

Shengtian Yang

---

# Notes

ON Atiyah and MacDonald's  
*Introduction to Commutative Algebra*

VERSION: 0.1.2  
DATE: 2013-06-08

---

CODLAB.NET

Title: *Notes on Atiyah and MacDonald's Introduction to Commutative Algebra.*

Author: Shengtian Yang.

Version: 0.1.2 (no. 201306080627).<sup>1</sup>

Copyright © 2013 by Shengtian Yang.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>.

The latest version of this work is available from <http://www.codlab.net/>.

---

<sup>1</sup>This file was generated on June 8, 2013 by XeTeX 0.9998 with format LaTeX2e 2011/06/27.

Global options: a5paper, 10pt, twoside.

Options (for geometry): hscale = 0.84, vscale = 0.92, includeheadfoot, centering.

Options (for hyperref): pagebackref, pdfstartview = FitH, hidelinks.

---

# Contents

---

<b>Preface</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 Rings and Ideals</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Notes on Text . . . . .	1
1.2 Solutions to Exercises . . . . .	4
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>23</b>



---

# Preface

---

This document includes my solutions to the exercises of the book *Introduction to Commutative Algebra* (Atiyah and MacDonald, 1969), as well as my notes on some interesting facts in the book. The exercises of the book are quite good. Some of them in fact introduce more advanced material related to algebraic geometry. For me, a beginner, most of these exercises are not easy, but I enjoy doing them and writing down the solutions and ideas got in this process. Because of copyright reasons, the original text of the exercises is not included in the public release of this document.

I am very glad for bug reports as well as any comments on all aspects of this document.

Shengtian Yang  
Hangzhou, China  
yangst@codlab.net  
May 16, 2013

(Last revised on June 8, 2013)



# Rings and Ideals

## 1.1 Notes on Text

**Note 1.1** (p. 8, Exercise 1.12) 🔗

*Proof.* i) It is clear that  $x\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$  for any  $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ , which implies that  $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$ .

ii) By definition, every  $x \in (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})$  satisfies  $x\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ , so that  $(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b})\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ .

iii) Since  $\mathfrak{bc} = \mathfrak{cb}$ , it suffices to prove the second equality. Using property (ii), we have

$$((\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{c}) : \mathfrak{b})(\mathfrak{bc}) = (((\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{c}) : \mathfrak{b})\mathfrak{b})\mathfrak{c} \subseteq (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{c})\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$$

so that  $((\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{c}) : \mathfrak{b}) \subseteq (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{bc})$ . On the other hand, for  $x \in (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{bc})$ , we have  $x\mathfrak{bc} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ , and in particular,  $xbc \in \mathfrak{a}$  for all  $b \in \mathfrak{b}$  and  $c \in \mathfrak{c}$ , so that  $xb \in (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{c})$  for  $b \in \mathfrak{b}$ , hence  $x \in ((\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{c}) : \mathfrak{b})$ , and therefore  $(\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{bc}) \subseteq ((\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{c}) : \mathfrak{b})$ .

iv)  $x \in (\bigcap_t \mathfrak{a}_t : \mathfrak{b}) \Leftrightarrow x\mathfrak{b} \in \bigcap_t \mathfrak{a}_t \Leftrightarrow x\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{a}_t$  for all  $t \Leftrightarrow x \in (\mathfrak{a}_t : \mathfrak{b})$  for all  $t \Leftrightarrow x \in \bigcap_t (\mathfrak{a}_t : \mathfrak{b})$ .

v)  $x \in (\mathfrak{a} : \sum_t \mathfrak{b}_t) \Leftrightarrow x \sum_t \mathfrak{b}_t \in \mathfrak{a} \Leftrightarrow x\mathfrak{b}_t \in \mathfrak{a}$  for all  $t \Leftrightarrow x \in (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}_t)$  for all  $t \Leftrightarrow x \in \bigcap_t (\mathfrak{a} : \mathfrak{b}_t)$ . □

**Note 1.2** (p. 9, Exercise 1.13) 🔗

*Proof.* i) It is clear that  $x^1 \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$  for all  $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ .

ii) By (i) we have  $r(r(\mathfrak{a})) \supseteq r(\mathfrak{a})$ , and for  $x \in r(r(\mathfrak{a}))$  we have  $x^{mn} = (x^m)^n \in \mathfrak{a}$  for some  $m, n > 0$ , so that  $x \in r(\mathfrak{a})$ , and therefore  $r(r(\mathfrak{a})) \subseteq r(\mathfrak{a})$ .

iii) Since  $\mathfrak{ab} \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}$ , it is clear that  $r(\mathfrak{ab}) \subseteq r(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b})$ . On the other hand,  $x \in r(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b})$  implies  $x^n \in \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}$ , so that  $x^{2n} \in \mathfrak{ab}$ , hence  $x \in r(\mathfrak{ab})$ , and therefore  $r(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}) \subseteq r(\mathfrak{ab})$ .

Analogously, it is clear that  $r(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}) \subseteq r(\mathfrak{a}) \cap r(\mathfrak{b})$ . On the other hand,  $x \in r(\mathfrak{a}) \cap r(\mathfrak{b})$  implies  $x^m \in \mathfrak{a}$  for some  $m > 0$  and  $x^n \in \mathfrak{b}$  for some  $n > 0$ , so that  $x^{m+n} \in \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}$ , hence  $x \in r(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b})$ , and therefore  $r(\mathfrak{a}) \cap r(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq r(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b})$ .

iv)  $r(\mathfrak{a}) = (1) \Leftrightarrow 1 \in r(\mathfrak{a}) \Leftrightarrow 1 \in \mathfrak{a} \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{a} = (1)$ .

v) Since  $\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b} \subseteq r(\mathfrak{a}) + r(\mathfrak{b})$ , it is clear that  $r(\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b}) \subseteq r(r(\mathfrak{a}) + r(\mathfrak{b}))$ . On the other hand,  $x \in r(r(\mathfrak{a}) + r(\mathfrak{b}))$  implies that  $x^m = y + z$  for some  $y \in r(\mathfrak{a})$  and  $z \in r(\mathfrak{b})$ . Then for sufficiently large  $n$ , we have  $x^{mn} = (y + z)^n = \sum_i \binom{n}{i} y^i z^{n-i} \in \mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b}$ , so  $r(r(\mathfrak{a}) + r(\mathfrak{b})) \subseteq r(\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{b})$ .

vi) It is trivially true for  $n = 1$  by the definition of prime ideal. By induction on  $n$  and (iii), we have  $r(\mathfrak{p}^n) = r(\mathfrak{p}^{n-1} \cap \mathfrak{p}) = r(\mathfrak{p}^{n-1}) = \mathfrak{p}$ .  $\square$

**Note 1.3** (p. 10, the example before Proposition 1.17) This example contains some basic facts:

**Fact 1.1.**  $\mathbf{Z}[i]$  is a principal ideal domain.

This can be proved by showing that it has a Euclidean algorithm (see e.g., Hungerford, 1974, Section 3.3). Define

$$\phi(x) := x\bar{x} = a^2 + b^2 \quad \text{for } x = a + bi \in \mathbf{Z}[i].$$

It has the following simple properties:

1.  $\phi(xy) = \phi(x)\phi(y)$ ;
2.  $\phi(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = 0$ ;
3.  $\phi(x) \geq 1$  for  $x \neq 0$ .

Then for  $xy \neq 0$ , we have  $\phi(y) \geq 1$ , so that

$$\phi(x) \leq \phi(x)\phi(y) = \phi(xy).$$

The difficult part is to show that if  $x, y \in \mathbf{Z}[i]$  and  $x \neq 0$ , then there exist  $q, r \in \mathbf{Z}[i]$  such that  $y = qx + r$  with  $r = 0$  or  $\phi(r) < \phi(x)$ .

We first assume that  $y = a + bi$  and  $x \in \mathbf{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ . Then there exist  $q_1, r_1, q_2, r_2$  such that

$$a = q_1x + r_1 \text{ with } |r_1| \leq x/2,$$

$$b = q_2x + r_2 \text{ with } |r_2| \leq x/2,$$

so that

$$y = (q_1 + q_2i)x + (r_1 + r_2i),$$


where  $\phi(r_1 + r_2i) = r_1^2 + r_2^2 \leq x^2/2 < \phi(x)$ .

Generally, for any  $x \neq 0$ , we apply the above result to the number  $x' = x\bar{x}$  and  $y' = y\bar{x}$ , and we have  $y' = qx' + r'$  with  $r' = 0$  or  $\phi(r') < \phi(x')$ . Then

$$r := y - qx$$

satisfies  $\phi(r) = 0$ , or  $\phi(r\bar{x}) = \phi(r') < \phi(x\bar{x})$ , that is,  $\phi(r) < \phi(x)$ , since  $\phi(\bar{x}) > 0$ .

✔TODO: More comments to be added. 

