

# Integer-valued polynomials on subsets of quaternion algebras

Nicholas J. Werner

December 31, 2024

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $R$  be either the ring of Lipschitz quaternions, or the ring of Hurwitz quaternions. Then,  $R$  is a subring of the division ring  $\mathbb{D}$  of rational quaternions. For  $S \subseteq R$ , we study the collection  $\text{Int}(S, R) = \{f \in \mathbb{D}[x] \mid f(S) \subseteq R\}$  of polynomials that are integer-valued on  $S$ . The set  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  is always a left  $R$ -submodule of  $\mathbb{D}[x]$ , but need not be a subring of  $\mathbb{D}[x]$ . We say that  $S$  is a ringset of  $R$  if  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  is a subring of  $\mathbb{D}[x]$ . In this paper, we give a complete classification of the finite subsets of  $R$  that are ringsets.

## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we study integer-valued polynomials on subsets of noncommutative rings. In the commutative setting, these rings emerge by letting  $D$  be a (commutative) integral domain with fraction field  $K$ , taking  $S \subseteq D$ , and defining

$$\text{Int}(S, D) := \{f \in K[x] \mid f(S) \subseteq D\},$$

which is the ring of integer-valued polynomials sending  $S$  into  $D$ . When  $S = D$ , we let  $\text{Int}(D) := \text{Int}(D, D)$ . Work on the ring-theoretic aspects of  $\text{Int}(S, D)$  dates to at least the 1970s. The book [1] is the standard reference for results in this field up to the late 1990s.

During the past fifteen years, attention has turned to similar constructions over noncommutative rings. Integer-valued polynomials have been studied over various quaternion algebras [2, 3, 7, 17, 19], matrix algebras [5, 10, 12, 13, 14, 18], and rings of upper triangular matrices [4, 6, 9]. When  $D$  is a commutative domain, it is clear that  $\text{Int}(D)$  and  $\text{Int}(S, D)$  are subrings of  $K[x]$ . However, this may not be the case when working with polynomials with noncommuting coefficients; see Example 1.2 below.

Let  $B$  be a noncommutative ring. We will follow standard conventions for working with the noncommutative polynomial ring  $B[x]$  as in [8, §16]. In  $B[x]$ , polynomials are added and multiplied as in the commutative case, and the indeterminate  $x$  is central in  $B[x]$ . The main difference from the commutative setting is that we will assume polynomials satisfy right evaluation, i.e. that before a polynomial  $f \in B[x]$  can be evaluated, it must be written as  $f(x) = \sum_i a_i x^i$ , where the indeterminate appears to the right of any coefficients. Because of this, evaluation at an element of  $B$  may not define a multiplicative map  $B[x] \rightarrow B$ . For instance, let  $a, b \in B$ ,  $f(x) = ax$ , and  $g(x) = bx$ . Denote the product of  $f$  and  $g$  in  $B[x]$  by  $(fg)(x)$ . Then,  $(fg)(x) = abx^2$ , so  $(fg)(\alpha) = ab\alpha^2$  for  $\alpha \in B$ , and this may fail to equal  $f(\alpha)g(\alpha) = (a\alpha)(b\alpha)$ . Note that if  $\alpha \in B$  is central, then it is true that  $(fg)(\alpha) = f(\alpha)g(\alpha)$  for all  $f, g \in B[x]$ . Also, if each coefficient of  $g$  is central in  $B$ , then  $(gf)(\alpha) = (fg)(\alpha) = f(\alpha)g(\alpha)$  for all  $f \in B[x]$  and all  $\alpha \in B$ .

When  $A$  is a subring of  $B$  and  $S \subseteq A$ , we can define the sets of polynomials

$$\text{Int}(S, A) := \{f \in B[x] \mid f(S) \subseteq A\}$$

and  $\text{Int}(A) := \text{Int}(A, A)$  as in the commutative case. It is straightforward to check that  $\text{Int}(S, A)$  is a left  $A$ -module, but  $\text{Int}(S, A)$  may not be closed under multiplication, and hence may fail to be a ring. One of the basic problems in the study of noncommutative integer-valued polynomials is to determine when  $\text{Int}(S, A)$  is a ring. For this, we focus on the case where  $A$  is an associative, torsion-free  $D$ -algebra such that  $A \cap K = D$ , and we take  $B = K \otimes_D A$ , which is the extension of  $A$  to a  $K$ -algebra.

**DEFINITION 1.1.** A subset  $S \subseteq A$  is called a *ringset* of  $A$  if  $\text{Int}(S, A)$  is a ring.

**EXAMPLE 1.2.** [19, Ex. 39] Assume that  $D$  is a commutative Noetherian domain, and that  $A$  is a noncommutative  $D$ -algebra. Choose  $\alpha, \beta \in A$  such that  $\alpha\beta \neq \beta\alpha$ . We show that  $S = \{\alpha\}$  is not a ringset. Since  $D$  is Noetherian, there exists  $d \in D \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha \notin dA$ . Take  $f(x) = (x - \alpha)/d$  and  $g(x) = x - \beta$ . Both polynomials are in  $\text{Int}(S, A)$ , but  $(fg)(x) = (x^2 - (\alpha + \beta)x + \alpha\beta)/d$ , and  $(fg)(\alpha) = (\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha)/d \notin A$ . Thus,  $fg \notin \text{Int}(S, A)$ ,  $\text{Int}(S, A)$  is not a ring, and  $S$  is not a ringset.

In contrast to the situation with singleton sets, there are many cases for which  $A$  itself is a ringset.

**THEOREM 1.3.** [18, Thm. 1.2] *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be as above. Assume that each  $\alpha \in A$  can be written as a finite sum  $\alpha = \sum_i c_i u_i$ , where  $c_i, u_i \in A$  are such that each  $c_i$  is central in  $B$  and each  $u_i$  is a unit of  $A$ . Then,  $\text{Int}(A)$  is a ring.*

Theorem 1.3 applies to many types of  $D$ -algebras, including matrix rings and group algebras over  $D$ . Even when  $A$  fails to satisfy the hypothesis of the theorem,  $A$  may still be a ringset. For instance, if  $A$  is a ring of upper triangular matrices over

$D$ , then there may exist elements of  $A$  that cannot be written in the form  $\sum_i c_i u_i$ . Nevertheless, it is known [6, Thm. 5.4] that  $\text{Int}(A)$  is a ring. To date, no example has been given of a  $D$ -algebra  $A$  for which  $\text{Int}(A)$  is not a ring.

The purpose of this article is to study finite ringsets of two quaternion algebras over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\mathbf{i}$ ,  $\mathbf{j}$ , and  $\mathbf{k}$  be the standard quaternion units that satisfy  $\mathbf{i}^2 = \mathbf{j}^2 = -1$  and  $\mathbf{ij} = \mathbf{k} = -\mathbf{ji}$ . The ring of Lipschitz quaternions  $\mathbf{L}$  and the ring of Hurwitz quaternions  $\mathbf{H}$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{L} &:= \{a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \mid a_i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for each } i\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathbf{H} &:= \{a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \mid a_i \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for each } i, \text{ or } a_i \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2} \text{ for each } i\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,  $\mathbf{L} \subseteq \mathbf{H}$ , and both  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{H}$  are subrings of the division ring

$$\mathbb{D} := \{a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \mid a_i \in \mathbb{Q} \text{ for each } i\}.$$

Basic properties of the arithmetic of  $\mathbf{L}$ ,  $\mathbf{H}$ , and  $\mathbb{D}$  can be found in [16, Chap. 11]. Note that both  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{H}$  have center  $\mathbb{Z}$ . The elements in  $\mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$  are exactly those of the form  $(a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k})/2$  with  $a_i$  an odd integer for each  $0 \leq i \leq 3$ . The unit group  $\mathbf{L}^\times$  of  $\mathbf{L}$  is  $\mathbf{L}^\times = \{\pm 1, \pm\mathbf{i}, \pm\mathbf{j}, \pm\mathbf{k}\}$ , which is the well-known quaternion group  $Q_8$ . The ring  $\mathbf{H}$  contains the additional Hurwitz unit  $\mathbf{h} := (1 + \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k})/2$ , and the full unit group  $\mathbf{H}^\times$  has order 24 and is generated by  $\mathbf{i}$  and  $\mathbf{h}$ .

For the remainder of this paper,  $R$  will be either  $\mathbf{L}$  or  $\mathbf{H}$ . The majority of our results and proofs hold for both  $\mathbf{L}$  and  $\mathbf{H}$ , so we will distinguish between the two rings only when necessary. By [17, Thm. 2.3],  $\text{Int}(R)$  is a ring, so  $R$  is a ringset of itself. Our goal is to characterize the finite subsets of  $R$  that are ringsets. That is, we will describe all finite  $S \subseteq R$  such that

$$\text{Int}(S, R) := \{f \in \mathbb{D}[x] \mid f(S) \subseteq R\}$$

is a subring of  $\mathbb{D}[x]$ . Similar sets of polynomials have been studied previously in the context of matrix algebras [13] and upper triangular matrix algebras [9]. Some basic results on ringsets of  $R$  were proved in [19].

LEMMA 1.4. [19, Sec. 6.3] *Let  $S, T \subseteq R$ .*

- (1) *A singleton set  $S = \{\alpha\}$  is a ringset if and only if  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ .*
- (2) *For each  $\alpha \in R$ , the conjugacy class  $\{u\alpha u^{-1} \mid u \in R^\times\}$  is a ringset.*
- (3) *If  $S$  and  $T$  are ringsets, then  $S \cup T$  is a ringset.*
- (4) *If  $S$  is a union of conjugacy classes, then  $S$  is a ringset.*

EXAMPLE 1.5.

- When  $R = \mathbf{L}$ , the full conjugacy class of  $\mathbf{i}$  in  $R$  is  $\{\pm\mathbf{i}\}$ . So,  $\{\pm\mathbf{i}\}$  is a ringset with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ . When  $R = \mathbf{H}$ , the full conjugacy class of  $\mathbf{i}$  is  $\{\pm\mathbf{i}, \pm\mathbf{j}, \pm\mathbf{k}\}$ , so this set is a ringset of  $\mathbf{H}$ .

- Let  $S = \{\pm \mathbf{i}\}$ . Then,  $S$  is not a ringset with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ . To see this, let  $f(x) = (x - \mathbf{i})/2 \in \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{H})$ . Then,  $(f\mathbf{h})(x) = (\mathbf{h}x - \mathbf{h}\mathbf{i})/2$ , so  $(f\mathbf{h})(\mathbf{i}) = (\mathbf{h}\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{i}\mathbf{h})/2 = (\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k})/2 \notin \mathbf{H}$ . Thus,  $f\mathbf{h} \notin \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{H})$  and  $S$  is not a ringset with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ .
- It will follow from our later results (see Theorem 3.4) that every  $S \subseteq \{\pm \mathbf{i}, \pm \mathbf{j}, \pm \mathbf{k}\}$  such that  $|S| \geq 2$  is a ringset with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ . So, both  $\{\pm \mathbf{i}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$  are ringsets, but  $\{\mathbf{i}\} = \{\pm \mathbf{i}\} \cap \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\}$  is not a ringset by Lemma 1.4(1). This shows that intersections of ringsets need not be ringsets.

