

LECTURE 24
MATH 229

LECTURE: PROFESSOR PIERRE SIMON
NOTES: JACKSON VAN DYKE

Recall we're still in this situation where M has few substructures. Then we're studying tameness of definable linear orders. The last lemma we had was:

Lemma 1. *Let \bar{V} be transitive and linearly ordered. Then for $f : X \rightarrow \bar{V}$, $\pi : D \rightarrow \bar{V}$ we have $X = D$ and $f = \pi$.*

It follows that the induced structure on B is o -minimal.¹ We now have a stronger statement which will effectively tell us that V has no structure.

Proposition 1. *Let $\pi : D \rightarrow V$ be as above. In particular V is transitive and linear ordered. Then π has finite fibers and any formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ (defining a subset of D^n) definable over some \bar{b} is equivalent to a Boolean combination of formulas of the form*

- (a) $\pi(x_i) \square \pi(x_j)$, where $\square \in \{=, \leq\}$,
- (b) $\pi(x_i) < \pi(a)$, where $a \in \bar{b} \cap D$, and
- (c) $x_i = a$ for some $a \in \pi^{-1}(\pi(\bar{b} \cap D))$.

Proof. Let $\bar{c} = (c_0, \dots, c_{l-1}) \in M^l$, and let $v \in V$ be definable over \bar{c} . Then there is some index $i < l$ such that $v = \pi(c_i)$. Take l minimal such that this is false. Then let $\bar{c}_* = (c_0, \dots, c_{l-2})$, $\bar{c}_* \wedge c_{l-1}$. First notice c_{l-1} is not algebraic over \bar{c}_* because otherwise v would be algebraic over \bar{c}_* , and

$$v \in \text{acl}(\bar{c}_*) = \text{dcl}(\bar{c}_*) \cap V .$$

So over \bar{c}_* we have a definable function $f_{\bar{c}_*}$ such that

$$f_{\bar{c}_*}(c_{l-1}) = v .$$

Let

$$W = \{w \in V \mid \text{tp}(w/\bar{c}_*) = \text{tp}(v/\bar{c}_*)\}$$

and apply the previous lemma to this (replacing D with $\pi^{-1}(W)$). So $f_{\bar{c}_*} = \pi$ and thus $v = \pi(c_{l-1})$. We also have that $\text{acl}(\bar{c}) \cap D = \pi^{-1}(\pi(\bar{c} \cap D))$.

We prove the proposition by induction on n . For $n = 1$ $\varphi(x_1)$ is a Boolean combination of convex subsets of V . The end cuts of those convex sets are in

$$\text{dcl}(\bar{b}) \cap \bar{V} = \pi(\bar{v} \cap D)$$

so $\varphi(x_1)$ is as desired.

Now we complete the inductive step. Fix values for x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} then apply the case $n = 1$. There are finitely many possibilities for the set $\varphi(c_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)$. Now for each of these possibilities we can define the set of c_1, \dots, c_{n-1} for which each possibility is realized. Hence by induction the formula has the desired form. \square

Date: April 23, 2019.

¹This means a definable set is a finite union of intervals.

As a consequence of this, the induced structure on V is just DLO.

Proposition 2. *A similar statement holds for circular orders, i.e. $\pi : D \rightarrow V$, V transitive, has a definable circular order.*

The point is that instead of inequalities we have things like $C(\pi(x_i), \pi(x_j), \pi(c))$ for $c \in \pi(D \cap \bar{b})$.

Proof. Take $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ over \bar{b} as in the previous proposition. If $D \cap \bar{b} \neq \emptyset$, then over \bar{b} , V splits into linear orders and we can apply proposition 1.

In general, pick any $a \in D$, then working over a we can apply proposition 1. Since we can change a , a cannot appear in the decomposition of φ . \square

The conclusion is the following.