**Note 1.4** (p. 10, Exercise 1.18) 



*Proof.* i) Since  $\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2 \supseteq \mathbf{a}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2 \supseteq \mathbf{b}_i$ , it is clear that  $(\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2)^c \supseteq \mathbf{a}_1^c + \mathbf{a}_2^c$  and  $(\mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2)^c \supseteq \mathbf{b}_1^c + \mathbf{b}_2^c$ . On the other hand,

$$(\mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2)^c \subseteq (\mathbf{a}_1^{cc} + \mathbf{a}_2^{cc})^c \subseteq (\mathbf{a}_1^c + \mathbf{a}_2^c)^{cc} \subseteq \mathbf{a}_1^c + \mathbf{a}_2^c.$$

ii) Since  $\mathbf{a}_1 \cap \mathbf{a}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{a}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_1 \cap \mathbf{b}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{b}_i$ , it is clear that  $(\mathbf{a}_1 \cap \mathbf{a}_2)^c \subseteq \mathbf{a}_1^c \cap \mathbf{a}_2^c$  and  $(\mathbf{b}_1 \cap \mathbf{b}_2)^c \subseteq \mathbf{b}_1^c \cap \mathbf{b}_2^c$ . On the other hand,

$$(\mathbf{b}_1 \cap \mathbf{b}_2)^c \supseteq (\mathbf{b}_1^{cc} \cap \mathbf{b}_2^{cc})^c \supseteq (\mathbf{b}_1^c \cap \mathbf{b}_2^c)^{cc} \supseteq \mathbf{b}_1^c \cap \mathbf{b}_2^c.$$



This proof is also right for arbitrary intersections, and hence we have  $(\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathbf{a}_i)^c \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathbf{a}_i^c$  and  $(\bigcap_{i \in I} \mathbf{b}_i)^c = \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathbf{b}_i^c$  (cf. Note 1.6).

iii) On one hand, it is clear that  $f(\mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2) \subseteq \mathbf{a}_1^c \mathbf{a}_2^c$  and hence  $(\mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2)^c \subseteq \mathbf{a}_1^c \mathbf{a}_2^c$ , so that

$$(\mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_2)^c \supseteq (\mathbf{b}_1^{cc} \mathbf{b}_2^{cc})^c \supseteq (\mathbf{b}_1^c \mathbf{b}_2^c)^{cc} \supseteq \mathbf{b}_1^c \mathbf{b}_2^c.$$

On the other hand, any  $y \in \mathbf{a}_1^c \mathbf{a}_2^c$  is a finite sum of the following terms

$$\sum_i b_{1,i} f(a_{1,i}) \sum_j b_{2,j} f(a_{2,j}) = \sum_{i,j} b_{1,i} b_{2,j} f(a_{1,i} a_{2,j}) \in (\mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2)^c,$$

where  $a_{1,i} \in \mathbf{a}_1$ ,  $a_{2,j} \in \mathbf{a}_2$ , and  $b_{1,i}, b_{2,j} \in B$ . Therefore  $(\mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2)^c \supseteq \mathbf{a}_1^c \mathbf{a}_2^c$ .

iv) If  $y \in (\mathbf{a}_1 : \mathbf{a}_2)^c$ , then  $y = \sum_i b_i f(x_i)$  where  $x_i \mathbf{a}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{a}_1$  and  $b_i \in B$ . Then for any  $y' = \sum_j b'_j f(x'_j) \in \mathbf{a}_2^c$  with  $x'_j \in \mathbf{a}_2$  and  $b'_j \in B$ , it is clear that  $yy' = \sum_{i,j} b_i b'_j f(x_i x'_j) \in \mathbf{a}_1^c$ , so that  $(\mathbf{a}_1 : \mathbf{a}_2)^c \subseteq (\mathbf{a}_1^c : \mathbf{a}_2^c)$ .

If  $x \in (\mathbf{b}_1 : \mathbf{b}_2)^c$ , then  $f(x) \mathbf{b}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{b}_1$ , so that  $f(x f^{-1}(\mathbf{b}_2)) \subseteq f(x) \mathbf{b}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{b}_1$ , hence  $x f^{-1}(\mathbf{b}_2) \subseteq f^{-1}(\mathbf{b}_1)$ , or  $x \in (\mathbf{b}_1^c : \mathbf{b}_2^c)$ , and therefore  $(\mathbf{b}_1 : \mathbf{b}_2)^c \subseteq (\mathbf{b}_1^c : \mathbf{b}_2^c)$ .

v) Since every  $x \in r(\mathbf{a})$  satisfies  $(f(x))^m = f(x^m) \in f(\mathbf{a})$  for some  $m > 0$ , it is clear that  $f(r(\mathbf{a})) \subseteq r(\mathbf{a}^c)$ , so that  $r(\mathbf{a})^c \subseteq r(\mathbf{a}^c)$ .

Since every  $x \in r(\mathbf{b})^c$  satisfies  $f(x^m) = (f(x))^m \in \mathbf{b}$  for some  $m > 0$ , it is clear that  $r(\mathbf{b})^c \subseteq r(\mathbf{b}^c)$ . On the other hand,  $r(\mathbf{b})^c \supseteq r(\mathbf{b}^{cc})^c \supseteq r(\mathbf{b}^c)^{cc} \supseteq r(\mathbf{b}^c)$ .

vi) The last statement is obviously true by the properties already proved. For example, for  $\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2 \in C$ , we have

$$(\mathbf{a}_1 : \mathbf{a}_2) = (\mathbf{a}_1^{cc} : \mathbf{a}_2^{cc}) \supseteq (\mathbf{a}_1^c : \mathbf{a}_2^c)^c \supseteq (\mathbf{a}_1 : \mathbf{a}_2)^{cc},$$

so that  $(\mathbf{a}_1 : \mathbf{a}_2) = (\mathbf{a}_1 : \mathbf{a}_2)^{cc}$  and therefore  $(\mathbf{a}_1 : \mathbf{a}_2) \in C$ . □

## 1.2 Solutions to Exercises

1.

*Proof.* If  $1+x$  were not a unit, then  $1+x$  is contained in a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  of  $A$ , so that  $1 = (1+x) - x \in \mathfrak{a}$  (Proposition 1.8), which is absurd. A similar argument shows that the sum of a nilpotent element and a unit is a unit.  $\square$

2.

*Proof.* i) If  $f$  is a unit, then there is a polynomial  $g = b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m$  such that  $fg = 1$ , and hence it follows that  $a_0b_0 = 1$  and

$$\sum_{i=0}^r a_{n-i}b_{m-r+i} = 0 \quad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq m.$$

Here, we assume that  $a_{n-i} = 0$  for  $i > n$ . Multiplying each equation with  $a_n^r$ , we find that  $a_n^{r+1}$  annihilates  $b_{m-r}$ . In particular,  $a_n^{m+1}b_0 = 0$ . Since  $b_0$  is a unit,  $a_n$  is nilpotent. Then  $f' = f - a_nx^n$  is a unit (Ex. 1). Repeating the above argument, we deduce that  $a_0$  is a unit in  $A$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent.

Conversely, a polynomial with  $a_0$  a unit in  $A$  and  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  nilpotent must be a unit (Ex. 1).

ii) If  $f$  is nilpotent, then  $1+xf$  is a unit, and hence it follows from (i) that  $a_0, \dots, a_n$  are all nilpotent. The converse is trivially true.

iii) Let  $g = b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m$  be the polynomial of least degree  $m$  such that  $fg = 0$ . Then  $a_nb_m = 0$ , hence  $a_ng = 0$  because  $a_ngf = 0$  and  $a_ng$  has degree  $< m$ . Let  $f' = f - a_nx^n$ . We have  $f'g = fg = 0$ , and then a similar argument shows that  $a_{n-1}g = 0$ . Continuing this process, we have  $a_rg = 0$  for all  $0 \leq r \leq n$ . In particular  $a_rb_m = 0$  for all  $0 \leq r \leq n$ , and therefore  $b_mf = 0$ .

The converse is clearly true.

iv) For convenience, we denote by  $C(f)$  the ideal  $(a_0, \dots, a_n)$  of  $A$  and we adopt the convention that  $a_i = 0$  for  $i < 0$  or  $i > n$  when calculating a sum.

Let  $g = b_0 + b_1x + \cdots + b_mx^m$ , and then

$$fg = \sum_{r=0}^{m+n} c_r x^r = \sum_{r=0}^{m+n} \left( \sum_{i=0}^r a_i b_{r-i} \right) x^r.$$

If  $fg$  is primitive, then  $(1) = C(fg) \subseteq C(f)$  and  $(1) = C(fg) \subseteq C(g)$ , so that  $f$  and  $g$  must be primitive.

Conversely, suppose that  $f$  and  $g$  are primitive. Let  $I$  be a maximal ideal containing  $C(fg)$  or be  $A$  if  $C(fg) = A$ . Let  $s$  and  $t$  be the least integers such that  $a_s \notin I$  and  $b_t \notin I$ . If  $s$  (or  $t$ ) does not exist, then we are done by observing

that  $I = A$  is necessary to contain all the coefficients of  $f$  because  $f$  is primitive. If however both  $s$  and  $t$  exist, note that

$$a_s b_t = c_{s+t} - \sum_{i < s} a_i b_{s+t-i} - \sum_{j < t} a_{s+t-j} b_j \in I,$$

which implies  $a_s \in I$  or  $b_t \in I$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

### 3.

*Proof.* At first, we state the generalized results. For  $f \in A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , we denote the coefficient of its monomial  $x_1^{k_1} \cdots x_n^{k_n}$  by  $a_{k_1, \dots, k_n}$ .

