

Notes on “Finite-Dimensional Vector Spaces”

by Paul R. Halmos

November 25, 2022

Each \section corresponds to the scope of one member’s assignment, and each \subsection corresponds to one theorem or exercise in the textbook, specified in the format $m.n$ where m is the section number and n is the theorem/exercise number. If n is not given, we use $n = 1$ instead.

Contents

1	Toga (2022/09/19)	1
1.1	Exercise 1.1	1
2	Mohehe (2022/09/27)	2
2.1	Exercise 1.1	2
3	Mohehe (2022/09/19)	2
3.1	Exercise 1.2	2
4	Mohehe (2022/10/8)	4
4.1	Exercise 1.3	4
4.2	Exercise 1.4 (2022/10/24)	5
4.3	Exercise 1.5	6
4.4	Exercise 1.6	8
4.5	Exercise 1.7	8

1 Toga (2022/09/19)

1.1 Exercise 1.1

- (a) Since addition is commutative, $0 + \alpha = \alpha + 0$ holds. We also have $\alpha + 0 = \alpha$ by definition, hence $0 + \alpha = \alpha$.

2 Mohehe (2022/09/27)

2.1 Exercise 1.1

- (b) If $\alpha + \beta = \alpha + \gamma$, we have $\beta = \beta + 0 = 0 + \beta = (\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \beta = ((-\alpha) + \alpha) + \beta = (-\alpha) + (\alpha + \beta) = (-\alpha) + (\alpha + \gamma) = ((-\alpha) + \alpha) + \gamma = (\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \gamma = 0 + \gamma = \gamma + 0 = \gamma$ by definition. Therefore, $\beta = \gamma$ holds.
- (c) We have $\alpha + (\beta - \alpha) = \alpha + (\beta + (-\alpha)) = \alpha + ((-\alpha) + \beta) = (\alpha + (-\alpha)) + \beta = 0 + \beta = \beta + 0 = \beta$ by definition. Therefore, $\alpha + (\beta - \alpha) = \beta$ holds.
- (d) We have $\alpha 0 + \alpha 0 = \alpha(0 + 0) = \alpha 0 = \alpha + 0$ by definition, hence $\alpha 0 = 0$ by Exercise 1(b). We also have $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \alpha$ by definition. Therefore, $\alpha \cdot 0 = 0 \cdot \alpha = 0$.
- (e) We have $\alpha + (-1)\alpha = 1\alpha + (-1)\alpha = (1 + (-1))\alpha = 0\alpha = 0$ by definition and Exercise 1(d). Since the additive inverse is unique, we obtain $(-1)\alpha = -\alpha$.
- (f) We have $(-\alpha)(-\beta) = ((-1)\alpha)((-1)\beta) = (\alpha(-1))((-1)\beta) = \alpha((-1)((-1)\beta)) = \alpha((-1)(-1)\beta)$ by Exercise 1(e) and definition. We also have $(-1)(-1) = 0 + (-1)(-1) = (1 + (-1)) + (-1)(-1) = 1 + (-1) + (-1)(-1) = 1 + (-1)((-1) + 1) = 1 + (-1)(1 + (-1)) = 1 + (-1)0 = 1 + 0 = 1$ by definition. By it and definition, $\alpha((-1)(-1)\beta) = \alpha(1\beta) = \alpha(\beta 1) = \alpha\beta$ holds. Therefore, $(-\alpha)(-\beta) = \alpha\beta$ holds.
- (g) If $\alpha\beta = 0$, suppose $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$ hold. By supposition and definition, we have $0 = \alpha^{-1}0 = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha\beta) = (\alpha^{-1}\alpha)\beta = (\alpha\alpha^{-1})\beta = 1\beta = \beta 1 = \beta$, hence $\beta = 0$. However, this result contradicts supposition, “ $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\beta \neq 0$ ”. Therefore, if $\alpha\beta = 0$, then either $\alpha = 0$ or $\beta = 0$ (or both).

