Independence in tame abstract elementary classes

Sebastien Vasey

Carnegie Mellon University

January 11, 2015
Joint Mathematics Meeting
AMS-ASL Special Session on Beyond First-Order Model Theory
San Antonio, USA

Introduction

- Forking is one of the key notions of modern stability theory.

Introduction

- Forking is one of the key notions of modern stability theory.
- Is there such a notion outside of first-order (e.g. for logics such as $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$)?

Introduction

- Forking is one of the key notions of modern stability theory.
- Is there such a notion outside of first-order (e.g. for logics such as $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$)?
- We provide the following answer in the framework of abstract elementary classes (AECs):

Introduction

- Forking is one of the key notions of modern stability theory.
- Is there such a notion outside of first-order (e.g. for logics such as $L_{\omega_1,\omega}$)?
- We provide the following answer in the framework of abstract elementary classes (AECs):

Theorem

Let K be a fully tame and short AEC which has a monster model and is categorical in unboundedly-many cardinals.
Then there exists λ such that $K_{\geq\lambda}$ admits an independence notion with all the properties of forking in a superstable first-order theory.

Abstract elementary classes

Definition (Shelah, 1985)

Let K be a nonempty class of structures of the same similarity type $L(K)$, and let $\leq$ be a partial order on K. $(K, \leq)$ is an *abstract elementary class (AEC)* if it satisfies:

1. K is closed under isomorphism, $\leq$ respects isomorphisms.
2. If $M \leq N$ are in K, then $M \subseteq N$.
3. Coherence: If $M_0 \subseteq M_1 \leq M_2$ are in K and $M_0 \leq M_2$, then $M_0 \leq M_1$.
4. Downward Löwenheim-Skolem axiom: There is a cardinal $\text{LS}(K) \geq |L(K)| + \aleph_0$ such that for any $N \in K$ and $A \subseteq |N|$, there exists $M \leq N$ containing A of size $\leq \text{LS}(K) + |A|$.
5. Chain axioms: If δ is a limit ordinal, $\langle M_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is a $\leq$-increasing chain in K, then $M := \bigcup_{i<\delta} M_i$ is in K, and:
   5.1 $M_0 \leq M$.
   5.2 If $N \in K$ is such that $M_i \leq N$ for all $i < \delta$, then $M \leq N$.

Example of an AEC

For $\psi \in L_{\omega_1,\omega}$, Φ a countable fragment containing ψ,
$K := (\mathrm{Mod}(\psi), \prec_\Phi)$ is an AEC with $\mathrm{LS}(K) = \aleph_0$.

Two approaches to AECs

Question (The local approach to AECs)

Make simplifying assumptions in only a few cardinals. When can we transfer them up? Can we build a structure theory cardinal by cardinal?

Two approaches to AECs

Question (The local approach to AECs)

Make simplifying assumptions in only a few cardinals. When can we transfer them up? Can we build a structure theory cardinal by cardinal?

- This is the approach Shelah adopts in his books on classification theory for AECs.
- Many proofs have a set-theoretic flavor and rely on GCH-like principles.

Two approaches to AECs

Question (The local approach to AECs)

Make simplifying assumptions in only a few cardinals. When can we transfer them up? Can we build a structure theory cardinal by cardinal?

- This is the approach Shelah adopts in his books on classification theory for AECs.
- Many proofs have a set-theoretic flavor and rely on GCH-like principles.

Question (The global approach to AECs)

Work in ZFC, but make *global* model-theoretic hypotheses (like a monster model or locality conditions on types). What can we say about the AEC?

Global assumptions

Throughout the talk, we fix an AEC K. We assume we work inside a "big" model-homogeneous universal model $\mathfrak{C}$.

Global assumptions

Throughout the talk, we fix an AEC K. We assume we work inside a "big" model-homogeneous universal model $\mathfrak{C}$.

Fact

Such a $\mathfrak{C}$ exists if and only if K has joint embedding, no maximal models, and amalgamation.

