

**1. A Field is a Ring with Exactly Two Ideals.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring.

- (a) Let  $I \subseteq R$  be an ideal. Show that  $I = R$  if and only if  $I$  contains a unit.
- (b) If  $R$  is a field, use part (a) to show that  $\{0\} \subsetneq I \subseteq R$  implies  $I = R$ .
- (c) Conversely, suppose that  $R$  has exactly two ideals:  $\{0\}$  and  $R$ . Use this to prove that  $R$  is a field. [Hint: For any non-zero element  $0 \neq a \in R$ , the ideal  $aR$  must equal  $R$ . Use this to prove that  $a^{-1}$  exists.]

(a): If  $I = R$  then  $I$  contains all the units, and there is always at least one of these; namely, 1. Conversely, suppose that  $u \in I$  for some unit  $u \in R^\times$ . Then since  $u^{-1} \in R$  and  $u \in I$  we have  $1 = u^{-1}u \in I$ . Finally, for any  $a \in R$  we have  $a \in R$  and  $1 \in I$  hence  $a = 1a \in I$ .

(b): Let  $R$  be a field and consider an ideal  $\{0\} \subsetneq I \subseteq R$ . Since  $I \neq \{0\}$  there exists a nonzero element  $a \in I$ , and since  $R$  is a field this element  $a$  is a unit. Hence  $I = R$  by part (a).

(c): Let  $R$  be a ring with exactly two ideals:  $\{0\}$  and  $R$ . To show that  $R$  is a field, consider any nonzero element  $a \in R$  and the corresponding ideal  $aR$ . Since  $a \neq 0$  we have  $aR \neq \{0\}$ . Since  $\{0\}$  and  $R$  are the only ideals of  $R$ , this implies that  $aR = R$ . Finally, since  $1 \in R = aR$ , there exists some  $b \in R$  such that  $1 = ab$ . Hence  $R$  is a field.

**2. Quotients of Euclidean Domains.** Let  $(R, N)$  be a Euclidean domain.

- (a) Show that every ideal  $I \subseteq R$  has the form  $I = aR$  for some  $a \in R$ . [Hint: If  $I = \{0\}$  then we have  $I = 0R$ . If  $I \neq \{0\}$ , choose some non-zero element  $a \in I$  with minimum size  $N(a)$ . Show that  $I = aR$ .]
- (b) Show that  $aR = bR$  if and only if  $a$  and  $b$  are associates.
- (c) Consider an ideal  $pR \neq R$  (so that  $p$  is not a unit). If  $p$  is prime,<sup>1</sup> prove that  $R/pR$  is a field. [Hint: Consider a non-zero coset  $a + pR \neq 0 + pR$ . Show that we must have  $\gcd(a, p) = 1$ , hence from Bézout's Identity we have  $ax + py = 1$  for some  $x, y \in R$ .]

(a): Consider an ideal  $I \subseteq R$ . If  $I = \{0\}$  then  $I = 0R$  is principal. Otherwise, consider a nonzero element  $a \in I$  with minimum size  $N(a)$ . I claim that  $I = aR$ . On the one hand, since  $a \in I$  we have for all  $r \in R$  that  $ar \in I$ , and hence  $aR \subseteq I$ . On the other hand, consider any element  $b \in I$  and divide by  $a$  to obtain  $q, r \in R$  such that

$$\begin{cases} b = aq + r, \\ r = 0 \text{ or } N(r) < N(a). \end{cases}$$

Since  $a, b \in I$  and  $q \in R$  we have  $r = b - aq \in I$ . If  $r \neq 0$  then  $r$  is a nonzero element of  $I$  that is smaller than  $a$ . Contradiction. Hence we must have  $r = 0$  and hence  $b = aq \in aR$ . Since this holds for all  $b \in I$  we have shown that  $I \subseteq aR$  as desired.

