

0. This is a continuation of the Handout *Integers modulo n*.

We assume $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ throughout this Handout.

R_n is the equivalence relation in \mathbb{Z} with graph $E_n = \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } x \equiv y \pmod{n}\}$.

We call R_n the **congruence modulo n relation on \mathbb{Z}** .

Recall Lemma (1), Theorem (3) and terminologies associated to Theorem (3).

Lemma (1).

Let $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. The following statements are equivalent:

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| (a) $x - y = qn$ for some $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. | (d) $y \in [x]$. |
| (b) $x \equiv y \pmod{n}$. | (e) $x \in [y]$. |
| (c) $(x, y) \in E_n$. | (f) $[x] = [y]$. |

Theorem (3).

The following statements hold:

- (0) $\mathbb{Z}_n = \{[0], [1], \dots, [n-2], [n-1]\}$.
- (1) For any $u \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $u \neq \emptyset$.
- (2) $\{x \in \mathbb{Z} : x \in u \text{ for some } u \in \mathbb{Z}_n\} = \mathbb{Z}$.
- (3) For any $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, exactly one of the following statements hold:
 - (3a) $u = v$.
 - (3b) $u \cap v = \emptyset$.

Remark on terminologies.

(a) \mathbb{Z} is **partitioned** into the n pairwise disjoint non-empty sets

$$[0], [1], \dots, [n - 2], [n - 1].$$

We may simply refer to the set (of sets) \mathbb{Z}_n as a **partition of \mathbb{Z}** .

(b) Because such a partition of \mathbb{Z} arises ultimately from the equivalence relation R_n , we refer to \mathbb{Z}_n as the **quotient of \mathbb{Z} by the equivalence relation R_n** .

We are going to introduce two functions, called ‘addition in \mathbb{Z}_n ’ and ‘multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_n ’ respectively.

These two functions possess properties which are analogous to usual addition and usual multiplication for integers respectively.

‘Addition in \mathbb{Z}_n ’ makes \mathbb{Z}_n an abelian group.

‘Addition in \mathbb{Z}_n ’ and ‘multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_n ’ together make \mathbb{Z}_n a commutative ring with unity. For certain values of n , they in fact make \mathbb{Z}_n a field.

1. Theorem (4).

Define

$$G_\alpha = \left\{ ((u, v), w) \mid \begin{array}{l} u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ and} \\ \text{there exist } k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } u = [k], v = [\ell] \text{ and } w = [k + \ell] \end{array} \right\}.$$

Define $\alpha = (\mathbb{Z}_n^2, \mathbb{Z}_n, G_\alpha)$.

Then α is a function from \mathbb{Z}_n^2 to \mathbb{Z}_n .

Proof.

Note that $G_\alpha \subset (\mathbb{Z}_n^2) \times \mathbb{Z}_n$. Hence α is a relation from \mathbb{Z}_n^2 to \mathbb{Z}_n .

(E) [Is each 'input pair' 'assigned' to at least one 'output' by α ?]

[Check: For any $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, there exists some $w \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $((u, v), w) \in G_\alpha$.]

Pick any $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.

There exist some $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u = [k]$ and $v = [\ell]$.

For these $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $k + \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define $w = [k + \ell]$. We have $w \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.

By definition of G_α , we have $((u, v), w) \in G_\alpha$. \square

(U) [Is each 'input pair' 'assigned' to at most one 'output' by α ?]

We want to define the function $\alpha: \mathbb{Z}_n^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ through this declaration:
'Define $\alpha: \mathbb{Z}_n^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ by $\alpha([k], [\ell]) = [k + \ell]$ whenever $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$.'
But is this α well-defined as a function?

Theorem (4).

Define

$$G_\alpha = \left\{ ((u, v), w) \mid \begin{array}{l} u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ and} \\ \text{there exist } k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } u = [k], v = [\ell] \text{ and } w = [k + \ell] \end{array} \right\}.$$

Define $\alpha = (\mathbb{Z}_n^2, \mathbb{Z}_n, G_\alpha)$.