3 Mohehe (2022/09/19)

3.1 Exercise 1.2

- (a) The set of positive integers is not a field since there is no additive inverse for 1.
- (b) The set of integers is not a field since there is no multiplicative inverse for 2.
- (c) There exists a bijective map φ from \mathcal{N} (or \mathcal{Z}) to \mathcal{Q} [1], where \mathcal{Q} is a field [2]. We can make \mathcal{N} a field by re-defining (i) addition by $a \oplus b = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a) + \varphi(b))$ and (ii) multiplication by $a \otimes b = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(a)\varphi(b))$ for each $a, b \in \mathcal{N}$. Note that the additive and multiplicative identities become $\varphi^{-1}(0)$ and $\varphi^{-1}(1)$, respectively. For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$, the additive inverse becomes $\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha))$, and the multiplicative inverse becomes $\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha))$ if $\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$.

Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \alpha', \beta' \in \mathcal{N}$. Note that

- 1) $\alpha \oplus \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\alpha)) = \beta \oplus \alpha$ holds. (addition is commutative)
- 2) $\alpha \oplus (\beta \oplus \gamma) = \alpha \oplus (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + (\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}((\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) + \varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta))) + \varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\beta)) \oplus \gamma = (\alpha \oplus \beta) \oplus \gamma$ holds. (addition is associative)
- 3) $\alpha \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(0))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + 0) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)) = \alpha$ holds. (there exists additive identity, $\varphi^{-1}(0)$) If α' and β' are additive identity, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \oplus \beta' = \beta' \oplus \alpha' = \beta'$ by 1) and the definition of additive identity. (additive identity is unique)
- 4) $-\varphi(\alpha) \in \mathcal{Q}$ holds by definition, so $\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathcal{N}$ holds. Therefore, $\alpha \oplus \varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(-\varphi(\alpha)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) + (-\varphi(\alpha))) = \varphi^{-1}(0)$ holds. (for each α ($\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$), there exists additive inverse) For each α , if α' and β' are additive inverse, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \alpha' \oplus (\alpha \oplus \beta') = (\alpha' \oplus \alpha) \oplus \beta' = (\alpha \oplus \alpha') \oplus \beta' = \varphi^{-1}(0) \oplus \beta' = \beta \oplus \varphi^{-1}(0) = \beta'$ by 1), 2), 3) and the definition of additive inverse. (additive inverse is unique)
- 5) $\alpha \otimes \beta = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\alpha)) = \beta \otimes \alpha$ holds. (multiplication is commutative)
- 6) $\alpha \otimes (\beta \otimes \gamma) = \alpha \otimes (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)))\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta)) \otimes \gamma = (\alpha \otimes \beta) \otimes \gamma$ holds. (multiplication is associative)
- 7) $\alpha \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(1))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha) \cdot 1) = \alpha$ holds. (there exists additive identity, $\varphi^{-1}(1)$) If α' and β' are additive identity, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \otimes \beta' = \beta' \otimes \alpha' = \beta'$ by 5) and definition of multiplicative identity. (multiplicative identity is unique)
- 8) For each α ($\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$), $(1/\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathcal{Q}$ holds by definition, so $\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)) \in \mathcal{N}$ holds. Therefore, $\alpha \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(1/\varphi(\alpha)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)(1/\varphi(\alpha))) = \varphi^{-1}(1)$ holds. (for each α ($\alpha \in \mathcal{N}$), there exists multiplicative inverse) For each α ($\alpha \neq \varphi^{-1}(0)$), if α' and β' are multiplicative inverse, we have $\alpha' = \alpha' \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \alpha' \otimes (\alpha \otimes \beta') = (\alpha' \otimes \alpha) \otimes \beta' = (\alpha \otimes \alpha') \otimes \beta' = \varphi^{-1}(1) \otimes \beta' = \beta' \otimes \varphi^{-1}(1) = \beta'$ by 5), 6), 7) and the definition of multiplicative inverse. (multiplicative inverse is unique)
- 9) $\alpha \otimes (\beta \oplus \gamma) = \alpha \otimes (\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)(\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\gamma))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta) + \varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\gamma)) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\beta))) + \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha)\varphi(\gamma)))) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\alpha \otimes \beta) + \varphi(\alpha \otimes \gamma)) = \alpha \otimes \beta \oplus \alpha \otimes \gamma$ holds. (distributive law stands)