(b): First suppose that  $a \sim b$ , so that  $a = bu$  and  $b = au^{-1}$  for some unit  $u \in R^\times$ . Then for all  $r \in R$  we have  $ar = b(ur) \in bR$ , so that  $aR \subseteq bR$ . And for all  $r \in R$  we have  $br = a(u^{-1}r) \in aR$ , so that  $bR \subseteq aR$ . It follows that  $aR = bR$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $aR = bR$ . If one of  $a$  or  $b$  is zero, then so is the other, hence  $a \sim b$ . So let us suppose that  $a, b$  are both nonzero. Since  $a \in bR$  we have  $a = bu$  for some  $u \in R$

<sup>1</sup>Recall: We say that  $p \in R$  is prime when  $p$  is non-zero, non-unit, and  $p = ab$  implies that  $a$  or  $b$  is a unit.

and since  $b \in aR$  we have  $b = av$  for some  $v \in R$ . Since  $R$  is an integral domain, we see that  $u$  and  $v$  are both units, hence  $a \sim b$ :

$$\begin{aligned} b &= av \\ b &= buv \\ b(1 - uv) &= 0 \\ 1 - uv &= 0 && b \neq 0 \\ 1 &= uv. \end{aligned}$$

(c): Let  $p \in R$  be prime and consider the ideal  $pR \neq R$ . I claim that the quotient ring  $R/pR$  is a field. To see this, consider any nonzero coset  $a + pR \neq 0 + pR$ , so that  $a \notin pR$ . In other words, we have  $p \nmid a$ . Since  $p$  is prime and  $p \nmid a$  we must have  $\gcd(a, p) = 1$ , hence we can find some  $b, c \in R$  satisfying  $ab + pc = 1$ . It follows  $ab + pR = 1 + pR$ , so that

$$(a + pR)(b + pR) = ab + pR = 1 + pR.$$

We have shown that any nonzero element of  $R/pR$  has a multiplicative inverse.

**3. The Minimal Polynomial Theorem.** Consider a field extension  $\mathbb{E} \supseteq \mathbb{F}$ . Then for any element  $\alpha \in \mathbb{E}$  we have an *evaluation homomorphism*:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\alpha : \mathbb{F}[x] &\rightarrow \mathbb{E} \\ f(x) &\mapsto f(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

- (a) Prove that  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha] := \text{im } \varphi_\alpha$  is the smallest subring of  $\mathbb{E}$  that contains  $\mathbb{F}$  and  $\alpha$ .
- (b) Let  $\alpha$  be algebraic over  $\mathbb{F}$ , so that  $\ker \varphi_\alpha \neq \{0\}$ . In this case, prove that there exists a unique monic<sup>2</sup> polynomial  $m(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$  such that  $\ker \varphi_\alpha = m(x)\mathbb{F}[x]$ . [Hint: Use Problem 2(a,b).] This  $m(x)$  is called *the minimal polynomial of  $\alpha$  over  $\mathbb{F}$* .
- (c) Let  $d = \deg(m)$ . Prove that every element  $\beta \in \mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  can be expressed **uniquely** as

$$\beta = b_0 + b_1\alpha + b_2\alpha^2 + \cdots + b_{d-1}\alpha^{d-1} \quad \text{for some } b_0, b_1, \dots, b_{d-1} \in \mathbb{F}.$$

[Hint: By definition of  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  we have  $\beta = f(\alpha)$  for some polynomial  $f(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ . Divide  $f(x)$  by the minimal polynomial  $m(x)$  to get  $f(x) = m(x)q(x) + r(x)$ .]

- (d) Prove that  $m(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{F}$ . [Hint: Suppose that  $m(x) = f(x)g(x)$ . Since  $m(x)$  is in the kernel of  $\varphi_\alpha$  we have  $f(\alpha)g(\alpha) = m(\alpha) = 0$ , and hence  $f(\alpha) = 0$  or  $g(\alpha) = 0$ . If  $f(\alpha) = 0$  then  $f(x)$  is in the kernel of  $\varphi_\alpha$  which implies that  $m(x)|f(x)$ .]
- (e) Continuing from part (d), use the First Isomorphism Theorem and Problem 2(b) to show that  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  is a field.

