

# 1 Rings

## 1.1 Definition

**Definition 1.1** (Ring). *A ring is a triplet  $(R, +, \times)$ , where*

- $R$  is a set
- $+$  is a binary operation on  $R$  such that  $(R, +)$  is an Abelian group.
- $\times$  is a binary operation on  $R$  that satisfies

1.  $\times$  is associative, i.e. for all  $a, b, c$  in  $R$ , we have

$$(a \times b) \times c = a \times (b \times c)$$

2.  $\times$  distributes on  $+$ , i.e. for all  $a, b, c$  in  $R$  we have

$$a \times (b + c) = a \times b + a \times c, \quad (b + c) \times a = b \times a + c \times a.$$

Furthermore:

- We denote by  $0$  the neutral element for  $+$ .
- If the operation  $\times$  is commutative, we say that  $R$  is a commutative ring.
- If the operation  $\times$  admits a neutral element, we say that  $R$  has a unity. Although this is not, strictly speaking, part of our definition, all the rings that we will consider here have a unity - and in fact, in some books the existence of a unity is included in the definition of a ring.

As usual, with the definition of a structure comes the natural definition of the associated sub-structure.

**Definition 1.2** (Subring). *Let  $(R, +, \times)$  be a ring, and  $R' \subset R$  be a subset of  $R$ . We say that  $R'$  is a subring of  $R$  if  $(R', +, \times)$  is a ring by itself.*

In practice, to prove that  $R' \subset R$  is a subring of  $R$ , we check the following properties:

1.  $(R', +)$  is a subgroup of  $(R, +)$ .
2.  $R'$  is stable (or “closed”) by product, i.e. for all  $a, b$  in  $R'$ , the product  $a \times b$  is still in  $R'$ .

## 1.2 Some examples

- The “usual” examples: the sets  $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}$  with the usual addition and multiplication are all commutative rings with a unity. In fact  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a subring of  $\mathbb{Q}$ , who is a subring of  $\mathbb{R}$ , etc.
- The “functional examples”: the set  $\mathcal{F}$  of all functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  can be endowed with a commutative ring structure. We define the sum and product of two functions as follows

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (f + g)(x) := f(x) + g(x), \quad (f \times g)(x) := f(x) \times g(x).$$

Let us emphasize that when we write  $(f + g)(x) := f(x) + g(x)$ , the first symbol  $+$  denotes the binary operation on  $\mathcal{F}$ , which is being defined in terms of the usual addition on  $\mathbb{R}$ , to which the second symbol  $+$  corresponds. Inside the ring  $\mathcal{F}$  we may find interesting subrings:

- The ring  $C^0(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  of all continuous functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . It is a subring of  $\mathcal{F}$  because the sum, difference and product of two continuous function is still continuous.
- For all  $k \geq 1$ , the ring  $C^k(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$  of all functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  which are of class  $C^k$ , i.e.  $k$  times differentiable, and whose  $k$ -th derivative is continuous. It is a subring of  $\mathcal{F}$  because the sum, difference and product of functions of class  $C^k$  is still of class  $C^k$ .
- The ring  $\mathbb{R}[X]$  of all polynomial functions with real coefficients. We may also look at  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$  or  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ , and check that  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  is a subring of  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$ , itself a subring of  $\mathbb{R}[X]$ .
- The “matrix examples”. The set  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{R})$  of  $2 \times 2$  matrices with real coefficients, with the matrix addition and multiplication, is a ring. Its unity is the identity matrix. Of course, this is **not** a commutative ring. An interesting subring is formed by the “upper triangular” matrices, i.e. the matrices of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix}, \quad a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We could also consider the rings  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{Q})$  or  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{C})$ , or even  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{Z})$ .