4 Mohehe (2022/10/8)

4.1 Exercise 1.3

For two integers a and b , we denote by $a \% b$ the remainder after dividing a by b , and write $b \mid a$ if and only if $a \% b = 0$. For clarity, we denote the ordinary sum and product of two integers a and b by $a +_{\mathbb{Z}} b$ and $a \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} b$, respectively. Note that $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m$ and $\alpha\beta = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_m$.

(a) Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_m, k \in \mathbb{Z}$

1' Proof : if m is a prime, \mathbb{Z}_m is a field.

Suppose m is a prime,

- 1) $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \alpha) \% m = \beta + \alpha$ (addition is commutative)
- 2) Since $\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma) = \alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv \alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \equiv (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma = (\alpha + \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \pmod{m}$ holds, $\alpha + (\beta + \gamma) = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta + \gamma)) \% m = ((\alpha + \beta) +_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m = (\alpha + \beta) + \gamma$ holds. (addition is associative)
- 3) $\alpha + 0 = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} 0) \% m = \alpha \% m = \alpha$ (there exists additive identity)
By it and 1), if β and γ are additive identity, $\beta = \beta + \gamma = \gamma + \beta = \gamma$ (additive identity is unique)
- 4) If $\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta = m$, $\alpha + \beta = (\alpha +_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = m \% m = 0$ (there exists additive inverse)
- 5) $\alpha\beta = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m = (\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \alpha) \% m = \beta\alpha$ (multiplication is commutative)
- 6) Since $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta\gamma) = \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} ((\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m) \equiv \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \equiv ((\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta) \% m) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma = (\alpha\beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma \pmod{m}$ holds, $\alpha(\beta\gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta\gamma)) \% m = ((\alpha\beta) \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma) \% m = (\alpha\beta)\gamma$ holds. (multiplication is associative)
- 7) $\alpha 1 = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} 1) \% m = \alpha \% m = \alpha$ (there exists multiplicative identity) By it and 5), if β and γ are multiplicative identity, $\beta = \beta\gamma = \gamma\beta = \gamma$ (multiplicative identity is unique)
- 8) For all $\alpha (\alpha \neq 0)$, suppose there doesn't exist β that makes $\alpha\beta = 1$. There exist $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ with $\beta \neq \gamma$ and $\alpha\beta = \alpha\gamma$, because β is any one from 0 to $m-1$ and $\alpha\beta$ is any one from 0 to $m-1$ except 1. Therefore, $(\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} \gamma)) = \alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) = km$ holds. The right side has divisor m , but it contradicts that the left side doesn't have divisor of m except 1, because $0 < \alpha < (m-1)$ and $((-m) < (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) < 0$ or $0 < (\beta +_{\mathbb{Z}} (-\gamma)) < m$) holds. Thus, there exists β that makes $\alpha\beta = 1$. (there exists multiplicative inverse)

A brief proof: Since each $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_m \setminus \{0\}$ is coprime to m , there exist integers x and y such that $\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x +_{\mathbb{Z}} m \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} y = 1$ by [3]. Putting $x' = x \% m \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, we obtain $\alpha x' = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} x +_{\mathbb{Z}} m \cdot_{\mathbb{Z}} y) \% m = 1 \% m = 1$. Hence $x' = \alpha^{-1}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
9) \quad & \alpha(\beta + \gamma) = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} (\beta + \gamma)) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} ((\beta +_{\mathcal{Z}} \gamma) \% m)) \% m \equiv \\
& (\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} (\beta +_{\mathcal{Z}} \gamma)) \% m = (\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \beta + \alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv ((\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \beta) \% m +_{\mathcal{Z}} \\
& (\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \gamma) \% m) \% m \equiv (\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \beta) \% m + (\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \gamma) \% m \equiv \alpha\beta + \alpha\gamma \\
& \text{holds. (distributive law stands)}
\end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, if m is a prime, \mathcal{Z}_m is a field.

