

Prop |  $I \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$   $\xrightarrow{\quad} I(V)$   
 for  $V = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n)\} \subseteq k^n$   
 $I = (x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n)$   
 is a maximal ideal.

Proof: Suppose  $J \not\subseteq I \Rightarrow \exists f \in J$  s.t.  $f \notin I$   
 by div. alg.  
 $f = A_1(x_1 - a_1) + \dots + A_n(x_n - a_n) + b$   
 $f \notin I$   $\uparrow$   
 $\therefore b \neq 0$   $f \in J$   $b \in k$   
 $\therefore b \in J$   
 $\Rightarrow 1 \in J \Rightarrow J = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$   
 $I$  is maximal  $\square$

$$V(x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}$$

$\therefore$  Every point in  $k^n$  gives a maximal ideal

converse false over  $k$ -not alg. closed

Thm | If  $k$  alg. closed then every maximal ideal of  $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  has the form  $(x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n)$   $a_i \in k$ .

Proof:  $I \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  maximal.  $I \neq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$

$\therefore V(I) \neq \emptyset$  by weak Nullstellensatz

$\therefore (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in V(I)$  for some  $a_i \in K$

$$f \in I \Rightarrow f \in I(\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}) \\ \parallel \\ (x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n)$$

$$\therefore I \subseteq (x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n) \notin K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

$$\Rightarrow I = (x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n) \quad \text{(Since maximal)} \quad \blacksquare$$

Cor.  $K$  alg. closed. There is a 1-1 correspondence between points of  $K^n$  and maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .

Prop)  $V$  is irreducible iff for every  $W \not\subseteq V$   $V \setminus W$  is Zariski dense in  $V$ , i.e.  $\overline{V \setminus W} = V$ .

Proof: Take  $V$  irr.  $W \not\subseteq V$   
 $\uparrow$  a variety

$$V = W \cup \overline{V \setminus W}$$

$V$  is irr. and  $V \neq W$  by def of irreducible

$$V = \overline{V \setminus W}$$

Now take  $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ . If  $V_1 \not\subseteq V$   $\overline{V \setminus V_1} = V$  ← by assumption

$$\text{But } V \setminus V_1 \subseteq V_2 \Rightarrow \overline{V \setminus V_1} \subseteq V_2 \Rightarrow V \subseteq V_2$$

$\Rightarrow V = V_2 \therefore V$  is irreducible  $\blacksquare$

$$S \subseteq V$$

Zariski dense if  $\bar{S} = V$

$$S = W \not\subseteq V$$

Decompositions into irr.

Prop 1 (DCC Descending chain con.).

Any descending chain of varieties

$$V_1 \supseteq V_2 \supseteq \dots \text{ in } k^n$$

must stabilize, i.e.  $\exists N > 0$  s.t.  $V_N = V_{N+1} = \dots$

Proof ACC

$$I(V_1) \subseteq I(V_2) \subseteq \dots$$

Thm Let  $V \subseteq k^n$  be a variety. we can write

$$V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$$

where each  $V_i$  is an irreducible variety.

Proof:

Assume  $V$  can't be written as a finite union of irreducible

$\Rightarrow V$  is not irreducible

$$\Rightarrow V = V_1 \cup \tilde{V}_1 \quad V \neq V_1 \text{ and } V \neq \tilde{V}_1$$

$$\Rightarrow V_1 = V_2 \cup \tilde{V}_2 \quad V_1 \neq V_2, V_1 \neq \tilde{V}_2$$

$V_2$  not a finite union of irr...

$\Rightarrow$  we have

$$V \supseteq V_1 \supseteq V_2 \supseteq \dots$$

$V \neq V_1 \neq V_2 \neq \dots$  This contradicts the D.C.C.

$\therefore$

$$V(x^2, y^2) = V(x, y) \cup V(z)$$



is this unique

Def) Let  $V \subseteq k^n$  a variety. A decomp.

$$V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$$

is a minimal decomp. if  $V_i \not\subseteq V_j$  for  $i \neq j$

call  $V_i$  the irreducible components of  $V$ .

Thm] A variety  $V \subseteq k^n$  has a minimal decomp.

$$V = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_m$$

and this decomp is unique

Proof : we know  $V = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_m$  exists  
 for  $U_i$  irreducible. If  $U_i \subseteq U_j$   $i \neq j$  remove  
 $U_i$  until no such inclusion exists  
 This gives a minimal decomp.

$$V = U_1 \cup \dots \cup U_m$$

Uniqueness :

Suppose  $V = \tilde{U}_1 \cup \dots \cup \tilde{U}_k$  is also a minimal  
 decomp

$$\begin{aligned} U_i &= U_i \cap V = U_i \cap (\tilde{U}_1 \cup \dots \cup \tilde{U}_k) \\ &= (U_i \cap \tilde{U}_1) \cup \dots \cup (U_i \cap \tilde{U}_k) \end{aligned}$$

$U_i$  is irreducible  $\therefore U_i = U_i \cap \tilde{U}_j$  for some  $j$

$$U_i \subseteq \tilde{U}_j$$

same procedure gives  $\tilde{U}_j \subseteq U_k$

$\therefore U_i \subseteq \tilde{U}_j \subseteq U_k \therefore U_i = \tilde{U}_j = U_k$   
 by minimality.