

MODEL THEORY

STEFAN GESCHKE

CONTENTS

1. First order logic	2
1.1. Structures	2
1.2. Formulas	2
1.3. Semantics	3
1.4. Completeness	4
1.5. Examples of structures and first order theories	6
1.6. Compactness	8
1.7. Elementary substructures	15
2. Properties of first order theories	22
2.1. Categoricity and completeness	22
2.2. Quantifier elimination	30
2.3. Strongly minimal theories	43
3. Types	51
3.1. Isolated types	52
3.2. Saturation	55

1. FIRST ORDER LOGIC

1.1. **Structures.** A **vocabulary** τ is a set consisting of relation symbols, function symbols and constant symbols. We will usually use relation symbols such as P, Q, R, \leq, \dots , function symbols such as $f, g, h, \cdot, +, \dots$, and constant symbols such as $c, d, 0, 1, \dots$. To every relation symbol and every function symbol there is a natural number ≥ 1 attached to it, the **arity** of the symbol.

Now fix a vocabulary τ . A **structure** \mathcal{A} for τ (a τ -**structure**) is a nonempty set A together with

- (S1) relations $R^{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq A^n$ for every n -ary relation symbol $R \in \tau$,
- (S2) functions $f^{\mathcal{A}} : A^m \rightarrow A$ for every m -ary function symbol $f \in \tau$
and
- (S3) constants $c^{\mathcal{A}} \in A$ for every constant symbol $c \in \tau$.

A structure \mathcal{A} is often identified with its underlying set A . Sometimes we will denote the interpretation $R^{\mathcal{A}}, f^{\mathcal{A}}$ or $c^{\mathcal{A}}$ of a symbol R, f or c by R, f , respectively c as well.

A τ -structure \mathcal{B} is a **substructure** of \mathcal{A} if

- (U1) the underlying set B of \mathcal{B} is a subset of A ,
- (U2) every relation $R^{\mathcal{B}}$ is the restriction of $R^{\mathcal{A}}$ to B ,
- (U3) every function $f^{\mathcal{B}}$ is the restriction of $f^{\mathcal{A}}$ to B and
- (U4) every constant $c^{\mathcal{B}}$ agrees with $c^{\mathcal{A}}$.

Observe that (U3) implies that B is closed under all the functions $f^{\mathcal{A}}$. Similarly, (U4) implies that all constants $c^{\mathcal{A}}$ are already elements of B .

Two τ -structures \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are **isomorphic** if there is a bijection $i : A \rightarrow B$ such that

- (I1) for every n -ary relation symbol $R \in \tau$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$,
$$(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in R^{\mathcal{A}} \Leftrightarrow (i(a_1), \dots, i(a_n)) \in R^{\mathcal{B}},$$
- (I2) for every n -ary function symbol $f \in \tau$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$,
$$i(f^{\mathcal{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n)) = f^{\mathcal{B}}(i(a_1), \dots, i(a_n))$$

and
- (I3) for all constant symbols $c \in \tau$,
$$i(c^{\mathcal{A}}) = c^{\mathcal{B}}.$$

1.2. **Formulas.** A **first order formula** over τ is a finite sequence over the alphabet

$$\{\exists, \forall, \neg, =, (,)\} \cup \tau \cup \text{Var},$$

where Var is a countably infinite set of variables. We tacitly assume that the sets $\{\exists, \forall, \neg, =, (,)\}$, τ and Var are pairwise disjoint. The variables are usually denoted by x, y, z, \dots . Before defining formulas, let us define **terms**.

A term over τ is a finite sequence of characters that can be obtained by finitely many applications of the following rules:

- (T1) All constant symbols in τ and all variables are terms.
(T2) If t_1, \dots, t_n are terms and $f \in \tau$ is an n -ary function symbol, then $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is a term.

A first order formula over τ is a finite sequence of characters that can be obtained by finitely many applications of the following rules:

- (F1) If t_1 and t_2 are terms over τ , then $(t_1 = t_2)$ is a formula.
(F2) If $R \in \tau$ is an n -ary relation symbol and if t_1, \dots, t_n are terms over τ , then $R(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ is a formula.
(F3) If φ is a formula, then so is $\neg\varphi$.
(F4) If φ and ψ are formulas, then $(\varphi \vee \psi)$ is a formula.
(F5) If φ is a formula and x a variable, then $\exists x\varphi$ is a formula.

If φ and ψ are formula, we use $(\varphi \wedge \psi)$, $(\varphi \rightarrow \psi)$, $(\varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)$, and $\forall x\varphi$ as abbreviations for $\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \neg\psi)$, $(\neg\varphi \vee \psi)$, $\neg(\neg(\neg\varphi \vee \psi) \vee \neg(\varphi \vee \neg\psi))$, and $\neg\exists x\neg\varphi$, respectively. Also, we omit parentheses as long the readability does not suffer.

A variable x occurs **freely** in φ if x occurs outside the scope of a quantifier $\exists x$ or $\forall x$. A formula without free variables is a **sentence**.

We use the notation $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to indicate that x_1, \dots, x_n are pairwise distinct variables and that the free variables of φ are among the x_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$.

1.3. Semantics. We fix a τ -structure $\mathcal{A} = (A, \dots)$. Given a τ -term $t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ we define $t(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ (or, in more accurat notation, $t^{\mathcal{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$) as follows:

- (TA1) $x_i(a_1, \dots, a_n) = a_i$
(TA2) If $c \in \tau$ is a constant symbol, let $c(a_1, \dots, a_n) = c^{\mathcal{A}}$.
(TA3) If $f \in \tau$ is an m -ary function symbol and $t_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, t_m(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are terms, let

$$f(t_1, \dots, t_m)(a_1, \dots, a_n) = f^{\mathcal{A}}(t_1(a_1, \dots, a_n), \dots, t_m(a_1, \dots, a_n)).$$

Now, for every formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ we define the **validity** of $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ in \mathcal{A} :

- (FG1) If $t_1(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $t_2(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are terms, then $(t_1 = t_2)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} iff

$$t_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = t_2(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

- (FG2) If $t_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, t_m(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are terms and R is an m -ary relation symbol, then $R(t_1, \dots, t_m)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} iff

$$(t_1(a_1, \dots, a_n), \dots, t_m(a_1, \dots, a_n)) \in R^{\mathcal{A}}.$$

- (FG3) If $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are formulas, then $(\varphi \vee \psi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} iff at least one of $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} .
(FG4) If $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a formula, then $\neg\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} iff $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ does not hold in \mathcal{A} .

(FG5) If $\varphi(x, x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a formula, then $\exists x\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} iff there is $a \in A$ such that $\varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} .

If $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds in \mathcal{A} , we write $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

We extend the **model relation** \models to (possibly infinite) sets of formulas. Let $a : \text{Var} \rightarrow A$ be any function, an **assignment** of elements of A to each of the variables. Also, let Φ be a set of formulas over τ . Then Φ holds in \mathcal{A} under the assignment a (or with respect to a) iff for every formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \Phi$ we have

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a(x_1), \dots, a(x_n)).$$

In this case we write $\mathcal{A} \models \Phi[a]$ and say that (\mathcal{A}, a) is a **model** of Φ . If Φ holds in \mathcal{A} with respect to every assignment, then we write $\mathcal{A} \models \Phi$ and say that \mathcal{A} is a model of Φ .

Observe that the validity of a set of sentences in \mathcal{A} is independent of the particular assignment. If $i : A \rightarrow B$ is an isomorphism between the τ -structures \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , every assignment $a : \text{Var} \rightarrow A$ induces an assignment $b = i \circ a : \text{Var} \rightarrow B$ such that for every set Φ of formulas the following holds:

$$\mathcal{A} \models \Phi[a] \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{B} \models \Phi[b]$$

In particular, isomorphic structures satisfy exactly the same sentences.

The symbol \models is also used for the (semantic) implication between set of formulas. Let Φ and Ψ be sets of formulas over τ . Then Φ **implies** Ψ if for all τ -structures and all assignments a the following holds:

$$\mathcal{A} \models \Phi[a] \Rightarrow \mathcal{A} \models \Psi[a]$$

In this case we write $\Phi \models \Psi$.

We also allow single formulas on either side of \models , with the obvious meaning.

1.4. Completeness. One of the most important results of Mathematical Logic is the **Completeness Theorem** which states that the relation \models between sets of formulas can be defined in a purely syntactical way.

In order to do this, given a vocabulary τ , one fixes a set of rules and a set of axioms. The axioms are specific formulas over τ such as $(x = y) \rightarrow (y = x)$ for all variables x and y and $\varphi \vee \neg\varphi$ for every formula φ over τ . The rules typically are pairs of sets of formulas such as $(\{\varphi, \psi\}, \{(\varphi \wedge \psi)\})$. The rule $(\{\varphi, \psi\}, \{(\varphi \wedge \psi)\})$ allows it to **deduce** the formula $(\varphi \wedge \psi)$ from φ and ψ .

Given a set Φ of formulas over τ and a formula ψ , a **proof** of ψ from Φ is a finite sequence of formulas that ends with ψ and in which every formula is an axiom or an element of Φ or follows from previous formulas in the sequence by application of one of the rules. The formula ψ can be **deduced** from Φ if there is a proof of ψ from Φ . In this case we write $\Phi \vdash \psi$. If Ψ is a set of formulas and for all $\psi \in \Psi$, $\Phi \vdash \psi$, then we write $\Phi \vdash \Psi$.

The rules and axioms are chosen in such a way that the following theorem holds true:

Theorem 1.1 (Gödel's Completeness Theorem). *For every vocabulary τ , every set Φ of formulas over τ and every formula ψ over τ ,*

$$\Phi \vdash \psi \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Phi \models \psi.$$

A set Φ of formulas is **consistent** if there is a formula ψ which cannot be deduced from Φ . It turns out Φ is consistent iff no contradiction such as $\psi \wedge \neg\psi$ can be deduced from Φ .

The Completeness Theorem is usually proved in a slightly different form:

Theorem 1.2. *A set Φ of formulas over a vocabulary τ is consistent iff it has a model.*

Exercise 1.3. Show that Theorem 1.1 implies Theorem 1.2.

Hint: This implication can be proved without showing that Theorem 1.1 or Theorem 1.2 are actually true. Moreover, you have to be a little bit careful since we are considering sets of formulas, not just sets of sentences. A model of a set of formulas consists of both a structure and an assignment.

Exercise 1.4. Show that Theorem 1.2 implies Theorem 1.1.

Hint: The same as in Exercise 1.3.

1.5. Examples of structures and first order theories. A theory over a vocabulary τ is a set of sentences over τ . Given a structure \mathcal{A} , the theory of \mathcal{A} is the set $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$ of all sentences φ over τ such that $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi$. If \mathcal{C} is a class of τ -structures, then

$$\text{Th}(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{C}} \text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$$

is the theory of \mathcal{C} . If Φ is a theory, then $\text{Mod}(\Phi)$ is the class of all structures that are models of Φ .

We briefly discuss a few concrete examples of vocabularies, structures and theories.

1.5.1. Groups. There are several choices for vocabularies of group theory, namely a single binary function symbol \cdot for the multiplication, a binary function symbol together with a constant symbol e for the identity element or \cdot, e and a unary function symbol $^{-1}$ for the inversion of group elements.

If $\tau = \{\cdot\}$, we say a **group** is a τ -structure (G, \cdot) satisfying the following sentences:

- (G1) $\forall x \forall y \forall z ((x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z))$
- (G2) $\exists x \forall y (x \cdot y = y \wedge y \cdot x = y)$
- (G3) $\forall x \exists y \forall z (\forall z' (z \cdot z' = z' \wedge z' \cdot z = z') \rightarrow (x \cdot y = z \wedge y \cdot x = z))$

Group theory is the theory of the class of all groups, which by the Completeness Theorem is the **deductive closure** of the set of axioms of group theory stated above.

If we use the vocabulary $\{\cdot, e, ^{-1}\}$, we can state the axioms as follows:

- (G1) $\forall x \forall y \forall z ((x \cdot y) \cdot z = x \cdot (y \cdot z))$
- (G2a) $\forall x (e \cdot x = x \wedge x \cdot e = x)$
- (G3a) $\forall x (x \cdot x^{-1} = e \wedge x^{-1} \cdot x = e)$

Observe that these axioms are all of the same form: universal quantifiers followed by an equation (or a conjunction of equations). A formula is **atomic** if it contains no quantifiers or logical connectives (\neg, \vee).

Exercise 1.5. Let τ be a vocabulary and let Φ be a set of sentences that start with some universal quantifiers followed by an atomic formula. If \mathcal{A} is a model of Φ and \mathcal{B} is a substructure of \mathcal{A} , then \mathcal{B} is a model of Φ .

Notice that in a group (G, \cdot) the identity element and the inversion of elements are definable in the following sense: there are formulas $\varphi(x)$ and $\psi(x, y)$ such that for all $a \in G$, $(G, \cdot) \models \varphi(a)$ iff a is the identity element of G and for all $b, c \in G$, $(G, \cdot) \models \psi(b, c)$ iff b is the inverse of c . Namely, let $\varphi(x)$ be the formula $\forall y (x \cdot y = y \wedge y \cdot x = y)$ and let $\psi(x, y)$ be the formula

$$\forall z (\varphi(z) \rightarrow (x \cdot y = z \wedge y \cdot x = z)).$$

1.5.2. *The natural numbers.* Now consider the structure $(\mathbb{N}, S, 0)$, where S denotes the function that maps every natural number to its immediate successor. Consider the following **Peano Axioms**:

- (PA1) $\forall x \neg(S(x) = 0)$
- (PA2) $\forall x \forall y(S(x) = S(y) \rightarrow x = y)$
- (PA3) Whenever $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ contains 0 and is closed under the function S , then $A = \mathbb{N}$.

It is well known that these three axioms determine $(\mathbb{N}, S, 0)$ up to isomorphism. However, there is no way to express (PA3) in first order logic. A reasonable approximation is the following **scheme**: for every formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ consider

$$(PA3(\varphi)) \forall y_1 \dots \forall y_n ((\varphi(0, y_1, \dots, y_n) \wedge \forall x(\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \rightarrow \varphi(S(x), y_1, \dots, y_n))) \rightarrow \forall x \varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)).$$

Here $\varphi(0, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $\varphi(S(x), y_1, \dots, y_n)$ are used to denote the formulas obtained from φ by replacing every free occurrence of x by 0 or $S(x)$, respectively.

PA is the theory consisting of the axioms (PA1), (PA2) and (PA3(φ)) for all formulas $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ over the vocabulary $\{0, S\}$. As we will see later, PA does not determine $(\mathbb{N}, S, 0)$ up to isomorphism.

1.5.3. *Fields.* If for fields we choose the vocabulary $\{+, -, \cdot, ^{-1}, 0, 1\}$, where we consider $-$ as a unary function symbol, we have to be careful with the axioms. Namely, for a field $(F, +, -, \cdot, ^{-1}, 0, 1)$, the function $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ is only a partial function since it is not defined on 0. However, our concept of a structure does not allow for partial functions. So, if we insist on having $^{-1}$ in our vocabulary, we should add a new axiom to the usual field axioms, such as $0^{-1} = 0$, understanding that we always have to exclude 0 when we talk about multiplicative inverses of field elements.

1.5.4. *Vector spaces.* In linear algebra one typically considers at the same time various vector spaces over the same field, rather than vector spaces over different fields. One way to treat vector spaces as structures is to fix a field F and to introduce for each $a \in F$ a unary function symbol f_a that represents the multiplication of elements of the vector space with a . So, let $\tau = \{+, -, 0\} \cup \{f_a : a \in F\}$. In the case of an uncountable field F such as $F = \mathbb{R}$ or $F = \mathbb{C}$, this gives a natural example of an uncountable vocabulary.

Observe that in the case that F is infinite, we need infinitely many axioms to axiomatize the interaction between field elements and elements of the vector space. For example, for all $a, b \in F$ we need the axiom $\forall x(f_a(f_b(x)) = f_{ab}(x))$. This scheme of axioms corresponds to the single axiom

$$\text{“for all } a, b \in F \text{ and all } v \in V, a \cdot (b \cdot v) = (a \cdot b) \cdot v\text{”}$$

that is usually used in linear algebra. Here V stands for the vector space under consideration.

Exercise 1.6. Give a complete axiomatization of vector spaces as structures over τ .

1.6. **Compactness.** One of the important properties of first order logic is its **compactness**. If there is a proof of a formula ψ from a set of formulas Φ , then this proof uses only finitely many formulas from Φ . Therefore we have the following theorem:

Theorem 1.7 (Finiteness Theorem). *If Φ is a set of formulas over a vocabulary τ and ψ is a formula over τ , then $\Phi \vdash \psi$ iff there is a finite set $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ such that $\Phi_0 \vdash \psi$.*

Using the Completeness Theorem, we obtain that $\Phi \models \psi$ iff there is a finite set $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ such that $\Phi_0 \models \psi$. However, we will give a purely semantic proof of the Finiteness Theorem for the relation \models . The Finiteness Theorem for \models follows from

Theorem 1.8 (Compactness Theorem). *Let Φ be a set of formulas over τ . Then Φ has a model iff every finite subset of Φ does.*

In order to prove the Compactness Theorem, we will use **ultraproducts**, which are formed using **ultrafilters**.

Definition 1.9. Let I be a nonempty set. A nonempty collection $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(I)$ is a **filter** on I if

- (F1) $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{F}$
- (F2) If $A \in \mathcal{F}$ and $A \subseteq B \subseteq I$, then $B \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (F3) If $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $A \cap B \in \mathcal{F}$.

A filter \mathcal{F} is an **ultrafilter** if it is a maximal filter (with respect to set-theoretic inclusion).

A collection $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(I)$ has the **finite intersection property** if for all $A_1, \dots, A_n \in \mathcal{S}$, $A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_n \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 1.10. *Every family \mathcal{S} of subsets of I with the finite intersection property can be extended to an ultrafilter.*

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ A \subseteq I : \text{there is a finite } \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \text{ such that } \bigcap \mathcal{T} \subseteq A \right\}.$$

\mathcal{F} is the smallest filter that includes \mathcal{S} . Consider the partial order of all filters on I that extend \mathcal{F} , ordered by set-theoretic inclusion. It is easily checked that the union of every chain of filters is again a filter on I . Hence, by Zorn's Lemma, the partial order has a maximal element, which is an ultrafilter that extends \mathcal{S} . \square

Lemma 1.11. *Let \mathcal{F} be a filter on a set I . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{F} is an ultrafilter.
- (2) For all $A \subseteq I$, $A \in \mathcal{F}$ iff $I \setminus A \notin \mathcal{F}$.
- (3) For all $A, B \subseteq I$, if $A \cup B \in \mathcal{F}$, then $A \in \mathcal{F}$ or $B \in \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Since \mathcal{F} is a filter, it contains at most one of the sets A and $I \setminus A$. Suppose $I \setminus A \notin \mathcal{F}$. Since \mathcal{F} is closed under taking supersets, this implies that \mathcal{F} contains no subset of $I \setminus A$. In other words, every element of \mathcal{F} intersects A . Since \mathcal{F} is closed under finite intersections, it follows that $\mathcal{F} \cup \{A\}$ has the finite intersection property. Hence there is an ultrafilter \mathcal{G} on I such that $\mathcal{F} \cup \{A\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Since \mathcal{F} is a maximal filter, $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}$ and thus $A \in \mathcal{F}$.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Suppose neither A nor B are elements of \mathcal{F} . By (2), $I \setminus A, I \setminus B \in \mathcal{F}$ and therefore $I \setminus A \cap I \setminus B = I \setminus (A \cup B) \in \mathcal{F}$. It follows that $A \cup B \notin \mathcal{F}$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Let \mathcal{F} be a filter satisfying (3). We show that \mathcal{F} is maximal. Let $A \subseteq I$ be such that $\mathcal{F} \cup \{A\}$ is contained in a filter, i.e., has the finite intersection property. Then $I \setminus A \notin \mathcal{F}$. However, $(I \setminus A) \cup A = I \in \mathcal{F}$ since \mathcal{F} is nonempty and closed under taking supersets. By (3), $A \in \mathcal{F}$. This shows the maximality of \mathcal{F} . \square

Exercise 1.12. Let \mathcal{F} be an ultrafilter on I . Show that if $A_1, \dots, A_n \subseteq I$ and $A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_n \in \mathcal{F}$, then at least one of the sets $A_i, i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, is an element of \mathcal{F} .

