ALGEBRAIC NUMBER THEORY I & II

LECTURE NOTES

WINTER 2017 / 2018
SUMMER 2018

PROF. DR. GABRIELA WEITZE-SCHMITHÜSEN

Table of contents

Part I.

Algebraic number theory I

1. Small prefix

<u>Recall:</u>

- L numberfield : $\iff$ L is a finite extension of $\mathbb{Q}$
  In particular: $L/\mathbb{Q}$ is separable $\Rightarrow L/\mathbb{Q}$ is primitive, i.e. $L = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha), \mathbb{Q}[X] \ni f_\alpha =$ minimal polynomial of α over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $[L : \mathbb{Q}] = \deg(f_\alpha)$.

- $\mathcal{O} := \{\alpha \in L \mid f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$ is called *ring of integers* (generalization of $\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$).
  $\mathcal{O}$ is an integral domain.

- <u>Goal:</u> study the ring $\mathcal{O}$

- <u>Questions:</u>
  1. What is $\mathcal{O}^\times$? What is its structure?
  2. What are the prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}$?
  3. Do we have a unique prime factorization, i.e. is $\mathcal{O}$ a UFD?

1.1. Motivation

Problem 1.1.1 (Fermat's conjecture, $\sim$ 1640). Show that the equation $x^n + y^n = z^n$ has no nontrivial integer solutions, i.e. solutions (x, y, z) with $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ for $n \geq 3$.

<u>History:</u>

- 1770: Euler found solution for $n = 3$

- 1825: Dirichlet and Legendre using Germain

- Kummer showed it for many primes, he showed as well that his idea doesn't work for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>2}$

- Conjecture was proved by Wiles in 1997

Remark 1.1.2.   i) If Fermat's is true for n, then also for nk for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

  ii) It is sufficient to prove Fermat's conjecture for $n = 4$ and all odd primes.

Proof.   i) Suppose (x, y, z) is a nontrivial solution of $x^{nk} + y^{nk} = z^{nk} \Rightarrow (x^k, y^k, z^k)$ is a nontrivial solution to $x^n + y^n = z^n$.

  ii) Follows from i).

<div align="right">□</div>

Proposition 1.1.3 ($n = 2$). *Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}, \gcd(x, y, z) = 1$*

   i) x, y, z are pairwise coprime if $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$

   ii) $x^2 + y^2 = z^2 \Rightarrow$ either x or y is even

   iii) $x^2 + y^2 = z^2 \iff \exists\, r, s \in \mathbb{N}_0, \gcd(r, s) = 1$ s.t. $x = \pm 2rs, y = \pm(r^2 - s^2),$
     $z = \pm(r^2 + s^2)$.

Proof.   i) clear ✓

   ii) One of x, y, z has to be even, since $odd + odd \neq odd$. Suppose z is even. Then look
      at equation   mod 4, this gives a contradiction. By i) only one of x and y is even.

   iii) „$\Leftarrow$": calculation
     „$\Rightarrow$": Wlog. assume $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}_0$, x even, y, z odd:

$$\Rightarrow x = 2u, z + y = 2v, z - y = 2w, \gcd(w, v) = 1 (y, z \text{ are coprime}), x^2 + y^2 = z^2$$
$$\Rightarrow 4u^2 = x^2 = z^2 - y^2 = (z - y)(z + y) = 4wv \Rightarrow u^2 = wv$$
$$\overset{\gcd(v,w)=1}{\Longrightarrow} v = r^2, w = s^2 \Rightarrow z = v + w = r^2 + s^2, y = v - w = r^2 - s^2$$
$$\text{and } x = 2u = 2\sqrt{vw} = 2rs$$

<div align="right">□</div>

Remark. $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $x^2 + y^2 = z^2$ are called *pythagorean triples*.

Proposition 1.1.4 ($n = 4$). *The equation $x^4 + y^4 = z^2$ (and $x^4 + y^4 = z^4$) have no nontrivial integer solutions.*

Proof. Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x^4 + y^4 = z^2, xyz \neq 0$. Wlog $x, y, z > 0, x, y, z$ coprime, $x = 2\tilde{x}$ for some $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{N}$. Choose z minimal with this conditions.

   Prop. 1.2 $\Rightarrow \exists r, s \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $x^2 = 2rs, y^2 = r^2 - s^2, z = r^2 + s^2$ and $\gcd(r, s) = 1$
            $\Rightarrow y^2 + s^2 = r^2$ with y, s, r coprime.
   Prop. 1.2 $\Rightarrow \exists a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $s = 2ab, y = a^2 - b^2, r = a^2 + b^2$ and $\gcd(a, b) = 1$.
      plug in $\Rightarrow x^2 = 4ab(a^2 + b^2)$
            $\Rightarrow \tilde{x}^2 = ab(a^2 + b^2)$ and $a, b, a^2 + b^2$ pairwise coprime

As in proof of Prop. 1.2 (they are coprime but a square number)

$$\Rightarrow \exists\, c, d, e \in \mathbb{N} \text{ s.t. } a = c^2, b = d^2, a^2 + b^2 = e^2$$
$$\Rightarrow c^4 + d^4 = a^2 + b^2 = e^2 \text{ and } e \leq a^2 + b^2 = r < z$$

⚡since z was chosen to be minimal.   □

<u>From now on:</u> $n = p$ odd prime.

Idea 1.1.5 (by Germain). Distinguish 2 cases in Fermat's problem:

1. „First case": x, y, z with p does not divide xyz.

2. „Second case": exactly one of x, y, z is divided by p.

Some approach:

- Use primitive p-th root of unity $\zeta = \zeta_p$.

- Reminder: $X^p - 1 = (X - 1)(X - \zeta) \ldots (X - \zeta^{p-1})$

- Setting $\tilde{y} = -y$ we get:

$$x^p + y^p = x^p - \tilde{y}^p = \tilde{y}^p((\frac{x}{\tilde{y}})^p - 1)$$
$$= \tilde{y}^p(\frac{x}{\tilde{y}} - 1)(\frac{x}{\tilde{y}} - \zeta) \ldots (\frac{x}{\tilde{y}} - \zeta^{p-1})$$
$$= (x - \tilde{y})(x - \tilde{y}\zeta) \ldots (x - \tilde{y}\zeta^{p-1})$$
$$= (x + y)(x + y\zeta) \ldots (x + y\zeta^{p-1})$$

Lemma 1.1.6. *For $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $x^p + y^p = z^p \iff (x+y)(x+y\zeta) \ldots (x+y\zeta^{p-1}) = z^p$*

Idea: Look at prime divisors in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.
Problem: Would be good to have unique prime factorization. This will not be true in general.

1.2. The ring $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$

Suppose ζ is a primitive n-th root of unity

Reminder 1.2.1.   i) $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ is algebraic extension of degree $[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) : \mathbb{Q}] = \varphi(n)$

  ii) $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ is a Galois extension. In particular:
$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}) = \{\sigma_i \text{ with } \sigma_i(\zeta) = \zeta^i \mid i \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times\} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$

 iii) Consider the norm map $\mathcal{N} : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \to \mathbb{Q}$, $\alpha \mapsto \det(\gamma \mapsto \alpha\gamma)$. We have for $\alpha = r(\zeta)$ ($r \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ polynomial) with min. polynomial $f_\alpha = X^k + c_{k-1}X^{k-1} + \cdots + c_0$:

- If we have $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha) = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, then $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = (-1)^{\varphi(n)}c_0$

- $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \prod_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})} \sigma(\alpha) = \prod_{i \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times} r(\zeta^i)$

- $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \alpha^{\varphi(n)}$

 iv) $X^{n-1} + X^{n-2} + \cdots + 1 = \frac{X^n - 1}{X - 1} = (X - \zeta)(X - \zeta^2) \ldots (X - \zeta^{n-1})$
$\overset{X=1}{\Rightarrow} n = (1 - \zeta)(1 - \zeta^2) \ldots (1 - \zeta^{n-1})$

Reminder 1.2.2 (and preview).   i) $\mathcal{O} := \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] := \{r(\zeta) \mid r \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$

  ii) $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \mid f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$ (proof later)

iii) $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a free $\mathbb{Z}$-module with basis $\{1, \zeta, \ldots, \zeta^{d-1}\}$ with $d = \varphi(n)$ (proof later)

iv) $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$ (proof later)

v) $\{\alpha \in \mathcal{O} \mid |\alpha| = 1\}$ is finite (proof later)

Reminder 1.2.3. Suppose R is an integral domain:

i) $\alpha \in R$ is *irreducible* : $\Longleftrightarrow$ If $\alpha = \alpha_1 \alpha_2$ with $\alpha_i \in R$, then $\alpha_1 \in R^\times$ or $\alpha_2 \in R^\times$

ii) $\alpha, \alpha' \in R$ are *associated to each other* : $\Longleftrightarrow$ $\exists \varepsilon \in R^\times : \alpha = \varepsilon \alpha'$

iii) R is called *factorial* : $\Longleftrightarrow$ each $\alpha \in R, \alpha \neq 0$ can be written in a unique way as $\alpha = \varepsilon \pi_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot \pi_r$ with π_i irreducible up to multiplication with $\varepsilon \in R^\times$

iv) $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in R$ are called *coprime* : $\Longleftrightarrow$ If $\alpha' \in R$ with $\exists \beta_1, \beta_2 \in R : \alpha_1 = \alpha' \beta_1, \alpha_2 = \alpha' \beta_2$ then $\alpha' \in R^\times$.

Remark (and correction).   1. Recall: $L/\mathbb{Q}$ field extensions:

$$\mathcal{O} := \{\alpha \in L \mid f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X]\}$$

!! Here: f_α is by definition monic, i.e leading coefficient is 1.
<u>Remark:</u> $\mathcal{O} = \{\alpha \in L \mid \exists f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with f monic and $f(\alpha) = 0\}$
„$\subseteq$": clear
„$\supseteq$": Lemma of Gauss

2. <u>Recall:</u> Definition of field norm for L/K finite field extension How is norm defined?
$\mathcal{N} : L \to K$ defined as follows:
Suppose $\alpha \in L \Rightarrow \varphi_\alpha : \beta \mapsto \alpha\beta$ is linear map over K. Then:

$$\mathcal{N}_{L/K}(\alpha) := \det(\phi_\alpha)$$

<u>Properties:</u>

a) If $L = K(\alpha)$ and $X^n + c_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0$ is a minimal polynomial of α over K, then $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(\alpha) = (-1)^n c_0$.

b) $\mathcal{N}_{L/K}(\alpha) = (\prod_{i=1}^r \sigma_i(\alpha))^q$ with $\text{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r\}$ and $q =$ inseparable degree, i.e. $[L : K] = [L : K]_s \cdot q$.

c) $\alpha \in K \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{L|K}(\alpha) = \alpha^d$ with $d = [L : K]$ (see Bosch „Algebra"4.7).

General reference: NEUKIRCH
This chapter: BOREVICH + SHAFEREVICH Chapter 3.1.

<u>Recall:</u> Goal: prove for p prime and odd

$$x^p + y^p = z^p$$

has no non-trivial solutions. Last time:

$$x^p + y^p = z^p = (x + y)(x + y\zeta)(x + y\zeta^2) \ldots (x + y\zeta^{p-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$$

From now on: p odd prime, $\zeta = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p}}$ primitive $p - th$ root of unity $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

Proposition 1.2.4. *For the group of units $\mathcal{O}^\times$ of $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ we have:*

$$\mathcal{O}^\times = \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O} \mid \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \pm 1\}$$

Notation: $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}}$ in this chapter.

Proof. „$\subseteq$" $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times \Rightarrow \exists \beta \in \mathcal{O}$ with $\alpha\beta = 1 \Rightarrow 1 = N(\alpha\beta) \overset{!}{=} \underbrace{\mathcal{N}(\alpha)}_{\in \mathbb{Z}} \underbrace{\mathcal{N}(\beta)}_{\in \mathbb{Z} \text{ by 2.2 v)}} \Rightarrow$ claim

„$\supseteq$": Suppose $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$ with $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \pm 1$.
$\Rightarrow \pm 1 = \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \prod_{\sigma \in Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)|\mathbb{Q})} \sigma(\alpha)$
Note: $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\zeta + \dots a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2} \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$
$\Rightarrow \sigma(\alpha) = a_0 + a_1\zeta^i + \dots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{i(p-2)}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, p-1\} \Rightarrow \sigma(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$
$\Rightarrow \alpha$ is a divisor of 1 in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \Rightarrow \alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 1.2.5.   i) $\mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta^s) = p$ for $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $s \not\equiv 0 \mod p$

    ii) $1 - \zeta$ is irreducible in $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

    iii) $p = \varepsilon \cdot (1 - \zeta)^{p-1}$ with some $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$.

Proof.   i) 2.1. iv) $\Rightarrow p = (1 - \zeta)(1 - \zeta^2) \dots (1 - \zeta^{p-1})$
        2.1. iii) $\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta^s) = \prod_{\sigma \in Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})} \sigma(1 - \zeta^s) = \prod_{i=1}^{p-1}(1 - \zeta^{si}) = \prod_{j=1}^{p-1}(1 - \zeta^j) = p$

    ii) We obtain from i) that $1 - \zeta \notin \mathcal{O}^\times$. Suppose $1 - \zeta = \alpha\beta$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{O}$
       $\Rightarrow p = \mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta) = \mathcal{N}(\alpha)\mathcal{N}(\beta) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \pm 1$ or $\mathcal{N}(\beta) = \pm 1 \overset{\text{Prop 2.4}}{\Longrightarrow} \alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ or
       $\beta \in \mathcal{O}^\times$.

    iii) Use: $1 - \zeta^s = (1 - \zeta)\underbrace{(1 + \zeta + \zeta^2 + \dots + \zeta^{s-1})}_{\varepsilon_s} = (1 - \zeta)\varepsilon_s$

       $\Rightarrow p = \mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta^s) = \underbrace{\mathcal{N}(1 - \zeta)}_{=p} \cdot \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon_s) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\varepsilon_s) = 1 \Rightarrow \varepsilon_s \in \mathcal{O}^\times$

       Hence $p = \prod_{s=1}^{p-1}(1 - \zeta^s) = \prod_{s=1}^{p-1} \underbrace{\varepsilon_s}_{\in \mathcal{O}^\times}(1 - \zeta) = (1 - \zeta)^{p-1}\underbrace{\prod_{s=1}^{p-1} \varepsilon_s}_{\in \mathcal{O}^\times}$

                                                          $\square$

Notation: $\varepsilon_s = 1 + \zeta + \dots + \zeta^s$.

Lemma 1.2.6.   i) $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 - \zeta$ divides a in $\mathcal{O} \Rightarrow p$ divides a.

    ii) *An n-th root of unity lies in $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \iff n$ divides $2p$.*

Proof.   i) $a = (1 - \zeta)\beta$ with $\beta \in \mathcal{O} \Rightarrow a^{p-1} = \mathcal{N}(a) = p\mathcal{N}(\beta) \overset{(\mathcal{N}(\beta) \in \mathbb{Z})}{\Longrightarrow} p$ divides a.

    ii) „$\Leftarrow$": $-1 \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$ and thus $e^{\frac{2\pi i}{2p}} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$
       „$\Rightarrow$": Consider $H := \{\omega \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \mid \omega \text{ is a root of unity}\}$

a) $H \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$: Suppose $\omega \in H \Rightarrow \omega^n - 1 = 0$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow f_\omega$ is a divisor of $X^n - 1 \Rightarrow f_\omega \in \mathbb{Z}[X] \overset{2.2ii)}{\Longrightarrow} \omega \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

b) $\tilde{\omega}$ some conjugate of $\omega \Rightarrow \tilde{\omega}$ is a root of $X^n - 1 \Rightarrow |\tilde{\omega}| = 1 \overset{2.2v)}{\Longrightarrow} H$ is finite $\Rightarrow H$ is a cyclic subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^\times$.
Choose some generator ω_0 of H and denote $m := \mathrm{ord}(\omega_0)$. Since $\zeta \in H$ and $\mathrm{ord}(\zeta) = p \Rightarrow p$ divides m. Decompose $m = p^s \cdot m'$ with $s \geq 1$ and $\gcd(m', p) = 1$. Consider the field extensions chain:

$$\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}(\omega_0) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$$

with degrees $[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) : \mathbb{Q}] = p - 1 = \varphi(p)$ and $[\mathbb{Q}(\omega_0) : \mathbb{Q}] = \varphi(m) = p^{s-1}(p-1)\varphi(m') \leq p - 1 \Rightarrow s = 1$ and $\varphi(m') = 1$ and thus $m' = 1, 2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{ord}(\omega_0) \leq 2p$.

$\square$

Notation 1.2.7.

1. L/K field extension, $\alpha \in L, \overline{K}$ given algebraic closure. The elements $\sigma(\alpha)$ with $\sigma \in \mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \bar{K})$ are called *conjugates of α*. In particular: L/K normal $\Rightarrow$ conjugates live in L.

2. R ring, I ideal in R, $p : R \to R/I$ canonical projection. For $\alpha, \beta \in R$ we denote $\alpha \equiv \beta \mod I :\Longleftrightarrow p(\alpha) = p(\beta)$.
If $I = <q>$ is a principal ideal, we denote $\alpha \equiv \beta \mod q :\Longleftrightarrow \alpha \equiv \beta \mod <q>$

Example 1.2.8. Consider $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q}$ with $\zeta^p = 1, R = \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta], \alpha = a_0 + a_1\zeta + a_2\zeta^2 + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2}$

i) The conjugates of α are: $\alpha_h = a_0 + a_1\zeta^h + a_2\zeta^{2h} + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{h(p-2)}$ with $h \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$.

ii) Consider $\lambda = 1 - \zeta$ and $I = <\lambda>$.
$1 \equiv \zeta \mod \lambda$ and $\alpha \equiv a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{p-2} \mod \lambda (\in \mathbb{Z})$.

iii) $\alpha^p \equiv a_0^p + (a_1\zeta)^p + \cdots + (a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2})^p = \underbrace{a_0^p + a_1^p + \cdots + a_{p-1}^p}_{\in \mathbb{Z}} \mod p$

Theorem 1 (Kummer's Lemma). *If $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a unit, i.e. $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]^\times$,*

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{\varepsilon}} = \zeta^a \quad \text{for some } a \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Here $\bar{\varepsilon} = \tau(\varepsilon)$, where τ is the complex conjugation.
Recall: $\tau \in \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)/\mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. Denote $\varepsilon = a_0 + a_1\zeta + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2} = r(\zeta)$ with $r(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-2} a_i X^i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$.
Observe:

1. $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times \Rightarrow \exists \varepsilon' \in \mathcal{O}$ s.t. $\varepsilon\varepsilon' = 1 \Rightarrow \bar{\varepsilon}\bar{\varepsilon}' = 1 \Rightarrow \bar{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{O}^\times$

2. $\mu := \frac{\varepsilon}{\bar{\varepsilon}} = \frac{r(\zeta)}{r(\zeta^{-1})}$ and the conjugate μ_k of μ is $\frac{r(\zeta^k)}{r(\zeta^{-k})} = \frac{r(\zeta^k)}{\overline{r(\zeta^k)}}$. In particular $|\mu_k| = 1$.
   It follows that $\mu_k \in \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times \mid |\alpha| = 1\}$ which is by 2.2. v) a finite subgroup of
   $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)^\times \Rightarrow \mu$ is a root of unity
   Lemma 2.6 $\Rightarrow \mu = \pm\zeta^a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.
   <u>Claim:</u> $\mu = \zeta^a$
   <u>Proof of claim:</u> suppose $\mu = -\zeta^a$, i.e. $\varepsilon = -\bar{\varepsilon}\zeta^a$ $(\star)$
   <u>Idea:</u> calculation mod $\lambda = 1 - \zeta$ $\varepsilon = a_0 + a_1\zeta + \cdots + a_{p-2}\zeta^{p-2}$
   Ex. 2.8.ii) $\Rightarrow \varepsilon \equiv \underbrace{a_0 + a_1 + \cdots + a_{p-2}}_{=:M \in \mathbb{Z}} \equiv \bar{\varepsilon} \mod \lambda$

   $(\star) \Rightarrow \varepsilon \equiv -\bar{\varepsilon} \mod \lambda \Rightarrow M \equiv -M \mod \lambda \Rightarrow 2M \equiv 0 \mod \lambda \overset{\text{Lemma 2.6 i)}}{\Longrightarrow} p$ divides
   $2M$ in $\mathbb{Z} \overset{p \text{ odd}}{\Longrightarrow} p$ divides M.
   $\Rightarrow \lambda = 1 - \zeta$ divides M in $\mathcal{O}$ by Lemma 2.5.
   $\Rightarrow \varepsilon \equiv \bar{\varepsilon} \equiv M \equiv 0 \mod \lambda = 1 - \zeta \Rightarrow$ Contradiction to ε is unit and $1 - \zeta$ is
   irreducible

   $\square$

Corollary 1.2.9. ε *unit in* $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \Rightarrow \varepsilon = r\zeta^s$ *with some* $r \in \mathbb{R}, s \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Prop 2.9 $\Rightarrow \exists a \in \mathbb{Z}, \varepsilon = \zeta^a \cdot \bar{\varepsilon}$.
Choose $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $2s \equiv a \mod p$
$\Rightarrow \frac{\varepsilon}{\zeta^s} = \zeta^s \cdot \bar{\varepsilon} = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\zeta^{-s}} = \overline{\frac{\varepsilon}{\zeta^s}} = r \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon = r \cdot \zeta^s$. $\square$

Lemma 1.2.10. *Suppose* $x, y, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ *with* $m \not\equiv n \mod p$. $x + y\zeta^n$ *and* $x + y\zeta^m$ *are*
relatively prime $\iff$ *(x and y are relatively prime) and (x + y not divisible by p)*

Proof. „$\Rightarrow$":

- $d|x$ and $d|y \Rightarrow d|x + \zeta^n y$ and $d|x + \zeta^n y$ ⚡

- „$p|x + y$" Recall: $p = \varepsilon(1 - \zeta)^{p-1}$ with $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$
  $\Rightarrow x + \zeta^m y = \underbrace{x + y}_{\text{divisible by } p} + y \cdot \underbrace{(\zeta^m - 1)}_{(\zeta-1)(1+\zeta+\zeta^2\cdots+\zeta^{m-1})} \equiv 0 \mod 1 - \zeta$
  same way $x + \zeta^n y \equiv 0 \mod 1 - \zeta$ ⚡

„$\Leftarrow$": <u>Idea:</u> show: $\exists \alpha_0, \beta_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ with:

$$1 = \alpha_0(x + \zeta^m y) + \beta(x + \zeta^n y)$$

Consider: $A := \{\alpha(x + \zeta^m y) + \beta(x + \zeta^n y) \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{O}\}$
A is an ideal in $\mathcal{O}$. We have:

1. $(x + \zeta^m y) - (x + \zeta^n y) = \zeta^m(1 - \zeta^{n-m})y = \underbrace{\zeta^n \varepsilon_{n-m}}_{\in \mathcal{O}^\times}(1 - \zeta)y \Rightarrow (1 - \zeta)y \in A$

2. $\zeta^n(x + \zeta^m y) - \zeta^m(x + \zeta^n y) = (\zeta^n - \zeta^m)x = \zeta^n \cdot (1 - \zeta^{n-m})x = \underbrace{\zeta^n \varepsilon_{m-n}}_{\in \mathcal{O}^\times} \cdot (1 - \zeta)x \Rightarrow$

$(1 - \zeta)x \in A.$

3. $\gcd(x, y) = 1 \Rightarrow \exists\, a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 = ax + by \Rightarrow (1 - \zeta)xa + (1 - \zeta)yb = 1 - \zeta \overset{1.\&2.}{\Rightarrow}$
   $1 - \zeta \in A$

4. $x + y = \underbrace{x + \zeta^n y}_{\in A} + \underbrace{(1 - \zeta^n)y}_{\in A} \in A$

5. $\gcd(p, x + y) = 1 \Rightarrow \exists \bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathbb{Z} : 1 = \underbrace{\bar{a}p}_{\in A} + \bar{b}\underbrace{(x + y)}_{\in A} \in A.$

   $\Rightarrow$ Hence $x + \zeta^n y$ and $x + \zeta^m y$ are coprime.

$\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Remark 1.2.11. Suppose $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\zeta + \cdots + a_{p-1}\zeta^{p-1} \in \mathcal{O}$ with $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and at least one $a_j = 0$.
If $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with n divides α in $\mathcal{O}$, then n divides all a_i

Proof. Recall from 2.2 (preview): $1, \zeta, \zeta^2, \ldots, \zeta^{p-2}$ is a basis of $\mathcal{O}$.
Furthermore: $1 + \zeta + \cdots + \zeta^{p-1} = 0$
$\Rightarrow \{1, \zeta, \ldots, \zeta^{p-1}\} \setminus \{\zeta^j\}$ is a basis $\Rightarrow$ claim. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

1.3. First case of Fermat in case of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a UFD (unique factorization domain)

Reference: BOREVICH + SHAFEREVIC + WASHINGTON Chapter 1
As before: p odd prime, $\zeta = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{p}}$ p-th root of unity.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a UFD, then $x^p + y^p = z^p$ has no non-trivial solutions (x, y, z), such that neither x, y nor z is divisible by p.*

Theorem 3 ($p = 3$). *Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x^3 + y^3 = z^3 \mod 9 \Rightarrow 3$ divides x, y or z.*

Proof. Recall: Little Fermat's theorem $x^p \equiv x, y^p \equiv y, z^p \equiv z \mod p.$

$$x^3 + y^3 = z^3 \mod 3 \Rightarrow x + y \equiv z \mod 3$$
$$\Rightarrow z = x + y + 3u \text{ with } u \in \mathbb{Z}$$
$$\Rightarrow \underline{x^3 + y^3} \equiv (x + y + 3u)^3 \equiv \underline{x^3 + y^3} + 3xy^2 + 3x^2y \mod 9$$
$$\Rightarrow 0 \equiv xy^3 + x^2y \equiv xy(x + y) \equiv xyz \mod 3$$
$$\Rightarrow x, y \text{ or } z \text{ is divisible by } 3$$

$\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Lemma 1.3.1. *Let $p \geq 5$. Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x^p + y^p = z^p$. If $x \equiv y \equiv -z \mod p$, then $p | z$.*

Proof. $z \equiv z^p = x^p + y^p \equiv -2z^p \equiv -2z \mod p \Rightarrow 3z \equiv 0 \mod p \overset{p \neq 3}{\Longrightarrow} p | z$. $\qquad\square$

Remark 1.3.2. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that in the first case of Fermat we may assume for $p \geq 5$ that $x \not\equiv y \mod p$ because we can replace $x^p + y^p = z^p$ by $x^p + (-z)^p = (-y)^p$ and $x \not\equiv -z \mod p$.

of Thm. 1. $p = 3 \Rightarrow$ claim follows from Prop 3.1.
Now: $p \geq 5$. Suppose $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ with p divides neither x, y nor z, x, y, z are pairwise coprime and $x \not\equiv y \mod p$. Suppose $z^p = x^p + y^p = (x + y)(x + \zeta y) \ldots (x + \zeta^{p-1} y)$.
Apply Lemma 2.11:

- $\gcd(x, y) = 1$ ✓

- Little Fermat $\Rightarrow x + y \equiv x^p + y^p \equiv z^p \not\equiv 0 \mod p$

$\overset{2.11}{\Longrightarrow} x + y, x + \zeta y, \ldots, x + \zeta^{p-1} y$ are pairwise coprime.
$\overset{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \text{ UFD}}{\Longrightarrow}$ „$x + \zeta^i y$ have to be p-power" More precisely: $x + \zeta y = \varepsilon \alpha^p$ with $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times, \alpha \in \mathcal{O}$, since they are coprime factors of a p-th power.

1. Cor. 2.10 $\Rightarrow \varepsilon = r \zeta^s$ with $r \in \mathbb{R}, s \in \mathbb{Z}$

2. Example 2.8. iii) $\Rightarrow \exists a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\alpha^p \equiv a \mod p$.

$$x + \zeta y = r \zeta^s \alpha^p \equiv r \zeta^s a \quad \mod p$$
$$x + \zeta^{-1} y = \overline{x + \zeta y} \equiv r \zeta^{-s} a \quad \mod p$$
$$\Rightarrow \zeta^{-s}(x + \zeta y) \equiv r a \equiv \zeta^s (x + \zeta^{-1} y) \quad \mod p$$
$$\Rightarrow \underbrace{x + \zeta y - \zeta^{2s} x - \zeta^{2s-1} y}_{= x \cdot 1 + y\zeta - x\zeta^{2s} - y\zeta^{2s-1}} \equiv 0 \quad \mod p$$

      Idea: Use Rem. 2.12
      <u>Case 1:</u> $1, \zeta, \zeta^{2s-1}, \zeta^{2s}$ are distinct $\overset{p \geq 5, \text{ Rem } 2.12}{\Longrightarrow} p | x$ and $p | y$. Contradiction to first case.

$\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Recall: $L = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$, $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, where ζ is a p-th root of unity

Last time:

(1) $a_1 1 + a_2 \zeta + \cdots + a_p \zeta^{p-1} = \alpha$ and at least one $a_j = 0$

    If α is divided by $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ then all the a_i are divided by n.

(2) $x + y\zeta - x\zeta^{2s} - y\zeta^{2s-1} \equiv 0 \mod p$

Continuation of proof of Theorem 1. "Case 2" $1, \zeta, \ldots, \zeta^{2s}$ are not distinct.
Observe: $1 \neq \zeta$ and $\zeta^{2s-1} \neq \zeta^{2s}$

"Case 2A" $1 = \zeta^{2s} (\Leftrightarrow p|s)$.
(2) implies $y\zeta - y\zeta^{2s-1} \equiv 0 \mod p$ such that Remark 2.12 yields the contradiction $p|y$.

"Case 2B" $1 = \zeta^{2s-1} (\Leftrightarrow \zeta = \zeta^{2s})$.
(2) implies $(x - y)1 + (y - x)\zeta \equiv 0 \mod p$ such that Remark 2.12 yields $p|y - x$, which contradicts the assumption $x \not\equiv y \mod p$.

"Case 2C" $\zeta = \zeta^{2s-1}$.
(2) implies $x - x\zeta^2 \equiv 0 \mod p$ such that Remark 2.12 yields the contradiction $p|x$. $\square$

Questions:

(1) Under which assumption is $\mathcal{O}$ a UFD?

(2) What can we do if $\mathcal{O}$ is not a UFD?

     $\rightarrow$ Idea of Kummer: "calculate with ideals"

Prospect: Theorem (Montgomery, Uchida, 1971)
$\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$ is a UFD if and only if $p \leq 19$, p prime.

Preview: From Kummer's idea we obtain a better criterion for p called **regular**, which ensures that Fermat's conjecture holds for p.

Conjecture. *There are infinitely many regular primes.*

2. Ring of integers

In this chapter, all rings are assumed to be commutative with 1.

2.1. Integral ring extensions

Definition 2.1.1 ("ganze Ringerweiterungen"). Let $A \subset B$ be a ring extension.

(i) $b \in B$ is **integral** over A if there exists a monic polynomial $f(X) = X^n + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in A[X]$ with $f(b) = 0$.

(ii) B is **integral** over A if all $b \in B$ are integral over A.

Proposition 2.1.2. *Let $A \subset B$ be a ring extension and $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in B$. Then $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ are integral over A if and only if*

$$A[b_1, \ldots, b_n] = \{f(b_1, \ldots, b_n) \mid f \in A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]\}$$

is a finitely generated A-module.

Reminder 2.1.3 ("Adjunkte"). Let R be a ring and $A \in R^{n \times n}$

(i) $A^{\#} = (a_{i,j}^{\#})$ with $a_{i,j}^{\#} = (-1)^{i+j} \det(A_{j,i})$, where $A_{j,i}$ is obtained from A by deleting the j-th row and i-th column of A.

(ii) We have $AA^{\#} = A^{\#}A = \det(A)I$. In particular, $Ax = 0$ implies $A^{\#}Ax = 0$ such that $\det(A)x = 0$.

Proof of Proposition 1.2. "$\Rightarrow$" If $n = 1$ and b is integral over A, then there is an $f \in A[X]$ with f monic such that $f(b) = 0$. Let $g \in A[X]$ be arbitrary. Then

$$g(X) = q(X)f(X) + r(X)$$

with $q, r \in A[X]$ and $\deg r < \deg f = d$. Hence $g(b) = r(b)$ with $\deg r < d$. Thus $\{1, b, \ldots, b^{d-1}\}$ generate $A[b]$ as an A-module. The case $n \geq 2$ follows by induction.

"$\Leftarrow$" $A[b_1, \ldots, b_n]$ is finitely generated as an A-module by $w_1, \ldots, w_r$. If $b \in A[b_1, \ldots, b_n]$ then

$$bw_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{j,i}w_j$$

such that

$$(bI - (a_{i,j}))\, w = 0.$$

Thus, $\det\left(bI - (a_{i,j})\right)w = 0$ and hence

$$\det\left(bI - (a_{i,j})\right)w_i = 0$$

for all $i = 1, \ldots, r$. If we now use that

$$1 = c_1 w_1 + \cdots + c_r w_r$$

we can infer $\det\left(bI - (a_{i,j})\right)1 = 0$. Consider

$$M = bI - (a_{i,j}) = \begin{pmatrix} b - a_{1,1} & -a_{1,2} & \cdots & -a_{1,r} \\ -a_{2,1} & b - a_{2,2} & \cdots & -a_{2,r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -a_{r,1} & -a_{r,2} & \cdots & b - a_{r,r} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the Leibniz formula we have

$$\det(M) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^{n} m_{\sigma(i),j}$$

which is a polynomial over b with leading coefficient 1. Hence b is integral over A. $\quad\square$

Corollary 2.1.4 (And Definition). *(i) If $A \subset B$ is an extension of rings then*

$$\overline{A} = \{b \in B \mid b \text{ is integral over } A\}$$

*is a ring. It is called the **integral closure** of A in B. If $\overline{A} = A$ then A is called **integrally closed** in B.*

(ii) We have transitivity, that is to say, if A, B, C are rings with $A \subset B \subset C$ such that C is integral over B and B is integral over A then C is integral over A.

(iii) The integral closure of A in B is integrally closed, i.e., $\overline{\overline{A}} = \overline{A}$.

Proof. "(i)" If $b_1, b_2 \in \overline{A}$ then $A[b_1], A[b_2]$ are finitely generated A-modules. Hence $A[b_1, b_2]$ is a finitely generated A-module. Thus, by Proposition 1.3, $b_1 + b_2$ and $b_1 b_2$ are integral, i.e., elements of $\overline{A}$.

"(ii)" If $c \in C$ then c is integral over B and hence there is a monic polynomial $f = X^n + b_{n-1} X^{n-1} + \cdots + b_0 \in B[X]$ with $f(b) = 0$. This shows that c is integral over $R = A[b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}]$ such that Proposition 1.3 shows that $R[c]$ is a finitely generated R-module. Furthermore, $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1}$ are integral over A such that another application of Proposition 1.3 shows that R is a finitely generated A-module. Hence, $R[c]$ is a finitely generated A module such that c is integral over A by Proposition 1.3.

"(iii)" Follows from (ii). $\quad\square$

Definition 2.1.5 ("ganzer Abschluss und normaler Ring"). If A is an integral domain we call its integral closure $\overline{A}$ in $K = \mathrm{Quot}(A)$ the **normalization** or the **integral closure** of A. We say A is **integrally closed** if A is integrally closed in K.

Remark 2.1.6. If A is a UFD then A is integrally closed.

Proof. Suppose $b = \frac{a}{a'} \in \mathrm{Quot}(A)$ with $\gcd(a, a') = 1$ is integral over A. Then there exist $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in A$ with

$$\left(\frac{a}{a'}\right)^n + a_{n-1}\left(\frac{a}{a'}\right)^{n-1} + a_{n-2}\left(\frac{a}{a'}\right)^{n-2} + \cdots + a_0 = 0$$

such that

$$a^n + a_{n-1}a'a^{n-1} + a_{n-2}a'^2 a^{n-2} + \cdots + a_0 a'^n = 0.$$

Let $a' = \varepsilon \pi_1 \cdots \pi_r$ be the prime factorization of a' with $\varepsilon \in A^\times$ and $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r$ primes. Since $\pi_i | a'$ the above equation shows that actually $\pi_i | a^n$. But this implies $\pi_i | a$ which is a contradiction to $\gcd(a, a') = 1$. Hence we have $a' = \varepsilon \in A^\times$ such that $b \in A$. $\qquad\square$

2.2. Integral closures in field extensions

Setting:

- A is an integral domain.

- A is integrally closed.

- $K = \mathrm{Quot}(A)$.

- L/K is a finite field extension with $\overline{A}_K = A \subset K = \mathrm{Quot}(A) \hookrightarrow L \supset B = \overline{A}_L$.

- B is the integral closure of A in L. Observe: $B \cap K = A$

Remark 2.2.1.   (i) B is integrally closed in L.

(ii) If $\beta \in L$ then there are $b \in B$ and $a \in A \backslash \{0\}$ such that $\beta = \frac{b}{a}$.

In particular, $L = \mathrm{Quot}(B)$.

(iii) For $\beta \in L$ we have $\beta \in B$ if and only if $f_\beta \in A[X]$, where f_β is the minimal polynomial of β over K.

Proof. "(i)" Follows from the transitivity in Corollary 1.4.

"(ii)" Choose $a \in A$ with $a^n f_\beta(X) = a^n X^n + a^{n-1} c_{n-1} X^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0 \in A[X]$. Then we have

$$a^n \beta^n + c_{n-1} a^{n-1} \beta^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0 = 0$$

and hence

$$(a\beta)^n + c_{n-1}(a\beta)^{n-1} + \cdots + c_0 = 0$$

such that $a\beta$ is integral over A. Consequently, $b = a\beta \in B$ and $\beta = \frac{b}{a}$.

"(iii)" "$\Leftarrow$" Obvious. "$\Rightarrow$" Let β be a zero of $g(X) = X^n + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in A[X]$. Then f_β divides g. If $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n$ are the zeros of f_β in $\overline{K}$ then they are also zeros of g and thus integral over A. Hence the coefficients of f_β are integral over A and are elements of K such that $f_\beta \in A[X]$ as claimed. $\qquad\square$

Reminder 2.2.2 (Trace, Norm). Let $K \subseteq L$ be a finite field extension. For α in L consider the map $T_\alpha : \beta \mapsto \alpha\beta$. The following holds

   i) $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha) = \mathrm{Tr}(T_\alpha)$ and $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(\alpha) = \det(T_\alpha)$,

   ii) If $L = K(\alpha)$ and $f_\alpha(X) = X^n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i X^i$ then

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha) = -a_{n-1} \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_{L|K}(\alpha) = (-1)^n \cdot a_0,$$

   iii) Since $T_{\alpha+\beta} = T_\alpha + T_\beta$ and $T_{\alpha\cdot\beta} = T_\alpha \circ T_\beta$, we conclude that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K} : (L, +) \to (K, +) \text{ and } \mathcal{N}_{L|K} : (L^*, \cdot) \to (K^*, \cdot)$$

   are group homomorphisms,

   iv) Suppose $K \subseteq L$ is a seperable field extension with $L = K(\alpha)$. Further assume $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$. Then the following holds
   - $f_\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \sigma_i(\alpha))$,
   - $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(\alpha)$,
   - $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(\alpha) = \prod_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(\alpha)$,

   v) Trace and norm are transitive, i.e., for field extensions $K \subseteq L \subseteq M$ it holds
   - $\mathcal{N}_{L|K} \circ \mathcal{N}_{M/L} = \mathcal{N}_{M/K}$,
   - $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K} \circ \mathrm{Tr}_{M/L} = \mathcal{N}_{M/K}$.

Definition 2.2.3 (Discriminant). Let $K \subseteq L$ be a seperable field extension and let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ be a K-basis of L. Further let $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$. Consider the matrix

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1(\alpha_1) & \sigma_1(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \sigma_1(\alpha_n) \\ \sigma_2(\alpha_1) & \sigma_2(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \sigma_2(\alpha_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \sigma_n(\alpha_1) & \sigma_n(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \sigma_n(\alpha_n) \end{pmatrix} = (\sigma_i(\alpha_j))_{i,j} \in L^{n\times n}.$$

We call $d(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n) := \det(A^2)$ the **discriminant** of L over K with respect to the basis $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n$.

Remark 2.2.4. In the situation of Definition (2.2.3) the following holds.

i) Consider the matrix $B = \left(\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha_i\alpha_j)\right)_{i,j}$ in $K^{n\times n}$. Then the discriminant is given by $d(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n) = \det(B)$. In particular, the discriminant $d(\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n)$ lies in K.

ii) Suppose we have Θ in L such that $1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1}$ forms a basis of L. Then the following equality holds

$$d(1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1}) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (\Theta_i - \Theta_j)^2.$$

Here Θ_i denotes $\sigma_i(\Theta)$. If $L = K(\Theta)$ then $d(1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1})$ coincides with the discriminant of the minimal polynomial f_Θ. Note that we use the notion of discriminants for polynomials here.

