

## MODEL THEORY II HOMEWORK 7

DAKOTA BLAIR

**Theorem (22).** *Let  $T$  be a countable  $\aleph_1$ -categorical theory. If  $\mathcal{M} \preceq \mathcal{N}$  then  $\dim \mathcal{N} = \dim \mathcal{M} + \dim(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{M}_0$  be the prime model of  $T$ ,  $\varphi(x) \in L(\mathcal{M}_0)$  a strongly minimal formula,  $I$  a basis for  $\varphi(\mathcal{M})$ ,  $J$  a maximally independent set in  $\varphi(\mathcal{N}) \setminus \mathcal{M}$ .

... Then from Proposition 22  $\dim(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = |J|$ . □

**16.** *Justify Theorem 22 for  $|J| \geq \aleph_0$ .*

*Proof.* □

**17.** Calculate  $I(T_E^{\text{fcp}}, \aleph_1)$ .

*Proof that  $I(T_E^{\text{fcp}}, \aleph_1) = \aleph_0$ .* Any  $\aleph_1$  model of  $T_E^{\text{fcp}}$  must have at least one infinite congruence class. Further any infinite congruence class must have cardinality either  $\aleph_0$  or  $\aleph_1$ . If there are no congruence classes of size  $\aleph_1$  then there must be  $\aleph_1$  congruence classes of cardinality  $\aleph_0$ . This defines a single isomorphism class, say  $A_0$ , and is characterized by having no  $\aleph_1$  congruence classes and  $\aleph_1$  many  $\aleph_0$  classes.

Let  $m = \aleph_1$  or  $m \in \omega + 1$  such that  $m > 0$ . Similarly let  $n = \aleph_1$  or  $n \in \omega + 1$  such that  $n > 0$ . Note then there are  $|\aleph_0 \cdot \aleph_0| = \aleph_0$  choices for  $(m, n)$ . There is exactly one corresponding isomorphism class corresponding to a model with exactly  $n$  distinct  $\aleph_0$  classes and exactly  $m$  distinct  $\aleph_1$  classes. Assume two models  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  correspond to the same pair  $(m, n)$ . Then any partial elementary map  $f$  preserving the finite equivalence classes may be extended to an isomorphism. Let the  $\aleph_0$  and  $\aleph_1$  congruence classes of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  be  $\{a_i\}_{i \in {}^1I_0}$  and  $\{a_i\}_{i \in {}^1I_1}$  respectively. Similarly let the  $\aleph_0$  and  $\aleph_1$  congruence classes of  $\mathcal{M}_2$  be  $\{b_i\}_{i \in {}^2I_0}$  and  $\{b_i\}_{i \in {}^2I_1}$  respectively. Define  ${}^1I = {}^1I_0 \cup {}^1I_1$  and  ${}^2I = {}^2I_0 \cup {}^2I_1$ . Further define  $g_1 : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow {}^1I$  be the function which gives the index in  ${}^1I$  of the congruence class of  $\mathcal{M}_1$  containing the given element. Define  $g_2 : \mathcal{M}_2 \rightarrow {}^2I$  similarly. Then  $F : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$  will define an isomorphism when the following condition is satisfied: if  $m \in \mathcal{M}_1, \alpha \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $g_1(m) \in {}^1I_\alpha$  then  $F(m) = f(m)$  or  $g_2(F(m)) = f_\alpha(g_1(m))$ .

Note that the isomorphism class of each such pair is distinct from  $A_0$ . Further two models  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  such that their corresponding pairs are distinct, that is  $(m_1, n_1) \neq (m_2, n_2)$ , define two distinct isomorphism classes. This is because any infinite congruence class must map to a class of the same cardinality. But if either  $m_1 \neq m_2$  or  $n_1 \neq n_2$  then  $|{}^1I_0| \neq |{}^2I_0|$  or  $|{}^1I_1| \neq |{}^2I_1|$  which prevents the construction of an elementary bijection from  $\mathcal{M}_1$  to  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . Then each pair  $(m, n)$  corresponds to a unique isomorphism class, say  $A_{(m,n)}$ .

Therefore  $A_0$  and  $A_{(m,n)}$  define  $\aleph_0$  distinct isomorphism classes. These classes exhaust all  $\aleph_1$  models of  $T_E^{\text{fcp}}$  as any other models would have a different cardinality. Hence  $I(T_E^{\text{fcp}}, \aleph_1) = \aleph_0$ .  $\square$

**18.** Show that  $\mathcal{M}$  as in Lemma 23 (1) is  $\omega$ -saturated if and only if  $\dim \varphi(\mathcal{M})$  is infinite for some (all) strongly minimal  $\varphi$  over  $\mathcal{M}$ .

**19** (optional). Explore  $\omega$ -stable  $T$  where Lemma 23 holds

**Definition.** A  $M$  model is  $\omega$ -**homogeneous** if for all  $\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$  and  $a_0$  there exists a  $b_0$  such that  $\bar{a}a_0 \equiv_M \bar{b}b_0$ .

**Theorem** (Baldwin-Lachlan). A countable theory  $T$  is  $\kappa$ -categorical if and only if  $T$  is  $\omega$ -stable without Vaughtian Pairs.

