

# MODEL EQUIVALENCES

MICHAEL BENEDIKT AND EHUD HRUSHOVSKI

ABSTRACT. We look at equivalence relations on the set of models of a theory – MERs, for short – such that the class of equivalent pairs is itself an elementary class, in a language appropriate for pairs of models. We provide many examples of definable MERs, along with the first steps of a classification theory for them. We characterize the special classes of definable MERs associated with preservation of formulas, either in classical first order logic or in continuous logic, and uncover an intrinsic role for the latter. We bring out a nontrivial relationship with interpretations (imaginary sorts), leading to a wider hierarchy of classes related to the preservation of reducts. We give results about the relationship between these classes, both for general theories and for theories satisfying additional model-theoretic properties, such as stability.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We will study equivalence relations defined on the set of models of a given theory defined via logical formulas in a vocabulary appropriate for pairs of models, MERs for short.

A sentence in the language of pairs of models will usually not define an equivalence relation. There are some simple classes of sentences that do give MERs, and we pay particular attention to these. One family of MERs is associated with preservation of open formulas (a.k.a. definable relations) – either formulas of first-order logic or (“ydlept MERs”) or open formulas of continuous logic (“yclept MERs”). We also extend the ydlept MER to a hierarchy of families (“ $n$ -ydlept”, for  $n$  a natural number). These can be described via the preservation of definable families of sets, or by considering ydlepts over imaginaries. We also consider the subclass of MERs defined by restricting the quantifier complexity of the formula in the two-model language defining the MER.

One motivation for the study is a step towards model-theoretic analysis of families of mappings between structures. We have examples of MERs that arise from considering natural function classes. A second motivation is to generalize classification theory to the study of models “up to an equivalence relation”.

Naturally, we are far from achieving any of these goals. We will show that continuous logic plays a natural role in the study of MERs, in that every MER can be associated with a continuous logic lower approximation. We are able to identify some connections between families mentioned above: for example, MERs that are definable with restricted quantifier alternation must be given by an open formula. We point the reader to Theorem 11.3, which gives a classification of the MERs that are given by reducts in continuous logic. The reader may wish to look ahead to Figure 4, which shows the classes we study, illustrating some connections.

We also establish some connections between traditional model-theoretic criteria on the underlying theory and properties of the corresponding MERs. In stable theories one family of MERs collapses to an a priori smaller class. We show that theories defining a nontrivial partial ordering on their universe always admit non-yclept MERs: see Proposition 14.1. The hypothesis is natural in view of Shelah's basic stability classification, where one of the classes is theories with a partial ordering on tuples (SOP).

Finally, we provide a large class of examples of MERs, in the process showing non-connections between families.

**Organization.** The first part of the paper introduces our basic objects of study. We give preliminaries on the logics we use in Section 2, then introduce our main definition in Section 3, MERs that are definable either with a finite or an infinite set of sentences. The former will be called definable MERs. In Section 4 we define a special class of MERs given by preserving continuous logic definable sets – the yclept MERs. And similarly for classical logic, the ydlept MERs. We also introduce a hierarchy of MERs that extend ydlept MERs, the  $n$ -ydlepts for  $n \geq 1$ . In Section 5 we show that each MER definable by infinitely many sentences is associated with a maximal yclept MER. This *maximal CL reduct* often gives significant information about the MER.

The second part of the paper deals with relationship between the families of MERs defined previously. In Section 6 and Section 7 we investigate the intersection of yclept MERs and definable MERs. The intersection of  $n$ -ydlept MERs with yclepts, and more generally  $n$ -ydlept MER coarsenings of an yclept MER, is examined in Section 8. In Section 9 we show that when we introduce a classical model-theoretic restriction, stability, the hierarchy of  $n$ -ydlept MERs collapses. Section 10 shows that if we assume that a definable MER has a defining formula of low quantifier complexity, then we can make strong conclusions about where it fits in the hierarchy of families. Section 11 utilizes the

results of the prior section to give several characterizations of yclept MERs.

The final part of the paper moves from relationships between restricted classes to explore generalization of traditional classification theory to the setting of model equivalence relations. While most of the results in the paper concern the relationship between MERs within restricted families, like the yclept MERs, Section 13 give some results about what structure in a theory is implied by the presence of a non-trivial MER, while Section 14 provides some preliminary results concerning theories all of whose MERs are yclept, making a connection to the strict order property.

In Section 15, we present a larger number of examples. We close with further questions in Section 16.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We often refer to two-valued first order logic as DL (discrete, or disconnected logic), in the context of formulas or theories, contrasting it with Continuous Logic (CL). In this work, unless otherwise specified,  $T$  will denote a DL theory in language  $L$ . The word “*definable*” will always mean, by default, *definable with a formula without parameters*.

In the main line, our results require only basic logic. Occasionally we will also discuss statements specific to certain tame classes in Shelah’s classification, and for these we will assume some basic familiarity:

- Stable theories, [Poi00].
- NIP theories and the strict order property [Sim15]
- o-minimal theories (which are NIP) [Dri98]

In fact we use little more than their definitions; NIP occurs only in examples. Stability enters in §9 via the more general notion of *stable embeddedness*, see e.g. [Sim15, 3.1].

We will make use of continuous logic (CL) as in [YBHU08], but “unmetrized” (as in [CK66]). Equivalently we can use the foundations of [YBHU08] but assume a trivial metric. This drastically reduces the complexity of the metatheory. Continuous logic works over models in which predicates take truth values in a bounded subset of the reals.

Formulas are built up from real-valued predicates using composition with continuous functions from products of reals to the reals, along with the quantifiers sup and inf. Each such formula defines a bounded real-valued function on a model. We also close under uniform limits: if  $F_i(x)$  are real-valued predicates that converge for all  $x$ , their limit is a new real-valued predicate.

In much of the paper, we will be interested in CL over classical models – the truth values of the predicates are just  $\{0, 1\}$ , but the formulas can take more general real values. The reader might look ahead to Example 15.8 and Example 15.4 for typical uses of CL. While in most of the paper we will need little more than the semantics of CL formulas, in Section 7 we will make use of the notion of a *CL theory*: this is a collection of assertions of the form  $\phi = 0$ , where  $\phi$  is a CL sentence. The notion of a model satisfying such a theory is the obvious one. We crucially use type spaces as well; they are compact Hausdorff but not necessarily totally disconnected, in fact they may be connected.

We will frequently use saturated models. It turns out that the notion of *resplendent* models is especially suitable to our context. Recall that for a cardinal  $\kappa$ , a structure  $M$  in a language  $L$ , we say that  $M$  is  $\kappa$ -resplendent if for every  $A \subseteq M$  with  $|A| < \kappa$ , letting  $M_A$  be the expansion of  $M$  with  $A$ , and  $L_A$  the corresponding language, for every language  $L^+ \supseteq L_A$  with  $|L^+ \setminus L_A| < \kappa$ , if  $\Sigma$  is a set of sentences of  $L^+$  consistent with  $Th(M_A)$ , then there is an  $L^+$  expansion of  $M_A$  satisfying  $\Sigma$ .

### 3. DEFINITION OF MODEL EQUIVALENCES AND BASIC PROPERTIES

Let  $L$  be a vocabulary, possibly with multiple sorts. We let  $S_0$  be a subset of the sorts of  $L$ : the *coupled sorts*. The other sorts are the *decoupled sorts* of  $L$ .

We define a new language  $(L, =_{S_0}, L')$ . It will have two copies of the decoupled sorts, unprimed and primed, and only one copy of the coupled sorts. It will also have two copies of each non-logical symbol of  $L$ . Suppose we have a relation  $R(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  of  $L$ , where  $x_i$  has sort  $S_i$ . Then in  $(L, =, L')$  we have a relation  $R(x_1 \dots x_n)$ , where each  $x_i$  has the unprimed sort corresponding to  $S_i$ , along with a relation  $R'(x_1 \dots x_n)$  where  $x_i$  has sort  $S_i$  if  $S_i$  has a coupled sort, while  $x_i$  has sort  $S'_i$  if  $S_i$  is a decoupled sort. The intuition for  $(L, =_{S_0}, L')$  is that it describes a pair of  $L$ -structures, where on the coupled sorts they are forced to have the same universe, while on the decoupled sorts they are disjoint.

We now formalize this intuition. Let  $T$  be a first order  $L$  theory. Let  $\Omega$  be a universe for each coupled sort of  $L$ . By  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  we denote the models of theory  $T$  where the universes of the coupled sorts match  $\Omega$ . A pair of models in  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  can be made into a model for  $(L, =_{S_0}, L')$  in the obvious way, just by priming the relations and the decoupled sorts in the second model. Thus we can talk about a pair of models satisfying a sentence in  $(L, =_{S_0}, L')$ .

An arbitrary equivalence relation on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  will, informally, be called a **MER**<sup>1</sup>. We will however only consider the situation where a theory  $\tau$  in  $(L, =_{s_0}, L')$  defines an equivalence relation on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$ , for any set  $\Omega$ . We say that  $\Xi$  is an *elementary MER* or an  $\bigwedge$ -definable **MER**. If  $\tau$  is finitely axiomatizable, we talk of a *bidefinable Model Equivalence Relation* or just definable **MER**. Thus in case  $T$  has no finite models, it suffices to check the definition of a definable **MER** on a single set  $\Omega$  of size at least  $|L| + \aleph_0$ ; and similarly for  $\bigwedge$ -definable **MER**s. Only  $\bigwedge$ -definable **MER**'s (and among them, definable **MER**'s) will be considered from here on.

For most of the result in this work, it suffices to deal with the case where all sorts of  $L$  are coupled: we refer to these as *completely-coupled MERs*, and this will be our default. We refer to the language for pairs in this case as  $(L, =, L')$ . While when we want to highlight the more general case with some decoupled sorts, we refer to *decoupled MERs*. In the completely-coupled case we will sometimes assume a single sort for simplicity.

We note that when the language is finite, we can basically assume the theory is finite as well:

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $T$  be a theory in a finite language  $L$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER for  $T$ . Then there exists a finite  $T_0 \subset T$  and a definable MER  $\mathcal{E}_0$  on models of  $T_0$ , such that  $\mathcal{E}_0 \upharpoonright \text{Mod}(T) = \mathcal{E}$ .*

*Proof.* We can assume that  $L$  consists of a single relation  $R$ . So  $(L, =, L')$  is generated by  $R, R'$  and the equality across models. We write  $T(R')$  for the theory  $T$ , with  $R$  replaced everywhere by  $R'$ . We abuse notation to identify  $\mathcal{E}$  with its defining formula. We have:  $\mathcal{E}(R, R')$  is symmetric, reflexive and transitive on  $(L, =, L')$ -models of  $T(R) + T(R')$ . By compactness, for some finite  $T_0 \subset T$ ,  $\mathcal{E}(R, R')$  is symmetric, reflexive and transitive on  $(L, =, L')$ -models of  $T_0(R) + T_0(R')$ .  $\square$

Actually the finite language assumption is unnecessary in Lemma 3.1; we leave this to the reader.

**3.1. Correspondence with definable groupoids.** A *groupoid* is a category where every morphism is invertible. All groupoids considered here will have the same class of objects, namely  $\text{Mod}(T)$ ; so they will be distinguished by their morphisms. We have the groupoid  $ISOT$  of models of  $T$  with isomorphisms. We also have the larger groupoid

---

<sup>1</sup>We are aware of set-theoretic difficulties with arbitrary equivalence relations on a class!

$Bij_T$  whose objects are models of  $T$ , and whose morphisms  $Bij_T(M, N)$  are all bijections  $M \rightarrow N$ . By a  $T$ -groupoid we mean an intermediate groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$ , with objects  $\text{Mod}(T)$  and morphisms  $\mathcal{G}(M, N)$  with  $Isot_T(M, N) \subset \mathcal{G}(M, N) \subset Bij_T(M, N)$ .

We consider a language describing two  $L$ -structures, along with bijections between their coupled sorts  $S_0$ . A groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\wedge$ -definable if there exists a set  $\Theta$  of sentences of  $(L, +_{S_0}, L')$  whose models are precisely the  $\mathcal{G}$  morphisms. If  $\Theta$  is finite, we say  $\mathcal{G}$  is definable.

In more detail, let  $S_0$  again represent the coupled sorts.

By  $(L, +_{S_0}, L')$  we denote the language with two copies of each sort of  $L$ , referred to as primed and unprimed. For each relation or function in  $L$ ,  $(L, +_{S_0}, L')$  has two copies, one taking the unprimed sorts and the other taking the primed sorts. We have additional function symbols,  $f$ , going from the unprimed copy of a sort in  $S_0$  to its primed copy. A *bidefinable groupoid*  $\mathcal{G}$  over coupled sorts  $S_0$  is given by a formula  $\Theta$  in  $(L, +_{S_0}, L')$ , where  $\mathcal{G}(M, N) = \{f : (M, N, f) \models \Theta\}$ . If  $\Theta$  is allowed to be a possible infinite set of formulas, we refer to an  $\wedge$ -definable groupoid. We write  $Th(\mathcal{G})$  to denote the  $(L, +_{S_0}, L')$ -partial type defining groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$ . Thus  $Th(\mathcal{G})$  is the  $(L, +_{S_0}, L')$  theory of  $\{(M, N, f) : M, N \models T, f \in \mathcal{G}(M, N)\}$ . When all sorts are coupled we refer simply to  $(L, +, L')$ .

**Warning 3.2.** The definition of bidefinability and  $\wedge$ -bidefinability used in groupoids applies even if it happens that  $M = N$ . It is not the same as definability in the structure  $(M, f)$ , since in our definition the sorts of the two components are distinct, so we cannot compare (e.g.)  $x$  and  $f(x)$  directly. Put another way, equality in the  $(L, =, L')$  setting is being replaced by identification via  $f$  in  $(L, +, L')$ , so we do not have an additional equality.

In the rest of this section, we will assume for simplicity a single-sorted completely-coupled setting. That is,  $L$  has a single sort, this is the coupled sort. In this case there is a single function symbol in  $(L, +, L')$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *There is a natural 1-1 correspondence between definable MERs for  $T$ , and bidefinable groupoids for  $T$ , and similarly for  $\wedge$ -definable MERs and  $\wedge$ -definable groupoids.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Psi$  be a definable MER for  $T$ . Define a  $T$ -groupoid  $Gr(\Psi)$  by letting the morphisms  $Gr(\Psi)(M, M')$  be the set of bijections  $f : M \rightarrow M'$  such that  $M + f^*M' \models \Psi$ , where  $M + f^*M'$  is the  $L = L$  structure with the same universe as  $M$  such that the interpretation of the first copy of a given  $R$  is  $R^M$ , and of the second copy,  $f^{-1}(R^M)$ .

Conversely, given a  $T$ -groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$ , let  $\Psi_{\mathcal{G}}$  be the set of double models  $(M', M'')$  of  $T$  with the same universe  $M$ , such that  $Id_M \in \mathcal{G}(M', M'')$ . It is easy to see that these operations are inverse to each other, and that  $\Psi$  is bidefinable iff  $\mathcal{G}$  is bidefinable.  $\square$

The following proposition indicates that the behavior of the groupoid is in some sense determined by its restriction to a single model.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Assume  $T$  is complete. Let  $M$  be any resplendent model of  $T$ , countable or not. Then there is a canonical 1 to 1 correspondence between definable groupoids for  $T$  and bidefinable subgroups of  $Sym(M)$  containing  $Aut(M)$ . Likewise for  $\wedge$ -definable groupoid and  $\wedge$ -bidefinable subgroups.*

See Warning 3.2 regarding the meaning of “bidefinability” even when the two parts are the same model.

*Proof.* In one direction the correspondence is obvious: a  $\wedge$ -definable groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$  maps to  $\mathcal{G}(M, M) \leq Sym(M)$ . Let us show that this is one to one. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a  $\wedge$ -definable groupoid, and assume  $\mathcal{G}(M, M) = H$  is known. We show that  $\mathcal{G}$  is the unique  $\wedge$ -definable groupoid inducing  $H$  on  $M$ . Given any  $N_1, N_2 \models T$  and bijection  $b : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$ , one can find  $(M_1, M_2, b')$  elementarily equivalent to  $(N_1, N_2, b)$ , as  $(L, +, L')$  structures, and with  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  saturated of the same cardinality as  $M$ . Then  $M_i \cong M$  and we have  $(M_1, M_2, b') \cong (M, M, f)$  for some bijection  $f : M \rightarrow M$ . We have  $b \in \mathcal{G}(N_1, N_2)$  iff  $b' \in \mathcal{G}(M_1, M_2)$  iff  $f \in \mathcal{G}(M, M) = H$ . Thus the values of the groupoid on an arbitrary pair of models  $N_1, N_2$  are determined by  $H$ .

It remains to prove surjectivity. Let  $H$  be a  $\wedge$ -definable subgroup of  $Sym(M)$  containing  $Aut(M)$ . Then  $H$  is defined by some collection  $\Psi$  in  $(L, +, L')$ . Define  $\mathcal{G}$  by

$$\mathcal{G}(N_1, N_2) = \{f : N_1 \rightarrow N_2 : (N_1, N_2, f) \models \Psi\}$$

So  $\mathcal{G}(N_1, N_2)$  is a  $\wedge$ -definable set of functions  $N_1 \rightarrow N_2$ , but we have to check it is a groupoid: if  $f \in \mathcal{G}(N_1, N_2)$  and  $g \in \mathcal{G}(N_2, N_3)$  then  $g \circ f \in \mathcal{G}(N_1, N_3)$ . And similar statements for inverses and for the identity maps. Suppose otherwise, and take a saturated  $(M_1, M_2, M_3, f', g')$  elementarily equivalent to  $(N_1, N_2, N_3, f, g)$  and of the same cardinality as  $M$ . Then  $M_1 \cong M_2$  by completeness, so we may assume  $M_1 = M_2 = M$ . In this case we have  $f', g' \in H$  but  $g' \circ f' \notin H$ , a contradiction.

It is clear that going in this way from a subgroup  $H$  to a groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$  and back returns the same subgroup  $H$ .

The other direction follows from the fact, shown in the first paragraph, that  $\mathcal{G} \mapsto H$  is 1-1. For the same reason, the choice of defining formulas  $\Psi$  does not matter, so the correspondence is canonical.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** It is remarkable that in the setting of MERs, a definable equivalence relation automatically gives a definable groupoid.

Similarly, a definable partial ordering on models automatically gives a definable category.

Assume for simplicity that  $T$  is complete and that  $\kappa$  is a cardinal with  $\kappa^+ = 2^\kappa$ ; let  $M$  be a saturated model of size  $\kappa^+$ . We saw that  $\bigwedge$ -definable MER is determined by a subgroup  $H$  of  $Sym(M)$  containing  $Aut(M)$ .  $H$  is not in general closed in the usual topologies on  $Sym(M)$ ; however it does enjoy a closure property similar to the one Lascar introduced in [Las82], in defining the topology on the Lascar group. Namely if  $U$  is an ultrafilter on  $\kappa$ ,  $(M^*, H^*)$  is the  $U$ -ultrapower of  $(M, H)$ , and  $f : M \rightarrow M^*$  is an isomorphism, we have  $f^{-1}H^*f \leq H$ .