(a): Let  $R$  be a ring satisfying  $\mathbb{F} \subseteq R \subseteq \mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  and  $\alpha \in R$ . A general element of  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  looks like

$$\beta = a_0 + a_1\alpha + \cdots + a_n\alpha^n,$$

for some  $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{F}$ . Then since  $a_0, \dots, a_n, \alpha \in R$  and since  $R$  is closed under addition and multiplication, we must have  $\beta \in R$ . Hence  $R = \mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  as desired.

(b): If  $\ker \varphi_\alpha = \{0\}$  then since  $\mathbb{F}[x]$  is a PID we must have  $\ker \varphi_\alpha = f(x)\mathbb{F}[x]$  for some  $f(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ . Furthermore, if  $f(x)\mathbb{F}[x] = g(x)\mathbb{F}[x]$  then from Problem 2(b) we must have  $f(x) = \lambda g(x)$  for some nonzero constant  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ . It follows that there exists a unique monic polynomial  $m(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$  such that  $\ker \varphi_\alpha = m(x)\mathbb{F}[x]$ . Indeed, we can take  $m(x) = f(x)/\lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is the leading coefficient of  $f(x)$ . Then for any other monic polynomial  $m'(x)$  satisfying

<sup>2</sup>The leading coefficient is 1.

$m(x)\mathbb{F}[x] = m'(x)\mathbb{F}[x]$  we must have  $m(x) = \mu m'(x)$  for some constant  $\mu$ . But since  $m(x)$  and  $m'(x)$  have the same leading coefficient, we must have  $\mu = 1$  and hence  $m(x) = m'(x)$ .

(c): Let  $m(x)$  be a generator of  $\ker \varphi_\alpha$  and let  $d = \deg(m)$ . I claim that for any element  $\beta \in \mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  there exist unique  $b_0, \dots, b_{d-1} \in \mathbb{F}$  such that

$$\beta = b_0 + b_1\alpha + \dots + b_{d-1}\alpha^{d-1}.$$

Existence: By definition, any element of  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  looks like  $\beta = f(\alpha)$  for some polynomial  $f(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ . Divide  $f(x)$  by the nonzero polynomial  $m(x)$  to obtain

$$\begin{cases} f(x) = m(x)q(x) + r(x), \\ r(x) = 0 \text{ or } \deg(r) < \deg(m). \end{cases}$$

Since  $r(x) = 0$  or  $\deg(r) < \deg(m) = d$ , we can write  $r(x) = b_0 + b_1x + \dots + b_{d-1}x^{d-1}$  for some elements  $b_0, \dots, b_{d-1} \in \mathbb{F}$  (possibly all zero). Then since  $m(\alpha) = 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= f(\alpha) \\ &= m(\alpha)q(\alpha) + r(\alpha) \\ &= r(\alpha) \\ &= b_0 + b_1\alpha + \dots + b_{d-1}\alpha^{d-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Uniqueness: Suppose that we have

$$b_0 + b_1\alpha + \dots + b_{d-1}\alpha^{d-1} = c_0 + c_1\alpha + \dots + c_{d-1}\alpha^{d-1}$$

for some  $b_0, \dots, b_{d-1}, c_0, \dots, c_{d-1} \in \mathbb{F}$ . We wish to show that  $b_i = c_i$  for all  $i$ . To do this, we define the polynomials  $r(x) = b_0 + b_1x + \dots + b_{d-1}x^{d-1}$  and  $s(x) = c_0 + c_1x + \dots + c_{d-1}x^{d-1}$ . We will be done if we can show that  $r(x) - s(x)$  is the zero polynomial, since then the coefficients of  $r(x)$  and  $s(x)$  will be equal.

By assumption we have  $r(\alpha) = s(\alpha)$  and hence  $r(\alpha) - s(\alpha) = 0$ . In other words, we have  $r(x) - s(x) \in \ker \varphi_\alpha$ , which implies that  $r(x) - s(x)$  is divisible by  $m(x)$ . If  $r(x) - s(x) \neq 0$  then this gives a contradiction:

$$d = \deg(m) \leq \deg(r - s) \leq \max\{\deg(r), \deg(s)\} < d.$$

Hence  $r(x) - s(x) = 0$  as desired.