### 1.3 Ring morphisms and ideals

Once the ring structure is defined, we have the usual definition of a ring morphism:

**Definition 1.3** (Ring morphism and kernel). *Let  $(R, +_R, \times_R)$  and  $(S, +_S, \times_S)$  be two rings, and  $\varphi : R \rightarrow S$  be a map. We say that  $\varphi$  is a ring morphism when*

$$\forall a, b \in R, \quad \varphi(a +_R b) = \varphi(a) +_S \varphi(b), \quad \varphi(a \times_R b) = \varphi(a) \times_S \varphi(b).$$

*In other words,  $\varphi$  respects the ring structures of  $R$  and  $S$ .*

*To a ring morphism  $\varphi : R \rightarrow S$  is associated its kernel*

$$\ker \varphi := \{a \in R, \varphi(a) = 0_S\}.$$

**Remark 1.4.** *A ring morphism from  $(R, +_R, \times_R)$  to  $(S, +_S, \times_S)$  is in particular a **group morphism** from  $(R, +_R)$  to  $(S, +_S)$ . Its kernel in the sense of “ring morphism” as defined above and its kernel in the sense of “group morphism” as defined previously **are the same object**. In particular, we know that  $\ker \varphi$  is a **subgroup** of  $(R, +_R)$ . It is not difficult to check that it is a **subring** of  $(R, +_R, \times_R)$ . In fact, we have more!*

**Proposition 1.5.** *Let  $\varphi : R \rightarrow S$  be a ring morphism.*

- $\ker \varphi$  is a subgroup of  $R$ .
- $\ker \varphi$  “absorbs elements through product”: if  $a$  is in  $\ker \varphi$  and  $b$  is in  $R$ , then  $a \times b$  and  $b \times a$  are both in  $\ker \varphi$ .

**Definition 1.6** (Ideal). *Let  $R$  be a ring. A subset  $I$  of  $R$  is an ideal of  $R$  if  $I$  is a subgroup of  $R$  which satisfies:*

- For all  $a$  in  $I$ , for all  $b$  in  $R$ ,  $a \times b$  is in  $I$  (right ideal).

- For all  $a$  in  $I$ , for all  $b$  in  $R$ ,  $b \times a$  is in  $I$  (left ideal).
- For all  $a$  in  $I$ , for all  $b$  in  $R$ ,  $a \times b$  and  $b \times a$  are both in  $I$  (two-sided ideal).

Of course, in a commutative ring, there is no distinction between left, right and two-sided ideals.

It follows immediately from Proposition 1.5 and the definition above that the kernel of a ring morphism is always a two-sided ideal.

**Proposition 1.7.** 1. The sets  $\{0\}$  and  $R$  itself are always ideals of  $R$ , although not very interesting ones.

2. If  $R$  has a unity, any ideal containing  $1$  is equal to  $R$  itself. (This is frequently used to prove that some ideal is equal to the whole ring).

*Proof.* Proof of 2. if  $1 \in I$ , and  $I$  is e.g. a left ideal, then for all  $b$  in  $R$  we have  $b \times 1 \in I$ , but  $b \times 1 = b$ , so  $b \in I$  and  $I$  contains all the elements of  $R$ .  $\square$

Example: evaluation morphisms and their kernel. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be, as above, the set of all functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . For any  $\alpha$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ , we consider the map  $\varphi_\alpha$  from  $\mathcal{F}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  defined as follows

$$\forall f \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \varphi_\alpha(f) := f(\alpha).$$

Then  $\varphi_\alpha$  is a ring morphism. Its kernel is given by

$$\ker \varphi_\alpha := \{f \in \mathcal{F}, f(\alpha) = 0\},$$

which is the set of all functions vanishing at  $\alpha$ . It is an ideal of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

## 1.4 More about ideals

**Definition 1.8** (Principal ideals). Let  $R$  be a commutative ring and  $x$  be an element of  $X$ . The ideal generated by  $x$  is defined as the set  $\{x \times a, a \in R\}$ , and denoted by  $(x)$  (or  $\langle x \rangle$ , depending on the convention).