Investigating this further would be very interesting.

#### 4. SPECIAL CLASSES OF EQUIVALENCE RELATIONS

We will look at equivalence relations defined over models of  $T$  using preservation of a set of CL or DL formulas.

A *DL reduct* of a theory  $T$  is given by a collection of formulas of discrete logic and the associated theory. Given a set of relation symbols, we consider the DL reduct given by these relations as atomic formulae. Thus a language  $L$  can be considered a vacuous reduct of itself. A CL reduct is defined analogously.

Now suppose we are given a reduct  $R$  on the coupled sorts within  $L$ , given by formulas of the corresponding logic. We let  $\equiv_R$  be the equivalence relation saying that two structures agree on these formulas, and  $Aut(R)$  the corresponding groupoid, which consists of mappings  $g$  taking a model  $M$  to a model  $M'$ . Thus, for a CL reduct given by a collection of formulas  $F$ , we are saying that each the function defined by  $f \in F$  on model  $M$  is the same as the function defined on  $M'$ .

When the theory is incomplete, the reduct may include 0-place relations, corresponding to sentences the theory does not decide. To say that these relations agree on two  $L$ -structures just means that they have the same truth value.

**Definition 4.1.** We will say that a model equivalence relation is *yclept* if it has the form  $\equiv_R$  for some continuous logic reduct  $R$ . And we say that it is *ydlept* if  $R$  consists of standard first-order two-valued



formulas: that is, it is a “disconnected” or “discrete” or “classical” first-order logic reduct.

Note that a reduct only defines a MER when its vocabulary is on the coupled sorts, since on the decoupled sorts we cannot talk about two formulas having the same tuples. Often in the sequel, we will specify an yclept or ydlept by simply listing the formulas or relations that are preserved. The default convention is that the coupled sorts are all the sorts.

Any yclept equivalence relation is  $\bigwedge$ -definable:

**Lemma 4.2.** *The equivalence relation corresponding to preserving a CL reduct is a  $\bigwedge$ -definable MER.*

*Proof.* The reduct includes certain uniform limits  $f(x)$  of  $T$ -definable functions  $f_n(x)$  with finite range in  $[0, 1]$ . We may assume  $|f - f_n| \leq 1/n$  uniformly. Thus the groupoid consists of triples  $(M, M', g)$  such that  $M \models T, M' \models T$  and  $(\forall x)(|f_n(x) - f_n(g(x))| \leq 2/n)$  for each such  $f$  and  $n$ . Thus it is defined by infinitely many DL sentences.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an ydlept MER. Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is a definable MER if and only if it has the form  $\equiv_R$  for a finite collection of first-order formulas.*

*Proof.* One direction is immediate. For the other, we have by ydleptness that  $\mathcal{E}$  is equivalent to a conjunction of  $\equiv_{R_i}, i \in I$ . Suppose, for each finite  $I_0 \subset I$ , we can find inequivalent  $M, N$  on the same universe, such that  $R_i^M = R_i^N$  for  $i \in I_0$ . Taking an ultraproduct (using definability of  $E$ ), we find  $M, N$  that are inequivalent, yet  $R_i^M = R_i^N$  for  $i \in I$ . This contradiction shows that we may take  $I$  to be finite, say  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ .  $\square$

An extension is to look at defining equivalence relations via *definable families*.

Let  $\phi(\vec{x}_1 \dots \vec{x}_{n+1})$  be a formula, possibly with parameters from the model, with  $\vec{x}_i$  a partition of the free variables. We define the  $(n + 1)$ -set associated with the partitioned formula by induction on  $n$ , denoted  $[\phi(\vec{x}_1 \dots \vec{x}_{n+1})]$ . If  $n = 0$  it is just the single set of satisfiers of  $\phi$ . For  $n > 0$ , the  $(n + 1)$ -set is the family of sets  $[\phi(\vec{x}_1 \dots \vec{a}_{n+1})]$  as  $a_{n+1}$  varies over the model.

For a definable set  $R$ , let  $\mathcal{E}_n([R])$  be the equivalence relations of preserving the  $n$ -set  $[R]$ . If  $R$  is defined by  $\phi(\vec{x}_1 \dots \vec{x}_{n+1})$ , the  $n$ -set is an element of the iterated power set over the sorts of  $\vec{x}_1$ . Thus it is natural to take the coupled sorts of this MER to be the sorts of  $\vec{x}_1$ .

When we want to emphasize the particular sorts  $S_0$  that the higher-order object is built on we talk about an  $n$ -set *over* sort  $S_0$ .

We give another definition of higher-order ydlept that will be more amenable to inductive proofs.

We recall the usual <sup>eq</sup> procedure, in a form that will be more convenient here. Let  $D$  be a definable subset of some finite product  $S_1 \times \cdots \times S_n$  of sorts of a language  $L$ . Let  $F$  be a definable family of subsets of  $D$ . Thus for some definable  $Q$  and definable  $R \subset D \times Q$ , we have

$$F = \{R(d') : d' \in Q\}$$

**Definition 4.4.** Let  $T$  be a theory in a language  $L$ , and  $F$  a definable family as above. We define the ‘‘Shelahization’’  $T_F$  of  $T$  at  $F$ . We let  $L_F$  be the language  $L$  with an additional sort  $S_F$ , and a new relation  $C_F$  that relates elements of  $S_F$  to elements of  $D$ . Abusing notation, we will sometimes treat  $C_F$  as a function from elements of the sort to subsets of  $D$ . The theory  $T_F$  includes  $T$  along with the statement that

$$s \mapsto C_F(s) : S_F \rightarrow F$$

is a bijection.

Note that a model of  $T$  extends canonically to a model of  $T_F$ , and every model of  $T_F$  is obtained in this way. Definable sets of  $T_F$  can be understood in terms of definable sets in  $T$ .

**Definition 4.5.** We define the class of  $n$ -ydlept equivalence relations by induction on  $n$ . The base case,  $n = 1$ , are the ydlept definable MERs. An  $(n + 1)$ -ydlept equivalence relation on models with a given universe is determined by a definable family  $\mathcal{F}$ , say given by  $\phi(\vec{x}_0, \vec{p})$  with  $\vec{x}_0$  having sorts  $S_0$ , along with a *well-behaved*  $n$ -ydlept equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $T_{\mathcal{F}}$  with respect to coupled sorts  $S_1$  that contain: the sorts  $S_0$  and the additional imaginary sort  $S_F$ , where well-behaved means that they preserve the new relation  $C_F$ . The equivalence relation will have coupled sorts  $S_1$ , and we declare models  $M, M'$  of  $L$  that agree on the universe for  $S_1$  to be equivalent iff the 2-sets given by  $\mathcal{F}$  are the same in both models, and the expansions of both models are  $\mathcal{E}$  equivalent.

Thus an  $n$ -ydlept is formed by first taking a definable family to create an equivalence relation, and identify equivalent tuples. Then take a definable family in the quotient, and so forth. As with  $n$ -sets, we can talk about an  $n$ -ydlept on sort  $X$ , where we iterate the process above where in every iteration the  $L$  sorts used are in  $S$ .

It is easy to see that every  $n$ -set induces an  $n$ -ydlept. The fact that a 2-set is a 2-ydlept is almost by definition. For a 3-set given

by partitioned formula  $R(\vec{x}_1; \vec{x}_2; \vec{x}_3)$ , we first use the definable family  $R(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2; \vec{x}_3)$  to create an imaginary sort with elements  $o$  corresponding to tuples  $\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2$ . We then define a 2-ydlept on the corresponding expansion, via a family indexed by  $\vec{x}_1$  and defining all the  $o$ 's corresponding to  $\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2$ . Similarly for higher values of  $n$ .

We will now show the converse: every  $n$ -ydlept is induced by an  $n$ -set. We start by showing that every 2-ydlept is a 2-set.

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $L$  be a language,  $S$  a subset of the sorts of  $L$ ,  $\phi_1(\vec{x}_1, \vec{p})$  be a partitioned  $L$  formula, representing a definable family, with  $\vec{x}_1$  having sorts in  $S$ . Let  $L_1$  be formed from adding a sort  $S_1$  and a relation  $C_1$  mapping  $\vec{x}$  to the corresponding canonical parameters for  $\phi_1$ . Consider an ydlept MER  $\mathcal{E}$  over  $L_1$  with coupled sorts  $S \cup S_1$ , given by  $\phi_2(\vec{x}, \vec{o})$ , where  $\vec{x}$  are also over sorts in  $S$  and  $\vec{o}$  are over sorts in  $S_1$ . Then there is a 2-partitioned  $L$ -formula  $\phi_3(\vec{x}_1, \vec{p}_1)$  such that for  $M, M'$   $L$ -structures that agree on sorts  $S$ ,  $M$  and  $M'$  agree on the 2-set defined by  $\phi_3$  if and only if they agree on the 2-set  $\phi_1$ , and, letting  $M_1$  and  $M'_1$  be their canonical extensions with  $S_1$  and  $C_1$ , the models  $M_1$  and  $M'_1$  agree on the definable set  $\phi_2$ .*

*Proof.* For simplicity we consider the case  $\phi_2(x, o)$ : one ordinary variable  $x$  and one imaginary variable  $o$ . Now the 2-ydlept  $\mathcal{E}$  is the equivalence relation setting  $M$  equivalent to  $M'$  if and only if  $M$  and  $M'$  agree on the 2-set given by  $\phi_1$  and also on  $D_{2,1} = \{x, \vec{p} \mid \phi_2(x, C_1(\vec{p}))\}$ . But since the addition of imaginaries gives no new 0-definable sets on the original  $L$ -structure,  $D_{2,1}$  is a definable set.  $\square$

The following is proven similarly, using induction.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Every  $n$ -ydlept definable MER  $\mathcal{E}$  is induced by an  $n$ -set.*

We say that a MER is  $\omega$ -ydlept if it is  $n$ -ydlept for some  $n$ . We have now defined the main subclasses that will be considered in the paper. Figure 4 shows them schematically. Note that in the figure the intersection of yclept with  $\omega$ -ydlept is ydlept. This is Corollary 8.4 that will be proven in Section 8. On the other hand, the figure shows the intersection of yclept with definable MER as being bigger than ydlept. This will be shown in Section 7.

## 5. THE MAXIMAL CL REDUCT

We study here the maximal definable structure preserved by a  $\bigwedge$ -definable groupoid. Our proofs, as well as the main statements, require working in continuous logic, even if  $T$  is a DL theory; see Example 15.8. In case  $T$  is small, any CL reduct is essentially DL so that the




FIGURE 1. Classes of model equivalence relations

statements are true for the maximal DL reduct; however our proofs still go through continuous logic.

For a groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$  and theory  $T$ , we say that a model of  $T$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent if  $M$  is  $\aleph_0$ -homogeneous, and whenever  $a, b \in M^n$  and the  $(L, +, L')$  partial type  $tp_M(a)(x) + tp_M(b)(y) + (M, M, g) \models Th(\mathcal{G}) + g(x) = y$  is consistent, there exists  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, M)$  with  $g(a) = b$ . Note that if  $L$  is countable, any countable  $M_0$  has a  $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent countable elementary extension. In fact, if  $M$  is countable and recursively-in- $Th(\mathcal{G})$ -saturated, then  $M$  is  $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent. If  $\mathcal{G}$  is definable, ordinary resplendence suffices.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $T$  be a first order theory in a language  $L$ , and  $\mathcal{G}$  be a  $\bigwedge$ -definable groupoid for  $T$ . Then:*

- (1) *There exists a unique richest continuous logic reduct  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$  of  $T$ , such that,  $Iso_T = Iso_L \leq \mathcal{G} \leq Iso_{(L^{\mathcal{G}})}$ .*
- (2)  *$\mathcal{G}$  is dense in each automorphism group of the groupoid corresponding to  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ , taken with the pointwise convergence topology; i.e.: for  $M$   $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent, the orbits of  $\mathcal{G}$  and of  $Iso_{L^{\mathcal{G}}}$  on  $M^n$  coincide for each  $n$ .*
- (3) *Suppose  $T$  is small: only countably many  $n$ -types over  $\emptyset$  for each  $n$ . Then  $Iso_{L^{\mathcal{G}}}$  is ydlept: that is, is given by a DL reduct.*

*Proof.* We start by proving (1). Let  $L^c$  consist of all continuous logic relations, viewed as 0-definable functions  $F : X \rightarrow [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}$  where  $X$  is a finite product of sorts of  $T$ , that are  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant. Here 0-definable means that  $F^{-1}(U)$  is  $\bigwedge$ -definable for any closed  $U \subset [0, 1]$ .  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant means that if  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, N)$  then for any  $x \in X$ ,  $F(x) = F(gx)$ . It is

clear that  $L^c$  is the richest continuous logic reduct  $T' = T \upharpoonright L^c$  of  $T$  with  $\mathcal{G} \leq Iso_{L'}$ .

We turn to (2), density. Let  $S_n$  be the space of types of  $T$  on  $X^n$ . Define an equivalence relation on  $S_n$ :  $p \sim q$  iff there exist  $M \models T$  and  $a \models p, b \models q$  in  $M$  and  $f \in \mathcal{G}(M, M)$  with  $f(a) = b$ . This is a closed subset of  $(S_n)^2$  by an ultraproduct argument: if  $p_i \sim q_i$  for  $i \in I$ , this is witnessed by  $f_i \in \mathcal{G}(M_i, M_i)$ . Let  $U$  be any ultrafilter on  $I$ ; let  $p$  be the limit of the  $p_i$  along  $U$ , and similarly  $q$ ; let  $f : M \rightarrow M$  be the ultraproduct of  $f_i : M_i \rightarrow M_i$ . Then since  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is  $\wedge$ -bidefinable,  $f \in \mathcal{G}(M, M)$ .

Note that  $p \sim q$  iff for some/any  $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent  $M \models T$  that realizes  $p, q$ , for some / any  $a \models p$  and  $b \models q$  there exists  $f \in \mathcal{G}(M, M)$  with  $f(a) = b$ . The second passage from “some” to “any” uses the fact that  $Iso_T \leq \mathcal{G}$ , composing with an automorphism taking one realization of  $q$  to another. It follows that  $\sim$  is an equivalence relation. In the case  $n = 0$ ,  $p, q$  are completions of  $T$ , and  $p \sim q$  iff for some resplendent pair  $(M, N)$  we have  $p = Th(M)$ ,  $q = Th(N)$ , iff this holds for all resplendent pairs of models of  $T$ .

Let  $Y$  be the quotient space  $S/\sim$ ,  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$  the quotient map. From the fact that  $\sim$  is closed in  $X^2$ , we conclude that  $Y$  is a Hausdorff space, and since it is compact it is thus a normal space, and by Urysohn’s Lemma points can be separated by continuous functions. Let  $M \models T$  be resplendent,  $a, b \in X(M)$ , and suppose there is no  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  with  $g(a) = b$ . Let  $p = tp(a), q = tp(b)$ . Then  $p \not\sim q$ . So  $p, q$  have distinct images  $p', q'$  in  $Y$ . As mentioned just above, there is a continuous function  $\phi : Y \rightarrow [0, 1]$  with  $\phi(p') \neq \phi(q')$ . So  $F = \phi \circ \pi$  is a definable function and it is  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant, hence belongs to the reduct  $L^c$ ; and  $F(a) \neq F(b)$ . Thus  $tp_{L^c}(a) \neq tp_{L^c}(b)$ .

Finally, we argue for (3). For small  $T$ , by definition  $S_n(T)$  is countable and hence so is the quotient. Countable compact spaces are totally disconnected, so we can choose  $\phi$  above valued in  $\{0, 1\}$ : there must be a clopen subset  $C$  of  $Y$  with  $p' \in C$  and  $q' \notin C$ , so we let  $\phi$  be the characteristic function of  $C$ . This shows that we could take  $L^c$  to consist of all  $\{0, 1\}$ -valued  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant definable functions, i.e. an ordinary reduct.

□

We can similarly refer to  $L^\mathcal{E}$  for the maximal CL reduct of a model equivalence  $\mathcal{E}$ . We also introduce notation for the theory of the maximal reduct.

**Definition 5.2.** For a  $\wedge$ -definable groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$ , we let  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$  be the set of CL-definable relations that are invariant under  $\mathcal{G}$ . We let  $T^{\mathcal{G}}$  be the restriction of  $T$  to  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ .

Consider a CL formula whose range is finite. Such a formula corresponds to a finite collection of pairs, each consisting of a DL formula and a real number. We call such a formula *essentially DL*, and similarly refer to an essentially DL reduct.

**Remark 5.3.** Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -definable MER. Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -definable iff the maximal CL reduct is essentially DL.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be given by CL formulas  $\Gamma$ . The easy direction is to assume that the maximal CL reduct is essentially DL. Since the maximal CL reduct will include  $\Gamma$ , we have that  $\Gamma$  can be taken to be essentially DL, and thus the equivalence relation is generated by DL formulas. Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -definable. So it is the definable MER corresponding to some DL reduct  $L^d$ . We have  $L^d \subset L^{\mathcal{E}}$  as  $L^{\mathcal{E}}$  is maximal invariant. And any model of  $T' = T \upharpoonright L^d$  expands *uniquely* to  $T \upharpoonright L^{\mathcal{E}}$ . It follows by Beth's theorem that all relations of  $L^{\mathcal{E}}$  are already definable over  $L^d$ .  $\square$

**Definition 5.4.** For a groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$  on models of a theory  $T$ , we let  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T$  denote the theory of the equivalence relation generated by  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ , which we conflate below with the theory of the groupoid, the latter consisting of triples  $(M, M', g)$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be an  $\wedge$ -definable MER. Assume that  $T$  has quantifier-elimination. Then every universal consequence  $\alpha$  of the theory of  $\mathcal{G}$  in the language  $(L, +, L')$  is a consequence of  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T$ .*

Here, assuming  $T$  has quantifier-elimination is equivalent to redefining “universal”  $(L, +, L')$  formulas to be those that have only universal quantification across the primed and unprimed signature.

*Proof.* A consequence  $\alpha$  can be taken to have the form  $(\forall x)(\neg\beta(x, gx))$  where  $\beta$  is a formula of  $L$  - indeed a Boolean combination of  $L$  formulas in  $x$  and in  $g(x)$ , which we considered quantifier-free by convention, and  $x$  is a tuple of variables. Consider any complete type  $p(x)$  of  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ . If  $p(x) \wedge \beta(x, y) \wedge p(y)$  is consistent with  $T$ , it is realized in a resplendent model  $M$  of  $T$  by some  $(a, b)$ ; but then by density of  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  in  $\text{Aut}_{L^{\mathcal{G}}}(M)$ , Proposition 5.1, there exists  $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}(M, M)$  with  $\sigma(a) = b$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\alpha$  follows from the theory of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Hence  $T \cup \{\beta(x, y)\} \cup tp_{L^{\mathcal{G}}}(x) = tp_{L^{\mathcal{G}}}(y)$  is inconsistent.

