

## Solutions of exercise sheet 8

The content of the marked exercises (\*) should be known for the exam.

1. (\*) [Formal construction of the polynomial ring] Let  $A$  be a commutative ring and consider the set

$$V = \{(a_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, a_i \in A, a_i = 0 \text{ for } i \text{ large enough}\}.$$

Endowing  $V$  with componentwise sum and with the scalar multiplication  $a \cdot (a_i) = (a \cdot a_i)$ , we have that  $V$  is an  $A$ -module. Define a multiplication

$$V \times V \rightarrow V$$
$$((a_i), (b_i)) \mapsto (a_i) \cdot (b_i) = (c_i), c_i = \sum_{\substack{j,k \geq 0 \\ j+k=i}} a_j b_k$$

1. Show that this product is well defined.
2. Show that  $(1_A, 0_A, 0_A, \dots)$  is a neutral element for this product, and that the product is associative, commutative and distributive with respect to addition. This allows us to conclude that  $V$  is a ring.
3. Let  $Y := (\alpha_i)$ , with  $\alpha_1 = 1_A$  and  $\alpha_i = 0_A$  for  $i \neq 1$ . For  $j \geq 0$ , find the sequence of elements  $\beta_i$  for which  $Y^j = (\beta_i)$ . Deduce that  $(Y^j)_{j \geq 0}$  is a basis of  $V$  as an  $A$ -module.
4. Let  $B$  be a commutative ring,  $f_0 : A \rightarrow B$  a ring homomorphism and  $b \in B$ . Prove that there exists a unique ring homomorphism  $f : V \rightarrow B$  sending  $f(Y) = b$  and  $f(a \cdot 1_V) = f_0(a)$  for each  $a \in A$ .
5. Let  $M$  be an  $A$ -module and  $T : M \rightarrow M$  an  $A$ -linear map. Show that there exists a unique  $V$ -module structure  $\cdot_V$  on  $M$  such that  $Y \cdot_V m = T(m)$  and  $(a \cdot 1_V) \cdot_V m = a \cdot_A m$ . Moreover, show that if  $M$  is finitely generated as an  $A$ -module, then so it is as a  $V$ -module. Is the converse true?
6. Prove that  $V$  and  $A[X]$  are isomorphic rings.

### Solution:

1. We have that  $(a_i) \cdot (b_i)$  defined as above is a uniquely determined sequence  $(c_i)$  of elements in  $A_i$ , for every  $(a_i), (b_i) \in V$ . The product is well-defined if this sequence belongs to  $V$ , that is, if  $c_i = 0$  for  $i \gg 0$ . By hypothesis, there exists positive

**Please turn over!**

numbers  $n, m \geq 0$  such that  $a_i = 0$  for  $i \geq n$  and  $b_i = 0$  for  $i \geq m$ . Then one has for every  $N \geq n + m$  that

$$c_N = \sum_{i=0}^N a_i b_{n+m-i} = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i b_{n+m-i} + \sum_{i=m+1}^N a_i b_{n+m-i} = 0 + 0 = 0,$$

since for  $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$  we have  $n + m - i \geq m$ , so that  $b_{n+m-i} = 0$ , and for  $i \in \{m + 1, \dots, m + n\}$  we have  $a_i = 0$ .

2. First, notice that the product is commutative, as we can interchange the indexes  $j$  and  $k$  in the sum appearing in the definition. Then we just need to check that  $(e_i) = (1, 0, 0, \dots)$  is neutral on one side, and we have

$$(1, 0, 0, \dots) \cdot (a_i) = \left( \sum_{\substack{j, k \geq 0 \\ j+k=i}} e_j a_k \right) = (a_i),$$

since for  $j \neq 0$  we have  $e_j = 0$ . Hence  $1_V := (1, 0, 0, \dots)$  is a neutral element for the multiplication.

