arXiv:0908.2029v5 [math.HO] 7 Dec 2011

YET ANOTHER PROOF FROM THE BOOK: THE GAUSS THEOREM ON REGULAR POLYGONS

A. Skopenkov [1]

Abstract. The statement of the Gauss theorem on the constructibility of regular polygons by means of compass and ruler is simple and well-known. However, its proofs given in most textbooks rely upon much unmotivated material and are far from being economic. In this note a short elementary proof of the Gauss theorem is presented. The note is accessible for students familiar with polynomials and complex numbers, and could be an interesting easy reading for mature mathematicians.

Listeners are prepared to accept unstated (but hinted) generalizations much more than they are able ... to decode a precisely stated abstraction and to re-invent the special cases that motivated it in the first place.
P. Halmos, How to talk mathematics.

The Gauss Theorem. *A calculator (which calculates with absolute precision and has infinite memory) has operations*

$$1 \text{ (getting number 1)}, \quad + \text{ (summation)}, \quad - \text{ (subtraction)},$$

$$\times \text{ (multiplication)}, \quad : \text{ (division) and } \quad \sqrt{} \text{ (square root).}$$

The number $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{n}$ *is calculable at this calculator if and only if* $n = 2^\alpha p_1 \dots p_l$, *where* $p_1, \dots, p_l$ *are distinct primes of the form* $2^{2^s}+1$.

In this note we present a *short elementary proof of this celebrated result.* [2] This proof is in essence the same as those longer proofs that use Galois theory. 'Nevertheless, most of the standard approach had to be stripped away before the present proof became visible' [S]. The terms 'field extension' and 'Galois group' (even 'field' and 'group') are not used. (Cyclic groups and quadratic extensions of rationals are used, but naming them groups or fields does not make the proof simpler.) However, our presentation may be a good way to learn (or recall) starting ideas of the Galois theory, cf. [E, Sk]. For history of the Gauss theorem see [CR].

A reduction to complex numbers.

A real number is called *real-constructible*, if it can be calculated using our calculator.

A complex number is *constructible* if it can be calculated using the complex analogue of our calculator (that calculator gives *two* square roots of a complex number).

Complexification Lemma. *A complex number is constructible if and only if its real and imaginary parts are real-constructible.*

Hint. The 'if' part is clear. In order to prove the 'only if' part write $\sqrt{a+bi} = u+vi$ and express u, v by quadratic radicals of a and b. QED

[1] skopenko@mccme.ru; Info: http://dfgm.math.msu.su/files/skopenkov/PAPERSC.pdf. The Lomonosov Moscow State University and the Independent University of Moscow. Supported by Simons-IUM fellowship.

[2] Proof of the 'if' part is borrowed from [E, §24]; we simplify it by not using [E, §24, Lemma 2]; some motivation for the proof can be found in [E] . Proof of the 'only if' part appeared in a discussion with A.Ya. Kanel-Belov. Proof presented here is simpler than the proof in the published version of [KS]. I would like to acknowledge A.Ya. Belov, I.I. Bogdanov, G.R. Chelnokov, J. Cigler, A.L. Glazman, A.S. Golovanov, A.A. Kaznacheev, P.V. Kozlov, V.V. Prasolov, L.M. Samoilov and M.N. Vyalyi for useful discussions.

Proof of the 'if' part of the Gauss theorem.

Proof of the 'if' part of the Gauss theorem for $n = 5$. (This proof is formally not required for the general case.) Set

$$\varepsilon := \cos\frac{2\pi}{5} + i\sin\frac{2\pi}{5}, \qquad T_0 := \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^4 + \varepsilon^3 = -1,$$

$$T_1 := \varepsilon + i\varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon^4 - i\varepsilon^3, \qquad T_2 := \varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^4 - \varepsilon^3 \qquad \text{and} \qquad T_3 := \varepsilon - i\varepsilon^2 - \varepsilon^4 + i\varepsilon^3.$$

Then $\varepsilon = \dfrac{T_0 + T_1 + T_2 + T_3}{4}$. So by the Complexification Lemma it suffices to prove that T_1, T_2, T_3 are constructible.