In case  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$  is generated by DL formulas, by compactness, for some  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ -formulas  $P_j$ , we have  $T \vdash (\forall x) \bigvee_{j=1}^m P_j(x)$  and  $T \models P_j(x) \wedge P_j(y) \vdash$

$\neg\beta(x, y)$ . Since  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T \models P_j(x) \iff P_j(gx)$ , it follows that  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T$  proves  $\alpha$  as claimed. The argument in the case where  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$  is generated by CL formulas is similar: we find  $P_j$  and  $\epsilon$  such that  $T$  is inconsistent with  $|P_j(x) - P_j(y)| \leq \epsilon \wedge \beta(x, y)$ . □

We give a corollary of Proposition 5.1.

**Corollary 5.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\wedge$ -definable MER with groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept iff  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is a closed subgroup of  $Sym(M)$ , for all  $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent  $M$ .*

*In case  $T$  is complete,  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept iff  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is closed for one resplendent  $M$ .*

*Proof.* For one direction, if  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept, then  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is the subgroup of  $Sym(M)$  fixing a certain family of finitary relations, or functions  $\rho$  into the reals. This is clearly closed: if  $g$  does not fix  $\rho$  then  $\rho(a) \neq \rho(g(a))$  for some tuple  $a$ , and so the same inequality holds for each  $h$  with  $h(a) = g(a)$ , an open subset of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

We prove the direction from right to left, assuming that  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is a closed subgroup of  $Sym(M)$  for any resplendent  $M$ , and arguing that  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept. Being closed and dense, by Proposition 5.1,  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  must be the full automorphism group of the maximal CL reduct  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ .

Let  $(M, N)$  be a pair of models of  $T$  on the same universe, and assume  $M \upharpoonright L^{\mathcal{G}} = N \upharpoonright L^{\mathcal{G}}$ ; we have to show that  $M \mathcal{E} N$ . By the remark following Proposition 5.1 there exists  $M' \mathcal{E} M$  with  $Th(M') = Th(N)$ ; thus we may assume  $Th(M) = Th(N)$ . Further we may assume  $(M, N)$  is resplendent; so  $M \cong N$ , say via  $g : M \rightarrow N$ . Since  $M \upharpoonright L^{\mathcal{G}} = N \upharpoonright L^{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $g$  is a  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ -automorphism, and hence by the previous paragraph,  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, M)$ . So  $M \mathcal{E} N$ . □

## 6. DL AND CL REDUCTS

With the definitions behind us, we now begin the second part of the paper, where we address some basic questions about yclept MERs versus definable MERs. For example, we give properties of MERs that are both yclept and a definable MER, but show that this does not imply being ydlept.

In small theories the distinction between CL and DL reducts is not critical. Let us show a converse to this.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $T$  be a theory in a countable language. Then  $T$  is small iff every CL reduct of an expansion of  $T$  by finitely many constants can be presented as a DL reduct.*

*Therefore a small  $T$  as well as expansions by finitely many constants have the property that ydlept = yclept: if an equivalence relation comes from a CL reduct then it comes from a DL reduct.*

*Proof.* If  $T$  is small, then every expansion by constants and every CL reduct of such an expansion is small. Hence every CL reduct is generated by the discretely valued formulas in it: the type spaces are totally disconnected.

If  $T$  is not small, some expansion by constants has uncountably many 1-types. So we may assume this holds for  $T$ . So  $S_x$  is uncountable. Then  $S_x$  contains a perfect subset  $P$ .  $P$  is homeomorphic to the Cantor set, and admits a continuous map onto the interval  $[0, 1]$ . By the Tietze extension theorem, there exists a continuous, surjective  $F : S_x \rightarrow [0, 1]$ . Now  $F$  can be viewed as a CL relation in the variables  $x$ . Since  $x$  is a single variable, the reduct generated by  $F$  admits quantifier elimination, and actually  $F(x) = \alpha$  generates a complete type, so that the space of 1-types is homeomorphic to  $[0, 1]$ . Hence every unary relation of the reduct to  $F$  is a continuous function  $C(F(x))$  of  $F(x)$ , and as  $[0, 1]$  is connected, if  $C \circ F$  takes more than one value then it takes infinitely many. So  $F$  cannot be approximated by definable relations with finitely many values.  $\square$

As an alternative statement, a theory is small iff in any bi-interpretable theory, every yclept MER is ydlept. (Smallness is of course preserved under bi-interpretation, giving the left-to-right direction. In the opposite direction, assuming  $T$  is not small, it has uncountably many  $n$ -types on some product  $S$  of sorts. Taking a bi-interpretable theory with  $S$  a sort, we obtain an yclept but non-ydlept reduct as above.

We now consider the intersection of definable MERs with yclepts.

**Theorem 6.2.** *Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is a definable MER on models of theory  $T$ , and that  $\mathcal{E}$  is also yclept.*

*Then there exists a CL definable map  $R$  on  $M^k$  into a finite metric space  $(Y, d)$ , and some  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $M \mathcal{E} N$  iff  $d(R^M(a), R^N(a)) < \epsilon$  for all  $a$ . Note that such a map is essentially DL, in the sense defined earlier.*

*Conversely, the existence of such a map implies that  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept.*

One might say  $T$  is approximately ydlept in the above case.

We note a corollary:

**Corollary 6.3.** *Whenever we have a definable MER  $\mathcal{E}$  that is also yclept, and we move to an expansion of  $T$  with quantifier elimination, then  $\mathcal{E}$  is defined by a universal  $(L, =, L')$  sentence.*



*Proof.* The theorem shows that  $M\mathcal{E}N$  iff for all  $a$ , a certain Boolean combination of the truth values of  $R^i(a), R^i(b)$  is valid, where  $R^i$  are DL formulas.  $\square$

We now prove Theorem 6.2.

*Proof.* We have some CL relations  $(R_i)_{i \in I}$  such that  $M\mathcal{E}N$  iff  $R_i^M = R_i^N$  for each  $i \in I$ . As in Proposition 4.3,  $I$  can be taken to be finite; say  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ . We may replace  $R_1, \dots, R_n$  with a single  $k$ -ary relation taking values in  $Y = [0, 1]^n$ . Fix some metric  $d$  on  $[0, 1]^n$ , say  $d(x, y) = \sup |x_i - y_i|$ . By a compactness argument, for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , if  $d(R(a)^M, R(a)^N) < \epsilon$  for all  $a \in M^k$ , then  $M\mathcal{E}N$ , and hence  $R(a)^M = R(a)^N$ .

There exists a DL definable function  $\delta_R$  into a finite subset of  $[0, 1]^n$ , such that  $d(R(x), \delta_R(x)) < \epsilon/8$  for all  $x$ . We have  $M\mathcal{E}N$  iff  $d(\delta_R^M(x), \delta_R^N(x)) < \epsilon/4$  for all  $x$ .

For the converse, we may assume  $T$  admits quantifier-elimination. Thus we can assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is defined by a universal formula. The quantifier-free part is a Boolean combination of formulas over both models along with equalities. It is clear that a universal definable MER gives a groupoid that is closed. Hence by Corollary 5.6  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept.  $\square$

For much of this work we focus on complete theories. But the following results will allow us to transfer characterizations of ydlept and yclept equivalence relations from complete theories to incomplete theories. We start with a result about ydlepts.

**Proposition 6.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER for a theory  $T$ . If  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept when restricted to  $\text{Mod}(T')$  for any completion  $T'$  of  $T$ , then  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept.*

*Proof.* Let  $L_{DL}^{\mathcal{E}}$  be the maximal DL reduct associated with  $\mathcal{E}$ , and let  $\mathcal{E}_r$  be the (ydlept) model equivalence relation of having the same  $L_{DL}^{\mathcal{E}}$  reduct. We begin with an observation:

**Claim 6.5.** Let  $\Sigma$  be any set of sentences of  $L$ , closed under conjunctions. The map  $\mathcal{E} \mapsto \mathcal{E}_r$  commutes with restriction to  $\text{Mod}(T \cup \Sigma)$ .

*Proof.* On the face of it  $L_{DL}^{\mathcal{E}}$  may grow upon this restriction, since some new  $\phi$  may be  $\mathcal{E}$ -invariant on  $\text{Mod}(T \cup \Sigma)$ . But if this is the case, by compactness there exists a single  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  responsible for it. Then  $\sigma \rightarrow \phi$  is  $\mathcal{E}$ -invariant on  $\text{Mod}(T)$ . So  $\sigma \rightarrow \phi$  is in  $L_{DL}^{\mathcal{E}}$  and on  $\text{Mod}(T \cup \Sigma)$  it is equivalent to  $\phi$ . Thus  $\phi$  is not really new.  $\square$

We now consider a special case of the proposition:

**Claim 6.6.** The proposition holds in the case that  $T \upharpoonright L^\mathcal{E}$  is complete.

*Proof.* Accordingly, we assume  $T \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}$  is complete, and that  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept when restricted to  $\text{Mod}(T')$  for any completion  $T'$ . We will use for the first time the assumption that  $\mathcal{E}$  is definable, rather than just  $\wedge$ -definable. So  $\neg\mathcal{E}$  is definable, and

$$M \equiv M', \quad M \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E} = M' \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}, \quad \neg\mathcal{E}$$

is inconsistent. By compactness there are sentences  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$  such that if  $M \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E} = M' \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}$ , and  $M \models \sigma_i$  iff  $M' \models \sigma_i$ , then  $M \mathcal{E} M'$ .

Let  $X'$  be the space of (at most  $2^k$ ) consistent extensions of  $T$  by  $\sigma_i$  or  $\neg\sigma_i$  for each  $i$ , which are complete for these  $k$  sentences. Since  $T \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}$  is complete, we can fix some resplendent model  $M_0$  of  $T \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}$ , and consider expansions  $M$  of  $M_0$  to  $T$ . Two such expansions are  $\mathcal{E}$ -equivalent if they agree on each  $\sigma_i$ . So the  $\mathcal{E}$ -class of such an  $M$  is completely determined by  $Th_{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k}(M)$ . We can define an equivalence relation on  $X'$ :  $T' \sim T''$  if for some (equivalently all)  $M' \models T'$  and  $M'' \models T''$ , both expansions of  $M_0$ , we have  $M' \mathcal{E} M''$ . Let  $C_1, \dots, C_m$  be the classes of  $\sim$  on  $X'$ . For each class  $C_j$  let  $\tau_j = \bigvee_{T' \in C_j} \bigwedge_{\pm\sigma_i \in T'} \pm\sigma_i$ . Then  $\sim$  preserves each  $\tau_j$ , so each  $\tau_j \in L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}$ , and hence since any two expansions  $M', M''$  of  $M_0$  agree on the  $\tau_j$ , they satisfy the same  $\tau_j$ , and so by definition of  $\sim$ , they are  $\mathcal{E}$ -equivalent.

Thus the ydlept equivalence relation we need is given by the sentences  $\tau_j$  and by  $L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}$ .  $\square$

We now return to the proof of the proposition. Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept when restricted to any completion of  $T$ . Let  $X$  be the space of extensions of  $T$  by  $L^\mathcal{E}$ -sentences which are complete for  $L^\mathcal{E}$  sentences. By the claim,  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept when restricted to any  $T' \in X$ . Thus by Claim 6.5  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_r$  on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T')$ . But if  $M, M' \in \text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  and are  $\mathcal{E}_r$  equivalent, automatically they both lie in  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T')$  for some  $T' \in X$ , namely  $T' = Th(M \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E}) = Th(M' \upharpoonright L_{DL}^\mathcal{E})$ . So  $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_r$  on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$ , and we have proven the proposition.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER for a theory  $T$ . If  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept when restricted to  $\text{Mod}(T')$  for any completion  $T'$  of  $T$ , then  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept.*

*Proof.* We will use the criterion of Theorem 6.2 for ycleptness: a definable MER is yclept iff there is an essentially DL map into a finite metric space such that two models are equivalent if the images under the map are closed.

An essentially DL formula  $R$  taking values in a finite metric space  $X$  is called *quasi-invariant* if whenever  $M\mathcal{E}N$ , we have  $d(R^M(a), R^N(a)) < 1$  for all  $a$ . If  $t$  is a completion of  $T$ ,  $R : M^n \rightarrow X$  is  *$t$ -quasi-invariant* if whenever  $M\mathcal{E}N$ , with  $M, N \models t$  we have  $d(R^M(a), R^N(a)) < 1$  for all  $a$ . Equivalently  $d(R^M(a), R^N(a)) \leq v_X$ , where  $v_X$  is the greatest possible distance below 1 of pairs of points of  $X$ . If  $R$  is  $t$ -quasi-invariant, then by compactness the  $t$ -quasi-invariance is due to a single sentence  $\sigma \in t$ . We can modify  $R_X$  with no prejudice to  $t$  by redefining it as  $R$  if  $\sigma$  holds, and some constant element of  $X$  if  $\sigma$  fails. This is quasi-invariant.

For each completion  $t$ , by assumption and Theorem 6.2, there exists a  $t$  quasi-invariant mapping that witnesses this. And from the argument above, there exists a quasi-invariant, not just  $t$ -quasi-invariant,  $R_t : M^n \rightarrow X_t$  such that if  $M, N \models t$ , then  $M\mathcal{E}N$  iff  $d_{X_t}(R_t^M(a), R_t^N(a)) < 1$  for all  $a \in M^n$ . It follows that for  $M, N \models T$  on the same universe,  $M\mathcal{E}N$  iff  $d_{X(t)}(R_t^M(a), R_t^N(a)) < 1$  for all  $a$  and for every  $t$ . Using the definability of  $\mathcal{E}$ , and compactness, there must exist a finite set  $t_1, \dots, t_k$  such that  $M\mathcal{E}N$  iff  $d_{X(t)}(R_t^M(a), R_t^N(a)) < 1$  for all  $a$  and for every  $t_i, i = 1, \dots, k$ . At this point let  $X = \prod_i X_{t_i}$ , with distance  $\sup_i d_{X_{t_i}}(x(i), y(i))$ . Using dummy variables assume all  $n_t = n$  for some  $n$ . Define  $R(a, b) = (R_i(a, b) : i = 1, \dots, k)$ . Then  $M\mathcal{E}N$  iff  $d_X(R^M(a), R^N(a)) < 1$  for all  $a$ . Thus using Theorem 6.2 in the other direction, we are done. □

## 7. AN YCLEPT, NON-YDLEPT DEFINABLE MER, AND CHAOTIC DYNAMICS.

We exhibit here an yclept definable MER which is not ydlept. Thus Theorem 6.2 cannot be pushed further to say that a definable MER which is yclept must be ydlept, even for superstable or weakly minimal theories.

There is a tension between strict ycleptness, and the definability of the MER. To assert that a CL formula has the same interpretation in two models, one must express that at any input they take the same real value; this seem to require infinitely many formulas, asserting equality digit-by-digit as it were. We overcome this using a phenomenon of chaotic dynamics: two orbits cannot permanently stay near each other. Thus knowing the approximate location of a point over all time determines the point precisely.

This example is moreover superstable, weakly minimal. We will define a DL theory  $T_d$ , and an equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  on models of  $T_d$  based on preserving a CL reduct.

Let  $\Gamma$  be a countable group, acting by homeomorphisms on a connected compact Hausdorff space  $W$  in such a way that for some open set  $U_1$ , letting  $U_0 = W \setminus cl(U_1)$ , we have:

(\*) for any  $u \neq v \in W$ , for some  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  we have  $\gamma u \in U_1$  and  $\gamma v \in U_0$ .

This implies that for any  $w \in W$ ,  $\Gamma w$  is dense in  $W$ . For instance,  $PGL_2(\mathbb{Q})$  acting on the circle  $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{R})$  by fractional linear transformations has this property, for any nonempty and non-dense open set  $U$ , since  $PGL_2(\mathbb{R})$  is 2-transitive on  $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{R})$ . Later in the proof, we will need additional requirements about  $(\Gamma, W)$ , still true for  $(PGL_2(\mathbb{Q}), \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{R}))$ , and we focus on a specific  $U_1$ . In terms of  $(\Gamma, W)$  we will require:

(\*\*) For any nonempty open  $U_1$ , and  $U'' \subset W \setminus cl(U_0)$  and any  $u \neq v \in W$  there exists  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  with  $\gamma u \in U''$ ,  $\gamma v \in U_1$ .

Note that (\*) and (\*\*) persist for subgroups  $\Gamma$  of  $PGL_2(\mathbb{Q})$  that are dense in  $PGL_2(\mathbb{R})$ . One can take  $\Gamma$  finitely generated. In this case  $T_d$  will admit a finite language.

As for  $U_1$ , identifying  $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{R})$  with  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ , we will later specify that  $U_1$  is the interval  $(-2, 2)$ , and we will also fix  $U''$  to be the interval  $(-1/2, 1/2)$ . These specific choices will play no role in the first two claims below, defining the reduct, and through it the equivalence relation. But they will be helpful in showing that our equivalence relation is a definable MER.

Let  $L_0$  be the language with a unary function symbol for each  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , that we will denote also by  $\gamma$ . The universal theory  $T_0$  consists of the axioms for a free  $\Gamma$ -action; it becomes complete once we add that the universe is nonempty.

$L_d = L_0 \cup \{Q\}$  is the expansion of  $L_0$  by a unary predicate  $Q$ . We also write  $Q_1$  for  $Q$  and  $Q_0$  for the complement of  $Q$ . Further we will write  $Q(a) = 1$  if  $a \in Q_1$  and  $Q(a) = 0$  if  $a \in Q_0$ .

The universal axioms  $T_{d,\forall}$  of  $T_d$  state that

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^{-1} Q_{\nu_i} = \emptyset$$

whenever  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m \in \Gamma$ ,  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m \in \{0, 1\}$ , and  $\bigcap_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^{-1} cl(U_{\nu_i}) = \emptyset$ .

Note that  $\gamma_i$  in the intersection refers to a unary function symbol in the language, while in the condition  $\gamma_i$  refers to the transformation. Thus the axioms assert a close relationship between the unary predicate  $Q_1$  in a model of  $T_d$  and the open subset  $U_1$  of  $W$ .

To see that  $T_{d,\forall}$  is consistent, pick any point  $a \notin \cup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \gamma(cl(U_0) \setminus U_0)$ . Let  $M = \Gamma a$  be the  $\Gamma$ -orbit of  $a$ ; so  $M \cap cl(U_0) \setminus U_0 = \emptyset$ . Define  $Q_1^M = M \cap U_1$ . Then  $Q_0^M = M \cap cl(U_0) = M \cap U_0$ . It is clear that  $M$  is a model of  $T_{d,\forall}$ .

