# Homework 6

## D. Zack Garza

October 24, 2019

## **Contents**

1	Hon	nework Problems	1
	1.1	Problem 1	1
	1.2	Problem 2	2
	1.3	Problem 3	2
		1.3.1 Part 1	2
		1.3.2 Part 2	2
	1.4	Problem 4	3
	1.5	Problem 5	3
	1.6	Problem 6	4
		1.6.1 Part 2	4
		1.6.2 Part 3	4
2	Qua	al Problems	4
	2.1	Problem 1	4
		2.1.1 Part 1	4
		2.1.2 Part 2	4
		2.1.3 Part 3	4
	2.2	Problem 2	4
		2.2.1 Part 1	4
		2.2.2 Part 2	5
		2.2.3 Part 3	5
	2.3	Problem 3	5
		2.3.1 Part 1	5
		2.3.2 Part 2	5

## 1 Homework Problems

### 1.1 **Problem 1**

Todo

### 1.2 Problem 2

We can note that since f has 4 roots, the Galois group G of its splitting field will be a subgroup of  $S_4$ . Moreover, G must be a transitive subgroup of  $S_4$ , i.e. the action of G on the roots of f should be transitive. This reduces the possibilities to  $G \cong S^4$ ,  $A^4$ ,  $D^4$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$ .

Since f has exactly 2 real roots and thus a pair of roots that are complex conjugates, the automorphism given by complex conjugation is an element of G. But this corresponds to a 2-cycle  $\tau = (ab)$ , and we can then make the following conclusions:

- Not  $A_4$ :  $A_4$  contains only even cycles, and  $\tau$  is odd.
- Not  $Z_4$ : This subgroup is generated by a single 4-cycle  $\sigma$ , which up to conjugacy is (1234), and  $\sigma^n$  is not a 2-cycle for any n.
- Not  $\mathbb{Z}_2^2$ : In order to be transitive, this subgroup must be  $\{e, (12)(34), (13)(24), (14)(23)\}$ , which does not contain  $\tau$ .

The only remaining possibilities are  $S^4$  and  $D^4$ .  $\square$ 

### 1.3 Problem 3

### 1.3.1 Part 1

To see that  $\phi(n)$  is even for all n > 2, we can take a prime factorization of n and write

$$\phi(n) = \phi\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m} p_i^{k_i}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \phi(p_i^{k_i}) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} p^{k_i - 1} (p - 1) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} p^{k_i - 1} \prod_{i=1}^{m} (p - 1)$$

where each  $k_i \geq 1 \implies k_i - 1 \geq 0$ . But every prime power is odd, and a product of odd numbers is odd, so the first product is odd. It is also true that p-1 is even for every prime p, and the second term is a product of even terms and thus even. So  $\phi(n)$  is the product of an even and an odd number, which is always even.

### 1.3.2 Part 2

Suppose  $\phi(n) = 2$ . Take a prime factorization of n, so we have

$$2 = \phi(n) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} \phi(p_i^{k_i})$$

Since the only factors of 2 are 1 and 2, we must have  $\phi(p_i^{k_i}) = 2$  for exactly one i, and the rest must be equal to 1.

Consider the term that equals 2. We have  $\phi(p_i^{k_i}) = p^{k_i-1}(p-1) = 2$ , so we must have either

- Case 1: p-1=2 and  $p^{k_i-1}=1$ , so p=3 and  $k_i=1$ . So  $3\mid n$ , but  $3^\ell$  does not divide n for any  $\ell>1$ .
- Case 2:  $p^{k_i-1}=2$  and (p-1)=1, so p=2 and  $k_i=2$ . Thus  $2^2$  divides n but  $2^\ell$  does not for any  $\ell>2$ .

In either case, it remains to check are whether the other factors where  $\phi(p_j^{k_j}) = 1$  can contribute any other distinct divisors to n. We can note that  $\phi(p_j^{k_j})$  iff  $p^{k_j-1}(p-1) = 1$ , so this forces p=2 and  $k_j=1$ . So n may or may not contain a single factor of 2, but by uniqueness of prime factorization, this can only happen in case 1. Note that this also forces  $2 \mid n$  but  $2^2$  does not divide n.

In summary, we've found that  $\phi(n) = 2$  implies that

3 | n, 9 does not divide n, and
2 | n, 4 does not divide n
2 does not divide n
2<sup>2</sup> | n, 2<sup>3</sup> does not divide n.

This reduces the possibilities to the finite set  $n \in \{6, 3, 4\}$ , and  $\phi(6) = \phi(3) = \phi(4) = 2$ .

### 1.4 Problem 4

Note that since  $\zeta(\zeta + \zeta^{-1}) = \zeta^2 + 1$ , we have the relation  $\zeta^2 - (\zeta + \zeta^{-1})\zeta + 1 = 0$ . But then

$$f(x) = x^2 - (\zeta + \zeta^{-1})x + 1$$

is a polynomial in  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$  for which  $f(\zeta) = 0$ . Thus  $g = \min(\zeta, \mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1}))$  divides f, but since  $\deg f = 2$  and  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$  is totally real,  $\zeta \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$ . This means that g can not be linear and must have degree at least 2, but the above argument shows that g has degree at most 2, so it must be 2. Letting  $m = [\mathbb{Q}(\zeta + \zeta^{-1}) : \mathbb{Q}]$ , we have

$$[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta):\mathbb{Q}] = [\mathbb{Q}(\zeta):\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})][\mathbb{Q}(\zeta+\zeta^{-1}):\mathbb{Q}]$$
  

$$\implies \phi(n) = 2m,$$

and so  $m = \phi(n)/2$  as desired.