Clearly, T_1 goes to $-iT_1$ under the substitution of ε to ε^2. Hence T_1^4 is invariant under this substitution. Open brackets in the product T_1^4 and substitute ε^5 to 1. We obtain a number represented in the form $a_0 + a_1\varepsilon + a_2\varepsilon^2 + a_3\varepsilon^3 + a_4\varepsilon^4$ with $a_k \in \mathbb{Z} + i\mathbb{Z}$. Since T_1^4 is invariant under substitution of ε to ε^2, we have $a_1 = a_2 = a_4 = a_3$. [3] Therefore $T_1^4 = a_0 - a_1 \in \mathbb{Z} + i\mathbb{Z}$. Thus T_1 is constructible. Analogously T_2 and T_3 are constructible. QED

Multiplication Lemma. *If $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{m}, \cos\dfrac{2\pi}{n}$ are constructible and m, n are relatively prime, then $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{2n}$ and $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{mn}$ are constructible.*

Hint. The constructibility of $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{2n}$ follows because $\cos\dfrac{\alpha}{2} = \pm\sqrt{\dfrac{1-\cos\alpha}{2}}$. The constructibility of $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{mn}$ follows because $\cos\dfrac{2\pi(mx+ny)}{mn}$ is constructible. QED

Primitive Root Theorem. *For each prime p there exists an integer g (a* primitive root modulo *p) such that the residues modulo p of $g^1, g^2, g^3 \ldots, g^{p-1}$ are distinct.*

Hint for $p = 2^m + 1$ (only this case is used for the Gauss Theorem). If there are no primitive roots, then the congruence $x^{2^{m-1}} \equiv 1\ (p)$ has $p - 1 = 2^m > 2^{m-1}$ solutions. QED

Proof of the 'if' part of the Gauss theorem. If l is odd, then $2^{kl} + 1$ is divisible by $2^k + 1$. Thus if $2^m + 1$ is a prime then m is a power of 2. So by the Complexification and the Multiplication Lemmas it suffices to prove that $\varepsilon := \cos\dfrac{2\pi}{n} + i\sin\dfrac{2\pi}{n}$ is constructible for $n = 2^m + 1$ a prime. Let g be a primitive root modulo n. Since $n = 2^m + 1$, by the Multiplication Lemma $\beta := \cos\dfrac{2\pi}{n-1} + i\sin\dfrac{2\pi}{n-1}$ is constructible. For

$$r = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n-2 \quad \text{denote} \quad T_r(x) := x + \beta^r x^g + \beta^{2r} x^{g^2} + \cdots + \beta^{(n-2)r} x^{g^{n-2}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta][x].$$

('Lagrange resolutions.') Then $\varepsilon = \dfrac{(T_0 + T_1 + \cdots + T_{n-2})(\varepsilon)}{n-1}$. We have $T_0(\varepsilon) = -1$. So it suffices to prove that $T_r(\varepsilon)$ is constructible for each $r = 1, 2, \ldots, n-2$.

Since

$$T_r(x^g) \equiv \beta^{-r} T_r(x) \mod (x^n - 1), \qquad \text{we have} \qquad T_r^{n-1}(x^g) \equiv T_r^{n-1}(x) \mod (x^n - 1).$$

Take the polynomial $a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}x^{n-1}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[\beta]$, that is congruent to $T_r^{n-1}(x)$ modulo $x^n - 1$. Then $a_k = a_{kg \bmod n}$ for each $k = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$. Hence $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-1}$. Therefore $T_r^{p-1}(\varepsilon) = a_0 - a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta]$. So $T_r(\varepsilon)$ is constructible. QED

[3] This needs a justification, see the proof for the general case below or [E, Lemma 2 in p. 27].

Proof of the 'only if' part of the Gauss theorem.

Plan of the proof is given by statements of Lemmas.

Lemma. *If* $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{nk}$ *is constructible, then* $\cos\dfrac{2\pi}{n}$ *is constructible.*

Hint. Follows because $\cos k\alpha$ is a polynomial of $\cos\alpha$. QED

The Lemma implies that in order to prove the 'only if' part of the Gauss theorem we need to prove that $\varepsilon := \cos\dfrac{2\pi}{n} + i\sin\dfrac{2\pi}{n}$ is not constructible for

(A) n a prime not of the form $2^m + 1$, and

(B) $n = p^2$ the square of a prime.

Tower of Extensions Lemma. *A number* $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$ *is constructible if and only if there are positive* $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $a_1, \dots a_r \in \mathbb{C}$ *such that*

$$\mathbb{Q} = Q_1 \subset Q_2 \subset Q_3 \subset \ldots \subset Q_r \subset Q_{r+1} \ni \varepsilon, \quad \text{where} \quad \text{for each} \quad k = 1, ..., r-1$$

$$Q_{k+1} = Q_k[\sqrt{a}_k] := \{x + y\sqrt{a}_k \mid x, y \in Q_k\}, \quad a_k \in Q_k, \quad \sqrt{a}_k \notin Q_k.$$

Hint. Use induction on the number of operations of the calculator, which are necessary to construct given number ε. In the inductive step use multiplication by conjugate. QED

Such a sequence is called *a tower of quadratic extensions* (this term is considered as 'one word', in this paper we do not use the term 'quadratic extension' alone).