- i)  $f$  is a unit in  $A[x_1, \dots, x_n] \Leftrightarrow a_{0, \dots, 0}$  is a unit in  $A$  and other coefficients are nilpotent.
- ii)  $f$  is nilpotent  $\Leftrightarrow$  all its coefficients are nilpotent.
- iii)  $f$  is a zero-divisor  $\Leftrightarrow$  there exists  $a \neq 0$  such that  $af = 0$ .
- iv)  $f$  is said to be primitive if the ideal (of  $A$ ) generated by all its coefficients is  $A$ . If  $f, g \in A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , then  $fg$  is primitive  $\Leftrightarrow f$  and  $g$  are primitive.

Next, we provide the proofs:

i)  $\Rightarrow$ : Consider the ring  $A'[x_n]$  with  $A' = A[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$  and apply Ex. 2.(i). Repeat such an argument with Exs. 2.(i) and 2.(ii) until  $A' = A$ .

$\Leftarrow$ : Use Ex. 1.

ii)  $\Rightarrow$ : Consider  $f' = 1 + x_1 f$  and then use Ex. 1 and (i).

$\Leftarrow$ : Obvious (since the nilpotent elements of  $A$  belong to the nilradical of  $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , which is an ideal of  $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ ).

iii) Use an argument similar to Ex. 2.(iii) and employ an ordering  $<$  on monomials in  $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  (see Cox et al., 2007, Chapter 2). The ordering  $<$  on  $\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  satisfies:

(1)  $>$  is a total ordering on  $\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ .

(2) If  $\alpha > \beta$  and  $\gamma \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , then  $\alpha + \gamma > \beta + \gamma$ .

(3)  $>$  is a well-ordering on  $\mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ .

iv) The proof is similar to Ex 2.(iv) and also requires a monomial ordering in the proof of (iii). For illustration, we consider  $A[x_1, x_2]$  by a lexicographic monomial ordering (with indeterminate order  $x_1 > x_2$ ).

Let

$$f = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^2} a_{i,j} x_1^i x_2^j, \quad g = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^2} b_{i,j} x_1^i x_2^j.$$

Note that almost all of the  $a_{i,j}$  (i.e., all but a finite set) are zero. We denote by  $C(f)$  the ideal generated by all coefficients  $a_{i,j}$  of  $f$ . It is clear that

$$fg = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^2} c_{i,j} x_1^i x_2^j = \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^2} \left( \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i' \leq i \\ 0 \leq j' \leq j}} a_{i',j'} b_{i-i',j-j'} \right) x_1^i x_2^j.$$

The statement that  $fg$  is primitive  $\Rightarrow f$  and  $g$  are primitive is obviously true.

Conversely, let  $I$  be a maximal ideal containing  $C(fg)$  or be  $A$  if  $C(fg) = A$ . Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{Z}_{\geq 0}^2$  be the smallest pairs of integers (in lexical ordering) such that  $a_\alpha \in I$  and  $b_\beta \in I$ . If  $\alpha = (0, 0)$  (or  $\beta = (0, 0)$ ), then we are done by observing that  $I = A$  is necessary to contain all  $a_{i,j}$  because  $f$  is primitive. If however  $\alpha > (0, 0)$  and  $\beta > (0, 0)$ , we let  $\gamma$  and  $\delta$  be the predecessors of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , respectively, and we note that

$$a_\gamma b_\delta = c_{\gamma+\delta} - \sum_{(\alpha', \beta') \neq (\gamma, \delta), \alpha' + \beta' = \gamma + \delta} a_{\alpha'} b_{\beta'} \in I,$$

which implies  $a_\gamma \in I$  or  $b_\delta \in I$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

#### 4.

*Proof.* It suffices to show that the Jacobson radical is a subset of the nilradical. Let  $f = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n$  be an element of the Jacobson radical of  $A[x]$ . Then  $1 + xf$  is a unit (Proposition 1.9) and hence  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n$  are nilpotent (Ex. 2.(i)), so that  $f$  is nilpotent.  $\square$

#### 5.

*Proof.* i) If  $f$  is a unit, then there is a power series  $g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$  such that  $fg = 1$ . In particular, we have  $a_0 b_0 = 1$  and therefore  $a_0$  is a unit.

If  $a_0$  is a unit in  $A$ , then there is an element  $b_0$  of  $A$  such that  $a_0 b_0 = 1$ . If choosing  $b_n$  in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &= -b_0(b_0 a_1), \\ b_2 &= -b_0(b_0 a_2 + b_1 a_1), \\ &\vdots \\ b_n &= -b_0 \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} b_k a_{n-k}, \\ &\vdots \end{aligned}$$

we have  $fg = 1$  for  $g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$ .

ii) If  $f$  is nilpotent, then  $f^m = 0$  for some  $m > 0$ . In particular,  $a_0^m = 0$ , so that  $a_0$  is nilpotent. Then  $f_1 = f - a_0$  is also nilpotent and hence  $a_1$  is nilpotent. Repeat this kind of argument and by induction on  $n$ , we prove that  $a_n$  is nilpotent for all  $n \geq 0$ .

The converse is false. ✔TODO: Need a counterexample.

iii) If  $f$  belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A[[x]]$ , then for all  $g \in A[[x]]$ ,  $1 - fg$  is a unit in  $A[[x]]$  (Proposition 1.9). From (i) it follows that  $1 - a_0 b_0$  is a unit in  $A$  for all  $b_0 \in A$ , so that  $a_0$  belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A$ .

Conversely, if  $a_0$  belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A$ , then  $1 - a_0 b_0$  is a unit in  $A$  for all  $b_0 \in A$ . Again from (i) it follows that  $1 - fg$  is a unit in  $A[[x]]$  for all  $g \in A[[x]]$  with  $g = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} b_n x^n$ , so that  $f$  belongs to the Jacobson radical of  $A[[x]]$ .

iv) It is clear that  $\mathfrak{m}^c \neq A$  for otherwise  $\mathfrak{m} \supseteq (1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n x^n) = A[[x]]$  (see (i)). Let  $a$  be an element of  $A$  not in  $\mathfrak{m}^c$ . Consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{m}^c + (a)$ . It is clear that  $\mathfrak{m}$  is a proper ideal of  $\mathfrak{a} + (x)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{m}$  is maximal in  $A[[x]]$ ,  $\mathfrak{a} + (x)$  must be  $A[[x]]$ , so that  $\mathfrak{a} = A$  and hence  $\mathfrak{m}^c$  is maximal in  $A$ .

It is also easy to show that  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^c + (x)$ , and hence  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}^c + (x)$  because if  $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$  then  $\mathfrak{m} + (x)$  would be a larger proper ideal of  $A[[x]]$ .

v) Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime ideal of  $A$ . Consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{q}$  of  $A[[x]]$  generated by  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $x$ . It is clear that  $\mathfrak{q}^c = \mathfrak{p}$ . If  $fg \in \mathfrak{q}$ , then  $a_0 b_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$ , so that  $a_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$  or  $b_0 \in \mathfrak{p}$ , hence  $f \in \mathfrak{q}$  or  $g \in \mathfrak{q}$ , and therefore  $\mathfrak{q}$  is prime. □

## 6.

*Proof.* Let  $x$  be an element of the Jacobson radical of  $A$ . If  $(x)$  is a subset of the nilradical of  $A$ , then we are done. Otherwise, there would be an element  $e \in (x)$  such that  $e^2 = e \neq 0$ . Clearly,  $1 - e$  is a unit in  $A$  (Proposition 1.9). However,  $(1 - e)e = 0$  shows that it is absurd. □

## 7.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime ideal of  $A$ . Then  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is an integral domain. By condition, every nonzero  $x + \mathfrak{p} \in A/\mathfrak{p}$  satisfies  $x^n + \mathfrak{p} = x + \mathfrak{p}$  for some  $n > 1$ , so that  $x^{n-1} + \mathfrak{p} = 1 + \mathfrak{p}$ , hence  $x + \mathfrak{p}$  is a unit, and therefore  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is a field or  $\mathfrak{p}$  is maximal in  $A$ . □

## 8.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{P}$  be the set of prime ideals of  $A$ , with inclusion order, and it is nonempty because  $A \neq 0$ . For every chain  $(\mathfrak{p}_i)_{i \in I}$  of ideals in  $\mathfrak{P}$ , let  $\mathfrak{p} = \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{p}_i$ . Then for  $xy \in \mathfrak{p}$ , we have  $xy \in \mathfrak{p}_i$  for all  $i \in I$ . If  $x \notin \mathfrak{p}_i$  and  $y \notin \mathfrak{p}_j$  for some  $i$  and  $j$ , then  $xy$  would not be an element of  $\mathfrak{p}_i \cap \mathfrak{p}_j = \mathfrak{p}_i$  or  $\mathfrak{p}_j$ , so that  $x \in \mathfrak{p}$  or

$y \in \mathfrak{p}$ , and hence  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a prime ideal. This implies  $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathfrak{P}$  and  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a lower bound of the chain. Hence by Zorn's lemma  $\mathfrak{P}$  has a minimal element with respect to inclusion.  $\square$

**9.**

*Proof.* If  $\mathfrak{a} = r(\mathfrak{a})$ , then  $\mathfrak{a}$  is the intersection of all prime ideals of  $A$  containing  $\mathfrak{a}$  (Proposition 1.14).

