

---

## 20241215 MATH3301 NOTE 9[1]

---

**Author:** Be  $\sqrt{-1}$ maginative, and nothing will be  $\frac{d}{dx}$ ifficult!

**Email:** [u3612704@connect.hku.hk](mailto:u3612704@connect.hku.hk);

**Phone:** +852 5693 2134; +86 19921823546;

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Polynomial Ring <math>R[t]</math></b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Convolution . . . . .	3
2.2	The Evaluation Ring Homomorphism . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Polynomial Ring <math>F[t]</math></b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Division Algorithm . . . . .	7
3.2	Principal Ideal Property . . . . .	9
3.3	Root and Irreducibility . . . . .	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Finite Field</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1	Characteristic and Order . . . . .	16
4.2	Field Extension . . . . .	17
4.3	Primitive Root . . . . .	18

# 1 Introduction

This note intends to connect fields with polynomials.

## 2 Polynomial Ring $R[t]$

### 2.1 Convolution

**Definition 2.1. (Convolution)**

Let  $R$  be a nonzero commutative ring.

Define convolution  $*$  on the set of all  $R$ -valued sequences by:

$$a * b[n] = \sum_{i+j=n} a_i b_j$$

**Lemma 2.2.** Convolution is commutative.

*Proof.* For all  $R$ -valued sequences  $a, b$ :

$$a * b[n] = \sum_{i+j=n} a_i b_j = \sum_{j+i=n} b_j a_i = b * a[n]$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Lemma 2.3.** Convolution is associative.

*Proof.* For all  $R$ -valued sequences  $a, b, c$ :

$$(a * b) * c[n] = \sum_{i+j+k=n} a_i b_j c_k = a * (b * c)[n]$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Lemma 2.4.** If  $R$  has a unity 1, then  $*$  has an identity  $1 = (1, 0, 0, \dots)$ .

*Proof.* For all  $R$ -valued sequence  $a$ :

$$1 * a[n] = \sum_{i+j=n} \delta_{0,i} a_j = a_n$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Lemma 2.5.** If  $R$  has unity 1 and  $a_0 b_0 = 1$ , then  $(a_0, 0, 0, \dots) * (b_0, 0, 0, \dots) = 1$ .

*Proof.*

$$a * b[n] = \sum_{i+j=n} a_i b_j = a_0 b_0 \sum_{i+j=n} \delta_{0,i} \delta_{0,j} = \delta_{0,n}$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Example 2.6.** In  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ , if  $a_n = \delta_{0,n} + 2\delta_{1,n}$ , then  $a^2 = 1$ . Hence, all invertible element  $a$  under  $*$  are not necessarily given by **Lemma 2.5.**

**Lemma 2.7.** Convolution distributes over addition.

*Proof.* For all  $R$ -valued sequences  $\lambda, a, b$ :

$$\lambda * (a + b)[n] = \sum_{i+j=n} \lambda_i (a_j + b_j) = \sum_{i+j=n} \lambda_i a_j + \sum_{i+j=n} \lambda_i b_j = \lambda * a + \lambda * b[n]$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Definition 2.8. (The Formal Power Series Ring  $R[[t]]$ )**

Let  $R$  be a nonzero commutative ring. If we define an indeterminate  $t = (0, 1, 0, \dots)$  in the set  $R[[t]]$  of all  $R$ -valued sequences, and identify all expressions  $a_0 + a_1 t + a_2 t^2 + \dots$  with  $(a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots)$ , then  $R[[t]]$  forms a commutative ring, namely, the formal power series ring, under  $+$  and  $*$ .

**Remark:** The elements of  $R[[t]]$  are called formal power series. We denote them by  $f(t), g(t), h(t), \dots$ . If there is no ambiguity, we write them as  $f, g, h, \dots$ , and omit  $*$ .

**Example 2.9.** As every integer  $n$  in  $R[[t]]$  is a constant,  $\text{Char}(R[[t]]) = \text{Char}(R)$ .

**Theorem 2.10.**  $R[[t]]$  has a zero divisor iff  $R$  has a zero divisor.

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into two parts.

**“if” direction:** If the product of some nonzero elements  $s, t$  of  $R$  is 0, then the product of some nonzero elements  $a = s, b = t$  of  $R[[t]]$  is 0.

**“only if” direction:** If the product of some nonzero elements  $a, b$  of  $R[[t]]$  is 0, then take the minimal nonzero entries  $s = a_i, t = b_j$  of  $a, b$  respectively, the product of some nonzero elements  $s, t$  of  $R$  is  $a_i b_j = a * b[i + j] = 0$ .

Hence, we’ve proven the logical equivalence. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Example 2.11.** As the product of  $t, f(t)$  has no constant term,  $t$  is not a unit.

**Example 2.12.** In  $\mathbb{Z}[[t]]$ , the ideal  $\langle 2, t \rangle$  is not principal, because for all  $f(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[[t]]$ , either the constant term of  $f(t)$  is even, and  $\langle f(t) \rangle$  misses  $t$ , or the constant term of  $f(t)$  is odd, and  $\langle f(t) \rangle$  misses 2. In both cases,  $\langle f(t) \rangle \neq \langle 2, t \rangle$ .

**Theorem 2.13. (The Polynomial Ring  $R[t]$ )**

Let  $R$  be a nonzero commutative ring.

