

Connections between generalised Baire spaces and model theory

Miguel Moreno
Kurt Gödel Research Center for Mathematical Logic
University of Vienna

Fifth Workshop on Generalised Baire Spaces

3 February 2020

Outline

- 1 Borel* sets
- 2 The isomorphism relation
- 3 Classifiable theories in the Borel hierarchy
- 4 The division line Classifiable vs Unclassifiable

Outline

- 1 Borel* sets
- 2 The isomorphism relation
- 3 Classifiable theories in the Borel hierarchy
- 4 The division line Classifiable vs Unclassifiable

Borel and Δ_1^1 Sets

Definition

The collection of Borel subsets of κ^κ is the smallest set which contains the basic open sets and is closed under unions and intersections, both of length κ .

Definition

$A \subseteq \kappa^\kappa$ is an analytic if there is a closed subset F of the product space $\kappa^\kappa \times \kappa^\kappa$ such that its projection $pr(F) = \{\eta \in \kappa^\kappa \mid \exists \xi \in \kappa^\kappa (\eta, \xi) \in F\}$ is equal to A .

Definition

$A \subseteq \kappa^\kappa$ is a Δ_1^1 set if A and $\kappa^\kappa \setminus A$ are analytic sets.

Borel*-code

- A tree T is a κ^+ , λ -tree if it does not contain chains of length λ and its cardinality is less than κ^+ . It is *closed* if every chain has a unique supremum.

- A pair (T, h) is a *Borel*-code* if T is a closed κ^+ , κ -tree and h is a function with domain T such that if $x \in T$ is a leaf, then $h(x)$ is a basic open set and otherwise $h(x) \in \{\cup, \cap\}$.

Borel*-game

For an element $\eta \in \kappa^\kappa$ and a Borel*-code (T, h) , the *Borel*-game* $B^*(T, h, \eta)$ is played as follows. There are two players, **I** and **II**. The game starts from the root of T .

At each move, if the game is at node $x \in T$ and $h(x) = \cap$, then **I** chooses an immediate successor y of x and the game continues from this y . If $h(x) = \cup$, then **II** makes the choice.

At limits the game continues from the (unique) supremum of the previous moves.

Finally, if $h(x)$ is a basic open set, then the game ends, and **II** wins if and only if $\eta \in h(x)$.

Borel* sets

Definition (Borel*)

A set $X \subseteq \kappa^\kappa$ is a Borel*-set if there is a Borel*-code (T, h) such that for all $\eta \in \kappa^\kappa$, $\eta \in X$ if and only if \mathbb{II} has a winning strategy in the game $B^*(T, h, \eta)$.

We will write $\mathbb{II} \uparrow B^*(T, h, \eta)$ when \mathbb{II} has a winning strategy in the game $B^*(T, h, \eta)$ and $\mathbb{I} \uparrow B^*(T, h, \eta)$ when \mathbb{I} has a winning strategy in the game $B^*(T, h, \eta)$.

Definition (Dual sets)

We say that X and Y are duals if there is a Borel*-code (T, h) such that:

$$\eta \in X \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{II} \uparrow B^*(T, h, \eta),$$

$$\eta \in Y \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{I} \uparrow B^*(T, h, \eta),$$

Separation Theorem

Theorem (Mekler-Väänänen)

Suppose A and B are disjoint analytic sets. There are Borel* sets C_0 and C_1 such that $A \subseteq C_0$ and $B \subseteq C_1$, and C_1 and C_0 are duals.

Fact

X is a Borel set if and only if there is a Borel*-code (T, h) coding X with T a κ^+, ω -tree.

Corollary

- X is Δ_1^1 if and only if there is a Borel*-code (T, h) coding X such that for all η

$$\text{II } \uparrow B^*(T, h, \eta) \Leftrightarrow \text{I } \not\uparrow B^*(T, h, \eta).$$

- $\text{Borel} \subseteq \Delta_1^1 \subseteq \text{Borel}^*$.

