



ANDRZEJ NOWICKI (Toruń)

The primary decomposition of differential modules

1. Introduction. In [8] A. Seidenberg proved the following theorem: *for any noetherian Ritt algebra each differential ideal A has an irredundant primary decomposition $A = A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_s$, where A_1, \dots, A_s are differential ideals.*

A more general case is presented in [1]. In [7] the above theorem was proved by S. Sato for arbitrary noetherian differential rings.

In this paper, using methods similar to those of S. Sato, we prove that: *if R is a noetherian differential ring and M is a differential R -module finitely generated over R , then any differential submodule N of M has an irredundant primary decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_s$, where all N_i are differential submodules.*

From this fact a number of interesting conclusions follow concerning differential modules over a noetherian d -MP-ring.

In the last section we show an example of a differential ring for which the Differential Nakayama Lemma does not hold and a particular version of this lemma is given.

The author wishes to thank Professor S. Balcerzyk for many valuable discussions and criticism which helped to improve the text.

2. Preliminary notions. A *differential ring* (shortly: a *d-ring*) is a pair (R, d) , where R is a commutative ring with unit and $d: R \rightarrow R$ is a mapping, called *derivation*, which satisfies the conditions:

$$d(r+s) = d(r) + d(s), \quad d(rs) = rd(s) + sd(r) \quad \text{for arbitrary } r, s \in R.$$

A *differential module* (shortly: a *d-module*) over a d -ring (R, d) is a pair (M, δ) , where M is a R -module and $\delta: M \rightarrow M$ is a mapping which satisfies the conditions: $\delta(m+n) = \delta(m) + \delta(n)$, $\delta(rm) = r\delta(m) + d(r)m$ for arbitrary $m, n \in M, r \in R$.

Let (R, d) be a d -ring and (M, δ) a d -module over (R, d) . An ideal A in R is called a *d-ideal* if $d(A) \subset A$. Similarly a submodule N of M is called a *d-submodule* if $\delta(N) \subset N$.

If A is a d -ideal in R , then AM is a d -submodule of M . If N and P are d -submodules of M , then $(N: P) = \{r \in R; rP \subset N\}$ is a d -ideal in R . Similarly, if A is a d -ideal and N a d -submodule, then $(N: A) = \{m \in M; Am \subset N\}$ is a d -submodule.

For an arbitrary subset T of $R(M)$ by $[T]$ we denote the smallest d -ideal (d -submodule) containing T .

We say that a d -module M is d -finitely generated if there is a finite number of elements $m_1, \dots, m_n \in M$ such that $M = [m_1, \dots, m_n]$. The d -ring (R, d) is called d -MP ring if a radical of an arbitrary d -ideal in R is a d -ideal. Equivalent definitions of d -MP ring may be found in [3]. If the d -ring (R, d) contains the field of rational numbers Q , then we call it a *Ritt algebra*. Every Ritt algebra is a d -MP ring. A d -ideal A is d -maximal if it is maximal among all d -ideals in R different from R . If R is a d -MP ring, then d -maximal ideals are prime (see [3]).

With every d -ring (R, d) we associate some ring (non-commutative in general) $D = D(R, d)$ (see [4], [5]) which is a left free R -module having basis $\{1, t, t^2, \dots\}$, with the multiplication defined by: $r \cdot t = rt$, $t^n \cdot t^m = t^{n+m}$, $t \cdot r = d(r) + rt$. If (M, δ) is a d -module over (R, d) , then M together with the multiplication $(r_n t^n + \dots + r_0)m = r_n \delta^n(m) + \dots + r_0 \cdot m$ is a left D -module. If M is a D -module, then the mapping $\delta: M \rightarrow M$, $\delta(m) = tm$, makes (M, δ) a d -module over (R, d) . Any d -module over (R, d) is d -finitely generated iff it is finitely generated as $D(R, d)$ -module.

For a R -module M by $\text{Ass}_R(M)$ we denote the set of all prime ideals in R associated with M (see [5]).

3. Primary decomposition. Let (R, d) be a noetherian d -ring, (M, δ) a d -module finitely generated over R , and N a d -submodule of M .