If  $\mathfrak{a}$  is an intersection of prime ideals, say  $(\mathfrak{p}_i)_{i \in I}$ , then for any  $x$  such that  $x^n \in \mathfrak{a}$  for some  $n > 0$ , we have  $x \in \mathfrak{p}_i$  for all  $i \in I$  and hence  $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ . This implies that  $r(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathfrak{a}$ .  $\square$

**10.**

*Proof.* i)  $\Rightarrow$  ii): If  $A$  has exactly one prime ideal, then it is the unique maximal ideal which is equal to  $\mathfrak{R}$  (Proposition 1.8), so that every element of  $A$  is either a unit or nilpotent (Corollary 1.5).

ii)  $\Rightarrow$  iii): By condition,  $\mathfrak{R}$  is the unique maximal ideal, so that  $A/\mathfrak{R}$  is a field.

iii)  $\Rightarrow$  i): If  $A/\mathfrak{R}$  is a field, then  $\mathfrak{R}$  is maximal in  $A$ , so that  $\mathfrak{R}$  is the unique prime ideal of  $A$  (Proposition 1.8).  $\square$

**11.**

*Proof.* i)  $2x = 4x - 2x = 4x^2 - 2x = (2x)^2 - 2x = 0$ .

ii) Since  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime,  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is an integral domain. Then for any nonzero  $x + \mathfrak{p} \in A/\mathfrak{p}$ ,  $x^2 + \mathfrak{p} = x + \mathfrak{p}$  implies  $x + \mathfrak{p} = 1 + \mathfrak{p}$ . This proves that  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is a field with two elements, and also that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is maximal in  $A$ .

iii) We will prove the result by induction on the number  $n$  of generators. The case  $n = 1$  is trivially true. Suppose that the statement is true for  $n - 1$  and consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{a} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . Then we have  $\mathfrak{a} = (y, x_n)$  where  $(y) = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ . Let  $z = y + x_n + yx_n$ . It is clear that  $z \in \mathfrak{a}$ . On the other hand,  $y = yz \in (z)$  and  $x_n = x_n z \in (z)$ . Therefore  $\mathfrak{a} = (z)$  is principal.  $\square$

**12.**

*Proof.* Suppose  $e$  is an idempotent. If  $(e) = (1)$ , then  $e = 1$ ; otherwise,  $(e)$  is contained in the unique maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ , and hence  $1 - e$  is a unit (Proposition 1.9) and satisfies  $(1 - e)^2 = 1 - e$ , so that  $1 - e = 1$ , and therefore  $e = 0$ .  $\square$

## Construction of an algebraic closure of a field (E. Artin)

### 13.

*Proof.* First, we show that  $\mathfrak{a} \neq (1)$ . It suffices to show that  $1 \notin \mathfrak{a}$ . If  $1 \in \mathfrak{a}$ , then

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i f_i(x_{f_i}),$$

where  $a_i \in A' = K[x_{f_1}, x_{f_2}, \dots, x_{f_n}]$  and  $f_i \in \Sigma$ .

To continue the proof, we consider the polynomial ring  $A'$  with the lexicographic monomial order. The degree, the leading term, the leading coefficient, and the leading monomial of a polynomial  $f \in A'$  are denoted  $\deg(f)$ ,  $\text{LT}(f)$ ,  $\text{LC}(f)$ , and  $\text{LM}(f)$ , respectively.

Since the lexicographic order is a well-ordering, we assume that the degree  $\mathbf{d} = \max_i \{\mathbf{d}_i\}$  is minimized where  $\mathbf{d}_i = \deg(a_i f_i)$ . On the other hand, however, it is clear that  $\deg(1) = (0, \dots, 0) < \mathbf{d}$ . This implies that there are some cancellations among the polynomials  $f_i$ , that is,

$$\deg \left( \sum_{i \in I} \text{LT}(a_i) f_i(x_{f_i}) \right) < \mathbf{d},$$

where  $I = \{i : \mathbf{d}_i = \mathbf{d}\}$ , or equivalently,

$$\sum_{i \in I} \text{LC}(a_i) = 0$$

since  $f_i$  are all monic polynomials.

Let  $m = |I|$ ,  $c_j = \text{LC}(a_{i_j})$ , and  $p_j = \text{LM}(a_{i_j}) f_{i_j}(x_{f_{i_j}})$ , where  $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m\}$  is an arbitrary ordering of  $I$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^m c_j p_j &= c_1 p_1 + \sum_{j=2}^m \left( \sum_{k=1}^j c_k - \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} c_k \right) p_j \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (p_j - p_{j+1}) \sum_{k=1}^j c_k + p_m \sum_{k=1}^m c_k \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (p_j - p_{j+1}) \sum_{k=1}^j c_k. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any distinct  $j, j'$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p_j - p_{j'} &= \text{LM}(a_i)f_i(x_{f_i}) - \text{LM}(a_{i'})f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}}) \\ &= \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{d}'} [\text{LT}(f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}}))f_i(x_{f_i}) - \text{LT}(f_i(x_{f_i}))(f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}}))] \\ &= \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{d}-\mathbf{d}'} [(\text{LT}(f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}})) - f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}}))f_i(x_{f_i}) \\ &\quad - (\text{LT}(f_i(x_{f_i})) - f_i(x_{f_i}))f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}})], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{d}' = \deg(f_i(x_{f_i})) + \deg(f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}}))$  and the second equality is because the leading terms of  $f_i(x_{f_i})$  and  $f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}})$  are coprime. In other words,  $p_j - p_{j'}$  can be rewritten as a linear combination of  $f_i(x_{f_i})$  and  $f_{i'}(x_{f_{i'}})$ , whose each monomial has a degree less than  $\mathbf{d}$ .

Note that

$$\sum_{i \in I} \text{LT}(a_i)f_i(x_{f_i}) = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} (p_j - p_{j+1}) \sum_{k=1}^j c_k,$$

so the degree  $\mathbf{d}$  can be further reduced by an algebraic substitution, an obvious contradiction to our minimal assumption of  $\mathbf{d}$ , and therefore  $1 \notin \mathfrak{a}$ .

Now that  $1 \notin \mathfrak{a}$ , every element of  $K$  is not in  $\mathfrak{a}$ , and hence, not in  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Then  $K_1$  is an extension field of  $K$  under the map  $x \mapsto x + \mathfrak{m}$  from  $K$  to  $K_1$ . If we identify  $x$  with  $x + \mathfrak{m}$ , then we may say that  $K$  is a subfield of  $K_1$ . Furthermore, for each  $f \in \Sigma$ ,  $f(x_f) \in \mathfrak{m}$ , which implies  $f(x_f + \mathfrak{m}) = f(x_f) + \mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}$ .

Since  $K_{n+1}$  is an extension field of  $K_n$  for all  $n$ , it is easy to show that  $L$  is a field. Each  $f \in \Sigma$  of degree  $n = \deg(f)$  can be factored over  $K_1$  into irreducible monic polynomials of degrees at most  $n - 1$ . If we repeat this process until over the field  $K_n$ ,  $f$  splits completely into linear factors.

For any  $a, b \in \bar{K}$ , let  $f, g \in \Sigma$  be the polynomials such that  $f(a) = g(b) = 0$ . Then the field  $K(a, b)$  generated by  $K$  and  $a, b$  is a finite dimensional extension of  $K$ , so that all elements of  $K(a, b)$ , including  $a - b$  and  $a/b$ , are algebraic over  $K$ . This proves that  $\bar{K}$  is a field extension of  $K$ .

Finally, we will show that every polynomial in  $\bar{K}[x]$  splits in  $\bar{K}[x]$ . Let  $f = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_nx^n \in \bar{K}[x]$ , which splits over  $L$  and we denote its roots by  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ . It is clear that the field  $K(a_0, \dots, a_n, r_1, \dots, r_n)$  is an algebraic extension of  $K(a_0, \dots, a_n)$ . Since  $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \bar{K}$ ,  $K(a_0, \dots, a_n)$  is an algebraic extension of  $K$ . Hence  $K(a_0, \dots, a_n, r_1, \dots, r_n)$  is an algebraic extension of  $K$ , and therefore  $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \bar{K}$ .  $\square$

#### 14.

*Proof.* Let  $(\mathfrak{a}_i)_{i \in I}$  be a chain of ideals in  $\Sigma$ . Let  $\mathfrak{a} = \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathfrak{a}_i$ . Then  $\mathfrak{a}$  is an ideal and  $\mathfrak{a} \in \Sigma$ . Thus every chain in  $\Sigma$  has an upper bound in  $\Sigma$ , and hence  $\Sigma$  has maximal elements by Zorn's Lemma.



Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be a maximal ideal in  $\Sigma$  and we assume that  $xy \in \mathfrak{m}$  and  $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$ . It is clear that  $(x) + \mathfrak{m} \notin \Sigma$ , so that there exist some  $a \in A$  and  $m \in \mathfrak{m}$  such that  $ax + m$  is not a zero-divisor. For any  $b \in A$  and  $n \in \mathfrak{m}$ , since  $xy \in \mathfrak{m}$ ,  $abxy + axn + bym + mn = (ax + m)(by + n)$  is a zero-divisor, so that  $by + n$  is a zero-divisor for all  $b \in A$  and  $n \in \mathfrak{m}$ , and hence  $y \in \mathfrak{m}$ . Therefore  $\mathfrak{m}$  is prime, and the set of zero-divisors in  $A$  is a union of prime ideals.  $\square$

**Note 1.5** The trick in the proof of Ex. 14 can be encapsulated into a reusable result:

**Fact 1.2.** *In a ring  $A$ , let  $S$  be a subset of  $A$  that is closed under multiplication, and let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be an ideal of  $A$  that is maximal in  $S^c$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}$  is prime.*



*Proof.* For  $xy \in \mathfrak{m}$ , if  $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$ , then  $(x) + \mathfrak{m}$  intersects  $S$  but  $(xy) + \mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}$ . Then in the quotient ring  $A/\mathfrak{m}$ ,  $ax + \mathfrak{m} \in S + \mathfrak{m}$  for some  $a \in A$  but  $(ax + \mathfrak{m})(by + \mathfrak{m}) = abxy + \mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m} \notin S + \mathfrak{m}$  for all  $b \in A$ . Since  $S$  is closed under multiplication, so is  $S + \mathfrak{m}$  in  $A/\mathfrak{m}$ , and hence we have  $by + \mathfrak{m} \notin S + \mathfrak{m}$  for all  $b \in A$ , so that  $(y) + \mathfrak{m} \subseteq S^c$  and therefore  $y \in \mathfrak{m}$ .  $\square$

## The prime spectrum of a ring

### 15.

*Proof.* i) Since for any  $A \subseteq B$ ,  $V(A) \supseteq V(B)$ . It is clear that  $V(E) \supseteq V(\mathfrak{a}) \supseteq V(r(\mathfrak{a}))$ . On the other hand, if a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(E)$ , then  $E \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ , so that  $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  and  $r(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq r(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p}$ , hence  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(r(\mathfrak{a}))$ , and therefore  $V(E) \subseteq V(r(\mathfrak{a}))$ .

ii) Obvious.

iii)  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\bigcup_{i \in I} E_i) \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{p} \supseteq E_i$  for all  $i \in I \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{p} \in V(E_i)$  for all  $i \in I \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{p} \in \bigcap_{i \in I} E_i$ .

iv)  $V(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b}) = V(r(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b})) = V(r(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})) = V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$ .

It is clear that  $V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}) \supseteq V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$ . On the other hand, if a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b})$  and  $\mathfrak{p} \notin V(\mathfrak{a})$ , then there exists some  $a \in \mathfrak{a}$  such that  $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$  but  $ab \in \mathfrak{p}$  for all  $b \in \mathfrak{b}$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  and hence  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq V(\mathfrak{a}) \cup V(\mathfrak{b})$ .  $\square$

### 16.

*Solution.* Let  $X(A)$  be the set of all prime ideals of the ring  $A$ .

i)  $X(\mathbf{Z})$  consists of all principal ideals generated by prime numbers, as well as the zero ideal. Given any  $E \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$  with  $E \neq \{0\}$ , let  $g = \prod_{i=1}^m p_i^{n_i}$  be the greatest common divisor of  $E$ , and then  $V(E) = \{(p_1), (p_2), \dots, (p_m)\}$ . In case  $g = 1$ ,  $V(E) = \emptyset$ ; in case  $E = \{0\}$ ,  $V(E) = X(\mathbf{Z})$ .

Thus  $\text{Spec}(\mathbf{Z})$  consists of the empty set and all subsets of  $X(\mathbf{Z})$  such that their complements are finite, that is,  $\text{Spec}(\mathbf{Z})$  is the finite complement topology of  $X(\mathbf{Z})$ .

ii) Since  $X(\mathbf{R}) = \{(0)\}$ , it is clear that  $\text{Spec}(\mathbf{R}) = \{\emptyset, X(\mathbf{R})\}$ .

iii)  $X(\mathbf{C}[x])$  consists of the zero ideal and all principal ideals generated by polynomials  $x-c$  where  $c \in \mathbf{C}$ . Thus  $\text{Spec}(\mathbf{C}[x])$  is the finite complement topology of  $X(\mathbf{C}[x])$ . In the plane of  $\mathbf{C}$ , these open sets correspond to the empty set and all subsets of  $\mathbf{C}$  whose complements are finite sets of points.

iv)  $X(\mathbf{R}[x])$  consists of the zero ideal and all principal ideals generated by irreducible polynomials. Thus  $\text{Spec}(\mathbf{R}[x])$  is the finite complement topology of  $X(\mathbf{R}[x])$ . In the plane of  $\mathbf{C}$ , these open sets correspond to the empty set and all subsets  $S$  of  $\mathbf{C}$  whose complements are finite sets of points such that  $c \notin S$  if and only if  $\bar{c} \notin S$ .

v)  $X(\mathbf{Z}[x])$  consists of the zero ideal and all principal ideals generated by irreducible polynomials (including the prime constant polynomials). Although  $\mathbf{Z}[x]$  is not a principal ideal domain, it is still a unique factorization domain. Thus  $\text{Spec}(\mathbf{Z}[x])$  is the finite complement topology of  $X(\mathbf{Z}[x])$ .  $\square$

## 17.

*Proof.* First, for any prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \in X$ , choose  $f \notin \mathfrak{p}$ , and then  $\mathfrak{p} \notin V(f)$ , so that  $\mathfrak{p} \in X_f$ . Second, by property (i),  $X_f \cap X_g = X_{fg}$  for all  $f, g \in A$ . Therefore, the sets  $X_f$  form a basis of open sets for the Zariski topology.

Next, let us prove the properties:

i) By definition,  $X_f \cap X_g = (V(f) \cup V(g))^c$ . It follows that  $V(f) \cup V(g) = V((f)(g)) = V((fg))$  (Ex. 15.(iv)), so that  $X_f \cap X_g = X_{fg}$ .

ii)  $X_f = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow V(f) = X \Leftrightarrow f$  is nilpotent (Proposition 1.8).

iii)  $X_f = X \Leftrightarrow V(f) = \emptyset \Leftrightarrow f$  is not contained in every maximal ideal, so that  $f$  is a unit.

iv)  $X_f = X_g \Leftrightarrow V(r((f))) = V(f) = V(g) = V(r((g)))$  (Ex. 15.(i))  $\Leftrightarrow r((f)) = r((g))$  ((Proposition 1.14)).

v) Since the open sets  $X_f$  form a basis, it is enough to assume that  $X$  is covered by the open sets  $(X_{f_i} : i \in I)$ . It follows that

$$V\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \{f_i\}\right) = \bigcap_{i \in I} V(f_i) = \emptyset. \quad (\text{Ex. 15.(iii)})$$

This implies the  $f_i$  generate the unit ideal. Then there is a finite subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that

$$1 = \sum_{i \in J} g_i f_i \quad (g_i \in A).$$

Therefore the  $X_{f_i}$  ( $i \in J$ ) cover  $X$ .

vi) Suppose that  $X_f$  is covered by the open sets  $(X_{f_i} : i \in I)$ . It follows that

$$V\left(\bigcup_{i \in I} \{f_i\}\right) = \bigcap_{i \in I} V(f_i) \subseteq V(f). \quad (\text{Ex. 15.(iii)})$$

This implies  $f$  belongs to the radical of the ideal generated by  $f_i$ . Then there is some  $m > 0$  and a finite subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that

$$f^m = \sum_{i \in J} g_i f_i \quad (g_i \in A).$$

Therefore the  $X_{f_i}$  ( $i \in J$ ) cover  $X_f$ .

vii) By (vi), it suffices to show that a quasi-compact open subset of  $X$  is a finite union of sets  $X_f$ , which is also obvious by the definition of quasi-compact sets and the fact that the sets  $X_f$  are a basis.  $\square$

### 18.

*Proof.* i) Use (ii).

ii) Since the closure of  $x$  is the intersection of all closed sets containing  $\{x\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\{x\}} &= \bigcap_{E: E \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_x} V(E) \\ &= V\left(\bigcup_{E: E \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_x} E\right) \quad (\text{Ex. 15.(iii)}) \\ &= V(\mathfrak{p}_x). \end{aligned}$$

iii)  $y \in \overline{\{x\}} \Leftrightarrow y \in V(\mathfrak{p}_x) \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{p}_x \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_y$ .

iv) Given any distinct  $\mathfrak{p}_x$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_y$ , the relations  $\mathfrak{p}_x \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_y$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_y \subseteq \mathfrak{p}_x$  cannot be both true. Suppose, for example, that  $\mathfrak{p}_x \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_y$ . Then  $y \notin \overline{\{x\}}$  by (iii), so that  $\overline{\{x\}}^c$  is a neighborhood of  $y$  which does not contain  $x$ .  $\square$

**Note 1.6** It is necessary to go further to consider the closure of a general subset  $X'$  of  $X$ . We need some definitions first:

**Definition 1.3.** Let  $A$  be a ring and  $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ . The *radical*  $r(X')$  of  $X' \subseteq X$  is defined by

$$r(X') := \bigcap_{x \in X'} \mathfrak{p}_x.$$

Then, some useful properties follow:

**Fact 1.4.** For an ideal  $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq A$ ,  $r(V(\mathfrak{a})) = r(\mathfrak{a})$ .