As concerns associativity, for every  $(a_i), (b_i), (c_i) \in V$  applying the definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((a_i) \cdot (b_i)) \cdot (c_i) &= \left( \sum_{j=0}^i a_j b_{i-j} \right) \cdot (c_i) = \left( \sum_{k=0}^i \left( \sum_{j=0}^k a_j b_{k-j} \right) c_{i-k} \right) = \\ &= \left( \sum_{k=0}^i \sum_{j=0}^k a_j b_{k-j} c_{i-k} \right) = \left( \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 0 \\ \alpha + \beta + \gamma = i}} a_\alpha b_\beta c_\gamma \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (a_i) \cdot ((b_i) \cdot (c_i)) &= (a_i) \cdot \left( \sum_{k=0}^i b_k c_{i-k} \right) = \left( \sum_{j=0}^i a_j \left( \sum_{k=0}^{i-j} b_k c_{(i-j)-k} \right) \right) = \\ &= \left( \sum_{j=0}^i \left( \sum_{k=0}^{i-j} a_j b_k c_{i-j-k} \right) \right) = \left( \sum_{\substack{\alpha, \beta, \gamma \geq 0 \\ \alpha + \beta + \gamma = i}} a_\alpha b_\beta c_\gamma \right) \end{aligned}$$

so that the product is associative. Finally, we check distributivity with respect to addition (only one side, being the product commutative): for every  $(a_i), (b_i), (c_i) \in V$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} ((a_i) + (b_i)) \cdot (c_i) &= (a_i + b_i) \cdot (c_i) = \left( \sum_{j=0}^i (a_j + b_j) c_i \right) = \left( \sum_{j=0}^i (a_j c_{i-j} + b_j c_{i-j}) \right) = \\ &= \left( \sum_{j=0}^i (a_j c_{i-j}) \right) + \left( \sum_{j=0}^i (b_j c_{i-j}) \right) = (a_i) \cdot (c_i) + (b_i) \cdot (c_i). \end{aligned}$$

So  $V$  is a ring with componentwise sum, multiplication defined as above,  $0_V = (0, \dots)$  and  $1_V = (1, 0, \dots)$ .

**See next page!**

3. For  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  we denote with  $\delta_{i,j} \in A$  the Kronecher's delta of  $i$  and  $j$ , which is 1 if  $i = j$ , and 0 otherwise. Then  $Y = (\delta_{i1})_i$ . We claim that  $Y^j = (\delta_{i,j})_i$  for all  $j \geq 0$ . This is easily proven by induction. For  $j = 0, 1$  this is clear. Now suppose that  $Y^k = (\delta_{i,k})_i$  (inductive hypothesis) and let us prove that  $Y^{k+1} = (\delta_{i,(k+1)})_i$ . Write  $Y^{k+1} = (\vartheta_i)$ . Then  $\vartheta_{k+1} = \sum_{\substack{j,l \geq 0 \\ j+l=k+1}} \delta_{j,k} \delta_{l,1} = 1$ , because we can make both  $\delta$ 's non-zero only when we choose  $j = k$  and  $l = 1$ , in which case we obtain 1 as summand. On the other hand, for  $h \neq k+1$  we see that  $\vartheta_h = \sum_{\substack{j,l \geq 0 \\ j+l=h}} \delta_{j,k} \delta_{l,1} = 0$ , because the couple of indexes  $(j, l) = (k, 1)$ , which is the only one making both  $\delta$ 's non-zero, is not considered in the sum. In conclusion,  $Y^k = (\delta_{i,k})_i$ , that is,  $Y^k$  is the sequence with 1 in the  $k$ -th position and 0 everywhere else.

Then for every  $a = (a_i) \in V$  we have that  $a = \sum_{i: a_i \neq 0} a_i Y^i$ , which is a finite sum by definition of  $V$ , so that  $(Y^i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$  spans all  $V$  over  $A$ . Moreover a finite linear combination  $\sum_{j=0}^m a_{i_j} \cdot Y^{i_j}$ , where the  $i_j$ 's are distinct indexes in  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  is zero if and only if all the  $a_{i_j}$  are zero, so that we can conclude that  $(Y^i)_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$  is an  $R$ -basis for  $V$ . As the set of indexes  $i$  such that  $a_i \neq 0$  is finite, there exists  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  bigger or equal than all those  $i$ 's, and we can rewrite  $a = \sum_{i \leq d} a_i Y^i$ . Notice that since the  $Y^j$  are  $R$ -linear independent, this decomposition is unique up to choosing a different  $d$ , in which case we can just have fewer/more zero summand.

