

Stability

Qi'ao Chen

February 12, 2022

Contents

1	Preface	1
2	Preliminaries	2
2.1	Indiscernibles	2
2.2	Definability and Generalizations	4
2.3	Imaginaries and T^{eq}	7
2.4	Examples and counterexamples	18
3	Stability	20
3.1	Historic remarks and motivations	20
3.2	Counting types and stability	20
3.3	Local ranks and definability of types	25
3.4	Cantor-Bendixson Rank	29
3.5	Indiscernible sequences and stability	30
3.6	Stable= $\text{NIP} \cap \text{NSOP}$ and the classification picture	33
4	TODO Problems	33
5	Index	34
6	References	35

1 Preface

A combination of various notes from [Pillay(2018)] [Chernikov(2019)] [Tent and Ziegler(2012)] [van den Dries(2019)]

A monster model \mathfrak{C}

[Pillay(2018)] has many typos☹

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Indiscernibles

Definition 2.1. Let I be a linear order and \mathfrak{A} an L -structure. A family $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ of elements of A is called a **sequence of indiscernibles** if for all L -formulas $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and all $i_1 < \dots < i_n$ and $j_1 < \dots < j_n$ from I

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_n})$$

or

$$\text{tp}(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}) = \text{tp}(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_n})$$

Theorem 2.2. Compactness let us “stretch” indiscernibles. Let $(a_i : i \in \omega)$ be indiscernibles in \mathfrak{C} , and $(I, <)$ an ordering. Then there exists an indiscernible $(b_i : i \in I)$ in \mathfrak{C} s.t. $\forall i_1 < \dots < i_n \in I$

$$\text{tp}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \text{tp}(b_{i_1}, \dots, b_{i_n})$$

Indiscernible sequence are a fundamental tool of model theory, and there are many ways to obtain them.

Theorem 2.3 (Ramsey, extended). Let $n_1, \dots, n_r < \omega$. For each $i = 1, \dots, r$, let $X_{i,1}, X_{i,2}$ be a partition of $[\omega]^{n_i}$. Then there is an infinite subset $Y \subseteq \omega$ which is homogeneous, i.e., $\forall i = 1, \dots, r$, either $[Y]^{n_i} \subseteq X_{i,1}$ or $[Y]^{n_i} \subseteq X_{i,2}$

Proposition 2.4. For each $n \in \omega$, let $\Sigma_n(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a collection of L -formulas in variables x_1, \dots, x_n . Suppose that there are $a_1, a_2, \dots \in \mathfrak{C}$ s.t.

$$\models \Sigma_n(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n}), \quad \forall i_1 < \dots < i_n < \omega$$

Then there is an indiscernible $(b_i : i \in \omega)$ in \mathfrak{C} s.t.

$$\models \Sigma_n(b_{i_1}, \dots, b_{i_n}), \quad \forall i_1 < \dots < i_n < \omega$$

we can expand $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} \Sigma_n$ and obtain the Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski type $\text{EM}((a_i)_{i \in \omega})$. This is just the Standard Lemma in Tent

Example 2.1. Suppose $\Sigma_2 = \{x_1 \neq x_2\}$. Then the proposition yields the existence of infinite indiscernible sequences

Proof. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(x_1, x_2, \dots) = & \{ \varphi(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_n}) : \\ & i_1 < \dots < i_n, j_1 < \dots < j_n \in \omega, \varphi \in L \} \\ & \cup \bigcup_n \Sigma(x_1, \dots, x_n) \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Gamma'(x_1, \dots, x_n) \subseteq_f \Gamma$. Let $\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_r$ be the L -formulas appearing in Γ' . For $i = 1, \dots, r$, let

$$\begin{aligned} X_{i,1} &= \{ (j_1, \dots, j_n) : j_1 < \dots < j_n \in \omega, \models \varphi_i(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_n}) \} \\ X_{i,2} &= \{ (j_1, \dots, j_n) : j_1 < \dots < j_n \in \omega, \models \neg \varphi_i(a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_n}) \} \end{aligned}$$

By Ramsey's theorem, there exists an infinite $Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\forall i = 1, \dots, r, [Y]^{n_i}$ is either contained in $X_{i,1}$ or in $X_{i,2}$. Write $Y = \{k_1 < k_2 < \dots\}$. Interpret each x_i as a_{k_i} to satisfy Γ' \square

Definition 2.5. Let $M < N < \mathfrak{C}$ be models, and $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{x}}(N)$. We say p is finitely satisfiable in M , or $p(\bar{x})$ is a **coheir** of $p \upharpoonright M \in S_{\bar{x}}(M)$, if every $\varphi(\bar{x}) \in p(\bar{x})$ is satisfied by some $\bar{a} \in M$

Remark. $p(\bar{x}) \in S_n(N)$ is finitely satisfiable (f.s.) in M iff $p(\bar{x})$ is in the topological closure of $\{\text{tp}(\bar{a}/N) : \bar{a} \in M\} \subseteq S_n(N)$

Lemma 2.6. Suppose $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{x}}(M)$ and $M < N$, then there is $p'(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{x}}(N)$ s.t. $p \subseteq p'$ and p' is f.s. in M

Proof. Consider $\Gamma(\bar{x}) = p(\bar{x}) \cup \{ \neg \varphi(\bar{x}) : \varphi(\bar{x}) \in L_N \text{ and not realized in } M \}$. Let $\Gamma \supseteq_f \Gamma' = \{ \Psi(\bar{x}), \neg \varphi_1(\bar{x}), \dots, \neg \varphi_r(\bar{x}) \} \in p$. Then any solution \bar{a} of Ψ in M satisfies Γ' as $M \models \forall \bar{x} (\neg \varphi_i(\bar{x}))$ \square

Remark. Let $i_M : M^{\bar{x}} \rightarrow S_{\bar{x}}(M)$ s.t. $m \mapsto \text{tp}(m/M)$. Define $i_N : M^{\bar{x}} \rightarrow S_{\bar{x}}(N)$ similarly. Let $r : S_{\bar{x}}(N) \rightarrow S_{\bar{x}}(M)$. Note that $r \circ i_N = i_M$ and the set of types in $S_{\bar{x}}(N)$ that are f.s. in M is exactly the closure of $i_N(M^{\bar{x}})$ in $S_{\bar{x}}(N)$. Hence its image under r is closed. However the image must contain $i_M(M^{\bar{x}})$ which is dense in $S_{\bar{x}}(M)$. Therefore it must be onto, which proves the desired result

r is continuous and $r(\overline{i_N(M^n)}) \supseteq i_M(M^n)$ is closed. $\overline{i_M(M^n)} = S_n(M)$. Then r is onto? Then its preimage of p is what we want

Proposition 2.7. Let $p(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{x}}(M)$, $N \succ M$ be $|M|^+$ -saturated, and $p'(\bar{x}) \in S_{\bar{x}}(N)$ a coheir of p . Let $\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2, \dots \in N$ be defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{a}_1 &\text{ realises } p(\bar{x}) \\ \bar{a}_2 &\text{ realises } p'(\bar{x}) \upharpoonright (M, \bar{a}_1) \\ \bar{a}_3 &\text{ realises } p'(\bar{x}) \upharpoonright (M, \bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2) \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

Then $(\bar{a}_i : i \in \omega)$ is indiscernible over M

Proof. We prove by induction on k that for any $n \leq k$ and $i_1 < \dots < i_n \leq k$ and $j_1 < \dots < j_n \leq k$, we have

$$\text{tp}_M(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}/M) = \text{tp}_M(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{j_n}/M)$$

Assume this is true for k and consider $k+1$. Let $i_1 < \dots < i_n \leq k$, $j_1 < \dots < j_n \leq k$. We need to show that

$$\text{tp}_M(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}, \bar{a}_{k+1}/M) = \text{tp}_M(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{j_n}, \bar{a}_{k+1}/M)$$

Consider a formula $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n, \bar{x}_{n+1}) \in L_M$. Assume by contradiction that

$$M \models \varphi(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}, \bar{a}_{k+1}) \wedge \neg \varphi(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{j_n}, \bar{a}_{k+1})$$

But $\text{tp}(\bar{a}_{k+1}/M, \bar{a}_1, \dots, \bar{a}_k)$ is f.s. in M , so there is $\bar{a}' \in M$ s.t.

$$M \models \varphi(\bar{a}_{i_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{i_n}, \bar{a}') \wedge \neg \varphi(\bar{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \bar{a}_{j_n}, \bar{a}')$$

contradicting IH □

2.2 Definability and Generalizations

Definition 2.8. $X \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^n$ is **definable almost over** A if there is an A -definable equivalence relation E on \mathfrak{C}^n with finitely many classes and X is a union of some E -classes

Lemma 2.9. Let \mathbb{D} be a definable class and A a set of parameters. T.F.A.E.

1. \mathbb{D} is definable over A
2. \mathbb{D} is invariant under all automorphisms of \mathfrak{C} which fix A pointwise

$$S \subseteq K^{\text{alg}} \Rightarrow M \setminus S \subseteq K^{\text{alg}}$$

Proof. \Rightarrow is easy as for any $F \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ and $\mathbb{D} = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{a})$, $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi(\bar{s}, \bar{a})$ iff $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi(F(\bar{s}), \bar{a})$. **StackExchange**

$$x \in \mathbb{D} \Leftrightarrow \models \varphi(x, \bar{a}) \Leftrightarrow \varphi(F(x), F(\bar{a})) \Leftrightarrow \varphi(F(x), \bar{a}) \Leftrightarrow F(x) \in \mathbb{D}$$

\Leftarrow . Another proof from Chernikov. Assume that $\mathbb{D} = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b)$ where $b \in \mathfrak{C}$, and let $p(y) = \text{tp}(b/A)$

Claim 1. $p(y) \vdash \forall x(\varphi(x, y) \leftrightarrow \varphi(x, b))$, which says that for any realisations b' , $\varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b) = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b')$

Indeed, let $b' \models p(y)$ be arbitrary. Then $\text{tp}(b/A) = \text{tp}(b'/A)$ so there is some $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ with $\sigma(b) = b'$. Then $\sigma(X) = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b')$ and by assumption $\sigma(X) = X$, thus $\varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b) = X = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b')$.

There is some $\psi(y) \in p$ (there is a finite subset of $p(y)$ that does the job and we take the conjunction) s.t.

$$\psi(y) \models \forall x(\varphi(x, y) \leftrightarrow \varphi(x, b))$$

Let $\theta(x)$ be the formula $\exists y(\psi(y) \wedge \varphi(x, y))$. Note that $\theta(x)$ is an $L(A)$ -formula, as $\psi(y)$ is

Claim 2. $X = \theta(\mathfrak{C})$

If $a \in X$, then $\models \varphi(a, b)$, and as $\psi(y) \in \text{tp}(b/A)$ we have $\models \theta(a)$. Conversely, if $\models \theta(a)$, let b' be s.t. $\models \psi(b') \wedge \varphi(a, b')$. But by the choice of ψ this implies that $\models \varphi(a, b)$

\Leftarrow Let \mathbb{D} be defined by φ , defined over $B \supset A$. Consider the maps

$$\mathfrak{C} \xrightarrow{\tau} S(B) \xrightarrow{\pi} S(A)$$

where $\tau(c) = \text{tp}(c/B)$ and π is the restriction map. Let Y be the image of \mathbb{D} in $S(A)$. Since $Y = \pi[\varphi]$, Y is closed. **Note that $\tau(\mathbb{D}) = [\varphi]$. $\tau(\mathbb{D}) = \{\text{tp}(c/B) : \mathfrak{C} \models \varphi(c)\} \subseteq [\varphi]$. For any $q(x) \in [\varphi]$, as \mathfrak{C} is saturated, $\mathfrak{C} \models q(d)$ and $d \in \mathbb{D}$. Thus $q \in \tau(\mathbb{D})$. π is continuous**

Assume that \mathbb{D} is invariant under all automorphisms of \mathfrak{C} which fix A pointwise. Since elements which have the same type over A are conjugate by an automorphism of \mathfrak{C} , this means that \mathbb{D} -membership depends only on the type over A , i.e., $\mathbb{D} = (\pi\tau)^{-1}(Y)$. **For any $\text{tp}(c/A) = \text{tp}(d/A)$ and $c \in \mathbb{D}$, as c and d are conjugate, $d \in \mathbb{D}$.**

For any $c \notin \mathbb{D}$, $\pi\tau(c) \in Y$ iff $\text{tp}(c/A) \in \pi[\varphi]$ iff there is $d \in \mathbb{D}$ s.t. $\text{tp}(c/A) = \text{tp}(d/A)$ but then $c \in \mathbb{D}$.

