

3 lectures ago, introduced prime ideals
let's say more about them.

$R = \text{comm. ring.}$

Def. An ideal $P \subsetneq R$ is prime

if $ab \in P$ implies $a \in P$ or $b \in P$

Def an element $p \in R$
is prime iff the ideal $\langle p \rangle$ is prime.

equiv: p is not a unit
and $p|ab \Rightarrow p|a$ or $p|b$.

(p sat. the conclusion of Euclid's lemma.)

Def an ^{non-zero? not a zero-divisor?} element $r \in R$ is irreducible
if r is not a unit and
 $r = ab$ implies a is a unit
or b is a unit

equiv: r is reducible if can write $r = a \cdot b$
where a, b are not units.

Prop If R is an integral domain and
 p is ^{non-zero} prime then p is irreducible.

Pf: suppose $p = a \cdot b$. then $p|ab$,
so $p|a$ or $p|b$

if $p|a$, write $a = cp$

then $p = a \cdot b = c \cdot p \cdot b$

$$\text{so } p(1 - c \cdot b) = 0$$

so either $p = 0$ or $1 - cb = 0$

$$\downarrow$$
$$\text{so } cb = 1$$

so b is a unit. \square

Prop R is an integral domain iff 0 is prime.

Pf observe that $0|r$ iff $r = 0 \cdot (\text{something})$ iff $r = 0$.

Now R is an int. domain

iff $ab = 0$ implies $a = 0$ or $b = 0$

iff $0|ab$ implies $0|a$ or $0|b$

iff 0 is prime. \square

Prop. An ideal $P \subset R$ is prime iff R/P is an integral domain.

Proof: R/P is an integral domain means:

$\forall a, b \in R/P$, if $ab = \bar{0}$ then $a = \bar{0}$ or $b = \bar{0}$

write $a = \bar{r}$ and $b = \bar{s}$ for some $r, s \in R$

equiv: $\forall r, s \in R$, if $\bar{r}\bar{s} = \bar{0}$ then $\bar{r} = \bar{0}$ or $\bar{s} = \bar{0}$

equiv: $\forall r, s \in R$, if $rs \in P$ then $r \in P$ or $s \in P$

\square

Example: studied $P = \langle 3, 1 - \sqrt{5} \rangle \subset R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}]$

had $\varphi: \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_3$ surj. hom.
with $\ker \varphi = P$

by 1st iso thm, $R/P \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$

\mathbb{Z}_3 is an int. domain so P is prime.

seen: in an int. domain, prime (and nonzero) implies irreducible.

Thm: if R admits a division algorithm,
— e.g. $R = \mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ or $\mathbb{Z}[i]$,

then irreducible \Rightarrow prime.

\square : read the pf of Euclid's lemma. \square

But in $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}]$, seen that $2, 3, 1 + \sqrt{5}, 1 - \sqrt{5}$
are irreducible
but they're not prime.

$$2 \cdot 3 = 6 = (1 + \sqrt{5})(1 - \sqrt{5})$$

another example: $3 \cdot 3 = 9 = (2 + \sqrt{5})(2 - \sqrt{5})$

$2 + \sqrt{5}$ is irred. because if $2 + \sqrt{5} = z \cdot w$

then $9 = |z|^2 \cdot |w|^2$ so either $|z|^2 = 1 \rightarrow z = \pm 1$
 $|w|^2 = 1 \rightarrow w = \pm 1$
or $|z|^2 = |w|^2 = 3$ w/ impossible.

Also seen: in a ring w/ a division alg,
every ideal is principal.

given $I \subset R$, $\exists a \in R$ s.t. $I = \langle a \rangle$
(the Euclidean alg.)

Project? | In an int. domain where every ideal
is principal (a principal ideal domain, PID)
irreducible implies prime

In $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}]$, 3 is not prime.

so $R/\langle 3 \rangle$ should not be an int. domain.

what is it?

let $J = \langle 3, 1 + \sqrt{5} \rangle$ $K = \langle 3, 1 - \sqrt{5} \rangle$

know: $R/J \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$

$R/K \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$

$J \cdot K = \langle 3 \rangle$

$J + K = \langle 1 \rangle$

bec. $1 + \sqrt{5} + 1 - \sqrt{5} = 2$
and $3 - 2 = 1$.

if $J + K = \langle 1 \rangle$ then $J \cap K = J \cdot K$

Final version of the Chinese Remainder theorem:

if R is a comm. ring
and $J, K \subset R$ are ideals with
 $J+K = \langle 1 \rangle$

$$\text{then } R/J \cdot K \cong R/J \times R/K$$

example: ① above, $R/\langle 3 \rangle = \mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ (not an int. domain!)

$$\text{② } R = \mathbb{Z}, J = \langle 2 \rangle \quad K = \langle 3 \rangle$$

$$\mathbb{Z}/6 \cong \mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/3$$

$$\text{③ } R = \mathbb{Q}[x] \quad J = \langle x-5 \rangle \quad K = \langle x-6 \rangle \quad J+K = \langle 1 \rangle$$

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{Q}[x] / \langle x^2 - 11x + 30 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Q}[x] / \langle x-5 \rangle \times \mathbb{Q}[x] / \langle x-6 \rangle \\ \cong \mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{Q} \end{array}$$

Proof: Consider the map $R \xrightarrow{\varphi} R/J \times R/K$

defined by $\varphi(r) = (\bar{r}, \bar{r})$
 \hookrightarrow in R/J ! \hookrightarrow in R/K !

check: φ is a hom.

ker φ ? $\varphi(r) = (\bar{0}, \bar{0})$
iff $r \in J$ and $r \in K$
iff $r \in J \cap K$.

$J+K = \langle 1 \rangle$, so $J \cap K = J \cdot K$.

next I claim that φ is surjective.

let $\bar{a} \in R/J$, $\bar{b} \in R/K$. $a, b \in R$

because $J+K = \langle 1 \rangle$, we can write
 $1 = j+k$ for $j \in J$, $k \in K$.

then $a = aj + ak$, so $\bar{a} = \overline{ak}$ in R/J

and $b = bj + bk$, so $\bar{b} = \overline{bj}$ in R/K

let $r = ak + bj$

then in R/J we have $\overline{r} = \overline{ak} = \bar{a}$

and in R/K , $\overline{r} = \overline{bj} = \bar{b}$

so $\varphi(\overline{r}) = (\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \in R/J \times R/K$.

Now by 1st iso thm,

$$R/\ker \varphi \cong \text{im } \varphi$$

$$R/J \cdot K \cong R/J \times R/K \quad \text{as desired.} \quad \square$$