Material Interpretation and Constructive Analysis of Maximal Ideals in $\mathbb{Z}[X]$

Franziskus Wiesnet

TU Wien
This research was funded in whole or in part by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF)
10.55776/ESP576.

December 18, 2024

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

Material interpretation – general concept

Given a possibly classical proof of a statement of the form $A \to B$.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

Material interpretation – general concept

Given a possibly classical proof of a statement of the form $A \to B$.

Goal: A proof for a statement $\neg A \vee B$, where $\neg A$ is a constructively stronger form of the negation of A.

Material interpretation – general concept

Given a possibly classical proof of a statement of the form $A \to B$.

Goal: A proof for a statement $\neg A \vee B$, where $\neg A$ is a constructively stronger form of the negation of A.

A and B may also be slightly modified. However, the statement and the proof should remain as close as possible to their original form.

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$:

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$: Either $X \in M$, or $X \notin M$ and there is some $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $gX - 1 \in M$ as M is maximal.

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$: Either $X \in M$, or $X \notin M$ and there is some $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $gX - 1 \in M$ as M is maximal. Let d be the leading coefficient of f.

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$: Either $X \in M$, or $X \notin M$ and there is some $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $gX - 1 \in M$ as M is maximal. Let d be the leading coefficient of f. Assume there is no prime number p with $p \in M$.

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$: Either $X \in M$, or $X \notin M$ and there is some $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $gX - 1 \in M$ as M is maximal. Let d be the leading coefficient of f. Assume there is no prime number p with $p \in M$. As a maximal ideal is also a prime ideal, $M \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0\}$.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$: Either $X \in M$, or $X \notin M$ and there is some $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $gX - 1 \in M$ as M is maximal. Let d be the leading coefficient of f. Assume there is no prime number p with $p \in M$. As a maximal ideal is also a prime ideal, $M \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0\}$. Hence the canonical homomorphism $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}[X]/M$ is injective into the field $\mathbb{Z}[X]/M$ and induces a ring extension $\mathbb{Z}[d^{-1}] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]/M$.

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$: Either $X \in M$, or $X \notin M$ and there is some $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $gX - 1 \in M$ as M is maximal. Let d be the leading coefficient of f. Assume there is no prime number p with $p \in M$. As a maximal ideal is also a prime ideal, $M \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0\}$. Hence the canonical homomorphism $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}[X]/M$ is injective into the field $\mathbb{Z}[X]/M$ and induces a ring extension $\mathbb{Z}[d^{-1}] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]/M$. This is an **integral ring extension** with the integral polynomial $d^{-1}f$.

A classical proof

Theorem

Let $M \subseteq \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a maximal ideal. Then, there exists a prime number p with $p \in M$.

Proof.

There is some non-constant $f \in M$: Either $X \in M$, or $X \notin M$ and there is some $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ with $gX - 1 \in M$ as M is maximal. Let d be the leading coefficient of f. Assume there is no prime number p with $p \in M$. As a maximal ideal is also a prime ideal, $M \cap \mathbb{Z} = \{0\}$. Hence the canonical homomorphism $\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}[X]/M$ is injective into the field $\mathbb{Z}[X]/M$ and induces a ring extension $\mathbb{Z}[d^{-1}] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]/M$. This is an **integral ring extension** with the integral polynomial $d^{-1}f$. As $\mathbb{Z}[X]/M$ is a field, also $\mathbb{Z}[d^{-1}]$ must be a field, which is impossible. $\square$

A constructive proof

Definition

Let R be a ring. For a boolean valued function $M : R \to \mathbb{B}$ and a function $\nu : R \to R$, we say that (M, ν) is an EXPLICIT MAXIMAL IDEAL if M is an ideal, $1 \notin M$ and $a\nu(a) - 1 \in M$ for all $a \in R \setminus M$.

A constructive proof

Definition

Let R be a ring. For a boolean valued function $M : R \to \mathbb{B}$ and a function $\nu : R \to R$, we say that (M, ν) is an EXPLICIT MAXIMAL IDEAL if M is an ideal, $1 \notin M$ and $a\nu(a) - 1 \in M$ for all $a \in R \setminus M$.
Furthermore, we say that there is EVIDENCE THAT (M, ν) IS NOT AN EXPLICIT MAXIMAL IDEAL if one of the following cases holds:

- $0 \notin M$,
- there are $a, b \in M$ with $a + b \notin M$,
- there are $\lambda \in R$ and $a \in M$ with $\lambda a \notin M$,
- $1 \in M$, or
- there is $a \in R \setminus M$ with $a\nu(a) - 1 \notin M$.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

A constructive proof

Theorem

Let $M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$ and $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be given. Then, either there exists a prime number $p \in M$, or there is evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal in $\mathbb{Z}[X]$.

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$

Take some non-constant $f \in M$: If $X \in M$, we are done. Otherwise, $X \notin M$ and either $X\nu(X) - 1 \in M$ or there is evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$, $n := \deg(f)$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$, $n := \deg(f)$

Take some prime number $q \nmid d$. Check if $q \in M$ or $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \notin M$. If yes, there is evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$, $n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$, $n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$

For each $i \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$ we get some $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $h_i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ and $(a_{ij})_{j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with

$$d^{k_i} \nu(q) x^i + h_i f = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_{ij} x^j. \quad (!)$$

Let A be the matrix $(d^{k_i} \nu(q) \delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$, then

$$A \begin{pmatrix} x^0 \\ \vdots \\ x^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -h_0 f \\ \vdots \\ -h_{n-1} f \end{pmatrix}$$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$

Let $\hat{A}$ be the adjugate matrix of A with $\hat{A}A = \det(A)E$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} \det(A)x^0 \\ \vdots \\ \det(A)x^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \hat{A} \begin{pmatrix} -h_0 f \\ \vdots \\ -h_{n-1} f \end{pmatrix}.$$

in particular $\det(A) = -\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \hat{A}_{0j} h_j f$ by the first line

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \ldots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \ldots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $\det(A) = -\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \hat{A}_{0j} h_j f$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i} \nu(q) \delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \ldots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \ldots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $\det(A) = -\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \hat{A}_{0j} h_j f$

Looking at the definition of A, we have
$\det(A) = d^K \nu(q)^n + b_{n-1}\nu(q)^{n-1} + \cdots + b_1 \nu(q) + b_0$ for some $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $K := \sum k_i$.

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, K := \sum k_i$,
$d^K \nu(q)^n + b_{n-1}\nu(q)^{n-1} + \dots + b_1\nu(q) + b_0 = -\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \hat{A}_{0j} h_j f$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, K := \sum k_i$,
$d^K \nu(q)^n + b_{n-1}\nu(q)^{n-1} + \dots + b_1\nu(q) + b_0 = -\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \hat{A}_{0j} h_j f$

Multiplying both sides with q^n leads to

$$d^K (q\nu(q))^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{j+1} (q\nu(q))^{n-j-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f$$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, K := \sum k_i$,
$d^K (q\nu(q))^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{j+1} (q\nu(q))^{n-j-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \ldots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \ldots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, K := \sum k_i$,
$d^K (q\nu(q))^n + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{j+1} (q\nu(q))^{n-j-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f$

For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ one can easily compute some polynomial g_i with $(m+1)^i = 1 + m g_i$. This leads to
$d^K + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f - (d^K g_n + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} g_j) m$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $K := \sum k_i$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \ldots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \ldots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,
$d^K + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f + (-d^K g_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} g_j) m$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$,$K := \sum k_i$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,
$d^K + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f + (-d^K g_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} g_j) m$

$D := d^K + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $d^K + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} \neq 0$ as otherwise $q \mid d$.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$,$K := \sum k_i$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,
$D = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j)f + (-d^K g_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} g_j)m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$,$K := \sum k_i$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \ldots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \ldots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,
$D = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j)f + (-d^K g_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} g_j)m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$

As $m, f \in M$ either $D \in M$ or there is evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$,$K := \sum k_i$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\dots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \dots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \dots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,
$D = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f + (-d^K g_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} g_j) m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \cap M$

A constructive proof

Goal:
Prime number $p \in M$ or evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal.
Given:
$M : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{B}$, $\nu : \mathbb{Z}[X] \to \mathbb{Z}[X]$, $f \in M$ non-constant, $d := \mathrm{LC}(f)$,
$n := \deg(f)$, $q \nmid d$ prime, $q \notin M$, $m := q\nu(q) - 1 \in M$,
$(k_i)_{i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{N}^n$,$K := \sum k_i$, $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$,
$A = (d^{k_i}\nu(q)\delta_{ij} - a_{ij})_{i,j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}}$,
$A(x^0, \ldots, x^{n-1})^T = (-h_0 f, \ldots, -h_{n-1} f)^T$, $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,
$D = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(-q^n \hat{A}_{0j} h_j) f + (-d^K g_n - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_j q^{n-j} g_j) m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \cap M$

Let $D = \prod_{i=1}^{m} p_i$ be the prime factorization of D, then there is some p_i with $p_i \in M$ or there is evidence that (M, ν) is not an explicit maximal ideal (!).

Notes

- At first glance, the constructive proof may seem more complex; however, it is actually very elementary.

Notes

- At first glance, the constructive proof may seem more complex; however, it is actually very elementary.
- A few “non-constructive” principles remain. In particular, membership to M must be decidable.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

Notes

- At first glance, the constructive proof may seem more complex; however, it is actually very elementary.
- A few "non-constructive" principles remain. In particular, membership to M must be decidable.
- Instead of applying Modus Ponens, there is often a case distinction if a certain element is in M or not.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

Notes

- At first glance, the constructive proof may seem more complex; however, it is actually very elementary.
- A few "non-constructive" principles remain. In particular, membership to M must be decidable.
- Instead of applying Modus Ponens, there is often a case distinction if a certain element is in M or not.
- An implementation already exists as a Python program using **SymPy**.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

An Agda implementation

Work in progress, supported by **Felix Cherubini**

- The implementation is based on the Agda Cubical library, as it provides polynomials and matrices.
- As part of the project, Cubical has already been extended by the determinant and the adjugate matrix.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

Suitability of Agda for the material interpretation

Work in progress

- + Proof interpretations are fundamentally straightforward to implement in Agda
- – Agda is more intended for implementing everything from scratch.
- – Agda has few tactics
- – The Agda library is small compared to proof assistants such as Lean or Coq.

$\Rightarrow$ At present, Agda is somewhat unsuitable for material interpretation, as several additions to the library are required.

FWF Österreichischer Wissenschaftsfonds

Suitability of Lean for the material interpretation

In the early stages

- + The Lean library is very advanced.
- + Lean has many tactics.
- – Implementing proof interpretations in Lean may present some challenges.
- – The Lean library supports only classical logic.

Application

Theorem (Hilbert's 17th Problem)

Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ be given with $f(\vec{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. Then f is a sum of squares in $\mathbb{Q}(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$.

Application

Theorem (Hilbert's 17th Problem)

Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be given with $f(\vec{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. Then f is a sum of squares in $\mathbb{Q}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$.

The problem was classically solved in 1927 by Emil Artin[1] using several lemmas, including Sturm's theorem and the **Artin-Schreier Theorem** [2]:

Application

Theorem (Hilbert's 17th Problem)

Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ be given with $f(\vec{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. Then f is a sum of squares in $\mathbb{Q}(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$.

The problem was classically solved in 1927 by Emil Artin[1] using several lemmas, including Sturm's theorem and the **Artin-Schreier Theorem** [2]:

Theorem

Let K be an field, then

$$\bigcap \{U \subseteq K \mid U \text{ is an order of } K\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} x_i^2 \;\middle|\; n \in \mathbb{N},\ x_0, \ldots, x_n \in K \right\}.$$

Application

Theorem (Hilbert's 17th Problem)

Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ be given with $f(\vec{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$. Then f is a sum of squares in $\mathbb{Q}(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$.

The problem was classically solved in 1927 by Emil Artin[1] using several lemmas, including Sturm's theorem and the **Artin-Schreier Theorem** [2]:

Theorem

Let K be an field, then

$$\bigcap \{U \subseteq K \mid U \text{ is an order of } K\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n} x_i^2 \;\middle|\; n \in \mathbb{N},\ x_0, \ldots, x_n \in K \right\}.$$

Hilbert's 17th Problem was constructively considered by Charles N. Delzell in 1984 [3].

Application

Theorem (Zariski's Lemma)

Let K be a field and R an K-algebra, which is also a field. Suppose that $R = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ for some $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R$. Then R is algebraic over K, i.e. there are non-zero $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in K[X]$ such that $f_i(x_i) = 0$ for all i.

Application

Theorem (Zariski's Lemma)

Let K be a field and R an K-algebra, which is also a field. Suppose that $R = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ for some $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R$. Then R is algebraic over K, i.e. there are non-zero $f_1, \ldots, f_n \in K[X]$ such that $f_i(x_i) = 0$ for all i.

This theorem could also be used to prove the statement in the case study above. In 1947 Zariski used it to prove Hilbert's Nullstellensatz [5].

Theorem (Hilbert's Nullstellensatz)

Let K be an algebraically closed field, $\vec{X} := X_1, \ldots, X_n$ and $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in K[\vec{X}]$ be given. Then, either there are $g_1, \ldots, g_m \in K[\vec{X}]$ with $g_1 f_1 + \cdots + g_m f_m = 1$ or there are $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in K$ with $f_i(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$ for all i.

An algorithmic version of Zariski's Lemma was already developed, which can be used to develop a material interpretation of Zariski's Lemma [4]. This can lead to a material interpretation of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz.

Emil Artin.

Über die Zerlegung definiter Funktionen in Quadrate.

Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg, 5(1):100–115, December 1927.

Emil Artin and Otto Schreier.

Algebraische Konstruktion reeller Körper.

Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg, 5(1):85–99, December 1927.

C. N. Delzell.

A continuous, constructive solution to Hilbert's 17th problem.

Inventiones Mathematicae, 76(3):365–384, October 1984.

Franziskus Wiesnet.

An Algorithmic Version of Zariski's Lemma, pages 469–482.

Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer International Publishing, 2021.

Oscar Zariski.

A new proof of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz.

Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society, 53:362–368, 1947.