**20.** Every model of a countable  $\aleph_1$ -categorical theory is  $\omega$ -homogeneous.

*Proof.* By the Baldwin-Lachlan theorem  $T$  is  $\omega$ -stable. Let  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}, a_0 \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $\bar{a} \equiv_M \bar{b}$ . If  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\omega$ -saturated then  $\text{tp}(a_0/\bar{a})$  is realized in  $\mathcal{M}$  by some element  $b_0$ . Thus  $\bar{a}a_0 \equiv_M \bar{b}b_0$ . If  $\mathcal{M}$  is uncountable then it is  $\omega$ -saturated by categoricity. Therefore the only case remaining is when  $\mathcal{M}$  is countable and not  $\omega$ -saturated. In this case,

□

**21.** Show there is a natural injection of  $M$  into  $S_1(B)$  for  $M \subset B$ . Identify  $M$  with its image and let  $\overline{M}$  be its, topological, closure in  $S_1(B)$ . Show that  $q \in S_1(B)$  is in  $\overline{M}$  if and only if  $q$  is a coheir of  $q|_M$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f : M \rightarrow S_1(B)$  be defined as  $f(m) = \text{tp}(m/B)$ . Note that this map is well defined as  $M \subset B \subset \mathbb{M}$ . Note that if  $m_1, m_2 \in M$  are distinct then  $q_1 = \text{tp}(m_1/B) \neq q_2 = \text{tp}(m_2/B)$  since the formula  $x = m_1$  is in  $q_1$  but  $x \neq m_1$  is in  $q_2$ . Therefore  $f$  is injective.

Let  $\overline{M} = \overline{f(M)}$  in  $S_1(B)$  and  $q \in \overline{M}$ . To show that  $q$  is a coheir of  $q|_M$  we need to see that it is finitely realized in  $M$ , that is for each formula  $\varphi(x, \overline{b}) \in q$  there is an  $m \in M$  such that  $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(m, \overline{b})$ . Since  $q$  is a complete type it is consistent and therefore finitely consistent.

If  $q$  is a coheir of  $q|_M$  then for each  $\varphi(x, \overline{b}) \in q$  there is an  $m \in M$  such that  $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi(m, \overline{b})$ . □

**22.** Prove that every ultrapower of a type  $p$  over  $M$  is an heir of  $p$ .

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be a nonprincipal ultrafilter on  $I$  and  $M^U$  and  $p^U$  be the ultrapowers of  $M$  and  $p$  respectively.

$$(p)_M = \cup_{m < \omega} \{ \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in L_{n+m} \mid \exists \bar{a} \in A^m \text{ such that } \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in p \}$$

$p^U$  is an heir of  $p$  if  $(p^U)_M = (p)_M$

$$(p^U)_M = \cup_{m < \omega} \{ \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in L_{n+m} \mid \exists \bar{a} \in A^m \text{ such that } \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in p^U \}$$

Let  $\bar{a}$  be some realization of  $p$  in  $N$  where  $M \prec N$ . then  $p^U = \text{tp}((\bar{a}^I/U)/M^U)$

$$M \rightarrow M^U \quad \bar{a} \mapsto \bar{a}^U$$

□

**23.** Prove  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/M\bar{b})$  is an heir of  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}/M)$  if and only if  $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/M\bar{a})$  is an coheir of  $\text{tp}(\bar{b}/M)$

**24.** Let  $T_E^\infty$  be the theory of an equivalence relation with infinitely many infinite congruence classes.

a) Analyze the complete types over  $A \subset M \models T_E^\infty$ , especially  $A = M$ .

b) Analyze the definable complete types over  $A \subset M \models T_E^\infty$ .

c) Let  $M \prec N$  and  $p \in S(M), q \in S(N), p \subset q$ . Find when  $q$  is an heir.

d) Let  $M \prec N$  and  $p \in S(M), q \in S(N), p \subset q$ . Find when  $q$  is an coheir.

**Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$  and  $q \in S(N)$ . Say  $q$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant if  $\forall f \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$  then  $q \subset f(q)$ .

**25.** a) If  $q$  does not split over  $\mathcal{M}$  then  $q$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant.

b) if  $\mathcal{N}$  is strongly homogeneous over  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $q$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant then  $q$  does not split over  $\mathcal{M}$ .

c) In particular  $q$  is a global type over a model if and only if it is  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant.

**26.** Let  $\mathcal{M} \models T, p \in S(\mathcal{M}), q \in S(\mathbb{M})$ .

a)  $q$  is an heir of  $q|_M$ .

b)  $q$  is definable over  $M$ .

c)  $q$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant

d)  $q$  is a coheir of  $q|_M$ .

For  $\eta \models DLO_-$  find which implications fail. Which implications are true for any  $T$ ?

*Proof.*  $(b \Rightarrow c)$  is always true. If  $q$  is definable over  $M$  then it does not split over  $M$  by lemma 28(4). If  $q$  does not split over  $M$  then it is  $\mathcal{M}$ -invariant by (HW.25.a).

□