*Exercise:* check that this is indeed an ideal. Of course, if  $R$  is not commutative, one should define three notions: left ideal generated by  $x$  (sometimes denoted by  $Rx$ ), right ideal generated by  $x$  (sometimes denoted by  $xR$ , and two-sided ideal generated by  $x$  (sometimes denoted by  $RxR$ ).

- For any  $n \geq 1$ , the set  $n\mathbb{Z}$  of all multiples of  $\mathbb{Z}$  is an ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$ .
- In  $\mathbb{R}[X]$ , for all  $k \geq 1$  the set  $(X^k)$  of all polynomials which have no coefficient of order  $0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$  is an ideal of  $\mathbb{R}[X]$ .

**Definition 1.9** (Principal ideal). If an ideal  $I$  is of the form  $(x)$  for some  $x$  in  $R$ , we say that  $I$  is a principal ideal

The ideal  $6\mathbb{Z}$  is principal. However:

- It is strictly contained in the ideals  $2\mathbb{Z}$  and  $3\mathbb{Z}$ .
- We have  $3 \times 2 = 6 \in 6\mathbb{Z}$  even though  $2 \notin 6\mathbb{Z}$  and  $3 \notin 6\mathbb{Z}$ .

To address these two situations, we introduce two definitions.

**Definition 1.10.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring and  $I$  be an ideal of  $R$ .

$I$  is said to be a maximal ideal if, for any ideal  $I'$  such that  $I \subset I'$ , we have  $I' = I$  or  $I' = R$ .  
 $I$  is said to be a prime ideal if, for any  $a, b$  in  $R$  such that  $a \times b \in I$ , we must have  $a \in I$  or  $b \in I$ .

For example,  $6\mathbb{Z}$  is not maximal because  $6\mathbb{Z} \subset 2\mathbb{Z}$  and yet  $2\mathbb{Z} \neq 6\mathbb{Z}$  and  $2\mathbb{Z} \neq \mathbb{Z}$ . It is not prime neither, because  $2 \times 3 \in 6\mathbb{Z}$  and yet  $2 \notin 6\mathbb{Z}$  and  $3 \notin 6\mathbb{Z}$ .

## 1.5 Two constructions

### 1.5.1 Direct product of rings

Let  $(R, +_R, \times_R)$  and  $(S, +_S, \times_S)$  be two rings. The Cartesian product  $R \times S$  can be endowed with a ring structure  $(R \times S, +, \times)$  named the *product ring* and defined as follows: for  $a, a'$  in  $R$  and  $b, b'$  in  $S$ , we let

$$(a, b) + (a', b') := (a +_R a', b +_S b'), \quad (a, b) \times (a', b') := (a \times_R a', b \times_S b').$$

The ring  $R \times S$  is commutative if and only if both  $R$  and  $S$  are commutative (proof: exercise).

$R$  and  $S$  are both “included” in  $R \times S$  as follows: the maps  $i_1 : R \rightarrow R \times S$  and  $i_2 : S \rightarrow R \times S$  defined by

$$i_1(a) := (a, 0), \quad i_2(b) := (0, b),$$

are injective ring morphisms.

Conversely,  $R \times S$  can be “projected down” onto  $R$  or  $S$  as follows: the maps  $\pi_1 : R \times S \rightarrow R$  and  $\pi_2 : R \times S \rightarrow S$  defined by

$$\pi_1(a, b) := a, \quad \pi_2(a, b) := b,$$

are surjective ring morphisms.

**Lemma 1.11.** *If  $R, S$  are two rings,  $I$  is an ideal of  $R$  and  $J$  is an ideal of  $S$ , then  $I \times J$  is an ideal of  $R \times S$ .*

*Proof.* Exercise. □

### 1.5.2 Quotient ring

Let  $(R, +_R, \times_R)$  be a commutative ring, and  $I$  be an ideal of  $R$ . In particular,  $I$  is a subgroup of  $R$ , and it is even a *normal* subgroup of  $R$  since  $(R, +)$  is always, by definition, an Abelian group. So we can consider the quotient group  $(R/I, \bar{+})$ .