This implies that $[\varphi] = \pi^{-1}(Y)$ $\tau(\mathbb{D}) = [\varphi] = \tau(\tau^{-1}\pi^{-1})(Y) = \pi^{-1}(Y)$, or $S(A) \setminus Y = \pi[\neg\varphi]$; hence $S(A) \setminus Y$ is also closed and we conclude that Y is clopen. By Lemma ?? $Y = [\psi]$ for some $L(A)$ -formula ψ . This ψ defines \mathbb{D} . **For any $d \in \mathfrak{C}$**

$$\models \psi(d) \Leftrightarrow \text{tp}(d/A) \Leftrightarrow d \in \mathbb{D}$$

□

A slight generalization of the previous lemma

Lemma 2.10. *Let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^n$ be definable. TFAE*

1. *X is almost A -definable, i.e., there is an A -definable equivalence relation E on \mathfrak{C}^n with finitely many classes, s.t. X is a union of E -classes*
2. *The set $\{\sigma(X) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)\}$ is finite*
3. *The set $\{\sigma(X) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)\}$ is small*

Proof. $1 \rightarrow 2$. Let $\varphi(x_1, x_2) \in L(A)$ be the A -definable equivalence relation E , and let $b_1, \dots, b_n \in M$ be representatives in each equivalence class so that each class can be written as $[b_i] = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b_i)$. Given $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$, since $\varphi(x_1, x_2) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\sigma(x_1), \sigma(x_2))$, the image of each $[b_i]$ under σ will be

$$\sigma([b_i]) = \{\sigma(x) : \varphi(x, b_i)\} = \{x' : \varphi(x', \sigma(b_i))\} = \{x : \varphi(x, b_{j_i})\} = [b_{j_i}]$$

for some $j_i \leq n$. Now X is a disjoint union of some $[b_i]$'s, so $\sigma(X)$ is a disjoint union of some $[b_j]$'s. Since there are only finitely many equivalence classes, there can only be finitely many possibilities for disjoint unions of these classes

$2 \rightarrow 1$. Let $X = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b)$ and $p(y) = \text{tp}(b/A)$. Given $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$, we have $\sigma(X) = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, \sigma(b))$. Then from assumption, there must be distinct b_1, \dots, b_n s.t.

$$\{\sigma(X) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)\} = \{\varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b_i) : i \leq n\}$$

Now if $\text{tp}(b'/A) = \text{tp}(b/A)$, then strong homogeneity yields some $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ s.t. $\sigma(b) = b'$. Then the above argument again shows that $\varphi(x, b')$ defines $\sigma(X)$ for some $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$. Thus $\sigma(X) = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b') = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b_i)$ for some $i \leq k$. Therefore $p(y) \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq k} \forall x (\phi(x, y) \leftrightarrow \phi(x, b_i))$. By compactness there is some $\psi(y) \in p$ s.t. $\psi(y) \vdash \bigvee_{i \leq k} \forall x (\phi(x, y) \leftrightarrow \phi(x, b_i))$. Now define $E(x_1, x_2)$ as

$$\forall y (\psi(y) \rightarrow (\phi(x_1, y) \leftrightarrow \phi(x_2, y)))$$

so it is A -definable. It is easy to check that E is an equivalence relation with finitely many classes, and that X is a union of E -classes ($a_1 E a_2$ iff they agree on $\phi(x, b_i)$ for all $i \leq k$, and so $X = \phi(\mathfrak{C}, b_0)$ is given by the union of all possible combinations intersected with it)

3 \rightarrow 1 Assume for contradiction that

$$|\{\sigma(X) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)\}| = \lambda \geq \omega$$

we can find λ -many elements $(b_i : i < \lambda) \subset \mathfrak{C}$ to represent the distinct images under automorphisms. Then the set

$$q(y) = p(y) \cup \{\neg \forall x (\varphi(x, y) \leftrightarrow \varphi(x, b_i)) : i < \lambda\}$$

will be finitely satisfiable. Thus $q(y)$ is realised by some b' . But such b' has the same type as b over A and so strong homogeneity yields some $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ s.t. $\sigma(b) = b'$. Applying such σ on X gives the image $\varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b') = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, b_i)$ for some $i < \lambda$, a contradiction \square

Proposition 2.11. *We can identify definable sets with continuous functions in a certain settings*

1. Formulas $\varphi(\bar{x}), \psi(\bar{x}) \in L_A$ are equivalent iff $[\varphi(\bar{x})] = [\psi(\bar{x})]$
2. The clopen subsets of $S_{\bar{x}}(A)$ are precisely the basic clopen sets
3. Clopen subsets X of $S_{\bar{x}}(A)$ correspond exactly to continuous functions $f : S_{\bar{x}}(A) \rightarrow 2$ (with discrete topology) where $f(p(\bar{x})) = 1$ if $p(\bar{x}) \in X$ and 0 otherwise
4. The definable subsets of \mathfrak{C}^c are in one-to-one correspondence with continuous functions from $S_{\bar{x}}(A)$ to 2

Proof. 3. If X is clopen, then $f^{-1}(2) = S_{\bar{x}}(A)$, $f^{-1}(0) = \emptyset$, $f^{-1}(\{1\}) = X$, $f^{-1}(\{0\}) = X^c$

4. By 1, definable sets are in one-to-one correspondence with basic clopen subsets. By 2, basic clopen sets are exactly all of the clopen subsets, so definable sets are in one-to-one correspondence with clopen sets. By 3, clopen sets are in one-to-one correspondence with continuous functions $f : S_{\bar{x}}(A) \rightarrow 2$

\square

2.3 Imaginaries and T^{eq}

A **multi-sorted** structure is a family of sets $(M_s)_{s \in S}$ equipped with relations

$$R \subseteq M_{s_1} \times \cdots \times M_{s_m}, \quad (s_1, \dots, s_m \in S)$$

A multi-sorted language L is a triple (S, L^r, L^f) and S are the sorts of L

M_s is the underlying set of sort s . Elements of M_s are also called “elements of \mathcal{M} ” of sort s . Given any tuple $\bar{s} = (s_i)_{i \in I}$ of sorts in S , we let $M_{\bar{s}} = \prod_{i \in I} M_{s_i}$

Given a variable $x = (x_i)_{i \in I}$ of L , with x_i of sorts s_i for $i \in I$, we define the x -set of \mathcal{M} to be the product set

$$M_x := M_{\bar{s}} = \prod_i M_{s_i}, \quad \bar{s} = (s_i)_{i \in I}$$

$x = (x_i)_{i \in I}$ and $y = (y_j)_{j \in J}$ is **disjoint** if $x_i \neq y_j$ for all $i \in I$ and $j \in J$, and in that case we put $M_{x,y} = M_x \times M_y$. If in addition $I = J$ and x_i and y_i have the same sort for $i \in I$ (so that $M_x = M_y$), we call x and y **disjoint and similar**

Definition 2.12. The **definable closure** $\text{dcl}(A)$ of A is the set of elements c for which there is an $L(A)$ -formula $\varphi(x)$ s.t. c is the unique element satisfying φ . Elements or tuples a and b are said to be **interdefinable** if $a \in \text{dcl}(b)$ and $b \in \text{dcl}(a)$.

Lemma 2.13. Assume $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ and $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}$

1. $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}(A)$ iff $\{f(\bar{b}) : f \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)\}$ is finite
2. $\bar{b} \in \text{dcl}(A)$ iff $f(\bar{b}) = \bar{b}$ for all $f \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$

Proof. 1. Suppose $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}(A)$ with witness $\exists^{\leq k} \varphi(\bar{x})$. Then $\varphi(\mathfrak{C})$ is A -definable and hence is $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ -invariant by Lemma 2.9

Suppose the finiteness. Since the composition of automorphisms is an automorphism, this set is $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ -invariant and therefore A -definable by some $\varphi(\bar{x})$.

2. $\{\bar{b}\}$ is $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ -invariant

□

The first motivation to develop T^{eq} is dealing with quotient objects, without leaving the context of first order logic. That is, if E is some definable equivalence relation on some definable set X , we want to view X/E as a definable set

We work in the setting of multi-sorted languages. Let L be a 1-sorted language and let T be a (complete) L -theory. We shall build a many-sorted language L^{eq} -theory T^{eq} . We will ensure that in natural sense, L^{eq} contains L and T^{eq} contains T

First we define L^{eq} . Consider the set L -formula $\varphi(x, y)$, up to equivalence, such that T models that φ is an equivalence relation. For each φ , define s_φ to be a new sort in L^{eq} . Of particular importance is $s_=$, the sort given by the formula " $x = y$ ". **= is an equivalence relation** This sort $s_=$ will yield, in each model of T^{eq} , a model of T

Also define f_φ to be a function symbol with domain sort $s_=^n$ (where φ has n free variables) and codomain sort s_φ

For each m -place relation symbol $R \in L$, make R^{eq} an m -place relation symbol in L^{eq} on $s_=^m$. Likewise for all constant and function symbols in L . Finally, for the sake of formality, we put a unique equality symbol $=_\varphi$ on each sort

Remark. Let N be an L^{eq} structure. Then N has interpretations $s_\varphi(N)$ of each sort s_φ and $f_\varphi(N) : s_=(N)^{n_{f_\varphi}} \rightarrow s_\varphi(N)$ of each function symbol f_φ . Additionally, N will contain an L -structure consisting of $s_=$ and interpretations of the symbols of L inside of $s_=$

Definition 2.14. T^{eq} is the L^{eq} -theory which is axiomatised by the following

1. T , where the quantifiers in the formulas of T now range over the sort $s_=$
2. For each suitable L -formula $\varphi(x, y)$, the axiom $\forall_{s_=} \bar{x} \forall_{s_=} \bar{y} (\varphi(x, y) \leftrightarrow f_\varphi(\bar{x}) = f_\varphi(\bar{y}))$
3. For each L -formula φ , the axiom $\forall_{s_\varphi} y \exists_{s_=} \bar{x} (f_\varphi(\bar{x}) = y)$

Axioms 2 and 3 simply state that f_φ is the quotient function for the equivalence relation given by φ

Definition 2.15. Let $M \models T$. Then M^{eq} is the L^{eq} structure s.t. $s_=(M^{\text{eq}}) = M$ and for each suitable L -formula $\varphi(x, y)$ of n variables, the sort $s_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})$ is equal to $M^{n_{f_\varphi}} / E$ where E is the equivalence relation defined by $\varphi(x, y)$ and $f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})(b) = b / E$

Example 2.2 (Projective planes). From Hodges.