(d): Let  $m(x)$  be a generator of  $\ker \varphi_\alpha$ . To prove that  $m(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{F}$ , suppose that we have  $m(x) = f(x)g(x)$  for some (nonzero)  $f(x), g(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ . Evaluating at  $x = \alpha$  gives

$$0 = m(\alpha) = f(\alpha)g(\alpha),$$

which implies that  $f(\alpha) = 0$  or  $g(\alpha) = 0$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $f(\alpha) = 0$ . Then since  $f(x) \in \ker \varphi_\alpha$  we must have  $m(x)|f(x)$ . But since  $m(x) = f(x)g(x)$  we also have  $f(x)|m(x)$ . It follows that  $m(x) = \lambda f(x)$  for some constant  $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ . Finally, since  $f(x)g(x) = \lambda g(x)$ , it follows that  $g(x) = \lambda$  is constant. We have shown that

$$m(x) = f(x)g(x) \implies f(x) \text{ or } g(x) \text{ is constant.}$$

In other words,  $m(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{F}$ .

(e): If  $\ker \varphi_\alpha = \{0\}$  then we have shown that  $\ker \varphi_\alpha = m(x)\mathbb{F}[x]$  for a unique, monic polynomial  $m(x) \in \mathbb{F}[x]$ , which is irreducible. From the First Isomorphism Theorem we have

$$\mathbb{F}[\alpha] = \text{im } \varphi_\alpha \cong \frac{\mathbb{F}[x]}{\ker \varphi_\alpha} = \frac{\mathbb{F}[x]}{m(x)\mathbb{F}[x]}.$$

Finally, since  $m(x)$  is prime in  $\mathbb{F}[x]$  we conclude from 2(c) that this quotient ring is a field.

Remark: This is a rather indirect way to prove that  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  is a field. In particular, it does not provide an algorithm to compute inverses in  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha]$ . The solution to this problem is to use 3(c) to express  $\mathbb{F}[\alpha]$  as a vector space over  $\mathbb{F}$  with basis  $1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{d-1}$  and then use linear algebra.

**4. Cube Roots of 2.** Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  be any root of the polynomial  $x^3 - 2 \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ .

- (a) Prove that  $x^3 - 2$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , hence it is the minimal polynomial for  $\alpha$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . [Hint: If  $x^3 - 2$  is not irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  then it has a root  $a/b \in \mathbb{Q}$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ . Use this to get a contradiction.]
- (b) It follows from Problem 3 that the following set of numbers is a field:

$$\mathbb{Q}[\alpha] = \{a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2 : a, b, c \in \mathbb{Q}\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}.$$

Find the inverse of the number  $1 + \alpha + \alpha^2$ . [Hint: Let  $(1 + \alpha + \alpha^2)(a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2) = 1 + 0\alpha + 0\alpha^2$ . Expand the left side and equate coefficients. Use the fact that  $\alpha^3 = 2$ .]

(a): Let  $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfy  $\alpha^3 - 2 = 0$ , let  $f(x) = x^3 - 2 \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  and let  $m(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  be the minimal polynomial of  $\alpha$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , so that  $m(x)|f(x)$ . I claim that in fact  $m(x) = f(x)$ . To show this, it is enough to prove that  $f(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , since then  $m(x)|f(x)$  implies  $m(x) = \lambda f(x)$  and since  $f(x), m(x)$  are both monic we must have  $\lambda = 1$ .