**Fact 1.5.** For  $X' \subseteq X$ ,  $\overline{X'} = V(r(X'))$ .

**Fact 1.6.** Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  be a ring homomorphism,  $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ , and  $Y = \text{Spec}(B)$ . Then  $r(V(\mathfrak{a}))^c \subseteq r(V(\mathfrak{a}^c))$  and  $r(V(\mathfrak{b}))^c = r(V(\mathfrak{b}^c))$ , where  $\mathfrak{a}$  and  $\mathfrak{b}$  are ideals of  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively.



## 19.

*Proof.* Let  $X = \text{Spec}(A)$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$  be the nilradical of  $A$ .

$\Rightarrow$ : For  $fg \in \mathfrak{R}$ , it is clear that  $X_{fg} = \emptyset$  (Ex. 17.(ii)). Since  $X$  is irreducible and  $X_{fg} = X_f \cap X_g$  (Ex. 17.(i)), we have  $X_f = \emptyset$  or  $X_g = \emptyset$ , so that  $f \in \mathfrak{R}$  or  $g \in \mathfrak{R}$ , and therefore  $\mathfrak{R}$  is prime.

$\Leftarrow$ : Let  $B$  be an arbitrary nonempty open set in  $X$ . Then  $V(r(B^c)) = B^c \neq X$ , so that  $\mathfrak{R} \notin B^c$ , or  $\mathfrak{R} \in B$ . This implies that  $\overline{B} = V(r(B)) = V(\mathfrak{R}) = X$ , that is,  $B$  is dense in  $X$ . Therefore  $X$  is irreducible.  $\square$

## 20.

*Proof.* i) Since every nonempty open subset  $A$  of  $\overline{Y}$  can be expressed as  $A = \overline{Y} \cap B$  where  $B$  is open in  $X$ , we have  $A \supseteq Y \cap B$ , so that  $\overline{A} \supseteq \overline{Y \cap B} \supseteq Y$  because  $Y \cap B$  is open in  $Y$  which is irreducible, hence  $\overline{A} \supseteq \overline{Y}$ , and therefore  $\overline{Y}$  is irreducible.

ii) Let  $X_0$  be an irreducible subspace of  $X$ . Let  $\Sigma$  denote the set of all irreducible subspaces of  $X$  containing  $X_0$ , ordered by inclusion.  $\Sigma$  is not empty since  $X_0 \in \Sigma$ . Let  $(Y_i)_{i \in I}$  be a chain of subspaces in  $\Sigma$ . Let  $Y = \bigcup_{i \in I} Y_i$ , which clearly contains  $X_0$ . For every nonempty open subset  $Y \cap B$  of  $Y$  where  $B$  is open in  $X$ ,  $Y_i \cap B$  is open in  $Y_i$  and hence either  $\overline{Y_i \cap B} = \emptyset$  or  $\overline{Y_i \cap B} \supseteq Y_i$  ultimately, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{Y \cap B} &= \overline{\bigcup_{i \in I} Y_i \cap B} \\ &= \overline{\bigcup_{i \in I} (Y_i \cap B)} \\ &\supseteq \bigcup_{i \in I} \overline{Y_i \cap B} \\ &\supseteq \bigcup_{i: \overline{Y_i \cap B} \supseteq Y_i} Y_i \\ &= Y, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore  $Y$  is irreducible. Hence  $Y \in \Sigma$ , and  $Y$  is an upper bound of the chain. By Zorn's Lemma  $\Sigma$  has a maximal element.

iii) From (i) it follows that the maximal irreducible subspaces of  $X$  are closed. Since  $\{x\}$  is irreducible for every  $x \in X$ ,  $X$  is covered by all of its maximal irreducible subspaces. The irreducible components of a Hausdorff space are just the singleton sets  $\{x\}$  since a subspace of a Hausdorff space is Hausdorff.

iv) Let  $Y$  be an irreducible component of  $X$ . Since  $Y$  is closed, we have  $V(\mathfrak{p}) = Y$  where  $\mathfrak{p} = r(Y)$ . For  $fg \in \mathfrak{p}$ ,  $X_{fg} \cap Y = \emptyset$ . Since  $Y$  is irreducible and  $X_{fg} \cap Y = (X_f \cap Y) \cap (X_g \cap Y)$  (Ex 17.(i)), we have  $X_f \cap Y = \emptyset$  or  $X_g \cap Y = \emptyset$ , viz.,  $f \in \mathfrak{p}$  or  $g \in \mathfrak{p}$ . This proves that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime, so that  $\mathfrak{p} \in Y$ . For any  $x \notin Y$ , consider the space  $Z = Y \cup \{x\}$ . Then  $Z$  is not irreducible and hence there exist two nonempty disjoint open subsets of  $Z$ , one of which contains  $x$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{p} \notin \overline{\{x\}}$ , so that  $\mathfrak{p}_x \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  (Ex 18.(iii)), and therefore  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a minimal prime ideal of  $A$ .

Conversely, let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a minimal prime ideal of  $A$ . First, we show that  $Y = V(\mathfrak{p})$  is an irreducible subspace. For any nonempty open subset  $B = Y \cap C$  of  $Y$  where  $C$  is open in  $X$ , since  $\overline{Y \cap C^c}$  is closed in  $Y$  and  $B$  is not empty, it is clear that  $\mathfrak{p} \notin Y \cap C^c$ . Then  $\overline{B} \supseteq \overline{\{\mathfrak{p}\}} = V(\mathfrak{p}) = Y$ . Second, we show that  $Y$  is maximal. For any  $Z \supset Y$ ,  $r(Z) \subset \mathfrak{p}$  and hence is not prime. Then there are two elements  $f, g \in A \setminus r(Z)$  such that  $fg \in r(Z)$ . We thus find two open subsets  $X_f$  and  $X_g$  such that  $X_f \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ ,  $X_g \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ , and  $(X_f \cap Z) \cap (X_g \cap Z) = X_{fg} \cap Z = \emptyset$ . This implies that  $Z$  is not irreducible, and hence  $Y$  is an irreducible component.  $\square$

**Note 1.7** The result of Ex. 20.(iv) can be divided into two parts:

**Fact 1.7.** *The subspace  $V(\mathfrak{a})$  of  $X$  is irreducible if and only if  $r(\mathfrak{a})$  is a prime ideal.*

This fact can be easily proved by considering the natural ring homomorphism  $A \rightarrow A/r(\mathfrak{a})$ , which induces a homeomorphism from  $Y = \text{Spec}(A/r(\mathfrak{a}))$  onto  $V(\mathfrak{a})$  (Ex. 21). Then,  $V(\mathfrak{a})$  is irreducible  $\Leftrightarrow Y$  is irreducible  $\Leftrightarrow$  the nilradical  $r(Y)$  is prime (Ex. 19)  $\Leftrightarrow r(Y)^c = r(Y^c) = r(V(\mathfrak{a}))$  is prime  $\Leftrightarrow r(\mathfrak{a})$  is prime.

**Fact 1.8.** *The irreducible subspace  $X'$  of  $X$  is maximal if and only if  $r(X')$  is minimal in  $X$  (with respect to inclusion).*



**21.**

*Proof.* i) It is clear that  $(f)^c = (\phi(f))$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{\phi^*(y)} = \mathfrak{p}_y^c$  for  $y \in Y$ . Then,  $y \in Y_{\phi(f)} \Leftrightarrow (f)^c \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_y \Leftrightarrow (f) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_y^c \Leftrightarrow \phi^*(y) \in X_f$ . This proves that  $\phi^{*-1}(X_f) = Y_{\phi(f)}$ , and hence  $\phi^*$  is continuous (Ex. 17).

ii)  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{a}^c) \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{a}^c \subseteq \mathfrak{p} \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}^c \Leftrightarrow \phi^*(\mathfrak{p}) = \mathfrak{p}^c \in V(\mathfrak{a})$ .

iii) It is clear that  $\mathfrak{p} \in \overline{\phi^*(V(\mathfrak{b}))} \Leftrightarrow r(V(\mathfrak{b})^\mathfrak{c}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{c}) \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ . Then it suffices to show that  $\mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  if and only if  $r(V(\mathfrak{b})^\mathfrak{c}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ , which is true because  $r(V(\mathfrak{b})^\mathfrak{c}) = r(V(\mathfrak{b}))^\mathfrak{c} = r(\mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{c}) = r(\mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{c})$ .