4. We first prove uniqueness and then existence. Also, by abuse of notation, for  $r \in A$  we write  $r = r \cdot 1_V \in V$ . It is the sequence with  $r$  in the 0-th position and 0 everywhere else.

Suppose that  $f : V \rightarrow B$  is a ring homomorphism sending  $A \ni a \mapsto f_0(a)$  and  $Y \mapsto b$ . Then by applying previous point, for  $s \in V$  we can write  $s = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i$  for some  $s_i \in A$  and  $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , giving

$$f(s) = f\left(\sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i\right) = \sum_{i=0}^d f(s_i) f(Y^i) = \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(s_i) f(Y^i) = \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(s_i) b^i,$$

which means that  $f$  has a prescribed behavior on all  $V$ , that is, if  $f$  exists it is unique.

To prove existence, we just check that the definition for  $f$  on  $s$  that we found while proving uniqueness, that is,

$$f\left(\sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i\right) = \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(s_i) b^i$$

gives indeed a ring homomorphism. First, notice that this is a good definition because the decomposition  $s = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i$  is unique up to extra zero-summand, and  $f_0(0) = 0$  being  $f_0$  a ring homomorphism. Then we have  $f(0) = f(0 \cdot Y^0) = f_0(0) b^0 = 0$ , and  $f(1) = f(1 \cdot Y^0) = f_0(1) b^0 = 1$  being  $f_0$  a ring homomorphism. To conclude, we prove that  $f$  respects sums and multiplications. For every  $s, t \in V$ , we let  $d$  be big enough so that we can write  $s = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i$  and  $t = \sum_{i=0}^d t_i Y^i$ .

**Please turn over!**

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
f(s+t) &= f\left(\sum_{i=0}^d (s_i + t_i)Y^i\right) = \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(s_i + t_i)b^i = \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^d (f_0(s_i) + f_0(t_i))b^i = \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(s_i)b^i + \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(t_i)b^i = \\
&= f\left(\sum_{i=0}^d s_iY^i\right) + f\left(\sum_{i=0}^d t_iY^i\right) = f(s) + f(t),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
f(s \cdot t) &= f\left(\sum_{i=0}^{2d} \left(\sum_{j=0}^i s_j t_{i-j}\right)Y^i\right) = f\left(\sum_{i=0}^{2d} f_0\left(\sum_{j=0}^i s_j t_{i-j}\right)b^i\right) = \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{2d} \left(\sum_{j=0}^i f_0(s_j)f_0(t_{i-j})\right)b^i = \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(s_i)b^i \cdot \sum_{i=0}^d f_0(t_i)b^i = f(s) \cdot f(t),
\end{aligned}$$

and  $f : V \rightarrow B$  is a ring homomorphism which maps  $Y \mapsto b$  and  $A \ni a \mapsto f_0(a)$ .

5. Similarly as in previous point, we first prove uniqueness, and then existence. By hypothesis, we have an  $A$ -module structure on  $M$ , and an  $A$ -linear map  $T : M \rightarrow M$ .

Suppose we have that  $M$  has also a  $V$ -module structure with  $Y \cdot m = T(m)$  and with  $a \in A$  acting on  $m \in M$  as it does with respect to the given  $A$ -module structure. Then for every  $s = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i \in V$  and  $m \in M$  we have

$$s \cdot m = \left(\sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i\right) \cdot m = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i \cdot T^i(m) = \sum_{i=0}^d T^i(s_i \cdot m),$$

so that  $s \cdot m$  is uniquely determined, and the  $V$ -module structure is unique, if it exists.

*Disclaimer:* Notice that by  $T^i$  we denote the multiplication of  $T$  with itself in the ring of additive endomorphisms  $\text{End}(M)$ , which is just the  $i$ -th iteration of the endomorphism  $T$ .