Proof. We begin by proving statement i). One computes

$$\det(A)^2 = \det(A^t) \cdot \det(A) = \det(A^t \cdot A).$$

The following calculation proves the claim

$$
\begin{aligned}
A^t \cdot A &= (\sigma_j(\alpha_i))_{i,j} \cdot (\sigma_k(\alpha_\ell))_{k,\ell} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_j(\alpha_i) \cdot \sigma_j(\alpha_\ell) \right)_{i,\ell} \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma_j(\alpha_i \cdot \alpha_\ell) \right)_{i,\ell} \\
&= (\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha_i \cdot \alpha_\ell))_{i,\ell} \\
&= B.
\end{aligned}
$$

For statement ii), we will compute the determinant of the following Vondermonde matrix

$$\det(A) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Theta_1 & \cdots & \Theta_1^{n-1} \\ 1 & \Theta_2 & \cdots & \Theta_2^{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \Theta_n(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \Theta_n^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} =: V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n).$$

By induction, we prove that $V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n)$ is nonzero and that the following equality holds

$$V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (\Theta_j - \Theta_i).$$

For $n = 2$, we have

$$\det(A) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Theta_1 \\ 1 & \Theta_2 \end{pmatrix} = \Theta_2 - \Theta_1 \neq 0.$$

Hence the claim holds for $n = 2$. Now we assume that the claim holds for a $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. We want to prove that viewed as polynomials in Z the following equality holds

$$V_{n+1}(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n, Z) = V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} (Z - \Theta_i). \tag{2.1}$$

This implies that

$$V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_{n+1}) = V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} (\Theta_{n+1} - \Theta_i) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (\Theta_j - \Theta_i).$$

To show equality (2.1), recall that

$$V_{n+1}(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n, Z) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \Theta_1 & \cdots & \Theta_1^n \\ 1 & \Theta_2 & \cdots & \Theta_2^n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \Theta_n(\alpha_2) & \cdots & \Theta_n^n \\ 1 & Z & \cdots & Z^n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Ones sees that the polynomials on both sides of equality (2.1) have degree n. Moreover, $\{\Theta_1, \cdots, \Theta_n\}$ is the set of zeros for both polynomials. Since the leading coefficient in both cases is $V_n(\Theta_1, \ldots, \Theta_n)$, the polynomials are equal. This proves the claim. $\qquad\square$

Example 2.2.5. Consider $L = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ for a square free integer D different from 0 and 1. Then the following holds

- $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \{1, \sqrt{D}\}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of L.

- Define $\sigma_2 : L \to \overline{\mathbb{Q}}, a + b\sqrt{D} \mapsto a - b\sqrt{D}$. Then we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}}(L, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}) = \{\sigma_1 = \mathrm{id}, \sigma_2\}.$$

- $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/\mathbb{Q}}(a + b\sqrt{D}) = a + b\sqrt{D} + a - b\sqrt{D} = 2a$.

- $\mathcal{N}_{L/\mathbb{Q}}(a + b\sqrt{D}) = (a + b\sqrt{D}) \cdot (a - b\sqrt{D}) = a^2 - b^2 \cdot D$.

- $d(\mathfrak{B}_1) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{D} \\ 1 & -\sqrt{D} \end{pmatrix}^2 = (-2\sqrt{D}) = 4D$.

- We have

$$(\alpha_i \alpha_j)_{i,j} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{D} \\ \sqrt{D} & D \end{pmatrix}.$$

  Hence we compute

$$\det((\mathrm{Tr}(\alpha_i \alpha_j))_{i,j}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2D \end{pmatrix} = 4D.$$

- Consider the $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of L given by $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \{1 + \sqrt{D}, 1 - \sqrt{D}\}$. Computing the discriminant for this basis yields

$$d(1 + \sqrt{D}, 1 - \sqrt{D}) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \sqrt{D} & 1 - \sqrt{D} \\ 1 - \sqrt{D} & 1 + \sqrt{D} \end{pmatrix}^2 = 16D.$$

Hence we see that the discriminant depends on the basis we choose.

Proposition 2.2.6. *Let $K \subseteq L$ be a seperable field extension.*

  i) The bilinear map

$$h : L^2 \to K, \ (x, y) \mapsto \mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(xy)$$

  is non degenerate, i.e., $h(x, y) = 0$ for all $y \in L$ implies that $x = 0$.

  ii) If $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ forms a basis of L/K then $d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \neq 0$.

Proof. For statement i), we choose a primitive element Θ. Then $1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1}$ is a K-basis of L. Let B be the matrix representation of h with respect to this basis. We find

$$\det(B) \overset{(2.4)\ i)}{=} d(1, \Theta, \ldots, \Theta^{n-1})$$
$$\overset{(2.4)\ ii)}{=} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (\Theta_i - \Theta_j)^2 \neq 0.$$

Here Θ_i denotes $\sigma_i(\Theta)$. This shows that h is non degenerate. We now prove statement ii). Observe that the matrix $M = (\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha_i \alpha_j))_{i,j}$ is the matrix representation of h with respect to $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$. By Remark (2.4), we conclude

$$d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) = \det(M).$$

Now, i) implies that $\det(M)$ is nonzero. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \square$

Remark 2.2.7. Let $A \subseteq B$ be an integral ring extension with $B \subseteq L$ and $A = B \cap K \subseteq K$. Assuming that $\mathrm{Hom}_K(L, \overline{K}) = \{\mathrm{id} = \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ the following holds

  i) If $x \in B$ then $\sigma_i(x) \in B$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

  ii) For all $x \in B$ the trace $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(x)$ and the norm $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x)$ lie in A.

  iii) Let $x \in B$. Then x lies in B^* if and only if the norm $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x)$ lie in A^*.

Proof. We start by proving i). Let x in B. By Remark (2.1), we have that the minimal polynomial f_x lies in $A[X]$. Since $\sigma(x)$ is also a zero of f_x, it is contained in B. This shows i). Now, statement ii) follows from i), Reminder (2.2) iv) and the fact that $A = B \cap K$. For iii), assume that x is a unit in B, i.e., we find y in B with $xy = 1$. Hence

$$\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x) \cdot \mathcal{N}_{L|K}(y) = \mathcal{N}_{L|K}(xy) = 1.$$

Using ii), we deduce that $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x)$ lies in A^*. This proves one direction. For the other direction, assume that $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x)$ lies in A^*, i.e., we find $a \in A$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
1 =& a \cdot \mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x) \\
=& a \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i(x) \\
=& a \cdot x \cdot \underbrace{\prod_{i=2}^{n} \sigma_i(x)}_{\in B, \; by \; i)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence x lies in B^*. This proves iii). $\qquad\qquad\square$

Proposition 2.2.8. *Suppose* $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in B$ *forms a K-basis of L. Let d denote the discriminant* $d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in A$. *Then* $d \cdot B$ *is contained in* $A\alpha_1 + \cdots + A\alpha_n$.

Proof. Suppose $\alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \alpha_i \in B$ for $c_i \in K$. We want to solve for $(c_1, \ldots, c_n)$. Applying the trace to the equalities

$$
\alpha_i \alpha = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \alpha_i \alpha_j, \; 1 \le i \le n,
$$

we obtain

$$
\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha_i \alpha) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} c_j \, \mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha_i \alpha_j), \; 1 \le i \le n.
$$

Hence $x = (c_1, \ldots, c_n)$ is the solution of the linear system $Mx = y$, where

$$
M = ((\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha_i \alpha_j)))_{i,j} \in A^{n \times n}, \; y = (\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(\alpha_i \alpha))_i \in A^n.
$$

By Reminder (1.3), we have

$$
\det(M) \cdot x = M^{\#} M x = M^{\#} y \in A^n.
$$

Using Remark (2.4), we know $\det(M) = d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) =: d$. We conclude that dc_i lies in A for $1 \le i \le n$, which proves the claim. $\qquad\square$

Definition 2.2.9 (Ganzheitsbasis). Suppose $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n \in B$ forms a basis of B over A, i.e., every $\alpha \in B$ can be written in a unique way as an A-linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \omega_i$. Then $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n$ is called an **integral basis** of B over A.

Example 2.2.10. Same situation as in Ex. 2.5. $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{1, \sqrt{D}\} \subseteq B$. Consider:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\alpha =& \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}) \Rightarrow 2\alpha = 1 + \sqrt{D} \\
\Rightarrow & (2\alpha - 1)^2 = D \Rightarrow 4\alpha^2 - 4\alpha + 1 = D \\
\Rightarrow & f_\alpha(X) = X^2 - X + \frac{1 - D}{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence if $D \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \alpha \in B$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ is not an integral basis.

Proposition 2.2.11. *Let $D \in \mathbb{Z}$, D square-free, $D \neq 0, 1$, $B :=$ integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}) = L$.*

   i) $D \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \{1, \sqrt{D}\}$ *is an integral basis of $B/\mathbb{Z}$ in particular $B = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}]$.*

   ii) $D \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \{1, \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{D}+1)\}$ *is an integral basis of $B/\mathbb{Z}$. and $B = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}(1+\sqrt{D})]$.*

Proof. Consider $\alpha = a + b\sqrt{D} \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ with $a, b, \in \mathbb{Q}$.
$\Rightarrow f_\alpha = X^2 - 2aX + a^2 - b^2 D$.
Rem 2.1: $\alpha \in B \iff f_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[X] \iff 2a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a^2 - b^2 D \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(1) $\underline{\text{Show}}$: $\alpha \in B \Rightarrow 2b \in \mathbb{Z}$.
   $\alpha \in B \Rightarrow 4a^2 - 4b^2 D = 4z$ with $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. Write $b = \frac{p}{q}$ with $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}, \gcd(p, q) = 1$
   $\Rightarrow 4p^2 D = ((2a)^2 - 4z)q^2 \quad (\star)$
   $\Rightarrow q = 1$ or 2.

(2) $\underline{\text{Show}}$: $q = 2 \Rightarrow D \equiv 1 \mod 4$
   $(\star) \Rightarrow p^2 D = (2a)^2 - 4z \equiv (2a)^2 \mod 4$
   p is odd, hence $p^2 \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow (2a)$ is odd (i.e. $a = \frac{2n-1}{2} \in \mathbb{Q}$)
   $\Rightarrow (2a)^2 \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow D \equiv 1 \mod 4$.

(3) It follows from (2) if $D \equiv 1 \mod 4$:
   $\alpha \in B \iff \alpha = a + b\sqrt{D}$ or $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(a + b\sqrt{D})$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence we obtain:

$$B = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}] & \text{, if } D \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4 \\ \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}] & \text{, if } D \equiv 1 \mod 4 \end{cases}$$

   For the second case observe that $\frac{a}{2} + \frac{b}{2}\sqrt{D} = \frac{a-b}{2} + \frac{b}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}) \in \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D}]$.
   This implies the claim.

$\square$

Proposition 2.2.12. *Suppose L/K separable and A is a principal ideal domain. Let $M \neq 0$ be a finitely generated B-submodule of $L \Rightarrow M$ is a free A-module. In particular: B is a free A-module of rank $n := [L : K]$.*

Reminder 2.2.13. Suppose A is a principal ideal domain and M_0 is a finitely generated free A-module.

   i) Any submodule M of M_0 is free.

   ii) $\text{rank}(M_0) \geq \text{rank}(M)$

of Prop 2.12. Let $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r \in M \subseteq L$ be generators of M as B-module and let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ be a basis of L/K in B and $d := d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in A$.
Recall: $L = \{\frac{b}{a} \mid b \in B, a \in A \setminus \{0\}\}$.

   (1) Prop 2.7 $\Rightarrow dB \subseteq A\alpha_1 + \cdots + A\alpha_n$

(2) $\exists a \in A : a\mu_1, \ldots, a\mu_r \in B$

Hence: $daM \subseteq dB \subseteq A\alpha_1 + \cdots + A\alpha_n =: M_0$
(M_0 is a free A-module, since $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are basis of L/K).
Reminder 2.13 $\Rightarrow adM$ is a free A-module $\Rightarrow M$ is a free A-module.
Furthermore: $\mathrm{rank}(M) = \mathrm{rank}(adM) \overset{Rem.2.13}{\leq} \mathrm{rank}(M_0) = n$.
Suppose that $M = B$. So far we got that B is a free A-module and $\mathrm{rank}(B) \leq n$.
<u>Show:</u> $\mathrm{rank}(B) \geq n$.
Let $\mu_1, \ldots \mu_r$ be a basis of B as A-module. By $L = \{\frac{b}{a} \mid b \in B, a \in A \setminus \{0\}\}$ we have that $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_r$ generate L over K. $\square$

Hence: if A is a principal ideal domain, then B has always an integral basis.

Proposition 2.2.14. *Suppose we are in the following situation:*

- *L/K and L'/K are Galois extensions of degree n and m in some field E*

- *A a subring of K such that $K = \mathrm{Quot}(A)$ and B and B' are the integral closures of A in L and L'.*

- *$\{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n\}$ and $\{\omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_m\}$ are integral basis for B/A and B'/A.*

- *$d := d(\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n)$ and $d' := d(\omega'_1, \ldots, \omega'_m) \in A$ with d and d' are coprime in A, i.e. $\exists x, x' \in A$ with $1 = dx + d'x'$.*

- *$K = L \cap L'$*

Then we have: $\{\omega_i \omega'_j \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\}$ is an integral basis and its discriminant is $d^m (d')^n$.

Proof. Recall: $L \cap L' = K \Rightarrow [LL' : K] = nm$ and $\{\omega_i \omega'_j\}$ is a basis of the field extension LL'/K.
$\mathrm{Gal}(L/K) = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ and $\mathrm{Gal}(L'/K) = \{\sigma'_1, \ldots, \sigma'_m\}$
$\Rightarrow$ obtain unique lifts $\hat{\sigma}_i \in \mathrm{Gal}(LL'/L')$ and $\hat{\sigma}'_j \in \mathrm{Gal}(LL'/L)$ and $\mathrm{Gal}(LL'/K) = \{\hat{\sigma}_i \hat{\sigma}'_j \mid i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}\}$.
Consider: $\alpha \in \tilde{B} :=$ integral closure of A in LL'.
Write $\alpha = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_{i,j} \omega_i \omega'_j = \sum_j \beta_j \omega'_j$ with $\alpha_{i,j} \in K$ and $\beta_j = \sum_i \alpha_{i,j} \omega_i \in L$.
$\Rightarrow \hat{\sigma}'_i(\alpha) = \sum_j \beta_j \hat{\sigma}'_i(\omega'_j)$, since $\hat{\sigma}'_i \in \mathrm{Gal}(LL'/L)$.
$\Rightarrow$ We have a linear system:

$$a = Tb \text{ with } a = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}'_1(\alpha) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\sigma}'_m(\alpha) \end{pmatrix} \in \tilde{B}^m \ , \ b = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_m \end{pmatrix} \in L^m \ , \ T = (\hat{\sigma}'_i(\omega'_j))_{(i,j)} \in \tilde{B}^{m \times m}$$

Observe: $\det(T)^2 = d'$

$$\Rightarrow \det(T)b = T^\# T b = T^\# a \in \tilde{B}^m \qquad\qquad \Rightarrow d'b \in \tilde{B}^m$$

$$\Rightarrow \forall j : d'\beta_j = \sum_i d'\alpha_{i,j}\omega_i \in \tilde{B} \cap L = B$$

$$\Rightarrow d'\alpha_{i,j} \in A, \text{ since } \{\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_n\} \text{ is an integral basis.}$$

$$\Rightarrow d\alpha_{i,j} \in A \text{ in the same way}$$

$$\Rightarrow \alpha_{i,j} = (x'd' + xd)\alpha_{i,j} = x'd'\alpha_{i,j} + xd\alpha_{i,j} \in A.$$

Hence: $\{\omega_i\omega_j' \mid (i,j) \in \{(1,1), \ldots, (n,m)\}\}$ is an integral basis of $\tilde{B}/A$.

For calculating the discrimant consider the matrix $M = (\hat{\sigma}_k \circ \hat{\sigma}_l'(\omega_i\omega_j'))_{(k,l),(i,j)} = (\hat{\sigma}_k(\omega_i)\hat{\sigma}_l'(\omega_j'))$.

Consider $Q = (\hat{\sigma}_k(\omega_i))$

$$\Rightarrow M = \begin{pmatrix} Q & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ldots & 0 & Q \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} I \cdot \hat{\sigma}_1'(\omega_1') & \cdots & I \cdot & \hat{\sigma}_1'(\omega_1') \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ I \cdot \hat{\sigma}_1'(\omega_m') & \cdots & I \cdot & \hat{\sigma}_m'(\omega_m') \end{pmatrix}$$

Observe:

(1) $\det(Q)^2 = d(\omega_1, \omega_n) = d$

(2) The second matrix can be transformed by switching rows and columns to $\begin{pmatrix} Q' & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \ldots & 0 & Q' \end{pmatrix}$

   with $Q' = (\sigma_l'(\omega_j'))$ and $\det(Q') = d'$

$$\Rightarrow \det(M)^2 = \det(Q)^{2m} \cdot \det(Q')^{2n} = d^m d'^n. \qquad \qquad \square$$

Remark 2.2.15 (and Definition). Suppose $K = \mathbb{Q}, A = \mathbb{Z}, L$ a number field and $B = \mathcal{O}_k$.

(i) There is always an integral basis $w_1, \ldots, w_n$.

(ii) The **discriminant** $d_k = d_k(\mathcal{O}_k) = d(w_1, \ldots, w_n)$ does not depend on the choice of integral basis.

Proof. "(i)" Proposition 2.12 "(ii)" Let $w_1', \ldots, w_n'$ be another integral basis. Then there exists a base change matrix $T \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ with

$$\begin{pmatrix} w_1' \\ \vdots \\ w_n' \end{pmatrix} = T \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ \vdots \\ w_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence

$$
\begin{pmatrix} \sigma(w_1') \\ \vdots \\ \sigma(w_n') \end{pmatrix} = T \begin{pmatrix} \sigma(w_1) \\ \vdots \\ \sigma(w_n) \end{pmatrix}.
$$

such that

$$
d(w_1', \ldots, w_n') = \underbrace{\det T}_{\in \{1, -1\}}{}^2 d(w_1, \ldots, w_n) = d_k.
$$

$\square$

Example 2.2.16. Let $L = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ with $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ square-free. By Proposition 2.14 we have:

(i) $\mathcal{O}_k = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}]$ and $\{1, \sqrt{D}\}$ is an integral basis for $D \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4$ and $d_k = 4D$.

(ii) $\mathcal{O}_k = \mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1+\sqrt{D}}{2}\right]$ and $\left\{1, \frac{1+\sqrt{D}}{2}\right\}$ is an integral basis for $D \equiv 1 \mod 4$ and $d_k = D$.

In particular, this holds for $D = -1$, i.e., the Gaussian integers $\mathbb{Z}[i]$.

2.3. Ideals

Let R be a commutative ring with 1.
Problem: O_k is not a UFD in many cases, e.g. in $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$ we have

$$
(1 + \sqrt{-5})(1 - \sqrt{-5}) = 1 + 5 = 6 = 2 \cdot 3,
$$

that is, two different ways to factor 6 in irreducible elements.

Idea:

(1) Maybe we have too few elements, i.e.,

$$
1 + \sqrt{-5} = p_1 p_2, \, 1 - \sqrt{-5} = p_3 p_4 \text{ and } 2 = p_2 p_3, 3 = p_1 p_4
$$

for some primes p_i.

(2) An element is determined (up to units) by the set of elements it divides, e.g.

$$
p_i \longleftrightarrow \{x \in \mathcal{O}_k; \, p_i | x\} = p_i \mathcal{O}_k \text{ (this is an ideal).}
$$

Notation 2.3.1. Let $I, J \subset R$ be ideals. We define

- $I + J = \{a + b; \, a \in I, b \in J\}$,

- $IJ = \{\sum_i a_i b_i; \, a_i \in I, b_i \in J\}$.

Definition 2.3.2 (and Reminder)**.** Let $I \subsetneq R$ be an ideal.

(a) I is called **prime** if for all $a, b \in R$ with $ab \in I$ we already have $a \in I$ or $b \in I$.

    $\Leftrightarrow$ For all ideals $A, B \subset R$ with $AB \subset I$ we have $A \subset I$ or $B \subset I$.

(b) I is called **maximal** if for any ideal $I \subset J \subset R$ we have $J = I$ or $J = R$.

    $\Leftrightarrow$ R/I is a field.

(c) R is called **Noetherian** if every ascending chain of ideals

$$I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \cdots$$

becomes stationary, i.e., if there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $I_n = I_N$ for alls $n \geq N$.

    $\Leftrightarrow$ Every ideal in R is finitely generated.

(d) R is called a **Dedekind domain** if

- R is an integral domain,
- R is integrally closed,
- R is Noetherian, and
- every prime ideal in R is maximal.

Proposition 2.3.3. *If $\mathcal{O}$ is the integral closure of $\mathbb{Z}$ in a number field then $\mathcal{O}$ is a Dedekind domain.*

Proof. It is clear that $\mathcal{O}$ is an integral domain and integrally closed. Furthermore, by Proposition 2.12 each $\mathbb{Z}$-submodule is finitely generated as a $\mathbb{Z}$-module, thus also as an $\mathcal{O}$-module. Hence $\mathcal{O}$ is Noetherian.

Now, let $I \subset \mathcal{O}$ be a prime ideal. Then $I \cap \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ is a prime ideal such that $\mathbb{Z}/(I \cap \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{F}_p$. Using $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[w_1, \ldots, w_n]$ we conclude

$$\mathcal{O}/I = \mathbb{Z}/(I \cap \mathbb{Z})[w_1', \ldots, w_n'] = \mathbb{F}_p[w_1', \ldots, w_n'] = \mathbb{F}_p(w_1', \ldots, w_n'),$$

where $w_i' \equiv w_i \mod I$. Thus $\mathcal{O}/I$ is a field ad hence I maximal. $\qquad\square$

From now on: Let $\mathcal{O}$ denote a Dedekind domain.

Theorem 4. *Every ideal $0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O}$ has a unique factorization*

$$I = P_1 \cdots P_n$$

into prime ideals $P_i \subset \mathcal{O}$.

Lemma 2.3.4. *For every ideal $0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O}$ there exist nonzero prime ideals $P_i \subset \mathcal{O}$ such that*

$$P_1 \cdots P_n \subset I.$$

Proof. Set $M = \{0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O} \text{ ideal}; I \text{ does not have such } P_i\}$ and suppose $M \neq \emptyset$. Then M is partially ordered by inclusion and since $\mathcal{O}$ is Noetherian, every chain in M has an upper bound. Thus, the Lemma of Zorn yields a maximal element $I_0 \in M$. Since I_0 cannot be prime there are $a, b \in \mathcal{O}$ such that $ab \in I_0$ but $a, b \notin I_0$. Consider the ideals $I_1 = (a) + I_0$ and $I_2 = (b) + I_0$ which satisfy $I_0 \subsetneq I_1$, $I_0 \subsetneq I_2$ and $I_1 I_2 \subset I_0$. Since I_0 is a maximal ideal in M, we have $I_{1,2} \notin M$ hence we find prime ideals $P_1, \ldots, P_n, P_1', \ldots, P_m' \subset \mathcal{O}$ with

$$P_1 \ldots P_n \subset I_1 \text{ and } P_1' \ldots P_m' \subset I_2.$$

Finally, we conclude $P_1 \ldots P_n P_1' \ldots P_m' = I_1 I_2 \subset I_0 \Rightarrow I_0 \notin M \,\lightning\Rightarrow M = \emptyset.$ $\qquad\square$

Lemma 2.3.5. *Let $0 \neq P \subset \mathcal{O}$ be a prime ideal, $I \subset \mathcal{O}$ an ideal and $K = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O})$. Then:*

(i) $P^{-1} := \{x \in K; xP \subset \mathcal{O}\} \supsetneq \mathcal{O}$

(ii) $I \subsetneq P^{-1}I := \{\sum_i a_i x_i; a_i \in I, x_i \in P^{-1}\}$

Proof. "(i)" Let $0 \neq a \in P$, $P_1 \cdots P_n \subset (a) \subset P$ as in Lemma 3.5 with n minimal.

Claim: Without loss of generality we can assume that $P_1 = P$.
Proof of the claim: Since $P_1 \cdots P_n \subset P$ and P is prime, there is an index i such that $P_i \subset P$, by reindexing we may assume that $i = 1$. However, we assumed $\mathcal{O}$ to be Dedekind, hence P_1 is a maximal ideal in $\mathcal{O}$. Thus, $P_1 \subset P \subsetneq \mathcal{O}$ implies that $P_1 = P$ as claimed.

Now, since n was chosen minimal we have $P_2 \cdots P_n \not\subset (a)$, i.e, there exists an element $b \in (a) \backslash P_2 \cdots P_n$. On the one hand we thus have

$$a^{-1}b \notin \mathcal{O}$$

and on the other hand $bP \subset (a)$ such that $a^{-1}bP \subset \mathcal{O}$ and hence

$$a^{-1}b \in P^{-1}.$$

Both of this together shows that $P^{-1} \supsetneq \mathcal{O}$.

"(ii)" Assume there is an ideal $I \subset \mathcal{O}$ such that $P^{-1}I \subset I$. Let $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \subset I$ be a generating set and choose $x \in P^{-1} \backslash \mathcal{O}$. Then,

$$x\alpha_i = \sum_j a_{ij}\alpha_j$$

for some $a_{ij} \in \mathcal{O}$. Consider the matrix $A = xE_n - (a_{ij})_{i,j}$, which satisfies

$$A \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_n \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Since $A^{\#}A = \det A$ we conclude $\det A = 0$ such that x is a zero of the monic polynomial $\det\left(XE_n - (a_{ij})_{i,j}\right)$ over $\mathcal{O}$. But since $\mathcal{O}$ is integrally closed this implies $x \in \mathcal{O}$, a contradiction. $\qquad\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.4. **Existence of a factorization:** Let

$$M = \{0 \neq I \subset \mathcal{O} \text{ ideal}; I \text{ has no factorization}\}$$

and assume that $M \neq \emptyset$. As in Lemma 3.5, let $I_0 \in M$ be a maximal element and let $P \supset I_0$ be a maximal ideal containing I_0. Since I_0 is not prime we have $I_0 \neq P$ such that by Lemma 3.6,

$$I_0 \subsetneq P^{-1} I_0 \subset P^{-1} P = \mathcal{O}.$$

Note that $I_0 = I_0 \mathcal{O} = I_0 P^{-1} P$ and $I_0 \neq P$ imply $P^{-1} I_0 \subsetneq \mathcal{O}$. Since I_0 was maximal in M we thus have $P^{-1} I_0 \notin M$, i.e., there are prime ideals $P_1, \ldots, P_n \subset \mathcal{O}$ with $P^{-1} I = P_1 \cdots P_n$. This leads to the contradiction $I = P P_1 \cdots P_n$.

Uniqueness of the factorization: Suppose that

$$I = P_1 \cdots P_n = Q_1 \cdots Q_m$$

are two prime factorizations. Then $P_1 \supset I = Q_1 \cdots Q_m$, hence without loss of generality we can assume that $Q_1 \subset P_1$. Since $\mathcal{O}$ is Dedekind we conclude $Q_1 = P_1$ such that

$$P_2 \cdots P_n = P_1^{-1} I = Q_2 \cdots Q_m.$$

The claim follows by induction. $\qquad\qquad\square$

Definition 2.3.6. We call two ideals $0 \neq I, J \subset \mathcal{O}$ **coprime** $:\Leftrightarrow I + J = \mathcal{O}$. For example, one could take two distinct prime ideals in a Dedekind ring.

Remark 2.3.7. Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n \subset \mathcal{O}$ be pairwise coprime. Then P_1 and $P_2 \cdots P_n$ are coprime and we have $\prod_{i=1}^n P_i = \bigcap_{i=1}^n P_i$.

Proof. Induction on n: The case $n = 2$ is clear. Let $n > 2$. Since P_1 and P_2 are coprime, $\exists p_1 \in P_1, p_2 \in P_2$, such that we can write $1 = p_1 + p_2$. By induction hypothesis, $\exists p_1' \in P_1$, $p \in P_3 \cdots P_n$, such that $1 = p_1' + p$. It follows

$$1 = p_1 + p_2 \cdot (p_1' + p) = \underbrace{p_1 + p_2 p_1'}_{\in P_1} + \underbrace{p_2 p}_{\in P_2 \cdots P_n},$$

which yields the first claim.

For the second claim, first note that $\prod P_i \subset \bigcap P_i$ is clear.
For the converse, let $a \in \bigcap P_i$, which of course implies that $a \in P_i$ for all i. As above, we write $1 = p_1 + p$, $p_1 \in P_1$, $p \in P_2 \cdots P_n$. We get $a = a p_1 + a p$, which implies that $a \in a P_1 + P_1 \cdot \prod_{i=2}^n P_i$ for all i and by induction hypothesis, we get $a \in \prod P_i$. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 5 (Chinese Remainder Theorem)**.** *Let $P_1, \ldots, P_n \subset \mathcal{O}$ bet pairwise coprime ideals, $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^n P_i$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{O}/I \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}/P_i$$

Proof. Consider the map

$$\phi : \mathcal{O} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}/P_i, \quad a \mapsto \bigoplus_i a \mod P_i.$$

Obviously, $\ker(\phi) = I$. It remains to show, that ϕ is surjective. Let first $n = 2$: For $p_1 \in P_1$, $p_2 \in P_2$ let $1 = p_1 + p_2$ and for any a_1, $a_2 \in \mathcal{O}$ write $a = a_2 p_1 + a_1 p_2$. Then $\phi(a) = a_1 \oplus a_2 \in \mathcal{O}/P_1 \oplus \mathcal{O}/P_2$.

In general, by **3.8**, we know that $\exists y_i \in \mathcal{O}$ with $y_i \equiv 1 \mod P_i$ and $y_i \equiv 0 \mod \bigcap_{j \neq i} P_i$. Hence the element $a = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i y_i$ is mapped to $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n a_i \mod P_i$ $\qquad\square$

Definition 2.3.8. A **fractional ideal** of K is a finitely generated $\mathcal{O}$-module $0 \neq I$ of K. Since $\mathcal{O}$ is noetherian, this is equivalent to: $\exists c \in \mathcal{O}$, such that $c \cdot I \subset \mathcal{O}$ is an ideal (since every submodule of $\mathcal{O}$ is finitely generated). The product of two fractional ideals is denoted in the same way as introduced in **3.3**. Ideals in $\mathcal{O}$ are called **integral ideals**.

Theorem 6. *The fractional ideals of K, together with the product, form an abelian group, which we denote by $\mathcal{J}_K$.*

Proof. Commutativity and associativity are clear. The unit in $\mathcal{J}_K$ is given by $\mathcal{O}$. We define $I^{-1} := \left\{ x \in K \mid x \cdot I \subset K \right\}$ and show, that this defines an inverse for all $I \in \mathcal{J}_K$.

For a prime ideal $P \subset \mathcal{O}$, we have already seen in **3.4** that $P^{-1}P = \mathcal{O}$ and for an integral ideal $I = P_1 \cdots P_n$, we have $J = P_1^{-1} \cdots P_n^{-1}$ as an inverse:

$J \subset I^{-1}$ is clear. For the converse, let $x \in I^{-1}$, we then have $x \cdot IJ \subset \mathcal{O}$, with $x \cdot I \subset \mathcal{O}$ and $IJ = \mathcal{O}$, therefore $x \cdot 1 \in J$ and $I^{-1} \subset J$ follows.
Let now I be fractional. Then $\exists c \in \mathcal{O}$, such that cI is integral. But then $(cI)^{-1} = c^{-1}I^{-1}$ and hence $II^{-1} = (cI)(c^{-1}I^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}$ $\qquad\square$

Corollary 2.3.9. *Every fractional ideal I has a unique factorization $I = \prod P_i^{n_i}$, with $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $P_i \subset \mathcal{O}$ distinct prime ideals and only finitely many $n_i \neq 0$. In particular, $\mathcal{J}_K$ is a free abelian group on the prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. By **3.11**, every element $I \in \mathcal{J}_K$ can be written as $I = AB^{-1}$ for some integral ideals $A, B \subset \mathcal{O}$. Therefore, by **3.4**, we get $I = \prod P_i^{n_i}$ and by multiplying denominators, we see that this presentation is unique. $\qquad\square$

Definition 2.3.10. The principle ideals generate a subgroup $\mathcal{P}_K$ of $\mathcal{J}_K$. We call the quotient group $\mathrm{Cl}_K := \mathcal{J}_K/\mathcal{P}_K$ the **ideal class group**. We have an exact sequence of groups

$$1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}^\times \longrightarrow K^\times \xrightarrow{a \mapsto a\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{J}_K \longrightarrow \mathrm{Cl}_K \longrightarrow 1.$$

2.4. Lattices and Minkowski

Definition 2.4.1. Let V be an n-dimensional $\mathbb{R}$-vector space. A **lattice** $\Lambda \subset V$ is a subgroup of the form $\mathbb{Z}v_1 + \ldots \mathbb{Z}v_m$, where $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ are linearly independent over V. We call $(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$ a **basis** of Λ and $\phi := \left\{ x_1 v_1 + \ldots x_m v_m \mid x_i \in [0, 1) \right\}$ a **fundamental domain** of Λ. We call Λ **complete**, if $n = m$.

CAUTION: For many people, lattices are always complete!

Example 2.4.2.   (a) $\mathbb{Z} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathbb{Z} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a complete lattice

   (b) $\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\sqrt{2} \subset \mathbb{R}$ is not a lattice, since 1 and $\sqrt{2}$ are not linearly independent.

   (c) $\mathbb{Z} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a non-complete lattice.

Proposition 2.4.3. *A subgroup $\Lambda \subset V$ is a lattice $\Leftrightarrow \Lambda$ is a discrete subgroup of V.*

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$": Take $\left\{ \lambda + x_1 v_1 + \cdots + x_n v_n + \text{rest of basis} \mid |x_n| < 1 \right\}$ as a neighbourhood for $\lambda \in \Lambda$.
"$\Leftarrow$": Let $V_0 = \langle \Lambda \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then we can choose a basis $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ of V_0 in Λ, such that $\Lambda_0 := \mathbb{Z}v_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}v_m$ is a lattice in V_0.

Claim: The index $[\Lambda : \Lambda_0]$ is finite.
Proof of the claim: Since Λ_0 is complete, $V = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_0} \phi_0 + \lambda$. Since Λ is discrete and ϕ_0 bounded, $\Lambda \cap \phi_0$ is finite. Hence we have only finitely many residue classes $\lambda + \Lambda_0$ of Λ and therefore $[\Lambda : \Lambda_0] =: d < \infty$.

From this follows, that $\Lambda \subset \frac{1}{d}\Lambda_0 = \mathbb{Z}(\frac{1}{d}v_1) + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}(\frac{1}{d}v_m)$. Therefore, Λ has a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $w_1 = v_1 n_1, \ldots, w_r = v_r n_r$ for some $n_i \in \frac{1}{d}\mathbb{N}$ and since Λ spans V_0, we get $r = m$ and they are linearly independent. $\qquad\square$

Let $\Gamma = v_1 \mathbb{Z} + \cdots + v_n \mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a complete lattice. We define

$$\operatorname{vol} \Gamma = \operatorname{vol} \phi = |\det(v_1, \ldots, v_n)| \,.$$

Note that this definition is independent of the chosen basis since for a transformation

$$A(v_1, \ldots, v_n) = (v_1', \ldots, v_n')$$

between two bases we have $\det A = \pm 1$.

Theorem 7 (Minkowski). *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex, symmetric central (i.e., $x \in X$ implies $-x \in X$) subset and let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a complete lattice. If*

$$\operatorname{vol} X > 2^n \operatorname{vol} \Gamma$$

then there exists some $\gamma \in \Gamma \backslash \{0\}$ such that $\gamma \in X$.

Proof. **Claim:** It suffices to show that there are $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma$, $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2$, such that

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma_1\right) \cap \left(\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma_2\right) \neq \emptyset.$$

Proof of claim: Let $x = \frac{1}{2}x_1 + \gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}x_2 + \gamma_2$ with some $x_1, x_2 \in X$. Then

$$y = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 - x_2) = \gamma_2 - \gamma_1 \in \Gamma \backslash \{0\}$$

with $y \in X$ since X is symmetrical central.

Now let us assume that the family $\left(\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma\right)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ is pairwise disjoint. Then

$$\left(\left[\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma\right] \cap \phi\right)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$$

also consists of pairwise disjoint sets such that we obtain the contradiction

$$\operatorname{vol}\Gamma = \operatorname{vol}\phi \geq \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \operatorname{vol}\left(\left[\frac{1}{2}X + \gamma\right] \cap \phi\right) = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \operatorname{vol}\left(\frac{1}{2}X \cap [\phi - \gamma]\right)$$

$$= \operatorname{vol}\left(\frac{1}{2}X\right) = \frac{1}{2^n}\operatorname{vol}X.$$

$\square$

2.5. Minkowski theory

Let $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = n$ be a field extension, $\tau_i \colon K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ different embeddings and consider the embedding

$$j \colon K \hookrightarrow K_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{\tau_i} \mathbb{C}, \, a \mapsto (\tau_1(a), \ldots, \tau_n(a)).$$

Define a hermitian scalar product on $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by

$$\langle (x_{\tau_i}), (y_{\tau_i}) \rangle = \sum_{\tau_i} x_{\tau_i} \overline{y_{\tau_i}}$$

and consider the complex conjugation $F \in \operatorname{Gal}(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R})$ given by $\mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}, z \mapsto \bar{z}$. Let

$$F(\tau) = \bar{\tau} \colon a \mapsto \overline{\tau(a)}$$

and extend it to $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ by

$$F \colon K_{\mathbb{C}} \to K_{\mathbb{C}}, \, (x_\tau) \mapsto (\overline{x_{\bar{\tau}}}).$$

Example. Let $D > 0$ be square-free. Consider

$$\mathbb{Q}\left(\sqrt{D}\right) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Q}\left(\sqrt{D}\right)_{\mathbb{C}} = \prod_{\tau_i} \mathbb{C}$$

with

$$\tau_1\left(a + b\sqrt{D}\right) = a + b\sqrt{D} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tau_2\left(a + b\sqrt{D}\right) = a - b\sqrt{D}.$$

Then

$$j\left(a + b\sqrt{D}\right) = \left(a + b\sqrt{D}, a - b\sqrt{D}\right)$$

and $F(\tau_1) = \tau_1, F(\tau_2) = \tau_2$ such that

$$F\left(x_{\tau_1}, x_{\tau_1}\right) = \left(\overline{x}_{\tau_1}, \overline{x}_{\tau_2}\right).$$

Remark.   • $F(\langle x, y \rangle) = \langle F(x), F(y) \rangle$

     • $\text{Tr} \colon K_{\mathbb{C}} \to \mathbb{C}$, $(x_\tau) \mapsto \sum_\tau x_\tau$ such that $(\text{Tr} \circ j)(a) = \text{Tr}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(a)$

Now define the F-invariant $\mathbb{R}$-vector space

$$K_{\mathbb{R}} = K_{\mathbb{C}}^+ = \{x \in K_{\mathbb{C}} \,|\, F(x) = x\} = \{x \in K_{\mathbb{C}} \,|\, x_{\overline{\tau}} = \overline{x_\tau} \text{ for all } \tau\}.$$

Since $\overline{\tau}(a) = \overline{\tau(a)}$ for all $a \in K$ and all τ, we have $j(K) \subset K_{\mathbb{R}}$. We call $K_{\mathbb{R}}$ the **Minkowski space** and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \big|_{K_{\mathbb{R}}}$ the **canonical metric**.

Remark. Note that $j \colon K \to K_{\mathbb{R}} \cong K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$, where the isomorphism is given by $a \otimes x \mapsto j(a)x$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$.

