

Solutions to HW1

- 1. Every element $u = a + b\varepsilon \in R$ with $a \neq 0$ is a unit since it has inverse $u^{-1} = \frac{a b\varepsilon}{a^2}$. No proper ideal contains a unit; if an ideal J contains a unit u then $R = R1$ $Ruu^{-1} \subseteq Ju^{-1} \subseteq J$ forcing $J = R$. Thus every proper ideal satisfies $J \subseteq (\varepsilon)$ where $(\varepsilon) = R\varepsilon = \{b\varepsilon : b \in F\}$. However, $(\varepsilon) \subset R$ is an ideal since it is a principal ideal. In order for the ideal J to be maximal, it must satisfy $J = (\varepsilon)$.
- 2. Let $f(X) \in F[X]$ be a polynomial of degree 2. Without loss of generality, $f(X)$ is monic; otherwise divide $f(X)$ by its leading coefficient without changing the principal ideal $(f(X)) \subset F[X]$. Now $f(X)$ has 0, 1 or 2 distinct roots in F. Denote the quotient ring $R = F[X]/(f(X)).$

If $f(X)$ has no roots in F, then it is irreducible in $F[X]$ so the ideal $(f(X)) \subset F[X]$ is maximal. This means that the quotient ring R is a field. Denoting $\alpha = X+(f(X)) \in$ R, every element of R is uniquely expressible as $a + b\alpha$ for some $a, b \in F$. (Simply take an arbitrary coset $g(X) + (f(X)) \in R$ and represent it by the remainder of $g(X)$ found after dividing by $f(X)$. This remainder $a + bX$ is unique.) Thus $[R : F] = 2$ and so conclusion (ii) holds.

If $f(X)$ has one double root in F then $f(X) = (X - r)^2$ for some $r \in F$. Without loss of generality $r = 0$. (The map $F[X] \rightarrow F[X + r]$, $g(X) \mapsto g(X + r)$ is a ring isomorphism mapping the ideal $((X - r)^2)$ to the ideal (X^2) .) In this case $R = F[X]/(X^2)$. Denote $\varepsilon = X + (X^2) \in R$. Every coset $g(X) + (X^2) \in R$ is uniquely expressible as $a + b\varepsilon$ where $a, b \in F$. (Again, find the remainder $a + bX$ of $g(X)$ after dividing by X^2 to obtain the unique representative.) Now R is a two-dimensional vector space over F with basis $\{1, \varepsilon\}$ satisfying $\varepsilon^2 = 0$. This gives case (iii).

Finally, suppose $f(X)$ has two distinct roots in F, so $f(X) = (X - r_1)(X - r_2)$ for distinct roots $r_i \in F$. Consider the ideals $J_1 = (X - r_i) \subset F[X], i = 1, 2$. Observe that $J_1J_2 = J_1 \cap J_2 = (f(X)) \subset F[X]$. It is easy to see that

$$
(*) \qquad F[X]/(f(X)) = F[X]/(J_1 \cap J_2) = (F[X]/J_1) \oplus (F[X]/J_2).
$$

Indeed, the map $\phi: F[X] \mapsto (F[X]/J_1) \oplus (F[X]/J_2)$ defined by $g(X) \mapsto (g(X) + g(X))$ $J_1, g(X) + J_2$) is a ring homomorphism since each of the maps $F[X] \to F[X]/J_i$ is a ring homomorphism. Since the kernel of ϕ is $J_1J_2 = J_1 \cap J_2$, the first isomorphism theorem gives (*). Now use the fact that $F[X]/J_i \cong F$ (each $X - r_i$ is irreducible of degree 1) to obtain case (i).