Global assumptions

Throughout the talk, we fix an AEC K. We assume we work inside a "big" model-homogeneous universal model $\mathfrak{C}$.

Fact

Such a $\mathfrak{C}$ exists if and only if K has joint embedding, no maximal models, and amalgamation.

Definition

For $\bar{b} \in {}^{<\infty}\mathfrak{C}$, $A \subseteq |\mathfrak{C}|$, let $\operatorname{gtp}(\bar{b}/A)$ be the orbit of $\bar{b}$ under the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{C}$ fixing A.

Tameness, or “easy” AECs

Let κ be an infinite cardinal.

Definition (Grossberg-VanDieren, 2006)

K is $(<\kappa)$-*tame* if for any M and any *distinct* $p, q \in \mathrm{gS}(M)$, there exists $A \subseteq |M|$ of size less than κ such that $p \upharpoonright A \neq q \upharpoonright A$.

Tameness, or "easy" AECs

Let κ be an infinite cardinal.

Definition (Grossberg-VanDieren, 2006)

K is $(< \kappa)$-*tame* if for any M and any *distinct* $p, q \in \mathrm{gS}(M)$, there exists $A \subseteq |M|$ of size less than κ such that $p \upharpoonright A \neq q \upharpoonright A$.

Definition (Boney, 2013)

K is *fully* $(< \kappa)$-*tame and short* if for any α, any M, and any distinct $p, q \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(M)$, there exists $A \subseteq |M|$ and $I \subseteq \alpha$ of size less than κ such that $p^I \upharpoonright A \neq q^I \upharpoonright A$.

Tame AECs and large cardinals

Fact (Makkai-Shelah, Boney)

Let $\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$ be strongly compact. Then:

1. (No need for K to have a monster model) If K is categorical in some $\lambda \geq \kappa$, then $K_{\geq \kappa}$ has a monster model.

Tame AECs and large cardinals

Fact (Makkai-Shelah, Boney)

Let $\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$ be strongly compact. Then:

1. (No need for K to have a monster model) If K is categorical in some $\lambda \geq \kappa$, then $K_{\geq \kappa}$ has a monster model.
2. K is fully $(< \kappa)$-tame and short.

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition

An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition

An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

1. K is stable in all $\lambda \geq \mathrm{LS}(K)$.

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition
An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

1. K is stable in all $\lambda \geq \mathrm{LS}(K)$.
2. There is a relation "p does not fork (dnf) over M", for $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{<\infty}(N)$, $M \leq N$, which satisfies:

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition

An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

1. K is stable in all $\lambda \geq \text{LS}(K)$.
2. There is a relation "p does not fork (dnf) over M", for $p \in \text{gS}^{<\infty}(N)$, $M \leq N$, which satisfies:
    2.1 **Invariance**: If $f \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, p dnf over M, then $f(p)$ dnf over $f[M]$.

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition

An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

1. K is stable in all $\lambda \geq \mathrm{LS}(K)$.
2. There is a relation "p does not fork (dnf) over M", for $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{<\infty}(N)$, $M \leq N$, which satisfies:
   2.1 **Invariance**: If $f \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, p dnf over M, then $f(p)$ dnf over $f[M]$.
   2.2 **Monotonicity**: if $M \leq M' \leq N' \leq N$, $I \subseteq \alpha$, and $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(N)$ dnf over M, then $p^I \upharpoonright N'$ dnf over M'.

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition

An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

1. K is stable in all $\lambda \geq \mathrm{LS}(K)$.
2. There is a relation "p does not fork (dnf) over M", for $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{<\infty}(N)$, $M \leq N$, which satisfies:
   2.1 **Invariance**: If $f \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, p dnf over M, then $f(p)$ dnf over $f[M]$.
   2.2 **Monotonicity**: if $M \leq M' \leq N' \leq N$, $I \subseteq \alpha$, and $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(N)$ dnf over M, then $p^I \upharpoonright N'$ dnf over M'.
   2.3 **Existence of unique extension**: If $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(M)$ and $N \geq M$, there exists a unique $q \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(N)$ extending p and not forking over M. Moreover q is algebraic if and only if p is.

