



# MATH 250A

PROFESSOR KENNETH A. RIBET

Final Exam

December 15, 2015

8:00–11:00PM, 247 Cory Hall

Please write your NAME clearly:

Please put away all books, calculators, cell phones and other devices. You may consult a single two-sided sheet of notes. Please write carefully and clearly in *complete sentences*.

Problem	Your score	Possible points
1		5 points
2		5 points
3		5 points
4		5 points
5		5 points
6		5 points
7		5 points
Total:		35 points

**1a.** Show that the alternating group  $\mathbf{A}_6$  does not have a subgroup of index 3. (You can assume that  $\mathbf{A}_6$  is simple.)

If  $H < \mathbf{A}_6$  has index 3, the action by left translation of  $\mathbf{A}_6$  on  $\mathbf{A}_6/H$  gives a non-trivial homomorphism  $\mathbf{A}_6 \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_3$ . Such a homomorphism must have trivial kernel because of the simplicity of  $\mathbf{A}_6$ ; in other words, the homomorphism is injective. This is ridiculous because the target group has order 6, whereas the source has order 360.

**b.** Prove that there is no simple group of order 120. [Assume that  $G$  is such a group and consider the 5-Sylow subgroups of  $G$ .]

Let  $G$  be such a group. The number of 5-Sylows of  $G$  divides 24 and is 1 mod 5; it can only be 1 or 6. If it's 1, the unique 5-Sylow is normal, which is impossible because  $G$  is simple. Therefore there are six 5-Sylow subgroups.

The action of  $G$  by conjugation on the set of 5-Sylows of  $G$  defines a homomorphism  $G \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_6$ ; as in part (a), this homomorphism must be an embedding. The image of  $G$  in  $\mathbf{S}_6$  must lie in  $\mathbf{A}_6$ ; otherwise the intersection of  $G$  with  $\mathbf{A}_6$  inside  $\mathbf{S}_6$  would be an index-2 subgroup of  $G$ . Hence  $G$  is an index-3 subgroup of  $\mathbf{A}_6$ ; this is impossible by part (a).

**2a.** If  $A$  is a finite abelian group (written additively), let

$$S_A = \sum_{a \in A} a$$

be the sum of all elements in  $A$ . Show that  $2 \cdot S_A = 0$ .

As  $a$  runs over  $A$ , so does  $-a$ . Thus

$$2 \cdot S_A = \sum_{a \in A} a + \sum_{a \in A} (-a) = \sum_{a \in A} (a + (-a)) = \sum_{a \in A} 0 = 0.$$

**b.** Prove that  $S_A$  is non-zero if and only if  $A$  has exactly one element of order 2.

In the sum defining  $S_A$ , we can pair up elements  $a$  with their negatives  $-a$ . As long as  $a$  and  $-a$  are different from each other, they will both occur in the sum and cancel each other out. Thus  $S_A$  is the sum of those  $a$  in  $A$  such that  $a = -a$ . The  $a$ s like this are the ones for which  $2a = 0$ . In other words,  $S_A$  is the sum of all elements of order 1 or 2 in  $A$ . If  $A[2] = \{a \in A \mid 2a = 0\}$ , then  $S_A = S_{A[2]}$ . Thus we can, and will, assume that  $A$  is annihilated by 2; thus  $A$  consists of 0 and elements of order 2. We have to prove that  $S_A$  is non-zero if and only if  $A$  has two elements.

If  $A = (0)$ , then  $A$  has no elements of order 2 and  $S_A = 0$ . Thus the statement is true in this case. Accordingly, we can and will assume that  $A$  is non-zero, so that  $A$  has an element  $t$  of order 2. We partition  $A$  into pairs  $\{a, a + t\}$ ; the number of such pairs is one-half the order of  $A$ . The sum of the elements in each pair is  $a + (a + t) = 2a + t = t$ . As a result,  $S_A = n \cdot t$ , where  $n$  is half the order of  $A$ . Thus  $S_A$  is non-zero if and only if  $n$  is odd; this happens if and only if  $A$  has two elements, i.e., exactly when  $A$  has a unique element of order 2.

**3a.** Let  $K$  be a field and let  $n$  be a positive integer prime to the characteristic of  $K$ . (If  $K$  has characteristic 0, there is no condition on  $n$ .) Let  $\zeta \in \bar{K}^*$  be a primitive  $n$ th root of 1. Prove that  $K(\zeta)$  is a Galois extension of  $K$  and that  $[K(\zeta) : K]$  divides  $\varphi(n)$ . (Here  $\varphi$  is the Euler phi function.)