**Question:** can  $R/I$  be endowed with a ring structure?

Yes! Let  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$  be two elements of  $R/I$ , i.e. two equivalence classes for the relation “equal modulo an element of  $I$ ” on  $R$ . We want to define  $\bar{a} \bar{\times} \bar{b}$ , the natural guess is to let

$$\bar{a} \bar{\times} \bar{b} := \overline{a \times_R b},$$

in other words we define  $\bar{a} \bar{\times} \bar{b}$  as the equivalence class of  $a \times_R b$  in  $R$ .

**Question:** is this well-defined?

Yes! But as for the quotient group construction, we need to check that the definition above does **not** depend on the choice of  $a, b$  among their equivalence class. In order to do that, let

$a', b'$  be such that  $\bar{a} = \overline{a'}$  and  $\bar{b} = \overline{b'}$ . By definition of the relation “equal modulo an element of  $I$ ”, it means that there exist  $i$  and  $j$  in  $I$  such that

$$a' = a + i, \quad b' = b + j.$$

Now, let us compute (using the fact that product distributes on sum!)

$$a' \times_R b' = (a + i) \times_R (b + j) = a \times_R b + i \times_R b + a \times_R j + i \times_R j.$$

The last three terms in the right-hand side all belong to  $I$  because  $I$  is an ideal and  $i, j$  are in  $I$ . So  $a' \times_R b'$  is equal to  $a \times_R b$  plus an element of  $I$ , which means that they are equivalent modulo  $I$ , and have the same equivalence class in  $R/I$ , so indeed

$$\overline{a' \times_R b'} = \overline{a \times_R b},$$

and the product operation on  $R/I$  is well-defined.

We call  $(R/I, \overline{+}, \overline{\times})$  the *quotient ring* of  $R$  by the ideal  $I$ .

## 2 The ring $\mathbb{Z}$

### 2.1 $\mathbb{Z}$ as a principal ring

**Theorem 1** (Ideals of  $\mathbb{Z}$ ). *Every ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  is principal, i.e. of the form  $n\mathbb{Z}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .*

*Proof.* An ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  is, in particular, a subgroup of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , but  $\mathbb{Z}$  is cyclic, and we know that all subgroups of a cyclic group is cyclic. So there exists  $n$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $I = \langle n \rangle$  (as a subgroup). It is easy to check that  $\langle n \rangle = n\mathbb{Z}$  and that  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is indeed an ideal.

As a reminder, review the proof that “every subgroup of a cyclic group is cyclic”: we introduce  $n$  as

$$n := \min \{k \in I, k > 0\},$$

and show that every element of  $I$  is a multiple of  $n$ , using Euclidean division. □

**Proposition 2.1.** *Let  $n \geq 1$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *The ideal  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is a maximal ideal.*
2. *The ideal  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is a prime ideal.*
3.  *$n$  is a prime number.*

*Proof.* We show

- 2.  $\iff$  3. If  $n$  is a prime number, and if  $pq \in n\mathbb{Z}$ , it means that  $n$  divides  $pq$ , so  $n$  must divide  $p$  or  $q$  (Gauss’s lemma), so  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is a prime ideal.  
Conversely, if  $n$  is not a prime number and can be written as  $n = pq$  for  $1 < p, q < n$ , then  $pq \in n\mathbb{Z}$  and yet  $p \notin n\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $q \notin n\mathbb{Z}$  so the ideal  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is not prime.
- 1.  $\iff$  3. If  $n$  is a prime number, and if  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is included in some ideal  $I$ , since  $\mathbb{Z}$  is principal we know that  $I$  is of the form  $m\mathbb{Z}$  for some  $m$ , but then  $n \in n\mathbb{Z} \subset m\mathbb{Z}$  so  $m$  divides  $n$ , which means  $m = 1$  or  $m = n$ , and thus  $m\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}$  or  $m\mathbb{Z} = n\mathbb{Z}$ . So indeed  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is a maximal ideal.  
Conversely, if  $n$  is not a prime number, there exists a number  $m$  with  $1 < m < n$  which divides  $n$ , and thus  $n\mathbb{Z} \subset m\mathbb{Z}$ , so  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is not a maximal ideal. □

**Question:** What is the quotient ring  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ? Nothing but  $\mathbb{Z}_n$ .

