

Stability

Let κ be an infinite cardinal.

Definition

A theory T is κ -stable if in each model of T , over set of parameters of size at most κ , and for each n , there are at most κ many n -types. That is:

$$|A| \leq \kappa \Rightarrow |S_n(A)| \leq \kappa.$$

An easy induction argument shows that it suffices to require that $|A| \leq \kappa \Rightarrow |S_1(A)| \leq \kappa$.

The theory ACF_0 is ω -stable, but DLO and $RCOF$ are not!

Goal of the day

Theorem

A countable theory T which is categorical in an uncountable cardinal is ω -stable.

By the way, by a countable theory I mean a theory in a countable language. For the proof I need two ingredients:

- 1 Ramsey's Theorem: a result from combinatorics.
- 2 The notion of (order) indiscernible.

Ramsey's Theorem

Ramsey's Theorem

Let A be infinite and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Partition $[A]^n$, the set of n -element subsets of A , into subsets C_1, \dots, C_k (their *colours*). Then there is an infinite subset of A all whose n -element subsets belong to the same subset C_j .

Proof.

By induction on n . $n = 1$ is the pigeon hole principle. So we assume the statement is true for n and prove it for $n + 1$. Let $a_0 \in A$: then any colouring of $[A]^{n+1}$ induces a colouring of $[A \setminus \{a_0\}]^n$: just colour $\alpha \in [A \setminus \{a_0\}]$ by the colour of $\{a_0\} \cup \alpha$. We obtain a infinite monochromatic subset $B_1 \subseteq A \setminus \{a_0\}$. Picking an element $a_1 \in B_1$ and continuing in this fashion we obtain an infinitely descending sequence $A = B_0 \supseteq B_1 \supseteq \dots$ and elements $a_i \in B_i - B_{i+1}$ such that the colour of any $(n + 1)$ -element subset $\{a_{i(0)}, \dots, a_{i(n)}\}$ ($i(0) < \dots < i(n)$) depends only on the value of $i(0)$. By the pigeon hole principle there are infinitely many $i(0)$ for which this colour will be the same. These $a_{i(0)}$ then yield the desired monochromatic set. □

Indiscernibles

Definition

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

$$A \models \varphi(i_1, \dots, i_n) \leftrightarrow \varphi(j_1, \dots, j_n).$$

Definition

Let I be an infinite linear order and $\mathcal{I} = (a_i)_{i \in I}$ be a sequence of elements in M , $A \subseteq M$. The *Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski type* $\text{EM}(\mathcal{I}/A)$ of \mathcal{I} over A is the set of $L(A)$ -formulas $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ with $M \models \varphi(a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n})$ for all $i_1 < \dots < i_n$.

The Standard Lemma

The Standard Lemma

Let I and J be two infinite linear orders and $\mathcal{I} = (a_i)_{i \in I}$ be a sequence of distinct elements of a structure M . Then there is a structure $N \equiv M$ with an indiscernible sequence $(b_j)_{j \in J}$ realizing the Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski type $\text{EM}(\mathcal{I}/A)$.

Proof.

Choose a set C of new constants with an ordering isomorphic to J . We need to show that

$$\text{Th}(M) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{c}) : \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \text{EM}(\mathcal{I}/A)\} \cup \{\varphi(\bar{c}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{d}) : \bar{c}, \bar{d} \in C\}$$

is consistent. (Here the $\varphi(\bar{x})$ are L -formulas and \bar{c}, \bar{d} tuples in increasing order.) □

Proof of The Standard Lemma, finished

Proof.

By compactness it is sufficient to show that

$$\text{Th}(M) \cup \{\varphi(\bar{c}) : \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \text{EM}(\mathcal{I}/A), \bar{c} \in C_0\} \cup \\ \{\varphi(\bar{c}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{d}) : \varphi(\bar{x}) \in \Delta, \bar{c}, \bar{d} \in C_0\}$$

has a model, where C_0 and Δ are finite. In addition, we may assume that all tuples \bar{c} have the same length n .

In that case we may define an equivalence relation \sim on $[A]^n$ by

$$\bar{a} \sim \bar{b} \Leftrightarrow M \models \varphi(\bar{a}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\bar{b}) \text{ for all } \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Delta$$

where \bar{a}, \bar{b} are tuples in increasing order. Since this equivalence relation has at most $2^{|\Delta|}$ equivalence classes, there is an infinite subset B of A with all n -elements subsets in the same equivalence class. Interpret $c \in C_0$ by elements b_c in B ordered in the same way as the c . Then $(M, b_c)_{c \in C_0}$ is a model. □

Another lemma

Corollary

Assume T has an infinite model. Then, for any linear order I , the theory T has a model with a sequence $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ of distinct indiscernibles.

Lemma

Assume L is countable. If the L -structure M is generated by a well-ordered sequence $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ of indiscernibles, then M realises only countably many types over every countable subset of M .

Proof.

See handout. □

Another corollary

Corollary

Let T be a countable L -theory with an infinite model and let κ be an infinite cardinal. Then T has a model of cardinality κ which realises only countably many types over every countable subset.

Proof.

Let T' be the skolemisation of T in richer language $L' \supseteq L$, and let I be a well-ordering of cardinality κ and N' be a model of T' with indiscernibles $(a_i)_{i \in I}$. Then the Skolem hull M' generated by $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ has cardinality κ and is an elementary substructure of N' . In addition, it realises only countably many types over every countable subset by the previous lemma. But then the same is certainly also true for the reduct $M = M' \upharpoonright L$. \square

Goal of the day achieved

Theorem

A countable theory T which is categorical in an uncountable cardinal is ω -stable.

Proof.

Let N be a model and $A \subseteq N$ countable with $S(A)$ uncountable. Let $(b_i)_{i \in I}$ be a sequence of ω_1 -many elements realizing different types over A . First choose an elementary substructure M_0 of N of cardinality ω_1 which contains both A and the b_i , and then choose an elementary extension M of M_0 of cardinality κ . The model M is of cardinality κ and realises uncountably many types over the countable set A . But by the previous corollary T also has a model of cardinality κ in which this is not the case. So T is not κ -categorical. □