Explicit description of $K_{\mathbb{R}}$: Let $n = r + 2s$, where r and s are the number of embeddings

$$\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_r \colon K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

and

$$\sigma_1, \overline{\sigma_1}, \ldots, \sigma_s, \overline{\sigma_s} \colon K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C},$$

respectively. Notice that $F(\varphi_i) = \varphi_i$ and $F(\sigma_j) = \overline{\sigma_j}$. Then elements of $K_{\mathbb{C}}$ are of the form

$$x = \left(x_{\varphi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\varphi(r)}, x_{\sigma_1}, x_{\overline{\sigma_1}}, \ldots, x_{\sigma_s}, x_{\overline{\sigma_s}}\right)$$

with

$$F(x) = \left(\overline{x_{\varphi_1}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{\varphi_r}}, \overline{x_{\overline{\sigma_1}}}, \overline{x_{\sigma_1}}, \ldots, \overline{x_{\overline{\sigma_s}}}, \overline{x_{\sigma_s}}\right).$$

Hence we have

$$K_{\mathbb{R}} = \left\{x \in K_{\mathbb{C}} \,\big|\, x_{\varphi_i} \in \mathbb{R}, x_{\overline{\sigma_j}} = \overline{x_{\sigma_j}}\right\}.$$

Proposition 2.5.1. *The map*

$$f\colon K_\mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{R}^{r+2s} = \prod_\tau \mathbb{R},$$

$$x \mapsto (x_{\varphi_1}, \ldots, x_{\varphi_r}, \operatorname{Re} x_{\sigma_1}, \operatorname{Im} x_{\sigma_1}, \ldots, \operatorname{Re} x_{\sigma_s}, \operatorname{Im} x_{\sigma_s}.)$$

is an isomorphism. It transforms the canonical metric into the scalar product

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \sum_\tau \alpha_\tau x_\tau y_\tau,$$

where

$$\alpha_\tau = \begin{cases} 1, & \tau = \varphi_i \text{ for some } i, \\ 2, & \tau = \sigma_j \text{ for some } j. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Obviously, f is an isomorphism. For $x = (x_\tau), y = (y_\tau) \in K_\mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\langle x, y \rangle \big|_{K_\mathbb{R}} = \sum_\tau x_\tau \overline{y_\tau}$$

$$= \sum_{\varphi_i} x_{\varphi_i} y_{\varphi_i} + \sum_{\sigma_j} x_{\sigma_j} \overline{y_{\sigma_j}} + \sum_{\overline{\sigma_j}} \overline{\left(x_{\sigma_j} \overline{y_{\sigma_j}} \right)}$$

$$= \cdots = (f(x), f(y)).$$

$\square$

Remark.   • The canonical metric induces a volume $\operatorname{vol}_{\text{can}}$ on $K_\mathbb{R}$ and thus on $\mathbb{R}^{r+2s}$.

   • If we denote the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{r+2s}$ by $\operatorname{vol}_{\text{Leb}}$ then, for $X \subset K_\mathbb{R}$,

$$2^s \operatorname{vol}_{\text{Leb}} f(X) = \operatorname{vol}_{\text{can}} X.$$

   • We will thus consider $K \supset U \xrightarrow{j} j(U) \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{R}^{r+2s}$.

Example. Let $e_j = (0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0)$. Note that we have $\langle e_{\varphi_i}, e_{\varphi_i} \rangle = 1$ and $\langle e_{\sigma_j}, e_{\varphi_j} \rangle = 2$, such that $\langle \frac{e_{\sigma_j}}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{e_{\sigma_j}}{\sqrt{2}} \rangle = 1$. Hence

$$\left\{ e_{\varphi_1}, \ldots, e_{\varphi_r}, \frac{e_{\sigma_1}}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{e_{\overline{\sigma_1}}}{\sqrt{2}}, \ldots \right\}$$

is an orthonormal basis. Using the correspondence

$$X \subset K_\mathbb{R} \leftrightarrow f(X) \subset \mathbb{R}^{r+2s}$$

we thus define

$$\operatorname{vol}_{\text{can}} X = \operatorname{vol}_{\text{can}} f(X) = 2^s \operatorname{vol}_{\text{Leb}} f(X.)$$

Proposition 2.5.2. *If $I \neq 0$ is an $\mathcal{O}_k$-ideal then $\Gamma = j(I)$ is a complete lattice in $K_{\mathbb{R}}$. Its fundamental domain has volume*

$$\operatorname{vol} \Gamma = \operatorname{vol} \phi = \sqrt{|d_k|} \cdot [\mathcal{O}_k \colon I].$$

Proof. Choose α_i such that $I = \alpha_1 \mathbb{Z} + \cdots + \alpha_n \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\Gamma = j(I) = j(\alpha_1)\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + j(\alpha_n)\mathbb{Z}$. Define

$$A = (j(\alpha_1), \ldots, j(\alpha_n))^T = \begin{pmatrix} \tau_1(\alpha_1) & \cdots & \tau_n(\alpha_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \tau_1(\alpha_n) & \cdots & \tau_n(\alpha_n) \end{pmatrix}$$

such that

$$\operatorname{vol} \phi = |\det A| = \sqrt{|d_k|} \cdot [\mathcal{O}_k \colon I].$$

Furthermore,

$$d(I) = d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) = |\det A|^2 = d(\mathcal{O}_k) \cdot [\mathcal{O}_k \colon I]^2,$$

with $[\mathcal{O}_k \colon I] = |\det M|$ for the change of basis M from $\mathcal{O}_k$ to I. $\qquad\square$

Theorem 8. *Let $I \neq 0$ be an ideal in $\mathcal{O}_k$. Let $(c_\tau)_\tau$ be a collection of real number such that $c_\tau > 0$, $c_\tau = c_{\bar{\tau}}$ and*

$$\prod_\tau c_\tau > \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^s \sqrt{|d_k|} \cdot [\mathcal{O}_k \colon a].$$

Then there exists $a \in I \backslash \{0\}$ such that

$$|\tau(a)| < c_\tau$$

for all $\tau \in \operatorname{Hom}(K, \mathbb{C})$.

Proof. Consider the convex, central symmetric set

$$X = \{(x_\tau) \in K_{\mathbb{R}} \mid |x_\tau| < c_\tau \text{ for all } \tau\}$$

and let $f \colon K_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $n = r + 2s$, as in Proposition 5.1. Notice that for $x \in X$ we have $f(x) = (x_{\varphi_1}, \ldots, x_{\varphi_r}, a_1, b_1, \ldots, a_s, b_s)$ with $|x_{\varphi_i}| < c_{\varphi_i}$ and $a_j^2 + b_j^2 < c_{\sigma_j}^2$. Hence

$$\operatorname{vol}_{\operatorname{can}} X = 2^s \operatorname{vol}_{\operatorname{Leb}} f(X) = 2^s \left(\prod_{i=1}^r 2c_{\varphi_i}\right)\left(\prod_{j=1}^s \pi c_{\sigma_j}^2\right) = 2^{r+s}\pi^s \prod_\tau c_\tau,$$

and thus, by Proposition 5.2,

$$2^n \operatorname{vol} \Gamma = 2^{r+2s}\sqrt{|d_k|} \cdot [\mathcal{O}_k \colon I]$$

$$= 2^{r+s}\pi^s \left[\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^s \sqrt{|d_k|} \cdot [\mathcal{O}_k \colon a]\right]$$

$$< 2^{r+s}\pi^s \prod_\tau c_\tau$$

$$\operatorname{vol}_{\operatorname{can}} X.$$

Consequently, by Minkowski's theorem, there exists $j(a) \in \Gamma \backslash \{0\}$ with $j(a) \in X$ and $|\tau(a)| < c_\tau$ for all τ. $\qquad\square$

Multiplicative Minkowsky theory

Define

$$j \colon K^* \hookrightarrow K_{\mathbb{C}}* = \prod_{\tau} \mathbb{C}^*, \ a \mapsto (\tau(a))_{\tau}$$

and

$$\mathcal{N} \colon K_{\mathbb{C}}^* \to \mathbb{C}^*, \ (x_{\tau}) \mapsto \prod_{\tau} x_{\tau}.$$

Denote the composition of these maps by $\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}} = N \circ j$. Furthermore, consider

$$l \colon \mathbb{C}^* \to \mathbb{R}, \ z \mapsto \log |z|$$

and its extension

$$l \colon K_{\mathbb{C}}^* \to \prod_{\tau} \mathbb{R}, \ (x_{\tau}) \mapsto (\log |x_{\tau_1}|, \ldots, \log |x_{\tau_n}|).$$

All in all, we have

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
K^* & \overset{j}{\hookrightarrow} K_{\mathbb{C}}^* \overset{l}{\longrightarrow} \prod_{\tau} \mathbb{R} \\
\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}} \downarrow & \downarrow \mathcal{N} \qquad \qquad \downarrow \mathrm{Tr} \\
\mathbb{Q}^* & \overset{}{\hookrightarrow}_{i} \mathbb{C}^* \overset{}{\longrightarrow}_{l} \mathbb{R}
\end{array}
$$

with

$$\left[\prod_{\tau} \mathbb{R} \right]^+ = \prod_{\varphi_i} \mathbb{R} \times \prod_{\sigma_j} [\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}]^+ \overset{\cong}{\to} R^{r+s},$$

where the isomorphism is given by

$$(x_{\varphi_1}, \ldots, x_{\varphi_r}, x_{\sigma_1}, x_{\overline{\sigma_1}}, \ldots, x_{\sigma_s}, x_{\overline{\sigma_s}}) \mapsto (x_{\varphi_1}, \ldots, x_{\varphi_r}, 2x_{\sigma_1}, \ldots, 2x_{\sigma_s}),$$

and we have

$$K_{\mathbb{R}} \to \mathbb{R}^{r+s}, \ (x_{\tau}) \mapsto \left(\log |x_{\varphi_1}|, \ldots, \log |x_{\varphi_r}|, \log |x_{\sigma_1}|^2, \ldots, \log |x_{\sigma_s}|^2 \right).$$

2.6. The class number

Let $n = [K : \mathbb{Q}]$, denote by J_K the group of fractional ideals of K, by P_k its subgroup of principal ideals and by $\mathrm{Cl}_k = J_k/P_k$ the ideal class group. Define the **absolute norm** of an ideal $I \subset \mathcal{O}_k$ by

$$n(I) = [\mathcal{O}_k : I].$$

For $I = (\alpha)$, we have $n(I) = \mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)$. If $O_k = w_1 \mathbb{Z} + \cdots + w_n \mathbb{Z}$ and $I = \alpha w_1 \mathbb{Z} + \cdots + \alpha w_n \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\alpha w_i = \sum_j a_{ij} w_j$$

for some matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ such that $\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = |\det A| = [\mathcal{O}_k : I].$

Proposition 2.6.1. *If $I = P_1^{\nu_1} \cdots P_r^{\nu_r}$ then $n(I) = n(P_1)^{\nu_1} \cdots n(P_r)^{\nu_r}$.*

Proof. By the Chinese remainder theorem,

$$\mathcal{O}_k / I \cong (\mathcal{O}_k / P_1^{\nu_1}) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\mathcal{O}_k / P_r^{\nu_r}),$$

such that

$$n(I) = [\mathcal{O}_k : I] = \prod_j \left[\mathcal{O}_k : P_j^{\nu_j}\right] = \prod_j n(P_j)^{\nu_j}.$$

Claim: $P \supsetneq P^2 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq P^\nu$ and P^i / P^{i+1} is a $(\mathcal{O}_k / P)$-vector space of dimension 1
Proof of Claim: Let $a \in P^i / P^{i+1}$. Then we have

$$P^i \supset J = (a) + P^{i+1} \supsetneq P^{i+1}$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}_k \supset J' = JP^{-i} \supsetneq P = P^{i+1} P^{-i}.$$

Since $J' | P$ we have $J = P^i$ and thus $[a] \in P^i / P^{i+1}$ is a basis.

Now, the Claim yields

$$n(P^\nu) = [\mathcal{O}_k : P^\nu] = [\mathcal{O}_k : P] \left[P : P^2\right] \cdots \left[P^{\nu-1} : P^\nu\right] n(P)^\nu.$$

$\square$

In particular, for integral ideals I, J we have $n(IJ) = n(I)n(J)$ such that we can extend n to J_k by

$$n \colon J_k \to \mathbb{R}_+^*, \ I = P_1^{\nu_1} \cdots P_r^{\nu_r} \mapsto n(I) = n(P_1)^{\nu_1} \cdots n(P_r)^{\nu_r}.$$

Reminder 2.6.2. $\mathcal{J}_K =$ group of fractional ideals $=$ abelian group enerated by all prime ideals
$\mathcal{P}_K =$ group of all principal fractional ideals.
$\mathrm{Cl}_K := \mathcal{J}_K / \mathcal{P}_K$
$\Rightarrow$ obtain following exact sequence:

$$1 \to \underbrace{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}_{\text{How big?}} \to K^\times \to \mathcal{J}_K \to \underbrace{\mathrm{Cl}_K}_{\text{How big?}} \to 1$$

$$a \mapsto (a) = a\mathcal{O}_K$$

<u>Last Time:</u> $\mathfrak{a}$ ideal in $\mathcal{O}_K, \mathfrak{a} \neq 0$.

- $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}) = (\mathcal{O}_K : \mathfrak{a})$ absolute norm.

In particular: $\mathcal{N}((a)) := |\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(a)|$.

- $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{P}_1^{\nu_1} \ldots \mathcal{P}_r^{\nu_r}$ decomposition into primes
  $\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}_1)^{\nu_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}_r)^{\nu_r}$

In particular: $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}_1 \mathfrak{a}_2) = \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}_1) \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}_2)$.

- Hence $\mathcal{N}$ can be extended to fractional ideals: $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{J}_K \to \mathbb{R}_+^\times$.

Goal: Show that Cl_K is finite.
Idea:

- Find in each integral ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ an element $a \neq 0$ of norm bounded by $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a})$.

- Show: For $M > 0$ there are only finitely many integral ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ with $N(\mathfrak{a}) \leq M$.

- Show: Each class $[\mathfrak{a}] \in \mathrm{Cl}_K$ contains an integral ideal $\mathfrak{a}_1$ s.t. $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}_1) \leq M_0 = (\frac{2}{\pi})^s \sqrt{|d_K|}$.
  Recall: $s =$ number of not-real embeddings of K into $\mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 2.6.3. *Suppose: $\mathfrak{a} \neq 0$ is an integral ideal $\Rightarrow \exists a \in \mathfrak{a}, a \neq 0$ s.t. $|\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(a)| \leq (\frac{2}{\pi})^s \sqrt{|d_K|} \, \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a})$.*

Proof. $M_0 := (\frac{2}{\pi})^s \sqrt{|d_K|}$
Idea: Use „Thm. 5.3 "
given: $c_\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} (\tau \in \mathrm{Hom}(K, \mathbb{C}))$ with $c_\tau = c_{\bar{\tau}}$ and $\prod_\tau c_\tau > M_0 \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a})$
$\Rightarrow \exists a \in \mathfrak{a}, a \neq 0$ with $|\tau(a)| < c_\tau$ for all τ.
For each $\varepsilon > 0$ choose a sequence $c_\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with $c_\tau = c_{\bar{\tau}}$ and $\prod_\tau c_\tau = M_0 \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}) + \varepsilon$
$\overset{\mathrm{Thm\ 5.3}}{\Rightarrow}$ Find $a_\varepsilon \neq 0$ in $\mathfrak{a}$ with

$$|\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(a)| = \prod_\tau |\tau(a)| < M_0 \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}) + \varepsilon$$

Since left side is integer, we obtain: $\exists a \neq 0$ in $\mathfrak{a}$ with $|\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(a)| \leq M_0 \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a})$. $\square$

Lemma 2.6.4. *Let $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. There are only finitely many integral ideals $\mathfrak{a}$ with $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq M$.*

Proof. (1) Consider first only prime ideals $\mathcal{P} \neq 0$: Suppose $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}) \leq M$
Recall: $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z} = p\mathbb{Z}$ with p prime number (Prop. 3.3)
$\Rightarrow$ obtain embedding $\mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{P} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}) = (\mathcal{O}_K : \mathcal{P}) = \#\mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{P} = p^f$
Hence: $p^f \leq M$. In particular P is bounded.
Furthermore: There are only finitely many prime ideals $\mathcal{P}$ with $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z} = p\mathbb{Z}$.
Since $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z} = p\mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow p \in \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow (p) \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ But there are only finitely many prime ideals in $\mathcal{O}_K$ which divide (p).
(2) Suppose now $\mathfrak{a}$ is an arbitrary integral ideal, $\mathfrak{a} \neq 0$:
$\Rightarrow \mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{P}_1^{\nu_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathcal{P}_r^{\nu_r}$ with $\mathcal{P}_i$ prime ideal and $\nu_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}_1)^{\nu_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{P}_r)^{\nu_r}$.
Now the claim follows from (1). $\square$

Theorem 9 (Finiteness of Cl_K)**.** *The ideal class group of $\mathrm{Cl}_K = \mathcal{J}_K/\mathcal{P}_K$ is finite.*

Proof. Let $M_0 := (\frac{2}{\pi})^s \sqrt{|d_K|}$
Show that each class $[\mathfrak{a}] \in \mathrm{Cl}_K$ contains an integral ideal $\mathfrak{a}_1$ with $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{a}_1) \leq M_0$. Then the

claim follows from Lemma 6.3.

Let $[a] \in \mathrm{Cl}_K$. Choose $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_K, \gamma \neq 0$ with γa^{-1} is integral.

$$\text{Lemma 6.2} \Rightarrow \exists b \in \mathcal{b} := \gamma a^{-1} \text{ with } b \neq 0 \text{ and } |\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(b)| \leq M_0 \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{b})$$
$$\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}((b)\mathcal{b}^{-1}) = \mathcal{N}((b))\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{b}^{-1}) \leq M_0$$

Observe: The factorial ideal $(b)\mathcal{b}^{-1} = (b)\gamma^{-1}a \in [a]$, hence $a_1 := b\gamma^{-1}a$ does the job. a_1 is an integral ideal, since $(b) \subseteq \gamma a^{-1}$ $\square$

Definition 2.6.5 („Klassenzahl"). $h_K := \#\mathrm{Cl}_K := (\mathcal{J}_K : \mathcal{P}_K)$ is called the <u>class number</u> of K.

Proposition 2.6.6. *Suppose R is a Dedekind domain.*
R is a UFD $\iff$ R is a PID (principal ideal domain).

Proof. „$\Leftarrow$": true for general domains.
„$\Rightarrow$": Suppose R is a UFD.
Step 1: Every prime ideal is principal.
$\overline{\text{Let } \mathcal{P}}$ be a prime ideal, $\mathcal{P} \neq 0$. Choose $a \in \mathcal{P}, a \neq 0$. Let $a = p_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot p_n$ be its prime factor decomposition. $\mathcal{P}$ prime $\Rightarrow p_i \in \mathcal{P}$ for one of the i's $\Rightarrow \mathcal{P} \supseteq (p_i) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P} = (p_i)$, since (p_i) is a prime ideal and R is a Dedekinddomain.
Step 2: a arbitrary ideal.
$\Rightarrow a = \mathcal{P}_1 \cdot \ldots \mathcal{P}_n$ is a product of prime ideals
$\Rightarrow a$ is principal, since each $\mathcal{P}_i$ is. $\square$

Corollary 2.6.7. *We have for a number field K:*
$h_K = 1 \iff \mathcal{O}_K$ is a prinicpal domain $\iff \mathcal{O}_K$ is a UFD.

2.7. The theorem of Dirichlet

<u>Goal</u>: Describe $\mathcal{O}_K^{\times}$
<u>Recall</u>:

- $\mathcal{O}^{\times} = \{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K \mid \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(\varepsilon) = \pm 1\}$

- $\mu(K) := \{x \in \mathcal{O}_K \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } x^n = 1\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K^{\times}$ is a finite subgroup.

<u>Idea</u>: Use multiplicative Minkowsky theory:

- $\mathrm{Hom}(K, \mathbb{C}) = \{\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_r, \tau_{r+1}, \overline{\tau_{r+1}}, \tau_{r+s}, \overline{\tau_{r+s}}\}$

- $j : K^{\times} \hookrightarrow K_{\mathbb{R}}^{\times} = \{x \in \prod_{\tau} \mathbb{C}^{\times} \mid x_{\overline{\tau}} = \overline{x_{\tau}}\}, a \mapsto (\tau(a))_{\tau}$

- $l : K_{\mathbb{R}}^{\times} \to [\prod_{\tau} \mathbb{R}]^{+} := \{z \in \prod_{\tau} \mathbb{R} \mid z_{\overline{\tau}} = z_{\tau}\}, x = (x_{\tau}) \mapsto (\log|x_{\tau}|)_{\tau}$

$\Rightarrow$ commutative diagramm:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{O}_K^{\times} & & S & & H \\
\cap & & \cap & & \cap \\
K^{\times} & \overset{j}{\hookrightarrow} K_{\mathbb{R}}^{\times} & \overset{l}{\longrightarrow} & [\prod_{\tau} \mathbb{R}]^{+} \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathcal{N}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{Tr}} \\
\mathbb{Q}^{\times} & \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} & \overset{\log|\cdot|}{\longrightarrow} & \mathbb{R}
\end{array}
$$

with $\mathcal{N}(x) = \prod_{\tau} x_{\tau}$, $\mathrm{Tr}(z) = \sum_{\tau} z_{\tau}$.

Consider the three groups:

(1) $\mathcal{O}_K^{\times} = \{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K \mid \mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\varepsilon) = \pm 1\}$

(2) $S := \{x \in K_{\mathbb{R}}^{\times} \mid \mathcal{N}(x) = \pm 1\}$ „Norm 1 hyper surface"

(3) $H := \{z \in [\prod_{\tau} \mathbb{R}]^{+} \mid \mathrm{Tr}(z) = 0\}$ „Trace 0 hypersurface"

$\Rightarrow$ Morphisms restrict to

$$\mathcal{O}_K^{\times} \overset{j}{\to} S \overset{l}{\to} H.$$

Define $\Gamma := l \circ j(\mathcal{O}_K^{\times}) = $ image of $l \circ j$.

Recall from additive Minkowski-Theory: $j(\mathcal{O}_K)$ is a complete lattice in $K_{\mathbb{R}}$

Proposition 2.7.1. *The sequence*

$$1 \to \mu(K) \to \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} \overset{l \circ j}{\to} \Gamma \to 1$$

is an exact sequence.

Proof. $\lambda := l \circ j$

We have to show: $\ker(\lambda) = \mu(K)$.

Observe: $a \in \ker(\lambda) \iff \forall \tau \in \mathrm{Hom}(K, \mathbb{C}) : \log|\tau(a)| = 0 \iff |\tau(a)| = 1$

Hence: $\ker(\lambda) = \{a \in \mathcal{O}^{\times} \mid |\tau(a)| = 1\}$.

„$\supseteq$": ✓

„$\subseteq$": $j(\ker(\lambda))$ is bounded as subset of $K_{\mathbb{R}}^{\times}$. Furthermore: $j(\ker(\lambda)) \subseteq j(\mathcal{O})$ which is a lattice in $K_{\mathbb{R}} \Rightarrow j(\ker(\lambda))$ is finite and thus also $\ker(\lambda)$.

Altogether: $\ker(\lambda)$ is a finite subgroup of $K^{\times} \Rightarrow$ every element in $\ker(\lambda)$ has finite order $\Rightarrow$ every element is a root of unity. $\qquad\square$

Goal: Describe Γ

Recall: $\alpha, \alpha' \in \mathcal{O}_K$ are associated $: \iff \exists, \varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K^{\times}$ s.t. $\alpha' = \alpha \cdot \varepsilon$.

Proposition 2.7.2. *Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. There are at most $(\mathcal{O}_K : a\mathcal{O}_K) = \mathcal{N}((a))$ elements $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$ up to associates with $\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = \pm a$.*

Proof. Suppose w.l.o.g.: $a > 1$.

Consider the cosets of $\mathcal{O}_K$ modulo the subgroup $a\mathcal{O}_K$. Show that each coset contains at most one such α up to associatives.

Suppose: $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$ with $\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = \pm a$ and suppose $\beta = \alpha + a\gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_K$ also satisfies $\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\beta) = \pm a \Rightarrow \frac{\beta}{\alpha} = 1 \pm \frac{\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)}{\alpha}\gamma$.

Recall: $\frac{\mathcal{N}(\alpha)}{\alpha} \in \mathcal{O}_K \Rightarrow \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \in \mathcal{O}_K$.

Obtain in the same way $\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Hence $\frac{\alpha}{\beta}$ and $\frac{\beta}{\alpha}$ are in $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \Rightarrow \alpha$ and β are associated. $\square$

Lemma 2.7.3. *Let V be an $\mathbb{R}$-vector space of dimension n, Γ a lattice in V.*
Γ is complete $\iff \exists M \subseteq V$ with M bounded s.t. $\bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} M + \gamma = V$.

Proof. „$\Rightarrow$": $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}v_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}v_n \Rightarrow M := \phi := \{r_1 v_1 + \cdots + r_n v_n \mid 0 \le r_i < 1\}$ does it.

„$\Leftarrow$": Consider: $V_0 := \mathbb{R}$-vector space generated by Γ. Have to show: $V_0 = V$.

Let $v \in V$. Consider the sequence $kv (k \in \mathbb{N})$.

Precondition $\Rightarrow \forall k \exists a_k \in M$ and $\gamma_k \in \Gamma$ with $kv = a_k + \gamma_k$

M bounded $\Rightarrow \frac{1}{k} a_k \to 0 \Rightarrow v = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} a_k + \frac{1}{k} \gamma_k = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{1}{k} \gamma_k \Rightarrow v \in V_0$, since V_0 is closed. $\square$

Theorem 10. *The group Γ is a complete lattice in $H = \{x \in [\prod_\tau \mathbb{R}]^+ \mid \mathrm{Tr}(x) = 0\} \cong \mathbb{R}^{r+s-1}$. Hence Γ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^{r+s-1}$.*

Proof. <u>Step 1</u>: Show that Γ is a lattice, i.e. show that Γ is a discrete subgroup of H.

More precisely: show that $\forall c > 0$:

$$\Gamma \cap \{(z_\tau)_\tau \in \prod_\tau \mathbb{R} \mid |z_\tau| \le c\} =: Q_c$$

is finite.

Observe: $l^{-1}(Q_c) = \{(x_\tau)_\tau \in \prod_\tau \mathbb{C}^\times \mid e^{-c} \le |x_\tau| \le e^c\}$ since $l((x_\tau)_\tau) = (log|x_\tau|)_\tau$.

$\Rightarrow l^{-1}(Q_c) \cap j(\mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ is finite, since $j(\mathcal{O}_K)$ is a lattice in $K_\mathbb{R}$. This shows the claim.

Step 2: Show that Γ is complete.

<u>Idea</u>: Use Lemma 7.3.

Hence: find $M \subseteq H$ as required in the lemma.

Equivalently: find $T \subseteq S$, s.t. $S = \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times} T \cdot j(\varepsilon)$ and T is bounded.

Then we have for $M := l(T) : H = \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times} M + l(j(\varepsilon)) = \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} M + \gamma$.

Furthermore: T bounded $\Rightarrow \exists C > 0 : \forall x \in T : \forall \tau : |x_\tau| < C$.

Since $\prod_\tau |x_\tau| = 1 \Rightarrow \exists c > 0 : \forall x \in T : \forall \tau : |x_\tau| > c \Rightarrow M = l(T)$ is bounded in H.

<u>Step 3</u>: Definition of T

- Choose sequence (c_τ) with $c_\tau > 0, c_{\bar\tau} = c_\tau$ and $C := \prod c_\tau > M_0 = (\frac{2}{\pi})^s \sqrt{d_K}$ and define $X := \{(x_\tau)_\tau \mid |x_\tau| < c_\tau\}$.

- Choose $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N \in \mathcal{O}_K$ s.t. each $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K, \alpha \ne 0$ with $|\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)| \le C$ is associated to one α_i (by Prop 7.2. possible).

Define $T := S \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^n X \cdot j(\alpha_i)^{-1}$.

<u>Step 4</u>: T does the job:

(1) X is bounded $\Rightarrow Xj(\alpha_i)^{-1}$ is bounded $\Rightarrow T$ is bounded.

(2) Observe: $y = (y_\tau) \in S \Rightarrow Xy = \{(x_\tau) \in K_\mathbb{R} \mid |x_\tau| < c'_\tau\}$ with $c'_\tau = c_\tau \cdot |y_\tau|$
$\Rightarrow c'_\tau = c'_{\bar\tau}$ and $\prod_\tau c'_\tau = \prod c_\tau \underbrace{\prod |y_\tau|}_{=1 (y \in S)} = C.$

$\Rightarrow \exists \alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$ with $|\tau(\alpha)| < c'_\tau \forall \tau \Rightarrow j(\alpha) \in Xy$

(3) Show that: $S = \bigcup_{\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times} Tj(\varepsilon)$

Suppose $y \in S \overset{(2)}{\Rightarrow} \exists \alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ with $j(\alpha) \in Xy^{-1} \Rightarrow j(\alpha) = xy^{-1}$ for some $x \in X$.
Furthermore: $|\mathcal{N}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)| = |\mathcal{N}(xy^{-1})| = |\mathcal{N}(x)| < \prod_\tau c_\tau = C.$
$\Rightarrow \alpha$ is associated to some α_i, hence $\alpha_i = \varepsilon \alpha$ with $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$.
$\Rightarrow y = xj(\alpha)^{-1} = xj(\alpha_i^{-1}\varepsilon).$
Finally: y and $j(\varepsilon) \in S \Rightarrow xj(\alpha_i)^{-1} \in S \cap Xj(\alpha_i)^{-1} \subseteq T \Rightarrow y \in Tj(\varepsilon).$

$\square$

Corollary 2.7.4. $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cong \mathbb{Z}^{r+s-1} \times \mu(K).$

Proof. We have the exact sequence

$$1 \to \mu(K) \to \mathcal{O}_K^\times \overset{l}{\to} \Gamma \cong \mathbb{Z}^{r+s-1} \to 1$$

Fix a basis $v_1, \ldots, v_t (t := r + s - 1)$ of Γ and preimages $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_t$ in $\mathcal{O}_k^\times$.
Let $A := <\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_t> \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K^\times$.
Then $\lambda_{|A}$ is an isomorphism and thus $A \cap \mu(K) = \{1\}$. In particular every $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ decomposes in a unique way as $\alpha = \nu \cdot \mu$ with $\nu \in A$ and $\mu \in \mu(K)$. $\square$

2.8. Prime ideals in $\mathcal{O}_K$

Question: Describe the prime ideals in $\mathcal{O}_K$ that "live above a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathbb{Z}$".
Consider the following, more general situation: Let

- $\mathcal{O}$ be a Dedekind domain,

- $K = \text{Quot}(\mathcal{O})$,

- $L \mid K$ a finite and separable field extension,

- $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ the integral closure of $\mathcal{O}$ in L.

Definition 2.8.1. In the setting above, we say that a prime ideal $\hat{\mathfrak{p}} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ lies above a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{O} :\Leftrightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p}$.

Proposition 2.8.2. $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ *is a Dedekind domain.*

Proof. (1) $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is an integral domain and is integrally closed (see **Remark 2.1**).

(2) We show, that every prime ideal $0 \neq \hat{\mathfrak{p}} \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is maximal: We know that $\mathfrak{p} := \hat{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \mathcal{O}$ is a prime ideal in $\mathcal{O}$.

(Claim:) $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$. Choose $0 \neq x \in \hat{\mathfrak{p}}$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is integrally closed, $\exists a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}$, such that

$$x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 = 0.$$

We may assume that the equation is minimal, i.e $a_0 \neq 0$. Then we have

$$0 \neq a_0 = -a_1 x - \cdots - a_{n-1}x^{n-1} - x^n \in \hat{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of $\mathcal{O}$, it is also maximal, i.e $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ is a field. Hence $\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a finite extension of $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ as an $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$-algebra. Therefore $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ a field $\Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a field $\Rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a maximal ideal.

(3) $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is Noetherian: Choose a basis $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ of $L \mid K$ with $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Let $d := d(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \neq 0$ (**Proposition 2.6**). Recall that $d \cdot \hat{\mathcal{O}} \subset \mathcal{O}\alpha_1 + \cdots + \mathcal{O}\alpha_n$ (**Proposition 2.8**) and that therefore $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \subset \mathcal{O}\frac{\alpha_1}{d} + \cdots + \mathcal{O}\frac{\alpha_n}{d}$. Hence every ideal $I \subset \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ can be regarded as a submodule of the $\mathcal{O}$-module $\mathcal{O}\frac{\alpha_1}{d} + \cdots + \mathcal{O}\frac{\alpha_n}{d}$. But since this module is finitely generated and $\mathcal{O}$ is Noetherian, I must be finitely generated as well.

$\square$

Proposition 2.8.3. *Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{O}$ be a prime ideal. Then $\mathfrak{p} \cdot \hat{\mathcal{O}} \subsetneq \hat{\mathcal{O}}$.*

Proof. We may assume $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$.

(1) Choose $\pi \in \mathfrak{p} \setminus \mathfrak{p}^2$. Then we can write $\pi \cdot \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p} \cdot \mathfrak{a}$ with $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{a}$ coprime, i.e $\mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p} + \mathfrak{a} \Rightarrow \exists s \in \mathfrak{a}, t \in \mathfrak{p} : 1 = s + t$. In particular, $s \notin \mathfrak{p}$ since $1 \notin \mathfrak{p}$ and $s \cdot \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathfrak{p} = \pi \cdot \mathcal{O}$.

(2) Suppose $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Then $s \cdot \hat{\mathcal{O}} = s\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} \subset \pi\hat{\mathcal{O}} \Rightarrow s = \pi x$ with some $x \in \hat{\mathcal{O}} \cap K = \mathcal{O} \Rightarrow s \in \pi\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{p}$, a contradiction.

$\square$

Remark 2.8.4. Let $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$ be a prime ideal in $\mathcal{O}$. Then:

(i) $\mathfrak{p} \cdot \hat{\mathcal{O}} = \mathfrak{p}_1^{e_1} \cdots \cdot \mathfrak{p}_r^{e_r}$ with $e_1, \ldots, e_r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{p}_r$ prime ideals in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

(ii) A prime ideal $\hat{\mathfrak{p}}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ satisfies: $\hat{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p} \Leftrightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathfrak{p}_i$ for some i.

Proof.   (i) follows from **Proposition 8.2+8.3**.

(ii) "$\Leftarrow$": $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \mathfrak{p}_1^{e_1} \cdots \cdot \mathfrak{p}_r^{e_r} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O} \subset \mathfrak{p}_i \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{p}_i \cap \mathcal{O}$. We have $\mathfrak{p}_i \cap \mathcal{O} \neq 0$, $1 \notin \mathfrak{p}_i \cap \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal, hence $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_i \cap \mathcal{O}$.
"$\Rightarrow$": $\hat{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p} \Rightarrow \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} \subset \hat{\mathfrak{p}} \Rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{p}}$ divides $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

$\square$

Definition 2.8.5. Let $0 \neq \mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal in $\mathcal{O}$ and $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \mathfrak{p}_1^{e_1} \cdot \cdots \cdot \mathfrak{p}_r^{e_r}$ the decomposition into prime ideals.

  (i) e_i is called **ramification index of $\mathfrak{p}_i$**.
       $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is called **unramified** $:\Leftrightarrow e_i = 1$.
       $\mathfrak{p}$ is called unramified, if all $\mathfrak{p}_i$ are unramified.
       $\mathfrak{p}$ is called **totally ramified** $:\Leftrightarrow r = 1$.

  (ii) $f_i := \dim_K \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}_i$ with $K := \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ is called **local degree** or **relative degree** of $\mathfrak{p}_i$.

Theorem 11. *In the situation of **Definition 8.5**, we have the fundamental equation:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} e_i \cdot f_i = n \quad \text{with } n = [L : K]$$

Proof. We can write

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i}$$

by the Chinese Remainder Theorem. Let $k = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$

Step 1: We show, that $\dim_k \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = n$. Choose a basis $\bar{\omega}_1, \ldots, \bar{\omega}_m$ of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ over k and choose preimages $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. We will show, that $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m$ is a basis of $L \mid K$, i.e $m = n$, from which the claim follows.

  (1) Suppose $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m$ are linearly dependant, i.e $\exists \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m \in K$, not all zero and such that

$$\alpha_1 \omega_1 + \cdots + \alpha_m \omega_m = 0. \tag{$*$}$$

Since $K = \text{Quot}(\mathcal{O})$, we may choose $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m \in \mathcal{O}$, since we can just clear denominators. Consider the ideal $\mathfrak{a} := \langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_m \rangle \subset \mathcal{O}$. $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{p} \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}^{-1}$. Choose some $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \setminus \mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{p} \Rightarrow \alpha \cdot \mathfrak{a} \nsubseteq \mathfrak{p} \Rightarrow \alpha\alpha_1, \ldots \alpha\alpha_m \in \mathcal{O}$, but not all lie in $\mathfrak{p}$.

$\stackrel{(*)}{\Longrightarrow} \alpha\alpha_1 \omega_1 + \cdots + \alpha\alpha_m \omega_m = 0 \mod \mathfrak{p}$ with at least one of the $\alpha\alpha_i \notin \mathfrak{p}$. Hence $\alpha\alpha_1 \bar{\omega}_1 + \cdots + \alpha\alpha_m \bar{\omega}_m = 0$ with at least one $\alpha\alpha_i \neq 0$, which contradicts the assumption that $\bar{\omega}_1, \ldots, \bar{\omega}_m$ is a basis.

  (2) Consider $M := \mathcal{O}\omega_1 + \cdots + \mathcal{O}\omega_m$ and $N := \hat{\mathcal{O}}/M$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = K\bar{\omega}_1 + \cdots + K\bar{\omega}_m$, we have $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = M + \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} \stackrel{\mod M}{\Longrightarrow} N = \mathfrak{p}N$. The proof of **Proposition 8.2** implies, that $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and N are finitely generated as $\mathcal{O}$-modules. Choose generators $\bar{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \bar{\alpha}_s$ of N. $N = \mathfrak{p}N \Rightarrow \exists \alpha_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{p}$ with $\bar{\alpha}_i = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \alpha_{i,j}\bar{\alpha}_j$. Consider $A = (\alpha_{i,j})_{i,j=1}^{s} - I$. Then

$$A \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\alpha}_s \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Furthermore, $d := \det(A) = (-1)^s \mod \mathfrak{p} \Rightarrow d \neq 0$. We now see

$$0 = A^\# A \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\alpha}_s \end{pmatrix} = d \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \bar{\alpha}_s \end{pmatrix} \implies d \cdot N = 0,$$

hence $d \cdot \hat{\mathcal{O}} \subset M = \mathcal{O}\omega_1 + \ldots \mathcal{O}\omega_m$. Now, for some $\beta \in L$, we have $\beta = d \underbrace{\beta'}_{\in L} = d \cdot \frac{b}{a} = \frac{1}{a}db$, with $b \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and $a \in \mathcal{O}$. Hence $\beta \in K\omega_1 + \cdots + K\omega_m \Rightarrow m = n$ and $\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m$ generate $L \mid K$.

Step 2: We show, that $\dim_K \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i} = e_i f_i$. Consider the chain

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i} \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_i/\mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i} \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i-1}/\mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i} \supsetneq 0$$

as a chain of K-vectorspaces. Choose an $\alpha \in \mathfrak{p}_i^j \setminus \mathfrak{p}_i^{j+1}$ and consider the homomorphism

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{p}_i^j/\mathfrak{p}_i^{j+1}$$
$$a \longmapsto \alpha \cdot a,$$

which is surjective with kernel $\mathfrak{p}_i$ (since $\mathfrak{p}_i^{j+1}$ is coprime to $\alpha\hat{\mathcal{O}}$). Therefore $\mathfrak{p}_i^j/\mathfrak{p}_i^{j+1} \cong \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}_i$ and we have

$$\dim_K \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}_i^{e_i} = \sum_{j=0}^{e_i-1} \dim_K \mathfrak{p}_i^j/\mathfrak{p}_i^{j+1} = e_i \cdot f_i$$

$\square$

Next, we will examine the example of the Gaussian integers $\mathbb{Z}[i]$. By **Proposition 2.10**, $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ is the ring of integers $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ of the field extension $\mathbb{Q}[i] \mid \mathbb{Q}$.

Reminder 2.8.6.   (i) $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ is an euclidean ring $\Rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[i]$ is a PID $\Rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[i]$ is an UFD

(ii) In particular, all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} = \langle \pi \rangle$ with π prime.

Remark 2.8.7. Let R be a domain, $a, b \in R$. Then $\langle a \rangle = \langle b \rangle \Leftrightarrow a$ and b are associated.

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$": $\langle a \rangle = \langle b \rangle \Rightarrow \exists r, r' \in R : b = ra$ and $a = r'b \Rightarrow b = rr'b \Rightarrow (1 - rr')b = 0 \overset{R \text{ domain}}{\Rightarrow} r, r' \in R^{\times}$.

"$\Leftarrow$": $a = \epsilon b$ with $\epsilon \in R^{\times} \Rightarrow b = \epsilon^{-1}a \Rightarrow \langle a \rangle = \langle b \rangle$. $\square$

Remark 2.8.8. For $L = \mathbb{Q}[i]$ and $K = \mathbb{Q}$, we have

(i) $\operatorname{Gal} L \mid K = \{\operatorname{id}, (a + bi \mapsto a - bi)\}$

(ii) $\mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L|K}}(a + bi) = (a + bi) \cdot (a - bi) = a^2 + b^2$.

(iii) Since $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ is a UFD, an element is prime $\Leftrightarrow$ it is irreducible.

(iv) $\mathbb{Z}[i]^{\times} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}[i] \mid \mathcal{N}_{\mathrm{L|K}}(\alpha) = 1\} = \{1, -1, i, -i\}$.

(v) For $\alpha = a + bi$, its associated elements are $-a - bi$, $ai - b$, $-ai + b$.

Proposition 2.8.9 (Theorem of Wilson). *Let $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a prime nuber. Then:*

(i) $(p - 1)! \equiv -1 \mod p$.