Now we prove existence, by checking that the definition we found,

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i\right) \cdot m = \sum_{i=0}^d T^i(s_i \cdot m),$$

gives indeed a  $V$ -module structure on  $M$  coinciding with the one of  $A$ -module on elements  $a \in A$  and satisfies  $Y \cdot m = T(m)$ . Those properties are clear from the definition, which is well-given as the decomposition  $s = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i$  is unique up to adding zero summands, and  $0_A \cdot m = 0$  by hypothesis. Clearly, for every  $m \in M$

**See next page!**

we have  $1_V \cdot m = (1 \cdot Y^0) \cdot m = T^0(1 \cdot m) = m$ . Now we check that  $s \cdot$  is additive for every  $s = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i \in V$ : for every  $m, n \in M$ , we have indeed:

$$\begin{aligned} s \cdot (m + n) &= \left( \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i \right) \cdot (m + n) = \sum_{i=0}^d T^i(s_i \cdot (m + n)) = \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^d T^i(s_i \cdot (m)) + \sum_{i=0}^d T^i(s_i \cdot (n)) = s \cdot m + s \cdot n. \end{aligned}$$

Now we check compatibility with operations in  $V$ . For every  $m \in M$  and  $s, t \in V$ , with  $s = \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i$  and  $t = \sum_{i=0}^d t_i Y^i$ , we have

$$(s + t) \cdot m = \sum_{i=0}^d T^i((s_i + t_i) \cdot m) = \sum_{i=0}^d T^i(s_i \cdot m) + \sum_{i=0}^d T^i(t_i \cdot m) = s \cdot m + t \cdot m$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (s \cdot t) \cdot m &= \left( \sum_{i=0}^{2d} \left( \sum_{j=0}^i s_j t_{i-j} \right) Y^i \right) \cdot m = \sum_{i=0}^{2d} \sum_{j=0}^i s_j t_{i-j} \cdot T^i(m) = \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^d \sum_{h=0}^d s_k t_h \cdot T^{k+h}(m) = \sum_{k=0}^d s_k \cdot T^k \left( \sum_{h=0}^d t_h \cdot T^h(m) \right) = s \cdot (t \cdot m) \end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished, since we have also proven that the axioms of  $V$ -modules are satisfied.

6. Define a map

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : V &\rightarrow R[X] \\ \sum_{i=0}^d s_i Y^i &\mapsto \sum_{i=0}^d s_i X^i. \end{aligned}$$

It is well-defined because of Point 3, and it is clearly surjective. The operations defined in  $V$  makes  $\phi$  a ring homomorphism, whose kernel is trivial since a polynomial is zero if it only has zero coefficients. Hence this is an isomorphism of rings.

2. Let  $A$  be a commutative ring

1. Show that there exists a unique  $A$ -linear map

$$D : A[X] \rightarrow A[X]$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} D(X^i) &= iX^{i-1}, \quad i \geq 1 \\ D(1) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Is  $D$  a ring homomorphism?

**Please turn over!**

2. Prove that for all  $P, Q \in A[X]$  one has

$$D(PQ) = PD(Q) + QD(P)$$

3. (Factorization Theorem) Now let  $A = K$  be a field, and  $P \in K[X]$ . Prove that for every  $\alpha \in K$  one has  $P(\alpha) = 0$  if and only if  $P$  is divisible by  $X - \alpha$ , that is, there is a polynomial  $Q \in K[X]$  such that  $P(X) = (X - \alpha)Q(X)$  [Hint: One implication is immediate. For the other, divide  $P$  by  $X - \alpha$ .]
4. We say that  $\alpha \in K$  is a multiple root of  $P \in K[X]$  if  $P$  is divisible by  $(X - \alpha)^2$ . Prove:  $\alpha$  is a multiple root of  $P$  if and only if  $P(\alpha) = D(P)(\alpha) = 0$ .

