n X_i$ with each X_i nonempty connected, and the Boolean algebra $\operatorname{Clopen} \operatorname{Spec} R$ has order 2^n. For $1 \le i \le n$, put $Y_i := \operatorname{Spec} R \setminus X_i = \coprod_{1 \le j \le n,\ j \ne i} X_j \in \operatorname{Clopen} \operatorname{Spec} R$. By Theorem 13.5, for all $1 \le i \le n$ there is an idempotent $e_i \in R$ such that $Y_i = U(e_i)$. We know that $e \mapsto U(e)$ gives an isomorphism of Boolean algebras, so for all $1 \le i \ne j \le n$ we have

$$U(e_1 \cdots e_n) = U(e_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge e_n) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n U(e_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n Y_i = \varnothing = U(0),$$

so $e_1 \cdots e_n = 0$. If $x \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i$, then for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $x = e_i x_i$ for some $x_i \in R$ and thus $e_i x = e_i^2 x_i = e_i x_i = x$. It follows that $x = e_1 \cdots e_n x = 0$, so $\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i = (0)$. For $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ we have

$$U(e_i \wedge e_j) = U(e_i) \cup U(e_j) = Y_i \cup Y_j = X = U(1),$$

so $e_i \wedge e_j = 1$. Thus

$$1 = e_i \wedge e_j = e_i + e_j - e_i e_j \in I_i + I_j.$$

So we may apply the Chinese Remainder Theorem to get (31). Moreover we have

$$\operatorname{Spec} R/I_i = \operatorname{Spec} R/\langle e_i \rangle = V(e_i) = \operatorname{Spec} R \setminus U(e_i) = \operatorname{Spec} R \setminus Y_i = X_i.$$

Finally, (31) implies that n must be the number of connected components of $\operatorname{Spec} R$.
b) Suppose there are nonzero rings $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_N$ such that $R \cong \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathfrak{r}_i$. Each $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is a quotient of R hence Noetherian, so by part a) is itself a finite product of connected nonzero rings. So if $N > n$ then this would express R as a product of more than n connected nonzero rings, contradicting part a). Let us now assume that each $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is connected. Again, this forces $N = n$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ let J_i be the kernel of the natural map $R \to \mathfrak{r}_i$, so we get an R-algebra isomorphism $\mathfrak{r}_i \cong R/J_i$. By Exercise 4.13 we have $J_i + J_j = R$ for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$. Thus for all $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ we have

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \operatorname{Spec} R/J_i = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V(J_i) = V(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} J_i) = V(0) = \operatorname{Spec} R$$

and

$$\operatorname{Spec} R/J_i \cap \operatorname{Spec} R/J_j = V(J_i) \cap V(J_j) = V(J_i + J_j) = V(R) = \varnothing.$$

Thus the $V(J_i)$'s are precisely the connected components of $\operatorname{Spec} R$, so after reordering we have $V(J_i) = V(I_i)$ and thus $\operatorname{rad} J_i = \operatorname{rad} I_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Both I_i and J_i are ideals genearted by an idempotent element: this was the construction of I_i, while $J_i = \{(r_1, \ldots, r_{i-1}, 0, r_{i+1}, \ldots, r_n) \mid r_j \in \mathfrak{r}_j\}$ so it is generated by the element of R corresponding to $(1, 1, \ldots, 0, 1, \ldots, 1) \in \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{r}_i$. Since both I_i and J_i are finitely generated, by Proposition 4.16g) this implies that there is $M \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $I_i^M \subset J_i$ and $J_i^M \subset I_i$. It follows that $J_i = I_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. $\qquad \square$

The above result continues to hold under weaker hypotheses.

EXERCISE 13.20. *Let R be a nonzero ring, and let κ be the number of connected components of $\operatorname{Spec} R$.*

   a) *Show that the following are equivalent:*
      (i) *We have $\kappa < \aleph_0$.*
      (ii) *The ring R has $2^\kappa < \aleph_0$ idempotents.*
      (iii) *The ring R is a finite product of connected rings.*
   b) *When the equivalent conditions of part a) hold, if R is a product of α nonzero rings, then $\alpha \leq \kappa$. If R is a product of β connected rings, then $\beta = \kappa$. Moreover if we have connected rings $\mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_\kappa, \mathfrak{s}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{s}_\kappa$ such that*

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{r}_i \cong R \cong \prod_{i=1}^{\kappa} \mathfrak{s}_i,$$

   then after permuting the indices we have R-algebra isomorphisms $\mathfrak{r}_i \cong \mathfrak{s}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq \kappa$.

EXERCISE 13.21. *Let R_1, R_2, R_3 be nonzero rings such that $R_1 \times R_2 \cong R_1 \times R_3$.*

    a) *Show: if each R_i is Noetherian (or indeed is a finite product of connected rings), show that $R_2 \cong R_3$.*

    b) *Give an example to show that we need not have $R_2 \cong R_3$ in general.*

EXERCISE 13.22. *Let X be a Noetherian topological space, and let $x \in X$.*
a) Show: every irreducible component containing x is contained in the connected component of x. Deduce: every connected component is a finite union of irreducible components.
b) Show: the union of the irreducible components containing x may be a proper subset of the connected component of x.
c) For two irreducible components of X, write $A_i \sim A_j$ if $A_i \cap A_j \neq \varnothing$. Show: $\sim$ need not be transitive. Let $\approx$ be the transitive closure of $\sim$: explicitly, $A \approx B$ if there is a finite chain $A \sim A_1 \sim \ldots \sim A_n \sim B$. Show: $\approx$ is an equivalence relation on the set of irreducible components of X and the unions of the components in any one equivalence class are precisely the connected components of X.

7. Krull Dimension of Topological Spaces

The Krull dimension $\dim X$ of a topological space is the supremum of lengths of chains of irreducible closed subsets of X. This is a cardinal number. In a ring R we have a bijective correspondence between prime ideals of R and irreducible closed subspaces of Spec R, which gives

$$\dim R = \dim \operatorname{Spec} R.$$

EXAMPLE 13.21. *Let X be the topological space with underlying set $\mathbb{Z}^+$ and with nonempty open sets*

$$U(n) = \{m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \mid m \geq n\}$$

as n ranges over all positive integers. Then families of nonempty open sets are indexed by subsets $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$. If $A \neq \varnothing$ then $\bigcup_{n \in A} U(n) = U(\min A)$. If A is finite, then $\bigcap_{n \in A} U(n) = U(\max A)$, whereas if A is infinite then $\bigcap_{n \in A} U(n) = \varnothing$. Thus X is an Alexandroff topological space: the family of open sets is closed under arbitrary unions and intersections.

    Since every nonempty open subset of X is cofinite, X is Noetherian. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the proper closed sets containing x are the intervals $[1, m] = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ with $n \leq m$, so $\overline{n} = [1, n]$. Thus every nonempty closed subset of X is irreducible, and an irreducible closed subset has a generic point iff it is proper, and $\dim X = \aleph_0$.

    Let $\tilde{X} = X \coprod \{\eta\}$, where η is some point not in X. We define a nonempty subset of $\tilde{X}$ to be open if it is of the form $U(n) \cup \{\eta\}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. This gives a topology on $\tilde{X}$. Since every nonempty open subset of $\tilde{X}$ contains η, we have $\overline{\eta} = \tilde{X}$. Let $\iota : X \hookrightarrow \tilde{X}$. The map ι^{-1} gives an order-preserving bijection from the open subsets of $\tilde{X}$ to the open substs of X. Thus $\tilde{X}$ is Noetherian and $\dim \tilde{X} = \aleph_0$.

8. Jacobson spaces

Let X be a topological space. We denote by X_0 the subset of closed points of X. We endow X_0 with the subspace topology.

EXERCISE 13.23. *Let X be a topological space.*
a) Show: if X is finite, then X_0 is closed in X.
b) Exhibit a topological space X for which X_0 is not closed in X.
(Suggestion: take $X = \operatorname{Spec} R$ for a suitable ring!)

A subset $Y \subset X$ is **locally closed** if it is the intersection of an open set with a closed subset. A subset $Z \subset X$ is **strongly dense** if $Z \cap Y \neq \varnothing$ for all nonempty locally closed subsets $Y \subset X$. A topological space X is **Jacobson** if X_0 is strongly dense in X.

Notice that X is separated iff $X_0 = X$; such spaces are certainly Jacobson. The concept is only interesting when not all points are closed.

LEMMA 13.22. *For a topological space X, the following are equivalent:*
(i) X_0 is strongly dense in X.
(ii) For all closed subsets $Z \subset X$, we have $Z = \overline{Z \cap X_0}$.
(iii) For all $x \in X$, we have $\overline{\{x\}} = \overline{\{x\} \cap X_0}$.
*A space satisfying these equivalent properties is called a **Jacobson space**.*

EXERCISE 13.24. *Prove it.*

EXERCISE 13.25. *a) Let X be at topological space, and let $\{U_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an open cover of X. Show: X is Jacobson iff U_i is Jacobson for all i.*
b) Suppose X is Jacobson and $Y \subset X$ is a union of locally closed subspaces of X. Show: Y is Jacobson.
c) Show: a finite Jacobson space is separated (hence discrete).

EXERCISE 13.26. *For a topological space X, we define the **Jacobson subspace***

$$J(X) = \{x \in X \mid \overline{\{x\}} = \overline{\{x\} \cap X_0}\}.$$

a) Show: X is Jacobson iff $J(X) = X$.
b) Show: $J(X)$ is a Jacobson space.

LEMMA 13.23. *Let X be a Jacobson topological space, and let $\iota : X_0 \to X$ be the inclusion map.*

a) *The map $Y \subset X \mapsto \iota^{-1}(Y) = Y \cap X_0$ s a bijection from the closed subspaces of X to the closed subspaces of X_0.*
b) *A closed subset $Y \subset X$ is irreducible if and only if $Y \cap X_0$ is irreducible.*
c) *We have $\dim X_0 = \dim X$.*

PROOF. a) Certainly if $Y \subset X$ is closed in X, then $Y \cap X_0$ is closed in X_0, and by definition of the subspace topology every closed subset of X_0 is of the form $Y \cap X_0$ for some closed $Y \subset X$. Suppose Y_1, Y_2 are closed in X and $Y_1 \cap X_0 = Y_2 \cap X_0$. If $Y_1 \neq Y_2$, then $(Y_1 \setminus Y_2) \cup (Y_2 \setminus Y_1)$ is a nonempty locally closed set, so it meets X_0: contradiction.
b), c) Left to the reader. $\square$

PROPOSITION 13.24. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *R is a Jacobson ring.*
(ii) *$\operatorname{Spec} R$ is a Jacobson space.*

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$. Then $\overline{\mathfrak{p}} = \{\mathfrak{q} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid \mathfrak{q} \supset \mathfrak{p}\}$ and

$$\overline{\{\mathfrak{p}\}} \cap \operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R, \ \mathfrak{m} \supset \mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{m},$$

so the equivalence follows from Lemma 13.23. $\square$

For a ring R, we define the **Jacobson spectrum** JSpec R to be the set of all prime ideals which are intersections of maximal ideals.[4] Thus MaxSpec $R \subset$ JSpec $R \subset$ Spec R, and JSpec $R =$ Spec R iff R is Jacobson. We endow JSpec R with the topology it receives as a subspace of Spec R. Since JSpec R consists precisely of the prime ideals of R which lie in the closure of the set of maximal ideals containing them, we have that

$$\text{JSpec } R = J(\text{Spec } R),$$

i.e., JSpec R is the Jacobson subspace of Spec R. In particular, JSpec R is a Jacobson space.

A topological space X is **sober** if for every irreducible closed subspace Y of X, there exists a unique point $y \in Y$ such that $Y = \overline{\{y\}}$. Equivalently, a sober space is one for which every irreducible closed subset has a unique generic point.

EXERCISE 13.27.
   a) *Show that any Hausdorff space is sober.*
   b) *Show that a sobser space is Kolmogorov.*
   c) *Show that the cofinite topology on an infinite set is separated but not sober.*

A map $f : (X, \tau_X) \to (Y, \tau_Y)$ of topological spaces is a **quasi-homeomorphism** if it is continuous and $f^{-1} : V \in \tau_Y \mapsto f^{-1}(V) \in \tau_X$ is a bijection.

EXERCISE 13.28. *(Sobrification) For a topological space X, let X^+ denote the set of irreducible closed subspaces of X. If $Y \subset X$ is closed, then $Y^+ \subset X^+$. Consider the family $\mathcal{C} = \{Y^+ \mid Y \subset X$ is closed $\}$ of subsets of X^+.*
   a) *Show: $\mathcal{C}$ contains $\varnothing$ and X^+ and is closed under finite unions and arbitrary intersections, thus forms the closed sets for a unique topology on X^+.*
   b) *Define a map $j : X \to X^+$ by $j : x \mapsto \overline{\{x\}}$. Show: if $Y \subset X$ is closed, then $j^{-1}(Y^+) = Y$. Deduce: $V \mapsto V^+$ is a bijection from the family of closed subsets of X to the family of closed subsets of X^+, with inverse bijection $V^+ \mapsto f^{-1}(V^+) = V$. In particular, j is quasi-homeomorphism.*
   c) *Show: X has the initial topology coming from the map $j : X \to X^+$, i.e., the coarsest topology that makes j continuous.*
   d) *Show: if $V \subset X$ is closed, then V is irreducible iff V^+ is irreducible, so $V \mapsto V^+$ gives a bijection from the closed irreducible subsets of X to the closed irreducible subsets of X^+. Deduce: X^+ is sober.*
   e) *Show: the map $j : X \to X^+$ is the universal continuous function from X into a sober topological space: if $f : X \to Y$ is continuous and Y is sober, then there is a unique $F : X^+ \to Y$ such that $f = F \circ j$. We say that $j : X \to X^+$ (and, by a standard abuse of terminology, X^+ itself) is the* **sobrification** *of X.*
   f) *Show: j is injective if and only if X is Kolmogorov and j is surjective if and only if every irreducible closed subset of X has a generic point* (**quasi-sober**).
   g) *Show: the following are equivalent:*
      (i) *X is sober.*
      (ii) *j is a homeomorphism.*

_____
[4]The Jacobson spectrum was introduced by R.G. Swan [**Sw67**].

(iii) *j is bijection.*

(iv) *j is a closed injection.*

PROPOSITION 13.25. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a quasi-homeomorphism.*

a) *If X is Kolmogorov, then f is injective.*

b) *If X is sober and Y is Kolmogorov, then f is a homeomorphism.*

PROOF. a) Seeking a contradiction, we suppose there are $x_1 \neq x_2$ in X such that $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$. After interchanging x_1 and x_2 if necessary, we may assume there is an open subset $U \subset X$ containing x_1 and not x_2. Let $V \subset Y$ be open such that $q^{-1}(V) = U$. Then $q(x_1) \in V$ and $q(x_2) \notin V$: contradiction.

b) It suffices to show f is bijective, since a bijective quasi-homeomorphism is a homeomorphism. By part a), f is injective. Let $y \in Y$. Then $f^{-1}(\overline{\{y\}})$ is irreducible and closed in the sober space X, so it has a generic point x. Thus

$$\overline{\{x\}} \subset f^{-1}(\overline{\{f(x)\}}) \subset f^{-1}(\overline{\{y\}}) = \overline{\{x\}},$$

so $f^{-1}(\overline{\{f(x)\}}) = f^{-1}(\overline{\{y\}})$. Since f is quasi-homeomorphism, we have $\overline{\{f(x)\}} = \overline{\{y\}}$, and since Y is Kolmogorov we conclude $f(x) = y$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 13.26. *If $f : X \to Y$ is a quasi-homeomorphism and Y is sober, then f is the sobrification of X.*

PROOF. The universal property of the sobrification $j : X \to X^+$ gives us a factorization $f = F \circ j$ for a continuous map $F : X^+ \to Y$. We have $f^{-1} = j^{-1} \circ F^{-1}$. Since f^{-1} and j^{-1} are each bijections between lattices of open sets, so is F^{-1}. Thus F is a quasi-homeomorphism of sober spaces, hence a homeomorphism. $\qquad\square$

EXAMPLE 13.27. *Let X be a topological space which is Kolmogorov but not sober: e.g. take X to be an inifnite endowed with the cofinite topology. Let $j : X \to X^+$ be the sobrification, so j is a quasi-homeomorphism. There is no quasi-homeomorphism $f : X^+ \to X$: indeed, the previous result implies that f would have to be a homeomorphism and thus X would be sober, contradiction.*

So beware: as a relation, quasi-homeomorphism is not symmetric, hence not an equivalence relation. However, if $\equiv$ is the equivalence relation on topological spaces generated by quasi-homeomorphism, then it is easy to see that $X \equiv Y$ iff X^+ and Y^+ are homeomorphic.

We come now to the following result, which is the main payoff of the material of this section and will be used in our treatment of the Forster-Swan Theorem.

THEOREM 13.28. *For any ring R, the inclusion map $\iota : \operatorname{MaxSpec} R \hookrightarrow \operatorname{JSpec} R$ is the sobrification of $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$.*

PROOF. We leave it to the reader to check that the argument that shows $\operatorname{Spec} R$ is sober carries over to show the sobriety of $\operatorname{JSpec} R$. By the above corollay it is enough to show that ι is a quasi-homeomorphism. Since ι is an inclusion map, certainly ι^{-1} is surjective on closed sets, so it's enough to see injectivity. If Z is a closed subset of $\operatorname{JSpec} R$, then since $\operatorname{JSpec} R$ is Jacobson, we have $Z = \overline{Z \cap \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} = \overline{\iota^{-1}(Z)}$, giving the injectivity. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 13.29. *Let R be a ring.*

a) *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ *is Noetherian.*

(ii) JSpec R *is Noetherian.*
(iii) The ascending chain condition holds on intersections of maximal ideals in R.
b) If Spec R *is Noetherian, then the conditions of part a) hold.*
c) The supremum of lengths of chains in JSpec R *is the Krull dimension of both*
JSpec R *and of* MaxSpec R.
d) We have dim MaxSpec $R \leq$ dim Spec R.

EXERCISE 13.29. *Prove it.*

9. Hochster's Theorem

A topological space X is **spectral** if:
(SS1) X is quasi-compact,
(SS2) X is sober, and
(SS3) The family of quasi-compact open subsets of X is closed under finite intersections and is a base for the topology.

Remark: A Bourbakiste would insist that (SS3) $\implies$ (SS1) by taking the empty intersection. But we will not do so.

Exercise 13.16: Show that a finite space is spectral iff it is T_0.

The following result gives an arguably cleaner characterization of spectral spaces.

PROPOSITION 13.30. *. For a topological space X, the following are equivalent:*
(i) X is homeomorphic to an inverse limit of finite T_0 spaces.
(ii) X is spectral.

Exercise 13.17: Prove Proposition 13.30.

PROPOSITION 13.31. *For any ring R,* Spec R *is spectral.*

EXERCISE 13.30. *Prove Proposition 13.31.*
(Hint: you will find the needed results in the previous subsections. Especially, use Proposition 13.13 to prove sobriety.)

For any ring R we endow the set MaxSpec(R) of maximal ideals of R with the topology it inherits as a subset of Spec(R). When necessary, we describe MaxSpec R as the "maximal spectrum" of R.

PROPOSITION 13.32. *For any ring R,* MaxSpec R *is separated and quasi-compact.*

EXERCISE 13.31. *Prove Proposition 13.32.*

THEOREM 13.33. *(Hochster's Thesis [**Ho69**])*
a) A spectral topological space is homeomorphic to the prime spectrum of some ring.
b) A separated quasi-compact space is homeomorphic to the maximal spectrum of some ring.

We do not aspire to give a proof of Theorem 13.33 at this time.

EXERCISE 13.32. *Show: every compact space X is homeomorphic to* MaxSpec$(C(X))$, *where $C(X)$ is the ring of continuous $\mathbb{R}$-valued functions on X.*

EXERCISE 13.33. *a) Show: the specialization relation gives an equivalence of categories between the category of T_0 finite spaces and the category of finite partially ordered sets.*
b) Formulate a generalization of part a) in which T_0 finite spaces are replaced by T_0 **Alexandroff spaces**.*
(A topological space is Alexandroff if an arbitrary intersection of closed subsets is closed.)

EXERCISE 13.34. *Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.*
a) Use Hochster's Thesis and the previous exercise to show: there exists a ring R with exactly n prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n$ such that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_2 \subset \ldots \subset \mathfrak{p}_n$.
b) For $n = 1, 2$, exhibit Noetherian rings with these properties. For $n \geq 3$, show: there is no such Noetherian ring.

10. Rank functions revisited

THEOREM 13.34. *Let M be a finitely generated module over a ring R.*
a) For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set

$$U_r = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid M_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ can be generated over } R_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ by at most } r \text{ elements}\}$$

is open in $\operatorname{Spec} R$.
b) If M is finitely presented (e.g. if R is Noetherian), then the set

$$U_F = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid M_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ is a free } R_{\mathfrak{p}}\text{-module}\}$$

is open in $\operatorname{Spec} R$.

PROOF. (Matsumura) Suppose $M_{\mathfrak{p}} = \langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_r \rangle_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}$. Each ω_i is of the form $\frac{m_i}{s_i}$ with $m_i \in M$ and $s_i \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. But since $s_i \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$ for all i, we also have $\langle m_1, \ldots, m_r \rangle_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} = M_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Thus it is no loss of generality to assume that each ω_i is the image in $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of an element of M. Let $\varphi : R^r \to M$ be the R-linear map given by $(a_1, \ldots, a_r) \mapsto \sum_i a_i \omega_i$, and put $C = \operatorname{coker} \varphi$, whence an exact sequence

$$R^r \to M \to C \to 0.$$

Localizing this at a prime $\mathfrak{q}$ of R gives an exact sequence

$$R_{\mathfrak{q}}^r \to M_{\mathfrak{q}} \to C_{\mathfrak{q}} \to 0.$$

When $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}$ we of course have $C_{\mathfrak{q}} = 0$. Moreover, C is a quotient of M hence a finitely generated R-module, so by Proposition 10.11 its support $\operatorname{supp} C$ is a Zariski-closed set. It follows that there exists an open neighborhood V of $\mathfrak{p}$ such that $C_{\mathfrak{q}} = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{q} \in V$.
b) Suppose that $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a free $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$-module with basis $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_r$. As above it is no loss of generality to assume that each ω_i is the image in $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of an element of M. Moreover, as we have also just seen, there exists a basic open neighborhood $U(f)$ such that for all $\mathfrak{q} \in U(f)$, the images of $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_r$ in $M_{\mathfrak{q}}$ generate $M_{\mathfrak{q}}$ as an $R_{\mathfrak{q}}$-module. Replacing R by R_f and M by M_f we may assume that this occurs for all $\mathfrak{q} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$. Thus $M/\langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_r \rangle_R$ is everywhere locally zero, so it is locally zero: $M = \langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_r \rangle$. Defining an R-linear map $\varphi : R^r \to M$ as above and setting $K = \operatorname{Ker} \varphi$, we have the exact sequence

$$0 \to K \to R^r \to M \to 0.$$

Since M is finitely *presented*, according to Proposition 3.6 K is a finitely generated R-module. Moreover we have $K_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$ hence as above $K_{\mathfrak{q}} = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{q}$ on some open

neighborhood V of $\mathfrak{p}$. By construction, for each $\mathfrak{q} \in V$, the images of $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_r$ in $M_{\mathfrak{q}}$ give an $R_{\mathfrak{q}}$-basis for $M_{\mathfrak{q}}$. $\square$

Let M be a finitely generated, locally free module over a ring R. Earlier we defined the rank function $r : \operatorname{Spec} R \to \mathbb{N}$. Applying Theorem 13.34a) to the locally free module M says that the rank function is *upper semicontinuous*: it can jump up upon specialization, but not jump down.

We now ask the reader to look back at Theorem 7.30 and see that for a finitely generated module M over a general ring R, M is projective iff it is locally free and finitely presented. When R is Noetherian, being finitely presented is equivalent to being finitely generated, so being projective is the same as being locally free. However, in the general case we have had little to say about the distinction between finitely presented and finitely generated modules. Is there some way to rephrase the subtly stronger property of finite presentation, perhaps a more geometric way?

Indeed there is:

THEOREM 13.35. *Let M be a finitely generated locally free R-module. the following are equivalent:*
(i) The rank function $r_M : \operatorname{Spec} R \to \mathbb{N}$ is locally constant.
(ii) M is a projective module.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): By Theorem 7.30, it is enough to show that for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, there is $f \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ such that M_f is a free module. Let $n = r(\mathfrak{m})$, and let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be an $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$-basis for $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Choose $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in M$ such that for all i, the image of X_i in $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is of the form $u_i x_i$ for $u_u \in R_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\times}$. Let $u : R^n \to M$ be the map sending the ith standard basis element e_i to X_i. Since M is finitely generated, by Proposition 7.28 there is $f \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ such that $u_f : R_f^n \to M_f$ is surjective. It follows that for all $g \in R \setminus \mathfrak{m}$, u_{fg} is surjective. Moreover, by hypothesis there is some such g such that $r(\mathfrak{p}) = n$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in X(g)$. Replacing f by fg we may assume that $r(\mathfrak{p}) = n$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in X(f)$. For all such $\mathfrak{p}$, $u_{\mathfrak{p}} : R_{\mathfrak{p}}^n \to M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is therefore a surjective endomorphism from a rank n free module to itself. Since finitely generated modules are Hopfian, $u_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism. By the local nature of isomorphisms (Proposition 7.15) we conclude u_f is an isomorphism, so M_f is free.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): By Theorem 7.30, M is Z-locally free: there exists a finite Z-family $\{f_i\}_{i \in I}$ such that for all $i \in I$, M_{f_i} is finitely generated and free. Thus the module $\prod_{i=1}^n M_{f_i}$ is finitely generated and projective over the faithfully flat R-algebra $\prod_{i=1}^n R_{f_i}$, so by faithfully flat descent (Theorem 3.114) M itself is projective. $\square$

COROLLARY 13.36. *Let R be a ring with $\operatorname{Spec} R$ irreducible (e.g. a domain). For a finitely generated R-module M, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is projective.
(ii) R is Z-locally free.
(iii) R is locally free.
(iv) R is flat.

EXERCISE 13.35. *Prove Corollary 13.36.*

11. The Forster-Swan Theorem

For a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of a ring R, put $k(\mathfrak{p}) = R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. For a fnitely generated R-module M, we let $\mu(M)$ denote the minimal cardinality of a set of R-module generators for M. Recall that if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is local, then by Nakayama's Lemma we have

$$\mu(M) = \dim_{R/\mathfrak{m}} M/\mathfrak{m}M.$$

For $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ let $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M)$ be the minimal cardinality of a set of generators for the $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$-module $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

LEMMA 13.37. *Let M be a finitely generated R-module, and let S be a finite subset of $\operatorname{supp} M$. Then there is $m \in M$ such that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in S$, the image of M in $M_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is nonzero, and thus*

$$\forall \mathfrak{p} \in S, \ \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M/\langle m \rangle) = \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) - 1.$$

PROOF. We go by induction on the number of elements s of S. The base case $s = 0$ is clear, so let $s \geq 1$ and suppose the statement holds when $\#S = s - 1$. We may order the elements of S as $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_s$ so as to have $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_{s-1} \not\subset \mathfrak{p}_s$; choose $x_s \in \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_{s-1} \setminus \mathfrak{p}_s$. By induction, there is $m_1 \in M$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq s - 1$, the image of m_1 in $M_{\mathfrak{p}_i}/\mathfrak{p}_i M_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is nonzero. We are done if the image of m_1 in $M_{\mathfrak{p}_s}/\mathfrak{p}_s M_{\mathfrak{p}_s}$ is nonzero, so assume otherwise. Let $m_2 \in M$ have nonzero image in $M_{\mathfrak{p}_s}/\mathfrak{p}_s M_{\mathfrak{p}_s}$. Then $m_1 + x_s m_2$ has nonzero image in $M_{\mathfrak{p}_i}/\mathfrak{p}_i M_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. $\square$

THEOREM 13.38. *(Forster-Swan [**Fo64**], [**Sw67**]) Let R be a ring such that the space $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is Noetherian, and let M be a finitely generated R-module. Then*

$$(32) \qquad \mu(M) \leq \sup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{JSpec} R} \left(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) + \dim \operatorname{JSpec} R/\mathfrak{p} \right).$$

PROOF. We follow an exposition of Swan's proof due to C.-L. Chai.

We may assume that $\sup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{JSpec} R} \dim \operatorname{JSpec} R/\mathfrak{p} < \aleph_0$, for otherwise the conclusion is trivial. Since $\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) \leq \mu(M)$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, we have

$$\mu_{\operatorname{FS}}(M) := \sup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{JSpec} R} \left(\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) + \dim \operatorname{JSpec} R/\mathfrak{p} \right) < \aleph_0.$$

We go by induction on μ_{FS}. If $\mu_{FS}(M) = 0$ then $\mu_{\mathfrak{m}}(M) = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, so $M = 0$ and thus $\mu(M) = 0$.
Induction Step: Suppose $\mu_{\operatorname{FS}}(M) \geq 1$ and suppose the result holds for finitely generated R-modules N with $\mu_{\operatorname{FS}}(N) < \mu_{\operatorname{FS}}(M)$. Let

$$S = \{ \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{JSpec} R \mid \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) + \dim \operatorname{JSpec} R/\mathfrak{p} = \mu_{\operatorname{FS}}(M) \}.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, put

$$X_n(M) = \{ \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{JSpec} R \mid \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) \geq n \}.$$

Theorem 13.34 implies that $X_n(M)$ is closed in $\operatorname{JSpec} R$. For $\mathfrak{q} \in S$, put $n = \mu_{\mathfrak{q}}(M)$ and $Z = \overline{\{\mathfrak{q}\}}$, so $Z \subset X_n(M)$. We claim that Z is an irreducible component of $X_n(M)$: if not, there is $\mathfrak{p} \in X_n(M)$ such that $\mathfrak{p} \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}$ and

$$\mu_{\mathfrak{p}}(M) + \dim \operatorname{JSpec} R/\mathfrak{p} > \mu_{\mathfrak{q}}(M) + \dim \operatorname{JSpec} R/\mathfrak{q} = \mu_{\operatorname{FS}}(M),$$

contradiction. Because $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is Noetherian, so is $\operatorname{JSpec} R$ and thus also $X_n(M)$. It follows ($\operatorname{JSpec} R$ is sober, hence Kolmogorov) that S is finite. By

Lemma 13.37, there is $m \in M$ such that $\mu_q(M/\langle m \rangle) = \mu_q(M) - 1$ for all $\mathfrak{q} \in S$. Thus for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{JSpec}\, R$ we have

$$\mu_{\mathrm{FS}}(M/\langle m \rangle) \leq k - 1,$$

so $\mu(M/\langle m \rangle) \leq k - 1$ by induction. It follows that $\mu(M) \leq k$. $\qquad \square$

COROLLARY 13.39. *Let M be a finitely generated module over a semilocal ring.*
a) We have $\mu(M) = \sup_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R} \mu_{\mathfrak{m}}(M)$.
b) If M is projective, then M is free iff the rank function r_M is constant.

PROOF. a) Since $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$ is finite and separated, it is Noetherian and discrete. So $\dim \mathrm{JSpec}\, R = 0$ and $\mathrm{JSpec}\, R = \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$. Apply Forster-Swan.
b) Free modules have constant rank. Conversely, suppose $r_M(\mathfrak{m}) = n$ for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$. By part a), $\mu(M) = n$, so M is free by Proposition 7.20. $\qquad \square$

Integral Extensions

1. First properties of integral extensions

If S is a ring extension of R – i.e., $R \subset S$ – we will say that an element α of S is **integral** over R if there exist $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in R$ such that

$$\alpha^n + a_{n-1}\alpha^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1\alpha + a_0 = 0.$$

Note that every element $\alpha \in R$ satisfies the monic polynomial $t - \alpha = 0$, so is integral over R.

THEOREM 14.1. *Let $R \subset T$ be an inclusion of rings, and $\alpha \in T$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) *The element α is integral over R.*
(ii) *$R[\alpha]$ is finitely generated as an R-module.*
(iii) *There is an intermediate ring $R \subset S \subset T$ such that $\alpha \in S$ and S is finitely generated as an R-module.*
(iv) *There is a faithful $R[\alpha]$-submodule M of T that is finitely generated as an R-module.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): If α is integral over R, there are $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in R$ such that

$$\alpha^n + a_{n-1}\alpha^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1\alpha + a_0 = 0,$$

or equivalently

$$\alpha^n = -a_{n-1}\alpha^{n-1} - \ldots - a_1\alpha - a_0.$$

This relation allows us to rewrite any element of $R[\alpha]$ as a polynomial of degree at most $n - 1$, so that $1, \alpha, \ldots, \alpha^{n-1}$ generates $R[\alpha]$ as an R-module.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Take $S := R[\alpha]$.
(iii) $\implies$ (iv): Take $M := S$.
(iv) $\implies$ (i): Let $m_1, \ldots, m_n$ be a finite set of generators for M over R, and express each of the elements $m_i\alpha$ in terms of these generators:

$$\alpha m_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} r_{ij}m_j, \ r_{ij} \in R.$$

Let A be the $n \times n$ matrix $\alpha I_n - (r_{ij})$; then recall from linear algebra that

$$AA^* = \det(A) \cdot I_n,$$

where A^* is the "adjugate" matrix (of cofactors). If $m = (m_1, \ldots, m_n)$ (the row vector), then the above equation implies $0 = mA = mAA^* = m\det(A) \cdot I_n$. The latter matrix equation amounts to $m_i \det(A) = 0$ for all i. Thus $\bullet \det(A) = \bullet 0$ on M, and by faithfulness this means $\det(A) = 0$. Since so that α is a root of the monic polynomial $\det(T \cdot I_n - (a_{ij}))$. $\qquad \square$

EXERCISE 14.1. *Let S be a finitely generated R-algebra. Show that the following are equivalent:*

(i) *S/R is integral.*
(ii) *S is a finitely generated R-module.*

Deduce: if S/R is an extension and $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are all integral over R, then $R[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n]$ is a finitely generated R-module.

PROPOSITION 14.2. *(Integrality is preserved under quotients and localizations) Let S/R be an integral ring extension.*

a) *Let J be an ideal of S. Then S/J is an integral extension of $R/(J \cap R)$.*
b) *Let T be a multiplicatively closed subset of nonzero elements of R. Then S_T is an integral extension of R_T.*

PROOF. a) First note that the kernel of the composite map $R \hookrightarrow S \to S/J$ is $J \cap R$, so that $R/(J \cap R) \hookrightarrow S/J$ is indeed a ring extension. Any element of S/J is of the form $x + J$ for $x \in S$, and if $P(t)t^n + a_{n-1}t^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1 t + a_0 = 0 \in R[t]$ is a polynomial satisfied by x, then reducing coefficientwise gives a monic polynomial $\overline{P}(t) \in R/(J \cap R)$ satisfied by x.

b) Let $J = \{s \in S \mid \exists t \in T \mid ts = 0\}$, an ideal of S. Let $\overline{T}$ be the image of T in $R/(J \cap R)$. Then $S_T \cong (S/J)_{\overline{T}}$ and $J_T \cong (R/(J \cap R))_{\overline{T}}$, so we may assume that the maps $R \to R_T$ and $S \to S_T$ are injective. Let $\frac{x}{y} \in S_T$ with $x \in S$, $y \in T$. Let $P(t) = t^n + a_{n-1}t^{n-1} + \ldots + a_0 \in R[t]$ be a monic polynomial satisfied by x. Then

$$\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)^n + \frac{a_{n-1}}{y}\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)^{n-1} + \ldots + \frac{a_0}{y^n} = 0,$$

showing that $\frac{x}{y}$ is integral over R_T. $\qquad \square$

LEMMA 14.3. *Let $R \subset S \subset T$ be an inclusion of rings. If $\alpha \in T$ is integral over R, then it is also integral over S.*

PROOF. If α is integral over R, there exists a monic polynomial $P \in R[t]$ such that $P(\alpha) = 0$. But P is also a monic polynomial in $S[t]$ such that $P(\alpha) = 0$, so α is also integral over S. $\qquad \square$

LEMMA 14.4. *Let $R \subset S \subset T$ be rings. If S is a finitely generated R-module and T is a finitely generated S-module, then T is a finitely generated R-module.*

PROOF. If $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r$ generates S as an R-module and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s$ generates T as an S-module, $\{\alpha_i \beta_j\}_{1 \le i \le r, 1 \le j \le s}$ generates T as an R-module: for $\alpha \in T$,

$$\alpha = \sum_j b_j \beta_j = \sum_i \sum_j (a_{ij} \alpha_i) \beta_j,$$

with $b_j \in S$ and $a_{ij} \in R$. $\qquad \square$

COROLLARY 14.5. *(Transitivity of integrality) If $R \subset S \subset T$ are ring extensions such that S/R and T/S are both integral, then T/R is integral.*

PROOF. For $\alpha \in T$, let $\alpha^n + b_{n-1}\alpha^{n-1} + \ldots + b_1 \alpha + b_0 = 0$ be an integral dependence relation, with $b_i \in S$. Thus $R[b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}, \alpha]$ is finitely generated over $R[b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}]$. Since S/R is integral, $R[b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}]$ is finite over R. By Lemma 14.4, $R[b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}, \alpha]$ is a subring of T containing α and finitely generated over R, so by Theorem 14.1, α is integral over R. $\qquad \square$

COROLLARY 14.6. *If S/R is a ring extension, then the set $I_S(R)$ of elements of S which are integral over R is a subring of S, the **integral closure of** R **in** S. Thus $R \subset I_S(R) \subset S$.*

PROOF. If $\alpha \in S$ is integral over R, $R[\alpha_1]$ is a finitely generated R-module. If α_2 is integral over R it is also integral over $R[\alpha_1]$, so that $R[\alpha_1][\alpha_2]$ is finitely generated as an $R[\alpha_1]$-module. By Lemmma 14.4, this implies that $R[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$ is a finitely generated R-module containing $\alpha_1 \pm \alpha_2$ and $\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2$. By Theorem 14.1, this implies that $\alpha_1 \pm \alpha_2$ and $\alpha_1 \alpha_2$ are integral over R. $\qquad\square$

If $R \subset S$ such that $I_S(R) = R$, we say R is **integrally closed** in S.

PROPOSITION 14.7. *Let S be a ring. The operator $R \mapsto I_S(R)$ on subrings of R is a closure operator in the abstract sense, namely it satisfies:*
(CL1) $R \subset I_S(R)$,
(CL2) $R_1 \subset R_2 \implies I_S(R_1) \subset I_S(R_2)$.
(CL3) $I_S(I_S(R)) = I_S(R)$.

PROOF. (CL1) is the (trivial) Remark 1.1. (CL2) is obvious: evidently if $R_1 \subset R_2$, then every element of S which satisfies a monic polynomial with R_1-coefficients also satisfies a monic polynomial with R_2-coefficients. Finally, suppose that $\alpha \in S$ is such that $\alpha^n + a_{n-1}\alpha^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1\alpha + a_0 = 0$ for $a_i \in I_S(R)$. Then each a_i is integral over R, so $R[a_1, \ldots, a_n]$ is finitely generated as an R-module, and since $R[a_1, \ldots, a_n, \alpha]$ is finitely generated as an $R[a_1, \ldots, a_n]$-module, applying Lemma 14.4 again, we deduce that α lies in the finitely generated R-module $R[a_1, \ldots, a_n, \alpha]$ and hence by Theorem 14.1 is integral over R. $\qquad\square$

2. Integral closure of domains

Until further notice we restrict to the case in which $R \subset S$ are **domains**.

PROPOSITION 14.8. *Let $R \subset S$ be an integral extension of domains.*

a) *R is a field if and only if S is a field.*
b) *An extension of fields is integral if and only if it is algebraic.*

PROOF. a) Suppose first that R is a field, and let $0 \neq \alpha \in S$. Since α is integral over R, $R[\alpha]$ is finitely generated as an R-module, and it is well-known in field theory that this implies $R[\alpha] = R(\alpha)$. Indeed, taking the polynomial of least degree satisfied by α, say $\alpha(\alpha^{n-1} + a_{n-1}\alpha^{n-2} + \ldots + a_1) = -a_0$, then $0 \neq a_0 \in R$ is invertible, so

$$\frac{-(\alpha^{n-1} + a_{n-1}\alpha^{n-2} + \ldots + a_1)}{a_0} = \frac{1}{\alpha},$$

and S is a field. Conversely, if S is a field and $a \in R$, then $R[a^{-1}]$ is finite-dimensional over R, i.e., there exist $a_i \in R$ such that

$$a^{-n} = a_{n-1}a^{-n+1} + \ldots + a_1 a^{-1} + a_0.$$

Multiplying through by a^{n-1} gives

$$a^{-1} = a_{n-1} + a_{n-2}a + \ldots + a_1 a^{n-2} + a_0 a^{n-1} \in R,$$

completing the proof of part a). Over a field every polynomial relation can be rescaled to give a monic polynomial relation, whence part b). $\qquad\square$

Remark: A more sophisticated way of expressing Proposition 14.8 is that if S/R is an integral extension of domains, then $\dim R = 0$ iff $\dim S = 0$. Later we will see that in fact $\dim R = \dim S$ under the same hypotheses.

If $R \subset S$ are fields, $I_S(R)$ is called the **algebraic closure** of R in S.

EXERCISE 14.2.
  a) *Let L/K be a field extension. Show: if L is algebraically closed, so is $I_L(K)$.*
  b) *Deduce: if $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $L = \mathbb{C}$, then $I_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{Q})$ is an algebraically closed field extension of $\mathbb{Q}$. This field is denoted $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and called the field of algebraic numbers.*

THEOREM 14.9. *Let S/R be an extension of domains, and let $T \subset R$ be a multiplicatively closed subset. Then $I_{T^{-1}S}(T^{-1}R) = T^{-1}I_S(R)$. In other words, localization commutes with integral closure.*

PROOF. Let K be the fraction field of R and L the fraction field of S. Then $T^{-1}I_S(R)$ is the subring of L generated by T^{-1} and the elements of S which are integral over R. Since both of these kinds of elements of $T-1S$ are integral over $T^{-1}R$ and integral elements form a subring, we must have $T^{-1}I_S(R) \subset I_{T^{-1}S}(T^{-1}R)$. Conversely, let $x \in T^{-1}S$ be integral over $T^{-1}(R)$, so there are $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} \in T^{-1}(R)$ such that

$$x^n + b_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \ldots + b_1 x + b_0 = 0.$$

We may take a common denominator $t \in T$ such that $x = \frac{s}{t}$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, $b_i = \frac{a_i}{t}$. Making this substitution and multiplying through by t^n, we get

$$s^n + a_{n-1}s^{n-1} + ta_{n-2}s^{n-2} + \ldots + t^{n-2}a_1 s + t^{n-1} = 0.$$

Thus s is integral over R and $x = \frac{s}{t} \in T^{-1}I_S(R)$. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 14.10. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K, let L/K be a field extension, and let S be the integral closure of R in L. Then the fraction field of S is $I_L(K)$.*

PROOF. We write M for the fraction field of S.
Step 1: Every element of S is an element of L that is integral over R, hence also integral over K, so $S \subseteq I_L(K)$. Proposition 14.8 gives that $I_L(K)$ is a field, so also the fraction field M of S is contained in $I_L(K)$.
Step 2: Let $x \in I_L(K)$, so there are $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in K$ such that

$$x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1 x + a_0 = 0.$$

Each a_i may be written as quotient of two elements of R; multiplying by the product of the denominators of these elements and relabelling, there are $b_0, \ldots, b_n \in R$ with $b_n \neq 0$ such that

$$b_n x^n + \ldots + b_1 x + b_0 = 0.$$

Multiplying through by b_n^{n-1}, we get

$$(b_n x)^n + b_{n-1}(b_n x)^{n-1} + \ldots + b_1 b_n^{n-2}(b_n x) + b_n^{n-1}b_0 = 0,$$

and thus $b_n x \in S$. Also $b_n \in R \subset S$, so $b_n x, b_n^{-1} \in M$, so $x \in M$. $\qquad\square$

Example: If $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $S = \mathbb{C}$, then $I_S(R)$ is called **the ring of all algebraic integers**, and often denoted $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$. By Proposition 14.10, its fraction field is the field $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ of all algebraic numbers. This turns out to be a very interesting ring, and it will crop up several times in the sequel as an example or counterexample. For instance:

EXERCISE 14.3. *Show: $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is not finitely generated as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module.*[1]

Let R be a domain with fraction field K. We say that R is **integrally closed** if $I_K(R) = R$, i.e., if any element of the fraction field satisfying a monic integral polynomial with R-coefficients already belongs to R.

COROLLARY 14.11. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K, let L/K be a field extension, and let $S = I_L(R)$. Then S is integrally closed.*

PROOF. Let M be the fraction field of S, and let $\tilde{S}$ be the integral closure of S in M. By Corollary 14.5, $\tilde{S}/R$ is integral, so $\tilde{S} \subseteq S$ and thus $\tilde{S} = S$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 14.4. *Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}] = \mathbb{Z}[t]/(t^2 + 3)$. Show that R is not integrally closed, and compute its integral closure.*

The geometric terminology for an integrally closed domain is **normal**. The process of replacing R by its integral closure $I_K(R)$ is often called **normalization**.

3. Spectral properties of integral extensions

Going down (GD): If we have $I_1 \supset I_2$ of R and $J_1 \in \operatorname{Spec} S$ such that $J_1 \cap R = I_1$, there exists $J_2 \in \operatorname{Spec} S$ such that $J_2 \subset J_1$ and $J_2 \cap R = I_2$.

LEMMA 14.12. *Let R be a local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ and S/R an integral extension. Then the pushed forward ideal $\mathfrak{p}S$ is proper.*

PROOF. Suppose not: then there exist $p_i \in \mathfrak{p}$, $s_i \in S$ such that $1 = \sum_i s_i p_i$. Therefore any counterxample would take place already in the finite R-module $R[s_1, \ldots, s_d]$. By induction on d, it is enough to consider the case of $n = 1$: $S = R[s]$. Consider as usual a relation

$$(33) \qquad\qquad s^n = a_{n-1}s^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1 s + a_0, \ a_i \in R$$

of minimal possible degree n. If $1 \in \mathfrak{p}S$ then we have

$$(34) \qquad\qquad 1 = p_0 + p_1 s + \ldots + p_k s^k, \ p_i \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

In view of (33) we may assume $k \le n - 1$. Since $1 - p_0$ is not in the maximal ideal of the local ring R, it is therefore a unit; we may therefore divide (34) by $1 - p_0$ and get an equation of the form

$$1 = p_1' s + \ldots + p_q' s^q, \ p_i' \in \mathfrak{p}.$$

This shows that $s \in S^\times$. Replacing $a_0 = a_0 \cdot 1$ in (33) by $a_0(p_1' s + \ldots + p_q' s^q)$, we get an integral dependence relation which is a polynomial in s with no constant term. Since s is a unit, we may divide through by it and get an integral dependence relation of smaller degree, contradiction. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 14.13. *An integral ring extension S/R satisfies property (LO):*[2] *every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R is of the form $S \cap \mathcal{P}$ for a prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$ of S.*

---

[1] In fact it is not even a Noetherian ring, so not even finitely generated as a $\mathbb{Z}$-algebra.
[2] Or, **lying over**.

PROOF. For $\mathfrak{p}$ a prime ideal of R, we denote – as usual – by $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the localization of R at the multiplicatively closed subset $R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. Then $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is local with unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and if we can show that there exists a prime ideal $\mathcal{Q}$ of $S_{\mathfrak{p}}$ lying over $\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, then the pullback $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q} \cap S$ to S is a prime ideal of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$. By Lemma 14.12, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathcal{Q} \supset \mathfrak{p}S$ and then $\mathcal{Q} \cap R$ is a proper ideal containing the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ and therefore equal to it. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 14.14. *(Going Up Theorem of Cohen-Seidenberg* [**CS46**]*) Let S/R be an integral extension and $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q}$ be two prime ideals of R. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a prime ideal of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$ (which necessarily exists by Theorem 14.13). Then there exists a prime ideal $\mathcal{Q}$ of S containing $\mathcal{P}$ and lying over $\mathfrak{q}$.*

PROOF. Apply Theorem 14.13 with $R = R/\mathfrak{p}$ $S = S/\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{p}$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 14.15. *(Incomparability) Suppose S/R is integral and $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{Q}$ are two primes of S. Then $\mathcal{P} \cap R \neq \mathcal{Q} \cap R$.*

PROOF. By passage to $S/\mathcal{P}$, we may assume that $\mathcal{P} = 0$ and S is a domain, and our task is to show that any nonzero prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$ of S lies over a nonzero ideal of R. Indeed, let $0 \neq x \in \mathcal{P}$, and let $P(t) = t^n + a_{n-1}t^{n-1} + \ldots + a_0 \in R[t]$ be a monic polynomial satisfied by x; we may assume $a_0 \neq 0$ (otherwise divide by t). Then $a_0 \in xS \cap R \subset \mathcal{P} \cap R$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 14.16. *Let S/R be an integral extension, $\mathcal{P}$ a prime ideal of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$. Then $\mathcal{P}$ is maximal iff $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal.*

PROOF. FIRST PROOF: Consider the integral extension $S/\mathcal{P}/(R/\mathfrak{p})$; we want to show that $S/\mathcal{P}$ is a field iff $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a field. This is precisely Proposition 14.8a). SECOND PROOF: If $\mathfrak{p}$ is not maximal, it is properly contained in some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{q}$. By the Going Up Theorem, there exists a prime $\mathcal{Q} \supset \mathcal{P}$ lying over $\mathfrak{q}$, so $\mathcal{P}$ is not maximal. Conversely, suppose that $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal but $\mathcal{P}$ is not, so there exists $\mathcal{Q} \supsetneq \mathcal{P}$. Then $\mathcal{Q} \cap R$ is a proper ideal containing the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathcal{Q} \cap R = \mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} \cap R$, contradicting the Incomparability Theorem. $\qquad\square$

Invoking Going Up and Incomparability to (re)prove the elementary Corollary 14.16 is overkill, but these more sophisticated tools also prove the following

COROLLARY 14.17. *Let S/R be an integral extension of rings. Then the Krull dimensions of R and S are equal.*

PROOF. Suppose $\mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_d$ are primes in R. Applying Theorem 14.1, we get a prime $\mathcal{P}_0$ of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}_0$, and then repeated application of the Going Up Theorem yields a chain of primes $\mathcal{P}_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_d$, so that $\dim(S) \geq \dim(R)$. Similarly, if we have a chain of prime ideals $\mathcal{P}_0 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_d$ of length d in S, then Theorem 14.15 implies that for all $0 \leq i < d$, $\mathcal{P}_i \cap R \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_{i+1}$. $\qquad\square$

4. Integrally closed domains

Let $R \subset S$ be domains. Immediately from the definition of integrality, there is a concrete way to show that $x \in S$ is integral over R: it suffices to exhibit a monic polynomial $P \in R[t]$ with $P(x) = 0$. What if we want to show that $x \in S$ is *not* integral over R? It would suffice to show that $R[x]$ is not a finitely generated R-module, but exactly how to do this is not clear.

As an example, it is obvious that $\alpha = \sqrt{2}$ is an algebraic integer, but unfortunately it is not obvious that $\beta = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$ is not an algebraic integer. (And of course we need to be careful, because e.g. $\gamma = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is an algebraic integer, since it satisfies $t^2 + t - 1 = 0$.) One thing to notice is that unlike α and γ, the minimal polynomial of β, $t^2 - \frac{1}{2}$, does not have $\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients. According to the next result, this is enough to know that β is not integral over $\mathbb{Z}$.

THEOREM 14.18. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K, let S/R be an extension domain, and $x \in S$ an integral element over R.*
a) Let $P(t) \in K[t]$ be the minimal polynomial of x over K. Then $P(t) \in I_K(R)[t]$.
b) If R is integrally closed, the minimal polynomial of x has R-coefficients.

PROOF. a) Let $g \in R[t]$ be a monic polynomial satisfied by x. Let K be the fraction field of R, and let $P \in K[t]$ be the minimal polynomial of x over K, and let M/K be the splitting field of P, so there are $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d \in M$ such that $P = \prod_{i=1}^{d}(t - \alpha_i)$. There is $h \in K[t]$ such that $g = Ph$ in $K[t]$. For all $1 \leq i \leq d$ we have $g(\alpha_i) = 0$, so each α_i is integral over R. Since the roots of P lie among the α_i's they are also integral over R, hence so too are the coefficients of P, being polynomial expressions in the roots.
b) This follows immediately from part a). $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 14.5. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K. Let S/R be an extension such that for every $x \in S$ which is integral over R, the minimal polynomial $P(t) \in K[t]$ has R-coefficients. Show: R is integrally closed.*

THEOREM 14.19. *(Local nature of integral closure) For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is integrally closed.
(ii) For all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is integrally closed.
(iii) For all maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is integrally closed.

PROOF. Let K be the fraction field of R. Assume (i), and let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$. By Theorem 14.9, the integral closure of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ in K is $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Evidently (ii) $\implies$ (iii). Assume (iii), and let x be an element of K which is integral over R. Then for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, certainly x is integral over $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$, so by assumption $x \in R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and thus $x \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m}} R_{\mathfrak{m}}$. By Corollary 7.16 we have $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{m}} R_{\mathfrak{m}} = R$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 14.6. *Let R be an integrally closed domain with fraction field K, L/K an algebraic field extension, S the integral closure of R in L and $G = \operatorname{Aut}(L/K)$.*
a) Show: for every $\sigma \in G$, $\sigma(S) = S$.
b) For $\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{Spec} S$ and $\sigma \in G$, show $\sigma(\mathcal{P}) = \{\sigma(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{P}\}$ is a prime ideal of S.
c) Show: $\mathcal{P} \cap R = \sigma(\mathcal{P}) \cap R$.
In conclusion, for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, there is a well-defined action of G on the (nonempty!) set of prime ideals $\mathcal{P}$ of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$.

LEMMA 14.20. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K of characteristic $p > 0$, let L/K be a purely inseparable algebraic extension of K (possibly of infinite degree), and let S be the integral closure of R in L. For any $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $\operatorname{rad}(\mathfrak{p}R)$ is the unique prime of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$.*

EXERCISE 14.7. *Prove Lemma 14.20.*
(Suggestions: recall that since L/K is purely inseparable, for every $x \in L$, there

exists $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x^{p^a} \in K$. First observe that $\mathrm{rad}(\mathfrak{p}R)$ contains every prime ideal of S which lies over $\mathfrak{p}$ and then show that $\mathrm{rad}(\mathfrak{p}R)$ is itself a prime ideal.)

THEOREM 14.21. *(Going Down Theorem of Cohen-Seidenberg [**CS46**]) Let R be an integrally closed domain with fraction field K, and let S be an integral extension of R. If $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_2$ are prime ideals of R and $\mathcal{P}_2$ is a prime ideal of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}_2$, then there is a prime ideal $\mathcal{P}_1$ of S which is contained in $\mathcal{P}_2$ and lies over $\mathfrak{p}_1$.*

PROOF. Let L be a normal extension of K containing S, and let T be the integral closure of R in L. In particular T is integral over S, so we may choose $\mathcal{Q}_2 \in \mathrm{Spec}\, T$ lying over $\mathcal{P}_2$ and also $\mathcal{Q}_1 \in \mathrm{Spec}\, T$ lying over $\mathfrak{p}_1$. By the Going Up Theorem there exists $\mathcal{Q}' \in \mathrm{Spec}\, T$ containing $\mathcal{Q}_1$ and lying over $\mathfrak{p}_2$. Both $\mathcal{Q}_2$ and $\mathcal{Q}'$ lie over $\mathfrak{p}_2$, so by Theorem 14.39 there exists $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(L/K)$ such that $\sigma(\mathcal{Q}') = \mathcal{Q}_2$. Thus $\sigma(\mathcal{Q}_1) \subset \sigma(\mathcal{Q}') = \mathcal{Q}_2$ and $\sigma(\mathcal{Q}_1)$ lies over $\mathfrak{p}_1$, so that setting $\mathcal{P}_1 = \sigma(\mathcal{Q}_1) \cap S$ we have $\mathcal{P}_1 \cap R = \mathfrak{p}_1$ and $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \sigma(\mathcal{Q}') \cap S = \mathcal{Q}_2 \cap S = \mathcal{P}_2$. $\square$

Remark: In [**AM**, Chapter 5] one finds a proof of Theorem 14.21 which avoids all Galois-theoretic considerations. However it is significantly longer than the given proofs of Theorems 14.39 and 14.21 combined and – to me at least – rather opaque.