Corollary 1. *Let D be definable, $\pi : D \rightarrow V$ an interpretable map, where V is transitive, infinite, and has a definable separation relation. Take $\bar{b} \in M \setminus D$. Then V is transitive over \bar{b} and its structure over \bar{b} is precisely one of the four unstable reducts of DLO.*

1. GLUING ORDERS

Say that a definable set $D_{\bar{a}} \subseteq M$ (over \bar{a}) is *almost linear (over \bar{a})* if there is $\pi : D_{\bar{a}} \rightarrow V_{\bar{a}}$ interpretable over \bar{a} and $V_{\bar{a}}$ has an \bar{a} -definable linear order. The point is that π might have finite fibers so it might not actually be linear. We can see $\leq_{\bar{a}}$ as a quasi-order over $D_{\bar{a}}$.

Now we want to see what happens when we vary \bar{a} .

Lemma 2. *Let $D_{\bar{a}}$ be almost linear, transitive over \bar{a} , $\pi : D_{\bar{a}} \rightarrow V_{\bar{a}}$. Define the equivalence relation $E_{\bar{a}}$ as:*

$$xE_{\bar{a}}y \iff \pi(x) = \pi(y) .$$

Let $c \in D_{\bar{a}}$. Then for $c' \in M$ the following are equivalent:

- (1) $c' \in D_{\bar{a}}$, $E_{\bar{a}}$ -equivalent to c
- (2) $c \in \text{acl}(c')$.

Proof. (2) \implies (1): This follows from proposition 1. The point is that if c is algebraic over c' so is its projection, but the only way a point in M can know a point in V is if it lies above it.

(1) \implies (2): Enumerate the $E_{\bar{a}}$ class of c as $\bar{c}_0 \wedge \bar{c}_1$ where $\bar{c}_0 \in \text{acl}(c)$, $\bar{c}_1 \notin \text{acl}(c)$. There is $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(M)$ fixing c and such that

$$\sigma(\bar{c}_1) \cap \text{acl}(\bar{a} \wedge c) = \emptyset .$$

Let $\bar{a}' = \sigma(\bar{a})$. Then we claim that $c \in \text{acl}(\bar{a} \wedge \bar{a}')$, as the set of $E_{\bar{a}'}$ -classes which $D_{\bar{a}'}$ intersects non-trivially is finite. Now \bar{a} must contain a point in the $E_{\bar{a}'}$ -class of c . Now this point is algebraic over $\bar{a} \wedge c$ since it is in \bar{a} . But this means it is in \bar{c}_0 . But this is not possible since $D_{\bar{a}}$ is transitive. So we are done. \square

Note that $E_{\bar{a}}$ is just the relation of inter-algebraicity over \emptyset .

Lemma 3. *Let $D_{\bar{a}}$ and $D'_{\bar{b}}$ be transitive and almost-linear over \bar{a} and \bar{b} respectively. Assume there is $c \in D_{\bar{a}} \cap D'_{\bar{b}}$. Then $D_{\bar{a}}$ and $D'_{\bar{b}}$ agree up to reversal on an open neighborhood of c .*

Proof. First we know that the $E_{\bar{a}}$ -class of c and the $E'_{\bar{b}}$ -class of c coincide. We claim that $c \notin \text{acl}(\bar{a} \wedge \bar{b})$. Working over \bar{a} , if $c \in \text{acl}(\bar{a} \wedge \bar{b})$, then \bar{b} has a point in the $E_{\bar{a}}$ -class of c . This is the $E_{\bar{b}}$ -class of c , so this would contradict transitivity of $D'_{\bar{b}}$.

It follows that c is not an endpoint of the intersection (in $D_{\bar{a}}$). Therefore there is an open neighborhood of c in $D_{\bar{a}}$ inside the intersection. Then the order induced on this intersection by $D'_{\bar{b}}$ must either be the original order, or the reversed order. More specifically we can work in a small neighborhood of c which doesn't intersect $\text{acl}(\bar{a} \wedge \bar{b})$ so \bar{b} cannot do anything besides reverse the order in this neighborhood.

Now repeat the same argument for \bar{b} and it is easy to see we are done. \square