

(L13) (April 6, 2020) | I will start this lecture ^①

with a nice exercise/problem for you. In fact, with two of them. But first I have to ~~define~~ introduce an important class of rings. We say that a ~~ring~~ ring R is an integral domain if for every $a, b \in R$ we have: $ab = 0_R \Rightarrow a = 0_R$ or $b = 0_R$. For example, \mathbb{Z} is an i.d., but \mathbb{Z}_6 is not because $\bar{2} \cdot \bar{3} = \bar{0}$ in \mathbb{Z}_6 .

Proposition If R is a finite integral domain then R is a field (every $a \in R, a \neq 0_R$, has a multiplicative inverse). Proof is **Problem 13.1**. Prove this proposition. Hint: for any $a \in R, a \neq 0_R$, consider the map $x \mapsto ax$ from $R \setminus \{0_R\}$ to itself.

From this we get another **Proposition** If $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ then the ring $\mathbb{Z}_m = \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ (of residue classes modulo m) is a field $\iff m = p$, i.e. m is a prime number.

Proof: **Problem 13.2**. Prove this proposition. Hint: use the previous proposition. An interesting result related to the last but one proposition but which is

much deeper and harder to prove is the following. (2)

Theorem (J. Wedderburn, 1905) There is no

finite skew field (~~to~~ field with ~~a~~ non-commu-
tative multiplication). That is, every non-commuta-
tive field has to be infinite. ~~A proof~~ For a proof

see the book H. Aigner & G. Ziegler: Proofs from
THE BOOK. A point of interest is that a "group-the-
oretic" proof was published in a 2 page note in 1964
by Theodore Kaczynski who later became the Unu-
member, see Wikipedia for the whole story. An exam-

ple of a non-comm. field is the field of
quaternions $K = \{a + bi + cj + dk \mid a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{R}\}$ where
 $i^2 = j^2 = k^2 = -1$ and $ij = k, ji = -k, jk = i, kj = -i,$
 $ki = j$ and $ik = -j$ and otherwise we add and multi-
ply in K in the "obvious" way. For example,
 $(2 + 3i - 4j + k) + (-1 - i + j - 2k) = 1 + 2i - 3j - k,$
 $(-1 - i + j - 2k) \cdot (-1 - i + j - 2k) = (-2 - 2i + 2j - 4k) +$
 $(-3i + 3 + 3k + 6j) + (4j - 4k + 4 + 8i) + (-2 - j - i$
 $+ 2) = 7 + 2i + 11j - 6k.$ Since the multiplication is

③

non-commutative, in the other order we get:

$$(-1-i+j-2k) \cdot (2+3i-4j+k) = (-2-3i+4j-k) + (-2i+3+4k+j) + (2j-3k+4+i) + (-4k-6j-8i+2) =$$

$$= 7 - 12i + j - 4k.$$

So every commutative finite field is

but how do the fin. fields look like? We eventually prove: $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \forall$ prime number $p \exists$ field $F: |F| = p^n$. I leave the opposite implication (if F is a fin. field then $|F| = p^n$) for you as an exercise but first, to make the proof easier for you, we recall further notions from comm. algebra.

Proposition/Definition If R is an integral domain

and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ~~then~~ $n \cdot 1_R = \underbrace{1_R + 1_R + \dots + 1_R}_n$ then either

$n \cdot 1_R \neq 0_R$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ or the minimum $n \in \mathbb{N}$

s.t. $n \cdot 1_R = 0_R$ is a prime number, $n = p$. In the former case we say that R has characteristic 0 and in the latter case that R has characteristic p .

Proof.