3. (a) In this case $f(x) = (x + \alpha + \beta)(x - \alpha - \beta)(x + \alpha - \beta)(x - \alpha + \beta)$ where $\alpha = i$ √ se $f(x) = (x + \alpha + \beta)(x - \alpha - \beta)(x + \alpha - \beta)(x - \alpha + \beta)$ where $\alpha = i\sqrt{2}$ and $\beta = i\sqrt{5}$. The splitting field of $f(x)$ over $\mathbb Q$ is

$$
E = \mathbb{Q}(\pm \alpha \pm \beta) = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta) = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \sqrt{10})
$$

since $\alpha\beta = \sqrt{10}$. The extension $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{10}) \supseteq \mathbb{Q}$ has degreee 2 since 10 is not a perfect square in \mathbb{Q} ; and $E = K(\alpha) \supseteq K$ has degree $2([E:K] \leq 2$ since α is a root of $t^2 + 2 \in K[t]$; but $[E: K] > 1$ since $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ whereas $\alpha \in E$ is not real). This shows that $[E:\mathbb{Q}]=4$. Since E is the splitting field of $f(t)\in\mathbb{Q}[t], E\supset\mathbb{Q}$ is Galois and hence $|G| = [E : \mathbb{Q}] = 4$. Since every automorphism of E maps $\alpha \mapsto \pm \alpha$ and $\beta \mapsto \pm \beta$, the only possibility is $G = \{\iota, \sigma, \tau, \sigma\tau\}$, a Klein 4-group satisfying $\sigma(\alpha) = -\alpha$, $\sigma(\beta) = \beta$, $\tau(\alpha) = \alpha$, $\tau(\beta) = -\beta$.

(b) By Eisenstein's Criterion (for the prime 2), $f(x)$ is irreducible over Q. Note that $f(x) = (x+\alpha)(x-\alpha)(x+\beta)(x-\beta)$ where $\alpha = \sqrt{2-\beta}$ $\frac{11}{11}$ $\overline{2}$ and $\beta = \sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}}$; so $f(x)$ is the minimal polynomial over $\mathbb Q$ for each of its four roots. Since $\beta = \alpha(3 - \alpha^2)$, we have $E = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta) = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. Since E is the splitting field of $f(x)$ over \mathbb{Q} , the extension $E \supset \mathbb{Q}$ is Galois of degree 4. Every $g \in G$ maps α to one of the four roots of $f(x)$ and the choice of $g(\alpha) \in {\pm \alpha, \pm \beta}$ uniquely determines g since α generates the extension $E \supset \mathbb{Q}$. Denote by $\sigma \in G$ the unique automorphism mapping $\alpha \mapsto \beta$; then

$$
\sigma^{2}(\alpha) = \sigma(\beta) = \sigma(\alpha(3 - \alpha^{2})) = \beta(3 - \beta^{2}) = -\alpha;
$$

$$
\sigma^{3}(\alpha) = \sigma(-\alpha) = -\beta
$$

so $G = \langle \sigma \rangle = {\iota, \sigma, \sigma^2, \sigma^3}$ is cyclic of order 4 where the generator σ cyclically permutes the roots of $f(x)$ as

$$
\alpha \mapsto \beta \mapsto -\alpha \mapsto -\beta \mapsto \alpha.
$$

4. Suppose $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}_p$ satisfies $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$. If $c = \|\alpha\|_p > 1$ then

$$
c^{2} = \|\alpha^{2}\|_{p} = \|\alpha - 1\|_{p} = \max\{c, 1\},\
$$

which is impossible; so we must have $||\alpha||_p \leq 1$, i.e. $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. Now reducing the equation $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$ mod p or mod p^2 , gives zeroes of $X^2 + X + 1$ in $\mathbb{Z}_p/p\mathbb{Z}_p \cong \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ and in $\mathbb{Z}_p/p^2Z_p \cong \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$. But we quickly check that $X^2 + X + 1$ has no zeroes in $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{Z}/9\mathbb{Z}$ or in $\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$; so there are no solutions in (a,b,c).