Suppose A is a three-dimensional vector space over a finite field, and let L be the first-order language of A . Then we can write a formula $\theta(x, y)$ of L which expresses 'vectors x and y are non-zero and are linearly dependent on each other'. The formula θ is an equivalence formula of A , and the sort s_θ is the set of points of the projective plane P associated with A

Now $M^{\text{eq}} \models T^{\text{eq}}$. Moreover, passing from T to T^{eq} is a canonical operation, in the following sense

- Lemma 2.16.** 1. For any $N \models T^{\text{eq}}$, there is an $M \models T$ s.t. $N \cong M^{\text{eq}}$
2. Suppose $M, N \models T$ are isomorphic, and let $h : M \cong N$. Then h extends uniquely to $h^{\text{eq}} : M^{\text{eq}} \cong N^{\text{eq}}$
3. T^{eq} is a complete L^{eq} -theory
4. Suppose $M, N \models T$ and let $\bar{a} \in M, \bar{b} \in N$ with $\text{tp}_M(\bar{a}) = \text{tp}_N(\bar{b})$. Then $\text{tp}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(\bar{a}) = \text{tp}_{N^{\text{eq}}}(\bar{b})$

Proof. 1. Take $M = s_=(N)$

2. Let $h^{\text{eq}} : M^{\text{eq}} \rightarrow N^{\text{eq}}$ be defined as $h^{\text{eq}}(f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})(b)) = f_\varphi(N^{\text{eq}})(h(b))$ for each $\varphi \in L$. This defines a function on M^{eq} , because $f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})$ is surjective by the T^{eq} axioms. Moreover h^{eq} is well-defined. Suppose $f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})(b) = f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})(b')$, then $\varphi(b, b')$ and hence $\varphi(h(b), h(b'))$, therefore $f_\varphi(N^{\text{eq}})(h(b)) = f_\varphi(N^{\text{eq}})(h(b'))$. Injectivity is the same since $\varphi(b, b') \leftrightarrow \varphi(h(b), h(b'))$.

$$\begin{aligned} f_\varphi(N^{\text{eq}})(h(b)) = f_\varphi(N^{\text{eq}})(h(b')) &\Leftrightarrow h(b)/E_\varphi = h(b')/E_\varphi \\ &\Leftrightarrow \varphi(h(b), h(b')) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \varphi(b, b') \\ &\Leftrightarrow f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})(b) = f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})(b') \end{aligned}$$

3. Let $M, N \models T^{\text{eq}}$, we want to show that they are elementary equivalent. Assume the generalized continuum hypothesis. By GCH, there are $M', N' \models T^{\text{eq}}$ which are λ saturated of size λ , for some large λ (strongly inaccessible), which $M \leq M'$ and $N \leq N'$. Since we want to show elementary equivalence, we can replace M, N with M' and N' . By 1, we have $M = M_0^{\text{eq}}, N = N_0^{\text{eq}}$ for some $M_0, N_0 \models T$. Furthermore, M_0, N_0 are λ -saturated of size λ . By assumption, T is complete, so $M_0 \equiv N_0$, and therefore $M_0 \cong N_0$. By 2, $M \cong N$, and therefore $M \equiv N$

We could simply prove that there is a back and forth system between M and N , using such a system between $M \supset M_0 \models T$ and $N \supset N_0 \models T$
 $M_0 \equiv N_0$ iff $M_0 \sim_\omega N_0$. We want to show that $M \sim_\omega N$. For any $p \in \omega$,

- given $a \in s_=(M)$, choose according to M
- given $a \in s_\varphi(M)$, then there is $\bar{b}\bar{c} \in s_=(M)$ s.t. $f_\varphi(M^{\text{eq}})(\bar{b}\bar{c}) = a$ and $\varphi(\bar{b}, \bar{c})$. If $\bar{b} \in s_=(M^{\text{eq}})^n$, then there is a local isomorphism $\bar{b} \mapsto \bar{d}$ as $M \sim_\omega N$. Take $b = \bar{d}/E_\varphi$.

4. Let $M, N \models T$, they are elementary submodels of \mathfrak{C} . Since $\text{tp}_M(\bar{a}) = \text{tp}_N(\bar{b})$, there exists an $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ with $\sigma(\bar{a}) = \bar{b}$. By 2, this automorphism extends to $\sigma^{\text{eq}} : \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$ with $\sigma^{\text{eq}}(a) = b$, hence $\text{tp}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(a) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}}(a) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}}(b) = \text{tp}_{N^{\text{eq}}}(b)$

□

Corollary 2.17. *Consider the Strong space $S_{(s=)^n}(T^{\text{eq}})$. The forgetful map $\pi : S_{(s=)^n}(T^{\text{eq}}) \rightarrow S_n(T)$ is a homeomorphism*

Proof. Observe that it is continuous and surjective. By 4 of the previous lemma it is injective. Any continuous bijection from a compact space to a Hausdorff space is a homeomorphism

□

Proposition 2.18. *Let $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ be an L^{eq} formula, where x_i is of sort S_{E_i} . There is an L -formula $\psi(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k)$ s.t.*

$$T^{\text{eq}} \models \forall \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k (\psi(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k) \leftrightarrow \varphi(f_{E_1}(\bar{y}_1), \dots, f_{E_k}(\bar{y}_k)))$$

Proof. Let n be the length of $\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k$. Consider the set $\pi[\varphi(f_{E_1}(\bar{y}_1), \dots, f_{E_k}(\bar{y}_k))]$, it is a clopen subset of $S_n(T)$ by the previous lemma, hence equal to $\psi(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k)$ for some formula ψ .

Guess the intuition is $[\varphi] = [\psi]$ iff $\models \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi$. Consider $\pi[\psi(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k)] = \pi[\varphi(f_{E_1}(\bar{y}_1), \dots, f_{E_k}(\bar{y}_k))]$ and as π is homeomorphism, $[\psi(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k)] = [\varphi(f_{E_1}(\bar{y}_1), \dots, f_{E_k}(\bar{y}_k))]$

□

This proposition also shows that T^{eq} is complete since f_{E_i} is surjective
Also, for any $\bar{c} \in \mathfrak{C}$, $\bar{c} \in \text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset) \Leftrightarrow \bar{c} \in \text{dcl}(\emptyset)$, $\bar{c} \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset) \Leftrightarrow \bar{c} \in \text{acl}(\emptyset)$

Corollary 2.19. 1. *Let $M, N \models T$, and let $h : M \rightarrow N$ be an elementary embedding. Then $h^{\text{eq}} : M^{\text{eq}} \rightarrow N^{\text{eq}}$ is also an elementary embedding*

2. \mathfrak{C}^{eq} is also κ -saturated

Proof. 1. $h : M \rightarrow \text{im}(h)$ is an isomorphism and can extend to $h^{\text{eq}} : M^{\text{eq}} \rightarrow (\text{im}(h))^{\text{eq}}$, and $(\text{im}(h))^{\text{eq}} \subseteq N^{\text{eq}}$

2. By Proposition 2.18

□

Remark. For $M \models T$, a definable set $X \subseteq M^n$ can be viewed as an element of M^{eq} . Suppose X is defined in M by $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ where $\bar{a} \in M$. Consider the equivalence relation E_ψ defined by $\psi(\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2) = \forall \bar{x} (\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_1) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_2))$
 $\bar{y}_1 \sim \bar{y}_2$ iff this $\varphi(M, \bar{y}_1) = \varphi(M, \bar{y}_2)$, and consider $c = \bar{a}/E_\psi = f_\psi(\bar{a}) \in$

M^{eq} . Then X is defined in M^{eq} by $\chi(\bar{x}, c) = \exists \bar{y}(\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge f_\psi(\bar{y}) = c)$. Moreover, if $c' \in S_\psi(M^{\text{eq}})$ and $\forall \bar{x}(\chi(\bar{x}, c) \leftrightarrow \chi(\bar{x}, c'))$, then $c = c'$. To see this, let $c' = f_\psi(\bar{a}')$, and let X' be defined in M by $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{a}')$. Then X' is defined in M^{eq} by $\chi(\bar{x}, c')$, so we have that $X = X'$ (in M^{eq}). And then $X = X'$ (in M) so $c = f_\psi(\bar{a}) = f_{\psi'}(\bar{a}') = c'$

Definition 2.20. With the above considerations in mind, given $M \models T$ and a definable set $X \subseteq M^n$, we call such a $c \in M^{\text{eq}}$ a **code** for X

Remark. Any automorphism of \mathfrak{C}^{eq} fixes a definable set X set-wise iff it fixes a code for X . However, the choice of a code for X will depend on the formula φ used to define it

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(X) = X &\Leftrightarrow \sigma(X) = \{\sigma(x) : \varphi(x, b)\} = \{x : \varphi(x, \sigma(b))\} = \{x : \varphi(x, b)\} = X \\ &\Leftrightarrow \forall x(\varphi(x, b) \leftrightarrow \varphi(x, \sigma(b))) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \psi(b, \sigma(b)) \Leftrightarrow f_\psi(b) = f_\psi(\sigma(b)) \end{aligned}$$

We can think of \mathfrak{C}^{eq} as adjoining codes for all definable equivalence relations (as c/E' codes $E'(x, c)$ for an arbitrary equivalence relation E)

Definition 2.21. Let $A \subseteq M \models T$. Then $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A) = \{c \in M^{\text{eq}} : c \in \text{acl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(A)\}$ and $\text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$ is defined similarly

Remark. Suppose $A \subseteq M < N$, then $\text{acl}_{N^{\text{eq}}}(A), \text{dcl}_{N^{\text{eq}}}(A) \subseteq M^{\text{eq}}$, so this notation is unambiguous

Lemma 2.22. Let $M \models T$, a definable subset X of M^n , and $A \subseteq M$. Then X is almost A -definable iff X is definable in M^{eq} by a formula with parameters in $\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$

Proof. We can work in \mathfrak{C} , since $M < \mathfrak{C}$. Let c be a code for X . From 2.10 X is almost A -definable iff $|\{\sigma(X) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)\}| < \omega$ iff $|\{\sigma(c) : \sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}/A)\}| < \omega$ (note that σ extends uniquely in \mathfrak{C}^{eq} , that is, $c \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$).

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(b)/E = \sigma'(b)/E &\Leftrightarrow \forall x(\varphi(x, \sigma(b)) \leftrightarrow \varphi(x, \sigma'(b))) \\ &\Leftrightarrow \sigma(X) = \sigma'(X) \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 2.23. Let $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}$ have length n . Let \bar{a}, \bar{b} have the same strong type over A (written as $\text{stp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\bar{a}/A) = \text{stp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\bar{b}/A)$) if $E(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ for any finite equivalence relation (finitely many classes) defined over A

Remark. If $\varphi(\bar{x})$ is a formula over A , then it defines an equivalence with two classes $E(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$ iff $(\varphi(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}_2)) \vee (\neg\varphi(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \neg\varphi(\bar{x}_2))$. Hence strong types are a refinement of types

Hence for any formula if $\text{stp}(\bar{a}/A) = \text{stp}(\bar{b}/B)$, at least we have $\varphi(\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{b})$

Lemma 2.24. *If $A = M < \mathfrak{C}$, then $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(a/M) \models \text{stp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(a/M)$*

$$\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(a/M) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(b/M) \Rightarrow \text{stp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(a/M) = \text{stp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(b/M)$$

Proof. Let E be an equivalence relation with finitely many classes, defined over M , and \bar{b} another realization of $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\bar{a}/M)$, we want to show $E(a, b)$. Since E has only finitely many classes, and M is a model, there are representants e_1, \dots, e_n of each E -class in M . Hence we must have $E(a, e_i)$ for some i , and therefore $E(b, e_i)$, which yields $E(a, b)$ \square

Lemma 2.25. *Let $A \subseteq M \models T$, and let $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in M$. TFAE*

1. $\text{stp}(\bar{a}/A) = \text{stp}(\bar{b}/A)$
2. \bar{a}, \bar{b} satisfy the same formulas almost A -definable
3. $\text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\bar{a}/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)) = \text{tp}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\bar{b}/\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A))$

Proof. $3 \rightarrow 2$. 2.22. Suppose $X = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{d})$ is almost A -definable, then $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{d})$ iff $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \theta(\mathfrak{C}) := \exists \bar{y}(\varphi(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{y}) \wedge \bar{y}/E_{\psi} = \bar{c})$ where $\bar{c} = \bar{d}/E_{\psi} \in \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A)$.

$2 \rightarrow 3$

$1 \rightarrow 2$. Let X be almost definable over A . We want to show that $\bar{a} \in X$ iff $\bar{b} \in X$.

