

# Commutative Algebra – Lecture 10: Algebras and Affine Fields (Oct. 11, 2013)

NAVID ALAEI

December 9, 2013

## 1 Theorem A, Artin-Tate Lemma, and Integral Extensions

Recall that last time we stated Theorem A concerning characterization of affine domains.

**Theorem 1.1** (Main Theorem A). *An affine algebra  $R = F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  is a field if and only if  $R$  is algebraic over  $F$ .*

To this end, we stated, and proved, two main lemmas to help with the proof of Theorem (1.1);

**Lemma 1.** *Suppose  $R$  is an  $F$ -algebra and  $a \in R$ . If the field of fractions  $K$  of  $F[a]$  is affine over  $F$ , then  $a$  is algebraic over  $F$ , and thus  $K = F[a]$ .*

**Lemma 2.** *Suppose  $R$  is an algebra over a commutative ring  $K$ , which as a  $K$ -module is free with base  $B = \{b_j : j \in J\}$  for some index set  $J$ . If  $H$  is a subring of  $K$  over which  $B$  spans  $R$ , then  $H = K$ .*

In order to prove theorem (1.1), we need one last lemma.

**Lemma 3** (Artin-Tate). *Suppose  $R = F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  is an affine  $F$ -algebra, and  $K$  a subfield of  $R$ , with  $R$  a finite dimensional vector space over  $K$ . Then  $K$  is affine over  $F$ .*

*NOTE: Before we prove the Artin-Tate lemma, recall that we have already established that if  $R = F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  is algebraic over  $F$ , then  $R$  is a field. So Artin-Tate lemma will facilitate the proof of the forward direction. We proceed by induction on  $n$ . When  $n = 1$ , we know from field theory that  $F[a_1]$  is a field if and only if  $a_1$  is algebraic over  $F$  (see Remark 4.7 in [1] for more details). Now suppose that the result is valid for all positive integers up to and including  $n - 1$ . Suppose  $R = F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  is a field. Let  $K$  denote the field of fractions of  $F[a_1]$  (inside  $R$ ). Then we may write  $R = K[a_2, \dots, a_n]$ , which by our induction hypothesis is algebraic over  $K$ , and thus finite dimensional as a  $K$ -vector space. Hence, it is sufficient to show that  $K$  is algebraic over  $F$ . By Lemma (1), this boils down to showing that  $K$  is affine over  $F$ . This is precisely what the Artin-Tate lemma allows us to conclude.*

*Proof.* Since  $R$  is finite dimensional as a  $K$ -vector space, there exists  $b_1, \dots, b_m \in R$  such that  $\{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$  forms a basis for  $R$  over  $K$ . By definition of a basis, we may find  $\alpha_{ijk}, \beta_{uk} \in K$  such that

$$b_i b_j = \sum_{k=1}^m \alpha_{ijk} b_k, \quad a_u = \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_{uk} b_k, \quad (1)$$

for each  $1 \leq i, j \leq m$  and  $1 \leq u \leq n$ . Now consider

$$H = F[\alpha_{ijk}, \beta_{uk} : 1 \leq i, j \leq m, 1 \leq u \leq n] \subseteq K.$$

Set  $R_0 := Hb_1 + \dots + Hb_m$ , and observe that (1) implies that  $R_0$  is indeed closed under multiplication, and therefore is a subalgebra of  $R$  containing  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ . As  $R_0 \subseteq R$  and contains the generators of  $R$  we must have  $R_0 = R$ . Applying Lemma (2) finishes the proof.  $\square$

**REMARK:** Note that the assumption that  $R = F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  is a domain is crucial in Theorem A. For instance, let  $F$  be a field and consider  $F \times F = F[(0, 1), (1, 0)]$ . Then this is an affine algebra generated by algebraic elements  $(1, 0), (0, 1)$ , but is not a field, since  $(1, 0) \cdot (1, 0) = (0, 0)$ .