In (d), if we start with $\alpha_0 = 2$, a root of $X^2 + X + 1$ in $\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z}$, then successive iterations of Newton's method give subsequent approximate roots in \mathbb{Q}_7 :

$$
\alpha_1 = 2 + 4 \cdot 7 + 5 \cdot 7^2 + 2 \cdot 7^3 + 7^4 + 4 \cdot 7^5 + 5 \cdot 7^6 + 2 \cdot 7^7 + \cdots;
$$

\n
$$
\alpha_2 = 2 + 4 \cdot 7 + 6 \cdot 7^2 + 3 \cdot 7^3 + 3 \cdot 7^4 + 0 \cdot 7^5 + 4 \cdot 7^6 + 4 \cdot 7^7 + \cdots;
$$

\n
$$
\alpha_3 = 2 + 4 \cdot 7 + 6 \cdot 7^2 + 3 \cdot 7^3 + 0 \cdot 7^4 + 2 \cdot 7^5 + 6 \cdot 7^6 + 2 \cdot 7^7 + \cdots;
$$

\n
$$
\alpha_4 = 2 + 4 \cdot 7 + 6 \cdot 7^2 + 3 \cdot 7^3 + 0 \cdot 7^4 + 2 \cdot 7^5 + 6 \cdot 7^6 + 2 \cdot 7^7 + \cdots
$$

using the iteration $\alpha_{i+1} = g(\alpha_i)$, $g(\alpha) = \alpha - \frac{\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1}{2\alpha + 1}$. From the last iteration, we obtain an approximate root

$$
2 + 4 \cdot 7 + 6 \cdot 7^2 + 3 \cdot 7^3 + 0 \cdot 7^4 = 1353,
$$

correct to within 7^{-5} < 0.00006. Since the sum of the two roots is -1 , the other root is approximately −1354, also correct to the same accuracy. (The second root can be rewritten in standard form as $7^5 - 1354 = 15453 = 4 + 2 \cdot 7 + 0 \cdot 7^2 + 3 \cdot 7^3 + 6 \cdot 7^4$, again correct to within 7^{-5} .)

5. Writing $\zeta = e^{\pi i/6} = \cos \frac{\pi}{6} + i \sin \frac{\pi}{6} = \frac{1}{2}$ $rac{1}{2}(i +)$ √ $\overline{3}$, it is easy to check that ζ is a root of $f(x) = x^4 - x^2 + 1$. Similarly, each of $\zeta, \zeta^5, \zeta^7, \zeta^{11}$ is a root of $f(x)$ so

$$
f(x) = x4 - x2 + 1 = (x - \zeta)(x - \zeta5)(x - \zeta7)(x - \zeta11).
$$

Denote the splitting field of this polynomial by $E = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta, \zeta^5, \zeta^7, \zeta^{11}) = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$. Note that E contains $\zeta + \zeta^{11} = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{6} =$ $\sqrt{3}$. Since $\zeta \notin \mathbb{R}$ and $\sqrt{3}$ is real irrational, we have that *E* contains $\zeta + \zeta = 2 \cos \frac{\pi}{6} = \sqrt{3}$. Since $\zeta \notin \mathbb{R}$ and $\sqrt{3}$ is really proper containments $E \supset \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{3}] \supset \mathbb{Q}$ and so $[E : \mathbb{Q}] = [E : \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{3}]$ $\overline{3}$] $\left[\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{3}]:\mathbb{Q}\right]\geq 4.$ On the other hand, $[E:\mathbb{Q}]\leq 4$ since $E=\mathbb{Q}[\zeta]$ where ζ is a root of the polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ of degree 4. Thus $[E:\mathbb{Q}] = 4$ and $f(x)$ is the minimal polynomial of ζ over Q. Moreover since E is the splitting field of $f(x)$ over Q, the extension $E \supset \mathbb{Q}$ is Galois and its Galois group G has order 4. We may write $G = \{i, \rho, \sigma, \tau\}$ where $\rho(\zeta) = \zeta^5$, $\sigma(\zeta) = \zeta^7$ and $\tau(\zeta) = \zeta^{11}$ and $\iota(\zeta) = \zeta$. Note that $\rho^2(\zeta) = \zeta^{25} = \zeta$, $\sigma^2(\zeta) = \zeta^{49} = \zeta$ and $\tau^2(\zeta) = \zeta^{121} = \zeta$ so $\rho^2 = \sigma^2 = \tau^2 = \iota$, i.e. G is a Klein 4-group. Also note that $\rho(\sigma(\zeta)) = \zeta^{35} = \zeta^{11}$ so $\rho\sigma = \tau$. Now ρ fixes $\zeta + \zeta^{5} = i$; σ fixes $\zeta \cdot \zeta^7 = \zeta^8 = \frac{1}{2}$ $rac{1}{2}(1 -$ √ $\overline{-3}$); and τ fixes $\zeta + \zeta^{11} =$ √ 3. Each of these last three elements of E is quadratic irrational and therefore generates the fixed field of the corresponding automorphism. Now the subgroups of G and the subfields of E are pictured in the lattice diagrams