The first step in our classification of finite ringsets of  $R$  is to reduce the problem to sets in which each element satisfies the same polynomial over  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

DEFINITION 1.6. Given  $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{D}$ , the *real part* of  $\alpha$  is  $a_0$ , and we call  $a_1$ ,  $a_2$ , and  $a_3$  the *imaginary coefficients* of  $\alpha$ . Let  $\bar{\alpha} := a_0 - a_1\mathbf{i} - a_2\mathbf{j} - a_3\mathbf{k}$ . The norm of  $\alpha$  is  $N(\alpha) := \alpha \cdot \bar{\alpha} = a_0^2 + a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2$ . The minimal polynomial  $\mu_\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  of  $\alpha$  is

$$\mu_\alpha(x) := \begin{cases} x - \alpha, & \alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \\ x^2 - 2a_0x + N(\alpha), & \alpha \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \mathbb{Q}. \end{cases}$$

When  $\alpha \in R$ ,  $\mu_\alpha$  will have integer coefficients. Given a monic polynomial  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  of degree 1 or 2, we define  $\mathcal{C}_R(m) := \{\alpha \in R \mid \mu_\alpha = m\}$ , which is the *minimal polynomial class* of  $m$  in  $R$ .

Note that since  $\mathbb{D}$  is a division ring,  $\mu_\alpha$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ . Also, it is clear that conjugate elements of  $R$  share the same minimal polynomial, but the converse is not true. For example,  $3\mathbf{i}$  and  $\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}$  both have minimal polynomial  $x^2 + 9$ , but they are not conjugate in  $R$ . Thus, the sets  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  need not coincide with conjugacy classes in  $R$ . However,  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  is always a union of conjugacy classes.

LEMMA 1.7. *Let  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  be monic and have degree 1 or 2. Then,*

$$\mathcal{C}_R(m) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_R(m)} \{u\alpha u^{-1} \mid u \in R^\times\},$$

and  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  is a ringset.

PROOF. It is clear that  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  is contained in the above union of conjugacy classes. Conversely, if  $\beta \in \{u\alpha u^{-1} \mid u \in R^\times\}$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_R(m)$ , then  $\beta \in \mathcal{C}_R(m)$ . Thus, the given decomposition of  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  holds, and  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  is a ringset by Lemma 1.4.  $\square$

Any finite subset  $S \subseteq R$  can be partitioned as  $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^t S_i$ , where each subset  $S_i$  lies in a different minimal polynomial class. In Corollary 2.2, we prove that  $S$  is a ringset if and only if each  $S_i$  is a ringset. Thus, describing all finite ringsets of  $R$

amounts to classifying the subsets of  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  that are ringsets. For this, we introduce the notion of a *reduced* set.

DEFINITION 1.8. Let  $S \subseteq R$ . For  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $S + a := \{\alpha + a \mid \alpha \in S\}$ . We say that  $S$  is *reduced* if both of the following two conditions hold.

- (i)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  for some monic quadratic  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ .
- (ii) For all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,  $S + a \not\subseteq nR$ .

More details and motivation for this definition are given in Section 2. We prove in Proposition 2.10 that each nonempty  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  has an associated reduced set  $T$ , and furthermore  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $T$  is a ringset. This leads us to our main result, which is a full classification of the reduced subsets of  $R$  that are ringsets.

THEOREM 1.9. *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be reduced and such that  $|S| \geq 2$ . Let  $\Delta(S) = \{\alpha - \beta \mid \alpha, \beta \in S\}$  and let  $\Gamma(S) = \gcd(\{N(\delta) \mid \delta \in \Delta(S)\})$ .*

- (1) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . Then,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $\Gamma(S) = 2$ ; or  $\Gamma(S) = 4$ ; or  $\Gamma(S) = 8$  and the following condition holds: there exist  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \Delta(S)$  such that  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  are congruent modulo 4 to distinct residues in  $\{2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ .*
- (2) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . Then,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $\Gamma(S) = 1$  or  $\Gamma(S) = 2$ .*

The majority of this paper is dedicated to proving Theorem 1.9 and working with the quantity  $\Gamma(S)$  that is given in its statement. Section 3 deals with most cases in Theorem 1.9 (see Theorem 3.13), while Section 4 handles the exceptional case  $R = \mathbf{L}$  and  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ . We close the paper with a short summary of how to use our results to decide if a finite subset of  $R$  is a ringset, and give some remarks on the difficulty of determining whether an infinite subset of  $R$  is a ringset.

## 2. Minimal Polynomial Classes and Reduced Sets

Recall from the introduction that  $R$  denotes either the Lipschitz quaternions  $\mathbf{L}$  or the Hurwitz quaternions  $\mathbf{H}$ . Any result that does not specify  $R = \mathbf{L}$  or  $R = \mathbf{H}$  will apply to both rings. For a monic  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  of degree 1 or 2,  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  is the set of elements of  $R$  having minimal polynomial  $m$ . Our first theorem shows that distinct minimal polynomial classes can be separated via polynomials from  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ . As a consequence of this, it will be enough to work with subsets of the classes  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  when studying finite ringsets of  $R$ .

Note that when  $f \in \mathbb{D}[x]$  and  $g \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ , we have  $(gf)(\alpha) = (fg)(\alpha) = f(\alpha)g(\alpha)$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ . We will use this fact freely and frequently throughout the paper.

THEOREM 2.1. *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be finite and nonempty. Let  $T \subseteq R$  be nonempty and such that each element of  $T$  has the same minimal polynomial  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , but no element of  $S$  has minimal polynomial  $m$ . That is,  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  and  $S \cap \mathcal{C}_R(m) = \emptyset$ .*

(1) There exists  $F \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  such that for  $\alpha \in S \cup T$ ,

$$F(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 0, & \alpha \in S \\ 1, & \alpha \in T. \end{cases}$$

(2) If  $T$  is not a ringset, then  $S \cup T$  is not a ringset.

PROOF. (1) Let  $M$  be the product of all the distinct minimal polynomials of elements in  $S$ . Then,  $M$  is monic and has integer coefficients. Note that  $m$  does not divide  $M$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ , because no element of  $S$  has minimal polynomial  $m$ , and  $\mu_\alpha$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  for all  $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ . If  $\deg m = 1$ , then  $T = \{\alpha\}$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In this case, we can take  $F(x) = M(x)/M(\alpha)$ , and we are done.

From here, assume that  $\deg m = 2$ . Divide  $M$  by  $m$  to get  $M = qm + r$ , where  $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  and either  $r = 0$  or  $\deg r \leq 1$ . Then,  $M(\alpha) = 0$  for all  $\alpha \in S$ , and  $M(\alpha) = r(\alpha)$  for all  $\alpha \in T$ . Since  $m$  does not divide  $M$ ,  $M(\alpha) \neq 0$  and  $r \neq 0$ .

Let  $m(x) = x^2 - 2ax + n$ . Since  $T \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$ , each element of  $T$  has real part  $a$  and norm  $n$ . Write  $r(x) = c_1x + c_0$  for some  $c_0, c_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For every  $\alpha \in T$ , we have

$$r(\alpha) = c_1\alpha + c_0 = (c_1a + c_0) + c_1(\alpha - a).$$

Let  $d = N(r(\alpha)) = c_0^2 + 2c_0c_1a + c_1^2n$ . Observe that  $d$  is independent of the choice of  $\alpha \in T$ . Moreover,  $d \neq 0$  because  $r(\alpha) \neq 0$ , and 0 itself is the only element of  $\mathbb{D}$  with norm 0. Let  $s(x) = c_1a + c_0 - c_1(x - a) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ . Then,  $s(\alpha) = \overline{r(\alpha)}$  for all  $\alpha \in T$ . Since both  $M$  and  $s$  have integer coefficients,  $(Ms)(\alpha) = M(\alpha)s(\alpha)$  for all  $\alpha \in S \cup T$ . Thus,  $(Ms)(\alpha) = 0$  when  $\alpha \in S$ , and

$$(Ms)(\alpha) = M(\alpha)s(\alpha) = r(\alpha)s(\alpha) = d$$

when  $\alpha \in T$ . Hence, the polynomial  $F(x) = (Ms)(x)/d$  has the desired properties.

(2) Assume that  $T$  is not a ringset. Then, there exist  $f, g \in \text{Int}(T, R)$  such that  $fg \notin \text{Int}(T, R)$ . Let  $F \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  be as in part (1). Then, for any  $\alpha \in S \cup T$ ,

$$(fF)(\alpha) = f(\alpha)F(\alpha) \text{ and } (gF)(\alpha) = g(\alpha)F(\alpha),$$

so both  $fF$  and  $gF$  are in  $\text{Int}(S \cup T, R)$ . We claim that  $fF \cdot gF \notin \text{Int}(S \cup T, R)$ . To see this, pick  $\beta \in T$  such that  $(fg)(\beta) \notin R$ . We have

$$(fF \cdot gF)(\beta) = (fg)(\beta) \cdot (F(\beta))^2 = (fg)(\beta) \notin R.$$

Thus,  $fF \cdot gF \notin \text{Int}(S \cup T, R)$  and  $S \cup T$  is not a ringset.  $\square$

COROLLARY 2.2. Let  $S \subseteq R$  be finite and nonempty. Let  $m_1, \dots, m_t$  be the distinct minimal polynomials of all of the elements of  $S$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , let  $S_i = S \cap \mathcal{C}_R(m_i)$ . Then,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $S_i$  is a ringset for all  $1 \leq i \leq t$ .

PROOF. The sets  $S_1, \dots, S_t$  form a partition of  $S$ , so  $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^t S_i$ . If each  $S_i$  is a ringset, then  $S$  is a ringset by Lemma 1.4. Conversely, if some  $S_i$  is not a ringset, then  $S$  is not a ringset by Theorem 2.1.  $\square$

By Corollary 2.2, determining the finite ringsets of  $R$  amounts to characterizing the ringsets within each minimal polynomial class  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$ . When  $m$  is linear,  $\mathcal{C}_R(m) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  and every subset of  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  is a ringset. So, for the remainder of the paper, we will focus on the classes  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  with  $m$  quadratic. Note that when  $R = \mathbf{H}$ , the classes that lie within  $\mathbf{L}$  are disjoint from those within  $\mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ . Explicitly,  $\mathcal{C}_R(m) \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  if and only if the linear coefficient of  $m$  is even, and  $\mathcal{C}_R(m) \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$  if and only if the linear coefficient of  $m$  is odd.

For a subset  $S$  of a single minimal polynomial class  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$ , we can further reduce the problem by considering integer translations and integer multiples of  $S$ . When  $a, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $n \neq 0$ , we define  $S + a := \{\alpha + a \mid \alpha \in S\}$  and  $nS := \{n\alpha \mid \alpha \in S\}$ .

