An Example Of A Finitely Generated Module Over An Integral Domain r Which Is Not A Direct Sum Of Cyclic

An Example Of A Finitely Generated Module Over An Integral Domain r Which Is Not A Direct Sum Of Cyclic

Understanding the structure of modules over rings, particularly over integral domains, is a cornerstone of algebraic theory. While many modules exhibit decompositions into simpler components—such as cyclic modules—there are intriguing instances where such decompositions are impossible. This article explores a concrete example of a finitely generated module over an integral domain r that cannot be expressed as a direct sum of cyclic modules. This example not only illustrates the nuanced nature of module theory but also provides insight into the limitations of the structure theorem in non-Noetherian or more complex settings.

Background: Modules Over Integral Domains

Before delving into the specific example, it is essential to understand key concepts related to modules over integral domains.

Integral Domains and Their Significance

An integral domain r is a commutative ring with unity $1 \neq 0$ such that the multiplication operation has no zero divisors. Classic examples include:

- The ring of integers $\mathbb{Z}$
- Polynomial rings over a field $k[x]$
- The ring of integers in a number field

Integral domains serve as foundational objects in algebra because they generalize the properties of integers, enabling the extension of number-theoretic concepts to more abstract algebraic structures.

Modules Over Rings and Cyclic Modules

A module M over a ring r can be viewed as an algebraic generalization of vector spaces, where scalars come from r rather than a field. An important class of modules are cyclic modules, which are generated by a single element:

$$
M = r \cdot m
$$

for some $m \in M$.

The structure theorem for finitely generated modules over principal ideal domains (PIDs) states that every finitely generated module over a PID decomposes uniquely into a direct sum of cyclic modules, often expressed as a combination of free and torsion parts. However, this theorem does not generally hold over rings that are not PIDs, especially in the absence of additional properties such as being Noetherian or having certain finiteness conditions.

Motivation and Theoretical Context

The classical structure theorem highlights that over PIDs, finitely generated modules are entirely decomposable into cyclic modules. Yet, over more general integral domains, such as Dedekind domains or non-Noetherian rings, modules may behave more intricately.

Key Point: Not all finitely generated modules over an integral domain can be expressed as a direct sum of cyclic modules. Constructing explicit examples of such modules is fundamental to understanding their structure and limitations.

The Core Example: A Finitely Generated Module Not Decomposable into Cyclics

We now present an explicit example illustrating a finitely generated module over an integral domain r which is not a direct sum of cyclic modules.

The Setting: The Ring r and the Module M

Let r be an integral domain that is not a principal ideal domain. For concrete illustration, consider:

$$
r = \mathbb{Z}[x]
$$

the polynomial ring over integers, which is an integral domain but not a PID.

Define the module:

$$
M = r / (f)
$$

where $f \in r$ is a non-zero, non-unit polynomial. Since r is a Noetherian ring (as a polynomial ring over a Noetherian ring), M is finitely generated over r.

However, to ensure that M cannot be decomposed into a direct sum of cyclic modules, we need to select a module with more complex structure, such as a submodule that is not projective or free, and which resists such decomposition.

Constructing the Example: The Module $M = r / (f)$ with a Non-Principal Ideal

Suppose $r = \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$, the polynomial ring in two variables over the integers. This ring is:

- An integral domain
- Not a PID, as it contains ideals that are not principal

Choose a non-principal ideal $I \subset r$:

$$
I = (x, y)
$$

which is maximal in certain localizations but not principal in the global ring.

Define the module:

$$
M = r / I
$$

This module is finitely generated (by the class of 1, i.e., the residue class of 1 in r / I).

Key properties:

- M is generated by a single element $\overline{1}$
- M has torsion elements because I is the annihilator of $\overline{1}$

Why M Is Not a Direct Sum of Cyclic Modules

The essential insight lies in the nature of the ideal $I = (x, y)$:

- It is not principal; thus, r / I cannot be expressed simply as a cyclic module.
- Attempting to decompose M into a direct sum of cyclic modules would require expressing the relations defined by (x, y) as a sum of cyclic modules, which is impossible because:

1. The ideal (x, y) cannot be generated by a single element, which prevents M from being cyclic or decomposable into cyclic submodules corresponding to such generators.
2. The structure of M encapsulates relations that are inherently "non-split," reflecting the non-principal nature of I.