where the Galois correspondence is given by $G \leftrightarrow \mathbb{Q}, \langle \iota \rangle \leftrightarrow E, \langle \rho \rangle \leftrightarrow \mathbb{Q}[i], \langle \sigma \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_i | \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_i \rangle$ $\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-3}], \langle \tau \rangle \leftrightarrow \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{3}].$ (I have used double lines to indicate normality.)

6. There was a misprint in the hint given for this problem (the formula for b_j did not appear correctly). The actual question was however stated correctly; and the exact form of the b_j was not important in the solution, only the fact that $b_j \in \mathcal{O}$). In any case, I have chosen a different presentation here to highlight an interesting generalization of Taylor expansion, made possible by replacing ordinary derivatives by Hasse derivatives. (Recall that the familiar form of Taylor expansion requires denominators k! which are not permitted in prime characteristic.) Also in the online copy of the homework assignment, I rewrote the hint accordingly.

Given $f(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} a_i X^i \in F[X]$ and $k \geq 0$, the kth Hasse derivative of $f(X)$ is the polynomial

$$
f^{[k]}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{d-k} {k+i \choose i} a_{k+i} X^i \in F[X].
$$

Observe the following:

- (i) If $f(X) \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ then $f^{[k]}(X) \in \mathcal{O}[X]$.
- (ii) The usual k -th derivative satisfies

$$
f^{(k)}(X) = k! f^{[k]}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{d-k} (i+1)(i+2) \cdots (i+k)a_{k+i}X^i.
$$

If F has characteristic zero then we can solve for $f^{[k]}(X) = \frac{1}{k!} f^{(k)}(X)$; however if $p = \text{char } F$ is prime then $f^{(k)}(X) = 0$ whenever $k \geqslant p$ and so $f^{[k]}(X)$ cannot be recovered from $f^{(k)}(X)$; in general the polynomial $f^{[k]}(X)$ contains more information not found in the usual derivatives.

- (iii) For $k = 1$, our modified 'derivative' coincides with the usual derivative, using the argument in (ii): $f^{[1]}(X) = f^{(1)}(X) = f'(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} (i+1)a_{i+1}X^i$.
- (iv) We easily obtain the identity

$$
f(X+\delta) = f(X) + \delta f'(X) + \delta^2 f^{[2]}(X) + \delta^3 f^{[3]}(X) + \cdots + \delta^d f^{[d]}(X)
$$

by using the Binomial Theorem to expand each term of $f(X+\delta) = \sum_i a_i (X+\delta)^i$. This identity easily generalizes to more general series $f(X) \in F[[X]]$, giving a more general form of Taylor expansion valid in arbitrary characteristic.

Now suppose $f(X) \in \mathcal{O}[X]$, and $\alpha_0 \in \mathcal{O}$ satisfies $||f(\alpha_0)|| < ||f'(\alpha_0)||^2$. We will recursively define the sequence of approximate roots

$$
\alpha_{n+1} = \alpha_n + \delta_n
$$
 where $\delta_n = -\frac{f(\alpha_n)}{f'(\alpha_n)}$

for $n \geq 0$. The first step in this recursion uses $\delta = \delta_0 = -\frac{f(\alpha_0)}{f'(\alpha_0)}$ $\frac{J(\alpha_0)}{f'(\alpha_0)}$. (Our hypothesis guarantees that $||f'(\alpha_0)|| > 0$ so that δ is well-defined.) Note that