Then α is a function from \mathbb{Z}_n^2 to \mathbb{Z}_n .

Proof.

Note that $G_\alpha \subset (\mathbb{Z}_n^2) \times \mathbb{Z}_n$. Hence α is a relation from \mathbb{Z}_n^2 to \mathbb{Z}_n .

(E) [Is each 'input pair' 'assigned' to at least one 'output' by α ? Yes.]

(U) [Is each 'input pair' 'assigned' to at most one 'output' by α ?]

[Check: For any $u, v, w, w' \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, if $((u, v), w) \in G_\alpha$ and $((u, v), w') \in G_\alpha$ then $w = w'$.]

Pick any $u, v, w, w' \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Suppose $((u, v), w) \in G_\alpha$ and $((u, v), w') \in G_\alpha$.

Since $((u, v), w) \in G_\alpha$, there exist some $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u = [k]$, $v = [\ell]$ and $w = [k + \ell]$.

Since $((u, v), w') \in G_\alpha$, there exist some $k', \ell' \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $u = [k']$, $v = [\ell']$ and $w' = [k' + \ell']$.

We have $[k] = u = [k']$. Then $k \equiv k' \pmod{n}$ by Lemma (1).

We have $[\ell] = v = [\ell']$. Then $\ell \equiv \ell' \pmod{n}$ by Lemma (1).

$k - k'$, $\ell - \ell'$ are divisible by n . Then $(k + \ell) - (k' + \ell')$ is also divisible by n .

Therefore $k + \ell \equiv k' + \ell' \pmod{n}$. Hence $w = [k + \ell] = [k' + \ell'] = w'$. \square

We want to define the function $\alpha: \mathbb{Z}_n^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ through this declaration:
'Define $\alpha: \mathbb{Z}_n^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$ by $\alpha([k], [\ell]) = [k + \ell]$ whenever $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$.'
But is this α well-defined as a function?

Theorem (4).

Define

$$G_\alpha = \left\{ ((u, v), w) \mid \begin{array}{l} u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ and} \\ \text{there exist } k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } u = [k], v = [\ell] \text{ and } w = [k + \ell] \end{array} \right\}.$$

Define $\alpha = (\mathbb{Z}_n^2, \mathbb{Z}_n, G_\alpha)$.

Then α is a function from \mathbb{Z}_n^2 to \mathbb{Z}_n .

Proof.

Note that $G_\alpha \subset (\mathbb{Z}_n^2) \times \mathbb{Z}_n$. Hence α is a relation from \mathbb{Z}_n^2 to \mathbb{Z}_n .

(E) [Is each 'input pair' 'assigned' to at least one 'output' by α ? Yes.]

(U) [Is each 'input pair' 'assigned' to at most one 'output' by α ? Yes.]

It follows that α is a function from \mathbb{Z}_n^2 to \mathbb{Z}_n .

Remark.

The function α is called **addition in \mathbb{Z}_n** because of its resemblance with the function 'addition' for other more familiar mathematical objects, such as numbers and matrices.

From now on, we write $\alpha(u, v)$ as $u + v$, and call it the sum of u, v .

By the definition of addition in \mathbb{Z}_n ,
whenever $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $[k] + [\ell] = \alpha([k], [\ell]) = [k + \ell]$.
This happens in \mathbb{Z}_n . This happens in \mathbb{Z} .

2. Addition table for 'small' values of n :

$$[k] + [l] = [k + l]$$

↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z}_n .
 ↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z} .