LEMMA 1. For any $x \in R$ there is a natural number k such that $(N: x^k)$ is a d -submodule of M and $(N: x^n) = (N: x^k)$ for any $n \geq k$.

Proof. For any $m \in U = \bigcup_{s=0}^{\infty} (N: x^s)$ we have $x^s m \in N$ for some s and then the element $\delta(x^s m) = x^s \delta(m) + s x^{s-1} d(x)m$ is in N , thus $x^{s+1} \delta(m) \in N$, i.e. $\delta(m) \in U$. It means that U is a d -submodule of M . It suffices now to consider the sequence $(N: x^1) \subset (N: x^2) \subset \dots$

DEFINITION 2. A d -submodule N of M is d -primary if for any d -ideal A and any d -submodule P of M , from $AP \subset N$ it follows that either $P \subset N$ or $A^n \subset (N: M)$ for some natural number n .

DEFINITION 3. A d -submodule N of M is d -irreducible if it is not an intersection of two d -submodules different from N .

LEMMA 4. If N is a d -primary d -submodule, then it is a primary submodule.

Proof. Let for given $r \in R, m \in M$, the element rm be in N . We must

show that either $m \in N$ or $r \in \sqrt{(N: M)}$. By Lemma 1 there is a natural number k such that $(N: r^k)$ is a d -submodule of M . $rm \in N$ implies $m \in (N: r^k)$ since $r^k m \in N$; hence $[m] \subset (N: r^k)$ and therefore $r^k \in (N: [m])$.

Now, $(N: [m])$ is a d -ideal in R , thus $[r^k] \subset (N: [m])$, i.e. $[r^k][m] \subset N$. Since N is d -primary, we have either $[m] \subset N$ or $[r^k]^n \subset (N: M)$, i.e. $m \in N$ or $r \in \sqrt{(N: M)}$.

LEMMA 5. *If N is d -irreducible d -submodule of M , then N is a d -primary d -submodule.*

Proof. Assume that for a d -ideal A and a d -submodule P we have $AP \subset N$ and $A \not\subset \sqrt{(N: M)}$. Let $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_k$ be a primary decomposition of N . Since $A \not\subset \sqrt{(N: M)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \sqrt{(N_i: M)}$, we have $A \not\subset \sqrt{(N_i: M)}$ for some i . Assume that $A \not\subset \sqrt{(N_i: M)}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $A \subset \sqrt{(N_j: M)}$ for $j = s+1, \dots, k$.

If $s = k$, then, for any $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$, $(N_i: A) = N_i$ and therefore $P \subset (N: A) = \bigcap_{i=1}^k (N_i: A) = \bigcap_{i=1}^k N_i = N$. Assume that $s < k$. Since R is noetherian, there is a natural number n such that $A^n \subset (N_j: M)$ for $j = s+1, \dots, k$. In this case $(N_i: A^n) = N_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, s$ and $(N_j: A^n) = M$ for $j = s+1, \dots, k$. Thus we have

$$N \subset (N: A^n) \cap (N + A^n M) \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^s N_i \cap \bigcap_{j=s+1}^k N_j = N,$$

i.e. $N = (N: A^n) \cap (N + A^n M)$.

Since $AP \subset N$, we have $A^n P \subset N$ and $N + P \subset (N: A^n)$. Therefore $N \subset (N + P) \cap (N + A^n M) \subset (N: A^n) \cap (N + A^n M) = N$,

i.e. $N = (N + P) \cap (N + A^n M)$.

By d -irreducibility of $N \neq N + A^n M$ we have that $N = N + P$, i.e. $P \subset N$.

THEOREM 6. *Let (R, d) be a noetherian d -ring and (M, δ) a d -module finitely generated over R . Then any d -submodule N of M has an irredundant primary decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \dots \cap N_n$ such that N_i are d -submodules of M .*

Proof. Using Lemmas 4 and 5 the argument is standard.

4. Conclusions from Theorem 6 for noetherian d -MP rings. We assume now that R is a noetherian d -MP ring and M is a d -module finitely generated over R .

From Theorem 6 we have an immediate

COROLLARY 7. *Any prime ideal associated with a d -module M is a d -ideal.*

LEMMA 8. *For any $m \in M$ if $(\circ: m)$ is a d -ideal, then $(\circ: m) = (\circ: [m])$.*

Proof. See [2], Lemma 2.