The set Q_k is closed under the summation, subtraction, multiplication and division by a non-zero element. Hence the Bezout theorem and its corollaries hold for polynomials with coefficients in Q_k.

Main Lemma. *Suppose that* Q_k *is an element of a tower of quadratic extensions for a constructible number* $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{C}$*. If* P *is a polynomial with coefficients in* Q_k *such that* $P(\varepsilon) = 0$ *and* P *is irreducible over* Q_k*, then* $\deg P$ *is a power of 2.*

Proof. By induction on $\deg P$. Base $\deg P = 1$ is clear. Let us prove the inductive step. We use the notation of the Tower of Extensions Lemma. Since $P(\varepsilon) = 0$ and $\varepsilon \in Q_{r+1}$, polynomial P is reducible over Q_{r+1}. We may assume that $r = k$. Let P_1 be a proper irreducible factor of P over Q_{k+1}. Define the *conjugation map*

$$\bar{\cdot} : Q_{k+1}[\sqrt{a_k}] \to Q_{k+1}[\sqrt{a_k}] \quad \text{by} \quad \overline{x + y\sqrt{a_k}} := x - y\sqrt{a_k}.$$

Clearly, this map is well-defined,

$$\overline{z+w} = \overline{z} + \overline{w}, \quad \overline{zw} = \overline{z} \cdot \overline{w} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{z} = z \Leftrightarrow z = x + 0\sqrt{a_k} \in Q_k.$$

Then P is divisible by the polynomial $\overline{P}_1$ that is conjugate to P_1. Since P_1 is irreducible, either $\overline{P}_1 = P_1$ or $\overline{P}_1$ is relatively prime to P_1. In the first case the coefficients of P_1 are in Q_k, so P is reducible over Q_k, which is a contradiction. In the second case P is divisible by the polynomial $P_1\overline{P}_1$ with coefficients in Q_k. Since P is irreducible over Q_k, we have $P = P_1\overline{P}_1$. Without loss of generality $P_1(\varepsilon) = 0$. Hence by the induction hypothesis $\deg P_1$ is a power of 2. Therefore $\deg P = 2\deg P_1$ is a power of 2. QED

Now the non-constructibility follows by applying the Tower of Extensions Lemma and the Main Lemma to $\varepsilon = \cos\dfrac{2\pi}{n} + i\sin\dfrac{2\pi}{n}$, $k = 1$,

- $P(x) := x^{n-1} + x^{n-2} + \cdots + x + 1$ for the case (A) and
- $P(x) := x^{p(p-1)} + x^{p(p-2)} + \cdots + x^p + 1$ for the case (B).

The irreducibility of $P(x)$ over $\mathbb{Z}$ follows (in both cases) by the irreducibility of $P(x+1)$ over $\mathbb{Z}$. The latter is implied by the following Eisenstein criterion.

Let p be a prime. If the leading coefficient of a polynomial with integer coefficients is not divisible by p, other coefficients are divisible by p and the constant term is not divisible by p^2, then this polynomial is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$.

The irreducibility over $\mathbb{Q}$ follows by the irreducibility over $\mathbb{Z}$ and the following Gauss lemma.

If a polynomial with integer coefficients is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$, then it is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Both Eisenstein criterion and Gauss lemma are easily proved by passing to polynomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ (for the Gauss lemma take a decomposition $P = P_1P_2$ of given polynomial P over $\mathbb{Q}$, take N_1 and N_2 such that both N_1P_1 and N_2P_2 have integer coefficients and take a prime divisor p of N_1N_2).

Appendix: Gauss' proof of the 'if' part.

The material before proof of the 'if' part of the Gauss theorem is only required to show how the proof could be invented, and could be omitted if a reader wants just a formal proof.

Proof of the 'if' part of the Gauss theorem for $n = 5$. It suffices to prove that

$$\varepsilon := \cos\frac{2\pi}{5} + i\sin\frac{2\pi}{5}$$

is constructible. We shall first prove that *some polynomials* of ε are such. Since

$$1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^4 = 0, \quad \text{we have} \quad (\varepsilon + \varepsilon^4)(\varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^3) = \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^3 + \varepsilon^4 = -1.$$

Denote

$$A_0 := \varepsilon + \varepsilon^4 \quad \text{and} \quad A_1 := \varepsilon^2 + \varepsilon^3.$$

Then A_0 and A_1 are roots of the equation $t^2 + t - 1 = 0$ by the Vieta theorem. Hence these numbers are constructible. Since $\varepsilon \cdot \varepsilon^4 = 1$, the numbers ε and ε^4 are roots of the equation $t^2 - A_0t + 1 = 0$ by the Vieta theorem. Therefore ε (and ε^4) is constructible.