The field  $K(\zeta)$  is the splitting field of the polynomial  $x^n - 1$  because the roots of this polynomial are the powers of  $\zeta$ . The polynomial has distinct roots because  $n$  is non-zero in  $K$ . Thus the splitting field is a separable and normal extension—it's a Galois extension of  $K$ .

As we discussed in class (and as is explained in Chapter VI of Lang), the Galois group of the extension  $K(\zeta)/K$  is naturally a subgroup of the group of automorphisms of the group of  $n$ th roots of unity in  $K(\zeta)$ . This group of automorphisms is  $(\mathbf{Z}/n\mathbf{Z})^*$ , which has order  $\varphi(n)$ .

b. If  $p$  is a prime number and  $t$  is a positive integer, show that the polynomial

$$\frac{x^{p^t} - 1}{x^{p^{t-1}} - 1} = x^{(p-1)p^{t-1}} + x^{(p-2)p^{t-1}} + \cdots + x^{p^{t-1}} + 1$$

is irreducible over  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

Let  $f(x)$  be the polynomial in question. Certainly  $f(x)$  is irreducible if and only if  $f(x+1)$  is irreducible. We will establish the irreducibility of  $f(x+1)$  by using Eisenstein's criterion (p. 183 of the book) at the prime  $p$ . Note that  $f(x+1)$  is a monic polynomial whose constant term is  $f(1) = 1 + 1 + \cdots + 1 = p$ . Thus  $f(x+1)$  will satisfy Eisenstein's criterion if it is congruent to  $x^{(p-1)p^{t-1}} \pmod{p}$ .

Let's work mod  $p$ . We have

$$(x+1)^{p^t} - 1 = ((x+1)^{p^{t-1}} - 1)f(x+1).$$

But  $(x+1)^{p^t} - 1 = ((x+1) - 1)^{p^t} = x^{p^t}$  in characteristic  $p$ . Similarly,  $(x+1)^{p^{t-1}} - 1 = x^{p^{t-1}}$  in characteristic  $p$ . Thus  $f(x+1)$  is  $x^{p^t}/x^{p^{t-1}} = x^{p^{t-1}(p-1)}$ , as required.

4. A *prime field* is a field that is either  $\mathbf{Q}$  or one of the fields  $\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$  with  $p$  a prime number.

Let  $K$  and  $L$  be prime fields. Show that  $K \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} L$  is non-zero if and only if  $K$  and  $L$  are the same field.

If  $K = L$ , there is a non-zero bilinear map  $K \times K \rightarrow K$ , namely  $(x, y) \mapsto xy$ . This map corresponds to a non-zero homomorphism  $K \otimes K \rightarrow K$ ; accordingly, the tensor product is non-zero.

If  $K$  and  $L$  are different, then one of them is  $\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z}$  with  $p$  prime and the other is either  $\mathbf{Z}/\ell\mathbf{Z}$  with  $\ell$  prime different from  $p$  or is the field  $\mathbf{Q}$ . We know that  $\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z} \otimes \mathbf{Z}/\ell\mathbf{Z}$  is zero because it is killed both by multiplication by  $p$  and by  $\ell$  (and hence by multiplication by 1). How about  $\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z} \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ ? Well, each tensor  $a \otimes b$  may be rewritten

$$a \otimes \left( p \cdot \frac{b}{p} \right) = pa \otimes \frac{b}{p} = 0 \otimes \frac{b}{p} = 0.$$

Since  $\mathbf{Z}/p\mathbf{Z} \otimes \mathbf{Q}$  is generated by such pure tensors, it is 0. (We could also argue in terms of bilinear maps.)

5. Let  $A$  be a Dedekind ring. We know from homework that  $A$  is Noetherian; that every non-zero ideal of  $A$  is a product of non-zero prime ideals of  $A$ ; that every non-zero prime ideal of  $A$  is maximal.

*Suppose that the Dedekind ring  $A$  is a unique factorization domain.* Show that  $A$  is a principal ideal domain:

a. Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a non-zero prime ideal of  $A$ . Show that  $\mathfrak{p}$  contains an irreducible element  $x$  of  $A$ .

Since  $\mathfrak{p}$  is non-zero, it contains a non-zero element  $a$  of  $A$ . Since  $A$  is a UFD, we can write  $a$  as a product of irreducible elements, say  $a = x_1 \cdots x_t$ . Because  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a prime ideal, one of the  $x_i$  must lie in  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

**b.** With  $x$  as in (a), show that  $\mathfrak{p} = (x)$ .

In a UFD, the ideal generated by an irreducible element is a prime ideal. (In other words, if an irreducible element  $\pi$  occurs in the factorization of  $ab$ , it must appear in the factorization of  $a$  or of  $b$ .) Thus  $(x)$  is prime; hence it is maximal, by the remarks made at the beginning of the problem. Since we have  $(x) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ , the two ideals are equal.