LEMMA 9. *If $M \neq 0$, then there exists a d -submodule $N \neq 0$ and a prime d -ideal P such that N is a torsion-free d -submodule over R/P .*

Proof. Let P be a maximal ideal in the family $\{(o: m); o \neq m \in M\}$. It is known that $(o: x) = P$ is a prime ideal. By Corollary 7, P is a d -ideal.

Put $N = [x]$. Clearly, N is a non-zero d -submodule and, by Lemma 8, $P = (o: x) = (o: [x]) = (O: N)$, thus $PN = 0$, i.e. N is a d -module over the d -ring R/P .

Now assume that $rn = o$, $r \in R \setminus P$, $o \neq n \in N$. Then $r \in (o: n)$, $r \notin (o: x) = P$, which gives $(o: x) \not\subseteq (o: n)$, contrary to the maximality of $(o: x)$.

COROLLARY 10. *If $M \neq 0$, then there exist a sequence of d -submodules $0 = M_0 \not\subseteq M_1 \not\subseteq \dots \not\subseteq M_k = M$ and a sequence of prime d -ideals P_1, \dots, P_k in R such that M_i/M_{i-1} is a torsion-free d -module over the d -ring R/P_i , $i = 1, \dots, k$.*

Proof. Let N and P be as in Lemma 9. We put $M_1 = N$ and $P_1 = P$. Then $M_1/M_0 = N$ is a torsion-free d -module over R/P_1 . If $M_1 = M$, then there is nothing more to do. If $M_1 \not\subseteq M$, then we apply Lemma 9 to the d -module $M/M_1 \neq 0$. Thus there exist a d -submodule $N_1 \neq 0$ of M/M_1 and a prime d -ideal P_2 such that N_1 is a torsion-free d -module over R/P_2 . We take $M_2 = \varphi^{-1}(N_1)$, where $\varphi: M \rightarrow M/M_1$ is canonical. So we have $0 \not\subseteq M_1 \not\subseteq M_2$ and $M_2/M_1 = N_1$ is torsion-free d -module over R/P_2 . Since M is noetherian, this procedure ends.

COROLLARY 11. *Assume that $M \neq 0$ is a d -simple d -module (i.e. M is without any proper d -submodels). Then*

- (1) $(O: M)$ is a prime d -ideal,
- (2) M is a torsion-free d -module over $R/(O: M)$,
- (3) for any $o \neq m \in M$, we have $(o: m) = (O: M)$.

Proof. (1) Since $M \neq 0$, the set $\text{Ass}_R(M)$ is non-empty. Let $P = (o: m) \in \text{Ass}_R(M)$. By Corollary 7, P is a d -ideal. Thus Lemma 8 implies that $(O: M) = (O: [m]) = (o: m) = P$ is a prime d -ideal;

(2) Follows from (1) and from the proof of Lemma 9;

(3) For such m , since $[m] = M$, we have $(O: M) = (O: [m]) \subset (o: m)$. Assume that $(O: M) \not\subseteq (o: m)$ and take $x \in (o: m)$ such that $x \notin (O: M)$. Since M is d -simple, O is a d -primary d -submodule, and by Lemma 4 it is a primary submodule of M . But $xm = o$; hence $m = o$ or $x \in \sqrt{(O: M)} = (O: M)$, a contradiction.

COROLLARY 12. *If for all d -maximal d -ideals \mathfrak{M} in R , $M_{\mathfrak{M}} = 0$, then $M = 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $M \neq 0$. Then there is a prime d -ideal P of the form $P = (o: x)$, for some $x \in M$, $x \neq o$, since $\text{Ass}_R(M) \neq \emptyset$. Let \mathfrak{M} be

a d -maximal d -ideal containing P . Then $M_{\mathfrak{M}} = 0$, thus $x/1 = 0$ in $M_{\mathfrak{M}}$. It follows now that, for some $a \in R \setminus \mathfrak{M}$, $ax = 0$, hence $s \in (0 : x) = P \subset \mathfrak{M}$, a contadiction.