### 1.5 Problem 5

Suppose  $F = K[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n]$  where  $\alpha_1^{n_1} \in K$  for some  $n_1$  and  $\beta$  or each i we have  $\alpha_i^{n_i} \in K[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1}]$  for some powers  $n_i$ . We want to show that  $F = E[\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m]$  where each  $\beta_i$  satisfy a similar condition

Let  $A = \{\alpha_i \ni \alpha_i \notin E\}$ , then it is since  $E \hookrightarrow F$ , adjoining all elements of A to E will yield exactly F. Using the order of  $\alpha_i$  given by the definition of F as a radical extension, let  $\beta_1$  be the  $\alpha_i \in A$  with the smallest index i. Then by assumption, there is some  $m_1$  such that  $\beta^{m_1} \in K[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{i-1} \subset F]$ , so we can construct  $F_1 := E[\beta_1]$  which will be a radical extension.

Inductively letting  $A_2 = A \setminus \{\beta_1\}$  and repeating this process to construct  $L_2$  will yield radical extensions at every step, and since A is finite, there is some n such that  $L_n = L$ . But then L is a radical extension over E as desired.

### 1.6 Problem 6

### 1.6.1 Part 2

The normal closure L of K is defined as the smallest extension of K such that if  $\alpha$  is a root of any irreducible polynomial in K[x] and  $\alpha \in L$ , then all of its conjugates are in L as well. But this means any such polynomial splits in L. In particular, if  $u \in L$ , then f splits in L, and so L contains the splitting field F.

### 1.6.2 Part 3

### 2 Qual Problems

### 2.1 Problem 1

### 2.1.1 Part 1

If L/K is a finite field extension which is both separable and a splitting field of some polynomial in K[x], then [L:K] = |Gal|L/K.

### 2.1.2 Part 2

The extension  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{43})$  is the splitting field of the cyclotomic polynomial  $\Phi_{43}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} 2x^i$ , which is degree  $\phi(43) = 42$  since 43 is prime.

Moreover, the Galois group is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}_{43}^{\times} \cong \mathbb{Z}_{42}$ .

### 2.1.3 Part 3

Since proper subfields will correspond to intermediate extensions which will correspond to subgroups of the Galois group, this problem is reduced to counting the number of distinct subgroups of  $\mathbb{Z}_{42}$ . This is a cyclic group, so there is exactly one subgroup of order d for each d dividing 42. Since 42 = 2 \* 3 \* 7, we have

- A subgroup of order 2, corresponding to a field extension of degree 21,
- A subgroup of order 3, corresponding to a field extension of degree 14,
- A subgroup of order 6, corresponding to a field extension of degree 7,
- A subgroup of order 7, corresponding to a field extension of degree 6,
- A subgroup of order 14, corresponding to a field extension of degree 3,
- A subgroup of order 21, corresponding to a field extension of degree 2.

### 2.2 Problem 2

#### 2.2.1 Part 1

A splitting field of f over F is an extension  $L \ge F$  that contains every root of f, so that f can be decomposed as a product of linear factors i.e.  $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{\deg f} (x - \alpha_i)^{m_i}$  in L[x].

### 2.2.2 Part 2

If  $E \geq F$  is a finite extension, then it is algebraic and  $E = F[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n]$ . So we can let  $g(x) = \prod_{i=1}^n (x - \alpha_i)$ . By construction, each  $\alpha_i$  is a root, and so E is a splitting field for g.

### 2.2.3 Part 3

Since E was shown to be a splitting field, it only remains to show that it is separable.

### 2.3 Problem 3

### 2.3.1 Part 1

False: take  $K \leq L \leq M$  as  $\mathbb{Q} \leq \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[3]{2}) \leq \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt[3]{2}, \zeta_3)$ . Then M is the splitting field of  $x_3 - 2$ , and in characteristic zero is thus Galois. But L is not the splitting field of any irreducible polynomial in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ , so it is *not* Galois.

### 2.3.2 Part 2

This is true. By the Galois correspondence, it suffices to show that  $H := \operatorname{Gal}(M/L)$  is a normal subgroup of  $G := \operatorname{Gal}(M/K)$ . To that end, let  $\phi \in G$ , so  $\phi : M \to M$  is a lift of  $\operatorname{id}_K$ . Then  $H \subseteq G$  iff  $\phi H \phi^{-1} = H$ . Letting  $\sigma \in H$ , we need to show that

$$(\phi^{-1} \circ \sigma \circ \phi)(L) = L,$$

i.e. that this composition is some automorphism of M that fixes L.

Consider how this acts on elements of L. If  $\ell \in L$ , then  $\ell = \sum k_i \ell_i$  since L is a finite-degree extension, thus algebraic, thus spanned by some basis  $\ell_i \in L$  as a vector space over K.

In particular, since  $\phi$  is some M-automorphism, it restricts to an L-automorphism, which must send each  $\ell_i$  to some conjugate  $\ell'_i$ . Similarly,  $\phi^{-1}(\ell'_i) = \ell_i$ .

We thus have

$$(\phi^{-1}\sigma\phi)(a) = (\phi^{-1}\sigma\phi)(\sum k_i\ell_i)$$

$$= (\phi^{-1}\sigma)(\sum k_i\phi(\ell_i))$$

$$= (\phi^{-1}\sigma)(\sum k_i\ell'_i)$$

$$= (\phi^{-1})(\sum k_i\sigma(\ell'_i))$$

$$= (\phi^{-1})(\sum k_i\ell'_i) \text{ since } \sigma \text{ fixes } L$$

$$= \sum k_i\phi^{-1}(\ell'_i)$$

$$= \sum k_i\ell_i$$

and so this composite fixes L as desired. This  $H \subseteq G$ , which is what we wanted to show.