Towards defining our CL reduct, we start with the following observation:

**Claim 7.1.** Let  $M \models T_d$  and  $a \in M$ . Then

$$R(a) := \cap \{ \gamma^{-1}cl(U_i) : \gamma \in \Gamma, i = Q(\gamma(a)) \}$$

is a subset of  $W$  with a unique point.

*Proof.* The axioms of  $T_d$  ensure the finite intersection property for the above sets. Since  $W$  is compact,  $\cap \{ \gamma^{-1}cl(U_i) : \gamma \in \Gamma, i = Q(\gamma(x)) \} \neq \emptyset$ . If  $u \neq v$  are two distinct points of  $W$  then by (\*), for some  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  we have  $\gamma u \in U_1$  and  $\gamma v \in U_0$ . Say  $Q(\gamma(a)) = 0$ . Then  $R(a) \subset \gamma^{-1}cl(U_1)$  while  $v \in \gamma^{-1}(U_0)$  so  $v \notin R(a)$ . Likewise if  $Q(\gamma(a)) = 1$  then  $u \notin R(a)$ . Hence  $R(a)$  cannot contain two distinct points, so  $|R(a)| = 1$ .  $\square$

We denote the point whose existence is shown by the claim as  $r(a)$ . The behavior of  $r(a)$  in terms of  $U_1$  closely mirrors that of  $\alpha$  in terms of  $Q_1$ , and similarly for  $\gamma(a)$  with  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ . For example if  $r(a) \in U_1$  then  $a \in Q_1$ , and if  $a \in Q_1$  then  $r(a) \in cl(U_1)$ . The function  $r$ , along with the  $L_0$  structure, will be our CL reduct  $L_c$ .

**Claim 7.2.** The function  $r(a)$  depends only on  $tp(a)$ , and is a continuous function of  $tp(a)$ .

*Proof.* The first statement is obvious. To prove continuity, let  $O$  be an open neighborhood of  $r(a)$ . Then  $\cap \{ \gamma^{-1}cl(U_i) : \gamma \in \Gamma, i = Q(\gamma(a)) \} \subset O$ , so by compactness of  $W$ , some finite intersection  $\cap_{\gamma \in F_0} \{ \gamma^{-1}cl(U_i) : \gamma \in \Gamma, i = Q(\gamma(a)) \} \subset O$ . But this means that the truth values of finitely many atomic relations  $Q(\gamma_i(x))$  force  $r(x)$  to be in  $O$ , i.e.  $r^{-1}(O)$  contains a clopen neighborhood of  $tp(a)$ .  $\square$

At this point we may view  $r$  as a CL definable relation on  $M$ . Define  $\mathcal{G}$  to be the groupoid of  $L_c$ -isomorphisms between models of  $T_d$ , i.e. bijections  $g$  preserving  $L_0$  and  $r$ , but not necessarily  $Q$ .  $\mathcal{E}$  is the corresponding equivalence relation. Since  $r$  is CL definable, this is a CL reduct.

The next thing to show is that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a *definable groupoid*, or alternatively  $\mathcal{E}$  is a definable MER. In fact, we get universal definability. But this is to be expected, from Theorem 6.2.

Let  $\gamma_1$  be the element  $x \mapsto x + 1$ . Note that if  $\gamma_1^{-1}a, a, \gamma_1 a \in cl(U_1)$  then  $a \in U_1$ .

**Claim 7.3.** Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the equivalence relation over  $T_d$  corresponding to preserving the  $L_0$  structure and  $r$ . Then  $M\mathcal{E}M'$  iff  $M$  and  $M'$  agree on the  $L_0$  structure and

$$\diamond \quad (\forall x \in M)(M \models Q_1((\gamma_1)^{-1}x) \wedge Q_1(x) \wedge Q_1(\gamma_1 x)) \rightarrow M' \models Q_1(x)$$

Thus in particular  $\mathcal{E}$  is a definable MER.

*Proof.* For the “only if” direction, we assume that there is  $x_0 \in M$  such that  $Q_1$  holds of  $x_0$ ,  $\gamma_1(x_0)$  and  $(\gamma_1)^{-1}(x_0)$ , but in  $M'$   $Q_1(x_0)$  fails to hold. The hypothesis concerning  $M$  tell us that in  $M$  we must have  $r(x_0) \in cl(U_1)$ ,  $\gamma_1(r(x_0)) \in cl(U_1)$ ,  $\gamma_1^{-1}(r(x_0)) \in cl(U_1)$ , and keeping in mind  $U_1 = (-2, 2)$  we have  $r(x_0) \in (-1, 1)$ . On the other hand, in  $M'$  we cannot have  $r(x_0) \in cl(U_1)$ . So clearly  $r$  is not preserved by the equivalence relation.

We prove the “if” direction by contrapositive. Suppose  $M$  and  $M'$  agree on their domains and the  $L_0$  structure, let  $r$  denote the function  $r$  in  $M$  and  $r'$  the function in  $M'$ . Assume  $r(a) \neq r'(a)$  for some  $a \in M$ . By (\*\*), there exists  $\gamma \in G$  with  $\gamma(r'(a)) \in U_0$  and  $\gamma(r(a)) \in U''$ . But we can check that  $r$  “commutes modulo starring” with  $\gamma$  in any model.

Thus we have  $r'(\gamma a) = \gamma r'(a) \in U_0$  and  $r(\gamma a) \in U''$ . Let  $b = \gamma a$ ; then  $r'(b) \in U_0$ , and  $r(b) \in U'' = (-1/2, 1/2)$ . So applying the definition of  $r$  in  $M$ , we get  $M \models (\gamma_1)^{-1}b, b, \gamma_1 b \in Q_1$ . By  $\diamond$ ,  $M' \models Q_1(b)$ , contradicting  $r'(b) \in U_0$ .  $\square$

We now need to show that  $\mathcal{G}$  is not given by a DL reduct. We begin by studying a CL theory  $T_c$  that will turn out to be a reduct of  $T_d$ .

Let  $L_c$  expand  $L_0$  by a unary predicate  $r$  in the sense of CL, interpreted as a map into  $W$ . The universal axioms, denoted  $T_{c,\forall}$ , state that  $T_0$  holds and  $r$  is a  $\Gamma$ -homomorphism, i.e.  $r(\gamma x) = \gamma r(x)$ , referring to the action above on  $W$ .

**Claim 7.4.** There is a (necessarily unique) theory  $T_c$  eliminating quantifiers with universal part axiomatized by  $T_{c,\forall}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $T_c$  be  $T_{c,\forall}$  along with axioms:

(♣) For each  $w \in W$  there exist infinitely many  $\Gamma$ -orbits  $O$  of  $N$  with elements  $a$  such that  $r(a) = w$ .

Any model of  $T_{c,\forall}$  clearly extends to a model of  $T_c$ ; so the universal part of  $T_c$  is precisely  $T_{c,\forall}$ .

To see that  $T_c$  is complete, suppose  $T', T''$  are two completions. Let  $M, M'$  be models of  $T', T''$  respectively, of cardinality  $2^{\aleph_0}$ , and such that for any  $w \in W$  there exist  $2^{\aleph_0}$  distinct elements  $a$  of  $M$  (resp.  $M'$ ) with  $r(a) = w$ . It is easy to find such models by compactness.

We argue that  $M \cong M'$ . Let  $(w_i : i \in I)$  be a set of representatives for the  $\Gamma$ -orbits on  $W$ . For each  $i$ , let  $m_{i,j} : j < 2^{\aleph_0}$  be a maximal subset of  $M$  consisting of elements in distinct orbits, such that  $r(m_{i,j}) = w_i$ . Then any element of  $M$  has the form  $\gamma m_{i,j}$  for some  $i \in I, j < 2^{\aleph_0}$  and some  $\gamma \in \Gamma$ , necessarily unique. In the same way, we find  $m'_{i,j} \in M'$  with  $r(m'_{i,j}) = w_i$ . Let  $f$  map  $\gamma m_{i,j}$  to  $\gamma m'_{i,j}$ . This is well-defined and an  $L_c$ -isomorphism. So  $M \cong M'$ .

Hence  $T' = T''$ . So  $T_c$  is complete.

In a similar way, we can construct an isomorphism between countable substructures of  $M, M'$  extends to an isomorphism  $M \rightarrow M'$ . This holds also when  $M = M'$ ; so the quantifier-free type of a tuple from  $M$  determines the complete type. Thus  $T_c$  admits quantifier-elimination.  $\square$

By QE for  $T_c$ , or more directly by the argument for Claim 7.4, complete 1-types have the form  $r(x) = w$  for some  $w \in W$ . A partial type can be viewed as a closed set of complete types, and hence has the form  $r^{-1}(C) = \{x : r(x) \in C\}$  for some closed  $C \subset W$ .

**Claim 7.5.** Every DL definable set  $X$  of  $T_c$  in  $n$  variables is already  $L_0$ -definable

*Proof.* Take  $n = 1$ . As  $X$  is  $\wedge$ -definable, it is a partial type. By the comment above the claim, it has the form  $r^{-1}(C)$  for some closed  $C \subset W$ . As the complement of  $X$  is also  $\wedge$ -definable, it also has this form, so that  $X = r^{-1}(C')$  for some open  $C' \subset W$ . By surjectivity of  $r$ , in sufficiently saturated models, we have  $C' = r(X) = C$  so  $C$  is clopen. Since  $W$  is connected,  $C = \emptyset$  or  $C = W$  and so there are no unary definable sets other than  $\emptyset$  and the universe. For  $n > 1$ , let  $P$  be the  $L_0$ -partial  $n$ -type asserting that  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  lies in distinct orbits. Then an  $n$ -type extending  $P$  is determined by the values of  $r(x_1), \dots, r(x_n)$ . A partial  $n$  type extending  $P$  is the intersection of  $P$  with the pullback of a closed subset of  $W^n$ . Since  $W^n$  is connected, the same argument shows that if  $X$  is a definable set in  $n$  variables, then either  $X$  or the complement  $X$  is disjoint from  $P$ ; say the former. Then  $X$  implies a finite disjunction of terms  $\gamma x_i = x_j$ . So  $X = X_1 \cup \dots \cup X_k$  where  $X_i$  includes such a term. By induction each  $X_i$  is  $L_0$ -definable and hence so is  $X$ .  $\square$

**Claim 7.6.** Let  $M \models T_d$ , and let  $M_0$  be the reduct to  $L_0$ . Then  $(M_0, r)$  is a model of  $T_c$ .

*Proof.* For this we may assume  $M$  is saturated. Recall the set function  $R$  from Claim 7.1. Clearly,  $R(\gamma x) = \cap \{\beta^{-1}cl(U_i) : \beta \in$

$\Gamma, i = Q(\beta(\gamma a))\} = \cap\{\beta^{-1}cl(U_i) : \beta\gamma \in \Gamma, i = Q(\beta(\gamma a))\} = \cap\{(\alpha\gamma^{-1})^{-1}cl(U_i) : \alpha \in \Gamma, i = Q(\alpha a)\} = \gamma R(x)$ . So  $r(\gamma x) = \gamma r(x)$ . Thus  $(M_0, r) \models T_{c,\forall}$ . We also have to show ( $\clubsuit$ ):

For any  $w \in W$  there exist, in infinitely many  $\Gamma$ -orbits,  $a \in M$  with  $r(a) = w$

Define an  $L_d$ -structure on the orbit  $\Gamma w$  by setting  $Q^w = \Gamma w \cap U_1$ . If  $\cap_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^{-1}cl(U_{\nu_i}) = \emptyset$ , then  $\cap_{i=1}^m \gamma_i^{-1}Q_{\nu_i} = \emptyset$ . This is because  $Q_1 \subset cl(U_1)$  and  $Q_0 \subset cl(U_0)$ . Thus  $(\Gamma w, Q^w) \models T_{d,\forall}$ . And so there exist (many disjoint)  $L_d$ -embeddings  $j : (\Gamma w, Q^w) \rightarrow M$ ; and we have  $w \in R(j(w))$  so  $w = r(j(w))$ . Letting  $a = j(w)$ , we have proven our claim.  $\square$

We have seen in Claim 7.5 that DL reducts of  $T_c$  must be  $L_0$  definable. Hence  $(M_0, r)$  has no DL reduct bigger than  $L_0$ . So  $L_0$  is the maximal DL reduct respected by  $\mathcal{E}$ . Certainly  $r$  is not  $L_0$ -definable, since  $T_0$  has a unique 1-type: thus any  $L_0$ -definable map into the reals is constant. Hence  $\mathcal{E}$  is not ydlept.

## 8. HIGHER YDLEPT EQUIVALENCE RELATIONS THAT ARE YCLEPT

In the previous section we considered the interaction of definable MERs with yclept MERs, and showed that this does not imply that the MER is ydlept. In this section we look at the intersection of higher ydlepts with yclept. In contrast to the previous section, we show that this does imply that the MER is ydlept.

Let  $T$  be a theory, for simplicity in a countable language. Let  $D$  be one of the sorts or a finite product of sorts of  $T$ .

Recall that in a CL theory with trivial metric, a subset  $X$  of  $D$  is called definable if both  $X$  and  $D \setminus X$  are  $\wedge$ -definable. Equivalently, there exists a formula  $\phi$  valued in  $\{0, 1\}$  with  $\phi^{-1}(1) = X$ .

**Proposition 8.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an yclept definable MER on  $T$ , associated to the CL reduct  $\mathcal{R}$ . Let  $\mathcal{D} = \{D_c : c \in Q\}$  be a  $T$ -definable family of definable subsets. Assume  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathcal{E}$ -invariant, i.e. invariant for the groupoid corresponding to  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}$  can be expressed as  $\mathcal{D} = \{D'_d : d \in Q'\}$  with  $D'$  and  $Q'$  both contained in the reduct  $\mathcal{R}$ .*

Before proving this, we give a corollary:

**Corollary 8.2.** *A MER that is both 2-ydlept and yclept is ydlept.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{D_c : c \in Q\}$  witness that the MER  $\mathcal{E}$  is 2-ydlept, and  $\mathcal{R}$  witness that  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept. Then the proposition implies that the family can be reparameterized as  $\{D'_d : d \in Q'\}$  with  $D', Q'$  in  $\mathcal{R}$ . Then  $D', Q'$  are invariant under  $\mathcal{E}$ , so  $\mathcal{E}$  is the ydlept equivalence relation generated by  $D', Q'$ .  $\square$



As a step towards proving the proposition, we start with:

**Claim 8.3.** Let  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  be as in the statement of Proposition 8.1. In any countable resplendent model  $M$  of  $T$ , each individual  $D_c$  is definable with parameters in  $M$  from  $\mathcal{R}$  alone. We recall that for CL this means that both the set and its complement are  $\mathcal{R}$ - $\wedge$ -definable with parameters.

*Proof.* Any  $\text{Aut}(M|\mathcal{R})$ -conjugate of  $D_c$  lies in  $\mathcal{D}(M)$ . This is because  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $G_M$ -invariant, and  $G_M = \text{Aut}(M|\mathcal{R})$  by cycleptness. Thus there are only countably many  $\text{Aut}(M|\mathcal{R})$ -conjugates of  $D_c$ . By Makkai's parameterized version of Beth's theorem [Mak64], there exists a finite  $d$  from  $M$  such that  $\text{Aut}(M|\mathcal{R}, d)$  fixes  $D_c$ . So there are no  $a \in D_c, a' \notin D_c$  with the same type over  $d$ . That is, the following  $L(c, d)$ -partial type is inconsistent:

$$\{\phi(x, d) = \phi(x', d) \wedge x \in D_c \wedge x' \notin D_c : \phi \in \mathcal{R}\}$$

So for some finite number of  $\phi_i$ , which we can put together into a single  $\phi$  valued in  $[0, 1]^n$ , the  $\phi^M$ -images of  $D_c$  and of  $D \setminus D_c$  are disjoint closed subsets, whose union of course covers  $\phi^M(D)$ . Thus the image of  $D$  in  $[0, 1]^n$  is disconnected, and there exists a continuous map  $f : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $f(\phi(x)) = 1$  if  $x \in D_c$  and  $f(\phi(x)) = 0$  if  $x \notin D_c$ .  $\square$

We now continue the proof of the proposition.

*Proof.* Let us say that  $\phi(x, d)$  is a *gap formula* if it takes values in  $[0, 1] \setminus [1/5, 4/5]$ . Consider the following set of formulas:

$$(\forall d)(\exists x)(1/5 \leq \phi(x, d) \leq 4/5) \vee (\exists x)(x \notin D_u \iff \phi(x, d) \leq 1/5)$$

Here the formula includes  $u$  as a free variable, and  $D_u$  refers to  $\mathcal{D}$  at variable  $u$ .  $\phi$  ranges over  $\mathcal{R}$ . For each  $\phi$  the formula asserts that  $\phi$  is either not a gap formula or does not define  $D_c$ . The conjunction is inconsistent. So there are finitely many formulas  $\phi_i \in \mathcal{R}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ , valued in  $[0, 1]$ , such that for each  $c$ , and for some  $d$ ,  $\phi_i(x, d)$  is a gap formula and defines  $D_c$ .

Let  $\psi_i (i = 1, \dots, \ell)$  be an essentially DL formula – corresponding to a finite set of pairs of  $L$  formulas and real values – such that  $|\phi_i - \psi_i| < 1/5$ . Then for each  $c$ , for some  $i \leq \ell$ , for some  $d$ :

$$\psi_i(x, d) < 2/5 \iff x \in D_c$$

For each  $i \leq \ell$ , consider  $\theta_i$  defined as

$$\{d \mid \exists Y \in \mathcal{D} (\psi_i(x, d) < 2/5 \iff x \in Y)\}$$

This is  $L$ -definable and  $\mathcal{E}$ -invariant, so it is in  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Thus the equivalence relation given by our original reduct  $\mathcal{D}$  is the same as the equivalence relation preserving  $\{x, d \mid \psi_i(x, d) \wedge \theta_i(d)\}$ . This is easily seen to be ydlept. □

**Corollary 8.4.** *A MER  $\mathcal{E}$  that is yclept and  $k$ -ydlept, then it is ydlept.*

*Proof.* Using Corollary 8.2 and induction, along the same lines as the proof of Proposition 9.5 from Lemma 9.4. □

Proposition 8.1 dealt with a higher ydlept preserved by a higher ydlept. We can also get a result on yclepts preserved by a higher ydlept, but this time only for maximal ones:

**Proposition 8.5.** *The maximal yclept of a  $k$ -ydlept must be ydlept.*

*Proof.* We prove the case  $k = 2$ , leaving the general case to the reader. Thus  $\mathcal{E}$  is specified by a definable family  $\mathcal{D}$  in the original signature, and DL formulas  $\phi_i(\vec{x}, \vec{\sigma})$  in the Shelahization, where  $\vec{\sigma}$  is over the imaginary sort. Then  $\mathcal{E}$  represents preservation of the imaginary sort and the corresponding function, and also the  $\phi_i$ . Let  $R'$  denote this reduct.

