

# Lecture 7: Galois stability

John T. Baldwin  
Department of Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science  
University of Illinois at Chicago

September 22, 2003

In this section we show that a countable  $\lambda$ -categorical AEC is  $\mu$ -stable for  $\mu$  above the Löwenheim number and below  $\lambda$ . The key idea is that for a linear order  $I$  and model  $EM(I, \Phi)$  automorphisms of  $I$  induce automorphisms of  $EM(I, \Phi)$ . And, automorphisms of  $EM(I, \Phi)$  preserve types in *any* reasonable logic; in particular, automorphisms of  $EM(I, \Phi)$  preserve Galois types. Note that a model  $N$  is (defined to be) stable if few types are realized in  $N$ . So if  $N$  is a brimful model (Definition 2) then the model  $N$  is  $\sigma$ -stable for every  $\sigma < |N|$ .

Since we deal with reducts, we will consider several structures with the same universe; it is crucial to keep the vocabulary of the structure in mind. The AEC under consideration has vocabulary  $\tau$ ; it is presented as reducts of models of theory  $T'$  (which omit certain types) in a vocabulary  $\tau'$ . In addition, we have the class of linear orderings ( $LO$ ) in the background.

We really have three AEC's:  $(LO, \subset)$ ,  $\mathbf{K}'$  which is  $Mod(T')$  with submodel as  $\tau'$ -closed subset, and  $(\mathbf{K}, \prec_{\mathbf{K}})$ . We are describing the properties of the EM-functor between  $(LO, \subset)$  and  $\mathbf{K}'$  or  $\mathbf{K}$ .  $\mathbf{K}'$  is only a tool that we are singling out to see the steps in the argument. The following definitions hold for any of the three classes and I write  $\leq$  for the notion of substructure. In this section of the paper I am careful to use  $\leq$  when discussing all three cases versus  $\prec_{\mathbf{K}}$  for the AEC.

**Definition 1**  $M_2$  is  $\sigma$ -universal over  $M_1$  in  $N$  if for every  $M_1 \leq M_2 \leq N$  and whenever  $M_1 \leq M'_2 \leq N$ , with  $|M_1| \leq |M'_2| \leq \sigma$ , there is a (partial isomorphism) fixing  $M_1$  and taking  $M'_2$  into  $M_2$ .

I introduce one term for shorthand. It is related to Shelah's notion of *brimmed* in [?].

**Definition 2**  $N$  is brimful if for every  $\sigma < |N|$ , and every  $M_1 \leq N$  with  $|M_1| = \sigma$ , there is an  $M_2$  that is  $\sigma$ -universal over  $M_1$  in  $N$ .

The next notion just makes it easier to write the proof of the following Lemma.

**Notation 3** Let  $I \subset J$  be linear orders. We say  $a$  and  $b$  in  $J$  realize the same cut over  $I$  and write  $a \sim_I b$  if for every  $j \in J$ ,  $a < j$  if and only if  $b < j$ .

**Claim 4 (Lemma 3.7 of [?])** The linear order  $I = \lambda^{<\omega}$  is brimful.

Proof. Let  $J \subset I$  have cardinality  $\theta < \lambda$ . Since we can increase  $J$  without harm, we can assume  $J = A^{<\omega}$  for some  $A \subset \lambda$ . Note that  $\sigma \sim_J \tau$  if and only if for the least  $n$  such that  $\sigma \upharpoonright n = \tau \upharpoonright n \in J$ ,  $\sigma(n) \sim_A \tau(n)$ . Thus

there are only  $\theta$  cuts over  $J$  realized in  $I$ . For each cut  $C_\alpha$ ,  $\alpha < \theta$ , we choose a representative  $\sigma_\alpha \in I - J$  of length  $n$  such that  $\sigma_\alpha \upharpoonright n-1 \in J$ , so a cut has the form  $\{\sigma_\alpha \widehat{\tau} : \tau \in \lambda^{<\omega}, \alpha < \theta\}$ . We can assume any  $J^*$  extending  $J$  has the form  $J^* = B^{<\omega}$  for some  $B \subset \lambda$ , say with  $\text{otp}(B) = \gamma$ . Thus, the intersection of  $J^*$  with a cut in  $J$  is isomorphic to a subset of  $\gamma^{<\omega}$ . We finish by noting for any ordinal  $|\gamma| = \theta$ ,  $\gamma^{<\omega}$  can be embedded in  $\theta^{<\omega}$ . Thus, the required  $\theta$ -universal set over  $J$  is  $J \cup \{\sigma_\alpha \widehat{\tau} : \tau \in \theta^{<\omega}, \alpha < \theta\}$ .

