

## Lecture 20: Prime ideals, prime avoidance, local rings 120

Last time: CRT & existence of maximal ideals in a commutative ring  $R$

Corollary: Let  $\mathfrak{a} \subsetneq R$  be a proper ideal. Then, there exists a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{M}$  of  $R$  containing  $\mathfrak{a}$ .

Proof: Maximal ideals in  $R' = R/\mathfrak{a} \iff$  maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{M}$  of  $R$  containing  $\mathfrak{a}$ .

§1 Prime ideals:  $R =$  commutative ring

Def  $\mathfrak{P} \subset R$  ideal is prime if  $a \cdot b \in \mathfrak{P} \implies a \in \mathfrak{P} \text{ or } b \in \mathfrak{P}$ .

Obs: We still don't know we have prime ideals!

• An equivalent characterization is:

Proposition:  $\mathfrak{P} \subsetneq R$  ideal is prime  $\iff R/\mathfrak{P}$  is an integral domain

Proof:  $\mathfrak{P}$  is prime  $\iff a \cdot b \in \mathfrak{P}$  implies  $a \in \mathfrak{P}$  or  $b \in \mathfrak{P}$ .

$\iff \pi(a) \pi(b) = 0$  in  $R/\mathfrak{P}$  implies  $\pi(a) = 0$  or  $\pi(b) = 0$   
(Here  $\pi: R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{P}$ ).

$\iff R/\mathfrak{P}$  is an integral domain. (no zero-divisors)  $\square$

Lemma: A commutative ring  $R$  is a field if & only if  $(0)$  &  $R$  are the only ideals in  $R$

PF/  $\implies$ ) Fix  $I \neq (0)$  an ideal of  $R$ . If  $x \in I \setminus \{0\}$  then  $\exists y$  st  $xy = 1$  so  $x$  is a unit and  $1 \in I$ , i.e.  $I = R$ . ( $R$  is a field)

$\iff$ ) Pick  $x \in R \setminus \{0\}$  & consider  $I = (x)$  ideal. Then  $I = R \ni 1$ , meaning  $\exists y \in R$  with  $1 = yx = xy$  so  $x \in R^*$ . ( $R$  is commutative)  $\square$

Proposition 2:  $\mathfrak{M} \subsetneq R$  ideal is maximal  $\iff R/\mathfrak{M}$  is a field

PF/  $R/\mathfrak{M}$  is a field  $\iff$   $(0)$  &  $R/\mathfrak{M}$  are the only ideals in  $R/\mathfrak{M}$   
↓  
Lemma

L20 [2]

Since  $\{ \text{ideals in } R/\alpha \} \xleftrightarrow{1-1} \{ \text{ideals in } R \text{ containing } \alpha \}$

We conclude :

$R/\mathfrak{M}$  is a field  $\Leftrightarrow$  the only ideals of  $R$  containing  $\mathfrak{M}$  are  $\mathfrak{M}$  and  $R \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{M} \subsetneq R$  is a maximal ideal.  $\square$

Corollary 2: Every maximal ideal is prime.

BF/ Fields are integral domains.

Examples:  $R = \mathbb{Z}$   $\{ (0), (p) : p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2} \text{ prime} \}$  are all the prime ideals.

- $(0)$  is prime but not maximal
- $(p)$  is maximal for every  $p \geq 2$  prime.

Proposition 3: Let  $f: A \rightarrow B$  be a ring homomorphism, where  $A, B$  are commutative rings. Let  $\mathfrak{q} \subsetneq B$  be a prime ideal. Then  $\mathfrak{P} = f^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}) \subsetneq A$  is a prime ideal.

**!** The statement fails for maximal ideals!

Ex:  $\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\mathfrak{q} = (0)$  is the only maximal ideal, but  $f^{-1}(0) = (0)$  is not maximal in  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

Proof: We know that  $f^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$  is an ideal of  $A$  (Lecture 17)

Given  $a, b \in A$  with  $ab \in \mathfrak{P}$ , we want to show  $a \in \mathfrak{P}$  or  $b \in \mathfrak{P}$ .