We can assume that the maximal CL reduct is given by a single CL formula  $\rho(\vec{x})$  where  $\vec{x}$  are variables in the language  $L$  of  $T$ . We know  $\rho$  must be preserved by  $\mathcal{E}$ . We claim that  $\rho$  must be definable in CL over  $R'$ . If not there are two models  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  with the same reduct to these formulas and sorts, disagreeing on  $\rho$ . But this contradicts the fact that  $\rho$  is invariant under  $\mathcal{E}$ .

Thus  $\rho$  is a limit of essentially DL formulas  $\rho_i$  definable over  $R'$ . Each of these formulas is specified by a DL-definable partition  $\rho_{i,j}(\vec{x})$ . Since they are definable over  $R'$ , each  $\rho_{i,j}(\vec{x})$  is invariant under  $\mathcal{E}$ . But then each  $\rho_{i,j}(\vec{x})$  is in the maximal CL reduct. We see that  $\mathcal{E}$  is in fact equivalent to preserving  $\rho_{i,j}$ , hence is ydlept. □

**Remark 8.6.** Note that we state and prove these results for the “completely-coupled” case. But the same arguments hold if we talk about a “yclept MER over coupled sorts  $S_0$ ”. Recall that a reduct defined using formulas having sorts  $S_0$  gives a MER over  $S_0$ , or over any set of sorts  $S'_0$  containing  $S_0$ : we are free to couple more. Thus modifying Corollary 8.4 we can conclude that if a MER is both yclept over  $S'_0$  and  $n$ -ydlept over the same  $S'_0$ , then it is ydlept over  $S'_0$ . We cannot conclude that if it is yclept over  $S'_0$  and  $n$ -ydlept over a different  $S''_0$  then it is ydlept over  $S''_0$ .

9. INTRINSICALLY STABLY EMBEDDED THEORIES AND HIGHER YDLEPTS

In this section we characterize theories for which every higher ydlept MER is ydlept. It turns out to be an interesting extension of the class of stable theories. We conjecture that every o-minimal structure has this property, and prove it for DLO.

Recall our convention that “definable” means 0-definable, i.e. by a formula of  $L$ .

**Definition 9.1.** A set of sorts  $\mathcal{S}$  in a multi-sorted theory  $T'$  is *stably embedded in  $T'$*  if in every model  $M$  of  $T'$ , any  $M$ -definable relation on the sorts  $\mathcal{S}$  is definable with parameters from  $\mathcal{S}(M)$ .

Equivalently, by a routine compactness argument every  $T'$ -definable family of definable relations on  $\mathcal{S}$  is equal, as a family, to a  $T'$ -definable family with parameter variables in  $\mathcal{S}$ :

For every  $n$ , for every  $\phi(x, y)$  with  $x$  an  $n$ -tuple of variables with sorts in  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\phi$  in  $T'$  – that is, a  $T'$  definable family of subsets of  $n$ -tuples of elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  – there is a formula  $\delta(x, x')$ , where  $x$  are the same variables as in  $\phi$  and  $x'$  is a tuple of variables with sorts in  $\mathcal{S}$   $\delta$  a formula in  $T'$ , such that, in all models of  $T'$ , there is  $x'_0$  with  $\forall y \exists x'_0 \forall x \phi(x, y) \leftrightarrow \delta(x, x'_0)$ .

For background on stable embeddedness, equivalent definitions, and extensions to partial types, see [Hru02, appendix B], [CH99, Appendix], [Pil11].

**Definition 9.2.** A theory  $T$  with sorts  $\mathcal{S}$  is *intrinsically stably embedded* (istem) if  $\mathcal{S}$  is stably embedded within any reduct of  $T^{eq}$ .

In particular, a one-sorted theory  $T$  is istem if its only sort is stably embedded within any reduct of  $T^{eq}$ . It is easy to see that a stable theory is istem: if  $T$  is stable, so is  $T^{eq}$ , and hence any reduct of  $T^{eq}$ .

**Lemma 9.3.** *Let  $T$  be an istem theory with one sort  $X$ . If the model equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  is 2-ydlept then  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept.*

Towards proving the lemma, let the equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  be given by a 0-definable family of definable subsets of  $X$ . So it has the form  $\{D_b : b \in Y\}$ , where  $D \subset X \times Y$   $D_b = \{a \in X : D(a, b)\}$ , and  $D$  is definable, hence  $Y \subseteq X^n$  is definable.

The following lemma states that in an istem theory we can reparameterize a definable family in a canonical way:

**Lemma 9.4.** *Let  $T$  be an istem theory in one sort  $X$ . Let  $D \subset X \times Y$  be definable in  $T$   $\mathcal{F} = \{D_b : b \in Y\}$ ,  $D_b = \{a \in X : D(a, b)\}$ . Then*

there exists a definable relation  $R \subset X \times Z$  ( $Z$  a definable subset of  $X^n$ ) such that

- (1)  $\mathcal{F} = \{R_c : c \in Z\}$ ;
- (2) Any permutation leaving  $X$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  invariant also leaves  $R$  invariant.

*Proof.* We consider the imaginary sort related to the definable family  $D$  itself: this will have a sort  $S'$  for the equivalence classes of the equivalence relation “coding the same member of the definable family”, and the corresponding relationship  $F$  relating equivalence classes in  $S'$  to elements  $x$  of the definable family. Thus we can consider  $D$  as a family, but now indexed by  $S'$ . It is still a definable family of subsets of  $X$  in the reduct  $R'$  consisting of  $S'$  and  $F$ . Since  $X$  is intrinsically stably embedded, we can obtain a  $\delta'(x, \vec{y})$  definable in the reduct  $R'$ , such that for every member  $R_c$  of the family there is  $\vec{a}_0$  such that  $\delta'(x, \vec{a}_0)$  is  $R_c$ .  $\delta'$  can be converted to a formula in the language of  $T$ . But since it is definable in the reduct  $R'$ , it is invariant under any permutation that preserves the equivalence classes.

□

*Proof of Lemma 9.3.* By Lemma 4.7 we can assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is given by a 2-set: that is, a definable family on some  $X^n$ . Apply Lemma 9.4 to get a relation  $R$ . It is easy to see that  $X$  and  $R$  witness that  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept. □

We now extend Lemma 9.3 from 2-ydlept to  $n$ -ydlept for  $n > 2$ .

**Proposition 9.5.** *Let  $T$  be an istem theory. If the model equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $n$ -ydlept for some  $n$  then  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept.*

*In particular, this is true for a stable theory.*

*Proof.* Assume inductively that every  $n$ -ydlept on a stable theory is ydlept. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be  $(n + 1)$ -ydlept. By definition there exists a definable family  $F$  of definable sets, such that  $\mathcal{E}$  arises from a well-behaved equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}_1$  of  $T_F$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_1$  is  $n$ -ydlept. By induction,  $\mathcal{E}_1$  is ydlept. Hence  $\mathcal{E}$  is 2-ydlept. By Lemma 9.3,  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept.

□

We show that the istem assumption is sharp; thus  $T$  is istem iff every higher ydlept is ydlept. In fact:

**Proposition 9.6.**  *$T$  is istem iff every 2-ydlept MER for  $T$  is ydlept.*

*Proof.* Assume every 2-ydlept MER for  $T$  is ydlept. We will show that  $X$  is istem. The other direction has already been proven.

We may assume the language of  $T$  is finite: if  $T$  is not istem, this is witnessed by a finite sublanguage; while the hypothesis on 2-ydlepts is by definition preserved under reducts. We have to show that  $X$  is stably embedded within any reduct  $\mathcal{R}$  of  $T^{eq}$ . We may take this reduct to include all sorts of  $T^{eq}$ , but not necessarily all relations among them. Let  $\mathcal{R}$  be such a reduct, and  $T_{\mathcal{R}}$  the restriction of  $T$  to  $\mathcal{R}$ . So  $T_{\mathcal{R}}$  still has a unique sort  $X$ , but the reduct contains only some of the relations of  $T$ .

Let  $Y$  and  $R \subset Y \times X^n$  be 0-definable in  $T^{eq}$ . For  $y \in Y$ , let  $R_y \subset X^n$  be defined by  $x \in R_y \iff R(x, y)$ . Let  $R_Y := \{R_y : y \in Y\}$ . We have to show  $\clubsuit$ :

Each  $R_y$  is definable in  $\mathcal{R}$  with parameters in  $X$ .

Note that if  $M \models T$  then we can canonically define  $M^{eq}$  and hence  $R_Y$ : it is a 2-subset of  $P(X(M))$  that is defined in terms of the structure  $M$  alone.

We have a 2-ydlept definable MER  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $Mod(T)$ :  $M \mathcal{E} M'$  iff  $X(M) = X(M')$  and  $R_Y^M = R_Y^{M'}$ . By assumption,  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept. So there exist an  $\mathcal{R}$ -definable relation  $S$  on  $X^n$  such that  $M \mathcal{E} M'$  iff  $X(M) = X(M')$  and  $S^M = S^{M'}$ . Here  $X(M) = X(M')$  simply says they have the same universe. Recall the Chang-Makkai theorem [Cha64, Mak64], in the following ‘‘pseudo-elementary’’ form:

Let  $T$  be a theory in a countable language  $L$ , and let  $T'$  be an expansion to a bigger countable language, including a formula  $R_0$ ,  $T = T' \upharpoonright L$ . If for any countable model  $M$  of  $T$ ,  $\{R_0(M') : M' \text{ expands } M, M' \models T'\}$  is countable, then each  $R_0(M')$  is definable with parameters in  $M$ .

This will be applied to the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of subsets  $Z$  of  $X^n$  such that for some expansion of  $M_{\mathcal{R}}$  to a model  $M$  of  $T$ ,  $M^{eq} \models (\exists y \in Y)(R_y = Z)$ . That is,  $Z \in R_Y^M$ .

**Claim 9.7.** Let  $M_{\mathcal{R}}$  be a countable model of  $T_{\mathcal{R}}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}(M_{\mathcal{R}})$  is countable.

*Proof.* To prove the claim, let  $M_1$  be an expansion of  $M_{\mathcal{R}}$  to a model of  $T$ . We will show that  $\mathcal{F} \subset R_Y(M_1)$ ; this of course implies that  $\mathcal{F}$  is countable. Let  $Z \in \mathcal{F}$ . Then  $Z \in R_Y(M)$  for some expansion  $M$  of  $M_{\mathcal{R}}$  to  $T$ . Since  $S$  is  $\mathcal{R}$ -definable, we have  $S^M = S^{M'}$ . Thus  $M \mathcal{E} M'$ . So  $R_Y^M = R_Y^{M'}$ . Hence  $Z \in R_Y^{M_1}$ , as promised.  $\square$

Given the claim, we can apply the Chang-Makkai theorem, concluding that each element of  $\mathcal{F}$  is parameterically definable in  $\mathcal{R}$ . Thus we have proven  $\clubsuit$ , which in turn proves Proposition 9.6.  $\square$

**Conjecture 9.8.** All o-minimal structures are istem.

A proof of the conjecture would imply a positive answer to the following:

**Question 9.9.** Does every o-minimal theory have the property that 2-ydlepts are ydlept?

As a small step towards proving the conjecture, we show that DLO is istem. The proof will go via a somewhat wider class of one-sorted structures.

**Definition 9.10.** We say that a structure is Cameron Thomas-minimal, or *CT-minimal* for short, if every reduct, except pure equality, interprets the whole upon adding constants.

Restated, this says that every nontrivial reduct of  $T$  is a reduct by constants, in the sense of Definition 12.3. From Cameron's classification of reducts of DLO [Cam90] it follows that DLO is CT-minimal. Since DLO is NIP, the result for DLO will follow from the following:

**Proposition 9.11.** *Any NIP CT-minimal structure is istem.*

*Proof.* We will assume  $T$  has a single sort  $D$  for convenience. Let  $M$  be the given structure; we may assume it is  $\aleph_0$ -saturated. Let  $Q$  be an imaginary sort, and  $M^-$  a reduct with sorts  $(D, Q)$ . We have to show that  $D$  is stably embedded in  $M^-$ .

We can work over a somewhat saturated model  $M$ , so that if  $F$  is a family of definable sets, not definable in pure equality, then some element of the family is not definable in pure equality.

If every family of definable subsets of any  $D^n$  in  $M^-$  is definable in pure equality, then of course  $D$  is stably embedded. A *stably 1-embedded* sort is one which satisfies the definition of stably embedded where we only consider definable families of subsets, not definable families of collections of tuples: that is, we only consider  $n = 1$ . We will use Pillay's theorem [Pil11]: for an NIP theory  $D$  is stably embedded iff it is *stably 1-embedded*.

Using the theorem, we can take  $n = 1$ . Let  $F$  be a nontrivial family of definable subsets of  $D$ . Then by the  $\aleph_0$ -saturation of  $M$  some element  $F_c$  of  $F$  is infinite and co-infinite.

As a first case, assume that pure equality is induced on  $D$  in  $M^-$ . Let  $m$  be any integer. Since  $F_c$  is infinite and co-infinite, there is  $A$  a subset of  $D(M)$  with  $|A \cap F_c| = |A \setminus F_c| = m$ . Since in the reduct, all  $2m$ -types of distinct elements of  $D$  are equal, for any subset  $A'$  of  $A$  of size  $m$ , there exists  $c'$  such that for  $a \in A$  we have  $a \in F_{c'}$  iff  $a \in A'$ .

Since  $m$  was arbitrary, we have shattered an arbitrarily large set  $A$ , which contradicts NIP.

This leaves the case where the induced structure on  $D$  from  $M^-$  is not pure equality. By CT-minimality, after adding constants  $(d_1, d_2, \dots)$  from  $D$ , the full original structure on  $D$  is interpretable in  $M^-$ . In this case, any  $M^-$  definable relation on  $D$  with parameters from  $M^-$  is certainly definable with parameters from  $D$  in the original structure, hence in  $M^-[d_1, d_2, \dots]$ , and hence in  $M^-$ .  $\square$

The following example shows that this phenomenon does not extend to general NIP theories. Later examples interpretable in the random graph will show the same for simple theories.

**Example 9.12.** Let  $T$  be the  $\aleph_0$ -categorical theory of a dense linear ordering  $M$  with a distinguished dense co-dense subset  $P$ . Then  $T$  is NIP, indeed distal and dp-minimal [Sim13]. We view  $T$  as 2-sorted, with one sort  $P$  and one sort  $Q = \text{complement of } P$ . The ordering on  $P \cup Q$  is thus viewed as three relations, namely  $<_P = < \cap (P^2)$ ,  $<_Q = < \cap (Q^2)$  and  $<_{PQ} = < \cap (P \times Q)$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the group of permutations  $\sigma$  of  $M$  that respect  $Q$ , and hence  $P$ , such that  $\sigma \upharpoonright Q$  lifts to an automorphism of  $M$ . An equivalent definition is that the equivalence relation preserves the family of definable sets  $R_p : p \in P$ , where  $R_p = \{x \in Q \text{ and } x > p\}$ . In particular  $\mathcal{G}$  is 2-ydlept.

Let us now see that it is not yclept. Note first that any finite order-preserving partial map from  $Q$  to  $Q$  extends to an element of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

We next claim that, from the above, we can conclude that the maximal  $\mathcal{G}$ -invariant reduct of  $M$  is the structure consisting of the sort  $P$  with no additional structure, as well as the sort  $Q$  with the restricted linear order. We denote this as  $(P, Q, <_Q)$ . That is, we claim a formula  $\kappa(x_1 \dots x_m)$  is preserved by  $\mathcal{G}$  if and only if it is definable in  $(P, Q, <_Q)$ . The direction from right to left follows since the definition of  $\mathcal{G}$  in terms of  $R_p$  above. So it suffices to show that if  $\kappa(x_1 \dots x_m)$  is not definable in  $(P, Q, <_Q)$  then it is not preserved by  $\mathcal{G}$ . Note that  $(P, Q, <_Q)$  is also  $\aleph_0$ -categorical, so there are finitely many  $m$ -types over the empty set. Since  $\kappa$  is not definable over the empty set, there must be a model with some  $\vec{c}$  and  $\vec{c}'$  satisfying the same type in the restricted language, but with  $\vec{c}$  and  $\vec{c}'$  disagreeing on  $\kappa$ . Considering the finite partial automorphism of  $(P, Q, <_Q)$  mapping sending  $\vec{c}$  to  $\vec{c}'$ , and applying the above, we get an element of  $\mathcal{G}$  that does not preserve  $\kappa$ .

Thus we know that if  $\mathcal{G}$  were yclept, it must be definable in the language above. And since the automorphism group of  $(P, Q, <_Q)$  is much bigger than  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$  cannot be definable from  $(P, Q, <_Q)$ . So  $\mathcal{G}$ , while being 2-ydlept, is not ydlept, and thus is not yclept.

We note that this theory does admit other groupoids that are not  $n$ -ydlept. Even DLO has these: see the example in Subsection 15.2.

**Question 9.13.** Does there exist a theory such that every definable MER is 2-ydlept, but not  $\forall$ -yclept?

See Proposition 12.2 for a setting where 2-ydleptness occurs naturally.

**Question 9.14.** Does every o-minimal theory have the property that 2-ydlepts are ydlept?

We note a corollary. A class of structures for a fixed language is said to be stable if the (incomplete) theory of the class is stable; equivalently for each  $\phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$  there is a maximum  $n$  such that in some model in the class there are  $\vec{a}_1 \dots \vec{a}_n \vec{b}_1 \dots \vec{b}_n$  with  $\phi(\vec{a}_i, \vec{b}_j)$  iff  $i < j$ . For finite graphs, the notion relates to several notions of sparsity [AA14].

**Corollary 9.15.** *If  $\mathcal{E}$  is an  $n$ -ydlept over a stable theory  $T$ , then  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept. In particular if  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of structures that is stable, and  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $n$ -ydlept, then  $\mathcal{E}$  is an ydlept equivalence relation when restricted to structures in  $\mathcal{C}$ .*

*Proof.* Any completion  $T^*$  of  $T$  is stable in the usual sense. Thus by Proposition 6.4,  $\mathcal{E}$  is ydlept on models of the completion, hence on models of  $T$ .  $\square$

## 10. MERs OF LOW QUANTIFIER COMPLEXITY

We can classify definable MERs by the quantifier complexity of their defining  $(L, +, L')$  sentences. We regard all  $L$ -formulas, and their primed copies, as having quantifier complexity 0; equivalently, we assume quantifier-elimination in the base theory. With this convention assumed, we employ the usual terminology for prenex classes of first order formulas: universal,  $\Pi_2$  etc. An equivalence relation on models of  $T$  defined by  $\Sigma_n$  (respectively  $\Pi_n$ ) formulas of  $(L, +, L')$  is said to be a  $\Sigma_n$  (resp.  $\Pi_n$ )  $\wedge$ -definable MER. And similarly for a definable MER if just finitely many such formulas are used. We will now explore the relationship of MERs restricted by prefix classes with each other and with the classes defined earlier.