Qing Zhang has provided the following elegant argument for the last claim. First show by induction on  $\gamma$  there is a map  $g$  embedding  $\gamma$  in  $\theta^{<\omega}$ . (E.g. if  $\gamma = \lim_{i < \theta} \gamma_i$ , and  $g_i$  maps  $\gamma_i$  into  $\theta^{<\omega}$ , let for  $\beta < \gamma$ ,  $g(\beta) = i \widehat{g}_i(\beta)$  where  $\gamma_i \leq \beta < \gamma_{i+}$ .) Then let  $h$  map  $\gamma^{<\omega}$  into  $\theta^{<\omega}$  by, for  $\sigma \in \gamma^{<\omega}$  of length  $n$ , setting  $h(\sigma) = \langle g(\sigma(0)), \dots, g(\sigma(n-1)) \rangle$ .  $\square_4$

The argument for Claim 4 yields:

**Corollary 5** *Suppose  $\mu < \lambda$  are cardinals. Then for any  $X \subset \mu^{<\omega}$  and any  $Y$  with  $X \subseteq Y \subset \lambda^{<\omega}$  and  $|X| = |Y| < \mu$ , there is an order embedding of  $Y$  into  $\mu^{<\omega}$  over  $X$ .*

Exercise: For an ordinal  $\gamma$ , let  $\gamma^{\omega*}$  denote the functions from  $\omega$  to  $\gamma$  with only finitely many non-zero values. Show  $\gamma^{\omega*}$  is a dense linear order and so is not isomorphic to  $\gamma^{<\omega}$ . Vary the proof above to show  $\gamma^{\omega*}$  is brimful.

Since every  $L'$ -substructure of  $EM(I, \Phi)$  has the form  $EM(I_0, \Phi)$  for some subset  $I_0$  of  $I$ , we have immediately:

**Claim 6** *If  $I$  is brimful as a linear order,  $EM(I, \Phi)$  is brimful as an  $L'$ -structure.*

Recall, Morley's omitting types theorem.

**Lemma 7** *If  $(X, <)$  is a sufficiently long linearly ordered subset of a  $\tau$ -structure  $M$ , for any  $\tau'$  extending  $\tau$  (the length needed for  $X$  depends on  $|\tau'|$ ) there is a countable set  $Y$  of  $\tau'$ -indiscernibles (and hence one of arbitrary order type) such that  $\mathbf{D}_\tau(Y) \subseteq \mathbf{D}_\tau(X)$ . This implies that the only (first order)  $\tau$ -types realized in  $EM(X, \mathbf{D}_{\tau'}(Y))$  were realized in  $M$ .*

Using this result, we can find Skolem models over indiscernibles in an AEC.

**Theorem 8** *If  $\mathbf{K}$  is an abstract elementary class in the vocabulary  $\tau$ , which is represented as a PCT class witnessed by  $\tau', T', \Gamma$  that has arbitrarily large models, there is a  $\tau'$ -diagram  $\Phi$  such that for every linear order  $(I, <)$  there is a  $\tau'$ -structure  $M = EM(I, \Phi)$  such that:*

1.  $M \models T'$ .
2. The  $\tau'$ -structure  $M = EM(I, \Phi)$  is the Skolem hull of  $I$ .
3.  $I$  is a set of  $\tau'$ -indiscernibles in  $M$ .
4.  $M \upharpoonright \tau$  is in  $\mathbf{K}$ .
5. If  $I' \subset I$  then  $EM_\tau(I', \Phi) \prec_{\mathbf{K}} EM_\tau(I, \Phi)$ .

