SUBSPACES OF COMPUTABLE VECTOR SPACES

RODNEY G. DOWNEY, DENIS R. HIRSCHFELDT, ASHER M. KACH, STEFFEN LEMPP, JOSEPH R. MILETI, AND ANTONIO MONTALBÁN

ABSTRACT. We show that the existence of a nontrivial proper subspace of a vector space of dimension greater than one (over an infinite field) is equivalent to WKL_0 over RCA_0, and that the existence of a finite-dimensional nontrivial proper subspace of such a vector space is equivalent to ACA_0 over RCA_0.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a continuation of [3], which is a paper by three of the authors of the present paper. In [3], the effective content of the theory of ideals in commutative rings was studied; in particular, the following computability-theoretic results were established:

Theorem 1.1. *(1) There exists a computable integral domain R that is not a field such that $\deg(I) \gg \mathbf{0}$ for all nontrivial proper ideals I of R.*

(2) There exists a computable integral domain R that is not a field such that $\deg(I) = \mathbf{0}'$ for all finitely generated nontrivial proper ideals I of R.

These results immediately gave the following proof-theoretic corollaries:

Corollary 1.2. *(1) Over RCA_0, WKL_0 is equivalent to the statement "Every (infinite) commutative ring with identity that is not a field has a nontrivial proper ideal."*

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03B30, 03C57, 03D45, 03F35.

Key words and phrases. computable vector space, reverse mathematics, subspace.

The first author's research was partially supported by The Marsden Fund of New Zealand. The second author's research was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0500590. The third author's research was partially supported by a VIGRE grant fellowship. The fourth author's research was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0140120. The fifth author's research was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0502215. The sixth author's research was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0600824.

(2) *Over* RCA_0, ACA_0 *is equivalent to the statement "Every (infinite) commutative ring with identity that is not a field has a finitely generated nontrivial proper ideal."*

In the present paper, we complement these results with related results from linear algebra. (We refer to [3] for background, motivation, and definitions.)

We start with the following

Definition 1.3. (1) *A* computable field *is a computable subset* $F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ *equipped with two computable binary operations* $+$ *and* $\cdot$ *on* F, *together with two elements* $0, 1 \in F$ *such that* $(F, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ *is a field.*

(2) *A* computable vector space *(over a computable field* F*) is a computable subset* $V \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ *equipped with two computable operations* $+ : V^2 \to V$ *and* $\cdot : F \times V \to V$, *together with an element* $0 \in V$ *such that* $(V, 0, +, \cdot)$ *is a vector space over* F.

This notion was first studied by Dekker [2], then more systematically by Metakides and Nerode [5] and many others.

As in [3] for nontrivial proper ideals in rings, one motivation in the results below is to understand the complexity of nontrivial proper subspaces of a vector space of dimension greater than one, and the proof-theoretic axioms needed to establish their existence. For example, consider the following elementary characterization of when a vector space has dimension greater than one.

Proposition 1.4. *A vector space* V *has dimension greater than one if and only if it has a nontrivial proper subspace.*

As in the case of ideals in [3], we will be able to show that this equivalence is not effective, and to pin down the exact proof-theoretic strength of the statement in two versions, for the existence of a nontrivial proper subspace and of a finite-dimensional nontrivial proper subspace:

Theorem 1.5. (1) *There exists a computable vector space* V *of dimension greater than one (over an infinite computable field) such that* $\deg(W) \gg \mathbf{0}$ *for all nontrivial proper subspaces* W *of* V.

(2) *There exists a computable vector space* V *of dimension greater than one (over an infinite computable field) such that* $\deg(W) \geq \mathbf{0}'$ *for all finite-dimensional nontrivial proper subspaces* W *of* V.