**Theorem 10.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\Pi_2$   $\wedge$ -definable MER for  $T$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept.*

From this and Theorem 6.2 we obtain:

**Corollary 10.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\Pi_2$   $\wedge$ -definable MER for  $T$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is actually a  $\Pi_1$   $\wedge$ -definable MER.*



Note that we cannot conclude  $\mathcal{E}$  is an ydlept MER: see Section 7.

We now begin steps toward the proof of Theorem 10.1. We can assume, using Proposition 6.7, that  $T$  is complete. We also assume, as we may, that  $T$  admits QE. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the associated groupoid. Recall that  $\mathcal{G}(M, M')$ , the set of  $\mathcal{G}$ -morphisms from  $M$  to  $M'$ , is the set of interpretations of the isomorphism symbol that make  $M, M', \sigma$  a model of a certain  $(L, +, L')$ -theory  $Th(\mathcal{G})$ . Recall also Definition 5.4, the theory  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T$  of the maximal reduct.

**Lemma 10.3.** *Assume  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\Pi_2$ . Let  $(M, M', g)$  be an existentially closed model of  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T$ . Then  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, M')$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.5,  $(M, M', g) \models Th(\mathcal{G})_{\forall}$ . In general, for a theory  $T$  with universal part  $T_{\forall}$ , a structure  $A \models T_{\forall}$  iff  $A$  extends to a model of  $T$ ; thus  $(M, M', g)$  extends to a model  $(N, N', g')$  of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Since  $(M, M', g)$  is existentially closed, every  $\Pi_2$  sentence true in  $(N, N', g')$  is true in  $(M, M', g)$ . But by assumption  $\mathcal{G}$  is  $\Pi_2$  axiomatizable. So  $(M, M', g) \in \mathcal{G}$ , i.e.  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, M')$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 10.4.** *Let  $(M, M', g)$  be a resplendent countable model of  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T$ . Then there exists  $M'' \models T$  and bijections  $h : M \rightarrow M''$ ,  $j : M' \rightarrow M''$  such that  $(M, M'', h)$  and  $(M', M'', j)$  are existentially closed models of  $T \times_{L^{\mathcal{G}}} T$ , and  $hg = h$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M''$  be a copy of  $M$ , i.e. a saturated model of the same cardinality. We will construct  $h, j$  by an induction of length  $|M|$ . At a given stage  $i$  we have small substructures  $A = A_i$  of  $M$ ,  $A' = A'_i$  of  $M'$  with  $g(A) = A'$ , and  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ -embeddings  $h_i : A \rightarrow M'', j_i : A' \rightarrow M''$  with  $j_i g = h_i$ . We will extend  $h_i$  in some stages, and  $j_i$  in other stages; then we will immediately define  $j_i$  (respectively  $h_i$ ) by the formula  $j_i g = h_i$ .

At stages  $0, 4, 8, \dots, \omega, \omega + 4, \dots$ , we will aim to make  $h$  onto, i.e. we find the least element of  $M''$  not hit by a previous  $h_{i'}$ , and extend  $h_i$  by mapping to it an element of  $M$  realizing the appropriate  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ -type over  $A$ . Similarly, we can make  $j$  onto at stages  $1, 5, 9, \omega + 1, \dots$ . At stages  $2, 6, \dots$  we seek to make  $(M, M'', h)$  existentially closed. We are handed by bookkeeping two  $T_{A_i}$ -types  $p(x), q(y)$  with the same restriction to  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$  over  $A_i$ . Then we simply realize  $p$  by  $a$  from  $M$ , we realize  $q$  by  $b$  from  $M''$  and we extend  $h_i$  by mapping  $a \mapsto b$ . Likewise at stages  $3, 7, \dots$  we ensure  $(M', M'', j)$  is existentially closed.  $\square$

We now complete the proof of Theorem 10.1. Fix  $(M, M', g)$  be a saturated model of  $Th(\mathcal{G})$  and let  $h, j, M''$  be as in the conclusion of Lemma 10.4. By Lemma 10.3 we have  $h \in \mathcal{G}(M, M'')$  and  $j \in \mathcal{G}(M', M'')$ , hence  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, M')$ . Thus for any saturated  $(M, M', g)$

in the groupoid,  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$  satisfies  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, M')$ . Hence the same holds for arbitrary  $(M, M', g)$  in  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ . So if  $\sigma$  is a  $L^{\mathcal{G}}$ -automorphism then  $\sigma \in \mathcal{G}(M, M')$ . Thus we have shown that the groupoid corresponding to the maximal CL reduct is the groupoid itself, and thus the groupoid is yclept. This proves Theorem 10.1.

**Remark 10.5.** Theorem 10.1 is sharp, in the sense that a  $\Sigma_2$  definable MER need not be yclept; see §15.11.

**Corollary 10.6.** *Consider a theory  $T$  in a language with a single sort  $V$ , with unary predicates  $P_i$  and functions  $F_j$  only, such that  $T \vdash “F_i$  is bijective” for each  $i$ . Then every definable MER for  $T$  is yclept.*

*Let  $L$  be a language with a single sort  $V$ , a binary function symbol  $+$ , predicates  $P_i \subseteq V^{n_i}$  and function symbols  $F_j : V^{m_j} \rightarrow V$ . Let  $T$  be a theory asserting that  $+$  is an abelian group operation, and that each  $P_i$  is a subgroup (of some  $V^{n_i}$ ) and each  $F_j$  is a homomorphism (from some  $V^{m_j}$  into  $V$ ). Then every definable MER for  $T$  is yclept.*

*Proof.* We prove the first part. The theory  $(L, +, L')$  still satisfies the same description. That is, it consists of unary predicates and invertible unary functions. Hence it admits QE to the level of Boolean combinations of existential formulas. In fact, as is easy to check, it admits QE as soon as we name the inverse function of each invertible function in the language. In particular, this is the case for sentences, and Theorem 10.1 applies. So any definable MER is yclept.

The second part is proven similarly, using QE for abelian structures, to Boolean combinations of positive primitive formulas [Fis77].  $\square$

## 11. SMOOTHNESS AND YCLEPTNESS

We give a more robust characterization of yclept MERs, relating it to the notion of smoothness on Borel equivalence relations. We then provide two applications, one to definable equivalence relations in the usual sense (Subsection 11.1) and the other to consequences of cardinality restrictions on MERs (Section 12).

In this section we consider a consistent theory  $T$  in a countable language with no finite models. We will only consider countable models, indeed models with universe  $\Omega = \mathbb{N}$ . This suffices of course for determining a MER.

Fix a universe  $\Omega$  and consider a definable MER  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $\text{Mod}_{\Omega}(T)$ . By Morley-izing  $T$ , noting that the set of models of  $T_{\forall}$  on  $\Omega$  is naturally a Polish space. In the Morleyization, the axioms are  $\forall\exists$ , thus the set of models of  $T$  forms a  $G_{\delta}$  subset, we can also view  $\text{Mod}_{\Omega}(T)$  as a Polish space.  $\mathcal{E}$  induces a Borel equivalence relation on  $\text{Mod}_{\Omega}(T)$ . So one can

ask if it is smooth in the sense of descriptive set theory, i.e. admits complete invariants in a standard Borel space. Recall that  $\mathcal{E}$  is smooth if there exists a Borel map  $\phi$  on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  into a Polish space, such that  $xEy$  iff  $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$ . This depends only on the Borel structure of  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$ , not on the Polish space structure. See [DH23] for another use of this notion in model theory.

**Theorem 11.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\wedge$ -definable MER. Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept iff  $\mathcal{E}$  is smooth.*

*Proof.* We will show that these are also equivalent to:  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is closed in  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ , for any resplendent countable  $M$ .

Here we take the usual group topology on  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ ; it is induced from the product topology on  $(^\Omega\Omega)^2$  via the map  $g \mapsto (g, g^{-1})$ .  $\Omega$  itself is taken to have the discrete topology. We note that for the functions in the groupoid, this is the same as the pointwise convergence topology. In general, a sequence of invertible functions may converge to a non-invertible one. But if  $g_n, g$  lie in the groupoid and if  $g_n$  pointwise converges to  $g$ , for each  $a$ , we must have  $g_n(a) = g(a)$  for large  $n$ , since the topology on  $\Omega$  is by definition discrete. Then letting  $b = g^{-1}(a)$  we have  $g_n(b) = g(b) = a$  for large  $n$ , so  $g_n^{-1}(a) = b = g^{-1}(a)$  for large  $n$ . This equivalence allows us to apply the characterizations in Proposition 5.1 and its corollaries.

Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept. We note that ycleptness implies that the group  $G(\Omega, \Omega)$  is closed in  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ : this follows from Corollary 5.6. Thus  $\mathcal{E}$  is smooth: the invariant function is just the “reduct” function  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T) \rightarrow \text{Mod}_\Omega(T')$ . We leave to the reader the choice of Borel codes for  $\text{Mod}(T)$  and  $\text{Mod}(T')$  and the verification that the restriction map is Borel.

Now we prove the direction from closed to yclept. Assume  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is closed for all  $M$ , or just for  $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent  $M$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept by Corollary 5.6.

Finally, we prove the direction from smooth to closed. Assume  $\mathcal{E}$  is smooth. Let  $M$  be a homogeneous and lightly saturated model of  $T$ , meaning that for any tuple  $a \in M^n$  there exist  $b \neq b' \in M$  with  $tp(b/a) = tp(b'/a)$ . Therefore  $\text{dcl}(a) \neq M$ . We will show that  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is closed in  $\text{Sym}(M)$ .

The group  $H := \mathcal{G}(M, M)$  is a Borel subgroup of  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ . In fact, it is at a finite level on the Borel hierarchy, since  $\mathcal{E}$ , or the associated groupoid, is definable. Let  $\mathbf{H}$  be the closure of  $H$  in  $\text{Sym}(\Omega)$ . Note that  $\mathbf{H}$  is a perfect Polish space: if  $\mathbf{H}$  has an isolated point, then by translating this point to the identity element 1 we see that 1 is isolated. Thus there exists some tuple  $a \in M^n$  such that the only element  $h$  of

$\mathbf{H}$  with  $h(a) = a$  is the identity. In particular this is true for  $Aut(M)$  since  $Aut(M) \subset \mathcal{G}(M, M) = H$ . But that contradicts the assumption that  $M$  is homogeneous and lightly saturated.

If  $H$  is non-meager in  $\mathbf{H}$ , then by [Pet50]  $H = HH^{-1}$  contains an open neighborhood of the identity of  $\mathbf{H}$ . Hence  $H$  is open. Since  $\mathbf{H}$  is a topological group, this implies that it is closed in  $\mathbf{H}$ . Thus  $H$  must equal  $\mathbf{H}$ , and thus  $H$  is closed in  $Sym(\Omega)$ , and we are done in this case.

So consider the case where  $H$  is meager in  $\mathbf{H}$ . Then by [BK96, Theorems 3.4.3 and 3.4.5], the right coset equivalence relation of  $H$ , namely  $Hx = Hy$ , is not smooth. However, note that for  $g \in Sym(\Omega)$ , we have  $M' \mathcal{E} M''$  then  $gM' \mathcal{E} gM''$ , since  $g$  is an isomorphism from the  $(L, +, L')$ -structure  $(M', M'')$  to  $(gM', gM'')$ , and  $\mathcal{E}$  is bipartite definable, and thus invariant under isomorphisms of the  $(L, +, L')$ -structures. Thus for  $g_1, g_2 \in Sym(\Omega)$ , we see that  $g_1, g_2$  are right  $H$ -conjugate iff  $g_1 = g_2 h$  for some  $h \in H$  iff  $g_2^{-1} g_1 \in H$  iff  $g_2^{-1} g_1 M \mathcal{E} M$  iff  $g_1 M \mathcal{E} g_2 M$  iff  $e(g_1 M) = e(g_2 M)$  where  $e$  is a Borel function giving a complete invariant for  $\mathcal{E}$ . This shows that the right  $H$ -coset equivalence relation is smooth on  $Sym(\Omega)$  and in particular on  $\mathbf{H}$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 11.2.** While smoothness is defined with respect to the class of all models of  $T$  with universe  $\Omega$ , the proof shows that smoothness on the (Borel) subset of homogeneous models of  $T$  with universe  $\Omega$  implies smoothness in full; likewise when restricted only to copies of the saturated model, if there is one, etc.

We now restate, in a slightly more general form, what we have learned thus far about definable MERs.

**Theorem 11.3.** *Let  $T$  be a theory in language  $L$  And  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER for  $T$ . The following are equivalent:*

- $\mathcal{E}$  can be defined by a  $\Pi_2$  sentence.
- $\mathcal{E}$  can be defined by a  $\Pi_1$  sentence.
- For any  $M \models T$ ,  $Aut_{\mathcal{E}}(M)$  is closed in  $Sym(M)$ .
- $\mathcal{E}$  is  $\forall$ -cleft
- $\mathcal{E}$  is closed in the set of pairs of models of  $T$  agreeing on the coupled sorts, for the topology where  $\{M : M \models \phi(\vec{a})\}$  is basic open.
- (equivalent for  $L$  countable)  $\mathcal{E}$  is smooth as a Borel equivalence relation on models of  $T$ .

We now apply these characterizations to get a result classifying the definable MERs for a given theory.

**Definition 11.4.** Say that a theory  $T$  is:

- $\forall$ - $\forall$ -cleft if every definable MER is given by a DL reduct

- $\forall$ -yclept if every definable MER is given by a CL reduct

Corollary 10.6 shows that certain theories are  $\forall$ -yclept.

**Corollary 11.5.** *If  $T$  is  $\forall$ -yclept, any reduct  $T_0$  is also  $\forall$ -yclept. In fact, if a  $T_0$ -equivalence relation is yclept when viewed as a  $T$ -equivalence relation, then it is yclept as a  $T_0$ -equivalence relation.*

*Proof.* Let  $\text{Mod}_{rs}(T_0)$  be the set of recursively saturated models of  $T_0$  with universe  $\Omega = \mathbb{N}$ . Following a variation on Henkin's construction, any recursively saturated model  $M_0$  of  $T_0$  can be extended in a deterministic way to a model of  $T$ ; this is the theorem that recursively saturated models are resplendent. This construction can be represented within  $Th(\mathbb{N}, M_0, T)$ . Indeed it can even be represented in Peano arithmetic with predicates for  $M_0$  and for  $T$ , induction axioms allowing these predicates. Hence there is a  $Th(\mathbb{N}, M_0, T)$ -definable expansion of  $M_0$  to a model of  $T$ . This gives a Borel section  $s : \text{Mod}_{rs}(T_0) \rightarrow \text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$ . Any  $\mathcal{E}_0$  on  $T_0$  also defines an equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$ , namely  $M \mathcal{E} M'$  iff  $M_0 \mathcal{E}_0 M'_0$  where  $M_0, M'_0$  are the reducts to  $L_0$ . If  $\mathcal{E}$  is smooth, there is a Borel function  $e$  with  $e(M) = e(M')$  iff  $M \mathcal{E} M'$ . But then  $e \circ s$  is a Borel invariant function for  $\mathcal{E}_0$ , and hence  $\mathcal{E}_0$  seen as an equivalence on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T_0)$  is smooth too.  $\square$

**Corollary 11.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an yclept MER. Let  $\mathcal{E}'$  be a definable MER refining  $\mathcal{E}$ , such that each  $\mathcal{E}$ -class splits into finitely many classes. Then  $\mathcal{E}'$  is yclept.*

Here is an ydlept version.

**Proposition 11.7.** *If  $T$  is  $\forall$ -ydlept, any reduct  $T_0$  is also  $\forall$ -ydlept. If a  $T_0$ -equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is ydlept when viewed as a  $T$ -equivalence relation, then it is ydlept; and likewise for yclept.*

*Proof.* For simplicity, assume  $\mathcal{E}_0$  lifted to  $T$  is ydlept via the reduct to one relation  $R$ . Then for any expansion of  $M_0$  and of  $N_0$  to  $T$ , if the axioms defining  $\mathcal{E}$  hold of  $M_0 + N_0$ , we must have  $R(M_0) = R(N_0)$ . Thus, applying this with  $M_0 = N_0$  say, there is a unique expansion of  $M_0$  to  $L_0 + \{R\}$ . By Beth's theorem,  $R$  is explicitly definable in  $T$ , by some formula  $\phi$ . We have  $M \mathcal{E}_0 N$  iff  $\phi(M) = \phi(N)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 11.8.** *The theory of an equivalence relation with infinitely many classes, all of size  $n$ , is  $\forall$ -ydlept.*

*Proof.* It is a reduct of the theory of  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ -actions, which is unary and hence  $\forall$ -yclept by Corollary 10.6. By Proposition 11.7, or by Corollary 11.5 along with smallness, it is ydlept.  $\square$

**11.1. Smoothness of definable equivalence relations on products.** Mostowski and Feferman-Vaught studied the theories of infinite products of structures. We apply the smoothness characterization to obtain results on definable equivalence relations *within* a model of such a theory: that is, the usual notion of “definable equivalence relation”.

Let  $I$  be an index set, and  $M_i$   $L$ -structures. Let  $M = \prod_{i \in I} M_i$ . We will view  $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$  with the language described in [DH23], 2.1. Namely there is an additional sort for the Boolean algebra  $P(I)$ , and for each formula  $\phi$  of  $L$  in  $n$  variables, a function symbol  $[\phi]$  in the same  $n$  variables, taking values in  $B$ . The intended interpretation is  $[\phi](a) = \{i : M_i \models \phi(a(i))\} \in B$ .

When the  $M_i$  and  $M$  are countable,  $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$  has a natural separable Polish space structure, and in particular a Borel structure.

**Theorem 11.9.** *Let  $I$  be a countable index set, and  $M_i$  countable  $L$ -structures. Let  $M = \prod_{i \in I} M_i$ . Then any definable equivalence relation on  $M^n$  is smooth.*

The rest of this subsection will provide the proof of theorem, which will make use of the smoothness characterization for MERs.

*Proof.* Along with the product we will consider a dual structure,  $M_* := \coprod_{i \in I} M_i$ . As a set it is the  $I$ -indexed disjoint sum; each basic relation  $R$  is interpreted as  $\coprod R(M_i)$ ; and we add another sort  $I$  and a map  $\varpi : M_* \rightarrow I$  whose fibers are the  $M_i$ . The theory  $T_*$  describes this structure, asserting that there are no relations across different  $\varpi$ -fibers, and that each  $\varpi$ -fiber is a model of  $T$ . Let  $T_*[n]$  be the expansion by symbols for  $n$  functions  $s$  from  $I$  to  $M_*$ . The theory will express that  $\varpi \circ s(i) = i$  for all  $I$ , and similarly for any element of the product  $M = \prod_{i \in I} M_i$ .