2' Proof : If \mathcal{Z}_m is a field, m is a prime.

By contraposition, it is equivalent to prove “If m is not a prime, \mathcal{Z}_m is not a field.” We can show 1) to 7) and 9) in the same way as 1'. For each m , suppose there exist α and β that make $\alpha\beta = 1$. m is not a prime, so let p be one of prime factors of m and then we have $m = p \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} p' (p' \in \mathcal{Z} \text{ and } 1 < p' < m)$

If $\alpha = p$, by $\alpha\beta = 1$ and $m = p \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} p'$, we have $\alpha \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \beta = k \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} m + 1 (k \in \mathcal{Z}) \Leftrightarrow p \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} \beta = k \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} p \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} p' +_{\mathcal{Z}} 1 \Leftrightarrow (\beta +_{\mathcal{Z}} (-k \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} p')) \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} p = 1$. The right side is 1 but the left one is not 1 because of $1 < p$ and $\beta +_{\mathcal{Z}} (-k \cdot_{\mathcal{Z}} p') \in \mathcal{Z}$. Therefore It is contradicted. For each m , there doesn't exist α and β that make $\alpha\beta = 1$. In conclusion, “If m is not a prime, \mathcal{Z}_m is not a field.” and “If \mathcal{Z}_m is a field, m is a prime.”

Because of 1' and 2', \mathcal{Z}_m is a field if and only if m is a prime.

(b) 4

(c) 5

4.2 Exercise 1.4 (2022/10/24)

Define $\alpha_n = \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{n \text{ terms}}$ for $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_m \alpha_n &= \alpha_m (\overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{n \text{ terms}}) \\
&= \alpha_m ((\overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(n-1) \text{ terms}}) + 1) \\
&= \alpha_m (\overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(n-1) \text{ terms}}) + \alpha_m \cdot 1 && \text{(by distributive law)} \\
&= \alpha_m (\overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(n-1) \text{ terms}}) + \alpha_m && \text{(by definition of multiplicative identity)} \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \alpha_m (1 + 1) + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
&= \alpha_m \cdot 1 + \alpha_m \cdot 1 + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} && \text{(by distributive law)} \\
&= \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{n \text{ terms}} && \text{(by definition of multiplicative identity)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{m \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{(1 + \cdots + 1)}^{m \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{m \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{((1 + \cdots + 1) + 1)}^{(m-1) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{m \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{(1 + (1 + \cdots + 1))}^{(m-1) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by commutative property}) \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(m+1) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{(1 + \cdots + 1)}^{(m-1) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by associative property}) \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(2m-2) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{(1 + 1)}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{2m \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{\alpha_m + \cdots + \alpha_m}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by associative property}) \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{m(n-1) \text{ terms}} + \alpha_m \\
&= \cdots \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{(mn-2) \text{ terms}} + \overbrace{(1 + 1)}^{(n-2) \text{ terms}} \\
&= \overbrace{1 + \cdots + 1}^{mn \text{ terms}} \quad (\text{by associative property}) \\
&= \alpha_{mn}
\end{aligned}$$

for all m, n .

Assume there exists an n with $\alpha_n = 0$ but $\alpha_k \neq 0$ for any $k < n$. It suffices to prove that n is a prime.

Suppose n is not any prime. Let p be one of prime factors of n and then we have $n = pp'$ ($p' \in \mathcal{N}$ and $p' > 1$). By $\alpha_m \alpha_n = \alpha_{mn}$ for all m and n , $\alpha_n = \alpha_p \alpha_{p'}$ holds. We have either $\alpha_p = 0$ or $\alpha_{p'} = 0$ (or both) because of $\alpha_n = 0$ and Exercise 1.1 (g). However, it is contradictory to $\alpha_p = 0$ and $\alpha_{p'} = 0$. Therefore, n is a prime.

