

### Fields of Quotients (Cont'd)

**Theorem.** Let  $F$  be a field of quotients for an integral domain  $D$ , and let  $L$  be any field that contains  $D$  as a subring. Then there is a unique homomorphism  $\psi: F \rightarrow L$  such that  $\psi(a) = a$  for all  $a \in D$ .

*Proof.* See the book for the existence of  $\psi$ , or use:

$$\psi([(a, b)]) = \psi(a/_F b) = \psi(a)/_L \psi(b) = a/_L b.$$

One also needs to show that it is well defined and is a homomorphism.

**Uniqueness:** It has to be as given. In detail, let  $x \in F$  be given. Then  $x = [(a, b)] = a/_F b$  for some  $a, b \in D$ ,  $b \neq 0$ . Then  $bx = a$  in  $D$ , hence in  $F$ . So  $\psi(b)\psi(x) = \psi(a)$ , therefore  $b\psi(x) = a$ , so  $\psi(x) = a/_L b$ .  $\square$

### Integral Domains as Subrings of Fields

We also proved: Every integral domain is a subring of a field, which contains the unity element of the field.

*Conversely*, let  $F$  be a field let  $1_F$  be its unity element, and let  $R$  be a subring of  $F$  that contains  $1_F$ . Then  $R$  is an integral domain:

- It is commutative because  $F$  is
- It has  $1 \neq 0$  because  $F$  does and  $1_F \in R$
- It has no zero divisors because  $F$  has none.

So:

A ring  $R$  is an integral domain

$\iff$  it is a subring of a field and contains the field's unity element

$\iff$  it is a subring of a field and has  $1 \neq 0$ .

(See Ex. 19.23: If  $F$  is a division ring then  $\{x \in F : x^2 = x\} = \{0, 1\}$ .)

### Polynomials

**Definition.** Let  $R$  be an integral domain. We define the set  $R[x]$  to be the set of all formal infinite sums  $a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots$  such that all but finitely many of the  $a_i$  are zero.

We define a binary operation  $+$  on  $R[x]$  by termwise addition:

$$(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots) + (b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + \dots) = (a_0 + b_0) + (a_1 + b_1)x + (a_2 + b_2)x^2 + \dots$$

We define a binary operation  $\cdot$  on  $R[x]$  as you've learned in grade school:

$$(a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots) \cdot (b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + \dots) = c_0 + c_1x + c_2x^2 + \dots,$$

where

$$c_n = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i b_{n-i} \quad \text{for all } n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

**Theorem.** With the above definitions,  $R[x]$  is a ring. It also contains  $R$  as a subring.

*Proof.* To show that it is a ring: Associativity of  $\cdot$  is proved on page 200, and the distributive law is Ex. 26.

To show that it contains  $R$  as a subring: The map  $R \rightarrow R[x]$  given by  $a \mapsto a$  is a ring homomorphism, and is injective.  $\square$

**Proposition.** Since  $R$  is assumed to be an integral domain,  $R[x]$  is also an integral domain.

*Proof.* The ring  $R[x]$  is commutative because  $R$  is, and it has  $1 \neq 0$  because  $R$  does (with the same unity element). To show that it has no zero divisors, let

$$f = a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots \quad \text{and} \quad g = b_0 + b_1x + b_2x^2 + \dots$$

be nonzero elements of  $R[x]$ . Then there are integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $a_n \neq 0$  but  $a_i = 0$  for all  $i > n$  and  $b_m \neq 0$  but  $b_j = 0$  for all  $j > m$ . Then

$$c_{n+m} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i b_{n+m-i} + a_n b_m + \sum_{i=n+1}^{n+m} a_i b_{n+m-i} = a_n b_m.$$

Indeed, the first sum vanishes because  $n + m - i > m$ , and therefore  $b_{n+m-i} = 0$  for all  $i < n$ ; and the second sum vanishes because  $a_i = 0$  for all  $i > n$ . Therefore  $fg \neq 0$  because its coefficient of  $x^{n+m}$  is  $a_n b_m \neq 0$ .  $\square$