LEMMA 2.3. *Let  $S \subseteq R$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $n \neq 0$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $S$  is a ringset.
- (ii)  $S + a$  is a ringset.
- (iii)  $nS$  is a ringset.

PROOF. Note that since  $a, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , both  $S + a$  and  $nS$  are subsets of  $R$ . Since  $a$  is central in  $\mathbb{D}$ , the mapping  $f(x) \mapsto f(x - a)$  is a ring automorphism on  $\mathbb{D}[x]$ . The image of  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  under this mapping is  $\text{Int}(S + a, R)$ ; hence,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $S + a$  is a ringset. The analogous result holds for  $S$  and  $nS$  by considering the mapping  $f(x) \mapsto f(x/n)$ , which is also a ring automorphism on  $\mathbb{D}[x]$ .  $\square$

EXAMPLE 2.4. Let  $S = \{4 + 5\mathbf{i}, 4 + 5\mathbf{j}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(x^2 - 8x + 41)$  and  $T = \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(x^2 + 1)$ . Then,  $S = 4 + 5T$ . In light of Lemma 2.3,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $T$  is a ringset. As our forthcoming work will show (see Theorem 3.4), we can conclude that  $T$  is a ringset simply because  $N(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j}) = 2$ . Hence,  $S$  is also a ringset.

The relationships among  $S$ ,  $a + S$ , and  $nS$  are the inspiration for reduced subsets of  $R$ . Recall from Definition 1.8 that  $S \subseteq R$  is *reduced* if the following two conditions hold:

- (i)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  for some monic quadratic  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ .
- (ii) For all  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n \geq 2$ ,  $S + a \not\subseteq nR$ .

Essentially, reduced sets are those for which we have “factored out” as many positive integers as possible from the imaginary coefficients of the elements of  $S$ . We state this more precisely in Proposition 2.6 below. Note that by condition (i),  $S \cap \mathbb{Z} = \emptyset$ , and condition (ii) implies that  $S$  is nonempty. So, any reduced set is a nonempty

subset of  $R \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ . Also, each element of a reduced set has the same real part. We will exploit these facts often in our subsequent work.

EXAMPLE 2.5. We give some examples to illustrate reduced sets.

- With  $S$  and  $T$  as in Example 2.4,  $S$  is not reduced, but  $T$  is reduced.
- Let  $S = \{3\mathbf{i}, 3\mathbf{j}, 3\mathbf{k}\}$  and  $T = \{3\mathbf{i}, 3\mathbf{j}, \mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ , which are both subsets of  $\mathcal{C}_R(x^2 + 9)$ . Then,  $S$  is not reduced, because  $S \subseteq 3R$ . However,  $T$  is reduced.
- Let  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . Let  $S = \{(1+5\mathbf{i}+15\mathbf{j}+25\mathbf{k})/2, (1-5\mathbf{i}-15\mathbf{j}-25\mathbf{k})/2\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(x^2 - x + 219)$  and  $T = \{(1+\mathbf{i}+3\mathbf{j}+5\mathbf{k})/2, (1-\mathbf{i}-3\mathbf{j}-5\mathbf{k})/2\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(x^2 - x + 9)$ . Then,  $T$  is reduced, but  $S + 2 = 5T$  and hence  $S$  is not reduced.
- Determining whether a subset is reduced or not can depend on whether  $R = \mathbf{L}$  or  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . For instance, let  $S = \{\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}\}$ . Then,  $S$  is reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ . However,  $\mathbf{H}$  contains both  $(1 + \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k})/2$  and  $(1 + \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k})/2$ , so  $S + 1 \subseteq 2\mathbf{H}$ . Thus,  $S$  is not reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ .
- More generally, when  $R = \mathbf{H}$ ,  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m) \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  for some monic quadratic  $m$ , and each imaginary coefficient of every element of  $S$  is odd, then  $S$  is not reduced. In this case, either  $S$  or  $S + 1$  is in  $2\mathbf{H}$ , depending on whether the real part of the elements of  $S$  is odd or even.

PROPOSITION 2.6. *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be nonempty. Assume that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  for some monic quadratic  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ .*

- (1) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . Then,  $S$  is reduced if and only if for each prime  $p$ , there exists  $\beta = b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that  $p \nmid b_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ .*
- (2) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{H}$ .*
  - (a) *Assume  $S \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ . Then,  $S$  is reduced if and only if for each odd prime  $p$ , there exists  $\beta = (b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k})/2 \in S$  such that  $p \nmid b_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ .*
  - (b) *Assume  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ . Then,  $S$  is reduced if and only if both of the following conditions hold:*
    - (i)  *$S$  is reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ .*
    - (ii) *There exists  $\alpha \in S$  such that at least one imaginary coefficient of  $\alpha$  is even.*

PROOF. For each part, we prove the contrapositive statement.

(1) ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume there exists a prime  $p$  such that  $p$  divides every imaginary coefficient of every element of  $S$ . Let  $b_0$  be the real part of each element of  $S$ . Then,  $S - b_0 \subseteq pR$ , so  $S$  is not reduced.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume that  $S$  is not reduced. Then, there exist  $a, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $n \geq 2$  and such that  $S + a \subseteq nR$ . Let  $p$  be a prime divisor of  $n$ . Then,  $S + a \subseteq pR$ , which means that  $p$  divides each imaginary coefficient of every element of  $S$ .



(2a) This is similar to the proof of (1). First, assume there exists a prime  $p$  such that for every  $(b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k})/2 \in S$ ,  $p$  divides  $b_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Necessarily,  $p$  must be odd. Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $b_0 + 2a = p$ . Then,  $S + a \subseteq pR$  and  $S$  is not reduced.

Conversely, assume that  $S$  is not reduced. As in the proof of (1),  $S + a \subseteq pR$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and some prime  $p$ . Given  $\beta = (b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k})/2 \in S$ , we have

$$b_0 + 2a + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} = 2(\beta + a) \in 2pR.$$

Let  $\gamma = c_0 + c_1\mathbf{i} + c_2\mathbf{j} + c_3\mathbf{k} \in R$  be such that  $2(\beta + a) = 2p\gamma$ . Then,  $b_i = 2pc_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Since  $2c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , this shows that  $p \mid b_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , and  $p$  must be odd because  $\beta \in \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ .

(2b) ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Certainly, if  $S$  is not reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ , then  $S$  is not reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ . Also, as pointed out at the end of Example 2.5, if every imaginary coefficient of every element of  $S$  is odd, then  $S$  is not reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume that  $S$  is not reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ . If  $S$  is not reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ , then the negation of (i) holds and we are done. So, assume that  $S$  is reduced with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ . Find  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and a prime  $p$  such that  $S + a \subseteq pR$ . By (1), there exists  $\beta = b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that  $p \nmid b_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $p \nmid b_1$ .

Let  $\gamma = c_0 + c_1\mathbf{i} + c_2\mathbf{j} + c_3\mathbf{k} \in R$  such that  $\beta + a = p\gamma$ . Then,  $b_1 = pc_1$ . Since  $p$  does not divide  $b_1$ , the only way this can be true is if  $p = 2$  and  $c_1 \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$ . Consequently,  $c_i \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq 3$ , and so  $b_i = 2c_i$  is odd for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ .

Finally, let  $\alpha = b_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \in S$ . Then,  $N(\alpha) = N(\beta)$ . Considering these norms modulo 4 and recalling that  $b_i$  is odd for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , we have

$$a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 \equiv b_1^2 + b_2^2 + b_3^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}.$$

This shows that  $a_i$  is odd for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Since  $\alpha \in S$  was arbitrary, the negation of (ii) holds.  $\square$

We record as a corollary the portions of Proposition 2.6 that we will reference most often.

**COROLLARY 2.7.** *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be reduced.*

- (1) *If  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ , then for each prime  $p$ , there exists  $\beta = b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that  $p \nmid b_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ .*
- (2) *If  $S \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ , then for each odd prime  $p$ , there exists  $\beta = (b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k})/2 \in S$  such that  $p \nmid b_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ .*

Regardless of whether we work over  $\mathbf{L}$  or  $\mathbf{H}$ , it suffices to consider reduced sets when looking for ringsets within minimal polynomial classes. In order to prove this—and to help decide when reduced sets are ringsets—we need one more definition.

**DEFINITION 2.8.** Let  $S \subseteq R$  be nonempty. We define  $\Delta(S) := \{\alpha - \beta \mid \alpha, \beta \in S\}$ . When  $|S| \geq 2$ , we set  $\Gamma(S) := \gcd(\{N(\delta) \mid \delta \in \Delta(S)\})$ . If  $S$  is a singleton set, then  $\Delta(S) = \{0\}$ . In this case, we define  $\Gamma(S) := 0$  to avoid complications with the definition of  $\gcd(\{0\})$ .

**REMARK 2.9.** When  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  is reduced,  $\Gamma(S)$  will always be even. Indeed, let  $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k}$  and  $\beta = a_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k}$  be elements of  $S$ . Then,  $a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 = b_1^2 + b_2^2 + b_3^2$ , so

$$N(\alpha - \beta) = (a_1 - b_1)^2 + (a_2 - b_2)^2 + (a_3 - b_3)^2 = 2N(\alpha - a) - 2(a_1b_1 + a_2b_2 + a_3b_3).$$

In contrast,  $\Gamma(S)$  can be odd if  $S \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ , as demonstrated by  $S = \{(1 + \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k})/2, (1 + \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k})/2\}$  with  $\Gamma(S) = 1$ .

The quantity  $\Gamma(S)$  is what we will ultimately use to classify reduced subsets of  $R$  that are ringsets. We pause to give some motivation for this definition. When  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  and  $f \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ , we can divide  $f$  by  $m$  to get  $f = qm + r$ , where  $q, r \in \mathbb{D}[x]$  and the remainder polynomial  $r$  is in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  and has the form  $r(x) = \gamma_1x + \gamma_0$ . As we show in Section 3, we can decide whether  $S$  is a ringset by studying the polynomials  $r$ . The subjects of Definition 2.8 arise in the following way. Given  $\alpha, \beta \in S$ , we have  $f(\alpha) - f(\beta) = r(\alpha) - r(\beta) = \gamma_1(\alpha - \beta)$ . Considering all such differences as  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  run through  $S$  leads to the set  $\Delta(S)$ , and then to  $\Gamma(S)$ .

Our first use of  $\Gamma(S)$  is to prove that any nonempty subset of a minimal polynomial class has an associated reduced subset.