Since X is almost definable over A , there is an A -definable equivalence relation E with finitely many classes, and $\bar{c}_1, \dots, \bar{c}_n$ s.t. for all $\bar{x} \in M$, we have $\bar{x} \in X$ iff $M \models E(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_1) \vee \dots \vee E(\bar{x}, \bar{c}_n)$. Hence $E(\bar{a}, \bar{c}_i)$ for some i , so by assumption $E(\bar{b}, \bar{c}_i)$.

$2 \rightarrow 1$. Let E be an A -definable equivalence relation with finitely many classes, we want to show that $E(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. The set $X = \{\bar{x} \in M : E(\bar{x}, \bar{a})\}$ is definable almost over A . But $\bar{a} \in X$, so $\bar{b} \in X$, hence $E(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ \square

Here is a note from scanlon

Definition 2.26. An **imaginary element** of \mathfrak{A} is a class a/E where $a \in A^n$ and E is a definable equivalence relation on A^n

Definition 2.27. \mathfrak{A} **eliminates imaginaries** if, for every definable equivalence relation E on A^n there exists definable function $f : A^n \rightarrow A^m$ s.t. for $x, y \in A^n$ we have

$$xEy \Leftrightarrow f(x) = f(y)$$

Remark. The definition give above is what Hodges calls **uniform elimination of imaginaries**

Remark. If \mathfrak{A} eliminates imaginaries, then for any definable set X and definable equivalence relation E on X , there is a definable set Y and a definable bijection $f : X/E \rightarrow Y$. Of course this is not literally true, we should rather say that there is a definable map $f' : X \rightarrow Y$ s.t. f' is invariant on the equivalence classes defined by E

So elimination of imaginaries is saying that quotients exists in the category of definable sets

Remark. If \mathfrak{A} eliminates imaginaries then for any imaginaries element $a/E = \tilde{a}$ there is some tuple $\hat{a} \in A^m$ s.t. \tilde{a} and \hat{a} are **interdefinable**, i.e. there is a formula $\varphi(x, y)$ s.t.

- $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi(a, \tilde{a})$
- If $a' Ea$ then $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi(a', \hat{a})$
- If $\varphi(b, \hat{a})$ then bEa
- If $\varphi(a, c)$ then $c = \hat{a}$

To get the formula φ we use the function f given by the definition of elimination of imaginaries and let $\varphi(x, y) := f(x) = y$

Almost conversely, if for every $\mathfrak{A}' \equiv \mathfrak{A}$ every imaginary in \mathfrak{A}' is interdefinable with a **real** (non-imaginary) tuple then \mathfrak{A} eliminates imaginaries

$$\{\forall xy(xEy \leftrightarrow f_E(x) = f_E(y)) \mid \forall E\}$$

Example 2.3. For any structure \mathfrak{A} , every imaginary in \mathfrak{A}_A is interdefinable with a sequence of real elements

Example 2.4. Let $\mathfrak{A} = (\mathbb{N}, <, \equiv \text{ mod } 2)$. Then \mathfrak{A} eliminates imaginaries. For example, to eliminate the “odd/even” equivalence relation, E , we can define $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by

$$f(x) = y \Leftrightarrow xEy \wedge \forall z[xEz \rightarrow y < z \vee y = z]$$

Definition 2.28. \mathfrak{A} has **definable choice functions** if for any formula $\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ there is a definable function $f(\bar{y})$ s.t.

$$\forall \bar{y} \exists \bar{x} [\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \theta(f(\bar{y}), \bar{y})]$$

(i.e., f is a skolem function for θ) and s.t.

$$\forall \bar{y} \forall \bar{z} [\forall \bar{x} (\theta(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \theta(\bar{x}, \bar{z})) \rightarrow f(\bar{y}) = f(\bar{z})]$$

Proof. If \mathfrak{A} has definable choice functions then \mathfrak{A} eliminates imaginaries \square

Proof. Given a definable equivalence relation E on A^n let f be a definable choice function for $E(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$. Since E is an equivalence relation we have $\forall \bar{y} E(f(\bar{y}), \bar{y})$ and

$$\forall \bar{y} \bar{z} [\bar{y}/E = \bar{z}/E \rightarrow f(\bar{y}) = f(\bar{z})]$$

Thus $f(\bar{y}) = f(\bar{z}) \Leftrightarrow \bar{y} E \bar{z}$ \square

Example 2.5. We now see that $\mathfrak{A} = (\mathbb{N}, <, \equiv \pmod{2})$ eliminates imaginaries. Basically since \mathfrak{A} is well ordered, we can find a least element to witness membership of definable sets, hence we have definable functions

Example 2.6. $\mathfrak{A} = (\mathbb{N}, \equiv \pmod{2})$ does not eliminate imaginaries

First note that the only definable subsets of \mathbb{N} are $\emptyset, \mathbb{N}, 2\mathbb{N}, (2n+1)\mathbb{N}$. This is because \mathfrak{A} has automorphisms which switches $(2n+1)\mathbb{N}$ and $2\mathbb{N}$

Now suppose $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^m$ eliminates the equivalence relation $\equiv \pmod{2}$, i.e.,

$$f(x) = f(y) \Leftrightarrow x \equiv y \pmod{2}$$

The $\text{im}(f)$ is definable and has cardinality 2. Since there are no definable subsets of \mathbb{N} of cardinality 2, we must have $m > 1$. Now let $\pi : \mathbb{N}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a projection. Then $\pi(\text{im}(f))$ is a finite nonempty definable subset of \mathbb{N} . But no such set exists

Proposition 2.29. *If \mathfrak{A} eliminates imaginaries, then \mathfrak{A}_A eliminates imaginaries*

Proof. The idea is that an equivalence relation with parameters can be obtained as a fiber of an equivalence relation in more variables. Let $E \subseteq A^n$ be an equivalence relation definable in \mathfrak{A}_A . Let $\varphi(x, y; z) \in L$ and $a \in A^l$ be s.t.

$$xEy \Leftrightarrow \mathfrak{A} \models \varphi(x, y; a)$$

We now define

$$\psi(x, u, y, v) = \begin{cases} u = v \wedge \text{"}\varphi \text{ defines an equivalence relation"} & \text{or} \\ u \neq v & \text{or} \\ \text{"}\varphi(x, y, v) \text{ does not define an equivalence relation"} & \end{cases}$$

Now ψ defines an equivalence relation on A^{n+l} . Let $f : A^{n+l} \rightarrow A^m$ eliminate ψ , then $f(-, a)$ eliminates E \square

Back to [Pillay(2018)]

- Definition 2.30.** 1. T has elimination of imaginaries (EI) if for any model $M \models T$ and $e \in M^{\text{eq}}$, there is a $\bar{c} \in M$ s.t. $e \in \text{dcl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(\bar{c})$ and $\bar{c} \in \text{dcl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(e)$
2. T has weak elimination of imaginaries if, as above, except $\bar{c} \in \text{acl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(e)$ (that is, $e \in \text{dcl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(\bar{c})$ and $\bar{c} \in \text{acl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(e)$)
3. T has geometric elimination of imaginaries if, as above, except $e \in \text{acl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(\bar{c})$ and $\bar{c} \in \text{acl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(e)$

Note that in particular, elimination of imaginaries imply the existence of codes for definable sets

Proposition 2.31. *TFAE*

1. T has EI
2. For some model $M \models T$, we have that for any \emptyset -definable equivalence relation E , there is a partition of M^n into \emptyset -definable sets Y_1, \dots, Y_r and for each $i = 1, \dots, r$ a \emptyset -definable $f_i : Y_i \rightarrow M^{k_i}$ where $k_i \geq 1$ s.t. for each $i = 1, \dots, r$, for all $\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2 \in Y_i$, we have $E(\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2)$ iff $f_i(\bar{b}_1) = f_i(\bar{b}_2)$
3. For any model $M \models T$, we have that for any \emptyset -definable equivalence relation E , there is a partition of M^n into \emptyset -definable sets Y_1, \dots, Y_r and for each $i = 1, \dots, r$ a \emptyset -definable $f_i : Y_i \rightarrow M^{k_i}$ where $k_i \geq 1$ s.t. for each $i = 1, \dots, r$, for all $\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2 \in Y_i$, we have $E(\bar{b}_1, \bar{b}_2)$ iff $f_i(\bar{b}_1) = f_i(\bar{b}_2)$
4. For any model $M \models T$, and any definable $X \subseteq M^n$ there is an L -formula $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ and $\bar{b} \in M$ s.t. X is defined by $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$ and for all $\bar{b}' \in M$ if X is defined by $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}')$ then $\bar{b} = \bar{b}'$. We call such a \bar{b} a code for X .

most typos i've ever seen in a proof

Proof. $2 \Leftrightarrow 3$. Since we concern only \emptyset -definable relations and functions, if it is true in some model, then it is true in any model

$1 \rightarrow 2$. Let $\pi_E : S_{\equiv}^n \rightarrow S_E$ the canonical definable quotient map. Let $e \in S_E$. By assumption, there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{c} \in \mathfrak{C}^k$ s.t. e and \bar{c} are interdefinable. In other words, there is a formula $\varphi_e(x, \bar{y})$ over \emptyset s.t. $\varphi_e(e, \bar{c})$. Moreover, $|\varphi_e(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{c})| = |\varphi_e(e, \mathfrak{C})| = 1$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} X_e = \{ \bar{x} \in \mathfrak{C}, \models \exists! \bar{y} \varphi_e(\pi_E(\bar{x}), \bar{y}) \\ \wedge \forall z (E(\bar{x}, \bar{z}) \leftrightarrow \\ (\forall y (\varphi_e(\pi_E(\bar{x}), \bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \varphi_e(\pi_E(\bar{z}), \bar{y}))) \} \end{aligned}$$

This means that φ_e defines a function on X_e , and that this function separates E -classes.

Then $\pi^{-1}(\{e\}) \subset X_e$.

Since each X_e contains $\pi^{-1}(\{e\})$, we get $\mathfrak{C}^n = \bigcup_{e \in \pi_E(\mathfrak{C}^n)} X_e$, and by compactness, there are e_1, \dots, e_l s.t. $\mathfrak{C}^n = \bigcup_{i=1}^l X_{e_i}$. **As each X_e is \emptyset -definable. Let $\bar{x} \in X_e \Leftrightarrow \theta_e(\bar{x})$. Suppose there is no such l , then $\{x = x\} \cup \{\neg \theta_e(x)\}$ is satisfiable and realised since \mathfrak{C} is saturated** Naively, we can pick $f_i = \varphi_{e_i} \circ \pi_E$, but X_{e_i} are not disjoint

However we can consider Y_1, \dots, Y_r to be the atoms of the boolean algebra generated by the X_i . These are disjoint, and we can pick, for each Y_j , appropriate f_i , to get the result

$3 \rightarrow 4$. Let $X = \varphi(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{a})$. Consider the \emptyset -definable equivalence relation $E(\bar{y}, \bar{z}) \Leftrightarrow \forall x (\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{z}))$. Let Y_i and f_i be as in 3 and say $\bar{a} \in Y_1$, and let $\bar{b} = f_1(\bar{a})$. Then $\exists \bar{y} (f_1(\bar{y}) = \bar{b} \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$ defines X , call this formula ψ

We have to show that \bar{b} is unique. Let \bar{b}' be s.t. $\exists \bar{y} (f_1(\bar{y}) = \bar{b}' \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}))$ also defines X , and let \bar{a}_0 be as the \bar{y} in the formula. Then $\varphi(x, \bar{a}_0)$ defines X , hence $\bar{a}_0 E \bar{a}$, which implies $\bar{b}' = f_1(\bar{a}_0) = f_1(\bar{a}) = \bar{b}$

$4 \rightarrow 1$. Let $e \in \mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}}$, then $e = \pi_E(\bar{a})$ for some $\bar{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^n$ and some \emptyset -definable equivalence relation E