Again, after a brief analysis of the induction needed to establish Theorem 1.5, we obtain the following proof-theoretic corollaries:

Corollary 1.6. *(1) Over* RCA_0, WKL_0 *is equivalent to the statement "Every vector space of dimension greater than one (over an infinite field) has a nontrivial proper subspace."*

(2) Over RCA_0, ACA_0 *is equivalent to the statement "Every vector space of dimension greater than one (over an infinite field) has a finite-dimensional nontrivial proper subspace."*

2. The proof of Theorem 1.5

For the proof of part (1) of Theorem 1.5, we begin with a few easy lemmas:

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that V is a vector space, that $\{v, w\}$ is a linearly independent set of vectors in V, and that $u \neq 0$ is a vector in V. Then there exists at most one scalar λ such that $u \in \langle v - \lambda w\rangle$.*

Proof. Suppose that $u \in \langle v - \lambda_1 w\rangle$ and that $u \in \langle v - \lambda_2 w\rangle$. Fix μ_1, μ_2 such that $u = \mu_1(v - \lambda_1 w)$ and $u = \mu_2(v - \lambda_2 w)$. Notice that $\mu_1, \mu_2 \neq 0$ because $u \neq 0$. We now have

$$\mu_1 v - \mu_1\lambda_1 w = u = \mu_2 v - \mu_2\lambda_2 w,$$

and hence

$$(\mu_1 - \mu_2)v + (\mu_2\lambda_2 - \mu_1\lambda_1)w = 0.$$

Since $\{v, w\}$ is linearly independent, it follows that $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$ and $\mu_2\lambda_2 - \mu_1\lambda_1 = 0$, hence $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\mu_1\lambda_1 = \mu_2\lambda_2$. Since $\mu_1 = \mu_2 \neq 0$, it follows from the second equation that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. □

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose that V is a vector space with basis B, which is linearly ordered by $\prec$. Suppose that*

(1) $v \in V$.
(2) $e \in B$.
(3) λ is a scalar.
(4) $e \succ \max(\mathrm{supp}(v))$ (where $\mathrm{supp}(v) = \mathrm{supp}_B(v)$, the support of v, is the finite set of basis vectors in B needed to write v as a linear combination in this basis).

Then $B \setminus \{e\}$ is a basis for V over $\langle e - \lambda v\rangle$, and, for all $w \in V$, $\max(\mathrm{supp}_{B\setminus\{e\}}(w + \langle e - \lambda v\rangle)) \preceq \max(\mathrm{supp}_B(w))$.

Proof. Notice that $e \in \langle (B \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{e - \lambda v\}\rangle$ because $e \notin \mathrm{supp}(v)$, so $(B \setminus \{e\}) \cup \{e - \lambda v\}$ spans V. Suppose that $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n \in B \setminus \{e\}$ are distinct and $\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_n$ are scalars such that

$$\mu_1 e_1 + \mu_2 e_2 + \cdots + \mu_n e_n \in \langle e - \lambda v\rangle.$$

Fix μ such that

$$\mu_1 e_1 + \mu_2 e_2 + \cdots + \mu_n e_n = \mu(e - \lambda v)$$

and notice that we must have $\mu = 0$ (by looking at the coefficient of e), hence each $\mu_i = 0$ because B is a basis. Therefore, $B \setminus \{e\}$ is a basis for V over $\langle e - \lambda v\rangle$. By hypothesis (4), the last line of the lemma now follows easily. □

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that V is a vector space with basis B, which is linearly ordered by $\prec$. Suppose that*

(1) $v_1, v_2 \in V$.
(2) $e_1, e_2 \in B$ *with* $e_1 \neq e_2$.
(3) λ *is a scalar.*
(4) $e_1 \succ \max(\mathrm{supp}(v_1) \cup \mathrm{supp}(v_2))$.
(5) $\{v_1, e_1\}$ *is linearly independent.*
(6) $v_1 \notin \langle e_2 - \lambda v_2\rangle$.

Then $\{v_1, e_1\}$ is linearly independent over $\langle e_2 - \lambda v_2\rangle$.

Proof. Suppose that

$$\mu_1 v_1 + \mu_2 e_1 = \mu_3(e_2 - \lambda v_2).$$

We need to show that $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$.

Case 1: $e_1 \prec e_2$. In this case, we must have $\mu_3 = 0$ (by looking at the coefficient of e_2). Thus, $\mu_1 v_1 + \mu_2 e_1 = 0$, and hence $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$ since $\{v_1, e_1\}$ is linearly independent.

