A First Course in Abstract Algebra by Anderson & Feil

Noah Lewis

October 22, 2025

Contents

1	The Natural Numbers	1
2	The Integers	6
3	Modular Arithmetic	10
4	Polynomials with Rational Coefficients	13

1 The Natural Numbers

Problem 1

Prove using mathematical induction that for all positive integers n,

$$1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$$

Proof. Let n = 1 then $\frac{n(n+1)}{2} = \frac{1(1+1)}{2} = \frac{1(2)}{2} = 1$. Assume the formula is true for some integer k = n - 1, thus:

$$1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + (n - 1) = \frac{(n - 1)((n - 1) + 1)}{2}$$

Thus:

$$1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + (n - 1) + n$$

$$= \frac{(n - 1)((n - 1) + 1)}{2} + n$$

$$= \frac{(n - 1)^2 + n - 1}{2} + \frac{2n}{2}$$

$$= \frac{(n - 1)^2 + 3n - 1}{2}$$

$$= \frac{n^2 - 2n + 1 + 3n - 1}{2}$$

$$= \frac{n(n + 1)}{2}$$

You probably recall from your previous mathematical work the *triangle inequality:* for any real numbers x and y,

$$|x + y| \le |x| + |y|$$

Accepts this as given (or see a calculus text to recall how it is proved). Generalize the triangle inequality, by proving that

$$|x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n \le |x_1| + |x_2| + \dots + |x_n|,$$

for any positive integer n.

Proof. For n = 1, trivially $|x_1| \le |x_1|$. For n = 2, $|x_1 + x_2| \le |x_1| + |x_2|$ by the triangle inequality. Now assume the formula holds for k = n - 1, thus:

$$|x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1}| \le |x_1| + |x_2| + \dots + |x_{n-1}|$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} |x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1} + x_n| \\ &\leq |(x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1}) + x_n| \\ &\leq |x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_{n-1}| + |x_n| \\ &\leq |x_1| + |x_2| + \dots + |x_n| \end{aligned}$$

triangle inequality

Problem 4

Given a positive integer n, recall that $n! = 1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 \cdots$ (this is read as n factorial). Provide an inductive definition for n!. (It is customary to actually start this definition at n = 0, setting 0! = 1)

Solution

We can define n! as follows. If $n \le 1$, then n! = 1. If n > 1, then n! = n(n - 1)!.

Problem 5

Prove that $2^n < n!$ for all $n \ge 4$.

Proof. Let n = 4, then $2^4 = 16 < 4! = 24$. Assume the inequality holds for k = n - 1, thus:

$$2^{n-1} < (n-1)!$$

Thus:

$$2^{n-1} \cdot 2 < (n-1)! \cdot n$$
 Note: $2 < 4 \le n$
 $2^n < n!$

Problem 7

Prove the familiar geometric progression formula. Namely, suppose that a and r are real numbers

with $r \neq 1$. Then show that:

$$a + ar + ar^{2} + \dots + ar^{n-1} = \frac{a - ar^{n}}{1 - r}$$

Proof. Let n=1, then $a=\frac{a-ar^n}{1-r}=\frac{a-ar}{1-r}=\frac{a(1-r)}{1-r}=a$. Assume the formula holds for k=n-1, thus:

$$a + ar + ar^{2} + \dots + ar^{n-2} = \frac{a - ar^{n-1}}{1 - r}$$

Thus

$$a + ar + ar^{2} + \dots + ar^{n-2} + ar^{n-1}$$

$$= \frac{a - ar^{n-1}}{1 - r} + ar^{n-1}$$

$$= \frac{a - ar^{n-1}}{1 - r} + \frac{(1 - r)ar^{n-1}}{1 - r}$$

$$= \frac{a - ar^{n-1} + (1 - r)(ar^{n-1})}{1 - r}$$

$$= \frac{a - ar^{n-1} + ar^{n-1} - ar^{n}}{1 - r}$$

$$= \frac{a - ar^{n}}{1 - r}$$

Problem 12

Consider the sequence a_n defined inductively as follows:

$$a_1 = 5, a_2 = 7, a_{n+2} = 3a_{n+1} - 2a_n$$

Proof. Let n = 1, then $a_1 = 5 = 3 + 2^n = 3 + 2^1 = 5$. Let n = 2, then $a_2 = 7 = 3 + 2^n = 3 + 2^2 = 7$ Assume the formula holds for k < n thus:

$$a_{n-1} = 3 + 2^{n-1}$$

and

$$a_{n-2} = 3 + 2^{n-2}$$

So k = n is:

$$a_n = 3a_{n-1} - 2a_{n-2} = 3(3 + 2^{n-1}) - 2(3 + 2^{n-2})$$

Then:

$$3(3 + 2^{n-1}) - 2(3 + 2^{n-2})$$

$$= 9 + 3 \cdot 2^{n-1} - 6 - 2 \cdot 2^{n-2}$$

$$= 3 + 3 \cdot 2^{n-1} - 2^{n-1}$$

$$= 3 + 2 \cdot 2^{n-1}$$

$$= 3 + 2^{n}$$

In this problem you will prove some results about the binomial coefficients, using induction. Recall that:

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{(n-k)!k!}$$

where *n* is a positive integer, and $0 \le k \le n$.

(a) Prove that

$$\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$

 $n \ge 2$ and k < n. Hint: You do not need induction to prove this. Bear in mind that 0! = 1.

(b) Verify that $\binom{n}{0} = 1$ and $\binom{n}{n} = 1$. Use these facts, together with part a, to prove by induction on n that $\binom{n}{k}$ is an integer, for all k with $0 \le k \le n$. (Note: You may have encountered $\binom{n}{k}$ as the count of the number of k element subsets of a set of n objects; it follows that from this $\binom{n}{k}$ is an integer. What we are asking for here is an inductive proof based on algebra.)

(c) Use part a and induction to prove the Binomical Theorem: For non-negative n and variables x, y,

$$(x+y)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} x^{n-k} y^k$$

Proof.

$$\binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$

$$= \frac{(n-1)!}{((n-1)-k)!k!} + \frac{(n-1)!}{((n-1)-(k-1))!(k-1)!}$$

$$= (n-1)! \left(\frac{1}{((n-1)-k)!k!} + \frac{1}{((n-1)-(k-1))!(k-1)!} \right)$$

$$= (n-1)! \left(\frac{1}{((n-1)-k)!k(k-1)!} + \frac{1}{((n-1)-(k-1))!(k-1)!} \right)$$

$$= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!} \left(\frac{1}{((n-1)-k)!k} + \frac{1}{((n-1)-(k-1))!} \right)$$

$$= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!} \left(\frac{1}{(n-k-1)!k} + \frac{1}{(n-k)!} \right)$$

$$= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!} \left(\frac{1}{(n-k-1)!k} + \frac{1}{(n-k)(n-k-1)!} \right)$$

$$= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-k-1)!} \left(\frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{(n-k)} \right)$$

$$= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-k-1)!} \left(\frac{n-k}{k(n-k)} + \frac{k}{k(n-k)} \right)$$

$$= \frac{(n-1)!}{(k-1)!(n-k-1)!} \left(\frac{n}{k(n-k)} \right)$$

$$= \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$$

Proof. Let k = 0 then, $\binom{n}{0} = \frac{n!}{(n-0)!(0!)} = \frac{n!}{n!} = 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let k = n then, $\binom{n}{n} = \frac{n!}{(n-n)!(n!)} = \frac{n!}{n!} = 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume this

holds for n-1, thus for all k where $0 \le k \le n-1$:

$$\binom{n-1}{k} \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Then:

$$\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k-1}$$

Since each of these terms exist in \mathbb{Z} their sum $\binom{n}{k}$ is in \mathbb{Z} since the integers are closed over addition.

Proof. Let n = 0. Then:

$$(x+y)^0 = 1 = \sum_{k=0}^{0} {0 \choose k} x^k y^{0-k} = {0 \choose 0} x^0 y^0 = 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 = 1$$

Assume the formula holds for n-1, thus:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} x^k y^{(n-1)-k} = (x+y)^{n-1}$$

Then:

$$(x+y)^{n} = (x+y)^{n-1} \cdot (x+y)s$$

$$= \left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} x^{k} y^{(n-1)-k}\right) \cdot (x+y)$$

$$= x \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} x^{k} y^{(n-1)-k} + y \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} x^{k} y^{(n-1)-k}$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n} \binom{n-1}{k-1} x^{k} y^{n-k} + \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{k} x^{k} y^{n-k}$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \left(\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \binom{n-1}{k}\right) x^{k} y^{n-k}$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} x^{k} y^{n-k}$$

Problem 15

Criticize the following "proof" showing that all cows are the same color.

It suffices to show that any herd of n cows has the same color. If the herd has but one cow, then trivially all the cows in the herd have the same color. Now suppose that we have a herd of n cows and n > 1. Pick out a cow and remove it from the herd, leaving n - 1 cows; by the induction hypothesis these cows all have the same color. Now put the cow back and remove another cow. (We can do so because n > 1.) The remaining n - 1 again must all be the same color. Hence, the first cow selected and the second cow selected have the same color as those not selected, and so the entire herd of n cows has the same color.

Solution

The proof selects a different set of n-1 cows each time.

Prove the converse of Theorem 1.1; that is, prove that the Principle of Mathematical Induction implies the Well-ordering Princple. (This shows that these two principles are logically equivalent, and so from an axiomatic point of view it doesn't matter which we assume is an axiom for the natural numbers.)

Proof. Assume that the principle of mathematical induction holds. Let $G \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be nonempty. For contradiction, suppose G has no least element. Define P(n) to be the statement: "Nothing $\leq n$ is in G."

If $1 \in G$, then 1 would be the least element of G, a contradiction. So $1 \notin G$ and P(1) is true.

Assume P(n) holds meaning no element of G is $\leq n$. If $n+1 \in G$, then n+1 would be the least element of G, a contradiction. Therefore $n+1 \notin G$, and hence P(n+1) holds.

By induction, P(n) holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. So no element of \mathbb{N} is in G, so $G = \emptyset$, contradicting the assumption that G is nonempty.

2 The Integers

Problem 3

Prove that the set of all linear combinations of a and b are precisely the multiple of gcd(a, b).

Proof. Let a, b be integers such that $a \ne 0$ or $b \ne 0$. We know $ax + by = \gcd(a, b)$ for some $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let t be an arbitrary integer. Then $t(ax + by) = t(\gcd(a, b))$. It follows that $a(tx) + b(ty) = t(\gcd(a, b))$ Showing that any integer multiple t of the $\gcd(a, b)$ is equivalent to some linear combination of a, b.

Let a, b, x, and y be arbitrary integers. Let $d = \gcd(a, b)$. It follows that $d \mid a$ and $d \mid b$. Then a = dt for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and b = df for some $f \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then:

$$ax + by = dtx + dfy = d(tx + fy)$$

So any linear combination of a and b is a multiple of the gcd(a, b).

Problem 4

Two numbers are said to be relatively prime if their gcd is 1. Prove a, b relatively prime if and only if every integer can be written as a linear combination of a and b.

Proof. → Suppose $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ are relatively prime. Let $d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since a, b are relatively prime gcd(a, b) = ax + by = 1 where $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then d(gcd(a, b)) = d(ax + by) = a(dx) + b(dy) = d(1) = d.

 \leftarrow Suppose every integer can be written as a linear combination of a and b. In particular 1 = ax + by for some $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then gcd(a, b) = 1 = ax + by so a and b are relatively prime.

Problem 5

Prove Theorem 2.6. That is, use induction to prove that if the prime p divides $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n$, then p divides a_i for some i.

Proof. Suppose *p* is prime.

Base case: If $p \mid a_1 a_2$ by definition of being prime $p \mid a_1$ or $p \mid a_2$.

Assume the Theorem holds for n-1 so if $p \mid a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{n-1}$ then $p \mid a_i$ for some i. Now suppose $p \mid a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{n-1} a_n$. Let $c = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{n-1}$, then $p \mid c \cdot a_n$. By definition of being prime $p \mid c$ by the induction hypothesis or $p \mid a_n$.

Problem 6

Suppose that *a* and *b* are positive integers. If a + b is prime, prove that gcd(a, b) = 1.

Proof. We've already proved n is prime iff n is irreducible. Suppose a+b is prime and for contradiction gcd(a,b)=x>1. Since a+b is prime it has no factors other than itself and 1. Since gcd(a,b)=x>1 then $x\mid a$ and $x\mid b$. Furthermore, a=tx and b=yx for some $t,y\in\mathbb{Z}$. Then a+b=tx+yx=x(t+y) a contradiction since a+b is prime.

Problem 7

- (a) A natural number greater than 1 that is not prime is called composite. Show that for any n, there is a run of n consecutive composite numbers. Hint: Think Factorial.
- (b) Therefore, there is a string of 5 consecutive composite numbers starting where?

Proof. Let $T = \{2, 3, ..., n + 1\}$ and let i be an element in T. Now let

$$d = i + (n + 1)!$$
.

First notice $2 \le i \le n + 1$. Then:

$$((i+1)+(n+1)!)-(i+(n+1)!)=1$$

Showing consecutive values of *i* produce consecutive values of *d*. Since $2 \le i \le n+1$, we have $i \mid (n+1)!$. Then:

$$d = i + (n+1)!$$

= $i \left(1 + \frac{(n+1)!}{i} \right)$

Clearly d is a composite number since it has been factored into 2 integers greater than 1. Thus, the n values of d produce a sequence of n consecutive composite numbers.

Solution (b):

$$722 = 2 \cdot 361,723 = 3 \cdot 241,724 = 2 \cdot 362,725 = 5 \cdot 145,726 = 2 \cdot 363$$

Problem 9

Notice that $gcd(30,50) = 5 gcd(6,10) = 5 \cdot 2$. In fact, this is always true; prove that if a > 0, then $gcd(ab,ac) = a \cdot gcd(b,c)$.

Proof. Let $p = \gcd(ab, ac) = abx + acy$. Since $a \mid p$ there exists r such that p = ar. So ar = abx + acy and dividing by a gives r = bx + cy. Since a > 0 and $ar = \gcd(ab, ac) > 0$ it follows that r > 0. Thus r is a positive linear combination of b and c. Suppose, for contradiction, there exists d that is a positive linear combination of b and c, and d < r. So d = bu + cv for some integers u, v. Since a > 0 it follows that ad > 0. But then ad = abu + acv and ad < ar = p contradicting the minimality of p. Therefore $r = \gcd(b, c)$. It follows that $\gcd(ab, ac) = ar = a \cdot \gcd(b, c)$.

Suppose two integers *a* and *b* have been factored into primes as follows:

$$a = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$$

and

$$b = p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_r^{m_r}$$

where the p_i 's are primes, and the exponents m_i and n_i are non-negative integers. It is the case that

$$gcd(a,b) = p_1^{s_1} p_2^{s_2} \cdots p_r^{s_r}$$

where s_i is the smaller of n_i and m_i . Show this with $a = 360 = 2^3 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$ and $b = 2^2 3^2 5^2$. Now prove this fact in general.

Solution:

Let

$$a = 360 = 2^3 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^1$$
, $b = 2^2 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2$.

Exponents of each prime factor:

Prime p_i	Exponent in $a(n_i)$	Exponent in $b(m_i)$				
2	3	2				
3	2	2				
5	1	2				

Minimum exponent for each prime:

$$s_i = \min(n_i, m_i)$$

Prime p_i	$s_i = \min(n_i, m_i)$					
2	2					
3	2					
5	1					

Multiply the primes raised to the minimum exponents:

$$gcd(a, b) = 2^2 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^1 = 4 \cdot 9 \cdot 5 = 180.$$

The gcd of 360 and 900 is 180.

Proof. Let $a = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{n_i}$ and $b = \prod_{i=1}^r p_i^{m_i}$. For each prime p_i , define $s_i = \min(n_i, m_i)$ and let $c_i = p_i^{s_i}$.

First note that the gcd will have the common prime factors of *a* and *b*. A prime not common to both would not divide both.

Let $f_i = p_i^{s_i+1}$ for the *i*th prime number appearing in *a* and *b*. Then $f_i > p_i^{m_i}$ or $f_i > p_i^{n_i}$ so $f_i \nmid p_i^{m_i}$ or $f_i \nmid p_i^{n_i}$. So c_i is the largest power of p_i dividing the *i*th prime of both numbers.

Since the primes are independent, the greatest common divisor of a and b is $gcd(a, b) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} c_i = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{s_i}$.

Problem 11

The **least common multiple** of natural numbers a and b is the smallest positive common multiple of a and b. That is, if m is the least common mulitple of a and b, then $a \mid m$ and $b \mid m$, and if $a \mid n$ and $b \mid n$ then $n \geq m$. We will write lcm(a,b) for the least common mulitple of a and b. Can you find a formula for the lcm of the type given for the gcd in the previous excersize.

Solution

Suppose two integers *a* and *b* have been factored into primes as follows:

$$a=p_1^{n_1}p_2^{n_2}\cdots p_r^{n_r}$$

and

$$b = p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_r^{m_r}$$

where the p_i 's are primes, and the exponents m_i and n_i are non-negative integers. It is the case that

$$lcm(a,b) = p_1^{s_1} p_2^{s_2} \cdots p_r^{s_r}$$

where s_i is the larger of n_i and m_i .

Problem 12

Show that if gcd(a, b) = 1, then lcm(a, b) = ab.

In general, show that:

$$lcm(a,b) = \frac{ab}{\gcd(a,b)}$$

Proof. We prove the general case first.

Let $a = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{n_i}$ and $b = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{m_i}$. So

$$ab = \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_i^{n_i + m_i}.$$

Now inspecting the *i*th prime in *ab* we get $p_i^{n_i+m_i}$. Then looking at the gcd's *i*th prime we get $p_i^{\min\{n_i,m_i\}}$. Suppose wlog that $n_i \ge m_i$. Then

$$\frac{p_i^{n_i+m_i}}{p_i^{\min\{n_i,m_i\}}} = \frac{p_i^{n_i+m_i}}{p_i^{m_i}} = p_i^{n_i+m_i-m_i} = p_i^{n_i} = p_i^{\max\{n_i,m_i\}}.$$

ı

This is the *i*th prime factor of the *lcm*.

Proof. Suppose that for each prime p_i , p_i divides a or b but not both. Then for the ith prime factor p_i , either $n_i = 0$ or $m_i = 0$. Then:

$$\frac{p_i^{n_i+m_i}}{p_i^{\min\{n_i,m_i\}}} = \frac{p_i^{n_i+m_i}}{p_i^0} = p_i^{n_i+m_i-0} = p_i^{n_i+m_i} = p_i^{\max\{n_i,m_i\}}.$$

Problem 13

Prove that if m is a common multiple of both a and b, then $lcm(a,b) \mid m$.

Proof. Suppose m is a common multiple of both a and b. Then there exist integers l and f such that m = la and m = fb. Let the ith prime factor of a, b, l, d be $p_i^{n_i}$, $p_i^{n_i}$, $p_i^{n_i}$, $p_i^{n_i}$, $p_i^{n_i}$ respectively. Then the ith prime factor of m is

$$m = la = p_i^{n_i + t_i}, \quad m = fb = p_i^{m_i + s_i}.$$

Let the *i*th prime factor of lcm(a, b) be $p_i^{max\{n_i, m_i\}}$. Then, in either case, we have

$$n_i + t_i = m_i + s_i \ge \max\{n_i, m_i\}.$$

So each $p_i^{\max\{n_i,m_i\}}$ divides the corresponding prime factor of m.

- (a) Show that in Euclid's Algorithm, the remainders are at least halved after two steps. That is $r_{i+2} < 1/2r_i$.
- (b) Use part a to find the maximum number of steps required for Euclid's algorithm. (Figure this in terms of the maximum of a and b).

Proof. Theorem 2.3 shows that the remainders form a strictly decreasing sequence of integers. Three steps of the algorithm are shown below.

step 1:
$$b_{n-2} = a_{n-2} \cdot q_{n-2} + r_{n-2}$$

step 2: $b_{n-1} = a_{n-1} \cdot q_{n-1} + r_{n-1}$
step 3: $b_n = a_n \cdot q_n + r_n$

Now for the *i*th iteration $b_i = a_{i-1}$ and $a_i = r_{i-1}$. Then:

step 1:
$$b_{n-2} = a_{n-2} \cdot q_{n-2} + r_{n-2}$$

step 2: $a_{n-2} = r_{n-2} \cdot q_{n-1} + r_{n-1}$
step 3: $r_{n-2} = r_{n-1} \cdot q_n + r_n$

Notice, in step 3, a larger q_n implies a smaller r_n . So in the worst case $q_n = 1$. So $r_{n-2} = r_{n-1} + r_n \iff r_n = r_{n-2} - r_{n-1}$. Now since $r_n < r_{n-1}$ then $r_{n-2} - r_{n-1} < r_{n-1} \iff r_{n-2} < 2r_{n-1}$. So $\frac{1}{2}r_{n-2} < r_{n-1}$. Now since $r_n < r_{n-2} - r_{n-1}$ then $r_n < r_{n-2} - \frac{1}{2}r_{n-2} = \frac{1}{2}r_{n-2}$.

Solution 18 (b):

Let $c = \max\{a, b\}$. From part (a), we know that after every two steps, the remainder is at most half of the remainder two steps before:

$$r_{i+2} < \frac{1}{2}r_i$$

Let *k* be the number of "two-step pairs" needed for the remainder to drop below 1. Then

$$\frac{c}{2k} < 1 \implies 2^k > c \implies k > \log_2 c$$

Since each k corresponds to two iterations, the maximum number of iterations of Euclid's algorithm is

$$\max \text{ steps } \le 2k \le 2\log_2 c$$

Problem 19

Recall from Excersize 1.13 the definition of the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{k}$. Suppose that p is a positive prime integer, and k is an integer with $1 \le k \le p-1$. Prove that p divides binomial coefficient $\binom{p}{k}$.

Proof. By Exercise 1.13, we know that $\binom{p}{k} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Using the factorial definition:

$$\binom{p}{k} = \frac{p!}{k!(p-k)!} = \frac{p \cdot (p-1)!}{k \cdot (k-1)!(p-k)!} = \frac{p}{k} \binom{p-1}{k-1}.$$

Since p is prime and $1 \le k \le p-1$, we have $\gcd(p,k)=1$, so k divides $\binom{p-1}{k-1}$. Therefore, p divides $\binom{p}{k}$.

3 Modular Arithmetic

Determine the elements of \mathbb{Z}_{15} that have multiplicative inverses. Give an example of an equation of the form [a]X = [b] ($[a] \neq 0$) that has no solution in \mathbb{Z}_{15} .

Solution

	[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]	[13]	[14]
[0]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
[1]	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
[2]	0	2	4	6	8	10	12	14	1	3	5	7	9	11	13
[3]	0	3	6	9	12	0	3	6	9	12	0	3	6	9	12
[4]	0	4	8	12	1	5	9	13	2	6	10	14	3	7	11
[5]	0	5	10	0	5	10	0	5	10	0	5	10	0	5	10
[6]	0	6	12	3	9	0	6	12	3	9	0	6	12	3	9
[7]	0	7	14	6	13	5	12	4	11	3	10	2	9	1	8
[8]	0	8	1	9	2	10	3	11	4	12	5	13	6	14	7
[9]	0	9	3	12	6	0	9	3	12	6	0	9	3	12	6
[10]	0	10	5	0	10	5	0	10	5	0	10	5	0	10	5
[11]	0	11	7	3	14	10	6	2	13	9	5	1	12	8	4
[12]	0	12	9	6	3	0	12	9	6	3	0	12	9	6	3
[13]	0	13	11	9	7	5	3	1	14	12	10	8	6	4	2
[14]	0	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

Elements with multiplicative inverses are [1],[2],[4],[7],[8],[11],[13], and [14].

Example of an equation of the form [a]X = [b] ($[a] \neq 0$) that has no solution.

$$[3]X = [5]$$

Problem 4

Find an example in \mathbb{Z}_6 where [a][b] = [a][c], but $[b] \neq [c]$. How is this related to the existence of multiplicative inverses in \mathbb{Z}_6 ?

Example where [a][b] = [a][c], but $[b] \neq [c]$:

$$[2][2] = [2][5] = [4]$$

You cannot assume that if [a][b] = [a][c] then [b] = [c]. This is only true if [a] has a multiplicative inverse.

Problem 5

If gcd(a, b) = 1 then the GCD identity 2.4 garuntees that there exists integers u and v such that 1 = au + mv. Show that in this case, $[u]_m$ is the multiplicate inverse of $[a]_m$ in \mathbb{Z}_m .

Proof. By Theorem 3.2 if x - y = km for some integer k then x,y are in the same residue (mod m). Now $1 = au + mv \iff au = -mv + 1$. Then x - y = (-mv + 1) - 1 = (-v)m. Thus $[au]_m = [1]_m$ and therefore $[a]_m \cdot [u]_m = [1]$.

Problem 6

Now use essentially the reverse of the argument from Excersize 5 to show that if [a] has a multiplicative inverse in \mathbb{Z}_{m} , then gcd(a, m) = 1.

Proof. Suppose $[a]_m$ has a multiplicative inverse $[b]_m$ in \mathbb{Z}_m . Then $[a] \cdot [b] = [ab] = [1]$. By Theorem 3.2, ab - 1 = km. But ab - km = 1 so ab + m(-k) = 1. Therefore $\gcd(a, m) = 1$.

Problem 7

According to what you have shown in Excersize 5 and 6, which elements of \mathbb{Z}_{24} have multiplicative inverses? What are the inverses for each of those elements? (The answer is somewhat suprising.)

Solution:

The following have multiplicate inverses in \mathbb{Z}_{24} .

- 1. $[1]_{24}$
- 2. $[5]_{24}$
- 3. $[7]_{24}$
- 4. $[11]_{24}$
- 5. $[13]_{24}$
- 6. $[17]_{24}$
- 7. $[19]_{24}$
- 8. $[23]_{24}$

Problem 9

Prove that the multiplication on \mathbb{Z}_m as defined in the text is well defined, as claimed in Section 3.2.

Proof. Consider [a] and [b]. Let x, y be elements in [a] and b, c be elements in [b]. We need to show [xb] = [yc]. But $x, y \in [a]$ implies $x - y = k_1 m$ for some integer k_1 . Also $b, c \in [b]$ implies $b - c = k_2 m$ for some integer k_2 . Then:

$$xb - yc$$

= $(k_1m + y)(k_2m + c) - yc$
= $k_1k_2m^2 + k_1mc + k_2my + yc - yc$
= $k_1k_2m^2 + k_1mc + k_2my$
= $m(k_1k_2m + k_1c + k_2y)$

Showing that [xb] = [yc]

Problem 10

Prove that if all non-zero \mathbb{Z}_m have multiplicative inverses, then multiplicative cancellation holds: that is, if [a][b] = [a][c], then [b] = [c].

Proof. Suppose all non-zero \mathbb{Z}_m have multiplicative inverses. Let [t] be the multiplicative inverse of [a]. Then $[a][b] = [a][c] \iff [t][a][b] = [t][a][c] \iff [b] = [c]$.

Problem 13

In the integers, the equation $x^2 = a$ has a solution only when a is a positive perfect square or zero. For which [a] does the equation $[X]^2 = [a]$ have a solution in \mathbb{Z}_7 ? What about in \mathbb{Z}_8 ? What about in \mathbb{Z}_9 ?

Solution:

Elements with square roots in \mathbb{Z}_7 :

[0], [1], [2], [4]

Elements with square roots in \mathbb{Z}_8 :

[0],[1],[4]

Elements with square roots in \mathbb{Z}_9 :

[0], [1], [4], [7]

Problem 14

Explain what $a \equiv b \pmod{1}$ means.

Solution:

It means when elements in [a] and [b] are divided by 1 the remainder is equivalent. Of course this is true for any a and b since $\frac{a}{1} = a$ and $\frac{b}{1} = b$. So $[a] = [b] = \mathbb{Z}$.

4 Polynomials with Rational Coefficients

Problem 2

Divide the polynomial $x^2 - 3x + 2$ by the polynomial 2x + 1, to obtain a quotient and remainder as garunteed by the Division Theorem 4.2. Note that although $x^2 - 3x + 2$ and 2x + 1 are elements of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, the quotient and remainder are not. Argue that this means that there is not Division Theorem for $\mathbb{Z}[x]$.

Solution:

When $x^2 - 3x + 2$ is divided by 2x + 1, the quotient is $\frac{1}{2}x - \frac{7}{4}$ and the remainder is $\frac{15}{4}$. To verify:

$$(2x+1)\left(\frac{1}{2}x - \frac{7}{4}\right) + \frac{15}{4} = x^2 - \frac{7}{2}x + \frac{1}{2}x - \frac{7}{4} + \frac{15}{4}$$
$$= x^2 - 3x + 2$$

Clearly, in this example the remainder is not in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. Therefore, the Division Theorem does not hold in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. Moreover, the quotient and remainder are unique as guaranteed by the Division Theorem in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$.

Problem 3

By Corollary 4.4 we know that a third-degree polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ has at most three roots. Give four examples of third-degree polynomials in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ that have 0, 1, 2, and 3 roots, respectively; justify your assertions. (Recall that here a root must be a rational number!)

- 1. 0 roots: $x^3 2 = 0$. x would have to satisfy $x^3 = 2$. Clearly no integer cubed equals 2 (so n = 1 is impossible). Suppose there exists a rational number in lowest terms $x = \frac{m}{n}$ with |n| > 1. Then $(\frac{m}{n})^3 = 2 \iff m^3 = 2n^3$. But this implies $n^3 \mid m^3$, so $n \mid m$, which contradicts that $\gcd(m, n) = 1$. Thus there is no rational root.
- 2. 1 root: (x-0)(x-0)(x-0) = 0. Justification is obvious by root theorem.
- 3. 2 roots: (x-1)(x-1)(x-2) = 0. Justification is obvious by root theorem.
- 4. 3 roots: (x-1)(x-2)(x-3) = 0. Justification is obvious by root theorem.

Your example in the previous excersize of a third-degree polynomial with exactly 2 roots had one repeated root; that is, a root a where $(x-a)^2$ is a factor of the polynomial. (Roots may have multiplicity greater than two of course.) Why can't a third-degree polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ have exactly 2 roots where neither is a multiple root.

Problem 6

Suppose that $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, and deg(f) > 0. Use the Root Theorem 4.3 to prove that the equation f(x) = q has at most finitely many solutions.

Problem 8

Prove that Theorem 4.7: the GCD identity for $\mathbb{Q}[x]$. Use Euclid's Algorithm 4.5, and the relationship we know between the gcd produced by the algorithm and an arbitrary gcd (Theorem 4.6).

Problem 9

One can also prove the GCD identity for $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ with an argument similar to the existential proof of the GCD identity for integers, found in Section 2.3. Try this approach.

Problem 10

We say that $p \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ has a multiplicative inverse if there exists $q \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ such that pq = 1. Prove that $p \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ has a multiplicative inverse if and only if deg(p) = 0.

Problem 11

Suppose that $g \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$, and g divides all elements of [Q][x]. Prove that g is a non-zero constant polynomial.

Problem 12

Find two different polynomials in $\mathbb{Z}_3[x]$ that are equal as functions from $\mathbb{Z}_3 = \mathbb{Z}_3$.

Problem 13

Find a non-zero polynomial in $\mathbb{Z}_4[x]$ for which f(a) = 0, for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}_4$.