Note that any function from  $I$  to  $M_*$  is entirely determined by the image  $s(I) \subset M_*$ . So we can treat  $s$  as a unary predicate.

**Claim 11.10.** Under the correspondence defined immediately above, any definable subset of  $M^n$  maps to an elementary subset of the space of expansions  $(M_*, u_1, \dots, u_n)$  of  $M_*$ . More precisely it is the set of models expanding  $M_*$  of  $T_*[n]$  along with a certain Boolean combination of universal and existential sentences.

*Proof.* By the FV quantifier-elimination (as described e.g. in Section 2.1 of [DH23]), a formula of  $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$  takes the form  $P([\phi_1], \dots, [\phi_n])$ , where  $[\phi]$  is the Boolean truth value of  $\phi$ , a subset of  $I$ , and  $P$  is some formula of atomic Boolean algebras. Keeping in mind quantifier elimination in Boolean Algebras, we can assume that this is a Boolean

combination of assertions that some  $[\psi]$  contains at most  $m$  atoms, or at least  $m$  atoms. And this can be expressed by the universal sentence:

$$(\forall t_0 \in I) \dots (\forall t_m \in I) \bigvee_{i \leq m} \psi(u_1(t_i), \dots, u_n(t_i))$$

and the obvious existential sentence for the “at least” case. Of course if we treat  $u_i$  as a unary predicate on  $M_*$  rather than a function, we can either universally or existentially introduce variables  $z_{i,j}$  for  $u_j(t_i)$ , with  $u_j(z_{i,j})$  and  $\varpi(z_{i,j}) = t_i$ , so it does not change the quantifier complexity.  $\square$

Now assume  $E(x_1, \dots, x_n; y_1, \dots, y_n)$  is a definable equivalence relation on  $M^n$ . By the claim,  $E$  induces a definable MER  $\mathcal{E}$  on models of  $T_*[n]$ , refining the ydlept equivalence relation associated to the reduct  $T_*$  of  $T_*[n]$ . And furthermore  $\mathcal{E}$  is defined by a Boolean combination of universal (and existential) sentences, in particular  $\Pi_2$ . Hence by Theorem 11.3  $\mathcal{E}$  is yclept. By the smoothness characterization – the easier direction of Theorem 11.3 – it defines a smooth equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}'$  on the space of expansions of  $M_*$  to  $T_*[n]$ . But we have a bi-continuous identification of this space of expansions with  $M^n$ , identifying  $E$  and  $\mathcal{E}'$ . Thus  $E$  is smooth on  $M^n$ .  $\square$

## 12. MERs WITH SMALL CLASSES AND FEW CLASSES

Let  $T$  be a theory in a countable language. We say that a MER  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $T$  has *small classes* if for any countable set  $\Omega$ , no equivalence class of  $\mathcal{E}$  on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  has size  $2^{\aleph_0}$ . A full characterization of this class of MERs would be very interesting. Here we apply the results on smoothness to show that it is essentially a subclass of the 2-ydlept class, fully determine it within the 1-ydlepts, and give some intriguing examples of non-yclept MERs with few classes.

**Lemma 12.1.** *Let  $T$  be a complete theory, and let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER with small classes. Then  $T$  essentially has a finite language, i.e. for some finite  $L_1 \subset L$ , every relation is  $T$ -equivalent to an  $L_1$ -formula.*

*Proof.* Take  $L_0$  a large enough finite sublanguage of  $L$  mentioning any symbol used, either primed or unprimed, in  $(L, =, L')$  to define  $\mathcal{E}$ . Then the  $\mathcal{E}$ -class of  $M$  is determined by  $M \upharpoonright L_0$ . Let  $T_0 = T \upharpoonright L_0$ . Then for any model  $M_0$  of  $T_0$ , all expansions of  $M_0$  to a model of  $T$  are  $\mathcal{E}$ -equivalent. Suppose  $T$  does not have an essentially finite language, i.e. no such  $L_1$  exists. Then there are  $T$ -definable elements  $c_1, c_2, \dots$  such that no  $c_n$  is definable in  $L_0(c_1, \dots, c_{n-1})$ . Now it is easy to

build a tree  $c_\eta : \eta \in 2^{<\omega}$  such that for each  $\eta$   $tp_{M_0}(c_1, \dots, c_n) = tp_{M_0}(c_{\eta|0}, c_{\eta|1}, \dots, c_{\eta|n})$  and for any  $\eta$ ,  $c_{\eta|0} \neq c_{\eta|1}$ . Any branch gives a different expansion of  $M_0$  to a model  $M$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Proposition 12.2.** *Let  $T$  be a theory in a finite language  $L$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  with small classes. Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is 2-ydlept.*

Note that we do not assume completeness here. If  $T$  is complete, the finite language assumption is not necessary, by Lemma 12.1.

*Proof.* We may take the language to consist of a single relation symbol  $R$ . Then in any countable model  $M = (\Omega, R)$  of  $T$ , there are only countably many solutions  $R'$  to  $R\mathcal{E}R'$ . By the Chang-Makkai theorem [Cha64, Mak64], applied to the  $(L, +, L')$  sentence defining  $\mathcal{E}$ , it follows that there is a formula  $\phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$  over  $R$  such that in any pair  $M\mathcal{E}M'$  with the same domain, there is  $\vec{p}$  in the common domain such that  $R' = \{\vec{x} \mid \phi(\vec{x}, \vec{p})\}$ . Conversely we may assume that for any parameter  $\vec{p}$ ,  $\{x : \phi(x, \vec{p})\}\mathcal{E}R$ . This is because we can modify  $\phi$ , setting it equal to  $R(x)$  whenever the above fails.

The formula  $\phi$  thus witnesses that the relation is a 2-ydlept.  $\square$

Here is the result in the ydlept case. The intuition is that a MER with small classes must preserve much of the structure.

**Definition 12.3.** Let  $L_0 \subset L$  be languages and let  $T$  be an  $L$  theory. Let  $T_0$  be the restriction of  $T$  to  $L_0$ . We say that  $L_0$  is a *reduct by constants* of  $T$  if  $T$  is equivalent to an expansion by constants of  $T_0^{eq}$ . In other words there exist sorts  $S_i$  of  $T_0^{eq}$  and  $T$ -0-definable elements  $c_i$  of  $S_i$ , such that  $T$  is obtained from  $T_0$  by adjoining the  $c_i$ ; i.e. for every relation  $R$  of  $T$  there exists a formula  $\phi(x, u)$  of  $T_0$  with  $T \models R(x) \iff \phi(x, c)$ , with  $c$  a tuple of these  $c_i$ .

We say  $L_0$  is a *reduct by a constant* of  $T$  if this is true with a single sort  $S$  and  $c \in S$ .

**Proposition 12.4.** *Let  $T$  be a theory, and let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an ydlept equivalence relation with small classes. Let  $L_\mathcal{E}$  consist of predicates for the first-order definable sets of  $L$  that are invariant by the groupoid of  $\mathcal{E}$ , and let  $T_\mathcal{E} = T \upharpoonright L_\mathcal{E}$ . Then  $L_\mathcal{E}$  is a reduct by a constant of  $T$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 12.1, we may assume that  $L$  is generated by a single relation  $R$ . Since any countable model  $M_0$  of  $T^S$  expands in only countably many ways to a model  $M = (M_0, R^M)$  of  $T$ , by [Mak64],  $R^M$  is  $M_0$ -definable with parameters. By passing to an imaginary sort of  $T_\mathcal{E}^{eq}$ , we may take  $R$  to be defined by  $\phi(x, b)$ , where  $b$  is a canonical parameter for  $\phi$ , and  $\phi$  belongs to  $L^S$ , as defined in Definition 5.2.



Then  $b$  is a  $T^\varepsilon$ -definable constant, and adding  $b$  to  $L_\varepsilon$  gives us all of  $L$  back.  $\square$

The same statement and proof hold in the yclept case, given that [Mak64] extends to CL theories. Based on Proposition 12.4 one can also describe the incomplete case; we leave the precise formulation to the reader.

We now give some examples of model equivalences with small classes. We will show that we cannot strengthen Proposition 12.2 to conclude that such an equivalence relation is ydlept, or even yclept: see Example 12.5 and 12.6.

Recall from Proposition 12.2 that a definable MER with small classes is 2-ydlept, for a finite language, or a complete theory. We give two examples of definable MERs over a theory in a finite language that have small classes, but which are not yclept. The first involves an incomplete theory, but in view of Remark 6.7, there is a completion in which it is still non-yclept.

**Example 12.5.** Let  $T_0$  be an extension of ZFC, or of a fragment of ZFC large enough to make sense of forcing, in  $L_0 = \{\epsilon\}$ . Let  $L = L_0 \cup \{Q\}$  with  $Q$  a unary predicate. For  $M \models T$ , let  $M_0$  be the reduct to  $L_0$ . We will consider only countable models here. Let  $P$  be the Cohen forcing poset, say with universe  $\omega$  in  $M_0$ .<sup>2</sup> Let  $T$  be the expansion of  $T_0$  asserting that  $Q$  is Cohen generic: every dense subset of the Cohen forcing notion  $P$  (represented by an element of  $M_0$ ) meets  $Q$  nontrivially.

Define  $M \mathcal{E} M'$  iff  $M_0 = M'_0$ ,  $Q' \in M_0[Q]$  and  $Q \in M_0[Q']$ .

Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is a definable MER. We use that  $Q' \in M_0[Q]$  exactly when:

$$(M_0, Q, Q') \models (\exists \tau \in Nset_P)(\forall p' \in P)(p' \in Q' \iff (\exists p \in Q)p \Vdash \widehat{p'} \in \tau)$$

Here  $\tau$  ranges over the set  $Nset_P$  of  $P$ -names for subsets of  $P$ ,  $p, p'$  over elements of  $P$ , and  $\widehat{p'}$  denotes the canonical name for  $p'$ . We used the definability in  $M_0$  of the forcing relation  $\Vdash$ .

Clearly  $\mathcal{E}$  has countable classes; given  $M_0, Q$ , there are only countably many names  $\tau$  and so countably many equivalent  $Q'$ .

Let us show that it is not ydlept. Suppose  $R \subset M_0^n$  is a definable relation, with the same interpretation in any expansion  $(M_0, Q')$  of  $M_0$  equivalent to  $(M_0, Q)$ . We will show that  $R$  is 0-definable in  $M_0$ . We can take  $n = 1$  here. We have  $R = \{x : \phi(x, Q)\}$ . If  $a \in R$ , then  $\Vdash \phi(a, Q)$ ; otherwise a finite modification  $Q'$  of  $Q$  will have  $\neg\phi(a, Q')$ ,

<sup>2</sup>We choose Cohen forcing for definiteness

so  $a \notin R(M_0[Q'])$ , contradicting the assumption on  $R$ . Similarly if  $a \notin R$  then this is forced by the empty condition. It follows that  $R$  is 0-definable in  $M_0$ , as  $\{x : \Vdash x \in R'\}$ . Compare [AH78, parenthetical example in first paragraph of §6].

One can use a similar proof to show that this model equivalence relation is not  $\text{yclept}$ . Alternatively, one can reference Corollary 8.2 to note that if it were  $\text{yclept}$ , it would be  $\text{ydlept}$ , contradicting the above.

**Example 12.6.** Let  $T_0 = Th(B, J)$ , where  $B$  is the Boolean algebra of finite or cofinite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , and  $J$  is the ideal of finite subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Note that  $\mathbb{N}$  corresponds bijectively to the definable set of atoms of  $B$ , with the bijection mapping each number to the corresponding singleton. Let  $Q$  be the set of atoms corresponding to even numbers, and let  $T = Th(B, J, Q)$ . Note that  $T$  is bi-interpretable with the product of two disjoint copies of  $T_0$ , one referring to the finite or cofinite sets of even numbers, the other to finite or cofinite sets of odd numbers; these theories admit quantifier elimination in a natural language<sup>3</sup>.

Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the equivalence relation:  $M \mathcal{E} M'$  iff  $B(M) = B(M')$ ,  $J(M) = J(M')$ , and  $Q \Delta Q' \in J$ . Again  $\mathcal{E}$  has small classes but is not  $\text{yclept}$ . Details are left to the reader.

Note that by Proposition 12.2, the example must be 2- $\text{ydlept}$ . The equivalence relation corresponds to preserving  $B$ , preserving  $J$  and preserving the definable family of sets  $Q \Delta j$  for  $j \in J$ .

For stable theories, 2- $\text{ydlepts}$  are  $\text{ydlept}$ . We may ask:

**Question 12.7.** If  $T$  is a simple theory, is every model equivalence with small classes  $\text{yclept}$ ?

**Remark 12.8.** Recall that Proposition 12.4 states that  $\text{ydlepts}$  with small classes must arise as a reduct via constants. We note what happens in the case of a group. Assume  $T$  is an extension of the theory of groups. In this case it is possible to remove the constant 1 denoting the identity of the group to obtain a theory  $T_0$ , recover  $T$  as  $T_0(1)$  by adding 1, and be sure that  $T \neq T_0$ . This can be extended to expansions of the theory of groups under various assumptions (originally of stability), and is often very useful in the theory of definable groups and group actions.

Other examples of reducts by constants arise among Cameron's five reducts of DLO, and Thomas's reducts of the random graph. Reducts

---

<sup>3</sup>The theory of atomic Boolean algebras with distinguished maximal ideals containing all atoms was determined, perhaps in a slightly different guise, by Skolem [Sko30] see [Mos52]

by constants also play an important role in the study of quasi-finite theories.

A general criterion for when a theory  $T$  admits a nontrivial reduct by constants would be very interesting; no such criterion is known to us.

**Question 12.9.** Let  $T$  be a complete theory. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$  with small classes. Does there exist a  $T_\mathcal{E}$ -definable group  $G$ , a definable set  $X$ , and an action of  $G$  on  $P(X)$ , such that the expansions of  $M_0 \models T_\mathcal{E}$  to  $M \models T$  are equi-definable with subsets of  $X$ , and  $\mathcal{E}$  is the orbit equivalence relation?

In this problem, the action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $P(X)$  should be definable in  $(L, +, L')$ , but  $G$  itself is definable in  $L$ . A stronger version would ask  $\mathcal{G}$  to act on  $X$ , with the action on  $P(X)$  being the naturally induced one. A weaker version, allowing a more sophisticated form of action of  $\mathcal{G}$  on  $P(X)$ , would still be very interesting.

We note that in both examples above, there is a definable group structure: at least if a sufficiently large fragment of ZF is chosen in the set-theoretic one. In Example 12.6,  $\mathcal{G}$  is the maximal ideal of the “finite” sets in the Boolean algebra, under the symmetric difference operation. In Example 12.5,  $\mathcal{G}$  is the automorphism group of the complete Boolean algebra associated with the forcing notion, as interpreted in  $M_0$ . Namely it is known that two generic filters on a forcing notion  $P$  that yield the same forcing extension are conjugate, perhaps not by  $\text{Aut}(P)$ , but by  $\text{Aut}(B)$ . See Vopenka’s theorem 59 in [Jec03]; or Theorem 3.5.1 in [Gri75]. If there exists a fragment of ZF that allows the basic theorems of forcing, but not Vopenka’s theorem, it may yield a counterexample to the strong version of our question.

We conclude the section with a complete description of the dual case, MERs with few classes.

**Lemma 12.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\wedge$ -definable equivalence relation on  $\text{Mod}_\Omega(T)$ , with countably many classes. Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is the reduct to a sublanguage  $L_0$  consisting of finitely many finite relations.*

*Proof.* Since a countable set is Borel,  $\mathcal{E}$  admits a Borel section and hence is smooth. By Theorem 11.1 it is  $\aleph_1$ -categorical so is determined as the reduct to a sublanguage  $L_0$ , possibly of continuous logic. Let  $M \models T$  and let  $M_0 = M \upharpoonright L_0$ . Then for a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $\Omega$ ,  $\sigma(M) \mathcal{E} M$  iff  $\sigma(M_0) = M_0$ . Hence there are only countably many models on  $\Omega$  isomorphic to  $M_0$ . By the Chang-Makkai theorem [Cha64, Mak64], each relation  $R$  of  $M_0$  is definable with parameters over the pure set  $\Omega$ . Now the theory of pure equality admits elimination of imaginaries

to the level of finite structures. Thus the canonical parameter for  $R$  can be taken to be a finite set  $U_R$ , and a finite set  $S_R$  of tuples of elements of  $U_R$ . It is also easy to see that  $\bigcup_R U_R$  must be a finite set  $U$ : otherwise it could not have countably many conjugates. Thus  $L_0$  is generated by naming an  $m$ -element set  $U$ , and possibly a subset of the set of  $m$ -tuples of  $U$ .  $\square$

An alternative proof uses the small index property for the symmetric group. We see that  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  has countable index in  $Sym(M)$ : if  $s_i \in Sym(M)$  are in distinct cosets of  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$ , then the models  $s_i^{-1}(M)$  are pairwise inequivalent. Hence by the small index property, for some tuple  $\vec{m}$  of  $M$ ,  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$  contains every element of  $Sym(M)$  fixing  $\vec{m}$ , and the result follows.

### 13. TOWARDS A BASIS FOR NONTRIVIAL MERs

We have given many examples of nontrivial MERs, but presented no general theory of how such a MER functions. Most if not all of the nontrivial MERs we have exhibited include two nontrivial classes  $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$  of definable sets  $F, F'$  of  $T$ , such that equivalence of  $M, N$  implies that each element of  $\mathcal{F}(M)$  is contained in some element of  $\mathcal{F}_2(N)$ . Nontrivial here means that they are not definable in pure equality.

Here we prove, under mild technical conditions, that a weakening of this must occur in every nontrivial MER: *some* element of  $\mathcal{F}_1$  is contained in *some* element of  $\mathcal{F}_2$ . See Corollary 13.4. In case  $T$  has a single sort  $V$  and  $\text{acl}$  is trivial on  $V$ , and  $T$  eliminates  $\exists^\infty$ , we actually get  $\mathcal{F}_1$  to be a family of definable subsets of  $V$ : see Remark 13.3.