Outline

- 1 Borel* sets
- 2 The isomorphism relation**
- 3 Classifiable theories in the Borel hierarchy
- 4 The division line Classifiable vs Unclassifiable

The isomorphism relation

Fix a relational language $\mathcal{L} = \{P_n \mid n < \omega\}$

Definition

Let π be a bijection between $\kappa^{<\omega}$ and κ . For every $\eta \in \kappa^\kappa$ define the structure \mathcal{A}_η with domain κ and for every tuple (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) in κ^n

$$(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in P_m^{\mathcal{A}_\eta} \Leftrightarrow \eta(\pi(m, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)) > 0$$

Definition

Given T a first-order complete countable theory in a countable vocabulary, we say that $\eta, \xi \in \kappa^\kappa$ are \cong_T equivalent if

- $\mathcal{A}_\eta \models T, \mathcal{A}_\xi \models T, \mathcal{A}_\eta \cong \mathcal{A}_\xi$
or
- $\mathcal{A}_\eta \not\models T, \mathcal{A}_\xi \not\models T$

Some Division Lines

- Unstable theories
- Stable unsuperstable theories
- Superstable theories with DOP
- Superstable theories with OTOP
- Superstable theories with no DOP nor OTOP

The tools used to construct models of a theory T , strongly depends on what kind of theory is T .

Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé Game

Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be structures with domain κ , and $\{X_\gamma\}_{\gamma < \kappa}$ an enumeration of the elements of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ and $\{f_\gamma\}_{\gamma < \kappa}$ an enumeration for all the functions with domain in $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$ and range in $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa)$. The game $EF_\omega^\kappa(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is played by **I** and **II** as follows.

In the n -th turn **I** chooses an ordinal $\beta_n < \kappa$ such that $X_{\beta_{n-1}} \subset X_{\beta_n}$, and **II** an ordinal $\theta_n < \kappa$ such that $X_{\beta_n} \subseteq \text{dom}(f_{\theta_n}) \cap \text{rang}(f_{\theta_n})$ and $f_{\theta_{n-1}} \subset f_{\theta_n}$, the game starts with X_{β_0} and f_{θ_0} as empty sets. The game finish after ω moves.

The player **II** wins if $\bigcup_{i < \omega} f_{\theta_i} : A \rightarrow B$ is a partial isomorphism, otherwise the player **I** wins.

Classifiable theories

A first-order complete countable theory in a countable vocabulary is classifiable if it is a superstable theory with no DOP nor OTOP.

We will write $\mathbb{II} \uparrow EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ when \mathbb{II} has a winning strategy in the game $EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

Fact

If T is a classifiable theory and \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} are models of T , then

$$\mathbb{II} \uparrow EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}.$$

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

If T is a classifiable theory, then \cong_T is Δ_1^1 . Moreover, if T is classifiable not shallow, then \cong_T is not Borel.

Corollary

Borel $\neq \Delta_1^1$.

Outline

- 1 Borel* sets
- 2 The isomorphism relation
- 3 Classifiable theories in the Borel hierarchy**
- 4 The division line Classifiable vs Unclassifiable

Reductions

A function $f: \kappa^\kappa \rightarrow \kappa^\kappa$ is *Borel*, if for every open set $A \subseteq \kappa^\kappa$ the inverse image $f^{-1}[A]$ is a Borel subset of κ^κ .

Let E_1 and E_2 be equivalence relations on κ^κ . We say that E_1 is *Borel reducible* to E_2 , if there is a Borel function $f: \kappa^\kappa \rightarrow \kappa^\kappa$ that satisfies $(x, y) \in E_1 \Leftrightarrow (f(x), f(y)) \in E_2$.

We write $E_1 \leq_B E_2$ and we say that E_1 is as most as complex as E_2 .

The Equivalence Modulo Non-stationary Ideals in GBS

Let $\lambda < \kappa$ be a regular cardinal. We say that $\eta, \xi \in \kappa^\kappa$ are $=_\lambda$ equivalent if the set $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \text{cof}(\alpha) = \lambda \ \& \ \eta(\alpha) \neq \xi(\alpha)\}$ is not stationary.

Theorem (Hyttinen-M.)

Suppose T is a classifiable theory and $\lambda < \kappa$ is a regular cardinal.

Then $\cong_T \hookrightarrow_B =_\lambda$.

Proof

For every $\alpha < \kappa$, structures \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} with domain κ , the game $\text{EF}_\omega^\kappa(\mathcal{A} \upharpoonright_\alpha, \mathcal{B} \upharpoonright_\alpha)$ is played by **I** and **II** as follows.

In the n -th turn **I** chooses an ordinal $\beta_n < \alpha$ such that $X_{\beta_n} \subset \alpha$, $X_{\beta_{n-1}} \subset X_{\beta_n}$, and **II** an ordinal $\theta_n < \alpha$ such that $\text{dom}(f_{\theta_n}), \text{rang}(f_{\theta_n}) \subset \alpha$, $X_{\beta_n} \subseteq \text{dom}(f_{\theta_n}) \cap \text{rang}(f_{\theta_n})$ and $f_{\theta_{n-1}} \subseteq f_{\theta_n}$.