Case 2: $e_1 \succ e_2$. In this case, we must have $\mu_2 = 0$ (by looking at the coefficient of e_1). Thus, $\mu_1 v_1 = \mu_3(e_2 - \lambda v_2)$. Since $v_1 \notin \langle e_2 - \lambda v_2\rangle$, this implies that $\mu_1 = 0$. □

By applying the above three lemmas in the corresponding quotient, we obtain the following results.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that V is a vector space, that $X \subseteq V$, that $\{v, w\}$ is linearly independent over $\langle X\rangle$, and that $u \notin \langle X\rangle$. Then there exists at most one λ such that $u \in \langle X \cup \{v - \lambda w\}\rangle$.* □

Lemma 2.5. *Suppose that V is a vector space, that $X \subseteq V$, and that B is a basis for V over $\langle X\rangle$ that is linearly ordered by $\prec$. Suppose that*

(1) $v \in V$.
(2) $e \in B$.
(3) λ *is a scalar.*
(4) $e \succ \max(\mathrm{supp}(v))$.

Then $B \setminus \{e\}$ is a basis for V over $\langle X \cup \{e - \lambda v\}\rangle$ and, for all $w \in V$, $\max(\mathrm{supp}_{B\setminus\{e\}}(w + \langle X \cup \{e - \lambda v\}\rangle)) \preceq \max(\mathrm{supp}_B(w))$. □

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose that V is a vector space, that $X \subseteq V$, and that B is a basis for V over $\langle X \rangle$ that is linearly ordered by $\prec$. Suppose that*

(1) $v_1, v_2 \in V$.
(2) $e_1, e_2 \in B$ *with* $e_1 \neq e_2$.
(3) λ *is a scalar.*
(4) $e_1 \succ \max(\operatorname{supp}(v_1) \cup \operatorname{supp}(v_2))$.
(5) $\{v_1, e_1\}$ *is linearly independent over* $\langle X \rangle$.
(6) $v_1 \notin \langle X \cup \{e_2 - \lambda v_2\} \rangle$.

Then $\{v_1, e_1\}$ *is linearly independent over* $\langle X \cup \{e_2 - \lambda v_2\} \rangle$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Fix two disjoint c.e. sets A and B such that $\deg(S) \gg \mathbf{0}$ for any set S satisfying $A \subseteq S$ and $B \cap S = \emptyset$. Let V^∞ be the vector space over the infinite computable field F on the basis $e_0, e_1, e_2, \ldots$ (ordered by $\prec$ as listed) and list V^∞ as $v_0, v_1, v_2, \ldots$ (viewed as being coded effectively by natural numbers). We may assume that v_0 is the zero vector of V^∞. Fix a computable injective function $g\colon \mathbb{N}^3 \to \mathbb{N}$ such that $e_{g(i,j,n)} \succ \max(\operatorname{supp}(v_i) \cup \operatorname{supp}(v_j))$ for all $i, j, n \in \mathbb{N}$. We build a computable subspace U of V^∞ with the plan of taking the quotient $V = V^\infty/U$.

We have the following requirements for all $v_i, v_j \notin U$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_{i,j,n} : n \notin A \cup B \Rightarrow\ & \text{each of } \{v_i, e_{g(i,j,n)}\} \text{ and } \{v_j, e_{g(i,j,n)}\} \\
& \text{are linearly independent over } U, \\
n \in A \Rightarrow\ & e_{g(i,j,n)} - \lambda v_i \in U \text{ for some nonzero } \lambda \in F, \text{ and} \\
n \in B \Rightarrow\ & e_{g(i,j,n)} - \lambda v_j \in U \text{ for some nonzero } \lambda \in F.
\end{aligned}
$$

We now effectively build a sequence $U_2, U_3, U_4, \ldots$ of finite subsets of V^∞ such that $U_2 \subseteq U_3 \subseteq U_4 \subseteq \ldots$, and we set $U = \bigcup_{n \geq 2} U_n$. We also define a function $h\colon \mathbb{N}^4 \to \{0,1\}$ for which $h(i,j,n,s) = 1$ if and only if we have acted for requirement $R_{i,j,n}$ at some stage $\leq s$ (as defined below). We ensure that for all $k \geq 2$, we have $v_k \in U$ if and only if $v_k \in U_k$, which will make our set U computable. We begin by letting $U_2 = \{v_0\}$ and letting $h(i,j,n,s) = 0$ for all i, j, n, s with $s \leq 2$. Suppose that $s \geq 2$ and we have defined U_s and $h(i,j,n,s)$ for all i, j, n. Suppose also that we have for any i, j, n, and s such that $v_i, v_j \notin \langle U_s \rangle$:

(1) If $h(i,j,n,s) = 0$, then each of $\{v_i, e_{g(i,j,n)}\}$ and $\{v_j, e_{g(i,j,n)}\}$ is linearly independent over $\langle U_s \rangle$.
(2) If $h(i,j,n,s) = 1$ and $n \in A_s$, then $e_{g(i,j,n)} - \lambda v_i \in U_s$ for some nonzero $\lambda \in F$.
(3) If $h(i,j,n,s) = 1$ and $n \in B_s$, then $e_{g(i,j,n)} - \lambda v_j \in U_s$ for some nonzero $\lambda \in F$.

Check whether there exists a triple $\langle i, j, n\rangle < s$ (under some effective coding) such that

(1) $v_i, v_j \notin \langle U_s\rangle$.
(2) $n \in A_s \cup B_s$.
(3) $h(i, j, n, s) = 0$.

Suppose first that no such triple $\langle i, j, n\rangle$ exists. If $v_{s+1} \in \langle U_s\rangle$, then let $U_{s+1} = U_s \cup \{v_{s+1}\}$, otherwise let $U_{s+1} = U_s$. Also, let $h(i, j, n, s+1) = h(i, j, n, s)$ for all i, j, n.

Suppose then that such a triple $\langle i, j, n\rangle$ exists, and fix the least such triple. If $n \in A_s$, then search for the least (under some effective coding) nonzero $\lambda \in F$ such that $v_k \notin \langle U_s \cup \{e_{g(i,j,n)} - \lambda v_i\}\rangle$ for all $k \leq s$ such that $v_k \notin U_s$. (Such λ must exist by Lemma 2.4 and the fact that F is infinite.) Let $U'_s = U_s \cup \{e_{g(i,j,n)} - \lambda v_i\}$ and let $h(i, j, n, s+1) = 1$. If $n \in B_s$, then proceed likewise with v_j replacing v_i. Now, if $v_{s+1} \in \langle U'_s\rangle$, then let $U_{s+1} = U'_s \cup \{v_{s+1}\}$; otherwise let $U_{s+1} = U'_s$. Also, let $h(i, j, n, s+1) = h(i, j, n, s)$ for all other i, j, n. Using Lemma 2.6, it follows that our inductive hypothesis is maintained, so we may continue.

We can now view the quotient space $V = V^\infty/U$ as the set of $<_{\mathbb{N}}$-least representatives (which is a computable subset of V^∞). Notice that V is not one-dimensional because $\{v_1, e_{g(1,2,n)}\}$ is linearly independent over U for any $n \notin A \cup B$ (since $v_1, v_2 \notin U$). Suppose that W is a nontrivial proper subspace of V, and fix W_0 such that $W = W_0/U$. Then W_0 is a W-computable subspace of V^∞, and $U \subset W_0 \subset V^\infty$. Fix $v_i, v_j \in V^\infty \setminus U$ such that $v_i \in W_0$ and $v_j \notin W_0$. Let $S = \{n : e_{g(i,j,n)} \in W_0\}$. We then have that $S \leq_T W_0 \equiv_T W$, that $A \subseteq S$, and that $B \cap S = \emptyset$. Thus $\deg(S) \gg \mathbf{0}$, establishing part (1) of Theorem 1.5.

Part (2) of Theorem 1.5 now follows easily from part (1) and Arslanov's Completeness Criterion [1]: If W is a finite-dimensional nontrivial proper subspace of the above vector space V then W_0 is a c.e. set that computes a degree $\gg \mathbf{0}$; thus $\deg(W)$ must equal $\mathbf{0}'$. □

3. The proof of Corollary 1.6

As usual for these arguments, we only have to check that

(i) WKL_0 (or ACA_0, respectively) suffices to prove the existence of a (finite-dimensional) nontrivial proper subspace (establishing the left-to-right direction of Corollary 1.6); and
(ii) the above computability-theoretic arguments can be carried out in RCA_0(establishing the right-to-left direction of Corollary 1.6).