(ii) If $p = 4n + 1$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $(2n)!^2 \equiv -1 \mod p$

Proof.   (i) Since the statement is obvious for $p = 2$, let $p > 2$. Consider $X^{p-1} - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[x]$ Then $1, \ldots, p - 1$ are all zeroes and

$$X^{p-1} - 1 = (x - 1) \cdot (x - 2) \cdot \cdots \cdot (x - (p - 1)) \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X].$$

When we look at the constant term, we see that $-1 = (-1)^{p-1} \cdot (p - 1)! = (p - 1)!$

(ii) $(-1) \equiv (p-1)! \equiv (4n)! = 1 \cdot 2 \cdots \cdots 2n \cdot (p-1) \cdots \cdots (p-2n) \equiv (2n)! \cdot (-1)^{2n} \cdot (2n)! \equiv (2n)!^2 \mod p$. $\square$

Proposition 2.8.10. *If p is a prime in $\mathbb{Z}$ with $p \equiv 1 \mod 4$, then p is not a prime in $\mathbb{Z}[i]$.*

Proof. Write $p = 4n + 1$. By the Theorem of Wilson, we have $X^2 \equiv -1 \mod p$ for $x = (2n)!$. Then $p | X^2 + 1 = (x + i)(x - i) \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$, but $\frac{x \pm i}{p} \notin \mathbb{Z}[i]$. $\square$

Proposition 2.8.11. *Each prime element $\pi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ is associated to one of the following prime elements of $\mathbb{Z}[i]$:*

(1) $\pi = 1 + i$.

(2) $\pi = a + bi$, with $a^2 + b^2 = p$ prime in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $p \equiv 1 \mod 4$.

(3) $\pi = p$ prime in $\mathbb{Z}$ and $p \equiv 3 \mod 4$.

Proof. We proof the proposition in 3 steps.

Step 1: If π is as in (1) or (2), then π is prime. Suppose $\pi = \alpha\beta$. Then $p = \mathcal{N}(\pi) = \mathcal{N}(\alpha) \cdot \mathcal{N}(\beta) \in \mathbb{Z}$, so either $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = 1$ or $\mathcal{N}(\beta) = 1$, i.e α or β is a unit.

Step 2: If π is as in (3), then π is a prime in $\mathbb{Z}$. Suppose $\pi = \alpha\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$. Then $p^2 = \mathcal{N}(\pi) = \mathcal{N}(\alpha) \cdot \mathcal{N}(\beta)$. If $\alpha, \beta \notin \mathbb{Z}[i]^\times$, then $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \mathcal{N}(\beta) = p$. Write $\alpha = a + bi$. Then $p = \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = a^2 + b^2 \not\equiv 3 \mod 4$, since it is always $a^2 + b^2 \equiv 0, 1 \mod 4$, a contradiction.

Step 3: We have now shown, that the elements $(1) - (3)$ are prime. Let now $\pi_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ be a prime element. We wil show, that π_0 is associated to one of the three elements above. Look at $\mathcal{N}(\pi_0) = p_1 \cdots \cdot p_r$ with $p_1, \ldots, p_r$ primes in $\mathbb{Z}$. Since π_0 is prime, it divides $p := p_i$, $\quad 1 \leq i \leq r \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\pi_0)$ divides $\mathcal{N}(p) = p^2$, i.e $\mathcal{N}(\pi_0) = p$ or p^2.

Case 1: $\mathcal{N}(\pi_0) = p$. if $p = 2$, then $\pi_0 \in \{1 + i, 1 - i, -1 + i, -1 - 1\}$, i.e π_0 is associated to $1 + i$. If $p > 2$, then $p = \mathcal{N}(\pi_0) = a^2 + b^2 \equiv 1 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \pi_0$ is associated to an element as in (2).

Cbse 2: $\mathcal{N}(\pi_0) = p^2 \Rightarrow \pi_0 | p^2 \Rightarrow \pi_0 | p \Rightarrow \frac{p}{\pi_0} \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ and $\mathcal{N}(\frac{p}{\pi_0}) = \frac{\mathcal{N}(p)}{\mathcal{N}(\pi_0)} = \frac{p^2}{p^2} = 1$, i.e $\frac{p}{\pi_0}$ is a unit, hence π_0 is associated to p. By **Proposition 8.10**, $p \not\equiv 1 \mod 4$. Also $p \neq 2$, since $2 = (1 + i)(1 - i)$ is not prime in $\mathbb{Z}[i]$. Hence $p \equiv 3 \mod 4$ and π_0 is associated to an element as in (3).

$\square$

Corollary 2.8.12 (Fermat).   *(i) If p is prime then $p = a^2 + b^2 \Leftrightarrow p \not\equiv 3 \mod 4$*

(ii) $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} : \quad n = a^2 + b^2 \Leftrightarrow \nu_p(n)$ is even for all primes $p \equiv 3 \mod 4$ ($\nu_p(n) =$ exponent of p in prime factorization of n over $\mathbb{Z}$).

Proof.   (i) "$\Rightarrow$": Same as in Step 2 of **8.11**

"$\Leftarrow$": If $p = 2$, then $2 = 1 + 1$. If $p \equiv \mod 4$, then by **Proposition 8.10**, $p = \alpha\beta \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$ with $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \mathcal{N}(\beta) = p$. Write $\alpha = a + bi$ and get $p = \mathcal{N}(\alpha) = a^2 + b^2$.

(ii) "$\Rightarrow$": $n = a^2 + b^2 \Rightarrow n = \mathcal{N}(\alpha)$ with $\alpha = a + bi \in \mathbb{Z}[i]$. Write $\alpha = \epsilon \cdot \pi_1 \cdots \cdot \pi_r \cdot \pi_{r+1} \cdots \cdot \pi_{r+s}$ with $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r$ as in (3) and $\pi_{r+1}, \ldots, \pi_{r+s}$ as in (1) or (2). Then $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = \prod_{i=1}^r \mathcal{N}(\pi_i) = p_1^2 \cdot \ldots p_r^2 \cdot p_{r+1} \cdots \cdot p_{r+s}$ with $p_1, \ldots, p_r \equiv 3 \mod 4$ and $p_{r+1}, \ldots, p_{r+s} \not\equiv 3 \mod 4$.

"$\Leftarrow$": $n = p_1^2 \cdots \cdot p_r^2 \cdot p_{r+1} \cdots \cdot p_{r+s}$ as above. By (i), $p_j \not\equiv 3 \mod 4$ and hence $p_j = a_j^2 + b_j^2$ for $r+1 \leq j \leq r+s$. Define $\alpha := p_1 \cdots \cdot p_r \cdot (a_{r+1} + ib_{r+1}) \cdots \cdot (a_{r+s} + ib_{r+s})$. Then $\mathcal{N}(\alpha) = n$.

$\square$

Corollary 2.8.13. *The prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_i$ in $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ that lie over a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$ in $\mathbb{Z}$ are obtained as follows:*

(i) $p = 2 \Rightarrow \langle 2 \rangle \mathbb{Z}[i] = \langle 1 + i \rangle \langle 1 - i \rangle = \langle 1 + i \rangle^2$. Hence $r = 1$, $e_1 = 2$, $f_1 = 1$.

(ii) $p \equiv 1 \mod 4 \overset{p=a^2+b^2}{\Longrightarrow} \langle p \rangle \, \mathbb{Z}[i] = \langle a+bi \rangle \langle a-bi \rangle$. *Hence* $r = 2$, $e_1 = e_2 = 1$, $f_1 = f_2 = 1$.

(iii) $p \equiv 3 \mod 4 \Rightarrow \langle p \rangle \, \mathbb{Z}[i]$ *is a prime ideal. Hence* $r = 1$, $e_1 = 1$, $f_1 = 2$.

. $\hfill \square$

GOAL: Describe prime ideals explicitly for all simple extensions $L = K[\Theta]$ with $\Theta \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$.
Caution: Before, we had $\mathbb{Z}[i] = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. In general, we might have $\hat{\mathcal{O}}' := \mathcal{O}[\Theta] \subsetneq \hat{\mathcal{O}}$.
Idea: Take the largest ideal of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ which also lies in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}'$.

Definition 2.8.14. The set $\mathcal{F} := \left\{ \alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{O}} \mid \alpha \hat{\mathcal{O}} \subset \hat{\mathcal{O}}' \right\}$ is called **conductor**.

Example 2.8.15. If $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbb{Z}[i]$ and $\Theta = i$, then $\hat{\mathcal{O}}' = \mathcal{O}[\Theta] \Rightarrow \mathcal{F} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

Proposition 2.8.16. *In the situation above, let* $f(X) := f_{\Theta}(X)$ *be the minimal polynomial of* Θ. *Let* $\mathfrak{p}$ *be a prime ideal in* $\mathcal{O}$ *and* $K := \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$. *consider the image* $\bar{f}$ *of* f *in* $K[X]$ *and let* $\bar{f} = \bar{f}_1^{e_1} \cdot \cdots \cdot \bar{f}_f^{e_r}$ *be the prime factorization in* $K[X]$. *Choose preimages* $f_1, \ldots, f_r \in \mathcal{O}[X]$. *Then:*
If $\mathfrak{p}$ *is coprime to* $\mathcal{F}$, *i.e* $\mathfrak{p} + \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$, *then the ideals in* $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ *which lie over* $\mathfrak{p}$ *are given as follows:* $\mathfrak{p}_i := \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} + f_i(\Theta)\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, $\quad 1 \leq i \leq r$ *and the local degree of* $\mathfrak{p}_i$ *is equal to* $\deg(\bar{f}_i)$.

Proposition 2.8.17. *Let* R *and* S *be rings and* $\varphi \colon R \to S$ *a ring homomorphism.*

(i) *If* $\mathfrak{q}$ *is a prime ideal in* S *then* $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$ *is a prime ideal in* R.

(ii) *If* φ *is surjective and* $\mathfrak{p}$ *is a prime ideal in* R *with* $\ker \varphi \subset \mathfrak{p}$ *then* $\varphi(\mathfrak{p})$ *is a prime ideal in* S.

Proof. "(i)" Preimages of ideals are ideals. Suppose $ab \in \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$. Then $\varphi(a)\varphi(b) \in \mathfrak{q}$ such that, without loss of generality, $\varphi(a) \in \mathfrak{q}$ and hence $a \in \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$.

"(ii)" Images of ideals under surjective homomorphisms are ideals. Let $\bar{a}\bar{b} \in \varphi(\mathfrak{p})$. Since φ is surjectiv there are $a, b \in R$ with $\varphi(a) = \bar{a}, \varphi(b) = \bar{b}$ and there is $c \in \mathfrak{p}$ with $\varphi(c) = \bar{a}\bar{b}$. Hence
$$ab - c \in \ker \varphi \subset \mathfrak{p}$$
such that $ab \in \mathfrak{p}$. We may assume that $a \in \mathfrak{p}$ and conclude $\bar{a} = \varphi(a) \in \varphi(\mathfrak{p})$. $\hfill \square$

Definition 2.8.18. In the situation of Proposition 2.8.17 we define:

(i) $\operatorname{Spec}(R) = \{ \mathfrak{p} \subset R \mid \mathfrak{p} \text{ is a prime ideal} \}$

(ii) $\operatorname{Spec}_S(R) = \{ \mathfrak{p} \subset \operatorname{Spec}(R) \mid \mathfrak{p} \supset \ker \varphi \}$

Corollary 2.8.19. *In the situation of Proposition 2.8.17 we have:*

(i) *If* $\varphi \colon R \to S$ *is a homomorphism of rings then* φ *induces a map*

$$\varphi^* \colon \operatorname{Spec}(S) \to \operatorname{Spec}_S(R), \, \mathfrak{p} \mapsto \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}).$$

(ii) If φ is surjective then φ^* is a bijection with inverse map

$$\varphi_*\colon \operatorname{Spec}_S(R) \to \operatorname{Spec}(S), \quad \mathfrak{p} \mapsto \varphi(\mathfrak{p}).$$

Reminder 2.8.20. For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and p prime in $\mathbb{Z}$ the **Legendre symbol** is defined by

$$\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = \begin{cases} 0, & p \text{ divides } a, \\ 1, & \text{there is an } x \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } x^2 \equiv a \mod p, \\ -1, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Example 2.8.21. Apply Proposition 8.15 for quadratic number fields, D square-free:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \hat{\mathcal{O}} & = & \mathbb{Z}[\theta] & \subset & \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}) \\ & & \big\uparrow & & \big\uparrow \\ \mathcal{O} & = & \mathbb{Z} & \subset & \mathbb{Q} \end{array}$$

Reminder 2.8.22. If $D \not\equiv 1 \mod 4$ then we can choose $\theta = \sqrt{D}$ and obtain $f = f_\theta = X^2 - D$ and $d(f_\theta) = 4D$.

If $D \equiv 1 \mod 4$ then we can choose $\theta = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \sqrt{D})$ and obtain $f = f_\theta = X^2 - X - \frac{D-1}{4}$ and $d(f_\theta) = D$.

Consider $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ prime and define $\overline{f} = \overline{f}_\theta$ as the image of f in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X]$.

Observe: $\overline{f}$ has two equal zeroes in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ iff $d(f) = 0$ in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ iff

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{4D}{p}\right) = 0, & D \not\equiv 1 \mod 4, \\ \left(\frac{D}{p}\right) = 0, & D \equiv 1 \mod 4. \end{cases}$$

$\overline{f}$ has two different zeroes in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ iff $d(f)$ is a non-zero square in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ iff

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{4D}{p}\right) = 1, & D \not\equiv 1 \mod 4, \\ \left(\frac{D}{p}\right) = 1, & D \equiv 1 \mod 4 \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{D}{p}\right) = 1.$$

$\overline{f}$ has no zeroes in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ iff $\left(\frac{D}{p}\right) = -1$.

Proposition 8.15 then implies in the first case that $p\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^2$ with

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \begin{cases} p\hat{\mathcal{O}} + \theta\hat{\mathcal{O}}, & D \not\equiv 1 \mod 4, \\ p\hat{\mathcal{O}} + \left(\theta - \frac{1}{2}\right)\hat{\mathcal{O}}, & D \equiv 1 \mod 4, \end{cases}$$

In the second case we obtain $p\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1\hat{\mathcal{P}}_2$ with $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{1,2} = p\hat{\mathcal{O}} + (\theta \pm x)\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, where $x^2 \equiv D$ mod p.

In the third case $p\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is a prime ideal.

Example. Let $D \not\equiv 1 \mod p$, $\left(\frac{4D}{p}\right) = 0$ and $p \neq 2$. Consider the map $\pi \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}} \to \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ with $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}]$ and $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \left\{a + b\sqrt{D} \mid p|a \text{ and } p|b\right\}$ and thus

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}/p\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cong \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}] \cong \left(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X]\right)/(X^2 - D),$$
$$\theta \leftrightarrow \qquad \left(0, \sqrt{D}\right) \leftrightarrow \qquad\qquad \overline{X}.$$

We have

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 = \pi^{-1}((\overline{\theta})) = \left\{a + b\sqrt{D} \mid p \text{ divides } a\right\}.$$

Example. Let $D \not\equiv 1 \mod p$ and $\left(\frac{4D}{p}\right) = 1$. Then there exists $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $x^2 \equiv D \mod p$ and $p \nmid x$. Here, $\pi \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}} \to \hat{\mathcal{O}}/p\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ is the map

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}] &\to \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}] \\
&\cong \left(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X]\right)/(X - x)(X + x) \\
&\cong \left(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X]\right)/(X - x) \oplus \left(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X]\right)/(X + x)
\end{aligned}$$

given by

$$a + b\sqrt{D} \mapsto \overline{a} + \overline{b}\sqrt{D} \cong \overline{a} + \overline{b}X \cong (\overline{a} + \overline{b}x, \overline{a} - \overline{b}x).$$

Recall that $\overline{f}(X) = (X - x)(X + x) = \overline{f}_1 \overline{f}_2$ with $\overline{f}_1, \overline{f}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ and

$$f_1(\theta) = \theta - x = \sqrt{D} - x = -x + \sqrt{D}$$

with $\pi(f_1(\theta)) \leftrightarrow (0, -2\overline{x})$. Observe that for $\overline{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^x$ we have the correspondence

$$(\pi(f_1(\theta))) \leftrightarrow \mathcal{O} \oplus \left(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[X]\right)/(X + p) \cong \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$$

and hence $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 = \pi^{-1}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$.

Proof of Prop. 8.16. Consider the map $\pi \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}} \to \hat{\mathcal{O}}/p\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. By Corollary 8.19 we have a bijection

$$\left\{\hat{\mathcal{P}} \mid \hat{\mathcal{P}} \text{ prime ideal in } \hat{\mathcal{O}} \text{ with } \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p}\right\} \leftrightarrow \left\{\mathfrak{q} \mid \mathfrak{q} \text{ prime ideal in } \hat{\mathcal{O}}/p\hat{\mathcal{O}}\right\}.$$

We show:

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}/p\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cong \hat{\mathcal{O}}'/p\hat{\mathcal{O}}' \cong k[X]/(\overline{f}),$$

where $k = \hat{\mathcal{O}}/p\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}' = \mathcal{O}[\theta]$.

Step 1: $\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cong \hat{\mathcal{O}}'/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}'$
Consider the homomorphism $\varphi \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}}' \to \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ induced by the inclusion $\hat{\mathcal{O}}' \hookrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

"(1)" φ is surjective: If $\mathfrak{p} + (\mathbb{F} \cap \mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}$ then $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} + \mathbb{F} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and hence $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} + \hat{\mathcal{O}}' = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ (multiply both sides of first equation with $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$).

"(2)" $\ker \varphi = \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}'$: "$\supset$" Clear. "$\subset$" We have $\ker \varphi = \hat{\mathcal{O}}' \cap \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Use $\mathfrak{p} + (\mathbb{F} \cap \mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{O}$ and write $1 = p + a$ with $p \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $a \in \mathbb{F} \cap \mathcal{O}$. For $x \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}' \cap \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ we have:

$$x = 1 \cdot x = (p + a)x = px + ax \in \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}'.$$

Step 2: $\hat{\mathcal{O}}'/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}' \cong k[X]/(\overline{f})$

Recall that $\hat{\mathcal{O}}' = \mathcal{O}[\theta] \cong \mathcal{O}[X]/(f)$. Consider $\Psi \colon \mathcal{O}[X] \to k[X]/(\overline{f})$, which is surjective. It holds that $\ker \Psi = (\mathfrak{p}, f)$ and hence Ψ induces an isomorphism $\hat{\mathcal{O}}'/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}' \to k[X]/(\overline{f})$.

Step 3: Consider now $R = k[X]/(\overline{f})$ and determine $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$.

"(1)" Recall the prime decomposition $\overline{f} = \overline{f}_1^{e_1} \cdots \overline{f}_r^{e_r}$ in $k[X]$ and consider the projection $k[X] \twoheadrightarrow k[X]/(\overline{f})$. By Corollary 8.19 we have the correspondence

$$\mathrm{Spec}(R) \leftrightarrow \{\mathfrak{p} \text{ prime ideal in } k[X] \,|\, \overline{f} \in \mathfrak{p}\}$$

and hence $\mathrm{Spec}(R) = \left\{ (\overline{f}_i) \,|\, i = 1, \ldots, r \right\}$.

"(2)" Notice that
$$R/(\overline{f}_i) = \left(k[X]/(\overline{f})\right)(\overline{f}_i) \cong k[X]/(\overline{f}_i)$$

is a k-vector space of dimension $\deg(\overline{f}_i)$ such that

$$\left[R/(\overline{f}_i) : k\right] = \deg(\overline{f}_i).$$

"(3)" In R we have

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^{r} (\overline{f}_i)^{e_i} = (\overline{f}) = 0.$$

Step 4: Use the isomorphism

$$k[X]/(\overline{f}) \to \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}, \; g \mapsto g(\theta)$$

and obtain from Step 3 with $\mathcal{P}_i = (f_i(\theta))$ that:

(i) $\mathrm{Spec}\left(\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}\right) = \{\mathcal{P}_i \,|\, i = 1, \ldots, r\}$

(ii) $\left[\left(\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}\right)/\mathcal{P}_i : k\right] = \deg(\overline{f}_i)$

(iii) $\bigcap_{i=1}^{r} \mathcal{P}_i^{e_i} = 0$

Step 5: Take preimages in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ via $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \to \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and observe that (iii) implies $\bigcap_{i=1}^{r} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_i^{e_i} \subset \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ divides $\bigcap_{i=1}^{r} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_i^{e_i}$. Furthermore,

$$[L : K] = n = \deg(f) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} e_i f_i$$

such that by Theorem 11, $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \hat{\mathcal{P}}_i^{e_i}$. $\qquad\qquad \square$

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}\mathcal{P} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{e_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_r^{e_r} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} \hat{\mathcal{P}} & \subseteq & \hat{\mathcal{O}} & \subseteq & L \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathcal{P} & \subseteq & \mathcal{O} & \subseteq & K \end{array}$$

Proposition 2.8.23. *There are only finitely many prime ideals $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ which are ramified over $\mathcal{P} = \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. Choose primitive element θ of $L|K$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Let $f_\theta \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ be the minimal polynomial of θ and $d := \mathrm{discr}(f_\theta) = \mathrm{discr}(1, \theta, \ldots, \theta^{n-1}) = \prod_{i<j}(\theta_i - \theta_j)^2 \in \mathcal{O}$.
Here θ_i, θ_j are the zeroes of f_θ in the algebraic closure.
<u>Claim:</u> If $\mathcal{P}$ is a prime ideal in $\mathcal{O}$ s.t.

- $\mathcal{P}$ is coprime to (d) and

- $\mathcal{P}$ is coprime to $\mathbb{F} \cap \mathcal{O}$

then $\mathcal{P}$ is unramified, i.e. all $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ lying above $\mathcal{P}$ are unramified.
From the claim we obtain that there are only finitely many $\mathcal{P}$ which allow ramification.
<u>Proof of the claim:</u> Write $\hat{\mathcal{O}}\mathcal{P} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{e_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_r^{e_r}$. Consider $\bar{f}_\theta \in \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P}[X]$. As in Prop. 8.15

$$\bar{f}_\theta = \bar{f}_1^{e_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \bar{f}_r^{e_r} \quad (\star)$$

a prime decomposition. (d) and $\mathcal{P}$ are coprime $\Rightarrow \bar{d} = $ image of d in $\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \bar{f}_\theta$ has only single zeroes in an algebraic closure of $\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P} \stackrel{(\star)}{\Rightarrow} e_1 = \cdots = e_r = 1$ $\qquad\qquad \square$

Definition 2.8.24.

- $\mathcal{P}$ is said to *split completly* or to be *totally split* $:\Longleftrightarrow e_i = f_i = 1 \; \forall i \in \underline{r}$.

- $\mathcal{P}$ is said to be *indecomposed*, *nonsplit* or *totally ramified* $:\Longleftrightarrow r = 1$.

2.9. Hilbert's theorem of ramification

<u>Idea:</u> Consider Galois extensions $L|K \to$ life becomes much nicer.
Same setting as in 8. Suppose further that $L|K$ normal and consider $G = \mathrm{Gal}(L|K)$.

Remark 2.9.1.   i) $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ prime ideals in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ with $\mathcal{P} := \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{O}$. For $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L|K)$ we have $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$ is a prime ideal in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ above $\mathcal{P}$.

   ii) $\mathrm{Gal}(L|K)$ acts transitively on the set of prime ideals $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ over $\mathcal{P}$.

Proof.   i) Recall from Rem 2.1 iii) that $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{O}}) = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$
       $\Rightarrow \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$ is again a prime ideal in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.
       $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) \cap \mathcal{O} = \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{O}) = \sigma(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{P}$
       $\Rightarrow \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$ lies above $\mathcal{P}$.

ii) follows from i) that we have such an action. Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}'$ be prime ideals above $\mathcal{P} = \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{O} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}' \cap \mathcal{O}$. Assume that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}'$ are not in the same G-orbit. Hence $\hat{\mathcal{P}}'$ and $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$ are coprime for each $\sigma \in G$.

$\Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}}'$ is coprime to $\sigma_1(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) \cdot \ldots \cdot \sigma_n(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$, where $G = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$.

CRT $\Rightarrow \exists x \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ with $x \equiv 0 \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}}'$ and $x \equiv 1 \mod \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$ for all $\sigma \in G$.

In particular: $\mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x) = \prod_{\sigma \in G} \sigma(x) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}' \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{P}$

Also: $\forall \sigma \in G : x \notin \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) \Rightarrow \forall \sigma \in G : \sigma(x) \notin \mathcal{P}$

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{L|K}(x) = \prod_{\sigma \in G} \sigma(x) \notin \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathcal{P} \; \unicode{x21af}$. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Definition 2.9.2. Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ be a prime ideal of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ above $\mathcal{P}$.

    i) $G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} := \mathrm{Stab}_G(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) = \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) = \hat{\mathcal{P}}\}$ is called <u>decomposition group</u> („Zerlegungs-gruppe")

    ii) $Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} := \{x \in L \mid \sigma(x) = x \text{ for all } \sigma \in G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}\}$ is called <u>decomposition field</u> („Zer-legungskörper")

Remark 2.9.3. Let $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$ be a prime ideal which lies above $\mathcal{P}$.

    i) $G/G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} := \{gG_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} \mid g \in G\} \overset{1:1}{\leftrightarrow} \{\hat{\mathcal{P}} \mid \hat{\mathcal{P}} \text{ lies above } \mathcal{P}\}$

    ii) $G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} = \{1\} \iff [G : G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}] = [L : K] = n \qquad\qquad (r = [G : G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}])$
                      $\iff \mathcal{P}$ is totally split
                      $\iff Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} = L$

    iii) $G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} = G \iff [G : G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}] = 1 \iff \mathcal{P}$ is nonsplit $\iff Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} = K$

    iv) $G_{\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0)} = \sigma \circ G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} \circ \sigma^{-1}$

Proof. Follows from Prop 9.1 + definitions + group actions. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Remark 2.9.4. Suppose $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{e_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_r^{e_r}$ with local degrees $f_i = [\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}_i : \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P}]$
Then $e_1 = \cdots = e_r$ and $f_1 = \cdots = f_r$.

Proof. Prop. 9.1 $\Rightarrow \exists \sigma_i \in G$ s.t. $\sigma_i(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1) = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_i$
$\Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \cong \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}_i$, $a \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \mapsto \sigma_i(a) \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}}_i$ as $k = \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P}$-vectorspaces $\Rightarrow f_1 = f_i$ and
$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_i^k \supseteq \mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{O}} \iff \hat{\mathcal{P}}_i^k = (\sigma_i(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1))^k \supseteq \mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \sigma_i(\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{O}}) \Rightarrow e_i = e_1$. $\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

Consider the field extensions $K \subseteq Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \subseteq L$. We have:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & \hat{\mathcal{P}} & \subseteq & \hat{\mathcal{O}} & \subseteq & L \\
& & | & & | & & | \\
\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z & := & \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} & \subseteq & \hat{\mathcal{O}} \cap Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} & \subseteq & Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \\
& & | & & | & & | \\
& & \mathcal{P} & \subseteq & \mathcal{O} & \subseteq & K
\end{array}
$$

Observe $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cap Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$ is the integral closure of $\mathcal{O}$ in $Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$.

Proposition 2.9.5. *Suppose* $\mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = (\prod_\sigma \sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}}))^e$ *with local degree* f.

　　i) $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z$ *is non-split in* $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, *i.e.* $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ *is the only prime ideal above* $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z$.

　　ii) $\hat{\mathcal{P}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z$ *has ramification index* e *and local degree* f.

　　iii) $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z/\mathcal{P}$ *has ramification index 1 and local degree 1, i.e.* $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z/\mathcal{P}$ *is totally split.*

Proof.　　i) $Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} = L^{G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}} \Rightarrow \mathrm{Gal}(L/Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) = G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$. Now statement follows from 9.3 iii)

ii)+iii) Let $e' =$ ramification index of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z$ and $e'' =$ ramification index of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z/\mathcal{P}$
　　　　Let $f' =$ local degree of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z$ and $f'' =$ local degree of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z/\mathcal{P}$.
　　　　Hence: $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}^{e'}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cap Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z^{e''} \cdot \ldots \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = (\hat{\mathcal{P}}^{e'})^{e''} \cdot \ldots$
　　　　$\Rightarrow e = e' \cdot e''$　　　　　　　　　　$(\star)$.
　　　　Also we have for the field extensions

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}} \underbrace{\supseteq}_{f'} \hat{\mathcal{O}} \cap Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z \underbrace{\supseteq}_{f''} \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P}$$

　　　　$\Rightarrow f = f' \cdot f''$　　　　　　　　$(\star\star)$.
　　　　Thm. 11 $\Rightarrow$ 1) For $L|K$: $n = [L:K] = e \cdot f \cdot r$ with $r = [G : G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}]$　$(n = |G|)$.
　　　　2) For $L|Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$: $|G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}| = \frac{n}{r} \overset{Thm.11}{=} e' \cdot f' \cdot \underbrace{r'}_{=1(\text{by i) })} \overset{1)}{=} e \cdot f \Rightarrow e' = e, f' = f$ and

$e'' = 1 = f'' \Rightarrow$ Claim.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　$\square$

Definition 2.9.6. In our general setting we call $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) := \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ the *residue class field* („Restklassenkörper").

Remark 2.9.7. Prop 9.5 iii) $\Rightarrow [\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z) : \kappa(\mathcal{P})] = 1$ hence, $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z) = \kappa(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P} =: k$.

Proposition 2.9.8. *If* $\hat{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{P}$ *is non-split, i.e.* $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ *is the only prime ideal over* $\mathcal{P}$, *then we obtain the following surjective group homomorphism:* $\varphi : G = \mathrm{Gal}(L/K) \to \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P}))$.

Proof. Step 1: φ is well-defined:
Since $\hat{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{P}$ is totally split, we have $\sigma(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) = \hat{\mathcal{P}}$. Therefore $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/K)$ induces an automorphism of $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$.
Step 2: $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(P)$ is a normal extension:
Denote $k := \kappa(\mathcal{P})$ and $\kappa := \kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$. Consider $\bar{\theta} \in \kappa$ and let $\bar{g} \in k[X]$ be its minimal polynomial over k. Have to show that $\bar{g}$ decomposes into linear factors over κ. Let θ be a preimage of $\bar{\theta}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ its minimal polynomial $\Rightarrow f(\bar{\theta}) = 0$. Let $\bar{f}$ be the image of f in $k[X]$, hence $\bar{f}(\bar{\theta}) = 0$ and thus $\bar{g}$ divides $\bar{f}$.
Furthermore: L/K is normal $\Rightarrow f$ decomposes into linear factors overs $L \Rightarrow$ also over $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, since Galois-Automorphisms preserve $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \Rightarrow \bar{f}$ decomposes into linear factors over $\kappa = \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\mathcal{P} \Rightarrow \bar{g}$ does so.
Step 3: φ is surjective:

Let $\bar{\sigma} \in \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa/k)$. Consider the field extension: $k \subseteq E \underbrace{\subseteq}_{\text{purely inseparable} \Rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa/E) = \{1\}} \kappa$ $(\star)$

with E is the maximal separable field extension.

$\Rightarrow \exists \bar{\theta} \in E$ with $E = k(\bar{\theta})$ and $\theta \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ a preimage. Let again $\bar{g} \in k[X]$ be the minimal polynomial of $\bar{\theta}$ and $f, \bar{f}$ as in Step 2.

$\Rightarrow \bar{\sigma}(\bar{\theta})$ is a zero of $\bar{g}$, hence $(X - \bar{\sigma}(\bar{\theta}))$ divides $\bar{g}$ and hence $\bar{f}$ since $\bar{g}, f$ and $\bar{f}$ decompose into linear factors.

$\Rightarrow \exists \theta' \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ with $\theta' \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}} = \bar{\sigma}(\bar{\theta})$ and θ' is a zero of f (there is a linear factor $(X - \theta')$ of f which is send to the factor $(X - \bar{\sigma}(\bar{\theta}))$ of $\bar{f}$)

$\Rightarrow \exists \sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/K)$ with $\sigma(\theta) = \theta'$ and thus $\sigma(\theta) \equiv \theta' \equiv \bar{\sigma}(\bar{\theta}) \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}}$.

$\Rightarrow \varphi(\sigma)_{|E} = \bar{\sigma}_{|E} \overset{(\star)}{\Rightarrow} \varphi(\sigma) = \bar{\sigma}$ $\square$

Remark 2.9.9. Observe that for Step 2 we did not need that $\hat{\mathcal{P}}/\mathcal{P}$ is non-split. Hence we have in the general situation of this section:

$$L/K \text{ normal} \Rightarrow \kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P}) \text{ is normal.}$$

Proposition 2.9.10. *In general, we obtain the following surjective grouphomom.:*

$$G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \to \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P})) \ , \ \sigma \mapsto (a \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}} \mapsto \sigma(a) \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}})$$

Proof. Idea: Consider $K \subseteq Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \underbrace{\subseteq}_{\text{non-split}} L$. Remark 9.7 $\Rightarrow \kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z) = k := \kappa(\mathcal{P})$

Lemma 9.8 $\Rightarrow \underbrace{\mathrm{Gal}(L/Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}})}_{=G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}} \twoheadrightarrow \underbrace{\mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z))}_{\mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P}))} \Rightarrow$ Claim. $\square$

Definition 2.9.11 („Trägheitsgruppe"/„Trägheitskörper"). Let $\varphi : G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Gal}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P}))$ be the surjective group homom. from Prop. 9.10.

    i) $I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} := \ker(\varphi)$ is called <u>*inertia group*</u>.

    ii) $T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} := \{x \in L \mid \sigma(x) = x \ \forall \sigma \in I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}\}$ is called <u>*inertia field*</u>.

Remark 2.9.12.   i) We obtain the following chain of field extensions:

$$K \subseteq Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \subseteq T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \subseteq L$$

    ii) We have the following short exact sequence:

$$1 \to I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \to G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \to \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P})) \to 1$$

**Proposition 2.9.13.** *In the situation of 9.12 we have:*

    i) $T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}/Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$ is normal and $\mathrm{Gal}(T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}/Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) \cong \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P}))$.
      Furthermore: $\mathrm{Gal}(L/T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) \cong I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$.

    ii) If $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P})$ is separable, then: $\#I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} = [L : T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}] = e$ and $[G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} : I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}] = [T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} : Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}] = f$

iii) If $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P})$ is separable and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T := \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$, then we have

- *The ramification index of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ over $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T$ is e and the local degree is 1.*
- *The ramification index of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T$ over $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z$ is 1 and the local degree is f.*

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\hat{\mathcal{P}} & \subseteq & \hat{\mathcal{O}} & \subseteq & L \\
| & & & & | \quad {\scriptstyle I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}} \\
\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T & & {\scriptstyle G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}} & & T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \\
| & & & & | \quad {\scriptstyle G} \\
\hat{\mathcal{P}}_Z & & & & Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \\
| & & & & {\scriptstyle r} \, | \\
\mathcal{P} & \subseteq & \mathcal{O} & \subseteq & K
\end{array}
$$

with $e \cdot f$ on the left.

Proof.   i)   • $I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$ is normal in $G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$.

- $\mathrm{Gal}(T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}/Z_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) \cong G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}/I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} \overset{Rem 9.12}{\cong} \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P}))$
- $T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$ is the fixed field of $I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$

ii) $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P})$ is separable $\Rightarrow \# \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\mathcal{P})) = [\underbrace{\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})}_{\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}} : \underbrace{\kappa(\mathcal{P})}_{\mathcal{O}/\mathcal{P}}] \overset{9.12}{=} \underbrace{\#G_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}/\#I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}}_{e \cdot f} = f$

iii) We will show below hat $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T) = \kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$ This implies:

- local degree of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T/\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is 1
- ramification index of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T/\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is e since $[L/T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}] = \#I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} = e$
- multiplicativity of e and $f \Rightarrow$ rest ✓

Show that $\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T) = \kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})$:
Use Lemma 9.8 $\Rightarrow$ Obtain surjective group homomorphism

$$I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}} = \mathrm{Gal}(L/T_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}) \overset{\varphi}{\twoheadrightarrow} \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T))$$

By definition of $I_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}$ the image of this homomorphism is trivial.
$\Rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}(\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}})/\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T)) = \{1\} \overset{\text{normal+separable}}{\Longrightarrow} [\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}) : \kappa(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_T)] = 1.$

$\square$

2.10. Cyclotomic Fields

In this section, we have

- $\zeta = \zeta_n =$ primitive n-th root of unity

- $L = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$

- $\mathcal{O}$ = ring of integers in L

- $d = \varphi(n) = [L : \mathbb{Q}]$.

GOAL:

(1) Show, that $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$

(2) Describe the prime ideals in $\mathcal{O}$

Lemma 2.10.1. *Suppose $n = l^k$ with l prime and hence $d = \varphi(n) = l^k - l^{k-1} = l^{k-1}(l-1)$.*

(i) *The minimal polynomial $\phi(X)$ of ζ is $\phi(X) = X^{(l-1)l^{k-1}} + X^{(l-2)l^{k-1}} + \cdots + X^{l^{k-1}} + 1$.*

(ii) *We have $l = \prod_{g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times} (1 - \zeta^g)$.*

(iii) *$1 - \zeta^g = \epsilon_g(1 - \zeta)$ with $\epsilon_g \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ for $g \not\equiv 0 \mod l$.*

(iv) *$l = \epsilon(1 - \zeta)^d$ with $\epsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$.*

(v) *$\mathcal{N}_{L|\mathbb{Q}}(1 - \zeta) = l$.*

Proof.   (i)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi(x) &= \prod_{g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times} (X - \zeta^g) = \frac{\prod_{g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})}(X - \zeta^g)}{\prod_{g \in (\mathbb{Z}/l^{k-1}\mathbb{Z})}(X - \zeta^{gl})} = \frac{X^{l^k} - 1}{X^{l^{k-1}} - 1} \\
&= X^{(l-1)l^{k-1}} + X^{(l-2)l^{k-1}} + \cdots + X^{l^{k-1}} + 1
\end{aligned}
$$

(ii) Follows from (i) with $X = 1$.

(iii) Observe

$$
\epsilon_g := \frac{1 - \zeta^g}{1 - \zeta} = 1 + \zeta + \cdots + \zeta^{g-1} \in \mathcal{O}
$$

and

$$
\frac{1}{\epsilon_g} = \frac{1 - \zeta}{1 - \zeta^g}
$$

Since $g \not\equiv 0 \mod l$, we can choose some $g' \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $gg' \equiv 1 \mod l^k$. Hence

$$
\frac{1}{\epsilon_g} = \frac{1 - \zeta^{gg'}}{1 - \zeta^g} = 1 + \zeta^g + \cdots + (\zeta^g)^{g'-1} \in \mathcal{O}.
$$

(iv) Follows from (ii) and (iii) with $\epsilon := \prod_{g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times} \epsilon_g$.

(v) Follows from (ii).

$\square$

Proposition 2.10.2. *Suppose again that $n = l^k$ with l prime. Set $\lambda := 1 - \zeta$. Then*

(i) $\Pi := (\lambda)$ *is a prime ideal of local degree 1.*

(ii) $l \cdot \mathcal{O} = \Pi^d$. *In particular, $l\mathcal{O}$ is non-split.*

Proof. 10.1 (iv) $\Rightarrow l\mathcal{O} = (\lambda)^d$. Let $l\mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p}_1^{e_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathfrak{p}_r^{e_r}$ be the decomposition into prime ideals. By Theorem 11, $d = e_1 f_1 + \cdots + e_r f_r$, where $f_i = $ local degree of $\mathfrak{p}_i$, hence the above is already the prime decomposition and the local degree is 1. $\square$

Remark 2.10.3. 10.1 and 10.2 generalize Lemma I.25.

Proposition 2.10.4. *Let $n = l^k$, l prime. The basis $1, \zeta, \zeta^2, \ldots, \zeta^{d-1}$ of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)|\mathbb{Q}$ has the discriminant $d(1, \zeta, \ldots, \zeta^{d-1}) = (-1)^a l^s$ with $s = l^{k-1}(kl - k - 1)$ and $a \in \{0, 1\}$.*

Proof. <u>Step 1</u>: Show $d(1, \ldots, \zeta^{d-1}) = \pm \mathcal{N}(\phi'(\zeta))$.
Let $\zeta = \zeta_1, \zeta_2, \ldots \zeta_d$ be the conjugates of ζ.

$$\text{Remark } 2.4 \Rightarrow d(1, \ldots \zeta^{d-1}) = d(\phi) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq d} (\zeta_i - \zeta_j) = \pm \prod_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{d} (\zeta_i - \zeta_j).$$

Observe

$$\phi(X) = \prod_{i=1}^{d}(X - \zeta_i) \Rightarrow \phi'(X) = \sum_{m=1}^{d} \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq m}}^{d}(X - \zeta_i)$$

and therefore

$$\phi'(\zeta_j) = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{d}(\zeta_j - \zeta_i).$$

Hence we have $d(1, \ldots \zeta^{d-1}) = \pm \prod_{j=1}^{d} \phi'(\zeta_j) = \pm \mathcal{N}(\phi'(\zeta))$.

