

Sheet 5

1. (1) Consider the sequences

$$M' \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} M'' \rightarrow 0 \quad (\star)$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M'', N) \xrightarrow{g_*} \text{Hom}_R(M, N) \xrightarrow{f_*} \text{Hom}_R(M', N). \quad (\star\star)$$

Now assume that (\star) is exact.

Let $\varphi \in \ker(g_*)$, i.e. $\varphi \circ g = 0$. As g is surjective, we get $\varphi = 0$. So g_* is injective.

Let $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_R(M'', N)$. Then $(f_*(g_*(\varphi))) = \varphi \circ g \circ f = 0$, since $\text{im}(f) = \ker(g)$. So we get $\text{im}(g_*) \subseteq \ker(f_*)$.

Let $\varphi \in \ker(f_*)$, i.e. $\varphi \circ f = 0$. This means $\ker(g) = \text{im}(f) \subseteq \ker(\varphi)$. As g is surjective we have $M'' \cong M/\ker(g)$. Thus we can define $\psi : M'' \cong M/\ker(g) \rightarrow N$ by $\psi(m + \ker(g)) := \varphi(m)$. This is well-defined because of $\ker(g) \subseteq \ker(\varphi)$. We clearly have $\varphi = \psi \circ g$, so $\ker(f_*) \subseteq \text{im}(g_*)$.

Now assume that $(\star\star)$ is exact.

Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \text{Hom}_R(M'', N)$ for any choice of N . Then the injectivity of g_* says

$$\varphi_1 \circ g = \varphi_2 \circ g \Rightarrow \varphi_1 = \varphi_2.$$

But this just means that g is right-cancellative, hence surjective.

Choose $N = M''$ and $id \in \text{Hom}_R(M'', M'')$. As $\ker(f_*) = \text{im}(g_*)$ we deduce $0 = f_*(g_*(id)) = g \circ f$, thus $\text{im}(f) \subseteq \ker(g)$.

Choose $N = M/\text{im}(f)$ and $\pi \in \text{Hom}_R(M, M/\text{im}(f))$ the canonical projection. Then $\pi \circ f = 0$, so $\pi \in \ker(f_*) = \text{im}(g_*)$. So we find $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_R(M'', M/\text{im}(f))$ with $\pi = \varphi \circ g$. Now let $m \in \ker(g)$. We get $0 = \varphi(0) = \varphi(g(m)) = \pi(m)$. So $m \in \ker(\pi) = \text{im}(f)$.

- (2) In general, when $M' \subseteq M$, the induced map $\text{Hom}_R(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(M', N)$ is just the restriction $\varphi \mapsto \varphi|_{M'}$.

Choose $R = M = N = \mathbb{Z}$ and $M' = 2\mathbb{Z}$. Then $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(2\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z})$ is not surjective, since the \mathbb{Z} -linear map

$$2\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad 2 \mapsto 1$$

is not induced by a \mathbb{Z} -linear map $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

2. To prove (1) and (2), we show the following general result:

Let R be a ring and $I, J \subseteq R$ be ideals. Then $R/I \otimes_R R/J \cong R/(I+J)$.

Proof: We have the bilinear map

$$R/I \times R/J \rightarrow R/(I+J), \quad (\bar{r}, \bar{s}) \mapsto \overline{rs}.$$

(Check that it is well-defined!)

The universal property of the tensor product gives an R -linear map

$$\phi : R/I \otimes_R R/J \rightarrow R/(I+J), \quad \bar{r} \otimes \bar{s} \mapsto \overline{rs}.$$

Now we make the following observation. Let $\sum \bar{r}_i \otimes \bar{s}_i \in R/I \otimes_R R/J$ be arbitrary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \bar{r}_i \otimes \bar{s}_i &= \sum r_i \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{s}_i) \\ &= \sum (r_i s_i \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{1})) \\ &= (\sum r_i s_i) \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{1}) \end{aligned}$$

So every element of $R/I \otimes_R R/J$ is of the form $r \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{1})$ for some $r \in R$. Thus the above map is given by $\phi(r \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{1})) = \bar{r}$. It is obviously surjective. To see that it is injective, too, use that for all $i \in I, j \in J$ we have

$$(i+j) \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{1}) = i \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{1}) + j \cdot (\bar{1} \otimes \bar{1}) = \bar{i} \otimes \bar{1} + \bar{1} \otimes \bar{j} = \bar{0} \otimes \bar{1} + \bar{1} \otimes \bar{0} = 0.$$

Alternatively, we can apply exercise 3. and get

$$\begin{aligned} R/I \otimes_R R/J &\stackrel{3.}{=} (R/I)/(J(R/I)) \\ &= (R/I)/(J/(I \cap J)) \\ &= (R/I)/(I+J/I) \\ &= R/(I+J). \end{aligned}$$

(2) Applying the above result we get $(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/\gcd(m,n)\mathbb{Z}$.

(1) Follows from (2).

(3) We had this in the lecture for free modules of rank m and n over arbitrary rings R . Apply for $R = k$.

3. We have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow R \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow 0.$$

Tensoring with M yields the exact sequence

$$I \otimes_R M \rightarrow M \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R M \rightarrow 0.$$

We have $I \otimes_R M \cong IM$ and $R/I \otimes_R M \cong M/\ker(M \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R M)$. Furthermore $\ker(M \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R M) = \text{im}(I \otimes_R M \rightarrow M) = IM$.

Alternatively, we can consider the bilinear map

$$R/I \times M \rightarrow M/IM, \quad (\bar{r}, m) \mapsto \overline{rm}.$$

We get an R -linear map

$$\phi : R/I \otimes_R M \rightarrow M/IM, \quad \bar{r} \otimes m \mapsto \overline{rm}.$$

Now let $\sum \bar{r}_i \otimes m_i \in R/I \otimes_R M$ be arbitrary. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \bar{r}_i \otimes m_i &= \sum r_i (\bar{1} \otimes m_i) \\ &= \sum (\bar{1} \otimes (r_i m_i)) \\ &= \bar{1} \otimes \left(\sum r_i m_i \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus every element of $R/I \otimes_R M$ is of the form $\bar{1} \otimes m$ for some $m \in M$. Now we can again easily show that ϕ is bijective.

4. Just follow the hint. To show the implication

$$M \otimes_R N = 0 \Rightarrow M_k \otimes_k N_k = 0$$

it is helpful to use the following cancellation law:

Let R be a ring, M an R -module, A an R -algebra and N an A -module. Then

$$(M \otimes_R A) \otimes_A N \cong M \otimes_R N,$$

as A -modules.

Proof: Consider the (A -)bilinear map

$$(M \otimes_R A) \times N \rightarrow M \otimes_R N, \quad ((m \otimes a), n) \mapsto m \otimes (an).$$

It induces the A -linear map

$$\phi : (M \otimes_R A) \otimes_A N \rightarrow M \otimes_R N, \quad (m \otimes a) \otimes n \mapsto m \otimes (an).$$

Next consider the (R -)bilinear map

$$M \times N \rightarrow (M \otimes_R A) \otimes_A N, \quad (m, n) \mapsto (m \otimes 1) \otimes n.$$

It induces the R -linear map

$$\psi : M \otimes_R N \rightarrow (M \otimes_R A) \otimes_A N, \quad m \otimes n \mapsto (m \otimes 1) \otimes n.$$

ψ is obviously A -linear. Now it is easy to see that ϕ and ψ are inverse to each other.