The following subset  $R[t]$ , namely, the polynomial ring, forms a subring of  $R[[t]]$ :

$$R[t] = \{a(t) \in R[[t]] : \exists M \geq 0, \forall i \geq M, a_i = 0\}$$

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into four parts.

**Part 1:**  $\exists 0 \geq 0, \forall i \geq 0, 0 = 0$ , so  $0 \in R[t]$ .

**Part 2:** For all  $a(t), b(t) \in R[[t]]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} a(t), b(t) \in R[t] &\implies \exists M \geq 0, \forall i \geq M, a_i = 0 \text{ and } \exists N \geq 0, \forall j \geq N, b_j = 0 \\ &\implies \exists \text{Max}\{M, N\} \geq 0, \forall k \geq \text{Max}\{M, N\}, a_k + b_k = 0 + 0 = 0 \\ &\implies a(t) + b(t) \in R[t] \end{aligned}$$

**Part 3:** For all  $a(t) \in R[[t]]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) \in R[t] &\implies \exists M \geq 0, \forall i \geq M, a_i = 0 \\ &\implies \exists M \geq 0, \forall i \geq M, -a_i = -0 = 0 \\ &\implies -a(t) \in R[t] \end{aligned}$$

**Part 4:** For all  $a(t), b(t) \in R[[t]]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} a(t), b(t) \in R[t] &\implies \exists M \geq 0, \forall i \geq M, a_i = 0 \text{ and } \exists N \geq 0, \forall j \geq N, b_j = 0 \\ &\implies \exists M + N \geq 0, \forall k \geq M + N, \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j = \sum_{i+j=k} 0 = 0 \\ &\implies a(t)b(t) \in R[t] \end{aligned}$$

$R[t]$  contains unity if  $R$  does. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

## 2.2 The Evaluation Ring Homomorphism

**Theorem 2.14. (The Evaluation Ring Homomorphism)**

Let  $R, S$  be two nonzero commutative rings,  $s$  be an element of  $S$ , and  $\phi : R \rightarrow S$  be a ring homomorphism. The following map  $\sigma_s$  is a ring homomorphism:

$$\sigma_s : R[t] \rightarrow S, \sigma_s \left( \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i t^i \right) = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \phi(a_i) s^i$$

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into four parts.

**Part 1:** As  $\exists M \geq 0, \forall i \geq M, a_i = 0$ , the summation  $\sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \phi(a_i)s^i$  contains finitely many nonzero terms, thus  $\sigma_s$  is well-defined.

**Part 2:** For all  $\sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i t^i, \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} b_j t^j \in R[t]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_s \left( \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i t^i + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} b_j t^j \right) &= \sigma_s \left( \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (a_k + b_k) t^k \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \phi(a_k + b_k) s^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} (\phi(a_k) + \phi(b_k)) s^k = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \phi(a_i) s^i + \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \phi(b_j) s^j \\ &= \sigma_s \left( \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i t^i \right) + \sigma_s \left( \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} b_j t^j \right) \end{aligned}$$

**Part 3:** For all  $(a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots), (b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots) \in R[t]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_s \left( \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i t^i \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} b_j t^j \right) &= \sigma_s \left( \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j t^k \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \phi \left( \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j \right) s^k \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \sum_{i+j=k} \phi(a_i) \phi(b_j) s^k = \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} \phi(a_i) s^i \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} \phi(b_j) s^j \\ &= \sigma_s \left( \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i t^i \right) \sigma_s \left( \sum_{j=0}^{+\infty} b_j t^j \right) \end{aligned}$$

$\sigma_s$  preserves unity if  $R, S$  have. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Definition 2.15. (Circulant Matrix)**

Let  $R$  be a nonzero commutative ring.

Define circulant matrix as a matrix in the following form:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & c_{n-1} & c_{n-2} & \cdots & c_3 & c_2 & c_1 \\ c_1 & c_0 & c_{n-1} & \cdots & c_4 & c_3 & c_2 \\ c_2 & c_1 & c_0 & \cdots & c_5 & c_4 & c_3 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ c_{n-3} & c_{n-4} & c_{n-5} & \cdots & c_0 & c_{n-1} & c_{n-2} \\ c_{n-2} & c_{n-3} & c_{n-4} & \cdots & c_1 & c_0 & c_{n-1} \\ c_{n-1} & c_{n-2} & c_{n-3} & \cdots & c_2 & c_1 & c_0 \end{pmatrix}$$

We collect all  $n$  by  $n$   $R$ -valued circulant matrices in the set  $\mathbf{C}_n(R)$ .

**Example 2.16.** Let  $R$  be a nonzero commutative ring with unity. If we define the following circulant matrix:

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

And define a ring homomorphism  $\phi : R \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_n(R), r \mapsto rI$ , then the evaluation ring homomorphism  $\sigma_H : R[t] \rightarrow S$  is explicitly given by:

$$\sigma_H \left( \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_i t^i \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i=0}^{+\infty} a_{6i+k} H^k$$

### 3 Polynomial Ring $F[t]$

#### 3.1 Division Algorithm

**Definition 3.1. (Degree Function Deg)**

Let  $F$  be a field. Define degree function  $\text{Deg} : F[t] \rightarrow \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  by:

$$\text{Deg}(f(t)) = \begin{cases} -\infty & \text{if } f(t) = 0; \\ [\text{The minimal } i \geq 0 \text{ such that } a_i \neq 0] & \text{if } f(t) \neq 0; \end{cases}$$

**Remark:** According to well-ordering principle,  $\text{Deg}$  is well-defined.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let  $F$  be a field, and  $f(t), g(t)$  be two polynomials in  $F[t]$ .