The set $X = \{\bar{x} \in \mathfrak{C}^n \mid \models E(\bar{x}, \bar{a})\}$ has a code $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{C}^k$, so that $X = \psi(\mathfrak{C}^n, \bar{b})$. We are going to prove interdefinability of e and \bar{b} using automorphisms of \mathfrak{C}

First suppose that $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, and fixes e . We have $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}} \models \forall \bar{x} (\pi_E(\bar{x}) = \pi_E(\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}))$. Applying σ , we get $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}} \models \forall \bar{x} (\pi_E(\bar{x}) = \pi_E(\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}, \sigma(\bar{b})))$. But \bar{b} is a code for X , hence $\bar{b} = \sigma(\bar{b})$. This implies $\bar{b} \in \text{dcl}(e)$

Now suppose $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$ and fixes \bar{b} . Again $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}} \models \forall \bar{x} (\pi_E(\bar{x}) = \pi_E(\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow$

$\psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b})$) and $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{eq}} \models \forall \bar{x} (\pi_E(\bar{x}) = \pi_E(\sigma(\bar{a})) \leftrightarrow \psi(\bar{x}, \bar{b}))$. But $\psi(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$, $e = \pi_E(\bar{a}) = \pi_E(\sigma(\bar{a})) = \sigma(e)$. Hence $e \in \text{dcl}(\bar{b})$ \square

Note that condition 2 is somewhat unsatisfying, as we would like to have a quotient function for E , that is, $r = 1$

Proposition 2.32. *Suppose T eliminates imaginaries. We get $r = 1$ in condition 2 iff $\text{dcl}(\emptyset)$ has at least two elements*

Proof. First, suppose that $r = 1$. Consider the equivalence on \mathfrak{C}^2 given by $E((x, y), (x', y'))$ iff $x = y \leftrightarrow x' = y'$. In other words, the E classes are the diagonal and its complement (only two). Then $\pi_E(\mathfrak{C}^2)$ has two elements, and they belong to $\text{dcl}^{\text{eq}}(\emptyset)$. But because T eliminates imaginaries, this implies that there is also two elements in $\text{dcl}(\emptyset)$ by Proposition 2.18

Second, suppose that $\text{dcl}(\emptyset)$ contains two constants a and b . Let Y_i, f_i be as in condition 2. Using a and b , we can find some number k and functions $g_i : \mathfrak{C}^{k_i} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}^k$ s.t. $g_i(\mathfrak{C}^{k_i})$ are pairwise disjoint. We can check that the \emptyset -definable function $f : \mathfrak{C}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}^k$ sending $y \in Y_i$ to $g_i(f_i(y))$ has all the required properties \square

Remark. Elimination of imaginaries also makes sense for many sorted theories

Proposition 2.33 (Assume T 1-sorted). *T^{eq} has elimination of imaginaries*

Proof. Prove a strong version of 2 in Proposition 2.31 **that is, we don't need to distinguish Y_1, \dots, Y_r and f_1, \dots, f_r .** Let E' be a \emptyset -definable equivalence relation on a sort s_E in some model M^{eq} of T^{eq} . By Proposition 2.18 there is an L -formula $\psi(\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2)$ (\bar{y}_i the appropriate length) s.t. for all $\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2 \in M$, $M \models \psi(\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2)$ iff $M^{\text{eq}} \models E'(f_E(\bar{a}_1), f_E(\bar{a}_2))$. So $\psi(\bar{y}_1, \bar{y}_2)$ is an L -formula defining an equivalence relation on M^k for the suitable length k . Consider the map h , taking $e \in S_E$ to $f_\psi(\bar{a})$ for any $\bar{a} \in M^k$ s.t. $f_E(\bar{a}) = e$ for any $\bar{a} \in M^k$ s.t. $f_E(\bar{a}) = e$. Suppose $f_E(\bar{a}) = e = f_E(\bar{a}')$, we easily see that $f_\psi(\bar{a}) = f_\psi(\bar{a}')$, hence the map h is well-defined, and satisfies 2 of 2.31 \square

2.4 Examples and counterexamples

Example 2.7. The theory of an infinite set has weak elimination of imaginaries but not full elimination of imaginaries

Proof. First, we show that T has weak elimination of imaginaries. Let M be an infinite set and let $e \in M^{\text{eq}}$ be an imaginary element. Suppose that. Let $A \subset M$ be a finite set over which X is definable ?? . Consider the set

$$\hat{A} := \bigcap_{\substack{\sigma \in \text{Aut}(M) \\ \sigma(X)=X}} \sigma(A)$$

Since A is finite, there are $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ s.t. $\hat{A} = \bigcap_i \sigma_i(A)$

To see that T does not have full elimination of imaginaries, observe that there is never a code for any finite set. Indeed, if M is an infinite set, $X \subset_f M$, and $\bar{a} \in M$, we can find a permutation of M which fixes X as a set but does not fix \bar{a} , meaning \bar{a} could not be a code for X \square

Example 2.8. Let $T = \text{Th}(M, <, \dots)$ where $<$ is a total well-ordering. Then T has elimination of imaginaries

Proof. Every definable set has a least element. We verify (2) in 2.31. Let E be a \emptyset -definable equivalence relation on M^n . Let $f : M^n \rightarrow M^n$ s.t. for any \bar{a} , $f(\bar{a})$ is the least element of the E -class of \bar{a} . Notice that f is \emptyset -definable, and for all \bar{a}, \bar{b} , $f(\bar{a}) = f(\bar{b})$ iff $E(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$ \square

Lemma 2.34. Let T be strongly minimal and $\text{acl}(\emptyset)$ be infinite (in some, any model). Then T has weak elimination of imaginaries

Proof. Fix a model M . Let $e \in M^{\text{eq}}$ **Ok, now i think the convention for pillay is that $e \in M^{\text{eq}}$ is automatically imaginary,** so $e = \bar{a}/E$ for some \bar{a} and E some \emptyset -definable equivalence relation. Let $A = \text{acl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(e) \cap M$. A is infinite as it contains $\text{acl}(\emptyset)$. A is infinite as it contains $\text{acl}(\emptyset)$.

We first prove that there exists some $\bar{b} \subset A$ s.t. $E(\bar{a}, \bar{b})$. Let $X_1 = \{y_1 \in M : M \models \exists y_2 \dots y_n (\bar{y} E \bar{a})\}$. It is definable over e . If X_1 is finite, any $b_1 \in X_1$ then belongs to A . Otherwise, X_1 is cofinite, hence meets the infinite set A . Either way, $X_1 \cap A \neq \emptyset$ and we have $b_1 \in X_1 \cap A$

Now let $X_2 = \{y_2 \in M : M \models \exists y_3 \dots y_n (b_1 \bar{y} E \bar{a})\}$. We remark $X_2 \neq \emptyset$ since $b_1 \in X_1$. Now X_2 is either finite or cofinite since T is strongly minimal. By the same argument above, we may find $b_2 \in X_2 \cap A$. Then repeating this process, we may find $\bar{b} \subset A$. Therefore $\bar{b} \in \text{acl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(e)$.

Finally notice that $e \in \text{dcl}_{M^{\text{eq}}}(\bar{b})$ since $\bar{a}/E = \bar{b}/E = e$ \square

Example 2.9. The theory ACF_p has elimination of imaginaries, for any p

Proof. By Lemma 2.34, ACF_p has weak elimination of imaginaries. Therefore it suffices to show that every finite set can be coded. Let K be an algebraically closed field and let $X = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\} \subseteq K$. Consider the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} P(x) &= \prod_{i=1}^n (x - c_i) \\ &= x^n + e_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots + e_1x + e_0 \end{aligned}$$

Then we may take the tuple $\bar{e} = (e_n, \dots, e_0)$ to be our code for X . □

3 Stability

3.1 Historic remarks and motivations

Throughout this chapter we will fix a complete theory T in some language L . Moreover, we will have no problem in working in T^{eq} (that is to say, to assume $T = T^{\text{eq}}$)

For a given theory T , the spectrum functions is given as

$$\begin{aligned} I(T, -) &: \text{Card} \rightarrow \text{Card} \\ I(T, \lambda) &= \# \text{ of models of } T \text{ of cardinality } \lambda \text{ (up to isomorphism)} \end{aligned}$$

Conjecture 3.1 (Morley). *Let T be countable, then function $I_T(\kappa)$ is non-decreasing on uncountable cardinals*

One of such dividing lines is stability

3.2 Counting types and stability

Definition 3.2. For a complete first order theory T , let $f_T : \text{Card} \rightarrow \text{Card}$ be defined by $f_T(\kappa) = \sup\{|S_1(M)| : M \models T, |M| = \kappa\}$, for κ an infinite cardinal

Exercise 3.2.1. Show that

$$f_T(\kappa) = \sup\{|S_n(M)| : M \models T, |M| = \kappa, n \in \omega\}$$

gives an equivalent definition

It is easy to see that $\kappa \leq f_T(\kappa) \leq 2^{\kappa+|T|}$

Fact 3.3 (Keisler, Shelah [Keisler(1976)]). *Let T be an arbitrary complete theory in a countable language. Then $f_T(\kappa)$ is one of the following functions (and all of these options occur for some T):*

$$\kappa, \kappa + 2^{\aleph_0}, \kappa^{\aleph_0}, \text{ded } \kappa, (\text{ded } \kappa)^{\aleph_0}, 2^\kappa$$

Here, $\text{ded } \kappa = \sup\{|I| : I \text{ is a linear order with a dense subset of size } \kappa\}$, equivalently $\sup\{\lambda : \text{there is a linear order of size } \kappa \text{ with } \lambda \text{ cuts}\}$

ded is called the **Dedekind function**

Lemma 3.4. $\kappa < \text{ded } \kappa \leq 2^\kappa$

Proof. Let μ be minimal s.t. $2^\mu > \kappa$, and consider the tree $2^{<\mu}$. Take the lexicographic ordering I on it, then $|I| = 2^{<\mu} \leq \kappa$ by the minimality of μ , but there are at least $2^\mu > \kappa$ cuts

Every cut is **uniquely** determined by the subset of elements in its lower half □

Definition 3.5. Let $M \models T$

1. A formula $\phi(x, y)$ with its variables partitioned into two groups x, y , has the **k -order property**, $k \in \omega$, if there are some $a_i \in M_x, b_i \in M_y$ for $i < k$ s.t. $M \models \phi(a_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$
2. $\phi(x, y)$ has the **order property** if it has the k -order property for all $k \in \omega$
3. A formula $\phi(x, y)$ is **stable** if there is some $k \in \omega$ s.t. it does not have the k -order property
4. A theory is **stable** if it implies that all formulas are stable

Proposition 3.6. *Assume that T is unstable, then $f_T(\kappa) \geq \text{ded } \kappa$ for all cardinals $\kappa \geq |T|$*

Proof. Fix a cardinal κ . Let $\phi(x, y) \in L$ be a formula that has the k -order property for all $k \in \omega$. Then by compactness we have:

Claim. Let I be an arbitrary linear order. Then we can find some $\mathcal{M} \models T$ and $a_i, b_i : i \in I$ from \mathcal{M} s.t. $\mathcal{M} \models \phi(a_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$, for all $i, j \in I$

Consider

$$T' = T \cup \{\phi(a_i, b_j) : i < j\} \cup \{\neg\phi(a_i, b_j) : i \geq j\}$$

Let I be an arbitrary dense linear order of size κ , and let $(a_i b_i : i \in I)$ in \mathcal{M} be as given by the claim. By Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem, we can assume that $|\mathcal{M}| = \kappa$

Given a cut $C = (A, B)$ in I , consider the set of $L(M)$ -formulas

$$\Phi_C = \{\phi(x, b_j) : j \in B\} \cup \{\neg\phi(x, b_j) : j \in A\}$$

Note that by compactness it is a partial type, let $p_C \in S_x(M)$ be a complete type over M extending $\Phi_C(x)$. Given two cuts C_1, C_2 , we have $p_{C_1} \neq p_{C_2}$. As I was arbitrary, this shows that $\sup\{|S_x(M)| : M \models T, |M| = \kappa\} \geq \text{ded } \kappa$. Note that we may have $|x| > 1$, however using Exercise ?? we get $f_T(\kappa) \geq \text{ded } \kappa$ \square

