

## M345P11 Galois Theory, Progress Test 1, 4/11/2013, solutions.

### Q1.

(a) This is standard bookwork. Say  $f = gh$  with  $g, h \in \mathbf{Q}[x]$ . Clear denominators and get  $Df = g_0h_0$  with  $g_0, h_0 \in \mathbf{Z}[x]$  and  $D \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$ . If we can prove that for any prime  $p|D$  we have that either all the coefficients of  $g_0$  are multiples of  $p$ , or all the coefficients of  $h_0$  are, then we're home (by induction on  $D$ ). So say  $p|D$ . Reducing modulo  $p$  (and putting a bar on top of things to denote the reduction) we have  $\overline{g_0h_0} = 0 \in (\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z})[x]$ . Those that know  $(\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z})[x]$  is an integral domain can now just say "... and hence  $\overline{g_0} = 0$  or  $\overline{h_0} = 0$  and now we're done"; those of you who know less ring theory can argue more prosaically (as I did in lectures) thus: if it's not true that  $p$  divides all the coefficients of  $g_0 = \sum a_i x^i$  then choose  $i$  as small as possible such that  $p \nmid a_i$ . Similarly if  $p$  doesn't divide all the  $b_j$  in  $h_0 = \sum_j b_j x^j$  then choose  $j$  as small as possible such that  $p \nmid b_j$ ; now an explicit calculation shows that  $p$  doesn't divide the coefficient of  $x^{i+j}$  in  $g_0h_0$  either – a contradiction. Four marks for this piece of standard algebra.

(b) Eisenstein's criterion says that if  $q$  is a prime and if  $p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i \in \mathbf{Z}[x]$  is a polynomial, such that  $q \nmid a_n$ ,  $q|a_i$  for  $i < n$  and  $q^2 \nmid a_0$ , then  $p(x)$  is irreducible. One mark.

(c) One mark each.

(i) Irreducible by Eisenstein ( $q = 17$ ).

(ii) Reducible:  $(x - \sqrt[8]{17})$  is a factor.

(iii) Reducible:  $p(1) = 0$  so  $(x - 1)$  is a factor of  $p$ .

(iv) This is irreducible, because it's cubic so if it were reducible then one factor will have to be linear – however neither  $x = 0$  nor  $x = 1$  are roots and those are the only possibilities in such a small field.

(v) This is reducible and indeed a cube – it's  $(x^2 + x + 2)^3$ .

### Q2.

(a) The degree  $[F : E]$  is the dimension of  $F$  considered as a vector space over  $E$ . One mark. The extension  $\mathbf{C}/\mathbf{Q}$  has infinite degree, because if it were finite then  $\mathbf{C}$  would be isomorphic to  $\mathbf{Q}^n$  as a vector space and hence countable, which it isn't. One mark.

(b) If  $E \subseteq F \subseteq K$  are fields, then  $[K : E] = [K : F][F : E]$ . I stated and proved this in lectures only for the case  $[K : E]$  finite, and it's fine if you stick to this case. One mark.

(c) For  $a$  to be algebraic over  $E$  we need a non-zero polynomial  $p(x) \in E[x]$  such that  $p(a) = 0$ . But  $[F : E] = n$  is finite, so there's an  $E$ -linear relation between the  $n + 1$  numbers  $1, a, a^2, \dots, a^n$ , and this gives the polynomial we seek. One mark.

If the min poly of  $a$  over  $E$  has degree  $d$ , and if  $L = E(a) \subseteq F$ , then a result from lectures says that  $[L : E] = d$ , so  $[F : E] = [F : L][L : E]$  has degree a multiple of  $d$ . One mark.

(d) Let's use the tower law. Set  $F = \mathbf{Q}(\sqrt{5}, \sqrt{11})$ , set  $K = \mathbf{Q}(\sqrt{5})$  and set  $E = \mathbf{Q}$ . Then  $[K : E]$  must be 2, because  $x^2 - 5$  is irreducible (as  $\sqrt{5} \notin \mathbf{Q}$ ). And similarly  $[F : K] = 2$  as  $F = K(\sqrt{11})$  and the min poly of  $\sqrt{11}$  over  $K$  must be  $x^2 - 11$ , as  $\sqrt{11} \notin K$ . So by the tower law  $[F : E] = 4$ . Two marks.

(e) We have  $[F : E] = 2$  and  $1 \in E \subseteq F$ ; extend to a basis  $\{1, b\}$  of  $F$  as an  $E$ -vector space. Then  $b^2 \in F$  so  $b^2 = \lambda b + \mu$  with  $\lambda, \mu \in E$ . Completing the square we see that if  $a = b - \lambda/2$  then  $a^2 \in E$ , but  $a \notin E$  as  $b \notin E$ , so  $F = E(a)$  as  $E(a)$  is strictly bigger than  $E$  so has  $E$ -dimension at least 2, but it is contained in a space of dimension 2 and is hence equal to it. Two marks.

(f) If  $F = E(a)$  then certainly  $a \notin E$  (as  $[F : E] = 2$  so  $F$  is strictly bigger than  $E$ ). But if  $a^2 \in E$  then  $a$  is either a root of  $x^2 = 0$  or  $x^2 - 1 = 0$  and both of these polynomial factor into linear factors over  $E$ , so all their roots are in  $E$ , and hence  $a \in E$ , a contradiction! One mark.