But  $f(ab) = f(a)f(b) \in \mathfrak{q} \xRightarrow{\substack{f \\ \mathfrak{q} \text{ prime}}} f(a) \in \mathfrak{q} \text{ or } f(b) \in \mathfrak{q}$ .

Hence,  $a \in \mathfrak{P}$  or  $b \in \mathfrak{P}$ .

§ 2. Prime avoidance:

Fix  $R$  commutative ring

Theorem: Fix  $\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_n$  prime ideals of  $R$  & let  $\mathfrak{a} \subset R$  be an ideal with  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{P}_i$ . Then, there exists some  $j=1, \dots, n$  with  $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{P}_j$ .

Proof We will prove the contrapositive:

$$\mathfrak{a} \not\subset \mathfrak{P}_j \quad \forall j=1, \dots, n \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathfrak{a} \not\subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{P}_i. \quad (\text{prime avoidance})$$

We argue by induction on  $n$

• The assertion is true for  $n=1$ .

• Assume  $n > 1$  & that the assertion has been verified for  $n-1$ .

Thus for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we have:

$$\mathfrak{a} \not\subset \mathfrak{P}_j \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i\} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathfrak{a} \not\subset \bigcup_{j \neq i} \mathfrak{P}_j.$$

That is, we can find  $a_i \in \mathfrak{a}$  with  $a_i \notin \mathfrak{P}_j \quad \forall j \neq i$ .

We analyze 2 cases:

(1) Now, if  $a_i \notin \mathfrak{P}_i$  for some  $i$ , we are done since  $a_i \in \mathfrak{a} \not\subset \bigcup_{j=1}^n \mathfrak{P}_j$ .

(2) On the contrary, if  $a_i \in \mathfrak{P}_i \quad \forall i=1, \dots, n$ , we consider the

element 
$$a = \sum_{l=1}^n a_1 \cdots a_{l-1} a_{l+1} \cdots a_n \in \mathfrak{a}$$

For each  $i=1, \dots, n$  every summand of  $\mathfrak{a}$ , except  $a_1 \cdots a_{i-1} a_{i+1} \cdots a_n$  lies in  $\mathfrak{P}_i$  (as  $a_i \in \mathfrak{P}_i$ )

Since  $a_1 \cdots a_{i-1} a_{i+1} \cdots a_n \notin \mathfrak{P}_i$  as none of its factors are in  $\mathfrak{P}_i$ ,

then we conclude  $a \notin \mathfrak{P}_i \quad \forall i=1, \dots, n$ , so  $\mathfrak{a} \not\subset \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{P}_i$ .

Theorem 2: Let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  be ideals of  $R$  (commutative) L20(9)

and  $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq R$  be a prime ideal.

If  $\bigcap_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ , then there exists  $l=1, \dots, n$  with  $\alpha_l \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ .

Proof: We will show:  $\alpha_l \not\subseteq \mathcal{P} \forall l \Rightarrow \bigcap_{l=1}^n \alpha_l \not\subseteq \mathcal{P}$

By hypothesis, we can find  $a_l \in \alpha_l \setminus \mathcal{P} \forall l$ .

Take  $a = a_1 \dots a_n$ .

$\left. \begin{array}{l} \cdot a \in \alpha_l \forall l \\ \cdot a \notin \mathcal{P} \quad (\mathcal{P} \text{ is prime}) \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \bigcap_{l=1}^n \alpha_l \not\subseteq \mathcal{P}$ .

To prove the statement for the equalities, we argue as follows

If  $\bigcap_{j=1}^n \alpha_j = \mathcal{P}$ , we know  $\alpha_l \subseteq \mathcal{P}$  for some  $l$ .