Fact 3.7 (Ramsey). $\aleph_0 \rightarrow (\aleph_0)_k^n$ holds for all $n, k \in \omega$ (i.e., for any coloring of subsets of \mathbb{N} of size n in k colors, there is some infinite subset I of \mathbb{N} s.t. all n -element subsets of I have the same color)

Lemma 3.8. Let $\phi(x, y), \psi(x, z)$ be stable formulas (where y, z are not necessarily disjoint tuples of variables). Then

1. $\neg\phi(x, y)$ is stable
2. Let $\phi^*(y, x) := \phi(x, y)$, i.e., we switch the roles of the variables. Then $\phi^*(y, x)$ is stable
3. $\theta(x, yz) := \phi(x, y) \wedge \psi(x, z)$ and $\theta'(x, yz) := \phi(x, y) \vee \psi(x, z)$ are stable
4. If $y = uv$ and $c \in M_v$, then $\theta(x, u) := \phi(x, uc)$ is stable
5. If T is stable, then every L^{eq} -formula is stable as well
6. The formula $\varphi(x, y)$ is stable for T iff there is $n < \omega$ s.t. $\varphi(x, y)$ is n -stable: it is not the case that there are a_i, b_i (in \mathfrak{C} , or in some/any $M \models T$), $i < n$, s.t. $\models \varphi(a_i, b_i)$ iff $i < j$ for all $i, j < n$
7. There are $T, M \models T$ and $\varphi(x, y)$ s.t. $\varphi(x, y)$ is stable in M but it is not stable for T

Proof. 1. Suppose $\neg\phi(x, y)$ is unstable, then there is $I = (a_i, b_i)_{i \in \omega}$ s.t. $\models \neg\varphi(a_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$, equivalently, $\models \varphi(a_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow i \geq j$. Then add constants $(a_i, b_i)_{i \in \omega}$ and consider

$$\Gamma = T \cup \{\varphi(a_i, b_j) : i < j\} \cup \{\neg\varphi(a_i, b_j) : i \geq j\}$$

For any finite subset $\Gamma' \subset_f \Gamma$, we can reverse the order of I : suppose n is the maximum index and then let $i' = n - i$, $j' = n + 1 - j$. Then $i' < j' \Leftrightarrow n - i < n + 1 - j \Leftrightarrow i \geq j$. Hence I satisfies this, and hence $\varphi(x, y)$ is unstable

2. Suppose $\varphi^*(y, x)$ is not stable, then $\neg\varphi^*(y, x)$ is also unstable. Let a_i, b_i be witnesses in \mathfrak{C} of the latter. Then $a'_i = b_i$ and $b'_i = a_{i+1}$, $i < \omega$, witness the instability of $\varphi(x, y)$ as $j + 1 > i$
3. Suppose that $\theta'(x, yz)$ is unstable, i.e., there are $(a_i, b_i b'_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$ s.t. $\models \phi(a_i, b_j) \vee \psi(a_i, b'_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$P := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : i < j, \models \phi(a_i, b_j)\}, Q := \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : i < j, \models \psi(a_i, b'_j)\}$$

then $P \cup Q = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : i < j\}$. By Ramsey there is an infinite $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ s.t. either all increasing pairs from I belong to P , or all increasing pairs from I belong to Q

7. Consider the graph G , disjoint union of all finite graphs. Then the edge relation E is stable in G . Indeed, if it wasn't, we would have a vertex x_0 and infinitely many vertices $\{y_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ s.t. $E(x_0, y_i)$ for all i , which is impossible

But by 6, edge relation is not stable in $\text{Th}(G)$

□

Lemma 3.9. *Let X be a set and Y_1, \dots, Y_n are subsets of X . Define*

$$E(x, y) := \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (x \in X_i \Leftrightarrow y \in X_i)$$

Then E is an equivalence relation on X and $Z \subseteq X$ is a boolean combination of X_i 's iff

$$E(x, y) \Rightarrow (x \in Z \Leftrightarrow y \in Z)$$

Proof. E is an equivalence relation is obvious

\Rightarrow : obvious

\Leftarrow : Let U be the set of all boolean combination of X_i 's. Let V be all the set Z satisfying $E(x, y) \Rightarrow (x \in Z \Leftrightarrow y \in Z)$. We want to show that $U \subseteq V$. First each X_i satisfies the condition. □

Theorem 3.10 (Erdős-Makkai). *Let B be an infinite set and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(B)$ a collection of subsets of B with $|B| < |\mathcal{F}|$. Then there are sequences $(b_i : i < \omega)$ of elements of B and $(S_i : i < \omega)$ of elements of \mathcal{F} s.t. one of the following holds*

$$1. b_i \in S_j \Leftrightarrow j < i (\forall i, j \in \omega)$$

$$2. b_i \in S_j \Leftrightarrow i < j (\forall i, j \in \omega)$$

Proof. Choose $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ with $|\mathcal{F}'| = |B|$, s.t. any two finite subsets B_0, B_1 of B , if $\neg \exists S \in \mathcal{F}$ with $B_0 \subseteq S, B_1 \subseteq B \setminus S$, then there is some $S' \in \mathcal{F}'$ with $B_0 \subseteq S', B_1 \subseteq B \setminus S'$ (possible as there are at most $|B|$ -many pairs of finite subsets of B)

By assumption there is some $S^* \in \mathcal{F}$ which is not a Boolean combination of elements of \mathcal{F}' (again there are at most $|B|$ -many different Boolean combinations of sets from \mathcal{F}')

We choose by induction sequences $(b'_i : i < \omega)$ in S^* , $(b''_i : i < \omega)$ in $B \setminus S^*$ and $(S_i : i < \omega)$ in \mathcal{F}' s.t.

- $\{b'_0, \dots, b'_n\} \subseteq S_n$ and $\{b''_0, \dots, b''_n\} \subseteq B \setminus S_n$
- $\forall i < n (b'_n \in S_i \Leftrightarrow b''_n \in S_i)$

Assume $(b'_i : i < n), (b''_i : i < n)$ and $(S_i : i < n)$ have already been constructed. Since S^* is not a Boolean combination of S_0, \dots, S_{n-1} , there are $b'_n \in S^*, b''_n \in B \setminus S^*$ s.t. for all $i < n$

$$b'_n \in S_i \Leftrightarrow b''_n \in S_i$$

by Lemma 3.9

By the choice of \mathcal{F}' , there is some $S_n \in \mathcal{F}'$ with $\{b'_0, \dots, b'_n\} \subseteq S_n$ and $\{b''_0, \dots, b''_n\} \subseteq B \setminus S_n$.

Now by Ramsey theorem we may assume that either $b'_n \in S_i$ for all $i < n < \omega$ or $b'_n \notin S_i$ for all $i < n < \omega$ (for $\{x, y\} \subset [\mathbb{N}]^2$ and assume $x < y$, color it according to whether $b'_y \in S_x$. Thus by Ramsey, there is an infinite $I \subseteq \omega$ s.t.

- either $\forall n > j \in I (b'_n \in S_j) \Rightarrow \forall i, j \in I (b''_i \in S_j \Leftrightarrow i > j)$
- or $\forall n > j \in I (b'_n \notin S_j) \Rightarrow \forall i, j \in I (b'_i \in S_j \Leftrightarrow i \leq j)$

Note that if $b''_i \in S_j$ and $i \leq j$, then as $\{b''_0, \dots, b''_i\} \subseteq B \setminus S_j, b''_i \notin S_j$

In the first case we set $b_i = b''_i$ and get 1, in the second case we set $b_i = b'_{i+1}$ and get 2. \square

Definition 3.11. Fix $\varphi(x, y) \in L$. By a **complete φ -type over $A \subseteq M_y$** , we mean a maximal consistent collection of formulas of the form $\varphi(x, b), \neg \varphi(x, b)$ where b ranges over A . Let $S_\varphi(A)$ be the space of all complete φ -types over A

Proposition 3.12. Assume that $|S_\varphi(B)| > |B|$ for some infinite set of parameters B . Then $\varphi(x, y)$ is unstable

Proof. For $a \in \mathbb{M}_x$, $\text{tp}_\varphi(a/B)$ is determined by $\varphi(a, B) = \{b \in B \mid \models \phi(a, b)\}$. Then $|S_\varphi(B)| > |B| \Rightarrow |\{\phi(a, B) \mid a \in \mathbb{M}_x\}| > |B|$. By Erdős-Makkai, there are sequences $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ and $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$ s.t.

$$\text{either } \models \phi(a_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j, \text{ or } \models \phi(a_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow j < i$$

□

Remark. 1. By a φ -**formula over** M we mean a Boolean combination of instances (over M) of φ and $\neg\varphi$. For example, $(\varphi(x, c) \wedge \varphi(x, b)) \vee \neg\varphi(x, d)$ is a φ -formula

2. Any type $p(x) \in S_\varphi(M)$ decides any φ -formula $\psi(x)$ over M , that is to say $p(x) \models \psi(x)$ or $p(x) \models \neg\psi(x)$, so in fact $p(x)$ extends to a unique maximal consistent set of φ -formulas over M
3. By defining the basic open sets of $S_\varphi(M)$ to be $\{p(x) \in S_\varphi(M) : \psi(x) \in p\}$ for ψ a φ -formula, $S_\varphi(M)$ becomes a compact totally disconnected space, where in addition the clopen sets are precisely given by φ -formulas, i.e., they are the basic clopen sets
4. Any $p(x) \in S_\varphi(M)$ extends to some $q(x) \in S_x(M)$ s.t. $p = q \upharpoonright \varphi$, where $q \upharpoonright \varphi$ is the set of φ -formulas in $q(x)$ (or instances of $\varphi, \neg\varphi$ in $q(x)$)

3.3 Local ranks and definability of types

Definition 3.13. We define **Shelah's local 2-rank** taking values in $\{-\infty\} \cup \omega \cup \{+\infty\}$ by induction on $n \in \omega$. Let Δ be a set of L -formulas, and $\theta(x)$ a partial type over \mathfrak{C}

- $R_\Delta(\theta(x)) \geq 0$ iff $\theta(x)$ is consistent ($-\infty$ otherwise)
- $R_\Delta(\theta(x)) \geq n + 1$ if for some $\phi(x, y) \in \Delta$ and $a \in \mathfrak{C}_y$ we have both $R_\Delta(\theta(x) \wedge \phi(x, a)) \geq n$ and $R_\Delta(\theta(x) \wedge \neg\phi(x, a)) \geq n$
- $R_\Delta(\theta(x)) = n$ if $R_\Delta(\theta(x)) \geq n$ and $R_\Delta(\theta(x)) \not\geq n + 1$, and $R_\Delta(\theta(x)) = \infty$ if for $n \in \omega$, $R_\Delta(\theta(x)) \geq n$

If $\phi(x, y)$ is a formula, we write R_ϕ instead of $R_{\{\phi\}}$

Proposition 3.14. $\phi(x, y)$ is stable iff $R_\phi(x = x)$ is finite (and so also $R_\phi(\theta(x))$ is finite for any partial type θ). Here $x = (x_i : i \in I)$ is a tuple of variables and $x = x$ is an abuse of notation for $\bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i = x_i$

Proof. If $\phi(x, y)$ is unstable, i.e., it has the k -order property for all $k \in \omega$, by compactness, we find $(a_i b_i : i \in [0, 1])$ s.t. $\models \phi(a_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$. We know both $\phi(x, b_{1/2})$ and $\neg\phi(x, b_{1/2})$ contain dense subsequences of a_i 's. Each of these sets can be split again