### Some Notes

- In the definition of  $R[x]$  the book allows  $R$  to be any ring, but we are requiring  $R$  to be an integral domain.
- $\mathbb{Q}$  is a field, but  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  is not ( $x$  has no inverse).
- If  $a_i = 0$  for all  $i > n$  then we may write  $a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots$  as the finite sum  $a_0 + \dots + a_nx^n$  or  $a_nx^n + \dots + a_0$ .
- In algebra, we don't have infinite sums, unless:
  - (1). all but finitely many of the terms are zero (so it's really a finite sum), or
  - (2). there is some notion of convergence in the ring (not in Math 113).

### Polynomials in Several Variables, and Rational Functions

**Definition.** Let  $R$  be an integral domain. For all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the polynomial ring  $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  is defined to be  $R$  if  $n = 0$ , or  $(R[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}])[x_n]$  if  $n > 0$ .

**Definition.** Let  $F$  be a field and let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then the **field of rational functions in  $n$  indeterminates  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  over  $F$**  is the field of quotients of  $F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .

## Clicker Questions!

### Evaluation Homomorphisms

**Theorem.** Let  $F \leq E$  be fields, let  $\alpha \in E$ , and let  $x$  be an indeterminate. Then the map  $\phi_\alpha: F[x] \rightarrow E$  defined by

$$\phi_\alpha(a_n x^n + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0) = a_n \alpha^n + \cdots + a_1 \alpha + a_0$$

is a well-defined homomorphism from  $F[x]$  to  $E$ . This map is called **evaluation at  $\alpha$** . It also satisfies (1)  $\phi_\alpha(a) = a$  for all  $a \in F$  and (2)  $\phi_\alpha(x) = \alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in E$ .

*Proof.* (1) and (2) are clear.

**Addition:**

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_\alpha \left( \sum a_i x^i + \sum b_i x^i \right) &= \phi_\alpha \left( \sum (a_i + b_i) x^i \right) = \sum (a_i + b_i) \alpha^i = \sum a_i \alpha^i + \sum b_i \alpha^i \\ &= \phi_\alpha \left( \sum a_i x^i \right) + \phi_\alpha \left( \sum b_i x^i \right). \end{aligned}$$

**Multiplication:** Similar but harder. □

**Examples** (1).  $\phi_0: F[x] \rightarrow F$  is  $\sum a_i x^i \mapsto a_0$

(2) Take  $F = \mathbb{Q}$  and  $E = \mathbb{R}$ . It is a deep theorem in number theory that  $\phi_\pi: \mathbb{Q}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $\phi_e: \mathbb{Q}[x] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are injective.

### Polynomials vs. Functions

For us, it's OK to write  $f(\alpha)$  instead of  $\phi_\alpha(f)$ .

*However:* Polynomials in  $R[x]$  are not the same as functions  $R \rightarrow R$ .

You know from grade school that if  $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]$  and  $\phi_\alpha(f) = 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$  then  $f = 0$ .

But: Let  $p$  be a prime number. Then

$$\phi_\alpha(x^p - x) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$$

(by Fermat). So both  $x^p - x \in \mathbb{Z}_p[x]$  and  $0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p[x]$  give rise to the same function  $\mathbb{Z}_p \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p$ .

### Our “Basic Goal”

**Definition.** Let  $F \leq E$  be fields, and let  $f \in F[x]$  (with  $x$  an indeterminate).

Then a **zero** of  $f$  in  $E$  is an element  $\alpha \in E$  such that  $\phi_\alpha(f) = 0$  (i.e.,  $f(\alpha) = 0$ ).