Proof. The first four clauses are a direct application of Lemma 7, Morley's theorem on omitting types. See also problem 7.2.5 of Chang-Keisler [?]. It is automatic that  $EM(I', \Phi)$  is an  $L'$  substructure of  $EM(I, \Phi)$ . The moreover clause allows us to extend this to  $EM_\tau(I', \Phi) \prec_{\mathbf{K}} EM_\tau(I, \Phi)$ .  $\square_8$

Now using amalgamation and categoricity, we move to the AEC  $\mathbf{K}$ . There are some subtle uses here of the 'coherence axiom':  $M \subseteq N \prec_{\mathbf{K}} N_1$  and  $M \prec_{\mathbf{K}} N_1$  implies  $M \prec_{\mathbf{K}} N$ .

**Claim 9** *If  $I$  is brimful as linear order,  $EM_\tau(I, \Phi)$  is brimful as a member of  $\mathbf{K}$ .*

Proof. Let  $M = EM(I, \Phi)$ ; we must show  $M \upharpoonright \tau$  is brimful as a member of  $\mathbf{K}$ . Suppose  $M_1 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M \upharpoonright \tau$  with  $|M_1| = \sigma < |M|$ . Then there is  $N_1 = EM(I', \Phi)$  with  $|I'| = \sigma$  and  $M_1 \subseteq N_1 \leq M$ . By Lemma 8.5,  $N_1 \upharpoonright \tau \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M \upharpoonright \tau$ . So  $M_1 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} N_1 \upharpoonright \tau$  by the coherence axiom. Let  $M_2$  have cardinality  $\sigma$  and  $M_1 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M_2 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M \upharpoonright \tau$ . Choose a  $\tau'$ -substructure  $N_2$  of  $M$  with cardinality  $\sigma$  containing  $N_1$  and  $M_2$ . Now,  $N_2$  can be embedded by a map  $f$  into the  $\sigma$ -universal  $\tau'$ -structure  $N_3$  containing  $N_1$  which is guaranteed by Claim 6. But  $f(N_2) \upharpoonright \tau \prec_{\mathbf{K}} N_3 \upharpoonright \tau$  by the coherence axiom so  $N_3 \upharpoonright \tau$  is the required  $\mathbf{K}$ -universal extension of  $M_1$ .  $\square_9$

**Definition 10** 1. *Let  $N \subset \mathbb{M}$ .  $N$  is  $\lambda$ -Galois-stable if for every  $M \subset N$  with cardinality  $\lambda$ , only  $\lambda$  Galois types over  $M$  are realized in  $N$ .*

2.  *$\mathbf{K}$  is  $\lambda$ -Galois-stable if  $\mathbb{M}$  is. That is  $\text{aut}_{\mathbb{M}}(\mathbb{M})$  has only  $\lambda$  orbits for every  $M \subset \mathbb{M}$  with cardinality  $\lambda$ .*

Since we are usually working in an AEC, we will frequently abuse notation and write stable rather than Galois-stable.

Since each Galois type over  $M_0$  realized in  $M$  is represented by an  $M_1$  with  $M_0 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M_1 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M$ ,  $M = EM(I, \phi)$  brimful, and  $|M_1| = |M_0|$ , Claim 9 implies immediately:

**Claim 11** *If  $\mathbf{K}$  is  $\lambda$ -categorical, the model  $M$  with  $|M| = \lambda$  is  $\sigma$ -Galois stable for every  $\sigma < \lambda$ .*

**Theorem 12** *If  $\mathbf{K}$  is categorical in  $\lambda$ , then  $\mathbf{K}$  is  $\sigma$ -Galois-stable for every  $\sigma < \lambda$ .*

Proof. Suppose  $\mathbf{K}$  is not  $\sigma$ -stable for some  $\sigma < \lambda$ . Then by Löwenheim-Skolem, there is a model  $N$  of cardinality  $\sigma^+$  which is not  $\sigma$ -stable. Let  $M$  be the  $\sigma$ -stable model with cardinality  $\lambda$  constructed in Claim 11. Categoricity and joint embedding imply  $N$  can be embedded in  $M$ . The resulting contradiction proves the result.  $\square_{12}$

**Remark 13** *Again, the assumption that  $\mathbf{K}$  has amalgamation isn't needed here; instead of using Löwenheim-Skolem from the monster, one can use amalgamation on  $\mathbf{K}_{<\lambda}$  and get joint embedding by restricting to the equivalence class of the categoricity model.*

**Corollary 14** *Suppose  $\mathbf{K}$  is categorical in  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda$  is regular. The model of power  $\lambda$  is saturated and so model homogeneous.*

Proof. Choose in  $M_i \prec_{\mathbf{K}} \mathbb{M}$  using  $< \lambda$ -stability and Löwenheim-Skolem, for  $i < \lambda$  so that each  $M_i$  has cardinality  $< \lambda$  and  $M_{i+1}$  realizes all types over  $M_i$ . By regularity, it is easy to check that  $M_\lambda$  is saturated.  $\square_{14}$

The same argument gives saturated models in smaller regular cardinals; more strongly we can demand that the saturated model be an Ehrenfeucht-Mostowski model.