COROLLARY 14.22. *Let R be an integrally closed domain, and let S be a domain that is an integral extension of R. If $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathrm{Spec}\, S$, then the height of the ideal $\mathcal{Q}$ of S is the height of the ideal $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{Q} \cap R$ of R.*

PROOF. Let
$$\mathcal{Q}_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{Q}_1 \subsetneq \ldots \mathcal{Q}_{n-1} \subsetneq \mathcal{Q}$$
be a chain of prime ideals of S having length n and terminating in $\mathcal{Q}$. By Corollary 14.15, the contraction of this chain to R (i.e., we intersect each ideal with R) is a chain of prime ideals of R having length n and terminating in $\mathcal{P}$, so the height of $\mathcal{P}$ is at least that of $\mathcal{Q}$.

Conversely, let
$$\mathcal{P}_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{P}_1 \subsetneq \ldots \mathcal{P}_{n-1} \subsetneq \mathcal{P}$$
be a chain of prime ideals of R having length n and terminating in $\mathcal{P}$. By Theorem 14.21 and Corollary 14.15, this is the contraction of a chain of prime ideals of S having length n and terminating in $\mathcal{Q}$, so the height of $\mathcal{Q}$ is at least that of $\mathcal{P}$. $\square$

5. The Noether Normalization Theorem

5.1. The classic version.

THEOREM 14.23. *(Noether Normalization) Let k be a field, and let R be a domain with fraction field K. Suppose that R is moreover a finitely generated k-algebra, generated say by elements $x_1, \ldots, x_m$. Then:*

a) *There is $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \le d \le m$, and algebraically independent elements $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in R$ such that R is finitely generated as a module over the polynomial ring $k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$ – or equivalently, that $R/k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$ is an integral extension.*

b) *We have $\dim R = d = \mathrm{trdeg}(K/k)$ (the transcendence degree of K/k).*

PROOF. a) (Jacobson) The result is trivial if $m = d$, so we may suppose $m > d$. Then the y_i are algebraically dependent over k: there exists a nonzero polynomial
$$f(s_1, \ldots, s_m) = \sum a_J s_1^{j_1} \cdots s_m^{j_m}, a_J \in k[s_1, \ldots, s_m]$$

with $f(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = 0$. Let X be the set of monomials $s^J = s_1^{j_1} \cdots s_m^{j_m}$ occuring in f with nonzero coefficients. To each such monomial we associate the univariate polynomial

$$j_1 + j_2 t + \ldots + j_m t^{m-1} \in \mathbb{Z}[t].$$

The polynomials obtained in this way from the elements of X are distinct. Since a univariate polynomial over a field has only finitely many zeroes, it follows that there exists $a \geq 0$ such that the integers $j_1 + j_2 a + \ldots + j_m a^{m-1}$ obtained from the monomials in X are distinct. Now consider the polynomial

$$f(s_1, s_1^a + t_1, \ldots, s_1^{a^{m-1}} + t_m) \in k[s, t].$$

We have

$$f(s_1, s_1^a + t_1, \ldots, s_1^{a^{m-1}} + t_m) = \sum_J a_J s_1^{j_1} (s_1^d + t_2)^{j_2} \cdots (s_1^{a^{m-1}} + t_m)^{j_m}$$

$$= \sum_J a_J s_1^{j_1 + j_2 a + \ldots + j_m a^{m-1}} + g(s_1, t_2, \ldots, y_m),$$

in which the degree of g in s_1 is less than that of $\sum_J a_J s_1^{j_1 + j_2 a + \ldots + j^m a^{m-1}}$. Hence for suitable $\beta \in k^\times$, $\beta f(s_1, s_1^a + t_2, \ldots, s_1^{a^{m-1}} + t_m)$ is a monic polynomial in x_1 with $k[t_2, \ldots, t_m]$-coefficients. Putting $w_i = x_i - x_1^{a^{i-1}}$ for $2 \leq i \leq m$, we get

$$\beta f(x_1, x_1^d + w_2, \ldots, x_1^{a^{m-1}} + w_m) = 0,$$

so that x_1 is integral over $R' = k[w_2, \ldots, w_m]$. By induction on the number of generators, R' has a transcendence base $\{y_i\}_{i=1}^d$ such that R' is integral over $k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$. Thus R is integral over $k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$ by transitivity of integrality.

b) Since $R/k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$ is integral, by Corollary 14.17 the Krull dimension of R is equal to the Krull dimension of $k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$, which by Corollary 12.17 is d. Since R is finitely generated as a $k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$ algebra, by Proposition 14.10 K is finitely generated as a $k(y_1, \ldots, y_d)$-module, so trdeg $K/k =$ trdeg $k(y_1, \ldots, y_d) = d$. $\quad\square$

5.2. Separable Noether Normalization.

Let K be a field and let $\overline{K}$ an algebraic closure of K. A field extension L/K is **regular** if $L \otimes_K \overline{K}$ is a field (equivalently, a domain).

For a field extension L/K, we say **K is algebraically closed in L** if any element of L which is algebraic over K lies in K. It is an easy exercise to show that if L/K is regular, K is algebraically closed in L. The converse is true in characteristic zero, but in positive characteristic we need a further hypothesis:

THEOREM 14.24. *Let L/K be a field extension.*
a) The following are equivalent:
(i) L/K is regular.
(ii) L/K is separable and K is algebraically closed in L.
b) In particular, if K is perfect and algebraically closed in L, then L/K is regular.

PROOF. a) The key result here is **Mac Lane's Theorem** [**FT**, §12]: a field extension L/K is separable iff L and $K^{p^{-\infty}}$ are linearly disjoint over K.
(i) $\implies$ (ii): If L/K is regular, then K is algebraically closed in L. Further, L and $\overline{K}$ are linearly disjoint over K, hence L and $K^{p^{-\infty}}$ are linearly disjoint over K.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let $K' = K^{p^{-\infty}}$ and $L' = L \otimes_K K'$. Since $L \otimes_K \overline{K} = (L \otimes_K K') \otimes_{K'} \overline{K} =$

$L' \otimes_{K'} \overline{K}$, it is enough to show that L' is a field and $L' \otimes_{K'} \overline{K}$ is a field. Now L' is a field by Mac Lane's Theorem, and since K' is perfect, $\overline{K}/K'$ is a Galois extension, and thus by [**FT**, §12.3], since $L' \cap \overline{K} = K'$, L' and $\overline{K}$ are linearly disjoint over K'.
b) If K is perfect, every extension of K is separable. Apply part a).   □

THEOREM 14.25. *(Separable Noether Normalization) Let k be a field, and let R be a domain that is finitely generated as a k-algebra. Assume moreover that the fraction field L of R is a* regular *extension of k.*
a) There exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \le d \le m$, and algebraically independent elements $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in R$ such that R is finitely generated as a $k[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$-module and $L/k(y_1, \ldots, y_d)$ is a finite separable field extension.
b) The integer d is equal to both the Krull dimension of R and the transcendence degree of K/k.

For now we refer the reader to [**Ei**, Cor. 16.18] for the proof.

5.3. Noether normalization over a domain.

THEOREM 14.26. *(Noether Normalization II) Let $R \subset S$ be domains with S finitely generated as an R-algebra. There exists $a \in R^{\bullet}$ and $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in S$ algebraically independent over the fraction field of R such that S_a (the localization of S at the multiplicative subset generated by a) is finitely generated as a module over $T = R_a[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$.*

PROOF. (K.M. Sampath) Let K be the fraction field of R and let $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ be a set of R-algebra generators for S. Then

$$S' := S \otimes_R K = K[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$$

is finitely generated over K (as above, the x_i's need not be algebraically independent). Applying Theorem 14.23, we get algebraically independent elements $y_1, \ldots, y_d \in S'$ such that S' is a finitely generated $T' := K[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$-module. Multiplying by a suitable element of $R^{\times}$, we may assume $y_i \in S$ for all i.

Since S' is finitely generated as a T'-module, it is integral over T'. For $1 \le i \le m$, x_i satisfies a monic polynomial equation with coefficients in T':

$$y_1^n + P_{i,1}(y_1, \ldots, y_d)y_i^{n-1} + \ldots + P_{i,n} = 0.$$

Let a be the product of the denominators of all coefficients of all the polynomials $P_{i,k}$. It follows that S_a is integral and finitely generated as a $T = R_a[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$-algebra, hence it is finitely generated as a T-module.   □

EXERCISE 14.8. *In the setting of Theorem 14.26 suppose S is a graded R-algebra. Show: we may take all the y_i to be homogeneous elements.*

5.4. Applications.

The Noether Normalization Theorem is one of the foundational results in algebraic geometry: geometrically, it says that every integral affine variety of dimension d is a finite covering of affine d-space $\mathbb{A}^d$. Thus it allows us to study arbitrary varieties in terms of rational varieties via branched covering maps. It is almost as important as a theorem of pure algebra, as even the "soft" part of the result, that the Krull dimension of an integral affine k-algebra is equal to the transcendence degree of its fraction field, is basic and useful.

One of the traditional applications of Noether Normalization is to prove Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. As we have seen, it is fruitful to channel proofs of the Nullstellensatz through Zariski's Lemma, and this is no exception.

PROPOSITION 14.27. *Noether Normalization implies Zariski's Lemma.*

EXERCISE 14.9. *Prove Proposition 14.27.*

For the next result, we write $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p})$ for the height of a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$.

THEOREM 14.28. *Let k be a field, and let R be a domain that is finitely generated as a k-algebra.*

a) *For all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, we have*

$$\dim R = \mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p}. \tag{35}$$

b) *Every maximal chain of prime ideals in R has length $\dim R$.*

PROOF. a) We claim that in any Noetherian ring R of finite Krull dimension, for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ we have

$$\dim R \geq \mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p}.$$

Indeed, let $\mathcal{C}_1$ be a chain of prime ideals teminating at $\mathfrak{p}$ of length $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p})$, and let $\mathcal{C}_2$ be a chain of prime ideals starting at $\mathfrak{p}$ of length $\dim R/\mathfrak{p}$. Then $\mathcal{C}_1 \cup \mathcal{C}_2$ is a chain of prime ideals of length $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p} \leq \dim R$.

Let $d = \dim R$. We will prove that

$$d \leq \mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p}$$

by induction on d. The case $d = 0$ is trivial. Let us inductively suppose that the inequality holds for all finitely generated k-algebras of dimension less than d.

Step 1: By Noether normalization, there are algebraically independent elements $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ of R such that R is finitely generated as a $k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$-module, hence R is integral over $k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$. Let $\underline{\mathfrak{p}} := \mathfrak{p} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$. The natural map

$$k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]/\underline{\mathfrak{p}} \to R/\mathfrak{p}$$

is an integral extension of domains, so $\dim R/\mathfrak{p} = \dim k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]/\underline{\mathfrak{p}}$. Moreover by Corollary 14.22 we have $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathrm{ht}(\underline{\mathfrak{p}})$. Thus we may assume without loss of generality that $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$ is a polynomial ring.

Step 2: Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is a nonzero prime ideal of the UFD $k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$, there is a nonzero prime element $f \in \mathfrak{p}$, and by Krull's Hauptidealsatz, (f) is a height one prime ideal. We claim that $\dim k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]/(f) = d - 1$. By Noether Normalization, it suffices to show that if K is the fraction field of the domain $k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]/(f)$, then the transcendence degree of K/k is $d - 1$. The polynomial f must have positive degree in at least one indterminate; without loss of generality, suppose it has positive x_d-degree. For $1 \leq i \leq d$ let $\overline{x_i}$ be the image of x_i in K. We claim that $\overline{x_1}, \ldots, \overline{x_d} = 0$. The polynomial f itself shows that $\overline{x_d}$ is algebraic over $k(\overline{x_1}, \ldots, \overline{x_{d-1}})$. Now let $Q \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_{d-1}]$ be a polynomial such that $Q(\overline{x_1}, \ldots, \overline{x_{d-1}}) = 0$. This means $Q \in (f)$, but then if Q were nonzero its degree in t_d would be be positive since the degree of f in x_d is positive...so $Q = 0$. Thus $\overline{x_1}, \ldots, \overline{x_{d-1}}$ is a transcendence basis for K/k, so $\dim k[x_1, \ldots, t_d]/(f) = d - 1$ as claimed.

Step 3: Put $R' := k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]/\langle f \rangle$ and $\mathfrak{p}' := \mathfrak{p}/\langle f \rangle$. Then $R/\mathfrak{p} \cong R'/\mathfrak{p}'$ and

$$\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) \geq \mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}') + 1,$$

so by induction we have

$$\dim R = 1 + \dim R' = 1 + \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}') + \dim R/\mathfrak{p}' = 1 + \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}') + \dim R/\mathfrak{p} \leq \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p},$$

completing the proof of part a).
b) Let

$$\mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_n$$

be a maximal chain of prime ideals of R. Then $\mathfrak{p}_0 = (0)$ and $\mathfrak{p}_n \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$. We argue by induction on n.

If $n = 0$, then $\mathfrak{p}_n = (0)$, so R is a field and $n = \dim R$. Now suppose that $n \geq 1$. The chain $\mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1$ must be maximal among chains terminating at $\mathfrak{p}_1$, so $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_1) = 1$. Then

$$\mathfrak{p}_1/\mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_2/\mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_n/\mathfrak{p}_1$$

is a maximal chain of length $n - 1$ in $R/\mathfrak{p}_1$, so by induction and part a) we have

$$n - 1 = \dim R/\mathfrak{p}_1 = \dim R - \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_1) = \dim R - 1,$$

so $n = \dim R$. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

We say that a partially ordered set $(X, \leq)$ is **catenary** if for two elements $x_1 \leq x_2$ there is a uniform bound on lengths of finite chains starting at x_1 and ending at x_2 and all maximal finite chains from x_1 to x_2 have the same length.

EXERCISE 14.10.
   a) *Let A be a set, and let $X = 2^A$ be the set of all finite subsets of X, partially ordered under inclusion. If $Y_1 \subseteq Y_2$ are finite subsets of A, show that every chain from Y_1 to Y_2 in X is finite and every maximal such chain has length $\#Y_2 - \#Y_1$. Thus X is catenary.*
   b) *Let κ be a cardinal number. Show: if $\kappa \leq 2$ then every partially ordered set of cardinality κ is catenary, while if $\kappa \geq 3$ there is a partially ordered set of cardinality κ that is not catenary.*

EXERCISE 14.11. *Let $(X, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. Suppose there is $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every finite chain in X has length at most d and that every maximal finite chain in X has length d. Show: X is catenary.*

We say that a ring R is **catenary** if $\operatorname{Spec} R$, partially ordered under inclusion, is catenary.

EXERCISE 14.12. *Let k be a field, and let R be a finitely generated k-algebra. Let $\mathfrak{p} \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}$ be prime ideals of R. Show: every maximal chain of primes from $\mathfrak{p}$ to $\mathfrak{q}$ has length $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{q}) - \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p})$. Deduce: R is caternary.*

6. Some Classical Invariant Theory

Let R be a commutative ring, let G be a finite group, and suppose G acts on R by automorphisms, i.e., we have a homomorphism $\rho : G \to \operatorname{Aut}(R)$. We define

$$R^G = \{x \in R \mid \forall g \in G, \ gx = x\},$$

the **ring of G-invariants** – it is indeed a subring of R.

Remark: As in the case of rings acting on commutative groups, we say that G-action on R is **faithful** if the induced homomorphism $\rho : G \to \operatorname{Aut}(R)$ is injective.

Any G-action induces a faithful action of $G/\ker(\rho)$, so it is no real loss of generality to restrict to faithful G-actions. We will do so when convenient and in such a situation identify G with its isomorphic image in $\operatorname{Aut} R$.

The simplest case is that in which $R = K$ is a field. Then K^G is again a field and K/K^G is a finite Galois extension. Conversely, for any finite Galois extension K/F, $F = K^{\operatorname{Aut}(K/F)}$. This characterization of Galois extensions was used by E. Artin as the foundation for an especially elegant development of Galois theory (which swiftly became the standard one). Note also the analogy to topology: we have the notion of a finite Galois covering $Y \to X$ of topological spaces as one for which the group $G = \operatorname{Aut}(Y/X)$ of deck transformations acts freely and properly discontinuously on Y such that $Y/G = X$.

The branch of mathematics that deals with invariant rings under linear group actions is called **classical invariant theory**. Historically it was developed along with basic commutative algebra and basic algebraic geometry in the early 20th century, particularly by Hilbert. Especially, Hilbert's work on the finite generation of invariant rings was tied up with his work on the Basis Theorem.

For $a \in R$, put $N_G(a) = \prod_{\sigma \in G} \sigma(a)$. Then $N_G(a) \in R^G$, so we have a map

$$N_G : R \to R^G.$$

Note that N_G is *not* a homomorphism of additive groups. However, when R is a domain, there is an induced map

$$N_G : R^\bullet \to (R^G)^\bullet$$

which is a homomorphism of monoids, so induces a homomorphism on unit groups.

EXERCISE 14.13. *Let $R[t]$ be the univariate polynomial ring over R. Show: there is a unique action of G by automorphisms of G on $R[t]$ extending the G-action on R and such that $gt = t$. Show that $(R[t])^G = R^G[t]$.*

PROPOSITION 14.29. *For a finite group G acting on R, R/R^G is integral.*

PROOF. For $x \in R$, define

$$\Phi_x(t) = N_G(t - x) = \prod_{g \in G} (t - gx),$$

so $\Phi_x(t) \in (R[t])^G = R^G[t]$. Thus $\Phi_x(t)$ is a monic polynomial with R^G-coefficients which is satisfied by x. $\qquad\square$

Base extension: Suppose that G is a finite group acting faithfully on R. Moreover, let A be a ring and $f : A \to R$ be a ring homomorphism, so R is an A-algebra. Suppose moreover that $f(A) \subset R^G$. In such a situation we say that G acts on R by A-automorphisms and write $G \subset \operatorname{Aut}(R/A)$.

Suppose we have another A-algebra A'. We can define an action of G on $R \otimes_A A'$ by putting $g(x \otimes y) := gx \otimes y$. We say that the G-action is **extended to** A'.

PROPOSITION 14.30. *In the above setup, suppose that A' is a flat A-algebra. Then there is a natural isomorphism*

$$R^G \otimes_A A' \xrightarrow{\sim} (R \otimes_A A')^G.$$

PROOF. Madapusi p. 65-66. $\square$

COROLLARY 14.31. *Let G be a finite group acting on the ring R, and let $S \subset R^G$ be a multiplicatively closed set. Then $(S^{-1}R)^G = S^{-1}R^G$.*

EXERCISE 14.14. *Prove Corollary 14.31.*

In particular, suppose R is a domain with fraction field K, and let F be the fraction field of R^G. Then the G-action on R extends to a G-action on K, and Corollary 14.31 gives $K^G = F$. Thus the invariant theory of domains is compatible with the Galois theory of the fraction fields.

PROPOSITION 14.32. *If R is integrally closed, so is R^G.*

PROOF. Let $x \in K$ be integral over R^G. Then x is also integral over R, and since R is integally closed in L we have $x \in R$. Thus $x \in R \cap K = R \cap L^G = R^G$. $\square$

THEOREM 14.33. *(Noether [**No26**]) Suppose that R is a finitely generated algebra over some field k with $k = k^G$. Then:*
   a) *R is finitely generated as an R^G-module.*
   b) *R^G is a finitely generated k-algebra.*

PROOF. a) Since R is a finitely generated k-algebra and $k \subset R^G$, R is a finitely generated R^G-algebra. But by Proposition 14.29 R/R^G is integral. So R is finitely generated as an R^G-module.
b) By part a), the Artin-Tate Lemma (Theorem 8.58) applies to the tower of rings $k \subset R^G \subset R$. The conclusion is as desired: R^G is a finitely generated k-algebra. $\square$

Remark: The title of [**No26**] mentions "characteristic p". In fact, when k has characteristic 0 the result had been proven by Hilbert significantly earlier [**Hi90**], and moreover for certain actions of infinite linear groups, like $\mathrm{SL}_n(k)$. But Noether's formulation and proof give an excellent illustration of the economy and power of the commutative algebraic perspective.

Let us make contact with the setup of *classical invariant theory*: let k be a field, V a finite-dimensional vector space and $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Aut}_k(V)$ a linear representation of G on V. Let $k[V] = \mathrm{Sym}(V^\vee)$ be the algebra of polynomial functions on V. If we choose a k-basis $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ of V and let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be the dual basis of $V^\vee$, then $k[V] = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a polynomial ring in n independent indeterminates. There is an induced action of G on $k[V]$, namely for $f \in k[V]$ we put $(gf)(x) = f(g^{-1}x)$.

All of our above results apply in this situation. Especially, Theorem 14.33 applies to tell us that the ring $k[V]^G$ is finitely generated as a k-algebra, or a **finite system of invariants**. Of course, we did not so much as crease our sleeves, let alone roll them up, to establish this: for a concretely given finite group G and action on a k-vector space V, it is of interest to explicitly compute such a finite system. Moreover, the polynomial ring $k[V]$ is integrally closed: in the next section we will see that it is a unique factorization domain and that this is a stronger property. Therefore Proposition 14.32 applies to show that $k[V]^G$ is integrally closed. This is actually quite a robust and useful procedure for producing integrally closed rings.

EXAMPLE 14.34. *Let k be a field, $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $V = k^n$, $G = S_n$ be the symmetric group, and let G act on V by permuting the standard basis elements $e_1, \ldots, e_n$. We will compute $k[V]^G$. Namely, for $1 \le i \le n$, we define the **ith elementary symmetric function** $s_i(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ as follows: let X be an independent indeterminate and put*

$$f(X) := \prod_{i=1}^{n}(X - t_i) = X^n + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^i s_i(t_1, \ldots, t_n) X^{n-i}.$$

THEOREM 14.35. *The invariant ring $k[V]^{S_n}$ is a polynomial k-algebra on the elementary symmetric functions $s_1, \ldots, s_n$.*

PROOF. Step 1: Explicitly, we have

$$s_1 = t_1 + \ldots + t_n,$$

$$s_2 = \sum_{i<j} t_i t_j;$$

each s_i is the sum of all $\binom{n}{k}$ monomials of degree k. Clearly $k[s_1, \ldots, s_n] \subset k[V]^{S_n}$.
Step 2: For any finite group G of automorphisms of a field L, L/K^G is a Galois extension with $\text{Aut}(L/L^G) = G$. Take $L = k(V)$ and note that $k(V)$ is the splitting field of the separable polynomial $f \in k(s_1, \ldots, s_n)[x]$, so $k(V)^G = k(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$.
Step 3: Because $k(t_1, \ldots, t_n)/k(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ is a finite extension, the transcendence degree of $k(s_1, \ldots, s_n)/k$ is equal to the transcendence degree of $k(t_1, \ldots, t_n)/k$, namely n. It follows that the elements $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ are algebraically independent, i.e., $k[s_1, \ldots, s_n]$ is a polynomial ring.
Step 4: As in the proof of Proposition 14.32,

$$k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]^{S_n} = k[t_1, \ldots, t_n] \cap k(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = k[s_1, \ldots, s_n]. \qquad \square$$

The above example is well-known and extremely useful, but gives a misleadingly simple impression of classical invariant theory. One can ask how often the ring of invariants of a finite group action on a polynomial ring is again a polynomial ring, and there is a nice answer to this. But let's back up a step and go back to "rational invariant theory": if G acts on $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, then as above it also acts on the fraction field $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and we know that $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)/k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ is a finite Galois extension. But must $k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^G$ itself be a rational function field, as it was in the example above? This is known as **Noether's Problem**: it was first posed by E. Noether in 1913. It is natural and important, for an affirmative answer would allow us to realize every finite group as a Galois group (i.e., the automorphism group of a Galois extension) of $\mathbb{Q}$ thanks to a famous theorem of Hilbert. For more than half of the twentieth century, Noether's problem remained open. Finally, in 1969 R.G. Swan (yes, the same Swan as before!) found a representation of the cyclic group of order 47 on a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space for which the invariant field is not a rational function field [**Sw69**]. Too bad – this was arguably the best shot that anyone has ever taken at the Inverse Galois Problem over $\mathbb{Q}$.[3]

EXAMPLE 14.36. *Let k be a field of characteristic different from 2, let $V = k^2$, and consider the action of the two-element group $G = \{\pm 1\}$ on V by -1 acting*

---

[3]Actually, Serre's *Topics in Galois Theory* describes a conjecture of J.-L. Colliot-Thélène – roughly a weaker form of Noether's problem – which would still imply that every finite group is a Galois group over $\mathbb{Q}$. I am not aware of any progress on this conjecture.

as the scalar matrix -1. The induced action on $k[V] = k[x, y]$ takes $x \mapsto -x$ and $y \mapsto -y$. This is, apparently, a not very interesting representation of a not very interesting group. But the invariant theory is very interesting!

EXERCISE 14.15.
   a) Show: $k[V]^G$ is generated as a k-algebra by x^2, y^2 and xy.
   b) Show: $k[V]^G$ is isomorphic to the k-algebra $k[A, B, C]/(AB - C^2)$.
   c) Show: $k[V]^G$ is not isomorphic to $k[x, y]$.[4]
   d) Show that nevertheless the fraction field of $k[V]^G$ is rational, i.e., is isomorphic to $k(X, Y)$ for independent indeterminates X and Y.

Before signing off on our quick glimpse of classical invariant theory, we cannot resist mentioning one more classic theorem in the subject. It answers the question: when is the invariant subalgebra $k[V]^G$ isomorphic to a polynomial algebra over k?

Let $\rho : G \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V)$ be a faithful representation of G on a finite-dimensional k-vector space V. An element $g \in \mathrm{GL}(V)$ is a **pseudoreflection** if it has finite order and pointwise fixes a hyperplane W in V. (Equivalently, a pseudoreflection has characteristic polynomial $(t - 1)^{\dim V - 1}(t - \zeta)$, where ζ is a root of unity in k.)

EXERCISE 14.16. If k is formally real, any nontrivial pseudoreflection has order 2 – i.e., it really is a hyperplane reflection.

A faithful representation ρ of G is a **pseudoreflection representation** of G if $\rho(G)$ is generated by pseudorflections.

THEOREM 14.37. (Shephard-Todd-Chevalley-Serre) Let k be a field, and let $\rho : G \hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V)$ be a faithful finite-dimensional k-linear representation.
   a) If $k[V]^G$ is a polynomial algebra, then ρ is a pseudoreflection representation.
   b) If ρ is a pseudoreflection representation and $\mathrm{char}\, k \nmid \#G$, then $k[V]^G$ is a polynomial algebra.

PROOF. See [**Be**, §7.2].   □

In the **modular** case $\mathrm{char}\, k \mid \#G$, there are pseudoreflection representations for which $k[V]^G$ is not a polynomial algebra. However, work of Kemper and Malle [**KM99**] shows that even in the modular case, if ρ is an irreducible pseudoreflection representation then the invariant *field* $k(V)^G$ is purely transcendental over k.

EXERCISE 14.17. It follows from Theorem 14.37 the fundamental theorem on symmetric functions that the standard permutation representation of the symmetric group S_n on k^n is a pseudoreflection representation. Show this directly.

7. Galois extensions of integrally closed domains

PROPOSITION 14.38. Let G be a finite group acting by automorphisms on a ring R, with invariant subring R^G. Let $\iota : R^G \hookrightarrow R$, and let $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}\, R^G$.
a) There is a natural action of G on the fiber $(\iota^*)^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})$ – i.e., on the set of primes $\mathcal{P}$ of R such that $\iota^* \mathcal{P} = \mathfrak{p}$.
b) The G-action on the fiber $(\iota^*)^{-1}(\mathfrak{p})$ is transitive.

---

[4]Suggestion: the proof of Theorem 15.42 shows that $\mathbb{C}[A, B, C]/(AB - C^2)$ is not a unique factorization domain. The argument goes through with $\mathbb{C}$ replaced by k.

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ and $\sigma \in G$. Define

$$\sigma\mathcal{P} = \{\sigma x \mid x \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

It is straightforward to verify that $\sigma\mathcal{P}$ is a prime ideal of R (if you like, this follows from the fact that Spec is a functor). Moreover $(\sigma\mathcal{P}) \cap R^G$ is the set of all elements σx with $x \in \mathcal{P}$ such that for all $g \in G$, $g\sigma x = \sigma x$. As g runs through all elements of G, so does $g\sigma^{-1}$, hence $(\sigma\mathcal{P}) \cap R^G = \mathcal{P} \cap R^G = \mathfrak{p}$.

b) Let $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$ be two primes of R lying over a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ of R^G. Let $x \in \mathcal{P}_1$. Then $N_G(x) \in \mathcal{P}_1 \cap R^G = \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{P}_2$. Since $\mathcal{P}_2$ is prime, there exists at least one $\sigma \in G$ such that $\sigma x \in \mathcal{P}_2$, and thus $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \bigcup_{\sigma \in G} \sigma\mathcal{P}_2$. By Prime Avoidance (Lemma 8.52), there exists $\sigma \in G$ such that $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \sigma\mathcal{P}_2$. Since R/R^G is integral, Incomparability (Corollary 14.15) yields $\mathcal{P}_1 = \sigma\mathcal{P}_2$. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 14.39. *Let R be an integrally closed domain with fraction field K, let L/K be a normal algebraic field extension (possibly of infinite degree), and let S be the integral closure of R in L. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, and let $X_\mathfrak{p}$ be the set of all prime ideals of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$. Then $G = \operatorname{Aut}(L/K)$ acts transitively on $X_\mathfrak{p}$.*

PROOF. Step 1: Suppose $[L : K] = n < \infty$, and write $G = \{\sigma_1 = 1, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$.[5] Seeking a contradiction, suppose there are $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in X_\mathfrak{p}$ such that $\mathcal{P}_2 \neq \sigma_j^{-1}\mathcal{P}_1$ for all j. By Corollary 14.15, $\mathcal{P}_2$ is not contained in any $\sigma_j^{-1}\mathcal{P}_1$, so by Prime Avoidance (Lemma 8.52) there is $x \in \mathcal{P}_2 \setminus \bigcup_j \sigma_j^{-1}\mathcal{P}_1$. Let q be the inseparable degree of L/K and put $y = \left(\prod_j \sigma_j(x)\right)^q$. Thus $y = N_{L/K}(x)$, so $y \in K$. Moreover y is integral over R, so $y \in R$. Since $\sigma_1 = 1$, $y \in \mathcal{P}_2$, so $y \in \mathcal{P}_2 \cap R = \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{P}_1$, and thus, since $\mathcal{P}_1$ is prime, $\sigma_j(x) \in \mathcal{P}_1$ for some j: contradiction!

Step 2: We will reduce to the case in which L/K is a Galois extension. Let $G = \operatorname{Aut}(L/K)$ and $K' = L^G$, so that L/K' is Galois and K'/K is purely inseparable. Let R' be the integral closure of R in K'. Then by Lemma 14.20 $\operatorname{Spec} R' \to \operatorname{Spec} R$ is a bijection. So we may as well assume that $K' = K$ and L/K is Galois.

Step 3: For each finite Galois subextension M of L/K, consider the subset

$$F(M) := \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(\mathcal{P}_1 \cap M) = \mathcal{P}_2 \cap M\}.$$

Observe that $F(M)$ is a union of cosets of $\operatorname{Gal}(L/M)$ hence is (open and) closed in the Krull topology. By Step 1, we have $F(M) \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, the compositum $M = \prod_i M_i$ of any finite number $\{M_i\}$ of finite Galois subextenions is again a finite Galois subextension, and we have $\bigcap_i F(M_i) \supset F(M) \neq \varnothing$. Therefore as M_i ranges through all finite Galois subextensions of L/K, $\{F(M_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is a family of closed subsets of the compact space G satisfying the finite intersection condition, and it follows that there exists $\sigma \in \bigcap_i F(M_i) = F(L)$ i.e., $\sigma \in G$ such that $\sigma\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P}_2$. $\quad\square$

8. Almost Integral Extensions

We come now to a technical variant of the notion of integrality. This variant will not be used until §19.4 on divisorial ideals. We honestly recommend that the reader skip past this section for now and return only when the concept of complete integral closure is needed and used.

Let $R \subset S$ be rings. An element $x \in S$ is **almost integral** over R if there is

---

[5] We are assuming that L/K is normal, so L/K is separable iff L/K is Galois iff $r = n$.

a finitely generated R-submodule of S which contains x^n for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. We say that S is **almost integral** over R if every element of S is almost integral over R.

PROPOSITION 14.40. *Let $R \subset S$ be rings, and let $x \in S$.*
a) If x is integral over R, it is almost integral over R.
b) If R is Noetherian and x is almost integral over R, then x is integral over R.

PROOF. Let $M = \langle R, x \rangle$. By Theorem 14.1, x is integral over R iff M is a finitely generated R-module.
a) If x is integral over R, then M is a finitely generated R-submodule of S containing x^n for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, so x is almost integral over R.
b) Suppose x is almost integral over R: there is a finitely generated R-submodule N of S containing x^n for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then $M \subset N$, and since R is Noetherian and N is finitely generated, M is finitely generated and x is integral over R. $\square$

Remark: As the proof shows, an equivalent – and perhaps more perspicuous – way of expressing the almost integrality condition is that, while integrality of x means that $M = \langle R, x \rangle_R$ is a finitely generated submodule of S, almost integrality means that there is *some* finitely generated R-submodule of S containing M.

For rings $R \subset S$, the **complete integral closure** of R in S is the set of all elements of S which are almost integral over R. A domain R is **completely integrally closed** if its complete integral closure in its fraction field is R itself.

THEOREM 14.41. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K. The complete integral closure of R is the set of all $x \in K$ such that there is $r \in R^\bullet$ with $rx^n \in R$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.*

PROOF. Let $x \in K$ be almost integral over R. Then there are $h_1, \ldots, h_s \in K$ such that $R[x] \subset \langle h_1, \ldots, h_s \rangle_R$. If r is the product of the denominators of the h_i, then $rx^n \in R$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.
Let $x \in K$ be such that there is $r \in R^\bullet$ with $rx^n \in R$ or all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then $R[x] \subset r^{-1}R$. $\square$

Tournant dangereux: If $R \subset S$ and R' is the complete integral closure of R in S, then R' is integrally closed in S [**LM**, Prop. 4.18]. However, the complete integral closure of a domain in its fraction field *need not* be completely integrally closed [**LM**, Exc. IV.14]! In other words, complete integral closure is unfortunately not a closure operator on the set of subrings of a field in the sense of §2.1.

Factorization

Let R be a domain, and x a nonzero, nonunit element of R. We say that x is **irreducible** if for any $y, z \in R$ such that $x = yz$, one of y or z is a unit.

For any unit $u \in R^\times$, we get factorizations of the form $x = u \cdot (u^{-1}x)$, so every x has at least these factorizations, which we wish to regard as "trivial". On the other hand, y and z cannot both be units, for then x would also be a unit. Let us then define a **factorization** of a nonzero nonunit $a \in R$ as a product

$$a = x_1 \cdots x_n,$$

such that each x_i is irreducible. We say that two factorizations

$$a = x_1 \cdots x_n = y_1 \cdots y_m$$

are **equivalent** if the multisets of associated principal ideals $\{\{(x_i)\}\} = \{\{(y_j)\}\}$ are equal. More concretely, this means that $m = n$ and that there is a bijection $\sigma : \{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $(y_{\sigma(i)}) = (x_i)$ for all $1 \le i \le n$.

If factorizations always exist and any two factorizations of a given element are equivalent, we say R is a **unique factorization domain** (UFD).

1. Kaplansky's Theorem (II)

A basic and important result that ought to get covered at the undergraduate level is that PID implies UFD. In fact this is easy to prove. What is more difficult is to get a sense of exactly how UFDs are a more general class of rings than PIDs. In this regard, an elegant theorem of Kaplansky seems enlightening.

EXERCISE 15.1. *Let x be an element of a domain which can be expressed as*

$$x = p_1 \cdots p_n,$$

such that for $1 \le i \le n$, $\mathfrak{p}_i = (p_i)$ is a prime ideal. If then there exist principal prime ideals $\mathfrak{q}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{q}_m$ such that $(x) = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_m$, then $m = n$ and there exists a permutation σ of the integers from 1 to n such that $\mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{p}_{\sigma(i)}$ for all i.

EXERCISE 15.2. *Let R be a domain, and let S be the set of all nonzero elements x in R such that (x) can be expressed as a product of principal prime ideals. Show: S is a saturated multiplicatively closed subset.*

THEOREM 15.1. *(Kaplansky) a domain is a UFD iff every nonzero prime ideal in R contains a prime element.*

PROOF. Suppose R is a UFD and $0 \neq \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$. Let $x \in \mathfrak{p}^\bullet$, and write

$$x = p_1 \cdots p_r$$

a product of prime elements. Then $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ implies $p_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for some i, so $(p_i) \subset \mathfrak{p}$.

Conversely, assume each nonzero prime ideal of R contains a principal prime. Let S be the set of all products of prime elements, so that by Exercise 15.2, S is a saturated multiplicative subset. By Exercise 15.1, it is enough to show that S contains all nonzero nonunits of R. Suppose for a contradiction that there exists a nonzero nonunit $x \in R \setminus S$. The saturation of S implies $S \cap (x) = \emptyset$, and then by Theorem 5.24 there is a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ containing x and disjoint from S. But by hypothesis, $\mathfrak{p}$ contains a prime element p, contradicting its disjointness from S. $\square$

COROLLARY 15.2. *Let R be a domain.*
a) If R is a UFD, then every height one prime ideal is principal. If R is Noetherian and every height one prime ideal is principal, then R is a UFD.
b) If every ideal of R is principal, R is a UFD.
c) Conversely, if R is a UFD of dimension one, every ideal of R is principal.

PROOF. We begin by recalling that in a domain R the height one primes are the nonzero prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}$ such that there is no prime ideal $\mathfrak{q}$ with $(0) \subsetneq \mathfrak{q} \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}$.
a) If R is a UFD and $\mathfrak{p}$ is a height one prime ideal, then by Theorem 15.1 $\mathfrak{p}$ has a prime element (π). Then $(\pi) \subset \mathfrak{p}$ is a containment of prime ideals, and since $\mathfrak{p}$ has height one we have $\mathfrak{p} = (\pi)$ is principal. Conversely, suppose R is Noetherian and every height one prime ideal is principal. Let $x \in R$ be irreducible: i.e., x is a nonzero nonunit and $x = yz$ implies $y \in R^\times$ or $z \in R^\times$. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a minimal prime over (x). By Krull's Hauptidealsatz, $\mathfrak{p}$ has height one and so by assumption $\mathfrak{p} = (\pi)$. Thus $\pi \mid x$ and since x is irreducible we must have $(\pi) = (x)$. Thus we have shown that every irreducible element of R is prime. As we will see §3 (and as the reader may know from "general algebra"), a Noetherian domain in which each irreducible element is prime is a UFD.
b) If every ideal of R is principal, then every ideal of R is finitely generated. So R is Noetherian and part a) applies.
c) In a UFD of dimension one, part a) implies that every prime ideal is principal. By Theorem 4.36, every ideal is principal. $\square$

One may ask: in a not necessarily Noetherian domain, if every height one prime is principal, must R be a UFD? The following exercise addresses this.

EXERCISE 15.3. *a) Let R be a domain which satisfies (DCC) on prime ideals. Show: R is a UFD iff every height one prime is principal.*
b) Show: a domain R in which nonzero primes have infinite height yields a negative answer to the question: every height one prime is principal but R is not a UFD.
*c) Show: there are domains in which every nonzero prime ideal has infinite height. (This is difficult. For the answer, see [**AKP98**, Ex. 2.2].)*

2. Atomic domains, ACCP

A domain in which every nonzero nonunit can be factored into irreducibles is an **atomic domain**.

EXERCISE 15.4. *Show: the ring $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ of all algebraic integers is not an atomic domain. Indeed, since for every algebraic integer x, there exists an algebraic integer y such that $y^2 = x$, there are no irreducible elements in $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$!*

The condition of factorization into irreducibles (in at least one way) holds in every Noetherian domain. In fact, a much weaker condition than Noetherianity suffices:

PROPOSITION 15.3. *Let R be a domain in which every ascending chain of **principal** ideals stabilizes. Then every nonzero nonunit factors into a product of irreducible elements. In particular, a Noetherian domain is atomic.*

PROOF. Let R be a domain satisfying the ascending chain condition for principal ideals (ACCP for short), and suppose for a contradiction that R is *not* an atomic domain. Then the set of principal ideals generated by unfactorable elements is nonempty, so by our assumption there exists a maximal such element, say $I = (a)$. Evidently a is not irreducible, so we can begin to factor a: $a = xy$ where x and y are nonunits. But this means precisely that both principal ideals (x) and (y) properly contain (a), so that by the assumed maximality of (a), we can factor both x and y into irreducibles: $x = x_1 \cdots x_m$, $y = y_1 \cdots y_n$. But then

$$a = x_1 \cdots x_m y_1 \cdots y_n$$

is a factorization of a, contradiction. $\qquad\square$

This proposition motivates us to consider also the class of domains which satisfy the **ascending chain condition for principal ideals** (ACCP).

EXERCISE 15.5. *Suppose $R \hookrightarrow S$ is an extension of rings such that $S^\times \cap R = R^\times$. (In particular, this holds for integral extensions.) Show that S satisfies (ACCP) implies R satisfies (ACCP). Does the converse hold?*

We have just seen that (ACCP) implies atomicity. The proof shows that under (ACCP) we can always obtain an expression of a given nonzero nonunit by a finite sequence of "binary factorizations" i.e., replacing an element x with $y_1 \cdot y_2$, where y_1 and y_2 are nonunits whose product is x. After a bit of thought, one is inclined to worry that it may be possible that this factorization procedure fails but nevertheless irreducible factorizations exist. This worry turns out to be justified:

THEOREM 15.4. *There exists an atomic domain which does not satisfy (ACCP).*

PROOF. See [**Gr74**]. $\qquad\square$

However, the following strenghtening of atomicity does imply ACCP:

A domain R is a **bounded factorization domain** BFD if it is atomic and for each nonzero nonunit $a \in R$, there exists a positive integer $N(a)$ such that in any irreducible factorization $a = x_1 \cdots x_r$ we have $r \leq N(a)$.

PROPOSITION 15.5. *A UFD is a BFD.*

PROOF. An immediate consequence of the definitions. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 15.6. *A BFD satisfies (ACCP).*

PROOF. Let R be a BFD. Suppose for a contradiction that $(x_i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is a strictly ascending chain of principal ideals. We therefore have

$$x_0 = y_1 x_1 = y_1 y_2 x_2 = \ldots = y_1 \cdots y_n x_n = \cdots,$$

with each x_i, y_i a nonunit. Since R is atomic, we can refine each factorization into an irreducible factorization, but clearly an irreducible refinement of $y_1 \cdots y_n x_n$ has at least $n + 1$ irreducible factors, contradicting BFD. $\qquad\square$

3. EL-domains

An element x of a domain R is **prime** if the principal ideal (x) is a prime ideal. Equivalently, x satisfies **Euclid's Lemma**: if $x \mid yz$, then $x \mid y$ or $x \mid z$.

PROPOSITION 15.7. *A prime element is irreducible.*

PROOF. If x is reducible, then $x = yz$ with neither y nor z a unit, so that $yz \in (x)$ but $y \notin (x)$, $z \notin (x)$.   □

However, it need not be the case that irreducible elements are prime!

Example: Let $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$. Then $2, 3$ and $1 \pm \sqrt{-5}$ are all irreducible, but
$$2 \cdot 3 = (1 + \sqrt{-5})(1 - \sqrt{-5})$$
shows that none of them are prime.

EXERCISE 15.6. *Check all these assertions. Hint: Define $N(a + b\sqrt{-5}) = a^2 + 5b^2$. Check that $N((a + b\sqrt{-5})(c + d\sqrt{-5})) = N(a + b\sqrt{-5})N(c + d\sqrt{-5})$. Show that $\alpha \mid \beta$ (in R) $\implies N(\alpha) \mid N(\beta)$ (in $\mathbb{Z}$), and use this to show that $2, 3, 1 \pm \sqrt{-5}$ are irreducible but not prime.*

It is tempting to call a domain in which all irreducible elements are prime "Euclidean," but this terminology is already taken for domains satisfying a generalization of the Euclidean algorithm (c.f. §16.3). So we will, provisionally, call a ring in which irreducible elements are prime an **EL-domain**. (EL = Euclid's Lemma).

THEOREM 15.8. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *R is a UFD.*
(ii) *R satisfies (ACCP) and is an EL-domain.*
(iii) *R is an atomic EL-domain.*

PROOF. i) $\implies$ (ii): In the previous section we saw UFD $\implies$ BFD $\implies$ (ACCP). We show UFD implies EL-domain: let $x \in R$ be irreducible and suppose $x \mid yz$. Let $y = y_1 \cdots y_m$ and $z = z_1 \cdots z_n$ be irreducible factorizations of y and z. Then the uniqueness of irreducible factorization means that x must be associate to some y_i or to some z_j, and hence $x \mid y$ or $x \mid z$: R is an EL-domain.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii) follows immediately from Proposition 15.3.

(iii) $\implies$ (i): This is nothing else than the usual deduction of the fundamental theorem of arithmetic from Euclid's Lemma: in a factorization domain we have at least one irreducible factorization of a given nonzero nonunit x. If we also assume irreducibles are prime, we may compare any two irreducible factorizations: suppose
$$x = y_1 \cdots y_m = z_1 \cdots z_n.$$
Then y_1 is a prime element so divides z_j for some j. WLOG, relabel to assume $j = 1$. Since z_1 is irreducible, we have $y_1 = u_1 z_1$ and thus we may cancel to get
$$y_2 \cdots y_m = (u_1^{-1} z_2) z_3 \cdots z_n.$$
Continuing in this way we find that each y_i is associate to some z_j; when we get down to $1 = \prod_j z_j$ we must have no factors of z_j left, so $m = n$ and R is a UFD.   □

We can now deduce the following important result, a characterization of Noetherian UFDs among all Noetherian domains.

THEOREM 15.9. *For a Noetherian domain R, the following are equivalent:*

   (i) *Every height one prime ideal of R is principal.*

   (ii) *R is a UFD.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): By Theorem 15.8, it is sufficient to prove that R is an EL-domain, so let $x \in R$ be irreducible. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a minimal prime containing x. By Krull's Hauptidealsatz (Theorem 8.49), $\mathfrak{p}$ has height one, so by assumption $\mathfrak{p} = (p)$ is principal. Thus $x = up$ for some $u \in R$, and since x and p are both irreducible, $u \in R^{\times}$, $(x) = \mathfrak{p}$, and x is a prime element.

(ii) $\implies$ (i): This implication is a special case of Kaplansky's Theorem 15.1 (and thus holds without the Noetherian assumption on R). $\qquad\square$

4. GCD-domains

For elements a and b of a domain R, a **greatest common divisor** is an element d of R such that: $d \mid a$, $d \mid b$ and for $e \in R$ with $e \mid a$, $e \mid b$, $e \mid d$.

EXERCISE 15.7. *Show: if d is a gcd of a and b, then an element d' of R is a gcd of a and b iff $(d) = (d')$. In particular, any two gcd's are associate.*

If a and b have a gcd, it would be more logically sound to write $\gcd(a, b)$ to mean the unique principal ideal whose generators are the various gcd's of a and b. It is traditional however to use the notation $\gcd(a, b)$ to denote an element, with the understanding that in general it is only well-defined up to multiplication by a unit.[1]

More generally, for elements $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ in a domain R, a greatest common divisor is an element d of R such that $d \mid a_i$ for all i and if $e \mid a_i$ for all i then $e \mid d$. If a GCD of $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ exists, it is unique up to associates, and we denote it by $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. As above, it can be characterized as the unique minimal *principal* ideal containing $\langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$. Moreover, these setwise GCDs can be reduced to pairwise GCDs.

EXERCISE 15.8. *Let a, b, c be elements of a domain R and assume that all pairwise GCD's exist in R. Then $\gcd(a, b, c)$ exists and we have $\gcd(a, \gcd(b, c)) = \gcd(a, b, c) = \gcd(\gcd(a, b), c)$.*

A domain R is a **GCD-domain** if for all $a, b \in R$, $\gcd(a, b)$ exists. By the above remarks, it would be equivalent to require that $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ for all n-tuples of elements in R.

PROPOSITION 15.10. *(GCD Identities) Let R be a GCD-domain. Then:*

a) *For all $a, b, c \in R$, $\gcd(ab, ac) = a \gcd(b, c)$.*

b) *For all $a, b \in R \setminus \{0\}$, $\gcd(\frac{a}{\gcd(a,b)}, \frac{b}{\gcd(a,b)}) = 1$.*

c) *For all $a, b, c \in R$, $\gcd(a, b) = \gcd(a, c) = 1$, then $\gcd(a, bc) = 1$.*

d) *For all $a, b, c \in R$, $\gcd(a, b + ac) = gcd(a, b)$.*

e) *For all $a, a_1, \ldots, a_n, b_1, \ldots, b_n, c \in R$, $\gcd(a, b_1 + ca_1, \ldots, b_n + ca_n) = \gcd(a, b_1, \ldots, b_n)$.*

PROOF. a) Let $x = \gcd(ab, ac)$. Then $a \mid ab$ and $a \mid ac$ so $a \mid x$: say $ay = x$. Since $x \mid ab$ and $x \mid ac$, $y \mid b$ and $y \mid c$, so $y \mid \gcd(b, c)$. If $z \mid b$ and $z \mid c$, then $az \mid ab$ and $az \mid ac$, so $az \mid x = ay$ and $z \mid y$. Therefore $\gcd(b, c) = y = \frac{1}{a} \gcd(ab, ac)$.

---

[1]In some rings, principal ideals have canonical generators: e.g. in the integers we may take the unique positive generator and in $k[t]$ we may take the unique monic generator. Under these circumstances, a common convention is to let $\gcd(a, b)$ stand for this canonical generator.

b) This follows immediately from part a).

c) Suppose $\gcd(a, b) = \gcd(a, c) = 1$, and let t divide a and bc. Then t divides ab and bc so $t \mid \gcd(ab, bc) = b \gcd(a, c) = b$. So t divides $\gcd(a, b) = 1$.

d) If d divides both a and b, it divides both a and $b + ac$. If d divides both a and $b + ac$, it divides $b + ac - c(a) = b$.

e) We have

$$\gcd(a, b_1 + ca_1, \ldots, b_n + ca_n) = \gcd(a, \gcd(a, b_1 + ac_1), \ldots, \gcd(a, b_n + ac_n))$$

$$= \gcd(a, \gcd(a, b_1), \ldots, \gcd(a, b_n)) = \gcd(a, b_1, \ldots, b_n). \qquad \square$$

PROPOSITION 15.11. *A GCD-domain is an EL-domain.*

PROOF. This follows from: $\gcd(x, y) = \gcd(x, z) = 1 \implies \gcd(x, yz) = 1$. $\quad\square$

THEOREM 15.12. *Consider the following conditions on a domain R:*
(i) R is a UFD.
(ii) R is a GCD-domain.
(iii) R is an EL-domain: irreducible elements are prime.
a) We have (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii).
b) If R is an ACCP-domain, (iii) $\implies$ (i).

PROOF. a) (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let x, y be nonzero elements of R. We may write

$$x = f_1 \cdots f_r g_1 \cdots g_s, \ y = u f_1 \cdots f_r h_1 \cdots h_t,$$

where the f's, g's and h's are prime elements, $(g_j) \neq (h_k)$ for all j, k and $u \in R^\times$. Then $f_1 \cdots f_r$ is a gcd for x and y.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii): This is Proposition 15.11.

b) (iii) + (ACCP) $\implies$ (i): This is Theorem 15.8. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 15.13. *For a Noetherian domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a UFD.
(ii) R is a GCD-domain.
(iii) R is an EL-domain.

We now present some simple results that are long overdue. An extremely useful fact in algebra is that any UFD is integrally closed in its fraction field. We give a slightly stronger result and then recall a classical application.

THEOREM 15.14. *A GCD-domain is integrally closed.*

PROOF. Let R be a GCD-domain with fraction field K. Suppose $x \in K$ satisfies

$$x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1 x + a_0 = 0, \ a_i \in R.$$

Write $x = \frac{s}{t}$ with $s, t \in R$, $t \neq 0$. By Proposition 15.10b), after dividing by the gcd we may assume $\gcd(s, t) = 1$. Plugging in $x = \frac{s}{t}$ and clearing denominators gives

$$s^n = - \left(a_{n-1} t s^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1 t^{n-1} s + a_0 t^n \right),$$

so $t \mid s^n$. But by Proposition 15.10c) $\gcd(s^n, t) = 1$, so $t \in R^\times$ and $x \in R$. $\quad\square$

COROLLARY 15.15. *An algebraic integer which is a rational number is an integer: $\overline{\mathbb{Z}} \cap \mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Z}$.*

EXERCISE 15.9. *Prove Corollary 15.15.*

Thus e.g. one can derive the irrationality of $\sqrt{2}$: it is a root of the monic polynomial equation $t^2 - 2 = 0$ but evidently not an integer, so cannot be rational.

PROPOSITION 15.16. *(Compatibility of GCD's with localization)* *Let R be a GCD-domain and S a multiplicative subset of R. Then:*
a) The localization $S^{-1}R$ is again a GCD-domain.
b) For all $x, y \in R^\bullet$, if d is a GCD for x and y in R, then it is also a GCD for x and y in $S^{-1}R$.

EXERCISE 15.10. *Prove Proposition 15.16.*

THEOREM 15.17. *Let R be a UFD with $2 \in R^\times$. Let $f \in R$ be squarefree – i.e., not divisible by the square of any nonunit – and not a square. Then*

$$S = R[\sqrt{f}] := R[x]/\langle x^2 - f \rangle$$

is an integrally closed domain.

PROOF. Let K be the fraction field of R. By Theorem 15.14 R is integrally closed, and thus f is not a square in K – if so, it would also be a square in R – so $x^2 - f$ is irreducible in $K[x]$ and thus $L := K[x]/(x^2 - f)$ is a quadratic field extension of K. Write $\sqrt{f}$ for the element $x + (x^2 - f)$ of L, so $L = K(\sqrt{f})$ and $S = R[\sqrt{f}]$. In particular, S is a domain.