We now fix a vocabulary τ .

Definition 1.13. Let I be a set and for each $i \in I$ let \mathcal{A}_i be a τ -structure. Let $\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$ be the usual product of the sets \mathcal{A}_i , i.e.,

$$\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i = \{a : a \text{ is a function defined on } I \text{ such that for all } i \in I, a(i) \in \mathcal{A}_i\}.$$

For every τ -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$ let

$$\llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket = \{i \in I : \mathcal{A}_i \models \varphi(a_1(i), \dots, a_n(i))\}.$$

If \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter on I and $a, b \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$, we let $a \sim_{\mathcal{U}} b$ iff

$$\llbracket a = b \rrbracket = \{i \in I : a(i) = b(i)\} \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Lemma 1.14. Let $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of τ -structures and let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on I .

- a) $\sim_{\mathcal{U}}$ is an equivalence relation on $\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i$.
- b) If $f \in \tau$ is an n -ary function symbol and $a_j \sim_{\mathcal{U}} b_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $\llbracket f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = f(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$.
- c) For every n -ary relation symbol $R \in \tau$, if $a_j \sim_{\mathcal{U}} b_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then

$$\llbracket R(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U} \iff \llbracket R(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Proof. a) It is clear that $\sim_{\mathcal{U}}$ is symmetric and reflexive. In order to show transitivity, let $a \sim_{\mathcal{U}} b$ and $b \sim_{\mathcal{U}} c$. Now $\llbracket a = b \rrbracket, \llbracket b = c \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. Since \mathcal{U} is closed under finite intersections, $\llbracket a = b \rrbracket \cap \llbracket b = c \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. Now $\llbracket a = b \rrbracket \cap \llbracket b = c \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket a = c \rrbracket$ and thus $\llbracket a = c \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. It follows that $a \sim_{\mathcal{U}} c$.

b) This is similar to the proof of a). If $a_j \sim_{\mathcal{U}} b_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $\llbracket a_1 = b_1 \rrbracket \cap \dots \cap \llbracket a_n = b_n \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. Now for all

$$i \in \llbracket a_1 = b_1 \rrbracket \cap \dots \cap \llbracket a_n = b_n \rrbracket$$

we have

$$f(a_1(i), \dots, a_n(i)) = f(b_1(i), \dots, b_n(i)).$$

It follows that $\llbracket f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = f(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$ and thus

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \sim_{\mathcal{U}} f(b_1, \dots, b_n).$$

c) This is similar to the proof of b). If $a_j \sim_{\mathcal{U}} b_j$ for every $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $\llbracket a_1 = b_1 \rrbracket \cap \dots \cap \llbracket a_n = b_n \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. If $i \in \llbracket a_1 = b_1 \rrbracket \cap \dots \cap \llbracket a_n = b_n \rrbracket$, then $(a_1(i), \dots, a_n(i)) \in R^{\mathcal{A}_i}$ iff $(b_1(i), \dots, b_n(i)) \in R^{\mathcal{A}_i}$. Now, if $\llbracket R(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$, then

$$J = \llbracket R(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \cap \llbracket a_1 = b_1 \rrbracket \cap \dots \cap \llbracket a_n = b_n \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}.$$

For every $i \in J$ we have $i \in \llbracket R(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket$ and thus $\llbracket R(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. The other direction of c) is symmetric. \square

Definition 1.15. Let $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in I}$ and \mathcal{U} be as in Lemma 1.14. The underlying set of the structure $\mathcal{A} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i / \mathcal{U}$ is the set $A = \prod_{i \in I} A_i / \sim_{\mathcal{U}}$ of all $\sim_{\mathcal{U}}$ -equivalence classes. For every constant symbol $c \in \tau$ we let $c^{\mathcal{A}}$ be the $\sim_{\mathcal{U}}$ -equivalence class of the function that assigns to every $i \in I$ the value $c^{\mathcal{A}_i} \in A_i$.

Given $a \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$, by $[a]_{\mathcal{U}}$ we denote the $\sim_{\mathcal{U}}$ -equivalence class of a . For every n -ary function symbol $f \in \tau$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$ let $f^{\mathcal{A}}([a_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [a_n]_{\mathcal{U}})$ be the $\sim_{\mathcal{U}}$ -equivalence class of the function that assigns to each $i \in I$ the value $f^{\mathcal{A}_i}(a_1(i), \dots, a_n(i))$.

For every n -ary relation symbol $R \in \tau$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$ let $([a_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [a_n]_{\mathcal{U}}) \in R^{\mathcal{A}}$ iff $\llbracket R(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. Observe that the structure \mathcal{A} is well-defined by Lemma 1.14. \mathcal{A} is the **ultraproduct** of the structures \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in I$, with respect to the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} .

Exercise 1.16. Let $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of τ -structures. Let $i_0 \in I$ and let \mathcal{U} be the ultrafilter on I that consists of all subsets of I that contain i_0 . Show that $\prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}_i / \mathcal{U}$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{A}_{i_0} .

Theorem 1.17 (Łoś). *Let \mathcal{A} be the ultraproduct of the structures \mathcal{A}_i , $i \in I$, with respect to the ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on I . Then for every formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$,*

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi([a_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [a_n]_{\mathcal{U}}) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction on the complexity of formulas. For atomic formulas, Łoś's Theorem follows immediately from the definition of the ultraproduct.

Now let $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be formulas and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$. Assume that for $\chi = \varphi$ and $\chi = \psi$ it holds that

$$\llbracket \chi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U} \text{ iff } \mathcal{A} \models \chi([a_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [a_n]_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

We have

$$\llbracket (\varphi \vee \psi)(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket = \llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \psi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket.$$

Now

$\llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \cup \llbracket \psi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$
iff $\llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$ or $\llbracket \psi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence, by our assumption on φ and ψ ,

$$\llbracket (\varphi \vee \psi)(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U} \text{ iff } \mathcal{A} \models (\varphi \vee \psi)([a_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [a_n]_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

Also,

$$\llbracket \neg \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket = I \setminus \llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket.$$

Since \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter,

$$I \setminus \llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U} \text{ iff } \llbracket \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \notin \mathcal{U}.$$

This shows that

$$\mathcal{A} \models \neg \varphi([a_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [a_n]_{\mathcal{U}}) \text{ iff } \llbracket \neg \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Finally, consider the formula $\exists x \varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$, let $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$ and assume that for all $a \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$,

$$\llbracket \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U} \text{ iff } \mathcal{A} \models \varphi([a]_{\mathcal{U}}, [b_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [b_n]_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

If $\llbracket (\exists x \varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$, for each $i \in I$ we choose $a(i) \in A_i$ such that $\mathcal{A}_i \models \varphi(a(i), b_1(i), \dots, b_n(i))$. For all $i \in I \setminus \llbracket (\exists x \varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket$ choose $a(i) \in A_i$ arbitrarily. Now

$$\llbracket (\exists x \varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \subseteq \llbracket \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket$$

and therefore $\llbracket \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. By our assumption on φ ,

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi([a]_{\mathcal{U}}, [b_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [b_n]_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

It follows that

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x \varphi)([b_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [b_n]_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

If

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x \varphi)([b_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [b_n]_{\mathcal{U}}),$$

there is some $a \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$ such that

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi([a]_{\mathcal{U}}, [b_1]_{\mathcal{U}}, \dots, [b_n]_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

By our assumption on φ , $\llbracket \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U}$. It follows that

$$\llbracket (\exists x \varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n) \rrbracket \in \mathcal{U},$$

finishing the proof of Łoś's theorem. \square

Definition 1.18. An ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on a set I is **free** if it does not contain any finite sets.

Exercise 1.19. Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter on an infinite set I . Show that \mathcal{U} contains a finite set iff \mathcal{U} is of the form $\{S \subseteq I : i \in S\}$ for some $i \in I$.

We have now gathered the necessary tools in order to prove the Compactness Theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Clearly, if Φ has a model, then so does every finite subset of Φ .

Now assume that every finite subset of Φ has a model. Let I denote the collection of all finite subsets of Φ . A set $S \subseteq I$ is **upward closed** if for every $\Phi_0 \in S$ and every $\Phi_1 \in I$ with $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi_1$ we have $\Phi_1 \in S$. If $S, T \subseteq I$ are nonempty and upward closed, then so is $S \cap T$. Namely, choose $\Phi_S \in S$ and $\Phi_T \in T$. Then $\Phi_S \cup \Phi_T$ is finite and, by the upward closedness of S and T , an element of both S and T . Hence $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$. Also, if $\Phi_0 \in S \cap T$ and $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi_1 \in I$, then Φ_1 is both in S and in T and thus in $S \cap T$.

This implies that the collection of all nonempty upward closed $S \subseteq I$ has the finite intersection property. By Lemma 1.10, the family of all nonempty upward closed subsets of I extends to an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on I . For every $\Phi_0 \in I$ choose a τ -structure \mathcal{A}_{Φ_0} that is a model of Φ_0 . Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \prod_{\Phi_0 \in I} \mathcal{A}_{\Phi_0} / \mathcal{U}.$$

Claim 1.20. $\mathcal{A} \models \Phi$

Let $\varphi \in \Phi$. Let $S = \{\Phi_0 \in I : \varphi \in \Phi_0\}$. Clearly, S is upward closed and nonempty. It follows that $S \in \mathcal{U}$. For every $\Phi_0 \in S$, $\mathcal{A}_{\Phi_0} \models \varphi$. Hence, by Łoś's theorem, $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi$. This shows that \mathcal{A} is a model of all of Φ . \square

Corollary 1.21 (Finiteness Theorem for \models). *For every set Φ of sentences over τ and every sentence ψ over τ , $\Phi \models \psi$ iff there is a finite set $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$ such that $\Phi_0 \models \psi$.*

Proof. Clearly, if $\Phi_0 \models \psi$ for some subset of Φ , then $\Phi \models \psi$. Now assume that for every finite $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$, $\Phi_0 \not\models \psi$. Then for every finite $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$, $\Phi_0 \cup \{\neg\psi\}$ has a model. It follows that every finite subset of $\Phi \cup \{\neg\psi\}$ has a model. By Theorem 1.8, $\Phi \cup \{\neg\psi\}$ has a model. This shows that $\Phi \not\models \psi$. \square

A special case of ultraproducts are **ultrapowers** where each factor is the same.

Exercise 1.22. Let I be a set, \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter on I , and \mathcal{A} a τ -structure. Let $\mathcal{B} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A} / \mathcal{U}$. Let B be the underlying set of \mathcal{B} . For

each $a \in A$ let $\bar{a} : I \rightarrow A$ be the map that assigns to all $i \in I$ the value a . Consider the map

$$j : A \rightarrow B; a \mapsto [\bar{a}]_{\mathcal{U}}.$$

Show that $j[A]$ carries a substructure of \mathcal{B} and that j is an isomorphism between \mathcal{A} and the substructure of \mathcal{B} that lives on $j[A]$.

We will now see our first example of a model of the first order Peano Axioms that is not isomorphic to \mathbb{N} .

Exercise 1.23. Let $\mathcal{A} = (\mathbb{N}, 0, S)$. Let $I = \mathbb{N}$ and let \mathcal{U} be a free ultrafilter on I . Consider the ultrapower $\mathcal{B} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{U}$ and define $j : A \rightarrow B$ as in Exercise 1.22. Show that j is not onto.

We give another application of ultraproducts.

Theorem 1.24. *Let Φ be a theory over a vocabulary τ . If Φ has arbitrarily large finite models, then it has an infinite model.*

Proof. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let \mathcal{A}_n be a model of Φ of size at least n . Let $I = \mathbb{N}$ and consider the **Fréchet filter**

$$\mathcal{F} = \{S \subseteq \mathbb{N} : \mathbb{N} \setminus S \text{ is finite}\}.$$

Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter that extends \mathcal{F} . It is easily checked that an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} is free iff it extends \mathcal{F} . Let $\mathcal{A} = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_n$.

For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $m \geq n$, \mathcal{A}_m satisfies the sentence

$$\varphi_n = \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n (x_1 \neq x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge x_1 \neq x_n \wedge x_2 \neq x_3 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n-1} \neq x_n).$$

By the choice of \mathcal{U} , for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the set $\{m \in \mathbb{N} : m > n\}$ is an element of \mathcal{U} . Hence, by Łoś's theorem, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi_n$. It follows that \mathcal{A} is an infinite structure. \square

This theorem can also easily be proved using the Compactness Theorem. Namely, if Φ has arbitrarily large finite models, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\Phi \cup \{\varphi_n\}$ has a model, where φ_n is defined as in the proof of the previous theorem. Since φ_m implies φ_n if $m \geq n$, we have that every finite subset of $\Phi \cup \{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a model. Hence $\Phi \cup \{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a model. But a model of $\Phi \cup \{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a model of Φ and has to be infinite.

Another application of ultraproducts is to prove the finite Ramsey Theorem from the infinite Ramsey Theorem. We only deal with the Ramsey Theorem for graphs. Let V be a set and let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph on V , i.e., let E be a binary relation on V that is both irreflexive ($\forall x \neg E(x, x)$) and symmetric ($\forall x \forall y (E(x, y) \leftrightarrow E(y, x))$). A set $H \subseteq V$ is **homogeneous** if either any two elements of H are related or no two elements of H are related.

Theorem 1.25 (Infinite Ramsey Theorem for graphs). *Every infinite graph has an infinite homogeneous subset.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an infinite graph. Without loss of generality we may assume that $V = \mathbb{N}$. We define a strictly increasing sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of natural numbers, a sequence $(i_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of 0's and 1's, and a sequence $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of subsets of \mathbb{N} such that $A_0 \supseteq A_1 \supseteq \dots$ and such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $m \geq n$, $a_m \in A_n$. Let $A_0 = \mathbb{N}$ and let $a_0 = 0$. Suppose a_n and A_n have been defined. One of the two sets $A_n^1 = \{a \in A_n : a > a_n \wedge E(a_n, a)\}$ and $A_n^0 = \{a \in A_n : a > a_n \wedge \neg E(a_n, a)\}$ is infinite.

Let $i_n \in \{0, 1\}$ be such that $A_n^{i_n}$ is infinite. Let $A_{n+1} = A_n^{i_n}$ and let $a_{n+1} = \min A_{n+1}$. This finishes the recursive definition of the three sequences. Now for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n < m$, whether or not $E(a_n, a_m)$ holds only depends on n . Namely, $E(a_n, a_m)$ holds iff $i_n = 1$.

Let $i \in \{0, 1\}$ be such that the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} : i_n = i\}$ is infinite. Now $H = \{a_n : i_n = i\}$ is an infinite homogeneous subset of V . \square

The finite Ramsey Theorem says that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph of size at least m has a homogeneous subset of size at least n .

Theorem 1.26 (Finite Ramsey Theorem for graphs). *For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that every graph of size at least m has a homogeneous subset of size at least n .*

Proof. Suppose the finite Ramsey theorem fails. Then there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a finite graph G_m of size at least m without a homogeneous set of size n . Let \mathcal{U} be a free ultrafilter on \mathcal{N} . Let $G = \prod_{m \in \mathbb{N}} G_m / \mathcal{U}$. Now G is an infinite graph that satisfies the statement

$$\neg \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{“the } x_i \text{ are pairwise distinct} \\ \text{and form a homogeneous set”} \end{array} \right),$$

which can be easily expressed in first order logic. This shows that G is a counter example to the infinite Ramsey Theorem. \square

Exercise 1.27. Use the Compactness Theorem to deduce the finite Ramsey Theorem from the infinite.

We conclude this section on compactness with an observation about fields of positive characteristic. Recall that a field F is of characteristic 0 iff for all $n > 0$ the sum $1 + \dots + 1$ with n summands is different from 0. F is of characteristic $n > 0$ if n is the minimal integer > 0 such that the sum $1 + \dots + 1$ with n summands is equal to 0. It turns out that the characteristic of a field is either 0 or a prime number.

Theorem 1.28. *Let $\tau = \{+, \cdot, 0, 1\}$. If Φ is a theory over τ that is satisfied by fields of arbitrarily large characteristic, then Φ is satisfied by a field of characteristic 0.*

Proof. For every $n > 0$ let ψ_n be the sentence over τ that says that the sum $1 + \dots + 1$ with n summands is different from 0. We may assume that Φ contains the axioms of field theory.

Consider the theory $\Phi \cup \{\psi_n : n \in \omega\}$. If $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi \cup \{\psi_n : n \in \omega\}$ is finite, then there is $m > 0$ such that $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi \cup \{\psi_n : n < m\}$. But since Φ is satisfied by fields of arbitrarily large characteristic, the theory $\Phi \cup \{\psi_n : n < m\}$ has a model. It follows that Φ_0 has a model.

By the Compactness Theorem, $\Phi \cup \{\psi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a model, which is a field of characteristic 0. \square

This theorem in particular shows that fields of positive characteristic cannot be axiomatized in first order logic.

Exercise 1.29. Show that if a sentence φ holds for every field of characteristic 0, then there is $p > 0$ such that φ holds in every field of characteristic at least p .

1.7. Elementary substructures.

Definition 1.30. Let \mathcal{B} be a τ -structure and let \mathcal{A} be a substructure of \mathcal{B} . A τ -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is **absolute** between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} iff for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$,

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \iff \mathcal{B} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

\mathcal{A} is an **elementary substructure** (or an **elementary submodel**) of \mathcal{B} ($\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{B}$) if every τ -formula is absolute between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

Two τ -structures are **elementary equivalent** if they satisfy the same sentences over τ . We write $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{B}$ if two structures \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are elementary equivalent.

Lemma 1.31 (Tarski-Vaught Criterion). *Let \mathcal{A} be a substructure of \mathcal{B} . Then $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{B}$ iff for every τ -formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$,*

- (1) *if there is $a \in B$ such that $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$, then there is $a \in A$ such that $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$.*

Proof. Clearly, if $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{B}$, then for all formulas $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ we have (1).

Now suppose for all formulas $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ we have (1). Since \mathcal{A} is a substructure of \mathcal{B} , every atomic formula is absolute between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . Also, it is easily checked that the class of absolute formulas is closed under negation and disjunction.

Now assume that $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is absolute between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} and let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Let $a \in A$ be such that $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$. By the absoluteness of φ , $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and thus $\mathcal{B} \models (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

On the other hand, if $\mathcal{B} \models (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, then by (1), there is $a \in A$ such that $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$. By the absoluteness of φ ,

$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$. It follows that $\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, showing that $\exists x\varphi$ is absolute between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . \square

Theorem 1.32 (Downward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem). *Let κ be an infinite cardinal and let τ be a vocabulary of size at most κ . Then for every structure \mathcal{B} and every set $X \subseteq B$ of at most κ there is an elementary substructure \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{B} such that $X \subseteq A$ and $|A| \leq \kappa$.*

Proof. Let $X \subseteq B$ be a set of size at most κ . For each formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ we define a function $f_\varphi : B^n \rightarrow B$ as follows: for all $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$ with $\mathcal{B} \models (\exists x\varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ choose an element $a \in B$ such that $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$ and let $f_\varphi(b_1, \dots, b_n) = a$. If $\mathcal{B} \not\models (\exists x\varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$, then let $f_\varphi(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be an arbitrary element of B . The functions f_φ are **Skolem functions**.

