

Théorie des modèles TD3

Professor: T. Servi

Juan Ignacio Padilla, M2 LMFI

Exercise 0.1 Let I be an infinite set, $I_0 \subseteq I$ and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter on I such that $I_0 \in \mathcal{U}$.

- (1) Show that $\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright I_0 = \{X \cap I_0, X \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is an ultrafilter over I_0 .
- (2) Show that $\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}_i / \mathcal{U} \simeq \prod_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{M}_i / \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright I_0$

Solution:

- (1) Let $A \subseteq I_0$, then either $A \in \mathcal{U}$ or not. If yes, then since $A = A \cap I_0$ then $A \in \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright I_0$, if not, then $I \setminus A \in \mathcal{U}$ and $I_0 \setminus A = I_0 \cap (I \setminus A) \in \mathcal{U}$.
- (2) Consider the map that sends $[a_i]_{i \in I}$ to its restriction $[a_i]_{i \in I_0}$ (equivalence classes in \mathcal{U} and $\mathcal{U} \upharpoonright I_0$ respectively). It is well defined since if $[a_i]_{i \in I} = [b_i]_{i \in I}$, then $\{i, a_i = b_i\} \in \mathcal{U}$, so $\{i, a_i = b_i\} \cap I_0 \in \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright I_0$, and hence $[a_i]_{i \in I_0} = [b_i]_{i \in I_0}$. It is also surjective: given $[a_i]_{i \in I_0}$ we can define $[b_i]_{i \in I_0}$ by setting $b_i = a_i$ for $i \in I_0$ and $b_i = \text{anything}$ for $i \notin I_0$, clearly $[a_i]_{i \in I_0}$ is a restriction of $[b_i]_{i \in I}$. Let $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{L})$, then if $\bar{a} \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}_i / \mathcal{U}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{a} \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}_i / \mathcal{U} &\iff \{i, \mathcal{M}_i \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i)\} \in \mathcal{U} \\ &\iff \{i, \mathcal{M}_i \models \varphi(\bar{a}_i)\} \cap I_0 \in \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright I_0 \\ &\iff \prod_{i \in I_0} \mathcal{M}_i / \mathcal{U} \upharpoonright I_0 \models \varphi(\bar{a}) \end{aligned}$$

Exercise 0.2 Let φ be a sentence in the language of rings. Suppose that $\text{ACF}_0 \models \varphi$. Show that there exists N such that $\text{ACF}_n \models \varphi$ for all $n > N$.

Solution: We use the axiomatization for algebraically closed fields of char. 0 given by

$$T = T_{fields} \cup \left\{ \underbrace{1 + 1 + \cdots + 1}_{n\text{-times}} \neq 0 \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

Since $T \models \varphi$, there is some finite $\Delta \subseteq T$ such that $\Delta \models \varphi$. In particular, there is N such that

$$\Delta \subseteq T_{fields} \cup \left\{ \underbrace{1 + 1 + \cdots + 1}_{n\text{-times}} \neq 0 \right\}_{n < N},$$

so if F is a field of characteristic $n > N$ then $F \models \Delta$, hence $F \models \varphi$.

Exercise 1 Let I be an infinite set and $\{\mathcal{M}_i\}$ a collection of \mathcal{L} -structures. Let \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} ultrafilters on I and consider the ultraproducts $\mathcal{M} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}_i / \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{N} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}_i / \mathcal{V}$. Discuss whether $\mathcal{M} \simeq \mathcal{N}$ depending on the choice of \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} .

(1) Let $I = \mathbb{N}$ and $M_i = \overline{\mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_i]}^{alg}$.

(2) Let $I = p, p$ prime, and let $\mathcal{M}_p = \mathbb{F}_p$.

Solution:

(1) First, if \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are both principal, then $\mathcal{M} \simeq \overline{\mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_i]}^{alg}$ and $\mathcal{N} \simeq \overline{\mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_j]}^{alg}$, so $\mathcal{M} \not\simeq \mathcal{N}$ unless $i = j$, as they would have different transcendence degree over \mathbb{Q} . Now, if both \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are non-principal, then by a theorem of the lectures, as M_i is countably infinite for every i , we have that $|M| = |N| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, so that \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N} are algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0, and by an algebra fact these are both $\simeq \mathbb{C}$. If one is principal and the other isn't, they can't be isomorphic for cardinality reasons.

