

# Constrained Zeros and the Ritt Nullstellensatz

Phyllis Joan Cassidy City College of CUNY

The Kolchin Seminar in Differential Algebra  
The Graduate Center of CUNY  
November 9, 2007

$\mathcal{G} := \Delta$ -field,  $\mathcal{H} :=$  extension field of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Neither field is assumed to be contained in a universal  $\Delta$ -field.

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}} := \mathcal{G} \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}.$$

$\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$  is a prime  $\Delta$ -ideal.

$$\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in \mathcal{H}^n.$$

$$\sigma_{\eta} : \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G} \{\eta\}, \quad y_i \longmapsto \eta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

$\eta$  is generic for  $\mathfrak{p}$  over  $\mathcal{G} \iff \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{G}}(\eta) = \mathfrak{p} \iff \sigma_{\eta}$  is a  $\Delta$ - $\mathcal{F}$ -isomorphism.

Suppose  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{U}$ , universal over  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then,  $\eta$  &  $\zeta \in \mathcal{U}^n$  are generic for the same prime  $\Delta$ -ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}} \iff \overline{\{\eta\}} = \overline{\{\zeta\}} \iff \mathcal{G}\langle\eta\rangle \underset{\Delta\text{-}\mathcal{G}}{\approx} \mathcal{G}\langle\zeta\rangle$ ,  
 $\eta_i \mapsto \zeta_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ .

## Definition

$\eta \in \mathcal{H}^n$  is *constrained* over  $\mathcal{G}$  if there exists  $C \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$  such that  $C(\eta) \neq 0$ , and  $C(\zeta) = 0$  for every *non-generic* specialization  $\zeta$  of  $\eta$ .

$C$  is called a *constraint* for  $\eta$ .  $\eta$  is said to be  *$C$ -constrained* over  $\mathcal{G}$ .

$\eta$  is  $C$ -constrained  $\iff C \notin \mathfrak{p}$  &  $C \in \mathfrak{q} \forall$  prime  $\Delta$ -ideals in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$  properly containing  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

Suppose  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{U}$ , universal over  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $\eta \in \mathcal{U}^n$  be  $C$ -constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$ , with defining ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$ .  $\overline{\{\eta\}} = V(\mathfrak{p})$ .  $\zeta \in \mathcal{U}^n$  is generic for  $\mathfrak{p} \iff C(\zeta) \neq 0 \iff \overline{\{\zeta\}} = \overline{\{\eta\}} = V(\mathfrak{p})$ . The set of generic points of  $V(\mathfrak{p})$  is the open subset of  $V(\mathfrak{p})$  consisting of the non-zeros of  $C$ .  $\mathcal{G}\langle\eta\rangle$  and  $\mathcal{G}\langle\zeta\rangle$  are  $\Delta$ - $\mathcal{G}$ -isomorphic by an isomorphism sending  $\eta$  to  $\zeta$ . They are “conjugate” over  $\mathcal{G}$  – Shelah’s “indiscernibles.”

The Ritt basis theorem implies that  $\mathcal{A}_G$  is Rittian (Property 1). Therefore, every non-empty set of radical  $\Delta$ -ideals in  $\mathcal{A}_G$  has a maximal element.

### Lemma

*Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime  $\Delta$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}_G$ , and let  $C \in \mathcal{A}_G \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ .  $\exists$  a prime  $\Delta$ -ideal  $\mathfrak{q} \supseteq \mathfrak{p}$  such that  $C \notin \mathfrak{q}$ , and  $C$  is in every prime  $\Delta$ -ideal properly containing  $\mathfrak{q}$ .*

### Proof.

Let  $S$  be the set of all prime  $\Delta$ -ideals containing  $\mathfrak{p}$  and excluding  $C$ . Set  $\mathfrak{q}$  equal to the maximal element of  $S$ . □

## Corollary

*Let  $\eta$  be generic for a prime  $\Delta$ -ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$ . Then,  $\exists$  a specialization  $\zeta$  of  $\eta$  such that  $\zeta$  is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  with constraint  $C$ .*

# The Ritt Nullstellensatz.

Until further notice,  $\mathcal{U}$  is a universal extension of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

In algebraic geometry, if  $V$  is a Zariski closed set, defined over  $k$ , the points in extension fields that are algebraic over  $k$  are dense in  $V$ .