iv) If  $\phi$  is surjective, then  $\phi$  induces a map  $\phi' : V(\ker(\phi)) \rightarrow Y$  given by  $\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}/\ker(\phi)$ . It is clear that  $\phi'$  is the inverse of  $\phi^*$  if  $\phi^*$  is understood as a map from  $Y$  to  $V(\ker(\phi))$ . Now it remains to show that  $\phi'$  is also continuous. Equivalently, we need to prove that  $\overline{\phi^*(V(\mathfrak{b}))}$  maps closed sets to closed sets. It suffices to show that  $\overline{\phi^*(V(\mathfrak{b}))} = \phi^*(V(\mathfrak{b}))$  for all ideals  $\mathfrak{b}$  of  $B$ . It is obviously true by noting that every  $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq r(V(\mathfrak{b})^\mathfrak{c}) \supseteq \mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{c}$  has the inverse image  $\phi(\mathfrak{p}) \supseteq \mathfrak{b}$  in  $Y$ .

v)  $\phi^*(Y)$  is dense in  $X \Leftrightarrow r(Y^\mathfrak{c}) \subseteq \mathfrak{R} \Leftrightarrow r(0)^\mathfrak{c} = r(Y)^\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{R} \Leftrightarrow r(\ker(\phi)) = r(0^\mathfrak{c}) \subseteq \mathfrak{R}$ .

vi) By the properties of mapping, the map  $(\psi \circ \phi)^{-1} : 2^C \rightarrow 2^A$  satisfies  $(\psi \circ \phi)^{-1} = \phi^{-1} \circ \psi^{-1}$ . The proof is complete by noting that the inverse of a ring homomorphism respects prime ideals.

vii) All prime ideals of  $B$  are  $\mathfrak{q}_1 = 0 \times K$  and  $\mathfrak{q}_2 = (A/\mathfrak{p}) \times 0$ , where the two zero ideals are understood as ideals of  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  and  $K$ , respectively. Their images under  $\phi^*$  are  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $0$ , the only two prime ideals of  $A$ . Hence  $\phi^*$  is bijective. However,  $\phi^{*-1}$  is not continuous because  $\phi^*(V(\mathfrak{q}_2)) = \{0\}$ , which is not closed and its closure is  $\{0, \mathfrak{p}\}$ .  $\square$

## 22.

*Proof.* Let  $\pi_i$  be the canonical projection of  $A$  onto  $A_i$ . Let  $X_i = V(\ker(\pi_i))$ . It is clear that  $X_i$  is closed and is canonically homeomorphic with  $\text{Spec}(A_i)$  by the induced map  $\pi_i^*$  (Ex. 21.(iv)).

For every  $\mathfrak{p} \in X = \text{Spec}(A)$ , it is clear that  $\pi_i(\mathfrak{p})$  is either  $A_i$  or a prime ideal of  $A_i$ . Since an ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  of  $A$  can be written as  $\mathfrak{a} = \sum_{i=1}^n \iota_i(\pi_i(\mathfrak{a}))$ , where  $\iota_i$  is the canonical injection of  $A_i$  into  $A$ , we conclude that there is only one  $i$  such that  $\pi_i(\mathfrak{p}) \neq A_i$  (if, for example,  $\pi_1(\mathfrak{p})$  and  $\pi_2(\mathfrak{p})$  were prime ideals of  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , respectively, then we may choose  $x = (a_1, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$  and  $y = (1, a_2, 0, \dots, 0)$  such that  $xy \in \mathfrak{p}$  but  $x, y \notin \mathfrak{p}$ , where  $a_1 \in \pi_1(\mathfrak{p})$  and  $a_2 \in \pi_2(\mathfrak{p})$ ). Therefore  $\text{Spec}(A)$  is the disjoint union of  $X_i$ , and each  $X_i = (\bigcup_{j \neq i} X_j)^\mathfrak{c}$  is open.

i)  $\Rightarrow$  iii) If  $X$  is disconnected, then  $X = X_1 \cup X_2$  where  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are nonempty open (and closed) subsets. Let  $\mathfrak{a}_i = r(X_i)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{a}_1 \cup \mathfrak{a}_2$  is not contained in any maximal ideal of  $A$ , we have  $\mathfrak{a}_1 + \mathfrak{a}_2 = (1)$ . Then there are  $a_1 \in \mathfrak{a}_1$  and  $a_2 \in \mathfrak{a}_2$  such that  $a_1 + a_2 = 1$ . Since  $a_1 a_2 \in \mathfrak{a}_1 \mathfrak{a}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_1 \cap \mathfrak{a}_2$ , the nilradical of  $A$ , we also have  $a_1^n a_2^n = 0$  for some  $n > 0$ . Let  $e_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{2n}{i} a_1^{2n-i} a_2^i$  and  $e_2 = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \binom{2n}{i} a_1^i a_2^{2n-i}$ . It is clear that  $e_i \in \mathfrak{a}_i$ ,  $e_1 + e_2 = (a_1 + a_2)^{2n} = 1$ , and  $e_1 e_2 = 0$ , so that  $e_i$  are idempotents  $\neq 0, 1$ .

iii)  $\Rightarrow$  ii) Let  $e$  be an idempotent  $\neq 0, 1$ . Let  $\mathfrak{a}_1 = (e)$  and  $\mathfrak{a}_2 = (1 - e)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{a}_1 + \mathfrak{a}_2 = (1)$  and  $\mathfrak{a}_1 \cap \mathfrak{a}_2 = \mathfrak{a}_1 \mathfrak{a}_2 = 0$ . Thus the natural homomorphism

$A \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{a}_1 \times A/\mathfrak{a}_2$  is a ring isomorphism (Proposition 1.10), that is,  $A \cong A_1 \times A_2$  where  $A_i = A/\mathfrak{a}_i$ .

ii)  $\Rightarrow$  i) Already proved at the beginning.

Finally, it follows from (iii) and Ex. 12 that the spectrum of a local ring is connected.  $\square$

### 23.

*Proof.* i) Since  $X_f \cap X_{1-f} = X_{f(1-f)} = X_0 = \emptyset$  (Ex. 17) and  $X_f \cup X_{1-f} = V(f)^c \cup V(1-f)^c = (V(f) \cap V(1-f))^c = V((f, 1-f))^c = V((1))^c = X$  (Ex. 15),  $X_f$  is closed.

ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_{f_i} &= \bigcup_{i=1}^n V(f_i)^c \\ &= \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^n V(f_i) \right)^c \\ &= V(((f_i)_{i=1}^n))^c && \text{(Ex. 15)} \\ &= V((f))^c && \text{(Ex. 11.(iii))} \\ &= X_f. \end{aligned}$$

iii) Let  $Y$  be a subset of  $X$ , both open and closed. Since  $Y$  is open, we have  $Y = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_{f_i}$  for some collection  $(f_i)_{i \in I}$  of elements in  $A$ , so that  $X = Y^c \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} X_{f_i}$ . Since  $X$  is quasi-compact (Ex. 17.(v)),  $X = Y^c \cup \bigcup_{i \in I'} X_{f_i}$  where  $I'$  is finite, so that  $Y = \bigcup_{i \in I'} X_{f_i}$ . By (ii),  $Y = X_f$  for some  $f \in A$ .

iv) Given any distinct  $x, y \in X$ , we may assume that  $\mathfrak{p}_y \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}_x$  and we choose an element  $f \in \mathfrak{p}_y \setminus \mathfrak{p}_x$ . Then  $x \in X_f$  and  $y \in V(f) = X_f^c$ , and both  $X_f$  and  $X_f^c$  are open. Therefore  $X$  is a compact Hausdorff space (Ex. 17.(v)).  $\square$

### 24.

*Proof.* By the properties of a Boolean lattice, it is easy to verify that

$$(a')' = a, \quad (a \vee b)' = a' \wedge b', \quad (a \wedge b)' = a' \vee b'.$$

i) First, it is easy to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} a + b &= b + a, & a + 0 &= a, & a + 1 &= a', & 2a &= 0, \\ ab &= ba, & a0 &= 0, & a1 &= a, & a^2 &= a. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we show that the addition and multiplication are associative. It is clear that the multiplication is associative. As for the addition, we note that

$$(a + b)' = (ab) \vee (a'b')$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} (a + b) + c &= (((ab') \vee (a'b))c') \vee (((ab) \vee (a'b'))c) \\ &= ((ab'c') \vee (a'bc')) \vee ((abc) \vee (a'b'c)) \\ &= (ab'c') \vee (a'bc') \vee (abc) \vee (a'b'c), \end{aligned}$$

which is invariant under any permutation of  $a, b, c$ . Hence the addition is associative.

Finally, we show that the multiplication is distributive over the addition.

$$\begin{aligned} (a + b)c &= ((ab') \vee (a'b))c \\ &= (ab'c) \vee (a'bc) \\ &= (acb' \vee acc') \vee (a'bc \vee c'bc) \\ &= (ac(bc)') \vee ((ac)'bc) \\ &= ac + bc. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $A(L)$  is a Boolean ring.

ii) We define the operations of the lattice, say  $L(A)$ , by

$$\begin{aligned} a \vee b &:= a + b + ab, \\ a \wedge b &:= ab, \\ a' &:= 1 - a. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that

$$a \vee b = b \vee a, \quad a \wedge b = b \wedge a.$$

Since  $a(a \vee b) = a^2 + ab + a^2b = a$  and  $a(a \wedge b) = a^2b = ab = a \wedge b$ ,  $a \vee b$  and  $a \wedge b$  are an upper bound and a lower bound of  $a, b$ , respectively. For any  $c, d$  such that  $c \leq a, b \leq d$ , we have

$$c(a \wedge b) = abc = ac = c, \quad d(a \vee b) = ad + bd + abd = a + b + ab = a \vee b,$$

which implies that  $a \vee b$  and  $a \wedge b$  are the least upper bound and the greatest lower bound, respectively.

