

Algebra II
Professor – Amritanshu Prasad
The Institute of Mathematical Sciences
Uniqueness of Algebraic Closure

(Refer Slide Time: 00:18)


Uniqueness of Algebraic Closure

Thm: If $\begin{matrix} K_1 \\ | \\ F \end{matrix}$ and $\begin{matrix} K_2 \\ | \\ F \end{matrix}$ are algebraic closures, then \exists ring homom. $\varphi: K_1 \rightarrow K_2$

Such that $\varphi|_F = \text{id}_F$.

Note: φ has to be surjective because $\varphi(K_1) \subset K_2$, $\begin{matrix} \varphi(K_1) \\ | \\ F \end{matrix}$ is an algebraic closure. So $\varphi(K_1) = K_2$.

Lemma: Suppose $\begin{matrix} K \\ | \\ F \end{matrix}$ and $\begin{matrix} E \\ | \\ F \end{matrix}$ any algebraic extn. Then \exists ring homom. $\varphi: E \rightarrow K$ such that $\varphi|_F = \text{id}_F$.



We are now ready to prove the Uniqueness of Algebraic Closure. The statement has to be made somewhat carefully. It says that if K_1 over F and K_2 over F are two algebraic closures of F , then they are isomorphic over F , which means that there exists a ring homomorphism φ from K_1 to K_2 , such that φ restricted to F is the identity function on F .

Note that the existence of a ring homomorphism will automatically mean with, with satisfying this condition will automatically mean that this ring homomorphism φ is an isomorphism. Firstly, such φ is going to be injective because its kernel is going to be an ideal of K_1 . And it is going to be a proper ideal of K_1 , because φ is not identically 0.

But the only proper ideal of K_1 is singleton 0, and so φ has to be injective. And φ has to be surjective, that is a little more subtle, φ has to be surjective, just because if you look at φ of K_1 , this is a subfield of K_2 and φ of K_1 being an isomorphic image of K_1 is an algebraically closed field. So, φ of K_1 inside over F is an algebraic closure.

So, if you take any element of K_2 it must lie inside φ of K_1 because it is the root of a polynomial in F . So, we must have φ of K_1 is equal to K_2 . So, all we need to do is show that we can construct such a ring homomorphism. Now what we will do is, we will prove a slightly more general lemma which is useful in its own right.

So, this lemma says that suppose we have an algebraic closure K over F and we have E over F any algebraic extension, not necessarily an algebraic closure, then there exists a ring homomorphism ϕ from E to K such that ϕ restricted to F is the identity function on F . So, this is a special, the theorem is a special case of this lemma where we take E to be K_1 and K to be K_2 . The proof of this lemma proceeds by using Zorn's lemma.

(Refer Slide Time: 03:33)

Proof: $P = \left\{ (L, \phi) \mid \begin{array}{l} E \\ L \\ F \end{array} \text{ and } \phi: L \rightarrow K, \phi|_F = \text{id}_F \right\}$

$(L_1, \phi_1) \leq (L_2, \phi_2)$ if $L_1 \subset L_2$ and $\phi_2|_{L_1} = \phi_1$.

Every chain in P has an upper bound.

$\{(L_i, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ chain,

$L = \bigcup L_i$

$\phi(x) = \phi_i(x)$ if $x \in L_i$

So, we must construct a partially ordered set to which we will apply Zorn's Lemma. I defined the partially ordered set to consist of all pairs L comma ϕ , where L is a field that lies between L and F and ϕ is a ring homomorphism from L to the algebraic closure, $K_2 \supset L_2 \supset K$ such that ϕ restricted to F is equal to the identity element of F .

So, we look at this collection and we define a partial order say that L_1 ϕ_1 is less than or equal to L_2 ϕ_2 , if L_1 is a subset of L_2 , and if we take ϕ_2 and restrict it to L_1 then we get ϕ_1 . So, that is your definition of P . And it is easy to see that every chain in P has an upper bound. You just take if you have a chain L_i ϕ_i , just define L to be union L_i and define ϕ of x to be ϕ_i of x , if x belongs to L_i .

And this ϕ is going to be well defined, it will not depend on which i I choose such that x belongs to L_i . Because of this condition here that if I take two different such extensions, they are going to be comparable and the restriction of ϕ from the larger one to the smaller one is going to be the ϕ corresponding to the smaller one.

(Refer Slide Time: 05:38)

Proof: $P = \left\{ (L, \varphi) \mid \begin{array}{l} E \\ L \\ F \end{array} \text{ and } \varphi: L \rightarrow K, \varphi|_F = \text{id}_F \right\}$

$(L_1, \varphi_1) \leq (L_2, \varphi_2)$ if $L_1 \subset L_2$ and $\varphi_2|_{L_1} = \varphi_1$.

Every chain in P has an upper bound.

$\{(L_i, \varphi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ chain,

$L = \bigcup_i L_i$

$\varphi(x) = \varphi_i(x)$ if $x \in L_i$

(L, φ) is an upper.