Let α be an element of L that is integral over R, so $\alpha = a + b\sqrt{f}$ with $a, b \in K$. If $b = 0$ then $\alpha \in K$ hence $\alpha \in R$ since R is integrally closed in K, so assume $b \neq 0$. Then the minimal polynomial of α is

$$P(t) = t^2 - 2at + (a^2 - b^2 f).$$

By Theorem 14.18 we have $-2a \in R$ and $a^2 - b^2 f \in R$. Since $2 \in R^\times$, we get that $a \in R$ and then that $b^2 f \in R$. Since f is squarefree, this implies that $b \in R$: otherwise, $\mathrm{ord}_p(b) \leq -1$ for some prime element p, so $\mathrm{ord}_p(b^2 f) \leq -2 + 1 < 0$. So $\alpha \in S$. Thus S is integrally closed. $\square$

EXERCISE 15.11. *Show: in Theorem 15.17 the hypothesis $2 \in R^\times$ is necessary. (E.g. show: $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]$ is not integrally closed.)*

5. GCDs versus LCMs

The definition of GCDs in a domain has an evident analogue for least common multiples. Namely, if a and b are elements of a domain R, a **least common multiple** of a and b is an element l such that for all $m \in R$ with $a \mid m$ and $b \mid m$ then $l \mid m$.

Many of the properties of GCD's carry over immediately to LCM's. For instance, if l is an LCM of a and b, then $l' \in R$ is an LCM of a and b iff l' is associate to l.

PROPOSITION 15.18. *Let a and b be elements in a domain R. Then $\mathrm{lcm}(a, b)$ exists iff the ideal $(a) \cap (b)$ is principal, in which case the set of all LCM's of a and b is the set of all generators of $(a) \cap (b)$.*

PROOF. This is straightforward and left to the reader. $\square$

LCM's exist in any UFD: if

$$a = x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_r^{a_r}, \ b = x_1^{b_1} \cdots x_r^{b_r},$$

with $a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$l = x_1^{\max(a_1,b_1)} \cdots x_r^{\max(a_r,b_r)}$$

is a greatest common divisor of a and b. Now the simple identity

$$\forall a, b \in \mathbb{N}, \min(a,b) + \max(a,b) = a + b$$

implies that for a, b in any UFD R we have

$$\gcd(a,b) \operatorname{lcm}(a,b) \sim ab.$$

This identity further suggests that the existence of either one of $\gcd(a,b)$, $\operatorname{lcm}(a,b)$ implies the existence of the other. However, this turns out only to be half correct!

THEOREM 15.19. *For a, b in a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\operatorname{lcm}(a,b)$ exists.
(ii) For all $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$, $\gcd(ra, rb)$ exists.

PROOF. Step 1: i) $\implies$ (ii). Suppose that there exists a least common multiple of a and b, say l. We claim that $d := \frac{ab}{l}$ is a greatest common divisor of a and b. (Since ab is a common divisor of a and b, $l \mid ab$, so indeed $d \in R$.) Indeed, suppose that $e \mid a$ and $e \mid b$. Then since $\frac{ab}{e}$ is a common multiple of a and b, we must have $l \mid \frac{ab}{e}$ and this implies $e \mid \frac{ab}{l}$. Thus d is a GCD of a and b.
Step 2: Suppose that for $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $a, b \in R$, $\gcd(ra, rb)$ exists. Then we claim that $\gcd(a,b)$ exists and $\gcd(ra, rb) = r \gcd(a,b)$. Put $g := \frac{\gcd(ra,rb)}{r}$, which is clearly an element of D. Since $\gcd(ra, rb)$ divides ra and rb, g divides a and b. Conversely, if $e \mid a$ and $e \mid b$, then $re \mid ra$ and $re \mid rb$ so $er \mid \gcd(ra, rb)$ and $e \mid g$.
Step 3: We claim that if $l := \operatorname{lcm}(a,b)$ exists then so does $\operatorname{lcm}(ra, rb)$ for all $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$. First observe that rl is a common multiple of ra and rb. Now suppose m is a common multiple of ra and rb, say $m = xra = yrb = r(xa - yb)$. Thus $r \mid m$ and $a \mid \frac{m}{r}$, $b \mid \frac{m}{r}$. So $l \mid \frac{m}{r}$ and $rl \mid m$. Thus $\operatorname{lcm}(ra, rb) = r \operatorname{lcm}(a,b)$.
Step 4: (ii) $\implies$ (i). We may assume that a and b are nonzero, since the other cases are trivial. Suppose $\gcd(ra, rb)$ exists for all $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$. We claim that $l := \frac{ab}{\gcd(a,b)}$ is an LCM of a and b. Clearly l is a common multiple of a and b. Now suppose that m is a common multiple of a and b. Then ab divides both ma and mb, so $ab \mid \gcd(ma, mb)$. By Step 2, $\gcd(ma, mb) = m \gcd(a,b)$. Thus $\frac{ab}{\gcd(a,b)} \mid m$. $\square$

THEOREM 15.20. *(Khurana, [**Kh03**, Thm. 4]) Let $d \geq 3$ be an integer such that $d + 1$ is not prime, and write $d + 1 = pk$ for a prime number p and $k \geq 2$. Then in the domain $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}]$, the elements p and $1 + \sqrt{-d}$ have a GCD but no LCM.*

PROOF. Step 1: We claim that p is irreducible as an element of R. Indeed, if it were reducible, then by the multiplicativity of the norm map $N(a + b\sqrt{-d}) = a^2 + dp^2$ we could write it as $p = \alpha\beta$, with

$$p^2 = N(p) = N(\alpha\beta) = N(\alpha)N(\beta),$$

and, since α, β are nonunits, $N(\alpha), N(\beta) > 1$. But then $N(\alpha) = N(\beta) = p$, i.e., there would be $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a^2 + db^2 = p$. But this is not possible: either $ab = 0$, in which the left hand side is a perfect square, or $a^2 + db^2 \geq d + 1 > p$.
Step 2: $\gcd(p, 1 + \sqrt{-d}) = 1$. Indeed, since $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p}\sqrt{-d} \notin R$, $p \nmid 1 + \sqrt{-d}$.
Step 3: We claim that kp and $k(1 + \sqrt{-d})$ do not have a GCD. Indeed, by Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 15.19, if any GCD exists then k is a GCD. Then, since

$1 + \sqrt{-d}$ divides both $(1 - \sqrt{-d})(1 + \sqrt{-d}) = 1 + d = kp$ and $k(1 + \sqrt{-d})$, $1 + \sqrt{-d}$ divides $\gcd(kp, k(1 + \sqrt{-d})) = k$, i.e., there exist $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$k = (1 + \sqrt{-d})(a + b\sqrt{-d}) = (a - db) + (a + b)\sqrt{-d},$$

i.e., $a = -b$ and $k = a - db = a + da = a(1 + d)$ and $d + 1 \mid k$, contradicting the fact that $1 < k < d + 1$.
Step 4: It follows from Theorem 15.19 that $\operatorname{lcm}(p, 1 + \sqrt{-d})$ does not exist.   □

Khurana produces similar examples even when $d + 1$ is prime, which implies that for no $d \geq 3$ is $R_d = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}]$ a GCD-domain. (In fact, since $(R_d, +) \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$, R_d is an abstract number ring and hence Noetherian, so the notions of EL-domain, GCD-domain and UFD are all equivalent.) Let us give an independent proof:

THEOREM 15.21. *For no $d \geq 3$ is $R_d = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-d}]$ an EL-domain.*

PROOF. As in the proof of Theorem 15.20 above, the easy observation that the equation $a^2 + db^2 = 2$ has no integral solutions implies that the element 2 is irreducible in R_d. Now, since (quite trivially) $-d$ is a square modulo 2, there exists $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $2 \mid x^2 + d = (x + \sqrt{-d})(x - \sqrt{-d})$. But now, if R_d were an EL-domain, the irreducible element 2 would be prime and hence Euclid's Lemma would apply to show that $2 \mid x \pm \sqrt{-d}$, i.e., that $\frac{x}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{-d} \in R_d$, which is a clear contradiction ($\frac{1}{2}$ is not an integer!).   □

Theorem 15.19 has the following immediate consequence:

COROLLARY 15.22. *(Cohn, [?, Thm. 2.1]) For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) Any two elements of R have a greatest common divisor.
(ii) Any two elements of R have a least common multiple.

Thus we need not define an "LCM-domain": these are precisely the GCD domains.

6. Polynomial rings over UFDs

Our goal in this section to show that if R is a UFD, then a polynomial ring in any number (possibly infinite) of indeterminates is again a UFD. This result generalizes a familiar fact from undergraduate algebra: if k is a field, $k[t]$ is a UFD. The corresponding fact that polynomials in $k[t_1, \ldots, t_n]$ factor uniquely into irreducibles is equally basic and important, and arguably underemphasized at the pre-graduate level (including high school, where factorizations of polynomials in at least two variables certainly do arise).

If we can establish that R a UFD implies $R[t]$ a UFD, then an evident induction argument using $R[t_1, \ldots, t_n, t_{n+1}] = R[t_1, \ldots, t_n][t_{n+1}]$ gives us the result for polynomials in finitely many indeterminates over a UFD. It is then straightforward to deduce the case for an arbitrary set of indeterminates.

There are several ways to prove the univariate case. Probably the most famous is via Gauss's Lemma. For this we need some preliminary terminology.

Let R be a domain, and consider a nonzero polynomial

$$f = a_n t^n + \ldots + a_1 t + a_0 \in R[t].$$

We say f is **primitive** if $x \in R$, $x \mid a_i$ for all i implies $x \in R^\times$. In a GCD-domain, this is equivalent to $\gcd(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 1$. In a PID, this is equivalent to $\langle a_0, \ldots, a_n \rangle = R$. For a general domain, this latter condition is considerably stronger: e.g. the polynomial $xt + y \in k[x, y][t]$ is primitive but the coefficients do not generate the unit ideal. Let us call this latter – usually too strong condition – **naively primitive**.

PROPOSITION 15.23. *Let R be a domain, and $f, g \in R[t]$ be naively primitive. Then fg is naively primitive.*

PROOF. Suppose f and g are naively primitive but fg is not. Then by definition the ideal generated by the coefficents of f is proper, so lies in some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R. For $g \in R[t]$, write $\overline{g}$ for its image in the quotient ring $(R/\mathfrak{m})[t]$. Then our assumptions give precisely that $\overline{f}, \overline{g} \neq 0$ but $\overline{fg} = \overline{f}\,\overline{g} = 0$. Thus $\overline{f}$ and $\overline{g}$ are zero divisors in the domain $(R/\mathfrak{m})[t]$, a contradiction. $\square$

If R is a GCD-domain and $0 \neq f \in R[t]$, we can define the **content** $c(f)$ of f to be the gcd of the coefficients of f, well-determined up to a unit. Thus a polynomial is primitive iff $c(f) = 1$.

EXERCISE 15.12. *Let R be a GCD-domain and $0 \neq f \in R[t]$.*
a) Show: f factors as $c(f)f_1$, where f_1 is primitive.
b) Let $0 \neq a \in R$. Show: $c(af) = ac(f)$.

THEOREM 15.24. *(Gauss's Lemma) Let R be a GCD-domain. If $f, g \in R[t]$ are nonzero polynomials, we have $c(fg) = c(f)c(g)$.*

If we assume the stronger hypothesis that R is a UFD, we can give a very transparent proof along the lines of that of Proposition 15.23 above. Since this special case may be sufficient for the needs of many readers, we will give this simpler proof first, followed by the proof in the general case.

PROOF. (Classical proof for UFDs) The factorization $f = c(f)f_1$ of Exercise 15.10 reduces us to the following special case: if f and g are primitive, then so is fg. Suppose that fg is not primitive, i.e., there exists a nonzero nonunit x which divides all of the coefficients of fg. Since R is a UFD, we may choose a prime element $\pi \mid x$. Now we may argue exactly as in the proof of Proposition 15.23: $(R/(\pi))[t]$ is a domain, $\overline{f}$ and $\overline{g}$ are nonzero, but $\overline{f}\,\overline{g} = \overline{fg} = 0$, a contradiction. $\square$

The proof of the general case uses the GCD identities of Proposition 15.10.

PROOF. (Haible) As above, we may assume that $f = a_n t^n + \ldots + a_1 t + a_0, g = b_m t^m + \ldots + b_1 t + b_0 \in R[t]$ are both primitive, and we wish to show that $fg = c_{m+n} t^{m+n} + \ldots + c_1 t + c_0$ is primitive. We go by induction on n. Since a primitive polynomial of degree 0 is simply a unit in R, the cases $m = 0$ and $n = 0$ are both trivial; therefore the base case $m + n = 0$ is doubly so. So assume $m, n > 0$. By Proposition 15.10, we have

$$c(fg) = \gcd(c_{n+m}, \ldots, c_0) =$$

$$\gcd(a_n b_m, \gcd(c_{n+m-1}, \ldots, c_0)) \mid \gcd(a_n, \gcd(c_{n+m-1}, \ldots, c_0)) \cdot \gcd(b_m, \gcd(c_{n+m-1}, \ldots, c_0)).$$

Now

$$\gcd(a_n, \gcd(c_{n+m-1}, \ldots, c_0)) = \gcd(a_n, c_{n+m-1}, \ldots, c_0)$$
$$= \gcd(a_n, c_{n+m-1} - a_n b_{m-1}, \ldots, c_n - a_n b_0, c_{n-1}, \ldots, c_0)$$

$$= \gcd(a_n, c((f - a_n t^n)g)).$$

Our induction hypothesis gives $c((f - a_n t^n)g) = c(f - a_n t^n)c(g) = c(f - a_n t^n)$, so

$$\gcd(a_n, c_{n+m-1} - a_n b_{m-1}, \ldots, c_n - a_n b_0, c_{n-1}, \ldots, c_0) = \gcd(a_n, c(f - a_n t^n)) = c(f) = 1.$$

Similarly we have $\gcd(b_m, \gcd(c_{n+m-1}, \ldots, c_0)) = 1$, so $c(fg) = 1$.   □

COROLLARY 15.25. *Let R be a GCD-domain with fraction field K, and let $f \in R[t]$ be a polynomial of positive degree.*
a) The following are equivalent:
(i) f is irreducible in $R[t]$.
(ii) f is primitive and irreducible in $K[t]$.
b) The following are equivalent:
(i) f is reducible in $K[t]$.
(ii) There exist $g, h \in R[t]$ such that $\deg(g), \deg(h) < \deg(f)$ and $f = gh$.

PROOF. a) Assume (i). Clearly an imprimitive polynomial in $R[t]$ would be reducible in $R[t]$, so f irreducible implies $c(f) = 1$. Suppose f factors nontrivially in $K[t]$, as $f = gh$, where both $g, h \in K[t]$ and have smaller degree than f. By Exercise 15.10, we may write $g = c(g)g_1$, $h = c(h)h_1$, with g_1, h_1 primitive, and then $f = c(g)c(h)g_1 h_1$. But then g_1, h_1, being primitive, lie in $R[t]$, and $c(f) = c(g)c(h) = c(gh) \in R$, so the factorization takes place over $R[t]$, contradiction. (ii) $\implies$ (i) is similar but much simpler and left to the reader.
b) That (ii) $\implies$ (i) is obvious, so assume (i). Because we can factor out the content, it is no loss of generality to assume that f is primitive. Let $f = g_1 h_1$ with $g_1, h_1 \in K[t]$ and $\deg(g_1), \deg(h_1) < \deg(f)$. Because R is a GCD-domain, we may write $g = \frac{\tilde{g}}{d_1}$, $h = \frac{\tilde{h}}{d_2}$ with $\tilde{g}, \tilde{h} \in R[t]$ primitive. Then we have $d_1 d_2 f = \tilde{g}\tilde{h}$, and equating contents gives $(d_1 d_2) = (1)$, so $d_1, d_2 \in R^\times$ and thus the factorization $f = gh$ has the properties we seek.   □

We now give Gauss's proof that a univariate polynomial ring over a UFD is a UFD.

THEOREM 15.26. *If R is a UFD, so is $R[t]$.*

PROOF. Let K be the fraction field of R, and let $f \in R[t]^\bullet$. We know that $K[t]$ is a PID hence a UFD, so we get a factorization

$$f = cg_1 \cdots g_r,$$

with $c \in R$ and each $g_i \in R[t]$ is primitive and irreducible. Then factoring c into irreducibles gives an irreducible factorization of f. If we had another irreducible factorization $f = dh_1 \cdots h_s$, then unique factorization in $K[t]$ gives that we have $r = s$ and after permuting the factors have $g_i = u_i h_i$ for all i, where $u_i \in K^\times$. Since both g_i and h_i are primitive, we must have $u_i \in R^\times$, whence the uniqueness of the factorization.   □

This proof relies on knowing that $K[t]$ is a UFD, which of course follows from the fact that polynomial division gives a Euclidean algorithm, as one learns in an undergraduate course. This is of course an adaptation of the proof that the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ is a UFD (the **Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic**) essentially due to Euclid.
It is interesting to find alternate routes to such basic and important results.

THEOREM 15.27. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K.*
a) If R is an ACCP-domain, so is $R[t]$.
b) If R is a GCD-domain, so is $R[t]$.
c) Thus, once again, if R is a UFD, so is $R[t]$.

PROOF. a) In an infinite ascending chain $\{(P_i)\}$ of principal ideals of $R[t]$, $\deg P_i$ is a descending chain of non-negative integers, hence eventually constant. Therefore for sufficiently large n we have $P_n = a_n P_{n+1}$ with $a_n \in R$ and $(a_{n+1}) \supset (a_n)$. Since R is an ACCP domain, we have $(a_n) = (a_{n+1})$ for sufficiently large n, hence also $(P_n) = (P_{n+1})$ for sufficiently large n.

b) (Haible, [**Ha94**]) Let $f, g \in R[t]$. We may assume that $fg \neq 0$. As usual, write $f = c(f)\tilde{f}$ and $g = c(g)\tilde{g}$. Since $K[t]$ is a PID, may take the gcd of $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$ in $K[t]$, say $\tilde{d}$. The choice of $\tilde{d}$ is unique only up to an element of $K^\times$, so by choosing the unit appropriately we may assume that $\tilde{d}$ lies in $R[t]$ and is primitive. We put $d = \gcd(c(f), c(g))\tilde{d}$.

Step 1: We claim that $\tilde{d}$ is a gcd of $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$ in $R[t]$. Since $\tilde{d} \mid f$ in $K[t]$, we may write $\frac{\tilde{f}}{\tilde{d}} = \frac{a}{b}q$ with $a, b \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $q \in R[t]$ primitive. Since $b\tilde{f} = a\tilde{d}$, we have $(b) = c(b\tilde{f}) = c(a\tilde{d}) = (a)$, i.e., $\frac{b}{a} \in R^\times$ and thus $\tilde{d} \mid \tilde{f}$ in $R[t]$. Similarly $\tilde{d} \mid \tilde{g}$. Moreover, sice $\tilde{d} \in \tilde{f}K[t] + \tilde{g}K[t]$, there exist $u, v \in R[t]$ and $c \in R \setminus \{0\}$ with $c\tilde{d} = u\tilde{f} + v\tilde{g}$. Suppose $h \in R[t]$ divides both $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$. Then $h \mid c\tilde{d}$, and $c(h) \mid c(\tilde{f}) = (1)$. Writing $\frac{cd}{h} = \frac{a}{b}q$ with $q \in R[t]$ primitive, and equating contents in $bc\tilde{d} = ahq$, we get $(bc) = (a)$, hence $\frac{\tilde{d}}{h} = \frac{ab}{c}q \in R[t]$, so $h \mid \tilde{d}$.

Step 2: We claim that d is a gcd of f and g in $R[t]$. Certainly we have

$$(d) = (\gcd(c(f), c(g)\tilde{d}) \mid (c(f)\tilde{f}) = (f),$$

so $d \mid f$. Similarly $d \mid g$. Conversely, let $h \in R[t]$ divide f and g. Write $h = c(h)\tilde{h}$ for $\tilde{h} \in R[t]$ primitive. From $h \mid f$ it follows that $c(h) \mid c(f)$ and thus $\tilde{h} \mid \tilde{f}$. Similarly $h \mid f$ so $\tilde{h} \mid \tilde{g}$. Thus $c(h) \mid \gcd(c(f), c(g))$, $\tilde{h} \mid \tilde{d}$ and thus finally $h \mid d$.

c) If R is a GCD domain and an ACCP domain, it is also an atomic EL domain, hence a UFD by Theorem 15.8. $\square$

Lindemann [**Li33**] and Zermelo [**Ze34**] (independently) gave (similar) striking proofs of the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic avoiding all lemmas and packaging the Euclidean division into a single inductive argument. Later several authors have recorded analogous proofs of Gauss's Theorem (Theorem 15.26): the earliest instance we are aware of in the literature is due to S. Borofsky [**Bo50**]. We give a third, "lemmless" proof of Theorem 15.26 here.

PROOF. It suffices to show that $R[t]$ is an ACCP domain and an EL-domain. By Theorem 15.27a), $R[t]$ is an ACCP domain. Now, seeking a contradiction, we suppose that $R[t]$ is not an EL-domain. Among the set of all elements in $R[t]$ admitting inequivalent irreducible factorizations, let p be one of minimal degree. We may assume

$$p = f_1 \cdots f_r = g_1 \cdots g_s,$$

where for all i, j, $(f_i) \neq (g_j)$ and

$$m = \deg f_1 \geq \deg f_2 \geq \ldots \geq \deg f_r,$$

$$n = \deg g_1 \geq \deg g_2 \geq \ldots \geq \deg g_s,$$

with $n \geq m > 0$. Suppose the leading coefficient of f_1 (resp. g_1) is a (resp. b). Put

$$q = ap - bf_1 x^{n-m} g_2 \cdots g_s = f_1(af_2 \cdots f_r - bx^{n-m} g_2 \cdots g_s) = (ag_1 - bf_1 x^{n-m})g_2 \cdots g_s.$$

Thus $q = 0$ implies $ag_1 = bf_1 x^{n-m}$. If, however, $q \neq 0$, then

$$\deg(ag_1 - bf_1 x^{n-m}) < \deg g_1,$$

hence $\deg q < \deg p$ and q has a unique factorization into irreducibles, certainly including $g_2, \cdots, g_s$ and f_1. But then f_1 must be a factor of $ag_1 - bf_1 x^{n-m}$ and thus also of ag_1. Either way $ag_1 = f_1 h$ for some $h \in R[t]$. Because a is constant, it can be factored into a product of prime elements $a = p_1 \cdots p_r$ of R, each of which remains prime in $R[t]$: $R[t]/(p_i) \cong R/(p_i)[t]$ is a domain. Since each p_i is constant and f_1 is irreducible, we have $p_i \nmid f_1$ for all i and it follows that $h = ah_2$. So $ag_1 = f_1 ah_2$, or $g_1 = f_1 h_2$, contradiction. $\square$

COROLLARY 15.28. *Let R be a UFD and let $\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ be any set of indeterminates. Then $S = R[\{t_i\}]$ is a UFD.*

PROOF. When I is finite, apply Theorem 15.26 and induction. When I is infinite, $S = \bigcup_J R[\{t_j\}]$, as J ranges over all finite subsets of I: any given polynomial can only involve finitely many indeterminates. For $f \in S$, let J be such that $f \in R[\{t_j\}]$, so $f = p_1 \cdots p_r$ is a factorization into prime elements of $R[\{t_j\}]$. Any two factorizations in S would themselves lie in some subalgebra involving finitely many determinates, so the factorization must be unique. $\square$

So a polynomial ring in infinitely many indeterminates over a field k is a non-Noetherian UFD. This is an important example to keep in mind: the UFD condition is in many ways a very delicate one, but it can still be satisfied by very "large"

We mention without proof two negative results.

THEOREM 15.29.
a) *(Roitman [**Ro93**]) There exists an integrally closed atomic domain R such that $R[t]$ is not atomic.*
b) *(Anderson-Quintero-Zafrullah) There exists an EL domain R such that $R[t]$ is not an EL domain.*

7. Application: the Schönemann-Eisenstein Criterion

The most famous criterion for irreducibility of univariate polynomials is named after Ferdinand Eisenstein [**Ei50**]. However, the version for polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}$ was proven several years earlier by Theodor Schönemann [**Sc45**], [**Sc46**]. For many years now few anglophone texts have associates Schönemann's name with this result, and his contribution might have been in real danger of being forgotten were it not for the beautiful recent article of Cox [**Co11**] on the early history of this result.

Nowadays it is common to state and prove a version of Eisenstein's criterion with respect to a prime ideal in a UFD. We give a slight generalization:

THEOREM 15.30. *(Schönemann-Eisenstein Criterion) Let R be a domain with fraction field K, and let $f(t) = a_d t^d + \ldots + a_1 t + a_0 \in R[t]$. Suppose that there exists a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R such that $a_d \notin \mathfrak{p}$, $a_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for all $0 \leq i < d$ and $a_0 \notin \mathfrak{p}^2$.*
a) *If f is primitive, then f is irreducible over $R[t]$.*
b) *If R is a GCD-domain, then f is irreducible over $K[t]$.*

PROOF. a) Suppose to the contrary that f is primitive and reducible over $R[t]$: i.e., there exists a factorization $f = gh$ with $g(t) = b_m t^m + \ldots + b_1 t + b_0$, $h(t) = c_n t^m + \ldots + c_1 t + c_0$, $\deg(g), \deg(h) < \deg(f)$ and $b_m c_n \neq 0$. Since $a_0 = b_0 c_0 \in \mathfrak{p} \setminus \mathfrak{p}^2$, it follows that exactly one of b_0, c_0 lies in $\mathfrak{p}$: say it is c_0 and not b_0. Moreover, since $a_d = b_m c_n \notin \mathfrak{p}$, $c_n \notin \mathfrak{p}$. Let k be the least index such that $c_k \notin \mathfrak{p}$, so $0 < k \leq n$. Then $b_0 c_k = a_k - (b_1 c_{k-1} + \ldots + b_k c_0) \in \mathfrak{p}$. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, it follows that at least one of b_0, c_k lies in $\mathfrak{p}$, a contradiction.
b) Suppose R is a GCD-domain and (seeking a contradiction) that f is reducible over $K[t]$. By Corollary 15.25b), we may write $f = gh$ with $g, h \in R[t]$ and $\deg(g), \deg(h) < \deg(f)$. Then the proof of part a) goes gives a contradiction. $\square$

COROLLARY 15.31. *Let R be a GCD-domain containing a prime element π (e.g. a UFD that is not a field). Then the fraction field K of R is not separably closed.*

PROOF. The element π is prime iff the principal ideal $\mathfrak{p} = (\pi)$ is a nonzero prime ideal. Then $\pi \notin \mathfrak{p}^2$, so for all $n > 1$, $P_n(t) = t^n - \pi$ is Eisenstein with respect to $\mathfrak{p}$ and hence irreducible in $K[t]$. Choosing n to be prime to the characteristic of K yields a degree n separable field extension $L_n := K[t]/(P_n)$. $\square$

8. Application: Determination of $\operatorname{Spec} R[t]$ for a PID R

Let R be a PID. We wish to determine all prime ideals of the ring $R[t]$. Let us begin with some general structural considerations. First, R is a one-dimensional Noetherian UFD; so by Theorems 8.38, 15.27 and 8.56, $R[t]$ is a two-dimensional Noetherian UFD. Being a UFD, its height one ideals are all principal. Since it has dimension two, every nonprincipal prime ideal is maximal. Therefore it comes down to finding all the maximal ideals.

However, to avoid assuming the Dimension Theorem, we begin with milder hypotheses on a prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$, following [**R**, pp. 22-23].

Namely, let $\mathcal{P}$ be a nonzero prime ideal of $R[t]$. We assume – only! – that $\mathcal{P}$ is not principal. By Theorem 15.1, we are entitled to a prime element f_1 of $\mathcal{P}$. Since $\mathcal{P} \neq (f_1)$, let $f_2 \in \mathcal{P} \setminus (f_1)$. Then $\gcd(f_1, f_2) = 1$: since $\gcd(f_1, f_2) \mid f_1$, the only other possibility is $(\gcd(f_1, f_2)) = (f_1)$, so $f_1 \mid f_2$ and $f_2 \in (f_1)$, contradiction.

FIRST CLAIM Let K be the fraction field of R. The elements f_1 and f_2 are also relatively prime in the GCD-domain $K[t]$. Indeed, suppose that $f_1 = hg_1$, $f_2 = hg_2$ with $h, g_1, g_2 \in K[t]$ and h a nonunit. By Gauss' Lemma, we may write $h = ah_0$, $g_1 = b_1 \gamma_1$, $g_2 = b_2 \gamma_2$ with $a_1, b_1, b_2 \in K$ and h_0, γ_1, γ_2 primitive elements of $R[t]$. Again by Gauss' Lemma, $h_0 \gamma_1$ and $h_0 \gamma_2$ are also primitive, so $f_1 = hg_1 = (ab_1)(h_0 \gamma_1) \in R[t]$, which implies that $ab_1 \in R$. Similarly, $ab_2 \in R$, so h_0 is a nonunit of $R[t]$ which divides both f_1 and f_2, contradiction.
    Let $\mathcal{M} := \langle f_1, \ f_2 \rangle$, and put $\mathfrak{m} = \mathcal{M} \cap R$. It remains to show that, as the notation suggests, $\mathcal{M}$ is a maximal ideal of $R[t]$ and $\mathfrak{m}$ is a maximal ideal of R.

SECOND CLAIM $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$. Since $K[t]$ is a PID and f_1, f_2 are relatively prime in $K[t]$, there exist $a, b \in K[t]$ such that $af_1 + bf_2 = 1$. Let $0 \neq c \in R$ be an element which is divisible by the denominator of each coefficient of a and b: then

$(ca)f_1 + (cb)f_2 = c$ with $ca, cb \in R$, so that $c \in \mathfrak{m}$.

Now put $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} \cap R$, so $\mathfrak{p} = (p)$ is a prime ideal of the PID R. Moreover,

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} \cap R \supset \mathcal{M} \cap R = \mathfrak{m} \supsetneq 0,$$

so $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal. Since $\mathcal{P} \supset \mathfrak{p}$, $\mathcal{P}$ corresponds to a prime ideal in $R[t]/\mathfrak{p}R[t] = (R/\mathfrak{p})[t]$, a PID. Therefore $\mathcal{P}$ is generated by $p \in \mathfrak{p}$ and an element $f \in R[t]$ whose image in $(R/\mathfrak{p})[t]$ is irreducible.

We therefore have proved:

THEOREM 15.32. *Let R be a PID, and $\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{Spec} R[t]$. Then exactly one of the following holds:*
(0) $\mathcal{P}$ has height 0: $\mathcal{P} = (0)$.
(i) $\mathcal{P}$ has height one: $\mathcal{P} = (f)$, for a prime element $f \in R[t]$.
(ii) $\mathcal{P}$ has height two: $\mathcal{P} = \langle p, f \rangle$, where p is a prime element of R and $f \in R[t]$ is an element whose image in $(R/p)[t]$ is irreducible. Moreover both $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathfrak{p} := \mathcal{P} \cap R$ are maximal, and $[R[t]/\mathcal{P} : R/\mathfrak{p}] < \infty$.

EXERCISE 15.13. *a) Suppose R has only finitely prime ideals, so is not a Hilbert-Jacobson ring. By Theorem 12.21, there $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R[t]$ such that $\mathfrak{m} \cap R = (0)$. Find one, and explain where $\mathfrak{m}$ fits in to the classification of Theorem 15.32.*
*b) (Zanello [**Za04**]) Deduce: for a PID R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R has infinitely many prime ideals.
(ii) Every maximal ideal of $R[t]$ has height two.

9. Power series rings over UFDs

EXERCISE 15.14. *Show: if R is ACCP, so is $R[[t]]$.*

In particular, if R is a UFD, $R[[t]]$ is ACCP. But of course the more interesting question is the following: *Must $R[[t]]$ be a UFD?*

In contrast to Gauss's Theorem, whether a formal power series ring over a UFD must be a UFD was a perplexing problem to 20th century algebraists and remained open for many years. Some special cases were known relatively early on.

THEOREM 15.33. *If R is a PID, then $R[[t]]$ is a UFD.*

PROOF. By Theorem 15.1, it suffices to show that every nonzero prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$ of $R[[t]]$ has a prime element. If $t \in \mathcal{P}$, we're done. Otherwise, let $q : R[[t]] \to R$ be the quotient map and $\mathfrak{p} = q_*\mathcal{P}$. Since R is a PID, $\mathfrak{p}$ can be generated by one element, and then by Theorem 8.40a), so can $\mathcal{P}$. $\qquad \square$

In particular, if k is a field then $k[[t_1]]$ is a PID, so $k[[t_1, t_2]] = k[[t_1]][[t_2]]$ is a UFD. This gives the first two cases of the following result, which we will not prove here.

THEOREM 15.34. *(Rückert [**Rü33**], Krull [**Kr37**]) Let k be a field, and let n be a positive integer. Then $k[[t_1, \ldots, t_n]]$ is a UFD.*

A significant generalization was proved by Buchsbaum and Samuel, independently, in 1961. A Noetherian domain R is **regular** if for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R, the height of $\mathfrak{m}$ is equal to the dimension of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ as a vector space over the field $R/\mathfrak{m}$.

THEOREM 15.35. *([**Bu61**], [**Sa61**]) If R is a regular UFD, then so is $R[[t]]$.*

The paper [**Sa61**] also exhibits a UFD R for which $R[[t]]$ is *not* a UFD.

What about formal power series in countably infinitely many indeterminates? Let k be a field. There is more than one reasonable way to define such a domain. One the one hand, one could simply take the "union" (formally, direct limit) of finite formal power series rings $k[[t_1, \ldots, t_n]]$ under the evident inclusion maps. In any element of this ring, only finitely many indeterminates appear. However, it is useful also to consider a larger ring, in which the elements are infinite formal k-linear combinations of monomials $t_{i_1} \cdots t_{i_n}$. Let us call this latter domain $k[[t_1, \ldots, t_n, \ldots]]$.

In fact, we have seen this domain before: it is isomorphic to the Dirichlet ring $\mathcal{D}_k$ of functions $f : \mathbb{Z}^+ \to k$ with pointwise addition and convolution product. To see this, we use unique factorization in $\mathbb{Z}$! Namely, enumerate the prime numbers $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ and write $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ as $n = \prod_{i=1}^\infty p_i^{a_i}$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $a_i = 0$ for all sufficiently large i. Then the map which sends $f \in \mathcal{D}_k$ to the formal power series $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} f(n) \prod_{i=1}^\infty t_i^{a_i}$ gives an isomorphism from $\mathcal{D}_k$ to $k[[t_1, \ldots, t_n, \ldots]]$. In 1959, E.D. Cashwell and C.J. Everett used Theorem 15.34 to prove the following result. A key part of their proof was later simplified by C.F. Martin, who pointed out the applicability of König's Infinity Lemma.

THEOREM 15.36. (**[CE59]**, **[Ma71]**)
a) *For any field k, the ring of formal power series $k[[t_1, \ldots, t_n, \ldots]]$ is a UFD.*
b) *In particular, the ring $\mathcal{D}_\mathbb{C} = \{f : \mathbb{Z}^+ \to \mathbb{C}\}$ of arithmetic functions is a UFD.*

In almost any first number theory course one studies unique factorization and also arithmetic functions, including the Dirichlet ring structure (which e.g. leads to an immediate proof of the Möbius Inversion Formula). That arithmetic functions are themselves an example of unique factorization is however a very striking result that does not seem to be well-known to most students or practitioners of number theory. I must confess, however, that I (a number theorist) know of no particular application of Theorem 15.36. I would be interested to learn of one!

10. Nagata's Criterion

PROPOSITION 15.37. *Let R be a domain, S a saturated multiplicative subset, and $f \in R \setminus S$. If f is prime as an element of R, it is also prime as an element of R_S.*

PROOF. Since $f \in R \setminus S$, f is not a unit in R_S. Let $\alpha, \beta \in R_S$ be such that $f \mid \alpha\beta$ in R_S. So there exists $\gamma \in R_S$ such that $\gamma f = \alpha\beta$; putting $\alpha = \frac{x_1}{s_1}$, $\beta = \frac{x_2}{s_2}$, $\gamma = \frac{x_3}{s_3}$ and clearing denominators, we get $s_1 s_2 x_3 f = s_3 x_1 x_2$, so $f \mid r_3 x_1 x_2$. If $f \mid s_3$, then since S is saturated, $f \in S$, contradiction. So, being prime, f divides x_1 or x_2 in R, hence *a fortiori* in R_S and therefore it also divides either $\frac{x_1}{s_1}$ or $\frac{x_2}{s_2}$ in R_S, since these are associates to x_1 and x_2. $\square$

THEOREM 15.38. *Every localization of a UFD is again a UFD.*

EXERCISE 15.15. *Prove Theorem 15.38.*
(Suggestions: one gets an easy proof by combining Theorem 15.1 with Proposition 15.37. But the result is also rather straightforward to prove directly.)

A saturated multiplicative subset S of R is **primal**[2] if it is generated by the units of R and by the prime elements of S.

LEMMA 15.39. *An irreducible element of a primal subset is prime.*

PROOF. Suppose S is primal and $f \in S$ is irreducible. By definition, there exists a unit u and prime elements $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_n$ such that $f = u\pi_1 \cdots \pi_n$. Since $u\pi_1$ is also prime, we may as well assume that $u = 1$. Then, since f is irreducible, we must have $n = 1$ and $f = \pi_1$. $\square$

THEOREM 15.40. *For an atomic domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) Every saturated multiplicative subset of R is primal.
(ii) R is a UFD.

PROOF. Since the set $R^\times$ of units is trivially generated by the empty set of prime elements, both conditions hold if R is a field, so let us now assume otherwise.

Assume (i). Then, since R is a factorization domain which is not a field, there exists an irreducible element f of R. Let S be the saturated multiplicative subset generated by S, which consists of all units of R together with all divisors of positive powers f^n of f. Since S is primal and strictly contains $R^\times$, there must exist a prime element π which divides f^n for some n. In other words, $f^n \in \pi R$, and since πR is prime, we must have that $f = x\pi$ for some $x \in R$. Since f is irreducible we must have $x \in R^\times$, i.e., $f \sim \pi$ and is therefore a prime element. So R is an ACCP domain and an EL-domain and hence a factorization domain by Theorem 3.3.

Assume (ii), let S be a saturated multiplicative subset of R, and suppose that $f \in S \setminus R^\times$. Then $f = u\pi_1^{a_1} \cdots \pi_n^{a_n}$ where the π_i's are prime elements. Since each $\pi_i \mid f$, $\pi_i \in S$ for all i. It follows that indeed S is generated by its prime elements together with the units of R. $\square$

Because of Theorem 15.40, it is no loss of generality to restate Theorem 15.38 as: the localization of a UFD at a primal subset is again a UFD. The following elegant result of Nagata may be viewed as a converse.

THEOREM 15.41. *(Nagata [**Na57**]) Let R be a factorization domain and $S \subset R$ a primal subset. If the localized domain R_S is a UFD, then so is R.*

PROOF. By Theorem 15.8 it's enough to show: if $f \in R$ is irreducible, then f is prime.
Case 1: $f \notin S$, so f is not a unit in R_S. Since R_S is a UFD, it is enough to show that f is irreducible in R_S. So assume not: $f = \frac{x_1}{s_1} \cdot \frac{x_2}{s_2}$ with $x_1, x_2 \in R \setminus S$ and $s_1, s_2 \in S$. hen $s_1 s_2 f = x_1 x_2$. By assumption, we may write $s_1 = up_1 \cdots p_m$ and $s_2 = vq_1 \cdots q_n$, where $u, v \in R^\times$ and p_i, q_j are all prime elements of R. So $p_1 \mid x_1 x_2$; since p_1 is a prime, we must have either $\frac{x_1}{p_1} \in R$ or $\frac{x_2}{q_2} \in R$. Similarly for all the other p_i's and q_j's, so that we can at each stage divide either the first or the second factor on the right hand side by each prime element on the left hand side, without leaving the ring R. Therefore we may write $f = (\frac{1}{uv})\frac{x_1}{t_1}\frac{x_2}{t_2}$ where t_1, t_2 are each products of the primes p_i and q_j, hence elements of S, and also such that $t_1 \mid x_1$, $t_2 \mid x_2$, i.e., the factorization takes place in R. Moreover, since $x_i \in R \setminus S$ and $t_i \in S$, $\frac{x_i}{t_i}$ is not even a unit in R_S, hence *a fortiori* not a unit in R. Therefore we have exhibited a nontrivial factorization of f in R, contradiction.
Case 2: $f \in S$. Since S is primal, by Lemma 15.39, f is prime. $\square$

---

[2]This terminology is my invention: do you like it?

Remark: If S is the saturation of a finitely generated multiplicative set, the hypothesis that R is a factorization domain can be omitted.

Application: Let A be a UFD and consider $R = A[t]$. Put $S = A \setminus \{0\}$. As for any multiplicative subset of a UFD, S is generated by prime elements. But moreover, since $A[t]/(\pi A[t]) \cong (A/\pi A)[t]$, every prime element π of A remains prime in $A[t]$, so viewing S as the multiplicative subset of $A[t]$ consisting of nonzero constant polynomials, it too is generated by prime elements. But if F is the fraction field of A, $R_S = (A[t])_S = F[t]$ which is a PID and hence a UFD. Nagata's theorem applied to R and S now tells us – for the third time! – that $R = A[t]$ is a UFD.

Nagata used Theorem 15.41 to study the coordinate rings of affine quadric cones.

Let k be a field of characteristic different from 2, and let $f(x) = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be a **quadratic form**, i.e., a homogeneous polynomial of degree 2 with k coefficients. We assume that f the associated bilinear form $(x, y) \mapsto \frac{1}{2}(f(x+y) - f(x) - f(y))$ is nonsingular. Equivalently, by making an invertible linear change of variables every quadratic form can be diagonalized, and a quadratic form is nonsingular iff it admits a diagonalization

$$(36) \qquad f(x) = a_1 x_1^2 + \ldots + a_n x_n^2 \text{ with } a_1, \ldots, a_n \in k^\times.$$

We wish to study the **affine quadric cone** associated to f, namely $R_f = k[x]/(f)$. If quadratic forms f and g are isometric – i.e., differ by an invertible linear change of variables – then $R_f \cong R_g$, so we assume if we like that f is in diagonal form as in (36) above. If $n \geq 3$ then every nonsingular diagonal quadratic polynomial is irreducible, so R_f is a domain. If k is quadratically closed – i.e., admits no proper quadatic extension – then conversely any binary ($n = 2$) quadratic form is reducible, so R_f is not a domain. (If f is not quadratically closed, there exist irreducible binary quadratic forms, but we will not consider them here.)

THEOREM 15.42. *Let* $f = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ *be a nondegenerate quadratic form. Then* $R_f = k[x]/(f)$ *is a UFD iff* $n \geq 5$.

PROOF. By the remarks above, R_f is a domain iff $n \geq 3$, so we may certainly restrict to this case. Because $\mathbb{C}$ is algebraically closed, every quadratic form in $n \geq 2$ variables is **isotropic**, i.e., there exists $0 \neq a \in k^n$ such that $f(a) = 0$: indeed, the first $n-1$ coordinates of a may be chosen arbitrarily. By an elementary theorem in the algebraic theory of quadratic forms [**La06**, Thm. I.3.4], we may make a change of variables to bring f into the form:

$$f(x) = x_1 x_2 + g(x_3, \ldots, x_n).$$

Case 1: Suppose $n = 3$, so that

$$f(x) = x_1 x_2 - a x_3^2$$

for some $a \in k^\times$. In this case, to show that R_f is not a UFD it suffices to show that the images $\overline{x_1}, \overline{x_2}, \overline{x_3}$ of x_1, x_2, x_3 in R_f are nonassociate irreducibles, for then $\overline{x_1 x_2} = a\overline{x_3}^2$ exhibits a non-unique factorization! To establish this, regard $k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ as a graded $\mathbb{C}$-algebra in the usual way – with x_1, x_2, x_3 each of degree 1 – so that the quotient R_f by the homogeneous ideal (f) inherits a grading. Since $\overline{x_1}$ has degree 1, if it were reducible, it would factor as the product of a degree one

element $c_1 x_1 + c_2 x_2 + x_3 x_3 + (f)$ and a degree zero element $r + (f)$, and thus

$$(rc_1 - 1)x_1 + rc_2 x_2 + rc_3 x_3 \in (f).$$

But the left hand side has degree 1, whereas all nonzero elements in (f) have degree 2 or higher, so $r \in \mathbb{C}[x]^\times$ and therefore the factorization is trivial. The irreducibility of $\overline{x_2}$ and $\overline{x_3}$ is proved in the same way. If $\overline{x_1} \sim \overline{x_3}$ in R_f, then we may divide both sides of $\overline{x_1 x_2} - a\overline{x_3}^2$ by $\overline{x_1}$ and deduce that also $\overline{x_2} \sim \overline{x_3}$. But in the quotient ring $R_f/(\overline{x_3})$, $\overline{x_3}$ maps to 0 and $\overline{x_1}$ and $\overline{x_2}$ do not, contradiction. So R_f is not a UFD.
Case 2: Suppose $n = 4$, so $f(x) = x_1 x_2 + g(x_3, x_4)$, where $g(x_3, x_4)$ is a nonsingular binary form. Here for the first time we use the full strength of the quadratic closure of k: since $k^\times = k^{\times 2}$, any two nonsingular quadratic forms in the same number of variables are isometric, so we may assume WLOG that

$$f(x) = x_1 x_2 - x_3 x_4.$$

Now we argue exactly as in Case 1 above: in R_f, the images $\overline{x_1}, \overline{x_2}, \overline{x_3}, \overline{x_4}$ are all non-associate irredcuble elements, so $\overline{x_1 x_2} = \overline{x_3 x_4}$ is a non-unique factorization.
Case 3: $n \geq 5$. Then $n - 2 \geq 3$, so g is irreducible in the UFD $\mathbb{C}[x_3, \ldots, x_n]$, hence also in $\mathbb{C}[x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_n]$. Therefore $R_f/(\overline{x_1}) = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/(x_1, f) = \mathbb{C}[x_2, \ldots, x_n]/(g)$ is a domain, i.e., $\overline{x_1}$ is a prime element. Moreover,

$$R[\overline{x_1}^{-1}] = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_1^{-1}]/(x_1 x_2 - g)$$

$$\cong \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_1^{-1}]/(x_2 - \frac{g}{x_1}) \cong \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_n, x_1^{-1}]$$

is a localization of the UFD $\mathbb{C}[x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_n]$ hence a UFD. By Nagata's Criterion (Theorem 15.41), R_f itself is a UFD. $\square$

Now let k be a field of characteristic not 2 and $f \in k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ a nondegenerate quadratic form. Without changing the isomorphism class of R_q we may diagonalize f; moreover without changing the ideal (f) we may scale by any element of $k^\times$, so without loss of generality we need only consider forms $x_1^2 + a_2 x_2^2 + \ldots + a_n x_n^2$.

THEOREM 15.43. *Let k be a field of characteristic different from 2, and let*

$$f = x_1^2 + a_2 x_2^2 + \ldots + a_n x_n^2$$

be a nonsingular quadratic form over k. Put $R_f = k[x]/(f)$.
   a) *If $n \leq 2$ then R_f is not an integrally closed domain.*
   b) *If $n = 3$, then R_f is a UFD iff f is anistropic: $\forall a \in k^n$, $f(a) = 0 \implies a = 0$.*
   c) *Suppose $f = x_1^2 - ax_2^2 - bx_3^2 - cx_4^2$.*
      (i) *If a is a square in k, then R_f is a UFD iff $-bc$ is not a square in k.*
      (ii) *If none of a, b, c, $-ab$, $-ac$, $-bc$ is a square in k, then R_f is a UFD iff $-abc$ is not a square.*
   d) *If $n \geq 5$, then R_f is a UFD.*

PROOF. a) If $n \leq 2$, R_f is never an integrally closed domain.
b) The proof of Theorem 15.42 goes through to show that if f is isotropic (i.e., not anisotropic), R_f is not a UFD. The anisotropic case is due to Samuel [**Sa64**].
Part c) is due to T. Ogoma [**O74**].
Part d) goes back at least to van der Waerden [**vdW39**]. In [**Na57**], M. Nagata gives a short proof using Theorem 15.41. $\square$

It is also interesting to consider affine rings of inhomogeneous quadric hypersurfaces. For instance, we state without proof the following result.

THEOREM 15.44. *For $n \geq 1$, let $R_n := \mathbb{R}[t_1, \ldots, t_{n+1}]/(t_1^2 + \ldots + t_{n+1}^2 - 1)$ be the ring of polynomial functions on the n-sphere S^n.*
a) (Bouvier [Bo78]) If $n \geq 2$, then R_n is a UFD.
b) (Trotter [Tr88]) R_1 is isomorphic to the ring $\mathbb{R}[\cos \theta, \sin \theta]$ of real trigonometric polynomials, in which $(\sin \theta)(\sin \theta) = (1 + \cos \theta)(1 - \cos \theta))$ is an explicit non-unique factorization into irreducible elements. Hence R_1 is not a UFD.

11. The Euclidean Criterion

In this section we give a commutative algebraic generalization of Euclid's proof that there are infinitely many prime numbers, following [Cl17a]. Euclid's result on the face of it pertains to irreducible elements. It happens that in $\mathbb{Z}$ every irreducible element is prime, but that is a different (and deeper) result of Euclid.

It will be helpful to slightly adjust our terminology: here an **atom** will be the principal ideal generated by an irreducible element, so two irreducible elements determine the same atom iff they are associate. It seems more interesting to count atoms than irreducible elements, since in particular whenever an atomic domain that is not a field has infinite unit group it necessarily has infinitely many irreducible elements but not necessarily infinitely many atoms.

In fact our generalization works in some domains in which not all nonzero nonunits factor into irreducibles. A **Furstenberg domain** is a domain R in which every nonzero nonunit has an irreducible divisor.

We call a ring **semiprimitive** if it has zero Jacobson radical: i.e., if the only element lying in every maximal ideal is zero.

EXERCISE 15.16.   a) *Show: every atomic domain is a Furstenberg domain.*
  b) *Show: the ring $\mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{C})$ of holomorphic functions on the complex plane is a semiprimitive Furstenberg domain that is not an atomic domain.*

EXERCISE 15.17.   a) *Show that for a ring R the following conditions are equivalent:*
    (i) *There is an infinite sequence $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of pairwise comaximal, proper ideals of R.*
    (ii) *The set $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$ is infinite.*
  b) *Let R be a semiprimitive domain that is not a field. Show: $\mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$ is infinite.*

THEOREM 15.45. *(Euclidean Criterion [Cl17a, Thm. 2.3]) Let R be a semiprimitive domain that is not a field.*
  a) *There is a sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of pairwise comaximal nonunits.*
  b) *Suppose moreover that R is a Furstenberg domain. Then there is a sequence $\{p_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of pairwise comaximal irreducible elements. In particular R has infinitely many atoms.*

PROOF. a) We go by induction on n. Since R is not a field there is $a_1 \in R^\bullet \backslash R^\times$. Having chosen $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ that are pairwise comaximal nonunits, because $J(R) = (0)$ and R is a domain, there is $y \in R$ such that

$$a_{n+1} := ya_1 \cdots a_n + 1 \in R^\bullet \backslash R^\times.$$

(Because $a_1 \notin R^\times$ we cannot have $a_{n+1} = 0$.) Evidently we have $\langle a_i, a_{n+1} \rangle = R$ for all $1 \le i \le n$.

b) Again we go by induction on n. Since R is a Furstenberg domain and not a field there is some irreducible element p_1. Having chosen pairwise comaximal irreducible elements $p_1, \ldots, p_n$, because $J(R) = 0$ there is $y \in R$ such that

$$x := yp_1 \cdots p_n + 1 \in R^\bullet \backslash R^\times.$$

Because we are in a Furstenberg domain, the element x has an irreducible divisor p_{n+1}. Then for all $1 \le i \le n$ we have

$$1 = \left(\frac{x}{p_{n+1}} \right) p_{n+1} - y \left(\prod_{j \neq i} p_j \right) p_i,$$

which shows that $\langle p_i, p_{n+1} \rangle = 1$. Comaximal irreducible elements are nonassociate, so R has infinitely many atoms. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 15.46. *For any domain R, the domain $R[t]$ has infinitely many atoms.*

EXERCISE 15.18. *Prove Corollary 15.46. (Hint: the most interesting case is when R is finite!)*

COROLLARY 15.47. *Let R be a Furstenberg domain, not a field, such that $\#R > \#R^\times$. Show: R has infinitely many atoms.*

EXERCISE 15.19.   a) *Prove Corollary 15.47. (Suggestion: make use of the fact that $\#I = \#R$ for every nonzero ideal of R.)*
   b) *Deduce that if $R = \mathbb{Z}$ or if $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-1}]$ then R has infinitely many atoms.*

EXERCISE 15.20. *Let K be a number field – i.e., a finite degree extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ – and let $\mathbb{Z}_K$ be the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in K. Can you use Theorem 15.45 to show that $\mathbb{Z}_K$ has infinitely many atoms?*[3]

EXERCISE 15.21. *Let $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the ring of all algebraic integers – i.e., the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{C}$. Show: $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a semiprimitive domain that is not a field that has no irreducible elements. Thus in Theorem 15.45b) the hypothesis that R is a Furstenberg domain cannot be omitted.*

EXERCISE 15.22. *Let R be an integrally closed, Noetherian domain of Krull dimension one. (In other words, R is a Dedekind domain that is not a field. See Chapter 20 for more on Dedekind domains. Results from this chapter may be helpful in solving this exercise.) Show that the following are equivalent:*
   (i) *R is semiprimitive.*
   (ii) *R has infinitely many maximal ideals.*
   (iii) *R has inifnitely many atoms.*

---

[3]In fact $\mathbb{Z}_K$ has infinitely many principal prime ideals, but this is a rather deep theorem in algebraic number theory.

PROPOSITION 15.48. *Let R be a Noetherian domain of Krull dimension one. Then R is semiprimitive iff $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is infinite. When these conditions hold, R has infinitely many atoms.*

PROOF. For any domain R, if $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n\}$ is finite, then

$$J(R) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{m}_i \supset \prod_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{m}_i \supsetneq (0),$$

so R is not semiprimitive. Conversely, if $J(R) \supsetneq (0)$, then maximal ideals of R are minimal prime ideals of the Noetherian ring $R/J(R)$ hence are finite in nubmer by Theorem 10.13. Since Noetherian domains are atomic and atomic domains are Furstenberg, when $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is infinite the Euclidean Criterion applies to show that R has infinitely many atoms. □

LEMMA 15.49. *In an atomic domain, every prime ideal is generated by irreducible elements.*

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of the atomic domain R, and let $\{x_s\}_{s \in S}$ be a set of nonzero generators for $\mathfrak{p}$. Since R is atomic, we may factor $x_s = f_{s,1} \cdots f_{s,n_s}$ into irreducibles. Since $f_{s,1} \cdots f_{s,n_s}$ lies in the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$, some f_{s,j_s} does. By replacing $\{x_s\}_{s \in S}$ by $\{f_{s,j_s}\}_{s \in S}$ we get a set of irreducible generators for $\mathfrak{p}$. □

THEOREM 15.50. *Let R be an atomic domain with finitely atoms. Then R is semilocal Noetherian and $\dim R \leq 1$.*

PROOF. By Lemma 15.49, every prime ideal of R is generated by irreducibles. Since replacing a generator by an associate element does not change the ideal generated, we conclude that every prime ideal is finitely generated – so R is Noetherian by Cohen's Theorem (Theorem 4.31) – and that there are only finitely many prime ideals. If the Noetherian domain R had a nonzero, nonmaximal prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$, then let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal strictly containing $\mathfrak{p}$. By Corollary 8.53, there are infinitely many prime ideals $\mathfrak{q}$ with $(0) \subsetneq \mathfrak{q} \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}$, contradiction. □

Here is what we have shown so far: if R is an atomic domain, not a field, with finitely many atoms, then R must be semilocal, Noetherian and of Krull dimension 1. Conversely, if R is semilocal, Noetherian of Krull dimension 1 and integrally closed, then R has finitely many atoms. It's natural to attempt to remove the integral closure hypothesis and thereby get a characterization of atomic domains with finitely many atoms. However, things are not so simple:

EXAMPLE 15.51. *Let k be a field, and consider the subring*

$$R = k[[t^2, t^3]] = k + t^2 k[[t]]$$

of the formal power series ring $k[[t]]$. For $0 \neq f = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t^n \in k[[t]]$, we define $v(f)$ to be the least n such that $a_n \neq 0$. Then v is a discrete valuation on $k[[t]]$, and the only nonzero prime ideal of $k[[t]]$ is $(t) = \{f \in R \mid v(f) > 0\} \cup \{0\}$. The element t is integral over R – it satisfies the monic polynomial $x^2 - t^2$ – and from this it follows that the only nonzero prime ideal of R is

$$\mathfrak{m} = (tk[[t]]) \cap R = t^2 k[[t]] = \{f \in R \mid v(f) \geq 2\} \cup \{0\} = \langle t^2, t^3 \rangle.$$

and $R^\times = \{a_0 + \sum_{n \geq 2} a_n t^n \mid a_0 \neq 0\}$. We will give a complete description of the irreducibles of R. First we claim that $f \in R$ is irreducible iff $v(f) \in \{2, 3\}$.

