

IMAGINARIES

F.

Deal with two problems which will turn out to have the same solution.

1) Quotients?

We are interested, given an \mathcal{L} -structure M in the definable subsets, but in particular in looking at "algebraic structures" definable in M :

Def: A map $f: M^n \rightarrow M^k$ is definable if its graph is definable.

A group (G, \cdot) is definable in M if $G \subset M^k$ and $\cdot: G \times G \rightarrow G$ is def. map.

Example in $K \models ACF$

if G is linear group over K then $G(K)$ the K -realization

points of G is clearly a definable group.

In fact any algebraic group can be considered as a definable group ...

if $H \trianglelefteq G$ both definable, what about G/H ?

it is not in general a definable set.

More generally, if $E \subset M^{2n}$ is any \emptyset -definable equivalence relation on M^n , what about M^n/E ?

One solution (always works) extend the language

and the model M , by adding in an innocuous

way coset spaces and cosets = imaginary elements

($\mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^{eq}$ = for each E eq. relat. def. on M^n , M^n/E .
add a new sort (or predicate))

$\tilde{M} = M \cup M^n/E$, add also $\pi_E : M^n \rightarrow M^n/E$
 $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha/E \dots$)

Before looking at examples, see how this solves

2nd question: Given a definable set $D \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$

D can be defined by different formulas

$$\varphi_1(x, a_1), \dots, \varphi_k(x, a_k) \dots$$

is there a "canonical" way to define D ?

Suppose M euclidean

$$\text{for } D = \{x \in M^n; \varphi(x, \bar{a})\} \quad \bar{a} \in M.$$

consider the relation $\bar{a} \sim \bar{a}'$ if

$$M \models \forall x \quad \varphi(x, \bar{a}) \iff \varphi(x, \bar{a}')$$

\sim is a definable eq. relation

and $\bar{a} \sim \bar{a}'$ the class of \bar{a} has the

property that any autom. of M fixes $\bar{a} \sim \bar{a}'$ pointwise

iff it fixes D setwise.

We call $\bar{\alpha}/n$ a canonical parameter

for \mathcal{D} (or for $\mathcal{U}(x, \bar{\alpha})$)

{ If M eliminates imaginaries then every definable subset has a canonical parameter in M .

Example The in finite set in $\mathcal{A}^1_{\mathbb{C}}$ does not completely eliminate imaginaries

Consider $a \neq b \in M$

$\{a, b\}$ is definable by the formula $\exists(x=a \wedge y=b) \vee (x=b \wedge y=a)$
but has no can. parameter.

- ACF eliminates imaginaries
- DCF₀ _____

in ACF : for a Zariski closed set $V \subseteq K^n$

The canon. parameter will be the smallest field of definition i.e. k such that $\mathbb{I}(V)$ is generated (in $k[X]$) by polynomials in $k[X]$ and smallest such. Then k is fixed pointwise by automorph. σ

iff σ fixes V setwise -

What about types or more generally infinitely definable sets?

Let $p \in S_n(K)$, M sat. homogeneous ideal, "big" Idea of Definition: $A \subseteq M$ is a canonical basis for P , if A is smallest and.

if for all $f \in \text{Aut}(K)$ f fixes A pointwise

iff $f(P) = P$

[iff $P = \langle \varphi_i(x, \bar{m}) \rangle ; i \in I$]
[$f(P) = \langle \varphi_i(x, f(\bar{m})) \rangle ; - ?$]

But there are cases when it is not necessary because all the E -classes already exist in M itself.

Definition We say M has ^(E-strong) elimination of imaginaries if for all definable equivalence relation on M^n , there is some definable map $f_E : M^n \rightarrow M^k$ such that $M \models x E y \iff f_E(x) = f_E(y)$.

Then $f_E(x)$ "represents" the class of E and in fact an automorphism will fix the class of x globally iff it fixes $f_E(x) \in M^k$ pointwise.

When M eliminates imaginaries (or $\text{th}(M)$ does) then any M^k/E can be considered as a definable set

$$\{ \underbrace{f_E(x)}_{\text{}} : x \in M^n \}$$

Does not exist in general.

Does exist for stable Hermites.

No hoi will be adapted to make sense in ACCFA.

As we will see in further lectures.