We now define a sequence $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of subsets of B . Let X_0 be a nonempty subset of B of size at most κ such that $X \subseteq X_0$. If X_m has been defined, let

$$X_{m+1} = X_m \cup \{f_\varphi(b_1, \dots, b_n) : b_1, \dots, b_n \in X_m \text{ and } \varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \text{ is a } \tau\text{-formula}\}.$$

Let $A = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} X_m$.

Now, whenever $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is a τ -formula and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$, then for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in X_m$ and therefore

$$f_\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in X_{m+1} \subseteq A.$$

It follows that A is closed under all the Skolem functions.

Clearly, for every n -ary function symbol $f \in \tau$ and all $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$, $\mathcal{B} \models \exists x(x = f(b_1, \dots, b_n))$. Let $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be the formula $x = f(y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Then $f_\varphi = f^{\mathcal{B}}$. Since A is closed under all the Skolem functions, for every n -ary function symbol $f \in \tau$, A is closed under $f^{\mathcal{B}}$. Also, for every constant symbol $c \in \tau$ and every $a \in A$, $f_{c=x}(a) = c^{\mathcal{B}}$ and thus $c^{\mathcal{B}} \in A$. This shows that A is the underlying set of a substructure \mathcal{A} of \mathcal{B} .

We now apply the Tarski-Vaught Criterion to show that $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{B}$. Let $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a τ -formula and let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ be such that $\mathcal{B} \models (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Let $a = f_\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. By the choice of A , $a \in A$. By the choice of f_φ , $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(a, a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Hence by the Tarski-Vaught Criterion, $\mathcal{A} \preceq \mathcal{B}$. \square

Exercise 1.33. $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ is a substructure of $\mathcal{R} = (\mathbb{R}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$. Show that \mathcal{Q} is not an elementary substructure of \mathcal{R} .

Observe that by the Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, \mathcal{R} has a countable elementary submodel that contains all rational numbers. We will see later that $(\mathbb{Q}, <)$ is an elementary submodel of $(\mathbb{R}, <)$

Theorem 1.34 (Upward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, weak version). *Let Φ be theory that has an infinite model. Then Φ has arbitrarily*

large models. In particular, for every infinite τ -structure \mathcal{A} there are arbitrarily large τ -structures that are elementary equivalent to \mathcal{A} .

Proof. Let Φ be a theory that has an infinite model. Let I be any set. For each $i \in I$ we introduce a new constant symbol c_i . Let σ be the vocabulary obtained by adding the constant symbol c_i , $i \in I$, to τ . Let

$$\Phi_I = \Phi \cup \{c_i \neq c_j : i, j \in I \text{ and } i \neq j\}.$$

For every finite subset Φ_0 of Φ_I there is a finite set $I_0 \subseteq I$ such that $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi \cup \{c_i \neq c_j : i, j \in I_0 \text{ and } i \neq j\}$. Let \mathcal{A} be an infinite model of Φ . If $I_0 \subseteq I$ is finite, choose pairwise distinct interpretations $c_i^{\mathcal{A}'}$ $\in A$ of the c_i , $i \in I_0$. This is possible since \mathcal{A} is infinite. Now let \mathcal{A}' be the σ -structure with underlying set is A , in which all the constant symbols, function symbols and relation symbols of τ are interpreted as in \mathcal{A} , in which the constant symbols c_i , $i \in I_0$, are interpreted by the respective $c_i^{\mathcal{A}'}$, and in which the constant symbols c_i , $i \in I \setminus I_0$, are interpreted arbitrarily.

By the choice of the $c_i^{\mathcal{A}'}$, $i \in I_0$,

$$\mathcal{A}' \models \Phi \cup \{c_i \neq c_j : i, j \in I_0 \text{ and } i \neq j\}.$$

It follows that every finite subset of Φ_I has a model. Hence, by the Compactness Theorem, Φ_I has a model \mathcal{B} . Since the c_i , $i \in I$, have pairwise distinct interpretations in \mathcal{B} , the underlying set B is at least of size $|I|$. Since I was arbitrary, this shows that Φ has arbitrarily large models. \square

Notice that for the proof of the Upward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem it is actually enough to assume that Φ has an infinite model or arbitrarily large finite models. However, we have already seen that a theory with arbitrarily large finite models has an infinite model.

It follows from the Upward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem that there are arbitrarily large models of the theory of $(\mathbb{N}, 0, S)$ and of the theory of $(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$. This shows that the natural numbers cannot be axiomatized in first order logic up to isomorphism.

On the other hand, if the usual axioms for set theory (ZFC) are consistent, and we have no reason to believe otherwise, then, by the Completeness Theorem together with the Löwenheim-Skolem Theorems, there is a countable model of set theory. In this model there are only countably elements that the model considers to be real numbers, even though the model itself believes that there are uncountably many real numbers. But this just means that the notion “countable” of the model is different from the corresponding notion in the real world, for instance because the model does not know the bijection between the countably many real numbers of the model and the natural numbers of the model that exists in the real world.

Definition 1.35. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be τ -structures. Then $j : A \rightarrow B$ is an **elementary embedding** of \mathcal{A} into \mathcal{B} if j is an isomorphism from \mathcal{A} onto an elementary substructure of \mathcal{B} . In other words, j is an elementary embedding iff for all formulas $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ we have

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{B} \models \varphi(j(a_1), \dots, j(a_n)).$$

Elementary embeddings play a major role in some areas of set theory and in nonstandard analysis.

Exercise 1.36. Let \mathcal{A} be a τ -structure, I a set and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter on I . Show that the embedding j of \mathcal{A} into the ultrapower $\mathcal{A}^I/\mathcal{U}$ as defined in Exercise 1.22 is elementary.

Definition 1.37. Let σ and τ be vocabularies such that $\sigma \subseteq \tau$. If \mathcal{A} is a σ -structure and \mathcal{A}' is a τ -structure on the same underlying set A such that every symbol in σ has the same interpretation in \mathcal{A} as in \mathcal{A}' , then \mathcal{A} is the **reduct** of \mathcal{A}' to σ and \mathcal{A}' is an **expansion** of \mathcal{A} to τ . We write $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}' \upharpoonright \sigma$.

Now let \mathcal{A} be a τ -structure. For each $a \in A$ let c_a be a new constant symbol. Let $\tau_A = \tau \cup \{c_a : a \in A\}$. The **diagram** of \mathcal{A} is the theory

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diag}(\mathcal{A}) = \{ & \varphi(c_{a_1}, \dots, c_{a_n}) : a_1, \dots, a_n \in A, \\ & \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ is an atomic formula or the negation} \\ & \text{of an atomic formula and } \mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The **elementary diagram** of \mathcal{A} is the theory

$$\begin{aligned} \text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A}) = \{ & \varphi(c_{a_1}, \dots, c_{a_n}) : a_1, \dots, a_n \in A, \\ & \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ is a } \tau\text{-formula and } \mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$ is a **complete theory** in the sense that for every τ_A -sentence φ either $\varphi \in \text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$ or $\neg\varphi \in \text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$.

Exercise 1.38. Let \mathcal{A} be a τ -structure. Show that for every τ_A -structure \mathcal{B} with $\mathcal{B} \models \text{diag}(\mathcal{A})$, the reduct $\mathcal{B} \upharpoonright \tau$ has a substructure that is isomorphic to \mathcal{A} .

Lemma 1.39. Let \mathcal{A} be a τ -structure. If \mathcal{B} is a model of $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$, then the map $e : A \rightarrow B; a \mapsto c_a^{\mathcal{B}}$ is an elementary embedding of \mathcal{A} into $\mathcal{B} \upharpoonright \tau$.

Proof. Let $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a τ -formula and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$. Then $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ iff $\varphi(c_{a_1}, \dots, c_{a_n}) \in \text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$ iff $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(c_{a_1}, \dots, c_{a_n})$ iff

$$\mathcal{B} \upharpoonright \tau \models \varphi(e(a_1), \dots, e(a_n)).$$

This shows that e is an elementary embedding. \square

Corollary 1.40 (Upward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, strong version). *Let \mathcal{A} be an infinite τ -structure. Then there are arbitrarily large τ -structures \mathcal{B} such that \mathcal{A} elementarily embeds into \mathcal{B} .*

Proof. Interpreting every constant c_a , $a \in A$, by a itself, we obtain an expansion of \mathcal{A} that is a model of $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$. Hence $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$ has an infinite model. By the weak version of the Upward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$ has arbitrarily large models and by Lemma 1.39, \mathcal{A} elementarily embeds into the reduct of any model of $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{A})$ to τ . \square

Corollary 1.41. *Let Φ be a theory over a vocabulary τ . Let κ be an infinite cardinal $\geq |\tau|$. If Φ has an infinite model, then Φ has a model of size κ .*

Definition 1.42. Let (I, \leq) be a partial order, i.e., let \leq be reflexive ($\forall i(i \leq i)$), transitive ($\forall i, j, k((i \leq j \wedge j \leq k) \rightarrow i \leq k)$) and anti-symmetric ($\forall i, j((i \leq j \wedge j \leq i) \rightarrow i = j)$). Then (I, \leq) is **directed** if for all $i, j \in I$ there is $k \in I$ such that $i \leq k$ and $j \leq k$.

A family $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in I}$ together with a family $(e_{ij})_{i, j \in I \wedge i \leq j}$ is an **elementary directed system** if for all $i, j \in I$ with $i \leq j$, e_{ij} is an elementary embedding of \mathcal{A}_i into \mathcal{A}_j and for all $i, j, k \in I$ with $i \leq j \leq k$, $e_{jk} \circ e_{ij} = e_{ik}$.

If $\mathcal{E} = ((\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in I}, (e_{ij})_{i, j \in I \wedge i \leq j})$ is an elementary directed system, then a τ -structure \mathcal{A} together with a family $(e_i)_{i \in I}$ is the **limit** of the system \mathcal{E} if for all $i \in I$, e_i is an elementary embedding of \mathcal{A}_i into \mathcal{A} such that for all $j \in I$ with $i \leq j$ we have $e_i = e_j \circ e_{ij}$ and moreover, $A = \{e_i(a) : i \in I \text{ and } a \in A_i\}$.

The definition of an elementary directed system sounds more complicated than it actually is. The next theorem and its proof show that if $\mathcal{E} = ((\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in I}, (e_{ij})_{i, j \in I \wedge i \leq j})$ is an elementary directed system, we may assume, without loss of generality, that for all $i, j \in I$ with $i \leq j$, $\mathcal{A}_i \preceq \mathcal{A}_j$ and e_{ij} is the identity function from A_i to A_j . In this situation, the underlying set of the limit of \mathcal{E} is the union of the A_i , the e_i are again identity functions, and the \mathcal{A}_i are elementary submodels of the limit \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 1.43. *Every elementary directed system*

$$\mathcal{E} = ((\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in I}, (e_{ij})_{i, j \in I \wedge i \leq j})$$

over a vocabulary τ has a limit \mathcal{A} .

Proof. We may assume that the \mathcal{A}_i are pairwise disjoint. Let $B = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$. We define an equivalence relation \sim on B as follows: for $a, b \in B$ let $a \sim b$ if there are $i, j, k \in I$ such that $i, j \leq k$, $a \in A_i$, $b \in A_j$ and $e_{ik}(a) = e_{jk}(b)$. The relation \sim is symmetric by definition and reflexive since \leq is. Showing the transitivity of \sim requires slightly more work.

Let $a \sim b$ and $b \sim c$. Let $i_0, j_0, k_0, i_1, j_1, k_1 \in I$ be such that $i_0, j_0 \leq k_0$ and $i_1, j_1 \leq k_1$ and $a \in A_{i_0}$ and $b \in A_{j_0}$ and $b \in A_{i_1}$ and $c \in A_{j_1}$ and $e_{i_0 k_0}(a) = e_{j_0 k_0}(b)$ and $e_{i_1 k_1}(b) = e_{j_1 k_1}(c)$. Since the A_i were assumed to be pairwise disjoint, j_0 and i_1 are the same. Since I is directed, there is $k \in I$ such that $k_0, k_1 \leq k$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} e_{i_0 k}(a) &= e_{k_0 k}(e_{i_0 k_0}(a)) = e_{k_0 k}(e_{j_0 k_0}(b)) \\ &= e_{k_1 k}(e_{i_1 k_1}(b)) = e_{k_1 k}(e_{j_1 k_1}(c)) = e_{j_1 k}(c) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $a \sim c$.

Now let A be the set B/\sim of \sim -equivalence classes. For each $i \in I$ and each $a \in A_i$ let $e_i(a)$ be the \sim -equivalence class of a . By the definition of \sim , for all $i, j \in I$ with $i \leq j$ and for all $a \in A_i$ and $b \in A_j$ with $e_{ij}(a) = b$ we have $e_i(a) = e_j(b)$ and thus $e_i = e_j \circ e_{ij}$. Clearly,

$$A = \{e_i(a) : i \in I \text{ and } a \in A_i\}.$$

We now define the interpretations of the symbol in τ in \mathcal{A} .

If $c \in \tau$ is a constant symbol, for every $i \in I$ we have $c^{A_i} \in A_i$. Given $i, j \in I$, there is $k \in I$ such that $i, j \leq k$. Since e_{ik} and e_{jk} are elementary embeddings, $e_{ik}(c^{A_i}) = c^{A_k} = e_{jk}(c^{A_j})$ and therefore $c^{A_i} \sim c^{A_j}$. Let $c^{\mathcal{A}}$ be the \sim -equivalence class of c^{A_i} for an arbitrary $i \in I$. By the previous argument, $c^{\mathcal{A}}$ is well defined.

Now let $R \in \tau$ be an n -ary relation symbol. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in B$. The a_m are representatives of equivalence classes in A . Each a_m is an element of some A_{i_m} . Since I is directed, there is $j \in I$ such that $i_1, \dots, i_n \leq j$. Now let

$$(e_{i_1}(a_1), \dots, e_{i_n}(a_n)) \in R^{\mathcal{A}} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (e_{i_1 j}(a_1), \dots, e_{i_n j}(a_n)) \in R^{A_j}.$$

$R^{\mathcal{A}}$ is well defined since I is directed and the e_{ij} are elementary embeddings.

Finally, let $f \in \tau$ be an n -ary function symbol. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ and choose $i_1, \dots, i_n, j \in I$ as in the definition of the interpretation of a relation symbol. Now let

$$f^{\mathcal{A}}(e_{i_1}(a_1), \dots, e_{i_n}(a_n)) = e_j(f^{A_j}(e_{i_1 j}(a_1), \dots, e_{i_n j}(a_n))).$$

Again, $f^{\mathcal{A}}$ is well defined by the directedness of I and since the e_{ij} are elementary embeddings.

This finishes the definition of the structure \mathcal{A} . We have to show that the e_i , $i \in I$, are elementary embeddings. We use the same induction on the complexity of formulas as in the proof of the Tarski-Vaught Criterion. Again, the only nontrivial case is the case of an existential formula.

So let $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a formula. Assume that for all $i \in I$ and $a, b_1, \dots, b_n \in A_i$ we have

$$\mathcal{A}_i \models \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{A} \models \varphi(e_i(a), e_i(b_1), \dots, e_i(b_n)).$$

Let $i \in I$, $b_1, \dots, b_n \in A_i$ and suppose that $\mathcal{A}_i \models (\exists x\varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Choose $a \in A_i$ such that $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$. By our assumption,

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(e_i(a), e_i(b_1), \dots, e_i(b_n))$$

and hence

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x\varphi)(e_i(b_1), \dots, e_i(b_n)).$$

Now suppose that

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x\varphi)(e_i(b_1), \dots, e_i(b_n)).$$

We show that $\mathcal{A}_i \models (\exists x\varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Let $a \in A$ be such that

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a, e_i(b_1), \dots, e_i(b_n)).$$

Choose $j \in I$ and $b \in A_j$ such that $a = e_j(b)$. Let $k \in I$ be such that $i, j \leq k$. By our assumption,

$$\mathcal{A}_k \models \varphi(e_{jk}(b), e_{ik}(b_1), \dots, e_{ik}(b_n))$$

and thus

$$\mathcal{A}_k \models (\exists x\varphi)(e_{ik}(b_1), \dots, e_{ik}(b_n)).$$

Since e_{ik} is an elementary embedding, $\mathcal{A}_i \models (\exists x\varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$. This finishes the proof of the theorem. \square

Corollary 1.44 (Tarski's Elementary Chain Theorem). *Let (I, \leq) be a linear order. For each $i \in I$ let \mathcal{A}_i be a τ -structure and assume that for all $i, j \in I$ with $i \leq j$ we have $\mathcal{A}_i \preceq \mathcal{A}_j$. Let $A = \bigcup_{i \in I} A_i$ and define a τ -structure \mathcal{A} on A in the natural way. Then for every $i \in I$, $\mathcal{A}_i \preceq \mathcal{A}$.*

Exercise 1.45 (For people with some background in set theory). Let κ be an uncountable cardinal. Recall that κ is regular if it is not the supremum of a set $A \subseteq \kappa$ of size $< \kappa$. A set $C \subseteq \kappa$ is **unbounded** in κ if for all $\alpha < \kappa$ there is $\beta \in C$ such that $\alpha \leq \beta$. $C \subseteq \kappa$ is **closed** if for all $S \subseteq C$, $\sup S = \kappa$ or $\sup S \in C$. C is **club** if C is both closed and unbounded in κ .

Let τ be a countable vocabulary and let κ be an uncountable regular cardinal. Show that for every τ -structure \mathcal{A} on κ , the set of $\alpha < \kappa$ such that α carries an elementary substructure of \mathcal{A} is club in κ .

Exercise 1.46. Let τ be a countable vocabulary and let \mathcal{A} be a τ -structure. Suppose the underlying set A of \mathcal{A} is of some regular size κ . If $(A_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ is an increasing sequence of subsets of A such that all A_α are of size $< \kappa$ and for all limit ordinals $\beta < \kappa$, $A_\beta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \beta} A_\alpha$. Show that there is $\alpha < \kappa$ such that A_α carries an elementary substructure of \mathcal{A} .

2. PROPERTIES OF FIRST ORDER THEORIES

2.1. Categoricity and completeness.

Definition 2.1. Let Φ be a first order theory over a vocabulary τ . The **deductive closure** of Φ is the theory

$$\text{Ded}(\Phi) = \{\varphi : \Phi \models \varphi\}.$$

Φ is **deductively closed** if $\Phi = \text{Ded}(\Phi)$. Φ is **complete** if it is consistent and for all sentences φ , either $\varphi \in \Phi$ or $\neg\varphi \in \Phi$.

Now let κ be a cardinal. A theory Φ is **κ -categorical** if up to isomorphism, it has exactly one model of size κ .

Observe that every complete theory is deductively closed and for every τ -structure \mathcal{A} , $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$ is complete.