(2) First, if \mathcal{U} and \mathcal{V} are both principal, then $\mathcal{M} \simeq \mathbb{F}_i$ and $\mathcal{N} \simeq \mathbb{F}_j$, so $\mathcal{M} \not\simeq \mathcal{N}$ unless $i = j$. On the other hand, consider I_0 to be the set of primes congruent to 1 modulo 4. By a number-theoretic fact, I_0 is infinite and co-infinite, so we can find non-principal ultrafilters \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} containing I_0 and $I \setminus I_0$ respectively. Consider the sentence $\exists x \ x^2 + 1 = 0$. By another number-theoretic fact, we know that $\mathbb{F}_p \models \phi$ if and only if $p \in I_0$, which allows us to conclude $\mathcal{M} \models \phi$ and $\mathcal{N} \not\models \phi$. Finally, if one is principal and the other isn't, they can't be isomorphic again for cardinality reasons.

Exercise 2 Let $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the ordered field of the rationals and let \mathcal{U} be a non-principal ultrafilter on \mathbb{N} . Consider the ultrapower $\mathcal{K} = \bar{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathcal{U}}$, and let i be the diagonal embedding of \mathbb{Q} into \mathcal{K} .

(1) Show that \mathcal{K} is an ordered field, and give at least two reasons why $\mathcal{K} \not\simeq \mathbb{R}$.

(2) Let

$$\mathcal{O} = \{a \in \mathcal{K}, \exists q \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0} \ i(-q) < a < i(q)\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M} = \{a \in \mathcal{K}, \forall q \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0} \ i(-q) < a < i(q)\}$$

Show that \mathcal{O} is a ring and that \mathcal{M} is a maximal ideal in \mathcal{O} .

(3) Let $R = \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{M}$. Show that R can be equipped with a structure \mathcal{R} of ordered field.

(4) Show that \mathbb{Q} can be identified with a dense subset of \mathcal{R} .

(5) Show that $\mathcal{R} \simeq \mathbb{R}$ as ordered fields

Solution:

(1) \mathcal{K} is an ultraproduct of structures belonging to an elementary class (ordered fields), therefore \mathcal{K} belongs to the same class. \mathcal{K} has infinitesimal elements: for example let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon = (1, 1/2, 1/3, \dots)_{\mathcal{U}}$ positive but less than $i(1/n)$ a.e with respect to \mathcal{U} , so $\mathcal{K} \models \varepsilon < i(1/n)$. Also \mathcal{K} has infinitely large elements, for example $1/\varepsilon$.

(2) We have that $0 = i(0), 1 = i(1) \in \mathcal{O}$. It suffices to show that \mathcal{O} is closed under addition, multiplication, and additive inverse. Let $a, b \in \mathcal{O}$ and pick $q, r \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$ such that $i(-q) < a < i(q)$ and $i(-r) < b < i(r)$. Recall that i is an elementary embedding, so we sum $i(-q) + i(-r) < a + b < i(q) + i(r)$ and get $i(-q - r) < a + b < i(q + r)$. Similarly one proves that $i(-qr) < ab < i(qr)$ (there are 3 cases to consider), it is clear also that $i(-q) < -a < i(q)$, so \mathcal{O} is a ring. Now consider $a, b \in \mathcal{M}$, and let $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $i(-q/2) < a, b < i(q/2)$, so by adding the two inequalities we obtain $i(-q) < a + b < i(-q)$, and also it's easy to see that \mathcal{M} is closed under $-$. To check that \mathcal{M} is an ideal, let $a \in \mathcal{M}$, $b \in \mathcal{O}$, and $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$. Since $b \in \mathcal{O}$ there is some q' such that $i(-q') < b < i(q')$, and since $a \in \mathcal{M}$ we have that in particular $i(-q/q') < a < i(q/q')$, so by multiplying these inequalities we get $i(-q) < ab < i(q)$ for any q , hence $ab \in \mathcal{M}$. Finally, suppose there exists some ideal I such that $\mathcal{M} \subsetneq I \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, and let $j \in I \setminus \mathcal{M}$, so that there is some q such that

$j \notin (i(-q), i(q))$. This implies $1/j \in (i(-q), i(q)) \rightarrow 1/j \in \mathcal{O}$ so that $j/j = 1 \in I$, hence $I = \mathcal{O}$. This proves that \mathcal{M} is maximal.