4.3 Exercise 1.5

- (a) For the followings, it is used that \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{R} are fields. Note that $\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\sqrt{2} \notin \mathcal{Q}$

Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2}) \subset \mathcal{R}$.

For all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$, $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ and $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ by the followings.

There exist $a, b, c, d \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\alpha_1 = a + b\sqrt{2}$ and $\alpha_2 = c + d\sqrt{2}$ hold.

We have $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = (a + b\sqrt{2}) + (c + d\sqrt{2}) = (a + c) + (b + d)\sqrt{2}$ and $(a + c), (b + d) \in \mathcal{Q}$, so $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$.

In addition, we have $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = (a + b\sqrt{2})(c + d\sqrt{2}) = (ac + 2bd) + (ad + bc)\sqrt{2}$ and $(ac + 2bd), (ad + bc) \in \mathcal{Q}$, so $\alpha_1\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$

- 1) $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \alpha_2 + \alpha_1$ (addition is commutative)
- 2) $\alpha_1 + (\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \alpha_3$ (addition is associative)
- 3) We have $0 = 0 + 0\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ and $\alpha_1 + 0 = \alpha_1$
($\mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ has additive identity)
- 4) For all $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$, put $\alpha_1 = a + b\sqrt{2}$ with $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}$. There exists $\alpha'_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ with $\alpha'_1 = (-a) + (-b)\sqrt{2}$. We have $\alpha_1 + \alpha'_1 = a + b\sqrt{2} + (-a) + (-b)\sqrt{2} = a - a + b\sqrt{2} - b\sqrt{2} = 0$. Therefore, to every $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$, there corresponds $\alpha'_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ with $\alpha_1 + (-\alpha_1) = 0$
- 5) $\alpha_1\alpha_2 = \alpha_2\alpha_1$ (multiplication is commutative)
- 6) $\alpha_1(\alpha_2\alpha_3) = (\alpha_1\alpha_2)\alpha_3$ (multiplication is associative)
- 7) We have $1 = 1 + 0\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ and $\alpha_1 \cdot 1 = \alpha_1$
($\mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ has multiplicative identity)
- 8) For all $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ with $\alpha_1 \neq 0$, put $\alpha_1 = a + b\sqrt{2}$ with $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}$. In this case, $a \neq 0$ or $b \neq 0$ holds by the followings.
“If $\alpha_1 = 0$, we have $\alpha_1 = a + b\sqrt{2} = 0 \Leftrightarrow a = -b\sqrt{2}$. Therefore, $a = b = 0$ by $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}$.”
Let $\alpha''_1 = \frac{a}{a^2 - 2b^2} + \left(-\frac{b}{a^2 - 2b^2}\right)\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$. Note that we have $a^2 - 2b^2 = (a + b\sqrt{2})(a - b\sqrt{2})$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $(a \neq 0 \text{ or } b \neq 0)$, so we have $a + b\sqrt{2} \neq 0$ and $a - b\sqrt{2} \neq 0$, and then $a^2 - 2b^2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ with $a^2 - 2b^2 \neq 0$. We have $\alpha_1\alpha''_1 = (a + b\sqrt{2})\left(\frac{a}{a^2 - 2b^2} + \left(-\frac{b}{a^2 - 2b^2}\right)\sqrt{2}\right) = \frac{a^2 - ab\sqrt{2} + ab\sqrt{2} - 2b^2}{a^2 - 2b^2} = 1$. Therefore, to every $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ with $\alpha_1 \neq 0$, there exists $\alpha''_1 \in \mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ with $\alpha_1\alpha''_1 = 1$
- 9) $\alpha_1(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) = \alpha_1\alpha_2 + \alpha_1\alpha_3$ (distributive law stands)

from 1) to 9), $\mathcal{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ is a field.

- (b) Let $\mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ be the set of all numbers of the form $\alpha + \beta\sqrt{2}$, where α and β are integers. If $\mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ is a field, $2 = 2 + 0\sqrt{2} (\in \mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2}))$ has multiplicative inverse. There exists $\exists\beta_1 = \{\alpha + \beta\sqrt{2} | \beta_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})\}$ with $2\beta_1 = 1 \iff \beta_1 = \frac{1}{2}$. However, $\frac{1}{2} \notin \mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ holds, so $\mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ is not a field.