The game starts with X_{β_0} and f_{θ_0} as empty sets, and finishes when one of the players cannot choose or after ω moves.

The player **II** wins if $\cup_{i < \omega} f_{\theta_i} : A \upharpoonright_\alpha \rightarrow B \upharpoonright_\alpha$ is a partial isomorphism, otherwise the player **I** wins.

Proof

Claim

For every pair of structures, \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} with domain κ , the following holds:

- $\mathbb{II} \uparrow EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \iff \mathbb{II} \uparrow EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A} \upharpoonright_{\alpha}, \mathcal{B} \upharpoonright_{\alpha})$ for club-many α .
- $\mathbb{I} \uparrow EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \iff \mathbb{I} \uparrow EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A} \upharpoonright_{\alpha}, \mathcal{B} \upharpoonright_{\alpha})$ for club-many α .

Definition

Given T a first-order complete countable theory in a countable vocabulary and $\alpha \leq \kappa$, define the relation $R_{EF}^{\alpha} \subseteq \kappa^{\kappa} \times \kappa^{\kappa}$ as $\eta R_{EF}^{\alpha} \xi$:

- $\mathcal{A}_{\eta} \upharpoonright_{\alpha} \not\models T$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\xi} \upharpoonright_{\alpha} \not\models T$, or
- $\mathcal{A}_{\eta} \upharpoonright_{\alpha} \models T$, $\mathcal{A}_{\xi} \upharpoonright_{\alpha} \models T$ and the player \mathbb{II} has a winning strategy for the restricted game $EF_{\omega}^{\kappa}(\mathcal{A}_{\eta} \upharpoonright_{\alpha}, \mathcal{A}_{\xi} \upharpoonright_{\alpha})$.

Proof

Claim

For every T first-order complete countable theory in a countable vocabulary, there are club many α such that R_{EF}^α is an equivalence relation.

Define the reduction as follows.

For every $\eta \in \kappa^\kappa$ define the function f_η , as:

- $f_\eta(\alpha)$ is a code in $\kappa \setminus \{0\}$ for the R_{EF}^α equivalence class for $\mathcal{A}_\eta \upharpoonright_\alpha$, when $cf(\alpha) = \lambda$, $\mathcal{A}_\eta \upharpoonright_\alpha \models T$, and R_{EF}^α is an equivalence relation;
- $f_\eta(\alpha) = 0$ in other case.

The Cantor Space

The isomorphism relation and the equivalence modulo non-stationary ideals can be easily define in the generalised Cantor space 2^κ .

$$\cong_T^2 \text{ is } \cong_T \cap (2^\kappa \times 2^\kappa)$$

$$=_\lambda^2 \text{ is } =_\lambda \cap (2^\kappa \times 2^\kappa)$$

Theorem (Hyttinen-Kulikov-M.)

Denote by S_λ^κ the set $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid cf(\alpha) = \lambda\}$.

Suppose T is a classifiable theory and $\lambda < \kappa$ is a regular cardinal. If

$\diamond(S_\lambda^\kappa)$ holds, then $\cong_T^2 \hookrightarrow_B =_\lambda^2$.

Outline

- 1 Borel* sets
- 2 The isomorphism relation
- 3 Classifiable theories in the Borel hierarchy
- 4 The division line Classifiable vs Unclassifiable

Unstable

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

If T is unstable, then \cong_T is not Δ_1^1 .

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$ and $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$. If T is an unstable, then $\cong_\lambda^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_T^2$.

Theorem (Hyttinen-Kulikov-M.)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$, $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ and $\diamond(S_\lambda^\kappa)$ holds. If T is a classifiable theory and T' is an unstable, then $\cong_T^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_\lambda^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_{T'}^2$.

Stable unsuperstable

Question

Can it be proved in ZFC that if T is stable unsuperstable, then \cong_T is not Δ_1^1 ?

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

Suppose for all $\lambda < \kappa$, $\lambda^\omega < \kappa$. If T is a stable unsuperstable, then $\cong_\omega^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_T^2$.