**PROPOSITION 2.10.** *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be nonempty. Assume that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  for some monic quadratic  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ . Then, there exists a reduced set  $T \subseteq R$  such that  $S = a + nT$  for some  $a, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $n \geq 1$ . Moreover,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $T$  is a ringset.*

**PROOF.** First, consider the case where  $S = \{\alpha\}$  is a singleton set. If  $\alpha \in \mathbf{L}$ , then let  $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k}$ , where each  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $n = \gcd(a_1, a_2, a_3)$  and  $\beta = (\alpha - a_0)/n$ . If  $R = \mathbf{L}$ , then  $\{\beta\}$  is reduced. We can take  $T = \{\beta\}$  and then  $S = a_0 + nT$ . If  $R = \mathbf{H}$ , then write  $\beta = b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k}$  for some  $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Necessarily,  $\gcd(b_1, b_2, b_3) = 1$ . If some  $b_i$  is even, then  $\{\beta\}$  is reduced and we can again take  $T = \{\beta\}$ . On the other hand, if each  $b_i$  is odd, then  $(1 + \beta)/2 \in \mathbf{H}$  and  $\{(1 + \beta)/2\}$  is reduced. In this case, we take  $T = \{(1 + \beta)/2\}$  and then  $S = a_0 - n + 2nT$ .

Next, assume that  $S = \{\alpha\}$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ . Then,  $\alpha = (a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k})/2$  for some odd integers  $a_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq 3$ . Let  $n = \gcd(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ , which is odd. There exists  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $2a + a_0 = n$ . Let  $\beta = (\alpha + a)/n = (1 + (a_1/n)\mathbf{i} + (a_2/n)\mathbf{j} + (a_3/n)\mathbf{k})/2$ . Then,  $T = \{\beta\}$  is reduced and  $S = -a + nT$ .

From here, assume that  $|S| \geq 2$ . If  $S$  is reduced, then we are done. If not, then  $S = a_1 + n_1T_1$  for some  $T_1 \subseteq R$  and  $a_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $n_1 \geq 2$ . By construction,

each element of  $T_1$  has the same minimal polynomial. Observe that  $n_1$  divides each element of  $\Delta(S)$ , and in fact  $\Delta(S) = n_1\Delta(T_1)$ . It follows that  $\Gamma(S) = n_1^2\Gamma(T_1)$ . Since both  $\Gamma(S)$  and  $\Gamma(T_1)$  are positive integers and  $n_1 \geq 2$ ,  $\Gamma(S) > \Gamma(T_1)$ . If  $T_1$  is reduced, then we are done. If not, then we may repeat the above argument with  $T_1$  to get  $T_1 = a_2 + n_2T_2$  for some  $T_2 \subseteq R$  and  $a_2, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . This procedure cannot continue indefinitely, because the sequence  $\{\Gamma(S), \Gamma(T_1), \Gamma(T_2), \dots\}$  is strictly decreasing. Thus, after a finite number of steps, we can express  $S$  as  $S = a + nT$ , where  $T$  is reduced. The final claim follows from Lemma 2.3.  $\square$

### 3. Classifying Reduced Sets that are Ringsets

In this section, we will use  $\Gamma(S)$  to determine when a reduced subset  $S$  of  $R$  is a ringset. Our general strategy is to examine the linear polynomials in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$ , and consider their effect not just on elements of  $S$ , but on the set of all conjugates of elements of  $S$ .

**DEFINITION 3.1.** For  $S \subseteq R$ , we define  $S^* := \{u\alpha u^{-1} \mid \alpha \in S, u \in R^\times\}$ .

**LEMMA 3.2.** Let  $\alpha \in R$  and  $u \in R^\times$ .

- (1) Assume  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . Then,  $\alpha - u\alpha u^{-1} \in 2R$ .
- (2) Assume  $R = \mathbf{H}$  and let  $I$  be the two-sided ideal of  $R$  generated by  $1 + \mathbf{i}$ . Then,  $\alpha - u\alpha u^{-1} \in I$ . Moreover, if  $\beta \in R$  and  $N(\beta)$  is even, then  $\beta \in I$ .

**PROOF.** When  $R = \mathbf{L}$ ,  $R/2R$  is a commutative ring of order 16. In this residue ring,  $\alpha - u\alpha u^{-1} \equiv \alpha - \alpha \equiv 0$ . Similarly, when  $R = \mathbf{H}$ ,  $R/I \cong \mathbb{F}_4$  is commutative, and hence  $\alpha - u\alpha u^{-1} \in I$ . In this case, if  $\beta \in R$  and  $N(\beta)$  is even, then  $\beta \cdot \bar{\beta} \equiv 0$  in  $R/I$ . Since  $R/I$  is a field, this means that  $\beta \in I$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 3.3.** Let  $S \subseteq R$  be nonempty. Assume that  $S \subseteq \mathcal{C}_R(m)$  for some monic quadratic  $m \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ .

- (1) If every linear polynomial in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  is in  $\text{Int}(S^*, R)$ , then  $S$  is a ringset.
- (2) Let  $r(x) = \gamma_1 x + \gamma_0 \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ .
  - (a) Assume  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . If  $2\gamma_1 \in R$ , then  $r \in \text{Int}(S^*, R)$ .
  - (b) Assume  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . If  $\gamma_1(1 + \mathbf{i}) \in R$ , then  $r \in \text{Int}(S^*, R)$ .

**PROOF.** (1) Assume that the stated condition holds. Note that  $S^*$  is a union of full conjugacy classes in  $R$ , hence is a ringset by Lemma 1.4. We will show that  $\text{Int}(S, R) = \text{Int}(S^*, R)$ . Certainly,  $\text{Int}(S^*, R) \subseteq \text{Int}(S, R)$  because  $S \subseteq S^*$ . For the reverse inclusion, let  $f \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ . Divide  $f$  by  $m$  to get  $f = qm + r$ , where  $q, r \in \mathbb{D}[x]$  and  $r(x) = \gamma_1 x + \gamma_0$  for some  $\gamma_1, \gamma_0 \in \mathbb{D}$ . Note that each element of  $S^*$  has minimal polynomial  $m$ , so  $f(\beta) = r(\beta)$  for all  $\beta \in S^*$ . In particular,  $r \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ . Now, if  $\gamma_1 = 0$ , then  $\gamma_0 \in R$  and hence  $f \in \text{Int}(S^*, R)$ . Otherwise,  $r$  is a linear

polynomial in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$ , and thus is in  $\text{Int}(S^*, R)$  by assumption. In this case,  $f$  is once again in  $\text{Int}(S^*, R)$ .

(2a) Assume that  $2\gamma_1 \in R$ . Let  $\beta \in S^*$ . Then,  $\beta = u\alpha u^{-1}$  for some  $\alpha \in S$  and some  $u \in R^\times$ . By Lemma 3.2,  $\alpha - \beta \in 2R$ . Thus,

$$r(\alpha) - r(\beta) = \gamma_1(\alpha - \beta) \in R.$$

By assumption,  $r(\alpha) \in R$ , so  $r(\beta) \in R$  as well. Thus,  $r \in \text{Int}(S^*, R)$ .

(2b) Let  $I$  be the two-sided ideal of  $\mathbf{H}$  generated by  $1 + \mathbf{i}$ . It is well known that  $1 + \mathbf{i}$  generates  $I$  as both a left ideal and a right ideal of  $\mathbf{H}$ . So, if  $\varepsilon \in I$ , then there exist  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in R$  such that  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1(1 + \mathbf{i}) = (1 + \mathbf{i})\varepsilon_2$ . Proceeding as in part (2a), we can show that  $\alpha - \beta \in (1 + \mathbf{i})R$ , and hence  $\gamma_1(\alpha - \beta) \in R$ . The result follows.  $\square$

From here, we will use the quantity  $\Gamma(S)$  to characterize reduced sets  $S$  that are ringsets. We begin with some positive results.

**THEOREM 3.4.** *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be reduced.*

- (1) *If  $\Gamma(S) = 1$ , then  $S$  is a ringset.*
- (2) *If  $\Gamma(S) = 2$ , then  $S$  is a ringset.*
- (3) *If  $R = \mathbf{L}$  and  $\Gamma(S) = 4$ , then  $S$  is a ringset.*

**PROOF.** For each part, we use the fact that  $\Gamma(S)$  can be written as a linear combination of the norms of differences of elements of  $S$ . So, throughout we will assume that there exists an integer  $t \geq 1$  and, for each  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , elements  $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in S$  and integers  $n_i$  such that

$$(3.5) \quad \Gamma(S) = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i N(\alpha_i - \beta_i).$$

Next, let  $r(x) = \gamma_1 x + \gamma_0 \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ . Then, for every  $\alpha, \beta \in S$ ,  $\gamma_1(\alpha - \beta) = r(\alpha) - r(\beta) \in R$ . Thus,  $N(\alpha - \beta)\gamma_1 = \gamma_1(\alpha - \beta)(\overline{\alpha - \beta}) \in R$ . Applying (3.5), we obtain

$$(3.6) \quad \Gamma(S)\gamma_1 = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i)(\overline{\alpha_i - \beta_i}) \in R.$$

Note that (3.6) holds for the leading coefficient  $\gamma_1$  of any linear polynomial in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$ .

(1) Assume that  $\Gamma(S) = 1$ . By (3.6),  $\gamma_1 \in R$ . Since  $r \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ , this forces  $\gamma_0 \in R$ , and hence  $r \in R[x]$ . Consequently,  $r \in \text{Int}(S^*, R)$  and  $S$  is a ringset by Lemma 3.3.

(2) Assume that  $\Gamma(S) = 2$ . Then,  $2\gamma_1 \in R$  by (3.6). If  $R = \mathbf{L}$ , then  $S$  is a ringset by Lemma 3.3. So, assume that  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . We will use (3.6) to show that  $\gamma_1(1 + \mathbf{i}) \in R$ .

For each  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , the norm of  $\alpha_i - \beta_i$  is even, so  $\alpha_i - \beta_i \in R(1 + \mathbf{i})$  by Lemma 3.2. For each  $i$ , let  $\varepsilon_i \in R$  be such that  $\alpha_i - \beta_i = \varepsilon_i(1 + \mathbf{i})$ . Also, note that since the real part of  $\alpha_i - \beta_i$  is 0,  $\overline{\alpha_i - \beta_i} = -(\alpha_i - \beta_i) = -\varepsilon_i(1 + \mathbf{i})$ . From (3.6), we obtain

$$(3.7) \quad \gamma_1(1 + \mathbf{i})(1 - \mathbf{i}) = 2\gamma_1 = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i)(-\varepsilon_i)(1 + \mathbf{i}).$$

The inverse of  $(1 - \mathbf{i})$  is  $(1 - \mathbf{i})^{-1} = (1 + \mathbf{i})/2$ . Multiplying each side of (3.7) on the right by this element produces

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1(1 + \mathbf{i}) &= \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i)(-\varepsilon_i)(1 + \mathbf{i})(1 + \mathbf{i})/2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i)(-\varepsilon_i)(\mathbf{i}). \end{aligned}$$

This last expression is in  $R$  because  $\gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i) \in R$  for each  $i$ . We conclude that  $\gamma_1(1 + \mathbf{i}) \in R$ . Hence,  $S$  is a ringset by Lemma 3.3.

(3) Assume that  $R = \mathbf{L}$  and  $\Gamma(S) = 4$ . Then,  $N(\delta) \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  for all  $\delta \in \Delta(S)$ . Given  $\delta = d_1\mathbf{i} + d_2\mathbf{j} + d_3\mathbf{k}$ , where each  $d_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , this means that  $d_1^2 + d_2^2 + d_3^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ . Thus, each  $d_i$  is even. Consequently,  $\alpha - \beta \in 2\mathbf{L}$  and  $\overline{\alpha - \beta} \in 2\mathbf{L}$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \in S$ . Applying (3.6), we have

$$(3.8) \quad 2\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}(4\gamma_1) = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i) \left( \frac{\overline{\alpha_i - \beta_i}}{2} \right).$$

For each  $i$ , both  $\gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i)$  and  $(\overline{\alpha_i - \beta_i})/2$  are in  $R$ . So,  $2\gamma_1 \in R$ , and hence  $S$  is a ringset by Lemma 3.3.  $\square$

As Theorem 3.4 shows,  $S$  will be a ringset when  $\Gamma(S)$  is a small power of 2. We next demonstrate that  $S$  will not be a ringset if  $\Gamma(S)$  is too large. To prove this, we will work with elements of the form  $u\alpha - \alpha u$ , where  $\alpha \in R$  and  $u \in R^\times$ . As an aid to the reader, we record the following computations. Let  $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{i}\alpha - \alpha\mathbf{i} &= -2a_3\mathbf{j} + 2a_2\mathbf{k}, \quad \mathbf{j}\alpha - \alpha\mathbf{j} = 2a_3\mathbf{i} - 2a_1\mathbf{k}, \quad \mathbf{k}\alpha - \alpha\mathbf{k} = -2a_2\mathbf{i} + 2a_1\mathbf{j}, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{h}\alpha - \alpha\mathbf{h} &= (a_3 - a_2)\mathbf{i} + (a_1 - a_3)\mathbf{j} + (a_2 - a_1)\mathbf{k}. \end{aligned}$$

**PROPOSITION 3.9.** *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be reduced.*

- (1) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . If 16 divides  $\Gamma(S)$ , then  $S$  is not a ringset.*
- (2) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . If 4 divides  $\Gamma(S)$ , then  $S$  is not a ringset.*

PROOF. By Lemma 1.4, both parts of the proposition are true when  $S$  is a singleton set. So, we will assume throughout that  $|S| \geq 2$ , and hence that  $\Gamma(S) \neq 0$ .

(1) Assume that  $16 \mid \Gamma(S)$ . Then, each  $\delta \in \Delta(S)$  has the form  $\delta = d_1\mathbf{i} + d_2\mathbf{j} + d_3\mathbf{k}$ , where  $d_1, d_2, d_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $N(\delta) = d_1^2 + d_2^2 + d_3^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{16}$ . The only way this congruence can be satisfied is if each  $d_i$  is divisible by 4. This holds for all  $\delta \in \Delta(S)$ , which means that the polynomial  $(x - \alpha)/4$  is in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  for all  $\alpha \in S$ . Since  $S$  is reduced, by Corollary 2.7 there exists  $\beta = b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that at least one of  $b_1, b_2$ , or  $b_3$  is odd. Without loss of generality, assume that  $b_1$  is odd. Let  $f(x) = (x - \beta)/4$ . Then,  $(f\mathbf{j})(x) = (\mathbf{j}x - \beta\mathbf{j})/4$ , and

$$(f\mathbf{j})(\beta) = (\mathbf{j}\beta - \beta\mathbf{j})/4 = (2b_3\mathbf{i} - 2b_1\mathbf{k})/4 \notin R.$$

This shows that  $f\mathbf{j} \notin \text{Int}(S, R)$ , and therefore  $S$  is not a ringset. When  $b_2$  or  $b_3$  is odd, we can reach the same conclusion by examining  $(f\mathbf{i})(\beta)$ .

(2) Assume that  $4 \mid \Gamma(S)$ . We consider cases depending on whether  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  or  $S \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ .

**Case 1:**  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.4(3), each  $\delta \in \Delta(S)$  has the form  $\delta = d_1\mathbf{i} + d_2\mathbf{j} + d_3\mathbf{k}$  with each  $d_i$  even. This means that all coefficients of elements of  $S$  have matching parities. That is, given  $\alpha = a + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  and  $\beta = a + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$ , we have  $a_i \equiv b_i \pmod{2}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ .

Suppose that each imaginary coefficient  $a_i$  is odd for every  $\alpha \in S$ . Then, either  $S \subseteq 2\mathbf{H}$  (if  $a$  is odd) or  $S + 1 \subseteq 2\mathbf{H}$  (if  $a$  is even). This is impossible, because  $S$  is reduced. So, there exists  $\beta = a + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that  $b_i$  is even for some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Furthermore, some  $b_j$  must be odd. If not, then—since coefficients of elements of  $S$  have matching parities—this would violate Corollary 2.7.

Now, since  $\Delta(S) \subseteq 2\mathbf{L}$ , the polynomial  $f(x) = (x - \beta)/2$  is in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$ . Since  $R = \mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathbf{h} \in R$  and we have

$$(f\mathbf{h})(\beta) = (\mathbf{h}\beta - \beta\mathbf{h})/2 = ((b_3 - b_2)\mathbf{i} + (b_1 - b_3)\mathbf{j} + (b_2 - b_1)\mathbf{k})/2.$$

As noted above, at least one  $b_i$  is even, and at least one  $b_j$  is odd. Thus, at least one of  $b_3 - b_2$ ,  $b_1 - b_3$ , or  $b_2 - b_1$  is odd. Therefore,  $(f\mathbf{h})(\beta) \notin R$  and  $S$  is not a ringset.

**Case 2:**  $S \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$

This is similar to part (1). This time, each  $\delta \in \Delta(S)$  has the form  $\delta = \frac{d_1}{2}\mathbf{i} + \frac{d_2}{2}\mathbf{j} + \frac{d_3}{2}\mathbf{k}$  with  $d_1, d_2, d_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The norm of  $\delta$  is  $N(\delta) = \frac{1}{4}(d_1^2 + d_2^2 + d_3^2)$ . Assuming that  $4 \mid \Gamma(S)$ , we must have  $d_1^2 + d_2^2 + d_3^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{16}$ , and hence 4 divides each  $d_i$ . Consequently, the polynomial  $(x - \alpha)/2 \in \text{Int}(S, R)$  for each  $\alpha \in S$ .

Fix  $\beta \in S$ . Since  $S \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ , we have  $\beta = \frac{1}{2}(a + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k})$ , where  $a, b_1, b_2$ , and  $b_3$  are odd integers. Let  $f(x) = (x - \beta)/2 \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ . Then,

$$(f\mathbf{i})(\beta) = (\mathbf{i}\beta - \beta\mathbf{i})/2 = (-2(\frac{b_3}{2})\mathbf{j} + 2(\frac{b_2}{2})\mathbf{k})/2 = (-b_3\mathbf{j} + b_2\mathbf{k})/2 \notin R.$$

Thus,  $f\mathbf{i} \notin \text{Int}(S, R)$ , and  $S$  is not a ringset.  $\square$

To this point, we have focused on powers of 2 that could divide  $\Gamma(S)$ . This is because whenever an odd prime  $p$  divides  $\Gamma(S)$ ,  $S$  will not be a ringset (see Proposition 3.12 below). It also remains to consider the possibility that  $R = \mathbf{L}$  and  $8 \mid \Gamma(S)$ . This case requires a more detailed analysis, and is done in Section 4.

**LEMMA 3.10.** *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be reduced. Assume that  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  contains a polynomial of the form  $f(x) = \gamma(x - \beta)/p$ , where  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$ , and  $p$  satisfy the following conditions:*

- (i)  $p$  is an odd prime.
- (ii)  $\gamma \in R$  but  $\gamma/p \notin R$ .
- (iii)  $\beta \in S$  satisfies the conclusion of Corollary 2.7 with respect to  $p$ .

*Then,  $S$  is not a ringset.*

**PROOF.** Suppose by way of contradiction that  $S$  is a ringset. Let  $\beta = b_0 + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k}$ , where each  $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  if  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ , and each  $b_i \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$  if  $S \subseteq \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ . By assumption, there is some  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  such that either  $p \nmid b_i$  (if  $\beta \in \mathbf{L}$ ) or  $p \nmid 2b_i$  (if  $\beta \in \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ ).

Since  $S$  is a ringset,  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  contains  $f\mathbf{i}$ ,  $f\mathbf{j}$ , and  $f\mathbf{k}$ . Consider  $(f\mathbf{i})(\beta)$ . In  $\mathbb{D}[x]$ , we have  $(f\mathbf{i})(x) = (\gamma\mathbf{i}x - \gamma\beta\mathbf{i})/p$ , and so

$$(f\mathbf{i})(\beta) = (\gamma\mathbf{i}\beta - \gamma\beta\mathbf{i})/p = (\gamma/p)(\mathbf{i}\beta - \beta\mathbf{i}) = (\gamma/p)(-2b_3\mathbf{j} + 2b_2\mathbf{k}) \in R.$$

Note that  $-2b_3\mathbf{j} + 2b_2\mathbf{k} \in R$ . Multiplying  $(f\mathbf{i})(\beta)$  on the right by  $\overline{-2b_3\mathbf{j} + 2b_2\mathbf{k}}$  produces  $(\gamma/p)(4b_2^2 + 4b_3^2) \in R$ . Performing similar steps with  $(f\mathbf{j})(\beta)$  and  $(f\mathbf{k})(\beta)$  shows that  $(\gamma/p)(4b_1^2 + 4b_3^2) \in R$  and  $(\gamma/p)(4b_1^2 + 4b_2^2) \in R$ . Then,  $R$  also contains

$$(\gamma/p)(8b_1^2) = (\gamma/p)(4b_1^2 + 4b_2^2) + (\gamma/p)(4b_1^2 + 4b_3^2) - (\gamma/p)(4b_2^2 + 4b_3^2).$$

Likewise,  $(\gamma/p)(8b_2^2), (\gamma/p)(8b_3^2) \in R$ .

By assumption,  $\gamma/p \notin R$ , so  $p$  must divide  $8b_i^2$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . Since  $p$  is odd, this means that for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ ,  $p$  divides  $b_i$  (if  $\beta \in \mathbf{L}$ ), or  $2b_i$  (if  $\beta \in \mathbf{H} \setminus \mathbf{L}$ ). This contradicts Corollary 2.7. Therefore,  $S$  cannot be a ringset.  $\square$

From here, we will prove that whenever an odd prime  $p$  divides  $\Gamma(S)$ ,  $\text{Int}(S, R)$  contains a polynomial of the form  $\gamma(x - \beta)/p$  as in Lemma 3.10. To do this, we will use the well-known fact (see e.g. [16, Chap. 11]) that  $R/pR \cong M_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ , the ring of  $2 \times 2$  matrices over the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_p$ .

LEMMA 3.11. *Let  $p$  be an odd prime. Let  $A, B \in M_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  be nonzero and such that  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $B - A$  are all nilpotent. Then,  $A$  and  $B$  are nonzero scalar multiples of one another.*

PROOF. Since  $A$  and  $B$  are nonzero and nilpotent, they are each similar to  $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . So, we may assume without loss of generality that  $A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ . Since  $B$  is nilpotent, both its trace and determinant are 0. So,  $B = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & -a \end{bmatrix}$  for some  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{F}_p$  such that  $-a^2 - bc = 0$ . We have  $0 = \det(B - A) = -a^2 - bc + c$ , so  $c = 0$ . This forces  $a = 0$ . Hence,  $B = bA$ , and  $b \neq 0$  because  $B$  is not the zero matrix.  $\square$

PROPOSITION 3.12. *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be reduced. If there is an odd prime  $p$  such that  $p$  divides  $\Gamma(S)$ , then  $S$  is not a ringset.*

PROOF. If  $S$  is a singleton set, then the result is true by Lemma 1.4. So, assume that  $|S| \geq 2$  and that the odd prime  $p$  divides  $\Gamma(S)$ . Let  $\beta \in S$  satisfy the conclusion of Corollary 2.7 for  $p$ .

The ring isomorphism  $R/pR \cong M_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  respects minimal polynomials over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ . Since  $S$  is reduced, each element of  $\Delta(S)$  has real part 0 and norm divisible by  $p$ . Hence, the residue of each element of  $\Delta(S)$  is nilpotent modulo  $p$ . Let

$$\Delta_\beta = \{\alpha - \beta \mid \alpha \in S, \alpha \neq \beta\} \subseteq \Delta(S).$$

Given  $\alpha_1 - \beta, \alpha_2 - \beta \in \Delta_\beta$ , we have  $(\alpha_1 - \beta) - (\alpha_2 - \beta) = \alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \in \Delta(S)$ . So, all elements in  $\Delta_\beta \pmod{p}$  are nilpotent, and have a nilpotent difference. By Lemma 3.11, all the nonzero elements of  $\Delta_\beta \pmod{p}$  are  $\mathbb{F}_p$ -scalar multiples of one another. If  $\Delta_\beta \equiv \{0\} \pmod{p}$ , then let  $\gamma = 1$ . If not, then there exists  $\gamma \in \Delta_\beta$  such that  $\gamma \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and  $\gamma(\alpha - \beta) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for all  $\alpha \in S$ . In either case, the polynomial  $\gamma(x - \beta)/p$  is in  $\text{Int}(S, R) \setminus R[x]$ . By Lemma 3.10, we conclude that  $S$  is not a ringset.  $\square$

We have now proved most cases of the classification theorem for reduced sets that are ringsets.

THEOREM 3.13. *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be reduced.*

- (1) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . If  $S$  is a ringset, then  $\Gamma(S) = 2, 4, \text{ or } 8$ . If  $\Gamma(S) = 2$  or  $4$ , then  $S$  is a ringset.*
- (2) *Assume  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . Then,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $\Gamma(S) = 1$  or  $2$ .*

PROOF. Apply Theorem 3.4 and Propositions 3.9 and 3.12. Note that when  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$ , each element of  $\Delta(S)$  has even norm (see Remark 2.9), so  $\Gamma(S) \neq 1$  in this case.  $\square$



#### 4. Reduced Sets $S$ with $\Gamma(S) = 8$

Throughout this section,  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . Here, we deal with the exceptional case in which a reduced set  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  has  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ . In this situation,  $S$  may or may not be a ringset.

EXAMPLE 4.1. Recall that  $R = \mathbf{L}$ , so that  $R^\times = \{\pm 1, \pm \mathbf{i}, \pm \mathbf{j}, \pm \mathbf{k}\}$ .

(1) Let  $\alpha = \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}$  and let

$$S = \{u\alpha u^{-1} \mid u \in R^\times\} = \{\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}\}.$$

Then,  $S$  is reduced,  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ , and  $S$  is a ringset because it is a full conjugacy class in  $R$  (Lemma 1.4).

(2) Let  $\alpha_1 = 2\mathbf{i} + 3\mathbf{j} + 4\mathbf{k}$ ,  $\alpha_2 = -2\mathbf{i} + 3\mathbf{j} + 4\mathbf{k}$ , and  $\beta = -5\mathbf{j} - 2\mathbf{k}$ . Take  $T = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta\}$ . Then,  $T$  is reduced and  $\Gamma(T) = 8$ . Modulo 4, we have

$$\alpha_1 - \beta \equiv 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k} \equiv \alpha_2 - \beta \pmod{4}.$$

Since  $(1 + \mathbf{j})(2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}) \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , this shows that  $f(x) = (1 + \mathbf{j})(x - \beta)/4 \in \text{Int}(T, R)$ . However,  $(f\mathbf{i})(\beta) = (-4 - 10\mathbf{i} + 4\mathbf{j} - 10\mathbf{k})/4 \notin R$ . Thus,  $T$  is not a ringset.

The key difference between  $S$  and  $T$  in Example 4.1 appears when we consider  $\Delta(S)$  and  $\Delta(T)$  modulo 4. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(S) &\equiv \{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\} \pmod{4}, \text{ and} \\ \Delta(T) &\equiv \{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}\} \pmod{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Essentially, the fact that  $\Delta(T)$  touches only one nonzero residue class modulo 4 makes it possible to construct a polynomial like  $f \in \text{Int}(T, R)$  above, and yet have one of  $f\mathbf{i}$ ,  $f\mathbf{j}$ , or  $f\mathbf{k}$  fail to be integer-valued on  $T$ . In contrast, when  $\Delta(S)$  touches more than one nonzero residue class modulo 4, this sort of obstruction does not appear, and we can prove that  $S$  is a ringset. The remainder of this section builds up the theory necessary to prove these statements.

LEMMA 4.2. *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  be reduced. Assume that  $\Delta(S) \pmod{4}$  is contained in one of  $\{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}\}$ ,  $\{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ , or  $\{0, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ . Then,  $S$  is not a ringset.*

PROOF. Assume without loss of generality that  $\Delta(S) \pmod{4} \subseteq \{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}\}$ . Then,  $(1 + \mathbf{k})(\alpha - \beta) \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \in S$ . So, the polynomial  $(1 + \mathbf{k})(x - \alpha)/4 \in \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$  for all  $\alpha \in S$ . Since  $S$  is reduced, by Corollary 2.7 there exists  $\beta = a + b_1\mathbf{i} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that at least one of  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ , or  $b_3$  is odd. Let  $f(x) = (1 + \mathbf{k})(x - \beta)/4 \in \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$ . Evaluating  $(f\mathbf{i})(\beta)$  and  $(f\mathbf{j})(\beta)$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (f\mathbf{i})(\beta) &= (1 + \mathbf{k})(\mathbf{i}\beta - \beta\mathbf{i})/2 = (-2b_2 + 2b_3\mathbf{i} - 2b_3\mathbf{j} + 2b_2\mathbf{k})/4, \text{ and} \\ (f\mathbf{j})(\beta) &= (1 + \mathbf{k})(\mathbf{j}\beta - \beta\mathbf{j})/2 = (2b_1 + 2b_3\mathbf{i} + 2b_3\mathbf{j} - 2b_1\mathbf{k})/4. \end{aligned}$$

Since at least one of  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ , or  $b_3$  must be odd, either  $f\mathbf{i}$  or  $f\mathbf{j}$  is not in  $\text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$ . Thus,  $S$  is not a ringset.

If, modulo 4,  $\Delta(S) \subseteq \{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$  (respectively,  $\{0, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ ), then we reach the same conclusion by considering  $f(x) = (1 + \mathbf{j})(x - \beta)/4$  (respectively,  $f(x) = (1 + \mathbf{i})(x - \beta)/4$ ). In all cases,  $f \in \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$ , but one of  $f\mathbf{i}$ ,  $f\mathbf{j}$ , or  $f\mathbf{k}$  will fail to be in  $\text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$ .  $\square$

Lemma 4.2 will be our main tool for showing that some sets  $S$  with  $\Gamma(S) = 8$  are not ringsets. Our next step is to examine the imaginary coefficients of the elements of such a set  $S$ .

LEMMA 4.3. *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  be reduced and such that  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ . Let  $\alpha = a + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k}$  and  $\beta = a + b_1\mathbf{j} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k}$  be elements of  $S$ .*

- (1) *For all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ ,  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  have the same parity.*
- (2) *For at least one  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , both  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are odd.*
- (3) *Either  $a_i - b_i \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ , or  $a_i - b_i \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  for exactly one  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .*

PROOF. Since  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ , we have

$$(4.4) \quad N(\alpha - \beta) \equiv (a_1 - b_1)^2 + (a_2 - b_2)^2 + (a_3 - b_3)^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{8}.$$

First, (4.4) implies that  $a_i - b_i$  is even for each  $i$ . Consequently, some  $a_i$  must be odd; if not, then  $b_i$  is even for every  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  and for every  $\beta \in S$ , which violates Corollary 2.7. This proves (1) and (2).

Next, if  $a_i - b_i \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  for exactly zero or two values of  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , then  $N(\alpha - \beta) \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$ . This contradicts (4.4), so (3) holds.  $\square$

LEMMA 4.5. *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  be reduced and such that  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ . If there exists  $\beta = a + b_1\mathbf{j} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that exactly one of  $b_1$ ,  $b_2$ , or  $b_3$  is even, then  $S$  is not a ringset.*

PROOF. Assume that such a  $\beta \in S$  exists. Without loss of generality, assume that  $b_1$  is even while  $b_2$  and  $b_3$  are odd. Let  $\alpha = a + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \in S$ . Note that  $a_1$  must be even and each of  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  must be odd, by Lemma 4.3(1).

We claim that  $a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{4}$ . To see this, consider the norms of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  mod 8. Since  $\alpha, \beta \in S$ , we have  $N(\alpha) = N(\beta)$ . Moreover, each of  $a_2, a_3, b_2$ , and  $b_3$  is odd, so  $a_2^2 + a_3^2 \equiv 2 \equiv b_2^2 + b_3^2 \pmod{8}$ . It follows that  $a_1^2 \equiv b_1^2 \pmod{8}$ . Because both  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are even, they must be equivalent modulo 4. Thus,

$$\alpha - \beta \equiv (a_1 - b_1)\mathbf{i} + (a_2 - b_2)\mathbf{j} + (a_3 - b_3)\mathbf{k} \equiv (a_2 - b_2)\mathbf{j} + (a_3 - b_3)\mathbf{k} \pmod{4}.$$

By Lemma 4.3(3), we see that  $\alpha - \beta \pmod{4} \in \{0, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ . This holds for all  $\alpha \in S$ . If  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in S$ , then  $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 = (\alpha_1 - \beta) + (\alpha_2 - \beta)$ . Thus,  $\Delta(S) \pmod{4}$  is contained in  $\{0, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ , and hence  $S$  is not a ringset by Lemma 4.2.

If  $b_2$  (respectively,  $b_3$ ) is even, then  $\Delta(S) \pmod{4}$  is contained in  $\{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$  (respectively,  $\{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}\}$ ). So, we reach the same conclusion in those cases.  $\square$

LEMMA 4.6. *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  be reduced and such that  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ . If there exists  $\beta = a + b_1\mathbf{j} + b_2\mathbf{j} + b_3\mathbf{k} \in S$  such that exactly two of  $b_1, b_2, \text{ or } b_3$  are even, then  $S$  is not a ringset.*

PROOF. This is similar to the proof of the previous lemma. Assume that such a  $\beta \in S$  exists. Without loss of generality, assume that  $b_3$  is odd, while  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  are even. Let  $\alpha = a + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \in S$ . By Lemma 4.3(3), the residue of  $\alpha - \beta$  modulo 4 must lie in  $\{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ . We will show that  $\alpha - \beta \pmod{4} \in \{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}\}$ .

Suppose that  $\alpha - \beta \equiv 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k} \pmod{4}$ . So,  $a_2 \equiv b_2 \pmod{4}$ , and hence  $a_2^2 \equiv b_2^2 \pmod{8}$ . We have  $a_3^2 \equiv b_3^2 \pmod{8}$  because both  $a_3$  and  $b_3$  are odd. Since  $N(\alpha) = N(\beta)$ , these equivalences force  $a_1^2 \equiv b_1^2 \pmod{8}$ . However, this is impossible. Both  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  are even, and  $a_1 - b_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ , so  $a_1^2 \not\equiv b_1^2 \pmod{8}$ . We will reach a similar contradiction if  $\alpha - \beta \equiv 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k} \pmod{4}$  by examining  $a_2$  and  $b_2$ .

Our work so far shows that  $\alpha - \beta \pmod{4} \in \{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}\}$ . As in Lemma 4.5, this implies that  $\Delta(S) \pmod{4} \subseteq \{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}\}$ . Hence,  $S$  is not a ringset by Lemma 4.2. We obtain the same result if  $b_1$  (respectively,  $b_2$ ) is odd, because  $\Delta(S) \pmod{4} \subseteq \{0, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$  (respectively,  $\{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ ).  $\square$

From Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, we see that if  $S$  is reduced,  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ , and  $S$  is a ringset, then it is necessary that every imaginary coefficient of every element of  $S$  is odd. Unfortunately, this condition is not sufficient.

EXAMPLE 4.7. Let  $\alpha = \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k}$ ,  $\beta = \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k}$ , and  $S = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ . Then,  $S$  is reduced,  $\Gamma(S) = 8$  and  $\Delta(S) = \{0, \pm(2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k})\}$ . By Lemma 4.2,  $S$  is not a ringset with respect to  $\mathbf{L}$ . We note, however, that  $S$  is a ringset with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ . In this larger ring,  $S$  is not reduced, because  $S + 1 \subseteq 2\mathbf{H}$ . Taking  $T = \{(1 + \mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j} + \mathbf{k})/2, (1 + \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} - \mathbf{k})/2\}$ , we have  $S = -1 + 2T$ . In  $\mathbf{H}$ ,  $T$  is reduced and  $\Gamma(T) = 2$ . By Theorem 3.13 and Lemma 2.3, both  $T$  and  $S$  are ringsets with respect to  $\mathbf{H}$ .

THEOREM 4.8. *Let  $S \subseteq \mathbf{L}$  be reduced and such that  $\Gamma(S) = 8$ . Then,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if there exist  $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \Delta(S)$  such that  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  are congruent modulo 4 to distinct residues in  $\{2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ .*

PROOF. Note that by Lemma 4.3,  $\Delta(S) \pmod{4}$  is contained in  $\{0, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}, 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}, 2\mathbf{j} + 2\mathbf{k}\}$ .

( $\Rightarrow$ ) This follows from Lemma 4.2.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume that the desired  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  exist. Without loss of generality, assume that  $\delta_1 \equiv 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}$  and  $\delta_2 \equiv 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}$ . From Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, we know that every imaginary coefficient of each element of  $S$  must be odd.

Let  $r(x) = \gamma_1 x + \gamma_0 \in \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$ . We will show that  $r \in \text{Int}(S^*, \mathbf{L})$ , where

$$S^* = \{u\alpha u^{-1} \mid \alpha \in S, u \in \mathbf{L}^\times\} = \{\alpha, -\mathbf{i}\alpha\mathbf{i}, -\mathbf{j}\alpha\mathbf{j}, -\mathbf{k}\alpha\mathbf{k}\}.$$

As in the proof of Theorem 3.4(3),  $\overline{\alpha - \beta} \in 2\mathbf{L}$  for all  $\alpha, \beta \in S$ . In analogy with (3.8), there exist  $t \geq 1$ ,  $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in S$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , such that

$$4\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}(8\gamma_1) = \sum_{i=1}^t n_i \gamma_1 (\alpha_i - \beta_i) \left( \frac{\overline{\alpha_i - \beta_i}}{2} \right).$$

Thus,  $4\gamma_1 \in \mathbf{L}$  because  $\gamma_1(\alpha_i - \beta_i)$ ,  $(\overline{\alpha_i - \beta_i})/2 \in \mathbf{L}$  for each  $i$ .

Now, for all  $\alpha, \beta \in S$ ,  $\gamma_1(\alpha - \beta) = r(\alpha) - r(\beta) \in \mathbf{L}$ . Thus,  $\gamma_1\delta \in \mathbf{L}$  for all  $\delta \in \Delta(S)$ . Let  $\varepsilon_1 \in \mathbf{L}$  be such that  $\delta_1 = 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j} + 4\varepsilon_1$ . Since  $\gamma_1\delta_1, 4\gamma_1 \in \mathbf{L}$ , we see that  $\gamma_1(2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}) \in \mathbf{L}$ . Similarly,  $\gamma_1(2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}) \in \mathbf{L}$  because  $\gamma_1\delta_2 \in \mathbf{L}$ .

Let  $\alpha = a + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \in S$ . Recall that  $a_i$  is odd for all  $1 \leq i \leq 3$ . This means that  $2a_i \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$  for each  $i$ . Let  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbf{L}$  be such that

$$2a_1\mathbf{i} + 2a_2\mathbf{j} = 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j} + 4\alpha_1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2a_1\mathbf{i} + 2a_3\mathbf{k} = 2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k} + 4\alpha_2.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\alpha) - r(-\mathbf{k}\alpha\mathbf{k}) &= \gamma_1(2a_1\mathbf{i} + 2a_2\mathbf{j}) = \gamma_1(2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{j}) + 4\gamma_1\alpha_1 \in \mathbf{L}, \text{ and} \\ r(\alpha) - r(-\mathbf{j}\alpha\mathbf{j}) &= \gamma_1(2a_1\mathbf{i} + 2a_3\mathbf{k}) = \gamma_1(2\mathbf{i} + 2\mathbf{k}) + 4\gamma_1\alpha_2 \in \mathbf{L}. \end{aligned}$$

These equations imply that  $r(-\mathbf{k}\alpha\mathbf{k}), r(-\mathbf{j}\alpha\mathbf{j}) \in \mathbf{L}$ . Finally,

$$r(\alpha) - r(-\mathbf{i}\alpha\mathbf{i}) = \gamma_1(2a_2\mathbf{j} + 2a_3\mathbf{k}) = \gamma_1(2a_1\mathbf{i} + 2a_2\mathbf{j}) - \gamma_1(2a_1\mathbf{i} + 2a_3\mathbf{k}) + 4\gamma_1a_3\mathbf{k},$$

so  $r(-\mathbf{i}\alpha\mathbf{i}) \in \mathbf{L}$  as well. This shows that  $r \in \text{Int}(S^*, R)$ , so  $S$  is a ringset by Lemma 3.3.  $\square$

## 5. Closing Remarks and Infinite Subsets

We now have all the tools necessary to determine whether or not a finite subset of  $R$  is a ringset.

**ALGORITHM 5.1.** Let  $S \subseteq R$  be finite and nonempty. To decide if  $S$  is a ringset or not, follow these steps.

- (1) Partition  $S$  as  $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^t S_i$ , where each  $S_i$  is a nonempty subset of a minimal polynomial class  $\mathcal{C}_R(m_i)$ , and each  $m_i$  is distinct. By Corollary 2.2,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if each  $S_i$  is a ringset.
- (2) Any  $S_i \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$  is a ringset by Lemma 1.4 and can be ignored. If any  $S_i \subseteq R \setminus \mathbb{Z}$  is a singleton set, then  $S_i$ —and hence  $S$ —is not a ringset.

- (3) For each  $S_i \subseteq R \setminus \mathbb{Z}$  that is not a singleton set, find an associated reduced set  $T_i$ . Compute  $\Gamma(T_i)$  and apply Theorem 1.9 to determine whether  $T_i$  is a ringset. If each  $T_i$  is a ringset, then  $S$  is a ringset; and if some  $T_i$  is not a ringset, then  $S$  is not a ringset.

The strategy used in Algorithm 5.1 depends heavily on the assumption that  $S$  is finite. Observe that any minimal polynomial class  $\mathcal{C}_R(m)$  in  $R$  is a finite set. Indeed, for any  $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} \in R$ , we have  $N(\alpha) = a_0^2 + a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2$ . Since each  $a_i$  is either an integer or a half-integer, for any given norm  $n$ , there are only finitely many  $\alpha \in R$  such that  $N(\alpha) = n$ . Thus, there are only finitely many elements of  $R$  that satisfy  $m$ . Consequently, Theorem 2.1 and Corollary 2.2 can only be applied to finite sets.

As we now demonstrate, there exist sets  $S$  with a minimal polynomial partition  $S = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} S_i$  such that each  $S_i$  is not a ringset, but  $S$  is a ringset. Rather than deal directly with elements of  $S$  in  $R$ , we will focus on calculations in the finite residue rings  $R/nR$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n \geq 2$ .

**DEFINITION 5.2.** Let  $A$  be a ring and  $S \subseteq A$ . The *null ideal* of  $S$  in  $A$  is  $\mathcal{N}(S, A) := \{f \in A[x] \mid f(\alpha) = 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in S\}$ .

It is straightforward to verify that  $\mathcal{N}(S, A)$  is a left ideal of  $A[x]$ . Whether it is a two-sided ideal depends on  $S$  and  $A$ ; this is a question that recently has been pursued for rings of matrices over finite fields [11, 15, 20]. Our interest in null ideals lies in their connection to integer-valued polynomials.

**LEMMA 5.3.** Let  $f \in \mathbb{D}[x]$  and write  $f(x)$  as  $f(x) = g(x)/n$ , where  $g \in R[x]$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $S \subseteq R$ . Use a tilde to denote passage from  $R$  to  $R/nR$ . Then,  $f \in \text{Int}(S, R)$  if and only if  $\tilde{g} \in \mathcal{N}(\tilde{S}, R/nR)$ .

**PROOF.** For each  $\alpha \in S$ , we have  $f(\alpha) \in R$  if and only if  $g(\alpha) \in nR$ , if and only if  $\tilde{g}(\tilde{\alpha}) = 0$  in  $R/nR$ .  $\square$

**LEMMA 5.4.** Let  $S \subseteq R$ .

- (1) Assume  $R = \mathbf{L}$ . Then,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if for all  $f \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ , each of  $f\mathbf{i}$ ,  $f\mathbf{j}$ , and  $f\mathbf{k}$  is in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$ .
- (2) Assume  $R = \mathbf{H}$ . Then,  $S$  is a ringset if and only if for all  $f \in \text{Int}(S, R)$ , each of  $f\mathbf{i}$ ,  $f\mathbf{j}$ ,  $f\mathbf{k}$ , and  $f\mathbf{h}$  is in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$ .

**PROOF.** (1) By [19, Prop. 40],  $S$  is a ringset if and only if  $f\alpha \in \text{Int}(S, R)$  for all  $f \in \text{Int}(S, R)$  and all  $\alpha \in R$ . Given  $\alpha \in \mathbf{L}$ , we have  $\alpha = a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k}$  for some  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq 3$ . Then,

$$(5.5) \quad f\alpha = a_0f + a_1f\mathbf{i} + a_2f\mathbf{j} + a_3f\mathbf{k}.$$

Clearly, if  $S$  is a ringset, then  $f\mathbf{i}$ ,  $f\mathbf{j}$ , and  $f\mathbf{k}$  are all in  $\text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$ . Conversely, if  $f\mathbf{i}, f\mathbf{j}, f\mathbf{k} \in \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$ , then by (5.5),  $f\alpha \in \text{Int}(S, \mathbf{L})$  for any choice of integers  $a_i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq 3$ . Thus,  $S$  is a ringset.

(2) This is identical to the proof of (1) after noting that  $\alpha \in \mathbf{H}$  can be written as

$$\alpha = a_0 + a_1\mathbf{i} + a_2\mathbf{j} + a_3\mathbf{k} + e\mathbf{h},$$

where  $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq 3$ , and  $e \in \{0, 1\}$ .  $\square$

**PROPOSITION 5.6.** *Let  $S \subseteq R$  be such that for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n \geq 2$ , and all  $\alpha \in S$ , there exists  $\beta \in S$  such that*

- (i) *the minimal polynomials of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are equivalent modulo  $n$ , and*
- (ii)  *$\alpha - \beta \equiv \pm(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j}) \pmod{n}$ .*

*Then,  $S$  is a ringset.*

**PROOF.** Let  $f \in \text{Int}(S, R)$  and write  $f(x) = g(x)/n$ , where  $g \in R[x]$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . From Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4, it suffices to show that the images of  $g\mathbf{i}$ ,  $g\mathbf{j}$ ,  $g\mathbf{k}$ , and  $g\mathbf{h}$  (if  $R = \mathbf{H}$ ) are in the null ideal of the image of  $S$  in  $R/nR$ . This is clear if  $n = 1$ , so assume that  $n \geq 2$ .

Fix  $\alpha \in S$  with minimal polynomial  $m$ . Let  $q, r \in R[x]$  be such that  $g = qm + r$  and  $r = \gamma_1x + \gamma_0$  for some  $\gamma_1, \gamma_0 \in R$ . Then,  $r(\alpha) = g(\alpha)$ , and  $g(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . By assumption, there exists  $\beta \in S$  such that  $m(\beta) \equiv m(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  and  $\alpha - \beta \equiv \pm(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j}) \pmod{n}$ . Since  $\beta \in S$ ,  $g(\beta) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . Hence,  $r(\beta) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ , and so

$$(5.7) \quad 0 \equiv r(\alpha) - r(\beta) \equiv \gamma_1(\alpha - \beta) \equiv \pm\gamma_1(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j}) \pmod{n}.$$

Since  $(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j})(-\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{j}) = 2$ , this implies that  $2\gamma_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . Furthermore, if  $R = \mathbf{H}$ , then  $1 + \mathbf{i} = (\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j})(-\mathbf{j}\mathbf{h}\mathbf{j})$  and (5.7) implies that

$$(5.8) \quad \gamma_1(1 + \mathbf{i}) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}.$$

Let  $u \in \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{h}\}$ . We wish to show that  $(gu)(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . Note that  $(gu)(\alpha) = (ru)(\alpha)$ , and  $r(\alpha)u \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . So,

$$(ru)(\alpha) \equiv (ru)(\alpha) - r(\alpha)u \equiv \gamma_1(u\alpha - \alpha u) \pmod{n}.$$

If  $R = \mathbf{L}$ , then  $u \in \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}\}$  and  $u\alpha - \alpha u \in 2R$  by Lemma 3.2. From (5.7), we see that  $(ru)(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ . If  $R = \mathbf{H}$ , then  $u\alpha - \alpha u \in (1 + \mathbf{i})R$ , so  $(ru)(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  by (5.8). Thus,  $(gu)(\alpha) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$  for each choice of  $u$ .

The arguments in the previous paragraphs hold for any  $\alpha \in S$  and all  $u \in \{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{h}\}$ . Thus,  $f\mathbf{i}, f\mathbf{j}, f\mathbf{k}$  (and  $f\mathbf{h}$ , if necessary) are all in  $\text{Int}(S, R)$ , and  $S$  is a ringset by Lemma 5.4.  $\square$

We close the paper with the promised example of an infinite ringset such that each set in its minimal polynomial partition is not a ringset.

EXAMPLE 5.9. For each integer  $n \geq 2$ , let

$$T_n := \{a + \mathbf{i} \mid n^2 - n \leq a \leq n^2 - 1\} \cup \{a + \mathbf{j} \mid n^2 \leq a \leq n^2 + n - 1\}.$$

Let  $S = \bigcup_{n=2}^{\infty} T_n$ . Observe that each element of  $S$  has the form  $a + \mathbf{i}$  or  $a + \mathbf{j}$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $a \geq 2$ . Furthermore, for each such  $a$ , there is a unique element of  $S$  having real part  $a$ . Thus, each element of  $S$  lies in a distinct minimal polynomial class of  $R$ . So,  $S = \bigcup_{\alpha \in S} \{\alpha\}$  is the minimal polynomial partition of  $S$ , and each  $\{\alpha\}$  is not a ringset by Lemma 1.4.

Consider  $T_n$  reduced modulo  $n$ . For each  $n \geq 2$ ,

$$T_n \equiv \{a + \mathbf{i}, a + \mathbf{j} \mid 0 \leq a \leq n - 1\} \pmod{n}.$$

Let  $\alpha \in S$ . Given  $n$ , there exists  $0 \leq a_n \leq n - 1$  such that either

$$\alpha \equiv a_n + \mathbf{i} \pmod{n} \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha \equiv a_n + \mathbf{j} \pmod{n}.$$

In either case, there exists  $\beta \in T_n$  such that  $\alpha - \beta \equiv \pm(\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j}) \pmod{n}$  and the minimal polynomials of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are equivalent modulo  $n$ . By Proposition 5.6,  $S$  is a ringset.

## References

- [1] Paul-Jean Cahen and Jean-Luc Chabert. *Integer-valued polynomials*, volume 48 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. doi:10.1090/surv/048.
- [2] A. Cigliola, K. A. Loper, and N. J. Werner. Split quaternions and integer-valued polynomials. *Comm. Algebra*, 43(1):182–196, 2015. doi:10.1080/00927872.2014.897561.
- [3] Antonio Cigliola, Dario Spirito, and Francesca Tartarone. Multiplicative properties of integer valued polynomials over split-quaternions. *Comm. Algebra*, 49(3):1338–1351, 2021. doi:10.1080/00927872.2020.1834572.
- [4] S. Evrard, Y. Fares, and K. Johnson. Integer valued polynomials on lower triangular integer matrices. *Monatsh. Math.*, 170(2):147–160, 2013. doi:10.1007/s00605-013-0481-6.
- [5] Sophie Frisch. Integer-valued polynomials on algebras. *J. Algebra*, 373:414–425, 2013. doi:10.1016/j.jalgebra.2012.10.003.
- [6] Sophie Frisch. Polynomial functions on upper triangular matrix algebras. *Monatsh. Math.*, 184(2):201–215, 2017. doi:10.1007/s00605-016-1013-y.
- [7] K. Johnson and M. Pavlovski. Integer-valued polynomials on the Hurwitz ring of integral quaternions. *Comm. Algebra*, 40(11):4171–4176, 2012. doi:10.1080/00927872.2011.605407.
- [8] T. Y. Lam. *A first course in noncommutative rings*, volume 131 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2001. doi:10.1007/978-1-4419-8616-0.
- [9] A. R. Naghipour and J. Sedighi Hafshejani. Integer-valued polynomials on subsets of upper triangular matrix rings. *Comm. Algebra*, 52(8):3237–3247, 2024. doi:10.1080/00927872.2024.2316895.
- [10] A. R. Naghipour, M. R. Rismanchian, and J. Sedighi Hafshejani. Some results on the integer-valued polynomials over matrix rings. *Comm. Algebra*, 45(4):1675–1686, 2017. doi:10.1080/00927872.2016.1222407.

- [11] Roswitha Rissner and Nicholas J. Werner. Counting core sets in matrix rings over finite fields. page 19pp, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.04106>.
- [12] J. Sedighi Hafshejani, A. R. Naghipour, and M. R. Rismanchian. Integer-valued polynomials over block matrix algebras. *J. Algebra Appl.*, 19(3):2050053, 17, 2020. doi:10.1142/S021949882050053X.
- [13] J. Sedighi Hafshejani, A. R. Naghipour, and A. Sakzad. Integer-valued polynomials over subsets of matrix rings. *Comm. Algebra*, 47(3):1077–1090, 2019. doi:10.1080/00927872.2018.1499926.
- [14] Javad Sedighi Hafshejani and Ali Reza Naghipour. Integer-valued polynomials over matrix rings of number fields. *Bull. Iranian Math. Soc.*, 47(6):2005–2013, 2021. doi:10.1007/s41980-020-00484-5.
- [15] Eric Swartz and Nicholas J. Werner. Null ideals of sets of  $3 \times 3$  similar matrices with irreducible characteristic polynomial. *Linear Multilinear Algebra*, 72(15):2516–2538, 2024. doi:10.1080/03081087.2023.2271639.
- [16] John Voight. *Quaternion algebras*, volume 288 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-56694-4.
- [17] Nicholas J. Werner. Integer-valued polynomials over quaternion rings. *J. Algebra*, 324(7):1754–1769, 2010. doi:10.1016/j.jalgebra.2010.06.024.
- [18] Nicholas J. Werner. Integer-valued polynomials over matrix rings. *Comm. Algebra*, 40(12):4717–4726, 2012. doi:10.1080/00927872.2011.606859.
- [19] Nicholas J. Werner. Integer-valued polynomials on algebras: a survey of recent results and open questions. In *Rings, polynomials, and modules*, pages 353–375. Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [20] Nicholas J. Werner. Null ideals of subsets of matrix rings over fields. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 642:50–72, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.laa.2022.02.007.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COMPUTER AND INFORMATION SCIENCE, SUNY AT OLD WESTBURY, OLD WESTBURY, NY 11568, USA

*Email address:* wernern@oldwestbury.edu