Lemma 2.2. *Let Φ be a deductively closed theory having only infinite models. If Φ is κ -categorical for some $\kappa \geq |\tau|$, then Φ is complete.*

Proof. Since Φ has a model of size κ , it is consistent. Assume that Φ is not complete. Then there is a sentence φ such that $\varphi, \neg\varphi \notin \Phi$. Note that since $\varphi \notin \Phi$ and Φ is deductively closed, $\Phi \not\models \varphi$. It follows that $\Phi \cup \{\neg\varphi\}$ has a model. By the Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, $\Phi \cup \{\neg\varphi\}$ has a model \mathcal{A} of size κ . Similarly, $\Phi \cup \{\varphi\}$ has a model \mathcal{B} of size κ . Since \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are not elementarily equivalent, they cannot be isomorphic, contradicting the κ -categoricity of Φ . \square

Example 2.3. Let τ be the empty vocabulary. The only relation that we can talk about using this vocabulary is equality. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let φ_n be the sentence over τ that says that there are at least n distinct elements. Now $\Phi = \text{Ded}(\{\varphi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\})$ is the **theory of infinite sets**. Φ is κ -categorical for every infinite κ . By Lemma 2.2, Φ is complete.

Example 2.4. Let τ be the vocabulary of vector spaces over \mathbb{Q} . Let Φ be the deductive closure of the set of axioms for vector spaces over \mathbb{Q} together with an axiom that says that the vector space has at least two elements. A \mathbb{Q} -vector space V is countable if and only if its dimension is at least 1 and at most \aleph_0 . If V is uncountable, then the dimension of V is equal to the cardinality. It follows that Φ is not \aleph_0 -categorical but κ -categorical for all uncountable κ . Again by Lemma 2.2, Φ is complete.

Our next example of a complete theory is the **theory of dense linear orders without endpoints**. The vocabulary consists of a single binary relation symbol \leq . We freely use $x < y$ as an abbreviation for $x \leq y \wedge x \neq y$. The theory is the deductive closure of the set consisting of the following axioms:

(DO1) $\forall x(x \leq x)$ (Reflexivity)

(DO2) $\forall x \forall y \forall z((x \leq y \wedge y \leq z) \rightarrow x \leq z)$ (Transitivity)

- (DO3) $\forall x \forall y ((x \leq y \wedge y \leq x) \rightarrow x = y)$ (Anti-symmetry)
- (DO4) $\forall x \forall y (x \leq y \vee y \leq x)$ (Linearity)
- (DO5) $\forall x \forall z (x < z \rightarrow \exists y (x < y \wedge y < z))$ (Density)
- (DO6) $\forall x \exists y \exists z (y < x \wedge x < z)$ (No endpoints)

Clearly, both (\mathbb{Q}, \leq) and (\mathbb{R}, \leq) are dense linear orders without endpoints.

Theorem 2.5. *The theory of dense linear orders without endpoints is \aleph_0 -categorical.*

Proof. Let (A, \leq) and (B, \leq) be countable linear orders without endpoints. Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be 1-1 enumerations of A and B , respectively. We will recursively define 1-1 sequences $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in A , respectively B such that the map that assigns q_n to p_n is an isomorphism between (A, \leq) and (B, \leq) .

Let $p_0 = a_0$ and $q_0 = b_0$. Suppose for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have defined p_m and q_m for all $m \leq n$. If n even, let p_{n+1} be the $a_\ell \in A \setminus \{p_0, \dots, p_n\}$ with the smallest index. We distinguish three cases:

- (1) For all $m \leq n$, $p_{n+1} < p_m$.
- (2) For all $m \leq n$, $p_{n+1} > p_m$.
- (3) Not (1) or (2).

In case (1) choose $q_{n+1} \in B$ such that $q_{n+1} < q_m$ for all $m \leq n$. This is possible since (B, \leq) has no endpoints. Similarly, in case (2) we can choose $q_{n+1} \in B$ such that $q_{n+1} > q_m$ for all $m \leq n$. In case (3) there are $m_0, m_1 \leq n$ such that p_{m_0} is the \leq -maximal element of $\{p_m : m \leq n, p_m < p_{n+1}\}$ and p_{m_1} is the \leq -minimal element of $\{p_m : m \leq n, p_m > p_{n+1}\}$. Choose $q_{n+1} \in B$ such that $q_{m_0} < q_{n+1} < q_{m_1}$. This is possible since (B, \leq) is a dense linear order.

If n is odd, we choose q_{n+1} to be the $b_\ell \in B \setminus \{q_0, \dots, q_n\}$ with the smallest index. We choose p_{n+1} exactly as we chose q_{n+1} in the case of even n , with the roles of A and B , a and b , and p and q switched. This finishes the definition of the sequences $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. It is easily verified that the map $f : A \rightarrow B; p_n \mapsto q_n$ is an isomorphism between the structures (A, \leq) and (B, \leq) . \square

This way of constructing an isomorphism between two structures is known as **back-and-forth argument**.

Corollary 2.6. *The theory of dense linear orders without endpoints is complete.*

Note that the theory of dense linear orders without endpoints is not 2^{\aleph_0} -categorical, i.e., not $|\mathbb{R}|$ -categorical. (\mathbb{R}, \leq) and $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \leq)$ are both dense linear orders without endpoints, but they are not isomorphic since one is Dedekind complete (every bounded subset has a least upper bound) and the other is not. In fact, the theory is not κ -categorical for any uncountable κ .

Exercise 2.7. Show that every countable linear order embeds into (\mathbb{Q}, \leq) .

Exercise 2.8. Let (L, \leq) be a linear order. Then $D \subseteq L$ is **dense in** L if every nonempty open interval of L contains an element of D . (L, \leq) is **separable** if it has a countable dense subset. Show that every separable linear order embeds into (\mathbb{R}, \leq) .

Note that the theory of dense linear orders without endpoints is not 2^{\aleph_0} -categorical, i.e., not $|\mathbb{R}|$ -categorical. (\mathbb{R}, \leq) and $(\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}, \leq)$ are both dense linear orders without endpoints, but they are not isomorphic since one is Dedekind complete (every bounded subset has a least upper bound) and the other is not. In fact, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 2.9. *The theory of dense linear orders without endpoints is not κ -categorical for any uncountable κ . Moreover, for each uncountable κ , there are 2^κ pairwise non-isomorphic dense linear orders without endpoints of size κ .*

Proof. The main building blocks are the following two dense linear orders without endpoints: One is the familiar linear order $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$. In order to define the second linear order, let $X \subseteq (0, 1)$ be a set of size \aleph_1 . By the Downward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem there is a set $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of size \aleph_1 such that $X \subseteq P$ and

$$(P, 0, 1, +, \cdot) \preceq (\mathbb{R}, 0, 1, +, \cdot).$$

$\mathcal{P} = (P, \leq)$ is the second linear order we will use.

\mathcal{P} has the following property: For all $p, q \in P$ with $p < q$, the set $\{r \in P : p < r < q\}$ is of size \aleph_1 . We say that P is \aleph_1 -**dense**.

This can be seen as follows: Since $(P, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is an elementary substructure of $(\mathbb{R}, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$, $1 \in P$ and P is closed under addition, multiplication and division. It follows that $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq P$. Now, if $p, q \in P$ are such that $p < q$, then there is an affine linear map f over \mathbb{Q} that is 1-1 and maps $(0, 1)$ into (p, q) . Since $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq P$ and since P is closed under addition and multiplication, $f[X] \subseteq P$. Now $f[X]$ is a subset of $\{r \in P : p < r < q\}$ of size \aleph_1 . This shows the \aleph_1 -density of P .

From \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} we construct two new linear orders, \mathcal{A}_0 and \mathcal{A}_1 . \mathcal{A}_0 simply consists of one copy of \mathcal{Q} followed by a copy of \mathcal{P} . \mathcal{A}_1 consists of a copy of \mathcal{Q} followed by ω_1 copies of \mathcal{P} , where all elements of the α -th copy of \mathcal{P} are smaller than all elements of the β -th copy if $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$.

Now, for each function $f : \kappa \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ we define a structure \mathcal{B}_f as follows: \mathcal{B}_f is the union of κ disjoint linear orders. For $\alpha < \kappa$, the α -th linear order is a copy of $\mathcal{A}_{f(\alpha)}$. Again, if $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$, then all elements of the α -th linear order are below all elements of the β -th linear order. It is clear that each \mathcal{B}_f is a dense linear order without endpoints of size κ .

We finish the proof of the theorem by showing that for $f, g : \kappa \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $f \neq g$ we have $\mathcal{B}_f \not\cong \mathcal{B}_g$. A subset of a linear order is

convex if with any two points it contains all the points between the two. The copies of \mathcal{Q} that have been used in the construction of \mathcal{B}_f and \mathcal{B}_g are maximal countably infinite convex subsets of B_f , respectively B_g . Now suppose that $f \neq g$ and $\mathcal{B}_f \cong \mathcal{B}_g$. Let $i : B_f \rightarrow B_g$ be an isomorphism. An easy transfinite induction shows that for each $\alpha < \kappa$, i maps the α -th maximal countably infinite subset of B_f to the α -th maximal countably infinite subset of B_g . Now let $\alpha < \kappa$ be minimal with $f(\alpha) \neq g(\alpha)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $f(\alpha) = 0$ and $g(\alpha) = 1$.

Then i maps the copy of \mathcal{A}_0 in \mathcal{B}_f that contains the α -th maximal countably infinite subset of B_f to the copy of \mathcal{A}_1 in \mathcal{B}_g that contains the α -th maximal countably infinite subset of B_g . It follows that i restricts to an isomorphism between a copy of \mathcal{A}_0 and a copy of \mathcal{A}_1 . But $\mathcal{A}_0 \not\cong \mathcal{A}_1$, a contradiction. \square

We now produce an example of a complete theory that is not κ -categorical for any infinite κ . The easiest way to come up with a complete theory is to consider the theory of a structure.

Let \mathcal{A} be the structure whose underlying set is

$$A = (\mathbb{N} \times \{0\}) \cup (\mathbb{N} \times \{1\})$$

and that has a single binary relation \leq defined as follows: for all $(a, i), (b, j) \in A$ let $(a, i) \leq (b, j)$ if $i = j = 0$ and $a \leq b$ in \mathbb{N} . In other words, \mathcal{A} is the disjoint union of a copy of (\mathbb{N}, \leq) and a countably infinite set with no relation between the two or within the countably infinite set.

Theorem 2.10. *Let \mathcal{A} be the structure defined above. Then $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$ is a complete theory that is not κ -categorical for any infinite κ .*

Proof. First observe that the two parts of the structure are definable. Let $\varphi(x)$ be the formula $\exists y(x < y)$. Now for all $a \in A$ we have $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a)$ iff a is of the form $(n, 0)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a model \mathcal{B} of $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$, we call $\{b \in B : \mathcal{B} \models \varphi(b)\}$ the **N-part** of the structure \mathcal{B} .

We first show that $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$ is not \aleph_0 -categorical. We introduce a new constant symbol c . For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let ψ_n be the sentence

$$\varphi(c) \wedge \exists x_0 \dots \exists x_n (x_0 < x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{n-1} < x_n \wedge x_n < c).$$

Intuitively, ψ_n says that c is in the \mathbb{N} -part of the structure and is at least $n + 1$.

Interpreting c in \mathcal{A} by a pair $(n, 0)$ with sufficiently large n , we see that every finite subset of $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A}) \cup \{\psi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a model. Hence, by the Compactness Theorem, $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A}) \cup \{\psi_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ has a model \mathcal{B} . By the Downward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, we may assume that \mathcal{B} is countable. Since $\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(c)$ and in \mathcal{B} the interpretation of c has infinitely many elements below it, $\mathcal{A} \not\cong \mathcal{B}$. Note that it is unnecessary

to use $\varphi(c)$ in the formulas ψ_n since once $c^{\mathcal{B}}$ is comparable with any other element of B , it has to be in the \mathbb{N} -part of \mathcal{B} .

To see that $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$ is not κ -categorical for any uncountable κ , we argue as follows. Let κ be an uncountable cardinal. We add pairwise distinct constant symbols c_α and d_α , $\alpha < \kappa$, to our vocabulary. Now consider the theory

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi = \text{Th}(\mathcal{A}) \cup \{ & \varphi(c_\alpha) \wedge \neg\varphi(d_\alpha) : \alpha < \kappa \} \\ & \cup \{ c_\alpha \neq c_\beta : \alpha < \beta < \kappa \} \cup \{ d_\alpha \neq d_\beta : \alpha < \beta < \kappa \}. \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of the Upward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, it is easily checked that every subset of Φ has a model. Hence Φ has a model by the Compactness Theorem. By the Downward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, Φ has a model \mathcal{B} of size κ .

We use the same notation \mathcal{B} for the structure \mathcal{B} and for its reduct to the original vocabulary $\{\leq\}$. Clearly, both the \mathbb{N} -part of \mathcal{B} and its complement are of size κ . Now consider the structure \mathcal{B}' that consists of the \mathbb{N} -part of \mathcal{B} and a countably infinite subset of the complement of the \mathbb{N} -part. A straight forward application of the Tarski-Vaught-Criterion shows that \mathcal{B}' is an elementary substructure of \mathcal{B} .

Since the \mathbb{N} -part of \mathcal{B}' is the same as of \mathcal{B} , \mathcal{B}' is of size κ . But since the complement of the \mathbb{N} -part of \mathcal{B}' is only countable, $\mathcal{B} \not\cong \mathcal{B}'$. Hence $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$ is not κ -categorical. \square

We provide another example of a theory that is \aleph_0 -categorical and not κ -categorical for any uncountable κ .

Definition 2.11. Recall that a **graph** G is a set V of **vertices** with a binary relation E that is irreflexive and symmetric. E is the **edge relation** of G and two vertices $v, w \in V$ are connected by an **edge** if they are related by E . The unordered pairs $\{x, y\}$, $(x, y) \in E$, are the **edges** of G

A graph G on a countably infinite set V of vertices is **random** if for all finite disjoint sets $A, B \subseteq V$ there is a vertex $v \in V \setminus (A \cup B)$ such that all $w \in A$ are connected to v by an edge and no $u \in B$ is connected to v . For all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n, m > 0$ let $\varphi_{n,m}$ be the sentence

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n \forall y_1 \dots \forall y_m (& \text{"}\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \text{ and } \{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \text{ are disjoint"} \\ & \rightarrow \exists z (z \neq x_1 \wedge \dots \wedge z \neq x_n \wedge z \neq y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge z \neq y_m \\ & \wedge E(x_1, z) \wedge \dots \wedge E(x_n, z) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg E(y_1, z) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg E(y_m, z)). \end{aligned}$$

If $n = 0$ and $m > 0$ let $\varphi_{n,m}$ be the sentence

$$\forall y_1 \dots \forall y_m \exists z (\neg E(y_1, z) \wedge \dots \wedge \neg E(y_m, z)).$$

If $n > 0$ and $m = 0$ let $\varphi_{n,m}$ be the sentence

$$\forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n \exists z (E(x_1, z) \wedge \dots \wedge E(x_n, z)).$$

Let $\varphi_{0,0}$ be the sentence $\exists z (z = z)$. The $\varphi_{n,m}$ are **extension axioms**.

Clearly, a countable structure (V, E) , where E is a binary relation, is a random graph iff it satisfies the theory

$$\Phi = \{\forall x(\neg E(x, x)), \forall x \forall y(E(x, y) \leftrightarrow E(y, x))\} \cup \{\varphi_{n,m} : n, m \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Theorem 2.12. *Up to isomorphism, there is exactly one random graph. In other words, Φ is \aleph_0 -categorical.*

Proof. We first prove the existence of the random graph. Let $V = \mathbb{N}$. Let $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be two sequences of finite subsets of \mathbb{N} such that for all finite sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ there are infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $A_n = A$ and $B_n = B$. Let

$$F = \{(n, m) : n < m, A_m \text{ and } B_m \text{ are disjoint subsets of } \{0, \dots, m-1\}, \text{ and } n \in A_m\}$$

Let $E = \{(n, m) : (n, m) \in F \text{ or } (m, n) \in F\}$. Clearly, (V, E) is a countably infinite graph. To show that it is random, let $A, B \subseteq V$ be disjoint and finite. By the choice of the sequences $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ there is $m > \max(A \cup B)$ such that $A_m = A$ and $B_m = B$. Now the vertex m is connected to all vertices in A and not connected to the vertices in B .

Next we show that any two random graphs are isomorphic. We use a back-and-forth argument. Let $G_i = (V_i, E_i)$ be a random graph for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a 1-1 enumeration of V_0 and let $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a 1-1 enumeration of V_1 . We construct two sequences $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ as follows:

Let $p_0 = a_0$ and $q_0 = b_0$. If we have chosen p_m and q_m for all $m < n$, we distinguish two cases. If n is even, let p_n be the $a_\ell \in V_0 \setminus \{p_m : m < n\}$ of the smallest index. Let $A = \{m : m < n \text{ and } (p_m, p_n) \in E_0\}$ and $B = \{m : m < n \text{ and } (p_m, p_n) \notin E_0\}$. Choose $q_n \in B \setminus \{q_m : m < n\}$ such that q_n is connected to all vertices in $\{q_m : m \in A\}$ and not connected to any vertex in $\{q_m : m \in B\}$.

If n is odd, find p_n and q_n as above, but after switching the roles of p and q , (V_0, E_0) and (V_1, E_1) and of a and b , respectively. Now $f : V_0 \rightarrow V_1; p_n \mapsto q_n$ is an isomorphism between (V_0, E_0) and (V_1, E_1) . \square

Because of this theorem, we refer to **the** random graph rather than **a** random graph.

Corollary 2.13. *Ded(Φ_{random}) is complete.*

Exercise 2.14. Show that every countable graph embeds into the random graph.

Theorem 2.15. *The theory of the random graph is not \aleph_1 -categorical.*

Proof. We construct two non-isomorphic models of Φ_{random} of size \aleph_1 . We construct two strictly increasing sequences $(G_\alpha)_{\alpha < \omega_1}$ and $(H_\alpha)_{\alpha < \omega_1}$

of countable graphs. Recall that for a graph G , by $V(G)$ we denote the set of vertices of G and by $E(G)$ we denote the edge relation of G .

We start by letting G_0 be the countably infinite graph with no edges and H_0 the countably infinite complete graph, i.e., a countably infinite graph in which any two vertices are connected by an edge. If $\delta < \omega_1$ is a limit ordinal, let

$$G_\delta = \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} V(G_\alpha), \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} E(G_\alpha) \right)$$

and

$$H_\delta = \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} V(H_\alpha), \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} E(H_\alpha) \right).$$

Now suppose that G_α and H_α have been constructed for some $\alpha < \omega_1$. Let $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of all finite subsets of $V(G_\alpha)$. Let $(B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of all finite subsets of $V(H_\alpha)$. Choose pairwise distinct a_n and b_n , $n \in \mathbb{N}$, outside $V(G_\alpha)$, respectively $V(H_\alpha)$. Let $V(G_{\alpha+1}) = V(G_\alpha) \cup \{a_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $V(H_{\alpha+1}) = V(H_\alpha) \cup \{b_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Choose $E(G_{\alpha+1})$ such that $E(G_{\alpha+1}) \upharpoonright V(G_\alpha) = E(G_\alpha)$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, a_n is connected to every element of A_n and not connected to any element of $V(G_\alpha) \setminus A_n$. Choose $E(H_{\alpha+1})$ such that $E(H_{\alpha+1}) \upharpoonright V(H_\alpha) = E(H_\alpha)$ and for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, b_n is connected to every element of $V(H_\alpha) \setminus B_n$ and not connected to any element of B_n . Finally, let

$$G = \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} V(G_\alpha), \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} E(G_\alpha) \right)$$

and

$$H = \left(\bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} V(H_\alpha), \bigcup_{\alpha < \omega_1} E(H_\alpha) \right).$$

We claim that G and H are both models of Φ_{random} , but not isomorphic. It is clear that G and H are graphs. If A and B are disjoint finite subsets of $V(G)$, then there is $\alpha < \omega_1$ with $A \cup B \subseteq V(G_\alpha)$. For the construction of $G_{\alpha+1}$ we chose an enumeration $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of all finite subsets of $V(G_\alpha)$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $A = A_n$. We chose some a_n such that $a_n \in V(G_{\alpha+1}) \setminus V(G_\alpha)$ and a_n is connected to all elements of A_n but not connected to any element of $V(G_\alpha) \setminus A_n$. Since B is disjoint from A , a_n is not connected to any element of B . This shows that G satisfies all the $\psi_{n,m}$. A symmetric argument shows that H satisfies all the $\psi_{n,m}$.