We now introduce the notion of *integrality*, and then use it to give an alternate proof of Theorem A. Before we do, recall that an element  $x$  of an arbitrary  $C$ -algebra  $R$  is called **algebraic** over  $C$  if  $x$  is a root of a polynomial  $f(\lambda) \in C[\lambda]$ .

**Definition 1.2** (Integral Extension). Suppose  $R$  is a  $C$ -algebra. We say that  $r \in R$  is **integral** over  $C$  if  $f(r) = 0$  for some **monic**  $f(\lambda) \in C[\lambda]$ . We also say that  $R$  is an **integral extension** of  $C$  if every element in  $R$  is integral over  $C$ . If this is the case, then  $R$  is said to be **integral over  $C$** .

**REMARK:** Observe that *begin integral implies algebraic and these notions coincide when  $C$  is a field*. The converse, however, is not true. For instance,  $\sqrt{2}/2$  is algebraic over  $\mathbb{Z}$  but is not integral. Indeed, let  $f(\lambda) = 2\lambda^2 - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$ , and note  $f(\sqrt{2}/2) = 0$  so that the minimal polynomial,  $m(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[\lambda]$ , for  $\sqrt{2}/2$  must have degree at most 2. But  $m(\lambda)$  is clearly not of degree one, and thus must equal  $f(\lambda)$ . As  $f(\lambda)$  is not monic,  $\sqrt{2}/2$  is not integral over  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

It is important to note that integrality is, in fact, the right notion which generalizes the notion of algebraicity to extensions of arbitrary commutative rings.

**Lemma 4.** Suppose  $R$  is a  $C$ -algebra and  $r \in R$  is algebraic over  $C$ ; i.e.,  $\sum_{j=0}^n c_j r^j = 0$  for some  $c_0, \dots, c_n \in C$ , and  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $c_n r$  is integral over  $C$ .

*Proof.* Consider the monic polynomial  $\lambda^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_n^{n-1-j} c_j \lambda^j \in C[\lambda]$ . Evaluating at  $c_n r$

gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(c_n r)^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_n^{n-1-j} c_j (c_n r)^j &= (c_n r)^n + c_n^{n-1} c_0 + c_n^{n-1} c_1 r + \cdots + c_{n-1} (c_n r)^{n-1} \\
&= c_n^n r^n + c_n^{n-1} (c_0 + c_1 r + \cdots + c_{n-1} r^{n-1}) \\
&= c_n^{n-1} (c_n r^n + c_0 + c_1 r + \cdots + c_{n-1} r^{n-1}) \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the assumption that  $r$  is algebraic.  $\square$

**Theorem 1.3.** *Suppose  $R$  is a  $C$ -algebra and  $r \in R$  is given. Then the following are equivalent.*

1.  $r$  is integral over  $C$ .
2.  $C[r]$  is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module.
3. There is a faithful  $C[r]$ -module  $M$  which is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module.

*Proof.* To begin, observe that (2) immediately implies (3). To show that (1) implies (2), note that if  $r$  is integral over  $C$ , then there exists  $n \geq 1$ , and suitable elements  $c_0, \dots, c_{n-1} \in C$  such that  $r^n = -(c_0 + c_1 r + \cdots + c_{n-1} r^{n-1})$ . But then it's evident that  $C[r] = C + Cr + \cdots + Cr^{n-1}$ . Lastly, it remains to show that (3) implies (1). To ease the notation, let  $M = Cr_1 + Cr_2 + \cdots + Cr_k$ , for some  $r_1, \dots, r_k \in R$ . Fix  $r \in M$  and note  $xr_j \in M$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq k$ . Hence, there exists elements  $c_{ij} \in C$  such that

$$rr_i = \sum_{j=0}^k c_{ij} r_j, \quad (2)$$

holds for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Let  $A$  be the  $k \times k$  matrix whose  $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$  entry is given by  $c_{ij}$ , and let  $\mathbf{v} = [r_1, \dots, r_k]^T$ , where  $T$  denotes the transpose operator. By (2), we obtain

$$(x\mathbf{I}_k - A)\mathbf{v} \begin{bmatrix} r - c_{11} & -c_{12} & \cdots & -c_{1k} \\ -c_{21} & r - c_{22} & \cdots & -c_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -c_{rk1} & -c_{rk2} & \cdots & r - c_{kk} \end{bmatrix} \cdot \begin{bmatrix} r_1 \\ r_2 \\ \vdots \\ r_r \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{0},$$

where  $\mathbf{I}_k$  denotes the  $k \times k$  identity matrix. This means

$$(\det A)\mathbf{v} = (\text{adj } A)(A\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (3)$$