In particular, there is no way to write M as:

$$
M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n r / (a_i)
$$

for some $a_i \in r$. The lack of principal generators for I obstructs such a decomposition.

Generalization and Broader Implications

The example above illustrates a fundamental aspect of module theory: over rings that are not PIDs, torsion modules often exhibit complex behaviors and resist straightforward decompositions into cyclic modules.

Key Takeaways:

- Modules over non-PID integral domains: Not every finitely generated module can be expressed as a direct sum of cyclic modules.
- Role of ideal structure: The principal or non-principal nature of ideals in r critically determines the decomposability of modules.
- Limitations of the structure theorem: Unlike PIDs, more general integral domains do not guarantee that finitely generated modules decompose into cyclic summands.

Implications for Algebraic Structures:

- In algebraic geometry, such modules often correspond to sheaves or sheaf modules with non-trivial torsion and extension properties.
- In number theory, understanding modules over rings like $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ informs the study of algebraic integers and their extensions.
- In homological algebra, these modules serve as counterexamples demonstrating the necessity of additional conditions (like being principal or Noetherian) for certain decomposition theorems.

Conclusion

The explicit example of a finitely generated module over an integral domain r, such as $r = \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$, which is not a direct sum of cyclic modules, underscores the rich and intricate structure of modules beyond PIDs. By examining modules like $r / (x, y)$, we gain insight into the limitations of classical decomposition theorems and appreciate the complexities inherent in module theory over more general rings.

This exploration emphasizes the importance of ideal structure, ring properties, and module relations in understanding the landscape of module decomposition. It also highlights ongoing areas of research in algebra where the classification of modules remains a challenging and deeply interesting problem, especially in non-Noetherian and non-principal contexts.

Keywords: finitely generated modules, integral domains, cyclic modules, module decomposition, non-

principal ideals, algebraic structures, module theory, ring theory, algebraic geometry, homological algebra

Frequently Asked Questions

What is an example of a finitely generated module over an integral domain that is not a direct sum of cyclic modules?

A classical example is the module Z/pZ over the ring Z, which is finitely generated but cannot be expressed as a direct sum of cyclic modules because it is a simple module and not decomposable into smaller cyclic components.

Why are certain finitely generated modules over integral domains not expressible as a direct sum of cyclic modules?

Because they lack a decomposition into cyclic submodules, often due to the presence of torsion or nontrivial extensions, making the module indecomposable or non-split over the ring.

Can you provide a concrete example involving polynomial rings?

Yes. Consider the module R/(f), where R is an integral domain and f is an irreducible polynomial; this module is finitely generated but might not decompose into a direct sum of cyclic modules if f is not a unit or if the module has a more complex structure.

What is the significance of a module not being a direct sum of cyclic modules over an integral domain?

It indicates that the module has a more intricate structure, possibly involving extensions or torsion that cannot be broken down into simpler cyclic components, highlighting the complexity of module theory over integral domains.

Are there conditions on the integral domain that guarantee a finitely generated module is a direct sum of cyclic modules?

Yes. For example, over a principal ideal domain (PID), every finitely generated module decomposes into a direct sum of cyclic modules (structure theorem for finitely generated modules). However, over more general integral domains, this is not guaranteed.

What role does the structure theorem for modules over PIDs play in this context?

It provides that finitely generated modules over PIDs can be decomposed into direct sums of cyclic modules, but this theorem does not extend to more general integral domains, where such a decomposition may fail.

Is the module Z/pZ over Z an example of a finitely generated module that is not a direct sum of cyclic modules?

No, Z/pZ itself is cyclic and thus trivially a direct sum of one cyclic module. The example illustrating a module that is not a direct sum of cyclic modules would involve more complex modules with extension properties or torsion components.

How does the example of the module over a polynomial ring illustrate modules that are not decomposable into cyclic modules?

Modules over polynomial rings like R[x]/(f), where f is not reducible or has certain algebraic properties, can have complex structures that prevent their decomposition into a direct sum of cyclic modules, especially when considering modules with extension or torsion phenomena.

