

Answer on Question #47342 – Math – Abstract Algebra

- (a) Show that $\langle x \rangle$ is not a maximal ideal in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$.
- (b) List all the subgroups of \mathbb{Z}_{18} , along with 3 their generators.
- (c) Let $H = \langle (1\ 2) \rangle$ and $k = \langle (1\ 2\ 3) \rangle$ be subgroups of S_3 . Show that $S_3 = Hk$. Is S_3 an internal direct product of H and k ? Justify your answer.
- (d) Check whether or not $\{(2, 5), (1, 3), (5, 2), (3, 1)\}$ is an equivalence relation on $\{1, 2, 3, 5\}$.

Solution:

We know that $\langle x \rangle$ is just all polynomials with even coefficients. This is not maximal because $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ contains many ideals more than \mathbb{Z} . For example, it contains the ideal $\langle x \rangle$, which is all things that have positive degree (i.e non-constants).

In the case of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$, the ideal equal to

$$\langle x \rangle = \{a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_nx^n; x_k \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq k \leq n\}$$

is a principal ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ generated by x . $\frac{\mathbb{Z}[x]}{\langle x \rangle} \cong \mathbb{Z}$, an integral domain. So, $\langle x \rangle$ is a prime ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. Let $J = \langle x, 2 \rangle$ the ideal generated by x and 2 in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. J is a maximal ideal (of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$), which contain polynomials of the form:

$$a_0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + \dots + a_nx^n; a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq i \leq n$$

Where a_0 is even. As $\frac{\mathbb{Z}[x]}{J}$ is a field having two elements, J is a maximum ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ containing the prime ideal $\langle x \rangle$. So, the prime ideal $\langle x \rangle$ is not a maximum ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. Thus, $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ is not a Dedekind domain. $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ is not a PID also, as a principal ideal domain has to be a Dedekind domain. This conclusion is also obvious from the fact that J is not a principal ideal of $\mathbb{Z}[x]$.

- (b) List all the subgroups of \mathbb{Z}_{18} , along with 3 their generators.

The divisors of 18 are 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, and 12. There is a subgroup of each of these orders, and they are generated by $[0]$, $[9]$, $[6]$, $[3]$, $[2]$, and $[1]$ respectively.

That is, the subgroups of \mathbb{Z}_{18} $\langle [0] \rangle$, $\langle [9] \rangle$, $\langle [6] \rangle$, $\langle [3] \rangle$, $\langle [2] \rangle$ and $\langle [1] \rangle$.

- (c) Let $H = \langle (1\ 2) \rangle$ and $k = \langle (1\ 2\ 3) \rangle$ be subgroups of S_3 . Show that $S_3 = Hk$. Is S_3 an internal direct product of H and k ? Justify your answer.

We write e for the identity element of S_3 , note that $H = \{e, (1,2)\}$ and $K = \{e, (1,2,3), (1,3,2)\}$. So Hk clearly contains $e, (1,2), (1,2,3),$ and $(1,3,2)$. The computations

$$(1,2)(1,2,3) = (2,3)$$

$$(1,2)(1,3,2) = (1,3)$$

We need to show that HK also contains $(2,3)$ and $(1,3)$. Since $S_3 = \{e, (1,2), (1,3), (2,3), (1,2,3), (1,3,2)\}$ we have shown that Hk contains every element of S_3 , and hence $S_3 = Hk$.

We note that H and k are both abelian groups (because e.g. they are both cyclic). A direct product of abelian groups (whether internal or external) is abelian. Since S_3 is not abelian, this tells us that S_3 is not an internal direct product of H and K . (We know that any group of order less than 6 is abelian, this argument shows more: S_3 is not an internal direct product of any two of its proper subgroups.)

(d) Check whether or not $\{(2, 5), (1, 3), (5, 2), (3, 1)\}$ is an equivalence relation on $\{1, 2, 3, 5\}$.

In mathematics, an equivalence relation is the relation that holds between two elements if and only if they are members of the same cell within a set that has been partitioned into cells such that every element of the set is a member of one and only one cell of the partition. The intersection of any two different cells is empty; the union of all the cells equals the original set. These cells are formally called equivalence classes.

A relation R on a set A is an equivalence relation if and only if R is

- reflexive,
- symmetric, and
- transitive.

Let R be a relation on set A . Any equivalence relation must be reflexive i.e. for all a in A we must have (a, a) in R .

In our example we must have all $(1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3), (5, 5)$ present in R which we don't. In fact, none are in R .

Therefore R is not an equivalence relation, R is not reflexive, since $(1, 1) \notin R$ for example.