- (1)  $\text{Deg}(f(t) + g(t)) \leq \text{Max}\{\text{Deg}(f(t)), \text{Deg}(g(t))\}$ .
- (2)  $\text{Deg}(f(t)g(t)) = \text{Deg}(f(t)) + \text{Deg}(g(t))$ .

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into two cases.

**Case 1:** If  $f(t) = 0$  or  $g(t) = 0$ , then we may assume  $f(t) = 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Deg}(f(t) + g(t)) &= \text{Deg}(0 + g(t)) = \text{Deg}(g(t)) = \text{Max}\{-\infty, \text{Deg}(g(t))\} \\ &= \text{Max}\{\text{Deg}(0), \text{Deg}(g(t))\} = \text{Max}\{\text{Deg}(f(t)), \text{Deg}(g(t))\} \\ \text{Deg}(f(t)g(t)) &= \text{Deg}(0g(t)) = \text{Deg}(0) = -\infty = -\infty + \text{Deg}(g(t)) \\ &= \text{Deg}(0) + \text{Deg}(g(t)) = \text{Deg}(f(t)) + \text{Deg}(g(t)) \end{aligned}$$

**Case 2:** If  $f(t) \neq 0$  and  $g(t) \neq 0$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Deg}(f(t)) = i \text{ and } \text{Deg}(g(t)) = j \implies f(t) \text{ has no term after } t^i \\
& \text{and } g(t) \text{ has no term after } t^j \\
& \implies f(t) + g(t) \text{ has no term after } t^{\text{Max}\{i,j\}} \\
& \implies \text{Deg}(f(t) + g(t)) \leq \text{Max}\{i, j\} \\
& \text{Deg}(f(t)) = i \text{ and } \text{Deg}(g(t)) = j \implies f(t) = \cdots + a_i t^i \text{ and } a_i \neq 0 \\
& \text{and } g(t) = \cdots + b_j t^j \text{ and } b_j \neq 0 \\
& \implies f(t)g(t) = \cdots + a_i b_j t^{i+j} \text{ and } a_i b_j \neq 0 \\
& \implies \text{Deg}(f(t)g(t)) = i + j
\end{aligned}$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Example 3.3.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring, and  $f(t), g(t)$  be two polynomials in  $R[t]$ . The property  $\text{Deg}(f(t) + g(t)) \leq \text{Max}\{\text{Deg}(f(t)), \text{Deg}(g(t))\}$  still holds.

**Example 3.4.** In  $\mathbb{Z}_4[t]$ , if  $f(t) = g(t) = 2$ , then  $f(t)g(t) = 0$ . The property  $\text{Deg}(f(t)g(t)) = \text{Deg}(f(t)) + \text{Deg}(g(t))$  is violated.

**Theorem 3.5. (Division Algorithm)**

Let  $F$  be a field, and  $a(t), b(t)$  be two polynomials in  $F[t]$ . If  $b(t) \neq 0$ , then for some unique  $q(t), r(t) \in F[t]$ :

$$a(t) = q(t)b(t) + r(t) \text{ and } \text{Deg}(r(t)) < \text{Deg}(b(t))$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $\text{Deg}(g(t)) = m \geq 0$ , the uniqueness is clear as below:

$$\begin{aligned}
a(t) = q_1(t)b(t) + r_1(t) = q_2(t)b(t) + r_2(t) & \implies b(t)|r_2(t) - r_1(t) \\
& \implies q_1(t) = q_2(t) \text{ and } r_1(t) = r_2(t)
\end{aligned}$$

We prove the existence by mathematical induction.

(1) When  $\text{Deg}(a(t)) < \text{Deg}(b(t))$ , there exist  $0, a(t) \in F[t]$ , such that:

$$a(t) = 0b(t) + a(t) \text{ and } \text{Deg}(a(t)) < \text{Deg}(b(t))$$

(2) For all  $n \geq \text{Deg}(b(t))$ , when  $\text{Deg}(a(t)) < n$ , assume the existence of  $q(t), r(t) \in F[t]$ .

(3) When  $\text{Deg}(a(t)) = n$ ,  $a(t) = \cdots + a_n t^n$ ,  $b(t) = \cdots + b_m t^m$ , where  $a_n, b_m \neq 0$ .

Define  $A(t) = a(t) - \frac{a_n t^n}{b_m t^m} b(t)$ , as  $\text{Deg}(A(t)) < n$ ,

we may apply the inductive hypothesis to find  $Q(t), R(t) \in F[t]$ , such that:

$$A(t) = Q(t)b(t) + R(t) \text{ and } \text{Deg}(R(t)) < \text{Deg}(b(t))$$



Now, for some  $q(t) = Q(t) + \frac{a_n t^n}{b_m t^m}, r(t) = R(t) \in F[t]$ :

$$a(t) = q(t)b(t) + r(t) \text{ and } \text{Deg}(r(t)) < \text{Deg}(b(t))$$

Hence, we've proven the existence. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum.  $\square$

### 3.2 Principal Ideal Property

#### Definition 3.6. (Greatest Common Divisor)

Let  $F$  be a field,  $(a_\lambda(t))_{\lambda \in I}$  be an indexed family in  $F[t]$ , and  $b(t)$  be a polynomial in  $F[t]$ . If  $b(t)$  is a common divisor of  $(a_\lambda(t))_{\lambda \in I}$ , and every common divisor of  $(a_\lambda(t))_{\lambda \in I}$  divides  $b(t)$ , then  $b(t)$  is a greatest common divisor of  $(a_\lambda(t))_{\lambda \in I}$ .