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_2

+	[0]	[1]
[0]	[0]	[1]
[1]	[1]	[0]

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_3

+	[0]	[1]	[2]
[0]	[0]	[1]	[2]
[1]	[1]	[2]	[0]
[2]	[2]	[0]	[1]

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_4

+	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[0]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[1]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[0]
[2]	[2]	[3]	[0]	[1]
[3]	[3]	[0]	[1]	[2]

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_5

+	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
[0]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
[1]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[0]
[2]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[0]	[1]
[3]	[3]	[4]	[0]	[1]	[2]
[4]	[4]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_6

+	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
[0]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
[1]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[0]
[2]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[0]	[1]
[3]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[0]	[1]	[2]
[4]	[4]	[5]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[5]	[5]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_7

+	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
[0]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
[1]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[0]
[2]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[0]	[1]
[3]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[0]	[1]	[2]
[4]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[5]	[5]	[6]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
[6]	[6]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]

Addition table for 'small' values of n :

$$[k] + [l] = [k + l]$$

↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z}_n . ↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z} .

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_8

+	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
[0]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
[1]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[0]
[2]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[0]	[1]
[3]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[0]	[1]	[2]
[4]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[5]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
[6]	[6]	[7]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
[7]	[7]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]

Addition in \mathbb{Z}_9

+	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
[0]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
[1]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[0]
[2]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[0]	[1]
[3]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[0]	[1]	[2]
[4]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[5]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
[6]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
[7]	[7]	[8]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
[8]	[8]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

4. Corollary (6).

For any $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, there exists some unique $w \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $u + w = v$.

Proof.

Let $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.

- [Existence argument.]

By Theorem (5), there exists some $t \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $u+t = 0_n = t+u$.
Define $w = t+v$. By definition, $w \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.
Then $u+w = u+(t+v) \stackrel{[\text{Theorem (5)}]}{=} (u+t)+v \stackrel{[\text{Theorem (5)}]}{=} 0_n+v \stackrel{[\text{Theorem (5)}]}{=} v$. \square

- [Uniqueness argument.]

Let $w, w' \in \mathbb{Z}_n$. Suppose $u+w = v$ and $u+w' = v$.
Then $u+w = v = u+w'$.
By Theorem (5), there exists some $t \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ such that $u+t = 0_n = t+u$.
 $w = 0_n+w \stackrel{[\text{Theorem (5)}]}{=} (t+u)+w = t+(u+w) = t+(u+w') = (t+u)+w' = 0_n+w' = w'$. \square

Remark. Here we 'subtract u from v ': w is the difference of v from u , and we write $w = v - u$. We write $0_n - u$ as $-u$; it is the unique (additive) inverse of u .

6. Multiplication table for 'small' values of n :

$$[k] \times [l] = [k \cdot l]$$

↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z}_n . ↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z} .

Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_2 Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_3 Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_4 Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_5

\times	[0]	[1]
[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]

\times	[0]	[1]	[2]
[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]	[2]
[2]	[0]	[2]	[1]

\times	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]
[2]	[0]	[2]	[0]	[2]
[3]	[0]	[3]	[2]	[1]

\times	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
[2]	[0]	[2]	[4]	[1]	[3]
[3]	[0]	[3]	[1]	[4]	[2]
[4]	[0]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]

Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_6

\times	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]
[2]	[0]	[2]	[4]	[0]	[2]	[4]
[3]	[0]	[3]	[0]	[3]	[0]	[3]
[4]	[0]	[4]	[2]	[0]	[4]	[2]
[5]	[0]	[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]

Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_7

\times	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]
[2]	[0]	[2]	[4]	[6]	[1]	[3]	[5]
[3]	[0]	[3]	[6]	[2]	[5]	[1]	[4]
[4]	[0]	[4]	[1]	[5]	[2]	[6]	[3]
[5]	[0]	[5]	[3]	[1]	[6]	[4]	[2]
[6]	[0]	[6]	[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]

Multiplication table for 'small' values of n :

$$[k] \times [l] = [k \cdot l]$$

↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z}_n .
 ↑ This happens in \mathbb{Z} .

Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_8

\times	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]
[2]	[0]	[2]	[4]	[6]	[0]	[2]	[4]	[6]
[3]	[0]	[3]	[6]	[1]	[4]	[7]	[2]	[5]
[4]	[0]	[4]	[0]	[4]	[0]	[4]	[0]	[4]
[5]	[0]	[5]	[2]	[7]	[4]	[1]	[6]	[3]
[6]	[0]	[6]	[4]	[2]	[0]	[6]	[4]	[2]
[7]	[0]	[7]	[6]	[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]

Multiplication in \mathbb{Z}_9

\times	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]	[0]
[1]	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]
[2]	[0]	[2]	[4]	[6]	[8]	[1]	[3]	[5]	[7]
[3]	[0]	[3]	[6]	[0]	[3]	[6]	[0]	[3]	[6]
[4]	[0]	[4]	[8]	[3]	[7]	[2]	[6]	[1]	[5]
[5]	[0]	[5]	[1]	[6]	[2]	[7]	[3]	[8]	[4]
[6]	[0]	[6]	[3]	[0]	[6]	[3]	[0]	[6]	[3]
[7]	[0]	[7]	[5]	[3]	[1]	[8]	[6]	[4]	[2]
[8]	[0]	[8]	[7]	[6]	[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]

7. Theorem (8).

The following statements hold:

- (a) *For any $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $u \times v = v \times u$.*
- (b) *For any $u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $(u \times v) \times w = u \times (v \times w)$.*
- (c) *There exists some $e \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, namely $e = [1]$, such that $e \times u = u \times e = u$.*
- (d) *For any $u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z}_n$, $u \times (v + w) = (u \times v) + (u \times w)$ and $(u + v) \times w = (u \times w) + (v \times w)$.*

Proof. Exercise. (Imitate the argument for Theorem (5).)

Remark on terminologies.

Because of Statement (c), it is natural for us to write $[1]$ as 1_n .

$(\mathbb{Z}_n, +, \times)$ is a **commutative rings with unity** with additive identity 0_n and multiplicative identity 1_n .

8. For the moment, assume n is a prime number. Write $n = p$.

Lemma (9).

For any $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, if x is not divisible by p then there exists some $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $xy \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and y is not divisible by p .

Theorem (10).

Let $u \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Suppose $u \neq 0_p$.

Then there exists some unique $v \in \mathbb{Z}_p \setminus \{0_p\}$ such that $v \times u = u \times v = 1_p$.

Corollary (11).

Let $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Suppose $u \neq 0_p$ and $v \neq 0_p$.

Then there exists some unique $w \in \mathbb{Z}_p \setminus \{0_p\}$ such that $u \times w = v$.

Remarks on terminologies.

$(\mathbb{Z}_p, +, \times)$ is a **field**.

$(\mathbb{Z}_p, +, \times)$ is a **finite field**.

As a consequence of Theorem (10),
for any $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}_p$, if $s \times t = 0_p$
then $s = 0_p$ or $t = 0_p$.
(Why? Exercise.)

9. What if n is definitely not a prime number?

Theorem (12).

Suppose n is not a prime number.

Then there exist some $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0_n\}$ such that $u \times v = 0_n$.

Remark.

Such elements u, v of $\mathbb{Z}_n \setminus \{0_n\}$ which satisfy $u \times v = 0_n$ are called **zero divisors**.

10. The result below holds whether n is a prime number or not.

Theorem (13).

$$\underbrace{1_n + 1_n + \cdots + 1_n}_{n \text{ times}} = 0_n.$$

Proof.

$$\text{By definition, } \underbrace{1_n + 1_n + \cdots + 1_n}_{n \text{ times}} = \underbrace{[1] + [1] + \cdots + [1]}_{n \text{ times}} = \underbrace{[1 + 1 + \cdots + 1]}_{n \text{ times}} = [n] = 0_n.$$

Remark.

We do not obtain the integer 0 by adding up many copies of the integer 1 together.

The commutative ring with unity $(\mathbb{Z}_n, +, \times)$ is some mathematical object which possesses many properties common to $(\mathbb{Z}, +, \times)$, $(\mathbb{Q}, +, \times)$, but which is **decisively different** from them. (*This is one of the starting points of MATH2070.*)