**Solution:**

1. First, notice that such a map  $D$  cannot be a ring homomorphism, since it sends  $1 \mapsto 0 \neq 1$ .

Since the  $X^i$ ,  $i \geq 0$ , form a basis of  $A[X]$  as an  $A$ -module (as the isomorphism in Exercise 1.6 is easily seen to be an isomorphism of  $A$ -modules as well), for every map  $f : \{X^i\} \rightarrow A[X]$  there exists a unique  $R$ -linear map  $R[X] \rightarrow R[X]$  which behaves as  $f$  on the  $X^i$ . In this case, we can take  $f : X^i \mapsto iX^{i-1}$ . This is because of the Universal Property of free modules:

**Theorem** Let  $M$  be a free  $R$ -module  $M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} R \cdot m_i$ , and denote  $B = \{m_i | i \in I\}$ . Let  $N$  be another  $R$ -module. Then for every map  $f : B \rightarrow N$  there exists a unique  $R$ -linear map  $\alpha : M \rightarrow N$  such that  $\alpha|_B = f$

*Proof:* Suppose that  $m \in M$ , then by hypothesis we have a unique decomposition  $m = \sum_{i \in I} r_i \circ m_i$ , with  $r_i = 0$  for almost every  $i \in I$ . If  $\alpha : M \rightarrow N$  is  $R$ -linear and  $\alpha|_B = f$ , then we have that  $\alpha(m) = \sum_{i \in I} r_i \alpha(m_i) = \sum_{i \in I} r_i f(m_i)$  is uniquely determined, proving uniqueness of  $\alpha$ . To conclude, we need to check that

$$\alpha\left(\sum_{i \in I} r_i \circ m_i\right) = \sum_{i \in I} r_i f(m_i)$$

defines indeed an  $R$ -linear map. Uniqueness of the linear combination expressing  $m \in M$  proves that  $\alpha$  is well-defined, and linearity follows easily from the fact that linear combinations of linear combinations of the  $m_i$ 's are still linear combinations of the  $m_i$ . □

2. The identity can be directly checked by writing  $P = \sum_{i=0}^m a_i X^i$  and  $Q = \sum_{j=0}^n b_j X^j$  and computing both sides. An equivalent (but faster) way to do this is to observe that both sides of the identity  $D(PQ) = PD(Q) + QD(P)$  are linear in  $P$  and in  $Q$ . Then it is enough to check the equality for an arbitrary  $P$  and  $Q = X^k$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , and this is then equivalent to check the equality for  $P = X^j$  and  $Q = X^k$ , with  $j, k \geq 0$ , which is immediate:

$$D(X^j X^k) = D(X^{j+k}) = (j+k)D^{j+k-1} = X^j \cdot kX^{k-1} + X^k \cdot jX^{j-1}.$$

**See next page!**

3. Suppose that  $P \in K[X]$  is divisible by  $(X - \alpha)$ , that is, there is a polynomial  $Q \in K[X]$  such that  $P(X) = (X - \alpha)Q(X)$ . Then clearly  $P(\alpha) = 0 \cdot Q(0)$ , so that  $\alpha$  is a root of  $P$ .

Conversely, assume that  $P(\alpha) = 0$ . As seen in class, we can use Euclidean division to obtain polynomials  $Q(X), R(X)$  such that  $P(X) = (X - \alpha)Q(X) + R(X)$  and  $\deg(R) < \deg(X - \alpha) = 1$ . Then  $R(X) = r \in K$ , and

$$0 = P(\alpha) = 0 \cdot Q(\alpha) + r = r,$$

so that  $P(X)$  is divisible by  $X - \alpha$ .

4. Suppose that  $\alpha \in K$  is a multiple root of  $P$ , that is,  $P(X) = (X - \alpha)^2Q(X)$ . Clearly,  $P(\alpha) = 0$ . Moreover, by Point 2 we have

$$D(P) = (X - \alpha)^2D(Q) + QD((X - \alpha)^2) = (X - \alpha^2)D(Q) + 2(X - \alpha)Q,$$

from which  $D(P)(\alpha) = 0$  just by substitution.

Conversely, assume that  $P(\alpha) = D(P)(\alpha) = 0$ . By previous point we can write  $P = (X - \alpha)S$  for some polynomial  $S \in K[X]$ . Then by Point 2

$$D(P) = D((X - \alpha)S) = (X - \alpha)D(S) + S,$$

and the condition  $D(P)(\alpha) = 0$  gives  $S(\alpha) = 0$ , so that  $S$  is again divisible by  $X - \alpha$ , and we can conclude that  $P$  is divisible by  $(X - \alpha)^2$ , so that  $\alpha$  is a multiple root of  $P$ .