#### Definition 3.7. (Least Common Multiple)

Let  $F$  be a field,  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$  be a finite list in  $F[t]$ , and  $b(t)$  be a polynomial in  $F[t]$ . If  $b(t)$  is a common multiple of  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ , and  $b(t)$  divides every common multiple of  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ , then  $b(t)$  is a least common multiple of  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ .

**Remark:** To prove the existence of greatest common divisor and least common multiple, we need to apply principal ideal property.

**Example 3.8.** Let  $F$  be a field,  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$  be a nonempty finite list in  $F[t] \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $A(t) = \prod_{k=1}^m a_k(t)$  be their product, and  $(A_k(t) = \prod_{l \neq k} a_l(t))_{k=1}^m$  be their dual. For all  $b(t), B(t) \in F[t]$  with  $b(t)B(t) = A(t)$ , the followings are equivalent:

- (1)  $b(t)$  is a common multiple of  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ .
- (2)  $B(t)$  is a common divisor of  $(A_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ .

Hence, the followings are equivalent:

- (1)  $b(t)$  is a least common multiple of  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ .
- (2)  $B(t)$  is a greatest common divisor of  $(A_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ .

**Example 3.9.** In  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}i]$ ,  $6, 2 + 2\sqrt{5}i$  have common divisors  $\pm 1, \pm 2, \pm(1 + \sqrt{5}i)$ , where the maximal divisors  $\pm 2, \pm(1 + \sqrt{5}i)$  are not associated, so greatest common divisor of  $6, 2 + 2\sqrt{5}i$  fails to exist.[2]

**Proposition 3.10.** Let  $F$  be a field.  $F[t]$  is a principal ideal domain.

*Proof.* As  $F$  is an integral domain,  $F[t]$  is an integral domain.

For all nonzero ideal  $\mathfrak{a}$  of  $F[t]$ , well-ordering principal suggests that  $\mathfrak{a}$  contains a nontrivial element  $b(t)$  where  $\text{Deg}(b(t))$  is minimal. Assume to the contrary that  $b(t)$  doesn't divide some  $a(t) \in \mathfrak{a}$ . Apply division algorithm, and we get the remainder  $r(t)$  of  $a(t)$  modulo  $b(t)$ , which is a nontrivial element in  $\mathfrak{a}$ , and this contradicts with the minimality of  $\text{Deg}(b(t))$ . Hence,  $\mathfrak{a} = \langle a(t) \rangle$  is principal. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum.  $\square$

**Remark:** To keep principal ideal property, we construct polynomial ring over a field.

**Theorem 3.11.** Let  $F$  be a field,  $(a_\lambda(t))_{\lambda \in I}$  be a nonempty indexed family in  $F[t]$ , and  $b(t)$  be a greatest common divisor of  $(a_\lambda(t))_{\lambda \in I}$ .

$$\sum_{\lambda \in I} \langle a_\lambda(t) \rangle = \langle b(t) \rangle$$

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into two parts.

“ $\subseteq$  inclusion”: For all  $\lambda \in I$ ,  $b(t) | a_\lambda(t)$  iff  $\langle b(t) \rangle \supseteq \langle a_\lambda(t) \rangle$ , so:

$$\sum_{\lambda \in I} \langle a_\lambda(t) \rangle \subseteq \langle b(t) \rangle$$

“ $\supseteq$  inclusion”: As  $F[t]$  is a principal ideal domain, for some  $B(t) \in F[t]$ :

$$\sum_{\lambda \in I} \langle a_\lambda(t) \rangle = \langle B(t) \rangle$$

For all  $\lambda \in I$ ,  $\langle B(t) \rangle \supseteq \langle a_\lambda(t) \rangle$  iff  $B(t) | a_\lambda(t)$ , so:

$$B(t) \text{ is a common divisor of } (a_\lambda(t))_{\lambda \in I}$$

As  $b(t)$  is greatest,  $B(t) | b(t)$ , and it follows that:

$$\sum_{\lambda \in I} \langle a_\lambda(t) \rangle \supseteq \langle b(t) \rangle$$

To conclude, we’ve proven the equality. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum.  $\square$

**Remark:** This simultaneously proves the existence of greatest common divisor.

**Theorem 3.12.** Let  $F$  be a field,  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$  be a nonempty finite list in  $F[t]$ , and  $b(t)$  be a least common multiple of  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$ .

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^m \langle a_k(t) \rangle = \langle b(t) \rangle$$

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into two parts.