Idea of Gauss' proof of the 'if' part of the Gauss theorem. Assume that $n = 2^m + 1$. It suffices to prove that

$$\varepsilon = \cos\frac{2\pi}{n} + i\sin\frac{2\pi}{n}$$

is constructible. First it would be good to split the sum

$$\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \cdots + \varepsilon^{n-1} = -1$$

into two summands A_0 and A_1 whose *product* is constructible (or, in other words, to *group* the roots of the equation $1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \cdots + \varepsilon^{n-1} = 0$ in a clever way). Then A_0 and A_1 would be constructible by the Vieta Theorem.

Next it would be good to split the sum A_0 into two summands A_{00} and A_{01} whose product is constructible, and analogously split $A_1 = A_{10} + A_{11}$. And so on, until we obtain that $A_{0\ldots0} = \varepsilon$ is constructible.

It is however quite non-trivial to find the necessary splittings. This is possible only for a *prime* $n = 2^m + 1$. This is done using the Primitive Root Theorem.

Gauss' proof of the 'if' part of the Gauss theorem. [G] If l is odd, then $2^{kl} + 1$ is divisible by $2^k + 1$. Thus if $2^m + 1$ is a prime then m is a power of 2. So by the Complexification and

the Multiplication Lemmas it suffices to prove that $\varepsilon := \cos\frac{2\pi}{n} + i\sin\frac{2\pi}{n}$ is constructible for $n = 2^m + 1$ a prime.

Assume that $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$ for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, m-1\}$. Denote

$$\overline{a_{m-1}\ldots a_1 a_0} := a_0 + 2a_1 + 2^2 a_2 + \cdots + 2^{m-1}.$$

('Binary expansion.') It is important for our proof that zeroes at the beginning are not thrown away.

Let g be a primitive root modulo n. For $A \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ denote

$$T_A := \sum_{B \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{m-k}} \varepsilon^{g^{\overline{BA}}}.$$

Let us prove by induction on k that *for each k and $A \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ the number T_A is constructible.* Then for $k = m$ we obtain that $T_{\underbrace{0\ldots0}_{m}} = \varepsilon$ is constructible.

Base $k = 0$ follows because $T_\emptyset = -1$. Let us prove the inductive step.

We have $T_A = T_{\overline{0A}} + T_{\overline{1A}}$. The number $T_{\overline{0A}} T_{\overline{1A}}$ is a polynomial of ε of degree less than n with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$. (More precisely, this number is the value at ε of certain polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$ of x modulo $x^p - 1$.) Under substitution $\varepsilon \to \varepsilon^{g^{2^k}}$ numbers $T_{\overline{0A}}$ and $T_{\overline{1A}}$ exchange. Hence number $T_{\overline{0A}} T_{\overline{1A}}$ does not change. Thus the coefficient of the above polynomial at ε^s equals to the coefficient at $\varepsilon^{sg^{2^k}}$. Since g is a primitive root modulo p, for each fixed $A' \in \mathbb{Z}_2^k$ and different $B \in \mathbb{Z}_2^{m-k}$ the coefficients of this polynomial at $\varepsilon^{g^{\overline{BA'}}}$ are equal. This and the definition of $T_{A'}$ imply that $T_{\overline{0A}} T_{\overline{1A}}$ is a linear combination with integer coefficients of 1 and $T_{A'}$ with $A' \in [k, 1]$. This implies the inductive step. QED

References

[CR] R. Courant and H. Robbins, What is Mathematics, Oxford Univ. Press.

[E] H.M. Edwards, Galois Theory, Springer Verlag, 1984.

[G] K.F. Gauss, Die Gesammelten Werke, http://gdz.sub.uni-goettingen.de/dms/load/toc/?IDDOC=38910

[KS] P. Kozlov and A. Skopenkov, A la recherche de l'algèbre perdue: du cote de chez Gauss, Mat. Prosveschenie, 12 (2008), 127–144. arxiv:math/0804.4357

[S] J. Stillwell, Galois theory for beginners, Amer. Math. Monthly, 101 (1994), 22-27.

[Sk] A. Skopenkov, Philosophical and methodical appendix, in: Mathematics as a sequence of problems, Ed. A. Zaslavsky, D. Permyakov, A. Skopenkov, M. Skopenkov, A. Shapovalov, MCCME, Moscow, 2009.