Indeed a nontrivial factorization $f = xy$ involves $v(x), v(y) \geq 2$ hence $v(f) \geq 4$; conversely, if $v(f) \geq 4$ then $f = t^2 \frac{f}{t^2}$ is a nontrivial factorization. Since $k^\times \subset R^\times$, every irreducible is associate to one of the form

$$t^2 + \sum_{n \geq 3} a_n t^n, \ (v(f) = 2 \ case)$$

or one of the form

$$t^3 + \sum_{n \geq 4} a_n t^n, \ (v(f) = 3 \ case).$$

Associate elements have the same valuation, so certainly no irreducible of the first type is associate to an irreducible of the second type. We claim that $t^2 + \sum_{n \geq 3} a_n t^n$ is associate to $t^2 + \sum_{n \geq 3} b_n t^n$ iff $a_3 = b_3$ and $t^3 + \sum_{n \geq 3} a_n t^n$ is associate to $t^3 + \sum_{n \geq 3} b_n t^n$ iff $a_4 = b_4$. This can be done by direct computation:

$$(t^2 + a_3 t^3 + a_1 4 t^4 + a_5 t^5 + \ldots)(1 + u_2 t^2 + u_3 t^3 + \ldots)$$
$$= t^2 + a_3 t^3 + (a_4 + u_2)t^4 + (a_5 + a_3 u_2 + u_3)t^5 + \ldots,$$

so $a_3 = b_3$ and there is a unique choice of $u_2, u_3, \ldots$ leading to $a_n = b_n$ for all $n \geq 4$. The $v(f) = 3$ case is similar. Thus there are precisely $2\#k$ atoms, and hence a finite number iff k is finite.

In Chapter 22 we will revisit the study of **Cohen-Kaplansky domains**, i.e., atomic domains with finitely many atoms, once we have developed further structure theory of one-dimensional Noetherian domains.

CHAPTER 16

Principal rings and Bézout domains

A ring R in which every ideal is principal is called a **principal ring**. If R is moreover a domain, it is called a **principal ideal domain** (PID).

1. Principal ideal domains

PROPOSITION 16.1. *Let R be a UFD.*
  a) *If every maximal ideal of R is principal, then R is a PID.*
  b) *The ring R is a PID iff $\dim R \leq 1$.*

PROOF. a) Let R be a UFD in which every maximal ideal is principal. By Theorem 4.30 it is enough to show that every prime ideal in R is principal. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ be a nonzero prime ideal. By Theorem 15.1, $\mathfrak{p}$ contains a prime element p. But also $\mathfrak{p}$ lies in a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (\ell)$, so

$$(p) \subset \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{m} = (\ell).$$

Thus $\ell \mid p$; since p is a prime element we get $(p) = (\ell)$, so $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m} = (\ell)$ is principal.
b) The proof of part a) shows that in no domain can one have a proper containment of nonzero principal prime ideals. From this it follows that a PID has dimension at most 1. Conversely, Theorem 15.1 implies that every height one prime ideal in a UFD is prinicpal, so if $\dim R \leq 1$ then every prime ideal in R is principal, so – again by Theorem 4.30 – we get that R is a PID. $\square$

EXERCISE 16.1. *We develop an alternate proof of Proposition 16.1a) following W. Dubuque.*
a) Let R be a UFD, and let $S \subset R^{\bullet}$ be any subset. Show: $\gcd(S)$ exists.
b) Let R be a UFD in which all maximal ideals are principal, let I be a nonzero ideal in R. Show that we may write $I = \gcd(I)J$ for an ideal J which is not contained in any proper principal ideal, and conclude that $I = \gcd(I)$ is principal.

We now follow with some very familiar examples.

PROPOSITION 16.2. *The integer ring $\mathbb{Z}$ is a principal ideal domain.*

PROPOSITION 16.3. *For any field k, the univariate polynomial ring $k[t]$ is a principal ideal domain.*

Surely the most reasonable way to prove Propositions 16.2 and 16.3 is by exploiting the division algorithms that both rings are well known to possess. We will consider Euclidean rings later in this chapter, so for now we take it as a challenge to bring the theory we have developed so far to bear to give other, less reasonable, proofs! For a property P of rings, a ring R is **residually P** if for all nonzero ideals I of R, the quotient R/I has property P.

LEMMA 16.4.   a) *The ring $\mathbb{Z}$ is residually Artinian.*

    b) *For any field k, the ring $k[t]$ is residually Artinian.*
    c) *If a ring R is residually Artinian, then $\dim R \leq 1$.*

PROOF. a) For any nonzero $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the ring $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is finite and thus Artinian.
b) For any nonzero $n(t) \in k[t]$, the ring $k[t]/(n(t))$ is a k-vector space of dimension
equal to the degree of $n(t)$. So $k[t]/(n(t))$ is Artinian as a k-module hence *a fortiori*
is Artinian as a ring.
c) By contraposition: if $\mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_2$ are prime ideals, then the chain $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_2$
shows that $\dim R/\mathfrak{p}_1 \geq 1$, so $R/\mathfrak{p}_1$ is not Artinian. $\square$

Combining Proposition 16.1 and Lemma 16.4 we find that it suffices to show that
the rings $\mathbb{Z}$ and $k[t]$ are PIDs it suffices to show that they are UFDs. Indeed we have
already seen that $k[t]$ is a UFD, a special case of Theorem 15.27. As for showing
that $\mathbb{Z}$ is a UFD, here are two proofs the reader may not have seen before:

First proof: Indeed a decomposition $n = p_1 \cdots p_r$ corresponds to a composition
series for the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is finite, it is certainly Noetherian
and Artinian, so composition series exist. Moreover the Jordan-Hölder theorem
implies that any two composition series have the same number of terms – i.e.,
$r = s = \ell(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$ – and that after a permutation the sequences of isomorphism
classes of composition factors become identical.

Second proof (Lindemann [**Li33**], Zermelo [**Ze34**]): We prove both the existence
and uniqueness of the factorization by an inductive argument, specifically by appeal
to the well-ordering of the positive integers under $\leq$.
    Existence: let S be the set of integers $n > 1$ which *do not* have at least one
prime factorization. We wish to show that S is empty so, seeking a contradiction,
suppose not. Then by well-ordering S has a least element, say N. If N is prime,
then we have found a prime factorization, so suppose it is not prime: that is, we
may write $N = N_1 N_2$ with $1 < N_1, N_2 < N$. Thus N_1 and N_2 are too small to lie
in S so each have prime factorizations, say $N_1 = p_1 \cdots p_r$, $N_2 = q_1 \cdots q_s$, and then
$N = p_1 \cdots p_r q_1 \cdots q_s$ gives a prime factorization of N, contradiction!
    Uniqueness: we claim that the factorization of a positive integer is unique.
Assume not; then the set of positive integers which have at least two different
standard form factorizations is nonempty, so has a least element, say N, where:

$$(37) \qquad N = p_1 \cdots p_r = q_1 \cdots q_s.$$

Here the p_i's and q_j's are prime numbers, not necessarily distinct from each other.
However, we must have $p_1 \neq q_j$ for any j. Indeed, if we had such an equality, then
we could cancel and, by an inductive argument we have already rehearsed, reduce
to a situation in which the factorization must be unique. In particular $p_1 \neq q_1$.
Without loss of generality, assume $p_1 < q_1$. Then, if we subtract $p_1 q_2 \cdots q_s$ from
both sides of (37), we get

$$(38) \qquad M := N - p_1 q_2 \cdots q_s = p_1(p_2 \cdots p_r - q_2 \cdots q_s) = (q_1 - p_1)(q_2 \cdots q_s).$$

By the assumed minimality of N, the prime factorization of M must be unique.
However, (38) gives two different factorizations of M, and we can use these to
get a contradiction. Specifically, $M = p_1(p_2 \cdots p_r - q_2 \cdots q_s)$ shows that $p_1 \mid M$.
Therefore, when we factor $M = (q_1 - p_1)(q_2 \cdots q_s)$ into primes, at least one of the
prime factors must be p_1. But $q_2, \ldots, q_j$ are already primes which are different from

p_1, so the only way we could get a p_1 factor is if $p_1 \mid (q_1 - p_1)$. But this implies $p_1 \mid q_1$, and since q_1 is also prime this implies $p_1 = q_1$. Contradiction!

EXERCISE 16.2. *Let R be a ring, and suppose that the univariate polynomial ring $R[t]$ is a PID. Show: R is a field.*

PROPOSITION 16.5. *Let R be a Noetherian local ring with a principal maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (a)$. Then every nonzero ideal of R is of the form (a^i) for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, R is a principal ring.*

PROOF. The Krull Intersection Theorem gives $\bigcap_i \mathfrak{m}^i = \bigcap_i (a^i) = 0$. It follows that for any nonzero $r \in R$, there exists a largest $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r \in (a^i)$, i.e., there exists $s \in R$ such that $r = sa^i$. But if s were not a unit then it would lie in $\mathfrak{m}$ and thus r would lie in $\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}$, contradiction. So s is a unit and $(r) = \mathfrak{m}^i$. Thus to every nonzero element r of I we attach a non-negative integer i_r. Now if I is any nonzero ideal of R, choose a nonzero element r of I with i_r minimal among elements of I. Then $I \supset (r) = \mathfrak{m}^i$, and the other containment follows by minimality of i_r. $\square$

PROPOSITION 16.6. *For any field k, the formal power series ring $k[[t]]$ is a PID.*

EXERCISE 16.3. *Give several proofs of Proposition 16.6.*
(Suggestions: (i) Use Theorem 8.40a). (ii) Use Theorem 8.40b) and Proposition 16.5.) (iii) Let I be a nonzero ideal in $k[[t]]$ and let $f \in I$ be an element whose "order of vanishing" – i..e., the index of the least nonzero Laurent series coefficient – is minimal among elements of I. Show: $I = \langle f \rangle$.)

2. Structure theory of principal rings

PROPOSITION 16.7. *Let R be a principal ring.*
a) For any multiplicative subset S, the localization R_S is principal.
b) For any ideal I of R, the quotient R/I is principal.

EXERCISE 16.4. *Prove Proposition 16.7.*

PROPOSITION 16.8. *For rings $R_1, \ldots, R_n$, the following are equivalent:*
(i) Each R_i is a principal ring.
(ii) The direct product $\prod_{i=1}^{n} R_i$ is a principal ring.

EXERCISE 16.5. *a) Prove Proposition 16.8.*
b) Show: no infinite product of nonzero principal rings is a principal ring.

A principal ring $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is **special** if it is a local Artinian ring, i.e., if it is local and the maximal ideal is principal and nilpotent. The complete structure of ideals in special principal rings can be deduced from Proposition 16.5: if n is the least positive integer such that $\mathfrak{m}^n = 0$, then the ideals of R are precisely the powers $\mathfrak{m}^i = (\pi^i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$.

We now give a structure theorem for principal rings, due originally to Krull [**Kr24**], as a byproduct of a striking result of Kaplansky [**Ka49**].

THEOREM 16.9.   a) *(Kaplansky) Let R be a Noetherian ring in which each maximal ideal is principal. Then R is the direct product of a finite number of PIDs and special principal rings.*

b) *(Krull) A ring is principal iff it is a finite direct product of rings, each of which is either a PID or a special principal ring.*

PROOF. It suffices to prove part a), for then part b) follows immediately.
Step 1: Since R is Noetherian of dimension at most 1, it has finitely many minimal primes $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r$, and all other primes are maximal. The irreducible components of $\operatorname{Spec} R$ are $V(\mathfrak{p}_1), \ldots, V(\mathfrak{p}_r)$. We claim that the irreducible components are pairwise disjoint: if not there is $\mathcal{P} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ containing two distinct minimal primes, and then $R_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a Noetherian local ring with principal maximal ideal and more than one minimal prime. In particular its ideals are not totally ordered under inclusion, which contradicts Proposition 16.5.

In other words, the minimal primes are pairwise comaximal. By Exercise 10.13 there is $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^r \mathfrak{p}_i^N = (0)$. Taking $R_i := R/\mathfrak{p}_i^N$, the Chinese Remainder Theorem gives

$$R = \prod_{i=1}^r R_i.$$

The maximal ideals of R_i are precisely the pushforwards under the quotient map of the maximal ideals of R containing $\mathfrak{p}_i$, so each R_i is a Noetherian ring in which each maximal ideal is principal and having a unique minimal prime. So it suffices to show that a Noetherian ring R having a unique minimal prime in which each maximal ideal is principal is either a PID or a special principal ring.
Step 2: If $\dim R = 0$ then R is Artinian local with principal maximal ideal, so Proposition 16.5 implies that R is a special principal ring. So suppose $\dim R = 1$. If $\operatorname{nil} R = (0)$ then we are assuming that all the prime ideals of R are principal, so R is a PID by Theorem 4.30. If $\operatorname{nil} R \supsetneq (0)$, let x be a nonzero nilpotent element, and let $\mathcal{P}$ be a maximal ideal containing $\operatorname{ann}(x)$. Then the image of x in $R_{\mathcal{P}}$ is a nonzero nilpotent. The ring $R_{\mathcal{P}}$ is one-dimensional local with principal maximal ideal $\mathcal{P} R_{\mathcal{P}} = \langle a \rangle$, say, so by Proposition 16.5 every nonzero ideal of $R_{\mathcal{P}}$ is of the form $\langle a^i \rangle$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. In such a ring the only nonzero prime ideal is $\langle a \rangle$, so since $R_{\mathcal{P}}$ has dimension 1, the zero ideal must be prime and $R_{\mathcal{P}}$ must be a domain, contradicting the existence of nonzero nilpotent elements. $\square$

Having studied PIDs, let us now turn to the case of special principal rings and principal Artinian rings: to be sure a ring is principal Artinian iff it is a finite product of special principal rings.. The most familiar examples of principal Artinian rings (resp. of special principal rings) are $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}/p^a\mathbb{Z}$ for a prime number p). Any quotient of a PID by a nonzero ideal is a principal Artinian ring (Exercise 16.9a)) and any quotient of a PID by a prime power ideal is a special principal ring.

A ring R is **self-injective** if R is an injective R-module. By Exercise 3.50d), a domain is self-injective iff it is a field.

EXERCISE 16.6. *Let $\{R_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a nonempty family of nonzero rings, and put $R := \prod_{i \in I} R_i$. Show: R is self-injective iff R_i is self-injective for all $i \in I$.*

PROPOSITION 16.10. *A principal Artinian ring is self-injective.*

PROOF. Every special principal ring is a finite product of local special principal rings, so by Exercise 16.6 we reduce to the case of a local special principal ring $(R, (\pi))$. By Proposition 16.5 if N is the least positive integer such that $\pi^N = 0$ then the ideals of R are precisely (π^a) for $0 \leq a \leq N$. By Baer's Criterion it is

enough to extend every R-module homomorphism $\varphi : (\pi^a) \to R$ to all of R. The R-module (π^a) is cyclic with annihilator (π^{N-a}), hence $(\pi^a) \cong_R R/(\pi^{N-a})$, so each such homomorphism is uniquely specified by mapping π^a to any element of R killed by π^{N-a}, i.e., to any element of (π^a). Thus φ maps π^a to $x\pi^a$ for some $x \in R$, and we can extend it to $[x] : R \to R$, i.e., $y \in R \mapsto xy$. $\square$

Proposition 16.10 implies that for $N > 1$ the ring $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ is self-injective. It follows that if A is an N-torsion commutative group and $x \in A$ has order N, then there is a subgroup B of A such that $A = \langle x \rangle \oplus B$. This is precisely what is needed in order to write a finite commutative group as a direct sum of cyclic subgroups. More generally, we can recover the following well known structure theorem.

THEOREM 16.11. *Every finitely generated module over a PID is a finite direct sum of cyclic modules.*

PROOF. Let R be a PID, and let M be a finitely generated R-module. As usual, we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \to M[\mathrm{tors}] \to M \to M/M[\mathrm{tors}] \to 0.$$

The module $M/M[\mathrm{tors}]$ is finitely generated and torsionfree, hence by Theorem 3.64 is free, i.e., is isomorphic to a finite direct sum of copies of R itself. Since R is Noetherian and M is finitely generated, the torsion submodule $T := M[\mathrm{tors}]$ is also finitely generated, hence it has nonzero annihilator $I = (a)$. Thus T is a finitely generated module over the special principal ring $R/(a)$. We claim that it has an element x with annihilator (a), so that the R-submodule $\langle x \rangle$ is isomorphic to $R/(a)$. Assuming the claim for the moment, we have an R-submodule T_2 of T such that $T = \langle x \rangle \oplus T'$. The submodule T', also being a quotient of T, is again a finitely generated torsion submodule, so we can argue as above splitting off direct summands. Since $\langle x_1 \rangle \subsetneq \langle x_1 \rangle \oplus \langle x_2 \rangle \subsetneq$ an ascending chain of submodules in the Noetherian module T, it must terminate, showing that T is a finite direct sum of cyclic modules.

To see that T has an element annihilated by a: we can easily reduce – e.g. using the CRT for modules; we leave the details to the reader – to the case of $a = \pi^k$ a prime power, and then the result is clear, since the annihilator of T is the ideal generated by the annihilators of the elements of T, so if the annihilator of each element of T were contained in (π^{k+1}) then the annihilator of T would be contained in (π^{k+1}), a contradiction. $\square$

EXERCISE 16.7. *Let R be a PID, and let M be an R-module.*
   a) *Show: M has finite length iff it is a finitely generated torsion R-module.*
   b) *Suppose M is finitely generated. Show: M is indecomposable iff M is free of rank 1 or M is cyclic with prime power annihilator.*
   c) *Let T be a finitely generated torsion R-module. Use the Krull-Schmidt Theorem to show that T admits a decomposition as a finite direct sum of cyclic modules with prime power annihilator. Explain the sense in which this decomposition is unique. Check the fine print of the structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a PID in a standard algebra text, and confirm that Theorem 16.11 and this exercise recover that full result.*

Earlier we said that quotients of PIDs are the main examples of special principal rings. In fact they are the only examples:

THEOREM 16.12. *(Hungerford [**Hu68**]) Every special principal ring is the quotient of a PID.*

Hungerford's Theorem relies on Cohen's structure theorem for complete Noetherian local rings, a topic which we unfortunately do not treat in this text, so the proof must be omitted.

EXERCISE 16.8. *Show: for a commutative ring R, the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *R is a special principal ring.*
  (ii) *R is the quotient of a discrete valuation ring by a nonzero ideal.*

EXERCISE 16.9.
  a) *Show that a PID is residually Artinian principal: i.e., every quotient of a PID by a nonzero ideal is an Artinian principal ring.*
  b) *Hungerford's Theorem says that the quotients of PIDs by prime power ideals are precisely the local Artinian principal ring. Show: not every Artinian principal ring is a quotient of a PID.*
  (Suggestion: use Exercise 8.46.)

EXERCISE 16.10. *Let k be a field. Let $R = k[x, y]$, and $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal $\langle x, y \rangle$ in R. Show that the quotient ring $S = R/\mathfrak{m}^2$ is nonprincipal. In particular, if k is finite, then S is a finite nonprincipal local ring.*

EXERCISE 16.11. *For $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, show that the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *Every finite ring of order n is principal.*
  (ii) *The integer n is **cubefree**, i.e., it is not divisible by the cube of any prime number.*

EXERCISE 16.12. *It follows from the previous exercise that the least cardinality of a nonprincipal ring is 8.*
  a) *Show that up to isomorphism there are 10 rings of order 8, of which two are nonprincipal: $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}[x, y]/\langle x^2, xy, y^2 \rangle$ and $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}[x]/\langle 2x, x^2 \rangle$.*
  b) *Show that there is up to isomorphism a unique noncommutative ring of order 8.*
  c) *Show that for any prime $p \geq 3$ there are up to isomorphism 11 rings of order p^3 and one noncommutative ring of order p^3. How many of these rings are principal?*

EXERCISE 16.13. *(Inspired by* http://math.stackexchange.com/questions/361258*) Show: for a ring R the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *The polynomial ring $R[t]$ is principal.*
  (ii) *R is a finite product of fields.*
(Suggestions: (ii) $\implies$ (i) is easy. As for (i) $\implies$ (ii), show first that if $R[t]$ is principal, then R is principal Artinian, and then reduce to showing that if R is a local principal Artinian ring with nonzero maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p} = \langle \pi \rangle$, then $R[t]$ is not principal. For this let $\mathfrak{m} := \langle \pi, t \rangle \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R[t]$ and show that $\dim_{R[t]/\mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = \dim_{R/\pi R} \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = 2$.)

3. Euclidean functions and Euclidean rings

THIS SECTION WILL SOON BE REWRITTEN

If R is a domain, then a **Euclidean function** is a function $N : R \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that: for all $a \in R$ and $b \in R \setminus \{0\}$, there exists q, $r \in R$ such that $a = qb + r$ with $r = 0$ or $N(r) < N(b)$.

EXERCISE 16.14. *For each of the following rings R, we give a function $N :$ $R \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{N}$. Verify that N is a Euclidean function on R.*
a) $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $N(a) = |a|$.
b) $R = k[t]$, $N(p(t)) = \deg(p(t))$.
c) $R = k[[t]]$, $N(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t^n) :=$ the least n such that $a_n \neq 0$.
d) For $d \in \{-2, -1, 2, 3\}$, $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}] = \mathbb{Z}[t]/(t^2 - d)$, $N(a + b\sqrt{d}) = |a^2 - db^2|$.

EXERCISE 16.15. *Let R be a local PID. Use Proposition 16.5 to construct a Euclidean function on R.*

The virtue of Euclidean functions lies in the following result:

PROPOSITION 16.13. *A domain R which admits a Euclidean function is a PID.*

PROOF. Let I be any nonzero ideal of R, and choose an element x in I such that $N(x)$ is minimal. For any $y \in I$, by definition of a Euclidean function we may write $y = qx + r$ with $r = 0$ or $N(y) < N(x)$. Our choice of x rules out the second alternative and thus we have $y = qx$, i.e., $y \in (x)$. $\qquad\square$

Remark: It is common to define a **Euclidean domain** as a domain which admits some Euclidean function. In my opinion, this definition is somewhat of a false step in the theory. The merit of the notion of a Euclidean function is that for certain rings R there is an evident Euclidean function (e.g. for $\mathbb{Z}$ and $k[t]$), and when this occurs one deduces immediately that R is a PID. Moreover, if the Euclidean function is (in some sense) computable, the **Euclidean algorithm** can be used to find greatest common divisors and, accordingly, generators of ideals.

In contrast, since the specific Euclidean function is not part of the definition of a Euclidean domain, in order to show that a given ring R is *not* Euclidean one needs to argue that no Euclidean function can exist. Evidently if R is not a PID, no such function can exist. However, there are PIDs which admit no Euclidean function (more details are given below).

One way to assess the naturality of the notion Euclidean domain is to examine its stability under small perturbations of the definition. In other words, to what extent do similar axioms for a "Euclidean function" lead to an equivalent class of rings?

There are several results to the effect that a certain weakening of the definition of a Euclidean function captures precisely the class of all PIDs. For example:

THEOREM 16.14. *(Dedekind-Hasse) For a domain R with fraction field K, the following are equivalent:*
(i) There exists a function $N : K \to \mathbb{Q}$ satisfying:
(QN1) $\forall x \in K$, $N(x) \geq 0$; $N(x) = 0 \iff x = 0$.
(QN2) $\forall x, y \in K$, $N(xy) = N(x)N(y)$.
(QN3) $\forall x \in R$, $N(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(QN4) $\forall x \in R, N(x) = 1 \iff x \in R^{\times}$.
(QN5) $\forall x \in K \setminus R$, $\exists a, b \in R$ such that $0 < N(ax - b) < 1$.
(ii) R is a principal ideal domain.

EXERCISE 16.16. *Prove Theorem 16.14. (Suggestions: (i) $\implies$ (ii) is the usual argument that an ideal is generated by any element of minimal norm. Conversely, if R is a PID, define N on $R \setminus \{0\}$ by, e.g., setting $N(x)$ to be 2^r, where $r = \ell(R/xR)$ is the number of irreducibles appearing in a factorization of x and extend this map to K.)*

In another direction, P. Samuel considered the notion of a **W-Euclidean function** on a domain R. Here W is a well-ordered set and $N : R \to W$ is a function such that for all $a \in R, b \in R \setminus \{0\}$ such that $b \nmid a$, $\exists\, q, r \in R$ with $a = qb + r$ and $N(r) < N(b)$. If R admits, for some W, a W-Euclidean function, then R is a PID.

EXERCISE 16.17. *Show: a domain is W-Euclidean for some finite W iff it is a field.*

Say that a domain is **Samuel-Euclidean** if it is W-Euclidean for some well-ordered set W. Samuel remarks that the an imaginary quadratic fields $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-d})$ has a Samuel-Euclidean ring of integers R_d iff $d = 1, 2, 3, 7, 11$. On the other hand, it goes back at least to Gauss that for each of $d = 19, 43, 67, 163$ the ring R_d is a PID. Thus there are PIDs which are not Samuel-Euclidean. Samuel further showed that any Samuel-Euclidean ring is W-Euclidean for a unique minimal well-ordered set (up to canonical order isomorphism) W_R and asked the question of whether one has $W_R \leq \mathbb{N}$ for all domains R. This was answered in the negative by Hiblot [**Hi75**], [**Hi77**].

4. Bézout domains

PROPOSITION 16.15. *Let a, b be elements of a domain R. If the ideal $\langle a, b \rangle$ is principal, then its generator is a greatest common divisor of a and b.*

PROOF. In other words, we are assuming the existence of some $d \in R$ such that $dR = aR + bR$. Then $a, b \in dR$, so d is a common divisor of a and b. If $e \mid a$ and $e \mid b$ then since there are $x, y \in R$ such that $d = xa + yb$, we have $e \mid d$. $\square$

COROLLARY 16.16. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *Every finitely generated ideal is principal.*
  (ii) *For any two elements a and b of R, their gcd exists and is an R-linear combination of a and b.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is immediate from Proposition 16.15: $\gcd(a, b)$ will be a generator of the ideal $\langle a, b \rangle$. Conversely, if $d = \gcd(a, b)$ exists and is of the form $d = xa + yb$ for some $x, y \in R$, then clearly $(d) = \langle a, b \rangle$, so that every ideal with two generators is principal. By an obvious induction argument, we conclude that any finitely generated ideal is principal. $\square$

At least according to some, it was Étienne Bézout who first explicitly noted that for polynomials $P, Q \in k[t]$, $\gcd(a, b)$ exists and is a linear combination of a and b: this fact is called **Bézout's identity** or **Bézout's Lemma**. For this (somewhat tenuous) reason, a possibly non-Noetherian domain satisfying the equivalent conditions of Corollary 16.16 is called a **Bézout domain**.

EXERCISE 16.18. *Show: a localization of a Bézout domain is again a Bézout domain.*

THEOREM 16.17. *For a Bézout domain R, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *R is a PID.*
(ii) *R is Noetherian.*
(iii) *R is a UFD.*
(iv) *R is an ACCP domain.*
(v) *R is an atomic domain.*

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii) immediately from the definitions.
(i) $\implies$ (iii): this is Corollary 15.2.
(iii) $\implies$ (iv) $\implies$ (v) holds for all domains.
(v) $\implies$ (iii): A Bézout domain is a GCD-domain (Corollary 16.16), a GCD-domain is an EL-domain (Proposition 15.11), and an atomic EL-domain is a UFD (Theorem 15.8), so a Bézout atomic domain is a UFD.
(iv) $\implies$ (ii): assume that R is *not* Noetherian. Then it admits an infinitely generated ideal I, which we can use to build an infinite strictly ascending chain of finitely generated ideals $I_1 \subsetneq I_2 \subsetneq \ldots \subsetneq I$. Since R is Bézout, each I_i is principal, contradicting ACCP. $\qquad\square$

Let us say that a domain is **properly Bézout** if it is Bézout but not a PID.

We have already seen some examples of properly Bézout domains: the ring of entire functions (Theorem 5.21) and the ring of all algebraic integers (Theorem 5.1). To get further examples we move on to the next topic: valuation rings.

Valuation rings

1. Basic theory

Consider the divisibility relation – i.e., $a \mid b$ – on a domain R. Evidently it is reflexive and transitive, so is a **quasi-ordering**.[1] Divisibility need *not* be a partial ordering because $a \mid b$ and $b \mid a$ does not imply that $a = b$ but only that a and b are associates: $(a) = (b)$. However, one of the first ideas of ideal theory is to view associate elements as being somehow "equivalent." This motivates us to consider the equivalence relation on R in which $a \sim b$ iff $(a) = (b)$. This is easily seen to be a **monoidal equivalence relation**. In plainer language, if $(a_1) = (a_2)$ and $(b_1) = (b_2)$, then $(a_1 b_1) = (a_2 b_2)$. We can therefore consider the commutative monoid of principal ideals of R under multiplication, on which the divisibility relation is a partial ordering.

Having made a quasi-ordering into a partial ordering, it is natural to ask for conditions under which the divisibility relation induces a **total ordering**. Equivalently, for any $a, b \in R$ either $a \mid b$ or $b \mid a$.

PROPOSITION 17.1. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K. the following are equivalent:*
(i) For every $a, b \in R$, $a \mid b$ or $b \mid a$.
(ii) For every $0 \neq x \in K$, $x \in R$ or $x^{-1} \in R$.

EXERCISE 17.1. *Prove Proposition 17.1.*

A domain R satisfying the conditions of Proposition 17.1 is called a **valuation domain** or **valuation ring**.

Note that any field is a valuation ring. This is a trivial example which is often implicitly excluded from consideration (we will try our best to be explicit in our exclusion of trivial cases). Apart from this, in a first algebra course one may not see examples of valuation rings. But we have: if p is a prime number, then the ring $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ of integers localized at p is such an example. Define $x \mid_p y$ if $\operatorname{ord}_p(\frac{y}{x}) \geq 0$. Then p-divisibility is immediately seen to be a total quasi-ordering: given two integers, at least one p-divides the other. The fundamental theorem of arithmetic implies

$$x \mid y \iff \forall \text{ primes } p, \; x \mid_p y.$$

However, in $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$, we have $x \mid y \iff x \mid_p y$, i.e., we have localized the divisibility relation to get a total quasi-order: $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ is a valuation domain.

This argument generalizes as follows: let R be a PID[2] and $\mathfrak{p} = (\pi)$ be a prime

---

[1]By definition, a quasi-ordering is a reflexive, transitive binary relation on a set.
[2]In fact we can take R to be any Dedekind domain, as soon as we know what such a thing is. See §18.

ideal of R. We define $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$ to be the least n such that $(x) \supset \mathfrak{p}^n$, and extend it to a map on $K^\times$ by $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\frac{x}{y}) = \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) - \operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(y)$. (One should check that this is well-defined; this is easy.) Finally, we define $x \mid_{\mathfrak{p}} y$ to mean $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\frac{y}{x}) \geq 0$. Arguing as above, we see that the localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a valuation ring.

In showing that $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ was a valuation domain we proceeded by constructing a map $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ on the nonzero elements of the fraction field K. This can be generalized, as follows: if R is a domain with quotient field K, we can extend the divisibility relation to $K^\times$ by saying that $x \mid y$ iff $\frac{y}{x} \in R$. Clearly $x \mid y$ and $y \mid x$ iff $\frac{y}{x}$ is a unit in R. Therefore the quotient of $(K^\times, \cdot)$ on which divisibility (from R!) becomes a partial ordering is precisely the quotient group $K^\times/R^\times$.

For $[x], [y] \in K^\times/R^\times$, let us write $[x] \leq [y]$ if $[\frac{y}{x}] \in R$. (Take a second and check that this is well-defined.)

EXERCISE 17.2. *Show: the divisibility quasi-ordering on R is a total ordering iff the ordering on $K^\times/R^\times$ is a total ordering.*

In other words, if R is a valuation ring, then the canonical map $v : K^\times \to K^\times/R^\times$ is a homomorphism onto a totally ordered commutative group. Let us relabel the quotient group by G and denote the group law by addition, so that the homomorphism property gets recorded as

(VRK1) $\forall x, y \in K^\times \ v(ab) = v(a) + v(b)$.

We recover R as
$$R = \{x \in K^\times \mid v(x) \geq 0\} \cup \{0\}.$$
Everything that has been said so far takes into account only the multiplicative structure on R. So the following additional property is very important:

(VRK2) $\forall x, y \in K^\times \mid x + y \neq 0, \ v(x + y) \geq \min(v(x), v(y))$.

Indeed, suppose WLOG that $v(x) \leq v(y)$, i.e., $\frac{y}{x} \in R$. Then $\frac{x+y}{x} = 1 + \frac{y}{x} \in R$ so $v(x) \leq v(x + y)$.

EXERCISE 17.3. *Suppose $v(x) \neq v(y)$. Show that $v(x + y) = \min(v(x), v(y))$.*

Let $(G, +, \leq)$ be a totally ordered commutative group. We write $G^+ = \{g \in G \mid g \geq 0\}$, so G^+ is a totally ordered submonoid of G. A **(G-valued) valuation** on a field K is a surjective map $v : K^\times \to G$ satisfying (VRK1) and (VRK2) above.

EXERCISE 17.4. *Let $v : K^\times \to G$ be a valuation. Let R be the set of elements of $K^\times$ with non-negative valuation, together with 0. Show: R is a valuation ring with fraction field K.*

EXERCISE 17.5. *Let R be a domain, G a totally ordered group and $v : R \setminus \{0\} \to G^+$ be a map which satisfies all of the following properties:*
(VRR1) $\forall x, y \in R \setminus \{0\}, \ v(ab) = v(a) + v(b)$.
(VRR2) $\forall x, y \in R \setminus \{0\} \mid x + y \neq 0, \ v(x + y) \geq \min(v(x), v(y))$.
(VRR3) $v(R \setminus \{0\}) \supset G^+$.
Show that there is a unique extension of v to a valuation $v : K^\times \to G$, namely $v(x/y) = v(x) - v(y)$.

PROPOSITION 17.2. *A valuation ring is a local domain, in which the unique maximal ideal* $\mathfrak{m}$ *consists of elements of positive valuation.*

PROOF. The set of elements of strictly positive valuation form an ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R. Its complement, the set of elements of zero valuation, is the group of units. $\square$

PROPOSITION 17.3. *Let I be a finitely generated ideal in a valuation ring. Then the set $v(I)$ has a least element, and for any $x \in I$ of minimal valuation, $I = v(x)$.*

PROOF. Write $I = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle$ with $v(x_1) \leq \ldots \leq v(x_n)$. Then for any $r_1, \ldots, r_n \in R$, $v(r_1 x_1 + \ldots + r_n x_n) \geq \min_i v(r_i x_i) \geq v(x_1)$, so x_1 is an element of I of minimal valuation. Thus for all $i > 1$, $v(\frac{x_i}{x_1}) \geq 0$, so $\frac{x_i}{x_1} \in R$ and $x_1 \mid x_i$. So $I = \langle x_1 \rangle$. $\square$

COROLLARY 17.4. *A valuation ring is a Bézout domain. In particular, a Noetherian valuation ring is a PID.*

Conversely:

PROPOSITION 17.5. *A local Bézout domain is a valuation domain.*

PROOF. Let x, y be elements of a local Bézout domain, and suppose $d = \gcd(x, y)$. Then $\frac{x}{d}$ and $\frac{y}{d}$ are coprime. Since in a local ring the nonunits form an ideal, this implies that at least one of $\frac{x}{d}$ and $\frac{y}{d}$ is a unit. In other words, up to associates, $d = x$ (so $x \mid y$) or $d = y$ (so $y \mid x$). $\square$

A **valued field** is a field together K together with a valuation $v : K^\times \to G$. An isomorphism of valued fields $(K, v) \to (K', v')$ is an isomorphism $f : K \to K'$ of fields such that $v = v' \circ f$. A valued field is **trivial** if G is the trivial group. Evidently each field carries a unique trivial valuation up to isomorphism: the valuation ring is K itself. The reader will lose nothing by making the tacit assumption that all valuations are nontrivial.

EXERCISE 17.6. *A **chain ring** is a ring R in which the partially ordered set $\mathcal{I}(R)$ of ideals of R is linearly ordered.*
a) Show: for a ring R, the following are equivalent:
(i) R is a chain ring.
(ii) For all $x, y \in R$, either $xR \subset yR$ or $yR \subset xR$.
b) Show: a domain R is a chain ring iff it is a valuation ring.

2. Ordered commutative groups

Let $(G, +)$ be an commutative group, written additively. In particular the identity element of G will be denoted by 0. As for rings, we write $G^\bullet$ for $G \setminus \{0\}$.

By an **ordering** on G we mean a total (a.k.a. linear) ordering $\leq$ on G which is compatible with the addition law in the following sense:

(OAG) For all $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in G$, $x_1 \leq x_2$ and $y_1 \leq y_2$ implies $x_1 + y_1 \leq x_2 + y_2$.

One has the evident notions of a homomorphism of ordered commutative groups, namely an isotone group homomorphism.

EXERCISE 17.7. *Let $(G, \leq)$ be an ordered commutative group.*
a) Let $x \in G^\bullet$. Show: either $x > 0$ or $-x > 0$ but not both.
b) Show: for all $x, y \in G$, $x \leq y \iff -y \leq -x$.

EXERCISE 17.8. *Let $(G, \leq)$ be an ordered commutative group, and let H be a subgroup of G. Show: the induced order on H makes H into an ordered commutative group.*

EXAMPLE 17.6. *For an ordered field $(F, \leq)$, the additive group $(F, +)$ is an ordered commutative group. In particular, the additive group $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ of the real numbers is an ordered commutative group, as is any subgroup. In particular, $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ and $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$ are ordered commutative groups.*

EXERCISE 17.9. *Exhibit an commutative group which admits two nonisomorphic orderings.*

EXAMPLE 17.7. *(Lexicographic ordering): Let $\{G_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a nonempty indexed family of ordered commutative groups. Suppose that we are given a well-ordering on the index set I. We may then endow the direct product $G = \prod_{i \in I} G_i$ with the structure of an ordered commutative group, as follows: for $(g_i), (h_i) \in G$, we decree $(g_i) < (h_i)$ if for the least index i such that $g_i \neq h_i$, $g_i < h_i$.*

EXERCISE 17.10. *Check that the lexicographic ordering on the product $\prod_{i \in I} G_i$ is indeed a total ordering on G.*

THEOREM 17.8. *(Levi [**Le43**]) For an commutative group G, the following are equivalent:*
(i) G admits at least one ordering.
(ii) G is torsionfree.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) Suppose $<$ is an ordering on G and let $x \in G^\bullet$. Then exactly one of $x, -x$ is positive; without loss of generality say it is x. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $nx = x + \ldots x$ (n times) must be positive, so x has infinite order in G.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let G be a torsionfree commutative group. By Corollary 3.98, G is a flat $\mathbb{Z}$-module. Tensoring the injection $\mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ gives us an injection $G \hookrightarrow G \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Since $\mathbb{Q}$ is a field, the $\mathbb{Q}$-module $G \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is free, i.e., it is isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Q}$. Choose a well-ordering on I. Give each copy of $\mathbb{Q}$ its standard ordering as a subfield of $\mathbb{R}$ and put the lexicographic ordering on $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Q} \cong G \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Via the injection $G \hookrightarrow G \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ this induces an ordering on G. $\square$

EXERCISE 17.11. *a) Show: the commutative group $\mathbb{Z}$ admits exactly one ordering (here when we say "ordering", we always mean "ordering compatible with the group structure in the sense of (OAG).*
b) Give an example of an commutative group which admits two distinct – even nonisomorphic – orderings.

An ordered commutative group $(G, +)$ is **Archimedean** if for all $x, y \in G$ with $x > 0$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $nx > y$.

EXERCISE 17.12. *a) Suppose H is a subgroup of the Archimedean ordered group $(G, +)$. Show: the induced ordering on G is Archimedean.*
b) Let $(G, +)$ be an ordered commutative group such that there exists an embedding $(G, +) \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{R}, +)$ into the additive group of the real numbers. Deduce: G is Archimedean.

Conversely:

THEOREM 17.9. *(Hölder [**Hö01**]) Let $(G, +)$ be an ordered commutative group. If G is Archimedean, there exists an embedding $(G, +) \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{R}, +)$.*

PROOF. We may assume G is nontrivial. Fix any positive element x of G. We will construct an order embedding of G into $\mathbb{R}$ mapping x to 1.

Namely, let $y \in G$. Then the set of integers n such that $nx \leq y$ has a maximal element n_0. Put $y_1 = y - n_0 x$. Now let n_1 be the largest integer n such that $nx \leq 10 y_1$: observe that $0 \leq n_1 < 10$. Continuing in this way we get a set of integers $n_1, n_2, \ldots \in \{0, \ldots, 9\}$. We define $\varphi(y)$ to be the real number $n_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{n_k}{10^k}$. It is not hard to show that φ is isotone – $y \leq y' \implies \varphi(y) \leq \varphi(y')$ – and also that φ is injective: we leave these tasks to the reader.

But let us check that φ is a homomorphism of groups. For $y \in G$, and $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, let $\frac{n}{10^r}$ be the rational number obtained by truncating $\varphi(y)$ at r decimal places. The numerator n is characterized by $nx \leq 10^r y < (n+1)x$. For $y' \in G$, if $n'x \leq 10^r y' \leq (n'+1)x$, then

$$(n + n')x \leq 10^r (y + y') < (n + n' + 2)x,$$

so

$$\varphi(y + y') - (n + n')10^{-r} < \frac{2}{10^r}$$

and thus

$$|\varphi(y + y') - \varphi(y) - \varphi(y')| < \frac{4}{10^r}.$$

Since r is arbitrary, we conclude $\varphi(y + y') = \varphi(y) + \varphi(y')$. □

A nontrivial ordered commutative group which can be embedded in $\mathbb{R}$ is said to have **rank one**. For many applications this is by far the most important case. Later we will give the general definition of the rank of an ordered commutative group.

The following result gives another characterization of valuation rings of rank one.

LEMMA 17.10. *Let R be a domain, $(G, \leq)$ a totally ordered commutative group, and let $G^+ = \{g \in G \mid g \geq 0\}$. Then:*
a) G^+ is an ordered commutative monoid.
b) The monoid ring $R[G^+]$ is a domain.
c) The group ring $R[G]$ is naturally isomorphic to the localization of $R[G^+]$ at the multiplicative subset G^+. In particular, $R[G]$ is a domain.

EXERCISE 17.13. *a) Write out the statements of Lemma 17.10 when $G = \mathbb{Z}$.*
b) Prove Lemma 17.10.

THEOREM 17.11. *(Malcev, Neumann) For any ordered commutative group G, there exists a valuation domain with value group isomorphic to G.*

PROOF. It suffices to construct a field K and a surjective map $v : K^\times \to G$ satisfying (VD1K) and (VD2K). Let k be any field and put $A = k[G^{\geq 0}]$. By Lemma 17.10, A is a domain; let K be its fraction field. Define a map $v : A^\bullet \to G$ by sending a nonzero element $\sum_{g \in G} a_g g$ to the least g for which $a_g \neq 0$. Then v satisfies the three properties of Exercise 17.5 and therefore extends uniquely to a valuation $v : K^\times \to G$, where K is the fraction field of R. □

Recall from §5.5 the notion of a "big monoid ring" $k[[\Gamma]]$, the collection of *all* functions $f : \Gamma \to k$ under pointwise addition and convolution product. As we saw though, in order for the convolution product to be defined "purely algebraically" – i.e., without recourse to some limiting process – we need to impose the condition of *divisor finiteness* on Γ. It follows easily from Proposition 17.20 that for $\Gamma = G^{\geq 0}$ the monoid of non-negative elements in a totally ordered commutative group, divisor finiteness holds iff $G = \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., iff the valuation is discrete.

However, Malcev [**Ma48**] and Neumann [**Ne49**] independently found a way around this by considering a set in between $k[G^{\geq 0}]$ and $k[[G^{\geq 0}]]$. Namely, define $k_{\mathrm{MN}}[G^{\geq 0}]$ to be the set of all functions $f : G^{\geq 0} \to k$ such that the *support* of f – i.e., the set of $g \in G^{\geq 0}$ such that $f(g) \neq 0$ – is well-ordered. It turns out that on such functions the convolution product can be defined and endows $k_{\mathrm{MN}}[G^{\geq 0}]$ with a domain. The fraction field $k_{\mathrm{MN}}(G)$ is simply the collection of all functions $f : G \to k$ with well-ordered support. Moreover, mapping each such nonzero function to the least element of G in its support gives a G-valued valuation. The elements of such rings are called **Malcev-Neumann series**.

2.1. Convex Subgroups.

A subset S of a totally ordered set $(X, \leq)$ is **convex** if for all $x < y < z \in X$, if $x, z \in S$, then $y \in S$.

EXERCISE 17.14. *Let H be a subgroup of an ordered commutative group $(G, \leq)$. Show: H is convex iff for all $x, y \in G$ with $0 \leq x \leq y$, if $y \in H$ then also $x \in H$.*

PROPOSITION 17.12. *Let $(G, \leq)$ be an ordered commutative group, and let $\mathcal{C}(G)$ be the family of convex subgroups of G. Then $\mathcal{C}(G)$ is totally ordered under inclusion.*

PROOF. Let H_1 and H_2 be convex subgroups. Seeking a contradiction, we suppose there is $h_1 \in H_1 \setminus H_2$ and $h_2 \in H_2 \setminus H_1$. Since subgroups are closed under inversion, we may assume that $h_1, h_2 \geq 0$ and then, without loss of generality, that $0 \leq h_1 \leq h_2$. Since H_2 is a convex subgroup, it follows that $h_1 \in H_2$, contradiction. $\square$

For an ordered commutative group G, we define $r(G)$ to be the order isomorphism type of the linearly ordered set $\mathcal{C}(G)^{\bullet} = \mathcal{C}(G) \setminus \{\{0\}\}$ of nontrivial convex subgroups of G. When this set is finite we may view $r(G)$ as a natural number. In particular, $r(G) = 1$ iff G is nontrivial and has no proper, nontrivial convex subgroups.

EXERCISE 17.15. *a) Let G_1 and G_2 be ordered commutative groups, and let $G = G_1 \times G_2$ be lexicographically ordered. Show: $r(G) = r(G_1) + r(G_2)$, where on the right hand side we have the ordered sum: every element of the first linearly ordered set is less than every element of the second linearly ordered set.*
b) Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$. Show: $r(\mathbb{Z}^n) = n$.

PROPOSITION 17.13. *For a nontrivial ordered commutative group G, the following are equivalent:*
(i) G is Archimedean.
(ii) $r(G) = 1$.

PROOF. $\square$

In view of Proposition 17.13 it makes sense to call $r(G)$ the **rank** of the linearly ordered group G: indeed we have already defined a group to have rank one if it is nontrivial and can be order embedded in $(\mathbb{R}, +)$. By Theorem 17.9, G is Archimedean iff it can be order embedded in $(\mathbb{R}, +)$, so by Proposition 17.13 our new notion of rank coincides with our old notion of rank one.

THEOREM 17.14. *Let $v : K^{\times} \to (G, \leq)$ be a valuation on a field K, with valuation ring R. There is an inclusion reversing bijection $\Phi : \operatorname{Spec} R \to \mathcal{C}(G)$ given by*

$$\mathfrak{p} \mapsto G \setminus \pm v(\mathfrak{p}).$$

PROOF. Step 1: We claim that for $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $\Phi(\mathfrak{p})$ is a convex subgroup. Clearly $\Phi(\mathfrak{p})$ contains 0 and is closed under inversion, so suppose $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \Phi(\mathfrak{p})$. Since $\Phi(\mathfrak{p})$ is closed under inversion, we may assume that either $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$ or $\sigma_1 > 0$, $\sigma_2 < 0$ and $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 > 0$.
Case 1: Suppose $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 > 0$. Choose $x_1, x_2 \in R$ with $v(x_i) = \sigma_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. If $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \notin \Phi(\mathfrak{p})$, then there is $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ with $v(x) = \sigma_1 + \sigma_2 = v(x_1 x_2)$. Thus $ux = x_1 x_2$ for some $u \in R^{\times}$, so $x_1 x_2 \in \mathfrak{p}$. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime this implies that at least one of x_1, x_2 lies in $\mathfrak{p}$, hence at least one of σ_1, σ_2 does not lie in $\Phi(\mathfrak{p})$, contradiction.
Case 2: Suppose $\sigma_1 > 0$, $\sigma_2 < 0$, $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 > 0$. If $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 \notin \Phi(\mathfrak{p})$, then there is $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ with $v(x) = \sigma_1 + \sigma_2$. Choose $y \in R$ with $v(y) = -\sigma_2$. Then $yx \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $v(yx) = \sigma_1$, so $\sigma_1 \in v(\mathfrak{p})$, contradiction.

To show convexity: let $0 \leq \sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2 \in G$, and suppose $\sigma_2 \in \Phi(\mathfrak{p})$. If $\sigma_1 \in v(\mathfrak{p})$, then there exists $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ with $v(x) = \sigma_1$. There is $y \in R$ such that $v(y) = \sigma_2 - \sigma_1$, and thus $v(yx) = \sigma_2$, so $\sigma_2 \notin \Phi(\mathfrak{p})$, contradiction.
Step 2: To a convex subgroup H of G, we associate

$$\Psi(H) = \{x \in R^{\bullet} \mid v(x) \notin H\} \cup \{0\}.$$

By similar – but easier – reasoning to the above, one checks that $\Psi(H) \in \operatorname{Spec} R$.
Step 3: One checks that Φ and Ψ are mutually inverse maps, hence Φ is a bijection. $\square$

EXERCISE 17.16. *Supply the details of Steps 2 and 3 in the proof of Theorem 17.14.*

EXERCISE 17.17. *Show: the maps Φ and Ψ are obtained by restricting the Galois connection associated to a relation on $R \times G$.*

COROLLARY 17.15. *For a valuation ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R has rank one, i.e., the value group is Archimedean.
(ii) R has Krull dimension one.

3. Connections with integral closure

Let $(R, \mathfrak{m}_R)$ and $(T, \mathfrak{m}_T)$ be local rings with $R \subset T$. We say that **T dominates R**, and write $R \leq T$, if $\mathfrak{m}_T \cap R = \mathfrak{m}_R$.

LEMMA 17.16. *Let R be a subring of a field K, and let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$. Then there exists a valuation ring T of K such that $R \subset T$ and $\mathfrak{m}_T \cap R = \mathfrak{p}$.*

PROOF. (Matsumura)
Step 0: We may replace R by $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and thus asume that $(R, \mathfrak{p})$ is a local ring. In this case, what we are trying to show is precisely that there exists a valuation ring of

K dominating R.

Step 1: Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the set of all rings R' with $R \subset R' \subset K$ such that $\mathfrak{p}R' \subsetneq R'$, partially ordered by inclusion. We have $R \in \mathcal{F}$, so $\mathcal{F} \neq \varnothing$. Moreover the union of a chain in $\mathcal{F}$ is again an element of $\mathcal{F}$, so Zorn's Lemma gives us a maximal element T of $\mathcal{F}$. Since $\mathfrak{p}T \subsetneq T$, there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of T containing $\mathfrak{p}T$. Since $T \subset T_\mathfrak{m}$ and $T_\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{F}$, by maximality of T we have $T = T_\mathfrak{m}$, so $(T, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring dominating $(R_\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p})$.

Step 2: We CLAIM that T is a valuation ring.

PROOF OF CLAIM: Let $x \in K^\times$. We wish to show that at least one of x, x^{-1} lies in T. Seeking a contradiction, assume neither is the case. Then $T[x]$ properly contains T, so by maximality of T we have $1 \in \mathfrak{p}T[x]$, i.e., we get a relation of the form

$$1 = a_0 + a_1 x + \ldots + a_n x^n, a_i \in \mathfrak{p}T.$$

Since T is local, $1 - a_0 \in T^\times$, and the relation may be rewritten in the form

$$(39) \qquad\qquad\qquad 1 = b_1 x + \ldots + b_n x^n, b_i \in \mathfrak{m}.$$

Among all such relations, we may choose one with minimal exponent n. In exactly the same way, $T[x^{-1}]$ properly contains T and thus there exists a relation

$$(40) \qquad\qquad\qquad 1 = c_1 x^{-1} + \ldots + c_n x^{-m}, c_i \in \mathfrak{m},$$

and among all such relations we may choose one with minimal m. Without loss of generality $m \leq n$: otherwise interchange x and x^{-1}. Then multiplying (40) by $b_n x^n$ and subtracting from (39) gives another relation of the form (39) but with exponent smaller than n, contradiction. $\qquad\square$

A subring R of a field K is a **maximal subring** if $R \subsetneq K$ and there is no ring intermediate between R and K.

EXERCISE 17.18. *a) Show: any field K admits at least one maximal subring. b) Show: if K is not finite of prime order, then all maximal subrings are nonzero. c) Excluding the case in which K is finite of prime order, show: any maximal subring of K is a valuation ring of K (possibly a field).*

EXERCISE 17.19. *Let K be a field, and R a valuation ring of K. Show the following are equivalent: (i) R is a maximal subring of K. (ii) R has rank at most one.*

THEOREM 17.17. *Let K be a field and $R \subset K$ a subring. Then the integral closure $\overline{R}$ of R in K is the intersection of all valuation rings of K containing R.*

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the intersection of all valuation rings of K containing R. Since each such ring is integrally closed in K and the intersection of a family of rings each integrally closed in K is again integrally closed in K, $\mathcal{R}$ is integrally closed in K, whence $\overline{R} \subset \mathcal{R}$.

Conversely, let $x \in K \setminus \overline{R}$. It suffices to find a valuation ring of K containing R but not x. Let $y = x^{-1}$. The ideal $yR[y]$ of $R[y]$ is proper: for if $1 = a_1 y + \ldots + a_n y^n$ with $a_i \in R$, then x would be integral over R. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a maximal ideal of R containing y. By Lemma 17.16, there exists a valuation ring T of K such that $R[y] \subset K$ and $\mathfrak{m}_T \cap R[y] = \mathfrak{p}$. Then $y = x^{-1} \in \mathfrak{m}_T$, so $x \notin T$. $\qquad\square$

4. Another proof of Zariski's Lemma

The following result is a close relative of Lemma 17.16.

LEMMA 17.18. *Let K be a field and Ω an algebraically closed field. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all pairs (A, f) with A is a subring of K and $f : A \hookrightarrow \Omega$, partially ordered by*

$$(A, f) \leq (A', f') \iff A \subset A' \text{ and } f'|_A = f.$$

Then $\mathcal{S}$ contains maximal elements, and for any maximal element (B, g), B is a valuation ring of K.