Conversely,  $\mathcal{P} = \bigcap_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \subseteq \alpha_l$ , so  $\mathcal{P} = \alpha_l$ .  $\square$

§3. Local rings: Fix  $R$  to be a commutative ring

Def:  $R$  is a local ring if it has only one maximal ideal

Notation:  $(R, \mathfrak{M})$  where  $\mathfrak{M}$  is its unique maximal ideal.

Examples: ① Every field is a local ring ( $\mathfrak{M} = (0)$ )

②  $R = K[x]/(x^3)$  is local when  $K$  is any field

Max ideals of  $R \iff$  max ideals of  $K[x]$  containing  $(x^3)$ ,

But  $K[x]$  is PID, so any  $\mathfrak{m} \subset K[x]$  maximal equals  $(f)$  for some  $f \in K[x]$  irreducible

But  $f \mid x^3$ , so  $(f) = (x)$ . This is maximal in  $K[x]$ !

$\Rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{M}} = \frac{(x)}{(x^3)}$  is the unique max ideal of  $R$

③  $R = K[x] =$  power series in one variable over  $K$ .

Claim:  $R$  is a ring.

Operations: • Componentwise addition (degree-by-degree)

$$\left(\sum_{k \geq 0} a_k x^k\right) + \left(\sum_{k \geq 0} b_k x^k\right) = \sum_{k \geq 0} (a_k + b_k) x^k.$$

• Multiplication:  $\left(\sum_{k \geq 0} a_k x^k\right) \left(\sum_{l \geq 0} b_l x^l\right) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n a_k b_{n-k}\right) x^n.$

Q: Why is  $R$  local?

Claim: Any  $f \in R$  with constant term  $\neq 0$  is invertible!

So any  $g \in R$  is  $g = x^n u$  with  $u \in R^\times$  &  $n \geq 0$ .

Conclusion:  $\mathcal{M} = (x)$  is the unique maximal ideal of  $R$ .

Proof of claim: Write  $f = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n x^n$  with  $a_0 \neq 0$ .

We build  $f^{-1}$  term-by-term. Write  $g = \sum_{n \geq 0} b_n x^n$  with  $fg = 1$

This gives  $a_0 b_0 = 1 \implies b_0 = 1/a_0$

$$a_1 b_0 + a_0 b_1 = 0 \implies b_1 = \frac{-a_1 b_0}{a_0} = -\frac{a_1}{a_0}$$

$$a_2 b_0 + a_1 b_1 + a_0 b_2 = 0 \implies b_2 = \frac{-a_2 b_0 - a_1 b_1}{a_0}$$

In general, assuming  $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}$  have been determined, we have!

$$a_0 b_n + a_1 b_{n-1} + \dots + a_n b_0 = 0 \implies b_n = \frac{-a_1 b_{n-1} - \dots - a_n b_0}{a_0}$$

We've computed  $b_n$ . □

Obs: In our definition of  $+$  &  $\cdot$  in  $K[x]$  only finitely many operations in  $K$  were performed to get the coefficient of  $x^n$  once  $n$  is fixed.

Eg  $\sum_{k=0}^n a_k b_{n-k}$  &  $a_n + b_n$  gave the  $x^n$ -coeff of  $\cdot$  &  $+$ .

The same idea will give us a ring structure on  $K((x)) =$  ring of Laurent series

$$= \left\{ \sum_{j=-N}^{\infty} a_j x^j \mid a_j \in K \ \forall j \geq -N, \ N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \right\}$$

Fun exercise: This definition of  $\bullet$  will not work for the abelian

$$\text{sp } \mathbb{K} \llbracket x^{-1}, x \rrbracket = \left\{ \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} a_j x^j : a_j \in \mathbb{K} \forall j \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$$

(Because if it did:  $\dots + x^{-2} + x^{-1} + 1 + x + x^2 + \dots = \frac{-x^{-1}}{1-x^{-1}} + \frac{1}{1-x} = 0$ )  
Compare coeff of  $x^k$  to get  $1=0!$  □