5. The Differential Nakayama Lemma. Let $Jd(R)$ denote the intersection of all d -maximal d -ideals of the d -ring (R, d) . We call $Jd(R)$ the *Jacobson d -radical*.

DEFINITION 13. We say that d -ring (R, d) satisfies the *Differential Nakayama Lemma* if for any d -ideal $A \subset Jd(R)$ and any d -finitely generated d -module M the condition $AM = M$ implies $M = 0$.

Now we give an example of a d -ring which does not satisfy the Differential Nakayama Lemma.

EXAMPLE 14. Let k be a field of characteristics zero, $R = k[x]$ a ring of polynomials in one variable x over k and let $d(x) = x$, $d(k) = 0$. Since the only d -maximal d -ideal in the d -ring (R, d) is (x) , we have $Jd(R) = (x)$.

Note that for any $w \in D = D(R, d)$ there is $w' \in D$ such that $wx = xw'$. Indeed,

- (a) if $w \in R$, then $wx = xw$,
- (b) since $tx = d(x) + xt = x + xt = x(1+t)$, we have $t^n \cdot x = x(1+t)^n$,
- (c) if $w = r_0 + r_1 t + \dots + r_n t^n$ is an arbitrary element of D , then

$$wx = \left(\sum_{i=0}^n r_i t^i \right) x = \sum_{i=0}^n r_i x(1+t)^i = x \left(\sum_{i=0}^n r_i (1+t)^i \right).$$

Let $f: k[x] \rightarrow k$ be such a homomorphism of rings that $f(x) = 1$ and $f(k) = k$ for any $k \in k$. The homomorphism f induces on k a structure of R -module given $wk = f(w)k$.

Put $M = D \otimes_R k$. Since M is a left D -module generated by the element $1 \otimes_R 1$, M is a d -module d -finitely generated over (R, d) . We show now that $(x)M = M$. Take $m \in M$. Then $m = w(1 \otimes 1)$ for some $w \in D$. Thus we have:

$$\begin{aligned} m &= w(1 \otimes 1) = w(1 \otimes 1 \cdot 1) = w(1 \otimes f(x) \cdot 1) = w(1 \otimes x \cdot 1) \\ &= w(1 \cdot x \otimes 1) = wx(1 \otimes 1) = xw'(1 \otimes 1), \quad \text{i.e. } m \in (x)M. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that the d -ring (R, d) does not satisfy the Differential Nakayama Lemma.

With some limitations on d -ring R and d -module M one may prove the following version of the Differential Nakayama Lemma, different from previous one.

PROPOSITION 15. Let (R, d) be a noetherian d -MP ring and (M, δ) a d -module finitely generated over R . If A is d -ideal such that $A \subset Jd(R)$ and $AM = M$, then $M = 0$.

Proof. If \mathfrak{M} is an arbitrary d -maximal d -ideal in R , then $A \subset Jd(R) \subset \mathfrak{M}$, $A_{\mathfrak{M}} M_{\mathfrak{M}} = M_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and $A_{\mathfrak{M}} \subset \mathfrak{M}R_{\mathfrak{M}}$. From the Nakayama Lemma, $M_{\mathfrak{M}} = 0$; hence by Corollary 12, $M = 0$.

References

- [1] W. C. Brown and W. E. Kuan, *Ideals and higher derivations in commutative rings*, *Canad. J. Math.* 24 (1972), p. 400–415.
- [2] H. E. Gorman, *Zero divisors in differential rings*, *Pacific J. Math.* 39 (1971), p. 163–172.
- [3] —, *Differential rings and modules*, *Scripta Math.* 29 (1973), p. 25–35.
- [4] J. Johnson, *Differential dimension polynomials and a fundamental theorem on differential modules*, *Amer. J. Math.* 91 (1969), p. 239–248.
- [5] S. Lang, *Algebra*, Addison–Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Mass. 1965.
- [6] E. C. Posner, *Differentiably simple rings*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 11 (1960), p. 337–343.
- [7] S. Sato, *On the primary decomposition of differential ideals*, *Hiroshima Math. J.* 6 (1976), p. 55–59.
- [8] A. Seidenberg, *Differential ideals in rings of finitely generated type*, *Amer. J. Math.* 89 (1967), p. 22–42.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, N. COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY, TORUŃ