**Corollary 15** *Suppose  $\mathbf{K}$  is an AEC with vocabulary  $\tau$  that is categorical in  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda$  is regular. Then for every regular  $\mu$ ,  $\text{LS}(\mathbf{K}) < \mu < \lambda$  there is a model  $M_\mu = EM_\tau(I_\mu, \Phi)$  which is saturated. In particular, it is  $\mu$ -model homogeneous.*

Proof. For any ordered set  $J$  of cardinality  $\lambda$ , let  $N = EM_\tau(J, \phi)$  be the model of cardinality  $\lambda$ . We construct an alternating chain of  $\mathbf{K}$ -submodels of length  $\mu$ .  $M_0 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M$  is arbitrary with cardinality  $\mu$ .  $M_{2\alpha+1}$  has cardinality

$\mu$  and realizes all types over  $M_{2\alpha}$  (possible by Corollary 14).  $M_{2\alpha+2}$  has cardinality  $\mu$ ,  $M_{2\alpha+1} \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M_{2\alpha+2}$  and  $M_{2\alpha+2}$  is  $EM_{\tau}(I_{\alpha+1}, \Phi)$  where  $I_{\alpha} \subset I_{\alpha+1} \subset J$  and all  $I_{\alpha}$  have cardinality  $\mu$ . Then  $EM_{\tau}(I_{\mu}, \Phi) = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} EM_{\tau}(I_{\alpha}, \Phi)$  is saturated by regularity.  $\square_{15}$

Now using stability we can get a still stronger result, eliminating the hypothesis that  $\mu$  is regular. We show the proofs of both Corollary 15 and Corollary 16 since in the first case we constructed a saturated model directly and in the second a model homogeneous structure.

**Corollary 16** *Suppose  $\mathbf{K}$  is categorical in  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda$  is regular. Then for every  $\mu$ ,  $\text{LS}(\mathbf{K}) < \mu < \lambda$  there is a model  $M_{\mu} = EM(\mu^{<\omega}, \Phi)$  which is  $\mu$ -model homogeneous.*

Proof. Represent the categoricity model as  $M^* = EM_{\tau}(\lambda^{<\omega}, \Phi)$ . We show  $M_{\mu} = EM_{\tau}(\mu^{<\omega}, \Phi)$  is model homogenous. Suppose  $M_1 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M \upharpoonright \tau$  with  $|M_1| = \sigma < |M|$ . Then there is  $N_1 = EM_{\tau}(I_1, \Phi)$  with  $|I_1| = \sigma$ ,  $M_1 \subset N_1$  and  $I_1 \subset \mu^{<\omega}$ . Let  $M_2$  have cardinality  $\sigma$  and  $M_1 \prec_{\mathbf{K}} M_2$ . By amalgamation, choose  $N_2 \in \mathbf{K}$  which is an amalgam of  $N_1$  and  $M_2$  over  $M_1$ . By the  $\lambda$ -model homogeneity of  $M^*$ , there is an embedding of  $N_2$  into  $M^*$  over  $N_1$  say with image  $N'_2$ . Then  $M'_2 \subset EM(J, \Phi)$  for some  $J$  with  $I_1 \subset J \subset (\lambda^{<\omega})$  and  $|J| = \sigma$ . Now by Corollary 5 and an argument like that in Claim 9, there is an embedding of  $EM_{\tau}(J, \Phi)$  into  $M = EM_{\tau}(\mu^{<\omega}, \Phi)$  over  $N_1$ , and *a fortiori* over  $M_1$  and we finish.  $\square_{16}$

**Exercise 17** *Show Corollary 16 can be marginally strengthened by dropping the hypothesis that  $\lambda$  is regular but requiring that  $\mu$  be less than the cofinality of  $\lambda$ .*