In particular, the left hand side of (3) immediately gives  $(\det A)r_j = 0$  for each  $j = 1, \dots, k$ . But then

$$(\det A)M = (\det A) \sum_{j=1}^k Cr_j = 0. \quad (4)$$

Since  $M$  is faithful, its annihilator is trivial and so (4) implies  $\det A = 0$ . Noting that  $\det A$  is a monic polynomial in  $r$ , we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

Theorem (1.3) has many striking implications.

**Corollary.** *If  $R$  is  $C$ -algebra which is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module, then  $R$  is an integral extension of  $C$ .*

*Proof.* Given  $r \in R$ , note  $C[r] \subseteq R$  and one may view  $R$  (naturally) as a  $C[r]$ -module. Now apply Theorem (1.3).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose  $C \subseteq L \subseteq R$  are rings with  $C$  and  $L$  commutative. Then*

1. *If  $L$  is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module and  $R$  is finitely generated as an  $L$ -module, then  $R$  is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module.*
2. *If  $r \in R$ , and if  $L$  and  $C[r]$  are both finitely generated as a  $C$ -module, then  $L[r]$  is also finitely generated as a  $C$ -module.*

*Proof.* For (1), note we may pick  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n \in L$  and  $r_1, \dots, r_m \in R$  such that  $L = C\ell_1 + \dots + C\ell_n$  and  $R = Lr_1 + \dots + Lr_m$ . We claim that  $R = C\ell_1r_1 + \dots + C\ell_nr_m$ . Indeed, note  $x \in R$  if and only if there exist  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m \in L$  such that  $x = \sum_{i=1}^m \beta_i r_i$ . Similarly  $\beta_i \in L$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ) if and only if there are  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in C$  such that  $\beta_i = \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{ik} \ell_k$ . Hence, we may write

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{ik} \ell_k \right) r_i = \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_{ik} \ell_k r_i \right),$$

as desired. For part (2), note

$$C[r] := \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^n c_j r^j : c_j \in C, n \geq 0 \right\}, \quad L[r] := \left\{ \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j r^j : \alpha_j \in L, n \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Now we know we can write  $L = C\ell_1 + \dots + C\ell_k$  and  $C[r] = Cd_1, \dots, Cd_m$  for some  $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_k \in L$  and  $d_1, \dots, d_m \in C[r]$ . This means that every power of  $r$  is spanned by some subset of  $\{d_1, \dots, d_m\}$ . Consequently, one may write  $L[r] = Ld_1 + \dots + Ld_m$ ; i.e.,  $L[r]$  is finitely generated as an  $L$ -module and  $L$  is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module. Applying part (1) gives the desired result.  $\square$

**Corollary.** *If  $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$  are integral over  $C$ , then  $C[r_1, \dots, r_n]$  is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module, and thus is an integral extension of  $C$ .*

*Proof.* This follows trivially by induction on  $n$  in view of Lemma (5) and the corollary preceding it.  $\square$

Recall from field theory that if  $F \supseteq M \supseteq L$  is a tower of field extensions such that  $F$  is algebraic over  $L$ , then  $F$  is algebraic over  $M$  and  $M$  is algebraic over  $L$ . Similarly, an analogous result holds for integral extensions.

