

Assume R is a field. Let's try to find an inverse for $(a, b) \neq (0, 0)$

$$(a, b)(x, y) = (ax - by, ay + bx) = (1, 0)$$

$$\text{We need: } ax - by = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad a \cdot ax - a \cdot b \cdot y = a$$

$$bx + ay = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad b \cdot bx + b \cdot a \cdot y = 0$$

$$\text{add'em } (aa + bb)x = a$$

$$\text{Similarly } \dots \dots \dots (b \cdot b + a \cdot a)y = -b$$

Therefore: If $a \cdot a + b \cdot b = 0$, but $(a, b) \neq 0$, we cannot have an inverse (since $0 \cdot \text{anything} = 0$)

If $(a \cdot a + b \cdot b) \neq 0$, the only candidate for an inverse is

$((aa + bb)^{-1}a, -(aa + bb)^{-1}b)$. It is indeed an inverse, as can be checked by plugging it back in.

~~The~~ Conclusion: If $a \cdot a + b \cdot b = 0$ can ^(in the field R) happen only for $a = b = 0$, then $R[i]$ is a field.

Therefore: $\mathbb{R}[i]$, $\mathbb{Q}[i]$ are fields, but $\mathbb{Z}_2[i]$ is not
 $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{E, 0\}$

Note: One can simplify the condition

$$"aa + bb = 0 \text{ only if } a = b = 0" : (1)$$

~~Rephrase it: "aa + bb = 0 and b~~

$$\text{to } "x \cdot x + 1 \neq 0 \text{ for all } x" \quad (2)$$

Why? Suppose (1) holds. Then (2) holds, by choosing ~~x=a~~ $a=x, b=1$

Suppose ~~(2) holds, then~~ (1) fails. Then there exists a, b with $a^2 + b^2 = 0$, but $b \neq 0$ (or $a \neq 0$, which is analogous)