The basic goal for much of the remainder of the course is:

**Theorem (29.3).** *Let  $F$  be a field. Then for any nonconstant polynomial  $f \in F[x]$  there is a field  $E$ , containing  $F$  as a subfield, such that  $f$  has a zero in  $E$ .*

*Note:* If  $F \leq E$  and  $f, g \in F[x]$  are such that their product  $fg$  has a zero  $\alpha \in E$ , then  $\alpha$  is a zero of  $f$  or of  $g$  (or both):

$$(fg)(\alpha) = 0 \iff f(\alpha)g(\alpha) = 0 \iff f(\alpha) = 0 \text{ or } g(\alpha) = 0 .$$

### The Degree of a Polynomial

**Definition.** Let  $R$  be an integral domain and let  $f = \sum a_i x^i \in R[x]$  be a polynomial (in one variable). Then the **degree** of  $f$ , denoted  $\deg f$ , is the largest integer  $n$  such that  $a_n \neq 0$ , or  $-\infty$  if  $f = 0$ .

Note that  $\deg(fg) = \deg f + \deg g$  for all  $f, g \in R[x]$ .

(The book says that  $\deg f$  is undefined when  $f = 0$ ; we are defining it to be  $-\infty$ .)

### The Division Algorithm for $F[x]$

**Theorem** (Division Algorithm for  $F[x]$ ). *Let  $F$  be a field, and let  $f$  and  $g$  be elements of  $F[x]$  with  $g \neq 0$ .*

*Then there are unique polynomials  $q, r \in F[x]$  such that*

$$f = qg + r \quad \text{and} \quad \deg r < \deg g .$$

*Proof. Existence.* Write

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= a_n x^n + \cdots + a_0 \\ \text{and} \quad g(x) &= b_m x^m + \cdots + b_0 \end{aligned}$$

with  $b_m \neq 0$  (we don't need to assume  $a_n \neq 0$  or  $m > 0$ ).

Let  $S = \{f - sg : s \in F[x]\}$  and let  $r \in S$  be an element of smallest degree. Then  $r = f - qg$  for some  $q \in F[x]$ , so  $f = qg + r$ , and we'll be done if we can show that  $\deg r < m$ .

Suppose not. Then  $r(x) = c_t x^t + \cdots + c_0$  with  $c_t \neq 0$  and  $t \geq m$ . Also

$$\begin{aligned} f - qg - (c_t/b_m)x^{t-m}g &= r(x) - (c_t/b_m)x^{t-m}g \\ &= (c_t x^t + \cdots + c_0) - \frac{c_t}{b_m}(b_m x^t + b_{m-1}x^{t-1} + \cdots + b_0 x^{t-m}) \\ &= \left(c_{t-1} - \frac{c_t}{b_m}b_{m-1}\right)x^{t-1} + (\text{lower-order terms}) . \end{aligned}$$

This is an element of  $S$  (with  $s(x) = q(x) - (c_t/b_m)x^{t-m}$ ) of degree  $< t$ , contradicting the choice of  $r(x)$ .

Therefore we have  $q$  and  $r$  with  $\deg r < m$ .

*Uniqueness.* See book. □

**Example.** Long division of  $x^2 + x + 1$  by  $x - 2$  (on board).

**Definition.** Let  $F$  be a field and let  $f, g \in F[x]$ . Then we say that  $f \mid g$  ( $f$  **divides**  $g$ ) if  $f \cdot q = g$  for some  $q \in F[x]$ .

If  $f \neq 0$  then  $f \mid g$  is equivalent to  $g/f \in F[x]$ . In the context of the division algorithm,  $f \mid g$  if and only if the division algorithm gives  $g = qf + r$  with  $r = 0$ .

**Corollary** (of the Division Algorithm). *Let  $f \in F[x]$  and let  $a \in F$ . Then  $a$  is a zero of  $f$  if and only if  $(x - a) \mid f$ .*

*Proof.* There exist  $q, r \in F[x]$  such that  $f(x) = q(x)(x - a) + r(x)$  and  $\deg r < 1$ . Since  $\deg r < 1$ ,  $r$  is a constant  $c$ . Then

$$c = r(a) = f(a) - q(a)(a - a) = f(a) - q(a) \cdot 0 = f(a).$$

So  $f(a) = 0$  if and only if  $r = 0$ , if and only if  $(x - a) \mid f$ . □