

Algebra – II
Professor Amritanshu Prasad
Mathematics
The Institute of Mathematical Sciences
Lecture 4
Degree of an Extension

(Refer Slide Time: 00:14)

Degree of a field extension


Defn: The degree of $\begin{matrix} K \\ | \\ F \end{matrix}$ is $\dim_F K$, denoted $[K:F]$.

Example: $[\mathbb{C}:\mathbb{R}] = 2$, $[\mathbb{R}:\mathbb{Q}] = \infty$.

$\alpha \in K$
|
F

Thm: $[F(\alpha):F] = \deg p(t)$, where $p(t)$ is the irreducible poly of α over F .

Pf: $F(\alpha) = F[t]/(p(t))$



We define the degree of a field extension as the dimension of the larger field as a vector space over the smaller field. So, the degree of an extension F, K over F is the dimension of K over F , see F is a subring of K , and therefore, K becomes an F module. And in this case, F is a field. So, K is a vector space over F , it makes perfect sense to talk about the dimension of K over F . And the notation is K colon F . So, for example, the degree of \mathbb{C} , over \mathbb{R} is 2, but the degree of \mathbb{R} over \mathbb{Q} is infinity. So, degrees can be infinite as well. Now, what about the extensions generated by an element?

So, let us consider the situation where we have a field extension K over F and we have an element α . So, then we can ask what is the degree of $F(\alpha)$ over F ? It turns out that it is just the degree of $p(t)$, where $p(t)$ is the irreducible polynomial of α over F . And the proof is very simple, it is just that we know already that $F(\alpha)$ is $F[t]/(p(t))$. And this $F[t]/(p(t))$, if $p(t)$ is a polynomial of degree n , then $1, t, t^2, \dots, t^{n-1}$ form a basis of $F[t]/(p(t))$. So, the dimension of $F(\alpha)$ over F must be n .

(Refer Slide Time: 02:55)

Extensions of degree 2 are called quadratic extensions.

Suppose $\begin{matrix} K \\ | \\ F \end{matrix}$ is a quadratic extension. Assume $\text{char } F \neq 2$
($2 = 1+1 \neq 0$ in F)


Take any $\alpha \in K - F$. Then $\{1, \alpha\}$ is a basis of K over F .

$\alpha^2 = -b\alpha - c$

Let $p(t) = t^2 + bt + c$. Then $p(\alpha) = 0$. $K \cong F[t]/(p(t))$.

$\alpha = \frac{-b + \sqrt{b^2 - 4c}}{2} = \frac{-b + \sqrt{D}}{2}$ \swarrow $D = b^2 - 4c$
for an appropriate choice δ of \sqrt{D} .

$\alpha = \frac{-b + \delta}{2}$, $\delta = 2\alpha + b$. $F(\alpha) = F(\delta)$, $K = F(\sqrt{D})$ for some $D \in F$.



The smallest non-trivial extensions of what are called quadratic extensions. So, extensions of degree 2 are called quadratic extensions. That is because they come from a quadratic polynomials. It is very easy to describe quadratic extensions exactly what they are. So, now, suppose K over F is a quadratic extension, then take any element of K which is not in F . So, α is in K minus F , then we know that $1, \alpha$ is a basis of K over F just because it is a linearly independent set of size 2.

And so, what we know is that α squared must be a linear combination of 1 and α . So, I can write α squared as $b\alpha + c$, but just for what is about to come, I will write as $-\alpha^2 = b\alpha + c$ does not matter, but the point is now, that let $p(t)$ be the polynomial $\alpha^2 + b\alpha + c$. So, then $p(\alpha) = 0$. So, we can write down a polynomial, a quadratic polynomial such that K is isomorphic to $F[t]/(p(t))$. And this is an isomorphism over F .

Now, we can simplify the situation further by trying to, so if we try to solve, so there are two roots of this polynomial, one of them is α and the other is something else. How are these roots given? So, know that the roots of $p(t)$ are $-\frac{b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4c}}{2}$, and we need to divide by 2. So, let us assume that F is not a field of characteristic 2. So, that means that $1 + 1$ is not equal to 0 in F . So, 2 is equal to $1 + 1$ is not equal to 0 in F with that assumption we can divide by 2, 2 is non-zero, so, we can divide by 2 and so we get that these are the roots and 1 of them is α .