Another way : Let $\mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ be the set of all numbers of the form $\alpha + \beta\sqrt{2}$, where α and β are integers. $\mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ is not a field since there is no multiplicative inverse for $2 + \sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ by the followings.

Suppose there exists multiplicative inverse for $2 + \sqrt{2}$. There exists $\exists\beta_1 \in \mathcal{Z}(\sqrt{2})$ with $\beta_1 = \alpha + \beta\sqrt{2}$ and $(2 + \sqrt{2})\beta_1 = 1$ by supposition. Therefore,

we have $(2+\sqrt{2})\beta_1 = (2+\sqrt{2})(\alpha+\beta\sqrt{2}) = 2(\alpha+\beta) + (\alpha+2\beta)\sqrt{2} = 1 \iff 2(\alpha+\beta) - 1 = -(\alpha+2\beta)\sqrt{2} \implies 2(2(\alpha+\beta)^2 - 2(\alpha+\beta)) - 1 = 2(\alpha+2\beta)^2$. It is contradicted because the left is odd number and the right is even number. Therefore, $(2+\sqrt{2})\beta_1 = 1$ is contradicted and then there is no multiplicative inverse for $2+\sqrt{2}$.

4.4 Exercise 1.6

- (a) Let P be such set of all polynomials with integer coefficients, $\text{id} \in P$ be $\text{id}(x) = x$ ($x \in \mathcal{R}$), and $I \in P$ be $I(x) = 1$ ($x \in \mathcal{R}$).

Suppose there exists $q \in P$ with $\text{id} \cdot q = I$. Then, we have $\text{id}(0) \cdot q(0) = 0$, and it is contradicted to supposition. Therefore, there does not exist $q \in P$ with $\text{id} \cdot q = I$. In other words, id does not have the multiplicative inverse. In conclusion, the set of all polynomials with integer coefficients does not form a field.

- (b) the set of all polynomials with real number coefficients does not form a field for the same reason.

4.5 Exercise 1.7

- (a) Suppose \mathfrak{F} is a field. Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{F}$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{R}$. Then, additive identity would be $(0, 0)$, because for all α, β , we have $\alpha + 0 = \alpha, \beta + 0 = \beta$. In additon, multiplicative identity would be $(1, 1)$, because for all α, β , we have $\alpha 1 = \alpha, \beta 1 = \beta$.

Here, think about $(0, 1) (\neq (0, 0))$. For all (α, β) , we have $(0, 1)(\alpha, \beta) = (0, \beta) (\neq (1, 1))$. Therefore, $(0, 1)$ does not have multiplicative inverse. In conclusion, \mathfrak{F} is not a field.

- (b) Let $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), (\alpha_2, \beta_2), (\alpha_3, \beta_3) \in \mathfrak{F}$ with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in \mathcal{R}$.

(A) (1) $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) + (\alpha_2, \beta_2) = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \beta_1 + \beta_2) = (\alpha_2, \beta_2) + (\alpha_1, \beta_1)$. (addition is commutative)

(2) $(\alpha_1, \alpha_1) + ((\alpha_2, \beta_2) + (\alpha_3, \beta_3)) = (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3, \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) = ((\alpha_1, \beta_1) + (\alpha_2, \beta_2)) + (\alpha_3, \beta_3)$. (addition is associative)

(3) For every (α_1, β_1) , there exists $(0, 0) \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) + (0, 0) = (\alpha_1, \beta_1)$. (\mathfrak{F} has additive identity)

(4) For every (α_1, β_1) , there exists $(-\alpha_1, -\beta_1) \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) + (-\alpha_1, -\beta_1) = (0, 0)$ holds. (There exists additive inverse for every element in \mathfrak{F})