PROOF. An easy Zorn's Lemma argument shows that $\mathcal{S}$ has maximal elements. Let (B, g) be a maximal element. Put $\mathfrak{p} = \mathrm{Ker}(g)$; since $g(B)$ is a subring of the field Ω, it is a domain and thus $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of B. By functoriality of localization, G extends to a homomorphism $B_{\mathfrak{p}} \to \Omega$. By maximality of (B, g) we have $B_{\mathfrak{p}} = B$, so that B is a local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. If there existed an element $x \in K$ which is transcendental over the fraction field of B, then $B[x]$ is a polynomial ring and certainly g extends to $B[x]$. So K is algebraic over the fraction field of B.

Next let $x \in K^{\times}$. We claim that either the ideal $\mathfrak{p}B[x]$ or $\mathfrak{p}B[x^{-1}]$ is proper. Indeed this is proved exactly as in Lemma 17.16 above.

Finally, we show that B is a valuation ring of K. Let $x \in K^{\bullet}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\mathfrak{p}B[x]$ is a proper ideal of B (otherwise replace x by x^{-1}). Put $B' = B[x]$. By assumption, $\mathfrak{p}B[x]$ is contained in a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of B' and $\mathfrak{m} \cap B = \mathfrak{p}$. Hence the embedding of domains $B \to B'$ induces an embedding of fields $k := B/\mathfrak{p} \hookrightarrow B'/\mathfrak{m} = k'$. Moreover k' is generated over k by the image of the algebraic element x, so k'/k is a finite degree field extension. So g induces an embedding $k \hookrightarrow \Omega$, and since Ω is algebraically closed, this extends to an embedding $k' = B'/\mathfrak{m} \hookrightarrow \Omega$. By maximality of B, this implies $x \in B$. $\square$

Remark: It should be possible to consolidate Lemmas 17.16 and 17.18 into a single result. Let me know if you see how to do it.

PROPOSITION 17.19. *Let $A \subset B$ be domains with B finitely generated as an A-algebra. Let $\beta \in B^{\bullet}$. There exists $\alpha \in A^{\bullet}$ satisfying the following property: any homomorphism f of A into an algebraically closed field Ω with $f(\alpha) \neq 0$ extends to a homomorphism $f : B \to \Omega$ with $f(\beta) \neq 0$.*

PROOF.
Step 0: Induction on the number of generators reduces us to the case $B = A[x]$.
Step 1: Suppose that x is transcendental over A, i.e., B is a univariate polynomial ring over A. Write

$$\beta = a_n x^n + \ldots + a_1 x + a_0, a_i \in A$$

and put $\alpha = a_0$. If $f : A \to \Omega$ is such that $f(\alpha) \neq 0$, then since Ω is infinite, there exists $\zeta \in \Omega$ such that $f(a_n)\zeta^n + \ldots + f(a_1)\zeta + f(a_0) \neq 0$. Using the universal polynomial of polynomial rings, we may uniquely extend f to a homomorphism from B to Ω by putting $f(x) = \zeta$, and then $f(\beta) \neq 0$.
Step 2: Suppose that x is algebraic over the fraction field of A. Then so is β^{-1}. Hence we have equations of the form

$$a_n x^m + \ldots + a_1 x + a_0, \ a_i \in A$$

$$a'_m \beta^{-m} + \ldots + a'_1 \beta^{-1} + a'_0, a'_i \in A.$$

Put $\alpha = a_n a_m'$. Suppose $f : A \to \Omega$ is any homomorphism with $f(\alpha) \neq 0$. We may extend f to a homomorphism from $A[\alpha^{-1}] \to \Omega$ by mapping α^{-1} to $f(\alpha)^{-1}$ and then, by Lemma 17.18, to a homomorphism $f : C \to \Omega$ for some valuation ring C containing $A[\alpha^{-1}]$. By construction x is integral over $A[\alpha^{-1}]$. Since C is integrally closed, $x \in C$. Thus C contains B and in particular $\beta \in C$. Similarly, β^{-1} is integral over $A[\alpha^{-1}]$ so $\beta^{-1} \in C$. Thus $\beta \in C^\times$, so $f(\beta) \neq 0$. Restricting to B gives the desired homomorphism. $\square$

Proof of Zariski's Lemma: Let k be a field and B a field that is finitely generated as a k-algebra. We want to show that the field extension B/k has finite degree. For this it is enough to show that B/k is algebraic. In Proposition 17.19 take $A = k$, $\beta = 1$ and Ω to be an algebraic closure of k. $\square$

5. Discrete valuation rings

5.1. Introducing DVRs.

PROPOSITION 17.20. *For a valuation ring R with value group G, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a PID.
(ii) R is Noetherian.
(iii) R is an ACCP-domain.
(iv) $G^{\geq 0} = \{x \in G \mid x \geq 0\}$ is well-ordered.
(v) G is isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}, \leq)$.

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii) $\iff$ (iii) is a special case of Theorem 16.17.
(iii) $\iff$ (iv): a totally ordered set is well-ordered iff there are no infinite strictly descending chains. But an infinite strictly descending chain in $G^{\geq 0}$ gives rise to an infinite strictly ascending chain of principal ideals in R, and conversely.
(iv) $\implies$ (v): First suppose G is Archimedean, so $G \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$: this endows G with a topology. If G is discrete, it is generated by its least positive element hence is order-isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}$. If G is not discrete, there exists an infinite strictly decreasing sequence of positive elements of G converging to 0, so $G^{\geq 0}$ is not well-ordered. Next suppose that G is not Archimedean, and choose $x, y > 0$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $nx < y$. Then $\{y - nx\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+}$ is an infinite strictly descending sequence in $G^{\geq 0}$, contradicting well-ordering.
(v) $\implies$ (iv): famously, the standard ordering on $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ is a well-ordering. $\square$

EXERCISE 17.20. *Show directly: a local PID is a valuation ring with value group $\mathbb{Z}$.*

A valuation ring satisfying the equivalent conditions of Proposition 17.20 is called a **discrete valuation ring** (or, sometimes, a **DVR**).

5.2. Further characterizations of DVRs.

In many ways, discrete valuation rings are – excepting only fields – the simplest class of rings. Nevertheless they have an important role to play in algebra and arithmetic and algebraic geometry. One reason for this is as follows: every DVR is a one-dimensional Noetherian local ring. The converse does not hold.

Example: Let k be a field, and let R be the k-subalgebra of $k[t]$ generated by

t^2 and t^3. This is a one-dimensional Noetherian domain; the ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ generated by t^2 and t^3 is a nonprincipal maximal ideal. Indeed, even in the localization $R_\mathfrak{m}$ the ideal $\mathfrak{m}R_\mathfrak{m}$ is not principal: consider what its order at 0 would be with respect to the valuation ord_t on $k(t)$: it would have to be 1, but there is no such element in $R_\mathfrak{m}$.

The question then is to find necessary and sufficient conditions for a one-dimensional Noetherian local domain to be a DVR. As we have seen, being a PID is enough, but again, this is not very useful as whether a one-dimensional domain is a PID is difficult to check in practice. Remarkably, it turns out if a local, one-dimensional Noetherian domain has any one of a large number of good properties, it will necessarily be a DVR. Here is the theorem.

THEOREM 17.21. *(Recognition Theorem for DVRs) Let R be a one-dimensional Noetherian local domain, with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. the following are equivalent:*
*(i) R is **regular**: the dimension of $\frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{m}^2}$ as an $R/\mathfrak{m}$-vector space is 1.*
(ii) $\mathfrak{m}$ is principal.
(iii) R is a PID.
(iv) R is a UFD.
(v) R is integrally closed.
(vi) Every nonzero ideal is of the form $\mathfrak{m}^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii): Choose $t \in \pi \setminus \pi^2$. By assumption, t generates $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$, so by Nakayama's Lemma t generates $\mathfrak{m}$. Conversely, if $\mathfrak{m}$ is monogenic as an R-module, certainly $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ is monogenic as an $R/\mathfrak{m}$-module.
Evidently (iii) $\implies$ (ii). Proposition 16.5 gives (ii) $\implies$ (iii) and also (ii) $\implies$ (vi). Moreover (iii) $\iff$ (iv) by Proposition 16.1 and (iv) $\implies$ (v) by 15.14. Next, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $(\pi)^n/(\pi)^{n+1} \cong R/\mathfrak{m}$, thus R is regular.

(vi) $\implies$ (i): Assume that $\dim_{R/\mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 > 1$. Choose $u \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$. Then

$$\mathfrak{m} \subsetneq \langle u, \mathfrak{m}^2 \rangle \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}^2.$$

So we have (i) $\iff$ (ii) $\iff$ (iii) $\iff$ (iv) $\iff$ (vi) $\implies$ (v).

Finally, we show (v) $\implies$ (ii): Let $0 \neq x \in \mathfrak{m}$. Since $\mathfrak{m}$ is the only prime ideal containing (x) we must have $r((x)) = \mathfrak{m}$. Since $R/(x)$ is Noetherian, its radical, $\mathfrak{m}/(x)$, is nilpotent, so there is a unique *least* $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\mathfrak{m}^n \subset (x)$. Let $y \in \mathfrak{m}^{n-1} \setminus (x)$ and consider the element $q = \frac{x}{y}$ of the fraction field K of R. Since $y \notin (x)$, $q^{-1} = \frac{y}{x} \notin R$; since R is integrally closed in K, q^{-1} is not integral over R. Then $\mathfrak{q}^{-1}\mathfrak{m}$ is not contained in $\mathfrak{m}$, for otherwise $\mathfrak{m}$ would be a faithful $R[q^{-1}]$-module which is finitely generated as an R-module, contradicting Theorem 14.1. But by construction, $q^{-1}\mathfrak{m} = \frac{y}{x}\mathfrak{m} \subset R$, hence $q^{-1}\mathfrak{m} = R$ and then $\mathfrak{m} = Rx = (x)$. $\square$

5.3. Modules over DVRs.

LEMMA 17.22. *Let R be a DVR with uniformizing element π, and let $a \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then the ring $R_a = R/(\pi^a)$ is **self-injective** – i.e., R_a is an injective R_a-module.*

EXERCISE 17.21. *Prove Lemma 17.22. (Hint: Baer's Criterion!)*

THEOREM 17.23. *Let R be a DVR with uniformizing element π, and let M be a nonzero finitely generated R-module.*
a) There is $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and positive integers $n, a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \ldots \geq a_n$ such that

$$(41) \qquad M \cong R^N \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} R/(\pi^{a_i}).$$

b) The numbers $N, n, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ are invariants of the isomorphism class of the module M: i.e., they are the same for any two decompositions of M as in (41) above.

PROOF.
Step 0: Consider the canonical short exact sequence

$$0 \to M[\mathrm{tors}] \to M \to M/M[\mathrm{tors}] \to 0.$$

Since M is a finitely generated module over a Noetherian ring, $M[\mathrm{tors}]$ is finitely generated. Moreover, $M/M[\mathrm{tors}]$ is a finitely generated torsionfree module over a PID, hence is free (Proposition 3.64). Moreover, we know that the rank of a free module over any (commutative!) ring is well-defined (when R is a domain with fraction field K, the proof is especially easy: the rank of a free module M is $\dim_K M \otimes_R K$), so the invariant N in the statement of the theorem is precisely the rank of $M/M[\mathrm{tors}]$. Moreover, since $M/M[\mathrm{tors}]$ is free – hence projective – the sequence splits, so

$$M = R^N \oplus M[\mathrm{tors}].$$

We are reduced to the case of a nonzero finitely generated torsion module M.
Step 1: The annihilator of M is an ideal of R, of which there aren't so many: it must be (π^{a_1}) for some $a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Thus M may be viewed as a faithful $R_{a_1} = R/(\pi^{a_1})$-module. Moreover, choosing an element x of M which is not annihilated by π^{a_1-1}, the unique R_{a_1}-module map $R_{a_1} \to M$ which sends 1 to m is an injection. Taking $M' = M/R_{a_1}$, we get a short exact sequence

$$0 \to R_{a_1} \to M \to M' \to 0.$$

By Lemma 17.22, R_{a_1} is an injective R_{a_1}-module, so the sequence splits:

$$M \cong R_{a_1} \oplus M'.$$

Step 2: Since M is finitely generated over R_{a_1}, it is a quotient of some Artinian R_{a_1}-module $R_{a_1}^M$, hence by Theorem 8.4 M is Artinian. Moreover M is a finitely generated module over the Noetherian ring, so M is also Noetherian. By Theorem 8.14, this means that M has finite length as an R-module. Hence so does its direct summand M' and indeed clearly the length of M' is less than the length of M. This completes the proof of part a) by induction.
Step 3: So far we have that a finitely generated torsion R-module is of the form $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} R/(\pi^{a_i})$ with positive integers $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \ldots \geq a_n$, and with $\mathrm{ann}(M) = (\pi^{a_1})$. In order to prove the uniqueness statement of part b), it suffices to prove that for all $0 < b \leq a$, $R/(\pi^b)$ is an indecomposable $R/(\pi^a)$-module. If so, then

$$M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} R/(\pi^{a_i})$$

is simply the decomposition of the finite length module M into indecomposables described in the Krull-Schmidt Theorem: in particular, since clearly $R/(\pi^a) \cong R/(\pi^b)$ implies $a = b$ (consider annihilators), it is unique up to permutation of the factors. So suppose that $R/(\pi^a) = M_1 \oplus M_2$ with M_1, M_2 nonzero. If π^a does not annihilate M_1, then as above we can find a split embedding $R/(\pi^a) \hookrightarrow M_1$, which contradicts the fact that the length of M_1 must be smaller than the length of $R/(\pi^a)$. So M_1 – and similarly M_2 – is annihilated by π^{a-1} and thus $R/(\pi^a)$ would be annihilated by π^{a-1}, a contradiction. $\square$

Normalization theorems

We work in the following situation: R is an integrally closed domain with fraction field K, L/K is a field extension, and $S = I_L(R)$ is the integral closure of R in L. In more geometric language, S is the **normalization** of R in the extension L/K.

As above, we may as well assume that L/K is algebraic, since in the general case, if we let $L' = I_K(L)$ be the algebraic closure of K in L, then S is contained in L' anyway. So let us assume this. Then we know that S is integrally closed with fraction field L. We also know that the Krull dimensions of S and R coincide.

The major questions are the following:

(Q1) Is S finitely generated as an R-module?
(Q2) Is S Noetherian?
(Q3) If not, then can anything nice be said about S?

Note that if R is Noetherian, then an affirmative solution to (Q1) implies an affirmative answer to (Q2). Also, the example $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $L = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ shows that both (Q1) and (Q2) may have a negative answer if $[L : K]$ is infinite.

1. The First Normalization Theorem

The first, and easiest, result is the following:

THEOREM 18.1. *(First Normalization Theorem) Let R be an integrally closed domain with fraction field K, L/K a finite **separable** field extension, and $S = I_L(R)$.*
a) There exists a K-basis $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ of L such that S is contained in the R-submodule generated by $x_1, \ldots, x_n$.
b) If R is Noetherian, S is a finitely generated R-module.
c) If R is a PID, then S is a free R-module of rank $[L : K]$.

PROOF. a) By the proof of Proposition 14.10, for any $x \in L$, there exists $0 \neq r \in R$ such that $rx \in S$. Therefore there exists a K-basis $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ of L such that $u_i \in S$ for all i.[1] Now take $x \in S$ and write $x = \sum_i b_i u_i$ with $b_i \in K$. Since L/K is separable there are $n = [L : K]$ distinct K-embeddings of L into $\overline{K}$, say $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$, and the discriminant $\Delta = \Delta(u_1, \ldots, u_n) = (\det(\sigma_j(u_i)))^2$ is nonzero. We may put $\sqrt{\Delta}) = \det(\sigma_j(u_i))$. For all $1 \leq j \leq n$ we have

$$\sigma_j(x) = \sum_i b_i \sigma_j(u_i).$$

---

[1] We have not yet used the separability hypothesis, so this much is true in the case of an arbitrary finite extension.

Using Cramer's rule, we may solve for the b_i to get

$$\sqrt{\Delta}b_i = \sum_j d_{ij}\sigma_j(x), \ db_i = \sum_j \sqrt{d}d_{ij}\sigma_j(x),$$

where the d_{ij}'s are polynomials in the $\sigma_j(u_i)$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$. Thus Δb_i and $\sqrt{\Delta}b_i$ are integral over R. Since $\Delta \in K$ and R is integrally closed, we have $\Delta b_i \in A$. Therefore S is contained in the R-span $\langle \frac{u_1}{\Delta}, \ldots, \frac{u_n}{\Delta} \rangle_R$, establishing part a).
b) By part a), S is a submodule of a finitely generated R-module, hence if R is Noetherian S is finitely generated.
c) We know that S is a submodule of a free rank n R-module; if R is a PID, then S is a free R-module of rank at most n. Since $S \otimes_R K = L$, the rank must be n. $\square$

This has the following important result, which is the first of three fundamental **finiteness theorems** in algebraic number theory, the existence of a finite integral basis for the ring of integers of any algebraic number field:

COROLLARY 18.2. *Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $K = \mathbb{Q}$, L a number field of degree n. Then the ring $\mathbb{Z}_L = \overline{\mathbb{Z}} \cap K$ of all algebraic integers lying in L, is an integrally closed, Noetherian domain of Krull dimension one which is, as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, free of rank n.*

PROOF. Indeed $\mathbb{Z}_L = I_L(\mathbb{Z})$, so by Proposition 14.11, it is integrally closed in its fraction field L. Since $\mathbb{Z}$ is a PID and $L/\mathbb{Q}$ is finite separable, Theorem 18.1 applies to show that $\mathbb{Z}_L \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module. Being a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}$-module, still more is it a finitely generated *algebra* over the Noetherian ring $\mathbb{Z}$, so it is itself Noetherian. Since $\mathbb{Z}$, like any PID, has Krull dimension one and $\mathbb{Z}_L$ is an integral extension of $\mathbb{Z}$, by Corollary 14.17 $\mathbb{Z}_L$ also has Krull dimension one. $\square$

A **Dedekind domain** is a domain which is Noetherian, integrally closed and of Krull dimension at most one. We will systematically study Dedekind domains in §20, but for now observe that Corollary 18.2 implies that the ring of integers of an algebraic number field is a Dedekind domain. In fact, the argument establishes that the normalization S of any Dedekind domain R in a finite separable field extension L/K is again a Dedekind domain that is finitely generated as an R-module.

What about the nonseparable case?

EXAMPLE 18.3. *See $http://math.stackexchange.com/questions/1171259$*
COMPLETE ME! ♣

2. The Second Normalization Theorem

THEOREM 18.4. *(Second Normalization Theorem) Let R be a domain with fraction field K. Suppose that at least one of the following holds:*
• R is absolutely finitely generated – i.e., finitely generated as a $\mathbb{Z}$-algebra – or
• R contains a field k and is finitely generated as a k-algebra.
Let L/K be a finite degree field extension. Then $S = I_L(R)$ is a finitely generated R-module.

PROOF. First suppose that R is a finitely generated algebra over a field k.
Step 0: We may assume that L/K is normal. Indeed, let M be the normal closure of L/K, so M/K is a finite normal extension. Let T be the integral closure of R in M. If we can show that T is finitely generated over R, then, since R is Noetherian, the finitely submodule S is also finitely generated over R.

Step 1: We will make use of the field-theoretic fact that if M/K is normal and L is the maximal purely inseparable subextension of M/K, then M/L is separable [**FT**, §6.3]. Let S be the integral closure of R in L and T the integral closure of R in T. Then T is module-finite over R iff T is module-finite over S and S is module-finite over R. Suppose we can show that S is module-finite over R. Then S is a finitely generated R-algebra so S is a Noetherian integreally closed domain, and the module finiteness of T over S follows from Theorem 18.1. Thus we are reduced to the case in which L/K is purely inseparable, say $[L:K] = q = p^a$.

Step 2: By Noether Normalization, R is module-finite over a polynomial ring $k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$. If S is module-finite over $k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$, then certainly it is module-finite over the larger ring R. Thus we may assume without loss of generality that $R = k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$, $K = k(t_1, \ldots, t_d)$. In particular we may assume that R is integrally closed (in K). For all $a \in L$, $N_{L/K}(a) = a^q \in K$. Let k'/k be the extension obtained by adjoining the qth roots of the coefficients of the minimal polynomials of a finite set of generators of L/K, so k'/k is finite, so $L \subset k'(t_1^{1/q}, \ldots, t_d^{1/q})$. So it is enough to show that the integral closure of $k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$ in $k'(t_1^{1/q}, \ldots, t_d^{1/q})$ is finite over $k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$. But in this case the integral closure can be computed exactly: it is $k'[t_1^{1/q}, \ldots, t_d^{1/q}]$ (indeed it is at least this large, and this ring is a UFD, hence integrally closed), which is finite over $k[t_1, \ldots, t_d]$. $\qquad \square$

3. The Krull-Akizuki Theorem

In this section we come to one of the most beautiful and useful results in the subject, the Krull-Akizuki Theorem. Its content is essentially that normalization works magnificently well in dimension one. Our treatment follows [**M**, §11].

LEMMA 18.5. *For a Noetherian domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R has dimension at most one.
(ii) For every nonzero ideal I of R, R/I is an Artinian ring.
(iii) For every nonzero ideal I of R, $\ell_R(R/I) < \infty$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): R/I is Noetherian, and prime ideals of R/I correspond to prime ideals of R containing the nonzero ideal I, so are all maximal. By Theorem 8.36, R/I is Artinian.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Every finitely generated module over an Artinian ring is also Noetherian hence has finite length.
$\neg$ (i) $\implies \neg$ (iii): If R has dimension greater than one, there is a nonzero, non-maximal prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R. The R-module $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a domain which is not a field, hence not Artinian, hence of infinite length. $\qquad \square$

LEMMA 18.6. *Let R be a one-dimensional Noetherian domain with fraction field K. Let M be a torsionfree R-module with $r = \dim_K M \otimes_R K < \infty$. Then for all $x \in R^\bullet$, $\ell(M/xM) \leq r\ell(R/xR)$.*

PROOF. Step 1: First suppose that M is finitely generated. Let $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_r \in M$ be R-linearly independent and put $E = \langle \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_r \rangle_M$. Since $r = \dim_K M \otimes_R K$, for $\eta \in M$, there is $t \in R$ with $t\eta \in E$. Put $C = M/E$. Then C is finitely generated, so there is $t \in R^\bullet$ such that $tC = 0$. By Lemma 18.5, the ring R/tR is Artinian. Since C is a finitely generated R/tR-module, it has finite length, and thus it also has finite length, say m, as an R-module. For $x \in R^\bullet$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the exact sequence

$$E/x^n E \longrightarrow M/x^n M \to C/x^n C$$

yields

(42) $\ell(M/x^n M) \leq \ell(E/x^n E) + \ell(C).$

Since E and M are torsionfree, we have $x^i M/x^{i+1} M \cong M/xM$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and
similarly $x^i E/x^{i+1} E \cong E/xE$; it follows that

$$n\ell(M/xM) \leq n\ell(E/xE) + \ell(C) \ \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+,$$

and thus

$$\ell(M/xM) \leq \ell(E/xE).$$

Since $E \cong R^r$, $E/xE \cong (R/xR)^r$, so

$$\ell(M/xM) \leq \ell((R/xR)^r) = r\ell(R/xR).$$

Step 2: In the general case, put $\overline{M} = M/xM$ and let $\overline{N} = \langle \overline{\omega_1}, \ldots, \overline{\omega_s} \rangle$ be a finitely
generated submodule of $\overline{M}$. Lift each $\overline{\omega_i}$ to $\omega_i \in M$ and put $M_1 = \langle \omega_1, \ldots, \omega_s \rangle$.
We get

$$\ell(\overline{N}) \leq \ell(M_1/M_1 \cap xM) \leq \ell(M_1/xM_1) \leq r\ell(R/xR),$$

the last inequality by Step 1. Because the right hand side of this inequality is
independent of $\overline{N}$, by Exercise 8.13 $\ell(\overline{M}) \leq r\ell(R/xR)$.
Step 3: We have $\ell(R/xR) < \infty$ by Lemma 18.5. $\square$

THEOREM 18.7. *(Krull-Akizuki) Let R be a one-dimensional Noetherian domain with fraction field K, let L/K be a finite degree field extension of K, and let S be a ring with $R \subset S \subset L$. Then:*
a) S is Noetherian of dimension at most 1.
b) If J is a nonzero ideal of S, then S/J is a finite length R-module.

PROOF. b) It is no loss of generality to replace L by the fraction field of S. Let
$r = [L : K]$, so that S is a torsionfree R-module of rank r. By Lemma 18.6, for any
$x \in R^\bullet$ we have $\ell_R(S/aS) < \infty$. Let J be a nonzero ideal of S and $b \in J^\bullet$. Since b
is algebraic over R it satisfies a relation

$$a_m b^m + \ldots + a_1 b + a_0 = 0, \ a_i \in R$$

of minimal degree. Since S is a domain, $a_0 \in (J \cap R)^\bullet$, so

$$\ell_R(S/J) \leq \ell_R(S/a_0 S) < \infty.$$

a) Since

$$\ell_S(J/a_0 S) \leq \ell_R(J/a_0 S) \leq \ell_R(S/a_0 S) < \infty,$$

$J/a_0 S$ is a finitely generated S-module. Being an extension of a finitely generated
S-module by a finitely generated S-module, J is itself a finitely generated: S is
Noetherian. If $\mathcal{P}$ is a nonzero prime ideal of S then $S/\mathcal{P}$ has finite length so is an
Artinian domain, hence a field: S has dimension at most one. $\square$

We remark that S need not be finitely generated as an R-module. Thus Step 2 in
the proof of Lemma 18.6 is actually used in the proof of the Krull-Akizuki Theorem.

Comparing the following exercise with Exercise 8.35 gives a good illustration of
how much simpler things are in dimension 1.

EXERCISE 18.1. *Let k be a field, and let A be a k-subalgebra of $k[t]$. Show: either
$A = k$ or A is a one-dimensional Noetherian domain that is finitely generated as a
k-algebra.*

COROLLARY 18.8. *Let R be a one-dimensional Noetherian domain with fraction field K, let L/K be a finite degree field extension, and let S be the integral closure of R in L. Then S is a Dedekind domain, and for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R there are only finitely many prime ideals of S lying over $\mathfrak{p}$.*

EXERCISE 18.2. *Prove Corollary 18.8.*

The Picard Group and the Divisor Class Group

1. Fractional ideals

Let R be a domain with fraction field K. A **fractional ideal** of R is a nonzero R-submodule I of K for which there exists $0 \neq a \in R$ such that $aI \subset R$ – or equivalently, if $I \subset \frac{1}{a}R$.

When one is talking about fractional R-ideals, one inevitably wants to compare them to ideals of R in the usual sense, and for this it is convenient to speak of an **integral R-ideal**, i.e., an R-submodule of R.

> EXERCISE 19.1. *Show: a finitely generated R-submodule of K is a fractional ideal.*

Some texts *define* a fractional R-ideal to be a finitely generated R-submodule of K, but this seems wrong because we certainly want every nonzero integral ideal of R to be a fractional ideal, but if R is not Noetherian then not every integral ideal will be finitely generated. (It is not such a big deal because most of these references are interested only in *invertible* fractional ideals – to be studied shortly – and one of the first things we will see is that an invertible fractional ideal is necessarily finitely generated as an R-module.)

We denote the set of all fractional ideals of R by $\mathrm{Frac}(R)$.

> THEOREM 19.1. *Let I, J, M be fractional ideals in a domain R.*
> *a) Then*
> $$I \cap J = \{x \in K \mid x \in I \text{ and } x \in J\},$$
> $$I + J = \{x + y \mid x \in I, \ y \in J\},$$
> $$IJ = \{\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i, \ \mid x_i \in I, \ y_i \in J\},$$
> $$(I : J) = \{x \in K \mid xJ \subset I\}$$
> *are all fractional ideals.*
> *b) We may partially order $\mathrm{Frac}(R)$ under inclusion. Then the greatest lower bound of I and J is $I \cap J$ and the least upper bound of I and J is $I + J$.*
> *c) If $I \subset J$, then $IM \subset JM$.*
> *d) R itself is a fractional ideal, and $R \cdot I = R$. Thus the fractional ideals form a commutative monoid under multiplication.*

> PROOF. a) It is immediate that $I \cap J$, $I + J$, IJ and $(I : J)$ are all R-submodules of K. It remains to be seen that they are nonzero and can be scaled to lie inside R. Suppose $I \subset \frac{1}{a}R$ and $J \subset \frac{1}{b}R$. Then:

$0 \subsetneq I \subset I + J \subset \frac{1}{ab}R$, so $I + J$ is a fractional ideal.

$0 \subsetneq IJ \subset I \cap J \subset \frac{1}{ab}R$, so IJ and $I \cap J$ are fractional ideals.

Since $I \cap R$ is a fractional ideal, there exists a nonzero $c \in R$ lying in I. Then for $y \in J$, $\frac{c}{b}y \in cR \subset I$, so $\frac{c}{b} \in (I : J)$. Similarly, if $0 \neq d \in J$, then $\frac{1}{ad}(I : J) \subset R$. Parts b), c) and d) can be easily verified by the reader. $\qquad \square$

PROPOSITION 19.2. *Let I, J be fractional ideals for a domain R. The map*

$$(I : J) \to \mathrm{Hom}_R(J, I), \ \ x \mapsto (y \mapsto xy)$$

is an isomorphism of R-modules.

EXERCISE 19.2. *Prove it.*

PROPOSITION 19.3. *All the above operations on fractional ideals commute with localization: that is, if $S \subset R^\bullet$ is a multiplicatively closed subset, then*

$$S^{-1}(I \cap J) = S^{-1}I \cap S^{-I}J,$$
$$S^{-1}(I + J) = S^{-1}I + S^{-1}J,$$
$$S^{-1}(IJ) = (S^{-1}I)(S^{-1}J),$$
$$S^{-1}(I : J) = (S^{-1}I : S^{-1}J).$$

EXERCISE 19.3. *Prove Proposition 19.3.*

A fractional ideal is **principal** if it is of the form xR for some $x = \frac{a}{b} \in K^\bullet$.

PROPOSITION 19.4. *For a fractional ideal I of R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) I is principal.
(ii) I is monogenic as an R-module.
(iii) $I \cong_R R$.
(iv) I is free as an R-module.

PROOF. (i) $\iff$ (ii): By definition, a monogenic R-module M is one of the form Rx for some $x \in M$.

(i) $\implies$ (iii): For $x \in K^\times$ multiplication by x^{-1} is an R-module isomorphism from xR to R.

(iii) $\implies$ (ii) and (iii) $\implies$ (iv) are immediate.

(iv) $\implies$ (iii): It is no loss of generality to assume that $I \subset R$. Since any two elements $x, y \in I$ are R-linearly dependent – indeed $(y)x + (-x)y = 0$ – if I is free, it must have rank 1. $\qquad \square$

If xR is a principal fractional ideal, so is $x^{-1}R$, and we have

$$(xR)(x^{-1}R) = R.$$

Thus, in $\mathrm{Frac}(R)$, every principal fractional ideal xR is a unit, with inverse $x^{-1}R$.

Let $\mathrm{Prin}(R)$ denote the set of all principal fractional ideals of the domain R.

EXERCISE 19.4. *Show: $\mathrm{Prin}(R)$ is a subgroup of $\mathrm{Frac}(R)$, and we have a short exact sequence $1 \to R^\times \to K^\times \to \mathrm{Prin}(R) \to 1$.*

EXERCISE 19.5. *Define the **ideal class monoid** $C(R) = \mathrm{Frac}(R)/\mathrm{Prin}(R)$.*
a) Show: $C(R)$ is well-defined as a commutative monoid.
b) Show: $C(R)$ is trivial iff R is a PID.
c) Show: $C(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}])$ is a finite commutative monoid which is not a group.

For a general domain, $C(R)$ need only be a commutative monoid. In the next section we "repair" this by defining the **Picard group** $\text{Pic}(R)$.

2. The Ideal Closure

For $I \in \text{Frac}(R)$, put

$$I^* = (R : I) = \{x \in K \mid xI \subset R\}.$$

EXERCISE 19.6. *Let R be a domain. Show: for any fractional R-ideal I, I^* is a fractional R-ideal. (Hint: if $R \subset I$, then $I^* \subset R$. Reduce the general case to this.)*

The fractional ideal I^* is called[1] the **quasi-inverse** of I. As we shall see later in this section, if the ideal I has an inverse in the monoid $\text{Frac}\, R$, then its inverse must be I^*: i.e. $II^* = R$. In general though all we get from the definition of I^* is the relation $II^* \subset R$. This observation motivates the following one.

PROPOSITION 19.5. *Let R be a domain, and let $\mathcal{R} \subset K \times K$ given by $x\mathcal{R}y$ iff $xy \in R$. Let (Φ, Ψ) be the induced Galois connection from 2^K to itself. Then, for any fractional ideal I of R, $\Phi(I) = \Psi(I) = I^*$. In other words, $I \mapsto I^*$ is a self-dual antitone Galois connection on $\text{Frac}\, R$.*

EXERCISE 19.7. *Prove Proposition 19.5.*

As usual, we denote the associated closure operator by $I \mapsto \overline{I}$. Now the machinery of Galois connections gives us many facts for free that we would otherwise have to spend a little time deriving:

COROLLARY 19.6. *Let R be a domain and let $I, J \in \text{Frac}\, R$.*
a) If $I \subset J$, then $J^* \subset I^*$.
b) We have $I^* \subset J^* \iff \overline{I} \supset \overline{J}$.
c) We have $\overline{\overline{I}} = \overline{I}$.
d) We have $(I \cap J)^* = I^* + J^*$ and $\overline{I \cap J} = \overline{I} \cap \overline{J}$.

EXERCISE 19.8. *Prove Corollary 19.6.*

EXERCISE 19.9. *Give an example of $I, J \in \text{Frac}\, R$ with $J^* \subset I^*$ but $I \not\subset J$.*

PROPOSITION 19.7. *For a domain R and $I \in \text{Frac}\, R$, we have*

$$\overline{I} = \bigcap_{d \in K^\times \ \mid \ I \subset d^{-1}R} d^{-1}R.$$

PROOF.

$$\overline{I} = (I^*)^* = \{x \in K \mid xI^* \subset R\} = \{x \in K \mid \forall d \in K^\times, dI \subset R \implies xd \in R\}$$

$$= \bigcap_{d \in K^\times \ \mid \ I \subset d^{-1}R} d^{-1}R. \qquad \square$$

---

[1] Unfortunately?

3. Invertible fractional ideals and the Picard group

Like any monoid, $\text{Frac}(R)$ has a group of units, i.e., the subset of invertible elements. Explicitly, a fractional ideal I is **invertible** if there exists another fractional ideal J such that $IJ = R$. We denote the group $\text{Frac}(R)^\times$ of invertible fractional ideals by $\text{Inv}(R)$.

EXERCISE 19.10. *Let $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ be fractional ideals of R. Show: the product $I_1 \cdots I_n$ is invertible iff each I_i is invertible.*

LEMMA 19.8.   a) *For a fractional ideal I, the following are equivalent:*
    (i) *I is invertible.*
    (ii) *$II^* = R$.*
  b) *(**To contain is to divide**) If $I \subset J$ are fractional ideals with J invertible, then*

$$I = J(I : J).$$

PROOF. a) (i) $\implies$ (ii): As above, for any fractional ideal I we have $II^* \subset R$. Now suppose there exists some fractional ideal J such that $IJ = R$, then

$$J \subset (R : I) = I^*,$$

so

$$R = IJ \subset II^*.$$

(ii) $\implies$ (i) is obvious.
b) By definition of $(I : K)$ we have $J(I : J) \subset I$. Conversely, since $I \subset J$, $J^{-1}I \subset R$. Since $(J^{-1}I)J = I$, it follows that $J^{-1}I \subset (I : J)$ and thus $I \subset J(I : J)$. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 19.9. *Let I be an invertible fractional ideal. Then I is a finitely generated projective rank one module.*

PROOF. Step 1: We show an invertible fractional ideal I is a finitely generated projective module. Since $II^* = R$, we may write $1 = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i y_i$ with $x_i \in I$ and $y_i \in I^*$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, define $f_i \in \text{Hom}(I, R)$ be $f_i(x) = xy_i$. Then for all $x \in I$,

$$x = \sum_i x x_i y_i = \sum_i x_i f_i(x).$$

By the Dual Basis Lemma, I is a projective R-module generated by $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Step 2: To show that I has rank one, it suffices to show that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}\, R$, $I_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is free of rank one over $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. But since projective implies locally free, we know that $I_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a free $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$-module of some rank, and for any ring R and any ideal I, I cannot be free of rank greater than one over R. Indeed, if so I would have two R-linearly independent elements x and y, which is absurd, since $yx + (-x)y = 0$. $\qquad\square$

Conversely:

PROPOSITION 19.10. *Let I be a nonzero fractional ideal of R which is, as an R-module, projective. Then I is invertible.*

PROOF. We have the inclusion $\iota : II^* \subset R$ which we wish to show is an equality. This can be checked locally: i.e., it is enough to show that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}\, R$, $\iota_{\mathfrak{p}} : I_{\mathfrak{p}} I_{\mathfrak{p}}^* \to R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism. By Proposition 19.3, it is equivalent to show that $I_{\mathfrak{p}}(I_{\mathfrak{p}})^* \to R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is an isomorphism, but since I is projective, by Kaplansky's Theorem $I_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is free. As above, being a nonzero ideal, it is then necessarily free

of rank one, i.e., a principal fractional ideal $xR_\mathfrak{p}$. It follows immediately that $(I_\mathfrak{p})^* = x^{-1}R_\mathfrak{p}$ and thus that the map is an isomorphism. $\qquad\square$

To sum up:

THEOREM 19.11. *Let R be a domain, and let I be a fractional R-ideal. Then I is invertible iff it is projective, in which case it is projective of rank one.*

For any R-module M, the R-dual is defined to be $M^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}(M, R)$. There is a canonical R-bilinear map $T : M^\vee \times M \to R$ obtained by mapping $(f, x) \mapsto f(x)$. This induces an R-linear map $T : M^\vee \otimes_R M \to R$. We say that an R-module M is **invertible** if T is an isomorphism.

PROPOSITION 19.12. *Consider the following conditions on an R-module M.*
(i) M is rank one projective.
(ii) M is invertible.
(iii) There exists an R-module N and an isomorphism $T : M \otimes_R N \cong R$.
Then (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii) always, and (iii) $\implies$ (i) if M is finitely generated.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): We have a map $T : M^\vee \otimes M \to R$ so that it suffices to check locally that is an isomorphism, but M is locally free so this is easy.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii) is immediate.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): Since M is finitely generated, by Theorem 13.35 to show that M is projective it is enough to show that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}\, R$ $M_\mathfrak{p}$ is free of rank one. Thus we may as well assume that $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring with residue field $R/\mathfrak{m} = k$. The base change of the isomorphism T to $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is an isomorphism (recall that tensor product commutes with base change)

$$T_k : M/\mathfrak{m}M \otimes_k N/\mathfrak{m}N \to k.$$

This shows that $\dim_k M/\mathfrak{m}M = \dim_k N/\mathfrak{m}N = 1$, so in particular $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ is monogenic as an $R/\mathfrak{m}$-module. By Nakayama's Lemma the lift to R of any generator x of $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ is a generator of M, so M is a monogenic R-module and is thus isomorphic to R/I for some ideal I. But indeed $I = \mathrm{ann}(M) \subset \mathrm{ann}(M \otimes_R N) = \mathrm{ann}(R) = 0$, so $M \cong R/(0) = R$ is free of rank one. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 19.13. *(Cohen) Let R be a domain.*
a) The set of invertible ideals of R is an Oka family in the sense of § 4.5.
b) If every nonzero prime ideal of R is invertible, then every nonzero fractional ideal of R is invertible.

PROOF. a) Let $I \subset J$ be ideals of R with J and $(I : J)$ invertible (this implies $I \neq 0$). By Lemma 19.8, $I = J(I : J)$ and thus, as the product of two invertible ideals, I is invertible. Since for any ideals I, J of R we have $(I : J) = (I : I + J)$, by taking $J = \langle I, x \rangle$ for any $x \in R$ we recover the Oka condition.
b) Seeking a contradiction, suppose I is a nonzero ideal of R which is not invertible. Consider the partially ordered set $\mathcal{S}$ of ideals containing I which are not invertible. Then the union of any chain in $\mathcal{S}$ is a non-invertible ideal: indeed, if it were invertible then by Proposition 19.9 it would be finitely generated and thus equal to some element in the chain: contradiction. Thus by Zorn's Lemma there is a nonzero ideal J which is maximal element in the family of ideals which are not invertible. By part a) and the Prime Ideal Principle, J is prime: contradiction. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 19.14. *Let I and J be invertible fractional ideals. Then there is a canonical isomorphism of R-modules*

$$I \otimes_R J \xrightarrow{\sim} IJ.$$

PROOF. The natural multiplication map $I \times J \to IJ$ is R-bilinear so factors through an R-module map $m : I \otimes_R J \to IJ$. Once we have a globally defined map, to see that it is an isomorphism it is enough to check it locally: for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$,

$$m_{\mathfrak{p}} : I_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} J_{\mathfrak{p}} \xrightarrow{\sim} I_{\mathfrak{p}} J_{\mathfrak{p}}$$

and we are thus allowed to assume that I and J are principal fractional ideals. This makes things very easy, and we leave the endgame to the reader. $\square$

COROLLARY 19.15. *Let I and J be invertible fractional R-ideals. the following are equivalent:*
(i) There exists $x \in K^{\times}$ such that $xI = J$.
(ii) $I \cong_R J$, i.e., I and J are isomorphic R-modules.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): If $J = xI$, then multiplication by x gives an R-module isomorphism from I to J.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Since $I \cong_R J$ we have

$$I^{-1}J \cong I^{-1} \otimes_R J \cong I^{-1} \otimes_R I \cong II^{-1} = R.$$

By Proposition 19.4, $I^{-1}J$ is a principal fractional ideal, i.e., there exists $x \in K^{\times}$ such that $I^{-1}J = xR$. Multiplying through by I, we get $xI = J$. $\square$

PROPOSITION 19.16. *Let M be a rank one projective module over a domain R with fraction field K. Then there is a fractional R-ideal I such that $M \cong_R I$.*

PROOF. Since M is projective, it is flat, and so tensoring the injection $R \hookrightarrow K$ with M we get an injection $f : M = R \otimes_R M \hookrightarrow M \otimes_R K \cong K$, the last isomorphism since M is locally free of rank 1. Thus $f : M \xrightarrow{\sim} f(M)$, and $f(M)$ is a finitely generated R- submodule of K and thus a fractional R-ideal. $\square$

Putting together all the pieces we get the following important result.

THEOREM 19.17. *Let R be a domain. The following two commutative groups are canonically isomorphic:*
(i) $\operatorname{Inv}(R)/\operatorname{Prin}(R)$ with $[I][J] := [IJ]$.
(ii) Isomorphism classes of rank one projective R-modules under tensor product.
*We may therefore define the **Picard group** $\operatorname{Pic} R$ to be either the group of invertible fractional ideals modulo principal fractional ideals under multiplication or the group of isomorphism classes of rank one projective modules under tensor product.*

LEMMA 19.18. *In any domain R, let $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_k$ be a set of invertible prime ideals and let $\mathcal{Q}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{Q}_l$ be any set of prime ideals. Suppose that*

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{P}_i = \prod_{j=1}^{l} \mathcal{Q}_j.$$

Then $i = j$ and there exists some permutation σ of the set $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ we have $\mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{Q}_{\sigma(i)}$.

In other words, prime factorization is unique for products of invertible primes.

PROOF. Assume without loss of generality that $\mathcal{P}_1$ does not strictly contain any $\mathcal{P}_i$. Since $\prod_j \mathcal{Q}_j \subset \mathcal{P}_1$, some $\mathcal{Q}_j$, say $\mathcal{Q}_1$, is contained in $\mathcal{P}_1$. Similarly, since $\prod_i \mathcal{P}_i \subset \mathcal{Q}_1$, there exists i such that $\mathcal{P}_i \subset \mathcal{Q}_1$. Thus $\mathcal{P}_i \subset \mathcal{Q}_1 \subset \mathcal{P}_1$. By our assumption on the minimality of $\mathcal{P}_1$, we have $\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P}_i = \mathcal{Q}_1$. We can thus cancel $\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{Q}_1$ and obtain the result by induction. $\qquad\square$

LEMMA 19.19. *Let R be an integrally closed Noetherian domain with fraction field K, and let I be a fractional R-ideal. Then $(I : I) := \{x \in K \mid xI \subset I\} = R$.*

PROOF. Clearly $R \subset (I : I)$. Conversely, let $x \in (I : I)$. Then I is a faithful $R[x]$-module that is finitely generated over R, so x is integral over R. $\qquad\square$

LEMMA 19.20. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K, $S \subset R \setminus \{0\}$ a multiplicative subset, and I, J fractional R-ideals.*
a) We have $(I + J)_S = I_S + J_S$.
b) $(IJ)_S = I_S J_S$.
c) $(I \cap J)_S = I_S \cap J_S$.
d) If I is finitely generated, then $(I^*)_S = (I_S)^*$.

PROOF. Parts a) and b) are immediate and are just recorded for future reference. For part c), we evidently have $(I \cap J)_S \subset I_S \cap J_S$. Conversely, let $x \in I_S \cap J_S$, so $x = \frac{i}{s_1} = \frac{j}{s_2}$ with $i \in I$, $j \in J$, $s_1, s_2 \in S$. Put $b = a_1 s_2 = a_2 s_1 \in I \cap J$; then $x = \frac{b}{s_1 s_2} \in (I \cap J)_S$, establishing part c). For part d), note first that $(I + J)^* = I^* \cap J^*$. Also if $0 \neq x \in K$, then $(Rx)_S = R_S x$. Hence if $I = Rx_1 + \ldots + Rx_n$, then $I_S = R_S x_1 + \ldots + R_S x_n$, so $(I_S)^* = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} R_S$. On the other hand, $I^* = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} R$, and thus part c) we have

$$(I^*)_S = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} R_S = (I_S)^*. \qquad\qquad \square$$

LEMMA 19.21. *A nonzero ideal in a Noetherian domain contains a product of nonzero prime ideals.*

PROOF. Assume not: let I be a nonzero ideal which is maximal with respect to the property of not containing a product of nonzero prime ideals. Then I is not prime: there are x_1, $x_2 \in R \setminus I$ such that $x_1 x_2 \in I$. For $i = 1, 2$ put $I_i := \langle I, x_i \rangle$, so that $I \subsetneq I_i$ and $I \supset I_1 I_2$. By maximality of I, $I_1 \supset \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{r}}$ and $I_2 \supset \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (with $\mathfrak{p}_i$, $\mathfrak{q}_j$ prime for all i, j), and then $I \supset \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{r}} \mathfrak{q}_1 \supset \mathfrak{q}_{\mathfrak{s}}$, contradiction. $\qquad\square$

LEMMA 19.22. *(Jacobson) Let R be a Noetherian domain of Krull dimension at most one. Let I be a proper, nonzero ideal of R. Then $(R : I) \supsetneq R$.*

PROOF. Let $0 \neq a \in I$, so $aR \subset I \subset R$. By Lemma 19.21, there are nonzero prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_m$ such that $aR \supset \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m$; we may assume m is minimal. Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal containing I. Then $\mathfrak{m} \supset I \supset aR \supset \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m$; since nonzero prime ideals are maximal, this implies $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i, say for $i = 1$. If $m = 1$ then $I = aR$ so $(R : I) = a^{-1}R \supsetneq R$. Now suppose $m > 1$; by minimality of m, aR does *not* contain $\mathfrak{p}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m$ so we may choose $b \in \mathfrak{p}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m \setminus aR$. Put $c = a^{-1}b$. Then $c \notin R$ and $cI \subset c\mathfrak{m} = a^{-1}b\mathfrak{m} \subset a m \mathfrak{p}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m \subset a^{-1}(aR) = R$, so $c \in (R : I)$. $\qquad\square$

The following result gives information about when a prime ideal is invertible.

PROPOSITION 19.23. *Let R be a Noetherian domain, and $\mathfrak{p}$ a nonzero prime ideal of R. If $\mathfrak{p}$ is invertible, then it has height one and $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a DVR.*

PROOF. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is invertible, $R_\mathfrak{p}$ is a Noetherian local domain with a principal maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}R_\mathfrak{p}$. By Theorem 17.21, $R_\mathfrak{p}$ is a DVR, and thus $\mathfrak{p}$ has height one. $\square$

4. Divisorial ideals and the Divisor Class Group

For $I, J \in \operatorname{Frac}(R)$, we write $I \leq J$ if every principal fractional ideal Ra which is contained in I is also contained in J. This gives a preordering on $\operatorname{Frac}(R)$. Let R be the associated equivalence relation, i.e., $I \sim J$ if $I \leq J$ and $J \leq I$.

We write $D(R) = \operatorname{Frac}(R)/\sim$. Elements of $D(R)$ are called **divisors** on R. For a fractional ideal I, we denote its image in $D(R)$ by $\operatorname{div}(I)$, and for a principal fractional ideal aR, we write simply $\operatorname{div}(a)$. Such elements are called **principal divisors**. A fractional ideal I is **divisorial** if $\overline{I} = I$.

EXERCISE 19.11. *Let R be a domain and I a fractional R-ideal.*
a) Show: $\overline{I}$ is the unique divisorial ideal with $\operatorname{div} \overline{I} = \operatorname{div} I$.
b) Show: $\overline{I}$ is the smallest divisorial fractional ideal containing I.
c) Show: invertible fractional ideals are divisorial.

EXERCISE 19.12. *If I is a divisorial fractional ideal and $x \in K^\bullet$, then Ix is a divisorial fractional ideal.*

EXERCISE 19.13. *Let $\{I_i\}$ be a family of divisorial fractional ideals such that $I = \bigcap_i I_i$ is nonzero. Show: I is a divisorial fractional ideal.*

LEMMA 19.24. *Let $I, J \in \operatorname{Frac} R$.*
a) The following are equivalent:
(i) $I \leq J$.
(ii) $J^* \subset I^*$.
b) The following are equivalent:
(i) $I \sim J$.
(ii) $I^* = J^*$.
(iii) $\overline{I} = \overline{J}$.
(iv) $\operatorname{div} I = \operatorname{div} J$.

EXERCISE 19.14. *Prove Lemma 19.24.*

PROPOSITION 19.25. *For $I, J, M \in \operatorname{Frac} R$: $\operatorname{div} I \leq \operatorname{div} J \implies \operatorname{div} IM \leq \operatorname{div} JM$.*

PROOF. By hypothesis $\overline{J} \subset \overline{I}$; equivalently $(R : I) = I^* \subset J^* = (R : J)$. Then
$$(IM)^* = (R : IM) = ((R : I) : M) \subset ((R : J) : M) = [R : JM] = (JM)^*.$$
It follows that $\overline{JM} \subset \overline{IM}$, so $\operatorname{div} IM \leq \operatorname{div} JM$. $\square$

PROPOSITION 19.26. *Let R be a domain.*
a) For $\operatorname{div} I, \operatorname{div} J \in D(R)$, the operation $\operatorname{div} I + \operatorname{div} J = \operatorname{div} IJ$ is well-defined and endows $D(R)$ with the structure of a commutative monoid.
b) $(D(R), +, <)$ is a lattice-ordered monoid.

PROOF. We have
$$(R : IJ) = ((R : I) : J) = (R : \overline{I}) : J) = ((R : J) : \overline{I})$$
$$= ((R : \overline{J}) : \overline{I}) = (R : \overline{IJ}),$$

so $\operatorname{div} I + \operatorname{div} J = \operatorname{div} \overline{I} + \operatorname{div} \overline{J}$.

b) For $I, J, M \in \operatorname{Frac} R$ with $\operatorname{div} I \leq \operatorname{div} J$, by Proposition 19.25 and part a),

$$\operatorname{div} I + \operatorname{div} M = \operatorname{div} IM \leq \operatorname{div} JM = \operatorname{div} J + \operatorname{div} M,$$

and thus the partial ordering is compatible with the monoid structure. To show that we have a lattice, for any $I, J \in \operatorname{Frac} R$, we need to find the supremum and infimum of $\operatorname{div} I$ and $\operatorname{div} J$. We claim that in fact we have

$$\operatorname{div}(I \cap J) = \sup \operatorname{div} I, \operatorname{div} J$$

$$\operatorname{div}(I + J) = \inf \operatorname{div} I, \operatorname{div} J.$$

To see this we may assume I and J are divisorial. By Exercise 19.12, $I \cap J$ is divisorial, so it is clear that for any divisorial ideal M,

$$(\operatorname{div} I \leq M, \ \operatorname{div} J \leq M) \iff (M \subset I, \ M \subset J)$$

$$\iff (M \subset I \cap J) \iff \operatorname{div} I \cap J \leq \operatorname{div} M.$$

Next, observe that since $I, J \subset I + J$, $\operatorname{div} I + J \leq \operatorname{div} I, \operatorname{div} J$, i.e., $\operatorname{div} I + J$ is a lower bound for $\{\operatorname{div} I, \operatorname{div} J\}$. Conversely, if $M \in \operatorname{Frac} R$ is such that $\operatorname{div} M \leq \operatorname{div} I, \ \operatorname{div} J$, then $I, J \subset \overline{M}$ so $I + J \subset \overline{M}$ and $\overline{I + J} \subset \overline{\overline{M}} = \overline{M}$ and $\operatorname{div} M = \operatorname{div} \overline{M} \leq \operatorname{div} \overline{I + J} = \operatorname{div} I + J$. $\qquad\square$

Tournant Dangereux One may wonder why we work with divisors at all since every divisor is represented by a unique divisorial ideal. However, if I and J are divisorial fractional ideals, the product IJ *need not be divisorial*.

PROPOSITION 19.27.
a) In $D(R)$ every nonempty set which is bounded above admits a least upper bound. Explicitly, if (I_i) is a nonempty family of fractional ideals which is bounded above, then $\sup_i(\operatorname{div} I_i) = \operatorname{div}(\bigcap_i \overline{I}_i)$.
b) In $D(R)$ every nonempty set which is bounded below admits a greatest lower bound. Explicitly, if (J_i) is a nonempty family of fractional ideals which is bounded below, then $\inf_i(\operatorname{div} J_i) = \operatorname{div}(\sum_i I_i)$.
c) $D(R)$ is a lattice.

PROOF. Bourbaki, p. 477. **COMPLETE ME!** ♣ $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 19.28. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $D(R)$ is a group.
(ii) R is completely integrally closed.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let $x \in K^\times$. Suppose there is $d \in R^\bullet$ such that $dx^n \in R$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then $I = \langle R, a \rangle_R \in \operatorname{Frac} R$ and $aI \subset I$. Then

$$\operatorname{div} I \leq \operatorname{div} aI = \operatorname{div} a + \operatorname{div} I.$$

Since $D(R)$ is a group, $\operatorname{div} R = 0 \leq \operatorname{div} a$, and since aR and R are divisorial, $a \in R$. (ii) $\implies$ (i): We'll show: for all divisorial fractional ideals I, $(II^*)^* = R^* = R$, hence $\operatorname{div} I + \operatorname{div} I^* = \operatorname{div} R = 0$. By Proposition 19.7, it's enough to show that II^* and R are contained in the same principal fractional ideals. Since $II^* \subset R$, any principal fractional ideal which contains R contains II^*. Thus, let $x \in K^\times$ be such that $II^* \subset xR$; we want to show $R \subset xR$, i.e., $x^{-1} \in R$. Suppose that for $y \in K^\times$ we have $I \subset yR$, so $y^{-1} \in I^*$ and thus $Iy^{-1} \subset xR$; equivalently, $x^{-1}I \subset yR$. Thus $x^{-1}I$ is contained in every principal fractional ideal containing I, so $x^{-1}I \subset \overline{I} = I$. It follows that $x^{-n}I \subset I$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Let $w \in R^\bullet$ be such that $wI \subset R$. Then

$dx^{-n}I \subset R$, and if $z \in I^\bullet$ then $(wz)x^{-n} \in R$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Since $dc \in R^\bullet$ and R is completely integrally closed, by Theorem 14.41 $x^{-1} \in R$. $\square$

Let $P(R)$ be the image in $D(R)$ of the principal fractional ideals. Then $P(R)$ is a subgroup of $D(R)$. Thus if R is completely integrally closed (e.g. Noetherian and integrally closed!) we may form the quotient

$$\operatorname{Cl} R = D(R)/P(R),$$

the **divisor class group** of R.