$$
\|\delta\| = \frac{\|f(\alpha_0)\|}{\|f'(\alpha_0)\|} = \frac{\|f(\alpha_0)\|}{\|f'(\alpha_0)\|^2} \|f'(\alpha_0)\| < \|f'(\alpha_0)\| \leq 1
$$

using the hypothesis $|| f(\alpha_0) || < || f'(\alpha_0) ||^2$ and $f'(\alpha_0) \in \mathcal{O}[\alpha_0] \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. In particular, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_0 + \delta \in \mathcal{O}$. By (iv),

$$
f(\alpha_1) = f(\alpha_0 + \delta) = f(\alpha_0) + \delta f'(\alpha_0) + \delta^2 \varepsilon = \delta^2 \varepsilon
$$

where $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}$, so

$$
||f(\alpha_1)|| \le ||\delta||^2 = \frac{||f(\alpha_0)||^2}{||f'(\alpha_0)||^2}.
$$

In particular $||f(\alpha_1)|| = \frac{||f(\alpha_0)||}{||f'(\alpha_0)||}$ $||f(\alpha_0)|| \over ||f'(\alpha_0)||^2$ $||f(\alpha_0)|| < ||f(\alpha_0)||$ which gives (a). Before we can proceed inductively, we first apply (iv) to the polynomial $f'(X) \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ (in place of $f(X)$ to observe that

$$
f'(\alpha_1) = f'(\alpha_0 + \delta) = f'(\alpha_0) + \delta \tilde{\varepsilon}
$$

for some $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in \mathcal{O}$, where

$$
\|\delta \tilde{\varepsilon}\| \leq \|\delta\| = \frac{\|f(\alpha_0)\|}{\|f'(\alpha_0)\|^2} \|f'(\alpha_0)\| < \|f'(\alpha_0)\|
$$

so the ultranorm inequality gives

$$
||f'(\alpha_1)|| = ||f'(\alpha_0) + \delta \tilde{\varepsilon}|| = ||f'(\alpha_0)||.
$$

Now putting together three of the relations above,

$$
||f'(\alpha_1)|| \leq ||f'(\alpha_0)||^2 \leq ||f'(\alpha_0)||^4 \over ||f'(\alpha_0)||^2 = ||f'(\alpha_0)||^2 = ||f'(\alpha_1)||^2.
$$

Thus α_1 satisfies all the same assumptions made for α_0 . We may iterate the map $\alpha_n \mapsto \alpha_{n+1}$ and inductively apply the results above at every step. In particular we have $|| f'(\alpha_n) || = \cdots = || f'(\alpha_1) || = || f'(\alpha_0) ||$ and

$$
||f(\alpha_{n+1})|| \le ||\delta_n||^2 = \frac{||f(\alpha_n)||^2}{||f'(\alpha_n)||^2} = \frac{||f(\alpha_n)||^2}{||f'(\alpha_0)||^2}
$$

which establishes (b).

Now let $c = ||f'(\alpha_0)||$ and $k = ||f(\alpha_0)||/c^2$. Recall that $||f'(\alpha_n)|| = c > 0$ for all n; also $k < 1$. An easy induction shows that

$$
(\dagger) \qquad \|f(\alpha_n)\| \leq c^2 k^{2^n} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.
$$

Indeed, $|| f(\alpha_0) || = c^2 k^2$ giving equality for $n = 0$; and assuming (†) holds at iteration n, then as we have seen,

$$
||f(\alpha_{n+1})|| \leq ||\frac{f(\alpha_n)||^2}{c^2} \leq ||\frac{(c^2k^{2^n})^2}{c^2} = c^2k^{2^{n+1}}
$$

and so (†) holds also at iteration $n+1$. A consequence of (†) is

$$
\|\alpha_{n+1} - \alpha_n\| = \|\delta_n\| = \frac{\|f(\alpha_n)\|}{\|f'(\alpha_n)\|} \leq \frac{c^2 k^{2^n}}{c} = ck^{2^n}
$$

and so if $m > n \geqslant 0$ then

$$
\|\alpha_m - \alpha_n\| = \|(\alpha_m - \alpha_{m-1}) + (\alpha_{m-1} - \alpha_{m-2}) + \dots + (\alpha_{n+1} - \alpha_n)\|
$$

\$\leq\$ $\max\{ck^{2^{m-1}}, ck^{2^{m-2}}, \dots, ck^{2^n}\}= ck^{2^n}.$

This shows that the sequence $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots \in \mathcal{O}$ is Cauchy, verifying (c). Since $\mathcal O$ is complete, we have $\alpha = \lim_{n \to \infty} \alpha_n \in \mathcal{O}$. Since $f(X) \in \mathcal{O}[X]$ is a polynomial, it is continuous and $f(\alpha) = \lim_{n \to \infty} f(\alpha_n) = 0$ where this limit follows from (†).

7. (a) Let $\theta = \alpha + \alpha^2$. Then

$$
\theta^3 = \alpha^3 + 3\alpha^4 + 3\alpha^5 + \alpha^6 = 2 + 6\alpha + 6\alpha^2 + 4 = 6 + 6\theta
$$

so θ is a root of $f(t) = t^3 - 6t - 6 \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$. By Eisenstein's criterion (with either prime 2 or 3), $f(t)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[t]$ so it is the minimal polynomial of θ over Q.

(b) Let $\alpha =$ $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5}$. With some computational help from Maple, we find that $f(\alpha) = 0$ where

$$
f(x) = x^8 - 40x^6 + 352x^4 - 960x^2 + 576 \in \mathbb{Z}[x].
$$

To show that $f(x)$ is the minimal polynomial of α over \mathbb{Q} , we must show that it is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ (and hence also irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$).

Here is a silly argument (I say silly because it uses Maple to jump through lots of unnecessary hoops) but it works. Suppose on the contrary that $f(x) =$ $g(x)h(x)$ where each of the factors $g(x), h(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is monic of degree $\geqslant 2$. It is easy to see that $f(x) > 0$ for every $x \ge 6$ (in fact a little calculus shows that $f(x)$ represents an increasing function on this interval). It follows that both $g(x)$ and $h(x)$ are positive for $x \ge 6$. Now $f(11) = 148534489$ is prime, so ${g(11), h(11)} = {1,148534489}$. Similarly, $f(m)$ is prime for at least 63 distinct values of m (such values $m = 11, 13, 31, 35, \ldots, 991$ are easily found using Maple). This means that at least one of the polynomials $g(x)$, $h(x)$, say $g(x)$, assumes the value $g(m) = 1$ for at least 32 integer values of $m \ge 11$. But this is impossible: since deg $g(x) \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}, g(x)$ can assume any one value at most 6 times.

Here is a more conventional argument that accomplishes the same goal. Let $E = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. Clearly $E \subseteq \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \sqrt{5})$. To verify the reverse containment $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2},\sqrt{3},\sqrt{5})\subseteq E,$ one routinely checks (using Maple) that

$$
\sqrt{2} = \frac{1}{576} (\alpha^7 - 28\alpha^5 - 56\alpha^3 + 960\alpha);
$$

\n
$$
\sqrt{3} = -\frac{1}{96} (\alpha^7 - 37\alpha^5 + 244\alpha^3 - 360\alpha);
$$

\n
$$
\sqrt{5} = \frac{1}{576} (5\alpha^7 - 194\alpha^5 + 120\alpha^3 - 2544\alpha).
$$

(In fact, each of these relations was found by using Maple to solve a system of 8 linear equations in 8 unknown coefficients.) Thus $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3}, \sqrt{5}) = E$. Note that $E = K(\sqrt{5}) \supseteq K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{3})$. To save time, I will make use of the fact (which we have previously shown in class) that $K \supset \mathbb{Q}$ is Galois of degree 4. It suffices to show that $\sqrt{5} \notin K$, as this will force $[E:K] = 2$ and $[E:\mathbb{Q}] = 8$, whence α is algebraic of degree 8 over $\mathbb Q$ and $f(x)$ is its minimal polynomial. Suppose that, algebraic of degree δ over ψ and $f(x)$ is its minimal polynomial. Suppose that,
on the contrary, $\sqrt{5} = a + b\sqrt{2} + c\sqrt{3} + d\sqrt{6} \in K$ where $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Q}$. Recall on the contrary, $\sqrt{3} = a + b\sqrt{2} + c\sqrt{3} + a\sqrt{6} \in \mathbb{R}$ where $a, b, c, a \in \mathbb{Q}$. Recall that K has 4 automorphisms, one of which is a map σ fixing $\sqrt{3}$ and mapping at K has 4 automorphisms, one of which is a map σ fixing $\sqrt{3}$ and mapping
 $\sqrt{2} \mapsto -\sqrt{2}$, also $\sqrt{6} \mapsto -\sqrt{6}$. Now $\sigma(\sqrt{5}) = \pm \sqrt{5}$ since these are the only roots of the polynomial $t^2 - 5 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, so either

$$
a + b\sqrt{2} + c\sqrt{3} + d\sqrt{6} = \sqrt{5} = \sigma(\sqrt{5}) = a - b\sqrt{2} + c\sqrt{3} - d\sqrt{6}
$$

or

$$
a + b\sqrt{2} + c\sqrt{3} + d\sqrt{6} = \sqrt{5} = -\sigma(\sqrt{5}) = -a + b\sqrt{2} - c\sqrt{3} + d\sqrt{6}.
$$

In the first case, $\sqrt{5} = a + c$ $\sqrt{3}$; in the second case, $\sqrt{5} = b$ $2+d$ 6. Both of these yield contradictions: in the first case we repeat the argument above with these yield contradictions: in the first case we repeat the argument above with
a Galois automorphism of $\mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{3}]$ to get $\pm\sqrt{5} = a - c\sqrt{3}$ whence $\sqrt{5} \in \{a, c\sqrt{3}\}\$ a Galois automorphism of $\mathbb{Q}[V]$ to get $\pm \sqrt{v} = u - c\sqrt{v}$ whence $\sqrt{v} \in \{u, cv\}$
which is impossible; the second case takes the form $\sqrt{10} = 2b + 2c\sqrt{6} \in \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{6}]$ leading to a similar contradiction.

Remarks: The latter argument shows the beginning of an inductive proof Remarks: The latter argument shows the begins
that if p_n is the *n*th prime, then $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} + \cdots$ ⊥⊥⊥
∖ $\overline{p_n}$ is algebraic of degree 2^n over $\mathbb Q$. Some shortcuts are possible in our proof above: in particular it is immediate that all our coefficients $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Q}$ above are either integers or halfinimediate that all our coefficients $a, b, c, a \in \mathbb{Q}$ above are either integers or hall-
integers, using the integrality of $\sqrt{5}$. However we had not yet discussed algebraic integers at the time when this homework was assigned.

(c) Denote $\alpha = \sin \frac{2\pi}{7}$ and $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/7}$, so that

$$
0 = 1 + \zeta + \zeta^2 + \zeta^3 + \zeta^4 + \zeta^5 + \zeta^6;
$$

\n
$$
2i\alpha = \zeta - \zeta^{-1};
$$

\n
$$
-4\alpha^2 = \zeta^2 - 2 + \zeta^{-2};
$$

\n
$$
16\alpha^4 = \zeta^4 - 4\zeta^2 + 6 - 4\zeta^{-2} + \zeta^{-4};
$$

\n
$$
-64\alpha^6 = \zeta^6 - 6\zeta^4 + 15\zeta^2 - 20 + 15\zeta^{-2} - 6\zeta^{-4} + \zeta^{-6}.
$$

Add row 5, plus 7 times row 4, plus 14 times row 3, and subtract row 1; since $\zeta^7 = 1$ this gives

$$
-64\alpha^6 + 112\alpha^4 - 56\alpha^2 = -7.
$$

Thus α is a root of $f(x) = 64x^6 - 112x^4 + 56x^2 - 7 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. By Eisenstein's criterion (using the prime 7), $f(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$. Thus the minimal polynomial of α over $\mathbb Q$ is

$$
\frac{1}{64}f(x) = x^6 - \frac{7}{4}x^4 + \frac{7}{8}x^2 - \frac{7}{64}.
$$