

There are 4 problems with 12 parts. Each part is worth 2 points, for a total of 24 points.

1. Let  $R$  be a ring (i.e. commutative with 1). We say  $u \in R$  is a **unit** if there exists  $u^{-1} \in R$  such that  $uu^{-1} = 1$ . Let  $R^\times \subseteq R$  be the set of units. We define an equivalence relation on  $R$  (called **association**) by setting

$$"a \sim b" \iff "\exists u \in R^\times \text{ such that } a = ub".$$

- (a) Given  $a \in R$ , we define the **principal ideal**  $(a) := \{ar : r \in R\}$ . Prove that for that for all  $a, b \in R$  we have " $a \sim b$ "  $\Rightarrow$  " $(a) = (b)$ ".

*Proof.* Assume that  $a \sim b$  so that we have  $a = ub$  for some unit  $u \in R^\times$ . Then for any  $r \in R$  we have  $ar = b(ur) \in (b)$  hence  $(a) \subseteq (b)$ . Conversely, since  $u$  is invertible we have  $b = u^{-1}a$  and then for all  $r \in R$  we have  $br = a(u^{-1}r) \in (a)$ , hence  $(b) \subseteq (a)$ .  $\square$

We say that  $R$  is a **domain** if for all  $a \neq 0$  and  $b \neq 0$  we have  $ab \neq 0$ .

- (d) Prove that if  $R$  is a domain then for all  $a, b \in R$  we have " $(a) = (b)$ "  $\Rightarrow$  " $a \sim b$ ".

*Proof.* Assume that  $R$  is a domain and that  $(a) = (b)$ . If  $a = 0$  then we also have  $b = 0$  and hence  $a \sim b$ . Otherwise, assume that  $a$  and  $b$  are nonzero. Since  $a \in (b)$  we have  $a = br$  and since  $b \in (a)$  we have  $b = as$  for some  $r, s \in R$ , hence

$$\begin{aligned} a &= (as)r \\ a &= a(sr) \\ a - a(sr) &= 0 \\ a(1 - sr) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $R$  is a domain and since  $a \neq 0$  this implies that  $1 - sr = 0$ , i.e.,  $sr = 1$ . Since  $a = br$  with  $r \in R^\times$  we conclude that  $a \sim b$ .  $\square$

2. Let  $R$  be a domain. Given  $p, d \in R$  we say that  $d$  is a **proper divisor** of  $p$  if

- $d$  divides  $p$ ,
- $d$  is not a unit, and
- $d$  is not associate to  $p$  (i.e. there is no  $u \in R^\times$  such that  $p = ud$ ).

We say that  $p \in R$  is **irreducible** if it has no proper divisors.

- (a) Given  $a \in R$ , prove that  $(a) = R$  if and only if  $a \in R^\times$ . [Hint: See Problem 1.]

*Proof.* If  $(a) = R$  then we have  $1 \in (a)$  and hence there exists  $r \in R$  such that  $1 = ar$ . We conclude that  $a \in R^\times$ . Conversely, if  $a \in R^\times$  then for all  $r \in R$  we have  $r = (aa^{-1})r = a(a^{-1}r) \in (a)$ . We conclude that  $(a) = R$ .  $\square$

We say that an ideal  $I < R$  is **maximal** if there is no ideal  $J$  such that  $I < J < R$  (where " $<$ " means strict inclusion of ideals.)

- (b) If  $(p) < R$  is a maximal ideal, prove that  $p \in R$  is irreducible.

*Proof.* We will prove the contrapositive. Assume that  $p$  is **reducible**. By the definition given, there exists  $d \in R$  such that  $d$  divides  $p$  (i.e.  $(p) \leq (d)$ ),  $d$  is not a unit (i.e.  $(d) \neq R$  by part (a)), and  $d$  is not associate to  $p$  (i.e.  $(p) \neq (d)$  by Problem 1). Thus we have strict inclusions of ideals

$$(p) < (d) < R$$

which means that  $(p)$  is **not maximal**. □

We say that  $R$  is a **PID** if every ideal  $I \leq R$  has the form  $I = (a)$  for some  $a \in R$ .

(c) Now let  $R$  be a PID. If  $p \in R$  is irreducible, prove that  $(p)$  is a maximal ideal.

*Proof.* Let  $p \in R$  be irreducible and suppose for contradiction that there exists an ideal  $J$  with strict inclusions  $(p) < J < R$ . Since  $R$  is a PID we have  $J = (d)$  for some  $d \in R$ . But then, as in part (b), this  $d$  is a proper divisor of  $p$ , contradicting the fact that  $p$  is irreducible. □

**3.** In this problem let  $R$  be a **PID**.

(a) Suppose we have  $a, p \in R$  such that  $p$  does not divide  $a$ . Prove that we have a strict containment of ideals  $(p) < (a) + (p)$ .