EXERCISE 19.15. *Let R be a completely integrally closed domain. Show: there is a canonical injection*

$$\operatorname{Pic} R \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Cl} R.$$

THEOREM 19.29. *Let $R = \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]/(xy - z^2)$. Then R is a Noetherian integrally closed domain with $\operatorname{Pic} R = 0$ and $\operatorname{Cl} R \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.*

CHAPTER 20

Dedekind domains

A **Dedekind domain** is a domain which is Noetherian, integrally closed, and of dimension at most one. A Dedekind domain has dimension zero iff it is a field. Although we endeavor for complete precision here (why not?), the reader should be warned that in many treatments the zero-dimensional case is ignored, when convenient, in statements of results.

1. Characterization in terms of invertibility of ideals

THEOREM 20.1. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *R is Dedekind: Noetherian, integrally closed of dimension at most one.*
(ii) *Every fractional R-ideal is invertible.*
(iii) *Every nonzero prime ideal of R is invertible.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let R be a Noetherian, integrally closed domain of dimension at most one, and let I be a fractional R-ideal. Then $II^* \subset R$ and hence also $II^*(II^*)^* \subset R$, so $I^*(II)^* \subset I^*$. It follows from Lemma 19.19 that $(II^*)^* \subset R$; moreover, since $II^* \subset R$, Lemma 19.22 implies $II^* = R$, i.e., I is invertible.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Since invertible ideals are finitely generated, if every nonzero ideal is invertible, then R is Noetherian. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a nonzero, nonmaximal prime ideal of R, so that there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ which $0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p} \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}$. By the mantra "to contain is to divide" for invertible fractional ideals, there exists some invertible integral ideal I such that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}I$. Suppose that $I \subset \mathfrak{p}$. Then $I = RI \supset \mathfrak{m}I = \mathfrak{p}$, so we would have $\mathfrak{p} = I$ and then $\mathfrak{m} = R$, contradiction. Then there are $x \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ and $y \in I \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $xy \in \mathfrak{p}$, contradicting the primality of $\mathfrak{p}$.

Finally, we check that R is integrally closed: let $x = \frac{b}{c}$ be a nonzero element of K which is integral over R, so there exist $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in R$ such that

$$x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \ldots + a_1 x + a_0 = 0.$$

Let M be the R-submodule of K generated by $1, x, \ldots, x^{n-1}$; since M is finitely generated, it is a fractional R-ideal. We have $M^2 = M$, and thus – since M is invertible – $M = R$. It follows that $x \in R$.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii) is immediate.
(iii) $\implies$ (ii) by Theorem 19.13. $\square$

Recall that a ring R is **hereditary** if every ideal of R is a projective R-module.

COROLLARY 20.2. *A domain R is hereditary iff it is a Dedekind domain.*

PROOF. By Theorem 20.1 a domain R is a Dedekind domain iff every fractional ideal of R is invertible, and clearly the latter condition holds iff every nonzero integral ideal of R is invertible. Moreover, by Theorem 19.11, a nonzero ideal of a ring is invertible iff it is projective as an R-module. $\square$

2. Ideal factorization in Dedekind domains

Here we will show that in a Dedekind domain every nonzero integral ideal factors uniquely into a product of primes and derive consequences for the group of invertible ideals and the Picard group. (The fact that factorization – unique or otherwise! – into products of primes implies invertibility of all fractional ideals – is more delicate and will be pursued later.)

LEMMA 20.3. *Let I be an ideal in a ring R. If there exist J_1, J_2 ideals of R, each strictly containing I, such that $I = J_1 J_2$, then I is not prime.*

PROOF. Choose, for $i = 1, 2$, $x_i \in J_i \setminus I$; then $x_1 x_2 \in I$, so I is not prime. □

THEOREM 20.4. *Every proper integral ideal in a Dedekind domain has a unique factorization into a product of of prime ideals.*

PROOF. After Lemma 19.18 it suffices to show that a nonzero proper integral ideal I in a Dedekind domain R factors into a product of primes. Suppose not, so the set of ideals which do not so factor is nonempty, and (as usual!) let I be a maximal element of this set. Then I is not prime, so in particular is not maximal: let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a maximal ideal strictly containing I, so $I = \mathfrak{p}J$. Then $J = \mathfrak{p}^{-1}I$ strictly contains I so factors into a product of primes, hence I does. □

If I is any nonzero integral ideal of I and $\mathfrak{p}$ is any nonzero prime ideal of a Dedekind domain R, then we may define $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(I)$ via the prime factorization

$$I = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{p}^{\mathrm{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(I)}.$$

The product extends formally over all primes, but as I is divisible by only finitely many primes, all but finitely many exponents are zero, so it is really a finite product.

COROLLARY 20.5. *Let R be a Dedekind domain.*
a) The monoid $\mathcal{M}(R)$ of nonzero integral ideals is a free commutative monoid on the set of nonzero prime ideals.
b) The fractional ideals form a free commutative group on the set of prime ideals:

$$\mathrm{Frac}(R) = \bigoplus_{0 \neq \mathfrak{p} \ \in \ \mathrm{Spec}\, R} \mathbb{Z}.$$

PROOF. Part a) is simply the statement of unique factorization into prime elements in any commutative monoid. In the group $\mathcal{I}(R)$ of all fractional ideals, the subgroup G generated by the nonzero primes is a free commutative group on the primes: this just asserts that for primes $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r$ and integers $n_1, \ldots, n_r$, the equation $\mathfrak{p}_1^{n_1} \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r^{n_r} = R$ implies $n_1 = \ldots = n_r = 0$, which is easily seen – e.g. by localizing. Since any fractional ideal J is of the form $\frac{1}{x}I$ with I an integral ideal, decomposing I and (x) into their prime factorizations expresses J as a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of prime ideals, so $\mathrm{Frac}(R) = G$. □

Corollary 20.5 allows us to extend the definition of $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to any fractional R-ideal.

Since for a Dedekind domain there is no distinction between invertible fractional ideals and all fractional ideals, the Picard group takes an especially simple form: it is the quotient of the free commutative group $\mathrm{Frac}(R)$ of all fractional ideals modulo

the subgroup $\operatorname{Prin}(R) = K^\times / R^\times$ of principal fractional ideals. We therefore have a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Prin}(R) \to \operatorname{Frac}(R) \to \operatorname{Pic}(R) \to 0,$$

and also a slightly longer exact sequence

$$0 \to R^\times \to K^\times \to \operatorname{Frac}(R) \to \operatorname{Pic}(R) \to 0.$$

THEOREM 20.6. *For a Dedekind domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\operatorname{Pic}(R) = 0$.
(ii) R is a PID.
(iii) R is a UFD.
(iv) The set of nonprincipal prime ideals is finite.

PROOF. Evidently each fractional ideal is principal iff each integral ideal is principal: $(i) \equiv (ii)$. Since R has dimension at most one, $(ii) \iff (iii)$ by Proposition 16.1. Evidently $(ii) \implies (iv)$, so the interesting implication is that (iv) implies the other conditions. So assume that the set of (nonzero) nonprincipal prime ideals is nonempty but finite, and enumerate them: $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_n$. Let I be an integral ideal, and suppose that

$$I = \mathfrak{p}_1^{a_1} \cdots \mathfrak{p}_n^{a_n} \mathfrak{q}_1^{b_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_m^{b_m}.$$

(As usual, we allow zero exponents.) By the Chinese Remainder Theorem we may choose an $\alpha \in R$ such that $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}(\alpha) = a_i$ for all i.[1] Now consider the fractional ideal $(\alpha^{-1})I$; it factors as

$$(\alpha^{-1})I = \mathfrak{q}_1^{b_1} \cdots \mathfrak{q}_m^{b_m} \mathfrak{r}_1^{c_1} \cdots \mathfrak{r}_l^{c_l},$$

where the $\mathfrak{r}_i$'s are some other prime ideals, i.e., disjoint from the $\mathfrak{p}_i$'s. But all of the (fractional) ideals in the factorization of $(\alpha^{-1})I$ are principal, so $(\alpha^{-1})I = (\beta)$ for some $\beta \in K^\times$ and then $I = (\alpha\beta)$ is principal! $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 20.1. *a) Consider the ring*

$$R_1 = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}] = \mathbb{Z}[t]/(t^2 + 3).$$

Show: R_1 is a one-dimensional Noetherian domain with exactly one nonprincipal prime ideal, namely $\mathfrak{p}_2 = \langle 1 + \sqrt{-3}, 1 - \sqrt{-3} \rangle$.
b) For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, exhibit a ring R_n which is one-dimensional Noetherian and has exactly n nonprincipal prime ideals.

3. Local characterization of Dedekind domains

THEOREM 20.7. *Let R be a domain.*
a) If R is Dedekind and S is a multiplicative subset, then $S^{-1}R$ is Dedekind.
b) If R is a Dedekind domain and $0 \neq \mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of R, then $R_\mathfrak{p}$ is a DVR.

PROOF. Being Noetherian, dimension at most one and integrally closed are all preserved under localization, so part a) is immediate. Similarly, if $0 \neq \mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal, then the localization $R_\mathfrak{p}$ is a local, one-dimensional integrally closed Noetherian domain, hence by Theorem 17.21 a DVR, establishing b). $\qquad\square$

---

[1] Note that we want equality, not just $\operatorname{ord}_{P_i}(\alpha) \geq a_i$, so you should definitely think about how to get this from CRT if you've never seen such an argument before.

EXERCISE 20.2. *Let R be Dedekind with fraction field K; let $0 \neq \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$.*
a) Show: the map $\operatorname{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} : K^{\times} \to \mathbb{Z}$ defined above is nothing else than the discrete valuation corresponding to the localization $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.
b) Conversely, let $v : K^{\times} \to \mathbb{Z}$ be a discrete valuation. Show that the valuation ring $R_v = v^{-1}(\mathbb{N})$ is the localization of R at some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$.

4. Factorization into primes implies Dedekind

THEOREM 20.8. *(Matusita [**Ma44**]) Let R be a domain with the property that every nonzero proper integral ideal is a product of prime ideals. Then R is Dedekind.*

PROOF. Step 1: Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be an invertible prime of R. We show that $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal. Let $a \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, and suppose that $\langle a, \mathfrak{p} \rangle \subsetneq R$. Let us then write

$$I_1 := \langle a, \mathfrak{p} \rangle = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m,$$

$$I_2 := \langle a^2, \mathfrak{p} \rangle = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_n,$$

where the $\mathfrak{p}_i$ and $\mathfrak{q}_j$ are prime ideals. By assumption, $I_1 \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}$, and, since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime, we have also $I_2 \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}$. Therefore each $\mathfrak{p}_i$ and $\mathfrak{q}_j$ strictly contains $\mathfrak{p}$. In the quotient $\overline{R} = R/\mathfrak{p}$ we have

$$(\overline{a}) = a\overline{R} = \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_1 \cdots \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_m$$

and

$$(\overline{a^2}) = a^2\overline{R} = \overline{\mathfrak{q}}_1 \cdots \overline{\mathfrak{q}}_n.$$

The principal ideals $(\overline{a})$ and $(\overline{a^2})$ are invertible, and the $\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_i$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{q}}_j$ remain prime in the quotient. Therefore, we have

$$\overline{\mathfrak{q}}_1 \cdots \overline{\mathfrak{q}}_n = \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_1^2 \cdots \overline{\mathfrak{p}_m}^2.$$

Thus the multisets $\{\{\overline{\mathfrak{q}}_1, \ldots, \overline{\mathfrak{q}}_n\}$ and $\{\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_1, \ \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_1, \ldots, \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_m, \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_m\}\}$ coincide, and pulling back to R the same holds without the bars. Thus

$$I_1^2 = \langle a, \mathfrak{p} \rangle^2 = \mathfrak{p}_1^2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m^2 = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_n = \langle a^2, \mathfrak{p} \rangle,$$

so

$$\mathfrak{p} \subset \langle a, \mathfrak{p} \rangle^2 = a^2 R + a\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{p}^2 \subset aR + \mathfrak{p}^2.$$

So if $p \in \mathfrak{p}$, $p = ax + y$ with $x \in R$, $y \in \mathfrak{p}^2$, so $ax \in \mathfrak{p}$, and since $a \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, $x \in \mathfrak{p}$. Thus $\mathfrak{p} \subset a\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{p}^2 \subset \mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathfrak{p} = a\mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{p}^2$. Multiplication by $\mathfrak{p}^{-1}$ gives $R = a + \mathfrak{p}$, contrary to hypothesis. So $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal.

Step 2: Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be any nonzero prime ideal in R, and $0 \neq b \in \mathfrak{p}$. Then $\mathfrak{p} \supset bR$ and

$$bR = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m,$$

with each $\mathfrak{p}_i$ invertible and prime. Thus by Step 1 the $\mathfrak{p}_i$'s are maximal. Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime we have $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i and then by maximality $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_i$, hence $\mathfrak{p}$ is invertible. Since by assumption every proper integral ideal is a product of primes, we conclude that every integral ideal is invertible, which, by Theorem 20.1 implies that R is Dedekind. $\square$

Let $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{b}$ be ideals of a domain R. We say that $\mathfrak{b}$ **divides** $\mathfrak{a}$ if there is an ideal $\mathfrak{c}$ such that $\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{a}$.

EXERCISE 20.3. *Suppose $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ are ideals of a domain R such that $\mathfrak{b}$ divides $\mathfrak{a}$.*
a) Show: $\mathfrak{b} \supset \mathfrak{a}$.
b) Show: $\mathfrak{c} \subset (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$.
c) Can we have $\mathfrak{c} \subsetneq (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$?

PROPOSITION 20.9. *For a Noetherian domain R, the following are equivalent:*
- (i) *R is a Dedekind domain.*
- (ii) **To contain is to divide**: *For all ideals $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ of R, $\mathfrak{b} \supset \mathfrak{a} \iff \mathfrak{b}$ divides $\mathfrak{a}$.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): The statement is trivial if $\mathfrak{b} = (0)$. Otherwise, $\mathfrak{b}$ is invertible so $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$ by Lemma 19.8.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): We claim that every proper nonzero ideal of R is a product of prime ideals. Since R is Noetherian, if this is not the case there is an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ which is maximal with respect to not having this property. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a maximal ideal with $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}$. By hypothesis, there is an ideal $\mathfrak{c}$ with $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \mathfrak{c}$. Then $\mathfrak{c} \supset \mathfrak{a}$. Suppose we had equality; then repeatedly substituting $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \mathfrak{a}$ gives $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1^k \mathfrak{a}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and then by the Krull Intersection Theorem, $\mathfrak{a} \subset \bigcap_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{p}_1^k = (0)$, contradiction. So $\mathfrak{c}$ properly contains $\mathfrak{a}$, so we may write $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{p}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r$ and thus $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \mathfrak{p}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r$: contradiction. $\square$

THEOREM 20.10. *For a domain R which is not a field, the following are equivalent:*
- (i) *R is Noetherian, integrally closed, and of Krull dimension one.*
- (ii) *Every fractional (equivalently, every integral) R-ideal is invertible.*
- (iii) *R is Noetherian, and the localization at every maximal ideal is a DVR.*
- (iv) *Every nonzero proper integral ideal factors into a product of prime ideals.*
- (iv$'$) *Every nonzero proper integral ideal factors* uniquely *into a product of primes.*
- (v) *R is Noetherian, and to contain is to divide for all ideals of R.*

5. Generation of ideals in Dedekind domains

THEOREM 20.11. *Let R be a Dedekind domain and I a nonzero ideal of R. Then the quotient ring R/I is a principal Artinian ring.*

PROOF. Write $I = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathfrak{p}_i^{a_i}$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem,

$$R/I \cong \prod_{i=1}^{r} R/\mathfrak{p}_i^{a_i}.$$

Each factor $R/\mathfrak{p}_i^{a_i}$ is also a quotient of the localized ring $R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}_i^{a_i}$, which shows that it is Artinian and principal. Finally, a finite product of Artinian (resp. principal ideal rings) remains Artinian (resp. a principal ideal ring). $\square$

This has the following striking consequence:

THEOREM 20.12. *(Asano-Jensen) For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Dedekind domain.
(ii) For any nonzero ideal I of R and any nonzero element $a \in I$, there exists $b \in I$ such that $I = \langle a, b \rangle$.

PROOF. The direction (i) $\implies$ (ii) follows immediately from Theorem 20.11. Conversely, assume condition (ii) holds. By Theorem 20.10 it suffices to show that R is Noetherian and that its localization at each nonzero prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ is a DVR. Certainly condition (ii) implies Noetherianity; moreover it continues to hold for nonzero ideals in any localization. So let I be a nonzero ideal in the Noetherian local domain $(R_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{p})$. It follows that there exists $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ such that $\mathfrak{p} = I\mathfrak{p} + bR_{\mathfrak{p}}$. By Nakayama's Lemma, $I = bR_{\mathfrak{p}}$, so $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a local PID, hence a DVR. $\square$

PROPOSITION 20.13. ([**J2**, Ex. 10.2.11]) *Let R be a Dedekind domain, I a fractional ideal of R and J a nonzero integral ideal of R. Then there exists $a \in I$ such that $aI^{-1} + J = R$.*

PROOF. Let $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_s$ be the prime ideals of R dividing J. For each $1 \le i \le r$, choose $a_i \in I\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r \mathfrak{p}_i^{-1} \setminus I\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r$. Put $a = a_1 + \ldots + a_r$. We claim that $aI^{-1} + J = R$. It is enough to check this locally. For every prime $\mathfrak{q} \ne \mathfrak{p}_i$, we have $JR_{\mathfrak{q}} = R_{\mathfrak{q}}$. On the other hand, for all $1 \le i \le r$, aI^{-1} is not contained in $\mathfrak{p}_i$, so its pushforward to $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is all of $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$. $\square$

6. Modules over a Dedekind domain

The main aim of this section is to prove the following important result.

THEOREM 20.14. *Let M be a finitely generated module over a Dedekind domain.*
a) $P = M/M[\mathrm{tors}]$ is a finitely generated projective R-module, say of rank r.
b) If $r = 0$ then of course $M = M[\mathrm{tors}]$. If $r \ge 1$ then

$$M \cong M[\mathrm{tors}] \oplus P \cong M[\mathrm{tors}] \oplus R^{r-1} \oplus I,$$

with I a nonzero ideal of R.
c) The class $[I]$ of I in $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is an invariant of M.
d) There exists $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, maximal ideals $\mathfrak{p}_i$ and positive integers n_i such that

$$M[\mathrm{tors}] \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{N} R/\mathfrak{p}_i^{n_i}.$$

Much of the content of the main theorem of this section lies in the following converse of Proposition 3.8b) for finitely generated modules over a Dedekind domain.

THEOREM 20.15. *For a finitely generated module M over a Dedekind domain, the following are equivalent:*
(i) M is projective.
(ii) M is flat.
(iii) M is torsionfree.

PROOF. Of course (i) $\implies$ (ii) $\implies$ (iii) for modules over any domain, and we have seen that (i) $\equiv$ (ii) for finitely generated modules over a Noetherian ring. So it suffices to show (iii) $\implies$ (i).

Suppose R is a Dedekind domain and M is a finitely generated nonzero torsionfree R-module. By Proposition 3.8c), we may assume that $M \subset R^n$ for some $n \ge 1$. We prove the result by induction on n. If $n = 1$, then M is nothing else than a nonzero ideal of R, hence invertible by Theorem 20.10 and thus a rank one projective module by Theorem 19.11. So we may assume that $n > 1$ and that every finitely generated torsionfree submodule of R^{n-1} is projective. Let $R^{n-1} \subset R^n$ be

the span of the first $n-1$ standard basis elements. Let $\pi_n : R^n \to R$ be projection onto the nth factor, and consider the restriction of π_n to M:

$$0 \to M \cap R^{n-1} \to M \xrightarrow{\pi_n} \pi_n(M) \to 0.$$

Put $I = \pi_n(M)$. Then I is an ideal of R, hence projective, so the sequence splits:

$$M \to (M \cap R^{n-1}) \oplus I.$$

Now $M \cap R^{n-1}$ is a torsionfree, finitely generated (since M is finitely generated and R is Noetherian) submodule of R^{n-1}, hence is projective by induction. Certainly a direct sum of projective modules is projective, so we're done. $\square$

The method of proof immediately yields the following important corollary:

COROLLARY 20.16. *Let P be a finitely generated rank r projective module over a Dedekind domain R. Then we have a direct sum decomposition $P \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} I_i$, where each I_i is a nonzero rank one projective R-module.*

Let M a finitely generated module over the Dedekind domain R. We have:

$$0 \to M[\text{tors}] \to M \to M/M[\text{tors}] \to 0.$$

Put $P := M/M[\text{tors}]$. Then P is finitely generated and torsionfree by Proposition 3.8a), hence projective (by Theorem 20.15), and the sequence splits:

$$M \cong M[\text{tors}] \oplus P.$$

LEMMA 20.17. $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ *be fractional ideals in the Dedekind domain R. Then the R-modules $\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} I_i$ and $R^{n-1} \oplus I_1 \cdots I_n$ are isomorphic.*

PROOF. We will prove the result when $n = 2$. The general case follows by an easy induction argument left to the reader.
Choose $0 \neq a_1 \in I_1$. Applying Proposition 20.13 with $I = I_2$ and $J = a_1 I_1^{-1} \subset R$, that there exists $a_2 \in I_2$ such that $a_1 I_1^{-1} + a_2 I_2^{-1} = R$. That is there exist $b_i \in I_i^{-1}$ such that $a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2 = 1$. The matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} b_1 & -a_2 \\ b_2 & a_1 \end{bmatrix}$$

is invertible with inverse

$$A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ -b_2 & b_1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $(x_1, x_2) \in I_1 \oplus I_2$, we have

$$y_1 = x_1 b_1 + x_2 \in R, \ y_2 = -x_1 a_2 + x_2 a_1 \in I_1 I_2.$$

On the other hand, if $y_1 \in R$ and $y_2 = c_1 c_2 \in I_1 I_2$, then

$$x_1 = a_1 y_1 - b_2 c_1 c_2 \in I_1, \ x_2 = a_2 y_1 + b_1 c_1 c_2 \in I_2.$$

Thus $[x_1 x_2] \mapsto [x_1 x_2] A$ gives an R-module isomorphism from $I_1 \oplus I_2$ to $R \oplus I_1 I_2$. $\square$

Thus we may write

$$M = M[\text{tors}] \oplus M/M[\text{tors}] \cong M[\text{tors}] \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} I_i = M[\text{tors}] \oplus R^{r-1} \oplus (I_1 \cdots I_r),$$

which establishes Theorem 20.14a).

As for part b) of the theorem, let T be a finitely generated torsion R-module.

We notice that the statement of the classification is identical to that of finitely generated torsion modules over a PID. This is no accident, as we can easily reduce to the case of a PID – and indeed to that of a DVR, which we have already proven (Theorem 17.23). Namely, let I be the annihilator of T, and (assuming $T \neq 0$, as we certainly may) write $I = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathfrak{p}_i^{a_i}$. Then T is a module over $R/I \cong R/\prod_{i=1}^{r} \mathfrak{p}_i^{r_i} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} R/\mathfrak{p}_i^{a_i}$. T naturally decomposes as $T = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} T_i$, where T_i is a module over $R/\mathfrak{p}_i^{a_i}$. This gives the primary decomposition of T. Moreover, each T_i is a module over the DVR $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, so Theorem 17.23 applies.

COROLLARY 20.18. *For any Dedekind domain R, the Picard group $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is canonically isomorphic to the reduced K_0-group $\widetilde{K_0(R)}$.*

PROOF. Let P be a finitely generated projective R-module of rank $r \geq 1$. According to Theorem 20.14c) the monoid of isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective R-modules is *cancellative*: this means that the canonical map $\varphi : \operatorname{Pic}(R) \to K_0(R)$ is injective. It follows easily that the composite map $\Phi : \operatorname{Pic}(R) \xrightarrow{\varphi} K_0(R) \to \widetilde{K_0(R)}$ is an injection: indeed, for $\varphi(I)$ to be killed in $\widetilde{K_0(R)}$ but not $K_0(R)$ it would have to be a fractional ideal which has rank zero as an R-module, and there are no such things. Now an arbitrary nonzero finitely generated projective R-module is isomorphic to $R^{r-1} \oplus I$, hence becomes equal to the class of the rank one module I in $\widetilde{K_0(R)}$, so Φ is surjective. To check that it is a homomorphism of groups we may look on a set of generators – namely, the classes of rank one projective modules. Let us use $[P]$ for the class of the projective module P in $K_0(R)$ and $[[P]]$ for its image in $\widetilde{K_0(R)}$. Then by Lemma 20.17 we have

$$\Phi([I_1 \otimes I_2]) = [[I_1 \otimes I_2]] = [[I_1 I_2]] = [[R \oplus I_1 I_2]] = [[I_1 \oplus I_2]] = [[I_1]] + [[I_2]]. \quad \square$$

EXERCISE 20.4. *State and prove an appropriate analogue of Proposition 6.13 for finitely generated projective modules over a Dedekind domain R.*

COROLLARY 20.19. *For a module M over a Dedekind domain, the following are equivalent:*

   (i) *The module M is torsionfree.*
   (ii) *The module M is flat.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): If M is finitely generated and torsionfree, then M is flat by Theorem 20.15. By Corollary 3.96, every torsionfree R-module is flat.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): This holds for modules over any domain: Proposition 3.38. $\quad \square$

COROLLARY 20.20. *For a Noetherian domain R, the following are equivalent:*

   (i) *Every torsionfree R-module is flat.*
   (ii) *The ring R is a Dedekind domain.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let I be an ideal of R. Then I is a torsionfree R-module, hence flat by assumption. Since R is Noetherian, the ideal I is finitely generated, hence projective by Corollary 7.32. By Theorem 19.11, I is invertible. In particular every nonzero prime ideal of R is invertible, so by Theorem 20.1.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): This is part of Corollary 20.19. $\quad \square$

The full characterization of domains in which every torsionfree module is flat is coming up soon: Theorem 21.10.

7. Injective Modules

THEOREM 20.21. *For a domain R with fraction field K, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is Dedekind.
(ii) Every divisible R-module is injective.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let D be a divisible R-module. We will show D is injective using Baer's Criterion: let I be an ideal of R and $f : I \to D$ a module map. We may assume that I is nonzero and thus, since R is a Dedekind domain, invertible: if $I = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$, there are $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in K$ such that $b_i I \subset R$ for all i and $1 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i$. Since D is divisible, there are $d_1, \ldots, d_n \in D$ with $f(a_i) = a_i d_i$ for all i. Then for $x \in I$,

$$f(x) = f(\sum_i b_i a_i x) = \sum (b_i x) f(a_i) = \sum_i (b_i x) a_i d_i = x \sum_i (b_i a_i) e_i.$$

Put $d = \sum_{i=1}^n (b_i a_i) d_i$. Thus $F : R \to D$ by $x \mapsto dx$ lifts f.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let I be injective. Then I is divisible and a quotient of a divisible module is divisible, so every quotient of I is divisible, and thus by assumption every quotient of I is injective. By Corollaries 3.61 and 20.2, R is Dedekind. $\square$

As an application, we will prove a generalization to Dedekind domains of a nontrivial result in commutative group theory. Given an commutative group A, it is natural to ask when its torsion subgroup $A[\text{tors}]$ is a direct summand of A, so that A is the direct sum of a torsion group and a torsionfree group. It is easy to see that this happens when A is finitely generated, because then $A/A[\text{tors}]$ is a finitely generated torsionfree module over a PID, hence projective. The following exercise shows that some condition is necessary.

EXERCISE 20.5. *Let $A = \prod_p \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, where the product extends over all prime numbers. Show that $A[\text{tors}]$ is not a direct summand of A.*

These considerations should serve to motivate the following result.

THEOREM 20.22. *Let M be a module over a Dedekind domain R. If $M[\text{tors}] = M[r]$ for some $r \in R$, then $M[\text{tors}]$ is a direct summand of M.*

PROOF. Step 1: We CLAIM that if A is a torsionfree R-module, then for every R-module B, $\text{Ext}_R^1(A, B)$ is divisible.
PROOF OF CLAIM Let $V = A \otimes_R K$. Since A is torsionfree, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to A \to V \to V/A \to 0.$$

Applying the cofunctor $\text{Hom}(\cdot, B)$, a portion of the long exact Ext sequence is

$$\text{Ext}_R^1(V, B) \to \text{Ext}_R^1(A, B) \to \text{Ext}_R^2(V/A, B).$$

Since R is hereditary, Theorem 3.101a) gives $\text{Ext}_R^2(V/A, B) = 0$, so $\text{Ext}_R^1(A, B)$ is a quotient of $\text{Ext}_R^1(V, B)$. Since V is a K-module, so is $\text{Ext}_R^1(V, B)$ and thus $\text{Ext}_R^1(V, B)$ and its quotient $\text{Ext}_R^1(A, B)$ is a divisible module, hence injective by Theorem 20.21.
Step 2: Let $T = M[\text{tors}] = M[r]$. We will show that the sequence

$$0 \to T \to M \to M/T \to 0$$

splits by computing $\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M/T, T) = 0$. Since M/T is torsionfree, by Step 1 $\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M/T, T)$ is divisible. On the other hand, since $T = T[r]$, $\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M/T, T) = \mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M/T, T)[r]$. Thus multiplication by r on $\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M/T, T)$ is on the one hand surjective and on the other hand identically zero, so $\mathrm{Ext}^1_R(M/T, T) = 0$. By Theorem 3.92 the sequence splits. $\qquad\square$

Prüfer domains

A **Prüfer domain** is a domain in which each finitely generated ideal is invertible.[1]

EXERCISE 21.1. *Show: every Bézout domain is a Prüfer domain.*

1. Characterizations of Prüfer Domains

One might be forgiven for thinking the invertibility of finitely generated ideals is a somewhat abstruse condition on a domain. The following result shows that, on the contrary, this determines a very natural class of domains.

THEOREM 21.1. *(Characterization of Prüfer Domains) For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Prüfer domain: every nonzero finitely generated ideal is invertible.
(i′) Every nonzero ideal of R generated by two elements is invertible.
(ii) Nonzero finitely generated ideals are cancellable: if $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}$ are ideals of R and $\mathfrak{a}$ is finitely generated and nonzero, then $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c} \implies \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c}$.
(iii) For every $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a valuation ring.
(iii′) For every $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$, $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a valuation ring.
(v) For all ideals A, B, C of R, $A(B \cap C) = AB \cap AC$.
(vi) For all ideals A, B of R, $(A + B)(A \cap B) = AB$.
(vii) If A and C are ideals of R with C finitely generated and $A \subset C$, then there exists an ideal B of R such that $A = BC$.
(viii) For all ideals A, B, C of R with C finitely generated, we have

$$(A + B : C) = (A : C) + (B : C).$$

(ix) For all ideals A, B, C of R with C finitely generated, we have

$$(C : A \cap B) = (C : A) + (C : B).$$

(x) For all ideals A, B, C of R, $A \cap (B + C) = A \cap B + A \cap C$.

PROOF. We will show: (i) $\iff$ (i′),
(i) $\iff$ (ii), (i) $\implies$ (iii) $\implies$ (iv) $\implies$ (v) $\implies$ (vi) $\implies$ (ii), (i) $\implies$ (vii) $\implies$ (iv), (iv) $\implies$ (viiii) $\implies$ (ii), (iv) $\implies$ (ix) $\implies$ (ii), and (iv) $\iff$ (x). This suffices!
(i) $\implies$ (i′) is immediate.
(i′) $\implies$ (i): We go by induction on the number of generators. A nonzero ideal with a single generator is principal, hence invertible. By assumption, every nonzero ideal generated by two elements is invertible. Hence we may assume that $n \geq 3$

---

[1]Except for the zero ideal, of course.

and that every nonzero ideal of R generated by $n-1$ elements is invertible, and let $\mathfrak{c} = \langle c_1, \ldots, c_n \rangle$. We may assume $c_i \neq 0$ for all i. Put

$$\mathfrak{a} = \langle c_1, \ldots, c_{n-1} \rangle, \ \ \mathfrak{b} = \langle c_2, \ldots, c_n \rangle,$$

$$\mathfrak{d} = \langle c_1, c_n \rangle, \ \ \mathfrak{e} = c_1 \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}^{-1} + c_n \mathfrak{b}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}^{-1}.$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e} = (\mathfrak{a} + \langle c_n \rangle) c_1 \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}^{-1} + (\langle c_1 \rangle + \mathfrak{b}) c_n \mathfrak{b}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}^{-1}$$

$$= c_1 \mathfrak{d}^{-1} + c_1 c_n \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}^{-1} + c_1 c_n \mathfrak{b}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}^{-1} + c_n \mathfrak{d}^{-1}$$

$$= c_1 \mathfrak{d}^{-1} (R + c_n \mathfrak{b}^{-1}) + c_n \mathfrak{d}^{-1} (R + c_1 \mathfrak{a}^{-1}).$$

Since $c_n \mathfrak{b}^{-1}, \ c_1 \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \subset R$, we get

$$\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e} = c_1 \mathfrak{d}^{-1} + c_n \mathfrak{d}^{-1} = \langle c_1, c_n \rangle \mathfrak{d}^{-1} = R.$$

(iii) $\implies$ (iii′) is immediate. (iii′) $\implies$ (iii): if $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal containing $\mathfrak{p}$. Then $R_\mathfrak{p}$ is an overring of $R_\mathfrak{m}$, and every overring of a valuation ring is a valuation ring.

(i) $\implies$ (ii) is immediate, since invertible ideals are cancellable.

(ii) $\implies$ (iii): First suppose $\mathfrak{a}$ is a nonzero finitely generated ideal and $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}$ are ideals of R with $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}$. Then $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} + \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{a}(\mathfrak{b} + \mathfrak{c})$; cancelling $\mathfrak{a}$ gives $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{b} + \mathfrak{c}$, so $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{c}$. Now let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of R. By Exercise 17.6, it is enough to show that for any $\frac{a}{s}, \frac{b}{t} \in R_\mathfrak{p}$, we have either $(\frac{a}{s}) \subset (\frac{b}{t})$ or $(\frac{b}{t}) \subset (\frac{a}{s})$. Since $\frac{1}{s}, \frac{1}{t} \in R^\times$, it is equivalent to show that $(a) \subset (b)$ or $(b) \subset (a)$: for this we may assume $a, b \neq 0$. $\qquad \square$

THEOREM 21.2. *Let R be a domain.*
a) Suppose R is a GCD-domain. Then R is Prüfer iff it is Bézout.
b) A Prüfer UFD is a PID.

PROOF. a) Since principal ideals are invertible, any Bézout domain is a Prüfer domain. Conversely, suppose R is a GCD-domain and a Prüfer domain. Let $x, y \in R^\bullet$ and let d be a GCD of x, y. Certainly we have $(d) \supset \langle x, y \rangle$. Thus $\iota : \langle x, y \rangle \hookrightarrow (d)$ is a homomorphism of R-modules which we want to show is an isomorphism. By the Local-Global Principle for Module Homomorphisms it is enough to show that for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, $\iota_\mathfrak{p}$ is an isomorphism of $R_\mathfrak{p}$-modules, i.e., $\langle x, y \rangle_{R_\mathfrak{p}} = \langle d \rangle_{R_\mathfrak{p}}$. By Proposition 15.16, d is again the GCD of x and y in the valuation ring $R_\mathfrak{p}$ (equivalently, the valuation of d is the minimum of the valuations of x and y) so that the principal ideal $\langle x, y \rangle_{R_\mathfrak{p}}$ is generated by $\langle d \rangle_{R_\mathfrak{p}}$.

b) Suppose R is a Prüfer UFD. By part a) R is Bézout, and by Theorem 16.17 a Bézout UFD is a PID. $\qquad \square$

PROPOSITION 21.3. *For a Prüfer domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Bézout domain.
(ii) $\operatorname{Pic}(R) = 0$.

PROOF. In the Prüfer domain R, an ideal I is invertible iff it is finitely generated. So (i) and (ii) each assert that every finitely generated ideal is principal. $\qquad \square$

PROPOSITION 21.4. *A Prüfer domain is integrally closed.*

PROOF. In Theorem 20.1 we showed that a domain in which all fractional R-ideals are invertible is integrally closed. In the proof we only used the invertbility of finitely generated fractional ideals, so the argument works in any Prüfer domain. $\qquad \square$

EXERCISE 21.2. *Prove Corollary 21.4 using the local nature of integral closure.*

1.1. A Chinese Remainder Theorem for Prüfer domains.

Recall that we have a Chinese Remainder Theorem which is valid in any ring: Theorem 4.21. There is however another useful version of the Chinese Remainder Theorem which holds in a domain R iff R is a Prüfer domain.

Let R be a ring, let $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ be a finite sequence of ideals in R and let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be a finite sequence of elements in R. We may ask: when is there an element $x \in R$ such that $x \equiv x_i \pmod{I_i}$ for all i?

If we assume the ideals I_i are pairwise comaximal, then this holds in any ring by CRT (Theorem 4.21). But suppose we drop that condition. Then, if such an x exists, we have $x - x_i \in I_i$ for all i, hence for all i and j,

(43) $$x_i - x_j = (x - x_j) - (x - x_i) \in I_i + I_j.$$

Thus we get a necessary condition (which, notice, is vacuous when the ideals are pairwise comaximal). Let us say that a ring has property **ECRT(n)** if for all ideals $I_1, \ldots, I_n$ and elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ satisfying (43), there exists $x \in R$ such that $x \equiv x_i \pmod{I_i}$ for all i. We say that R satisfies **ECRT** (Elementwise Chinese Remainder Theorem) if it satisfies ECRT(n) for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

EXERCISE 21.3. *Show: a PID satisfies property ECRT.*

LEMMA 21.5. *Any ring satisfies ECRT(1) and ECRT(2).*

PROOF. ECRT(1) is trivial. For ECRT(2): let I, J be ideals of R, let $x_1, x_2 \in R$, and suppose $x_1 - x_2 \in I + J$: there are $i \in I$, $j \in J$ such that $x_1 - x_2 = i + j$. Put $x = x_1 - i = x_2 + j$. Then $x \equiv x_1 \pmod{I}$ and $x \equiv x_2 \pmod{J}$. $\square$

THEOREM 21.6. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) ECRT holds in R.
(ii) ECRT(3) holds in R.
(iii) For all ideals A, B, C in R, $A + (B \cap C) = (A + B) \cap (A + C)$.
(iv) For all ideals A, B, C in R, $A \cap (B + C) = (A \cap B) + (A \cap C)$.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is immediate.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): The inclusion $A + (B \cap C) \subset (A + B) \cap (A + C)$ holds for ideals in any ring. Conversely, let $t \in (A + B) \cap (A + C)$. Then by ECRT(3) there is $x \in R$ satisfying all of the congruences

$$x \equiv 0 \pmod{A},$$
$$x \equiv t \pmod{B},$$
$$x \equiv t \pmod{C},$$

and thus $x \in A$, $x - t \in B \cap C$, so $t = x - (x - t) \in A + (B \cap C)$.
(iii) $\implies$ (iv): For A, B, C ideals of R, we we have

$$(A \cap B) + (A \cap C) = ((A \cap B) + A) \cap ((A \cap B) + C) = A \cap ((A \cap B) + C)$$

and

$$(A \cap B) + (A \cap C) = (A + (A \cap C)) \cap ((A \cap C) + B) = A \cap ((A \cap C) + B),$$

and thus

$$(A \cap B) + C = (A \cap C) + B.$$

It follows that

$$(A \cap B) + C = (A \cap B) + C + (A \cap C) + B = B + C$$

and thus

$$(A \cap B) + (A \cap C) = A \cap ((A \cap B) + C) = A \cap (B + C).$$

(iv) $\implies$ (iii): Assume (iv). Then for all ideals A, B, C of R,

$$(A + B) \cap (A + C) = (A + B) \cap A + (A + B) \cap C = A \cap (A + B) + C \cap (A + B)$$

$$= (A \cap A) + (A \cap B) + (A \cap C) + (B \cap C) = A + (A \cap B) + (A \cap C) + (B \cap C) = A + (B \cap C).$$

(iii) $\implies$ (i): We go by induction on n. Having established that ECRT(1) and ECRT(2) hold in any ring, we let $n \geq 2$, assume ECRT(n) and show ECRT($n+1$): let $x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1} \in R$ and $I_1, \ldots, I_{n+1}$ be ideals of R such that $x_i - x_j \in I_i + I_j$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. By ECRT(n), there is $y \in R$ with $y \equiv x_i \pmod{I}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We CLAIM that $y - x_{n+1} \in I_{n+1} + \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i$.

PROOF OF CLAIM: Since we have assumed (iii), we have by induction that

$$\mathfrak{a} + \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{b}_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} (\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b}_i),$$

and in particular

$$I_{n+1} + \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} (I_i + I_{n+1}).$$

Also, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have

$$y - x_{n+1} = (y - x_i) + (x_i - x_{n+1}) \in I_i + I_i + I_{n+1} \in I_i + I_{n+1}$$

and thus indeed

$$y - x_{n+1} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} (I_i + I_{n+1}) = I_{n+1} + \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i.$$

Because of the claim and ECRT(2), there is $t \in R$ satisfying

$$t \equiv y \pmod{\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} I_i},$$

$$t \equiv x_{n+1} \pmod{I_{n+1}}.$$

Then for $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$t - x_i = (t - y) + (y - x_i) \in I_i.$$

$\square$

2. Butts's Criterion for a Dedekind Domain

One of our first results on Dedekind domains was Theorem 20.4: in a Dedekind domain –defined as a Noetherian, integrally closed domain of dimension at most one – every nonzero ideal factors uniquely as a product of prime ideals. It was then natural to ask about the converse: if in a domain R every nonzero proper ideal is uniquely a product of prime ideals, must R be Dedekind? We proved a result of Matusita which is stronger than this: a domain in which every nonzero proper ideal is a product of prime ideals is necessarily a Dedekind domain: uniqueness of the product was not required.

In particular if all ideals factor into primes then all ideals factor uniquely into primes. Let's try to show this directly: suppose we have nonzero prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r, \mathfrak{q}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{q}_s$ in a domain such that

$$\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_s.$$

Then $\mathfrak{p}_1 \supset \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_s$, so $\mathfrak{p}_1 \supset \mathfrak{q}_j$ for some j. It is natural to try to deduce $\mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_j$ from this. This certainly holds if each $\mathfrak{q}_j$ is maximal, so we get the desired implication when R has dimension one. In general it seems that we have acquired nothing more than further respect for Matusita's Theorem, but the above idea will be used in the proof of the main result of this section.

The deduction $\mathfrak{p}_1 \supset \mathfrak{q}_j \implies \mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_j$ also holds if $\mathfrak{p}_1 = (p)$ and $\mathfrak{q}_j = (q)$ are both principal: for principal ideals, to contain is to divide, so we get $q = xp$, and then because prime elements are irreducible elements we have $x \in R^\times$ so $\mathfrak{p}_1 = \mathfrak{q}_j$.

Neither of the above steps works in general. A Noetherian domain in which to contain is to divide is necessarily a Dedekind domain. Generalizing irreducible elements to ideals we get the condition on a nonzero proper ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ that $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}$ implies $\mathfrak{b} = R$ or $\mathfrak{c} = R$. We cannot call such an $\mathfrak{a}$ "irreducible" since that is already taken for a condition involving intersections of ideals, so following H. Butts we call such an ideal **unfactorable**. An ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ is **factorable** if it is not unfactorable, i.e., if there are proper ideals $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{c}$ such that $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}$.

Example: Let R be a valuation ring with valuation group $\mathbb{Q}$ and maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Then $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m} \cdot \mathfrak{m}$. Thus it is possible for a nonzero prime (even maximal) ideal to be factorable. This also shows that it is possible for an ideal to be a product of prime ideals in more than one way.

As usual in factorization theory, the ascending chain condition makes things nicer.

EXERCISE 21.4. *Let R be a Noetherian domain.*
a) Show: every nonzero ideal of R is a (finite, of course) product of unfactorable ideals. (Products over sets of cardinality 0 and 1 are allowed.)
b) Show that a nonzero prime ideal of R is unfactorable.

A domain in which each nonzero nonunit factors uniquely into a product of irreducible elements is, by definition, a UFD. So it is natural to ask in which domains each nonzero proper ideal factors uniquely into a product of unfactorable ideals. A theorem of H. Butts gives the answer.

THEOREM 21.7. *(Butts [**Bu64**]) Let R be a domain in which each nonzero proper ideal factors uniquely as a product of unfactorable ideals. Then R is Dedekind.*

PROOF. Step 1: Unique factorization into unfactorables implies: for ideals $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$, if $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}$ then $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$. By Theorem 21.1, R is Prüfer.
Step 2: We will show that every nonzero prime ideal of R is invertible and apply Theorem 20.1. So let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a nonzero prime ideal, and let $p \in \mathfrak{p}^\bullet$. Let $(p) = \mathfrak{u}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{u}_r$ be the unique factorization of p into unfactorable ideals. Since (p) is invertible, so is each $\mathfrak{u}_i$; by Proposition 19.9, each $\mathfrak{u}_i$ is finitely generated. Let $x \in R \setminus \mathfrak{u}_i$. Then $U_i = \mathfrak{u}_i + \langle x \rangle$ is a finitely generated ideal in a Prüfer domain, hence invertible, so by Lemma 19.8 $\mathfrak{u}_i = U_i(\mathfrak{u}_i : U_i)$. Since u_i is unfactorable, either $U_i = R$ or

$(\mathfrak{u}_i : U_i) = R$. If $(\mathfrak{u}_i : U_i) = R$ then $\mathfrak{u}_i = U_i$, contradiction. So $U_i = R$. Thus $\mathfrak{u}_i$ is maximal. Since $\mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{u}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{u}_r$, we have $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{u}_i$ for some i, so $\mathfrak{p}$ is invertible. $\qquad\square$

3. Modules over a Prüfer domain

Recall that a module is **semihereditary** if every finitely generated submodule is projective and that a ring R is **semihereditary** if the module R is semihereditary: i.e., every finitely generated ideal of R is projective.

PROPOSITION 21.8. *A domain R is a semihereditary iff it is a Prüfer domain.*

EXERCISE 21.5. *Prove Proposition 21.8.*

LEMMA 21.9. *Let R be a domain, and let M be a finitely generated torsionfree R-module. Then M is a submodule of a finitely generated free module.*

PROOF. Since M is torsionfree, $M \hookrightarrow M \otimes_R K$, and $\iota : M \otimes_R K \cong K^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since M is finitely generated, there exists $x \in R^\bullet$ such that the image of xM in $M \otimes_R K$ is contained in R^n, and thus $\iota \circ (x\bullet) : M \hookrightarrow R^n$. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 21.10. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
  (i) *Every torsionfree R-module is flat.*
 (ii) *Every finitely generated torsionfree R-module is projective.*
(iii) *R is a Prüfer domain.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let M be a finitely generated torsionfree R-module. By assumption M is flat, and since R is a domain, by Corollary 13.36 M is projective. (ii) $\implies$ (iii): Finitely generated ideals are assumed projective, hence invertible. (iii) $\implies$ (i): Let R be a Prüfer domain and M a torsionfree R-module. Then $M = \varinjlim_i M_i$ is the direct limit of its finitely generated submodules, hence a direct limit of finitely generated torsionfree modules M_i. By Lemma 21.9, each M_i is a finitely generated submodule of a free R-module. By Theorems 21.8 and 3.69, each M_i is projective, hence flat. Thus M is a direct limit of flat modules, hence is itself a flat module by Corollary 3.95. $\qquad\square$

CHAPTER 22

One Dimensional Noetherian Domains

1. Residually Finite Domains

For an ideal I in a ring R, we put $|I| = \#R/I$ (a possibly infinite cardinal).

R is a **residually finite ring** if or every nonzero ideal I, R/I is finite.

EXERCISE 22.1. *Show: finite rings and fields are residually finite.*

EXERCISE 22.2. *Let R be a ring such that $R/(a)$ is finite for all $a \in R^{\bullet}$. Show: R is residually finite.*

LEMMA 22.1. *Let $0 \le I \subset J$ be ideals in a residually finite ring. Then:*
a) $|J| \mid |I|$.
b) We have $I = J \iff |I| = |J|$.

EXERCISE 22.3. *Prove it.*

PROPOSITION 22.2. *Let R be a residually finite ring that is not a field. Then:*
a) R is Noetherian.
b) We have $\dim R \le 1$.
c) The following are equivalent:
(i) R is a domain.
(ii) $\dim R = 1$.
d) The following are equivalent:
(i) R is finite.
(ii) $\dim R = 0$.

PROOF. a) Since for any nonzero ideal I, R/I is finite, we can say even more: the length of a chain of ideals starting with I is at most the number of prime divisors (counted with multiplicity) of $|I|$.
b) If $\mathfrak{p}$ is a nonzero prime ideal of R, then $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a finite domain, hence a field, so $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal. Thus $\dim R \le 1$.
c) If R is a domain, then – since it is not a field – $\dim R \ge 1$. Combining with part b) we get $\dim R = 1$. Inversely, if R is not a domain, then (0) is not prime, so for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is finite, hence $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal: $\dim R = 0$.
d) Clearly if R is finite then it has dimension 0. Conversely, if $\dim R = 0$ then by part a) R is Artinian. By Theorem 8.35 we may reduce to the case in which R is Artinian local with nilpotent maximal ideal: suppose e is the least positive integer such that $\mathfrak{m}^e = 0$. Since R is not a field, $e > 1$ and thus $R/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite field. Then for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{m}^i/\mathfrak{m}^{i+1}$ is a finitely generated module over the finite field $R/\mathfrak{m}$, so it's finite. Thus $\#R = \#R/\mathfrak{m}\#\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 \cdots \#\mathfrak{m}^{e-1}/\mathfrak{m}^e < \infty$. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 22.3. *(Samuel [**Sa71**]) Let R be a Noetherian ring, and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Then the set of ideals I of R with $|I| = n$ is finite.*

PROOF. Since the number of isomorphism classes of rings of cardinality n is finite, it is enough to fix any ring S of cardinality n and show that the set $\{\mathfrak{b}_i\}_{i \in I}$ of ideals of R such that $R/\mathfrak{b}_i \cong S$ is finite.

Putting $\mathfrak{b} = \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{b}_i$, we have a monomorphism of rings

$$(44) \qquad B := R/\mathfrak{b} \hookrightarrow \prod_{i \in I} R/\mathfrak{b}_i \cong S^I.$$

Let $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_r$ be the maximal ideals of the (finite, hence Artinian) ring S, and for each $1 \leq j \leq r$, let q_j be the cardinality of the finite field $S/\mathfrak{m}_j$. Then $\mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_r = \bigcap_{j=1}^r \mathfrak{m}_j$ is the Jacobson radical which coincides with the nilradical, hence there exists $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $(\mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_r)^s = 0$. Let $P(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ be the polynomial

$$P(t) = \prod_{j=1}^r (t^{q_j} - t)^s.$$

Then for any $x \in S$ and any $1 \leq j \leq r$, $x^{q_j} - x \in \mathfrak{m}_j$, so $P(x) = 0$. It follows that for all $X = (x_i) \in S^I$, $P(X) = (P(x_i)) = 0$. From (44) it follows that $P(x) = 0$ for all $x \in B$. Since the nonzero polynomial P has only finitely many roots in any domain, for each prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of B, we conclude that $B/\mathfrak{p}$ is finite. Thus B is Noetherian of Krull dimension 0 hence is Artinian. But by the structure theory for Artinian rings, any Artinian ring with finite residue fields is actually finite (cf. the proof of Proposition 22.2d)). That is, $R/\mathfrak{b}$ is finite, so there are only finitely many ideals of R containing $\mathfrak{b}$. In particular I is finite. $\qquad \square$

PROPOSITION 22.4. *Let* $(0) \neq I, J$ *be ideals of the residually finite domain R.*
a) *If I and J are comaximal – i.e., $I + J = R$ – then $|IJ| = |I||J|$.*
b) *If I is invertible, then $|IJ| = |I||J|$.*

PROOF. Part a) follows immediately from the Chinese Remainder Theorem. As for part b), we claim that the norm can be computed locally: for each $\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R$, let $|I|_\mathfrak{p}$ be the norm of the ideal $IR_\mathfrak{p}$ in the local finite norm domain $R_\mathfrak{p}$. Then

$$(45) \qquad |I| = \prod_\mathfrak{p} |I|_\mathfrak{p}.$$

To see this, let $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{q}_i$ be a primary decomposition of I, with $\mathfrak{p}_i = \mathrm{rad}(\mathfrak{q}_i)$. It follows that $\{\mathfrak{q}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{q}_n\}$ is a finite set of pairwise comaximal ideals, so the Chinese Remainder Theorem applies to give

$$R/I \cong \prod_{i=1}^n R/\mathfrak{q}_i.$$

Since $R/\mathfrak{q}_i$ is a local ring with maximal ideal corresponding to $\mathfrak{p}_i$, it follows that $|\mathfrak{q}_i| = |\mathfrak{q}_i R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}|$, establishing the claim.
Using the claim reduces us to the local case, so that we may assume the ideal $I = (xR)$ is principal. In this case the short exact sequence of R-modules

$$0 \to \frac{xR}{xJ} \to \frac{R}{xJ} \to \frac{R}{(x)J} \to 0$$

together with the isomorphism

$$\frac{R}{J} \xrightarrow{\cdot x} \frac{xR}{xJ}$$

does the job. $\qquad \square$

THEOREM 22.5. *(Butts-Wade) For a residually finite domain R, the following are equivalent:*

    (i) *R is a Dedekind domain.*
    (ii) *For all nonzero ideals $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ of R, $|\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}| = |\mathfrak{a}||\mathfrak{b}|$.*

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Apply Theorem 20.1 and Proposition 22.4.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Step 1: By 22.2, R is Noetherian. So if we can show that **to contain is to divide**, Proposition 20.9 applies to show that R is Dedekind. Let $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ be ideals of R. The divisibility trivially holds if $\mathfrak{a} = (0)$, so we may assume that $\mathfrak{a} \neq (0)$.
Step 2: Suppose that we can show that if $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a} + \langle b \rangle$ we have

$$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}).$$

Then the general case follows: since R is Noetherian we may write $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a} + \langle b_1, \ldots, b_n \rangle$. For $1 \leq i \leq n$ put $\mathfrak{b}_i = \mathfrak{a} + \langle b_1, \ldots, b_i \rangle$. By Step 3,

$$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}_1(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}_1), \mathfrak{b}_1 = \mathfrak{b}_2(\mathfrak{b}_1 : \mathfrak{b}_2), \ldots, \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b}_{n-1}(\mathfrak{b} : \mathfrak{b}_{n-1}),$$

and thus

$$\mathfrak{a} = (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}_1)(\mathfrak{b}_1 : \mathfrak{b}_2) \cdots (\mathfrak{b}_{n-1} : \mathfrak{b})\mathfrak{b}.$$

Step 3: So suppose $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a} + \langle b \rangle$. Certainly $\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}) \subset \mathfrak{a}$. Since $(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}) \supset \mathfrak{a}$, $(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$ and hence also $\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$ is not zero, so the above containment gives

$$|\mathfrak{a}| \mid |\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})| = |\mathfrak{b}||(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})|.$$

Since $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{b}$, $k = \frac{|\mathfrak{a}|}{|\mathfrak{b}|} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and

$$\frac{|\mathfrak{a}|}{|\mathfrak{b}|} \mid |(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})|.$$

So if we can show $|(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})| \leq k$, then $|\mathfrak{a}| = |\mathfrak{b}||(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})| = |\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})|$, and by Lemma 22.1, $\mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{a}$. Let $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be a set of coset representatives for $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{b}$, and let $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be a set of coset representatives for $(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$ in R. We will define an injection from the first set to the second, which suffices to complete the proof. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, $by_i \in \mathfrak{b}$, so there is a unique $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $by_j \in \mathfrak{a} + x_i$, and we define

$$\Phi : \{y_j\}_{j=1}^n \to \{x_i\}_{i=1}^k, \ y_j \mapsto x_i.$$

(If $y \in R$ is such that $y + (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}) = y_j + (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$, then $b(y - y_j) \in \mathfrak{b}(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}) \subset \mathfrak{a}$, so $by + \mathfrak{a} = by_j + \mathfrak{a}$: that is, the mapping is well-defined on cosets, independent of the chosen representatives. But that is not necessary for the argument to go through.) We check the injectivity: if $1 \leq u, v \leq n$ are such that $by_u, by_v \in \mathfrak{a} + x_j$, then $b(y_u - y_v) \in \mathfrak{a}$ so $y_u - y_v \in ((b) : \mathfrak{a}) = ((b) + \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{a}) = (\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{a})$, so $u = v$. $\qquad\square$

EXERCISE 22.4. *Let R be a residually finite domain. By Theorem 22.3, for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, there are only finitely many ideals I with $N(I) \leq n$. We can therefore define a formal Dirichlet series*

$$\zeta_R(s) = \sum_{I \supsetneq \{0\}} N(I)^{-s},$$

*the **Dedekind zeta function** of R.*
a) Show that $\zeta_{\mathbb{Z}}(s) = \sum_n \frac{1}{n^s} = \prod_p \frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}} = \prod_p \zeta_{\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}}(s)$, where the products extend over all prime numbers p.

b) Let $R = \mathbb{F}_p[t]$. Show that $\zeta_R(s) = \frac{1}{1-p^{1-s}}$.
c) Suppose R is a Dedekind domain. Show that

$$\zeta_R(s) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} \zeta_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(s).$$

EXERCISE 22.5. *Let $R = Z[t]/(t^2+3)$ (or, equivalently, $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$). Let $\mathfrak{q} = (2)$.*
a) Show: there is a unique ideal $\mathfrak{p}_2$ with $R/\mathfrak{p}_2 = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. Evidently $\mathfrak{p}_2$ is maximal.
b) Show: $r(\mathfrak{q}) = \mathfrak{p}_2$, and deduce that I is primary.
c) Show: $\mathfrak{q}$ is not a prime power, and indeed, cannot be expressed as a product of prime ideals.[1]

2. Cohen-Kaplansky domains

Let R be a domain. For a cardinal number κ, the statement "R has κ irreducibles" will mean that there is a subset $\mathcal{P} \subset R$ such that every element of $\mathcal{P}$ is an irreducible element of R and for every irreducible element $f \in R$, there is exactly one $g \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $(f) = (g)$.