So, there is anyway always a choice of square roots of $b^2 - 4c$. So, let us just write to choose a square root in such a way that this is α . So, let us say we have α

equals $4ac$ an appropriate choice, so let us call this thing D , $b^2 - 4ac$. And so, this is $\frac{-b \pm \sqrt{D}}{2}$ for an appropriate choice of \sqrt{D} , let us call it δ . So, what we have is that α is $\frac{-b + \delta}{2}$ and we can also write $\delta = 2\alpha + b$.

So, what these 2 identities mean is that $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ is equal to $\mathbb{Q}(\delta)$ because, if a field contains α and not δ , I guess what I want to say is $F(\alpha)$ and $F(\delta)$, this is general and this is because if a field contains α , and it contains F , then it must contain $2\alpha + b$ because b is in F and 2 is in F , so, $2\alpha + b$ must be in that field. So, that means the δ is in that field. So, $F(\delta)$ is contained in $F(\alpha)$.

Conversely, if a field contains δ and it contains F then it must contain $\frac{-b + \delta}{2}$ which is α . So, $F(\alpha)$ is contained in $F(\delta)$. So, we have that $F(\alpha) = F(\delta)$. So, this field extension, this quadratic extension of degree 2 can be just written as it is the extension generated by the square root of some element D in K . So, it is $F(\sqrt{D})$, or we can write $F(\sqrt{D})$ for some D . So, every quadratic extension is of the form, well if you are working inside a larger field then it is of the form, it is generated by the square root of a single element in F . So, for some D , this D is in F for some D belonging to F .

(Refer Slide Time: 09:41)

Exercise: Given K , $E, D \in F$ are two elements, which do not have square roots in F .

If $F(E) \cong F(D)$, then $D = E$.

$$\begin{array}{c} E \quad D \\ \diagdown \quad / \\ F \end{array}$$

Here is an exercise for you. So, suppose you have some field extension K over F and not necessarily quadratic and E and D belonging to F are two elements without square roots, so they belong to F , which do not have square roots in F . So, then you can talk about $F(E)$, and you can talk about $F(D)$. So, then $F(E)$ is isomorphic to $F(D)$ over F , show that D is equal to E . So, what is the saying is that all the quadratic extensions of F inside K correspond to elements of F , which are not square roots and which are not perfect squares in F itself.

(Refer Slide Time: 11:08)

Tower of extensions


Consider:

$$\begin{array}{c} L \\ | \\ K \\ | \\ F \end{array}$$

Theorem: $[L:F] = [L:K] [K:F]$

Proof: Suppose (y_1, \dots, y_n) is a basis of L over K
 (x_1, \dots, x_m) is a basis of K over F .

Claim: $\{z_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq m\}$ is a basis of L over F .




Now, we will talk about the degree of a tower of extensions, this is a very important result. So, by a tower here, not a very tall tower in this case of extensions, I mean 3 fields L containing K containing F , so you consider such a tower of 3 fields. And so, then the question is what is the relationship between the degree of L over F and the degree of L over K and the degree of K over F . And it turns out that the degree of L over F is precisely the product of the degree of L over K and the degree of K over F . This is not a very difficult theorem to prove, if you just think about it, you will probably come up with a proof very similar to what I am going to give here.

So, you can try pausing the video and trying to come up with the proof or you can watch a little bit and then try to finish the proof. So, what we will do is, we will construct a basis of L over F from a basis of L over K and a basis of K over F . So, suppose we have y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n is a basis of L over K , and x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m is a basis of K over F . My claim is that you look at the set z_{ij} , where i goes from 1 to n and j goes from 1 to m , then this is a basis of L over F . You can try to prove this as an exercise, just pause the video and try to do it. If you cannot do it, then watch.

(Refer Slide Time: 13:41)

$$\text{Given } \alpha \in L, \alpha = \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_j y_j \text{ for } \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in K.$$
$$\beta_j = \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_{ij} x_i \text{ for } \gamma_{1j}, \dots, \gamma_{mj} \in F$$
$$\therefore \alpha = \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_{ij} x_i y_j$$

So $\{x_i y_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ spans L over F .