**Ideals of  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$**  Let us consider the direct product of  $\mathbb{Z}$  by itself, i.e. the ring  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ . We know a family of ideals of  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ : all the ideals of the form  $n\mathbb{Z} \times m\mathbb{Z}$  for  $n, m$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . **Question:** are there more ideals?

No! Let  $K$  be an ideal of  $\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$ . Its respective images by the projections  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  are subgroups (in fact, ideals) of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and are thus of the form  $m\mathbb{Z}$  and  $n\mathbb{Z}$ , thus  $K \subset m\mathbb{Z} \times n\mathbb{Z}$ . Moreover,  $K$  contains an element of the form  $(m, x)$  for some  $x$  and of the form  $(y, n)$  for some  $y$ . Multiplying the first by  $(1, 0)$  and the second by  $(0, 1)$ , we see that  $(m, 0)$  and  $(0, n)$  belong to  $K$ , and thus  $K$  contains  $m\mathbb{Z} \times n\mathbb{Z}$ . So  $K = m\mathbb{Z} \times n\mathbb{Z}$ .

### 3 Rings of functions

Let us start with the following question: what are the ideals of  $\mathbb{R}$ ?

**Proposition 3.1.** *All the ideals of  $\mathbb{R}$  are trivial, i.e. are equal to  $\{0\}$  or  $\mathbb{R}$  itself.*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $\mathbb{R}$ , and assume that  $I$  is not  $\{0\}$ . Then  $I$  contains some  $x \neq 0$ . Since  $I$  is an ideal, it also contains  $x \times \frac{1}{x} = 1$ . We know that any ideal that contains the unity is the ring itself.  $\square$

This is not specific to  $\mathbb{R}$ , in fact this is true in every *field* (see later).

Now, let us ask: what are the ideals of  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ ? Or  $\mathbb{R}^N$ ? We recall that  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  has the structure of a product ring, where

$$(x, y) + (x', y') := (x + x', y + y'), \quad (x, y) \times (x', y') := (x \times x', y \times y').$$

Let  $K$  be an ideal of  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . Let  $I$  be the image of  $K$  by the first projection  $\pi_1(x, y) := x$  and let  $J$  be the image of  $K$  by the second projection  $\pi_2(x, y) := y$ .

1.  $I, J$  are ideals of  $\mathbb{R}$ , thus they are equal to  $\{0\}$  or  $\mathbb{R}$ . Moreover we have  $K \subset I \times J$ .
2. Conversely, let  $(a, b)$  be in  $I \times J$ . By definition,  $a$  is in the image of  $\pi_1$ , so there exists  $b'$  such that  $(a, b')$  is in  $K$ . But then  $(a, 0) = (a, b') \times (1, 0)$  is also in  $K$ . Similarly,  $(0, b)$  is in  $K$ . Then  $(a, b) = (a, 0) + (0, b)$  is in  $K$ . This shows  $I \times J \subset K$ .

So the ideals of  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  are  $\{0\} \times \{0\}$ ,  $\{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$  and  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ . **Question:** which one are prime? maximal?

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $N \geq 2$ . The ideals of  $\mathbb{R}^N$  are of the form  $I_1 \times \cdots \times I_N$  where  $I_k$  is either  $\{0\}$  or  $\mathbb{R}$ . Which one are prime? Maximal? Show that all of them are principal.*

*Proof.* Homework.  $\square$

Now, let  $S$  ( $S$  as “sequence”) be the set of all sequences of real numbers  $(u_n)_{n \geq 1}$ . We endow it with a commutative ring structure by defining

$$(u + v)_n := u_n + v_n, \quad (u \times v)_n := u_n \times v_n.$$

There is a unity: the sequence constant equal to 1. **Question:** what are the ideals of  $S$ ?