Theorem (Hyttinen-Kulikov-M.)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+$ and $\lambda^\omega = \lambda$. If T is a classifiable theory and T' is a stable unsuperstable theory, then $\cong_T^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_\omega^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_{T'}^2$, and $\cong_{T'}^2 \not\hookrightarrow_B \cong_T^2$.

The Orthogonal Chain Property (OCP)

Definition

Given $p \in S(A)$ and $B \subseteq A$, we say $p \perp B$ if for every $q \in S(A)$ that doesn't fork over B the following holds; for every a, b , and $B' \supseteq A$, if a realizes p , b realizes q , $a \downarrow_A B'$ and $b \downarrow_A B'$, then $a \downarrow_{B'} b$.

Definition

A stable theory T has the property OCP if there exist $\lambda_r(T)$ -saturated models of T of power $\lambda_r(T)$, $\{\mathcal{A}_i\}_{i < \omega}$, and $a \notin \bigcup_{i < \omega} \mathcal{A}_i$ such that for all $i \leq j$, $\mathcal{A}_i \subseteq \mathcal{A}_j$, $t(a, \bigcup_{i < \omega} \mathcal{A}_i)$ is not algebraic and for all $j < \omega$, $t(a, \bigcup_{i < \omega} \mathcal{A}_i) \perp \mathcal{A}_j$.

Theorem (Hyttinen-M.)

Suppose T is a classifiable theory, T' is a stable theory with the OCP, and κ is an inaccessible cardinal. Then $\cong_T \hookrightarrow_B =_\omega \hookrightarrow_B \cong_{T'}$

Superstable with DOP

Definition (a -isolation)

Denote by F_ω^a the set of pairs (p, A) with $|A| < \omega$, such that for some $B \supseteq A$, $p \in S(B)$, $a \models p$ and $\text{stp}(a, A) \vdash p$.

From this isolation the notions of a -saturated, a -primary, and a -minimal are defined.

Definition (DOP)

A theory T has the dimensional order property if there are a -saturated models $(M_i)_{i < 3}$, $M_0 \subset M_1 \cap M_2$, $M_1 \downarrow_{M_0} M_2$, and the a -primary model over $M_1 \cup M_2$ is not a -minimal over $M_1 \cup M_2$.

Superstable with DOP

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

If T is superstable with DOP and $\kappa > \omega_1$, then \cong_T is not Δ_1^1 .

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$ and $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda > 2^\omega$. If T is superstable with DOP, then $\cong_\lambda^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_T^2$.

Theorem (Hyttinen-Kulikov-M.)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$, $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda > 2^\omega$ and $\diamond(S_\lambda^\kappa)$ holds. If T is a classifiable theory and T' is superstable with DOP, then $\cong_T^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_\lambda^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_{T'}^2$.

Superstable with S-DOP

Definition (S-DOP)

We say that a theory T has the strong dimensional order property if the following holds:

There are a -saturated models $(M_i)_{i < 3}$, $M_0 \subset M_1 \cap M_2$, such that

$M_1 \downarrow_{M_0} M_2$

, and for every M_3 a -primary model over $M_1 \cup M_2$, there is a non-algebraic type $p \in S(M_3)$ orthogonal to M_1 and to M_2 , that does not fork over $M_1 \cup M_2$.

Theorem (M.)

Suppose T is a classifiable theory, T' is a superstable theory with the S-DOP, $\lambda = (2^\omega)^+$, and κ an inaccessible cardinal. Then

$$\cong_T \hookrightarrow_B \models_\lambda \hookrightarrow_B \cong_{T'}$$

Superstable with OTOP

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

If T is stable with OTOP, then \cong_T is not Δ_1^1 .

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$ and $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$. If T is superstable with OTOP, then $\cong_\lambda^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_T^2$.

Theorem (Hyttinen-Kulikov-M.)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+ = 2^\lambda$, $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ and $\diamond(S_\lambda^\kappa)$ holds. If T is a classifiable theory and T' is superstable with OTOP, then $\cong_T^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_\lambda^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_{T'}^2$.

Sum up

Shelah's division lines can be studied in generalised descriptive set theory with two different approaches.

- By the Borel reducibility hierarchy.

Let $H(\kappa)$ be the following property: If T is a classifiable theory and T' is not a classifiable theory, then $\cong_T^2 \hookrightarrow_B \cong_{T'}^2$, and $\cong_{T'}^2 \not\hookrightarrow_B \cong_T^2$.

Theorem (Hyttinen-Kulikov-M.)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+$, $2^\lambda > 2^\omega$ and $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda$.