A **Cohen-Kaplansky domain** is an atomic domain with finitely many irreducibles. In §15.11 we showed that a Cohen-Kaplansky domain R that is not a field is a semilocal one-dimensional Noetherian domain. Let $\overline{R}$ be the integral closure of R in its fraction field K. By Krull-Akizuki the ring $\overline{R}$ is a Dedekind domain, and by Corollary 18.8, the ring $\overline{R}$ has only finitely many prime ideals, so $\overline{R}$ is a semilocal PID.

EXERCISE 22.6. *Let R be a PID. Show: R is a Cohen-Kaplansky domain iff $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is finite, in which case R has $\# \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ irreducibles.*

However, in Example 15.51 we saw that a semilocal one-dimensional Noetherian domain may or may not be Cohen-Kaplansky. And now our story continues.

EXAMPLE 22.6. *Let R be a primefree Cohen-Kaplansky domain which is not a field. We claim that any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of R has at least three irreducibles. By Lemma 15.49, $\mathfrak{m}$ is generated by its irreducibles; if it were generated by one irreducible we would have a prime element, so $\mathfrak{m}$ must contain nonassociate irreducibles f_1, f_2. Then $f_1 + f_2$ is a nonzero element of $\mathfrak{m}$ so has an irreducible factor $f_3 \in \mathfrak{m}$, which cannot be associate to either f_1 or f_2.*
Suppose now that $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local Cohen-Kaplansky domain with exactly three irreducibles f_1, f_2, f_3. Then $f_2 f_3 + f_1 \in \mathfrak{m}^\bullet$ and is not divisible by f_2 or f_3, so it follows that there is $\alpha \in R^\times$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $f_2 f_3 = \alpha f_1^a$. Similarly we find $\beta, \gamma \in R^\times$ and $b, c \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $f_3 f_1 = \beta f_2^b$ and $f_1 f_2 = \gamma f_3^c$. Multiplying these relations we get

$$f_1^2 f_2^2 f_3^2 \sim f_1^a f_2^b f_3^c$$

from which it follows (without using uniqueness of factorization!) that $a = b = c = 2$. Thus the multiplicative structure of such an R is completely determined.

LEMMA 22.7. *Let R be a semilocal ring, with $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_m\}$.*
a) We have that R is Noetherian iff $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ is Noetherian for all $1 \le i \le m$.
b) We have $\dim R = \max_j \dim R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$.

---

[1] Suggestion: show R is residually finite, and use properties of the norm function $||I|| = \# R/I$.

PROOF. a) If R is Noetherian, then so are all of its localizations, hence in particular $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. Suppose R is not Noetherian, and let $\{I_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be an infinite strictly ascending chain of ideals. To each I_n we may associate the subset V_n of $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ of maximal ideals in which I_n is contained. Since I_n is proper, each V_n is nonempty, Since $I_{n+1} \supset I_n$, we have $V_{n+1} \subset V_n$. Since $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is finite, it follows that there is some j such that $\mathfrak{p}_j \in V_n$ for all n, and thus $\{I_n\}$ is still an infinite strictly ascending chain in $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$, which is thus not Noetherian.
b) Every chain of prime ideals of R can be extended to a chain of prime ideals terminating at $\mathfrak{p}_j$ for some j, which is a chain of prime ideals in $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$. The result follows. $\qquad\square$

In any one-dimensional domain, a nonzero ideal I is primary iff $r(I)$ is prime iff $r(I)$ is maximal iff I is contained in a unique maximal ideal of R. Indeed, by Proposition 10.15, if I is primary, then $r(I) \supset I \supsetneq (0)$ is prime, so $r(I) = \mathfrak{m}$ is maximal and thus $\mathfrak{m}$ is the only maximal ideal containing I, whereas if I is contained in exactly one maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, then since nonzero primes are maximal, we have $r(I) = \mathfrak{m}$ and I is primary by Proposition 10.14.

Now suppose R is a semi-local one-dimensional domain, with $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_m\}$. For a nonzero ideal I of R, let $\iota_j : R \to R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ be the localization map, and put

$$I_j = \iota_j^*(\iota_j)_* I.$$

If I is not contained in $\mathfrak{p}_j$ then $(\iota_j)_* I = R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ so $I_j = R$. Suppose that $I \subset \mathfrak{p}_j$. Then $I_i \subset \iota_j^*(\iota_j)_* \mathfrak{p}_j = \mathfrak{p}_j$. Moreover, if $x \in \mathfrak{p}_j$, then since $r((\iota_j)_* I) = \mathfrak{p}_j + R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$, there is $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\iota_j(x^n) = \iota_j(x)^n \in (\iota_j)_* I$, so $x^n \in I_j$. It follows that $r(I_j) \supset \mathfrak{p}_j$. Thus $r(I_j) = \mathfrak{p}_j$ and I_j is $\mathfrak{p}_j$-primary.

Consider the family of ideals $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^m$. Since the radicals are pairwise comaximal, so are the I_j's, and thus

$$\prod_{j=1}^m I_j = \bigcap_{j=1}^m I_j.$$

Moreover, consider the injection $\varphi : I \hookrightarrow \bigcap_{j=1}^m I_j$. For all $1 \leq j \leq m$, upon tensoring to $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$, both sides are $\mathfrak{p}_j + R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ if $I \subset \mathfrak{p}_j$ and $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ otherwise. By Proposition **??**, φ is an isomorphism, and thus we get a primary decomposition

$$(46) \qquad I = \prod_{i=1}^m I_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^m I_i$$

which is unique by Theorem 10.28.

Suppose now that $I = (a)$ is principal. Then each I_i is invertible, hence principal since R is semilocal (Corollary **??**), say $I_i = (a_i)$. Thus there is $u \in R^\times$ such that

$$a = ua_1 \cdots a_n, \; a_i \in I_i.$$

Each a_i is either a unit in $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ or $\mathfrak{p}_i$-primary, and for all i we have

$$(a) + \mathfrak{p}_i = (a_i) + \mathfrak{p}_i.$$

So if a is irreducible in R, then there is a unique j such that a_j is irreducible and a_i is a unit for all $i \neq j$ and thus that $a \in \mathfrak{p}_j \setminus \bigcup_{i \neq j} \mathfrak{p}_i$. More generally, factorization

in R can be completely understood in terms of factorization in $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ for all i. The precise statement is as follows.

THEOREM 22.8. *Let R be a one-dimensional semi-local domain, with fraction field K, and let* $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_m\}$. *a) The map*

$$\Phi : x \in K^\times / R^\times \mapsto (x R_{\mathfrak{p}_1}^\times, \ldots, x R_{\mathfrak{p}_m}^\times)$$

induces an order-preserving group isomorphism

$$G(R) \overset{\sim}{\to} \bigoplus_{i=1}^m G(R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}).$$

b) There is an induced order-preserving monoid isomorphism

$$G^+(R) \overset{\sim}{\to} \bigoplus_{i=1}^n G^+(R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}).$$

PROOF. a) The map Φ is an order-preserving group homomorphism. Moreover its kernel is $\bigcap_{i=1}^m (R \setminus \mathfrak{p}_j) = R^\times$, so it is injective. For surjectivity, it is enough to show that for all $1 \leq j \leq m$ and all $x_j \in R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}^\bullet$ there is $x \in R^\bullet$ such that $\Phi(x)$ has j-component x_j and all other components 0 (i.e., lying in $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}^\times$): the subgroup generated by such elements is $\bigoplus_{i=1}^m G(R_{\mathfrak{p}_j})$. Write $x_j = \frac{y}{s}$ with $s \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}_j$. Perform the primary decomposition of the principal ideal (y) as above: for all $1 \leq i \leq m$,

$$((y) + R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}) \cap R = (y_i)$$

and take $x = y_j$. Then the jth component of $\Phi(x)$ is $x_j R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}^\bullet$ and every other component is a unit in $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i}^\times$.

b) Any isomorphism of partially ordered commutative groups induces an isomorphism on positive cones. And for any partially ordered commutative groups $G_1, \ldots, G_m$ we have $(\bigoplus_{i=1}^n G_i)^+ = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n G_i^+$. Thus the result follows from part a). □

COROLLARY 22.9. *Let R be a one-dimensional semilocal domain, with* $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_m\}$.
a) Each irreducible element of R belongs to exactly one maximal ideal of R.
b) For each $1 \leq j \leq m$, the localization map $R \to R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ induces a bijection from the atoms contained in $\mathfrak{p}_j$ to the atoms of $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$.

PROOF. The ordered monoid isomorphism $\Phi : G^+(R) \overset{\sim}{\to} \bigoplus_{i=1}^m G^+(R_{\mathfrak{p}_j})$ of Theorem 22.8 induces a bijection from atoms of $G^+(R)$ to atoms of $\bigoplus_{i=1}^m G^+(R_{\mathfrak{p}_j})$. The atoms of any direct sum of partially ordered commutative groups consist precisely of the tuples that are the identity in all coordinates except for one and an atom in the remaining coordinate. The result follows. □

COROLLARY 22.10. *Let R be a semilocal domain, with* $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \{\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_m\}$. *Then R is a Cohen-Kaplansky domain iff $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ is a Cohen-Kaplansky domain for all $1 \leq j \leq m$.*

PROOF. If R is a Cohen-Kaplansky domain, then R is Noetherian of dimension one, hence so is each $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$. By Corollary 22.9, since R has finitely many atoms, so does each $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$. So each $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ is Cohen-Kaplansky.

Suppose each $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ is Cohen-Kaplansky. Then each $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ is Noetherian of dimension one, so by Lemma 22.7 R is Noetherian of dimension on, and in particular

atomic. Since each $R_{\mathfrak{p}_j}$ has finitely many atoms, by Corollary 22.9 R has finitely many atoms. So R is Cohen-Kaplansky. □

In any local domain $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ an element of $f \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$ must be irreducible. Such an element induces a nonzero element of the **Zariski cotangent space** $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$, which is a vector space over the residue field $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$; let us write $\overline{f}$ for the element $f + \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. If $f, g \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \mathfrak{m}^2$ are associate elements, then $\overline{f}$ and $\overline{g}$ generate the same one-dimensional k-subspace of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$. (But the converse need not be true.) We have shown the following fact.

PROPOSITION 22.11. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local domain. Then R has at least as many nonassociate irreducibles as elements of $\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2)$, the projectivized Zariski cotangent space.*

EXERCISE 22.7. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local domain with residue field $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$. Suppose R is not a DVR. Show: R has at least $\#k + 1$ irreducibles. In particular, if R is a Cohen-Kaplansky domain then k is finite.*

Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a primefree local Cohen-Kaplansky domain which is not a DVR, with $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$. Thus $k \cong \mathbb{F}_q$ Thus $d = \dim_k \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 > 1$. By Proposition 22.11, R has at least $\#\mathcal{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \frac{q^d - 1}{q - 1}$-irreducibles. Our next order of business is to understand when we have equality.

Let R be a domain. An element $x \in R$ is **universal** if it is divisible by every irreducible element of R. The set of all universal elements of R forms an ideal, which we will denote by $\mathfrak{u}$. In fact this ideal is precisely the intersection of the principal ideals generated by all irreducible elements. We call an ideal I **universal** if it is contained in $\mathfrak{u}$.

EXERCISE 22.8. *a) Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local domain which is not a field. Show: $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{m}$ iff R is a DVR.*
b) Let R be a Cohen-Kaplansky domain. Show: the ideal $\mathfrak{u}$ of all universal elements is nonzero.
c) Let R be a domain in which the ideal $\mathfrak{u}$ of universal elements is not zero. Must R be a Cohen-Kaplansky domain?

THEOREM 22.12. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a primefree local Cohen-Kaplansky domain with $k = R/\mathfrak{m} \cong \mathbb{F}_q$ and $d = \dim_k \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$.*
a) R has exactly $\frac{q^d - 1}{q - 1}$ irreducibles iff $\mathfrak{m}^2$ is universal.
b) If $\mathfrak{m}^2$ contains an irreducible element then R has at least $\frac{q^{d+1} - 1}{q - 1}$ irreducibles.

PROOF. a) We have more than $\frac{q^d - 1}{q - 1}$ irreducibles iff either some element of $\mathfrak{m}^2$ is irreducible or there are nonassociate irreducibles $f, g \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $u \in R^\times$ such that $f - ug \in \mathfrak{m}^2$. If $\mathfrak{m}^2$ contains an irreducible element then $\mathfrak{m}^2$ is not universal. If there are nonassociate irreducibles $f, g \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $u \in R^\times$ such that $f - ug \in \mathfrak{m}^2$, then $f - ug$ cannot be divisible by either f or g so $\mathfrak{m}^2$ is not universal. Conversely, suppose $\mathfrak{m}^2$ is not universal and that every irreducible lies in $\mathfrak{m}$ (otherwise we know we have more than $\frac{q^d - 1}{q - 1}$ irreducibles). Since $\mathfrak{m}^2$ is generated by the set of products of two irreducibles, there are (not necessarily distinct) irreducibles f_1, f_2, f_3 such that $f_3 \nmid f_1 f_2$. Since $f_1 f_2 + f_3 \in \mathfrak{m}$, it has an irreducible divisor f_4, which cannot be

associate to f_3. Let $x \in R$ be such that $f_4 x = f_1 f_2 + f_3$. We must have $x \in R^\times$ for otherwise $f_3 \in \mathfrak{m}^2$, and we find that f_3 and f_4 are nonassociate irreducibles which generate the same one-dimensional subspace of $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$.

b) **COMPLETE ME!**   □

2.1. Groups of divisibility.

Let R be a domain with fraction field K and integral closure $\overline{R}$. The **group of divisibility** $G(R) = K^\times/R^\times$, partially ordered under divisibility.

EXERCISE 22.9. *Show: R is a Cohen-Kaplansky domain iff the semigroup $G(R)^+ = R^\bullet/R^\times$ is finitely generated.*

We have a short exact sequence

$$(47) \qquad\qquad \overline{R}^\times/R^\times \to G(R) \to G(\overline{R}) \to 0.$$

Since $\overline{R}$ is integrally closed, if $x \in K$ and $x^n \in \overline{R}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ then $x \in \overline{R}$: it follows that $G(\overline{R})$ is torsionfree. IF R is Cohen-Kaplansky then $G(R)^+$ is a finitely generated semigroup, hence $G(R)$ is a finitely generated group, hence $\overline{R}^\times/R^\times$ is finite and $G(\overline{R})$ is finitely generated, and thus (47) splits (as a sequence of commutative groups). Moreover if $\# \operatorname{MaxSpec} R = \# \operatorname{MaxSpec} \overline{R} = n$, then since $\overline{R}$ is a UFD with n primes, we have $G(\overline{R}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$. Thus finally we have an isomorphism of commutative groups

$$G(R) \cong \overline{R}^\times/R^\times \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z}.$$

THEOREM 22.13. *a) For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $G(R)$ is a finitely generated commutative group.
(ii) R is semilocal and $G(R_\mathfrak{m})$ is finitely generated for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$.
b) Let R be a one-dimensional semilocal domain with maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{m}_n$. The natural map

$$G(R) \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} G(R_{\mathfrak{m}_i})$$

is an order isomorphism. It follows that

$$G(R)^+ \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} G(R_{\mathfrak{m}_i})^+.$$

COROLLARY 22.14. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is Cohen-Kaplansky and $\# \operatorname{MaxSpec} R = n$.
(ii) $G(R) \cong T \oplus \mathbb{Z}^n$ with T finite.
(iii) R is Noetherian, $G(R)$ is finitely generated and $\# \operatorname{Max} R = \# Max \overline{R}$.

2.2. Composites.

An extension of domains $R \subset S$ is called **radical** if for all $s \in S$ there is $n = n(s) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $s^{n(s)} \in R$. In particular radical extensions are integral.

PROPOSITION 22.15. *If $\iota : R \subset S$ is radical, then $\iota^* : \operatorname{Spec} S \to \operatorname{Spec} R$ is a homeomorphism. It follows that $\iota^* : \operatorname{MaxSpec} S \to \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ is a bijection.*

3. Rings of Finite Rank

For a module M over a ring R, denote by $\mu(M)$ the minimal cardinality of a set
of R-module generators for M. This is a cardinal number, bounded above by $\#M$.
We define $\mu_*(M)$ to be the supremum of $\mu(N)$ as N ranges over all R-submodules of
M. Finally, define the **rank of R**, denoted $\operatorname{rk}(R)$, as $\mu_*(R)$, i.e., as the supremum
of $\mu(I)$ as I ranges over all ideals of R. We say R has **finite rank** if $\operatorname{rk}(R) < \aleph_0$.

EXERCISE 22.10. *a) Show: R is Noetherian iff $\mu(I) < \aleph_0$ for all ideals I of R.*
b) Show: if $\operatorname{rk}(R) < \aleph_0$, then R is Noetherian.
c) Must a Noetherian ring have finite rank?
(This is a difficult question to answer from scratch. We will soon give an an-
swer...but using results from dimension theory that we do not develop in this text.)

EXAMPLE 22.16. *Let R be a ring.*
a) We have $\operatorname{rk}(R) = 0$ iff R is the zero ring.
b) We have $\operatorname{rk}(R) = 1$ iff R is a nonzero principal ring.
c) Let R be a Dedekind domain and not a PID. Theorem 20.12 implies $\operatorname{rk}(R) = 2$.

EXERCISE 22.11. *Let $\iota : R \to S$ be a homomorphism of rings.*
a) Let M be an R-module, and let $\iota_*(M)$ be the S-module $S \otimes_R M$. Show:

$$\mu(\iota_*(M)) \leq \mu(M).$$

b) Suppose every ideal of S is extended from R: i.e., every ideal J of S is of the
form $\iota_*(I)$ for some ideal I of R. Show:

$$\operatorname{rk}(S) \leq \operatorname{rk}(R).$$

Deduce that this holds if ι is a quotient map or a localization map.

EXERCISE 22.12. *a) Let $R = R_1 \times R_2$ be a direct product of rings. Let M be*
an R-module. Show: there is an R_1-module M_1 and an R_2-module M_2 such that
M is isomorphic to $M_1 \times M_2$ as an $R_1 \times R_2$-module. Deduce:

$$\mu(M) = \max \mu(M_1), \mu(M_2).$$

b) Show: if $R = \prod_{i=1}^n R_i$ is a finite direct product of rings, then

$$\operatorname{rk}(R) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \operatorname{rk}(R_i).$$

EXERCISE 22.13. *Show: $\operatorname{rk}(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]) = 2$.*

EXERCISE 22.14. *Let R be an Artinian ring.*
a) Show $\operatorname{rk}(R) \leq \ell(R)$. Deduce: R has finite rank.
b) Suppose R is not a field. Show: $\operatorname{rk}(R) \leq \ell(R) - 1$.

3.1. Cohen.

EXERCISE 22.15. *Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field, and let $R = \mathbb{F}_q[t_1, \ldots, t_n]/\langle t_1, \ldots, t_n \rangle^2$.*
a) Show: R is a local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = \langle t_1, \ldots, t_n \rangle + \langle t_1, \ldots, t_n, \rangle^2$.
b) Show: $R/\mathfrak{m} = \mathbb{F}_q$, $\#\mathfrak{m} = q^n$ and $\#R = q^{n+1}$.
c) Show: $\mu(\mathfrak{m}) = n$ and thus $\operatorname{rk}(R) \geq n$.
d) What is $\operatorname{rk}(R)$?

A ring R is **residually Artinian** if R/I is Artinian for all nonzero ideals I of R.

EXERCISE 22.16. *Show:*
a) An Artinian ring is residually Artinian.
b) A residually Artinian ring that is not a domain is Artinian.
c) If R is residually Artinian, then $\dim R \leq 1$.
d) A residually Artinian ring is Noetherian.

PROPOSITION 22.17. *A domain R is residually Artinian iff it is Noetherian and $\dim R \leq 1$.*

PROOF. It follows from the previous exericse that a residually Artinian domain is Noetherian of dimension at most one. Conversely, suppose R is a Noetherian domain of dimension at most 1. If $\dim R = 0$ then R is a field, hence is certainly residually Artinian, so suppose $\dim R = 1$ and let I be a nonzero ideal in R. Let $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \mathfrak{q}_i$ be a primary decomposition of I, and let $\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i)$. Then as in §10.8, each $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is maximal, so by the Chinese Remainder Theorem we have

$$R/I \cong \prod_{i=1}^{n} R/\mathfrak{q}_i.$$

Moreover each $R/\mathfrak{q}_i$ is Noetherian with unique prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}_i$, so is a local Artinian ring. It follows that R/I is Artinian. $\square$

EXERCISE 22.17. *(Cohen) Let R be a residually Artinian domain with fraction field F, let K/F be a finite degree field extension, and let S be the integral closure of R in K. Show: S is residually Artinian.*

We warn the reader that the proof of the following result uses *three* different aspects of commutative algebra that are not covered in these notes.

THEOREM 22.18. *(Cohen [**Co50**])*
a) For a local domain $(R, \mathfrak{m})$, the following are equivalent:
(i) R has finite rank.
(ii) R is Noetherian of dimension at most 1.
b) If R has finite rank, then $\dim R \leq 1$.

PROOF. a) $\neg$ (ii) $\implies \neg$ (i): If R is not Noetherian, then certainly $\mathrm{rk}\, R \geq \aleph_0$, so we may assume that R is Noetherian and of Krull dimension at least 2 and show that R does not have finite rank. By the Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem, we have $2 \leq \mathrm{ht}\, \mathfrak{m} < \aleph_0$. By the theory of Hilbert polynomials – not covered here (sorry!) but see [**AM**, Ch. 11] – there is $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and a degree $d - 1$ polynomial $P(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ such that for all $n \geq N$ we have

$$\dim_{R/\mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m}^n/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1} = P(n).$$

It follows that

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mu(\mathfrak{m}^n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} P(n) = \infty$$

and thus $\mathrm{rk}(R) = \aleph_0$.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Noetherian local domain of dimension at most 1. By Proposition 22.17, the ring R is residually Artinian. Let $\overline{R}$ be the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic completion of R. By Cohen's results on the structure of complete local rings [**Co46**], there is a subring R_0 of R such that R_0 is a complete discrete valuation ring and R is finitely generated free R-module, say of rank d. By the standard PID structure theory, every ideal I of R is then an R_0-submodule of the rank d R_0-module R, hence is

itself free of rank at most d as an R_0-module and thus *a fortiori* can be generated as an ideal by at most d elements: that is, $\operatorname{rk} \overline{R} \leq d$.

Now let I be a nonzero ideal of R. Then $I\overline{R}$ can be generated by d elements $\overline{a_1}, \ldots, \overline{a_d}$. Since $\mathfrak{m}$ is the only proper prime ideal of R, $\mathfrak{m}I$ is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary, hence $\mathfrak{m}I \supset \mathfrak{m}^N$ for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Let $a_1, \ldots, a_d \in \mathbb{R}$ be such that

$$\overline{a_i} \equiv a_i \pmod{\mathfrak{m}I\overline{R}} \forall 1 \leq i \leq d.$$

We have $a_i \in I\overline{R}$; since $I\overline{R} \cap R = I$, we have $a_i \in I$. Let $J := \langle a_1, \ldots, a_d \rangle_R$, so $J \subset I$ and $\mu(J) = d$. Thus it suffices to show that $J = I$. We have

$$I\overline{R} \subset J\overline{R} + I\mathfrak{m}\overline{R},$$

so

$$I \subset (J\overline{R} + I\mathfrak{m}\overline{R}) \cap R = J + I\mathfrak{m},$$

so $J = I$ by Corollary 3.44.

b) Suppose R has finite rank. Then R is Noetherian. Seeking a contradiction, we assume $\dim R \geq 2$, i.e., that there are prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_2$ of R. Let S be the localization of $R/\mathfrak{p}_0$ at $\mathfrak{p}_2$, so S is Noetherian local and $\dim S \geq 2$. On the one hand, by part a) S does not have finite rank. On the other hand, since S is obtained from the finite rank ring S by a quotient map followed by a localization, S has finite rank: contradiction. $\qquad\square$

3.2. Gilmer.

PROPOSITION 22.19. *(Gilmer) Let M be an R-module, and let N be an R-submodule. Let r, s be cardinal numbers.*
a) If $\mu_*(M) \leq r$, then $\mu_*(N) \leq r$ and $\mu_*(M/N) \leq r$.
b) If $\mu_*(N) \leq r$ and $\mu_*(M/N) \leq s$, then $\mu_*(M) \leq r + s$.
c) If $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M_i$ is a finite direct sum of R-modules, then $\mu_*(M) < \aleph_0$ iff $\mu_*(M_i) < \aleph_0$ for all i.

PROOF. Let $q: M \to M/N$ be the natural map.
a) Suppose $\mu_*(M) \leq r$, so $\mu(N') \leq r$ for all submodules N' of M. Since every submodule of N is also a submodule of M, we deduce $\mu_*(N) \leq r$. Similarly, if P is a submodule of M/N, then $P = q^{-1}(P)/N$, and since $\mu(q^{-1}(P)) \leq r$, also $\mu(P) \leq r$ and thus $\mu_*(M/N) \leq r$.
b) Suppose $\mu_*(N) \leq r$ and $\mu_*(M/N) \leq s$, and let N' be a submodule of N. Then $\mu(q(N')) \leq s$, so let $S \subset N'$ of cardinality at most s mapping to a set of generators of $q(N')$. Let R be a set of generators of $N \cap N'$ of cardinality at most R. Then $R \cup S$ generates N and has cardinality at most $r + s$.
c) This follows from parts a) and b). $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 22.20. *(Gilmer) Let M be a finitely generated R-module. Then*

$$\mu_*(M) \leq \mu(M)\operatorname{rk}(R).$$

PROOF. We may assume $M \neq 0$. We proceed by induction on $k = \mu(M) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Base Case ($k = 1$): If M is monogenic, then $M \cong R/\operatorname{ann}(M)$, so

$$\mu_*(M) \leq \mu_*(R) = \operatorname{rk}(R).$$

Induction Step: suppose $k \geq 2$ and the result holds for all modules M with $\mu(M) \leq k - 1$, let M be a module with $\mu(M) = k$ and put $M = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_k \rangle$. Put $N =$

$\langle x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} \rangle$, so $\mu(N) \leq k - 1$ and $\mu(M/N) \leq 1$. By induction we have $\mu_*(N) \leq \mu(N) \operatorname{rk}(R)$ and $\mu_*(M/N) \leq \operatorname{rk}(R)$, so

$$\mu_*(M) \leq (\mu(N) + 1) \operatorname{rk} R \leq \mu(M) \operatorname{rk}(R). \qquad \square$$

THEOREM 22.21. *(Gilmer) For R Noetherian, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R has finite rank.
(iI) For all minimal primes $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$, the ring $R/\mathfrak{p}$ has finite rank.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii) is clear from Exercise 22.11.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Step 1: We show that for each minimal $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the ring $R/\mathfrak{p}^n$ has finite rank. We proceed by induction on n, and the base case is our hypothesis that $R/\mathfrak{p}$ has finite rank. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and suppose $\operatorname{rk} R/\mathfrak{p}^n$ is finite. Notice that since $R \to R/\mathfrak{p}^n$ is surjective, the rank of $f R/\mathfrak{p}^n$ as a ring is the same as its rank $\mu_*(R/\mathfrak{p}^n)$ as an R-module. Consider the exact sequence of R-modules

$$0 \to \mathfrak{p}^n/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1} \to R/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1} \to R/\mathfrak{p}^n \to 0.$$

By Proposition 22.19 we have

$$\mu_*(R/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}) \leq \mu_*(\mathfrak{p}^n/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}) + \mu_*(R/\mathfrak{p}^n).$$

The rank of $\mathfrak{p}^n/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}$ as an R-module is equal to its rank as an $R/\mathfrak{p}$-module. Thus we have

$$\mu_*(\mathfrak{p}^n/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}) \leq \operatorname{rk}(R/\mathfrak{p}) \operatorname{rk}(\mathfrak{p}^n/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}) < \aleph_0$$

since R is Noetherian. Thus overal we have shown $\operatorname{rk}(R/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}) = \mu_*(R/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1}) < \aleph_0$. Step 2: Because R is Noetherian, it has finitely many minimal primes $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r$, and by Exercise 10.13 there is $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^r \mathfrak{p}_i^N = (0)$. Thus we have an injection of R-modules

$$R \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^r R/\mathfrak{p}_i^N,$$

and it follows from Step 1 and Proposition 22.19 that $\operatorname{rk}(R) < \aleph_0$. $\qquad \square$

3.3. Further results.

In studying rings of finite rank, it seems reasonable to assume that R is Noetherian – for otherwise $\operatorname{rk} R \geq \aleph_0$ – and nonprincipal – for otherwise $\operatorname{rk} R \leq 1$. (Of course this presumes that we can recognize Noetherian and principal rings when we encounter them. The former seems reasonable in view of our large number of characterizations of Noetherian rings. The latter is in practice quite dubious – e.g. it is completely unclear when the integral closure $\mathbb{Z}_K$ of $\mathbb{Z}$ in a number field K is a principal ring – but from a *general* perspective it seems more reasonable.)

THEOREM 22.22. *Let R be a Noetherian, nonprincipal ring.*
a) If $\operatorname{rk} R < \aleph_0$, then $\dim R \leq 1$.
b) We have

$$(48) \qquad\qquad \operatorname{rk} R \leq \sup_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} (\operatorname{rk} R_\mathfrak{m} + 1)$$

*and thus [**Gi72**, Thm. 3] $\operatorname{rk} R < \aleph_0$ iff $\sup_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} \operatorname{rk} R_\mathfrak{m} < \infty$.*
c) Suppose R is moreover reduced. Then $\operatorname{rk} R$ can be computed locally:

$$(49) \qquad\qquad \operatorname{rk} R = \sup_{\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R} \operatorname{rk} R_\mathfrak{m}.$$

PROOF. a) We argue by contraposition: suppose $\dim R \geq 2$. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a minimal prime ideal of R. Then $R/\mathfrak{p}$ is a domain of dimension at least 2, so by Theorem 22.18 we have $\operatorname{rk} R/\mathfrak{p} = \aleph_0$ and thus by Exercise 22.11 we have $\operatorname{rk} R = \aleph_0$.

b) Let I be an ideal of R. By the Forster-Swan Theorem, we have

$$\mu(I) \leq \sup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{JSpec}\, R} (\mu(IR_{\mathfrak{p}}) + \dim \mathrm{JSpec}\, R/\mathfrak{p}) \leq \sup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}\, R} (\mu(IR_{\mathfrak{p}}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p}).$$

We may assume that $\dim R \leq 1$: otherwise $\dim R_{\mathfrak{m}} \geq 2$ for some $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R$, so by part a) we have $\operatorname{rk} R_{\mathfrak{m}} = \aleph_0$ which then implies $\operatorname{rk} R = \aleph_0$ and thus (49) holds. Thus $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}\, R$ is either maximal or minimal. If $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}$ is maximal we have $\mu(IR_{\mathfrak{m}}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{m} = \mu(IR_{\mathfrak{m}}) \leq \operatorname{rk} R_{\mathfrak{m}}$. If $\mathfrak{p}$ is minimal, let $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal containing $\mathfrak{p}$, so

$$\mu(IR_{\mathfrak{p}}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p} \leq \mu(IR_{\mathfrak{m}}) + 1 \leq \operatorname{rk} R_{\mathfrak{m}} + 1,$$

which establishes (48).

c) If R is reduced, then $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a reduced Artinian local ring, i.e., a field, so

$$\mu(IR_{\mathfrak{p}}) + \dim R/\mathfrak{p} \leq 2,$$

but since R is nonprincipal, we have $\operatorname{rk} R \geq 2$. This shows that

$$\operatorname{rk} R \leq \sup_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathrm{MaxSpec}\, R} \operatorname{rk} R_{\mathfrak{m}},$$

but again we certainly have $\operatorname{rk} R_{\mathfrak{m}} \leq \operatorname{rk} R$ for all $\mathfrak{m}$, so (49) follows. $\qquad\square$

CHAPTER 23

Structure of overrings

1. Introducing overrings

Let R be a domain with fraction field K. Let Σ_R be the set of height one prime ideals of R. By an **overring** of R we mean a subring of K containing R, i.e., a ring T with $R \subset T \subset K$. (We allow equality.) This is standard terminology among commutative algebraists, but we warn that someone who has not heard it before will probably guess incorrectly at its meaning: one might well think that "T is an overring of R" would simply mean that "R is a subring of T".

2. Overrings of Dedekind domains

In this section we will study overrings of a Dedekind domain R. In particular, we will answer the following questions.

QUESTION 5. *Let R be a Dedekind domain.*
a) Can we (in some sense) classify the overrings of R?
b) Under what conditions is every overring of R a localization?
c) Let T be an overring of R. What is the relationship between $\operatorname{Pic} T$ and $\operatorname{Pic} R$?

(In point of fact we can *ask* these questions for any domain R. But for a Dedekind domain we will obtain definitive, useful answers.)

As a warmup, suppose R is a PID. In this case every overring is indeed a localization: to see this it is enough to show that for all coprime $x, y \in R^\bullet$, $\frac{1}{y} \in R[\frac{x}{y}]$. But since x and y are coprime in the PID R, there are $a, b \in R$ such that $ax + by = 1$, and then $\frac{1}{y} = \frac{ax+by}{y} = a\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) + b \in R[\frac{x}{y}]$. It follows that every overring of a PID is obtained by localizing at a multiplicative subset $S \subset R^\bullet$. Further, by uniqueness of factorization the saturated multiplicatively closed subsets of $R^\bullet$ are in bijection with subsets of Σ_R: in other words, an overring is entirely determined by the set of prime elements we invert, and inverting different sets of prime elements leads to distinct overrings. Further, since a localization of a PID is a again a PID, in this case we have $\operatorname{Pic} T = 0$ for all overrings.

Some of the above analysis generalizes to arbitrary Dedekind domains: we will show that for any Dedekind domain R the overrings of R correspond bijectively to subsets of Σ_R. More precisely, for any subset $W \subset \Sigma_R$ we define

$$R_W = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in W} R_\mathfrak{p}$$

and also
$$R^W = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R \setminus W} R_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

(Note that $R^W = R_{\Sigma_R \setminus W}$. So it is logically unnecessary to consider both R_W and R^W, but it will be notationally convenient to do so.) When $W = \{\mathfrak{p}\}$ consists of a single element, we we write $R^{\mathfrak{p}}$ for $R^{\{\mathfrak{p}\}}$. Let $\Phi : \Sigma_R \to \mathrm{Pic}\, R$ be the ideal class map, i.e., $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto [\mathfrak{p}]$. Then we will show that every overring of a Dedekind domain R is of the form R^W for a unique subset $W \subset \Sigma_R$ and that $\mathrm{Pic}\, R^W \cong \mathrm{Pic}\, R / \langle \Phi(W) \rangle$.

On the other hand, it is not generally true that an arbitrary overring of R arsies as a localization. However, O. Goldman gave a beautiful analysis of the situation: it turns out that a Noetherian domain R has the property that every overring is a localization iff R is a Dedekind domain and $\mathrm{Pic}\, R$ is a torsion group.

2.1. Structure of overrings. Let R be a Dedekind domain with fraction field K.

LEMMA 23.1. *a) For all $\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R$, there exists $f_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R^{\mathfrak{p}} \setminus R$.*
b) The mapping from subsets of Σ_R to overrings of R given by $W \mapsto R^W$ is injective.

PROOF. a) Choose $x \in K \setminus R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and let S be the finite set of maximal ideals $\mathfrak{q}$ distinct from $\mathfrak{p}$ such that $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}}(x) < 0$. For each $\mathfrak{q} \in S$, let $y_{\mathfrak{q}} \in \mathfrak{q} \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. Let $N = \max_{\mathfrak{q} \in S} -\mathrm{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}}(x)$, and put $f_{\mathfrak{p}} = (\prod_{\mathfrak{q} \in S} y_{\mathfrak{q}})^N x$.
b) Suppose W_1 and W_2 are distinct subsets of Σ_R. After relabelling if necessary, we may assume that there exists $\mathfrak{p} \in W_2 \setminus W_1$. By part a), there exists $f_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R^{\mathfrak{p}} \setminus R$ and thus $f_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R^{W_1} \setminus R^{W_2}$. $\qquad\square$

PROPOSITION 23.2. *Let R be a Dedekind domain with fraction field K, and let T be an overring of R. Write $\iota : R \hookrightarrow T$ for the inclusion map.*
a) For every $\mathcal{P} \in \Sigma_T$, $T = R_{\mathcal{P} \cap R}$.
b) T is itself a Dedekind domain.
c) $\iota^* : \Sigma_T \hookrightarrow \Sigma_R$ is an injection.
d) For all $\mathcal{P} \in \Sigma_T$, $\iota_* \iota^* \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}$.
e) ι^* identifies Σ_T with the subset of $\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R$ such that $\mathfrak{p}T \subsetneq T$.

PROOF. a) Put $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} \cap R$. There exist $x, y \in R^{\bullet}$ such that $\frac{x}{y} \in \mathcal{P}$. Then $0 \neq x = y(\frac{x}{y}) \in \mathfrak{p}$, so $\mathfrak{p}$ is a nonzero prime ideal of R. Thus $T_{\mathfrak{P}}$ contains the DVR $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and is properly contained in its fraction field, so $T_{\mathcal{P}} = R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.
b) By the Krull-Akizuki Theorem, T is a Noetherian domain of Krull dimension one. By part a), the localization of T at every prime is a DVR. So T is integrally closed and is thus a Dedekind domain.
c) For distinct $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2 \in \Sigma_T$, the localizations $T_{\mathcal{P}_1}$, $T_{\mathcal{P}_2}$ are distinct DVRs. But by part a), putting $\mathfrak{p}_i = \iota^*(\mathcal{P}_i)$, we have $R_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = T_{\mathcal{P}_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$, so $\mathfrak{p}_1 \neq \mathfrak{p}_2$.
d) Suppose $\mathfrak{p} = \iota^*(\mathcal{P})$. Then
$$(\iota_* \iota * \mathcal{P})T_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathfrak{p}T_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{P}T_{\mathcal{P}}.$$

By part c), $\iota * \iota^* \mathcal{P}$ is not divisible by any prime other than $\mathcal{P}$, so $\iota_* \mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P}$.
e) This follows immediately and is stated separately for later use. $\qquad\square$

THEOREM 23.3. *For any overring T of the Dedekind domain R, we have*
$$T = R_{\iota^*(\Sigma_T)}.$$

The proof (that I know) of this theorem requires the study overrings of more general Prüfer domains, to which we turn in the next section.

2.2. When overrings are localizations.

LEMMA 23.4. *Let R be an integrally closed domain with fraction field K, and let T be an overring of R.*
a) The relative unit group $T^\times/R^\times$ is torsionfree.
b) Suppose that R is a Dedekind domain, $\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R$ and $T = R^{\mathfrak{p}}$. the following are equivalent:
(i) $T^\times/R^\times \cong \mathbb{Z}$.
(ii) $T^\times \supsetneq R^\times$.
(iii) $[\mathfrak{p}] \in \operatorname{Pic}(R)[\mathrm{tors}]$.
(iv) There exists $x \in R$ which is contained in $\mathfrak{p}$ and in no maximal ideal $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}$.

PROOF. a) Since R is integrally closed, all finite order elements of $K^\times$ (i.e., roots of unity in K) lie in R and *a fortiori* in T: $R^\times[\mathrm{tors}] = T^\times[\mathrm{tors}]$. On the other hand, let $x \in T^\times$ be of infinite order such that $x^n \in R^\times$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Again integral closure of R implies $x \in R$, and then $x^n \in R^\times \implies x \in R^\times$.
b) (i) $\implies$ (ii) is clear.
(ii) $\implies$ (iii): Let $x \in K^\times$. Then $x \in T^\times$ iff $Rx = \mathfrak{p}^a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $x \in R^\times$ iff $a = 0$. Therefore (ii) holds iff some power of $\mathfrak{p}$ is principal, which is to say that the class of $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Pic} R$ is torsion.
(iii) $\implies$ (i): Let a be the least positive integer such that $\mathfrak{p}^a$ is principal. Thus $\mathfrak{p}^a = xR$ with x uniquely determined modulo $R^\times$. It follows that $T^\times$ is generated by $R^\times$ and x, so $T^\times/R^\times$ is a nontrivial cyclic group. By part a) it is also torsionfree so $T^\times/R^\times \cong \mathbb{Z}$.
(iii) $\implies$ (iv): If $\mathfrak{p}^a = xR$, then x lies in $\mathfrak{p}$ but in no other maximal ideal $\mathfrak{q}$.
(iv) $\implies$ (iii): If $a = v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)$, then $a > 0$ and $xR = \mathfrak{p}^a$. $\qquad\square$

Remark: Part (iv) of Lemma 23.4 was added following an observation of H. Knaf.

THEOREM 23.5. *(Goldman [**Gol64**]) For a Dedekind domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is a torsion group.
(ii) Every overring of R is a localization.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R$. By Lemma 23.1 $R^{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a proper overring of R, so by assumption $R^{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a localization of R and thus has a strictly larger unit group. By Lemma 23.4 this implies that $[\mathfrak{p}] \in \operatorname{Pic}(R)[\mathrm{tors}]$. Since $\operatorname{Pic}(R)$ is generated by the classes of the nonzero prime ideals, it follows that $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is torsion.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let T be an overring of R, and put $S = R \cap T^\times$. We want to show that $T = S^{-1}R$. That $S^{-1}R \subset T$ is clear. Conversely, let $x \in T$, and write $xR = \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}^{-1}$ with $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}$ coprime integral ideals of R: $\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b} = R$. Thus $\mathfrak{a}T + \mathfrak{b}T = T$ whereas $\mathfrak{a}T = x\mathfrak{b}T \subset \mathfrak{b}T$, so $\mathfrak{b}T = T$ and hence also $\mathfrak{b}^nT = T$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. Since $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is torsion, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $\mathfrak{b}^n = bR$. It follows that $bT = T$ and thus $b \in S$. Now $x\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a} \subset R$, so $xb \in R$. Thus $x \in S^{-1}R$, and we conclude $T \subset S^{-1}R$. $\qquad\square$

COROLLARY 23.6. *Suppose that W is a finite subset of Σ_R and that every $\mathfrak{p} \in W$ has finite order in $\operatorname{Pic} R$. Then there is $a \in R^\bullet$ such that $R^W = R[\frac{1}{a}]$.*

EXERCISE 23.1. *Prove Corollary 23.6.*

EXERCISE 23.2. *Let $T = R^W$ be an overring of R such that $T = R[\frac{1}{a}]$ for some $a \in R^\bullet$.*
s) Show: W is finite.
b) Must it be the case that every $\mathfrak{p} \in W$ has finite order in $\operatorname{Pic} R$?

2.3. The Picard group of an overring.

THEOREM 23.7. *Let R be a Dedekind domain, $W \subset \Sigma_R$, let $R^W = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R \setminus W} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and let $\operatorname{Frac}_W R = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \in W} \mathbb{Z}$ denote the subgroup of fractional R-ideals supported on W. There is a short exact sequence*

$$1 \to R^\times \to (R^W)^\times \xrightarrow{v} \operatorname{Frac}_W R \to \operatorname{Pic} R \xrightarrow{\iota_*} \operatorname{Pic} R^W \to 1.$$

PROOF. The map $v : (R^W)^\times \to \operatorname{Frac}_W R$ is obtained by restricting the canonical map $K^\times \to \operatorname{Frac} R$ to $(R^W)^\times$: the fractional ideals so obtained have $\mathfrak{p}$-adic valuation 0 for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R^W = \operatorname{MaxSpec} R \setminus W$: thus the image lands in $\operatorname{Frac}_W R$.
It is easy to see most of the exactness claims: certainly $R^\times \to (R^W)^\times$ is injective; further, for $x \in (R^W)^\times$, $v(x) = 0$ iff $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in W \cup \operatorname{MaxSpec} R^W = \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ iff $x \in R^\times$. If $I \in \operatorname{Frac}_W R$, then I is principal iff it has a generator $x \in K^\times$ with $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) = 0 \forall \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R \setminus W = \operatorname{MaxSpec} R^W$ iff $I = (x)$ for $x \in (R^W)^\times$. Exactness at $\operatorname{Pic} R$: Let $[I] \in \operatorname{Pic} R$ be such that $\iota_*([I]) = 1$: thus there is $x \in K^\times$ with $IR^W = xR^W$. Then $[I] = [x^{-1}I]$ and $x^{-1}I \in \operatorname{Frac}_W R$. Conversely, if $I \in \operatorname{Frac}_W R$, then $IR^W = R^W$. Finally, by Proposition 23.2 $\iota_* \circ \iota^* = 1_{\Sigma(S)}$, so every prime ideal of R^W is of the form $\iota_*(\mathfrak{p})$ for a prime ideal of R. This certainly implies that $\iota_* : \iota_* : \operatorname{Pic} R \to \operatorname{Pic} R^W$ is surjective. $\square$

EXERCISE 23.3. *We maintain the setup of Theorem 23.7.*
a) Use Theorem 23.7 to give a new proof of Lemma 23.4.
a) Show that the relative unit group $(R^W)^\times / R^\times$ is free abelian. (This strengthens Lemma 23.4 when R is a Dedekind domain.)
b) Suppose $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is torsion. Show:

$$(R^W)^\times \cong R^\times \oplus \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \in W} \mathbb{Z}.$$

c) Deduce the Hasse-Chevalley S-Unit Theorem from the Dirichlet Unit Theorem.
d) Suppose that K is a number field. Show that $K^\times$ is isomorphic to the product of a finite cyclic group with a free commutative group of countable rank.

2.4. Repleteness in Dedekind domains.

Let R be a Dedekind domain, and consider the map $\Phi : \Sigma_R \to \operatorname{Pic} R$ given by $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto [\mathfrak{p}]$. We say that R is **replete** if Φ is surjective, i.e., if every element of $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is of the form $[\mathfrak{p}]$ for some *prime* ideal $\mathfrak{p}$.

Example: Let R be an S-integer ring in a global field. It follows immediately from the **Chebotarev Density Theorem** that R is replete.

For our coming applications it is useful to consider a variant: we say that a Dedekind domain R is **weakly replete** if for every subgroup $H \subset \operatorname{Pic} R$, there is a subset $W_H \subset \Sigma_R$ such that $\langle \Phi(W_H) \rangle = H$. The point of this condition is that it allows a complete classification of the Picard groups of overrings of R. Indeed:

PROPOSITION 23.8. *Let R be a weakly replete Dedekind domain. Then for any subgroup H of $\operatorname{Pic} R$, there is an overring T of R such that $\operatorname{Pic} T \cong (\operatorname{Pic} R)/H$.*

PROOF. By definition of weakly replete, there exists a subset $W \subset \Sigma_R$ such that $\langle \Phi(W) \rangle = H$. By Theorem 23.7, $\operatorname{Pic} R^W \cong \operatorname{Pic} R/\langle \Phi(W) \rangle \cong (\operatorname{Pic} R)/H$. $\square$

PROPOSITION 23.9. *Let R be a Dedekind domain and R^W an overring of R.*
a) If R is replete, so is R^W.
b) If R is weakly replete, so is R^W.

EXERCISE 23.4. *Prove Proposition 23.9.*

A **repletion** of a Dedekind domain R is a replete Dedekind domain S together with an injective ring homomorphism $\iota : R \hookrightarrow S$, such that $\iota_* : \operatorname{Pic}(R) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Pic}(S)$.

THEOREM 23.10. *(Claborn) For a Dedekind domain R, let R^1 denote the localization of $R[t]$ at the multiplicative set generated by all monic polynomials. Then R^1 is Dedekind and the composite map $\iota : R \to R[t] \to R^1$ is a repletion.*

PROOF. **COMPLETE ME!** $\square$

EXERCISE 23.5. *Use Proposition 23.8 and Theorem 23.10 to show: if for every cardinal κ, there is a Dedekind domain R with Picard group a free commutative group of rank κ, then for every commutative group G there is a Dedekind domain R with $\operatorname{Pic} R \cong G$.*

3. Elasticity in Replete Dedekind Domains

Let R be a domain and $x \in R^\bullet \setminus R^\times$. If for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ there are (not necessarily distinct) irreducible elements $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ of R such that $x = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n$, we say that x admits an irreducible factorization of **length** n.

A **half factorial domain** (or **HFD**) is an atomic domain in which for all $x \in R^\bullet \setminus R^\times$, any two irreducible factorizations of x have the same length.

EXERCISE 23.6. *(Zaks) Show: $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$ is a HFD which is not integrally closed.*

For R an atomic domain and $x \in R^\bullet \setminus R^\times$, let $L(x)$ be the supremum of all lengths of irreducible factorizations of x and let $\ell(x)$ be the minimum of all lengths of irreducible factorizations of x. We define the **elasticity of x**, $\rho(x)$, as the ratio $\frac{L(x)}{\ell(x)}$. We also make the convention that for $x \in R^\times$, $\rho(x) = 1$. Finally we define the **elasticity of R** as $\rho(R) = \sup_{x \in R^\bullet} \rho(x)$.

An atomic domain is a HFD iff $\rho(R) = 1$. Thus $\rho(R)$ is a quantitative measure of how far an atomic domain is from being a HFD.

Let $(G, \cdot)$ be a commutative group. A finite sequence $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ of elements in G is **irreducible** if for all nonempty proper subsets $S \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\prod_{i \in S} g_i \neq 1$.

LEMMA 23.11. *Let $(G, \cdot)$ be a commutative group, let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be an irreducible sequence in G, and let $x_{n+1} = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n x_i \right)^{-1}$. If $x_{n+1} \neq 1$, then $x_1, \ldots, x_n, x_{n+1}$ is an irreducible sequence.*

PROOF. A nontrivial proper subsequence of $x_1, \ldots, x_{n+1}$ with trivial product must be of the form $x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_k}, x_{n+1}$ for some nonempty proper subset $S = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Put $S' = \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus S$. Then $\prod_{i \in S'} x_i^{-1} = 1$, hence also $\prod_{i \in S'} x_i = 1$, contradicting the irreducibility of $x_1, \ldots, x_n$.   □

PROPOSITION 23.12. *Let R be a Dedekind domain, let $x \in R^\bullet \setminus R^\times$, and let*

$$(x) = \prod_{i=1}^r \mathfrak{p}_i$$

be the factorization of x into prime ideals.
*a) (Carlitz-Valenza [**Ca60**] [**Va90**]) The following are equivalent:*
(i) For no nonempty proper subset $S \subset \{1, \ldots, r\}$ is $\prod_{i \in S} \mathfrak{p}_i$ is principal.
(ii) The element x is irreducible.
b) If $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal such that $\mathfrak{p}^r = (x)$ and $\mathfrak{p}^s$ is nonprincipal for all $1 \le s < r$, then x is irreducible.
c) If no $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is principal, the length of any irreducible factorization of x is at most $\frac{r}{2}$.

EXERCISE 23.7. *Prove Proposition 23.12.*

For a commutative group $(G, \cdot)$ the **Davenport constant** $D(G)$ of G is the maximum length of an irreducible sequence in G, or ∞ if the lengths of irreducible sequences in G are unbounded.

PROPOSITION 23.13. *Let R be a Dedekind domain, and let $x \in R^\bullet$ be irreducible. Write $(x) = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r$. Then $r \le D(\operatorname{Pic} R)$.*

PROOF. By Proposition 23.12a), $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r$ is an irreducible sequence in $\operatorname{Pic} R$.   □

PROPOSITION 23.14.
a) If H is a subgroup of a commutative group G, then $D(H) \le D(G)$.
b) If H is a quotient of a commutative group G, then $D(H) \le D(G)$.
c) $D(G) \ge \exp G = \sup_{x \in G} \#\langle x \rangle$.
d) If G is infinite, $D(G) = \infty$.
e) If G is finite, then $D(G) \le \#G$.
f) If G is finite cyclic, then $D(G) = \#G$.
g) We have

$$(50) \qquad D(\bigoplus_{i=1}^r \mathbb{Z}/n_i\mathbb{Z}) \ge 1 + \sum_{i=1}^r (n_i - 1).$$

h) We have $D(G) = 1 \iff \#G = 1$ and $D(G) = 2 \iff \#G = 2$.