- (3) We denote $r + \mathcal{M}$ for the equivalence class of r modulo \mathcal{M} . We already know \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{M} is a field, as \mathcal{M} is a maximal ideal, so it suffices to define an ordering that preserves its field structure. Define $r + \mathcal{M} < s + \mathcal{M}$ iff $\mathcal{K} \models r < s$. This is well-defined, since given $r + \mathcal{M} < s + \mathcal{M}$, in particular $s - r \notin \mathcal{M}$ and also $\mathcal{K} \models 0 < s - r$. Let q such that $\mathcal{K} \models i(q) < s - r$ and notice that for all $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, in \mathcal{K} it's true that:

$$\begin{aligned} r + \varepsilon_1 &< r + i(q/2) \\ &< s - i(q/2) \\ &< s + \varepsilon_2 \end{aligned}$$

so $r + \varepsilon_1 + \mathcal{M} < s + \varepsilon_2 + \mathcal{M}$. Let's check it respects the field structure: suppose $r + \mathcal{M} < s + \mathcal{M}$

- Let $a + \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{M}$, then we have $\mathcal{K} \models r + a < s + a$ since \mathcal{K} is an ordered field, so $r + a + \mathcal{M} < s + a + \mathcal{M}$.
- Let $0 < a + \mathcal{M} \in \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{M}$ then we have $\mathcal{K} \models ra < sa$ since \mathcal{K} is an ordered field, so $ra + \mathcal{M} < sa + \mathcal{M}$.

Also $<_{\mathcal{R}}$ is a total order relation since $<_{\mathcal{K}}$ is.

- (4) Notice that \mathcal{R} is archimedean: suppose that $\mathcal{R} \models 0 \leq \varepsilon < i(1/n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $\varepsilon \leq i(q)$ for all $q \in \mathbb{Q}^{>0}$, therefore $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{M}$ which implies $\mathcal{R} \models \varepsilon = 0$. Let $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r < s$, pick n such that $i(1/n) < s - r$, then for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ it must happen that $r < i(m/n) < s$, for otherwise there would be k such that $i(k/n) \leq r$ and $i((k+1)/n) \geq s$, which is a contradiction. Hence we can identify \mathbb{Q} as a dense subfield of \mathcal{R} .
- (5) We regard \mathbb{R} as the set of equivalence classes of Cauchy sequences (denoted (a_i)) over \mathbb{Q} under the relationship $(a_i) \sim (b_i)$ iff $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_i - b_i| = 0$. Also the field operations are defined point-wise and the order is defined as $(a_i) < (b_i)$ iff there is N such that $a_n < b_n$ for $n \geq N$.

We define the mapping from \mathbb{R} to \mathcal{R} that sends $(a_i)_{\sim}$ to $(a_i)_{\mathcal{U}} + \mathcal{M}$ (we will drop the $+\mathcal{M}$ for commodity). This map is well defined: if $(a_i) \sim (b_i)$, then for all n there is N such that for $n \geq N$, $|a_i - b_i| < 1/n$, in particular the set $\{i, -1/n < a_i - b_i < 1/n\} \in \mathcal{U}$ for all n , so $(a_i)_{\mathcal{U}} - (b_i)_{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{M}$. It is easy to see that this map is a field embedding, since

$(a+b)_i = (a_i) + (b_i)$, so that $(a_i)_\sim + (b_i)_\sim$ is sent to $(a_i)_\mathcal{U} + (b_i)_\mathcal{U} = (a_i + b_i)_\mathcal{U}$, and similarly for the product. This map also preserves order: if $(a_i)_\sim < (b_i)_\sim$, then there is N such that for $n \geq N$, $a_i < b_i$, so again $\{i, a_i < b_i\} \in \mathcal{U}$, and $(a_i)_\mathcal{U} < (b_i)_\mathcal{U}$. Finally we only need to check surjectivity: let $r \in \mathcal{R}$, and choose a sequence of rationals (q_i) such that for all $k > 0$, there is N such that $q_n \in (r - 1/k, r + 1/k)$ for $n \geq N$ (in other words pick a convergent sequence), this is possible by the previous item. Notice that $\mathcal{R} \models (q_i) = r$, since otherwise, if for example $(q_i) < r$ then there is k such that the set $\{i, q_i < r_i - 1/k\} \in \mathcal{U}$ so it is an infinite set, contradicting the fact that (q_i) converges to r . We claim that (q_i) is Cauchy: let $k > 0$ and pick N such that for all $n \geq N$, $q_n \in (r - 1/2k, r + 1/2k)$, then if $m, n > N$, we have $q_n, q_m \in (r - 1/2k, r + 1/2k)$ so necessarily $-1/k < q_n - q_m < 1/k$, so we can conclude that r is the image of (q_i) , and therefore $\mathbb{R} \simeq \mathcal{R}$.