<u>Step 2</u>: Calculate $\mathcal{N}(\phi'(\zeta))$ partially.
Observe: $(X^{l^{k-1}} - 1)\phi(X) = X^{l^k} - 1$. Differentiating yields $(X^{l^{k-1}} - 1)\phi'(X) + \phi(X)(\ldots) = l^k X^{l^k - 1}$. Plugging in $X = \zeta$ gives $(\zeta^{l^{k-1}} - 1)\phi'(\zeta) = l^k \zeta^{l^k - 1} = l^k \zeta^{-1}$. Set $\xi := \zeta^{l^{k-1}}$. Then ξ is a root of unity of order l and we have $\mathcal{N}(\phi'(\zeta)) = \frac{(l^k)^d}{\mathcal{N}(\xi - 1)}$.

<u>Step 3</u>: Calculate $\mathcal{N}(\xi - 1)$.
Lemma 10.1 $\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}(\xi)|\mathbb{Q}}(\xi - 1) = l$. Hence $\mathcal{N}_{L|\mathbb{Q}}(\xi - 1) = \left(\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{Q}(\xi)|\mathbb{Q}}(\xi - 1)\right)^{l^{k-1}} = l^{l^{k-1}}$.
Now combining all 3 steps yields: $d(1, \ldots, \zeta^{d-1}) = \pm \frac{l^{k^d}}{l^{l^{k-1}}} = \pm l^s$. $\square$

Proposition 2.10.5. *Let n be some natural number. Then $1, \zeta, \dots \zeta^{d-1}$ is an integral basis of $\mathcal{O}$.*

Proof. <u>Step 1</u>: Show the claim for $n = l^k$ with l prime.

(1) Proposition 2.7 $\Rightarrow \pm l^s = d(1, \dots, \zeta^{d-1}) \Rightarrow l^s \cdot \mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{Z} + \dots + \mathbb{Z}\zeta^{d-1} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] \subset \mathcal{O}$.

(2) Consider $\lambda := (1 - \zeta)$. Proposition 10.2 $\Rightarrow$ local degree of (λ) is $1 \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}/(\lambda) = \mathbb{Z}/(l)$
$\Rightarrow \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z} + \lambda\mathcal{O}$ (every element of $\mathcal{O} \mod (\lambda)$ has an representant in $\mathbb{Z}$)
$\Rightarrow \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \lambda\mathcal{O}$ $(*)$.
Multiplying with λ yields $\lambda\mathcal{O} = \lambda\mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \lambda^2\mathcal{O} \overset{(*)}{\Rightarrow} \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \lambda^2\mathcal{O} \Rightarrow \dots$
$\Rightarrow \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \lambda^t\mathcal{O} \ \forall t \geq 1$.

(3) Plug in $t = s\varphi(l^k)$ and by Proposition 10.2 $l\mathcal{O} = \lambda^{\varphi(l^k)}\mathcal{O}$:
$\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + \lambda^{s\varphi(l^k)}\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] + l^s\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

<u>Step 2</u>: Generalize to arbitrary $n = l_1^{k_1} \cdot \dots \cdot l_r^{k_r}$.
Consider $\zeta_i := \zeta^{n_i}$ with $n_i := \frac{n}{l_i^{k_i}}$, a primitive $l_i^{k_i}$-th root of unity. Then $\mathrm{ord}(\zeta_1), \dots, \mathrm{ord}(\zeta_r)$ are relatively prime. Hence:

(1) $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_r)$.

(2) $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{i-1}) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_i) = \mathbb{Q}$.

(3) Apply Proposition 2.13 to $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_r)$ successively. We obtain, that

$$\left\{ \zeta_1^{j_1}, \dots, \zeta_r^{j_r} \ \middle|\ 0 \leq j_i \leq d_i - 1 \right\}$$

with $d_i = \varphi(l_i^{k_i})$ is an integral basis of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_r) = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.
Hence $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta] = \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\zeta + \dots + \mathbb{Z}\zeta^{d-1}$, since all ζ_i's are powers of ζ.

$\square$

Lemma 2.10.6. *Let p be a prime which does not divide n. Then we have in $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$:*

$$p\mathcal{O} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_r$$

with $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_i$ different prime ideals in $\mathcal{O}$ and the local degree of each $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_i$ is
$f = \min(\{ k \in \mathbb{N} \mid p^k \equiv 1 \mod n \})$.

Proof. Idea: Use Proposition 8.15.
Observe: Since $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$, Proposition 8.15 can be applied to all prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}$.

- Consider $f(X) = \phi_n(X)$.

- Take the image $h(X) := f(\bar{X}) \in \mathbb{F}_p[X]$ and decompose it as $h(X) = h_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot h_r^{e_r}$ into irreducible factors over $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Then we have: $p\mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{p}_1^{e_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathfrak{p}_r^{e_r}$ with prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_i$ of local degree $f_i := \deg h_i$.

Step 1: Show $e_1 = \cdots = e_r = 1$.
Consider $q(X) := X^n - 1 \in \mathbb{F}_p[X]$. Since $p \nmid n$, $q'(X) = nX^{n-1}$ and q have no common zeroes in $\mathbb{F}_p \Rightarrow q(X)$ has no multiple zeroes in $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p \Rightarrow$ The same must be true for $h(x) \Rightarrow e_1 = \cdots = e_r = 1$.

Step 2: Show: $f_1 = f_2 = \cdots = f_r = k_0 := \min\{k \mid p^k \equiv 1 \mod n\}$
Recall: $f(X) = \phi_n(X), h(X) :=$ image in $\mathbb{F}_p[X] = h_1^{l_1}(X) \cdot \ldots \cdot h_r^{l_r}(X)$
Consider the field $L := \mathbb{F}_{p^{k_0}}$ with p^{k_0} elements as field extension of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Write $p^{k_0} - 1 = nw$ with $w \in \mathbb{N}$.
Observe: $L^\times = <a>$ with $\mathrm{ord}(a) = nw \Rightarrow \bar{\zeta} = a^w$ is a primitive n-th root of unity and h decomposes into linear factors over L.
Furthermore: $L = \mathbb{F}_p(\bar{\zeta})$ by minimality of k_0, since $\#\mathbb{F}_p[\bar{\zeta}] = p^M$ for some M and $\mathrm{ord}(\bar{\zeta}) = n$ divides $p^M - 1 \Rightarrow k_0 = M$.
Let $\bar{f}_1(X)$ be the minimal polynomial of $\bar{\zeta}$ over $\mathbb{F}_p \Rightarrow$

- $\bar{f}_1$ is an irreducible divisor of $h(X) \Rightarrow$ w.l.o.g. $\bar{f}_1 = h_1$

- $f_1 = \deg(h_1) = \deg(\bar{f}_1) = [L : \mathbb{F}_p] = k_0 \Rightarrow f_1 = k_0$

$\square$

Proposition 2.10.7 (CHARACTERISATION OF PRIME IDEALS). *Let $n = p_1^{k_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot p_r^{k_r}$ be the prime decomposition of n and p some arbitrary prime number.*
Then $p\mathcal{O} = (\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_r)^{e_p}$ with $e_p = \varphi(p^{k_p})$ is the factorisation into prime ideals and each prime ideal $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_i$ is of local degree $f_p := \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid p^k \equiv 1 \mod \frac{n}{p^{k_p}}\}$

Proof. Again: Use Prop. 8.15 which applies to <u>all</u> prime ideals in $\mathcal{O}$
$\Rightarrow \phi_n(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ min. polynomial of $\zeta \Rightarrow \bar{\phi}_n(X) \in \mathbb{F}_p[X]$ image in $\mathbb{F}_p[X]$.
Denote $n = mp^a$ with $\gcd(p, m) = 1$, i.e. $a = k_p$.
Remember $U_m^\times = \{$primitive $m - th$ roots of unity $\} \cong ((\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^\times, \cdot) \quad (\zeta^k \leftrightarrow k)$.
Use the isomorphism:

$$U_m^\times \times U_{p^a}^\times \to U_n \ , \ (\xi, \eta) \mapsto \xi \cdot \eta$$
$$\Rightarrow \phi_n(X) = \prod_{g \in (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times} (X - \zeta^g) = \prod_{\substack{\xi \in U_m^\times, \\ \eta \in U_{p^a}^\times}} (X - \xi\eta)$$

Step 1: Show that $\phi_n(X) \equiv \phi_m(X)^{\varphi(p^a)} \mod p$

(1) Observe: $X^{p^a} - 1 \equiv (X - 1)^{p^a} \mod p$. For prime ideal $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ over (p):

$$X^{p^a} - 1 \equiv (X - 1)^{p^a} \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}}$$

Let $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_{\varphi(p^a)}$ be the primitve p^a-th roots of unity.
$0 = \eta_j^{p^a} - 1 \equiv (\eta_j - 1)^{p^a} \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}} \Rightarrow \eta_j \equiv 1 \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}}$.

(2)

$$\phi_n(X) = \prod_{\substack{\xi \in U_m^\times, \\ \eta \in U_{p^a}^\times}} (X - \xi\eta) = \prod_{g \in (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^\times} (X - \xi)^{\varphi(p^a)} = \phi_m^{\varphi(p^a)} \mod \hat{\mathcal{P}}$$

$$\Rightarrow \phi_n(X) \equiv \phi_m(X)^{\varphi(p^a)} \mod p$$

Step 2: Use Lemma 10.5:

Proof of Lemma 10.5 $\Rightarrow$ exponents of $\phi_m(X) \mod p$ are all $1 \Rightarrow$ all exponents of $\phi_n(X)$ mod p are $\varphi(p^a)$. The local degree of the prime factors are by Lemma 10.5 $f = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid p^k \equiv 1 \mod \underbrace{m}_{=n/p^a}\}$. $\hfill \square$

Corollary 2.10.8. *i) p is ramified in $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta) \iff n \equiv 0 \mod p$ and we have <u>not</u> $p = 2 = \gcd(4, n)$.*

ii) $p \neq 2$. Then p is totally split $\iff p \equiv 1 \mod n$.

Proof. i) Prop. 10.6 $\Rightarrow p$ is unramified $\iff e = 1 \overset{Prop10.6}{\iff} \varphi(p^{k_p}) = 1 \iff k_p = 0$ or $p^{k_p} - p^{k_p - 1} = p^{k_p - 1}(p - 1) = 1 \iff k_p = 0$ or $(p = 2$ and $2 = \gcd(4, n))$.

ii) $p \neq 2 : e = 1 \iff k_p = 0 \iff p \nmid n$
$f = 1 \iff \min\{k \mid p^k \equiv 1 \mod \frac{n}{p^k}\} = 1 \iff p \equiv 1 \mod n$.
$\hfill \square$

Remark 2.10.9. We have now in particular proved I.2.2.

3. Fermat's theorem for regular primes

3.1. The proof using a lemma of Kummer

<u>Setting:</u> K-number field, $\mathcal{O}$ = ring of integers

<u>Recall:</u> $\mathcal{J}_K$:= group of fractional ideals, $\mathcal{P}_K$ = subgroup of principal ideals, $\mathrm{Cl}_K = \mathcal{J}_K/\mathcal{P}_K, h_K = \#\,\mathrm{Cl}_K$

Definition 3.1.1. A prime $p \in \mathbb{N}$ is <u>regular</u> : $\iff$ h_K is not divisible by p where $K = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)$.

Remark 3.1.2. Suppose p regular. Then we have for each ideal I in $\mathcal{O}$ = ring of integers in K:

If I^p is a principal ideal, then I is a principal ideal.

Proof. $p \nmid h_K \Rightarrow$ No element of Cl_K has order p. $\qquad\qquad\square$

<u>Recall:</u> (Lemma I.2.11) $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}, \gcd(x, y) = 1, x + y \not\equiv 0 \mod p$

$\Rightarrow x + \zeta^i y$ and $x + \zeta^j y$ are coprime, if $i \not\equiv j \mod p$.

Theorem 12. *If p is a regular prime, then Fermat's theorem holds, i.e.*

$$x^p + y^p = z^p \text{ in } \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow xyz = 0.$$

<u>Recall:</u>

(1) $x^p + y^p = (x + y)(x + \zeta y) \cdot \ldots \cdot (x + \zeta^{p-1} y)$ in $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

(2) $\lambda = 1 - \zeta$ is prime in $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$

(3) $1 - \zeta \sim 1 - \zeta^g$ for all $g \not\equiv 0 \mod p$

Lemma 3.1.3. *Suppose that $x, y \in \mathcal{O}$ with x, y are coprime and p does not divide y.*
Then we have: <u>either</u> the ideals $(x + \zeta^i y)$ (with $i \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$) are relatively prime
*   <u>or</u> they all have $(1 - \zeta)$ as a common factor and the ideals $(\frac{x+\zeta \cdot y}{1-\zeta})$ (with*
$i \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\}$) are relatively prime.

Proof. Use from the proof of Lemma I.2.11: Let $0 \leq j < i \leq p - 1$. $A := (x + \zeta \cdot y, x + \zeta^j \cdot y) \Rightarrow$

(1) $(1 - \zeta) \cdot y \in A$

(2) $(1 - \zeta) \cdot x \in A$

(3) $1 - \zeta \in A$ and thus $p \in A$

(4) $x + y \in A$

Suppose q is a prime ideal with $q | (x + \zeta^i \cdot y)$ and $q | (x + \zeta^j \cdot y)$.

Hence $q \supseteq A \overset{(3)}{\ni} 1 - \zeta \overset{1-\zeta \text{ prime}}{\Longrightarrow} q = (1 - \zeta)$.

Hence $q = (1 - \zeta)$ is the only prime ideal which possibly divides $(x + \zeta^i \cdot y), (x + \zeta^j \cdot y)$.

Show: If $q = (1 - \zeta)$ divides $(x + \zeta^i \cdot y)$, then it divides $(x + \zeta^{i+1} \cdot y)$.

This follows from the following calculation: $x + \zeta^{i+1} \cdot y = x + \zeta^i \cdot y + \zeta^i (\zeta - 1) \cdot y$

Finally show: If $(1 - \zeta)$ divides $x + \zeta^i \cdot y$, then the $(\frac{x + \zeta^i \cdot y}{1 - \zeta})$ and $(\frac{x + \zeta^j \cdot y}{1 - \zeta})$ are coprime for $0 \leq j < i \leq p - 1$.

Recall: $p \nmid y \Rightarrow 1 - \zeta \nmid y$

Proof: $x + \zeta^i \cdot y - (x + \zeta^j \cdot y) = \zeta^j \cdot y \underbrace{(\zeta^{i-j} - 1)}_{\sim (\zeta - 1)} \Rightarrow \frac{x + \zeta^i \cdot y}{1 - \zeta} - \frac{x + \zeta^h \cdot y}{1 - \zeta} \sim y.$

But $(1 - \zeta) \nmid y \Rightarrow$ Claim. $\square$

Proposition 3.1.4 ("First Case"). *Suppose p is a regular prime with $p \geq 5$ such that $x^p + y^p = z^p$ and $p \nmid xyz$ with $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $xyz = 0$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that x, y, z are coprime. Proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1:

- $z^p = x^p + y^p = (x + y)(x + \zeta y) \cdots (x + \zeta^{p-1} y)$

- Since $p \nmid z$ we have $x + y \equiv x^p + y^p = z^p \equiv z \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ by little Fermat's theorem such that $p \nmid x + y$.

- Lemma 2.11 implies that $(x + y), (x + \zeta y), \ldots, (x + \zeta^{p-1} y)$ are pairwise coprime such that the first bullet point together with the regularity of p and Remark 1.2 yields $(x + \zeta^i y) = (\alpha_i)^p$ for some $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{O}$. Thus $x + \zeta^i y = \varepsilon_i \alpha_i^p$ with $\varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{O}^\times$.

Now continue as in the proof of Theorem 1. $\square$

Recall (Example 1.2.8). If $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}$ then $\alpha = a_0 + a_1 \zeta + \cdots + a_{p-2} \zeta^{p-2}$ such that

$$\alpha^p \equiv \underbrace{a_0^p + a_1^p + \cdots + a_{p-2}^p}_{=a \in \mathbb{Z}} \mod p.$$

Lemma 3.1.5 (Kummer's Lemma II). *Suppose p is a regular prime. If $u \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ such that $u \equiv a \mod p$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ then there is an $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ such that $u = \alpha^p$.*

The proof is hard and needs more theory.

Remark 3.1.6. $1, 1 - \zeta, \ldots, (1 - \zeta)^{p-2}$ is an integral basis of $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$.

Proof. $1, \zeta, \ldots, \zeta^{p-2}$ is an integral basis by Proposition 2.10.4. Furthermore,

$$\zeta^i = (1 - (1 - \zeta))^i = \sum_{k=0}^{i} \binom{k}{i} (-1)^{i-k} (1 - \zeta)^{i-k}$$

and $1 - \zeta$ has minimal polynomial of degree lesser equal than $p - 1$. $\square$

Lemma 3.1.7. *If $\alpha \in \mathcal{O} \backslash (1 - \zeta)$ then there exist $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that*

$$\zeta^l \alpha \equiv a \mod (1 - \zeta)^2.$$

Proof. We do the proof in multiple steps:

(1) Since $1, 1 - \zeta, \ldots, (1 - \zeta)^{p-2}$ is an integral basis of $\mathcal{O}$ we have

$$\alpha \equiv a_0 1 + a_1 (1 - \zeta) \mod (1 - \zeta)^2$$

with $a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(2) Since $1 - \zeta \nmid \alpha$ we have $1 - \zeta \nmid a_0$ such that $p \nmid a_0$ and hence there is $l \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $a_0 l \equiv a_1 \mod p$.

(3) Since $\zeta = 1 - (1 - \zeta)$ we have

$$\zeta^l \equiv 1 - l(1 - \zeta) \mod (1 - \zeta)^2.$$

(4) By (1), (2) and (3) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
\zeta^l \alpha &\equiv (1 - l(1 - \zeta)) (a_0 + a_1 (1 - \zeta)) \\
&\equiv a_0 + (a_1 - l a_0) (1 - \zeta) \\
&\equiv a_0 \mod (1 - \zeta)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Proposition 3.1.8 ("Second case"). *Suppose p is a regular prime with $p \geq 5$ such that $x^p + y^p = z^p$ and $p \mid xyz$ with $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $xyz = 0$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality x, y, z are pairwise coprime. By changing the role of x, y and z and possibly replacing x by $-x$, y by $-y$ and z by $-z$ we can furthermore assume that $p \mid z$, $p \nmid x$ and $p \nmid y$. Then, by 2.10.1,

$$z = p^m z_0 = \varepsilon (1 - \zeta)^{(p-1)m} z_0$$

with $z_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 1, \gcd(z_0, p) = 1$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ such that

$$x^p + y^p = \varepsilon^p (1 - \zeta)^{(p-1)mp} z_0^p.$$

By assumption:

- x, y and z_0 are pairwise coprime since x, y and z are pairwise coprime.

- $1 - \zeta$ and z_0 are coprime since p and z are coprime.

- x and $1 - \zeta$ are coprime since $p \nmid x$. The same holds for y and $1 - \zeta$.

Hence the following Lemma 1.9 yields $xyz_0 = 0$ such that $xyz = 0$ as claimed. $\square$

Lemma 3.1.9. *Suppose p is a regular prime with $p \geq 5$, $x, y, z_0 \in \mathcal{O}$, $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ and $x, y, z_0, 1 - \zeta$ are pairwise coprime. If $x^p + y^p = \varepsilon(1 - \zeta)^{kp} z_0^p$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $xyz_0 = 0$.*

Proof. Assume that there are x, y, z_0 as in the lemma with $xyz_0 \neq 0$. We may assume that k is minimal.

"Step 1:" Show that $(1 - \zeta)^2 | x + y$.

(1) By assumption we have

$$\varepsilon(1 - \zeta)^{kp} z_0^p = (x + y)(x + \zeta y) \cdots \left(x + \zeta^{p-1} y\right) \tag{$*$}$$

such that, since $1 - \zeta$ is prime, there is $i \in \{0, \ldots, p - 1\}$ with $1 - \zeta | x + \zeta^i y$. Hence $1 - \zeta$ divides all $x + \zeta^i y$ by Lemma 1.3, in particular $x + y$.

(2) By Lemma 1.7 there are $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $l, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$\zeta^l x \equiv a \mod (1 - \zeta)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta^j y \equiv b \mod (1 - \zeta)^2.$$

(3) We may replace x by $x\zeta^l$ and y by $y\zeta^j$ and thus can assume that $x \equiv a, y \equiv b$ mod $(1 - \zeta)^2$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(4) $1 - \zeta | x + y$ implies $1 - \zeta | a + b$ such that $(1 - \zeta)^{p-1} | a + b$ (since $a + b \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have also $p | a + b$) and hence $(1 - \zeta)^2 | x + y$. In particular, $k \geq 2$.

"Step 2:" Show that $(1 - \zeta)^{(k-1)p+1} | x + y$.
Since the quotients $\frac{x + \zeta^i y}{1 - \zeta}$ are pairwise coprime, all "extra powers" of $1 - \zeta$ have to divide $x + y$. Thus,

$$(1 - \zeta)^{kp - (p-1)} | x + y.$$

Furthermore:

$$1 - \zeta \nmid \frac{x + y}{(1 - \zeta)^{kp - (p-1)}}$$

"Step 3:" Show that $\frac{x + \zeta^i y}{1 - \zeta}$ is associated to a p-power.
From $(*)$ we obtain

$$\left((1 - \zeta)^{k-1} z_0\right)^p = \prod_{i=0}^{p-1} \left(\frac{x + \zeta^i y}{1 - \zeta}\right).$$

Since the ideals on the right side are pairwise coprime, $\left(\frac{x+\zeta^i y}{1-\zeta}\right)$ is a p-th power. Thus Remark 1.2 yields

$$\frac{x + \zeta^i y}{1 - \zeta} = \varepsilon_i \alpha_i^p$$

with $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{O}$ and $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$. Furthermore, the α_i are pairwise coprime.

"Step 4:" Find $\varepsilon', \eta \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{O}$ with $\varepsilon'(1 - \zeta)^{(k-1)p}\beta^p = -\alpha_1^p + \eta\alpha_{-1}^p$.
By Step 2, $(1-\zeta)^{k-1}$ divides α_0. More precisely, $\alpha_0 = (1-\zeta)^{k-1}\beta$ with $\beta \in \mathcal{O}$ and $1-\zeta, \beta$ coprime. Do some ugly calculation:

$$y = \frac{x + y - (x + \zeta y)}{1 - \zeta} = \varepsilon_0\alpha_0^p - \varepsilon_1\alpha_1^p = \varepsilon_0(1 - \zeta)^{(k-1)p}\beta^p - \varepsilon_1\alpha_1^p \tag{A}$$

$$y = \frac{(x + \zeta^{-1}y) - (x + y)}{\zeta^{-1}(1 - \zeta)} = \zeta\varepsilon_{-1}\alpha_{-1}^p - \zeta\varepsilon_0\alpha_0^p = \zeta\varepsilon_{-1}\alpha_{-1}^p - \zeta\varepsilon_0(1 - \zeta)^{(k-1)p}\beta^p \tag{B}$$

Then $(B) - (A)$ yields

$$0 = \zeta\varepsilon_{-1}\alpha_{-1}^p + \varepsilon_1\alpha_1^p + \varepsilon_0(1 - \zeta)^{p(k-1)}\beta^p(-\zeta - 1).$$

Now define

$$\varepsilon' = \frac{(1 + \zeta)\varepsilon_0}{-\varepsilon_1} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \eta = \frac{\zeta\varepsilon_{-1}}{-\varepsilon_1}$$

to obtain

$$\varepsilon'(1 - \zeta)^{p(k-1)}\beta^p = \eta\alpha_{-1}^p - \alpha_1^p. \tag{$**$}$$

"Step 5:" Show that η is a p-th power.
By $(**)$ we have $0 \equiv \eta\alpha_{-1}^p - \alpha_1^p \mod p$ such that Example 1.2.8 ascertains the existence of $a_{-1}, a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $a_{-1}^p \equiv a_1, \alpha_1^p \equiv a_1 \mod p$.

"Step 6:" Find a smaller solution to $(\star)$:

$$x' := \alpha_{-1}, y' := v\eta_1, z_0 := \beta.$$

With $(\star\star) : \varepsilon'(1 - \zeta)^{p(k-1)} \cdot z_0^p = y'^p + x'^p$ is a smaller solution, a contradiction. $\qquad \square$

4. Geometric aspects

4.1. Localisation

Recall: Here all rings are commutative with 1.

Reminder 4.1.1.   (i) Let R be a ring and $S \subseteq R \setminus \{0\}$ be a multiplicative system, i.e.

(1) $a, b \in S \Rightarrow a \cdot b \in S$ and

(2) $1 \in S$.

$$R \cdot S^{-1} := \{(a, s) \mid a \in R, s \in S\}/\sim$$

with $(a, s) \sim (a', s')$ if there is $t \in S : t(as' - a's) = 0$.
Denote $\frac{a}{s} := [(a, s)]/\sim$ equivalence class of (a, s).
RS^{-1} becomes a ring with

$$\frac{a_1}{s_1} + \frac{a_2}{s_2} = \frac{a_1 s_2 + a_2 s_1}{s_1 s_2},$$
$$\frac{a_1}{s_1} \cdot \frac{a_2}{s_2} = \frac{a_1 a_2}{s_1 s_2}$$

RS^{-1} is called *localisation of R by S*.

(ii) The map

$$j_S : R \to RS^{-1} \ , \ r \mapsto \frac{r}{1}$$

is a ring homomorphism with $j_S(S) \subseteq (RS^{-1})^\times$. $\ker(j_S) = \{r \in R \mid \exists a \in S \text{ with } ar = 0\}$. In particular: R is an integral domain $\Rightarrow j_S$ is an embedding an $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{a'}{b'}$ is equivalent to $ab' = a'b$.
Furthermore: R is an integral domain $\Rightarrow RS^{-1} \subseteq \mathrm{Quot}(R) \ , \ \frac{a}{b} \mapsto \frac{a}{b}$.

(iii) Localisation has the following universal property: $f : R \mapsto R'$ a ring homomorphism with $f(S) \subseteq (R')^\times$ then there exists a unique ringhomomorphism $g : RS^{-1} \to R'$ with $f = g \circ j_S$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
R & \xrightarrow{\ j_S\ } & RS^{-1} \\
 & \searrow^{f} \quad \swarrow_{\exists! g} & \\
 & R' &
\end{array}
$$

Example 4.1.2.   (i) R integral domain, $S = R \setminus 0 \Rightarrow RS^{-1} = \mathrm{Quot}(R)$

(ii) p prime ideal in R, $S := R \setminus p \Rightarrow R_p := RS^{-1}$.

Proposition 4.1.3 (Description of prime ideals in localisations). *We have the following bijection:*

$$\{p \in \mathrm{Spec}(R) \mid p \subseteq R \setminus S\} \leftrightarrow \{q \in \mathrm{Spec}(RS^{-1})\}$$
$$\phi : p \mapsto pS^{-1} = \{\frac{a}{s} \mid a \in p, s \in S\}$$
$$j_S^{-1}(q) \leftarrow q : \psi$$

Proof.   (1) $\frac{a}{s} = \frac{a'}{s'}$, then $a \in p \iff a' \in P$:

Suppose $a \in p, a' \in R, s, s' \in S$ and $\frac{a}{s} = \frac{a'}{s'} \Rightarrow \exists t \in S : \underbrace{t}_{\notin p}(as' - a's) = 0 \in p$

So $as' - a's \in p$, hence $a's \in p$ and $a' \in p$.

(2) ϕ is well defined, i.e. pS^{-1} is a prime ideal: clear.

(3) ψ is well-defined by Prop. II.8.16.

(4) $\psi \circ \phi(p) = j_S^{-1}(pS^{-1}) = p$:
$r \in j_S^{-1}(pS^{-1}) \iff j_S(r) \in pS^{-1} \iff \frac{r}{1} \in pS^{-1} \iff r \in p$

(5) $\phi \circ \psi(q) = \psi(j_S^{-1}(q)) = j_S^{-1}(q)S^{-1} = q$:
$\frac{r}{s} \in j_S^{-1}(q)S^{-1} \iff r \in j_S^{-1}(q) \iff j_S(r) \in q \iff \frac{r}{1} \in q \iff \frac{r}{s} \in q$ $\square$

Definition 4.1.4 (and Prop., lokaler Ring). A ring is a *local ring* if R has one of the following equivalent properties:

  (i) R has a unique maximal ideal m.

  (ii) $R \setminus R^\times$ is an ideal.

  (iii) $\forall x \in R : x \in R^\times$ or $1 - x \in R^\times$.

In particular we have: If R is a local ring then $m = R \setminus R^\times$ is the unique maximal ideal of R.

Proof. $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$: Show that $R = R^\times \dot\cup m$:

(1) $R = R^\times \cup m : a \in R \setminus m$. Hence (a) is not contained in m. So $(a) = R$ and hence $a \in R^\times$.

(2) $R^\times \cap m = \emptyset : a \in R^\times$, so $a \notin m$ since $m \neq R = (a)$. It follows that $m = R \setminus R^\times$ and thus $R \setminus R^\times$ is an ideal.

$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$: Suppose x and $1 - x \in R \setminus R^\times$. Hence $1 = x + (1 - x) \in R \setminus R^\times E$.
$(iii) \Rightarrow (i)$: Suppose that m and m' are two different maximal ideals. Let $a \in m' \setminus m$. Since m is maximal we have $(m, a) = R \Rightarrow \exists b \in m, r \in R$ with $1 = b + ra$. We know $ra \in m'$, hence $ra \notin R^\times$ and by assumption $(iii) \Rightarrow b = 1 - ra \in R^\times E$ to $b \in m$. $\square$

Proposition 4.1.5 (localisations by prime ideals are local)**.** *Let R be a ring and $p \in$ Spec(R). Then R_p is a local ring with maximal ideal pS^{-1} where $S = R \setminus p$.*

Proof. We show that $R_p = R_p^{\times} \dot\cup pS^{-1}$. Hence $R_p \setminus R_p^{\times} = pS^{-1}$ is an ideal. Thus R_p is a local ring.

(1) $R_p = pS^{-1} \cup Rp^{\times}$:
Let $a \in R, s \in S = R \setminus p$. Suppose $\frac{a}{s} \notin pS^{-1}$, i.e $a \notin p$. So $\frac{s}{a} \in R_p$ and $\frac{a}{s}\frac{s}{a} = 1$ Hence $\frac{a}{s} \in R_p^{\times}$.

(2) $pS^{-1} \cap R_p^{\times} = \emptyset$:
Suppose that $\frac{a}{s} \in R_p^{\times}$ (with $a \in R, s \in S$) $\Rightarrow \exists a' \in R, s' \in S : \frac{a}{s}\frac{a'}{s'} = 1 \Rightarrow \exists t \in S$ with $t(aa' - ss') = 0 \in p$ Since $t \notin p$ we have $aa' - \underbrace{ss'}_{\notin p} \in p$, so $aa' \notin p$. Since $a \notin p$

it follows $\frac{a}{s} \notin pS^{-1}$.

$\square$

Proposition 4.1.6 (being Dedekind is stable under localisation)**.** *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a Dedekind domain, $S \subseteq \mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\}$ multiplicative system, then $\mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ is a Dedekind domain.*

Proof. $\mathcal{O}$ is an integral domain, so $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}S^{-1} \subseteq$ Quot$(\mathcal{O})$.

(1) $\mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ is an integral domain, since $\mathcal{O}S^{-1} \subseteq$ Quot$(\mathcal{O})$.

(2) Show that $\mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ is Noetherian, i.e. each ideal is finitely generated:
Let q be an ideal in $\mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ and $p := j_S^{-1}(q)$.
Prop 1.3 says that $q = pS^{-1}$. $\mathcal{O}$ is a Dedekind domain, hence p is finitely generated i.e. $p = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \Rightarrow q = pS^{-1} = (\frac{a_1}{1}, \ldots, \frac{a_n}{1})$ is finitely generated.

(3) Show that $\mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ is integrally closed:
Suppose $x \in$ Quot$(\mathcal{O}S^{-1}) =$ Quot$(\mathcal{O})$ with $x^n + \frac{r_{n-1}}{s_{n-1}}x^{n-1} + \cdots + \frac{r_0}{s_0} = 0$ and $r_0, \ldots, r_{n-1} \in \mathcal{O}, s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1} \in S$.
Let $s := s_0 \cdot \ldots \cdot s_{n-1} \in S$, then

$$(sx)^n + s\underbrace{\frac{r_{n-1}}{s_{n-1}}}_{\in \mathcal{O}}(sx)^{n-1} + \cdots + s^n\underbrace{\frac{r_0}{s_0}}_{\in \mathcal{O}} = 0$$

$\Rightarrow sx$ is integral over $\mathcal{O}$ and $\hat{x} = sx \in \mathcal{O}$, since $\mathcal{O}$ is integrally closed.
$\Rightarrow x = \frac{\hat{x}}{s} \in \mathcal{O}S^{-1}$. Thus $\mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ is integrally closed.

(4) Prop 1.3 implies that every prime ideal $q \neq 0$ in $\mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ is maximal.

$\square$

Definition 4.1.7 („diskreter Bewertungsring "**).** A ring is called *discrete valuation ring* (DVR) if

- R is a principal ideal domain and

- R has a (unique) maximal ideal $m = (\pi) \neq 0$.

In particular

- R is an integral domain

- R is not a field.

Remark 4.1.8. Let R be a DVR with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (\pi)$.

(i) π is prime and any prime π' is associated to π.

(ii) Any $r \in R \backslash \{0\}$ can be written as $r = \varepsilon \pi^k$ with $\varepsilon \in R^\times$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on r.

Proof. "(i)" Since R is a PID it is also a UFD. Since π is prime, if $\pi = ab$ with $a, b \in R$ then $(\pi) \subset (a)$ such that $(a) = R$ or $(a) = (\pi)$. Hence $a \in R^\times$ or $a = \varepsilon \pi$ with $\varepsilon \in R^\times$. Thus one of a, b must be a unit such that π is prime as a irreducible element of a UFD.

If π' is another prime, then $(\pi') \subset (\pi)$ and we can write $\pi' = a\pi$ with $a \in R$. Since π' is prime, a must be a unit and $\pi' \sim \pi$ follows as claimed.

"(ii)" Since r has a unique prime factorization (up to a unit) the claim follows from (i). $\square$

Proposition 4.1.9. *R is a DVR if and only if R is a local Dedekind domain and not a field.*

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$" R is local since it is a DVR, noetherian since it is a PID and integrally closed since it is a UFD. Furthermore, by Remark 1.8 every prime ideal is maximal. Also, since for the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (\pi)$ we have $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$, R is not a field.

"$\Leftarrow$" R has a unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ since it is a local ring and $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ since R is not a field. We need to show that R is a PID:

(1) Show that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a principal ideal:

Since R is a Dedekind domain it holds that $\mathfrak{m} \neq \mathfrak{m}^2$. Let $\pi \in \mathfrak{m} \backslash \mathfrak{m}^2$ and observe that $\mathfrak{m}$ is the only non-zero prime ideal. Thus, $(\pi) = \mathfrak{m}^k$ and $k = 1$ since $\pi \notin \mathfrak{m}^2$.

(2) Any ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ is a principal ideal since $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{m}^k = (\pi^k)$.

$\square$

Definition 4.1.10. Let K be a field. A function $v \colon K \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ is called **discrete valuation** if for all $x, y \in K$ the following conditions hold:

(i) $v(xy) = v(x) + v(y)$

(ii) $v(x + y) \geq \min \{v(x), v(y)\}$

(iii) $v(x) = \infty$ if and only if $x = 0$

(iv) $v \not\equiv 0$ and $v \not\equiv \infty$

Example 4.1.11. Let $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ be prime and $K = \mathbb{Q}$. Define $v_p \colon \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ by:

(1) If $z \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash \{0\}$ with $z = p^k b$, where $\gcd(p, b) = 1$, then $v_p(z) = k$.

(2) If $x \in \mathbb{Q} \backslash \{0\}$ with $x = \frac{a}{b}$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $v_p(x) = v_p(a) - v_p(b)$.

Then v_p is a discrete valuation.

Proposition 4.1.12.   *(i) Let $v \colon K \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a discrete valuation. Then:*

- $v(1) = v(-1) = 0$
- $v\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) = v(a) - v(b)$
- $\mathcal{O}_K = \{x \in K; v(x) \geq 0\}$ *is a ring with units* $\mathcal{O}_K^\times = \{x \in K; v(x) = 0\}$

(ii) The ring $\mathcal{O}_K$ from (i) is a DVR.

(iii) Conversely, if R is a discrete valuation ring, then there exists a discrete valuation $v \colon K \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ with $K = \mathrm{Quot}(R)$ such that $R = \mathcal{O}_K$ for this valuation.

Proof. "(i)" We have
$$v(1) = v(1 \cdot 1) = v(1) + v(1)$$
such that $v(1) = 0$. Furthermore,
$$0 = v(1) = v((-1)(-1)) = 2v(-1)$$
and hence also $v(-1) = 0$. Next,
$$v(a) = v\left(\frac{a}{b} \cdot b\right) = v\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) + v(b)$$
such that $v\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) = v(a) - v(b)$. Now, if $v(x) = 0$ then $v\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) = v(1) - v(x) = -v(x)) = 0$ and hence $\frac{1}{x} \in \mathcal{O}_K$, i.e., $x \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$. Finally, if $x \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ then there is a $y \in \mathcal{O}_K$ with $xy = 1$ such that
$$0 = v(1) = v(xy) = \underbrace{v(x)}_{\geq 0} + \underbrace{v(y)}_{\geq 0}$$
and thus $v(x) = 0$.

"(ii)"

- $\mathcal{O}_K$ is an integral domain since $\mathcal{O}_K \subset K$.

- Show that $\mathcal{O}_K$ is a PID:

  Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be an ideal in $\mathcal{O}_K$. Choose $a \in \mathfrak{a}$ with $v(a)$ minimal. For $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ we have $v(b) \geq v(a)$ and hence $v\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) \geq 0$ such that $\frac{b}{a} \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Thus, $b = \frac{b}{a} \cdot a$ with $\frac{b}{a} \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $b \in (a)$ and hence $\mathfrak{a} = (a)$.

- Show that O_K has a unique maximal ideal:

  Define $\mathfrak{m} = \{a \in \mathcal{O}_K; v(a) > 0\}$. Observe that $\mathfrak{m}$ is an ideal in $\mathcal{O}_K$ and $\mathfrak{m} = \mathcal{O}_K \backslash \mathcal{O}_K^\times$ such that $\mathfrak{m}$ is a unique maximal ideal in $\mathcal{O}_K$.

- $\mathcal{O}_K$ is not a field since the valuation V is not allowed to be 0 everywhere on $K^\times$.

"(iii)"

(1) Use Remark 1.8 to define $v\colon R\backslash\{0\} \to \mathbb{N}_0$, $r = \varepsilon\pi^k \mapsto k$. Observe that $v(ab) = v(a) + v(b)$, $v(a + b) \geq \min\{v(a), v(b)\}$ and define $v(0) = \infty$.

(2) Define $v\colon K = \mathrm{Quot}(R) \to \mathbb{Z}$ by $v\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) = v(a) - v(b)$ if $a \neq 0$ and $v(0) = \infty$ to obtain a discrete valuation v.

(3) By definition we have $R \subset \mathcal{O}_K$. Show that $\mathcal{O}_K \subset R$:

  Let $\frac{a}{b} \neq 0$ be in $\mathcal{O}_K$, i.e., $v\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) \geq 0$. Then we have $v(a) \geq v(b)$. Let $\mathfrak{m} = (\pi) \neq 0$ be the unique maximal ideal of R. Then $a = \varepsilon_1\pi^{k_1}$ and $b = \varepsilon_2\pi^{k_2}$ with $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in R^\times$, $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $k_1 \geq k_2$ such that

$$\frac{a}{b} = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{\varepsilon_2}\pi^{k_1-k_2} \in R.$$

$\square$

Proposition 4.1.13. *Let R be an integral domain. Recall that for $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}\, R$ we have $R \subset R_\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathrm{Quot}(R)$. In this situation,*

$$R = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathrm{Spec}\, R} R_\mathfrak{p}.$$

Proof. Let $\frac{a}{b} \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathrm{Spec}\, R} R_\mathfrak{p}$. Consider $\mathfrak{u} = \{x \in R; xa \in bR\}$ and observe that $\mathfrak{u}$ is an ideal. We show that $a \not\subset \mathfrak{p}$ for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}\, R$:
Since $\frac{a}{b} \in R_\mathfrak{p}$ there are $c \in R, s \in R\backslash\mathfrak{p}$ with $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{c}{s}$. Then we have $as = cb$, which implies $s \in \mathfrak{u}$ and $s \notin \mathfrak{p}$.

It follows that $\mathfrak{u} = R$, i.e., $1 \in \mathfrak{u}$ such that $1 \cdot a \in bR$ and thus $\frac{a}{b} \in R$. $\square$

Theorem 13. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be a noetherian integral domain. Then $\mathcal{O}$ is a Dedekind domain if and only if $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{p}$ is a DVR for all $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O})\backslash\{0\}$.*

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$" By Proposition 1.6, $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{p}$ is a Dedekind domain and by Proposition 1.5, $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{p}$ is local. Since $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$ we have $\mathfrak{p}S^{-1} \neq 0$and hence $\mathcal{O}_p$ is not a field. Hence, $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{p}$ is a DVR by Proposition 1.9.