**c.** Show that every non-zero ideal of  $A$  is principal.

Every non-zero ideal of  $A$  is a product of prime ideals (as mentioned at the beginning of the problem). A product of principal ideals is principal.

**6.** Suppose that  $f(x)$  is a monic polynomial over a field  $K$  with the following unlikely-sounding property: the roots of  $f(x)$  in an algebraic closure  $\bar{K}$  of  $K$  are distinct and form a subfield of  $\bar{K}$ .

**a.** Show that the characteristic of  $K$  is a prime number  $p$ .

A field and its subfields all have the same characteristic. The subfield of  $\bar{K}$  formed by the roots of  $f$  has only a finite number of elements because a polynomial has only a finite number of roots. Thus this subfield must be of characteristic  $p$  for some prime number  $p$ . (Fields of characteristic 0 contain  $\mathbf{Q}$  and are thus infinite!) It follows that  $\bar{K}$  and  $K$  have characteristic  $p$  as well.

**b.** Show that  $f(x) = x^{p^n} - x$  for some integer  $n \geq 1$ .

Say that  $L$  is the field formed by the roots of  $f(x)$ . Then  $L$  is finite, so it's of order  $p^n$  for some  $n \geq 1$ . As George explained one day when I was traveling, the product  $\prod_{\alpha \in L} (x - \alpha)$  is

then  $x^{p^n} - x$ . However,  $f(x)$  is also this product: Any monic polynomial factors over  $\bar{K}$  as the product of linear factors  $x - r$  as  $r$  runs over the roots of the polynomial (counted with multiplicity). For  $f(x)$ , the multiplicities are all 1, by hypothesis. Because the product is both  $f(x)$  and  $x^{p^n} - x$ , these two polynomials are equal.

Note: When the exam was printed, the hypothesis that the roots of  $f(x)$  are distinct was omitted. It will be added when the exam is distributed.

Note: This is problem #13 in page 254 of the textbook.

**7.** Let  $A$  be a finite abelian group and let  $B$  be a subgroup of  $A$  such that the groups  $B$  and  $A/B$  have relative prime orders. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow B \rightarrow A \rightarrow A/B \rightarrow 0,$$

where the second map is the inclusion of  $B$  into  $A$  and the third map is the quotient map  $a \mapsto a + B$ . Show that this sequence is *split*.

Note that it is *not* enough to show that  $A$  is isomorphic abstractly to the direct sum  $B \oplus (A/B)$ . See <http://math.stackexchange.com/questions/131881/group-extensions/131895#131895> for a discussion of this point.

Let  $\pi$  be the quotient map. The aim is to find a homomorphism  $\sigma : A/B \rightarrow A$  such that  $\pi \circ \sigma$  is the identity map  $\text{id}$  on  $A/B$ .

By Euclid, we can find an integer  $n \geq 1$  that is divisible by the order of  $B$  and congruent to 1 mod the order of  $A/B$ . The executive summary of what happens now is as follows: we define

$$\sigma(a + B) := n \cdot a \in A;$$

this map is a well-defined homomorphism whose composition with  $\pi$  is the identity because  $n = 1$  on  $A/B$ .

A more leisurely approach to the situation begins by defining  $f : A \rightarrow A$  to be the map “multiplication by  $n$ .” Then the restriction of  $f$  to  $B$  is 0, while the map induced by  $f$  on  $A/B$  is the identity. We have a commutative digram of the shape:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow{\pi} & A/B & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow 0 & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \text{id} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & A & \xrightarrow{\pi} & A/B & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Because  $f$  vanishes on  $B$ , it factors through  $\pi$ ; this means that there is a homomorphism  $\sigma : A/B \rightarrow A$  so that  $f = \sigma \circ \pi$ .

I claim that  $\sigma$  is a splitting of  $\pi$ , meaning that  $\pi \circ \sigma = \text{id}$  on  $A/B$ . The two sides are equal after right composition with  $\pi$ :

$$(\pi \circ \sigma) \circ \pi = \pi \circ (\sigma \circ \pi) = \pi \circ f = \text{id} \circ \pi.$$

Since  $\pi$  is surjective, the two sides are equal before the composition; this is what we need for a splitting.