We now show that G and H are not isomorphic. Let $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$ be a bijection. We show that f cannot be an isomorphism. We choose a strictly increasing sequence $(\alpha_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of ordinals $< \omega_1$ as follows:

Let $\alpha_0 = 0$. If n is even, let α_{n+1} be such that $f[V(G_{\alpha_n})] \subseteq V(H_{\alpha_{n+1}})$. This is possible since $V(G_{\alpha_n})$ is countable and f is onto. If n is odd, let α_{n+1} be such that $f^{-1}[V(H_{\alpha_n})] \subseteq V(G_{\alpha_{n+1}})$. This is possible since $V(H_{\alpha_n})$ is countable and f is 1-1. Finally let $\alpha = \sup\{\alpha_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$.

Now we have $f[V(G_\alpha)] = V(H_\alpha)$. By the construction of G , every vertex in $V(G) \setminus V(G_\alpha)$ is connected to only finitely many vertices in $V(G_\alpha)$. By the construction of H , every vertex $V(H) \setminus V(H_\alpha)$ is connected to infinitely many vertices in $V(H_\alpha)$. It follows that f is not an isomorphism. \square

Exercise 2.16. Show that the graph H in the proof of the previous theorem has an uncountable complete subgraph while G does not. This also shows that G and H are not isomorphic.

Exercise 2.17. Show that every infinite graph can be embedded into a graph of the same size that is a model Φ_{random} .

Notice that the proof of Theorem 2.15 easily generalizes to all uncountable cardinals κ . Hence Φ_{random} is not κ -categorical for any $\kappa > \aleph_0$. This is not by accident. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.18 (Morley). *If a countable first order theory is κ -categorical for some uncountable κ , then it is κ -categorical for all uncountable κ .*

We mention another important family of complete theories that are not \aleph_0 -categorical but κ -categorical for all uncountable κ . For each prime number p let Φ_{ACF_p} be the theory of **algebraically closed fields of characteristic p** . Φ_{ACF_p} is the deductive closure of the axioms of field theory together with the axiom saying that the sum of p 1's is zero together with the infinitely many axioms that say that every polynomial that is not constant has a zero. The following axiom says that every polynomial of degree $n > 0$ has a zero:

$$\forall x_0 \dots \forall x_n (x_n \neq 0 \rightarrow \exists y (x_n y^n + \dots + x_1 y + x_0 = 0))$$

Here y^k is an abbreviation for the product $y \cdot \dots \cdot y$ with k factors.

Similarly, let Φ_{ACF_0} be the theory of **algebraically closed fields of characteristic zero**, i.e., the deductive closure of the axioms of field theory together with the infinitely many axioms that say that the field is not of characteristic p for any prime number p together with the infinitely many axioms that say that every polynomial that is not constant has a zero.

Theorem 2.19. *If p is either 0 or a prime number, then Φ_{ACF_p} is not \aleph_0 -categorical but κ -categorical for all uncountable κ . In particular, Φ_{ACF_p} is complete.*

Proof. Two algebraically closed fields of characteristic p are isomorphic iff they have the same transcendence degree over their minimal subfield, **the prime subfield**. If a field is uncountable, then its cardinality equals the transcendence degree over the prime subfield. \square

2.2. Quantifier elimination.

Definition 2.20. Let Φ be a first order theory over a vocabulary τ . Two τ -formulas $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are Φ -equivalent if

$$\Phi \models \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leftrightarrow \psi(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Φ has **quantifier elimination** if for every τ -formula is Φ -equivalent to a quantifier-free formula. A τ -structure \mathcal{A} has quantifier elimination if the theory $\text{Th}(\mathcal{A})$ does.

Lemma 2.21. *A first order theory Φ has quantifier elimination iff for every quantifier-free formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ there is a quantifier-free formula $\psi(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ such that*

$$T \models \exists x \varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \leftrightarrow \psi(y_1, \dots, y_n).$$

Proof. By induction on the complexity of formulas. \square

Lemma 2.22. *Let τ be a finite vocabulary without function symbols, i.e., a finite **relational vocabulary**. A complete theory Φ over τ has quantifier elimination iff for every model \mathcal{A} of Φ and all n -tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_n), (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in A^n$ the following holds:*

If (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{A} , then for every $a_{n+1} \in A$ there is $b_{n+1} \in A$ such that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{A} .

Proof. We start with a couple observations. Let \mathcal{A} be a τ -structure. Since τ is finite and relational, there are only finitely many atomic formulas in the variables x_1, \dots, x_n . Moreover, if two n -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas in a structure \mathcal{A} , then they satisfy the same quantifier free formulas. Low let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $\chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be the conjunction of all formulas $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ that are atomic or negations of atomic formulas and such that $\mathcal{A} \models \psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Now an n -tuple $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in A^n$ satisfies the same atomic formulas as (a_1, \dots, a_n) iff

$$\mathcal{A} \models \chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_n)}(b_1, \dots, b_n).$$

We now start the actual proof of the lemma. First assume that Φ has quantifier elimination. Let \mathcal{A} be a model of Φ and suppose that the n -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{A} . Let $a_{n+1} \in A$. Now

$$\mathcal{A} \models \chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})}(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})$$

and therefore

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x_{n+1} \chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})})(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

Since Φ has quantifier elimination, $\exists x_{n+1} \chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})}$ is Φ -equivalent to a quantifier free formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. But since (a_1, \dots, a_n) and

(b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas, they satisfy the same quantifier-free formulas. It follows that

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(b_1, \dots, b_n)$$

and therefore

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x_{n+1} \chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})})(b_1, \dots, b_n).$$

Let $b_{n+1} \in A$ be such that

$$\mathcal{A} \models \chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})}(b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}).$$

Now (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas.

On the other hand, suppose that for some model \mathcal{A} of Φ we have that if (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{A} , then for every $a_{n+1} \in A$ there is $b_{n+1} \in A$ such that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{A} .

Let $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$ be a quantifier-free formula over τ . Let $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A^n$ be such that

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x_{n+1} \varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

Let $a_{n+1} \in A$ be such that $\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_{n+1})$. Now let (b_1, \dots, b_n) be an n -tuple that satisfies the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{A} as (a_1, \dots, a_n) . By our assumption, there is b_{n+1} such that (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfies the same atomic formulas as (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) . In other words,

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x_{n+1} \varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n) \rightarrow (\exists x_{n+1} \varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n).$$

It follows that whether or not \mathcal{A} satisfies $(\exists x_{n+1} \varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ only depends on the atomic formulas that (a_1, \dots, a_n) satisfies. Let

$$X = \{ \chi_{(a_1, \dots, a_n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) : a_1, \dots, a_n \in A \text{ and } \mathcal{A} \models (\exists x_{n+1} \varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n) \}.$$

Since there are only finitely many atomic formulas in the variables x_1, \dots, x_{n+1} , the set X is finite. Let

$$\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \bigvee_{\chi \in X} \chi(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

Since the validity of $(\exists x_{n+1} \varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ in \mathcal{A} only depends on the atomic formulas satisfied by (a_1, \dots, a_n) , we have

$$\mathcal{A} \models \forall x_1, \dots, x_n (\exists x_{n+1} \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi).$$

Since Φ is a complete theory,

$$\Phi \models \forall x_1, \dots, x_n (\exists x_{n+1} \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi)$$

and therefore $(\exists x_{n+1} \varphi)(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are Φ -equivalent. By Lemma 2.21, this shows that Φ has quantifier elimination. \square

Remark 2.23. Note that even though the previous lemma was formulated as “a complete theory Φ has quantifier elimination iff for every model \mathcal{A} of Φ ...”, the proof of the lemma shows that the formulation “a complete theory Φ has quantifier elimination iff for some model \mathcal{A} of Φ ...” works as well.

Corollary 2.24. *The theory of dense linear orders without endpoints has quantifier elimination.*

Proof. We use Lemma 2.22 and the remark following it. We consider the structure $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}, \leq)$. Let (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) be n -tuples satisfying the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{Q} . We may assume that $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_n$. In this case $b_1 \leq \dots \leq b_n$. Now let $a_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Q}$. We have to find $b_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{Q} .

If there is $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_{n+1} = a_j$, choose $b_{n+1} = b_j$. If $a_{n+1} < a_1$, choose $b_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $b_{n+1} < b_1$. If $a_{n+1} > a_n$, choose $b_{n+1} > b_n$. If for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, $a_j < a_{n+1} < a_{j+1}$, choose $b_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $b_j < b_{n+1} < b_{j+1}$. In any case, (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{Q} . \square

Corollary 2.25. Φ_{random} has quantifier elimination.

Proof. The argument is almost the same as in the proof of Corollary 2.24. Let $G = (V, E)$ be the random graph. Let (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) be n -tuples satisfying the same atomic formulas in G . Now let $a_{n+1} \in V$. We have to find $b_{n+1} \in V$ such that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas in G .

If there is $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_{n+1} = a_j$, choose $b_{n+1} = b_j$. Otherwise choose b_{n+1} different from all the b_j , $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and such that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, b_{n+1} is connected to b_j iff a_{n+1} is connected to a_j . This is possible by the properties of the random graph. Now clearly, (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas in G . \square

Note that both the theory of dense linear orders without endpoints and Φ_{random} are \aleph_0 -categorical. It turns out that there is a connection between categoricity and quantifier elimination.

Theorem 2.26. *Let Φ be a complete theory in a finite relational vocabulary τ that has infinite models and quantifier elimination. Then Φ is \aleph_0 -categorical.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be countable models of Φ . We prove that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are isomorphic by using a back-and-forth argument. Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be 1-1 enumerations of A and B , respectively. We construct enumerations $(p_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(q_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of A and B , respectively, such that for all n , (p_0, \dots, p_n) and (q_0, \dots, q_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas,

the first n -tuple in \mathcal{A} , the second in \mathcal{B} . If we can accomplish this, then the function that maps p_n to q_n is an isomorphism between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

Let $p_0 = a_0$. Since τ is finite and relational, there are only finitely many atomic formulas in the variable x_1 and we can define the formula $\chi_{a_0}(x_0)$ as in the proof of Lemma 2.22. Now $\mathcal{A} \models \exists x_0 \chi_{a_0}$. Since Φ is complete, $\exists x_0 \chi_{a_0} \in \Phi$. Hence $\mathcal{B} \models \exists x_0 \chi_{a_0}$. Let $q_0 \in B$ be such that $\mathcal{B} \models \chi_{a_0}(q_0)$.

Now assume that n is even and we have already chosen $p_0, \dots, p_n \in A$ and $q_0, \dots, q_n \in B$ such that (p_0, \dots, p_n) and (q_0, \dots, q_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas in the respective structures. Let p_{n+1} be the $a_\ell \in A \setminus \{p_0, \dots, p_n\}$ of minimal index. Now

$$\mathcal{A} \models \chi_{(p_0, \dots, p_{n+1})}(p_0, \dots, p_{n+1})$$

and therefore

$$\mathcal{A} \models (\exists x_{n+1} \chi_{(p_0, \dots, p_{n+1})})(p_0, \dots, p_n).$$

By quantifier elimination,

$$(\exists x_{n+1} \chi_{(p_0, \dots, p_{n+1})})(x_0, \dots, x_n)$$

is Φ -equivalent to a quantifier-free formula $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_n)$. Now

$$\mathcal{A} \models \varphi(p_0, \dots, p_n).$$

Since if (p_0, \dots, p_n) and (q_1, \dots, q_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas, they satisfy the same quantifier-free formulas,

$$\mathcal{B} \models \varphi(q_0, \dots, q_n).$$

It follows that

$$\mathcal{B} \models (\exists x_{n+1} \chi_{(p_0, \dots, p_{n+1})})(q_0, \dots, q_n).$$

Choose $q_{n+1} \in B$ such that

$$\mathcal{B} \models \chi_{(p_0, \dots, p_{n+1})}(q_0, \dots, q_{n+1}).$$

If n is odd, proceed in the same way with the roles of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} switched. By the usual argument, $p_n \mapsto q_n$ defines an isomorphism between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . \square

Lemma 2.27. *Let τ be any vocabulary and let Φ be a complete theory over τ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) Φ has quantifier elimination.
- (2) For every τ -structure \mathcal{C} , if $f : C \rightarrow M$ and $g : C \rightarrow M$ are embeddings of \mathcal{C} into a model \mathcal{M} of Φ , then for every quantifier-free formula τ -formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and every n -tuple $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C^n$ we have

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x \varphi)(f(c_1), \dots, f(c_n)) \iff \mathcal{M} \models (\exists x \varphi)(g(c_1), \dots, g(c_n)).$$

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let C be a τ -structure and $f, g : C \rightarrow M$ embeddings into a model of Φ . Let $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C^n$. Let $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) = (f(c_1), \dots, f(c_n))$ and $\bar{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n) = (g(c_1), \dots, g(c_n))$. Now \bar{a} and \bar{b} satisfy the same atomic formulas.

Let $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a quantifier-free formula. Suppose

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{a}).$$

Since Φ has quantifier elimination, $(\exists x\varphi)(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is Φ -equivalent to a quantifier-free formula $\psi(y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Since the n -tuples \bar{a} and \bar{b} satisfy the same atomic formulas, they satisfy the same quantifier-free formulas. It follows that

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{a}) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models \psi(\bar{a}) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models \psi(\bar{b}) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{b}).$$

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Assume that Φ does not have quantifier elimination. By Lemma 2.21, there is a quantifier-free formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ such that the formula $(\exists x\varphi)(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is not Φ -equivalent to a quantifier-free formula.

Claim 2.28. There is a model \mathcal{M} of Φ and there are n -tuples

$$(a_1, \dots, a_n), (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in M^n$$

that satisfy the same atomic formulas such that $\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models \neg(\exists x\varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$.

For the proof of the claim, we add new constant symbols d_1, \dots, d_n and e_1, \dots, e_n to the vocabulary τ . Consider the theory

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi = \Phi \cup \{ & \psi(d_1, \dots, d_n) \leftrightarrow \psi(e_1, \dots, e_n) : \psi \text{ is an atomic formula} \} \\ & \cup \{ (\exists x\varphi)(d_1, \dots, d_n), \neg(\exists x\varphi)(e_1, \dots, e_n) \}. \end{aligned}$$

We show that every finite subset Ψ_0 of Ψ has a model. Let \mathcal{N} be a model of Φ and let $\Psi_0 \subseteq \Psi$ be finite. Then there is a finite set X of atomic formulas $\psi(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0 \subseteq \Phi \cup \{ & \psi(d_1, \dots, d_n) \leftrightarrow \psi(e_1, \dots, e_n) : \psi \in X \} \\ & \cup \{ (\exists x\varphi)(d_1, \dots, d_n), \neg(\exists x\varphi)(e_1, \dots, e_n) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider now the Boolean algebra \mathcal{B} of subsets of M^n that is generated by the sets $\{(a_1, \dots, a_n) : \mathcal{M} \models \psi(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}$, $\psi \in \Psi_0$. Note that \mathcal{B} is finite. A set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ is an **atom** if it is non-empty and does not have a proper subset in \mathcal{B} . Since Φ is complete, Φ knows that $(\exists x\varphi)(d_1, \dots, d_n)$ is not equivalent to a quantifier-free formula and hence not equivalent to a Boolean combination of formulas in X . It follows that the set $P = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in M^n : (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)\}$ is not an element of \mathcal{B} . But this implies that P is not the union of a set of atoms of \mathcal{B} . Hence, there is an atom $A \in \mathcal{B}$ containing n -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) with $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in P$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \notin P$. Since A is an atom of \mathcal{B} , (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same formulas in X .

Interpreting d_i by a_i and e_i by b_i for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, we obtain a model of Ψ_0 .

It follows that Ψ has a model \mathcal{M} . For all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ let $a_i = d_i^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $b_i = e_i$. Now \mathcal{M} and the two n -tuples (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) work for the claim. Let \mathcal{N}_a be the substructure of \mathcal{M} generated by a_1, \dots, a_n and let \mathcal{N}_b be the substructure generated by b_1, \dots, b_n . Since the two n -tuples satisfy the same atomic formulas, the two substructures are isomorphic by an isomorphism that maps each a_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, to the corresponding b_i . However, since $\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathcal{M} \models \neg(\exists x\varphi)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$, the condition in the lemma fails. \square

Exercise 2.29. Show that a complete theory Φ over an arbitrary vocabulary τ has quantifier elimination iff the following condition holds:

- (3) For every model \mathcal{M} of T and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, if (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{M} , then for every $a_{n+1} \in M$ there are an elementary extension \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} and an element $b_{n+1} \in N$ such that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas in \mathcal{N} .

Hint: Use compactness, elementary diagrams and the previous lemma.

We are now ready to show that the theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic p , $p = 0$ or p a prime number, has quantifier elimination.

Theorem 2.30. *Let p be a prime number or $p = 0$. Then Φ_{ACF_p} has quantifier elimination.*

Proof. We use condition (2) of Lemma 2.27. Let \mathcal{M} be a model of Φ_{ACF_p} , let \mathcal{C} be a τ -structure and let $g, f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow M$ be embeddings. Let $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C$. Let $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) = (f(c_1), \dots, f(c_n))$ and let $\bar{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n) = (g(c_1), \dots, g(c_n))$. We have to show that for each quantifier-free formula $\varphi(y_1, \dots, y_n, x)$ we have

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{a}) \iff \mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{b}).$$

Assume that $\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{a})$ and let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. Let R be the subring of \mathcal{M} generated by A . Every element of R can be written as a term in the elements of A . Note that $R \subseteq f[C]$. Also note that an element $a \in M$ is algebraic over R iff it is algebraic over the field generated by R . Now let $a_{n+1} \in M$ be such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, a_{n+1})$.

Case 1. There is a polynomial $p(x)$ with coefficients in R such that $p(a) = 0$.

In this case we take $p(x)$ to be a polynomial of minimal degree with coefficients in R such that $p(a) = 0$. We write the coefficients of p as terms in the elements of A . Now replace every a_i that appears in $p(x)$ by the corresponding b_i in order to obtain the polynomial $q(x)$.

Let S be the ring generated by b_1, \dots, b_n . Since the (a_1, \dots, a_n) and (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfy the same atomic formulas, there is an isomorphism between R and S that maps a_i to b_i for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. This isomorphism extends to the fields generated by the two rings and maps the coefficients of $p(x)$ to the coefficients of $q(x)$.

Since \mathcal{M} is algebraically closed, there is a root $b_{n+1} \in M$ of $q(x)$. Since $p(x)$ does not factor into polynomials of smaller degrees over R , $q(x)$ does not factor into polynomials of smaller degrees over S . It follows that there is an isomorphism from the field generated by R and a_{n+1} to the field generated by S and b_{n+1} that maps a_{n+1} to b_{n+1} . It follows that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas. Since φ is quantifier-free, it follows that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(b_1, \dots, b_{n+1})$, showing $\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{b})$.

Case 2. a_{n+1} is not algebraic over R .