“ $\supseteq$  inclusion”: For all  $1 \leq k \leq m$ ,  $a_k(t) | b(t)$  iff  $\langle a_k(t) \rangle \supseteq \langle b(t) \rangle$ , so:

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^m \langle a_k(t) \rangle \supseteq \langle b(t) \rangle$$

“ $\subseteq$  inclusion”: As  $F[t]$  is a principal ideal domain, for some  $B(t) \in F[t]$ :

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^m \langle a_k(t) \rangle = \langle B(t) \rangle$$

For all  $1 \leq k \leq m$ ,  $\langle a_k(t) \rangle \supseteq \langle B(t) \rangle$  iff  $a_k(t) | B(t)$ , so:

$B(t)$  is a common multiple of  $(a_k(t))_{k=1}^m$

As  $b(t)$  is least,  $b(t) | B(t)$ , and it follows that:

$$\bigcap_{k=1}^m \langle a_k(t) \rangle \subseteq \langle b(t) \rangle$$

To conclude, we've proven the equality. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum.  $\square$

**Remark:** This simultaneously proves the existence of least common multiple.

### 3.3 Root and Irreducibility

#### Definition 3.13. (Maximal Ideal)

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity, and  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a proper ideal of  $R$ .

If  $\forall a \in \mathfrak{p}^c$ ,  $\langle a \rangle + \mathfrak{p} = R$ , then  $\mathfrak{p}$  is maximal.

#### Definition 3.14. (Prime Ideal)

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity, and  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a proper ideal of  $R$ .

If  $\forall \mathfrak{p}^c \ni a, \forall \mathfrak{p}^c \ni b, \mathfrak{p}^c \ni ab$ , then  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime.

**Proposition 3.15.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity, and  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a proper ideal of  $R$ . If  $\mathfrak{p}$  is maximal, then  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime.

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into three steps.

**Step 1:** We prove that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is maximal iff  $R/\mathfrak{p}$  is a field.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p} \text{ is maximal} &\iff \mathfrak{p} \neq R \text{ and } \forall a \in \mathfrak{p}^c, \langle a \rangle + \mathfrak{p} = R \\ &\iff R/\mathfrak{p} \neq \{\mathfrak{p}\} \text{ and } \forall a + \mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{p}, \exists x + \mathfrak{p} \in R/\mathfrak{p}, (a + \mathfrak{p})(x + \mathfrak{p}) = 1 + \mathfrak{p} \\ &\iff R/\mathfrak{p} \text{ is a field} \end{aligned}$$

**Step 2:** We prove that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime iff  $R/\mathfrak{p}$  is an integral domain.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p} \text{ is prime} &\iff \mathfrak{p} \neq R \text{ and } \forall a, b \in \mathfrak{p}^c, ab \in \mathfrak{p}^c \\ &\iff R/\mathfrak{p} \neq \{\mathfrak{p}\} \text{ and } \forall a + \mathfrak{p}, b + \mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{p}, (a + \mathfrak{p})(b + \mathfrak{p}) \neq \mathfrak{p} \\ &\iff R/\mathfrak{p} \text{ is an integral domain} \end{aligned}$$

**Step 3:** As every field is an integral domain, every maximal ideal is a prime ideal.

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum.  $\square$

**Definition 3.16. (Prime Element)**

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity, and  $p$  be a nonunit element of  $R$ .  
If  $p \neq 0$  and  $\forall p \nmid a, p \nmid b, p \nmid ab$ , then  $p$  is prime.

**Example 3.17.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity. As  $p \nmid a$  iff  $\langle p \rangle \not\supseteq a$ , a nonzero principal ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime iff it is generated by a prime element  $p$ .

**Definition 3.18. (Irreducible Element)**

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity, and  $p$  be a nonunit element of  $R$ .  
If  $p \neq 0$  and  $\forall a, b \in (R^\times)^c, p \neq ab$ , then  $p$  is irreducible.

**Proposition 3.19.** Let  $R$  be an integral domain, and  $p$  be a nonunit element of  $R$ . If  $p$  is prime, then  $p$  is irreducible.

*Proof.* Assume that  $p$  is prime.

- (1)  $p$  is nonunit and nonzero.
- (2) For all elements  $a, b$  of  $R$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 p = ab &\implies p \mid ab \\
 &\implies p \mid a \text{ or } p \mid b \\
 &\implies 1 = (a/p)b \text{ or } 1 = a(b/p) \\
 &\implies a \text{ or } b \text{ is a unit}
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $p$  is irreducible. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Proposition 3.20.** Let  $R$  be a principal ideal ring, and  $p$  be an element of  $R$ .  
If  $p$  is irreducible, then  $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$  is maximal.

*Proof.* Assume that  $p$  is irreducible.

- (1)  $p$  is nonunit implies  $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$  is proper.
- (2) For all ideal  $\mathfrak{a} = \langle a \rangle$  of the principal ideal ring  $R$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle \subseteq \mathfrak{a} = \langle a \rangle &\implies \exists x \in R, p = xa \\
 &\implies x \text{ or } a \text{ is a unit} \\
 &\implies \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p} \text{ or } \mathfrak{a} = R
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$  is maximal. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Remark:** Now we have the following results:

- (1) In a commutative ring with unity,  $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$  is maximal implies  $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$  is prime.
- (2) In a commutative ring with unity,  $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$  is nonzero and prime iff  $p$  is prime.

(3) In an integral domain,  $p$  is prime implies  $p$  is irreducible.  
(4) In a principal ideal ring,  $p$  is irreducible implies  $\mathfrak{p} = \langle p \rangle$  is maximal.  
If we define principal ideal domain as the conjunction of principal ideal ring and integral domain, then the four lines are equivalent.