What is a key takeaway about finitely generated modules over integral domains from this example?

Not all finitely generated modules over an integral domain can be decomposed into a direct sum of cyclic modules; their structure can be significantly more complicated, especially outside the realm of PIDs, emphasizing the diversity of module theory over general rings.

Additional Resources

An Example Of A Finitely Generated Module Over An Integral Domain \(r \) Which Is Not A Direct Sum Of Cyclic

Understanding modules over rings is a fundamental aspect of algebra, especially in the context of module theory and its applications to algebraic structures. When working over an integral domain \(r \), a natural question arises: Are all finitely generated modules over \(r \) direct sums of cyclic modules? The answer, intriguingly, is no. In fact, there exist explicit examples of finitely generated modules over certain integral domains that cannot be decomposed into a direct sum of cyclic modules. This article explores such an example in detail, illustrating the subtleties of module decomposition and highlighting important theoretical nuances.

Background and Motivation

Before delving into specific examples, it’s crucial to understand the foundational concepts:

- Integral Domain \(r \): A commutative ring with unity, possessing no zero divisors. Examples include the ring of integers \(\mathbb{Z} \), polynomial rings over fields, and more.

- Modules over \(r \): Generalizations of vector spaces where scalars come from \(r \). When \(r \) is a field, modules are vector spaces; over more general rings, modules can exhibit more complex behavior.

- Finitely Generated Modules: Modules that can be generated by a finite set of elements. Such modules are central in algebra because they often mirror the properties of finite-dimensional vector spaces, but with richer structure.

- Cyclic Modules: Modules generated by a single element. Every cyclic module over r is of the form r / I, where I is an ideal of r.

- Decomposition into Cyclic Modules: A key question in module theory is whether a finitely generated module can be expressed as a direct sum of cyclic modules. Over principal ideal domains (PIDs), the structure theorem guarantees such a decomposition (e.g., the fundamental theorem of finitely generated modules over a PID). However, over more general integral domains, this is not always possible.

The motivation for studying modules that are not decomposable into cyclic modules stems from the desire to understand the limitations of the structure theorem and the complexity inherent to modules over non-PID integral domains.

Principal Ideal Domains and the Structure Theorem

The structure theorem for finitely generated modules over a PID states that every such module can be expressed as a direct sum of cyclic modules, which are either free or torsion modules. Formally:

> Theorem (Structure Theorem for Finitely Generated Modules over a PID):
> Every finitely generated module M over a PID r is isomorphic to a direct sum
> $$
> M \cong r^{n} \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} r / (a_{i}),
> $$
> where $a_{1} \mid a_{2} \mid \cdots \mid a_{k}$.

This theorem provides a complete classification in the PID case, facilitating straightforward decomposition into cyclic modules. However, when r is not a PID, such as $r = \mathbb{Z}[x]$ or other more complicated integral domains, the theorem no longer holds universally. The key reason is that modules over these rings can exhibit behaviors that prevent such clean decompositions—namely, the existence of non-principal ideals and more complex submodule structures.

Challenges in Non-PID Integral Domains

In integral domains that are not PIDs, modules can be more intricate:

- Presence of Non-Principal Ideals: Ideals that are not generated by a single element lead to modules that cannot be simplified into sums of cyclic modules.

- Lack of Unique Factorization: Without unique factorization, the ideal structure becomes complicated, impairing the ability to decompose modules into cyclic parts.

- Existence of Non-Split Extensions: Some modules can be extensions that do not split into direct sums, making decomposition impossible.

These features give rise to examples where a finitely generated module, though seemingly manageable, resists decomposition into cyclic modules.

An Explicit Example: A Finitely Generated Module Over r Not Decomposable Into Cyclics

To understand this concretely, consider the integral domain $r = \mathbb{Z}[x]$, the polynomial ring over the integers, which is a classic example of a Noetherian integral domain that is not a PID.

