

Thm (Ax - Grothendieck)

Say we have

$$f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

$$\text{giving } f: \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$$

Example $n=1$ $f_1(x_1) = x_1^2$ surjective, not injective
so converse is false

$n=2$ $f_1(x_1, x_2) = x_1$
 $f_2(x_1, x_2) = 0$ not surj ((1,1) not in image)
also not injective (does not depend on x_2)

\Rightarrow n invertible $n \times n$ matrix (f_j all linear in x_i)

$$\begin{aligned} n=2 \rightarrow f_1 &= x_1 - x_2^2 \\ f_2 &= x_2 \end{aligned}$$

\mathbb{C} is an algebraically closed field

- add, mult, everything but 0 has multiplicative inverse

and any polyn. has a ~~root~~ soln

$$x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots + a_1x + a_0 = 0$$

$n \geq 1$

p.2 \mathbb{Q} is not e.g. $x^3+x+1=0$ $x^2-2=0$ $x^2+1=0$
 now " \mathbb{R} has soln to first two" / get things of form $a+b\sqrt{2}$, $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$
 but not $x^2+1=0$ "so we just create this thing i
 and declare $i^2+1=0$ "

"formally adjoin a root to $x^2+1=0$ "

char 0 + write
 i.e. $1+...+1 \neq 0$
 as opposed to $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$

now consider $\mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ is a field p prime

say $f: (x_1, \dots, x_n)$

map $\mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^n$

$f: \mathbb{F}_p^n$

if injective ... then surjective!

now \mathbb{F}_p not alg. closed. ~~But can~~

e.g. $x^2-2=0$ has no soln in \mathbb{F}_3
 (can cook up higher deg examples)

can do $\mathbb{F}_9 = \{a+b\sqrt{2} \mid a, b \in \mathbb{F}_3\}$

\mathbb{F}_{27} ("if you adjoin roots of two irred. poly. of same degree
 get same field")

\mathbb{F}_{3^5} etc. ~~are~~ finite so thm is true

adjoining all roots of all polynomials get " $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ "

$\mathbb{F}_p \subseteq \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$
 so $\underbrace{1+1+\dots+1}_p = 0$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$
 p times

and every poly has soln.

now $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ is union of \mathbb{F}_{p^k} over $k \in \mathbb{N}$

~~was~~ was true for $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ in place of \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{F}_p
 say $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$
 $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ has all coeff in \mathbb{F}_{p^k}

then if $\mathbb{F}_{p^{k'}} \supseteq \mathbb{F}_{p^k}$ defines map

$$\mathbb{F}_{p^{k'}}^\wedge \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{p^k}^\wedge$$

inj as inj for $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$

so surj as $\mathbb{F}_{p^{k'}}$ is finite

now every $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{F}_p^\wedge$ lies in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{k'}}$ for some k'
 so in image of f . so f surjective

so done for $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ instead of \mathbb{C}

p 4 "proof" if \exists counterexample then \exists proof of counterexample using axioms of alg. closed fields of char 0

i.e. uses $1+1 \neq 0$ ("not char 2") $1+1+1 \neq 0$ ("not char 3") $1+1+1+1 \neq 0$ ($\dots - 5$) ~~7~~ etc $7 \neq 0$ ("not char 7")

"im writing $1+\dots+1$ b/c in any abstract field we have a unit elt."

guess what? a proof is finite

so uses finitely many of these axioms

so \exists p s.t. does not use the axiom $p \neq 0$ so \exists counterexample for \mathbb{F}_p but, we already proved... \square

Model Theory ~~(to start)~~ ~~(to start I)~~

What is a mathematical structure?

- $\mathbb{Z} - (0, 1, +, \cdot, <)$
- $\mathbb{R} - (0, 1, +, \cdot, <)$
- $\mathbb{Q} - \dots$

one board

@ Defn A structure is a set

- I_0 fns $\{f_i \mid i \in I_0\}$ $f_i: M^{n_i} \rightarrow M$ ($n_i \geq 1$)
- I_1 relations $\{R_i \mid i \in I_1\}$ $R_i: M^{m_i} \rightarrow \{\text{true, false}\}$ or $R_i \subseteq M^{m_i}$ another
- I_2 "constants" $\{c_i \mid i \in I_2\}$ $c_i \in M$

now theory of groups ~~is~~ "some set" w/operation p.5
 (or operations for rings)
 and w/certain axioms

a model of the theory is a set w/ an operation and an id
~~and some~~
 satisfying some axioms ~~(a)~~

be clear I say "axiom" for intuition ^{or}

so to talk in general: a

Defn A language \mathcal{L} is three sets of "symbols"

- I_0 " $\{\hat{f}_i\}$ " n.fcn $I_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$
- I_1 " $\{\hat{R}_i\}$ " n.fcn $I_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{N}$
- I_2 " $\{c_i\}$ "

Language	I ₀ = 1	I ₁ = 0	I ₂ = 1
e.g. groups			ordered fields
rings	I ₀ = 2	I ₂ = 2	
fields	I ₀ = 0	I ₂ = 2	

some language

Defn If \mathcal{L} is a language, an \mathcal{L} -structure M is a set M

along with ~~a~~ a fn $f_i: M^{n_i} \rightarrow M$ for each $i \in I_0$
 relation $R_i \subseteq M^{m_i} \quad \forall i \in I_1$
 an element $c_i \in M \quad \forall i \in I_2$

Formulas

~~$\forall x$~~

say $\mathcal{I} = (\hat{F}, \hat{X}, \hat{O}, \hat{I})$

$x_2 \times x_2$

$\hat{I} \times x_1$

$\hat{O} \times x_2$

$x_2 \times \hat{O} = x_1$

terms

constants and fens

atomic formula

use = or an R:

$x_2 + x_2 = x_1$

formula

use $\neg, \forall, \wedge, \rightarrow, \leftrightarrow$

$(x_2 + x_1) \times x_3 = \hat{O}$

formula

" $\forall x_1 \forall x_2$ " $(x_1 = x_2 \vee \neg (f(x_1) = f(x_2)))$

$x_1 < x_2$

$\neg (x_1 = x_2)$

~~$\forall x_1 \exists x_2$~~ $(x_2 \times x_2 = x_1)$

sentence

..... $(f_i(x_2) = x_1)$

f_i is surjective ($\forall a_i = 1$)

(f_i some fn in some language)

$\forall x_1 (x_1 = \hat{O} \vee (\exists x_2 (x_2 \times x_1 = 1)))$

a formula $(\exists x_2 x_2 \times x_2 = x_1) \vee (x_1 < 0)$

if we append $\forall x_1$ we get a sentence in $\mathcal{I} = (\hat{X}, \hat{K}, \hat{O})$

if ϕ is an \mathcal{I} -sentence and M an \mathcal{I} -structure

we write $M \models \phi$ to mean " ϕ holds in M "

else $M \models \neg \phi$

Defn An \mathcal{L} -theory T is a ^{collection} ~~set~~ of ~~the~~ sentences p in \mathcal{L} ("possibly infinite")

we say $M \models T$ if M is an \mathcal{L} -struct. s.t. $M \models \phi \forall \phi \in T$
 we say M is a model of T

Examp $\mathcal{L} = (\hat{+}, \hat{\times}, \hat{0}, \hat{1})$

theory of rings

$$\forall x_1, x_1 + \hat{0} = x_1$$

$$\forall x_1, \forall x_2, x_1 + x_2 = x_2 + x_1$$

$$\forall x_1, \forall x_2, \forall x_3, x_1 + (x_2 + x_3) = (x_1 + x_2) + x_3$$

$$\forall x_1, \exists x_2, x_1 + x_2 = \hat{0}$$

$$\text{id, assoc for mult. } \forall x_1, (\hat{1} \times x_1 = x_1)$$

$$\forall x_1, \forall x_2, \forall x_3, x_1 \times (x_2 + x_3) = x_1 \times x_2 + x_1 \times x_3$$

so a model of T "i.e. an \mathcal{L} -struct. in which all sentences in T are true" ^{"i.e. 0, 1, two bin. operators"}
 is ... a ring

say we ~~have~~ ^{add} these axioms (sentences) ϕ_0 in T :

$$\forall x_1 (\exists x_2 (x_1 \times x_2 = \hat{1})) \vee (x_1 = \hat{0})$$

$$\forall x_1 \neg (x_1 = \hat{0}) \rightarrow (\exists x_2 x_2 \times x_1 = \hat{1})$$

" ϕ_3 " $\forall x_1, \forall x_2, \forall x_3 \exists y (y^3 + x_1 \times y^2 + x_2 \times y + x_3 = \hat{0})$ " ϕ_n " in general

p.8 we get ACF a theory "collection of sentences in \mathcal{L} "

$$\text{now } \phi_3 \vdash (\hat{1} + \hat{1} + \hat{1} = 0)$$

$$\phi_2 \vdash (\hat{1} + \hat{1} = 0)$$

etc ϕ_5, ϕ_7, \dots

get ACF₀

faking $\vdash \phi_3, \phi_2, \phi_5, \phi_7, \dots$ get ACF₃
or ACF_p in general

Defn A theory T is

satisfiable if \exists a model M

consistent if cannot derive a contradiction from T

Clearly satisfiable \Rightarrow consistent


Thm (Gödel's Completeness) if T consistent, satisfiable

$\forall K \geq \aleph_0 \exists$ model M s.t. $|M| = K$

so say

$$T_0 = ACF_0 + \{\gamma_{n,d}\}_{n,d \in \mathbb{N}}$$



$\gamma_{2,2}$  (see next page)

T is consistent. why? if we could derive a contradiction then it would use finitely many Φ_p . so it would be true for $ACF_p^{(T_p)}$ for some p . But we showed this is not the case.

so T is satisfiable (by Gödel completeness)
by a model w/ cardinality $|\mathbb{C}| (= |\mathbb{R}|)$
^{↳ so some alg. closed field of char. 0 w/ ~~a~~ # of elts $|\mathbb{C}|$}
algebra tells us all ~~alg.~~ such things are
isom to \mathbb{C} so true for \mathbb{C}

(or $\Phi_{2 \times 2}$ in Marker's notes)

This is $\lambda_{2 \times 2}$

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{11} & & \\ & \lambda_{22} & \\ & & \dots \end{bmatrix}$$

$$V^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{11}^{-1} & & \\ & \lambda_{22}^{-1} & \\ & & \dots \end{bmatrix}$$

$$(x_1 \ y_1 \ y_2) \leftarrow (x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3) \leftarrow (x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3 \ y_1 \ y_2)$$

$$y_1 \ y_2 = \sum a_{ij} x_j \Rightarrow y_1 \ y_2 = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$A^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \end{bmatrix}$$