**Proposition** (Transitivity of Integral Extensions). *If  $R$  is integral over  $W$  and  $W$  is integral over  $C$ , then  $R$  is integral over  $C$ .*

*Proof.* Fix  $r \in R$  and note there exists monic  $f(\lambda) = \lambda^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} w_j r^j \in W[\lambda]$  with  $f(r) = 0$ . Consider  $W_0 = [w_0, \dots, w_{n-1}]$  and note the generators of  $W_0$  are integral over  $C$  by our original assumption, and thus the  $W_0$  is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module, by our second corollary. Hence,  $r$  is integral over  $W_0$  from which it follows, by part (1) of (5), that  $C[w_0, \dots, w_{n-1}, r]$  is finitely generated as a  $C$ -module. The result is now trivial.  $\square$

In order to give an alternate proof of Theorem A, we require three last results. We shall present the first one here and leave the other two for next class.

**Theorem 1.4** (Special Case of Noether Normalization). *Suppose an affine algebra  $R = F[a_1, \dots, a_n]$  is algebraic over  $F[a_1]$ . Then there exists a suitable choice of  $b \in R$  such that  $R = F[b, a_2, \dots, a_n]$  and  $R$  is integral over  $F[b]$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $n$ . When  $n = 1$ , the result is trivial since we may take  $b = a_1$ . Now suppose  $n = 2$ . We must show that if  $R = F[a_1, a_2]$  is affine and algebraic over  $F[a_1]$ , then there exists a  $d \in R$  for which  $R = F[d, a_2]$  and  $R$  is integral over  $F[d]$ . Equivalently, we wish to show that there exists  $d \in R$  with  $a_2$  is integral over  $F[d]$ . To begin, note that since  $R$  is algebraic over  $F[a_1]$ , there exists polynomials  $g_j(\lambda_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{m_j} \alpha_{kj} \lambda_1^k \in F[\lambda_1]$ , for each  $0 \leq j \leq n$  and with  $\alpha_{m_j j} \neq 0$ , such that

$$\sum_{j=0}^n g_j(a_1) a_2^j = 0. \quad (5)$$

Setting

$$f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \sum_{j=0}^n g_j(\lambda_1) \lambda_2^j = \sum_{j=0}^n \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_j} \alpha_{ij} \lambda_1^i \right) \lambda_2^j \in F[\lambda_1, \lambda_2],$$

we see that (5) is equivalent to  $f(a_1, a_2) = 0$ . In order to ensure that  $a_2$  is also integral over  $F[a_1]$ , we must have that  $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  is monic in  $\lambda_2$ . Define

$$h(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) := f(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2^{n+1}, \lambda_2), \quad \text{and} \quad d = a_1 - a_2^{n+1}.$$

Note  $h(d, a_2) = f(a_1, a_2) = 0$ . Now consider the expression for  $h = f(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2^{n+1}, \lambda_2)$ ; namely

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \left( \sum_{i=0}^{m_j} \alpha_{ij} (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2^{n+1})^i \right) \lambda_2^j. \quad (6)$$

It is evident that the highest order term of  $h$  in  $\lambda_2$  is obtained by choosing the largest  $j$  for which  $m_j$  is greatest; i.e., if we let  $j'$  denote the the largest  $j$  with respect to having the largest value  $m_j$ , then the leading coefficient of  $h$  in  $\lambda_2$  is given by

$$\alpha_{m_j j'} \lambda_2^{(n+1)m_j + j'}.$$

By construction, the value  $(n+1)m_{j'} + j'$  is unique so that the leading term in  $\lambda_2$  cannot vanish by cancellation through another term. Lastly, since we are working over a field  $F$ , all coefficients are invertible; it is no loss generality to assume  $h$  is monic. Since  $h(d, a_2) = 0$ , this shows that  $a_2$  is integral over  $F[d]$ . But note this forces  $a_1 = d + a_2^{n+1}$  to be integral over  $F[d]$ . Combining these observations, we conclude that  $R$  is integral over  $F[d]$ . This verifies the case for  $n = 2$ . WE WILL FINISH OFF THE INDUCTION NEXT TIME!  $\square$

## References

- [1] L.H. Rowen, *Graduate Algebra: Commutative View*, American Mathematical Society, 2006.