3. Let  $A$  be an integral domain. Show that  $A[X]^\times = A^\times$ .

**Solution:**

Of course,  $A^\times \subseteq A[X]^\times$  because  $A \subseteq A[X]$ . To conclude, we just need to prove that any invertible  $f \in A[X]$  is indeed in  $A^\times$ . Suppose that  $f \in A[X]^\times$ , and that  $fg = 1$  for some  $g \in A[X]$ . Of course  $f$  and  $g$  cannot be 0, so that we have well-defined  $\deg(f), \deg(g) \geq 0$ . Being  $A$  a domain, we have that  $\deg(fg) = \deg(f) + \deg(g)$  (because the product of the leading coefficients is the leading coefficient of the product, as it cannot vanish). Hence  $0 = \deg(1) = \deg(f) + \deg(g)$ , and the only possibility is that  $\deg(f) = \deg(g) = 0$ . Hence  $f, g \in A$ , giving  $f \in A^\times$ .

4. Let  $K$  be a field, and consider the ideal  $I$  generated by  $X$  and  $Y$  in  $K[X, Y]$ . Show:

1.  $I$  is not principal;
2.  $I$  is maximal.

**Solution:**

**Please turn over!**

1. By contradiction, suppose that  $I = (P)$  for some  $P \in K[X, Y]$ . Then there must exist  $Q, R \in K[X, Y]$  such that  $X = P \cdot Q$  and  $Y = P \cdot R$ . Notice that both  $K[X]$  and  $K[Y]$  are integral domains, so that regarding  $K[X, Y]$  as  $K[X][Y]$  or as  $K[Y][X]$  we have that both the degree in  $X$  and the degree in  $Y$  of a product of polynomials are the sum of the degrees of the polynomials. As  $P, Q, R$  cannot be zero, they have a well-defined degree. In particular, we have  $0 = \deg_Y(X) = \deg_Y(P) + \deg_Y(Q)$ , which implies  $\deg_Y(P) = 0$ , and  $0 = \deg_X(Y) = \deg_X(P) + \deg_X(R)$ , which implies  $\deg_X(P) = 0$ . Then  $P \in K$ , since it is constant in both variables. In particular,  $P \in K^\times$ , so that  $1 \in (P)$  and  $P = K[X, Y]$ . This means in particular that for some  $A, B \in K[X, Y]$  we can write  $X \cdot A + Y \cdot B = 1$ , which is a contradiction (as evaluating the two sides of the equality at  $X = Y = 0$  we obtain  $0 = 1$ , which is not true in a field. Hence  $I$  is not a principal ideal.
2. We can do this by proving that  $K[X, Y]/(X, Y)$  is a field. Since we are adding to  $K$  two variables which then we set equal to zero (by quotienting over  $I$ ), intuition suggests that  $K[X, Y]/(X, Y) \cong K$ , which is a field by hypothesis. This is true: consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : K[X, Y] &\rightarrow K \\ P(X, Y) &\mapsto P(0, 0). \end{aligned}$$

It is a ring homomorphism (as it is the composition of evaluation maps  $K[X][Y] \rightarrow K[X] \rightarrow K$ ), and it is clearly surjective, as every element in  $K$  is its own counterimage. We claim that  $\ker(\phi) = (X, Y)$ . The inclusion “ $\supseteq$ ” is immediate. For the other inclusion, take  $P \in \ker(\phi)$ . Dividing  $P$  by  $X$  and its remainder by  $Y$ , we obtain a constant  $c \in K[X, Y]$  and polynomials  $A \in K[X, Y]$ ,  $B \in K[Y]$  such that  $P = XA + YB + c$ , and then evaluating the two sides at  $(0, 0)$  we obtain  $0 = P(0, 0) = c$ , so that  $P = XA + YB \in (X, Y)$ .

To conclude, we apply First Isomorphism Theorem for rings, which gives an isomorphism  $K[X, Y]/(X, Y) \cong K$  as desired.