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition

An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

1. K is stable in all $\lambda \geq \mathrm{LS}(K)$.
2. There is a relation "p does not fork (dnf) over M", for $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{<\infty}(N)$, $M \leq N$, which satisfies:
   2.1 **Invariance**: If $f \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, p dnf over M, then $f(p)$ dnf over $f[M]$.
   2.2 **Monotonicity**: if $M \leq M' \leq N' \leq N$, $I \subseteq \alpha$, and $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(N)$ dnf over M, then $p^I \upharpoonright N'$ dnf over M'.
   2.3 **Existence of unique extension**: If $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(M)$ and $N \geq M$, there exists a unique $q \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(N)$ extending p and not forking over M. Moreover q is algebraic if and only if p is.
   2.4 **Set local character**: If $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(M)$, there exists $M_0 \leq M$ with $\|M_0\| \leq |\alpha| + \mathrm{LS}(K)$ such that p dnf over M_0.

Axioms of superstable forking

Definition

An AEC K with a monster model is *good* if:

1. K is stable in all $\lambda \geq \mathrm{LS}(K)$.
2. There is a relation "p does not fork (dnf) over M", for $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{<\infty}(N)$, $M \leq N$, which satisfies:
   2.1 **Invariance**: If $f \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{C})$, p dnf over M, then $f(p)$ dnf over $f[M]$.
   2.2 **Monotonicity**: if $M \leq M' \leq N' \leq N$, $I \subseteq \alpha$, and $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(N)$ dnf over M, then $p^I \upharpoonright N'$ dnf over M'.
   2.3 **Existence of unique extension**: If $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(M)$ and $N \geq M$, there exists a unique $q \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(N)$ extending p and not forking over M. Moreover q is algebraic if and only if p is.
   2.4 **Set local character**: If $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(M)$, there exists $M_0 \leq M$ with $\|M_0\| \leq |\alpha| + \mathrm{LS}(K)$ such that p dnf over M_0.
   2.5 **Chain local character**: If $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is increasing continuous, $p \in \mathrm{gS}^{\alpha}(M_\delta)$ and $\mathrm{cf}(\delta) > \alpha$, then there exists $i < \delta$ such that p dnf over M_i.

Localizing goodness

- For α a cardinal, $\mathcal{F}$ an interval of cardinals, we say K is $(< \alpha, \mathcal{F})$-*good* if it is good when we restrict types to have length less than α, and models to have size in $\mathcal{F}$.

Localizing goodness

- For α a cardinal, $\mathcal{F}$ an interval of cardinals, we say K is $(< \alpha, \mathcal{F})$-*good* if it is good when we restrict types to have length less than α, and models to have size in $\mathcal{F}$.
- For example, good means $(< \infty, \geq \mathrm{LS}(K))$-good. In Shelah's terminology, $(\leq 1, \lambda)$-good means K has a type-full good λ-frame.

Challenges in proving goodness

- Since we do not have much compactness, extension is usually very difficult to prove, especially across cardinals.

Challenges in proving goodness

- Since we do not have much compactness, extension is usually very difficult to prove, especially across cardinals.
- **A key question**: If $\langle p_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous chain of types and each p_i does not fork over M_0 for $i < \delta$, do we have that p_δ does not fork over M_0?

Challenges in proving goodness

- Since we do not have much compactness, extension is usually very difficult to prove, especially across cardinals.
- **A key question**: If $\langle p_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous chain of types and each p_i does not fork over M_0 for $i < \delta$, do we have that p_δ does not fork over M_0?
- For types of finite length, this follows from local character.

Challenges in proving goodness

- Since we do not have much compactness, extension is usually very difficult to prove, especially across cardinals.
- **A key question**: If $\langle p_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous chain of types and each p_i does not fork over M_0 for $i < \delta$, do we have that p_δ does not fork over M_0?
- For types of finite length, this follows from local character.
- But for longer types, this is much harder.