PROOF. a) If H is a subgroup of G, then any irreducible sequence in H is an irreducible sequence in G.
b) If $q : G \to H$ is a surjective homomorphism and $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ is irreducible in H, then choosing any lift $\tilde{x}_i$ of x_i to G yields an irreducible sequence $\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n$.
c) If $x \in G$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ is less than or equal to the order of x, then $x, x, \ldots, x$ (n times) is an irreducible sequence in G of length n.
d) By part c), we may assume G is infinite and of finite exponent. Then for some prime p, $G[p]$ is infinite, and by part a) it suffices to show that $D(G[p]) = \infty$. But $G[p]$ is an infinite-dimensional vector space over the field $\mathbb{F}_p$: let $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be an infinite $\mathbb{F}_p$-linearly independent subset of $G[p]$. Then for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ the sequence

$e_1, \ldots, e_n$ is irreducible.

e) Suppose $\#G = n$, and let $g_1, \ldots, g_{n+1}$ be a sequence in G. For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $P_i = g_1 \cdots g_i$. By the Pigeonhole Principle there is $1 \leq i < j \leq n + 1$ such that $P_i = P_j$, and thus $g_{i+1} \cdots g_j = 1$.

f) Since $\exp \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = \#\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = n$, this follows from parts c) and e).

g) Let $G = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{Z}/n_i\mathbb{Z},$[1] and let $d(G) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k}(n_i - 1)$. There is an "obvious" irreducible sequence $x_1, \ldots, x_{d(G)-1}$: for $1 \leq i \leq k$, let e_i be the element of G with ith coordinate 1 and other coordinates 0. Take $e_1, \ldots, e_1$ ($n_1 - 1$ times), $e_2, \ldots, e_2$ ($n_2 - 1$ times),....,$e_k, \ldots, e_k$ ($n_k - 1$ times). The sum of these elements is $(n_1 - 1, \ldots, n_k - 1) \neq 0$, so by Lemma 23.11 taking $x_{d(G)} = -\sum_{i=1}^{d(G)-1} x_i$, we get an irreducible sequence of length $d(G)$.

h) Left to the reader as an easy exercise in applying some of the above parts. $\quad\square$

THEOREM 23.15. *Let R be a Dedekind domain.*

a) *We have $\rho(R) \leq \max(\frac{D(\operatorname{Pic} R)}{2}, 1)$.*

b) *If R is replete, then $\rho(R) = \max(\frac{D(\operatorname{Pic} R)}{2}, 1)$.*

PROOF. For $x \in R^\bullet \setminus R^\times$, let $P(x)$ be the number of prime ideals (with multiplicity) in the factorization of (x).

Step 0: Of course if $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is trivial then $D(\operatorname{Pic} R) = 1$, $\rho(R) = 1$ and the result holds in this case. Henceforth we assume $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is nontrivial and thus $D(\operatorname{Pic} R) \geq 2$, and our task is to show that $\rho(R) \leq \frac{D(\operatorname{Pic} R)}{2}$, with equality if R is replete.

Step 1: Let $x \in R^\bullet \setminus R^\times$. Consider two irreducible factorizations

$$x = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m = \beta_1 \cdots \beta_n$$

of x with $m \geq n$. Let k be the number of principal prime ideals in the prime ideal factorization of (x). Then $k = n \iff k = m \implies \rho(x) = 1$. Henceforth we assume $k < \min(m, n)$ (since $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is nontrivial, there is at least one such x). We may further assume that $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k$ (resp. $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k$) are prime elements and $\alpha_{k+1}, \ldots, \alpha_m$ (resp. $\beta_{k+1}, \ldots, \beta_n$) are not; dividing through by these prime elements and correcting by a unit if necessary, we may write

$$x' = \alpha_{k+1} \cdots \alpha_m = \beta_{k+1} \cdots \beta_n.$$

Since for $k + 1 \leq i \leq m$, α_i is irreducible but not prime, $P(\alpha_i) \geq 2$ and thus

$$2(m - k) \leq P(\alpha_{k+1} \cdots \alpha_m) = P(x').$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 23.13 we have

$$P(x') = P(\beta_{k+1} \cdots \beta_n) \leq (n - k)D(\operatorname{Pic} R).$$

Combining these inequalities gives

$$\frac{m}{n} \leq \frac{m - k}{n - k} \leq \frac{D(\operatorname{Pic} R)}{2}.$$

It follows that $\rho(x) \leq \frac{D(\operatorname{Pic} R)}{2}$ and thus $\rho(R) \leq \frac{D(\operatorname{Pic} R)}{2}$, establishing part a).

Step 2: Suppose R is replete.

Step 2a: Suppose first that $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is finite and put $D = D(\operatorname{Pic} R)$. By repleteness, choose prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_D$ whose classes form an irreducible sequence in $\operatorname{Pic} R$. For $1 \leq i \leq D$, let $\mathfrak{q}_i$ be a prime ideal with $[\mathfrak{q}_i] = [\mathfrak{p}_i]^{-1}$. For $1 \leq i \leq D$, let

---

[1]Here we are considering G as an additive group.

c_i be such that $(c_i) = \mathfrak{p}_i \mathfrak{q}_i$; using Lemma 23.11 there are $d_1, d_2 \in R$ such that $(d_1) = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_D$ and $(d_2) = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{q}_D$ and

$$c_1 \cdots c_D = d_1 d_2.$$

By Proposition 23.12, $c_1, \ldots, c_D, d_1, d_2$ are all irreducible, and thus $\rho(R) \geq \frac{D}{2}$.
Step 2b: If $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is infinite, then $D(\operatorname{Pic} R) = \infty$ and from this, repleteness and Lemma 23.11, for all $D \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ there are prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_D$ whose classes form an irreducible sequence in $\operatorname{Pic} R$ and such that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_D$ is principal. The argument of Step 2a now shows $\rho(R) \geq \frac{D}{2}$. Since this holds for all $D \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\rho(R) = \infty$. □

Remark: When $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is finite, Theorem 23.15 is due to Steffan [**St86**] and Narkiewicz [**Na95**].

Remark: The condition that R be replete is essential in Theorem 23.15. For instance, A. Zaks has shown that for every finitely generated commutative group G, there is a half factorial Dedekind domain R with $\operatorname{Pic} R \cong G$ [**Za76**]. Whether any commutative group can occur, up to isomorphism, as the Picard group of a half factorial Dedekind domain is an open problem.

COROLLARY 23.16. *a) A replete Dedekind domain R is a HFD iff $\# \operatorname{Pic} R \leq 2$.*
*b) (Carlitz [**Ca60**]) Let K be a number field. Then its ring of integers $\mathbb{Z}_K$ is a HFD iff the class number of K – i.e., $\# \operatorname{Pic} \mathbb{Z}_K$ – is either 1 or 2.*
*c) (Valenza [**Va90**]) Let K be a number field. Then*

$$\rho(\mathbb{Z}_K) = \max\left(\frac{D(\operatorname{Pic} \mathbb{Z}_K)}{2}, 1 \right).$$

d) A replete Dedekind domain has infinite elasticity iff it has infinite Picard group.

EXERCISE 23.8. *Prove Corollary 23.16.*

Later we will show that every commutative group arises, up to isomorphism, as the Picard group of a Dedekind domain. Combining this with Theorems 23.10 and 23.15 we see that the possible elasticities for replete Dedekind domains are precisely $\frac{n}{2}$ for any integer $n \geq 2$ and ∞.

We end this section by giving a little more information on the Davenport constant: let G be a finite commutative group, so that there is a unique sequence of positive integers $n_1, \ldots, n_r$ with $n_r \mid n_{r-1} \mid \ldots \mid n_1 > 1$ such that $G \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \mathbb{Z}/n_i\mathbb{Z}$. We put $d(G) = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k}(n_i - 1)$, so that (50) reads more succinctly as

(51) $D(G) \geq d(G)$.

J.E. Olson conjectured that equality holds in (50) for all finite commutative groups G [**Ol69a**]. He proved that the conjecture holds for p-groups [**Ol69a**] and also when $r \leq 2$ [**Ol69b**]. However, it was shown by P. van Emde Boas and D. Kruyswijk that (for instance) $D(G) > d(G)$ for $G = \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ [**EBK69**]. Whether $D(G) = d(G)$ for all groups with $r = 3$ is still an open problem. In particular the exact value of $D(G)$ is unknown for most finite commutative groups.

4. Overrings of Prüfer Domains

THEOREM 23.17. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K, and let T be an overring of R. the following are equivalent:*
(i) For every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R, either $\mathfrak{p}T = T$ or $T \subset R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.
(ii) For every $x, y \in K^{\times}$ with $\frac{x}{y} \in T$, $((y) : (x))T = T$.
(iii) T is a flat R-algebra.

PROOF. **COMPLETE ME!** □

PROPOSITION 23.18. *Let R be a domain with fraction field K and consider rings $R \subset T \subset T' \subset K$.*
a) If T' is flat over R, then T' is flat over T.
b) If T' is flat over T and T is flat over R, then T' is flat over R.

PROOF. a) Suppose T' is flat over R. Let $a, b \in T$ be such that $\frac{a}{b} \in T'$. Write $a = \frac{c}{s}$, $b = \frac{d}{s}$ with $c, d, s \in R$. Then $\frac{c}{d} \in T'$, so by Theorem 23.17, $((d) : (c))T' = T'$. Hence $1 = t_1 u_1 + \ldots + t_k u_k$ for some $t_i \in T'$ and $u_i \in R$ with $u_i c \in (d)$ for all i. Then there is $z_i \in R$ such that $u_i c = d z_i$, so $u_i a = z_i \frac{d}{s} = z_i b \in Tb$ for all i. So $(Tb : Ta)T' = T'$. Applying Theorem 23.17 again, we get that T' is flat over T.
b) This holds for any $R_1 \subset R_2 \subset R_3$, since $M \otimes_{R_1} R_3 \cong (M \otimes_{R_1} R_2) \otimes_{R_2} R_3$. □

PROPOSITION 23.19. *For an overring T of a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) T is flat over R.
(ii) For all $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} T$, $T_{\mathfrak{p}} = R_{\mathfrak{p} \cap R}$.
(iii) $T = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} T} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

PROOF. **COMPLETE ME!** □

PROPOSITION 23.20. *Let T be an overring of a domain R which is both integral and flat over R. Then $R = T$.*

PROOF. Let $x, y \in R$ be such that $\frac{x}{y} \in T$. Then by Theorem 23.17, $((y) : (x))T = T$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec} R$. By Theorem 14.13, there exists a prime (in fact maximal by Corollary 14.16, but this is not needed here) ideal $\mathcal{P}$ of T lying over $\mathfrak{p}$. Since $\mathfrak{p}T \subset \mathcal{P}$, we have $\mathfrak{p}T \subsetneq T$. Therefore $((y) : (x))$ is not contained in any maximal ideal of R, so $((y) : (x)) = R$. It follows that $x \in (y)$, i.e., $x = ay$ for some $a \in R$, so that $\frac{x}{y} \in R$. Thus $R = T$. □

THEOREM 23.21. *For a domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) R is a Prüfer domain.
(ii) Every overring of R is a flat R-module.

PROOF. (i) $\implies$ (ii): An overring is a torsionfree R-module, so this follows immediately from Theorem 21.10.
(ii) $\implies$ (i): Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a maximal ideal of R. By Proposition 23.18, every overring of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is flat. Let $a, b \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and suppose that $aR_{\mathfrak{p}} \not\subset bR_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then $(bR_{\mathfrak{p}} : aR_{\mathfrak{p}}) \neq R_{\mathfrak{p}}$; since $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is local, this implies $(bR_{\mathfrak{p}} : aR_{\mathfrak{p}}) \subset \mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Now consider the ring $R_{\mathfrak{p}}[\frac{a}{b}]$. This is an overring of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$, hence flat. Since $\frac{a}{b} \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}[\frac{a}{b}]$ we have by Theorem 23.17

$$(bR_{\mathfrak{p}} : aR_{\mathfrak{p}})R_{\mathfrak{p}}[\frac{a}{b}] = R_{\mathfrak{p}}[\frac{a}{b}].$$

Thus there exist elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in (bR_{\mathfrak{p}} : aR_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}[\frac{a}{b}]$ such that $x_1 b_1 + \ldots + x_n b_n = 1.$ ... **COMPLETE ME!** $\square$

COROLLARY 23.22. *Every overring of a Prüfer domain is a Prüfer domain.*

PROOF. Let R be a Prüfer domain and T be an overring of R. Then every overring T' of T is in particular an overring of R, so T' is flat over R. By Proposition 23.18a), T' is also flat over T. Therefore every overring of T is flat over T, so by Theorem 23.21, T is a Prüfer domain. $\square$

COROLLARY 23.23. *For a Noetherian domain R, the following are equivalent:*
(i) Every overring of R is a localization.
(ii) R is a Dedekind domain and $\operatorname{Pic} R$ is a torsion group.

EXERCISE 23.9. *Prove Corollary 23.23.*

Finally we give a result which generalizes the (as yet unproven) Theorem 23.3. Namely, for R a domain, let W be a subset of $\operatorname{MaxSpec} R$ and put

$$R_W = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in W} R_{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

THEOREM 23.24. *Let R be a Prüfer domain, T an overring of R, and put*

$$W = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{MaxSpec}(R) \mid \mathfrak{p}T \subsetneq T\}.$$

Then $T = R_W$.

PROOF. **COMPLETE ME!** $\square$

5. Kaplansky's Theorem (III)

THEOREM 23.25. *(Kaplansky [**K**]) Let R be a Dedekind domain with fraction field K, and let $\overline{K}$ be an algebraic closure of K. Suppose that for every finite extension L/K, the Picard group of the integral closure R_L of R in L is a torsion commutative group. Then the integral closure S of R in $\overline{K}$ is a Bézout domain.*

PROOF. Let $I = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle$ be a finitely generated ideal of S. Then $L = K[a_1, \ldots, a_n]$ is a finite extension of K. Let R_L be the integral closure of R in L, and let $I_L = \langle a_1, \ldots, a_n \rangle_{R_L}$. By hypothesis, there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $b \in R_L$ such that $I_L^k = bR_L$. Let c be a kth root of b in S and let $M = L[c]$. Thus in the Dedekind domain R_M we have $(I_L R_M)^k = (c^k)$, and from unique factorization of ideals we deduce $I_L R_M = cR_M$. Thus $I = I_L R_M S = cR_M S = cS$ is principal. $\square$

Recall the basic fact of algebraic number theory that for any number field K, the Picard group of $\mathbb{Z}_K$ is finite. This shows that the ring $R = \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 23.25. We deduce that the ring of all algebraic integers $\overline{\mathbb{Z}}$ is a Bézout domain: Theorem 5.1.

EXERCISE 23.10. *Adapt the proof of Theorem 23.25 to show that the Picard group of the ring of integers of the maximal solvable extension $\mathbb{Q}^{\text{solv}}$ of $\mathbb{Q}$ is trivial.*

EXERCISE 23.11. *State a function field analogue of Theorem 5.1 and deduce it as a special case of Theorem 23.25.*

We quote without proof two more results on Picard groups of integer rings of infinite algebraic extensions of $\mathbb{Q}$.

THEOREM 23.26. *(Brumer [**Br81**]) Let $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{cyc}} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)$ be the field obtained by adjoining to $\mathbb{Q}$ all roots of unity, and let $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{cyc}}$ be its ring of integers, i.e., the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{cyc}}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Pic}\,\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{cyc}} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

THEOREM 23.27. *(Kurihara [**Ku99**]) Let $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{cyc}\,+} = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^+} \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n + \zeta_n^{-1})$ be the maximal real subfield of $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{cyc}}$, and let $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{cyc}\,+}$ be its ring of integers, i.e., the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathrm{cyc}\,+}$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Pic}\,\mathbb{Z}^{\mathrm{cyc}\,+} = 0.$$

6. Every commutative group is a class group

To any ring R we attached a commutative group, the Picard group $\mathrm{Pic}\,R$. In fact the construction is functorial: a homomorphism $\varphi : R \to R'$ of domains induces a homomorphism $\varphi_* : \mathrm{Pic}\,R \to \mathrm{Pic}\,S$ of Picard groups. Explicitly, if M is a rank one projective R-module, then $M \otimes_R R'$ is a rank one projective R'-module. In general when one is given a functor it is natural to ask about its image. Here we are asking the following

QUESTION 6. *Which commutative groups occur (up to isomorphism) as the Picard group of a commutative ring?*

We have also defined the divisor class group $\mathrm{Cl}\,R$ of a domain, so we may also ask:

QUESTION 7. *Which commutative groups occur (up to isomorphism) as the divisor class group of a domain?*

It would be interesting to know at what point algebraists began serious consideration of the above questions. I have not discussed the history of $\mathrm{Pic}\,R$ and $\mathrm{Cl}\,R$ in part because I am not sufficiently knowledgeable to do so, but their study was surely informed by two classical cases: the ideal class group of (the ring of integers of) a number field, and the Picard group of line bundles on an (affine or projective) complex algebraic variety. The groups that arise in these classical cases are very restricted: the class group of a number field is a finite commutative group, and the Picard group of a complex algebraic variety is an extension of a complex torus by a finitely generated commutative group. As far as I know the literature contains nothing beyond this until the dramatic full solution.

THEOREM 23.28. *(Claborn [**Cl66**]) For every commutative group G, there is a Dedekind domain R with $\mathrm{Pic}\,R = \mathrm{Cl}\,R \cong G$.*

Even after developing several hundred pages of commutative algebra, Claborn's proof still requires some technical tools that we lack. Especially, Claborn first constructs a *Krull domain* R with $\mathrm{Cl}\,R \cong G$ and then by an approximation process constructs a Dedekind domain with the same class group. But we have not yet discussed Krull domains in these notes.

A more elementary – but still quite ingenious and intricate – proof was given later by C.R. Leedham-Green [**Le72**]. Leedham-Green constructs the requisite R as the integral closure of a PID in a separable quadratic field extension.

Several years after that M. Rosen took a more naturally geometric approach,

inspired by the Picard groups of varieties which appear in algebraic geometry. Especially, his approach uses some elliptic curve theory.

Let k be a field of characteristic zero. Fix elements $A, B \in K$ such that $4A^3 + 27B^2 \neq 0$, and let $k[E] = k[x, y]/(y^2 - x^3 - Ax - B)$. The ring $k[E]$ is precisely the affine coordinate ring of the elliptic curve

$$E : y^2 = x^3 + Ax + B.$$

PROPOSITION 23.29. *The ring $k[E]$ is a Dedekind domain.*

EXERCISE 23.12. *Prove Proposition 23.29. (Suggestions: it should be clear that $k[E]$ is a one-dimensional Noetherian domain, so the matter of it is to show that it is integrally closed. For this, show that the condition that $4A^3 + 27B^2 \neq 0$ means that $x^3 - Ax - B \in k[x]$ is separable – i.e., has distinct roots in an algebraic closure – and thus is squarefree. Apply Theorem 15.17.)*

We denote the fraction field of $k[E]$ by $k(E)$, also called the **function field** of $E_{/k}$.

The overrings of R are all of the form $R^W = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \Sigma_R \setminus W} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for $W \subset \text{MaxSpec } R$, and by the Krull-Akizuki Theorem each R^W is a Dedekind domain. By definition, a Dedekind domain which arises in this way – i.e., as an overring of the standard affine ring of an elliptic curve over a field of characteristic zero – is called an **elliptic Dedekind domain**. We refer to k as the **ground field** of R.

EXERCISE 23.13. *Let k be a countable field, and let R be an elliptic Dedekind domain with ground field k. Show: $\text{Pic } R$ is countable.*
b) More generally, show: if R is an elliptic Dedekind domain with ground field k, then $\# \text{Pic } R \leq \max \aleph_0, \#k$.

Conversely:

THEOREM 23.30. *(Rosen [**Ro76**]) For every countable commutative group G, there exists an elliptic Dedekind domain R with ground field an algebraic extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ and such that $\text{Pic } R \cong G$.*

In 2008 I built on this work of Rosen to prove the following result [**Cl09**].

THEOREM 23.31. *For any commutative group G, there is an elliptic Dedekind domain R such that:*
   (i) *R is the integral closure of a PID in a separable quadratic field extension, and*
   (ii) *$\text{Pic } R \cong G$.*

Thus Theorem 23.31 implies the results of Claborn and Leedham-Green. On the other hand, Exercise 23.12 shows that the absolute algebraicity (or even the countability!) of the ground field k achieved in Rosen's construction cannot be maintained for uncountable Picard groups. Indeed our argument goes to the other extreme: we construct the ground field k as a transfinitely iterated function field.

Our argument will require some tenets of elliptic curve theory, especially the notion of the **rational endomorphism ring** $\text{End}_k E$ of an elliptic curve $E_{/k}$. A k-rational endomorphism of an elliptic curve is a morphism $\varphi : E \to E$ defined over k which carries the neutral point O of E to itself.

PROPOSITION 23.32. *Let k be a field and $E_{/k}$ an elliptic curve.*
a) The additive group of $\mathrm{End}_k(E)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^{a(E)}$ for $a(E) \in \{1, 2, 4\}$.
b) There is a short exact sequence

$$0 \to E(k) \to E(k(E)) \to \mathrm{End}_k(E) \to 0.$$

Since $\mathrm{End}_k(E)$ is free abelian, we have $E(k(E)) \cong E(k) \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}^{a(E)}$.
c) There is a canonical isomorphism $E(k) \cong \mathrm{Pic}\, k[E]$.

PROOF. a) See [**Si86**, Cor. III.9.4].
b) $E(k(E))$ is the group of rational maps from the nonsingular curve E to the complete variety E under pointwise addition. Every rational map from a nonsingular curve to a complete variety is everywhere defined, so $E(k(E))$ is the group of morphisms $E \to E$ under pointwise addition. The constant morphisms form a subgroup isomorphic to $E(k)$, and every map $E \to E$ differs by a unique constant from a map of elliptic curves $(E, O) \to (E, O)$, i.e., an endomorphism of E.
c) By Riemann-Roch, $\Psi_1 : E(k) \to \mathrm{Pic}^0 E$ by $P \in E(k) \mapsto [[P] - [O]]$ is an isomorphism [**Si86**, Prop. III.3.4]. Moreover, $\Psi_2 : \mathrm{Pic}^0(E) \to \mathrm{Pic}\, k[E]$ given by $\sum_P n_P[P] \mapsto \sum_{P \neq O} n_P[P]$ is an isomorphism. Thus $\Psi_2 \circ \Psi_1 : E(k) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Pic}\, k[E]$. $\square$

Now fix a field k, and let $(E_0)/k$ be any elliptic curve.[2] Define $K_0 = k$, and $K_{n+1} = K_n(E_{/K_n})$. Then Proposition 23.32 gives

$$E(K_n) \cong E(k) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{Z}^{a(E)}.$$

LEMMA 23.33. *Let K be a field, $(K_i)_{i \in I}$ a directed system of field extensions of K, and $E_{/K}$ an elliptic curve. There is a canonical isomorphism*

$$\lim_I E(K_i) = E(\lim_I K_i).$$

EXERCISE 23.14. *Prove Lemma 23.33.*

Now let o be an ordinal number. We define the field K_o by transfinite induction: $K_0 = k$, for an ordinal $o' < o$, $K_{o'+1} = K_{o'}(E_{/K_{o'}})$, and for a limit ordinal o, $K_o = \lim_{o' < o} K_{o'}$. By the Continuity Lemma, we have $E(K_o) = \lim_{o' \in o} E(K_{o'})$.

LEMMA 23.34. *Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. For a commutative group A, the following are equivalent:*
(i) A is free abelian of rank $a \cdot \kappa$ for some cardinal κ.
(ii) A has a well-ordered ascending series with all factors $A_{s+1}/A_s \cong \mathbb{Z}^a$.

EXERCISE 23.15. *Prove Lemma 23.34.*
(Suggestion: use the Transfinite Dévissage Lemma.)

COROLLARY 23.35. *We have $E(K_o)/E(k) \cong \bigoplus_{o' \in o} \mathbb{Z}^{a(E)}$.*

EXERCISE 23.16. *Prove Corollary 23.35.*

---

[2]In the paper [**Cl09**] I took the specific choice $(E_0)_{/\mathbb{Q}} : y^2 + y = x^3 - 49x - 86$, mostly for sentimental reasons. This curve has the property that $E_0(\mathbb{Q}) = 0$ [**Ko89**, Theorem H] and nonintegral j-invariant $\frac{2^{12}3^3}{37}$, so $\mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{Q}} E = \mathbb{Z}$. But in fact the construction can be made to work starting with any elliptic curve, and we have decided to phrase it this way here.

One can put together the results derived so far together with Exercise 22.2 to get a proof of Theorem 23.28. However, to prove Theorem 23.31 we need to circumvent the appeal to Theorem 23.10. This is handled as follows.

THEOREM 23.36. *Let $E_{/k}$ be an elliptic curve with equation $y^2 = P(x) = x^3 + Ax + B$. a) The affine ring $k[E]$ is weakly replete.*
b) If k is algebraically closed, $k[E]$ is not replete.
c) Suppose k does not have characteristic 2 and $k[E]$ is not replete. Then for all $x \in k$, there exists $y \in k$ with $y^2 = P(x)$.

PROOF. Each point $P \neq O$ on $E(k)$ a prime ideal in the standard affine ring $k[E]$; according to the isomorphism of Proposition 23.32c), every nontrivial element of $\mathrm{Pic}(k[E])$ arises in this way. This proves part a). Part b) is similar: if k is algebraically closed, then by Hilbert's Nullstellensatz every prime ideal of $k[E]$ corresponds to a k-valued point $P \neq O$ on $E(k)$, which under Proposition 23.32c) corresponds to a nontrivial element of the class group. Therefore the trivial class is not represented by any prime ideal. Under the hypotheses of part c), there exists an $x \in k$ such that the points $(x, \pm\sqrt{P(x)})$ form a Galois conjugate pair. Therefore the divisor $(x, \sqrt{P(x)}) + (x, -\sqrt{P(x)})$ represents a closed point on the curve C^o, in other words a nonzero prime ideal of $k[E]$. But the corresponding point on $E(k)$ is $(x, \sqrt{P(x)}) + (x, -\sqrt{P(x)}) = O$. $\square$

Finally we prove Theorem 23.31(i). Let G be a commutative group, and write it as F/H where F is a free commutative group of infinite rank. As above let k be any field of characteristic zero and $E_{/k}$ any elliptic curve. By Corollary 23.35, for all sufficiently large ordinals o, there is a surjection $E(K_0) \to F$ and thus also a surjection $E(K_o) \to G$. By Proposition 23.32c), there is a subgroup H of $K_o[E]$ such that $(\mathrm{Pic}\, K_o[E])/H \cong G$. By Proposition 18.1a) and Proposition 23.8, there is an overring T of $K_o[E]$ such that $\mathrm{Pic}\, T \cong G$, establishing Theorem 23.31(i).

As for the second part: let σ be the automorphism of the function field $k(E)$ induced by $(x, y) \mapsto (x, -y)$, and notice that σ corresponds to inversion $P \mapsto -P$ on $E(k) = \mathrm{Pic}(k[E])$. Let $S = R^\sigma$ be the subring of R consisting of all functions which are fixed by σ. Then $k[E]^\sigma = k[x]$ is a PID, and S is an overring of $k[x]$, hence also a PID. More precisely, S is the overring of all functions on the projective line which are regular away from the point at infinity and the x-coordinates of all the elements in H (since H is a subgroup, it is stable under inversion). Finally, to see that R is the integral closure of S in the separable quadratic field extension $k(E)/k(x)$, it suffices to establish the following simple result.

LEMMA 23.37. *Let L/K be a finite Galois extension of fields, and S a Dedekind domain with fraction field L. Suppose that for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/K)$, $\sigma(S) = S$. Then S is the integral closure of $R := S \cap K$ in L.*

PROOF. Since S is integrally closed, it certainly contains the integral closure of R in L. Conversely, for any $x \in S$, $P(t) = \prod_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/K)}(t - \sigma(x))$ is a monic polynomial with coefficients in $(S \cap K)[t]$ satisfied by x. $\square$

This completes the proof of Theorem 23.31.

Bibliography

[AB59]   M. Auslander and D.A. Buchsbaum, *Unique factorization in regular local rings.* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 45 (1959), 733–734.

[Ad62]   J.F. Adams, *Vector fields on spheres.* Ann. of Math. (2) 75 (1962), 603–632.

[AHRT]   J. Adámek, H. Herrlich, J. Rosický and W. Tholen, *Injective hulls are not natural.* Algebra Universalis 48 (2002), 379–388.

[AKP98]   D.D. Anderson, B.G. Kang and M.H. Park, *Anti-Archimedean rings and power series rings.* Comm. Algebra 26 (1998), 3223—3238.

[Al63]   N.L. Alling, *The valuation theory of meromorphic function fields over open Riemann surfaces.* Acta Math. 110 (1963), 79–96.

[Al99]   N. Alon, *Combinatorial Nullstellensatz.* Recent trends in combinatorics (Mátraháza, 1995). Combin. Probab. Comput. 8 (1999), 7–29.

[An00]   D.D. Anderson, *GCD domains, Gauss' lemma, and contents of polynomials.* Non-Noetherian commutative ring theory, 1–31, Math. Appl., 520, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000.

[AR97]   D.D. Anderson and M. Roitman, *A characterization of cancellation ideals.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 125 (1997), 2853–2854.

[AZ94]   D.D. Anderson and M. Zafrullah, *On a theorem of Kaplansky.* Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. A (7) 8 (1994), 397–402.

[AP82]   J.K. Arason and A. Pfister, *Quadratische Formen über affinen Algebren und ein algebraischer Beweis des Satzes von Borsuk-Ulam.* (German) J. Reine Angew. Math. 331 (1982), 181–184.

[Ar27]   E. Artin, *Zur Theorie der hyperkomplexen Zahlen.* Abh. Hamburg, 5 (1927), 251-260.

[AT51]   E. Artin and J.T. Tate, *A note on finite ring extensions.* J. Math. Soc. Japan 3 (1951), 74–77.

[At89]   M.F. Atiyah, *K-theory.* Notes by D. W. Anderson. Second edition. Advanced Book Classics. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Redwood City, CA, 1989.

[AM]   M.F. Atiyah and I.G. Macdonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra.* Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont. 1969.

[Ba40]   R. Baer, *Abelian groups that are direct summands of every containing commutative group.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 46 (1940), 800–806.

[Ba59]   H. Bass, *Global dimension of rings*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Chicago, 1959.

[Ba63]   H. Bass, *Big projective modules are free.* Illinois J. Math. 7 1963 24–31.

[Ba62]   G. Baumslag, *On abelian hopfian groups. I.* Math. Z. 78 1962 53–54.

[Ba63]   G. Baumslag, *Hopficity and commutative groups.* 1963 Topics in Abelian Groups (Proc. Sympos., New Mexico State Univ., 1962) pp. 331–335 Scott, Foresman and Co., Chicago, Ill.

[BCR]   J.Bochnak, M. Coste and M.-F. Roy, *Real algebraic geometry.* Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) 36. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[Be]   D.J. Benson, *Polynomial invariants of finite groups* London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 190. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[Bo50]   S. Borofsky, *Factorization of polynomials.* Amer. Math. Monthly 57 (1950), 317–320.

[BM58]   R. Bott and J. Milnor, *On the parallelizability of the spheres.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 64 (1958), 87–89.

[B]   N. Bourbaki, *Commutative algebra. Chapters 1–7.* Translated from the French. Reprint of the 1989 English translation. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[Bo78]   A. Bouvier, *Le groupe des classes de l'algebre affine d'une forme quadratique*. Publ.
            Dép. Math. (Lyon) 15 (1978), no. 3, 53–62.

[BMRH]   J.W. Brewer, P.R. Montgomery, E.A. Rutter and W.J. Heinzer, *Krull dimension
            of polynomial rings*. Conference on Commutative Algebra (Univ. Kansas, Lawrence,
            Kan., 1972), pp. 26-45. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 311, Springer, Berlin, 1973.

[Br02]   G. Brookfield, *The length of Noetherian modules*. Comm. Algebra 30 (2002), 3177–
            3204.

[Br81]   A. Brumer, *The class group of all cyclotomic integers*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra 20
            (1981), no. 2, 107–111.

[Bu61]   D.A. Buchsbaum, *Some remarks on factorization in power series rings*. J. Math.
            Mech. 10 1961 749–753.

[Bu64]   H.S. Butts, *Unique factorization of ideals into nonfactorable ideals*. Proc. Amer. Math.
            Soc. 15 (1964), 21.

[BW66]   H.S. Butts and L.I. Wade, *Two criteria for Dedekind domains*. Amer. Math. Monthly
            73 (1966), 14–21.

[Ca60]   L. Carlitz, *A Characterization of Algebraic Number Fields with Class Number Two*.
            Proc. AMS 11 (1960), 391–392.

[Cd-SF]   K.   Conrad,   *Stably   Free   Modules*.   Notes   available   at
            http://www.math.uconn.edu/~kconrad/blurbs/linmultialg/stablyfree.pdf

[CDVM13]   L.F. Cáceres Duque and J.A. Vélez-Marulanda, *On the Infinitude of Prime Elmeents*.
            Rev. Colombiana Mat. 47 (2013), 167–179.

[CE]   H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg, *Homological algebra*. Princeton University Press, Prince-
            ton, N. J., 1956.

[CE59]   E.D. Cashwell and C.J. Everett, *The ring of number-theoretic functions*. Pacific J.
            Math. 9 (1959) 975–985.

[CK46]   I.S. Cohen and I. Kaplansky, *Rings with a finite number of primes. I.* Trans. Amer.
            Math. Soc. 60 (1946), 468–477.

[CK51]   I.S. Cohen and I. Kaplansky, *Rings for which every module is a direct sum of cyclic
            modules.* Math. Z. 54 (1951), 97–101.

[Cl66]   L.E. Claborn, *Every commutative group is a class group.* Pacific J. Math. 18 (1966),
            219–222.

[Cl-GT]   P.L. Clark, *General Topology.* http://math.uga.edu/~pete/pointset2018.pdf.

[Cl09]   P.L. Clark, *Elliptic Dedekind domains revisited.* Enseignement Math. 55 (2009), 213–
            225.

[Cl15]   P.L. Clark, *A note on Euclidean order types.* Order 32 (2015), 157–178.

[Cl17a]   P.L. Clark, *The Euclidean criterion for irreducibles.* Amer. Math. Monthly 124 (2017),
            198–216.

[Cl17b]   P.L. Clark, *The cardinal Krull dimension of a ring of holomorphic functions.* Expo.
            Math. 35 (2017), 350–356.

[Cl18]   P.L. Clark, *A note on rings of finite rank.* Comm. Algebra 46 (2018), 4223–4232.

[Cn68]   P.M. Cohn, *Bézout rings and their subrings.* Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 64 (1968),
            251–264.

[Cn73]   P.M. Cohn, *Unique factorization domains.* Amer. Math. Monthly 80 (1973), 1–18.

[Co46]   I.S. Cohen, *On the structure and ideal theory of complete local rings.* Trans. Amer.
            Math. Soc. 59, (1946), 54–106.

[Co50]   I.S. Cohen, *Commutative rings with restricted minimum conditions.* Duke Math. J.
            17, (1950), 27–42.

[CP15]   P.L. Clark and P. Pollack, *The truth about torsion in the CM case.* C. R. Math. Acad.
            Sci. Paris 353 (2015), 683–688.

[CP17]   P.L. Clark and P. Pollack, *The truth about torsion in the CM case, II.* Q. J. Math.
            68 (2017), 1313–1333.

[CP18]   P.L. Clark and P. Pollack, *Pursuing polynomial bounds on torsion.* Israel J. Math.
            227 (2018), 889–909.

[CS46]   I.S. Cohen and A. Seidenberg, *Prime ideals and integral dependence.* Bull. Amer.
            Math. Soc. 52 (1946), 252–261.

[Co64]   A.L.S. Corner, *On a conjecture of Pierce concerning direct decompositions of Abelian
            groups.* 1964 Proc. Colloq. Abelian Groups (Tihany, 1963) pp. 43–48 Akadémiai Kiadó,
            Budapest.

[Co11]   D.A. Cox, *Why Eisenstein proved the Eisenstein criterion and why Schönemann discovered it first.* Amer. Math. Monthly 118 (2011), 3–21.

[Da09]   C.S. Dalawat, *Wilson's theorem.* J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux 21 (2009), 517–521.

[De71]   R. Dedekind...

[DM71]   F. DeMeyer and E. Ingraham, *Separable algebras over commutative rings.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 181 Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York 1971.

[Ea68]   P.M. Eakin, Jr. *The converse to a well known theorem on Noetherian rings.* Math. Ann. 177 (1968), 278–282.

[EBK69]   P. van Emde Boas and D. Kruyswijk, *A combinatorial problem on finite commutative groups, III*, Report ZW-1969-008, Math. Centre, Amsterdam, 1969.

[Ec00]   O. Echi, *A topological characterization of the Goldman prime spectrum of a commutative ring.* Comm. Algebra 28 (2000), 2329–2337.

[ES53]   B. Eckmann and A. Schopf, *Über injektive Moduln.* Arch. Math. (Basel) 4 (1953), 75–78.

[Ei]   D. Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra. With a view toward algebraic geometry.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 150. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[Ei50]   F. Eisenstein, *Über die Irredicibilität une einige andere Eigenschaften der Gleichung von welche der Theilung der ganzen Lemniscate abhängt.* J. Reine Angew. Math. 39 (1950), 160–179.

[Fo64]   O. Forster, *Über die Anzahl der Erzeugenden eines Ideals in einem Noetherschen Ring.* Math. Z. 84 (1) (1964) 80–-87.

[FR70]   R.L. Finney and J.J. Rotman, *Paracompactness of locally compact Hausdorff spaces.* Michigan Math. J. 17 (1970), 359–361.

[FT]   *Field Theory*, notes by P.L. Clark, available at http://www.math.uga.edu/∼pete/FieldTheory.pdf

[FW67]   C. Faith and E.A. Walker, *Direct-sum representations of injective modules.* J. Algebra 5 (1967), 203–221.

[Fl71]   C.R. Fletcher, *Euclidean rings.* J. London Math. Soc. 4 (1971), 79–82.

[Fo73]   E. Formanek, *Faithful Noetherian modules.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 41 (1973), 381–383.

[Fs73]   R.M. Fossum, *The divisor class group of a Krull domain.* Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 74. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1973.

[Fu59]   L. Fuchs, *The existence of indecomposable commutative groups of arbitrary power.* Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar. 10 (1959) 453–457.

[Fu74]   L. Fuchs, *Indecomposable commutative groups of measurable cardinalities.* Symposia Mathematica, Vol. XIII (Convegno di Gruppi Abeliani, INDAM, Rome, 1972), pp. 233-244. Academic Press, London, 1974.

[Ga71]   T.E. Gantner, *A Regular Space on which every Continuous Real-Valued Function is Constant.* Amer. Math. Monthly 78 (1971), 52–53.

[Ge91]   R. Germundsson, *Basic Results on Ideals and Varieties in Finite Fields.* Technical report, Department of Electrical Engineering, Lïnkoping University, 1991.

[Gi72]   R. Gilmer, *On commutative rings of finite rank.* Duke Math. J. 39 (1972), 381—383.

[GJ76]   L. Gillman and M. Jerison, *Rings of continuous functions.* Reprint of the 1960 edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 43. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.

[Gol51]   O. Goldman, *Hilbert rings and the Hilbert Nullstellensatz.* Math. Z. 54 (1951). 136–140.

[Gol64]   O. Goldman, *On a special class of Dedekind domains.* Topology 3 (1964) suppl. 1, 113–118.

[GoN]   P.L. Clark, *Geometry of numbers with applications to number theory.* http://math.uga.edu/~pete/geometryofnumbers.pdf

[Gov65]   V.E. Govorov, *On flat modules.* (Russian) Sibirsk. Mat. Ž. 6 (1965), 300–304.

[GoRo]   R. Gordon and J.C. Robson, *Krull dimension.* Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 133. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1973.

[GuRo]   R.C. Gunning and H. Rossi, *Analytic functions of several complex variables.* Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J. 1965.

[Gr74]   A. Grams, *Atomic rings and the ascending chain condition for principal ideals.* Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 75 (1974), 321–329.

[Gu73]   T.H. Gulliksen, *A theory of length for Noetherian modules.* J. Pure Appl. Algebra 3 (1973), 159–170.

[Ha]   R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.

[Ha94]   B. Haible, *Gauss' Lemma without Primes*, preprint, 1994.

[Ha28]   H. Hasse, *Über eindeutige Zerlegung in Primelemente oder in Primhauptideale in Integrit-tsbereichen.* J. reine Angew. Math. 159 (1928), 3–12.

[He40]   O. Helmer, *Divisibility properties of integral functions.* Duke Math. J. 6 (1940), 345–356.

[He53]   M. Henriksen, *On the prime ideals of the ring of entire functions.* Pacific J. Math. 3 (1953), 711–720.

[He70]   W. Heinzer, *Quotient overrings of an integral domain.* Mathematika 17 (1970), 139–148.

[He74]   R.C. Heitmann, *PID's with specified residue fields.* Duke Math. J. 41 (1974), 565–582.

[He06]   G. Hessenberg, *Grundbegriffe der Mengenlehre.* Göttingen, 1906.

[HH]   J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Monomial ideals.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 260. Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London, 2011.

[Hi90]   D. Hilbert, *Ueber die Theorie der algebraischen Formen.* Mathl Annalen 36 (1890), 473–534.

[Ho69]   M. Hochster, *Prime ideal structure in commutative rings.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 142 (1969), 43–60.

[Hi75]   J.-J. Hiblot, *Des anneaux euclidiens dont le plus petit algorithme n'est pas à valeurs finies.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 281 (1975), no. 12, Ai, A411–A414.

[Hi77]   J.-J. Hiblot, *Correction à une note sur les anneaux euclidiens: "Des anneaux euclidiens dont le plus petit algorithme n'est pas à valeurs finies" (C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 281 (1975), no. 12, A411–A414).* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris S er. A-B 284 (1977), no. 15, A847–A849.

[Hö01]   O. Hölder, *Die Axiome der Quantitat und die Lehre vom Mass.* Ber. Verh. Sachs. Ges. Wiss. Leipzig, Math.-Phys. Cl. 53 (1901), 1-64.

[Ho79]   W. Hodges, *Krull implies Zorn.* J. London Math. Soc. (2) 19 (1979), 285–287.

[Hu68]   T.W. Hungerford, *On the structure of principal ideal rings.* Pacific J. Math. 25 (1968), 543–547.

[Hs66]   D. Husemöller, *Fibre bundles.* McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-London-Sydney 1966.

[J1]   N. Jacobson, *Basic algebra. I.* Second edition. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1985.

[J2]   N. Jacobson, *Basic algebra. II.* Second edition. W. H. Freeman and Company, New York, 1989.

[Jo00]   P. Jothilingam, *Cohen's theorem and Eakin-Nagata theorem revisited.* Comm. Algebra 28 (2000), 4861–4866.

[JR80]   M. Jarden and P. Roquette, *The Nullstellensatz over p-adically closed fields.* J. Math. Soc. Japan 32 (1980), 425–460.

[Ka49]   I. Kaplansky, *Elementary divisors and modules.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 66 (1949), 464–491.

[Ka52]   I. Kaplansky, *Modules over Dedekind rings and valuation rings.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 72 (1952), 327–340.

[Ka58]   I. Kaplansky, *Projective modules.* Ann. of Math. 68 (1958), 372–377.

[K]   I. Kaplansky, *Commutative rings.* Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Mass. 1970.

[Ka]   M. Karoubi, *K-theory. An introduction.* Reprint of the 1978 edition. With a new postface by the author and a list of errata. Classics in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2008.

[KeOm10] K.A. Kearnes and G. Oman, *Cardinalities of residue fields of Noetherian integral domains.* Comm. Algebra 38 (2010), 3580–3588.

[Kh03]   D. Khurana, *On GCD and LCM in domains - a conjecture of Gauss.* Resonance 8 (2003), 72–79.

[KM99]   G. Kemper and G. Malle, *Invariant fields of finite irreducible reflection groups.* Math. Ann. 315 (1999), 569–586.

[Ko89]   V. Kolyvagin, *On the Mordell-Weil and Shafarevich-Tate groups for Weil elliptic curves*, Math. USSR-Izv. 33 (1989), 473–499.

[Kr24]   W. Krull, *Die verschiedenen Artender Hauptidealringe.* Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberg Akademie (1924) no. 6.

[Kr31]   W. Krull, *Allgemeine Bewertungstheorie.* J. Reine Angew. Math. 167 (1931), 160–196.

[Kr37]   W. Krull, *Beiträge zur Arithmetik kommutativer Integritätsbereiche, III, zum Dimensionsbegriff der Idealtheorie,* Mat. Zeit 42 (1937), 745–766.

[Kr51]   W. Krull, *Jacobsonsche Ringe, Hilbertscher Nullstellensatz Dimensionen theorie.* Math. Z. 54 (1951), 354–387.

[Ku99]   M. Kurihara, *On the ideal class groups of the maximal real subfields of number fields with all roots of unity.* J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) 1 (1999), 35–49.

[La87]   D. Laksov, *Radicals and Hilbert Nullstellensatz for not necessarily algebraically closed fields.* Enseign. Math. (2) 33 (1987), 323–338.

[La99]   T.Y. Lam, *Lectures on modules and rings.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 189. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[La05]   T.Y. Lam, *Introduction to quadratic forms over fields.* Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 67. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.

[La06]   T.Y. Lam, *Serre's problem on projective modules.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.

[LR08]   T.Y. Lam and M.L. Reyes, *A prime ideal principle in commutative algebra.* J. Algebra 319 (2008), 3006–3027.

[Lg53]   S. Lang, *The theory of real places.* Ann. of Math. (2) 57 (1953), 378–391.

[Lg02]   S. Lang, *Algebra.* Revised third edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 211. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.

[LM]   M.D. Larsen and P.J. McCarthy, *Multiplicative theory of ideals.* Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 43. Academic Press, New York-London, 1971.

[La05]   E. Lasker, *Zur Theorie der Moduln und Ideale.* Math. Ann. 60 (1905), 19–116.

[La64]   D. Lazard, *Sur les modules plats.* C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris 258 (1964), 6313–6316.

[Le72]   C.R. Leedham-Green, *The class group of Dedekind domains.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 163 (1972), 493–500.

[Le43]   F.W. Levi, *Contributions to the theory of ordered groups.* Proc. Indian Acad. Sci., Sect. A. 17 (1943), 199–201.

[Le67]   L. Lesieur, *Divers aspects de la théorie des idéaux d'un anneau commutatif.* Enseignement Math. 13 (1967), 75–87.

[Li33]   F.A Lindemann, *The Unique Factorization of a Positive Integer.* Quart. J. Math. 4, 319-320, 1933.

[Ma48]   A.I. Malcev, *On the embedding of group algebras in division algebras (Russian),* Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR 60 (1948), 1499–1501.

[Ma58]   H.B. Mann, *On integral bases.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 9 (1958), 167–172.

[Ma71]   C.F. Martin, *Unique factorization of arithmetic functions.* Aequationes Math. 7 (1971), 211.

[M]   H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory.* Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid. Second edition. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 8. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[Ma44]   K. Matusita, *Über ein bewertungstheoretisches Axiomensystem für die Dedekind-Noethersche Idealtheorie.* Jap. J. Math. 19 (1944), 97–110.

[McC76] J. McCabe, *A Note on Zariski's Lemma.* Amer. Math. Monthly 83 (1976), 560–561.

[Mi]   J.W. Milnor, *Topology from the differentiable viewpoint.* Based on notes by David W. Weaver. The University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va. 1965.

[Mo49]   T. Motzkin, *The Euclidean algorithm.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 55 (1949), 1142–1146.

[MRSW]   F.W. Moore, M. Rogers and S. Sather-Wagstaff, *Monomial ideals and their decompositions.* Universitext. Springer, Cham, 2018.

[msegc] `https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/3898391/`
         `image-of-sup-inf-under-galois-connection-between-lattices`

[Na57]   M. Nagata, *A remark on the unique factorization theorem.* J. Math. Soc. Japan 9 (1957), 143–145.

[Na68]   M. Nagata, *A type of subrings of a noetherian ring.* J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 8 (1968), 465–467.

[Na78]   M. Nagata, *On Euclid algorithm. C. P. Ramanujam-a tribute,* pp. 175–186, Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Studies in Math., 8, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1978.

[Na85]   M. Nagata, *Some remarks on Euclid rings*. J. Math. Kyoto Univ. 25 (1985), 421–422.

[Na05]   A.R. Naghipour, *A simple proof of Cohen's theorem*. Amer. Math. Monthly 112 (2005), 825–826.

[Na53]   N. Nakano, *Idealtheorie in einem speziellen unendlichen algebraischen Zahlkörper*. J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ. Ser. A. 16: 425–439.

[Na95]   W. Narkiewicz, *A Note on Elasticity of Factorizations*. J. Number Theory 51 (1995), 46–47.

[Ne49]   B.H. Neumann, *On ordered division rings*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 66 (1949), 202–252.

[Ne07]   M.D. Neusel, *Invariant theory*. Student Mathematical Library, 36. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.

[No21]   E. Noether, *Idealtheorie in Ringberereichen*. Math. Ann. 83 (1921), 24–66.

[No26]   E. Noether, *Der Endlichkeitsatz der Invarianten endlicher linearer Gruppen der Charakteristik p*. Nachr. Ges. Wiss. G-ttingen: 28-35.

[NT]   P.L. Clark, *Number Theory: A Contemporary Introduction*. http://www.math.uga.edu/~pete/4400FULL.pdf

[O74]   T. Ogoma, *On a problem of Fossum*. Proc. Japan Acad. 50 (1974), 266–267.

[Ol69a]   J.E. Olson, *A combinatorial problem on finite Abelian groups. I.* J. Number Theory 1 (1969), 8–10.

[Ol69b]   J.E. Olson, *A combinatorial problem on finite Abelian groups. II.* J. Number Theory 1 (1969), 195–199.

[Pa59]   Z. Papp, *On algebraically closed modules*. Publ. Math. Debrecen 6 (1959), 311–327.

[Pe04]   H. Perdry, *An elementary proof of Krull's intersection theorem*. Amer. Math. Monthly 111 (2004), 356–357.

[P]   A. Pfister, *Quadratic forms with applications to algebraic geometry and topology*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 217. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[Qu96]   C.S. Queen, *Factorial domains*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 124 (1996), no. 1, 11–16.

[Qu76]   D. Quillen, *Projective modules over polynomial rings*. Invent. Math. 36 (1976), 167–171.

[Ra30]   J.L. Rabinowitsch, *Zum Hilbertschen Nullstellensatz*. Math. Ann. 102 (1930), 520.

[R]   M. Reid, *Undergraduate commutative algebra*. London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 29. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[Ro67]   A. Robinson, *Non-standard theory of Dedekind rings*. Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 70=Indag. Math. 29 (1967), 444–452.

[Ro93]   M. Roitman, *Polynomial extensions of atomic domains*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra 87 (1993), 187–199.

[Ro76]   M. Rosen, *Elliptic curves and Dedekind domains*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 57 (1976), 197–201.

[Ro]   J.J. Rotman, *An introduction to homological algebra*. Second edition. Universitext. Springer, New York, 2009.

[Rü33]   W. Rückert, *Zum Eliminationsproblem der Potenzreihenideale*, Math. Ann. 107 (1933), 259–281.

[Ru87]   W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*. Third edition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1987.

[Sa61]   P. Samuel, *On unique factorization domains*. Illinois J. Math. 5 (1961), 1–17.

[Sa64]   P. Samuel, *Lectures on unique factorization domains*. Notes by M. Pavaman Murthy. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics, No. 30 Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay 1964.

[Sa68]   P. Samuel, *Unique factorization*. Amer. Math. Monthly 75 (1968), 945–952.

[Sa71]   P. Samuel, *About Euclidean rings*. J. Algebra 19 (1971), 282–301.

[Sa08]   A. Sasane, *On the Krull dimension of rings of transfer functions*. Acta Appl. Math. 103 (2008), 161- -168.

[S]   W. Scharlau, *Quadratic and Hermitian forms*. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften 270. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.

[Sc45]   T. Schönemann, *Grundzüge einer allgemeinen Theorie der höhern Congruenzen, deren Modul eine reelle Primzahl ist*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 31 (1845), 269–325.

[Sc46]   T. Schönemann, *Von denjenigen Moduln, welche Potenzen von Primzahlen sind*. J. Reine Angew. Math. 32 (1846), 93–105.

[Sc46b]   O.F.G. Schilling, *Ideal theory on open Riemann surfaces*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 52 (1946), 945–963.

[Se56]   A. Seidenberg, *Some remarks on Hilbert's Nullstellensatz*. Arch. Math. (Basel) 7 (1956), 235–240.

[Si86]   J. Silverman, *The Arithmetic of Elliptic Curves*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 106, Springer Verlag, 1986.

[St86]   J.-L. Steffan, *Longueurs des décompositions en produits d'éléments irréductibles dans un anneau de Dedekind*. J. Algebra 102 (1986), 229–236.

[ST42]   A.H. Stone and J.W. Tukey, *Generalized "sandwich" theorems*. Duke Math. J. 9 (1942), 356–359.

[Su11]   B. Sury, *Uncountably Generated Ideals of Functions*. College Math. Journal 42 (2011), 404–406.

[Su76]   A.A. Suslin, *Projective modules over polynomial rings are free*. Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR 229 (1976), 1063–1066.

[Sw62]   R.G. Swan, *Vector bundles and projective modules*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 105 (1962), 264–277.

[Sw67]   R.G. Swan, *The number of generators of a module*. Math. Z. 102 (4) (1967) 318-–322.

[Sw69]   R.G. Swan, *Invariant rational functions and a problem of Steenrod*. Invent. Math. 7 (1969), 148–158.

[Te66]   G. Terjanian, *Sur les corps finis*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 262 (1966), A167–A169.

[Te72]   G. Terjanian, *Dimension arithmétique d'un corps*. J. Algebra 22 (1972), 517–545.

[Tr88]   H.F. Trotter, *An overlooked example of nonunique factorization*. Amer. Math. Monthly 95 (1988), no. 4, 339–342.

[Va90]   R.J. Valenza, *Elasticity of factorizations in number fields*. J. Number Theory 36 (1990), 212–218.

[vdW39]   B.L. van der Waerden, *Einftihrung in die algebraische Geometrie*, Berlin, 1939.

[Wa]   R.B. Warfield, Jr., *Rings whose modules have nice decompositions*. Math. Z. 125 (1972) 187–192.

[We07]   J.H.M. Wedderburn, *On Hypercomplex Numbers*. Proc. of the London Math. Soc. 6 (1907), 77-118.

[W]   C.A. Weibel, *An introduction to homological algebra*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 38. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994.

[We80]   R.O. Wells Jr., *Differential analysis on complex manifolds*. Second edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 65. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1980.

[Za04]   F. Zanello, *When are there infinitely many irreducible elements in a principal ideal domain?* Amer. Math. Monthly 111 (2004), 150–152.

[Za76]   A. Zaks, *Half factorial domains*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 82 (1976), 721–723.

[Za47]   O. Zariski, *A new proof of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 53 (1947), 362–368.

[Za69]   H. Zassenhaus, *On Hensel factorization. I*. J. Number Theory 1 (1969), 291–311.

[Ze34]   E. Zermelo, *Elementare Betrachtungen zur Theorie der Primzahlen*. Nachr. Gesellsch. Wissensch. G-ttingen 1, 43-46, 1934.