Tower of extensions


Consider:

$$\begin{array}{c} L \\ | \\ K \\ | \\ F \end{array}$$

Theorem: $[L:F] = [L:K] [K:F]$

Proof: Suppose (y_1, \dots, y_n) is a basis of L over K
 (x_1, \dots, x_m) is a basis of K over F .

Claim: $\{x_i y_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ is a basis of L over F .



So, we need to show 2 things we need to show firstly, that L is spanned by the set. So, let us do that. So, given α in L . So, α is an element of L and we have a basis of L over K . So, we can write α in terms of the y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n with coefficients β_j , with coefficients in K . So, α is equal to summation j goes from 1 to n , $\beta_j y_j$ for some elements $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n$ in the intermediate field K , but now this $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \dots$, these are all elements of K .

So, we can expand them in terms of this basis x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m of F . So, we have β_j is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_{ij} x_i$ for $\gamma_{1j}, \dots, \gamma_{mj}$ in F and these are going to be elements of F and just because x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m is the basis for K and so now combining these you can write summation j goes from 1 to n , summation i goes from 1 to m $\gamma_{ij} x_i y_j$ and so

this set x_i, y_j spans L and as a vector space over F , it remains to prove our linear independence.

(Refer Slide Time: 16:23)

Suppose $\{\gamma_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\} \subset F$ are such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{ij} x_i y_j = 0$$

$\begin{array}{c} L \\ | \\ K \\ | \\ F \end{array}$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_{ij} x_i}_F \right) y_j = 0$$


[lin. indep. of y_1, \dots, y_n over K]

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{ij} x_i = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

[lin. indep. of x_1, \dots, x_m over F]

$$\Rightarrow \gamma_{ij} = 0 \forall 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

QED



Tower of extensions


Consider:

$$\begin{array}{c} L \\ | \\ K \\ | \\ F \end{array}$$

Theorem: $[L:F] = [L:K] [K:F]$

Proof: Suppose (y_1, \dots, y_n) is a basis of L over K
 (x_1, \dots, x_m) is a basis of K over F .

Claim: $\{x_i y_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ is a basis of L over F .



So, now, for linear independence. Suppose, we have scalars γ_{ij} $1 \leq i \leq m$, $1 \leq j \leq n$. These are elements of F the smallest field here such that $\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{ij} x_i y_j = 0$, we need to show that each of the γ_{ij} is equal to 0. So, now firstly, so just to recall we have L and then that sitting over K and that sitting over F . So, firstly, we will use the fact that the y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n are linearly independent over K . So, this sum can be written as $\sum_{j=1}^n$

And then we have gamma, let us write like this summation $\sum_{i,j} \gamma_{ij} x_i$ and then over y_j . So, what we have is this sum is equal to 0. And where do these elements live? Well, this γ_{ij} is live in F and this y_j is live in K . So, this thing lives in F and so, these are in F and this is a basis of L over K . So, since this is the basis of L over K , this implies that summation j goes from 1 to n , $\sum_{i,j} \gamma_{ij} x_i$ is equal to 0 for every i between 1 and m .

But that because the x_1, x_2, x_n form a basis of K over F , that would mean that each of these γ_{ij} is also equal to 0. Just from the linear independence of the x_i 's. So, this step is by the linear independence of y_1, y_n and this step is the linear independence of, by the linear independence of y_1, y_n over K and this is of x_1, x_m over F . And that is completes the proof.

In the statement of this theorem, nowhere to dimension that the degree of a L over K is finite or the degree of K over F is finite. So, but in the proof, I assume the degree of L over K is finite and the degree of K over F is finite. But this theorem actually holds. In general, even if the degree of L over F is infinite, or the degree of L over K is infinite, or the degree of K over F is infinite. So, a product of infinity and any finite number is to be taken as infinity. And the product of infinity and infinity is, of course, taken to be infinity.