**Claim 1.** *Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $S$ . If  $I$  contains a sequence that never vanishes, then  $I$  is equal to  $S$  itself.*

*Proof.* If  $u = (u_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is a sequence such that  $\forall n, u_n \neq 0$ , then the sequence  $v$  defined by  $v_n = \frac{1}{u_n}$  satisfies  $u \times v = 1_S$ , so  $I$  contains the unity and is thus equal to  $S$  itself.  $\square$

Thus every sequence in a non-trivial ideal of  $S$  must be equal to zero at least once.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $Z$  be a non-empty subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ . The set  $S_0(Z)$  of all sequences  $u$  such that*

$$\forall n \in Z, u_n = 0$$

*form an ideal of  $S$ . It is the principal ideal generated by the sequence  $v$  defined by*

$$v_n = 0 \text{ if } n \in Z, \quad v_n = 1 \text{ if } n \notin Z.$$

*Moreover*

$$S_0(Z) \text{ is prime} \iff S_0(Z) \text{ is maximal} \iff Z \text{ is a singleton.}$$

We could hope that all ideals of  $S$  are of the form  $S_0(Z)$  for some non-empty subset  $Z$ , and  $S$  would be principal. Unfortunately, here is a counter-example:

**Proposition 3.4.** *The set  $J$  of all sequences that have only finitely many terms not equal to zero is an ideal of  $J$ . It is not of the form  $S_0(Z)$  for any  $Z$ . It is not prime.*

*Proof.* The fact that  $J$  is not prime can be checked with an example: the sequences  $u, v$  defined by  $u_n = 0, v_n = 1$  if  $n$  is odd and  $u_n = 1, v_n = 0$  if  $n$  is even, are not elements of  $J$  but  $u_n \times v_n$  is always 0 and thus  $u \times v$  is in  $J$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** *Is the subset “sequences with infinitely many 0 terms” an ideal of  $S$ ? What about the subset “infinitely many terms not equal to 0”?*

**Lemma 3.6** (Bezout’s identity). *If  $R$  is a commutative ring with unity, if  $I$  is a maximal ideal and  $p \notin I$ , then there exists  $\alpha$  in  $R, i$  in  $I$  such that  $\alpha \times p + i = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be a maximal ideal and  $p$  be an element of  $R$  that does not belong to  $I$ . Let  $I + (p)$  be the set

$$I + (p) := \{i + \alpha \times p, i \in I, \alpha \text{ in } R\}.$$

Check that this is an ideal, that contains  $I$  and is not equal to  $I$ . Since  $I$  is maximal, this must be  $R$ , so it must contain 1, so there exists  $i \in I, \alpha \text{ in } R$  such that  $i + \alpha \times p = 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *If  $R$  is a commutative ring with unity, every maximal ideal is prime.*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be a maximal ideal (not equal to  $R$  otherwise there is nothing to prove), let  $p, q$  be two elements such that  $p \times q \in I$ . Assume, by contradiction, that  $p \notin I$  and  $q \notin I$ . Then by the previous result, we know that there exists  $\alpha, \beta$  in  $R$  and  $i, j$  in  $I$  such that

$$\alpha p + i = 1, \quad \beta q + j = 1.$$

But then  $(\alpha p + i)(\beta q + j) = 1 = \alpha \beta p q + i \beta q + j \alpha p + i j$ , which is a sum of terms in  $I$ . Thus  $1 \in I$ , and  $I$  is equal to  $R$ , contradiction.  $\square$

**Questions:** What do the quotient rings look like?

## 4 Rings of matrices

For  $n \geq 2$ , we let  $M_{n,n}(\mathbb{R})$  be the ring of  $n \times n$  matrices with real coefficients.

**Remark 4.1.**  $M_{n,n}$  is **not** commutative.

Start with  $n = 2$ , then, for e.g.

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we have

$$AB = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad BA = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and thus  $AB \neq BA$ .