Some previous work on independence in AECs

Fact (Shelah)

Let K be an AEC, categorical in λ, λ^+, with at least one but "few" models in λ^{++}.
If $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$ and the weak diamond ideal on λ^+ is not λ^{++}-saturated, then K is $(\leq \lambda^+, \lambda^+)$-good.

Some previous work on independence in AECs

Fact (Shelah)

Let K be an AEC, categorical in λ, λ^+, with at least one but "few" models in λ^{++}.
If $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$ and the weak diamond ideal on λ^+ is not λ^{++}-saturated, then K is $(\leq \lambda^+, \lambda^+)$-good.

Fact (V.)

If K is $(\leq \mu)$-tame and categorical in a λ with $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \mu$, then K is $(\leq 1, \geq \lambda)$-good.

Some previous work on independence in AECs

Fact (Shelah)

Let K be an AEC, categorical in λ, λ^+, with at least one but "few" models in λ^{++}.
If $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$ and the weak diamond ideal on λ^+ is not λ^{++}-saturated, then K is $(\leq \lambda^+, \lambda^+)$-good.

Fact (V.)

If K is $(\leq \mu)$-tame and categorical in a λ with $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \mu$, then K is $(\leq 1, \geq \lambda)$-good.

Fact (Makkai-Shelah, Boney-Grossberg)

Let $\kappa > \text{LS}(K)$ be strongly compact and let K be categorical in a $\lambda = \lambda^{<\kappa}$. Then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is good.

Main theorem

Theorem

Let $\kappa = \beth_\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$. Assume K is categorical in $\lambda > \kappa$.

Main theorem

Theorem

Let $\kappa = \beth_\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$. Assume K is categorical in $\lambda > \kappa$.

1. If K is $(< \kappa)$-tame, then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is $(\leq 1, \geq \lambda)$-good.

Main theorem

Theorem

Let $\kappa = \beth_\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$. Assume K is categorical in $\lambda > \kappa$.

1. If K is $(< \kappa)$-tame, then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is $(\leq 1, \geq \lambda)$-good.
2. If $\lambda > (\kappa^{<\kappa})^{+5}$ and K is fully $(< \kappa)$-tame and short, then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is good.

Main theorem

Theorem

Let $\kappa = \beth_\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$. Assume K is categorical in $\lambda > \kappa$.

1. If K is $(< \kappa)$-tame, then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is $(\leq 1, \geq \lambda)$-good.
2. If $\lambda > (\kappa^{<\kappa})^{+5}$ and K is fully $(< \kappa)$-tame and short, then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is good.

Corollary

If K is $(< \kappa)$-tame, $\kappa = \beth_\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$, and K is categorical in a $\lambda > \kappa$, then K is stable in *all* cardinals.

Main theorem

Theorem

Let $\kappa = \beth_\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$. Assume K is categorical in $\lambda > \kappa$.

1. If K is $(< \kappa)$-tame, then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is $(\leq 1, \geq \lambda)$-good.
2. If $\lambda > (\kappa^{<\kappa})^{+5}$ and K is fully $(< \kappa)$-tame and short, then $K_{\geq \lambda}$ is good.

Corollary

If K is $(< \kappa)$-tame, $\kappa = \beth_\kappa > \mathrm{LS}(K)$, and K is categorical in a $\lambda > \kappa$, then K is stable in *all* cardinals.

Remark

We can replace categoricity by a natural definition of superstability, analog to $\kappa(T) = \aleph_0$.

Shelah's categoricity conjecture in "easy" AECs?

Conjecture (Shelah)

Let K be an AEC. If K is categorical in unboundedly-many cardinals, then K is categorical on a tail of cardinals.

Shelah's categoricity conjecture in "easy" AECs?

Conjecture (Shelah)

Let K be an AEC. If K is categorical in unboundedly-many cardinals, then K is categorical on a tail of cardinals.

Claim (Shelah)

If K has an ω-successful good frame and weak GCH holds, then K is categorical in *some* $\lambda > \mathrm{LS}(K)$ if and only if K is categorical in *all* $\lambda > \mathrm{LS}(K)$.

