

## 553 Review Rings

39. Let  $R$  be a commutative ring with  $1 \neq 0$  and let  $P$  be a prime ideal of  $R$ . Let  $I$  and  $J$  be ideals of  $R$  s.t.  $I \cap J \subset P$ . Prove that  $I \subseteq P$  or  $J \subseteq P$ .

Proof. Suppose  $I \not\subseteq P$ . We will show  $J \subseteq P$ .

Let  $x \in I$  with  $x \notin P$ .  $\forall y \in J$ , the product  $xy$  is an element of  $I \cap J$  (since  $x \in I$  so  $xy \in I$  and  $y \in J$  so  $xy \in J$ ). Thus,  $xy \in P$ . Since  $P$  is a prime ideal,  $x \in P$  or  $y \in P$ . We already know  $x \notin P$ , so  $y \in P$ . Thus,  $J \subseteq P$ .

40. Prove a finite integral domain is a field.

Proof 1. Let  $x \in R$ ,  $x \neq 0$ . Consider the sequence  $x, x^2, x^3, x^4, \dots$ . Since  $R$  is finite, it follows that  $x^i = x^j$  for some  $i < j$ . Since  $x \neq 0$  and  $R$  is an integral domain, we have cancellation. Thus,  $1 = x^{j-i}$ , so  $x \cdot x^{j-i-1} = 1$  ( $j > i$  so  $j-i-1 \geq 0$ ). Hence,  $x$  is a unit.

Proof 2. Let  $\varphi_a: R \rightarrow R$  be defined so  $\varphi_a(x) = ax$  for  $a \neq 0$  an element in  $R$ .

$\varphi_a(x+y) - a(x+y) = ax+ay = \varphi_a(x) + \varphi_a(y)$ , so  $\varphi_a$  is a group endomorphism on the additive group  $R$ .

If  $x \in \ker \varphi_a$ , then  $\varphi_a(x) = ax = 0$ . Since  $R$  is an integral domain and  $a \neq 0$ , we get  $x = 0$ , so  $\varphi_a$  is injective.

Since  $R$  is finite and  $\varphi_a: R \rightarrow R$  is injective,  $\varphi_a$  is surjective. Thus,  $\exists b \in R$  s.t.  $\varphi_a(b) = 1 \in R$ . But  $\varphi_a(b) = ab$ . Thus,  $a$  is a unit.

41. An element  $x$  of a ring  $R$  is called nilpotent if some power of  $x$  is zero. Prove that if  $x$  is nilpotent, then  $1+x$  is a unit in  $R$ .

Proof. Suppose  $x \in R$  is nilpotent with  $x^n = 0$ .

$$\text{Now, } x^n - 1 = (x-1)(x^{n-1} + x^{n-2} + \dots + x + 1)$$

$$\text{But } x^n = 0, \text{ so } -1 = (x-1)(x^{n-1} + x^{n-2} + \dots + x + 1).$$

Since  $-1$  is a unit,  $x-1$  is a unit in  $R$ . Since  $x-1 = -1(1-x)$ , it follows that  $1-x$  is a unit in  $R$ .

We proved this for any nilpotent element  $x$ . If we can show that  $-x$  is nilpotent, then we have  $1-(-x) = 1+x$  is a unit.

Consider  $(-x)^n = \underbrace{(-x)(-x) \dots (-x)}_{n \text{ times}}$ .

Since  $(-x)(-y) = xy$  for  $x, y \in R$ , it follows that

$$(-x)^n = (-1)^n (x)^n = (-1)^n 0 = 0.$$

Thus  $-x$  is nilpotent, so  $1+x$  is a unit.

42. Let  $R$  be a non-zero commutative ring with  $1$ . Show that if  $I$  is an ideal of  $R$  such that  $1+a$  is a unit in  $R$  for all  $a \in I$ , then  $I$  is contained in every maximal ideal of  $R$ .

Proof. By way of contradiction, suppose  $M$  is a maximal ideal of  $R$  with  $I \not\subseteq M$ . Then  $\exists x \in I$  s.t.  $x \notin M$ .

Consider the ideal  $M+(x)$ . Since  $x \notin M$ ,  $M \subsetneq M+(x)$ , and  $x \in M+(x)$ , it follows that  $M \subsetneq M+(x)$ .

Since  $M$  is a maximal ideal, it follows that  $M+(x) = (1)$ .

Hence,  $\exists m \in M$  and  $r \in R$  s.t.  $m+rx = 1$ .

Then  $m = 1-rx$ . Since  $-r \in R$  and  $x \in I$ , an ideal, it follows that  $a := -rx$  is an element of  $I$ .

Thus,  $m = 1+a$ . But  $1+a$  is a unit in  $R$ . Thus,  $m$  is a unit in  $R$  and  $m \in M$ . Hence  $M = R$ , which contradicts that  $M$  is a maximal ideal.

Therefore,  $I$  is contained in every maximal ideal of  $R$ .

43. Let  $R$  be an integral domain and  $F$  its field of fractions. Let  $P$  be a prime ideal in  $R$  and  $R_P = \left\{ \frac{a}{b} \mid a \in R, b \notin P \right\} \subset F$ . Show that  $R_P$  has a unique maximal ideal.

Proof. We begin by showing that  $\frac{a}{b}$  is a unit if and only if  $\frac{a}{b} \notin (P)R_P$ .

$$\frac{a}{b} \text{ is a unit in } R_P \iff \frac{a}{b} \notin (P)R_P.$$

( $\Rightarrow$ ): Suppose  $\frac{a}{b}$  is a unit in  $R_P$ . Then  $\exists s \in R_P$  s.t.

$$\frac{ac}{bd} = 1, \text{ i.e., } \exists s \in (R \setminus P) \text{ s.t. } s(ac - bd) = 0 \text{ in } R.$$

Since  $R$  is an integral domain and  $s \neq 0$  ( $0 \in P$ , so  $0 \notin R \setminus P$ ),

$ac - bd = 0 \Rightarrow ac = bd$ . Since  $b \notin P$ ,  $d \notin P$  and

$P$  is prime,  $bd \notin P$ . Thus,  $ac \notin P$ , and in particular,  $a \notin P$ .

$$\therefore \frac{a}{b} \notin (P)R_P.$$

( $\Leftarrow$ ): Suppose  $\frac{a}{b} \in (P)R_P$ . In particular,  $a \in P$ .

Thus,  $a \in R \setminus P \therefore \frac{b}{a} \in R_P$ . (provided  $a \neq 0$ ).

$$\frac{a}{b} \cdot \frac{b}{a} = 1, \text{ so } \frac{a}{b} \text{ is a unit in } R_P.$$

Since  $(P)R_P$  doesn't contain any units,  $(P)R_P$  is a proper ideal. Moreover, if  $\frac{a}{b} \notin (P)R_P$ ,

$$(P)R_P + \left\{ \frac{a}{b} \right\} = R_P, \text{ so } (P)R_P \text{ is a maximal ideal.}$$

Any other ideal either contains a unit or is strictly contained in  $(P)R_P$ , so it is the unique maximal ideal.

44. Let  $m$  and  $n$  be relatively prime integers. Show that there is an isomorphism  $\mathbb{Z}_{mn}^{\times} \cong \mathbb{Z}_m^{\times} \times \mathbb{Z}_n^{\times}$ .

Proof. Since  $m$  and  $n$  are relatively prime, in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , the ideals  $(m) + (n) = (1)$ , so  $(m)$  and  $(n)$  are comaximal.

Thus, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem,

$\mathbb{Z}_{mn} \cong \mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$  as rings. Thus,

$(\mathbb{Z}_{mn})^{\times} \cong (\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n)^{\times}$ . Therefore, it suffices to show that  $(\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n)^{\times} = \mathbb{Z}_m^{\times} \times \mathbb{Z}_n^{\times}$ .

Let  $(a, b) \in (\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n)^{\times}$ . Then  $\exists (c, d) \in \mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n$  s.t.  $(ac, bd) = (a, b)(c, d) = (1, 1)$ . Thus,

$\exists c \in \mathbb{Z}_m$  s.t.  $ac = 1$  and  $\exists d \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  s.t.  $bd = 1$ .

So  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_m^{\times} \times \mathbb{Z}_n^{\times}$ .

Conversely, suppose  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}_m^{\times} \times \mathbb{Z}_n^{\times}$ . Then

$\exists c \in \mathbb{Z}_m$  s.t.  $ac = 1$  and  $\exists d \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  s.t.  $bd = 1$ .

Then  $(a, b)(c, d) = (ac, bd) = (1, 1)$ , so  $(a, b) \in (\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n)^{\times}$ .

Thus,  $(\mathbb{Z}_m \times \mathbb{Z}_n)^{\times} = \mathbb{Z}_m^{\times} \times \mathbb{Z}_n^{\times}$ .

So  $\mathbb{Z}_{mn}^{\times} \cong \mathbb{Z}_m^{\times} \times \mathbb{Z}_n^{\times}$ .

45. Show that if  $x$  is non-nilpotent in  $R$ , then an ideal  $P$  of  $R$  which is maximal with respect to <sup>(\*)</sup> not containing  $x^n$  for  $n = 1, \dots$  is a prime ideal.

Proof. Suppose  $a, b \notin P$ . We will show  $ab \notin P$ .

Consider the ideals  $P + (a)$  and  $P + (b)$ .

$P \subsetneq P + (a)$  and  $P \subsetneq P + (b)$ , since  $a \notin P$ ,  $b \notin P$ .

Since  $P$  is maximal with respect to not containing  $x^n$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x^n \in P + (a)$ ,  $x^m \in P + (b)$  for some  $n$  and  $m$  in  $\mathbb{N}$ .

Then  $x^{n+m} = x^n \cdot x^m \in (P + (a))(P + (b)) \subseteq P + (ab)$ .

But  $x^{n+m} \notin P$ , so it follows that  $P \not\subseteq P + (ab)$ .

Hence,  $ab \notin P$ . So  $P$  is prime.

(\*) The actual wording of this problem is awful.

Based on having done questions like this in MA 557,  
this is what I think it is supposed to say.

46. Let  $\mathbb{Q}$  be the field of rational numbers, and let  $D$  be the set of all elements of the form  $a+b\sqrt{2}$  where  $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

(a) Show that  $D$  is a principal ideal domain.

Proof. We will prove something much stronger - that  $D$  is a field.

$$\text{Let } a+b\sqrt{2} \neq 0. \quad \frac{1}{a+b\sqrt{2}} = \frac{(a-b\sqrt{2})}{(a+b\sqrt{2})(a-b\sqrt{2})} = \frac{a-b\sqrt{2}}{a^2-2b^2} = \frac{a}{a^2-2b^2} - \frac{b}{a^2-2b^2}\sqrt{2}.$$

If  $a^2-2b^2 \neq 0$ , then we have found an inverse in  $D$  for

$a+b\sqrt{2}$ . If  $a^2-2b^2 = 0$ , then  $a^2=2b^2$ , so  $a=\pm b\sqrt{2}$ .

Since  $a$  and  $b$  are rational numbers, this is impossible.

Thus,  $D$  is a field, and hence is trivially a PID.

(b) Show that  $\sqrt{3}$  is not an element of  $D$ .

Proof. Suppose  $\sqrt{3} \in D$ . Then  $\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$  st.  $\sqrt{3} = a+b\sqrt{2}$ .

Notice  $b \neq 0$  or  $a = \sqrt{3}$ , a contradiction since  $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\sqrt{3} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ .

$$\text{Then } 3 = \sqrt{3}^2 = (a+b\sqrt{2})^2 = a^2 + 2ab\sqrt{2} + 2b^2.$$

$$\text{Then } \sqrt{2} = \frac{3-a^2-2b^2}{2ab} \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ a contradiction,}$$

provided  $a \neq 0$  and  $b \neq 0$ .

If  $a = 0$ , then  $\sqrt{3} = b\sqrt{2} \Rightarrow \sqrt{3} \cdot \sqrt{2} = b\sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{2}$

i.e.,  $\sqrt{6} = 2b$ , a contradiction since  $2b \in \mathbb{Q}$  but  $\sqrt{6} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ .

Thus,  $\sqrt{3} \notin D$ .

47. Show that if  $p$  is a prime such that  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , then  $x^2 + 1$  is not irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p[x]$ .

Proof. Since  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ ,  $p = a^2 + b^2$  for some integers  $a$  and  $b$ . It follows that  $b \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  or else  $a = \sqrt{p}$  or  $a^2 + b^2 > p$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $b$  is a unit in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  (since  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  is an integral domain).

Claim:  $ab^{-1}$  is a root.

$$(ab^{-1})^2 + 1 = a^2b^{-2} + 1.$$

Since  $a^2 + b^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , it follows that  $b^{-2}(a^2 + b^2) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , but  $b^{-2}(a^2 + b^2) = a^2b^{-2} + 1$ . Thus,  $a^2b^{-2} + 1 \equiv 0$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , so  $x^2 + 1$  has a root in  $\mathbb{Z}_p[x]$  and hence, is reducible.

47. Alternative Proof using Field/Galois Theory.

If  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , then  $p-1 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , so 4 divides  $p-1$  for all such primes. Consider the field  $F_p = \mathbb{Z}_p$ .  $F_p^\times$  (is) a cyclic group consisting of  $p-1$  elements. Since  $4 \mid p-1$ , there is an element of order 4 in  $F_p^\times$ . Call this element  $a$ . This element is a primitive 4th root of unity, and hence,  $a^2 = -1$ . Thus,  $a^2 + 1 = 0$ , so  $a \in F_p$  is a root of  $x^2 + 1$ , meaning it is reducible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p[x]$ .

48. Show that if  $p$  is a prime such that  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ ,  
Then  $x^2 + 1$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p[x]$ .

Proof. Notice that  $p-1 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ . In particular,  $4 \nmid p-1$  for all such primes.

Now  $\mathbb{Z}_p = F_p$ , and  $F_p^\times$  is a cyclic group of order  $p-1$ . If  $F_p^\times$  had an element of order 4, then by Lagrange's Theorem,  $4 \mid p-1$ , which is false.

If there were an  $a \in F_p$  s.t.  $a^2 = -1$ , then  $a^4 = (-1)^2 = 1$ . It follows that  $a \neq 1$  and  $a^3 \neq 1$ , so  $a$  would be an element of order 4 in  $F_p^\times$ .

Thus,  $x^2 + 1$  does not have a root in  $\mathbb{Z}_p[x]$ .

Since  $x^2 + 1$  is of degree 2, it follows that  $x^2 + 1$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}_p[x]$  for  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ .

49. Find a simpler description for each of the following rings.

$$(a) \frac{\mathbb{Z}[x]}{(x^2-3, 2x+4)}$$

Let  $\varphi: \mathbb{Z}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]$  be the homomorphism fixing  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\varphi: x \mapsto \sqrt{3}$ .  $\varphi$  is surjective ( $\varphi(ax+bx) = ax+b\sqrt{3}$ ) and  $\ker \varphi = (x^2-3)$ . Thus, by the First Isomorphism Theorem,  $\frac{\mathbb{Z}[x]}{(x^2-3)} \cong \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]$ . Therefore,  $\frac{\mathbb{Z}[x]}{(x^2-3, 2x+4)} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]}{(2\sqrt{3}+4)}$  by Third Iso. Thm.

$\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]$  is a PID, so all irreducibles are primes.

$$2\sqrt{3}+4 = 2(\sqrt{3}+2) = (1+\sqrt{3})(-1+\sqrt{3})(2+\sqrt{3})$$

Let  $N$  be the field norm.

$$N(1+\sqrt{3}) = 1-3 = -2, \quad N(-1+\sqrt{3}) = -1-3 = -2$$

Since  $-2$  is prime in  $\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $1+\sqrt{3}, -1+\sqrt{3}$  are irreducible, and thus, prime in  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]$ .

$$N(2+\sqrt{3}) = 4-3 = 1, \text{ so } 2+\sqrt{3} \text{ is a unit.}$$

$$\text{Hence, } (2\sqrt{3}+4) = (1+\sqrt{3})(-1+\sqrt{3}) \text{ (as ideals)}$$

Since  $(1+\sqrt{3})$  and  $(-1+\sqrt{3})$  are distinct maximal ideals (generated by a nonzero prime element in a PID),

they are comaximal.

Thus, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem,

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]}{(1+\sqrt{3})(-1+\sqrt{3})} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]}{(1+\sqrt{3})} \times \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]}{(-1+\sqrt{3})}$$

Let  $f_1: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]}{(1+\sqrt{3})}$  and  $f_2: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{3}]}{(-1+\sqrt{3})}$

$$\ker f_1 = 2\mathbb{Z}, \quad \ker f_2 = 2\mathbb{Z}, \text{ so by F.I.T.,}$$

we get

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[x]}{(x^2-3, 2x+4)} \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$$

$$49(b), \frac{\mathbb{Z}[i]}{(2+i)}$$

Let  $\varphi: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \frac{\mathbb{Z}[i]}{(2+i)}$  be the map  $\varphi(x) = x + (2+i)$

$$x \in \ker \varphi \Leftrightarrow x + (2+i) = (2+i) \Leftrightarrow x \in (2+i).$$

$x$  is an integer and is a product of  $2+i$ .

$$\text{Hence, } x \text{ is a product of } (2+i)(2-i) = 5$$

$$\text{Thus, } \ker \varphi = 5\mathbb{Z}.$$

Therefore, by the First Isomorphism Theorem,

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[i]}{(2+i)} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{5\mathbb{Z}}$$

50. Show that  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]$  is not a Principal Ideal Domain. PP

Proof. We will show that  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]$  is not a UFD. (a)

Since all PIDs are UFDs, this is sufficient.

Consider  $(1+\sqrt{-13})(1-\sqrt{-13}) = 14 = 2 \cdot 7$

Let  $N$  be the field norm.  $(\varepsilon^{-s}x) = \eta$

$N(2) = 2^2 = 4$ . If  $2$  is reducible,  $\exists a+b\sqrt{-13}$  with norm  $2$ .

$N(a+b\sqrt{-13}) = a^2 + 13b^2$ . If  $b \neq 0$ , then  $a^2 + 13b^2 > 2$ .

Hence,  $a^2 = 2$ . Since  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , this is a contradiction.

Thus,  $2$  is irreducible. mon blest ent ed (1+u)

We see that  $2 \mid (1+\sqrt{-13})(1-\sqrt{-13})$ , but  $= (\varepsilon^{t+1})u$

$2 \nmid (1+\sqrt{-13})$  and  $2 \nmid (1-\sqrt{-13})$ . Hence,

$2$  is not prime.

Since all irreducibles are primes in a UFD,

$\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]$  is not a UFD. (1+u) = (\mu+\nu\varepsilon)

Thus,  $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]$  is not a PID. (1+u)(\varepsilon^{t+1})

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13})} \times \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13})} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13})(2\sqrt{-13})}$$

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13})} \leftarrow \mathbb{S} : st \text{ bis } \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13})} \leftarrow \mathbb{S} : \tilde{f} + u$$

$$T.I.F \quad \text{pd} \Rightarrow \mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{S} \text{ is not } \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S} \text{ is not } \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}$$

top row

$$\frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13})} \times \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13})} \cong \frac{\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-13}]}{(2\sqrt{-13}, \varepsilon^{-s}x)}$$

51. Let  $D$  be a principal ideal domain. Prove that every nonzero prime ideal of  $D$  is a maximal ideal.

Proof. Let  $P = (p)$  be a prime ideal of  $D$ . ( $p \neq 0$ ).  
 Let  $I = (a)$  be an ideal such that  $(p) \subseteq (a) \subseteq D$ .  
 Then  $p \in (a)$ , so  $p = ab$  for some  $b \in D$ , ( $b \neq 0$ ).  
 Then  $ab \in (p)$ . Since  $(p)$  is a prime ideal,  
 $a \in (p)$  or  $b \in (p)$ . If  $a \in (p)$ , then  
 $(a) \subseteq (p)$ , so  $(p) = (a)$ .  
 If  $b \in (p)$ , then  $b = cp$  for some  $c \in D$ .  
 Thus,  $p = ab = acp$ . Since PIDs are integral domains, we have cancellation. Thus,  
 $1 = ac$ , so  $a$  is a unit, giving  $(a) = D$ .  
 Thus,  $P = (p)$  is a maximal ideal.

52. Prove or disprove that a nonzero prime ideal  $P$  of a principal ideal domain  $R$  is a maximal ideal.

Proof. See problem 51.