So far, we have shown that  $L(A)$  is a lattice. Now let us show that  $L(A)$  is a Boolean lattice.



First, since  $0 = 0a$  and  $a = a1$  for all  $a \in A$ ,  $0$  and  $1$  are just the least and greatest element of  $L(A)$ .

Second, we show that  $\vee$  and  $\wedge$  are distributive over each other. We have

$$\begin{aligned}(a \vee b) \wedge c &= (a + b + ab)c \\ &= ac + bc + abc \\ &= ac + bc + acbc \\ &= (a \wedge c) \vee (b \wedge c)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}(a \vee c) \wedge (b \vee c) &= (a + c + ac)(b + c + bc) \\ &= (ab + ac + abc) + (bc + c + bc) + (abc + ac + abc) \\ &= ab + c + abc \\ &= (a \wedge b) \vee c.\end{aligned}$$

Third, it is easy to see that

$$a \vee a' = a + a' + a \wedge a' = 1$$

and

$$a \wedge a' = a(1 - a) = a - a^2 = 0.$$

The uniqueness of  $a'$  is ensured by the defining properties of the complement. If  $b, c$  are two complements of  $a$ , then it is easy to show that  $b = b \wedge c = c$ .

By the efforts above, we proved that  $L(A)$  is a Boolean lattice.  $\square$

## 25.

*Proof.* Let  $L$  be a Boolean lattice. By Ex. 24, we obtain a Boolean ring, also denoted  $L$ . Let  $X = \text{Spec}(L)$ . It follows from Ex. 23.(iv) that  $X$  is a compact Hausdorff space. Let  $L'$  be the set of all open-and-closed subsets of  $X$ . By Ex. 23.(iii), the elements of  $L'$  are just the sets  $X_f$ .

Under the ordinary set-inclusion order,  $X$  forms a Boolean lattice. Because the sup and inf operations induced by finite unions and intersections of  $X_f$ , as well as the complement operation induced by  $X_f^c$ , all yield elements in  $L'$ ,  $L'$  is a sub-lattice of  $X$ , and in fact, it is also a Boolean lattice.

Consider a map  $f : L \rightarrow L'$  given by  $a \mapsto X_a$ . It is clear that  $f$  is surjective. Let us show that  $f$  is injective. If  $f(a) = f(b)$ , then  $X_a = X_b$ , so that  $r((a)) = r((b)) = (b)$ , hence  $a = cb$  and  $b = da$ , and therefore  $a = cb = cb^2 = ab = ada = da = b$ . Finally, we show that  $f$  preserves the order. If  $a \leq b$ , then  $a = ab$ , so that  $X_a = X_{ab} = X_a \cap X_b$ , and hence  $X_a \subseteq X_b$ . Therefore  $L$  is isomorphic to  $L'$ .  $\square$

## 26.

*Proof.* Since the exercise has already provided the proofs of (i) and (ii), we only prove (iii).

iii) Since  $\mu : X \rightarrow \tilde{X}$  is injective and surjective, there is a one-to-one correspondence between  $x \in X$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_x \in \tilde{X}$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{m}_x \in \mu(U_f) \Leftrightarrow x \in U_f \Leftrightarrow f(x) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow f \notin \mathfrak{m}_x \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{m}_x \in \tilde{U}_f$ .

Since  $f \in C(X)$ ,  $U_f = f^{-1}(\{0\}^c)$  is open. For any  $x \in X$ , we have  $x \in U_1$ . For any  $x \in U_f \cap U_g$ , we have  $x \in U_{fg}$  since  $U_f \cap U_g = U_{fg}$ . Hence the sets  $U_f$  form a basis of the topology of  $X$ .

Since  $\tilde{U}_f = X_f \cap \tilde{X}$  where  $X_f := \text{Spec}(C(X)) \setminus V(f)$  (see Ex. 17),  $\tilde{U}_f$  is open in  $\tilde{X}$  with the induced topology. For any  $\mathfrak{m}_x \in \tilde{X}$ ,  $\mathfrak{m}_x \in \tilde{U}_1$ . For any  $\mathfrak{m}_x \in \tilde{U}_f \cap \tilde{U}_g$ , we have  $\mathfrak{m}_x \in \tilde{U}_{fg}$  since  $\tilde{U}_f \cap \tilde{U}_g = (X_f \cap \tilde{X}) \cap (X_g \cap \tilde{X}) = X_{fg} \cap \tilde{X}$  (Ex. 17.(i)). Hence the sets  $\tilde{U}_f$  form a basis of the topology of  $\tilde{X}$ .

Therefore  $\mu$  is a homeomorphism.  $\square$

## 27.

*Proof.* The exercise has already proved all the statements except the statement that  $\mu$  is surjective.

Just as the exercise mentioned, this is one form of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz, so we will not provide the whole proof, and instead, we will give a short proof by utilizing the result of Ex. 7.14.

Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be a maximal ideal of  $P(X)$ . Let  $\phi$  be the natural mapping from  $k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$  to  $P(X)$ . Under the induced map  $\phi^*$  (see Ex. 21),  $\text{Spec}(P(X))$  is homeomorphic to  $V(I(X))$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}^c = \phi^*(\mathfrak{m}) \in V(I(X))$ .

Let  $V'(S)$  denote the set of common zeros (in the corresponding domain) of all polynomials in  $S$ , viz., an (affine algebraic) variety. Since  $X$  is a variety, we assume that  $X = V'(S)$  for some  $S \subseteq k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ . It is clear that  $V'(\mathfrak{m}^c) \subseteq V'(I(X)) \subseteq V'(S) = X$  and hence  $V'(\mathfrak{m}) = V'(\mathfrak{m}^c)$ . Since  $I(V'(\mathfrak{m}^c)) = r(\mathfrak{m}^c) = \mathfrak{m}^c \neq k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ ,  $V'(\mathfrak{m}^c)$  must be nonempty (Ex. 7.14). Let  $x$  be a point of  $V'(\mathfrak{m})$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_x$ , and hence  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_x$ .  $\square$

**Note 1.8** Now that every point of  $X$  can be identified with a maximal ideal of  $P(X)$ , it may be helpful to imagine a variety  $X$  being the “crown of a subtree”. More exactly,  $X$  can be identified with  $V(I(X)) \cap \text{Max}(P(X))$ , a closed subset in the subspace  $\text{Max}(P(X))$  of  $\text{Spec}(P(X))$ .  $\color{blue}{\blacktriangleleft}$

## 28.

*Proof.* Let  $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^n$  and  $(\zeta_j)_{j=1}^m$  be the coordinate functions of  $P(X)$  and  $P(Y)$ , respectively. Then formally (and intuitively), we can denote  $P(X)$  and  $P(Y)$  by  $k[\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n]$  and  $k[\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_n]$ , respectively.

Every regular  $\phi : X \rightarrow Y$  induces a map  $\phi^* : P(Y) \rightarrow P(X)$  given by  $\eta \rightarrow \eta \circ \phi$ . Since  $\phi$  is regular, that is,  $\phi = (f_j|_X)_{j=1}^m$  where  $f_j \in k[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ , we have

$$\phi^*(\zeta_j) = f_j|_X = f_j(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in P(X).$$

It is then easy to verify that  $\phi^*$  is well defined and is a  $k$ -algebra homomorphism.

The map  $\phi \mapsto \phi^*$  thus define a correspondence between regular mappings and  $k$ -algebra homomorphisms. We will show that it is one-to-one and onto.

If  $\phi = (f_j)_{j=1}^m \neq \psi = (g_j)_{j=1}^m$  over  $X$ , then there is at least one  $j$  such that

$$f_j(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \neq g_j(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n),$$

so that  $\phi^*(\zeta_j) \neq \psi^*(\zeta_j)$ , hence  $\phi^* \neq \psi^*$ .

On the other hand, given a  $k$ -algebra homomorphism  $\phi^*$ , we define

$$\phi := (\phi^*(\zeta_j))_{j=1}^m.$$

It is easy to see that  $\phi^*(\eta) = \eta(\phi^*(\zeta_1), \dots, \phi^*(\zeta_m)) = \eta \circ \phi$  for  $\eta \in P(Y)$ . In particular,  $0 \circ \phi = 0$ , that is,  $g(\phi(x)) = 0$  for all  $g \in I(Y)$  and  $x \in X$ . This shows that  $\phi$  is a map of  $X$  into  $Y$  and hence that  $\phi$  is regular. The proof is complete.  $\square$



---

## Bibliography

---

- M. F. Atiyah and I. G. MacDonald. *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Massachusetts, 1969. v
- D. Cox, J. Little, and D. O'Shea. *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, New York, third edition, 2007. 5
- T. W. Hungerford. *Algebra*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974. 2