And the same proof goes through except that instead of finite basis, you may have to take infinite or maybe even uncountable bases. And you would still have this basis of L over F , which would be infinite. And so, this theorem also holds in the case of infinite extensions. Now, this theorem has some very, it is a simple theorem and the proof as you saw was not very difficult, but it has some very interesting consequences.


(Refer Slide Time: 21:05)

Suppose $\alpha \in K$, $[K:F] < \infty$.

Thm: Then $[F(\alpha):F] \mid [K:F]$

Pf: $[K:F] = [K:F(\alpha)] [F(\alpha):F]$

Corollary: If $[K:F]$ is a prime, $\alpha \in K-F$, then $F(\alpha) = K$.



So, one is, so let us suppose that we have an extension, let us just call it K over F . And we have α here. And the index of K over F is finite. So, if it is infinite, this really will not say anything, then what we know is that the index of $F(\alpha)$ over F is going to divide the index of K over F , so this is a theorem. Why? Well, because the index of K over F is just the index of K over $F(\alpha)$ times the index of $F(\alpha)$ over F .

So, the index of $F(\alpha)$ over F better divide the index of K over F . A very surprising consequence of this is the following that if the index of K over F is a prime and α belongs to K but is not in F , then $F(\alpha)$ must be equal to K because $F(\alpha)$ is clearly larger than F . So, the degree of $F(\alpha)$ over F would be some divisor of p but only divisor of p are p and 1 itself the index cannot be 1 because $F(\alpha)$ is larger, strictly larger than F . So, it has to be p , it is also kind of useful in analysing certain extensions, let us look at an example.

(Refer Slide Time: 23:08)

Example: $\alpha = \sqrt[3]{2}$, $\beta = \sqrt[4]{5}$.

$[\mathbb{Q}(\alpha) : \mathbb{Q}] = 3$

$[\mathbb{Q}(\beta) : \mathbb{Q}] = 4$

So $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}(\beta)$, since $3 \nmid 4$


$\beta \notin \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, since $4 \nmid 3$.

$[\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta) : \mathbb{Q}]$ is divisible by 3 and by 4
hence is divisible by 12.

So $[\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta) : \mathbb{Q}] \leq 12 \Rightarrow [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta) : \mathbb{Q}] = 12$.

$t^3 - 2$

$t^4 - 5$



So, let us take work over the rational numbers. So, let us take α to be cube root of 2 and β to be 4th root of 5 for example, then we know that $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ over \mathbb{Q} , this should have degree 3 because α satisfies the polynomial $t^3 - 2 = 0$ which is of degree 3 and this is irreducible over \mathbb{Q} . And we also know that $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$ over \mathbb{Q} is 4 because β satisfies the polynomial $t^4 - 5$.

So, this means that α cannot lie in $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$. Because if α was in $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$, then $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$ would be a subfield of $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$ and its degree would divide the degree of $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$, but 3 does not divide 4. So, so we can see since 3 does not divide 4, and similarly β does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, maybe I should just write the standard notation round brackets $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$, β does not belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, since 4 does not divide 3 of course.

And what can we say about the field generated by both the elements α and β , so we know that $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, so we have this field generated by α and β , it contains the field $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, it also contains the field $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$ and they both contain the field \mathbb{Q} . So, this is the, it is called a diamond of fields. And so, what we know is that the degree of this by, so here the degree is 3, here the degree is 4. So, the degree of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$ over \mathbb{Q} is divisible by 3 and 4, and by 4, hence, it is divisible by 12.

But we also know that the degree of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$ over $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$, this has to be less than or equal to 3, because α satisfies the equation $t^3 - 2$, which is an equation with coefficients in \mathbb{Q} , but it is also an equation with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$. So, α satisfies a polynomial of degree 3 over $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$.

And so, it is irreducible polynomial must be of degree less than or equal to 3. So, we know that the degree of $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$ over $\mathbb{Q}(\beta)$ is less than or equal to 3. Similarly, you could argue that the degree over here must be less than or equal to 4. And so, what we get is $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta)$ over \mathbb{Q} is less than or equal to 12 times, is less than or equal to 12, 4 into 3, which means that since we know that it is divisible by 12, it has to be exactly 12.