So suppose for contradiction that  $f(x) = g(x)h(x)$  for some  $g(x), h(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ , both non-constant. By comparing degrees we must have  $\deg(f) = 1$  or  $\deg(g) = 1$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $\deg(f) = 1$ , so that  $f(x) = \alpha x + \beta$  with  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $\alpha \neq 0$ . Write  $-\beta/\alpha = a/b$  for some  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ . Then we have

$$f(a/b) = g(a/b)h(a/b) = g(-\beta/\alpha)h(a/b) = 0h(a/b) = 0,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (a/b)^3 - 2 &= 0 \\ a^3 - 2b^3 &= 0 \\ a^3 &= 2b^3. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $a|2b^3$  and  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$  we must have  $a|2$  and since  $b|a^3$  we must have  $b|1$ . It follows that  $a/b$  is  $\pm 1$  or  $\pm 2$ .<sup>3</sup> But none of these four numbers is a root of  $x^3 - 2$ . Contradiction.

(b): If  $\alpha^3 - 2 = 0$  then we have shown that  $x^3 - 2$  is the minimal polynomial of  $\alpha$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Since  $\deg(x^3 - 2) = 3$  this implies that the field  $\mathbb{Q}[\alpha] \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  can be expressed as a vector space over  $\mathbb{Q}$  with basis  $1, \alpha, \alpha^2$ :

$$\mathbb{Q}[\alpha] = \{a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2 : a, b, c \in \mathbb{Q}\}.$$

This representation allows us to do computations in  $\mathbb{Q}[\alpha]$  via linear algebra. For example, we compute the inverse of the nonzero element  $1 + \alpha + \alpha^2 \in \mathbb{Q}[\alpha]$ . The inverse must have the form  $a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2$  for some  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Q}$  where

$$(1 + \alpha + \alpha^2)(a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2) = 1 + 0\alpha + 0\alpha^2.$$

---

<sup>3</sup>We have just performed the “rational root test”, to find a finite list of potential roots of  $x^3 - 2$  in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Expanding the left hand side and using the fact that  $\alpha^3 - 2 = 0$  gives

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1 + \alpha + \alpha^2)(a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2) &= a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2 \\
 &\quad a\alpha + b\alpha^2 + c\alpha^3 \\
 &\quad a\alpha^2 + b\alpha^3 + c\alpha^4 \\
 &= a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2 \\
 &\quad a\alpha + b\alpha^2 + 2c \\
 &\quad a\alpha^2 + 2b + 2c\alpha \\
 &= (a + 2b + 2c) + (a + b + 2c)\alpha + (a + b + c)\alpha^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then comparing coefficients<sup>4</sup> gives a system of three linear equations in the unknowns  $a, b, c$ :

$$\begin{cases} a + 2b + 2c = 1, \\ a + b + 2c = 0, \\ a + b + c = 0. \end{cases}$$

After a bit of work we find that  $(a, b, c) = (-1, 1, 0)$ , so that

$$(1 + \alpha + \alpha^2)(-1 + \alpha) = 1.$$

Remark: With a bit more work we can find a formula for the inverse of a general element  $r + s\alpha + t\alpha^2$ . By expanding  $(r + s\alpha + t\alpha^2)(a + b\alpha + c\alpha^2) = 1 + 0\alpha + 0\alpha^2$  we obtain the following system of linear equations in  $a, b, c$ :

$$\begin{cases} ra + 2tb + 2sc = 1, \\ sa + rb + 2tc = 0, \\ ta + sb + rc = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then my computer gives the following solution:

$$(a, b, c) = \frac{1}{r^3 + 2s^3 + 4t^3 - 6rst} (r^2 - 2st, rs - 2t^2, rt - s^2).$$

That is, for any  $r, s, t \in \mathbb{Q}$ , not all zero, we have

$$\frac{1}{r + s\alpha + t\alpha^2} = \frac{1}{r^3 + 2s^3 + 4t^3 - 6rst} ((r^2 - 2st) + (rs - 2t^2)\alpha + (rt - s^2)\alpha^2).$$

As an interesting consequence, if  $r, s, t \in \mathbb{Q}$  are not all zero then we must have

$$r^3 + 2s^3 + 4t^3 - 6rst \neq 0.$$

I have no idea how I would prove this by other methods.

---

<sup>4</sup>We can do this because of uniqueness.