- 1 If $\diamond(S_\omega^\kappa)$ and $\diamond(S_\lambda^\kappa)$ hold, then $H(\kappa)$ holds.
- 2 It is consistent that $H(\kappa)$ holds and there are 2^κ equivalence relations strictly between \cong_T^2 and $\cong_{T'}^2$.

Sum up

Shelah's division lines can be studied in generalised descriptive set theory with two different approaches.

- By the different analytic sets.

Theorem (Friedman-Hyttinen-Kulikov)

- *If T is classifiable and Shallow, then \cong_T is Borel.*
- *If T is classifiable but not shallow, then \cong_T is Δ_1^1 but not Borel.*
- *If T is stable unsuperstable, then \cong_T is analytic but not Borel.*
- *If T is unstable or stable with $OTOP$, then \cong_T is analytic but not Δ_1^1 .*
- *If T is superstable with DOP and $\kappa > \omega_1$, then \cong_T is analytic but not Δ_1^1 .*

Sum up

By using both approaches at the same time:

Let $G(\kappa)$ be the following property: If T is a countable first-order theory in a countable vocabulary, not necessarily complete, then one of the following holds:

- \cong_T is Δ_1^1 .
- \cong_T is Σ_1^1 -complete.

Theorem (Hyttinen-Kulikov-M.)

Suppose $V = L$. $G(\kappa)$ holds for all κ successor of a regular uncountable cardinal λ .

Theorem (Fernandes-M.-Rinot)

Suppose $\kappa = \lambda^+$ and $\lambda^{<\lambda} = \lambda > \omega$. There exists a $< \kappa$ -closed κ^+ -cc forcing extension, in which $G(\kappa)$ holds.

Fake reflection

It is a consequence of Π_1^1 -filter reflection with \diamond , $DI_S^*(\Pi_1^1)$.

Definition (Filter reflection with \diamond)

Suppose X and S are stationary subsets of κ , and $\vec{\mathcal{F}} = \langle \mathcal{F}_\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \rangle$ is a sequence such that, for each $\alpha \in S$, \mathcal{F}_α is a filter over α .

- 1 We say that $\vec{\mathcal{F}}$ captures clubs iff, for every club $C \subseteq \kappa$, the set $\{\alpha \in S \mid C \cap \alpha \notin \mathcal{F}_\alpha\}$ is nonstationary;
- 2 We say that X $\vec{\mathcal{F}}$ -reflects with \diamond to S iff $\vec{\mathcal{F}}$ captures clubs and there exists a sequence $\langle Y_\alpha \mid \alpha \in S \rangle$ such that, for every stationary $Y \subset X$, the set $\{\alpha \in S \mid Y_\alpha = Y \cap \alpha \ \& \ Y \cap \alpha \in \mathcal{F}_\alpha^+\}$ is stationary.

It can be forced by Sakai's forcing, Friedman-Holy's forcing, and Holy-Welch-Wu's forcing. It can be killed by $\text{Add}(\kappa, \kappa^+)$. It follows from $V = L$ but also from Martin's Maximum.

Questions

Question

Is $\Delta_1^1 = \text{Borel}^$ consistently true?*

Question







Can it be proved in ZFC that if T is stable unsuperstable, then \cong_T is not Δ_1^1 ?

Question

Suppose T is a first-order countable complete theory over a countable vocabulary. If T is stable unsuperstable, then T has the OCP?

Thank you

References

-  G. Fernandes, M. Moreno, and A. Rinot, *Fake reflection*, preprint.
-  S.D. Friedman, T. Hyttinen, and V. Kulikov, *Generalized descriptive set theory and classification theory*, *Memoirs of the Amer. Math. Soc.* Vol. 230/1081 (American Mathematical Society, 2014).
-  T. Hyttinen, and M. Moreno, *On the reducibility of isomorphism relations*, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*. 63, 175–192, 2017.
-  T. Hyttinen, V. Kulikov, and M. Moreno, *On Σ_1^1 -completeness of Quasi-orders on κ^κ* . *Fundamenta Mathematicae*. To appear.
-  M. Moreno, *The isomorphism relation of theories with S-DOP in generalized Baire spaces*, (arXiv:1803.08070).
-  A. Mekler, and J. Väänänen, *Trees and Π_1^1 subsets of $\omega_1^{\omega_1}$* , *J. Symbolic Logic*. 58, 1052–1070, 1993.