Reminder: If  $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ ,

$$V(S) = \{\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n) \in \mathcal{U}^n \mid F(\eta) = 0 \quad \forall F \in S\}.$$



# The prime decomposition theorem.

We now invoke the third property of Rittian  $\Delta$ -rings. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be any extension  $\Delta$ -field of  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $\mathcal{U}$ .

## Theorem

*Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be a proper radical  $\Delta$ -ideal of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$ . There exists a unique finite set  $\{\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r\}$  of prime  $\Delta$ -ideals of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$  containing  $\mathfrak{a}$ , none of which contains any other, such that*

$$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_r.$$

*This set is the set of minimal prime ideals containing  $\mathfrak{a}$ .*

## Proof.

See Notes, Talk II, posted on KSDA website. □

We now set  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{F}$ .

## Theorem

*The Ritt Nullstellensatz. Let  $S$  be a subset of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ , and let  $F$  be an element of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ .*

- 1 If  $F \in \sqrt{[S]}$ , then  $F(\zeta) = 0$  for all  $\zeta$  in  $V(S)$ .
- 2 If  $F(\zeta) = 0$  for all constrained points  $\zeta \in V(S)$ , then  $F \in \sqrt{[S]}$ .

## Proof.

The first statement is obvious.

To establish the second statement, suppose  $F \notin \sqrt{[S]}$ . Then, there is a prime component  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\sqrt{[S]}$  such that  $F \notin \mathfrak{p}$ . By the lemma on the existence of constrained zeros, there is a point  $\zeta \in V(\mathfrak{p})$  that is constrained with constraint  $F$ . In particular,  $F(\zeta) \neq 0$ . □

## Corollary

*Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be a radical  $\Delta$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . The set of points in  $V(\mathfrak{a})$  that are constrained over  $\mathcal{F}$  are dense in  $V(\mathfrak{a})$ .*

## Theorem

- 1 The map  $V \mapsto \mathfrak{J}(V)$  from the set of all closed subsets of  $\mathcal{U}^n$  to the set of all radical  $\Delta$ -ideals of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is bijective, with inverse the map  $\mathfrak{a} \mapsto V(\mathfrak{a})$ .
- 2  $V \subseteq W$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{J}(V) \supseteq \mathfrak{J}(W)$ .
- 3 If  $V$  and  $W$  are closed subsets of  $\mathcal{U}^n$ , then

$$\mathfrak{J}(V \cup W) = \mathfrak{J}(V) \cap \mathfrak{J}(W).$$

- 4 If  $(V_i)_{i \in I}$  is a family of closed subsets of  $\mathcal{U}^n$ ,

$$\mathfrak{J}\left(\bigcap_{i \in I} V_i\right) = \sum_{i \in I} \mathfrak{J}(V_i).$$

## Theorem

*A closed set  $V$  is irreducible if and only if  $\mathfrak{I}(V)$  is prime.*

## Proof.

Suppose  $V$  is irreducible, and  $F_1 F_2 \in \mathfrak{I}(V)$ . Then,  
 $V(F_1 F_2) = V(F_1) \cup V(F_2) \supseteq V(\mathfrak{I}(V)) = V$ . Therefore,

$$V = V \cap (V(F_1) \cup V(F_2)) = (V \cap V(F_1)) \cup (V \cap V(F_2)).$$

So,

$$V = V \cap V(F_1) \quad \text{or} \quad V = V \cap V(F_2).$$

$$V \subseteq V(F_1) \quad \text{or} \quad V \subseteq V(F_2).$$

Say  $V \subseteq V(F_1)$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{I}(V) \supseteq \mathfrak{I}(V(F_1))$ , whence  $F_1 \in \mathfrak{I}(V)$ .  
Therefore,  $\mathfrak{I}(V)$  is prime. The proof of the converse is similar. □

# Noetherian topological spaces.

$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is Rittian, but not Noetherian.

## Definition

A topological space  $X$  is Noetherian if every descending sequence of closed subsets stabilizes. Equivalently, every strictly descending sequence of closed subsets is finite.

Clearly, every subspace of a Noetherian space is Noetherian.

## Corollary

$\mathcal{U}^n$ , equipped with the Kolchin topology, is Noetherian.

## Proof.

There is a bijective inclusion reversing correspondence between the set of closed subsets of  $\mathcal{U}^n$  and the set of radical  $\Delta$ -ideals of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . □



# The component theorem.

## Theorem

*Let  $V$  be a closed subset of  $\mathcal{U}^n$ . Then, we can write  $V$  uniquely as a finite union*

$$V = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_r,$$

*where  $V_1, \dots, V_r$  are the distinct maximal irreducible subsets of  $V$ , called the components of  $V$ . If  $W$  is an irreducible closed subset of  $V$ ,  $\exists i$  with  $W \subseteq V_i$ .*

## Proof.

Let  $\mathfrak{p}_j = \mathfrak{I}(V_j)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . By the Ritt Nullstellensatz, and the prime decomposition theorem for radical differential ideals, the decomposition of  $V$  into components is clear. Suppose  $W$  is an irreducible closed subset of  $V$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{I}(W)$  is prime, and contains  $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{p}_r$ . Suppose  $\forall j$   $\mathfrak{p} \not\supseteq \mathfrak{p}_j$ . Then,  $\forall j \exists F_j \in \mathfrak{p}_j$ ,  $F_j \notin \mathfrak{p}$ . So,  $F_1 \cdots F_r \in \mathfrak{p}$ . Thus,  $\exists j$  such that  $F_j \in \mathfrak{p}$ .  $\square$

# Fields of definition of radical differential ideals.

The reference for this section is Kolchin, *Differential Algebra and Algebraic Groups (1973), Chapter IV*.

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a  $\Delta$ -field.

## Definition

Let  $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{G}}$  be a radical  $\Delta$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\Delta$ -subfield of  $\mathcal{G}$  such that there is a subset  $S$  of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$  with

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{G}} = \sqrt{[S]}.$$

$\mathcal{F}$  is called a *field of definition* of  $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{G}}$ .

## Theorem

*Let  $\mathfrak{a}_G$  be a radical  $\Delta$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}_G$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{a}_G$  has a field of definition that is finitely  $\Delta$ -generated over the prime field  $\mathbb{Q}$ .*

## Proof.

There exists a finite subset of  $\mathfrak{a}_G$  such that  $\mathfrak{a}_G = \sqrt{[S]}$ . □

## Theorem

*The mapping*

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{G}} \longmapsto \mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{G}} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$$

*from the set of radical  $\Delta$ -ideals of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$  with field of definition  $\mathcal{F}$  to the set of radical  $\Delta$ -ideals of  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$  is bijective, with inverse*

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{F}} \longmapsto \mathcal{G}\mathfrak{a}_{\mathcal{F}}.$$

*If  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{G}}$  is prime, every generic zero of  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{G}}$  rational over an extension field of  $\mathcal{G}$  is generic for  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$  over  $\mathcal{F}$ .*

The next theorem is used heavily in the proof of the theorem that states three equivalent conditions for a  $\Delta$ -field to be differentially closed.

## Theorem

*(See Kolchin, 1973.) Let  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{G}}$  be a prime  $\Delta$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$  with field  $\mathcal{F}$  of definition, let  $\mathcal{H}$  be an extension field of  $\mathcal{G}$ , and let  $\eta \in \mathcal{H}^n$  be generic for  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{G}}$ . Every specialization of  $\eta$  over  $\mathcal{F}$  lifts to a specialization of  $\eta$  over  $\mathcal{G}$ .*

## Definition

An extension field  $\mathcal{H}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  if every finite family of elements is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$ .

## Theorem

*Let  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{G} \langle \eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \rangle$  be a finitely  $\Delta$ -generated extension field of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then, it is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  if and only if  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n)$  is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$ .*

A field is algebraically closed if it has no proper algebraic extensions.

### Definition

(Kolchin) A  $\Delta$ -field is differentially closed if it has no proper constrained extensions.



## Theorem

Let  $n$  be a positive integer, and let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a universal  $\Delta$ -field that is an extension field of  $\mathcal{G}$  ( $\mathcal{U}$  need not be universal over  $\mathcal{G}$ ). The following conditions on  $\mathcal{G}$  are equivalent:

- 1  $\mathcal{G}$  is differentially closed.
- 2 For every  $n$ , every point in  $\mathcal{U}^n$  that is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  is rational over  $\mathcal{G}$ .
- 3 For every prime  $\Delta$ -ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{G}\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$  and every  $C \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$ , with  $C \notin \mathfrak{p}$ , there is a zero  $\eta$  of  $\mathfrak{p}$ , rational over  $\mathcal{G}$ , such that  $C(\eta) \neq 0$ .

## Proof.

We first show that the second and third statements are equivalent. □

$2 \implies 3$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $C$  be as in 3. There exists  $\eta$  with coordinates in some extension  $\Delta$ -field of  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $\eta$  is a  $C$ -constrained zero of  $\mathfrak{p}$ . Set  $q_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{G}}(\eta)$ . There is a  $\Delta$ -subfield  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ , with  $\mathcal{F}$  finitely  $\Delta$ -generated over  $\mathbb{Q}$  such that  $q_{\mathcal{G}}$  has field  $\mathcal{F}$  of definition, and  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$  contains  $C$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{U}$  is universal over  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $q_{\mathcal{F}} = q_{\mathcal{G}} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{U}^n$  contains a point  $\eta'$  that is generic for  $q_{\mathcal{F}}$  over  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since  $C \notin q_{\mathcal{F}}$ ,  $C(\eta') \neq 0$ . Now,  $\eta$  is also generic for  $q_{\mathcal{F}}$  over  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a field of definition for  $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{G}}(\zeta)$ ,  $\eta$  specializes over  $\mathcal{G}$  to  $\eta'$ . Since  $C(\eta') \neq 0$ , this extended specialization is generic. Thus,  $\eta' \in \mathcal{U}^n$  is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  with constraint  $C$ .  $2 \implies \eta'$  is rational over  $\mathcal{G}$ . Therefore,  $\eta$  is rational over  $\mathcal{G}$ . So,  $2 \implies 3$ .

## Proof.

3  $\implies$  2.

Let  $\eta \in \mathcal{U}^n$  be constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  with constraint  $C$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{I}_{\mathcal{G}}(\eta)$ .

Then,  $\mathfrak{p}$  is prime and  $C \notin \mathfrak{p}$ . Therefore, by 3,  $\exists \zeta \in \mathcal{G}^n$  such that

$\zeta \in V(\mathfrak{p})$  and  $C(\zeta) \neq 0$ . Since  $\eta$  is generic for  $\mathfrak{p}$  over  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\zeta$  is a specialization of  $\eta$  over  $\mathcal{G}$ . Since  $C(\zeta) \neq 0$ ,  $\zeta$  is generic for  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

Therefore, since  $\zeta \in \mathcal{G}^n$ , so is  $\eta$ . So, now, 2 and 3 are equivalent.  $\square$

Clearly,  $1 \implies 2$ .

$2 \implies 1$ .

### Proof.

If an element  $\eta \in \mathcal{U}$  is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  then, so is  $(\eta, \dots, \eta) \in \mathcal{U}^n$ . By 2,  $(\eta, \dots, \eta) \in \mathcal{G}^n$ , and, thus,  $\eta \in \mathcal{G}$ . Therefore, 2 holds when  $n$  is replaced by 1, and therefore, so does 3. Now, 3 is clearly independent of  $\mathcal{U}$ , and, therefore, so is 2. Aha! Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a constrained extension of  $\mathcal{G}$ . We know that there is a universal extension field of  $\mathcal{H}$ . So, every element of this universal extension field of  $\mathcal{H}$  that is constrained over  $\mathcal{G}$  is in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{G}$  is differentially closed. □

## Corollary

*Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a universal  $\Delta$ -field. Then,  $\mathcal{U}$  is differentially closed.*

## Proof.

Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime  $\Delta$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ , and let  $C \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{U}}$ ,  $C \notin \mathfrak{p}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a field of definition of  $\mathfrak{p}$  that is finitely  $\Delta$ -generated over the prime field. Then, there is a generic zero  $\eta$  of  $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{F}} = \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}}$  in  $\mathcal{U}^n$ . Of course,  $C(\eta) \neq 0$  (this doesn't require the Nullstellensatz). But,  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{U} \mathfrak{p}_{\mathcal{F}}$ . So,  $\eta$  is a zero of  $\mathfrak{p}$ . □