Conversely, suppose the rank is infinite, then we can find an infinite tree of parameters $B = (B_\eta : \eta \in 2^{<\omega})$ s.t. for every $\eta \in 2^\omega$ there set of formulas $\{\phi^{\eta(i)}(x, b_{\eta|i}) : i < \omega\}$ is consistent where $\phi^1 = \phi$ and $\phi^0 = \neg\phi$ (rank being $\geq k$ guarantees that we can find such a tree of height k , and then use compactness to find one of infinite height). This gives us that $|S_\phi(B)| > |B|$, which by Proposition 3.12 implies that $\phi(x, y)$ is unstable \square

Definition 3.15. 1. Let $\phi(x, y) \in L$ be given. A type $p(x) \in S_\phi(A)$ is **definable over B** if there is some $L(B)$ -formula $\psi(y)$ s.t. $\forall a \in A$

$$\phi(x, a) \in p \Leftrightarrow \models \psi(a)$$

2. A type $p \in S_x(A)$ is definable over B if $p \restriction \phi$ is definable over B for all $\phi(x, y) \in L$
 $\forall \phi(x, y) \in L, \exists \psi(y) \in L(B), \forall a \in A$ s.t.

$$\phi(x, a) \in p \Leftrightarrow \models \psi(a)$$

3. A type is **definable** if it is definable over its domain
4. types in T are **uniformly definable** if for every $\phi(x, y)$ there is some $\psi(y, z)$ s.t. every type can be defined by an instance of $\psi(y, z)$, i.e., for any A and $p \in S_\phi(A)$ there is some $b \in A$ s.t. $\phi(x, a) \in p \Leftrightarrow \models \psi(a, b)$ for all $a \in A$

Remark. Another way to think about it:

Given a set $A \subseteq \mathfrak{C}_x$, $B \subseteq A$ is **externally definable** (as a subset of A) if there is some definable (over \mathfrak{C}) set X s.t. $B = X \cap A$

Assume moreover that we have $X = \phi(c, \mathfrak{C})$ above. Then $\text{tp}_\phi(c/A)$ is definable iff B is internally definable, i.e., $B = A \cap Y$ for some A -definable Y . A set is called **stably embedded** if every externally definable subset of it is internally definable. $\phi(x, a) \in \text{tp}_\phi(c/A) \Leftrightarrow \models \phi(c, a) \Leftrightarrow a \in X \Leftrightarrow \models \psi(a)$. Thus $X = \phi(c, \mathfrak{C}) = \psi(\mathfrak{C})$

Example 3.1. Consider $(\mathbb{Q}, <) \models \text{DLO}$ and let $p = \text{tp}(\pi/\mathbb{Q})$. Then $x < y \in p(y) \Leftrightarrow x < \pi$. By QE, p is not definable

Lemma 3.16. 1. The set $\{e \in \mathbb{M}^k : R_\phi(\theta(x, e)) \geq n\}$ is definable, for all $n \in \omega$

2. If $R_\phi(\theta(x)) = n$, then for any $a \in \mathbb{M}_y$, at most one of $\theta(x) \wedge \phi(x, a)$, $\theta(x) \wedge \neg\phi(x, a)$ has R_ϕ -rank n

Proof. 1. Let $S_n(\theta) = \{e : R_\phi(\theta(x, e)) \geq n\}$ and suppose it is defined by $\psi_{n,\theta}(x)$. Induction on n to show that $S_n(\theta)$ is definable for any θ . For $n = 0$, consider $\psi_{0,\theta}(x) := \exists y(\theta(y, x))$. Then $e \in R_0(\theta)$ iff $\theta(x, e)$ is consistent iff $\models \exists x(\theta(x, e))$ iff $e \in \psi_{0,\theta}(\mathfrak{C})$.

Now for $n, e \in S_n(\theta)$ iff $\exists a(R_\phi(\theta(x, e) \wedge \phi(x, a)) \geq n - 1 \wedge R_\phi(\theta(x, e) \wedge \neg\phi(x, a)) \geq n - 1)$

□

Proposition 3.17. Let $\phi(x, y)$ be a stable formula. Then all ϕ -types are uniformly definable

Proof. Suppose that $R_\phi(x = x) = n \in \omega$. Let $p \in S_\phi(A)$. Then there is $\chi(x) \in p$ s.t. $R_\phi(\chi(x)) = \min\{R_\phi(\varphi(x)) \mid \varphi \in p\}$. For each $b \in A_y$ either $\phi(x, b) \in p$ or $\neg\phi(x, b) \in p$. Either $R_\phi(\chi(x) \wedge \phi(x, b)) < n$ or $R_\phi(\chi(x) \wedge \neg\phi(x, b)) < n$.

$R_\phi(\chi(x))$ is minimal $\Rightarrow (\phi(x, b) \in p \Leftrightarrow R_\phi(\chi(x) \wedge \phi(x, b)) = n)$ □

Summary

Theorem 3.18. TFAE

1. $\phi(x, y)$ is stable
2. $R_\phi(x = x) < \omega$
3. All ϕ -types are uniformly definable
4. All ϕ -types over models are definable
5. $|S_\phi(M)| \leq \kappa$ for all $\kappa \geq |L|$ and $M \models T$ with $|M| = \kappa$
6. There is some κ s.t. $|S_\phi(M)| < \text{ded } \kappa$ for all $M \models T$ with $|M| = \kappa$

Proof. 1 \leftrightarrow 2 3.14. 1 \rightarrow 3 3.16. 3 \rightarrow 4 obvious.

4 \rightarrow 5. There are $|L| + \kappa = \kappa$ possible formulas defining $S_\phi(M)$ over M

6 \rightarrow 1 3.6 □

Global case:

Theorem 3.19. *Let T be a complete theory. TFAE:*

1. T is stable
2. There is NO sequence of tuples $(c_i)_{i \in \omega}$ from \mathbb{M} and formula $\phi(z_1, z_2) \in L(M)$ s.t.

$$\models \phi(c_i, c_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$$
3. $f_T(\kappa) \leq \kappa^{|T|}$ for all infinite cardinals κ
4. There is some κ s.t. $f_T(\kappa) \leq \kappa$
5. There is some κ s.t. $f_T(\kappa) < \text{ded } \kappa$
6. All formulas of the form $\phi(x, y)$ where x is a singleton variable are stable
7. All types over models are definable

Proof. 1 \rightarrow 2: definition

2 \rightarrow 1: Let $\psi(x, y)$ be a formula with order property witnessed by sequence

$$\{(a_i, b_i) \mid i < \omega\}$$

Let $\phi(x_1 y_1, x_2 y_2) := \psi(x_1, y_2)$ and $c_i : a_i b_i$. Then $\models \phi(c_i c_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$

1 \rightarrow 3: $S_x(M) \rightarrow \prod_{\phi \in L} S_\phi(M)$ is injective

3 \rightarrow 4, 4 \rightarrow 5: obvious

5 \rightarrow 1: 3.6

6 \leftrightarrow 1: Fix some κ , then $S_1(M) \leq \kappa$ for all M with $|M| = \kappa$ iff $S_n(M) \leq \kappa$ for all M with $|M| = \kappa$

1 \leftrightarrow 7: 3.18

□

Example 3.2. • stability \Leftrightarrow all types over all models are definable

- some unstable theories have certain special models over which all types are definable
- $\mathcal{M} = (\mathbb{R}, +, \times, 0, 1)$, all types over \mathbb{R} are uniformly definable

As we will see later, a theory T iff all types over **all** models of T are definable.

Note that there are unstable theories for which all the types over a certain models are definable. For instance, in the case of dense linear orders, all types over \mathbb{R} are definable

Indeed, by quantifier elimination, any non-realised 1-type over any model of DLO corresponds to a cut in its order. But in the case of \mathbb{R} , the order is complete, so for any cut, there will in fact exist a real number r s.t. the cut is of the form $(\{l \in \mathbb{R}, l < r\}, \{d \in \mathbb{R}, d > r\})$. Using this real number r , one can easily show definability of 1-types over \mathbb{R}

Proposition 3.20. *Fix a model $M \models T$ and an L -formula $\varphi(x, y)$. TFAE*

1. $\varphi(x, y)$ is stable in M
2. Whenever $M^* \succ M$ is $|M|^+$ -saturated and $\text{tp}(a^*/M^*)$ is finitely satisfiable in M , then $\text{tp}_\varphi(a^*/M^*)$ is definable over M and, moreover, it is defined by some φ -formula φ^* , i.e., a Boolean combination of $\varphi(a, y)$'s, $a \in M$

1# + BEGIN_{proof} 1 \rightarrow 2. Fix some $p^*(x) = \text{tp}_\varphi(a^*/M^*)$ finitely satisfiable in M . We want to prove $\text{tp}_\varphi(a^*/M^*)$ is definable over M by a φ^* -formula. Note first that, as p^* is finitely satisfiable in M , whether or not some $\varphi(x, b)$, $b \in M^*$, is in p^* depends only on $\text{tp}(b/M)$; in fact, even only on $\text{tp}_{\varphi^*}(b/M) = q(y) \in S_{\varphi^*}(M)$

Suppose we had $b' \in M^*$ s.t. $\text{tp}_{\varphi^*}(b'/M) = \text{tp}_{\varphi^*}(b/M)$, but $\varphi(x, b) \in p^*$ and $\neg\varphi(x, b') \in p^*$. Then we would have $\models \# + \text{END}_{\text{proof}}$

3.4 Cantor-Bendixson Rank

Definition 3.21 (Cantor-Bendixson Rank). Let X be a topological space. The **Cantor-Bendixson rank** is a function $CB_X : X \rightarrow \text{On} \cup \{\infty\}$. Let $p \in X$, then:

1. $CB_X(p) \geq 0$
2. $CB_X(p) = \alpha$ if $CB_X(p) \geq \alpha$ and p is isolated in the (closed) subspace $\{q \in X : CB_X(q) \geq \alpha\}$
3. $CB_X(p) = \infty$ if $CB_X(p) > \alpha$ for every ordinal α

For example, $CB_X(p) = 0$ if p is isolated, equivalently if $\{p\}$ is open. $CB_X(p) \geq 1$ otherwise

Note that 2 claims that the subspace $\{q \in X : CB_X(q) \geq \alpha\}$ is closed for all α . This is a consequence of the fact that the set of isolated points of any topological space form an open set, as a union of open sets

Proposition 3.22. *Suppose X is compact and $CB_X(p) < \infty$ for every p in X . Then there exists a maximal element α of $\{CB_X(p) : p \in X\}$ and $\{p \in X : CB_X(p) = \alpha\}$ is finite and non empty*

Proof. Assume there is no maximal element. Then, for each ordinal α there exists some p_α in X s.t. $CB_X(p_\alpha) > \alpha$. The set $\{p_\alpha : \alpha \in On\}$ must have a limit point p in the compact set X , which cannot be isolated in any of the $\{q \in X : CB_X(q) \geq \alpha\}$. Hence $CB_X(p) = \infty$, a contradiction

Let $\alpha = \sup\{CB_X(p) : p \in X\}$. We want to show that $X_\alpha = \{p \in X : CB_X(p) = \alpha\}$ is non-empty. We only need to consider the limit case. Assume it is empty and for each $\beta < \alpha$, $X_{<\beta} = \{p \in X : CB_X(p) < \beta\}$. Since $\mathcal{C} = \{X_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ is an open cover of X which clearly has no finite subcover as α is a limit ordinal, a contradiction

$\{p \in X : CB_X(p) \geq \alpha\}$ is closed, so compact. Since α is maximal, all points in $\{p \in X : CB_X(p) \geq \alpha\}$ are isolated. Therefore $\{p \in X : CB_X(p) \geq \alpha\}$ is finite \square

Lemma 3.23. Suppose $\varphi(x, y)$ is stable in T . Let $M \models T$, $X = S_\varphi(M)$. Then $CB_X(p) < \infty$ for each $p \in X$