**Example 3.21.** As  $F[t]$  is a principal ideal domain, the followings are equivalent:

- (1) An ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  is nonzero and maximal in  $F[t]$ .
- (2) An ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  is nonzero and prime in  $F[t]$ .
- (3) An ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  is generated by a prime polynomial  $f(t) \in F[t]$ .
- (4) An ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  is generated by an irreducible polynomial  $f(t) \in F[t]$ .

**Remark:** Hence, we would like to test the irreducibility of  $f(t) \in F[t]$ .

**Definition 3.22. (Root)**

Let  $F$  be a field,  $\tau$  be an element of  $F$ , and  $f(t)$  be a polynomial in  $F[t]$ .

If the evaluation ring homomorphism  $\sigma_\tau$  maps  $f(t)$  to 0, then  $\tau$  is a root of  $f(t)$ .

**Proposition 3.23.** Let  $F$  be a field,  $\tau$  be an element of  $F$ , and  $f(t)$  be a polynomial in  $F[t]$ .  $\tau$  is a root of  $f(t)$  iff  $t - \tau | f(t)$ .

*Proof.* As  $t - \tau \neq 0$ , we apply division algorithm to find a unique quotient polynomial  $q(t) \in F[t]$  and a unique constant remainder  $r \in F$ , such that:

$$f(t) = q(t)(t - \tau) + r$$

As  $\sigma_\tau$  is a ring homomorphism, we have:

$$\tau \text{ is a root of } f(t) \iff f(\tau) = \sigma_\tau(f(t)) = \sigma_\tau(r) = r = 0 \iff r = 0 \iff t - \tau | f(t)$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Remark:** As a corollary, if  $\text{Deg}(f(t)) \geq 2$  and  $f(t)$  is irreducible, then  $f(t)$  has no root. However, the reversed implication is true only when  $n = 2$  or  $n = 3$ .

**Definition 3.24. (Algebraic Multiplicity)**

Let  $F$  be a field,  $\tau$  be an element of  $F$ , and  $f(t)$  be a polynomial in  $F[t]$ .

Define the algebraic multiplicity  $\text{AM}_f(\tau)$  of  $\tau$  as  $\text{Max}\{\alpha \geq 0 : (t - \tau)^\alpha | f(t)\}$ .

**Proposition 3.25.** Let  $F$  be a field, and  $f(t)$  be a nonzero polynomial in  $F[t]$ .

$$\sum_{\tau \in F} \text{AM}_f(\tau) \leq \text{Deg}(f(t))$$

*Proof.* We prove this statement by mathematical induction.

(1) When  $\text{Deg}(f(t)) = 0$ ,  $f(t)$  is a nonzero constant,  $f(t)$  has no root, so:

$$\sum_{\tau \in F} \text{AM}_f(\tau) = 0$$

(2) For all  $n \geq 0$ , when  $\text{Deg}(f(t)) = n$ , assume the statement.

(3) When  $\text{Deg}(f(t)) = n + 1$ , we wish to prove the statement by inductive hypothesis.

**Case 1:** If  $f(t)$  has no root, then:

$$\sum_{\tau \in F} \text{AM}_f(\tau) = 0 \leq n + 1$$

**Case 2:** If  $f(t)$  has a root  $\omega$ , then  $\exists! q(t) \in F[t]$ ,  $f(t) = (t - \omega)q(t)$  and  $\text{Deg}(q(t)) = n$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau \in F} \text{AM}_f(\tau) &= \sum_{\tau \neq \omega} \text{AM}_f(\tau) + \text{AM}_f(\omega) \\ &= \sum_{\tau \neq \omega} \text{AM}_q(\tau) + \text{AM}_q(\omega) + 1 \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in F} \text{AM}_q(\tau) + 1 \leq n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we've proven the statement. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.26. (Fundamental Theorem of Algebra)**

Let  $a(t)$  be a polynomial in  $\mathbb{C}[t]$ . If  $\text{Deg}(a(t)) \geq 1$ , then  $a(t)$  has a root  $\tau \in \mathbb{C}$ .

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that  $a(t)$  has no root. WLOG, assume that:

$$a(t) = t^n + a_{n-1}t^{n-1} + \dots, \text{ where } n \geq 1$$

Define the following function from  $\mathbb{S} \times [0, +\infty]$  to  $\mathbb{S}$  by:

$$H(z, s) = \begin{cases} a(sz)/|a(sz)| & \text{if } 0 \leq s < +\infty; \\ z^n/|z^n| & \text{if } s = +\infty; \end{cases}$$

As  $a(t)$  has no root,  $\forall (z, s) \in \mathbb{S} \times [0, +\infty)$ ,  $|f(st)| \neq 0$ , so  $H(z, s)$  is well-defined.

The following limit suggests that  $H(z, s)$  is continuous:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{(z,s) \rightarrow (z_0, +\infty)} \frac{a(sz)}{|a(sz)|} &= \lim_{(z,s) \rightarrow (z_0, +\infty)} \frac{s^n z^n + a_{n-1} s^{n-1} z^{n-1} + \dots}{|s^n z^n + a_{n-1} s^{n-1} z^{n-1} + \dots|} \\ &= \lim_{(z,s) \rightarrow (z_0, +\infty)} \frac{z^n + a_{n-1} s^{-1} z^{n-1} + \dots}{|z^n + a_{n-1} s^{-1} z^{n-1} + \dots|} = \frac{z^n}{|z^n|} \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $H(z, s)$  is an inverted deformation retraction from  $\{1\}$  to  $\mathbb{S}$ , contradicting to  $\pi_1(\{1\}) \cong \{e\} \not\cong \pi_1(\mathbb{S}) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ . Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum.  $\square$

**Definition 3.27. (Primitive Formal Power Series)**

Let  $f(t)$  be a formal power series in  $\mathbb{Z}[[t]]$ .