How to generalize for  $n \geq 2$ ? We find construct an example by hand. Or we can rely on the following “abstract” result:

**Lemma 4.2.** For  $m \geq n$ , the map  $\phi : M_{n,n}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow M_{m,m}(\mathbb{R})$  defined by

$$\phi(A) := \begin{pmatrix} A & 0_{n,m-n} \\ 0_{m-n,n} & 0_{m-n} \end{pmatrix},$$

(using block-matrix notation) is a one-to-one ring morphism.

In particular:  $M_{n,n}(\mathbb{R})$  is isomorphic to a subring of  $M_{m,m}(\mathbb{R})$ .

*Proof.* Exercise. The fact that if there is a one-to-one morphism from  $R$  to  $S$ , then  $R$  is isomorphic to a subring of  $S$  (the range of  $\phi$ ) was already mentioned in the case of groups.  $\square$

In particular, since  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{R})$  is not commutative, then  $M_{m,m}(\mathbb{R})$  is not commutative for  $m \geq 2$  (why?).

Since we are not dealing with commutative rings  $R$ , one has to distinguish between

- Left-ideal  $I : \forall a \in I, \forall b \in R, b \times a \in I$
- Right-ideal  $I : \forall a \in I, \forall b \in R, a \times b \in I$
- Two-sided ideal: both left and right.

How to find ideals? We still have *principal* ideals, but now of different types. Fix  $a$  in  $R$ .

- The left-ideal generated by  $a$  is  $Ra := \{ra, r \in R\}$  (notation  $Ra$  with  $R$  on the **left**)
- The right-ideal generated by  $a$  is  $aR := \{ar, r \in R\}$  (notation  $aR$  with  $R$  on the **right**)

**Question**, is the subset

$$\{ras, r \in R, s \in R\}$$

a two-sided ideal? Answer: it clearly “absorbs” elements on the left/right but is not clear that it is a subgroup!! To generate a two-sided ideal from  $a$ , we need to consider finite linear combinations of elements of the type  $ras$ , so in fact we define

$$RaR := \{r_1as_1 + \cdots + r_nas_n, n \geq 1, r_1, \dots, r_n \in R, s_1, \dots, s_n \in R\}.$$

**Fact:**  $Ra$  is a left-ideal,  $aR$  is a right-ideal,  $RaR$  is a two-sided ideal. Proof: exercise.

**Question:** who are the ideals of the ring  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{R})$ ?

**Remark 4.3.** *If  $I$  is an ideal (left, right, two-sided) of  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{R})$ , then either  $I$  is trivial or it contains only **non-invertible** matrices?*

*Proof.* Same reason than for functions: if  $A$  is invertible and in  $I$ , then  $A \times A^{-1}$  is in  $I$  (or  $A^{-1} \times A$  if  $I$  is a left-ideal) and then the identity is in  $I$  and  $I$  contains all the matrices.  $\square$

### The two-sided ideals

**Lemma 4.4.** *The only two-sided ideals of  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{R})$  are trivial.*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be a two-sided ideal, and assume it is not trivial, so it contains a matrix  $A$  of rank 1 (it cannot contain a matrix of rank 2 because this would be invertible, see above). We now from linear algebra that there exists  $P, Q$  (invertible, but here it does not matter) such that

$$PAQ = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and clearly we can also find  $P', Q'$  such that

$$P'AQ' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

since  $I$  is a two-sided ideal we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in I, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in I,$$

and so their sum is in  $I$  but this is the identity matrix, so  $I$  is trivial.  $\square$

**Remark 4.5.** *We have previously seen an example where all the two-sided ideals were trivial: the case of  $\mathbb{R}$  (because it is a “field”). Here we have another example, which is **not** a “field”. We say the ring is “simple” (compare to “simple groups” = all normal subgroups are trivial).*

**Question:** What about left ideals?

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $I$  be a non trivial left-ideal of  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{R})$ . For any  $A_1, A_2$  in  $I$ , we must have*

$$\ker A_1 \cap \ker A_2 \neq \{0\}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $I$  is not trivial,  $A_1, A_2$  have rank at most 1. Assume they both have rank 1 (otherwise there is nothing to prove), but  $\ker A_1 \cap \ker A_2 = \{0\}$ .