First observe that since \bar{a} and \bar{b} satisfy the same atomic formulas, for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, a_i is not algebraic over the ring generated by $\{a_j : 1 \leq j \leq n \wedge j \neq i\}$ iff b_{n+1} is not algebraic over the ring generated by $\{b_j : 1 \leq j \leq n \wedge j \neq i\}$. It follows that the field generated by a_1, \dots, a_n has the same transcendence degree over the prime subfields of \mathcal{M} as the field generated by b_1, \dots, b_n . Since a_{n+1} is transcendental over the field generated by a_1, \dots, a_n , the transcendence degree of \mathcal{M} over the prime subfield is at least one greater than the transcendence degree of the field generated by a_1, \dots, a_n and hence at least one greater than the transcendence degree of the field generated by b_1, \dots, b_n . It follows that there is some $b_{n+1} \in M$ that is transcendental over the field generated by b_1, \dots, b_n .

Now there is an isomorphism from the field generated by S and a_{n+1} to the field generated by R and b_{n+1} that maps each a_i to the corresponding b_i , $i \in \{1, \dots, n+1\}$. It follows that (a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}) and (b_1, \dots, b_{n+1}) satisfy the same atomic formulas. Since φ is quantifier-free, $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(b_1, \dots, b_{n+1})$ and hence $\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(\bar{b})$. \square

Definition 2.31. A theory Φ over τ is **model-complete** if for all models \mathcal{M} of Φ and every substructure \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} that is a model of Φ , \mathcal{N} is an elementary substructure of \mathcal{M} .

Lemma 2.32. *Let Φ be a complete theory with quantifier elimination. Then Φ is model-complete.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{M} be a model of Φ and let \mathcal{N} be a substructure of \mathcal{M} . By the Tarski-Vaught Criterion, it is enough to check that for every formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and parameters $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in N$, if there is $a \in M$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$, then there is $b \in N$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(b, b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Since Φ has quantifier-elimination, we may assume that φ is quantifier-free.

Since Φ has quantifier-elimination, $(\exists x\varphi)(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is Φ -equivalent to a quantifier-free formula $\psi(y_1, \dots, y_n)$. Since \mathcal{N} is a substructure

of \mathcal{M} , (b_1, \dots, b_n) satisfies the same atomic formulas, and therefore the same quantifier-free formulas, in \mathcal{N} and in \mathcal{M} . It follows that $\mathcal{N} \models \psi(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ and hence $\mathcal{N} \models (\exists \varphi x)(b_1, \dots, b_n)$. It follows that there is $b \in N$ such that $\mathbb{N} \models \varphi(b, b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Since $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is quantifier-free, we have $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(b, b_1, \dots, b_n)$. \square

Corollary 2.33. *For $p = 0$ or p a prime number, Φ_{ACF_p} is model-complete.*

The model-completeness of Φ_{ACF_p} has an important consequence for algebraic geometry, Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. Before we can prove the Nullstellensatz, we need a basic fact about rings of polynomials.

Theorem 2.34 (Hilbert's Basissatz). *Let K be a field and consider the polynomial ring $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ in n variables over K . Then every ideal of $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is generated by finitely many elements.*

Proof. Observe that $K[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}] = K[X_1, \dots, X_n][X_{n+1}]$. A commutative ring is **Noetherian** if every ideal is generated by finitely many elements. We show by induction that $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is Noetherian for every n . It is enough to show that for every commutative Noetherian ring R , the polynomial ring $R[X]$ is Noetherian.

So, assume that R is commutative and Noetherian. Let I be an ideal of $R[X]$. Suppose that I is not finitely generated. Then we can recursively construct a sequence $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of polynomials in I such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, f_n is not in the ideal generated by $\{f_i : i < n\}$ and such that f_n is of minimal degree among all the polynomials in I that are not in the ideal generated by $\{f_i : i < n\}$. Note that the sequence of degrees of the f_n is non-decreasing.

For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ let a_i be the leading coefficient of f_i . Let $n \in \omega$ be minimal such that the ideal generated by $\{a_i : i < n\}$ is equal to the ideal generated by $\{a_i : i \leq n\}$. Such an n exists since R is Noetherian. Then there are $u_0, \dots, u_{n-1} \in R$ such that $a_n = u_0 a_0 + \dots + u_{n-1} a_{n-1}$.

Now consider the polynomial

$$g = u_0 f_0 X^{k_0} + \dots + u_{n-1} f_{n-1} X^{k_{n-1}}$$

where $k_i = \deg(f_n) - \deg(f_i)$. Since $(\deg(f_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing, each k_i is ≥ 0 and therefore g is indeed a polynomial. The degree of g is the same as the degree of f_n . Also, the leading coefficient of g is a_n . It follows that the degree of $f_n - g$ is strictly smaller than the degree of f_n . Also, since $f_n = g + (f_n - g)$, $f_n - g$ is in I but not in the ideal generated by $\{f_i : i < n\}$, contradicting the choice of f_n . \square

Theorem 2.35 (Hilbert's Nullstellensatz). *Let F be an algebraically closed field. If I is an ideal in $F[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ such that $1 \notin I$, then there is $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in F^n$ such that for all $f \in I$, $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$.*

Proof. By the Basissatz, there are polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_k \in I$ such that I is the ideal generated by f_1, \dots, f_k . By Zorn's Lemma there is a

maximal ideal $P \subseteq F[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ such that $I \subseteq P$ and $1 \notin P$. Since P is a maximal ideal, $G = F[X_1, \dots, X_n]/P$ is a field. We can consider F as a subfield of G via the embedding $a \mapsto a+P$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$f_i(X_1 + P, \dots, X_n + P) = f_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) + P = 0 + P.$$

Let H be the algebraic closure of G . Now

$$G \models \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n (f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0 \wedge \dots \wedge f_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0).$$

Since F is an algebraically closed field and a substructure of G , we have $F \preceq G$. Therefore

$$F \models \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n (f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0 \wedge \dots \wedge f_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0).$$

Hence, the f_1, \dots, f_k have a common zero $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in F^n$. Since I is generated by f_1, \dots, f_n , for all $f \in I$ we have $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$. \square

Exercise 2.36. Let \mathcal{M} be a τ -structure for some vocabulary τ . A set $S \subseteq M^n$ is **definable** (with parameters) if there are a τ -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m)$ and $b_1, \dots, b_m \in M$ such that

$$S = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in M^n : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m)\}.$$

Let K be an algebraically closed field. The **zero-set** of a polynomial $f(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is the set

$$\{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in K^n : f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0\}.$$

Show that the definable subsets of K^n are precisely the Boolean combinations of zero-sets.

The theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0 is the theory of $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$. Let us have a look at the theory of $(\mathbb{R}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$, the **theory of real closed fields**.

Definition 2.37. Consider the vocabulary $\tau = \{0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq\}$. A τ -structure $(R, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ is an **ordered ring** if $(R, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is a ring (with unit), \leq is a linear order on R , and moreover, the following two axioms are satisfied:

$$(OR1) \quad \forall x \forall y \forall z (x \leq y \rightarrow x + z \leq y + z)$$

$$(OR2) \quad \forall x \forall y \forall z ((x \leq y \wedge 0 \leq z) \rightarrow xz \leq yz)$$

An **ordered field** is an ordered ring $(F, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ such that $(F, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is a field.

A field $(F, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is **real closed** if there is an order \leq on F which turns F into an ordered field such that every polynomial of odd degree with coefficients in F has at least one zero in F and such that every element ≥ 0 has a square root. Let Φ_{RCF} be the theory of real closed fields, i.e., the deductive closure of the axioms for real closed fields.

It is clear that $(\mathbb{R}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ is a real closed field. However, it is not clear that the theory of real closed fields is complete. In other words, there could be real closed fields that are not elementarily equivalent

to the ordered field of real numbers. However, this is not the case. Since the theory of real closed fields is not κ -categorical for any κ , our previous strategy for showing the completeness of a first order theory fails. Another way of showing completeness is to show quantifier elimination first.

Lemma 2.38. *If Φ_{RCF} has elimination of quantifiers, then it is complete.*

Proof. Assume Φ_{RCF} has elimination of quantifiers. Let φ be a sentence. The only constants in the vocabulary are 0 and 1. If φ is equivalent to a quantifier-free formula, then it is equivalent to a Boolean combination of atomic formulas without variables. But Φ_{RCF} decides the validity of every atomic formula without variables. Hence Φ_{RCF} is complete. \square

In order to prove quantifier elimination of the theory of real closed fields, we use a version of Lemma 2.27 that works for theories that have not been shown to be complete yet.

Lemma 2.39. *Let τ be any vocabulary and let Φ be a theory over τ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) Φ has quantifier elimination.
- (2) For every τ -structure \mathcal{C} , if $f : C \rightarrow M$ and $g : C \rightarrow N$ are embeddings of \mathcal{C} into a models \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} of Φ , then for every quantifier-free formula τ -formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and every n -tuple $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in C^n$ we have

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(f(c_1), \dots, f(c_n)) \iff \mathcal{N} \models (\exists x\varphi)(g(c_1), \dots, g(c_n)).$$

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): This is practically the same as the proof of (1) \Rightarrow (2) in Lemma 2.27.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Let $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a variable-free τ -formula. Consider the vocabulary $\sigma = \tau \cup \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ where c_1, \dots, c_n are new constant symbols. If \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are two σ -structures that are models of Φ and satisfy the same quantifier-free σ -sentences, then the substructures generated by $c_1^{\mathcal{M}}, \dots, c_n^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $c_1^{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, c_n^{\mathcal{N}}$ are isomorphic and hence, by (2),

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(c_1^{\mathcal{M}}, \dots, c_n^{\mathcal{M}}) \iff \mathcal{N} \models (\exists x\varphi)(c_1^{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, c_n^{\mathcal{N}}).$$

If no σ -structure that is a model of Φ is a model $(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)$, then $(\exists x\varphi)(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is equivalent to a (quantifier-free) formula that is always false. Now, let \mathcal{M} be a σ -structure that is a model of Φ and $(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)$. Let $\Psi(\mathcal{M})$ be the set of quantifier-free σ -sentences that hold in \mathcal{M} . Since every model of $\Phi \cup \Psi(\mathcal{M})$ is also a model of $(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ by (2), $\Phi \cup \Psi(\mathcal{M}) \models (\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)$. It follows that Φ together with a finite subset of $\Psi(\mathcal{M})$ implies $(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)$. Since $\Psi(\mathcal{M})$ is closed under finite conjunctions, Φ together with a single sentence $\psi_{\mathcal{M}} \in \Psi(\mathcal{M})$ implies $(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)$.

Now consider the theory

$$\Phi \cup \{(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)\} \cup \{\neg\psi_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)\}.$$

By the choice of the $\psi_{\mathcal{M}}$, this theory is inconsistent. Hence there are

$$\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k \in \{\neg\psi_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \models (\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)\}$$

such that

$$\Phi \cup \{\neg\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg\psi_k\} \models \neg(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n).$$

It follows that $(\exists x\varphi)(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ is Φ -equivalent to $\psi_1 \vee \dots \vee \psi_k$. Hence $(\exists x\varphi)(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is equivalent to a quantifier-free τ -formula. \square

Exercise 2.40. In the proof of the previous lemma we implicitly used (and proved) the **separation lemma**:

Let τ be a vocabulary. Let Ψ be a collection of τ -sentences that is closed under conjunction and disjunction and contains \perp , the sentence that is always false, and \top , the sentence that is always true. Let Φ_0 and Φ_1 be theories over τ . Suppose for every model \mathcal{M} of Φ_0 and every model \mathcal{N} of Φ_1 there is $\psi \in \Psi$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \psi$ and $\mathcal{N} \models \neg\psi$.

Show that there is $\psi \in \Psi$ such that $\Phi_0 \models \psi$ and $\Phi_1 \models \neg\psi$.

We collect some facts about real closed fields.

Definition 2.41. Let $(F, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ be an ordered field. Then an ordered field $(K, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ is the **real closure** of F if F is a substructure of K , K is a real closed field, and every element of K is algebraic over F .

Lemma 2.42. *a) If $(R, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ is an ordered ring, then the order on R extends to the field of fractions of R , turning the field of fractions into an ordered field.*

*b) A field $(F, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is **formally real** if -1 has no square root. If F is formally real and $a \in F$, then F has an order \leq with $a < 0$ iff a is not a sum of squares, i.e., not of the form $b_1^2 + \dots + b_n^2$ for some $b_1, \dots, b_n \in F$.*

b) If $(F, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ is a real closed field, then the order witnessing this is unique and can be defined by letting $a \leq b$ if there is $c \in F$ such that $b = a + c^2$.

*c) Every ordered field has a real closure. The real closure is unique up to isomorphism over the base field. (The **Artin-Schreier Theorem**.)*

d) If $(R, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ is a real closed field, then adjoining a zero of the polynomial $X^2 + 1$ to $(R, 0, 1, +, \cdot)$ yields an algebraically closed field $R[\sqrt{-1}]$.

e) If $(R, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ is a real closed field, then every polynomial in $R[X]$ is the product of linear and quadratic factors of the form $(X - d)^2 + e$ with $e > 0$.

Theorem 2.43. *The theory of real closed fields has quantifier elimination and is complete.*

Proof. Completeness follows from quantifier elimination by Lemma 2.38. We use Lemma 2.39 to show quantifier elimination. Let \mathcal{C} be an ordered ring and let $f : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow M$ and $g : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow N$ be embeddings into real closed fields \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} . Let $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a quantifier-free formula and $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathcal{C}$. Let

$$\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) = (f(c_1), \dots, f(c_n))$$

and

$$\bar{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n) = (g(c_1), \dots, g(c_n)).$$

Assume

$$\mathcal{M} \models (\exists x \varphi)(\bar{a}).$$

Choose $a \in M$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a, \bar{a})$. Let F_0 be the real closed subfield of \mathcal{M} generated by a_1, \dots, a_n and let F_1 be the real closed subfield of \mathcal{N} generated by b_1, \dots, b_n . Clearly, F_0 is isomorphic to F_1 via an isomorphism h that maps $f(c)$ to $g(c)$ for every $c \in \mathcal{C}$.

If $a \in F_0$, then $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(h(a), \bar{b})$. If $a \notin F_0$, then a is transcendental over F_0 and $F_0(a)$ is isomorphic to the field $F_0(X)$ of fractions of $F_0[X]$. Let F_0^ℓ denote the set of elements of F_0 that are less than a and let F_0^r denote the set of elements of F_0 that are greater than a . Let $F_1^\ell = h[F_0^\ell]$ and $F_1^r = h[F_0^r]$. Since ordered fields are dense linear orders, there is an elementary extension \mathcal{N}' of \mathcal{N} that contains an element b which is greater than all elements of F_1^ℓ and smaller than all elements of F_1^r . Since F_1 is real closed an $b \notin F_1$, b is transcendental over F_1 . Hence, algebraically h has a unique extension $\bar{h} : F_0(a) \rightarrow F_1(b)$ that maps a to b . We have to show that \bar{h} is order-preserving.

It is enough to show that \bar{h} is order-preserving on $F_0[a]$. But for this it is actually enough to show that \bar{h} preserves positivity on $F_0[a]$. Let $p(X) \in F_0[X]$. Since F_0 is real closed, $p(X)$ factors as

$$p(X) = \alpha \cdot \prod_{i < n} (X - c_i) \cdot \prod_{j < m} ((X - d_j)^2 + e_j),$$

with positive e_j 's. Now, whether or not $p(a)$ is positive depends on how many of the factors $\alpha, a - c_0, \dots, a - c_{n-1}$ are negative. Whether or not $\bar{h}(p(a))$ is positive depends in the same way on the factors $\bar{h}(\alpha), \bar{h}(a) - \bar{h}(c_0), \dots, \bar{h}(a) - \bar{h}(c_{n-1})$. But since \bar{h} preserves the order on F_0 and, by the choice of b , also between the elements of F_0 and a , it follows that $p(a)$ is positive iff $\bar{h}(p(a))$ is.

Since φ is quantifier-free, b witnesses $(\exists x \varphi)(\bar{b})$ in \mathcal{N}' . Since \mathcal{N}' is an elementary extension of \mathcal{N} , $\mathcal{N} \models (\exists x \varphi)(\bar{b})$. This shows condition (2) in Lemma 2.39. Hence the theory of real closed fields has quantifier elimination. \square

Since the theory of real closed fields has quantifier elimination, it is model-complete. We use this fact to prove a theorem that settles Hilbert's 17th problem.

Theorem 2.44. *Let K be a real closed field. A polynomial f in the polynomial ring $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is a sum of squares*

$$f = g_1^2 + \dots + g_k^2$$

of rational functions $g_1, \dots, g_k \in K(X_1, \dots, X_k)$ iff for all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in K$,

$$f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq 0.$$

Proof. Assume that

$$f = \frac{g_1^2}{h_1^2} + \dots + \frac{g_k^2}{h_k^2}$$

for polynomials $g_1, \dots, g_k, h_1, \dots, h_k \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$. Let D be the set of all $\bar{a} \in K^n$ such that for all $j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, $h_j(\bar{a}) \neq 0$. The set D is dense and open in K^n . For each $\bar{a} \in D$ we have $f(\bar{a}) \geq 0$. The set of all $\bar{a} \in K^n$ with $f(\bar{a}) \geq 0$ is closed and includes D . It follows that $f(\bar{a}) \geq 0$ for all $\bar{a} \in K^n$.

Now suppose that f is not a sum of squares. The field extension of K by $K(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is purely transcendental, i.e., no element of $K(X_1, \dots, X_n) \setminus K$ is algebraic over K . Since K is real closed, -1 has no square root in K and therefore, -1 has no square root in $K(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. It follows that $K(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is an ordered field. Since f is not a sum of squares in this field, there is an order with respect to which f is negative. Since the order of K is unique, the order on $K(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ extends the order on K . Let L be the real closure of $K(X_1, \dots, X_n)$. Since $f(X_1, \dots, X_n) < 0$ in L , we have

$$L \models \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n (f(x_1, \dots, x_n) < 0).$$

Since the theory of real closed fields is model-complete, $K \preceq L$ and therefore

$$K \models \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n (f(x_1, \dots, x_n) < 0).$$

It follows that there are $a_1, \dots, a_n \in K$ such that $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) < 0$. \square

2.3. Strongly minimal theories.

Definition 2.45. Let τ be a vocabulary and \mathcal{M} a τ -structure. Let B be a subset of M . A set $A \subseteq M^n$ is **definable over B** if there are a τ -formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m)$ and parameters $b_1, \dots, b_m \in B$ such that

$$A = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in M^n : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m)\}.$$

A subset A of M^n is **definable** if it is definable over M . A is **definable without parameters** if A is definable over the empty set.

Lemma 2.46. *If $A \subseteq M^n$ is finite or cofinite, then A is definable.*

Proof. If A is finite, say

$$A = \{(a_1^i, \dots, a_n^i) : i < m\},$$

then A is defined by the formula

$$\bigvee_{i < m} (x_1 = y_1^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_n = y_n^i)$$

using the parameters $a_1^i, \dots, a_n^i, i < m$.

Clearly, the complement of every definable set is definable. \square

Definition 2.47. An infinite structure \mathcal{M} is **minimal** if all definable subsets of M are finite or cofinite. \mathcal{M} is **strongly minimal** if every structure \mathcal{N} that is elementarily equivalent to \mathcal{M} is minimal. A theory is **strongly minimal** if all of its models are infinite and strongly minimal.

Observe that in the definition of minimality only definable subsets of M , and not of M^n are considered. The reason for this is that for every infinite structure \mathcal{M} the set $\{(a, a) : a \in M\}$ is definable and both infinite and coinfinite.

Example 2.48. a) The structure (\mathbb{Q}, \leq) is not minimal since for every $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ the set $\{a \in \mathbb{Q} : a \leq q\}$ is definable and both infinite and coinfinite.

b) The random graph is not minimal since for every vertex the set of neighbors is definable and both infinite and coinfinite.

Lemma 2.49. *Let Φ be a theory over τ that has quantifier elimination and only infinite models. Then Φ is strongly minimal iff for every model \mathcal{M} of Φ the subsets of M defined by atomic formulas are finite or cofinite.*

Proof. Clearly, if Φ is strongly minimal, then for every model \mathcal{M} of Φ , every subset of M definable by an atomic formula is finite or cofinite.

Now let \mathcal{M} be a model of Φ and assume that every subsets of M defined by an atomic formulas is finite or cofinite. Since Φ has quantifier

elimination, every definable subset of M is definable by a quantifier-free formula. Every quantifier-free formula is a Boolean combination of atomic formulas. A straight-forward induction shows that if every set definable by an atomic formula is finite or cofinite, then every set definable by a Boolean combination of atomic formulas is finite or cofinite. This shows that \mathcal{M} is minimal. \square

Corollary 2.50. *The theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic p , $p = 0$ or p a prime number, is strongly minimal.*

Proof. The theory has quantifier elimination and hence we can apply Lemma 2.49. Let \mathcal{M} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic p . The atomic formulas in the language of fields are equations between polynomials. Every such equation in the variables x, y_1, \dots, y_m is equivalent to an equation of the form $p(x, y_1, \dots, y_m) = 0$. If b_1, \dots, b_m are parameters from M , then the equation $p(x, b_1, \dots, b_m)$ has only finitely many solutions $a \in M$. It follows that the corresponding definable subset of M is finite. \square

Definition 2.51. Let \mathcal{M} be a τ -structure and $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ a τ -formula. Let $b_1, \dots, b_n \in M$. Then $\varphi(x, b_1, \dots, b_n)$ is **algebraic** if $\{a \in M : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)\}$ is finite. For $B \subseteq M$ and $a \in M$, a is **algebraic over B** if there are $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$ and a formula $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ such that $\varphi(x, b_1, \dots, b_n)$ is algebraic and $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$.

For $B \subseteq M$ let $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B)$ be the set of all $a \in M$ that are algebraic over B . The set $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B)$ is the **algebraic closure** of B . $A \subseteq M$ is **algebraically closed** if $A = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$.

Lemma 2.52. *a) Let \mathcal{M} be a τ -structure and $A, B \subseteq M$. Then the following hold:*

- (1) $A \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ (*Reflexivity*)
- (2) If $A \subseteq B$, then $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B)$. (*Monotonicity*)
- (3) $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)) = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ (*Idempotency*)
- (4) If $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$, then $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A_0)$ for some finite set $A_0 \subseteq A$. (*Finite character*)
- (5) $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ is the underlying set of a substructure of \mathcal{M} .

c) If \mathcal{M} is minimal, then for all $A \subseteq M$ and all $b, c \in M$ the following holds:

- (6) If $c \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A \cup \{b\})$ and $c \notin \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$, then $b \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A \cup \{c\})$. (*Exchange*)

Proof. (1) For every $a \in A$, $\{a\}$ is defined by $x = a$ and $x = a$ is algebraic.

(2) Every set definable over A is definable over B . If a is algebraic over A , then it is an element of a finite set that is definable over A . This finite set is definable over B and thus a is algebraic over B .

(3) By (1) and (2) we have $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A))$. Now assume that a is algebraic over $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$. Then there are a formula

$\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ such that $\varphi(x, b_1, \dots, b_n)$ is algebraic and $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a, b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of distinct x in M that satisfy $\varphi(x, b_1, \dots, b_n)$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ choose $\psi_i(y, z_1, \dots, z_{m_i})$ and $a_1^i, \dots, a_{m_i}^i \in A$ such that $\psi_i(y, a_1^i, \dots, a_{m_i}^i)$ is algebraic and $\mathcal{M} \models \psi_i(b_i, a_1^i, \dots, a_{m_i}^i)$.

For every formula χ let $\exists^{\ell} y \psi$ be the formula that expresses “there are exactly ℓ distinct x that satisfy ψ ”. Now

$$\exists y_1 \dots \exists y_n \left(\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \wedge \exists^{\ell} z \varphi(z, y_1, \dots, y_n) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n \psi(y_i, a_1^i, \dots, a_{m_i}^i) \right)$$

is algebraic and is satisfied in \mathcal{M} by a . Hence $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$.

(4) This is obvious.

(5) For every constant symbol c , $\{c^{\mathcal{M}}\}$ is definable without parameters. Hence $c^{\mathcal{M}} \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$. If f is a n -ary function symbol and $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$, then $\{f^{\mathcal{M}}(b_1, \dots, b_n)\}$ is definable over $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ and therefore

$$f^{\mathcal{M}}(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)) = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A).$$

It follows that $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ is closed under all the functions of \mathcal{M} . This shows (5).

(6) Let $c \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A \cup \{b\})$. Let $\varphi(x, y, z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be a formula and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $\varphi(x, b, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is algebraic and $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(c, b, a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\varphi(x, b, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is satisfied by exactly k distinct x in M . If $\varphi(c, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is algebraic, then $b \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A \cup \{c\})$.

Now assume that $\varphi(c, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is not algebraic. Then by the minimality of \mathcal{M} , the set

$$\{d \in M : \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(c, d, a_1, \dots, a_n)\}$$

is cofinite, i.e., $\varphi(c, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds for almost all y in M .

Hence, there is $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\neg \varphi(c, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds for exactly ℓ distinct y . Since $c \notin \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$, $\exists^{\ell} y \neg \varphi(x, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ holds for almost all x in M . But this means that for almost all $d \in M$, $\varphi(d, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is satisfied by all but at most ℓ distinct y in M .

Suppose that there are distinct $e_1, \dots, e_{\ell+1} \in M$ such that for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell+1\}$, $\varphi(x, e_i, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ fails for almost all x in M . Since finite intersections of cofinite sets are again cofinite, we can conclude that for almost all x , $\varphi(x, e_i, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ fails for all $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell+1\}$, contradicting the previous statement.

Hence, for all but at most ℓ distinct $e \in M$, $\varphi(x, e, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is satisfied by almost all x in M .

In particular, $\exists^{\neq k} x \varphi(x, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ fails for almost all y . But this shows that $\exists^{\neq k} x \varphi(x, y, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is algebraic and therefore

$$b \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A \cup \{c\}).$$

□

Definition 2.53. Let \mathcal{M} be a structure and $A, C \subseteq M$. Then A is **independent over** C if for every $a \in A$, $a \notin \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}((A \cup C) \setminus \{a\})$. A is **independent** if A is independent over \emptyset .

$B \subseteq A$ **generates** A **over** C iff $A \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B \cup C)$. Note that this is equivalent to $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A \cup C) = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B \cup C)$. B **generates** A iff it generates A over \emptyset .

$B \subseteq A$ is a **basis for** A **over** C iff B is independent and generates A over C . B is a **basis for** A if B is a basis for A over \emptyset .

Exercise 2.54. Show that the theory of infinite vector spaces over a fixed field F has quantifier elimination.

Exercise 2.55. Show that the theory of infinite vector spaces over a fixed field F is strongly minimal. Note that the model theoretic notions “independent” and “basis” coincide with their counter parts from linear algebra.

We will now show that minimal structures allow the definition of a dimension of sets.

Lemma 2.56. *Let \mathcal{M} be a minimal structure, let $C \subseteq M$ and let $E \subseteq M$ be finite and independent over C . If $F \subseteq M$ is such that $|E| = |F|$ and $E \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(F \cup C)$, then $F \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(E \cup C)$.*

Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on $n = |E| = |F|$. Let us start with the following claim:

Claim 2.57. If the lemma holds for n , then whenever $E \subseteq M$ is finite and independent over C and $F \subseteq M$ is finite and such that $E \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(F \cup C)$ and $|F| = n$, then $|E| \leq n$.

For the proof of the claim suppose that $|E| > n$. Let $E' \subseteq E$ be of size n . Clearly, $E' \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(F \cup C)$. By the lemma for n , $F \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(E' \cup C)$. It follows that $E \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(E' \cup C)$, contradicting the independence of E . This shows the claim.

Let us return to the proof of the lemma itself. For assume that $n = 1$. Let f be the unique element of F and let e be the unique element of E . Since $E = \{e\}$ is independent over C , $e \notin \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(C)$. By (6) of Lemma 2.52 (exchange), $f \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{e\} \cup C)$, i.e., $F \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(E \cup C)$.

Now let $n > 1$ and assume the lemma is true for sets of size less than n . Let $E \subseteq M$ be independent over C and $F \subseteq M$ such that $n = |E| = |F|$ and $E \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(F \cup C)$. We write $F = \{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$.

By the induction hypothesis together with the claim,

$$E \not\subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{f_2, \dots, f_n\} \cup C).$$

Hence, there is $e_1 \in E \setminus \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{f_2, \dots, f_n\} \cup C)$. By exchange,

$$f_1 \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{e_1, f_2, \dots, f_n\} \cup C).$$

Now suppose that for some k we have

$$\{f_1, \dots, f_k\} \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{e_1, \dots, e_k, f_{k+1}, \dots, f_n\} \cup C)$$

with pairwise distinct $e_1, \dots, e_k \in E$. By the induction hypothesis together with the claim,

$$E \not\subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{e_1, \dots, e_k, f_{k+1}, \dots, f_n\} \setminus \{f_{k+1}\} \cup C).$$

Let

$$e_{k+1} \in E \setminus \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{e_1, \dots, e_k, f_{k+1}, \dots, f_n\} \setminus \{f_{k+1}\} \cup C).$$

Again by exchange,

$$f_{k+1} \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{e_1, \dots, e_{k+1}, f_{k+1}, \dots, f_n\} \setminus \{f_{k+1}\} \cup C).$$

This process terminates after n steps and we have

$$f_1, \dots, f_n \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(\{e_1, \dots, e_n\} \cup C),$$

finishing the proof of the lemma. \square

Corollary 2.58. *Let \mathcal{M} be a minimal structure and $A, C \subseteq M$. If A is generated over C by a finite set, then A has a finite basis over C and any two bases of A over C are of the same size.*

Proof. Suppose A is generated over C by a set of size n . By Lemma 2.56, every set $B \subseteq A$ that is independent over C is of size at most n . Let $B \subseteq A$ be maximally independent over C . We show that B generates A over C .

Let $a \in A$. By the choice of B , $B \cup \{a\}$ is not independent over C . Hence we have $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B \cup C)$ or for some $b \in B$, $b \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}((B \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\} \cup C)$. In the latter case, by exchange, $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B \cup C)$. It follows that $A \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B \cup C)$. Hence B is a basis for A over C .

Let B' be another basis for A over C . Since B' is independent and $B' \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B \cup C)$, Lemma 2.56 implies that $|B'| \leq |B|$. With the roles of B and B' reversed, the same argument yields $|B| \leq |B'|$. Hence every basis for A over C has the same size as B . \square

Lemma 2.59. *Let \mathcal{M} be a minimal structure and $A, C \subseteq M$. Then A has a basis over C and any two bases for A over C have the same size.*

Proof. By Zorn's Lemma, there is a maximal set $B \subseteq A$ that is independent over C . Note that the proof of this fact uses the finite character of our notion of independence (a set is independent iff every finite subset is) and hence of the algebraic closure. By the same argument as in the corollary above, B is a basis for A over C .

If A has a finite basis over C , then the lemma follows from the previous corollary. Now let B and B' be two infinite bases for A over C and assume $|B| < |B'|$. We have $B' \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B \cup C)$. By the finite

character of the algebraic closure, for every $b \in B'$ there is a finite set $F_b \subseteq B$ such that $b \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(F_b \cup C)$. Since B is infinite, B has $|B|$ finite subsets. Since $|B'| > |B|$, there is a finite set $F \subseteq B$ such that $F_b = F$ for infinitely many $b \in B'$. But now $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(F \cup C)$ contains an infinite set that is independent over C , contradicting Lemma 2.56. \square

Exercise 2.60. Let \mathcal{M} be a minimal structure and $A, C \subseteq M$. Show that the following are equivalent for all $B \subseteq A$:

- (1) B is a basis for A over C .
- (2) B is a maximal independent set over C .
- (3) B is a minimal set that generates A over C .

Definition 2.61. Let \mathcal{M} be a minimal structure and $A, C \subseteq M$. The **dimension of A over C** is the size $\dim(A/C)$ of a basis of A over C . The **dimension of A** is the size $\dim(A)$ of a basis of A over \emptyset .

Lemma 2.62. Let \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} be elementary equivalent minimal structures, and $A \subseteq M$ and $C \subseteq N$. If $\dim(A) = \dim(C)$, then $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) \cong \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$.

Proof. Choose a bijection $f : B_A \rightarrow B_C$. We first show that f is elementary in the sense that for all formulas $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in B_A$,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n) \iff \mathcal{N} \models \varphi(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n)).$$

Next, we show that f can be extended to an isomorphism from $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ onto $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$.

Claim 2.63. For every formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in B_A$, if $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, then $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n))$.

We prove the claim by induction on the number of free variables of φ . If φ has no free variables, i.e., if $n = 0$, then the claim is satisfied since \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} satisfy the same sentences.

Now suppose we have proved the claim for n . Consider a formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1} \in B_A$. We may assume that the a_i are pairwise distinct. Since B_A is independent, $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, x_{n+1})$ is not algebraic. Since \mathcal{M} is minimal, $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, x_{n+1})$ is satisfied by cofinitely many x_{n+1} in M . In other words, $\neg\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, x_{n+1})$ is algebraic. Hence, for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \exists^{\neq \ell} x_{n+1} \neg\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, x_{n+1}).$$

By our induction hypothesis,

$$\mathcal{N} \models \exists^{\neq \ell} x_{n+1} \neg\varphi(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n), x_{n+1}).$$

It follows that $\neg\varphi(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_n), x_{n+1})$ is algebraic. Since B_C is independent, $f(a_{n+1})$ does not satisfy an algebraic formula with parameters from $B_C \setminus \{f(a_{n+1})\}$. It follows that $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(f(a_1), \dots, f(a_{n+1}))$. This proves the claim. Hence f is \mathcal{M} -elementary.

Claim 2.64. If $E \subseteq \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$, $B_A \subseteq E$, and $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) \setminus E$, then any elementary function $g : E \rightarrow \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$ extends to an elementary function $g' : E \cup \{a\} \rightarrow \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$.

Since a is algebraic over E , there is a formula $\theta(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)$ and parameters $e_1, \dots, e_n \in E$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \theta(a, e_1, \dots, e_n)$ and such that for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\theta(x, e_1, \dots, e_n)$ is satisfied by exactly ℓ x in M . We choose θ and e_1, \dots, e_n such that ℓ is as small as possible. This means that for every formula $\psi(x, z_1, \dots, z_m)$ and all parameters $d_1, \dots, d_m \in E$ with $\mathcal{M} \models \psi(a, d_1, \dots, d_m)$,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \forall x(\theta(x, e_1, \dots, e_n) \rightarrow \psi(x, d_1, \dots, d_m)),$$

since otherwise $\theta(x, e_1, \dots, e_n) \wedge \psi(x, d_1, \dots, d_m)$ witnesses that a is algebraic over E and has less solutions than $\theta(x, e_1, \dots, e_n)$.

We have $\mathcal{M} \models \exists^{=\ell} x \theta(x, e_1, \dots, e_n)$. Since g is elementary,

$$\mathcal{N} \models \exists^{=\ell} x \theta(x, g(e_1), \dots, g(e_n)).$$

In particular, there is $b \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$ such that $\mathcal{N} \models \theta(b, g(e_1), \dots, g(e_n))$. We extend g to $E \cup \{a\}$ by letting $g'(a) = b$ and $g' \upharpoonright E = g$. Now, let $\varphi(x, y_1, \dots, y_m)$ be a formula and $d_1, \dots, d_m \in E$. Suppose that $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a, d_1, \dots, d_m)$. By the minimality of ℓ ,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \forall x(\theta(x, e_1, \dots, e_n) \rightarrow \varphi(x, d_1, \dots, d_m)).$$

Since g is elementary, we have

$$\mathcal{N} \models \forall x(\theta(x, g(e_1), \dots, g(e_n)) \rightarrow \varphi(x, g(d_1), \dots, g(d_m))).$$

But since $\mathcal{N} \models \theta(b, g(e_1), \dots, g(e_n))$, this implies

$$\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(b, g(d_1), \dots, g(d_m)).$$

It follows that g' is elementary, as we wanted to show.

This second claim shows that by transfinite recursion, f can be extended to an elementary function $f' : \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) \rightarrow \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$. It is clear that f' is an isomorphism onto its image. It remains to show that f' is onto $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$.

Let $c \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$. Then there is an algebraic formula $\varphi(x, c_1, \dots, c_n)$ with parameters in B_C witnessing that c is algebraic over B_C . Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\mathcal{N} \models \exists^{=\ell} x \varphi(x, c_1, \dots, c_n)$. For each c_i let $a_i = f^{-1}(c_i)$. By elementarity of f , $\mathcal{M} \models \exists^{=\ell} x \varphi(x, a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Now the ℓ distinct elements of $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ satisfying $\varphi(x, a_1, \dots, a_n)$ are mapped by f' to the ℓ distinct elements of $\text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$ that satisfy $\varphi(x, c_1, \dots, c_n)$. In particular, there is $a \in \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A)$ such that $f'(a) = c$. It follows that $f' : \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(A) \rightarrow \text{acl}_{\mathcal{N}}(C)$ is an isomorphism. \square

Corollary 2.65. *Let Φ be a countable complete theory that is strongly minimal. Then it is κ -categorical for every uncountable cardinal κ .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.62, it is enough to show that any two models of Φ of size κ have the same dimension. Clearly, the dimension of a model of Φ of size κ is at most κ . On the other hand, if \mathcal{M} is a model of Φ and B is a basis for M , then $M = \text{acl}_{\mathcal{M}}(B)$. But if Φ is countable, then Φ only uses a countable vocabulary τ . There are only countably many formulas over τ . It follows that there are at most as many algebraic formulas with parameters from B as B has finite subsets. Since each algebraic formula is only satisfied by finitely many elements of M , this implies that B is infinite and therefore we only have $|B|$ elements of M that are algebraic over B . Hence $\kappa = |M| \leq |B|$. It follows that $\dim(M) = \kappa$. \square

Let us briefly mention a variation of strong minimality.

Definition 2.66. Let \mathcal{M} be a τ -structure for a vocabulary τ that contains the binary relation symbol \leq . \mathcal{M} is **o-minimal** if \mathcal{M} is totally ordered by \leq and every definable subset of \mathcal{M} is a finite union of intervals and singletons.

A theory is o-minimal if every model of the theory is o-minimal.

While the theory of a minimal structure is not necessarily strongly minimal, the theory of an o-minimal structure is o-minimal. Examples of o-minimal structures are real closed fields, dense linear orders, the ordered field of real numbers with exponentiation. Algebraically closed substructures of o-minimal structures have the exchange property. In particular, in o-minimal structure it is possible to define dimensions. However, o-minimal structures are not uncountably categorical.

3. TYPES

Definition 3.1. Fix a vocabulary τ . Let \mathcal{M} be a τ -structure and $B \subseteq M$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let Γ be a set of formulas $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b_1, \dots, b_m)$ that have free variables among x_1, \dots, x_n and additional parameters from B . Γ is an **n -type over B** if it is **consistent** in the sense that any finitely many formulas from Γ are simultaneously satisfied by an n -tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in M^n$. Γ is an **n -type** if it is an n -type over \emptyset .

We write $\Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ instead of just Γ to indicate that Γ is an n -type and that the formulas in Γ have free variables among x_1, \dots, x_n . Γ is **realized by** $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in M^n$ if for all $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Gamma$, $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m)$. If no n -tuple in M^n realizes Γ , we say that \mathcal{M} **omits** Γ .

Γ is a complete n -type over B if Γ is a maximal n -type over B . Otherwise, Γ is a partial type.

Example 3.2. a) The only 0-type over B is the set

$$\{\varphi(b_1, \dots, b_m) : \varphi(y_1, \dots, y_m) \text{ is a } \tau \text{ formula, } b_1, \dots, b_m \in B \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(b_1, \dots, b_m)\}.$$

b) For all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in M^n$,

$$\text{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}((a_1, \dots, a_n)/B) = \{\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) : \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) \text{ is a } \tau \text{ formula, } b_1, \dots, b_m \in B \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m)\}$$

is a complete n -type, the **type of** (a_1, \dots, a_n) **over** B .

c) If \mathcal{M} is a substructure of \mathcal{N} and $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in N^n$, then the type of (a_1, \dots, a_n) in \mathcal{N} is an n -type over B in \mathcal{M} .

Exercise 3.3. Determine all the complete 1-types in the structure (\mathbb{Q}, \leq) over the set \mathbb{Q} .

Hint: Consider the real numbers (and more!).

Lemma 3.4. Let \mathcal{M} be a structure, $A \subseteq M$ and let Γ be an n -type over A in \mathcal{M} . Then \mathcal{M} has an elementary extension \mathcal{N} in which Γ is realized.

Proof. Consider the elementary diagram $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{M})$ of \mathcal{M} . The vocabulary of $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{M})$ has a constant symbol c_a for every $a \in M$. We introduce new constant symbols d_1, \dots, d_n . Let Γ' be the theory obtained from Γ by replacing every formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Gamma$ by $\varphi(d_1, \dots, d_n, c_{b_1}, \dots, c_{b_m})$.

Since every finite subset of Γ is realized by an n -tuple in M , the theory $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{M}) \cup \Gamma'$ is consistent. Now, if \mathcal{N} is a model of $\text{eldiag}(\mathcal{M}) \cup \Gamma'$, we can consider \mathcal{N} as an elementary extension of \mathcal{M} . Clearly, $(d_1^{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, d_n^{\mathcal{N}})$ realizes Γ in \mathcal{N} . \square

Definition 3.5. Given a theory Φ over the vocabulary τ , let $S_n(\Phi)$ be the set of all complete n -types (over \emptyset) that are realized in some model of Φ . Let $S(\Phi) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n(\Phi)$.

$S_n(\Phi)$ carries a natural topology. $O \subseteq S_n(\Phi)$ is open if for all $\Gamma \in O$ there is a formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Gamma$ such that all $\Delta \in S_n(\Phi)$ with $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \Delta$ are types in O .

Lemma 3.6. *For every theory Φ and every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the space $S_n(\Phi)$ is compact.*

Observe that this lemma makes sense even for $n = 0$. In this case $S_n(\Phi)$ is the set of all complete theories that extend Φ .

Proof. We first show that $S_n(\Phi)$ is Hausdorff. Let $p, q \in S_n(\Phi)$ if $p \neq q$, there is a formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that $\varphi \in p$ and $\neg\varphi \notin q$. Let U be the set of all n -types that contain φ and let V be the set of all n -types that contain $\neg\varphi$. Now $p \in U$ and $q \in V$ and U and V are disjoint and open. This shows that $S_n(\Phi)$ is Hausdorff.

Now let \mathcal{U} be a collection of open subsets of $S_n(\Phi)$ such that $S_n(\Phi) = \bigcup \mathcal{U}$. For each type $p \in S_n(\Phi)$ there is some $U \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $p \in U$. Since U is open, there is a formula $\varphi_p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in p$ such that all n -types that contain this formula are elements of U . In order to show that $S_n(\Phi)$ is the union of finitely many sets from \mathcal{U} , it is enough to show that there are finitely many types $p_1, \dots, p_m \in S_n(\Phi)$ such that every type in $S_n(\Phi)$ contains at least one of the formulas $\varphi_{p_1}, \dots, \varphi_{p_m}$.

Suppose this is not the case. Then whenever $F \subseteq S_n(\Phi)$ is finite, there is an n -type q such that for all $p \in F$, $\varphi_p \notin q$. Since q is complete, $\{\neg\varphi_p : p \in F\} \subseteq q$. This shows that every finite subset of $\{\neg\varphi_p : p \in S_n(\Phi)\}$ can be realized. It follows that $\{\neg\varphi_p : p \in S_n(\Phi)\}$ is a type. This type extends to a complete type q that does not contain any formula of the form φ_p , $p \in S_n(\Phi)$, a contradiction. \square

Exercise 3.7. Let \mathcal{M} be a structure and $A \subseteq M$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ consider the space $S_n(\mathcal{M}, A)$ of complete n -types over A in \mathcal{M} . $S_n(\mathcal{M}, A)$ is topologized in analogy to $S_n(\Phi)$. Show that $S_n(\mathcal{M}, A)$ is compact.

3.1. Isolated types.

Definition 3.8. Let Φ be a theory. A type $p \in S_n(\Phi)$ is **isolated** if the set $\{p\}$ is open in $S_n(\Phi)$, i.e., if there is a formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in p$ such that p is the only type in $S_n(\Phi)$ that contains φ . Similarly, we defined isolated types in $S_n(\mathcal{M}, A)$ for a structure \mathcal{M} and $A \subseteq M$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let Φ be a complete theory and let $p \in S_n(\Phi)$ be isolated. Then p is realized in every model of Φ .*

Proof. Let $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a formula such that p is the only type in $S_n(\Phi)$ that contains φ . Let \mathcal{M} be a model of Φ in which p is realized. Then $\mathcal{M} \models \exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \varphi$. Since Φ is complete, we have $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n \varphi \in$

Φ . But this implies that in every model \mathcal{N} of Φ there is an n -tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) such that $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Since p is isolated and since this is witnessed by φ , $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{N}}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = p$. \square

Theorem 3.10 (Omitting Types Theorem). *Let Φ be a countable complete theory. If $p \in S_n(\Phi)$ is not isolated, then there is a countable model of Φ that omits p .*

Proof. Let $(c_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of new constant symbols. Let τ' be the vocabulary τ of Φ together with the new constant symbols c_i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We construct a maximal consistent theory Φ^+ over τ' with the following properties:

- (1) $\Phi \subseteq \Phi^+$
- (2) For every formula in Φ^+ of the form $\exists x\theta(x)$, there is some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\theta(c_i) \in \Phi^+$.
- (3) For all $(i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, there is a formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in p$ such that $\neg\varphi(c_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_n})$.

We construct Φ^+ as the union of countably many approximations Φ_m , $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\Phi_0 = \Phi$, let $(\psi_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of all sentences over τ' and let $(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an enumeration of the set of n -tuples from the set $C = \{c_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Since every Φ_m will be obtained by adding only finitely many sentences to Φ_0 , for each m , only finitely many of the constants c_i occur in Φ_m .

Suppose Φ_m has been defined. If $\Phi_m \cup \{\psi_m\}$ is not consistent, let $\Phi'_m = \Phi_m \cup \{\neg\psi_m\}$. If $\Phi_m \cup \{\psi_m\}$ is consistent and ψ_m is of the form $\exists x\theta(x)$, choose some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that c_i does not occur in $\Phi_m \cup \{\exists x\theta(x)\}$ and let $\Phi'_m = \Phi_m \cup \{\exists x\theta(x), \theta(c_i)\}$. Otherwise let $\Phi'_m = \Phi_m \cup \{\psi_m\}$. This makes sure that (2) is satisfied for Φ^+ .

Now, let $\varphi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m, \bar{c})$ be the conjunction of the finitely many sentences in Φ'_m that use constant symbols from C , where \bar{c} is a tuple consisting of all elements of C that are used in Φ'_m and are not in the n -tuple (d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m) . Note that $\Phi \cup \{\varphi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m, \bar{c})\}$ is equivalent to Φ'_m in the sense that the first theory implies every sentence in the second and the second theory implies every sentence in the first. We consider the formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{y})$ obtained from $\varphi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m, \bar{c})$ by replacing each occurrence of d_i by x_i and each occurrence of c_j by y_j .

Clearly, $\Phi'_m \models \exists \bar{y}\varphi(d_1, \dots, d_n, \bar{y})$. If $\exists \bar{y}\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{y}) \notin p$, then $\neg\exists \bar{y}\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{y}) \in p$ since p is complete. In this case let

$$\Phi_{m+1} = \Phi'_m \cup \{\exists \bar{y}\varphi(d_1, \dots, d_n, \bar{y})\}.$$

This takes care of (3). If

$$\exists \bar{y}\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{y}) \in p,$$

then, since p is not isolated, there is another type q such that

$$\exists \bar{y}\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{y}) \in q.$$

Let $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be any formula in $q \setminus p$. Then $\neg\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in p$.

Claim 3.11. $\Phi'_m \cup \{\psi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m)\}$ is consistent.

Since $\exists \bar{y} \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{y}) \in q$, $q \cup \{\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{y})\}$ can be realized. Since the variables from C do not occur in $q = q(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, this shows that $q(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m) \cup \{\varphi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m, \bar{c})\}$ is consistent. Let \mathcal{M} be a model of $q(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m) \cup \{\varphi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m, \bar{c})\}$. Since $q \in S(\Phi)$, $\Phi \subseteq q$. It follows that \mathcal{M} is a model of Φ . Since $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in q$,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \Phi \cup \{\varphi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m, \bar{c}), \psi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m)\}.$$

But $\Phi \cup \{\varphi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m, \bar{c})\} \models \Phi'_m$. Hence \mathcal{M} is a model of $\Phi'_m \cup \{\psi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m)\}$, which proves the claim.

Let $\Phi_{m+1} = \Phi'_m \cup \{\psi(d_1^m, \dots, d_n^m)\}$. The choice of $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ takes care of (3).

This finishes the construction of the theories Φ_m . Let $\Phi^+ = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Phi_m$. Since every Φ_m is consistent, so is Φ^+ . Let \mathcal{N} be a model of Φ^+ . Let $M = \{c_i^{\mathcal{N}} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. (2) implies that M is the underlying set of an elementary substructure \mathcal{M} of \mathcal{N} . (3) guarantees that \mathcal{M} omits p . \square

The proof of the omitting types theorem together with some book keeping can be used to show that countably many non-isolated types can be omitted simultaneously, in a countable model.

Corollary 3.12. *Let Φ be a countable complete theory. A type in $S(\Phi)$ is isolated iff it is realized in every countable model of Φ .*

Theorem 3.13. *Let Φ be a countable complete theory having only infinite models. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $S(\Phi)$ is countable and every type in $S(\Phi)$ is isolated.
- (2) Each $S_n(\Phi)$ is finite.
- (3) Φ is \aleph_0 -categorical.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If every type in $S_n(\Phi)$ is isolated, then every singleton in $S_n(\Phi)$ is open. Since $S_n(\Phi)$ is compact, the space is a finite union of singletons and therefore finite.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Let \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} be two countable models of Φ . We use back-and-forth argument that is practically the same as the one used to show the uniqueness of the random graph. The crucial step is this:

Suppose we have chosen elements p_1, \dots, p_n of M and q_1, \dots, q_n of N such that $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_1, \dots, p_n) = \text{tp}_{\mathcal{N}}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$. Note that for $n = 0$ this just says that \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are elementarily equivalent, which they are. Let $p_{n+1} \in M \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$. The type $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_1, \dots, p_{n+1})$ is isolated and hence implied by a single formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$. We have $\exists x_{n+1} \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \text{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_1, \dots, p_n)$. Hence $\exists x_{n+1} \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}) \in \text{tp}_{\mathcal{N}}(q_1, \dots, q_n)$. It follows that there is some $q_{n+1} \in N$ such that $\mathcal{N} \models \varphi(q_1, \dots, q_{n+1})$. Now $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{N}}(q_1, \dots, q_{n+1})$ is the type implied by $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{n+1})$ and hence equal to $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_1, \dots, p_{n+1})$.

This allows it to recursively construct an isomorphism between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} .

(3) \Rightarrow (1): If $p \in S(\Phi)$ is not isolated, there is a countable model \mathcal{M} of Φ that omits p . Let \mathcal{N} be a model of Φ in which p is realized by some n -tuple (a_1, \dots, a_n) . By the Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, \mathcal{N} has a countable elementary submodel that contains a_1, \dots, a_n . It follows that p is realized in some countable model of Φ . This model is not isomorphic to \mathcal{M} . Hence Φ is not \aleph_0 -categorical.

This shows that if Φ is \aleph_0 -categorical, then all types are isolated. If all types are isolated, then, again by compactness, each $S_n(\Phi)$ is finite. Therefore $S(\Phi)$ is countable in this case. \square

Exercise 3.14. Show that the theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic p , $p = 0$ or p a prime number, has exactly one 1-type that is not isolated, namely the type of an element that is transcendent over the prime subfield.

Exercise 3.15. How many n -types does the theory of dense linear orders without endpoints have?

3.2. Saturation.

Definition 3.16. Let κ be a cardinal. A structure \mathcal{M} is κ -saturated if for all $A \subseteq M$ with $|A| < \kappa$, every 1-type over A is realized in \mathcal{M} . \mathcal{M} is **saturated** if it is $|M|$ -saturated.

Example 3.17. a) The random graph is saturated. It is easily checked that a 1-type over a finite set either says that the vertex realizing this type is equal to a certain vertex in the finite set or specifies to which vertices from the finite set the vertex realizing the type is connected. The extension axioms precisely state that every 1-type over a finite set is realized.

b) (\mathbb{Q}, \leq) is saturated. The density axiom and the no endpoint axiom say that certain 1-types over sets of size 2, respectively of size 1 are realized. It turns out that there are essentially no other types over finite sets.

Theorem 3.18. *Let Φ be a complete theory that has only infinite models. a) If \mathcal{M} is a κ -saturated model of Φ , then every model \mathcal{N} of Φ of size $\leq \kappa$ embeds into \mathcal{M} elementarily.*

b) If \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are both saturated models of Φ of the same size, then they are isomorphic.

Proof. a) Let $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ be an enumeration of N . We define an elementary embedding e of \mathcal{N} into \mathcal{M} by recursion. Suppose for some $\beta < \kappa$ we have defined $e(a_\alpha)$ for all $\alpha < \beta$. Consider the type $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{N}}(a_\beta / \{a_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\})$. This type corresponds to the type p in \mathcal{M} over the set $\{e(a_\alpha) : \alpha < \beta\}$ that is obtained by replacing every formula of the form $\varphi(x, a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_n})$ by $\varphi(x, e(a_{i_1}), \dots, e(a_{i_n}))$. Since \mathcal{M} is κ saturated, there is some $b \in M$ that realizes p . Let $e(a_\beta) = b$. This finishes the recursive definition of e .

It is easily checked that $e : N \rightarrow M$ is an elementary embedding.

b) We use the same approach as in the proof of a), but in a back-and-forth way. Let $(a_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ and $(b_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ be enumerations of M and N , respectively. We call an ordinal α **even** if it is of the form $\beta + 2n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and some β that is either 0 or a limit ordinal. Otherwise α is **odd**.

Now suppose that for some $\beta < \kappa$ we have defined two sequences $(p_\alpha)_{\alpha < \beta}$ and $(q_\alpha)_{\alpha < \beta}$ in M , respectively in N . If β is even, let p_β be the $a_\gamma \in M \setminus \{p_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}$ of the smallest possible index. Choose $q_\beta \in N$ such that it realizes the type over $\{q_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\}$ that corresponds to $\text{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(p_\beta / \{p_\alpha : \alpha < \beta\})$. If β is odd, proceed in the same way with the roles of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} switched. This finishes the recursive definition of two sequences $(p_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ and $(q_\alpha)_{\alpha < \kappa}$ in M , respectively N .

It is easily checked that the map $p_\alpha \mapsto q_\alpha$ is an isomorphism between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} . \square

Definition 3.19. For an infinite cardinal κ , $2^{<\kappa}$ denotes the cardinal $\sup\{2^\lambda : \lambda < \kappa\}$.

Recall that the **Generalized Continuum Hypothesis** (GCH) is the statement that for every infinite κ , 2^κ is the cardinal successor κ^+ of κ . GCH is equivalent to the statement that for all infinite κ , $2^{<\kappa} = \kappa$.

Theorem 3.20. a) Let Φ be a complete countable theory with only infinite models. Then for every cardinal κ , Φ has a κ -saturated model.

b) GCH implies that Φ has arbitrarily large saturated models.

Proof. a) By enlarging κ if necessary, we may assume that κ is a successor cardinal, i.e., $\kappa = \lambda^+$ for some infinite cardinal λ . We define an elementary chain $(\mathcal{M}_\alpha)_{\alpha < \lambda^+}$ of models of Φ . Let \mathcal{M}_0 be any model of Φ of size κ . Suppose β is some ordinal $< \lambda^+$ and \mathcal{M}_α has been defined for all $\alpha < \beta$.

Let \mathcal{N}_0^β be the limit of the elementary chain $(\mathcal{M}_\alpha)_{\alpha < \beta}$. Let μ_β be the number of 1-types in \mathcal{N}_0^β over sets of size $< \kappa$ and let $(p_\gamma)_{\gamma < \mu_\beta}$ be an enumeration of those types. We construct an elementary chain $(\mathcal{N}_\gamma^\beta)_{\gamma < \mu_\beta}$ as follows: Suppose for some $\nu < \mu_\beta$, \mathcal{N}_γ^β has been defined for all $\gamma < \nu$. Let \mathcal{L}_ν^β be the limit of $(\mathcal{N}_\gamma^\beta)_{\gamma < \nu}$. Since \mathcal{L}_ν^β is an elementary extension of \mathcal{N}_0^β , p_ν is a type in \mathcal{L}_ν^β over a set of size $< \kappa$. Let \mathcal{N}_ν^β be an elementary extension of \mathcal{L}_ν^β in which p_ν is realized. This finishes the definition of the elementary chain $(\mathcal{N}_\gamma^\beta)_{\gamma < \mu_\beta}$.

Now let \mathcal{M}_β be the limit of $(\mathcal{N}_\gamma^\beta)_{\gamma < \mu_\beta}$. This finishes the definition of the elementary chain $(\mathcal{M}_\alpha)_{\alpha < \lambda^+}$. Finally, let \mathcal{M} be the limit of $(\mathcal{M}_\alpha)_{\alpha < \lambda^+}$. Let $A \subseteq M$ be a set of size $< \kappa = \lambda^+$. Then for some $\alpha < \lambda^+$, $A \subseteq M_\alpha$. If p is a type in \mathcal{M} over A , then by our construction, p is realized in $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha+1}$ and hence in \mathcal{M} .

b) The proof is exactly the same as for a), only we keep track of the sizes of the models \mathcal{M}_α , $\alpha < \lambda^+$. If \mathcal{N} is of size λ^+ , then N has

$(\lambda^+)^{\lambda} = (2^{\lambda})^{\lambda} = 2^{\lambda} = \lambda^+$ subsets of size λ . Since Φ is countable, for each set $A \subseteq N$ of size λ , there are λ 1-types in \mathcal{N} over A . It follows that in \mathcal{N} there are λ^+ 1-types over sets of size $< \lambda^+$. It follows that all the structures that occur in the proof of a) can be chosen of size κ . In particular, the final model is of size κ and hence saturated. \square