If the coefficients of  $f(t)$  are coprime, then  $f(t)$  is primitive.

**Lemma 3.28. (Gauss's Lemma)**

Let  $a(t), b(t)$  be two formal power series in  $\mathbb{Z}[[t]]$ .

If  $a(t), b(t)$  are primitive, then  $a(t)b(t)$  is primitive.

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that  $a(t)b(t)$  is not primitive, then:

$$\exists \text{ prime } p \geq 2, p|a_0b_0 \text{ and } p|a_0b_1 + a_1b_0 \text{ and } p|a_0b_2 + a_1b_1 + a_2b_0 \text{ and } \dots$$

As  $a(t), b(t)$  are primitive, there exist minimal  $r, s \geq 0$ , such that  $p \nmid a_r, b_s$ .

Now we arrive at the following contradiction:

$$p \nmid a_0b_{r+s} + \dots + a_{r-1}b_{s+1} + a_rb_s + a_{r+1}b_{s-1} + \dots + a_{r+s}b_0$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Proposition 3.29.** Let  $f(t)$  be a primitive polynomial in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ .

$f(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Q}[t]$  iff  $f(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ .

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into two parts.

**“if” direction:** Assume that  $f(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ .

For all factorization  $f(t) = p(t)q(t)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[t]$ , we take out common factor and get  $f(t) = cP(t)Q(t)$ , where  $c$  is a rational number and  $P(t), Q(t)$  are primitive in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ .

As both  $f(t)$  and  $P(t)Q(t)$  are primitive in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ ,  $c = \pm 1$ . WLOG, assume that  $c = 1$ .

As  $f(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ ,  $P(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]^\times$  or  $Q(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]^\times$ .

It follows that  $p(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]^\times$  or  $q(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]^\times$ , so  $f(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Q}[t]$ .

**“only if” direction:** Assume that  $f(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Q}[t]$ .

As  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$  is a subring of  $\mathbb{Q}[t]$ ,  $f(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ . Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Theorem 3.30. (Eisenstein's Criterion[3])**

Let  $p$  be a prime number, and  $a(t)$  be a polynomial in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$  with degree  $n$ .

If  $p \nmid a_n, p|a_{n-1}, p|a_{n-2}, \dots, p|a_1, p|a_0, p^2 \nmid a_0$ , then  $a(t)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ .

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that  $f(t)$  has a nontrivial factorization  $b(t)c(t)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ :

$$\begin{aligned} p|a_0 = b_0c_0 &\implies p|b_0 \text{ or } p|c_0 \\ p^2 \nmid a_0 = b_0c_0 &\implies p \nmid b_0 \text{ or } p \nmid c_0 \end{aligned}$$

WLOG, assume that  $p|b_0$  and  $p \nmid c_0$  and  $\text{Deg}(b(t)) = r$ , where  $1 \leq r \leq n-1$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned} p|a_1 = b_0c_1 + b_1c_0 &\implies p|b_1c_0 \implies p|b_1 \\ p|a_2 = b_0c_2 + b_1c_1 + b_2c_0 &\implies p|b_2c_0 \implies p|b_2 \\ &\vdots \\ p|a_r = b_0c_r + b_1c_{r-1} + \cdots + b_{r-1}c_1 + b_rc_0 &\implies p|b_rc_0 \implies p|b_r \end{aligned}$$

Now we arrive at a contradiction:

$$p|b_r \text{ and } b_r|a_n \implies p|a_n$$

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Example 3.31.** For all prime number  $p$ , **Theorem 3.30.** suggests that the following polynomial is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ :

$$\frac{(1+t)^p - 1}{t} = \frac{1}{0!}t^{p-1} + \frac{p}{1!}t^{p-2} + \frac{p(p-1)}{2!}t^{p-3} + \cdots + \frac{p(p-1)\cdots 2}{(p-1)!}$$

Shift this polynomial, and we get a family of irreducible polynomials in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ :

$$\frac{t^p - 1}{t - 1} = t^{p-1} + t^{p-2} + t^{p-3} + \cdots + 1$$

As a result, for all prime number  $p$  and integer  $q$ :

$$\cos \frac{2q\pi}{p} \in \mathbb{Q} \iff p|q \text{ or } p = 2 \text{ or } p = 3$$

## 4 Finite Field

### 4.1 Characteristic and Order

**Proposition 4.1.** If  $F$  is a finite field, then  $n = \text{Char}(F)$  is a prime number.

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that  $n = pq$  is a composite number, where  $p, q \geq 2$ . As there is a natural ring homomorphism from  $\mathbb{Z}$  to  $F$ , the followings hold in  $F$ :

$$0 = n = pq \text{ and } p \neq 0 \text{ and } q \neq 0$$

This contradicts to  $F$  is a field. Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Remark:** As a result, a smaller field  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is embedded in the larger field  $F$ .

**Example 4.2.** If  $F$  is a finite field, then  $F$  is a vector space over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .



**Remark:** By taking a basis, we may further show that  $|F| = p^n$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** If  $f(t)$  is an irreducible polynomial in  $\mathbb{Z}_p[t]$  with degree  $n$ , then  $\mathbb{Z}_p[t]/\langle f(t) \rangle$  is a finite field with basis  $1, u, u^2, \dots, u^{n-1}$ , where  $u = t + \langle f(t) \rangle$ .

*Proof.* We may divide our proof into three parts.

**Part 1:**  $f(t)$  is irreducible in the principal ideal domain  $\mathbb{Z}_p[t]$  implies  $\mathbb{Z}_p[t]$  is a field.

**Part 2:** For all  $c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ :

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 + c_1u + c_2u^2 + \dots + c_{n-1}u^{n-1} = 0 &\implies f(t)|c_0 + c_1t + c_2t^2 + \dots + c_{n-1}t^{n-1} \\ &\implies c_0 + c_1t + c_2t^2 + \dots + c_{n-1}t^{n-1} = 0 \\ &\implies c_0 = c_1 = c_2 = \dots = c_{n-1} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

**Part 3:** For all  $g(u) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[t]/\langle f(t) \rangle$ , as  $f(t) \neq 0$ , we may apply division algorithm to find  $q(t) \in \mathbb{Z}_p[t]$  and  $c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ , such that:

$$\begin{aligned} g(t) &= q(t)f(t) + c_0 + c_1t + c_2t^2 + \dots + c_{n-1}t^{n-1} \\ g(u) &= q(u)f(u) + c_0 + c_1u + c_2u^2 + \dots + c_{n-1}u^{n-1} \\ &= c_0 + c_1u + c_2u^2 + \dots + c_{n-1}u^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $\mathbb{Z}_p[t]/\langle f(t) \rangle$  is a finite field with basis  $1, u, u^2, \dots, u^{n-1}$ .

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

## 4.2 Field Extension

**Example 4.4.** Every quotient map  $\pi_n : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_n$  fails to preserve characteristic.

**Proposition 4.5.** Let  $F, F'$  be two fields.

Every ring homomorphism  $\sigma : F \rightarrow F'$  is injective.

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that  $\text{Ker}(\sigma) \neq \{0\}$ . As  $F$  is a field, the ideal  $\text{Ker}(\sigma) = F$ . This implies  $0' = \sigma(1) = 1'$ , contradicting to  $F' \neq \{0'\}$ . Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Remark:** As a result, every ring homomorphism  $\sigma : F \rightarrow F'$  preserves characteristic.

**Definition 4.6. (Field Extension)**

Let  $F, F'$  be two fields.

If there exists a ring homomorphism  $\sigma : F \rightarrow F'$ , then  $F'$  is an extension of  $F$ .

**Example 4.7.** Let  $F$  be a field, and  $f(t)$  be an irreducible polynomial in  $F[t]$ .  $F[t]/\langle f(t) \rangle$  is an extension of  $F$ .

### 4.3 Primitive Root

**Definition 4.8. (Primitive Root)**

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with unity, and  $g$  be an element of  $R$ .  
If  $g$  generates the group  $R^\times$  of units, then  $g$  is a primitive root of  $R$ .

**Example 4.9.** In  $\mathbb{Z}_8$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_8^\times$  is isomorphic to  $K_4$ , so  $\mathbb{Z}_8$  has no primitive root.

**Theorem 4.10.** Every finite field  $F$  has a primitive root  $g$ .

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that some finite field  $F$  has order  $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_m^{\alpha_m} + 1$ , where  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m$  are distinct prime numbers,  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_m$  are positive integers, and the  $p_1$ -part  $P_1$  of  $F^\times$  has at least two cyclic components. Assume that:

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &\cong P_{1,1} \times P_{1,2} \times \cdots \\ |P_{1,1}| &= p_1^{n_{1,1}} \text{ and } |P_{1,2}| = p_1^{n_{1,2}} \text{ and } \cdots \\ n_{1,1} &\geq 1 \text{ and } n_{1,2} \geq 1 \text{ and } \cdots \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following polynomial in  $F[t]$ :

$$f(t) = t^{|P_{1,1}|} - 1$$

As the multiplicative order  $\text{Ord}(\tau)$  of all  $\tau \in P_{1,1}$  divides  $|P_{1,1}|$ ,  $\tau$  is a root of  $f(t)$ .  
As  $P_{1,2}$  is a  $p_1$ -group,  $P_{1,2}$  has an element  $\xi$  of order  $p_1$ , which is also a root of  $f(t)$ .  
Now we arrive at the following contradiction:

$$\sum_{\tau \in F} \text{AM}_f(\tau) > |P_{1,1}| = \text{Deg}(f(t))$$

Hence,  $|F|$  must be in the form  $p_1 p_2 \cdots p_m + 1$ , and  $F^\times$  is cyclic.

Quod. Erat. Demonstrandum. □

**Remark:** However, it is hard to find this primitive root, so we stop here.

## References

- [1] H. Ren, “Template for math notes,” 2021.
- [2] M. user, “Intersection of principal ideals is not principal,” <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/443334/intersection-of-principal-ideals-is-not-principal>, 2023, accessed: 2023-10-17.
- [3] Wikipedia contributors, “Eisenstein’s criterion — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia,” 2024, [Online; accessed 19-December-2024]. [Online]. Available: [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Eisenstein%27s\\_\\_criterion&oldid=1247464065](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Eisenstein%27s__criterion&oldid=1247464065)