Part (i) just requires a bit of coding. Using WKL_0, one can code membership in a nontrivial proper subspace W of a vector space V on a binary tree T where one arbitrarily fixes two linearly independent vectors $w, w' \in V$ such that $w \in W$ and $w' \notin W$ is specified. A node $\sigma \in T_W$ is now terminal if the subspace axioms for W are violated along σ using coefficients with Gödel number $< |\sigma|$, which can be checked effectively relative to the open diagram of the vector space. Using ACA_0, one can form the one-dimensional subspace generated by any nonzero vector in V.

Part (ii) boils down to checking that Σ^0_1-induction suffices for the computability-theoretic arguments from Section 2. First of all, note that the definition of U and of the vector space operations on U can be carried out using Δ^0_1-induction. WKL_0 is equivalent to showing Σ^0_1-Separation, so fix any sets A and B that are Σ^0_1-definable in our model of arithmetic. Then their enumerations $\{A_s\}_{s\in\omega}$ and $\{B_s\}_{s\in\omega}$ exist in the model, and from them we can define the subspace U, the quotient space $V = V^\infty/U$, and the function mapping each vector $v \in V^\infty$ to its $<_{\mathbb{N}}$-least representative modulo U, using only Σ^0_1-induction. (The latter function only requires that in RCA_0, any infinite Δ^0_1-definable set can be enumerated in order.) The hypothesis now provides the nontrivial proper subspace W, and from it we can define the separating set S by Δ^0_1-induction.

Proving the right-to-left direction of Corollary 1.6 (2) could be done using the concept of maximal pairs of c.e. sets as in our companion paper [3]. But for vector spaces, there is actually a much simpler proof: In the above construction, simply set A to be any Σ^0_1-set and $B = \emptyset$. Now V must be a vector space of dimension greater than one. Since any finitely generated nontrivial proper subspace can compute a one-dimensional subspace, we may assume we are given a one-dimensional subspace W, spanned by v_i, say. But then

$$\begin{aligned} n \in A \text{ iff } & \{v_i, e_{g(i,1,n)}\} \text{ is linearly dependent in } V \\ \text{iff } & e_{g(i,1,n)} \in W, \end{aligned}$$

and so W can compute A as desired.

References

[1] Arslanov, Marat M., *Some generalizations of a fixed-point theorem*, Izv. Vyssh. Uchebn. Zaved. Mat. **25** (1981), no. 5, 9–16, translated in: Soviet Math. (Iz. VUZ) **25** (1981), no. 5, 1-10.

[2] Dekker, Jacob C. E. *Countable vector spaces with recursive operations. I*, J. Symbolic Logic **34** (1969), 363–387.

[3] Downey, Rodney G.; Lempp, Steffen; and Mileti, Joseph R., *Ideals in computable rings*, to appear.

[4] Jockusch, Carl G., Jr. and Soare, Robert I., Π^0_1 *classes and degrees of theories*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **173** (1972), 33–56.

[5] Metakides, George and Nerode, Anil, *Recursively enumerable vector spaces*, Ann. Math. Logic **11** (1977), 147–171.
[6] Odifreddi, Piergiorgio, *Classical recursion theory*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.
[7] Odifreddi, Piergiorgio, *Classical recursion theory, Vol. II*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1999.
[8] Simpson, Stephen G., *Subsystems of Second Order Arithmetic*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
[9] Soare, Robert I., *Recursively enumerable sets and degrees*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, New York, 1987.

Department of Mathematics, Victoria University, P. O. Box 600, Wellington, NEW ZEALAND
E-mail address: Rod.Downey@mcs.vuw.ac.nz

(Hirschfeldt/Mileti/Montalbán) Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637-1514, USA
E-mail address: drh@math.uchicago.edu
E-mail address: mileti@math.uchicago.edu
E-mail address: antonio@math.uchicago.edu

(Kach/Lempp) Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706-1388, USA
E-mail address: kach@math.wisc.edu
E-mail address: lempp@math.wisc.edu