"$\Leftarrow$" By Proposition 1.11 we have $\mathcal{O} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p}\in\mathrm{Spec}\,\mathcal{O}} \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{p}$. Furthermore, Proposition 1.9 implies that $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{p}$ is integrally closed for any $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O})$ and hence the same holds true for $\mathcal{O}$.

Show: Every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$ in $\mathcal{O}$ is maximal.

Consider $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{m}$ for some maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Consider the localisation $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{m}} = \mathcal{O}S^{-1}$ with $S = \mathcal{O}\backslash\mathfrak{m}$. Then we obtain $\mathfrak{p}S^{-1} \subset \mathfrak{m}S^{-1}$ and $\mathfrak{p}S^{-1}, \mathfrak{m}S^{-1}$ both are prime ideals by Proposition 1.3. Since $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a DVR, Proposition 1.9 implies that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a Dedekind domain, whence $\mathfrak{p}S^{-1} = \mathfrak{m}S^{-1}$, such that by Proposition 1.3 we may finally conclude $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}$. $\qquad\square$

Reminder: $v_p : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$, $\mathbb{Z} \ni z = p^k \cdot b \mapsto k$

Proposition 4.1.14. *The discrete valuations in Ex. 1.10 are up to scaling the only discrete valuations on $\mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof. Let $v : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a discrete valuation. Observe for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $v(n) = v(1 + \cdots + 1) \geq v(1) = 0$. For $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $v(z) \geq 0$, since $v(-1) = 0$.

1) Show that $\exists p$ prime with $v(p) < 0$:
   Suppose $v(p) = 0$ for all primes p.
   $\Rightarrow v(n) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.
   $\Rightarrow v(x) = 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{Q} E v \not\equiv 0$

2) Observe $\mathfrak{a} := \{a \in \mathbb{Z} \mid v(a) > 0\}$ is an ideal in $\mathbb{Z}$. Use that $v(z) \geq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}$.

3) Let p be prime with $v(p) > 0$. Such a prime exists by 1). Observe $\mathfrak{a} = (p)$, since $p \in \mathfrak{a}$ and (p) is maximal in $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $c := v(p) > 0$. Denote $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ as $z = p^k \cdot b$ with $\gcd(b, p) = 1$. $\Rightarrow v(z) = k \cdot v(p) + v(b) = k \cdot c$ since $v(b) = 0, b \notin (p) = \mathfrak{a}$.

4) Obtain the result for $x \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times}$.

$\qquad\square$

Example 4.1.15. Let $K/\mathbb{Q}$ be a number field, $\mathcal{O}$ its ring of integers, $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$ a prime ideal in $\mathcal{O}$ above (p).

Thm. $12 \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}$ is a discrete valuation ring.

What is the corresponding discrete valuation on $K = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}) = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O})$

$$v_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} : K \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}?$$

Let $x \in K^{\times} \Rightarrow \underbrace{x \cdot \mathcal{O}}_{\text{fractional ideal}} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1^{e_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n^{e_n} = \prod \hat{\mathcal{P}} \in \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O})\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}}^e(\star)$ with $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1, \ldots, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n$ are prime ideals in $\mathcal{O}$ and $e_1, \ldots, e_n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Claim: $v_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}(x) = e_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}$. Proof: Consider the localisation $\mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}$:

For $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \neq \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$ we have $\hat{\mathcal{P}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} = \mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}$.

$\Rightarrow \underbrace{x \cdot \mathcal{O}}_{\text{fractional ideal for } \mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}} = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_0^{e_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} \overset{(!)}{=} m^{e_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}}$, where m is the maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} \Rightarrow v_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0} = e_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}$.

Observe: $v_{\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0}|\mathbb{Q} = e \cdot v_p$ where e is the ramification index of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_0$.

Example 4.1.16 (Why „local ring"?). $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{C}[X] \Rightarrow$

- $\mathcal{O}$ is noetherian ✓

- $\mathcal{O}$ is a UFD $\Rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is integrally closed ✓

- $\mathcal{O}$ is a PID $\Rightarrow$ every prime ideal $\neq 0$ is maximal

$\Rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ is a Dedekind domain.
$\Rightarrow$

- $K := \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathbb{C}(C)$

- $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}) = \{(X_z) \mid z \in \mathbb{C}\} \cup \{(0)\}$

- $\mathcal{O}_{(X-z)} = \{\frac{f}{g} \in \mathbb{C}(X) \mid f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X], g \notin (X-z)\}$
  $= \{\frac{f}{g} \mid f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X], g(z) \neq 0\}$
  $= \{\frac{f}{g} \mid \frac{f}{g} \text{ is definied in } z\}$
  is a discrete valuation ring, in particular it is a local ring

- maximal ideal $m_{(X-z)} = \{\frac{f}{g} \in \mathbb{C}(X) \mid f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X] \text{ with } f(z) = 0, g(z) \neq 0\} = \{\frac{f}{g} \in \mathbb{C}(X) \mid \text{ s.t. } \frac{f}{g} \text{ has a zero } inz\}$ The corresponding discrete valuation $v : \mathbb{C}(X) \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ is induced by $v : \mathbb{C}[X9 \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{Z}$, $f \mapsto \mathrm{ord}_z(f) = $ oder of zero of f in $z = \max\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid (X-z)^k \text{ divides f.}$

4.2. Affine Schemes (Perspective

<u>Idea:</u> Link geomtreic objects to algebraic objects

Geometry	Algebra
affine varietes V	$\mathrm{Spec}(R)$
$+$	$+$
functions on V	R

4.2.1. Classical affine varieties

Definition 4.2.1. Let k be a field and denote $\mathbb{A}^n(k) = k^n$ („affine space")
$V \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n(k)$ is an <u>*affine variety*</u> $: \iff \exists S \subseteq k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ s.t. $V = V(S) = \{z \in \mathbb{A}^n(k) \mid \forall f \in S : f(z) = 0\}$.

*Remark* 4.2.2.   i) $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \Rightarrow V(S_1) \supseteq V(S_2)$

ii) Let (S) be the ideal generated by S in $k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$, then $V(s) = V((S))$.

iii) Denote for $f_1, \ldots, f_r : V(f_1, \ldots, f_r) = V(\{f_1, \ldots, f_r\})$. Every affine variety V is equal to $V(f_1, \ldots, f_r)$ for finitely many polynomial $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ since $K[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ is noetherian.

Example 4.2.3.   i) $S = \emptyset \Rightarrow V(S) = \mathbb{A}^n(k)$

   ii) $S = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \Rightarrow V(S) = V(1) = \emptyset$

   iii) $V(X^2 + Y^2 - 1) =$

   iv) $V(X \cdot Y) =$

   v) $V(Y^2 - X^3 + X)(\leftrightarrow Y^2 = X^3 - X = X(X-1)(X+1)) =$

   vi) $a, b \in k \Rightarrow V(X - a, Y - b) = \{(a, b)\}$

Example 4.2.4. What are the affine varieties in $\mathbb{A}^1(k)$?

- Rem 2.2 ii) $\Rightarrow$ sufficient to consider ideals I in $k[X]$

- Recall: Every ideal is a principal ideal, hence $I = (f)$ with $f \in k[X]$.

$$\Rightarrow V(I) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{A}^1(k), \text{ if } f = 0 \iff \deg(f) = -\infty \\ \emptyset, \text{ if } \deg(f) = 0 \\ \{z_1, \ldots, z_k \mid z_i \text{ zero of } f\}, \text{ if } \deg(f) \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Classical goal: Study geometry of affine varieties.

Idea: Consider „good"classes of funtions on them.

Consider: (1) $k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ as set of *regular functions* on $\mathbb{A}^n(k) = k^n$ and

(2) $k(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ as set of *rational functions* on $\mathbb{A}^n(k)$.

Observe: $f_1, f_2 \in k[X_1, \ldots, X_n], V \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n(k), f_1 \equiv f_2$ on $V \iff f_1 - f_2 \equiv 0$ on V.

Definition 4.2.5.   i) $I(V) := \{f \in k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \mid \forall z \in V : f(z) = 0\}$ is called *vanishing ideal of V*

   ii) $A(V) := k[V] := k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/I(V)$ is called the *k-algebra of regular functions of V*

Example 4.2.6.   i) $V = \emptyset \Rightarrow I(V) = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \Rightarrow k[V] = 0$

   ii) $V = \{z\} \subseteq \mathbb{A}^1(k) \Rightarrow I(V) = (X - z) \Rightarrow k[V] = k[X]/(X - z)$

   iii) $V = \mathbb{A}^1(k), k$ infinite $\Rightarrow I(V) = (0) \Rightarrow k[V] \cong k[X]$

   iv) $V = \mathbb{A}^1(k), k = \mathbb{F}_p$ finite $\Rightarrow I(V) = (X \cdot (X-1) \cdot \ldots \cdot (X - (p-1)))$

Remark 4.2.7. Suppose $V \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n(k)$

   i) $I(V)$ is a radical ideal, i.e. $f^e \in I(V) \Rightarrow f \in I(V)$

ii) $V(I(V)) \supseteq V$ and $I(V(I)) \supseteq I$.

iii) $\bar{V} := V(I(V))$ is the smallest affine variety containing V.
In particular, if V is already an affine variety, then $V(I(V)) = V$.

iv) For affine varieties $V_1 = V(I_1)$ and $V_2 = V(I_2) : V_1 \subseteq V_2 \iff I(V_1) \supseteq I(V_2)$. In particular $V_1 = V_2 \iff I(V_1) = I(V_2)$

v) $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \Rightarrow V(I_1) \supseteq V(I_2)$

Proof.   i) ✓

    ii) ✓

    iii) Consider affine variety $V(J) \supseteq V \Rightarrow J \subseteq I(V) \Rightarrow V(J) \supseteq V(I(V))$

    iv) „$\Rightarrow$": Suppose $f \in I(V_2) \Rightarrow \forall x \in V_1 \subseteq V_2 : f(x) = 0 \Rightarrow f \in I(V_2)$.
       „$\Leftarrow$": $I_2 \overset{ii)}{\subseteq} I(V(I_2)) = I(V_2) \subseteq I(V_1)$ Hence: $x \in V_1, f \in I_2 \Rightarrow f(x) = 0$. Thus $x \in V_2 = V(I_2)$.

    v) ✓

<div align="right">□</div>

Hilberts Nullstellensatz (without proof)
k is algebraically closed, I ideal in $k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$.
Then $I(V(I)) = \sqrt{I} := \{f \in k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \mid \exists l \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } f^e \in I\}$.

Idea: Define a topology on $\mathbb{A}^n(k)$.

Remark and Definition 4.2.8. *The affine varieties define the closed sets of a topology called* Zariski topology.

Proof.   • $\mathbb{A}^n(k) = V((0))$ and $\emptyset = V((1))$.

    • $V_1 = V(I_1)$ and $V_2 = V(I_2)$ affine varieties $\Rightarrow V_1 \cup V_2 \overset{(!)}{=} V(I_1 \cdot I_2) \overset{(!)}{=} V(I_1 \cap I_2)$

    • $V_j = V(I_j)$ family of affine varieties with $j \in J \Rightarrow \cap_{j \in J} V_j \overset{(!)}{=} V(\sum_{j \in J} I_j)$.

<div align="right">□</div>

Example 4.2.9. In $\mathbb{A}^1(k)$ a subset is closed $\iff$ it is finite or $\emptyset$ or $\mathbb{A}^1(k)$.

Definition 4.2.10. A topological space X is called *irreducible* $: \iff X = A \cup B$ with A, B closed implies $X = A$ or $X = B$.
Otherwise X is called *reducible*

$$V(X)$$

$$V(Y)$$

Example 4.2.11. $V = V(X \cdot Y) = V(X) \cup V(Y)$ is reducible.

Proposition 4.2.12. *An affine variety V is irreducible $\iff I(V)$ is a prime ideal.*

Proof. „$\Rightarrow$": Consider $f, g \in k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ with $f, g \in I(V)$.
Suppose: $f \notin I(V)$. Show that $g \in I(V)$.
$f \notin I(V) \Rightarrow \exists f(x) \neq 0 \Rightarrow V \nsubseteq V(f) (\star)$
Observe: $V \subseteq V(f \cdot g) = V(f) \cup V(g) \Rightarrow V = \underbrace{(V(f) \cap V)}_{\text{closed}} \cup \underbrace{(V(g) \cap V)}_{\text{closed}}$

$\overset{(\star)}{\Rightarrow} V(g) \cap V = V \Rightarrow V \subseteq V(g) \Rightarrow g \in I(V)$.
„$\Leftarrow$": Suppose $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ with $V_1 = V(I_1)$ and $V_2 = V(I_2)$.
Hence: $V = V(I_1) \cup V(I_2) = V(I_1 I_2)$ and thus $I_1 \cdot I_2 \overset{2.7}{\subseteq} I(V(I_1 \cdot I_2)) = I(V)$.
Suppose: $V_1 \neq V \Rightarrow \exists x \in V : f \in I_1$ with $f(x) \neq 0$.
Hence $f \notin I(V) \forall g \in I_2 : f \cdot g \in I_1 I_2 \subseteq I(V) \overset{I(V) \text{ prime}}{\Longrightarrow} g \in I(V)$.
Hence $I_2 \subseteq I(V) \Rightarrow V_2 = V(I_2) \supseteq V(I(V)) \supseteq V \Rightarrow V_2 = V$. $\qquad\qquad\square$

Remark 4.2.13. An affine variety V is irreducible $\iff k[V] = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/I(V)$ is an integral domain.

From now on k is always algebraically closed and all affine varieties are irreducible.

Example 4.2.14. $V = \mathbb{A}^1(k), I(V) = (0), k[V] = k[X]$

Definition 4.2.15. Let $U \subseteq V$ be an open subset of V. Define

$$\mathcal{O}(U) := \{\varphi : U \to k \mid \forall z \in U \; \exists \text{ open neighbourhood } U_z \ni z \overset{\text{open}}{\subseteq} V, \; \exists f, g, \in k[V]$$
$$\text{with } \forall x \in U_z : g(x) \neq 0 \text{ and } \varphi(x) = \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}\}$$

as the <u>*set of regular functions on U.*</u>

Remark. $\mathcal{O}$ defines a sheaf on V.

Definition 4.2.16. For $z \in V$ we define the <u>*local ring*</u> $\mathcal{O}_z$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{O}_z := \{(U, f) \mid U \text{ open neighbourhood of } z, f \in \mathcal{O}(U)\}/\sim$$

with $(U_1, f_1) \sim (U_2, f_2) \iff f_1|_{U_1 \cap U_2} = f_2|_{U_1 \cap U_2}$.

Remark.   • $\mathcal{O}_z$ is the stalk of the sheaf $\mathcal{O}$ in z.

     • $\mathcal{O}_z = k[V]_{m_z}$ here $m_z = \{f \in k[V] \mid f(z) = 0\}$

Remark 4.2.17. m_z as defined above is a maximal ideal in $k[V]$.

Proof. $\varphi_u : k[V] = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/I(V) \twoheadrightarrow k$, $f \mapsto f(z)$
is a k-algebra homomorphism, which is surjective.
Hence $m_z = \ker(\varphi_z)$ is a maximal ideal. $\hspace{2cm}$ $\square$

Remark 4.2.18. In particular $\mathcal{O}_z$ is a local ring.

Definition 4.2.19. The field of *rational functions* $\mathrm{Rat}(V)$:

$$\mathrm{Rat}(V) := \{(U, f) \mid U \text{ open in } V, f \in \mathcal{O}(U)\}/\sim$$

with $(U_1, f_1) \sim (U_2, f_2) \iff f_1|_{U_1 \cap U_2} = f_2|_{U_1 \cap U_2}$.

Remark (without proof). $\mathrm{Rat}(V) = \mathrm{Quot}(k[V])$

Conclusion 4.2.20. *Still assume k is algebraically closed, V affine variety.
Then we have the following correspondences:*

$$\text{closed subsets of } V \overset{1:1}{\leftrightarrow} \text{ radical ideals in } k[V]$$
$$V' \mapsto I(V')$$

$$\text{irreducible closed subsets of } V \overset{1:1}{\leftrightarrow} \text{prime ideals}$$
$$\text{points} \overset{1:1}{\leftrightarrow} \text{ maximal ideals in } k[V]$$
$$x \mapsto I(\{x\}) = m_x$$

Furthermore we have:

- *V_1, V_2 closed subsets of V: $V_1 \subseteq V_2 \iff I(V_1) \supseteq I(V_2)$
  In particular: $\hspace{1.5cm} x \in V_1 \iff m_x \supseteq I(V_1)$.*

- *$\mathfrak{a}$ ideal in $k[V]$:
  $V(\mathfrak{a}) = \{z \in V \mid \forall f \in \mathfrak{a} : f(z) = 0\}$
  $\hspace{1.2cm} = \{z \in V \mid \forall f \in \mathfrak{a} : f \in m_z\} = \{z \in V \mid \mathfrak{a} \subseteq m_z\}$*

- *$S \subseteq V : I(S) = \{f \in k[V] \mid \forall s \in S : f(s) = 0\} = \bigcap_{s \in S} m_s$.*

Example 4.2.21. Let $k = \mathbb{C}$, $I = (Y^2 - X(X-1)(X-\lambda))$ with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and $V = V(I)$.
Observe that I is a prime ideal since f_λ is irreducible (use Eisenstein criterion). In
particular, $I = I(V)$. Hence V is irreducible and

$$K[V] = k[X, Y]/I.$$

Graph for $\lambda = -1$:

Definition 4.2.22.   (i) Let X be a topological space. The **Krull dimension** $\dim(X)$ of X is defined as

$$\dim(X) = \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there are closed, irreducible subsets } X_i \subset X \text{ with}$$
$$\emptyset \neq X_0 \subsetneq X_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq X_n\}.$$

(ii) Let R be an arbitrary commutative noetherian ring. Then

$$\dim(R) = \sup\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{there are } \mathfrak{p}_i \in \operatorname{Spec} R \text{ with } \mathfrak{p}_0 \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_n\}.$$

is called the **dimension** of R.

Remark 4.2.23. By Conclusion 2.20 we have $\dim V = \dim k[V]$.

Fact 4.2.24. $\dim k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] = n$ and hence $\dim \mathbb{A}^n(k) = n$.

Observe. $(X_1, \ldots, X_n) \supsetneq (X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}) \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq (X_1) \supsetneq (0)$ is a chain of prime ideals of length n, hence $\dim k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \geq n$.
But you have to do some work to show that there is not a longer one.

Example 4.2.25. Let $V = V((f_\lambda))$ with $f_\lambda = Y^2 - X(X-1)(X-\lambda)$ and observe that $\mathfrak{p}_0 = (X, Y) \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 = (f_\lambda) = I$ in $k[X, Y]$ induces $\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_0 \supsetneq \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_1$ in $k[V] = k[X, Y]/I$, where $\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_i$ is the image of p_i in the quotient. Hence $\dim k[V] \geq 1$.
But any chain of prime ideals $\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_0 \supsetneq \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_1 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_n = (0)$ of length n in $k[V]$ induces a chain of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_0 \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_n \supsetneq (0)$ of length $N + 1$, where $\mathfrak{p}_i$ is the preimage of $\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_i$. Hence, by Fact 2.24, $\dim k[V] = 1$.

Definition 4.2.26. An **affine curve** over k is an irreducible affine variety V over k of dimension 1.

Definition 4.2.27. Let $V \subset \mathbb{A}^n(k)$ be an irreducible affine variety of dimension d with $V = V(f_1, \ldots, f_r)$. For $z \in V$ consider the Jacobian matrix

$$J = \left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j}(z)\right) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1}(z) & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_n}(z) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_r}{\partial x_1}(z) & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_r}{\partial x_n}(z) \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this case,

- $z \in V$ is called **singular** if $\operatorname{rank} J < n - d$,

- $z \in V$ is called **non-singular** or **regular** if $\operatorname{rank} J = n - d$,

- V is called **regular** if all points in V are regular points.

Fact 4.2.28 (without proof). We always have $\operatorname{rank} J \leq n - d$.

Example 4.2.29. For $V = V((f_\lambda))$ with

$$f_\lambda = Y^2 - X(X-1)(X-\lambda) = Y^2 - (X^3 - (1+\lambda)X^2 + \lambda X)$$

we have

$$J(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} d - 3x^2 + 2(1+\lambda)x - \lambda & 2y \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence $(x,y) \in V$ is singular iff rank $J(x,y) < 2 - 1 = 1$ iff rank $J(x,y) = 0$ such that (x,y) has to satisfy the following relations:

$$y^2 = x(x-1)(x-\lambda) \tag{1}$$
$$-3x^2 + 2(1+\lambda)x - \lambda = 0 \tag{2}$$
$$2y = 0 \tag{3}$$

Now, (3) implies $y = 0$ and hence $x \in \{0, 1, \lambda\}$ by (1).

Conclusion:

- $\lambda \notin \{0, 1\}$: V is a regular curve

- $\lambda = 0$: $(0,0)$ is a singularity

- $\lambda = 1$: $(1,0)$ is a singularity

Fact 4.2.30 (without proof). Let V be an affine curve. Then x is a regular point of V if and only if $\mathcal{O}_x = k[V]_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ is a discrete valuation ring.

Remark 4.2.31. Let V be an affine variety. Then V is a regular affine curve if and only if $k[V]$ is a Dedekind domain.

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$"

- $k[V] = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]I$ is noetherian.

- $k[V]$ is a domain since I is a prime ideal. This is because V is irreducible by the definition of a curve.

- By Theorem 12 and Fact 2.30, $k[V]$ is a Dedekind domain.

"$\Leftarrow$"

- Since $k[V]$ is a domain, V is irreducible.

- Every prime ideal is maximal, hence $\dim k[V] = \dim V = 1$.

- By Theorem 12 and Fact 2.30, V is regular.

$\square$

4.3. Affine schemes and Dedekind domains

Conclusion 2.20 motivates the following definition:

Definition 4.3.1. Let R be a ring and $X = \operatorname{Spec} R$.

(i) For an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ in R define its **vanishing locus** by $V(\mathfrak{a}) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid \mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{p}\}$.

(ii) For a subset $S \subset X$ define its **vanishing ideal** by $I(S) = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \mathfrak{p}$.

Remark and Definition 4.3.2. *Suppose $R = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$*

Note: In contrast to the geometric situation we consider all irreducible subsets of $\mathbb{A}^n(k)$ as points in $\operatorname{Spec} R$.

*The maximal ideals in $\operatorname{Spec} R$ are sometimes called **geometric points** or **closed points**.*

Remark 4.3.3. The sets $V(\mathfrak{a})$ with $\mathfrak{a}$ an ideal in R form the closed subsets of a topology on $\operatorname{Spec} R$ called the **Zariski topology**.

Proof. Check the axioms, similarly to Remark 2.8. $\qquad\qquad\square$

Remark 4.3.4. If $S \subset \operatorname{Spec} R$ then $\overline{S} = V(\mathfrak{a})$ with $\mathfrak{a} = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \mathfrak{p}$. In particular,

$$\overline{\{\mathfrak{p}\}} = V(\mathfrak{p}) = \{\mathfrak{a} \in \operatorname{Spec} R \mid \mathfrak{a} \supset \mathfrak{p}\}.$$

Hence $\{\mathfrak{p}\}$ is closed if and only if $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal.

Question. How can we understand the elements of R as functions on $\operatorname{Spec} R$?

Example 4.3.5. Let V be an affine variety and $R = k[V]$. If $f \in R$ then

$$f \colon V \to k, \; z \mapsto f(z).$$

Recall. The evaluation map $\Phi_z \colon k[V] \to k, \; f \mapsto f(z)$ defines an isomorphism $k[V]/\mathfrak{m}_z \cong k$ with $f(z) = f \mod \mathfrak{m}_z$.

Remark 4.3.6. R now an arbitrary ring.
The elements of R define functions on $\operatorname{Spec}(R)$ as follows:

$$f : p \mapsto f \mod p \in R_p/p =: \underbrace{\kappa(p)}_{\text{residue field of } p}$$

Example 4.3.7. $R = \mathbb{Z}, X = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}) = \{(p) \mid p \text{ prime }\} \cup \{(0)\}$. Observe:

- The (p) are closed points.

- $\{\overline{(0} =\} = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{Z})$

Definition 4.3.8. Let $U \subseteq \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ be an open subset. Define

$$\mathcal{O}(U) := \{s = (s_p)_{s \in U} \in \prod_{p \in U} R_p \mid \forall p \ \exists U_p \text{ open nbhd. of } p \text{ and } f, g \in R \text{ with} :$$

$$\forall q \in U_p : \quad \underbrace{g(q)}_{=g \mod q} \underbrace{\neq 0}_{\iff g \notin q} \text{ and } s_q = \frac{f}{g} \text{ in } R_q\}$$

Observe: $\mathcal{O}$ is a sheaf.

Definition 4.3.9. The pair $(\mathrm{Spec}\, R, \mathcal{O})$ is called an *affine scheme*.
It is called *noetherian* $\iff$ R is noetherian.
Its *dimension* is the dimension of R.

Example 4.3.10.   i) $R = k[V]$ for some affine variety V with k is algebraically closed
     $\Rightarrow V \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ as set of closed points.

   ii) $R = K$ field $\Rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(K) = \{(0)\} : \mathcal{O}(\{0\}) = K$
 $\underline{/!\backslash}\, \mathrm{Spec}(K)$ as affine scheme depends on K.

   iii) R discrete valuation ring with maximal ideal $m \Rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(R) = \{(0), m\}$
     Closed subsets: $\emptyset, \{m\}, \mathrm{Spec}(R)$
     Open subsets: $\mathrm{Spec}(R), \{0\}, \emptyset$
     $\mathcal{O}(\{0\}) = \mathrm{Quot}(R), \mathcal{O}(\mathrm{Spec}(R)) = R_m = R$

Definition 4.3.11. For a one-dimensional (!) noetherian domain R we say that the associated affine scheme $(\mathrm{Spec}\, R\mathcal{O})$ is *regular* $: \iff$ All local rings $R_p (p$ prime in $R, p \neq (0))$ are discrete valuation rings.

Observation 4.3.12. For a domain R we have: $(\mathrm{Spec}\, R, \mathcal{O})$ is a noetherian, one-dimensional, regular affine scheme $\iff$ R is a Dedekind domain.

4.4. A „general"example

Example 4.4.1. Consider $V_1 := V(f_\lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2(\mathbb{C})$ with $f_\lambda = Y^2 - X(X-1)(X-\lambda)$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}, V_2 : \mathbb{A}^1(\mathbb{C}), f : V_1 \to V_2$, $(x, y) \mapsto x$

Remark 4.4.2.   i) $x \in \mathbb{A}^1(\mathbb{C})$ has two preimages $\iff x \notin \{0, 1, \lambda\}$

   ii) $x \in \mathbb{A}^1(\mathbb{C})$ has one preimage $\iff x \in \{0, 1, \lambda\}$, namely $(x, 0)$.

Remark 4.4.3. Recall: $\mathcal{O}_1 := \mathbb{C}[V_1] = \mathbb{C}[X, Y]/(f_\lambda), \mathcal{O}_2 := \mathbb{C}[V_2] = \mathbb{C}[X]$
The map f induces:

  i) a morphism of k-algebras: $f^\star : \mathbb{C}[V_2] \to \mathbb{C}[V_1]$, $h \mapsto h \circ f$

  ii) a morphism of fields: $f^\star : \mathrm{Rat}(V_2) = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_2) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Rat}(V_1) = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_1)$ induced by $f^\star$ in i).

Conclusion 4.4.4. *Hence we have the following setting:*

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{O}_1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_1) =: K_1 & & V_1 = \mathbb{C} \\
f^\star \uparrow \qquad\qquad f^\star \uparrow & f^\star \uparrow \qquad\qquad \downarrow f & \\
\mathcal{O}_2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_2) =: K_2 & \mathbb{C}(X) \qquad V_2 = \mathbb{A}^1 \xrightarrow{\ h\ } \mathbb{C} &
\end{array}
$$

- $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ are Dedekind domains

- $\mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_2) = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathbb{C}[X]) = \mathbb{C}(X)$
  $\mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_1) = \mathrm{Quot}(\mathbb{C}[X,Y]/(f_\lambda)) = \mathbb{C}(X)(\alpha)$ *with α has minimal polynomial $Y^2 - X(X-1)(X-\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}(X)[Y]$*

- $[K_1 : K_2] = 2$

Recall: points in V_1 resp. $V_2 \leftrightarrow$ mmaximal ideals in $\mathcal{O}_1$ resp. $\mathcal{O}_2$
$f(a) = b \iff f^\star(m_b) \subseteq m_a \iff m_a$ lies above m_b.

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathbb{C}[X][\alpha] = \mathbb{C}[X,Y]/(f_\lambda) & = & \mathcal{O}_1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_1) =: K_1 & = & \mathbb{C}(X)(\alpha) \\
& & f^\star \uparrow \qquad\qquad f^\star \uparrow & & \\
(X - b) \subseteq \mathbb{C}[X] & = & \mathcal{O}_2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Quot}(\mathcal{O}_2) =: K_2 & = & \mathbb{C}(X)
\end{array}
$$

Remark 4.4.5. Consider the prime ideal $(X - b)$ for $b \in \mathbb{C}$.
Apply Prop. II.8.15: Observe $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}_2[\alpha], f_\alpha(Y) = Y^2 - X(X-1)(X-\lambda) \in \mathcal{O}_2[Y]$
Consider image $\bar{f}_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_2/(X-b)[Y] \overset{\text{evaluation map}}{\cong} \mathbb{C}[Y]$
Hence $\bar{f}_\alpha = Y^2 - b(b-1)(b-\lambda) \in \mathbb{C}[Y] = (Y - \sqrt{b(b-1)(b-\lambda)})(Y + \sqrt{b(b-1)(b-\lambda)})$.
Prop. II.8.15. $\Rightarrow$:

- If $b \notin \{0, 1, \lambda\} : o\mathcal{O}_1 = \hat{\mathcal{P}}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathcal{P}}_2$.
  Hence we have two prime ideals $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_2$ lying above $p := (X - b)$ and the ramification indices are $e_1 = e_2 = 1$.
  Degree forumula: $2 = e_1 f_1 + e_2 f_2 \Rightarrow f_1 = f_2 = 1$.

- If $b \in \{0, 1, \lambda\} : p\mathcal{O}_1 = \hat{\mathcal{P}}^2$.
  Hence we have one prime ideal $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ over p with ramification index 2 and $f = 1$.

Remark 4.4.6. Why is f in the example $= 1$?
Recall: $f = \dim_{\mathcal{O}_2/} \mathcal{O}_1/\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ Here: $\mathcal{O}_2 = k[V_2], p =$ maximal ideal corresp. to a point b. $\Rightarrow$
$\mathcal{O}_2/p \cong \mathbb{C}$. Same way: $\mathcal{O}_1/\hat{\mathcal{P}} \cong \mathbb{C}$.

Part II.

Algebraische Zahlentheorie II

5. Bewertungstheorie

5.1. Normierte Körper

Definition 5.1.1. Eine **Norm** auf einem Körper K ist eine Funktion $|\cdot| : K \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ mit:

  (i) $|x| \geq 0$ und $|x| = 0 \Leftrightarrow x = 0$

  (ii) $|xy| = |x| \, |y|$

  (iii) $|x + y| \leq |x| + |y|$

Remark 5.1.2.   (i) $|1| = |-1| = 1$ ud $|-x| = |x|$

  (ii) $|\cdot| : K \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ mit $|0| = 0$ und $|x| = 1$ für $x \neq 0$ is eine Norm und heißt **triviale Norm**.

Ab jetzt: K immmer ein Körper

Remark 5.1.3. Jede Norm definiert eine Metrik auf K durch $d(x, y) = |x - y|$.

Remark 5.1.4. Jede Metrik auf einer Menge X definiert eine Topologie auf X durch:

$$U \subset X \text{ offen } \Leftrightarrow \text{ für alle } x \in U \text{ existiert } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ mit } K_\varepsilon(x) \subset U$$

Hier: $K_\varepsilon(x) = \{y \in X \mid d(x, y) < \varepsilon\}$

Recall. Für eine Menge X heißt $T \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$ **Topologie** falls

  (i) $\emptyset, X \in T$,

  (ii) $U, V \in T$ impliziert $U \cap V \in T$,

  (iii) $U_i \in T$ für alle $i \in I$ impliziert $\bigcup_{i \in I} U_i \in T$.

Remark 5.1.5. Seien X eine Menge, d eine Metrik auf X und T die induzierte Topologie. Dann hängt Konvergenz von Punktfolgen nur von der Topologie ab.

Genauer: Für eine Folge von Punkten $x_n \in X$ und $x \in X$ gilt:
$x_n \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} x \Leftrightarrow$ Für alle $U \in T$ mit $x \in U$ ein $N \in \mathbb{N}$ existiert mit $x_n \in U$ für alle $n \geq N$.

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$" Zu $U \in T$ existiert $r > 0$ mit $K_r(x) \subset U$. Wähle $N \in \mathbb{N}$ mit $d(x_n, x) < r$ für alle $n \geq N$. Dann ist $x_n \in K_r(x) \subset U$ für alle $N \geq N$.

"$\Leftarrow$" Sei $\varepsilon > 0$. Wähle $U = K_\varepsilon(x)$. Da U offen ist, existiert $N \in \mathbb{N}$ mit $x_n \in U$ für alle $n \geq N$. Also ist $d(x_n, x) < \varepsilon$ für alle $N \geq N$. $\qquad\square$

Definition 5.1.6. Zwei Normen $|\cdot|_1$ und $|\cdot|_2$ auf K heißen **äquivalent**, $|\cdot|_1 \sim |\cdot|_2$, wenn sie die selbe Topologie auf K induzieren.

Proposition 5.1.7. $|\cdot|_1$ *und* $|\cdot|_2$ *sind äquivalent genau dann, wenn ein $s > 0$ existiert mit* $|\cdot|_2 = |\cdot|_1^s$.

Lemma 5.1.8. *Falls $|\cdot|_1$ und $|\cdot|_2$ äquivalent sind, dann gilt:*

$$|x|_1 < 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |x|_2 < 1$$

Proof. Seien d_1 und d_2 die zugehörigen Metriken.

$$|x|_1 < 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |x|_1^n \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x^n \xrightarrow{n \to \infty}_{d_1} 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad x^n \xrightarrow{n \to \infty}_{d_2} 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |x|_2 < 1$$

$\square$

Lemma 5.1.9. *Sei $|\cdot|_1$ eine nicht-triviale Metrik. Dann gilt:*
Es gibt $s \in \mathbb{R}$ mit $|\cdot|_2 = |\cdot|_1^s$ genau dann, wenn für alle $x, y \in K^\times$ gilt, dass

$$\log |x|_1 \log |y|_2 = \log |x|_2 \log |y|_1 .$$

In diesem Fall ist $s = \frac{\log|x|_2}{\log|x|_1}$, falls $x \in K^\times$ mit $|x|_1 \neq 1$.

Proof. "$\Rightarrow$" $\log |x|_1 \log |y|_2 = s \log |x|_1 \log |y|_1 = \log |x|_2 \log |y|_1$

"$\Leftarrow$" Wähle $x \in K^\times$ mit $|x|_1 \neq 1$ und setze $s = \frac{\log|x|_2}{\log|x|_1}$. Dann gilt für alle $y \in K^\times$:

$$\log |y|_2 = \frac{\log |x|_2}{\log |x|_1} \log |y|_1 = s \log |y|_1$$

$\square$

Proof of Proposition 5.1.7. "$\Leftarrow$" Die Kreisscheiben um x mit Radius ε bzgl. $|\cdot|_1$ sind genau die Kreisscheiben um x mit Radius ε^s bzgl. $|\cdot|_2$. Daher erhalten wir die selben Topologien.

"$\Rightarrow$" Ohne Einschränkung sei $|\cdot|_1$ nicht-trivial. Wähle $x \in K^\times$ mit $|x| \neq 1$. Sei nun $y \in K^\times$ und definiere $\alpha = \frac{\log|y|_1}{\log|x|_1}$ so, dass $|y|_1 = |x|_1^\alpha$.

(1) Zeige: $|y|_2 \leq |x|_2^\alpha$
Wähle Folge $\frac{m_i}{n_i} \in \mathbb{Q}$ mit $\frac{m_i}{n_i} \xrightarrow{i} \alpha$ und $\frac{m_i}{n_i} \geq \alpha$ für alle i. Dann gilt:

$$|y|_1 = |x|_1^\alpha \leq |x|_1^{\frac{m_i}{n_i}} \Leftrightarrow |y|_1^{n_i} \leq |x|_1^{m_i}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \left| \frac{y^{n_i}}{x^{m_i}} \right|_1 \leq 1$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \left| \frac{y^{n_i}}{x^{m_i}} \right|_2 \leq 1$$
$$\Leftrightarrow |y|_2 \leq |x|_2^{\frac{m_i}{n_i}}$$

Mit $i \longrightarrow \infty$ erhalte $|y_2| \leq |x|_2^{\alpha}$.

(2) Erhalte analog $|y|_2 \geq |x|_2^{\alpha}$ durch Folge $\frac{m_i}{n_i} \in \mathbb{Q}$ mit $\frac{m_i}{n_i} \xrightarrow{i} \alpha$ und $\frac{m_i}{n_i} \leq \alpha$ für alle i.

Insgesamt: $|y|_2 = |x|_2^{\alpha}$

Es gilt also

$$\log |y|_2 = \alpha \log |x|_2 = \frac{\log |y|_1}{\log |x|_1} \log |x|_2 .$$

Verwende Lemma 5.1.9 und erhalte für alle $y, y' \in K^{\times}$, dass

$$\log |y|_1 \log |y'|_2 = \log |y|_1 \frac{\log |y'|_1}{\log |x|_1} \log |x|_2 = \log |y|_2 \log |y'|_1 .$$

Lemma 5.1.9 liefert nun $|\cdot|_2 = |\cdot|_1^s$ mit $s = \frac{\log|x|_2}{\log|x|_1} > 0$ nach Lemma 5.1.8. $\qquad\square$

Remark 5.1.10. Für beliebige $s > 0$ gilt **nicht**: $|\cdot|_1$ Norm $\Rightarrow |\cdot|_2^s$ Norm

Example 5.1.11. Die **Betrags-Norm** auf $\mathbb{Q}$ ist definiert durch

$$|\cdot| : \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \ q \mapsto |q| = \begin{cases} q, & q \geq 0, \\ -q, & q \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Recall. $v_{\mathfrak{p}} \colon \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ p-adische Bewertung:

- Für $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ gilt: $v_p(z) = h \Leftrightarrow z = ap^h$ mit $\mathrm{ggT}(a, p) = 1$

- Für $q = \frac{x}{y} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times}$ mit $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ gilt: $v_p(q) = v_p(x) - v_p(y)$

- $v_p(0) = \infty$

Es gilt: v_p ist **diskrete Bewertung**:

(i) $v_p(x) = \infty \Leftrightarrow x = 0$

(ii) $v_p(xy) = v_p(x) + v_p(y)$

(iii) $v_p(x + y) \geq \min \{v_p(x), v_p(y)\}$

Remark 5.1.12. Definiere $|\cdot|_p : Q \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ durch $|0|_p = 0$ und $|x|_p = p^{-v_p(x)}$ für $x \neq 0$. Dann ist $|\cdot|_p$ eine Norm, die **p-adische Norm**.

Proof. (i) und (ii) in Definition 5.1.1 folgen aus (i) und (ii) in Beispiel 5.1.12. (iii) in Definition 5.1.1 folgt aus (iii) in Beispiel 5.1.12: Für $x, y \neq 0$ gilt:

$$\begin{aligned} |x + y|_p &= p^{-v_p(x+y)} \\ &\leq p^{-\min\{v_p(x), v_p(y)\}} \\ &= p^{\max\{-v_p(x), -v_p(y)\}} \\ &= \max \left\{ |x|_p, |y|_p \right\} \\ &\leq |x|_p + |y|_p \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Remark 5.1.13.   (i) Es gilt sogar die **verschärfte Dreiecksungleichung**:

$$|x + y|_p \leq \max \left\{ |x|_p, |y|_p \right\} \text{ für alle } x, y \in K$$

(ii) Für $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ gilt

$$|z|_p = |1 + \cdots + 1|_p \leq |1|_p = 1.$$

(iii) Die Norm $|\cdot|$ auf $\mathbb{Q}$ definiert durch $|x| = q^{-v_p(x)}$ mit beliebigem $q > 1$ ist äquivalent zu $|\cdot|_p$.

Example 5.1.14.   (i) $|1|_p = |2|_p = |11|_p = 1$

(ii) $|5|_p = \frac{1}{5}$, $|100|_p = \frac{1}{25}$

(iii) $\left|\frac{1}{5}\right|_p = 5$, $\left|\frac{1}{25}\right|_p = 25$

5.2. Archimedische und nicht-archimedische Normen

Ab jetzt: Betrachte nur nicht-triviale Normen!