So, then L, φ is an upper bound.

(Refer Slide Time: 05:47)

$\therefore P$ has a maximal element - (L_0, φ_0) .

Claim: $L_0 = E$

Pf: If not, pick $\alpha \in E - L_0$.

Let $p(t)$ be the irr. poly of α over L_0 .

If $p(t) = a_0 + a_1 t + \dots + a_n t^n$, define

$\varphi_0(p)(t) = \varphi_0(a_0) + \varphi_0(a_1)t + \dots + \varphi_0(a_n)t^n$

$\in K[t]$

Let $\alpha' \in K$ be a root of $\varphi_0(p)$.




Uniqueness of Algebraic Closure

Thm: If $\frac{K_1}{F}$ and $\frac{K_2}{F}$ are algebraic closures, then \exists ring homom. $\varphi: K_1 \rightarrow K_2$
 such that $\varphi|_F = \text{id}_F$.

Note: φ has to be surjective because $\varphi(K_1) \subset K_2$, $\frac{\varphi(K_1)}{F}$ is
 an algebraic closure. So $\varphi(K_1) = K_2$.

Lemma: Suppose $\frac{K}{F}$ and $\frac{E}{F}$ any algebraic ext. Then \exists ring
 homom. $\varphi: E \rightarrow K$ such that $\varphi|_F = \text{id}_F$.



It follows by Zorn's lemma that P has a maximal element. Let us call it L_0 comma φ_0 . I claim that L_0 has to be equal to E . If not just pick any α which is in E , but not in L_0 . Now α is in E and E is algebraic over F . Therefore, α is algebraic over F , which means that α is also algebraic over L_0 . So, let P_t be the irreducible polynomial of α over L_0 . And now, I will define a map.

So, let us so we have now this φ_0 from L_0 into the algebraically closed field K . So, let it φ_0 if P_t is the polynomial $a_0 + a_1 t + \dots + a_n t^n$ define $\varphi_0(P_t)$ to be the polynomial $\varphi_0(a_0) + \varphi_0(a_1)t + \dots + \varphi_0(a_n)t^n$. Now, this is a polynomial in $K[t]$ in an algebraically closed field, and therefore it has a root in K . So, let α' be a root, no, let us call it let α' in K be root of $\varphi_0(P_t)$.

(Refer Slide Time: 07:58)

Define $L_0[t] \xrightarrow{\psi} K$
 $t \mapsto \alpha'$
 $p(t) \in \ker \psi$
Since $\phi_0(p)(\alpha') = 0$
So we get a ring homom.
 $L_0[x] \cong L_0[t] \xrightarrow{\bar{\psi}} K$
 \swarrow
 F

So now what I will do is define a map. I am going to extend; I am going to define a map from $L_0[x]$ into K . So firstly, what I will do is I will take $L_0[t]$ to K by taking t to α' . Now it follows that $p(t)$ belongs to kernel of ψ , because ψ of $p(t)$ will take the coefficients of the polynomial to the corresponding, the image under ϕ_0 in K and α' has been chosen.

So, it is going to be ϕ_0 , sorry, I do not mean $\phi_0(t)$. I mean $p(t)$ is in the kernel of ψ . Since $\phi_0(p)$ of α' is equal to 0. We have chosen α' to be the root, a root of $p(x)$. And so, the ψ gives rise to a ring homomorphism $\bar{\psi}: L_0[t] \rightarrow K$. And this extends ϕ_0 but ϕ_0 restricted to F is the identity of F . So, this map $\bar{\psi}$ restricted to F is also the identity of F .

(Refer Slide Time: 10:10)

Define $L_0[t] \xrightarrow{\psi} K$
 $t \mapsto \alpha'$
 $p(t) \in \ker \psi$
 Since $\phi_0(p)(\alpha') = 0$
 So we get a ring homom.
 $L_0(\alpha) \cong L_0[t]/(p(t)) \xrightarrow{\bar{\psi}} K$

F

Contradicting the maximality of (L_0, ϕ_0) .



On the other hand, what we have is $L_0[t]$ is isomorphic to $L_0(\alpha)$, as is always the case because α is a root of p in $L_0[t]$, this is $L_0[t] \text{ mod } p(t)$. $L_0[t] \text{ mod } p(t)$ is isomorphic to $L_0(\alpha)$. And so, what we get is a ring homomorphism from $L_0(\alpha)$ to K and this of course is you know reserves is is when restricted to L_0 , it is the identity of L_0 . So, certainly when restricted to F it is still the identity of F .

And so, we get a ring homomorphism by composing this isomorphism with $\bar{\psi}$, we get a ring homomorphism from $L_0(\alpha)$ to K over F . And this is exactly; this contradicts the maximality of (L_0, ϕ_0) , because we have extended it to a larger field $L_0(\alpha)$ properly containing L_0 . And so, that concludes the proof of the lemma and as explained also the proof of the uniqueness of an algebraic closure.