Math Logic: Model Theory & Computability Lecture 17

Examples (watined) (c) let ogph := (E) be the signature of graphs. Let T2 be the theory of all 2-regular unchirected acyclic graphs, i.e. T₂:= 40, 42, V 40 = 123 }, where U says the graph is unlinected, Y says each vertex has exactly 2 neighbours, and On says there is no eycle of length n. let's completely characterize all models of T₂. Obs. C:= (V,E) = T2 it and only if each of its concreted components is a 2-negator tree, i.e. a Z-line. Ut r_{c} denote the concectedness equivalence relation on V, i.e. $U \sim c_{v}$ if u, v are in the care convected component. Two models G_{c} , $H \neq I_{2}$ we isomorphic if and if they have the one "unber" of concected components, $u \circ ro precisely, |V^{\underline{c}}/n_{\underline{u}}| = |V^{\underline{H}}/n_{\underline{H}}|$. Pop. To is K-categorical for all unable a field of the bijedion chrolinals K. Read Let $\underline{M}, \underline{H} \models Tn$ of cardinality K. Then $V^{\underline{G}} = \underline{LL} C$, so $K = [V^{\underline{G}}] = [V^{\underline{G}}]_{\underline{A}} [\cdot |\mathbb{Z}| = \max([V^{\underline{G}}]_{\underline{A}} [\cdot, \mathbb{N}_{O}]),$ $C \in V^{\underline{G}}/\underline{A}_{\underline{A}}$ hence $|V^{\underline{G}}/\underline{A}_{\underline{A}}| = K$, so \underline{L} has K-many connected to ponents. Same holds for \underline{H} , hence $\underline{L} \cong \underline{H}$, (d) let Ja := the signature of Q-vector space := (+, \approx_q = gEQ), there \approx_q is a more operation symbol. let VSa be the Ja-theory at

vector spaces over OL, which is infinish he are the axions about the elements of the heid to be leasted to each trife set of clements separately, e.g. to express that $\forall q_{1,q_{2}} \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\forall verters v, (q_{1}q_{2}) \cdot v = q_{1} \cdot (q_{2} \cdot v)$, we need to write one sentence for each pair $(q_{1}q_{2}) \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{Q}$. Thus, the models of VS are exactly the rector spaces over Q. As is know, two Q-vector spaces U,V are isonosphic iff they admit equinmerous bases Bu and BV, i.e. |Bu| = |Bv|. Prop. VSQ is K-categorial for every unifol and incl K. Vcoof- For a Q-voctor space V of cardinality K, Letting BV almoste a basis for V, we see Mt K= |V| = | V B × Q |= |SSol. | Prin (BV)| = |SSol. | U | Bv"| |= |SSol. | Bv | = BE Prin (BV) NEIN = max (\$\$, |Bv|), here |Bv|=K. Thus, any two such vector speces have equinaneoous bases, are therefore isomorphic. (e) For p prime or O, recall the theory ACEP of algebraically dosed fields of characteristic p. Lema, For every uly closed field F of characteristic p, thre is a maximal transcendental set B(5, torn) over the prime subfield For EF (i.e. the field generated 5, 1). Moreover, [F] = max (Slo, 1B]). Furthermore, two such fields are isomorphic iff their transcendence large are assimilations. bases are equinnuerous. Rost-sketch let BSF be a maximal trancendental set, i.e. each bEB is transcendental over Fo(BISB3) = the subfield severated by BISB.

(In other words B is algebraically independent over Fo.) Then, any a E F is algebraic over Fo (13) Is the maximality of B. (IF a is indep from 96,,..., Bu) then it can't be that b, is algebraic over Sa, b2,..., bu), This needs to be poored, but we'll skip it.) Then, F is the algebraic chosnic of Fo (B), and hence has cardion-lify Mool- (B). Moreover, any bije dection between transcedurce bases of two fields F, Fr FACFp is extended to an isomor-phicky Unlink may not be unissed. pluson Intrich may not be unique), Lor. For my p print or O, ACFp is K-categorical for any multiple and the condition K. lcoof let F, Ez EA(Fp af carchinglih K. let B, Bz be transcendence bases for F, and Fz. Then K=|Fi| = max (No, 1Bil) implies |Bi|=K, so $|B_1| = |B_2|$, $\lim F_1 \cong F_2$. It turns out that the tack that is Examples (c)-(e) we had K-ache-goricity for all much k is not a more coincidence: Modey theorem let & be a ctld signated and T a O-theory. If T is λ -categorical for some uncellal cardinal λ , then it is K-categorical for all uncellal cardinals K. What Modely actually proves (coughly) that for all &-categical theories T, their models admit an abstract version of a span operation, which allows for defining independence and basis, and hence extend bijedious between bases to isomorphisms. And this is why t-cakegoicity implies Kucategoricity for all K, like in our exaples (c)-(e).

In (c), the span of a set I of rectices is the union all the noncected components of all u EU. In (d), the span is the linear span, and in (e) the span is the algebraic dosure. What is categoricity useful for? Wash to's - Vaught test (for completenen). It a s-theory T is K-categorical to some cardinal KZ max (No, 151) Wen T is complete. Proof. To show NAT is complete, we were to show "It for any models $\underline{M}, \underline{N} \neq T$ ve have $\underline{M} \equiv \underline{N}$. But by upward or dominard Löwen-heim-Skolem Nuevnews, Rune are models $\underline{M}' \equiv \underline{M}$ and $\underline{N}' \equiv \underline{N}$ s.t. $\underline{M}', \underline{N}'$ have cardinality K. In particular, $\underline{M}', \underline{N}' \neq T$, hence $\underline{M}' \cong \underline{N}'$ by κ -categoricity, but in particular $M \equiv M' \equiv N' \equiv N$. Cocollary. The theories DLO, To (for 2-regular acyudic graphes), VSoc, and A(Fp for p prime or O, are complete (in their respective signatures).