Definition 5.2.1. Eine Norm $|\cdot| : K \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ heißt **nicht-archimedisch** falls ein $C \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ existiert mit $|n| \leq C$ für alle $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Andernfalls heißt $|\cdot|$ **archimedisch**.
Hierbei: $n = 1 + \cdots + 1 \in K$

Proposition 5.2.2. *Eine Norm $|\cdot| : K \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ist nicht-archimedisch genau dann, wenn die verschärfte Dreiecksungleichung gilt, d.h. für alle $x, y \in K$:*

$$|x + y| \leq \max \{|x|, |y|\}$$

Proof. "$\Leftarrow$" $|n| \leq \max\{|1|, \ldots, |1|\} = |1| = 1$

"$\Rightarrow$" Sei $C \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ mit $|n| \leq C$ für alle $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Für $x, y \in K$ können wir ohne Einschränkung annehmen, dass $\max\{|x|, |y|\} = |x|$ gilt und somit

$$|x|^j |y|^{n-j} \leq |x|^n$$

für alle $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ und daher

$$|x + y|^n = |(x + y)^n| = \left| \sum_{j=0}^{n} \binom{n}{j} x^j y^{n-j} \right|$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=0}^{n} \binom{n}{j} |x|^j |y|^{n-j} \leq \sum_{j=0}^{n} C |x|^n = (n+1) C |x|^n$$

Es folgt $|x + y| \leq \sqrt[n]{n+1} \sqrt[n]{C} |x|$ so, dass $|x + y| \leq |x| = \max\{|x|, |y|\}$. $\square$

Remark 5.2.3. Ist $|\cdot|$ nicht-archimedisch, so gilt:

$$|x| \neq |y| \quad \Rightarrow \quad |x + y| = \max\{|x|, |y|\}$$

Proof. Ohne Einschränkung sei $|y| < |x|$.

"$\leq$" Gilt nach der verschärften Dreiecksungleichung.

"$\geq$" $|y| < |x| = |x + y - y| \leq \max\{|x + y|, |y|\} = |x + y|$ $\square$

Definition 5.2.4. Wir betrachten eine Abbildung $v \colon K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$.

(i) v heißt **Bewertung**, falls für alle $x, y \in K$ die folgenden Bedingungen erfüllt sind:

  (i) $v(x) = \infty \Leftrightarrow x = 0$

  (ii) $v(xy) = v(x) + v(y)$

  (iii) $v(x + y) \geq \min\{v(x), v(y)\}$

(ii) v heißt **diskrete Bewertung**, falls v eine Bewertung ist und $v(K) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ein Minimum s besitzt. Dies ist genau dann der Fall, wenn $v(K) = s\mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$.

(iii) Zwei Bewertungen $v_1, v_2 \colon K \to \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ heißen **äquivalent**, falls ein $r \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ existiert mit $v_1(x) = r v_2(x)$ für alle $x \in K^\times$.

Die Bewertung $v_{\text{trivial}} \colon K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ mit $v_{\text{trivial}}(x) = 0$ für alle $x \in K^\times$ heißt **triviale Bewertung**.

Proposition 5.2.5. *Die Bewertungen auf K entsprechen bijektiv den nicht-archimedischen Normen, wobei die triviale Bewertung der trivialen Norm entspricht und äquivalente Bewertungen äquivalenten Normen entsprechen.*

Proof. Seien $q > 1$,

$$M_1 = \{v \colon K \to \mathbb{R}_\cup \{\infty\} \mid v \text{ ist Bewertung}\}$$

und

$$M_2 = \{|\cdot| \colon K \to \mathbb{R} \mid |\cdot| \text{ ist Norm}\}.$$

Definiere weiterhin

$$f = f_q \colon M_1 \to M_2, \colon v \mapsto |\cdot| \text{ mit } |x| = q^{-v(x)} \text{ für } x \in K^\times$$

sowie

$$g = g_q \colon M_2 \to M_1, \colon |\cdot| \mapsto v \text{ mit } v(x) = -\log_q |x| \text{ für } x \in K^\times.$$

Es gilt: f, g sind invers zueinander und bilden trivial (äuivalent) auf trivial (äuivalent) ab. $\square$

Remark 5.2.6. Im Beweis von Proposition 5.2.5 spielt das gewählte $q > 1$ bis auf Äquivalenz keine Rolle.

Theorem 1 (Satz von Ostrowski)**.** *Jede nicht-triviale Norm $\|\cdot\|$ auf $\mathbb{Q}$ ist äquivalent zu $|\cdot|_\infty$ oder zu $|\cdot|_p$.*

Proof. **Fall 1:** $\|\cdot\|$ ist archimedisch

Schreibe $|\cdot| = |\cdot|_\infty$. Da $\|\cdot\|$ archimedisch ist, gibt es $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}$ mit $\|n_0\| > 1$.

Zeige: Für alle $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ gilt: $\log \|m\| \log |n| = \log |m| \log \|n\|$

Dann folgt die Behauptung aus Lemma 5.1.9.

Für $n = 1$ oder $m = 1$ ist obige Gleichung offensichtlich erfüllt. Schreibe $m = a_r n^r + \cdots + a_0$ mit $a_i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ und $a_r \neq 0$. Insbesondere gelten:

(A) $0 \leq r \leq \frac{\log m}{\log n}$ (B) $\|a_i\| = \underbrace{\|1 + \cdots + 1\|}_{a_i\text{-mal}} \leq n$

Fall A: $\|n\| \geq 1$:

$$\|m\| = \|a_0 + \cdots + a_r n^r\| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{r} \|a_i\| \, \|n\|^i$$

$$\overset{(B)}{\leq} \sum_{i=0}^{r} n \, \|n\|^r = (r+1) n \, \|n\|^r$$

$$\leq \left(\frac{\log m}{\log n} + 1 \right) n \, \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}}$$

Es folgt für alle $k \in \mathbb{N}$, dass

$$\left\| m^k \right\| \leq \left(\frac{k \log m}{\log n} + 1 \right) n \left(\|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}} \right)^k$$

und somit

$$\|m\| \leq \left(\frac{k \log m}{\log n} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} n^{\frac{1}{k}} \, \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}} \, ,$$

also $\|m\| \leq \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}}$.

Fall B: $\|n\| < 1$:

Analog wie oben erhalte $\|m\| \leq \left(\frac{\log m}{\log n} + 1 \right) n$ und damit auch $\left\| m^k \right\| \leq \left(\frac{k \log m}{\log n} + 1 \right) n$ für alle $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Es folgt

$$\|m\| \leq \left(\frac{k \log m}{\log n} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{k}} n^{\frac{1}{k}}$$

so, dass der Grenzübergang $k \to \infty$ schließlich $\|m\| \leq 1$ liefert.

Insgesamt: $\|m\| \leq \max \left\{ \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}}, 1 \right\}$

Wähle jetzt $m = n_0$, d.h. $\|m\| = \|n_0\| >$ so, dass obige Abschätzung $\|m\| \leq \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}}$ liefert. Damit gilt insbesondere $\|n\| > 1$ für alle $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}$.

Also tritt Fall B nicht auf und für $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}$ gilt: $\|m\| \leq \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}}$ Durch Vertauschen der Rollen von m und n erhalten wir ebenso $\|n\| \leq \|m\|^{\frac{\log n}{\log m}}$ und damit

$$\|m\| \leq \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}} \leq \|m\|$$

so, dass

$$\|m\| = \|n\|^{\frac{\log m}{\log n}}.$$

Es folgt

$$\log \|m\| = \frac{\log |m|}{\log |n|} \log \|n\|$$

und Lemma 5.1.9 liefert schließlich $\|\cdot\| = |\cdot|^s$ mit

$$s = \frac{\log \|n_o\|}{\log |n_0|} > 0.$$

Dies zeigt die Äquivalenz von $\|\cdot\|$ und $|\cdot|$.

Fall 2: $\|\cdot\|$ ist nicht-archimedisch
AZT1 [IV, Prop. 1.3]: Die einzigen diskreten Bewertungen auf $\mathbb{Q}$ sind die p-adischen Bewertungen (bis auf Skalierung). Im Beweis wird **nicht** verwendet, dass v diskret ist. Also folgt die Behauptung aus Proposition 5.2.5 $\qquad \square$

Remark 5.2.7. Sei $v \colon K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ eine Bewertung und $\mathcal{O} = \{x \in K \mid v(x) \geq 0\}$. Dann gilt für alle $x \in K^\times$, dass $x \in \mathcal{O}$ oder $\frac{1}{x} \in \mathcal{O}$.

Definition 5.2.8. Sei R ein Integritätsbereich und $K = \operatorname{Quot}(R)$. Dann nennen wir R **Bewertungsring**, falls für alle $x \in K$ gilt, dass $x \in R$ oder $\frac{1}{x} \in R$.

Proposition 5.2.9. *Sei R ein Bewertungsring. Dann gilt:*

(i) $R^\times = \left\{ x \in R \mid \frac{1}{x} \in R \right\}$

(ii) $\mathfrak{m} = \left\{ x \in R \mid \frac{1}{x} \notin R \right\}$ ist das einzige maximale Ideal von R, insbesondere ist R lokal.

(iii) R ist ganz abgeschlossen.

Proof. "(i)" Klar. "(ii)" Es genügt zu zeigen, dass $\mathfrak{m}$ ein Ideal ist. Dann folgt die Behauptung aus $\mathfrak{m} = R \backslash R^\times$.

(a) Seien $r \in R \backslash \{0\}$ und $x \in \mathfrak{m} \backslash \{0\}$. Angenommen, $rx \notin \mathfrak{m}$. Dann gilt $rx \notin R$, denn sonst $rx \in R^\times$ und damit auch $x \in R^\times$. Da R ein Bewertungsring ist, folgt $\frac{1}{rx} \in R$ und damit

$$\frac{1}{x} = r\frac{1}{rx} \in R$$

so, das $x \in R^x$ im Widerspruch zur Annahme.

(b) Seien $x, y \in \mathfrak{m} \backslash \{0\}$. Ohne Einschränkung ist $\frac{x}{y} \in R$, da R ein Bewertungsring ist. Mit (a) folgt dann

$$x + y = \left(1 + \frac{x}{y}\right) y \in \mathfrak{m}.$$

"(iii)" Sei $x \in K = \operatorname{Quot} R$ ganz über R. Dann existieren $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in R$ mit

$$x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 = 0,$$

also

$$x^n = -a_{n-1} x^{n-1} - \cdots - a_0. \tag{$\star$}$$

Angenommen, $x \notin R$. Dann ist $\frac{1}{x} \in R$ und mit $(\star)$ folgt der Widerspruch

$$x = \frac{1}{x^{n-1}} x^n = -a_{n-1} - a_{n-2} \frac{1}{x} - \cdots - a_o \frac{1}{x^{n-1}} \in R.$$

$$\square$$

Corollary 5.2.10. *Sei $v \colon K \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ eine Bewertung mit zugehöriger Norm $|\cdot|$. Dann ist*

$$\mathcal{O} = \{x \in K \mid v(x) \geq 0\} = \{x \in K \mid |x| \leq 1\}$$

ein Bewertungsring mit Einheiten

$$\mathcal{O}^\times = \{x \in K \mid v(x) = 0\} = \{x \in K \mid |x| = 1\}$$

und eindeutigem maximalem Ideal

$$\mathfrak{m} = \{x \in K \mid v(x) > 0\} = \{x \in K \mid |x| < 1\}.$$

Example 5.2.11. Seien k ein Körper und

$$k\{X\} = \left\{a_0 X^{l_0} + a_1 X^{l_1} + \cdots \mid a_i \in k, l_i \in \mathbb{R}, l_0 < l_1 < \cdots, \lim_{i \to \infty} l_i = \infty\right\}$$

mit Addition und Multiplikation definiert analog zu formalen Laurent-Reihen. Dann ist $k\{X\}$ ein Körper und $v \colon K\{X\} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ mit $0 \mapsto \infty$,

$$0 \neq z = a_0 X^{l_0} + a_1 X^{l_1} + \cdots \mapsto l_0,$$

wobei $a_0 \neq 0$, ist eine Bewertung, die nicht diskret ist.

5.3. Komplettierung

Sei K stets ein Körper.

Definition 5.3.1. Sei (X, d) ein metrischer Raum.

(i) Eine Folge $(a_n)_n$ von Punkten in X heißt **Cauchy-Folge**, falls für alle $\varepsilon > 0$ ein $N \in \mathbb{N}$ existiert mit $d(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon$ für alle $n, m \geq N$.

(ii) (X, d) heißt **vollständig**, falls jede Cauchy-Folge in (X, d) konvergiert.

(iii) $\hat{X}, \hat{d}$ heißt **Komplettierung** von (X, d), falls

- $(\hat{X}, \hat{d})$ ist vollständig,

- es existiert eine isometrische Einbettung $\varphi \colon X \hookrightarrow \hat{X}$ mit $\varphi(X) \subset \hat{X}$ dicht.

Fact 5.3.2. Jeder metrische Raum besitzt eine **eindeutige** metrische Komplettierung.

Theorem 2. *(i) Jeder Körper $(K, |\cdot|)$ besitzt eine **Vervollständigung** $(\hat{K}, \|\cdot\|, i)$, d.h.*

- *$(\hat{K}, \|\cdot\|)$ ist ein normierter Körper,*

- *$i \colon K \to \hat{K}$ ist eine Körpererweiterung, die die Norm erhält, d.h. $\|i(x)\| = |x|$ für alle $x \in K$,*

- *$\hat{K}$ ist die metrische Komplettierung von K bezüglich den von den Normen induzierten Metriken.*

(ii) Die Vervollständigung in (i) ist eindeutig wie folgt: Sind $(\hat{K}_1, \|\cdot\|_1, i_1)$, $(\hat{K}_2, \|\cdot\|_2, i_2)$ Vervollständigungen von $(\hat{K}, \|\cdot\|, i)$, dann gibt es einen eindeutigen isometrischen Körperisomorphismus $h \colon \hat{K}_1 \to \hat{K}_2$ mit $h \circ i_1 = i_2$.

Fact 5.3.3. $\mathbb{R}$ ist die Vervollständigung von $\mathbb{Q}$ bezüglich $|\cdot|_\infty$.

Proposition 5.3.4. *(i) $(\mathbb{Q}, |\cdot|_p)$ ist nicht vollständig für $p \neq 2$.*

(ii) Ist $(K, |\cdot|)$ eine nicht-archimedische Norm, so gilt:

$$(a_n)_n \text{ ist Cauchy-Folge in } K \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad |a_{n+1} - a_n| \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0$$

Proof. "(ii)" "$\Rightarrow$" Klar. "$\Leftarrow$" Ohne Einschränkung sei $m < n$. Es gilt

$$|a_m - a_n| = |a_m - a_{m-1} + a_{m-1} - \cdots + a_{n-1} - a_n| \leq \max\{|a_m - a_{m-1}|, \ldots, |a_{n-1} - a_n|\}$$

und damit folgt die Behauptung.

"(i)" **Beweisidee für $p \neq 2$:** Wähle $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ mit

(1) $p \nmid a$,

(2) a kein Quadrat,

(3) $a \equiv b^2 \mod p$.

Konstruiere Folge $(b_n)_n$ mit

$$b_n \equiv b_{n-1} \mod p^n \qquad \text{und} \qquad b_n^2 \equiv a \mod p^{n+1}.$$

Dann gilt

$$|b_n - b_{n-1}|_p \leq \frac{1}{p^n} \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} 0,$$

also ist $(b_n)_n$ eine Cauchy-Folge. Angenommen $b_n \to b_\infty \in \mathbb{Q}$, dann auch $b_n^2 \to b_\infty^2$. Andererseits gilt $b_n^2 \to a$, also $a = b_\infty^2$, aber a ist kein Quadrat.

Existenz einer solchen Folge (b_n) folgt aus Lemma 5.3.6.   □

Example 5.3.5. $1, 1 + p, 1 + p + p^2, 1 + p + p^2 + p^3, \ldots$ ist eine Cauchy-Folge. Man kann zeigen, dass diese Folge in $\mathbb{Q}$ bezüglich $|\cdot|_p$ konvergiert.

Lemma 5.3.6. *Seien $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, n \in \mathbb{N}, p \neq 2$ prim mit $p \nmid a$ und $a \equiv b^2 \mod p^n$. Dann existiert ein $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ mit $x \equiv b \mod p^n$ und $x^2 \equiv a \mod p^{n+1}$.*

Proof. Nach Voraussetzung existiert ein $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ mit $a = b^2 + cp^n$. Wir suchen nun ein x mit $x = b + dp^n$ und $x^2 \equiv a \mod p^{n+1}$. Es gilt

$$(b + dp^n)^2 = b^2 + 2bdp^n + d^2p^{2n} = a - cp^n + 2bdp^n + d^2p^{2n} \equiv a + p^n(-c + 2bd) \mod p.$$

Wähle also d so, dass $-c + 2bd \equiv 0 \mod p$. Dies ist möglich, da $b \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ und $p \neq 2$. Dann leistet $x = b + dp^n$ das Gewünschte.   □

Beweisidee von Satz 2. "(i)" Konstruiere $\hat{K}$ wie folgt:

(1) $\mathcal{C} = \{(a_n)_n \,|\, a_n \in K, (a_n)_n \text{ Cauchy-Folge}\}$ mit komponentenweiser Addition und Multiplikation ist ein Ring.

(2) Sei $\mathcal{N} = \{(a_n)_n \in \mathcal{C} \,|\, |a_n| \to 0\}$ die Menge alle Nullfolgen. Dann ist $\mathcal{N}$ ein Ideal in $\mathcal{C}$, nach Lemma 3.7 sogar maximal.

(3) Definiere $\hat{K} = \mathcal{C}/\mathcal{N}$ und $i \colon K \hookrightarrow \hat{K}, z \mapsto (z, z, \ldots)$.

(4) Definiere $\|(a_n)_n\| = \lim_{n \to \infty} |a_n|$.

   □

Lemma 5.3.7. *$\mathcal{N}$ wie oben definiert ist maximal.*

Proof. Angenommen, es gibt ein Ideal I mit $\mathcal{C} \supsetneq I \supsetneq \mathcal{N}$. Wähle $b = (b_n) \in I \backslash \mathcal{N}$, d.h. b ist Cauchy-Folge, aber keine Nullfolge.

Erinnerung:

(1) (b_n) Cauchy-Folge $\Rightarrow (|b_n|)$ Cauchy-Folge

(2) (b_n) Nullfolge $\Leftrightarrow$ $(|b_n|)$ Nullfolge

Also existieren $\lambda > 0$ und $N \in \mathbb{N}$ so, dass $|b_n| > \lambda$ für alle $n \geq N$. Definiere $b' = (b'_n)$ mit

$$b'_n = \begin{cases} 1, & n < N, \\ b_n, & n \geq N. \end{cases}$$

Also $b \in \mathcal{C}^\times$ und $a = b - b' \in \mathcal{N} \subset I$ so, dass $b' \in I$ und daher $I = \mathcal{C}$. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 5.3.8. *Sei $a = (a_n) \in \mathcal{C}$. Dann existiert $\|a\| = \lim |a_n|$, ist invariant unter Addition von Nullfolgen und $a \mapsto \|a\|$ definiert eine Norm auf $\hat{K}$.*

Proof. Ist $a = (a_n)$ eine Cauchy-Folge, so auch $(|a_n|)$, also existiert $\lim |a_n|$, da $\mathbb{R}$ vollständig ist. Ist weiter (c_n) eine Nullfolge so gilt

$$\|a\| \overset{n}{\leftarrow} |a_n| - |c_n| \leq |a_n + c_n| \leq |a_n| + |c_n| \overset{n}{\to} \|a\|$$

so, dass $\lim |a_n + c_n| = \|a\|$. Schließlich gilt

$$\|a\| = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \lim |a_n| = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (a_n) \text{ Nullfolge}$$

und die restlichen Normeigenschaften bleiben bei Limesbildung erhalten. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 5.3.9. *$i(K)$ liegt dicht in $\hat{K}$.*

Proof. Sei $a = (a_n) \in \hat{K}$ und definiere die Folge $a^{(n)} \in \hat{K}$ durch

$$a^{(n)} = i(a_n) = (a_n, a_n, \dots).$$

Dann gilt $a^{(n)} \overset{n}{\to} a$, denn (a_n) ist eine Cauchy-Folge, also existiert zu allen $\varepsilon > 0$ ein $N \in \mathbb{N}$ mit $|a_n - a_m| < \varepsilon$ für alle $n, m \geq N$ so, dass

$$\left\| a - a^{(n)} \right\| = \lim_{j \to \infty} |a_j - a_n| < \varepsilon$$

für alle $n \geq N$ gilt. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 5.3.10. *$\hat{K}$ ist vollständig.*

Proof. Sei $(a^{(n)})$ eine Cauchy-Folge in $\hat{K}$. Nach Lemma 5.3.8 existiert für alle $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ein $x_n \in K$ mit $\left\| i(x_n) - a^{(n)} \right\| < \frac{1}{n}$, das heißt

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \left| x_n - a^{(n)}_j \right| < \frac{1}{n}.$$

Definiere $x = (x_n)$ und zeige:

(1) x ist Cauchy-Folge in K und somit $x \in \hat{K}$.

(2) $a^{(n)} \overset{n}{\to} x$ in $\hat{K}$.

"(1)" Sei $\varepsilon > 0$. Dann existiert N_1 mit $\left\| a^{(n)} - a^{(m)} \right\| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ für alle $N, m \geq N_1$. Wähle N_1 so groß, dass auch

$$\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{m} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

für alle $N, m \geq N_1$ gilt. Dann folgt

$$|x_n - x_m| = \|i(x_n) - i(x_m)\| \leq \left\| i(x_n) - a^{(n)} \right\| + \left\| a^{(n) - a^{(m)}} \right\| + \left\| a^{(m) - i(x_m)} \right\|$$
$$< \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{1}{m} < \varepsilon.$$

"(2)" Sei $\varepsilon > 0$. Dann existiert N_1 mit $|x_n - x_m| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ für alle $n, m \geq N_1$. Wähle $N_2 \geq N_1$ mit $\frac{1}{N_2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. Dann gilt

$$\left\| a^{(n)} - x \right\| = \lim_{j \to \infty} \left| a_j^{(n)} - x_j \right| \leq \lim_{j \to \infty} \left(\left| a_j^{(n)} - x_n \right| + |x_n - x_j| \right) \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} < \varepsilon$$

für alle $n \geq N_2$, also ist $\hat{K}$ vollständig. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Lemma 5.3.11. *In der Situation von Theorem 2 (ii) gilt: Definiere* $h\colon \hat{K}_1 \to \hat{K}_2$ *durch:*

$$a = \lim_{n \to \infty} i_1(a_n) \ mit \ a_n \in K \mapsto h(a) = \lim_{n \to \infty} i_2(a_n)$$

Proof. Nachrechnen. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Beweis von Theorem 2. Folgt aus Lemma 3.7-3.11. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Remark 5.3.12. Es sei $(\hat{K}, \|\cdot\|)$ die Vervollständigung von $(K, |\cdot|)$ für eine nicht-archimedische Norm $|\cdot|$ und

$$\hat{v}\colon \hat{K} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}, \ x \mapsto -\log \|x\|$$

die von $\|\cdot\|$ induzierte Bewertung. Dann gilt:

  (i) Für $x = (c_n) \in \hat{K}$ gilt $\hat{v}(x) = \lim_{n \to \infty} v(c_n)$, wobei $v = -\log |\cdot|$.

  (ii) Für $x \neq 0$ wird $v(c_n)$ stationär.

Proof. "(i)" Ergibt sich aus den Definitionen. "(ii)" Für große n wird $\|x - c_n\|$ klein, also wird $\hat{v}(x - c_n)$ groß. Nach Bemerkung 2.3 gilt daher

$$\hat{v}(c_n) = \hat{v}(c_n - x + x) = \min\{\hat{v}(c_n - x), \hat{v}(x)\} = \hat{v}(x).$$

Also wird die Folge $(v(c_n))$ stationär. $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\square$

Definition 5.3.13. Die Vervollständigung von $\mathbb{Q}$ bezüglich $|\cdot|_p$ heißt der **Körper der p-adischen Zahlen** $\mathbb{Q}_p$. Bezeichne die von $|\cdot|_p$ auf $\mathbb{Q}_p$ induzierte Norm ebenfalls mit $|\cdot|_p$ und definiere den zugehörigen Bewertungsring durch

$$\mathbb{Z}_p = \{q \in \mathbb{Q}_p \mid \|q\|_p \leq 1\}.$$

Wir nennen $\mathbb{Z}_p$ den **Ring der ganzen p-adischen Zahlen**.

5.4. Projektive Limiten

Sei $\mathcal{C}$ eine Kategorie. Bezeichne für zwei Objekte $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ mir $\mathrm{Mor}(X, Y)$ die Menge der Morphismen von X nach Y.

Definition 5.4.1. Ein **inverses System** besteht aus

   (i) einer partiell geordneten Menge $(I, \leq)$,

  (ii) einem Objekt $A_i \in \mathcal{C}$ für jedes $i \in I$,

 (iii) einem Morphismus $f_{ij} \colon A_j \to A_i$ für jedes $(i, j) \in I \times I$ mit $i \leq j$ mit folgenden Verträglichkeitseigenschaften:

         • $f_i i = \mathrm{id}_{A_i}$

         • $f_{ik} = f_{ij} \circ f_{jk}$, falls $i \leq j \leq k$

Example 5.4.2. Sei $\mathcal{C} = \mathbf{Groups}$.

   (i) Sei $I = \mathbb{N}$ mit $n \leq m$ falls $n | m$. Dann ist $A_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ und für $n \leq m$ ist

$$f_{nm} \colon \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$$

      die natürliche Projektion.

  (ii) Allgemeiner sei G eine beliebige Gruppe und

$$I = \{ N \,|\, N \text{ Normalteiler von } G \text{ von endlichem Index} \}$$

      mit $N_q \leq N_2$ falls $N_2 \subset N_1$. Dann ist $A_N = G/N$ und

$$f_{NM} \colon G/M \to G/N$$

      die natürliche Projektion.

Definition 5.4.3. Der **projektive Limes** oder **inverse Limes** eines inversen Systems wie in Definition 5.4.1 besteht aus

   (i) einem Objekt A,

  (ii) einem Morphismus $\Pi_i \colon A \to A_i$ für jedes $i \in I$,

so, dass

 (A) $f_{ij} \circ \Pi_j = \Pi_i$ für jedes $(i, j) \in I \times I$ mit $i \leq j$,

 (B) für jedes Objekt B mit einer Familie $\{ \Psi_i \colon B \to A_i \,|\, i \in I \}$ die ebenfalls (A) erfüllen gibt es einen eindeutigen Morphismus $u \colon B \to A$ so, dass $\Pi_i \circ u = \Psi_i$ für alle $i \in I$ gilt.

Der projektive Limes $(A, \{\Pi_i\}_{i \in I})$ wird mit $\varprojlim_{i \in I} A_i$ bezeichnet.

Remark 5.4.4. Falls ein projektiver Limes wie in Definition 5.4.3 definiert existiert, dann ist er eindeutig bis auf eindeutigen Isomorphismus, das heißt: Ist $(A', \{\Pi_i'\}_{i \in I})$ ebenfalls ein projektiver Limes, dann gibt es einen eindeutigen Isomorphismus $u \colon A' \to A$ mit $\Pi_i \circ u = \Pi_i'$ für alle $i \in I$.

Proof. Wie immer. $\qquad\square$

Proposition 5.4.5. *In der Kategorie* ***Groups*** *gibt es für jedes inverse System einen projektiven Limes.*

Proof. Verwende die Notation aus Definition 5.4.1. Definiere

$$A = \left\{ a = (a_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i \;\middle|\; f_{ij}(a_j) = a_i \text{ für alle } i \le j \right\}$$

und $\Pi_i \colon A \to A_i$, $a \mapsto a_i$. Mit komponentenweiser Verknüpfung wird $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ zu einer Gruppe und A ist eine Untergruppe. Zeige nun, dass A projektiver Limes ist. Offensichtlich gilt Eigenschaft (A), zu (B) definiere

$$u \colon B \to A,\ b \mapsto (\Psi_i(b_i))_{i \in I}.$$

$\qquad\square$

Example 5.4.6. (i) Für das inverse System in Beispiel 5.4.2 (i) erhalten wir als projektiven Limes

$$\hat{\mathbb{Z}} = \{(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mid a_n \in \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, n \text{ teilt } m \Rightarrow a_m \equiv a_n \mod n\}$$

mit komponentenweiser Addition.

(ii) Für Beispiel 5.4.2 (ii) erhalten wir

$$\hat{G} = \{(g_N)_{N \text{ Normalteiler von } G \text{ mit endlichem Index}} \mid g_N \in G/N,$$
$$M \subset N \Rightarrow g_N \mod N = g_M \mod M\}.$$

$\hat{G}$ heißt **proendliche Komplettierung** von G.

Remark 5.4.7. Analog erhält man projektive Limiten unter anderem in folgenden Kategorien:

$$\textbf{Mengen},\ \textbf{Ringe},\ R\textbf{-Moduln},\ k\textbf{-Algebren}$$

Definition 5.4.8. Eine **topologische Gruppe** besteht aus

(1) einer Gruppe G und

(2) einer Topologie T auf G so, dass

(A) die Gruppenabbildung $G \times G \to G, (a,b) \mapsto ab$ stetig ist und

(B) die Inversenabbildung $G \to G, g \mapsto g^{-1}$ stetig ist.

Ein **Morphismus** φ zwischen topologischen Gruppen ist ein stetiger Gruppenhomomorphismus.

Remark 5.4.9. Topologische Gruppen bilden mit Morphismen eine Kategorie, **TopGroups**.

Definition 5.4.10. Sei I eine Indexmenge und $(X_i, T_i)_{i \in I}$ eine Familie topologischer Räume. Sei $X = \prod_{i \in I} X_i$ das kartesische Produkt und $p_i \colon X \to X_i, (x_k) \mapsto x_i$. Dann ist die **Produkttopologie** T die kleinste Topologie auf X für die alle p_i stetig sind. Das heißt

$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{ p_i^{-1}(U) \,\middle|\, i \in I, U \subset X_i \text{ offen} \right\}$$

bildet eine Subbasis von T.

Reminder 5.4.11.   • $\mathcal{B} \subset T$ heißt **Subbasis**, falls jede offene Menge $U \in T$ eine beliebige Vereinigung von Mengen, die endliche Schnitte von Mengen in $\mathcal{B}$ sind, ist.

- Für $x \in X$ heißt $\mathcal{B}_x \subset T$ **Umgebungsbasis** von x, falls:
  (1) Für alle $U \in \mathcal{B}_x$ gilt $x \in U$.
  (2) Für jedes $V \in T$ mit $x \in V$ existiert ein $U \in B_x$ mit $U \subset V$.

Remark 5.4.12. Sei G eine topologische Gruppe mit neutralem Element 1.

(1) Jedes $g \in G$ definiert einen Homöomorphismus (**kein** Automorphismus)

$$\Phi_g \colon G \to G, \ x \mapsto gx$$

mit Umkehrabbildung $\Phi_{g^{-1}}$.

(2) $\mathcal{B}_{(1)}$ ist Umgebungsbasis von 1 genau dann, wenn

$$g\mathcal{B}_{(1)} = \{ gU \,|\, U \in \mathcal{B}_{(1)} \}$$

eine Umgebungsbasis von g ist für jedes $g \in G$.

(3) Ist G zusammenhängend so gilt

$$G = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}_{(1)}^n.$$

Remark 5.4.13. In der Kategorie **TopSpaces** und in der Kategorie **TopGroups** existieren jeweils projektive Limiten.

Proof. Analog zu Proposition 5.4.5 betrachte auf $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ die Produkttopologie und auf A die Spurtopologie davon. $\qquad\square$

Remark 5.4.14. Die proendliche Komplettierung $\hat{G}$ einer Gruppe G wird zu einer topologischen Gruppe wie folgt:

(1) Versehe die Quotienten G/N mit der diskreten Topologie $\mathcal{P}(G/N)$.

(2) Bilde den projektiven Limes in der Kategorie der topologischen Gruppen **TopGroups**.

Definition 5.4.15. Eine topologische Gruppe G heißt **proendlich**, falls G isomorph zum projektiven Limes von endlichen Gruppen, jeweils versehen mit der diskreten Topologie, ist.

Remark 5.4.16. Analog definiert man **topologische Ringe** als Ringe $(R, +, \cdot)$ mit $(R, +)$ topologische Gruppe und $\cdot \colon R \times R \to R$ stetig und sieht, dass auch für diese projektive Limiten existieren.

5.5. Ganze p-adische Zahlen

Ziel: Zeige, dass

$$\mathbb{Z}_p \cong \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z},$$

beziehungsweise allgemeiner, dass

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cong \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n.$$

Sei ab jetzt:

- K ein Körper, v eine diskrete Bewertung auf K und $|\cdot| = q^{-v(\cdot)}$ die zugehörige Norm für ein $q > 1$

- $\hat{K}$ die Vervollständigung von K bezüglich $|\cdot|$, $\hat{v}$ die zugehörige Bewertung und $|\cdot| = q^{-\hat{v}(\cdot)}$ die zugehörige Norm

- $\mathcal{O}$ der Bewertungsring zu v mit maximalem Ideal $\mathfrak{p} = \Pi \cdot \mathcal{O}$ mit $v(\Pi) = 1$

- $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ der Bewertungsring zu $\hat{v}$ mit maximalem Ideal $\hat{\mathfrak{p}} = \Pi \cdot \hat{\mathcal{O}}$

Remark 5.5.1. Da v diskrete Bewertung ist gilt $v(K) = \hat{v}(\hat{K})$, denn für $c_n \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} x$ gilt $\hat{v}(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} v(c_n)$.

Ohne Einschränkung sei ab jetzt $v(k) = \hat{v}(\hat{K}) = \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Proposition 5.5.2. *Für alle* $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *gilt* $\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n \cong \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$.

Proof. Für $x \in \mathcal{O}$ gilt:

$$x \in \mathfrak{p}^n \Leftrightarrow v(x) \geq n \Leftrightarrow \hat{v}(x) \geq n \Leftrightarrow x \in \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$$

Also steigt $i \colon O \hookrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ ab zu einem injektiven Morphismus $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n \hookrightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$. Dieser ist surjektiv, denn zu $x \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ existiert eine Folge (c_k) in K mit $c_k \to x$. Da v eine diskrete Bewertung ist, gilt ohne Einschränkung $c_k \in \mathcal{O}$, also ist für k groß genug $|x - c_k| < q^{-n}$ und damit $v(x - c_n) > n$. Also $c_k \equiv x \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$. Folglich wird $c_k \mod \mathfrak{p}^n$ abgebildet auf $x \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$. $\qquad\square$

Proposition 5.5.3. *Es gilt $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \cong \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$ in der Kategorie **TopRings** von topologischen Ringen. Hierbei erhält $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ die von der Norm $|\cdot|$ induzierte Topologie und die Ringe $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$ die diskrete Topologie.*

Proof. $p^r_{m,n} \colon \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n \to \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^m$ sei die natürliche Projektion für $m \leq n$ und

$$h_n \colon \mathcal{L} = \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n \to \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$$

die Projektionsabbildung des Limes.

(1) Definiere eine Abbildung $\Phi \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{L}$:

Verwende den Isomorphismus $\alpha_n \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n \to \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ aus Proposition 5.5.2 und definiere

$$\Phi_n \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n, \, x \mapsto \alpha_n \left(x \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n \right).$$

Dann ist Φ_n ein Ringhomomorphismus und die $\{\Phi_n\}$ passen zusammen mit den Projektionen $p_{m,n}$.

Zeige noch: Φ_n ist stetig

Sei $U \subset \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$ und $V = \Phi_n^{-1}(U)$, Es gilt $\ker \Phi_n = \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$. Für $x \in V$ und $\varepsilon_n = q^{-n}$ ist dann

$$
\begin{aligned}
K_{\varepsilon_n}(x) &= \{ y \in \hat{\mathcal{O}} \mid |y - x| < \varepsilon_n \} \\
&= \{ y \in \hat{\mathcal{O}} \mid \hat{v}(y - x) > n \} \\
&= x + \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^{n+1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Folglich gilt $\Phi(n)(K_{\varepsilon_n}(x)) = \{x\}$ und daher $K_{\varepsilon_n}(x) \subset V$. Also ist V offen. Nach der Definition von projektivem Limes induziert $\{\Phi_n\}$ also einen stetigen Ringhomomorphismus $\Phi \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{L}$.

(2) Φ ist injektiv:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi(x) = 0 &\Leftrightarrow \Phi_n(x) = 0 \text{ für alle } n \in \mathbb{N} \\
&\Leftrightarrow x \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n \text{ für alle } n \in \mathbb{N} \\
&\Leftrightarrow x = 0
\end{aligned}
$$

(3) Φ ist surjektiv:

Sei $s = (\overline{s_n}) \in \mathcal{L}$, also $p^r_{n,m}(\overline{s_m}) = \overline{s_n}$ für $n \leq m$. Wähle für jedes $\overline{s_n}$ ein Urbild $s_n \in \mathcal{O}$. Es gilt also $s_m - s_n \in \mathfrak{p}^n$ für $m \geq n$. Also ist (s_n) eine Cauchy-Folge und es existiert $x = \lim_n s_n \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Dann gilt $\Phi(x) = s$, denn:

Es gilt für alle $m \geq n$, dass $s_n \equiv s_m \mod \mathfrak{p}^n$. Wegen $s_n \to x$ existiert k_0 mit $v(x - s_n) \geq n$. Wähle $k \geq k_0, n$, dann gilt

$$x \equiv s_k \equiv s_n \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$$

und damit $\Phi_n(x) = \overline{s_n}$ so, dass $\Phi(x) = s$.

(3) Φ ist offen, d.h. für alle $U \subset \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ offen ist $\Phi(U)$ offen:

Da $(\hat{\mathcal{O}}, +)$ eine topologische Gruppe ist, genügt es, dies für alle U einer Umgebungsbasis von $\mathcal{O}$ zu überprüfen und

$$\mathcal{B} = \{K_{q^{-1}}(0) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_0\} = \{\hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

ist eine Umgebungsbasis von 0. Für $\hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n \in \mathcal{B}$ gilt:

$$\Phi(\hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n) = \{(\overline{s_k}) \in \mathcal{L} \mid \overline{s_k} = 0 \text{ für } k \leq n\}$$
$$= h_n^{-1}(\{0\}) \text{ offen in } \mathcal{L}$$

Somit ist Φ offen.

$\square$

Remark 5.5.4. Die Mengen

$$U_n = \{0\} \times \cdots \times \{0\} \times \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^{n+1} \times \cdots$$

als offene Teilmengen von $\mathcal{L} = \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$ bilden eine Umgebungsbasis der 0.

Remark 5.5.5. Der Homomorphismus

$$\mathcal{O}^\times \to (\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^\times, \, u \mapsto u \mod \mathfrak{p}^n$$

hat als Kern $U^{(n)} = 1 + \mathfrak{p}^n$ und ist surjektiv. Somit ist $U^{(n)}$ eine Untergruppe von $\mathcal{O}^\times$ und

$$\mathcal{O}^\times / U^{(n)} \cong (\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^\times.$$

Corollary 5.5.6. *Als topologische Gruppen gilt*

$$\hat{O}^\times = \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}^\times / U^{(n)}.$$

Proof. Der Isomorphismus $\Phi \colon \hat{\mathcal{O}} \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$ schränkt sich ein zu einem Isomorphismus

$\hat{O}^\times \to \left(\varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n\right)^\times$. Damit folgt

$$\left(\varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n\right)^\times \cong \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n)^\times \cong \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}^\times / U^{(n)}.$$

$\square$

Corollary 5.5.7. $\mathbb{Z}_p \cong \varprojlim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$

Ziel: Wähle zu jedem $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ eine eindeutige Folge (s_n) in $\mathbb{Z}$ mit $s_n \to x$ und zwar so, dass $v(s_{n+1} - s_n) > n$, d.h.

$$s_{n+1} = s_n + a_n p^n.$$

Damit hat s_{n+1} die Form

$$s_{n+1} = a_0 + a_1 p + a_2 p^2 + \cdots a_n p^n.$$

Idee: Wenn wir $a_i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p - 1\}$ fordern, dann geht das auf eindeutige Weise.

Proposition 5.5.8. *Sei $R \subset \mathcal{O}$ ein Repräsentantensystem für $\kappa = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ mit $0 \in R$.*

    (i) Für alle $x \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ existiert eine eindeutige Folge $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ in R mit

$$x \equiv s_n = a_0 + a_1 \Pi + a_2 \Pi^2 + \cdots a_{n-1} \Pi^{n-1} \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$$

    für alle $n \in \mathbb{N}$ und es gilt $s_n \to x$ bezüglich $|\cdot|$.

    (ii) Für $x \in \hat{K}^{\times}$ existiert eine analoge Folge mit

$$s_n = a_m \Pi^m + a_{m+1} \Pi^{m+1} + \cdots a_n \Pi^n$$

    für $n \geq m$ so, dass $s_n \equiv x \mod \hat{p}^n$ und $s_n \to x$. Hierbei ist $m = v(x)$.