*Proof.* By definition we have  $(a) + (p) = \{ar + ps : r, s \in R\}$ . Thus for all  $ps \in (p)$  we have  $ps = a0 + ps \in (a) + (p)$ , hence  $(p) \leq (a) + (p)$ . But if  $(p) = (a) + (p)$  then since  $a \in (a) + (p)$  we have  $a \in (p)$  which contradicts the fact that  $p$  does not divide  $a$ . We conclude that  $(p) < (a) + (p)$ . □

(b) Now suppose that  $p \in R$  from part (a) is **irreducible**. In this case, prove that there exist  $x, y \in R$  such that  $1 = ax + py$ . [Hint:  $R$  is a PID. Use Problem 2.]

*Proof.* Since  $R$  is a PID we have  $(a) + (p) = (d)$  for some  $d \in R$ . Since  $(p) < (d)$  and since  $p$  is irreducible we must have  $(d) = R$  (otherwise  $d$  is a proper divisor of  $p$ ). Then since  $(a) + (p) = (d) = R$  we have  $1 \in (a) + (p)$ , so there exist  $x, y \in R$  such that  $1 = ax + py$ . □

(c) Finally, suppose we have  $a, b, p \in R$  such that:  $p$  is irreducible,  $p$  divides  $ab$ , and  $p$  does not divide  $a$ . Prove that  $p$  divides  $b$ . [Hint: Use part (b).]

*Proof.* Assume that  $p$  is irreducible,  $p$  divides  $ab$  (say  $ab = pk$ ) and  $p$  does not divide  $a$ . By parts (a) and (b) there exist  $x, y \in R$  such that  $1 = ax + py$ . Multiply both sides by  $b$  to get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= ax + py \\ b &= abx + pby \\ b &= pkx + pby \\ b &= p(kx + by). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $p$  divides  $b$ . □

**4.** Let  $R$  be a **PID** and suppose that we have

$$p_1 p_2 = q_1 q_2,$$

where  $p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \in R$  are **irreducible**.

(a) Prove that  $p_1$  divides  $q_1$  or  $p_1$  divides  $q_2$ . [Hint: See Problem 3.]

*Proof.* Since  $R$  is a PID and since  $p_1$  divides  $q_1q_2$ , Problem 3(c) implies that  $p_1$  divides  $q_1$  or  $p_1$  divides  $q_2$ .  $\square$

- (b) Without loss, you can assume that  $p_1$  divides  $q_1$ . In this case prove that there exists a unit  $u \in R^\times$  such that  $q_1 = up_1$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, assume that  $p_1$  divides  $q_1$ , say  $q_1 = p_1u$  for some  $u \in R$ . If  $u$  is not a unit then  $p_1$  is a proper factor of  $q_1$ . (Indeed, we know that  $p_1$  divides  $q_1$  and  $p_1$  is not a unit (it's irreducible). If  $p_1$  were associate to  $q_1$  (say  $q_1 = p_1v$  for some  $v \in R^\times$ ) then  $p_1u = q_1 = p_1v$  implies  $p_1(u - v) = 0$  and hence  $u = v \in R^\times$ . Contradiction.) But we assumed that  $q_1$  has no proper factor, hence  $u$  is a unit.  $\square$

- (c) Following (b), prove that we must also have  $p_2 = uq_2$ . [Hint:  $R$  is a domain.]

*Proof.* From part (b) we know that  $p_1p_2 = q_1q_2 = up_1q_2$ , and hence

$$\begin{aligned} p_1p_2 &= up_1q_2 \\ p_1p_2 - p_1uq_2 &= 0 \\ p_1(p_2 - uq_2) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $R$  is a domain and since  $p_1 \neq 0$  (it's irreducible) we conclude that  $p_2 - uq_2 = 0$ , hence  $p_2 = uq_2$ .  $\square$

- (d) Give a **specific example** of a ring  $R$  and irreducible elements  $p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2 \in R$  where the above results fail. [Hint: Obviously, your  $R$  will not be a PID.]

*Proof.* Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$  and note that

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

On HW4 you showed that  $2$ ,  $1 + \sqrt{-3}$  and  $1 - \sqrt{-3}$  are irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$ , but that  $2$  is not associate to either  $1 + \sqrt{-3}$  or  $1 - \sqrt{-3}$ . By the results of (a),(b),(c) the ring  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-3}]$  is not a PID.  $\square$