Proof. $X_\alpha = \{p \in X : CB_X(p) \geq \alpha\}$. If $\exists q \in X$ s.t. $CB_X(q) = \infty$, then for some α , $X_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ and has no isolated points. If not, then each X_α has at least one isolation point and we could conclude that $CB_X(p) \leq |X|$ for any $p \in X$

Now fix an α . Since there are no isolated points in X_α , we can find $p_0, p_1 \in X_\alpha$ where $p_0 \neq p_1$. Since $S_\varphi(M)$ is Hausdorff, we can find $\psi_0(x)$ s.t. $\psi_0(x) \in p_0$ and $\neg\psi_0(x) \in p_1$. Notice that $\{p : p \in X_\alpha\} \cap [\psi_0(x)]$ and $\{p : p \in X_\alpha\} \cap [\neg\psi_0(x)]$ have no isolated points. Thus we could build a tree and $|S_\varphi(M')| \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ for some countable model M' by Löwenheim–Skolem Theorem since there is only countable many parameters \square

3.5 Indiscernible sequences and stability

Definition 3.24. Given a linear order I , a sequence of tuples $(a_i : i \in I)$ with $a_i \in \mathfrak{C}_x$ is **indiscernible** over a set of parameters A if $a_{i_0} \dots a_{i_n} \equiv_A a_{j_0} \dots a_{j_n}$ for all $i_0 < \dots < i_n$ and $j_0 < \dots < j_n$ from I and all $n \in \omega$

- Example 3.3.**
1. A constant sequence is indiscernible over any set
 2. A subsequence of a A -indiscernible sequence is A -indiscernible
 3. In the theory of equality, any sequence of singletons is indiscernible
 4. Any increasing sequence of singletons in a dense linear order is indiscernible
 5. Any basis in a vector space is an indiscernible sequence

Definition 3.25. For any sequence $\bar{a} = (a_i \mid i \in I)$ and a set of parameters B , we define $\text{EM}(\bar{a}/B)$, the Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski type of the sequence \bar{a} over B , as a partial type over B in countably many variables indexed by ω and given by the following collection of formulas

$$\{\phi(x_0, \dots, x_n) \in L(B) \mid \forall i_0 < \dots < i_n, \models \phi(a_{i_0}, \dots, a_{i_n}), n \in \omega\}$$

Exercise 3.5.1. For any sequence $\bar{a} = (a_i \mid i \in I)$ and a set of parameters B . If J is an infinite linear order, then there is a sequence $\bar{b} = (b_i \mid i \in J)$ which realises $\text{EM}(\bar{a}/A)$

Exercise 3.5.2. If $\bar{a} = (a_i \mid i \in I)$ is an A -indiscernible sequence. Then $\text{EM}(\bar{a}/A)$ is a complete ω -type over A

Let $\bar{a} = (a_i \mid i \in I)$ and $\bar{b} = (b_j \mid j \in J)$ be A -indiscernible sequences. We denote $\bar{a} \equiv_{\text{EM}, A} \bar{b}$ if $\text{EM}(\bar{a}/A) = \text{EM}(\bar{b}/A) \in S_\omega(A)$

Proposition 3.26. Let $\bar{a} = (a_i : i \in J)$ be an arbitrary sequence in \mathfrak{C} , where J is an arbitrary linear order and A is a small set of parameters. Then for any small linear order I we can find (in \mathbb{M}) an A -indiscernible sequence $(b_i : i \in I)$ realize the EM-type of \bar{a} over A

Corollary 3.27. If $(a_i : i \in I)$ is an A -indiscernible sequence and $J \supseteq I$ is an arbitrary linear order, then there is an A -indiscernible sequence $(b_j : j \in J)$ s.t. $b_i = a_i$ for all $i \in I$ (everything involved is small)

Proof. Let $(b_j : j \in J)$ be an arbitrary A -indiscernible sequence in \mathfrak{C} based on I , obtained by 3.26. In particular

$$(b_j : j \in I) \equiv_A (a_j : j \in I)$$

which by strong homogeneity of \mathfrak{C} implies that there is some $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C}/A)$ s.t. $\sigma(b_j) = a_j$. Then define $b'_j = \sigma(b_j)$ for all $j \in J$ \square

Lemma 3.28. If $\bar{a} = (a_i \mid i \in I)$ is an infinite A -indiscernible sequence, then for all $S \subseteq I$ and $i \in I \setminus S$, $a_i \notin \text{acl}(A, a_{j \in S})$

Proof. $a_i \in \text{acl}(A, a_{j \in S}) \Leftrightarrow \exists S_0 \subseteq_f S (a_i \in \text{acl}(A, a_{j \in S_0}))$. Let $(b_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Q}) \equiv_{\text{EM}, A} (a_i \mid i \in I)$. Then for any $i_0 < \dots < i_n \in I$ and $j_0 < \dots < j_n \in \mathbb{Q}$

$$a_{i_k} \in \text{acl}(A, \{a_{i_s} \mid s \neq k, s \leq n\}) \Leftrightarrow b_{j_k} \in \text{acl}(A, \{b_{j_s} \mid s \neq k, s \leq n\})$$

WLOG, we assume that $I = (\mathbb{Q}, <)$.

Suppose that

$$a_{i_k} \in \text{acl}(A, \{a_{i_s} \mid s \neq k, s \leq n\})$$

and $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_k, \dots, x_n) \in L(A)$ witness the property. Then for any $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ realizing the same cut of a_{i_k} over $\{a_{i_s} \mid s \neq k, s \leq n\}$ we have

$$\models \phi(a_{i_0}, \dots, a_q, \dots, a_{i_n})$$

So $\phi(a_{i_0}, \dots, \mathbb{M}, \dots, a_{i_n})$ is infinite, a contradiction \square

Exercise 3.5.3. Start with the sequence $\bar{a} = (1, 2, 3, \dots)$ in $(\mathbb{C}, +, \times, 0, 1) \models \text{ACF}_0$. Give an explicit example of an indiscernible sequence realizing $\text{EM}(\bar{a})$

Proof. $x \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \Leftrightarrow \exists y \ x = y^2 \wedge x \neq 0$. And in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we can define an order $x > y \Leftrightarrow \exists z (x = y + z^2 \wedge z \neq 0)$. Note that $\text{EM}_{\mathbb{R}_{>0}}(\bar{a}) \subseteq \text{EM}_{\mathbb{C}}(\bar{a})$.

Thus \bar{b} should be an increasing sequence of reals greater than or equal to 1. \square

Definition 3.29. A sequence $(a_i \mid i \in I)$ is **totally indiscernible over A** if $a_{i_0} \dots a_{i_n} \equiv_A a_{j_0} \dots a_{j_n}$ for any $i_0 \neq \dots \neq i_n, j_0 \neq \dots \neq j_n$ from I

Theorem 3.30. T is stable iff every indiscernible sequence is totally indiscernible

Proof. \Rightarrow : Suppose T is stable and $(a_i \mid i \in I)$ is indiscernible over A . If $(a_i \mid i \in I)$ is not totally indiscernible, then there are $i_0 \neq \dots \neq i_n, j_0 \neq \dots \neq j_n$ from I s.t. $a_{i_0} \dots a_{i_n} \not\equiv_A a_{j_0} \dots a_{j_n}$ which implies they are in different orders. WLOG, assume that $I = (\mathbb{Q}, <)$ and $i_0 = 0, \dots, i_n = n$. Then there is $\sigma \in S_{n+1}$ s.t.

$$a_{\sigma(0)} \dots a_{\sigma(n)} \equiv_A a_{j_0} \dots a_{j_n}$$

$\sigma = \tau_m \dots \tau_1$, where τ_1, \dots, τ_m are transpositions. Then there is $0 < k < m$ s.t. $a_{\tau_k(0), \dots, \tau_k(n)} \not\equiv_A a_0 \dots a_n$. Assume $\tau_k = (s, s+1)$, then there is an $L(A)$ -formula $\psi(x_0, \dots, x_n)$ s.t.

$$\models \psi(a_0, \dots, a_s, a_{s+1}, \dots, a_n) \wedge \neg \psi(a_0, \dots, a_{s+1}, a_s, \dots, a_n)$$

Let $\phi(x, y) := \psi(a_0, \dots, a_{s-1}, x, y, a_{s+2}, \dots, a_n)$. Then for all $s < q, r < s+1$, $\models \phi(a_q, a_r) \Leftrightarrow q < r$, contradicting 3.19

\Leftarrow : Assume T is unstable. Then suppose that $\bar{c} = (c_i \mid i \in \omega)$ witnesses the order property of $\phi(x, y)$. Let $\bar{a} = (a_i \mid i \in \omega)$ be an indiscernible sequence based on \bar{c} . Then

$$\models \phi(a_i, a_j) \Leftrightarrow i < j$$

so \bar{a} is not totally indiscernible \square

Proposition 3.31. *For any stable formula $\phi(x, y)$, in an arbitrary theory, there is some $k_\phi \in \omega$ depending just on ϕ s.t. for any indiscernible sequence $I \subseteq \mathbb{M}_x$ and any $b \in \mathbb{M}_y$, either $|\phi(I, b)| \leq k_\phi$ or $|\neg\phi(I, b)| \leq k_\phi$*

Proof. Suppose that $|\phi(I, b)| > k$ and $|\neg\phi(I, b)| > k$. By compactness, we assume that $I = \omega$. Then either $\phi(I, b)$ or $\neg\phi(I, b)$ is infinite. Assume that $\neg\phi(I, b)$ is infinite. Then there is a subsequence $J = \{n_0 < n_1 < \dots\} \subseteq \omega$ s.t.

$$\models \phi(a_{n_i}, b) \Leftrightarrow i \leq k$$

by $\models \neg\phi(a_{n_i}, b) \Leftrightarrow i > k$.

Let $c_i = a_{n_i}$ and $b_k = b$ we have

$$\models \bigwedge_{i \leq k} \phi(c_i, b_k) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=k+1}^{2k} \neg\phi(c_i, b_k)$$

Since $(c_i)_{i < \omega}$ is indiscernible, we have

$$\models \exists y \left(\bigwedge_{i \leq k} \phi(c_i, y) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=k+1}^{2k} \neg\phi(c_i, y) \right) \rightarrow \exists y \left(\bigwedge_{i \leq j} \phi(c_i, y) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=j+1}^k \neg\phi(c_i, y) \right)$$

for each $j < k$ (pick k elements from $2k$ and choose by indiscernibility)

Let

$$b_j \models \bigwedge_{i \leq j} \phi(c_i, y) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=j+1}^k \neg\phi(c_i, y)$$

Then $\models \phi(c_i, b_j) \Leftrightarrow i \leq j$, so ϕ has k -order property. Since ϕ is stable, k_ϕ exists \square

Corollary 3.32. *In a stable theory, we can define the average type of an indiscernible sequence $\bar{b} = (b_i)_{i \in I}$ over a set of parameters A as*

$$\text{Av}(\bar{b}/A) = \{\phi(x) \in L(A) \mid \models \phi(b_i) \text{ for all but finitely many } i \in I\}$$

By proposition 3.31 it is a complete consistent type over A

3.6 Stable=NIP \cap NSOP and the classification picture

4 TODO Problems

3.5.3 2.1 2.3 2.4 3.22

5 Index

This is a functional link that will open a buffer of clickable index entries:

6 References

References

- [Pillay(2018)] Anand Pillay. Topics in Stability Theory. https://www3.nd.edu/~apillay/Topics_in_Stability_Theory__No_Intro_.pdf, 2018.
- [Chernikov(2019)] Artem Chernikov. Lecture notes on stability theory. <https://www.ams.org/open-math-notes/omn-view-listing?listingId=110792>, 2019.
- [Tent and Ziegler(2012)] Katrin Tent and Martin Ziegler. *A course in model theory*. Number 40. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [van den Dries(2019)] Lou van den Dries. Introduction to Model-theoretic Stability. <https://faculty.math.illinois.edu/~vddries/stable.pdf>, 2019.
- [Keisler(1976)] H Jerome Keisler. Six classes of theories. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 21(3):257–266, 1976.