Proof. "(i)" Nach Proposition 5.5.2 existiert ein eindeutiges $a_0 \in R$ mit $a_0 \equiv x \mod \hat{p}^n$. Definiere a_n rekursiv wie folgt:
Es gilt bereits $x \equiv s_n = a_0 + a_1 \Pi + a_2 \Pi^2 + \cdots a_{n-1} \Pi^{n-1} \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^n$. Dann ist

$$x - s_n = u_n \Pi^n$$

für ein $u_n \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Nach Proposition 5.5.2 lässt sich u_n schreiben als

$$a_n + r\Pi$$

mit eindeutigem $a_n \in R$ und einem $r \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. Also

$$x = a_0 + a_1 \Pi + a_2 \Pi^2 + \cdots a_{n-1} \Pi^{n-1} + u_n \Pi^n$$
$$= a_0 + a_1 \Pi + a_2 \Pi^2 + \cdots a_{n-1} \Pi^{n-1} + a_n \Pi^n + r\Pi^{n+1}.$$

Also leistet a_n das Gewünschte, d.h.

$$x \equiv a_0 + a_1 \Pi + a_2 \Pi^2 + \cdots a_n \Pi^n = s_{n+1} \mod \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^{n+1}.$$

Schließlich $v(x - s_n) \geq n + 1$ und damit $s_n \to x$.

"(ii)" Sei $x \in \hat{K}$. Dann ist $x = u\Pi^m$ mit einem $u \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}$ und $m = v(x)$. Erhalte aus (i) eine Folge (a'_n) für u mit

$$a'_0 + a'_1 \Pi + \cdots a'_n \Pi^n \to u.$$

Wegen $u \in \mathcal{O}^{\times}$ ist $a'_0 \neq 0$. Erhalte also

$$\Pi^m \left(a'_0 + a'_1 \Pi + \cdots a'_n \Pi^n \right) \to x$$

und setzte $a_n = a'_{n+m}$. Dann leistet (a_n) das Gewünschte. $\square$

Example 5.5.9. Sei $K = \mathbb{Q}$ mit p-adischer Norm $|\cdot|_p$.

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\hat{K} & & \varprojlim \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z} & & \{0,\ldots,p-1\}^{N_0} \\
-1 & \leftrightarrow & (p-1,p-1,p-1,\ldots) & \leftrightarrow & p-1+(p-1)p+(p-1)p^2+\cdots
\end{array}
$$

Corollary 5.5.10. *Es gilt*

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Z}_p &= \{a_0 + a_1 p + a_2 p^2 + \cdots \mid a_i \in \{0,\ldots,p-1\}\} \\
&= \{0,\ldots,p-1\}^{N_0}
\end{aligned}
$$

und

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Q}_p &= \{a_m p^m + a_{m-1}p^{m-1} + a_{m-2}p^{m-2} + \cdots \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, a_i \in \{0,\ldots,p-1\}, a_m \neq 0\} \\
&= \mathrm{Quot}(\mathbb{Z}_p).
\end{aligned}
$$

Addition und Multiplikation ergibt sich wie bei Potenzreihen beziehungsweise Laurentreihen.

Example 5.5.11. Seien $K = k(T) = \mathrm{Quot}+(k[T])$ und

$$
v \colon K \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}, \frac{p}{q} \mapsto \deg(p) - \deg(q).
$$

Weiter sei $\mathcal{O} = k[T] \supset \mathfrak{p} = (T)$ und $\Pi = T$. Dann ist $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = k[[T]]$ der Ring der Potenzreihen und $\hat{K} = k((T))$ der Körper der Laurentreihen.

5.6. Endliche Erweiterung von vollständigen Körpern

Ziele

(1) Archimedische Normen sind langweilig.

(2) Vervollständigung bzgl. nicht archimedischer Normen „kann lokal "$\to$ Hensels Lemma.

(3) Fortsetzen von vollständigen Körpern bezüglich nicht-archimedischer Norm auf algebraische Körper-Erweiterung.

Lemma 5.6.1. *Seien $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}, \varepsilon > 0$ und $g(X) := X^2 - (z_0 + \bar{z}_0)X + z_0\bar{z}_0 + \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ Die beiden Nullstellen z_1 und z_2 von g sind nicht reell, also $z_2 = \bar{z}_1$ und $|z_1| > |z_0|$.*

Proof. (1) $z_{1/2} = \frac{z_0+\bar{z}_0}{2} \pm \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\underbrace{(z_0 + \bar{z}_0)^2 - 4z_0\bar{z}_0 - 4\varepsilon}_{=:D}}$

$\Rightarrow D = (\underbrace{z_0 - \bar{z}_0}_{2Im(z_0)})^2 - 4\varepsilon = -4(Im(z_0))^2 - 4\varepsilon < 0$

$\Rightarrow$ erhalte zwei nicht-reele, zueinander komplex konjugierte Nullstellen.

(2) Vieta $\Rightarrow z_1\bar{z}_1 = z_0\bar{z}_0 + \varepsilon \Rightarrow |z_1|^2 = |z_0|^2 + \varepsilon > |z_0|^2$

$\square$

Theorem 3 (Satz von Ostrawski). *Jeder vollständig normierte Körper* $(K, |\cdot|)$ *mit archimedischer Norm* $|\cdot|$ *ist isomorph zu* $\mathbb{R}$ *oder* $\mathbb{C}$.

Proof. Da $|\cdot|$ archimedisch ist, also $|n|$ beliebig groß wird für $n \in \mathbb{N}$, ist $\mathrm{char}(K) = \infty$.
$\Rightarrow$ Wir haben Einbettung von $\mathbb{Q} \hookrightarrow K$. Satz 1 $\Rightarrow |\cdot|_{|\mathbb{Q}} = |\cdot|_\infty$ mit der Betragsnorm $|\cdot|_\infty$.
Da K vollständig ist, lässt sich die Einbettung $\mathbb{Q} \hookrightarrow K$ fortsetzen zu einer Einbettung
$\mathbb{R} \hookrightarrow K$ und $|\cdot|_{|\mathbb{R}} = |\cdot|_\infty$ (Betragsnorm).
Zeige nun: K ist algebraisch über $\mathbb{R}$, genauer: jedes $\alpha \in K$ hat Minimalpolynom vom Grad ≤ 2.
Für $\alpha \in K$ definiere die Abbildung

$$f_\alpha : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{R} , \ z \mapsto |\alpha^2 - (z + \bar{z})\alpha + z\bar{z}|$$

Zeige: f_α hat eine Nullstelle $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, dann ist

$$X^2 - (z_0 + \bar{z}_0)X + z_0\bar{z}_0 \in \mathbb{R}[X]$$

Vielfaches vom Minimalpolynom von α.
<u>Schritt 1:</u> Zeige: f_α nimmt auf $\mathbb{C}$ ein Minimum an.
f_α ist stetig. Außerdem gilt

$$\begin{aligned} f_\alpha(z) &\geq |z\bar{z}| - |z + \bar{z}||\alpha| - |\alpha^2| \\ &\geq |z|^2 - 2|z||\alpha| - |\alpha^2| \to \infty \text{ für } |z| \to \infty \end{aligned}$$

$\Rightarrow$ Erhalte Minimum m.
<u>Schritt 2:</u> Zeige $m = 0$:
Sei $S := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid f_\alpha(z) = m\} = f_\alpha^{-1}(\{m\}) \Rightarrow \exists\, z_0 \in S$ mit $|z_0| \geq |z|$ für alle $z \in S$.
Annahme: $m > 0$. Wähle $\varepsilon > 0$ mit $0 < \varepsilon < m$.
<u>Einerseits:</u> Sei $g(X) := X^2 - (z_0 + \bar{z}_0)X + z_0\bar{z}_0 + \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}[X]$.
Lemma 6.1 $\Rightarrow g$ hat Nullstellen $z_1, \bar{z}_1$ mit $|z_1| > |z_0|$.
$\Rightarrow f_\alpha(z_1) > m$ wegen Maximalitätsbedingung in Def. von z_0.
<u>Andererseits:</u> Sei $G(X) := (g(X) - \varepsilon)^n - (-\varepsilon)^n$ für $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Es gilt $G(z_1) = (g(z_1) - \varepsilon)^n - (-\varepsilon)^n = 0$.
Seien $x_1 = z_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{2n}$ die Nullstellen in $\mathbb{C}$ von G. Das heißt:

$$G(X) = \prod_{i=1}^{2n}(X - x_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{2n}(X - \bar{x}_i)$$

$$\Rightarrow G(X)^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2n}(X^2 - (x_i + \bar{x}_i)X + x_i\bar{x}_i)$$

Es gilt dann $(\star)|G(\alpha)|^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2n} f_\alpha(x_i) \geq f_\alpha(z_1)m^{2n-1}$ Außerdem $|G(\alpha)| \leq |\alpha^2 - (z_0 + \bar{z}_0)\alpha + z_0\bar{z}_0|^n + (-\varepsilon)^n = f_\alpha(z_0)^n + \varepsilon^n = m^n + \varepsilon^n(\star\star)$

$$(\star) + (\star\star) \Rightarrow f_\alpha(z_1)m^{2n-1} \leq (m^n + \varepsilon^n)^2 \quad | : m^2 n$$

$$\Longleftrightarrow \frac{f_\alpha(z_1)}{m} \leq (1 + (\frac{\varepsilon}{m}^n)^2$$

Für $n \to \infty$ erhalte: $f_\alpha(z_1) \leq mE$ zu „Einerseits ". $\square$

Ab jetzt: $(K, |\cdot|)$ ein Körper mit nicht archimedischer Norm. $\nu, \mathcal{O}, p, \mathcal{O}/p = \kappa$ Restklassenkörper wie immer.

Definition 5.6.2. Sei $f = a_n X^n + a_{n-1} X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in \mathcal{O}[X]$.

1. $|f| := \max\{|a_0|, \ldots, |a_n|\} \leq 1$

2. f heißt primitiv $: \Longleftrightarrow |f| = 1 \Longleftrightarrow f(X) \not\equiv 0 \mod p$.

Theorem 4 (Lemma von Hensel[1]). *Sei K ein vollständiger Körper. Seien $f \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ ein primitives Polynom,*

$$proj : \mathcal{O}[X] \to \kappa[X]$$

die natürliche Projektion und $\bar{f} := proj(f)$.
Dann gilt: Falls $\bar{f} = \bar{g}\bar{h}$ mit $\bar{g}, \bar{h} \in \kappa[X]$ teilerfremd, dann gibt es $g, h \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ mit:

(1) $f(X) = g(X)h(X)$

(2) $proj(g) = \bar{g}, proj(h) = \bar{h}$

(3) $\deg(g) = \deg(\bar{g})$

Remark 5.6.3 (Vorbemerkung). $K[X]$ trägt die von $(K, |\cdot|)$ induzierte Topologie („Finale Topologie auf dem Raum der endlichen Folgen "). Insbesondere gilt für f_n Folge in $K[X]$ und $f \in K[X]$.
$f_n \to f(n \to \infty) \Longleftrightarrow$ Für die Koeffizienten $a_i^{(n)}$ von f_n gilt

$$\forall\, i : a_i^{(n)} \to a_i (n \to \infty)$$

wobei a_i die Koeffizienten von f sind. Wie in K gilt: $f_n \to f$ und $g_n \to g \Rightarrow f_n g_n \to f \cdot g, f_n + g_n \to f + g$

von Satz 4. Wähle $g_0, h_0 \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ mit $proj(g_0) = \bar{g}, proj(h_0) = \bar{h}, \deg(g_0) = \deg(\bar{g}) =:$ $m, \deg(h_0) = \deg(\bar{h}) =: m'$.
Dann gilt insbesondere $m + m' = \deg(\bar{f}) \leq \deg(f) =: d$.
Verwende: (1)$\bar{g}, \bar{h}$ sind teilerfremd $\Rightarrow \exists\, a, b, \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ mit $1 \equiv ag_0 + bh_0 \mod p$. Also $ag_0 + bh_0 - 1 \in p$.
(2)$f \equiv g_0 h_0 \mod p$, also $f - g_0 h_0 \in p$. Wähle Π als Koeffizient von $ag_0 + bh_0 - 1$, $f - g_0 h_0$, sodass $\nu(\Pi)$ minimal ist.
$\Rightarrow \Pi \in P$ und $ag_0 + bh_0 - 1$ und $f - g_0 h_0$ sind beide durch Π teilbar.
Ansatz: $g := g_0 + s_1 \Pi + s_2^2 + \ldots$
$h := h_0 + t_1 \Pi + t_2^2 + \ldots$

---

[1]Kurt Hensel, 1861-1941

(1) $g_n h_n \equiv f \mod \Pi^{n+1}$

(2) $\deg(g_n) = \deg(g_0) = m$

Bestimme s_n und t_n rekursiv:

Es gilt: $\Pi | f - g_0 h_0 \Rightarrow f \equiv g_0 h_0 \mod \Pi$

Außerdem: $\deg(g_0) = m$ und damit liegt der Leitkoeffizient nicht in p und ist somit eine Einheit.

Sei nun g_{n-1}, h_{n-1} wie gewünscht gegeben. Es gilt für $g_n = g_{n-1} + s_n \Pi^n$ und $h_n = h_{n-1} + t_n \Pi^n$:

$g_n h_n \equiv g_{n-1} h_{n-1} + (s_n h_{n-1} + t_n g_{n-1}) \Pi^n \mod \Pi^{n+1}$ und $f - g_{n-1} h_{n-1} = f_n \Pi^n$. Also ist $f \equiv g_n h_n \mod \Pi^{n+1} \iff g_{n-1} h_{n-1} + f_n \Pi^n \equiv g_{n-1} h_{n-1} + (s_n h_{n-1} + t_n g_{n-1}) \Pi^n$ $\mod \Pi^{n+1} \iff f_n \equiv s_n h_{n-1} + t_n g_{n-1} \mod \Pi$ Verwende $f_n = f_n \cdot 1 \equiv f_n (a g_0 + b h_0)$ $\mod \Pi$ und $g_{n-1} \equiv g_0$ und $h_{n-1} \equiv h_0 \mod \Pi$.

Also $(\star) \iff \underbrace{f_n a}_{\hat{t}_n} g_0 + \underbrace{f_n b}_{\hat{h}_n} h_0 \equiv s_n h_0 + t_n g_0 \mod \Pi$. Definiere s_n als Rest von $f_n b$ beim

Teilen durch g_0 d.h. $f_n b = q g_0 s_n$ mit $q \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ und $\deg(s_n) < m$ und $t'_n := f_n a + q h_0$ bzw. das Polynom das aus t'_n entsteht, wenn alle durch Π teilbaren Koeffizienten von t'_n auf 0 gesetzt werden. Insgesamt: $g_n := g_{n-1} + s_n \Pi^n, h_n := h_{n-1} + t_n \Pi^n \equiv h_{n-1} + \hat{t}_n \Pi^n$ $\mod \Pi^{n+1}$ mit s_n, t_n wie oben gewählt. $\Rightarrow$

(1) $f \equiv g_n h_n \mod \Pi^{n+1}$

(2) $\deg(g_n) = \deg(g_{n-1})$, da $\deg(s_n) < m$ und der Leitkoeffizient von g_n =Leitkoeff. von g_{n-1}.

$\square$

Example 5.6.4. $K = \mathbb{Q}_p, \mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z}_p, \mathcal{P} = p\mathbb{Z}_p, \kappa = \mathbb{Z}_p / \mathcal{P} = \mathbb{F}_p, f(X) = X^{p-1} - 1 \in \mathcal{O}[X], \bar{f}(X) = X^{p-1} - 1 \in \mathbb{F}_p[X] = (X-1)(X_2) \cdot \cdots \cdot (X - (p-1))$

Lemma von Hensel $\Rightarrow f$ hat $p-1$ Nullstellen $\Rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ enthält die $(p-1)$-ten Einheitswurzeln.

Corollary 5.6.5. *Seien $(K, |\cdot|)$ wieder vollständig+nicht-archimedisch, $f(X) = a_n X^n + a_{n-1} X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in K[X]$ irreduzibel. Dann gilt $|f| = max\{|a_0|, |a_n|\}$. Insbesondere: f normiert und $a_0 \in \mathcal{O} \Rightarrow f \in \mathcal{O}[X]$.*

Proof. Multipliziere f mit geeignetem $\alpha \in K \Rightarrow f \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ und $|f| = 1$.

Sei $r \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$ minimal mit $|a_r| = 1 \Rightarrow f(X) \equiv a_n X^n + \cdots + a_r X^r \equiv X^r (a_n X^{n-r} + \cdots + a_r) \mod p$.

Annahme: $0 < r < n$. Hensels Lemma $\Rightarrow f$ ist nicht irreduzibel E. $\square$

Lemma 5.6.6. *Seien K vollständig + nicht-archimedisch, L/K endliche KE und $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ der ganze Abschluss von $\mathcal{O}$ in L.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \hat{\mathcal{O}} & \longhookrightarrow & L \\ | & & | \\ \mathcal{O} & \longhookrightarrow & K \end{array}$$

Dann gilt:

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \{\alpha \in L \mid N_{L/K}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}\}$$

Proof. „$\subseteq$ "gilt auch für nicht vollständige Körper K [s. AZT 1, II.2.7].
„$\supseteq$ "Folgt aus Kor. 6.5 wie folgt:
$\alpha \in L^\times$ mit $N_{L/K}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}$. Sei $f(X) = X^d + a_{d-1}X^{d-1} + \cdots + a_0 \in K[X]$ Minimalpolynom
von $\alpha \Rightarrow N_{K(\alpha)/K}(\alpha) = (-1)^d a_0 \in \mathcal{O}$.
$\Rightarrow N_{L/K}(\alpha)$ ist Potenz von $(-1)^d a_0$ und damit in $\mathcal{O}$.
$\overset{Kor.}{\Rightarrow} f(X) \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ und damit $\alpha \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}$. $\square$

Example 5.6.7. $K = \mathbb{Q}, L = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{17}), f(X) = X^2 + \frac{1}{2}X - 1$ hat die Nullstellen $x_{1/2} = -\frac{1}{4} \pm \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{17}, \alpha = x_1 \Rightarrow N_{L/K}(\alpha) = -1$.
<u>Aber:</u> $\alpha \notin$ ganzem Abschluss von $\mathbb{Z}$ in L.

Theorem 5 (FORTSETZUNG VON NORMEN). *Sei $(K, |\cdot|)$ vollständig. Dann hat $|\cdot|$ auf jeder algebraischen KE L/K eine eindeutige Norm-Fortsetzung.*
Falls L/K endlich, ist diese definiert durch $|\alpha| := \sqrt[n]{|N_{L/K}(\alpha)|}$ und ist vollständig, wobei $[L:K] = n$.

Proposition 5.6.8. *Seien:*

- $(K, |\cdot|)$ *ein vollständig normierter Körper.*

- V *ein n-dimensionaler $K - VR$ mit einer Norm $||\cdot||_1$*

- $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ *Basis von V.*

Dann ist $\phi : K^n \to V, (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \mapsto a_1 v_1 + \cdots + a_n v_n$ ein Homöomorphismus. Insbesondere ist damit V vollständig bezüglich der von $||\cdot||_1$ induzierten Topologie.

Proof. Definiere die Norm $||\cdot||_2$ auf V wie folgt: $||a_1 v_1 + \cdots + a_n v_n|| := \max\{|a_1|, \ldots, |a_n|\}$.
Zeige noch: $||\cdot||_1$ und $||\cdot||_2$ definieren dieselbe Topoogie auf V. Dann folgt die Behauptung.
Zeige dazu: $\exists \rho, \rho' > 0$ mit $\rho||x||_2 \leq ||x||_1 \leq \rho'||x||_2 \forall x \in V$.

(1) Für $x = a_1 v_1 + \ldots, + a_n v_n$ gilt: $||x||_1 \leq |a_1|||v_1||_1 + \cdots + |a_n|||v_n||_1 \leq ||x||_2 \underbrace{(||v_1||_1 + \cdots + ||v_n||_1)}_{=:\rho'}$

Existenz von ρ via vollständiger Induktion über n:

$$n = 1 : ||x||_2 = ||x_1 v_1||_2 = |x_1|$$
$$||x||_1 = |x_1|||v_1||_1 \Rightarrow \rho := ||v_1||_1 \text{ tut es.}$$

„$n - 1 \to n$": $V_i := Kv_1 \oplus KV_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus Kv_{i-1} \oplus Kv_{i+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus Kv_n$ also: $V = V_i \oplus Kv_i$

Induktionsvoraussetzung: $\Rightarrow (V_i, ||\cdot||_1)$ ist vollständig $\Rightarrow V_i$ ist abgeschlossen in $(V, ||\cdot||_1)$
$$\Rightarrow V_i + v_i \text{ ist abgeschlossen.}$$
$$\Rightarrow \bigcup_{i=1}^n V_i + v_i \text{ ist abgeschlossen und enthält nicht } 0.$$
$$\Rightarrow \exists \rho > 0 \text{ mit } K_\rho(0) \cap \bigcup_{i=i}^n V_i + v_i = \emptyset$$
$$\Rightarrow \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} : ||w_i + v_i||_1 \geq \rho \forall w_i \in V_i$$

Also: Für $x = a_i v_1 + \cdots + a_n v_n \neq 0$ gilt: Sei $r : |a_r| = \max\{|a_1|, \ldots, |a_n|\} = ||x||_2 > 0$

$\Rightarrow ||a_r^{-1} x||_1 = || \underbrace{\dfrac{a_1}{a_r} v_1 + \cdots + \dfrac{a_n}{a_r} v_n}_{\in v_r + V_r} ||_1 \geq \rho$

$\Rightarrow ||x||_1 \geq |a_r| \rho = \rho ||x||_2.$ $\square$

Corollary 5.6.9. *In Satz 3 (Satz von Ostrawski) erhalte sogar Isomorphismus von normierten Körpern. Also $(K, |\cdot|)$ vollständiger Körper mit archimedischer Norm, dann:*

$$(K, |\cdot|) \cong (\mathbb{R}, |\cdot|_\infty) \ oder \ (\mathbb{C}, |\cdot|_\infty)$$

Proof. Sei $(K, |\cdot|)$ ein solcher Körper. Im Beweis von Satz 3: $\mathbb{R} \hookrightarrow K$ mit Einbettung erhält die Norm. $K/\mathbb{R}$ ist $\leq$ Grad 2 Erweiterung.
Prop 6.8+ Prop 1.7 $\Rightarrow$ Behauptung. $\square$

Lemma 5.6.10. *Sei K ein Körper und $h : K \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ Abbildung mit*

$$h(\alpha) = 0 \iff \alpha = 0 \ und \ \forall \ \alpha, \beta : h(\alpha \beta) = h(\alpha) h(\beta)$$

Dann sind äquivalent:

- *h erfüllt die verschärfte Dreiecksungleichung $\forall \ \alpha, \beta : h(\alpha + \beta) \leq \max\{h(\alpha), h(\beta)\}$*

- *Es gilt: $\forall \alpha \in K : h(\alpha) \leq 1 \Rightarrow h(\alpha + 1) \leq 1$*

Proof. „$\Rightarrow$": mit $\beta = 1$.
„$\Leftarrow$": $\alpha = \beta = 0$: $\checkmark$
$h(\alpha) \leq h(\beta)$ und $\beta \neq 0 \Rightarrow h(\frac{\alpha}{\beta}) = \frac{h(\alpha)}{h(\beta)} \leq 1 \Rightarrow h(\alpha + \beta) = h(\beta) h(\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + 1) \overset{Vor.}{\leq} h(\beta) \cdot$
$1) \max\{h(\alpha), h(\beta)\}$. $\square$

Beweis von Satz 5.   (A) Falls $||\cdot||$ archimedisch, dann folgt Beh. aus:

- $\mathbb{C}$ ist algebraischer Abschluss von $\mathbb{R}$
- Kor. 6.9
- $|z|_\infty = \sqrt{z \bar{z}} = \sqrt[2]{|\mathcal{N}_{\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}}(z)|}$ für $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

(B) Sei nun $||\cdot||$ nicht-archimedisch und L/K endlich. Zeige, dass $\alpha \mapsto \sqrt[n]{||\mathcal{N}_{L/K}(\alpha)||} =: h(\alpha)$ Norm ist.

    (1) $h(\alpha) = 0 = \mathcal{N}_{L/K}(\alpha) = 0 \iff \alpha = 0$

    (2) $h(\alpha \beta) = h(\alpha) h(\beta)$

    (3) Seien $\mathcal{O} = \{\alpha \in K \mid ||\alpha|| \leq 1\}$ der BWR zu $||\cdot||$, und $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ der ganze Abschluss von $\mathcal{O}$ in L.
       Lemma 6.6. $\Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}} = \{\alpha \in L \mid \mathcal{N}_{L/K}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{O}\} = \{\alpha \in L \mid h(\alpha) \leq 1\}$.
       Lemma 6.10. $\Rightarrow$ die verschärfte Dreiecksungleichung gilt.
       Prop. 6.8. $\Rightarrow$ Jede Fortsetzung der Norm auf K nach L ist äquivalent zu $h \Rightarrow$ Eindeutigkeit + Vollständigkeit.

(C) Sei nun $|| \cdot ||$ nicht-archimedisch und L/K algebraisch. Für $\alpha \in L$ wähle endlichen Zwischenkörper E von L/K. Definiere $|\alpha| := \sqrt[n]{||\mathcal{N}_{E/K}(\alpha)||}$, wobei $n := [E : K]$. Dies ist wohldefiniert, da für $\alpha \in F = E_1 \cap E_2$ mit $n_i := [E_i : F], d := [F : K]$ gilt:

$$\sqrt[n_1 \cdot d]{||\mathcal{N}_{E_1/K}(\alpha)||} = \sqrt[n_1 \cdot d]{||\mathcal{N}_{F/K} \underbrace{(\mathcal{N}_{E_1/F}(\alpha))}_{=\alpha^{n_1}} ||} = \sqrt[d]{||\mathcal{N}_{F/K}(\alpha)||} = \sqrt[n_2 \cdot d]{||\mathcal{N}_{E_2/K}||}$$

Außerdem ist das eine Norm, da die Bedingungen auf allen endlichen Zwischenkörpern erfüllt ist.

$\square$

Corollary 5.6.11. *In der Situation von Satz 5 gilt für nicht-archimedische Körper K und endliche KE L/K:*

(i) Die Bewertung auf K ist diskret $\iff$ die Bewertung auf L ist diskret.

(ii) $\hat{\mathcal{O}} :=$ der ganze Abschluss von $\mathcal{O}$ in L
       $= \{x \in L \mid \mathcal{N}_{L/K}(x) \in \mathcal{O}\}$
       $= \{x \in L \mid ||x|| \leq 1\} = \{x \in L \mid \hat{\nu}(x) \geq 0\}$

$$
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^e & \subset & \hat{\mathcal{O}} & \subset & L \\
& & \uparrow \scriptstyle{} & & \uparrow \scriptstyle{endlich} \\
\scriptstyle{ganzer\ Abschluss} & & & & \\
\mathfrak{p} & \subset & \mathcal{O} & \subset & K
\end{array}
$$

Wir sind also im Setting von Algebraischer Zahlentheorie I:
$\mathfrak{p}$ ist eindeutiges Primideal $\neq 0$ in $\mathcal{O}$. Dieses hat ein „Urbild" $\hat{\mathfrak{p}}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ und es gilt also $\mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \hat{\mathfrak{p}}^e$.
$\mathfrak{p}$ ist also voll-verzweigt und der Trägheitsgrad bzw. lokale Grad ist $[\hat{\kappa} : \kappa]$ mit $\hat{\kappa} := \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathfrak{p}}, \kappa := \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$.

Remark 5.6.12. Seien L/K Körpererweiterung von normierten Körpern mit nicht-archimedischer Norm.
Notation: $\hat{v}, \hat{\mathcal{O}}, \hat{\mathfrak{p}}, \hat{\kappa}$ zu L wie immer, $v, \mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{p}, \kappa$ zu K wie immer.
L/K endlich $\Rightarrow [\hat{\kappa} : \kappa]$ endlich.

Proof. Seien $\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_n \in \hat{\kappa} = \hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ linear unabhängig über κ. Wähle Urbilder $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \hat{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq L$ und zeige: diese sind linear unabhängig über K.
Seien $c_1, \ldots, c_n \in K$ mit $c_1 x_1 + \cdots + c_n x_n = 0$ nicht alle 0.
Durchmultiplizieren mit geeignetem $c \in K \Rightarrow c_1, \ldots, c_n \in \mathcal{O}$ und ein $c_i \notin \mathfrak{p}$
$\Rightarrow \bar{c}_1 \bar{x}_1 + \cdots + \bar{c}_n \bar{x}_n = 0$ mit $\bar{c}_i \neq 0$ in $\hat{\kappa}$. $\square$

5.7. Lokale Körper

Definition 5.7.1.   i) Ein Körper K heißt **globaler Körper** $: \iff$
       K ist Zahlkörper, d.h. endliche Erweterung von $\mathbb{Q}$, oder

K ist endliche Erweterung von $\mathbb{F}_q(T) = \mathrm{Quot}(F_q[T])$ mit $F_q =$ Körper mit q Elementen.

ii) Ein Körper K heißt **lokaler Körper** $:\Longleftrightarrow$
K ist bezüglich der Norm von einer nicht-archimedischen Bewertung v vollständig, v ist diskret und der Restklassenkörper κ ist endlich.

<u>Notation:</u> Für K, Bwertung v, $\mathcal{O}$, $|\cdot| = r^{-v(\cdot)}$ mit $r > 1$, $\mathfrak{p}$, $\kappa = \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$

Proposition 5.7.2. *Sei K lokaler Körper. Betrachte die von $|\cdot|$ induzierte Topologie auf K. Dann ist $\mathcal{O}$ kompakt und K lokal kompakt.*

Errinnerung 5.7.3. Sei (X, T) ein topologischer Raum der hausdorffsch ist. Dann ist (X, T) lokal-komtakt $\Longleftrightarrow$
$\forall\, x \in X \exists$ Umgebung C von x, die kompakt ist, d.h.
$\forall\, x \in X \exists\, \mathcal{U} \in T, C$ kompakt mit $x \in U \subseteq C$.
⚠ Für nicht hausdorffsche Räume gibt es unterschiedliche Definitionen.

Proof. Erinnerung: Für die Kette $\mathcal{O} \supset \mathfrak{p} \supset \mathfrak{p}^2 \supset \mathfrak{p}^3 \supset \ldots$ gilt:
$\mathfrak{p}^k/\mathfrak{p}^{k+1} \cong \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p} = \kappa$ endlich.
Aus $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ endlich folgt, dass $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$ endlich für alle $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
$\Rightarrow \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{O}/p^n$ ist kompakt (Satz von Tychonoff).
$\mathcal{O} \cong \varprojlim_n \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}$ ist abgeschlossen in $\prod_n \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{p}^n$ und damit ebenfalls kompakt.
Außerdem: $\mathcal{O}$ ist offen in K, denn:
$x \in \mathcal{O} \iff |x| \leq 1 \iff v(x) \geq 0 \overset{v(K)=\mathbb{Z}\cup\{\infty\}}{\iff} v(X) > -1 \iff |x| < r^{-1} \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ ist offene Kreisscheibe um 0.
$\Rightarrow a \in K$ ist also $a + \mathcal{O}$ eine offene und kompakte Umgebung und somit K lokal kompakt. $\square$

Remark 5.7.4. Sei L ein lokaler Körper mit Restklassenkörper κ mit q Elementen. Dann enthält L alle $(q-1)$-ten Einheitswurzeln, d.h. $X^{q-1} - 1$ zerfällt über L in Linearfaktoren.

Proof. Mit Hensels Lemma genau wie in Bsp. 6.4. $\square$

Theorem 6 (BESTIMMUNG ALLER LOKALEN KÖRPER). *L ist lokaler Körper $\Longleftrightarrow$ L ist endliche Erweiterung von $\mathbb{Q}_p$ oder $\mathbb{F}_p((T))$.*

Lemma 5.7.5. *Sei K vollständig nicht-archimedisch. Sei L/K Körpererweiterug normierter Körper mit diskreter Bewertung $\hat{v}$. Insbesondere $\hat{v}|_K = v$ soll nicht trivial sein. Falls $[\hat{\kappa} : \kappa]$ endlich ist, dann ist $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ ein endlich erzeugter $\mathcal{O}$-Modul und damit $[L : K]$ endlich.*

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
(\hat{\Pi}) = \hat{\mathcal{P}} & & \hat{\kappa} \longleftarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}} & \overset{\subset}{} & L & & \hat{v} \to \mathbb{Z} \\
& & \uparrow \quad\; | & & | & & \\
(\Pi) = \mathfrak{p} & & \kappa \longleftarrow \mathcal{O} & \overset{\subset}{} & K & & v \to e\mathbb{Z}
\end{array}
$$

Proof. <u>Vorüberlegung:</u> Normiere $\hat{v}$ so, dass $\hat{v}(L^\times) = \mathbb{Z}$. Dann ist $v(K^\times)$ eine Untergruppe $e\mathbb{Z}$ von $\mathbb{Z}$. $\Rightarrow v(\hat{\Pi})1$ und $v(\Pi) = e$ und damit $\Pi = \varepsilon\hat{\Pi}$ mit $\varepsilon \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}^\times \Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{P}} = \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

Seien $\bar{w}_1, \ldots, \bar{w}_f$ eine Basis von $\hat{\kappa}$ über κ und $w_1, \ldots, w_f$ Urbilder in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.
.

<u>Ansatz:</u> $M := \mathcal{O}w_1 + \mathcal{O}w_2 + \cdots + \mathcal{O}w_f + \mathcal{O}w_1\hat{\Pi} + \cdots + \mathcal{O}w_f\hat{\Pi} + \cdots + \mathcal{O}w_1\hat{\Pi}^2 + \cdots + \mathcal{O}w_1\hat{\Pi}^{e-1} + \cdots + \mathcal{O}w_f\hat{\Pi}^{e-1}$.

Zeige: $M = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

<u>Schritt 1:</u> Zeige: $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = M + \mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}$

Sei $N := \mathcal{O}w_1 + \mathcal{O}w_2 + \cdots + \mathcal{O}w_f$ und somit $M = N + N\hat{\Pi} + \cdots + N\hat{\Pi}^{e-1}$.

Verwende: $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = N + \hat{\mathcal{O}}\hat{\Pi}$ wegen $\bar{w}_1, \ldots, \bar{w}_f$ ist Basis von $\hat{\kappa}/\kappa$

$\Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}} = N + \hat{\mathcal{O}}\hat{\Pi} = N + (N + \hat{\mathcal{O}})\hat{\Pi} = N + N\hat{\Pi} + \hat{\mathcal{O}}\hat{\Pi} = \cdots = N + N\hat{\Pi} + \cdots + N\hat{\Pi}^{e-1} + \hat{\mathcal{O}}\hat{P}i^e = M + \hat{\mathcal{O}}\mathfrak{p}$.

<u>Schritt 2:</u> Zeige $\hat{\mathcal{O}} = M$

Verwende: $\mathfrak{p}^k \cdot M \subseteq M$ für $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, da $\mathfrak{p}^k \subseteq \mathcal{O}$.

$\hat{\mathcal{O}} = M + \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}} = M + \mathfrak{p}(M + \mathfrak{p}\hat{\mathcal{O}}) = M + \mathfrak{p}^2\hat{\mathcal{O}} = \cdots = M + \mathfrak{p}^k\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ für alle $k \geq 1$

$\Rightarrow M$ liegt dicht in $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccl}
& & & L & & & \\
& & & \uparrow & & & \\
\mathcal{O}^n & \stackrel{\cong}{} & M & \subset & M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} K & =: & V \quad V := M \otimes_{\mathcal{O}} K \text{ (endlich dimensionaler } K\text{-Vektorraum)} \\
& & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
& & \mathcal{O} & \subset & K & &
\end{array}
$$

und Prop. 6.8. $\Rightarrow V$ ist homöomorph zu K^d für ein d.

$\Rightarrow M \cong \mathcal{O}^n$ und ist damit abgeschlossen in $\hat{\mathcal{O}} \Rightarrow M = \hat{\mathcal{O}}$.

<u>Schritt 3:</u> $[L : K]$ ist endlich: Übungsaufgabe. $\square$

Beweis von Satz 6. „$\Leftarrow$" : Sei $K := \mathbb{Q}_p$ oder $K = \mathbb{F}_p((T))$ und L/K endliche Körpererweiterung.

Def. 3.12+Aufgabe 2 (Blatt 3) $\Rightarrow K$ ist vollständig $\stackrel{\text{Satz 5}}{\Longrightarrow} L$ ist vollständig.

Kor. 6.11 $\Rightarrow$ Norm auf L gehört zu diskreter Bewertung. Bem. 6.12 $\Rightarrow [\hat{\kappa} : \kappa]$ ist endlich $\stackrel{\kappa \text{ endlich}}{\Longrightarrow} \hat{\kappa}$ endlich $\Rightarrow L$ ist lokaler Körper.

„$\Rightarrow$" : Sei L lokaler Körper mit diskreter Bewertung $\hat{v}, \hat{\mathcal{O}}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}, \hat{\kappa}$ wie immer.

<u>Fall 1:</u> $\text{char}(L) = 0 \Rightarrow$ Habe Einbettung $\mathbb{Q} \hookrightarrow L$.

Zeige: $\hat{v}|_{\mathbb{Q}}$ ist nicht trivial:

Sei $p := \text{char}(\hat{\kappa}) \Rightarrow \hat{\mathcal{O}} \ni \underbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}_{p-\text{mal}} \in \hat{\mathcal{P}} \Rightarrow v(p) > 0$. Es folgt: $v|_{\mathbb{Q}} = v_p$.

$\Rightarrow$ Erhalte Einettung $\mathbb{Q}_p \hookrightarrow L$, da L vollständig.

Lemma 7.5 $\Rightarrow L/\mathbb{Q}_p$ ist endlich.

<u>Fall 2:</u> $\text{char}(L) \neq 0 \Rightarrow \text{char}() = \text{char}(\hat{\kappa}) =: p$.

(1) <u>Zeige:</u> $\kappa \hookrightarrow L$

     $\kappa = \mathbb{F}_p(\alpha)$ mit α hat separables Minimalpolynom $f_\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p[X]$.

Hensels Lemma $\Rightarrow f_\alpha$ hat Nullstelle x_0 in L.
$\Rightarrow \alpha \mapsto x_0$ induziert eine Einbettung $\iota : \hat{\kappa} = \mathbb{F}_P(\alpha) \hookrightarrow L$.

(2) Zeige: $L \cong \kappa((T))$.
Prop. 5.8 $\Rightarrow$ Ist $R \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{O}}$ ein Repräsentantensystem von $\hat{\mathcal{O}}/\hat{\mathcal{P}} = \hat{\kappa}$, dann lässt sich jedes Element aus L auf eindeutige Weise als Laurent-Reihe $\sum_{k=m}^{\infty} a_m \hat{\Pi}^m$ mit $a_m \in R$ beschreiben. Wähle $R := \text{Bild}(\iota) \Rightarrow$ Erhalte Isomorphismus $L \cong \hat{\kappa}((T))$.

(3) $\hat{\kappa}((T))$ ist endliche Körpererweiterung von $\mathbb{F}_p((T)) \to$ siehe Blatt 3. Aufgabe 2.

$\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$

ZIEL: Beschreibe $K^\times$ für lokalen Körper K.
Sei ab jetzt stets K lokaler Körper.

Remark 5.7.6. Sei κ der Restklassenkörper von K mit $q = p^a$ Elementen.

(1) $\mu_{q-1} = $ Gruppe der $(q-1)$-ten Einheitswurzeln $\cong \mathbb{F}_q^\times \cong \mathbb{Z}/(q-1)\mathbb{Z}$.

(2) $U^{(1)} = 1 + p$ und

(3) $(\Pi) = \{\Pi^k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\} \cong \mathbb{Z}$ (Π ist Erzeuger von maximalen Ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ in $\mathcal{O}$)

sind Untegruppen von $K^\times$.

Proposition 5.7.7. $K^\times \cong (\Pi) \times \mu_{q-1} \times U^{(1)}$

Proof.   (1) $x \in K^\times \Rightarrow x = \varepsilon \Pi^k$ mit $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}^\times$ und $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ auf eindeutige Weise $\Rightarrow$ Erhalte Isomorphismus $(\Pi) \times \mathcal{O}^\times \to K^\times$, $(\Pi^k, \varepsilon) \mapsto \varepsilon \Pi^k$.

(2) Sei $\varphi : \mathcal{O}^\times \to \kappa^\times$, $x \mapsto x \mod \mathfrak{p}$.
Es ist $\text{Kern}(\varphi) = U^{(1)}$. Außerdem: $\alpha := \phi|_{\mu_{q-1}} : \mu_{q-1} \to \kappa^\times$ ist Isomorphismus $\Rightarrow$ Erhalte Isomorphismus $\mu_{q-1} \times U^{(1)} \to \mathcal{O}^\times$, $(\omega, \alpha) \mapsto \omega\alpha$.

$\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\square$