(B) (1) $(\alpha_1, \beta_1)(\alpha_2, \beta_2) = (\alpha_1\alpha_2 - \beta_1\beta_2, \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_1) = (\alpha_2, \beta_2)(\alpha_1, \beta_1)$. (multiplication is commutative)

(2) $((\alpha_1, \beta_1)(\alpha_2, \beta_2))(\alpha_3, \beta_3) = (\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3 - \beta_1\beta_2\alpha_3 - \alpha_1\beta_2\beta_3 - \beta_1\alpha_2\beta_3, \alpha_1\beta_2\alpha_3 + \beta_1\alpha_2\alpha_3 + \alpha_1\alpha_2\beta_3 - \beta_1\beta_2\beta_3) = (\alpha_1, \beta_1)((\alpha_2, \beta_2)(\alpha_3, \beta_3))$. (multiplication is associative)

- (3) For every (α_1, β_1) , there exists $(1, 0) \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $(\alpha_1, \beta_1)(1, 0) = (\alpha_1, \beta_1)$. (\mathfrak{F} has multiplicative identity)
- (4) For every $(\alpha_1, \beta_1) \neq (0, 0)$, there exists $\left(\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2}, -\frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2}\right) \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that $(\alpha_1, \beta_1)\left(\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2}, -\frac{\beta_1}{\alpha_1^2 + \beta_1^2}\right) = (1, 0)$. (There exists multiplicative inverse for every element in \mathfrak{F})
- (C) $(\alpha_1, \beta_1)((\alpha_2, \beta_2) + (\alpha_3, \beta_3)) = (\alpha_1, \beta_1)(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3, \beta_2 + \beta_3) = (\alpha_1\alpha_2 + \alpha_1\alpha_3 - \beta_1\beta_2 - \beta_1\beta_3, \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_1\beta_3 + \beta_1\alpha_2 + \beta_1\alpha_3) = (\alpha_1\alpha_2 - \beta_1\beta_2, \alpha_1\beta_2 + \beta_1\alpha_2) + (\alpha_1\alpha_3 - \beta_1\beta_3, \alpha_1\beta_3 + \beta_1\alpha_3) = (\alpha_1, \beta_1)(\alpha_2, \beta_2) + (\alpha_1, \beta_1)(\alpha_3, \beta_3)$. (distributive law stands)
- (c) Let \mathfrak{F}' be the set of all pairs of (α, β) of complex numbers.
- (a) Suppose \mathfrak{F}' is a field. Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{F}'$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, additive identity would be $(0, 0)$, because for all α, β , we have $\alpha + 0 = \alpha, \beta + 0 = \beta$. In addition, multiplicative identity would be $(1, 1)$, because for all α, β , we have $\alpha 1 = \alpha, \beta 1 = \beta$.
Here, think about $(0, 1) (\neq (0, 0))$. For all (α, β) , we have $(0, 1)(\alpha, \beta) = (0, \beta) (\neq (1, 1))$. Therefore, $(0, 1)$ does not have multiplicative inverse. In conclusion, \mathfrak{F}' is not a field.
- (b) Suppose \mathfrak{F}' is a field. Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathfrak{F}'$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{C}$. Then, additive identity would be $(0, 0)$, because for all α, β , we have $\alpha + 0 = \alpha, \beta + 0 = \beta$. In addition, multiplicative identity would be $(1, 0)$, because for all α, β , we have $\alpha 1 - \beta 0 = \alpha, \alpha 0 + \beta 1 = \beta$.
Here, think about $(i, 1) (\neq (0, 0))$. For $\exists(\alpha, \beta)$, we have $(i, 1)(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha i - \beta, \beta i + \alpha) = (1, 0)$. Then, we have $\alpha i - \beta = 1$, and $\beta i + \alpha = 0 \iff \alpha i - \beta = 0$. It is contradicted. Therefore, $(i, 1)$ does not have multiplicative inverse. In conclusion, \mathfrak{F}' is not a field.

References

- [1] https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational_Numbers_are_Countably_Infinite
- [2] https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Rational_Numbers_form_Field
- [3] https://proofwiki.org/wiki/Bezout%27s_Identity