53. Consider the polynomial  $f(x) = x^4 + 1$ . 12

- (a) Use the Eisenstein Criterion to show that  $f(x)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ .

Solution.  $f(x+1) = (x+1)^4 + 1 = x^4 + 4x^3 + 6x^2 + 4x + 2$

Since  $4, 6, 2 \in (2)$ , but  $2 \notin (2)^2 = (4)$ ,  $f(x+1)$  is irreducible by Eisenstein.

If  $f(x) = p(x)q(x)$  is a factorization, then  $f(g(x)) = p(g(x))q(g(x))$  is a factorization.

So since  $f(x+1)$  is irreducible, so too is  $f(x)$ .

- (b) Prove that  $f(x)$  is reducible in  $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$  for every prime  $p$ .

(I don't know how to do this without Galois Theory!)

For  $p=2$ ,  $(1)^4 + 1 = 0$ , so it is reducible.

Assume  $p$  is odd. Then  $p \equiv 1, 3, 5, 7 \pmod{8}$ .  $p^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$  in all cases.

Thus,  $p^2 - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$  for odd primes  $p$ .

Consider the extension  $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}/\mathbb{F}_p$ . The group of units

$\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^\times$  consists of  $p^2 - 1$  elements, which is divisible by 8.

Thus,  $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^\times$  contains an element of order 8

(since  $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^\times$  is a cyclic group and  $8 \mid |\mathbb{F}_{p^2}^\times|$ ).

Thus,  $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}$  contains a primitive 8th root of unity, and so contains all primitive 8th roots of unity.

Thus,  $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}$  contains all roots of  $\mathbb{E}_8 = x^4 + 1$ .

If  $x^4 + 1$  were irreducible, it would be the minimal polynomial

for  $\zeta_8$ . Thus,  $[\mathbb{F}_p(\zeta_8) : \mathbb{F}_p] = 4$ . But  $\zeta_8 \in \mathbb{F}_{p^2}$  and

$[\mathbb{F}_{p^2} : \mathbb{F}_p] = 2$ . Therefore,  $x^4 + 1$  is reducible in  $\mathbb{F}_p[x]$ .

54. Assume that  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  are polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  and that  $f(x)g(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ . Prove that the product of any coefficient of  $f(x)$  with any coefficient of  $g(x)$  is an integer.

Proof. Let  $h(x) = f(x)g(x)$ . Since  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a UFD and  $\mathbb{Q}$  is its field of fractions, Gauss's Lemma gives us that  $\exists r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$  s.t.  $rf(x), sg(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  and  $rf(x)sg(x) = h(x)$ .

But then we have  $rsf(x)g(x) = h(x) = f(x)g(x)$ .

By the cancellation law of integral domains,

$$rs = 1.$$

Let  $a$  be any coefficient of  $f(x)$ .

Let  $b$  be any coefficient of  $g(x)$ .

Then by above,  $ra \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $sb \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Hence, their product  $rasb \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

But  $rasb = rsab = 1 \cdot ab = ab$ .

Thus, the product  $ab \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

55. Let  $\mathbb{k}$  be a field,  $x, y$  indeterminates. Let  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$  be relatively prime polynomials in  $\mathbb{k}[x]$ . Show that in the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{k}(y)[x]$ ,  $f(x) - y g(x)$  is irreducible.

Proof. Since  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field,  $\mathbb{k}[y]$  is a UFD.

Notice that the field of fractions of  $\mathbb{k}[y]$  is  $\mathbb{k}(y)$ . By Gauss's Lemma, if we show  $f(x) - y g(x)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{k}[y][x]$ , then we will have shown it irreducible in  $\mathbb{k}(y)[x]$ .

But  $\mathbb{k}[y][x] = \mathbb{k}[x][y]$ . In this ring,

$f(x) - y g(x)$  is a degree 1 polynomial in  $y$ .

This is reducible if and only if the coefficients share a common non-unit factor. But the coefficients are  $f(x)$  and  $g(x)$ , which are relatively prime.

Hence,  $f(x) - y g(x)$  is irreducible in  $\mathbb{k}[x][y]$  and so too in  $\mathbb{k}(y)[x]$ .