Shelah's categoricity conjecture in "easy" AECs?

Conjecture (Shelah)

Let K be an AEC. If K is categorical in unboundedly-many cardinals, then K is categorical on a tail of cardinals.

Claim (Shelah)

If K has an ω-successful good frame and weak GCH holds, then K is categorical in *some* $\lambda > \text{LS}(K)$ if and only if K is categorical in *all* $\lambda > \text{LS}(K)$.

It turns out our construction gives an ω-successful good frame. Thus *modulo Shelah's claim*, we get:

Corollary

Assume weak GCH. If there are unboundedly-many strongly compact cardinals, then Shelah's categoricity conjecture holds.

Shelah's categoricity conjecture in "easy" AECs?

Conjecture (Shelah)

Let K be an AEC. If K is categorical in unboundedly-many cardinals, then K is categorical on a tail of cardinals.

Claim (Shelah)

If K has an ω-successful good frame and weak GCH holds, then K is categorical in *some* $\lambda > \mathrm{LS}(K)$ if and only if K is categorical in *all* $\lambda > \mathrm{LS}(K)$.

It turns out our construction gives an ω-successful good frame. Thus *modulo Shelah's claim*, we get:

Corollary

Assume weak GCH. If there are unboundedly-many strongly compact cardinals, then Shelah's categoricity conjecture holds.

Remark

Shelah claims stronger results in chapter IV of his book on AECs.

A rough idea of the construction

Fix a "nice-enough" AEC K.

1. Using methods such as Galois-Morleyization and previous results of Boney-Grossberg, show that coheir has some (not all) of the properties of a good independence relation.

A rough idea of the construction

Fix a "nice-enough" AEC K.

1. Using methods such as Galois-Morleyization and previous results of Boney-Grossberg, show that coheir has some (not all) of the properties of a good independence relation.
2. Show that coheir induces a good $(\leq 1, \lambda)$-independence relation (for suitable λ).

A rough idea of the construction

Fix a "nice-enough" AEC K.

1. Using methods such as Galois-Morleyization and previous results of Boney-Grossberg, show that coheir has some (not all) of the properties of a good independence relation.
2. Show that coheir induces a good $(\leq 1, \lambda)$-independence relation (for suitable λ).
3. Use further properties of coheir and results of Shelah to get that this frame is *successful*, and hence induces a good $(\leq \lambda, \lambda)$-independence relation.

A rough idea of the construction

Fix a "nice-enough" AEC K.

1. Using methods such as Galois-Morleyization and previous results of Boney-Grossberg, show that coheir has some (not all) of the properties of a good independence relation.
2. Show that coheir induces a good $(\leq 1, \lambda)$-independence relation (for suitable λ).
3. Use further properties of coheir and results of Shelah to get that this frame is *successful*, and hence induces a good $(\leq \lambda, \lambda)$-independence relation.
4. Use a strong continuity property proven by Shelah as well as tameness and shortness to obtain a good $(\leq \lambda, \geq \lambda)$-independence relation.

A rough idea of the construction

Fix a "nice-enough" AEC K.

1. Using methods such as Galois-Morleyization and previous results of Boney-Grossberg, show that coheir has some (not all) of the properties of a good independence relation.
2. Show that coheir induces a good $(\leq 1, \lambda)$-independence relation (for suitable λ).
3. Use further properties of coheir and results of Shelah to get that this frame is *successful*, and hence induces a good $(\leq \lambda, \lambda)$-independence relation.
4. Use a strong continuity property proven by Shelah as well as tameness and shortness to obtain a good $(\leq \lambda, \geq \lambda)$-independence relation.
5. Use tameness and shortness to obtain a good $(< \infty, \geq \lambda)$-independence relation.

Thank you!

- For further reference, see:
  Sebastien Vasey, *Infinitary stability theory*.
- A preprint can be accessed from my webpage:
  `http://svasey.org/`
- For a direct link, you can take a picture of the QR code below: