13. Algebraic number theory

Definition 13.1. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ be a complex number.

We say that α is **algebraic** if there is a polynomial

$$p(x) = x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + a_{n-2}x^{n-2} + \dots + a_1x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$$

such that $p(\alpha) = 0$.

Example 13.2. Any rational number is algebraic.

Indeed, $p(x) = x - \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ and of course $p(\alpha) = 0$.

Example 13.3. $\sqrt{2}$ is algebraic.

Indeed $p(x) = x^2 - 2 \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ and $p(\sqrt{2}) = 0$. More generally, \sqrt{d} is algebraic, as it is one of the zeroes of $x^2 - d$.

Example 13.4. *i* is algebraic.

Indeed *i* is a zero of $x^2 + 1 \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$. Perhaps not surprisingly the more complicated p(x), the more complicated α . However if α is a zero of p(x) then α is a zero of p(x)q(x) for any polynomial q(x).

Definition-Lemma 13.5. Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ be algebraic.

The **minimal polynomial** of α , denoted $m_{\alpha}(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$, is the smallest degree polynomial such that α is a zero of $m_{\alpha}(x)$.

The minimal polynomial is irreducible and it divides any other polynomial for which α is a zero.

The **degree** of α is the degree of $m_{\alpha}(x)$.

Proof. If $p(\alpha) = 0$ and p(x) = q(x)r(x) then either $q(\alpha) = 0$ or $r(\alpha) = 0$.

It is therefore clear that the minimal polynomial is irreducible. Suppose that $p(\alpha) = 0$. We may write

$$p(x) = q(x)m_{\alpha}(x) + r(x),$$

where either r(x) = 0 or the degree of r(x) is less than the degree of $m_{\alpha}(x)$.

We have

$$0 = p(\alpha)$$

= $q(\alpha)m_{\alpha}(\alpha) + r(\alpha)$
= $r(\alpha)$.

As $r(\alpha) = 0$ and $m_{\alpha}(x)$ is the minimal polynomial, it follows that r(x) = 0, so that $m_{\alpha}(x)$ divides p(x).

Rational numbers have degree one and $\sqrt{2}$ has degree two.

It is not hard to see that the collection of all polynomials in α is a subring of the field of all complex numbers. It is denoted $\mathbb{Q}[\alpha]$. For example $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ the Gausian integers (note that $i^2 = -1$) and the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{d}]$ behind Pell's equation

Theorem 13.6. If α is an algebraic number then

$$\mathbb{Q}[\alpha] = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$$

is a field and not just a ring.

It is generated as a vector space over \mathbb{Q} by the powers of α up to n-1; in particular it is finite dimensional over \mathbb{Q} . Further,

$$\mathbb{Q}[\alpha] = \frac{\mathbb{Q}[x]}{\langle m_{\alpha}(x) \rangle}.$$

Proof. Define a ring homomorphism

$$\mathbb{Q}[x] \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}[\alpha]$$
 by the rule $x \longrightarrow \alpha$.

This map is clearly surjective. The kernel is the set of all polynomials which have α as a zero. We have already seen that this is the set of all multiples of $m_{\alpha}(x)$. This gives the isomorphism.

To show that

$$\mathbb{Q}[\alpha] = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$$

we have to show that the LHS is a field, that is, we have to show that every non-zero element of $\mathbb{Q}[\alpha]$ has an inverse. We are given $f(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ and we want to construct the inverse modulo $m_{\alpha}(x)$. $m_{\alpha}(x)$ is irreducible and does not divide f(x). It follows that we may find a(x) and b(x) such that

$$1 = a(x)f(x) + b(x)m_{\alpha}(x).$$

But then a(x) is the inverse of f(x), modulo $m_{\alpha}(x)$.

We check that $1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \ldots, \alpha^{n-1}$ are a basis for $\mathbb{Q}[\alpha]$. If they were dependent we could find $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{n-1}$ such that

$$\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 \alpha + \lambda_2 \alpha^2 + \dots + \lambda^{n-1} \alpha^{n-1} = 0.$$

If we put

$$f(x) = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 x + \lambda_2 x^2 + \dots + \lambda^{n-1} x^{n-1},$$

then f(x) is a polynomial with rational coefficients. As $f(\alpha) = 0$ and f(x) has smaller degree than $m_{\alpha}(x)$ it follows that f(x) = 0. But then $\lambda_i = 0$ for $0 \le i \le n-1$. It follows that $1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \ldots, \alpha^{n-1}$ are independent.

We now check they span. It is clear that all of the powers span and so we just need to check that we can get every power of α . So we just need to check that if $m \geq n$ then we can express α^m in terms of lower powers of α . But this is clear. As

$$m_{\alpha}(\alpha) = 0$$
,

 α^n is a linear combination of lower powers of α . Multiplying through by α^{m-n} , we express α^m in terms of lower powers.

It is also possible to define the norm of α :

Definition 13.7. If $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ is algebraic then the **norm** of α , denoted $N(\alpha)$, is $(-1)^n a_0$, where a_0 is the constant term of $m_{\alpha}(x)$.

Note that the norm of α is the product of the roots of $m_{\alpha}(x)$. For example, $\sqrt[3]{2}$ is algebraic and its norm is 2, as $m_{\sqrt[3]{2}}(x) = x^3 - 2$.

Perhaps the most interesting issue is to decide what should be the integers in the field $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. It cannot be $\mathbb{Q}[\alpha]$, since this is the whole field.

Definition 13.8. $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ is called an **algebraic integer** if α is algebraic and $m_{\alpha}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$.

It is a standard result of abstract algebra that the set of all algebraic integers is a ring, so that the sum and product of two algebraic integers is an algebraic integer. So if α is an algebraic integer then the ring generated by $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$ is a subring of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ consisting of algebraic integers.

One subtle issue is that there might be more algebraic integers. For example

$$\sqrt{2} \notin \mathbb{Z}[2\sqrt{2}]$$
 and yet $\sqrt{2} \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})$.

A much more interesting example is given by

$$\beta = \frac{1}{2}(1+\sqrt{5}).$$

Define

$$\bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \sqrt{5}).$$

Then

$$\beta + \bar{\beta} = 1$$
 and $\beta \bar{\beta} = -1$.

Thus β is a root of

$$x^2 - x - 1 = 0,$$

so that β is an algebraic integer.

Definition-Lemma 13.9. A field $\mathbb{Q} \subset F \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that F/\mathbb{Q} is a finite dimensional vector space is called a **number field**. The set of all algebraic integers in F, denoted \mathcal{O}_F , is called a **number ring**.

A unit ϵ is an invertible element of \mathcal{O}_F . $\epsilon \in \mathcal{O}_F$ is a unit if and only if $N(\epsilon) = \pm 1$.

Proof. If

$$x^{n} + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + a_{n-2}x^{n-2} + \dots + a_{1}x + a_{0}$$

is the minimal polynomial of ϵ then

$$\epsilon^n + a_{n-1}\epsilon^{n-1} + a_{n-2}\epsilon^{n-2} + \dots + a_1\epsilon + a_0 = 0.$$

Dividing through by e^n gives

$$1 + a_{n-1}(\epsilon)^{-1} + a_{n-2}(\epsilon)^{-2} + \dots + a_1 \epsilon^{1-n} + a_0(\epsilon)^{-n} = 0.$$

Thus

$$x^{n} + \frac{a_{1}}{a_{0}}x^{n-1} + \frac{a_{2}}{a_{0}}x^{n-2} + \dots + \frac{a_{n-1}}{a_{0}}x + \frac{a_{n}}{a_{0}}.$$

is a monic polynomial and $1/\epsilon$ is a root. It is not hard to see that this monic polynomial is irreducible and so it has integer coefficients if and only if $a_0 = \pm 1$. But $N(\epsilon) = \pm a_0$.

As with any integral domain, one can define divides, associates, irreducible and prime. If α and $\beta \in \mathcal{O}_F$ then α divides β if we can find $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_F$ suhe that $\beta = \alpha \gamma$. α and β are associates if α divides β and β divides α . This is the same as to say $\alpha = \beta \epsilon$, where ϵ is a unit.

Usually irreducible is defined to mean that one cannot factor anymore and prime is defined to mean that if one divides a product then one divides one of the factors. Unfortunately the definition of prime in a number ring is the same as irreducible.