Let  $u, v$  such that  $\ker A_1 = \mathbb{R}u, \ker A_2 = \mathbb{R}v$ , and by assumption  $u, v$  are not colinear, hence they form a basis. We have

$$A_1u = 0, A_1v = \alpha u + \beta v, \quad A_2u = \gamma u + \delta v, A_2v = 0.$$

- If  $\beta = 0$ , but  $\alpha \neq 0$  multiply  $A_1$  on the left by the matrix  $C$  such that

$$Cu = \frac{1}{\alpha}v, Cv = 0,$$

then  $CA_1$  sends  $u$  to 0 and  $v$  to  $v$

- If  $\beta \neq 0$ , multiply  $A_1$  on the left by the matrix  $C$  such that

$$Cu = 0, Cv = \frac{1}{\beta}v,$$

then  $CA_1$  sends  $u$  to 0 and  $v$  to  $v$ .

- Idem for  $A_2$ .

Since  $I$  is a left-ideal, we obtain that (written in a certain basis)

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in I, \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in I,$$

so the identity is in  $I$ , hence  $I$  is trivial. □

**Proposition 4.7.** *If  $I$  is a non-trivial left-ideal of  $M_{2,2}(\mathbb{R})$ , then*

$$\bigcap_{M \in I} \ker M$$

*is a subspace  $F$  of dimension 1, and  $I$  is the left-ideal of matrices whose kernel contains  $F$ .*

*Proof.* It follows from the previous lemma. Why? □

**Remark 4.8.** *This is a principal ideal. Can you find a generator? Complete  $F$  into a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^2$  (by adding a vector) and consider the matrix written*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

*in this basis. Then any matrix in the ideal can be written as*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Exercise: extend the result to  $n \geq 3$ , and to right-ideals.

## 5 Polynomials

**Definition 5.1.** *If  $R$  is a ring, we define the ring of polynomials with coefficients in  $R$ , denoted by  $R[X]$ , as the set of all sequences of elements of  $R$  that are eventually equal to 0, so*

$$R[X] := \{P = \{a_k\}_{k \geq 0}, a_k \in R \forall k, a_k = 0 \text{ for } k \text{ large enough}\}.$$

*We define the degree of  $P$  as*

$$\deg(P) := \max\{k, a_k \neq 0\}.$$

Given a sequence of coefficients  $\{a_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ , we usually write

$$P(X) = a_0 + a_1X + a_2X^2 + \cdots + a_kX^k + \cdots + a_{\deg(P)}X^{\deg(P)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\deg(P)} a_kX^k.$$

We define two operations  $+$  and  $\times$  on  $R[X]$ , cf. Textbook section 17.1. If  $R$  is a commutative ring with unity, then so is  $R[X]$ . In the sequel, we will focus on  $\mathbb{C}[X]$ , polynomials with coefficients in  $\mathbb{C}$ .

**Ideals?** Let us consider the “evaluation morphisms”: fix  $z$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  and define  $\Phi_z : \mathbb{C}[X] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$\Phi_z(P) := P(z).$$

Its kernel is the set of all polynomials vanishing at  $z$ , it is an ideal of  $\mathbb{C}[X]$ . More ideals?

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $R, S_1, S_2$  be three rings, let  $\varphi_1$  be a ring morphism from  $R$  to  $S_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  be a ring morphism from  $R$  to  $S_2$ . Then the map  $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$  defined by*

$$r \mapsto (\varphi_1, \varphi_2)(r) := (\varphi_1(r), \varphi_2(r))$$

*is a ring morphism from  $R$  to  $S_1 \times S_2$  and its kernel is the intersection  $\ker \varphi_1 \cap \ker \varphi_2$ .*