## 6. Prime and Maximal Ideals

Let R be a ring and let I be an ideal of R, where  $I \neq R$ . Consider the quotient ring R/I. Two very natural questions arise:

- (1) When is R/I a domain?
- (2) When is R/I a field?

**Definition-Lemma 6.1.** Let R be a ring and let I be an ideal of R. We say that I is **prime** if whenever  $ab \in I$  then either  $a \in I$  or  $b \in I$ . R/I is a domain if and only if I is prime.

*Proof.* Suppose that I is prime. Let x and y be two elements of R/I. Then there are elements a and b of R such that x = a + I and y = b + I. Suppose that xy = 0, but that  $x \neq 0$ , that is, suppose that  $a \notin I$ .

$$xy = (a+I)(b+I)$$
$$= ab + I$$
$$= 0.$$

But then  $ab \in I$  and as I is prime,  $b \in I$ . But then y = b + I = I = 0. Thus R/I is a domain.

Now suppose that R/I is a domain. Let a and b be two elements of R such that  $ab \in I$  and suppose that  $a \notin I$ . Let x = a + I, y = b + I. Then xy = ab + I = 0. As  $x \neq 0$ , and R/I is a domain, y = 0. But then  $b \in I$  and so I is prime.

**Example 6.2.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}$ . Then every ideal in R has the form  $\langle n \rangle = n\mathbb{Z}$ . It is not hard to see that I is prime if and only if n is prime.

**Definition 6.3.** Let R be an integral domain and let a be a non-zero element of R. We say that a is **prime**, if  $\langle a \rangle$  is a prime ideal, not equal to the whole of R.

Note that the condition that  $\langle a \rangle$  is not the whole of R is equivalent to requiring that a is not a unit.

**Definition 6.4.** Let R be a ring. Then there is a unique ring homomorphism  $\phi \colon \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow R$ .

We say that the **characteristic** of R is n if the order of the image of  $\phi$  is finite, equal to n; otherwise the characteristic is 0.

Let R be a domain of finite characteristic. Then the characteristic is prime.

*Proof.* Let  $\phi \colon \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow R$  be a ring homomorphism. Then  $\phi(1) = 1$ . Note that  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a cyclic group under addition. Thus there is a unique map that sends 1 to 1 and is a group homomorphism. Thus  $\phi$  is certainly unique and it is not hard to check that in fact  $\phi$  is a ring homomorphism.

Now suppose that R is a domain. Then the image of  $\phi$  is a domain. In particular the kernel I of  $\phi$  is a prime ideal. Suppose that  $I = \langle p \rangle$ . Then the image of  $\phi$  is isomorphic to R/I and so the characateristic is equal to p.

Another, obviously equivalent, way to define the characteristic n is to take the minimum non-zero positive integer such that n1 = 0.

**Example 6.5.** The characteristic of  $\mathbb{Q}$  is zero. Indeed the natural map  $\mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  is an inclusion. Thus every field that contains  $\mathbb{Q}$  has characteristic zero. On the other hand  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is a field of characteristic p.

**Definition 6.6.** Let I be an ideal. We say that I is **maximal** if for every ideal J, such that  $I \subset J$ , either J = I or J = R.

**Proposition 6.7.** Let R be a commutative ring.

Then R is a field if and only if the only ideals are  $\{0\}$  and R.

*Proof.* We have already seen that if R is a field, then R contains no non-trivial ideals.

Now suppose that R contains no non-trivial ideals and let  $a \in R$ . Suppose that  $a \neq 0$  and let  $I = \langle a \rangle$ . Then  $I \neq \{0\}$ . Thus I = R. But then  $1 \in I$  and so 1 = ba. Thus a is a unit and as a was arbitrary, R is a field.

## **Theorem 6.8.** Let R be a commutative ring.

Then R/M is a field if and only if M is a maximal ideal.

*Proof.* Note that there is an obvious correspondence between the ideals of R/M and ideals of R that contain M. The result follows immediately from (6.7).

Corollary 6.9. Let R be a commutative ring.

Then every maximal ideal is prime.

*Proof.* Clear as every field is an integral domain.

**Example 6.10.** Let  $R = \mathbb{Z}$  and let p be a prime. Then  $I = \langle p \rangle$  is not only prime, but it is in fact maximal. Indeed the quotient is  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

**Example 6.11.** Let X be a set and let R be a commutative ring and let F be the set of all functions from X to R. Let  $x \in X$  be a point of X and let I be the ideal of all functions vanishing at x. Then F/I is isomorphic to R.

Thus I is prime if and only if R is an integral domain and I is maximal if and only if R is a field. For example, take X = [0,1] and  $R = \mathbb{R}$ . In this case it turns out that every maximal ideal is of the same form (that is, the set of functions vanishing at a point).

**Example 6.12.** Let R be the ring of Gaussian integers and let I be the ideal of all Gaussian integers a + bi where both a and b are divisible by 3.

I claim that I is maximal. Indeed it is not hard to see that R/I is finite. As every finite integral domain is a field, in fact it suffices to prove that I is prime. Suppose that  $(a + bi)(c + di) \in I$ . Then

$$3|(ac-bd)$$
 and  $3|(ad+bc)$ .

Suppose that  $a + bi \notin I$ . Adding the two results above we have

$$3|(a+b)c + (a-b)d.$$

Now either 3 divides a and it does not divide b, or vice-versa, or the same is true, with a+b replacing a and a-b replacing b, as can be seen by an easy case-by-case analysis. Suppose that 3 divides a whilst 3 does not divide b. Then 3|bd and so 3|d as 3 is prime. Similarly 3|c. Thus we are done in this case. Similar analyses pertain in the other cases.

Thus I is prime. It turns out that R/I is a field with nine elements. Now suppose that we replace 3 by 5 and look at the resulting ideal J. I claim that J is not maximal. Indeed consider x=2+i and y=2-i. Then

$$xy = (2+i)(2-i) = 4+1 = 5,$$

so that  $xy \in J$ , whilst neither x nor y are in J.