If $n \cdot 1_R = 0_R$ and $n = kl$, $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$k \cdot l \cdot 1_R = \underbrace{(1_R + 1_R + \dots + 1_R)}_k \cdot \underbrace{(1_R + 1_R + \dots + 1_R)}_l =$$

$$= 1_R \cdot 1_R + \dots + 1_R \cdot 1_R = \underbrace{1_R + \dots + 1_R}_n = n \cdot 1_R = 0_R \quad \text{Since } \mathbb{Q} \quad (4)$$

is an integral domain $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \exists l \cdot 1_R = 0 \\ n \end{array} \right.$, $\exists_R = 0_R$ or $l = 0_R$. If n is minimum with $n \cdot 1_R = 0_R$ then $h = \exists l$ implies that $l = n$ or $l = 0$ and n is a prime number. \square

If F is any field, finite or infinite, the prime field GF is the subfield of F generated by applying $+$ and \cdot and $:$ to the elements 0_F and 1_F . More briefly, GF is the smallest (to \subset) subfield of F .

For example, the prime field of the fields \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{C} (the real and complex numbers) is the field \mathbb{Q} (the rational numbers). More generally, the prime field of any field F with $\text{char}(F) = 0$ is \mathbb{Q} . It is easy to see that the prime field of any field F with $\text{char}(F) = p$ is the field \mathbb{Z}_p (see Problem 13-2).

Proposition If F is a finite field then there exist a $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and a prime number p s.t. $|F| = p^q$.

Proof. Problem 13-3. Prove

this proposition. Hint: F over \mathbb{Z}_p forms also a vector space over its prime field \mathbb{Z}_p .

To go in the other way and to actually construct ⁽⁵⁾ for each q and p a field with p^q elements, we still have to recall ~~the~~ ideals in rings.

Definition If

R is a ring and $I \subset R$, ^{$\neq \emptyset$} we say that I is an ideal (in R) if: $a, b \in I \Rightarrow a - b \in I$,

$\bullet a \in I, b \in R \Rightarrow ab \in I$. In other words, an ideal in R is an Abelian subgroup of the Abelian group $(R, +)$ that is closed under multiplication by any element from R .

Two kinds of ideals are very

important: $I \subset R$ is a maximal ideal, if $I \neq \{0\}$ ($\{0\}$ is an ideal, the zero ideal), $I \neq R$ and $J \subset R$

is an ideal with $J \supset I$ then $J = R$ (R is another trivial ideal in R). $I \subset R$ is a prime ideal in R

if it has the property that: $a, b \in R, ab \in I \Rightarrow a \in I$ or $b \in I$.

For ^{an} ideal $I \subset R$ in a

ring R we define the factor ring R/I by:

$$R/I = \{a + I \mid a \in R\} \text{ where } a + I := \{a + b \mid b \in I\}$$

In fact, $R/I = R/\sim$ where \sim is the

equivalence relation $a \sim b$ iff $a - b \in I$ (it is easy to see that \sim is an equivalence). We define

operations $+$ and \cdot on R/I by:

$$(a+I) + (b+I) := (a+b) + I$$

Diagram illustrating the definition of addition in R/I . The expression $(a+I) + (b+I) := (a+b) + I$ is shown. An arrow points from the $+$ between the two terms on the left to the text "new defined operation in R/I ". Another arrow points from the $+$ between a and b on the right to the text "addition in R ".

not an operation, just part of the symbol denoting $\{a+b | b \in R\}, \dots$ and multipl. in R

~~$$(a+I) \cdot (b+I) := a \cdot b + I$$~~

$$(a+I) \cdot (b+I) := a \cdot b + I$$

Diagram illustrating the definition of multiplication in R/I . The expression $(a+I) \cdot (b+I) := a \cdot b + I$ is shown. An arrow points from the \cdot between the two terms on the left to the text "new defined multipl. in R/I ". Another arrow points from the \cdot between a and b on the right to the text "multipl. in R ".

For these new operations $+$ and \cdot on R/I to make a sense, they have to be independent on the selection of representatives of the equivalence classes in R/I . Due to the fact that I is an ideal in R , they are independent in this way and I (the ideal) show it next time. See you in 2 weeks (let's Monday is Easter Monday).