Construction of the Module

Let us define a module M over $r = \mathbb{Z}[x]$ as follows:

$$
M = \frac{r}{(2, x)} \oplus \frac{r}{(2, x)}.
$$

Here, $(2, x)$ is the ideal generated by 2 and x. Since $r = \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is not a PID, $(2, x)$ is a non-principal ideal, and the modules $r / (2, x)$ are finitely generated but not cyclic because:

- $(2, x)$ cannot be generated by a single element.
- The quotient $r / (2, x)$ cannot be expressed as $r / (f)$ for some single polynomial f.

The module M is finitely generated (by two generators), yet it is the direct sum of two copies of $r / (2, x)$, which are not cyclic modules themselves.

Why This Module Is Not a Direct Sum of Cyclic Modules

Suppose, for contradiction, that M can be decomposed into a direct sum of cyclic modules:

$$
M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n r / I_i,
$$
where each I_i is an ideal of r.

However, because $(2, x)$ is a non-principal ideal, the modules $r / (2, x)$ are not cyclic. They are examples of modules with more complex structure, akin to modules over non-PID rings that do not split into simpler cyclic components.

The key obstruction is that the ideal $(2, x)$ is not generated by a single element, and so the quotient module $r / (2, x)$ cannot be cyclic. Consequently, the direct sum M cannot be expressed solely as a sum of cyclic modules, each generated by a single element.

This explicit example demonstrates that the structure theorem akin to the PID case fails in this context, providing a concrete instance where a finitely generated module over an integral domain is not a direct sum of cyclic modules.

Implications and Further Examples

The example above underscores the importance of the ring’s structure in module decomposition. It highlights several important points:

- Not all finitely generated modules over an integral domain are decomposable into cyclic modules.
- Non-principal ideals generate modules that are inherently non-cyclic, complicating the decomposition.
- The structure theorem for modules over PIDs does not extend to all integral domains.

Further, similar constructions can be made over other non-PID integral domains, such as polynomial rings in multiple variables or rings with non-trivial ideal class groups.

Features and Characteristics of Such Modules

Understanding modules like M involves recognizing their key features:

- Complex Submodule Structure: Non-principal ideals lead to modules with intricate submodule lattices.
- Non-decomposability: These modules resist splitting into cyclic summands.
- Finitely Generated but Non-Principal: They are manageable in size but algebraically complex.
- Dependence on the Ring’s Ideal Structure: The properties hinge heavily on whether the ring is a PID, a Dedekind domain, or a more general integral domain.

Conclusion

The existence of finitely generated modules over an integral domain r that are not direct sums of cyclic modules exemplifies the rich and nuanced landscape of module theory beyond PIDs. The explicit example involving the ideal $(2, x)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ illustrates how non-principal ideals induce modules with inherent complexity and resistance to decomposition.

This exploration not only clarifies the limitations of the structure theorem outside PIDs but also emphasizes the importance of the ring's ideal-theoretic properties in determining module structure. Such examples serve as both cautionary tales and valuable tools in understanding the broader realm of module theory, inspiring further investigations into the behavior of modules over various classes of rings.

Pros and Cons of the Example:

Pros:
- Provides a concrete, explicit module to illustrate non-decomposability.
- Highlights the impact of non-principal ideals on module structure.
- Demonstrates the failure of the classical structure theorem outside PIDs.

Cons:
- The example is specific to polynomial rings and may not generalize straightforwardly.
- Requires a solid understanding of ideal theory and module quotients.
- May be complex for beginners unfamiliar with ideal class groups and non-principal ideals.

This example underscores the depth and subtlety in module theory and encourages further exploration into the algebraic structures that govern module decompositions over various rings.

An Example Of A Finitely Generated Module Over An Integral Domain R Which Is Not A Direct Sum Of Cyclic

An Example Of A Finitely Generated Module Over An Integral Domain R Which Is Not A Direct Sum Of Cyclic

Related Articles

- Experiential Marketing Is The Coordinated Effort To Handle The Effects Of Unfavorable Publicity, Ensuring
- Consider The Construction Of A Pen To Enclose An Area. You Have 400 Ft Of Fencing To Make A Pen For Hogs.
- Aaron Incorporated Reported Operating Expenses During 2022 Of $765,000 (including

$80,000 Of Depreciation

Back to Home