**Proposition 13.1.** *Let  $T$  be a theory with QE and with elimination of  $\exists^\infty$ . Let  $T + T$  denote the  $(L, =, L')$  theory that consists of  $T$  on the unprimed copy and a copy of  $T$  on the primed signature. Then:*

(1)  *$T + T$  admits a model companion  $\widetilde{2T}$ . Moreover, we have  $\diamond$ :*

*If  $(M_1, M_2, f) \models T + T$ ,  $A_i = \text{acl}_T(A_i) \subset M_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , and  $f(A_1) = A_2$  then the quantifier-free diagram of  $A_1 \cup A_2$  in  $(L, =, L')$  is complete. Here  $A_1$  is in the unprimed signature,  $A_2$  in the primed signature.*

(2) *Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\wedge$ -definable MER on models of  $T$ , and  $\mathcal{G}$  the corresponding groupoid. Then  $\mathcal{E}$  is trivial (all models are equivalent) iff  $\text{Th}(\mathcal{E}) \subseteq \widetilde{2T}$ .*

**Remark 13.2.** The actual condition we will need in the proof of Lemma 13.1 is this:

(\*) given  $B \subset M \models T$  and elements  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in M \setminus \text{acl}(B)$ , and a formula  $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b) \in \text{tp}(a_1, \dots, a_n/B)$ , with  $b$  a tuple from  $B$ , there exists  $\theta \in \text{tp}(b)$  such that for any  $M' \models T$  and  $b' \in \theta(M')$ , we have ( $*_{b'}$ ): for any  $B' \subset M'$  with  $b'$  from  $B'$ , there exist  $a'_1, \dots, a'_n$  in some elementary extension of  $M'$  with  $a'_i \notin \text{acl}(B')$  and  $\phi(a'_1, \dots, a'_n, b')$ . Note that ( $*_{b'}$ ) is equivalent to: there are infinitely many *pairwise disjoint* solutions to  $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, b')$ .

However (\*) follows from elimination of  $(\exists^\infty)$ . This can be seen by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 1$  (\*) is just the elimination of  $(\exists^\infty)$ . For  $n > 1$ , consider first the case where some  $a_i$  is algebraic over another, say  $a_1 \in \text{acl}(a_n, B)$ . Then we may assume  $\phi$  enforces this. By induction, given  $b', B'$ , find non-algebraic  $a'_1, \dots, a'_{n-1}$  that witness  $(\exists x_n)\phi$ , and choose any  $a_n$  such that  $\phi(a'_1, \dots, a'_n, b')$ . Then  $a'_n \notin \text{acl}(B)$  since otherwise we would have  $a_1 \in \text{acl}(B)$ , contradicting the assumption.

Thus we assume no  $a_i$  is algebraic over another  $a_j$  and  $B$ . In this case, working over  $B(a_1)$ , we find  $\theta'(y, x_1) \in \text{tp}(a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}/Ba_1)$  with the property above. Let  $\theta(y) = (\exists^\infty x_1)\theta'(y, x_1)$ . If  $\theta(b')$  holds, we may find  $a'_1 \notin \text{acl}(B')$  with  $\theta(b', a'_1)$ . Then by the property of  $\theta$  we may find  $a'_2, \dots, a'_n \notin \text{acl}(B, a'_1)$ , and in particular  $\notin \text{acl}(B)$ , with  $\phi(a'_1, \dots, a'_n, b')$ .

*Proof.* We prove the first item. Following on Remark 13.2, let the axioms  $A(\phi_1, \theta_1, \phi_2, \theta_2)$  for each pairs  $(\phi_1, \theta_1)$  and  $(\phi_2, \theta_2)$  assert:

whenever  $b_i \in \theta_i(M_i)$ , there exist  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  with  $\phi_1(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1)$  and  $\phi_2(fa_1, \dots, fa_n, b_2)$ .

The axioms of  $\widetilde{2T}$  include  $T + T$  along with the axioms  $A(\phi_1, \theta_1, \phi_2, \theta_2)$ , for each pairs  $(\phi_1, \theta_1)$  and  $(\phi_2, \theta_2)$ . It is easy to check that any existentially closed model of  $T + T$  is a model of  $\widetilde{2T}$ . The verification of the strong model completeness asserted is a routine back-and-forth over algebraically closed  $(A_1, A_2, f, f^{-1}) \leq (M_1, M_2, f, f^{-1})$  as in  $\diamond$ .

We now prove the second part. Let  $(N_1, N_2, g)$  be a countable model of  $T + T$ ,  $\mathcal{G}$ -resplendent so that the condition (\*) of Remark 13.2 holds for  $M' = N_i$  without going to an elementary extension. Construct  $M$  and  $f_i : N_i \rightarrow M$  for  $i = 1, 2$  such that  $(M, N_i) \models \widetilde{2T}$ . Then  $N_1 \mathcal{E} M \mathcal{E} N_2$ .  $\square$

**Remark 13.3.** A step of the above back-and-forth goes from  $A_1$  to  $\text{acl}_T(A_1(a))$  for a single element  $a$ . Hence  $\widetilde{2T}$  is already axiomatized by the axioms  $A(\phi_1, \theta_1, \phi_2, \theta_2)$  when one of  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  implies that each  $a_i$  is algebraic over each  $a_j$ .

**Corollary 13.4.** *Assume  $T$  eliminates  $(\exists^\infty)$ , and  $\text{acl}(0) = 0$  in the given sorts. Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a  $\bigwedge$ -definable MER on models of  $T$ , that has more than one class. Then there is a definable family  $\mathcal{F}_1$  of infinite definable subsets of the set of distinct  $n$ -tuples, and another definable family of co-infinite definable sets  $\mathcal{F}_2$  of distinct  $n$ -tuples, such that  $M_1 \mathcal{E} M_2$  implies that some element of  $\mathcal{F}_1(M_1)$  is contained in some element of  $\mathcal{F}_2(M_2)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\text{acl}(0) = 0$ ,  $\widetilde{2T}$  is complete. If it implies  $\mathcal{E}$ , then  $\mathcal{E}$  is trivial. Otherwise, it is inconsistent with  $\mathcal{E}$ , so that  $\mathcal{E}$  implies the negation of some axiom  $A(\phi_1, \theta_1, \phi_2, \theta_2)$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_1$  be the family of all definable sets  $\phi_1(x, b)$  as  $b$  ranges over  $\theta_1$ ; and let  $\mathcal{F}_2$  be the family of all definable sets  $\neg\phi_2(x, b')$  as  $b'$  ranges over  $\theta_2$ . □

We discuss possible extensions, variations, and applications of this result.

- A similar statement holds for definable partial orders on models.
- The conclusion of Corollary 13.4 does not in itself look transitive or symmetric. The most obvious transitive condition that implies it would be: (\*)  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2$ , and  $M_1 \mathcal{E} M_2$  implies that *every* element of  $\mathcal{F}_1(M_1)$  is contained in some element of  $\mathcal{F}_2(M_2)$ , and vice versa.

It seems possible that a better approximation to (\*) can be obtained by repeating the above idea with two, rather than one, intermediate models between  $M$  and  $N$ .

- For a general MER, there is no reason to expect  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2$  in (\*); witness the stable yclept example in an infinite language, with a family of equivalence relations. But one can ask: (\*\*): Does (\*) hold with  $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}$ , if  $\mathcal{E}$  is a definable MER?

If so this would give a basis for nontrivial model partial orderings, or model equivalence relations.

Assuming (\*\*), we obtain a map from  $\mathcal{F}(M)$  to  $\mathcal{F}(N)$  and another in the opposite direction. Composing, we obtain a map from  $\mathcal{F}(M)$  to itself, non-decreasing in the sense of inclusion. The set of elements that map to themselves forms a family of definable set that is  $\mathcal{E}$ -invariant (a 2-ydlept situation.) If this family is empty, every element of  $\mathcal{F}$  is a proper subset of some other element of  $\mathcal{F}$ ; implying that  $T$  has the strict order property.

Thus under (\*\*) and NSOP, the 2-ydlept definable MERs form a basis for the nontrivial definable MERs.

This gives some motivation towards Question 16.2.

14. NSOP AND  $\forall$ -YDLEPTNESS

Recall that we have made no general claims about which theories are  $\forall$ -yclept, although we provided an example in Corollaries 10.6 and 11.8. We know of no model-theoretic necessary and sufficient conditions. We give some partial results here. Recall that a theory has NSOP if there is no formula  $\phi(\vec{x}, \vec{x}')$  that defines a partial order with infinite chains.

**Proposition 14.1.** *Let  $T$  be  $\forall$ -yclept, and let  $\leq$  be a definable partial order on the sort  $X$ . Then every nonempty definable subset has a maximal element.*

*If every  $\bigwedge$ -definable MER on  $X$  is yclept, then no definable partial order on  $X$  has an infinite strictly increasing chain. Hence if every  $\bigwedge$ -definable MER on any finite product of sorts of  $T$  is yclept, then  $T$  has NSOP.*

*Proof.* We start with the first part. We consider a definable partial ordering  $\leq$  of a nonempty definable subset of the sort  $X$ . For simplicity we assume the order is on all of  $X$ . For  $a \in \Omega$ , let  $a^+ := \{b \in \Omega : a \leq b\}$ . Let  $X_{max}$  be the set of maximal elements of  $X$ , i.e.

$$\{x \in X : (\forall y \in X)(x \leq y \rightarrow x \geq y)\}$$

**Claim 14.2.**  $X_{max} \neq \emptyset$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $X_{max} = \emptyset$ ; we will define a non-yclept MER over  $T$ . Consider two models  $M, N$  of  $T$  with the same universe  $\Omega$ . Let

$$C(M, N) = \{a \in \Omega : (\forall x, y)(a \leq_M x, y \bigvee a \leq_N x, y) \rightarrow y \leq_M x \iff y \leq_N x\}$$

So  $C(M, N)$  is closed upwards for both both  $\leq_M$  and  $\leq_N$ , and they agree on  $C(M, N)$ . Define  $M \mathcal{E} N$  iff  $C(M, N)$  is cofinal in both  $M$  and  $N$ . We can easily verify that this is an equivalence relation. We use that  $C(M, N) \cap C(N, N') \subset C(M, N')$ . If  $a \in M$ , then there exists  $a' \in C(M, N)$  with  $a \leq_M a'$ , and  $a'' \in C(N, N')$  with  $a' \leq_N a''$ . So  $a'' \in C(M, N)$  too, and with  $a' \leq_M a''$ , etc. We will show that  $\mathcal{G}M, M$  is dense in  $Sym(\Omega)$ . It suffices to show that any permutation  $\sigma_F$  of a finite set  $F \subset \Omega$  extends to an element of  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$ . For each  $a \in \Omega$ , choose  $\beta(a) \geq a$  such that no element of  $F$  is  $\geq \beta(a)$ . This is easy to do using the condition  $X_{max} = \emptyset$ . Let  $C^* = \cup_{a \in \Omega} \beta(a)^+$ . Then  $C^* \cap F = \emptyset$ . Extend  $\sigma_F$  to a permutation  $g$  of  $\Omega$  fixing  $C^*$ . Let  $N =^g M$ , i.e.  $g : M \rightarrow N$  is an isomorphism. Then  $C(M, N) \supseteq C^*$ , and  $M \mathcal{E} N$ , i.e.  $g \in \mathcal{G}(M, N)$ . Thus we have proved density. By Theorem 11.3  $\mathcal{G}(M, M)$ , being closed and dense, contains every permutation. Thus the equivalence relation has either one class or just singleton classes.

In both of these, any definable set has a maximal element, namely any element, contradicting the assumption. Thus  $\mathcal{E}$  is not yclept.  $\square$

This proves the first item. For later use, note that since  $T$  is  $\forall$ -yclept, the claim above is valid not only for  $(X, \leq)$  but also for the induced partial ordering on  $X', X'', \dots$  as long as they are nonempty.

The proof of the second item is very similar. We prove the contrapositive. Thus assume  $\leq$  is a definable partial ordering of  $X$  with an infinite chain. It follows that for some complete type  $P$ ,  $\leq$  has no maximal element on  $P$ .  $P$  is the intersection of definable sets  $D_k$ . Define  $C(M, N)$  by exactly the same formula as in the proof above. But now define  $M \mathcal{E} N$  if  $D_i^M = D_i^N$  for each  $i$ , and  $C(M, N)$  is cofinal in both  $D_i(M)$  and  $D_i(N)$ . So  $\mathcal{E}$  is  $\bigwedge$ -definable. If  $\mathcal{E}$  holds then  $P^M = P^N$ , and  $P \cap C(M, N)$  is cofinal in  $D_k^M$  and in  $D_k^N$  for every  $k$ . Hence, if  $M, N$  are slightly saturated,  $P \cap C(M, N)$  is cofinal in  $P(M)$  and in  $P(N)$ . The proof that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a MER is the same as in the previous item. Let  $M$  be a countable resplendent model of  $T$ .  $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}(M, M)$  acts on  $P$ , and the same proof as in the first item shows that  $\mathcal{G}$  induces a dense subgroup of  $Sym(P)$ . If  $\mathcal{E}$  were yclept, then  $\mathcal{G}$  would be closed and so would induce  $Sym(P)$ . But clearly it is possible to construct a permutation of  $P$  that does not extend to any element of  $\mathcal{G}$ , since it is not order-preserving on any final segment of  $P$ . Thus  $\mathcal{E}$  is not yclept.  $\square$

**Remark 14.3.** If there is a unique 1-type on  $X$ , then the MER constructed in the proof above is actually definable, not just  $\bigwedge$ -definable. If  $T$  is  $\aleph_0$ -categorical and has a definable partial order on  $X$  with infinite chains, we have exhibited a non-yclept definable MER on it.

We remark on a higher-dimensional generalization, with the same proof, mutatis mutandis. Assume  $\leq$  is given on  $X^k$ . By a *hyperplane* of  $X^n$  we just mean a subset defined by  $x_i = a$ , where  $x_i$  is one of the coordinates. We call a definable set  $Y$  meager if for any  $a$ , for some  $b \geq a$ ,  $b^+ \cap Y = \emptyset$ . Then Proposition 14.1 generalizes to: Let  $\leq$  be a definable partial ordering on  $X^n$ , such that any hyperplane is meager. Then  $T$  admits a non-yclept MER.

We believe that the proof of Proposition 14.1 can be extended to show that if every  $\bigwedge$ -definable MER of  $T$  is  $k$ -ydlept for some  $k$ , then  $T$  has NSOP.

## 15. EXAMPLES

In this section we give a number of examples. In each case, we discuss the equivalence relation and the corresponding groupoid. The examples point to the different ways to approach MERs: for example,



through giving the equivalence relation, through giving the groupoid, or for showing a complete set of invariants.

**15.1. First-order reducts.** Let  $L_0$  be a reduct of  $L$ . Clearly, the invariants are the  $L_0$  reduct, and the  $\bigwedge$ -definable MER is having the same  $L_0$  reduct. If  $L_0$  is finite, this is a definable MER. The corresponding groupoid is the  $T$ -groupoid whose morphisms are  $L_0$ -isomorphisms.

**15.2. Definable topologies.** Let  $\tau$  be definable family of definable sets, forming a basis for a topology in  $T$  [FZ80]. The invariants are the set of open sets, and the groupoid is the set of homeomorphisms. For  $DLO$ , with the usual definable topology, the maximal CL reduct is trivial.

For the specific model  $\mathbb{R}$ , any automorphism preserving the topology preserves also the “betweenness” relation of triples. But for  $\mathbb{Q}$ , the homeomorphism group is dense. For instance interchanging  $(-2\pi, -\pi)$  with  $(\pi, 2\pi)$  while fixing the rest is a homeomorphism. Thus it is not the case that any automorphism of any model fixing  $\tau$  also fixes the betweenness relation.

It follows easily that the maximal CL reduct is trivial. Further, no definable family of definable sets is invariant, unless it is definable from pure equality. Hence the MER is not  $n$ -ydept for any  $n$ .

Note that Proposition 5.1 implies  $n$ -transitivity of homeomorphisms on saturated models, for each  $n$ ; but not for an arbitrary model, witness  $\mathbb{R}$ , where orientation is preserved.

**15.3. Uniform continuity.** Let  $T = Th((\mathbb{Q}, +, <))$ . Consider the category of uniformly continuous maps:

$$(\forall u > 0)(\exists v > 0)(\forall x)(\forall x')(|x - x'| < v \rightarrow (f(x) - f(x')) < u)$$

For maps from  $M$  to  $N$ ,  $v, x, x'$  range over  $M$  but  $u \in N$ .

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the groupoid of invertible morphisms in this category. The same can be done on a definable set  $X$ ; take  $X$  to be the plane (the set of pairs). Then even looking at just the single model  $\mathbb{R}$ , it is clear that the maximal CL reduct is trivial.

It is clear that no definable family of definable subsets of the plane  $\Pi = \mathbb{R}^2$  can be preserved by all uniformly continuous maps, unless it is definable in pure equality on  $\Pi$ . In particular it consists of finite and co-finite sets. For if  $X \subset \Pi$  is neither finite nor co-finite, it will have a 1-dimensional boundary which is a finite Boolean combination of lines and points, but with at least one line or interval among them. Then a uniformly continuous map can be found that moves the interval to an arc of circle say, or in any case something nonlinear. This shows that

the equivalence relation induced by uniformly continuous maps on  $\Pi$  is not  $n$ -“unary ydlept” for any  $n$ , i.e. where only definable families of subsets of  $\Pi$  itself are allowed.

It should not be difficult (though possibly a little tedious) to extend this and show that no definable family of definable subsets of  $\Pi^n$  is preserved, unless it is definable in pure equality alone. Given this, it follows that the equivalence relation induced by uniformly continuous maps on  $\Pi$  is not  $n$ -ydlept for any  $n$ .

**15.4. Higher-order internal set theory.** We give an example of an  $n$ -ydlept equivalence relation over a sort  $P$ , that is not  $(n - 1)$ -ydlept over sort  $P$ .  $T_n$  has sorts  $P, P_1, \dots, P_n$  with certain graph structures on them; the equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}_n$  looks only at  $P$  and a certain  $n$ -subset of  $P$ , associated with the graph structures. In particular, two models with the same  $P$  and same  $n$ -set on  $P$  will be  $\mathcal{E}_n$ -equivalent.

We construct  $T = T_n$ . The language will have a “main” sort  $P = P_0$  and additional sorts  $P_i$  for  $0 < i < 1+n$ . There will be binary relations  $\Gamma_i \subset P_i \times P_{i+1}$  for each  $0 \leq i < n$ . The axioms state that:

- $(P_0, P_1, \Gamma_0)$  and  $(P_{n-1}, P_n, \Gamma_{n-1})$  are random bipartite graphs;
- for  $0 < i < n$ : for any disjoint finite  $A, A' \subset P_{i-1}$  and  $B, B' \subset P_{i+1}$ , there exists an element  $c \in P_i$  such that for all  $a \in A, a' \in A', b \in B, b' \in B'$  we have  $(a, c) \in \Gamma_i, (c, b) \in \Gamma_{i+1}, (a', c) \notin \Gamma_i, (c, b') \notin \Gamma_{i+1}$ .

It is easy to check that  $T_n$  is complete,  $\aleph_0$ -categorical with QE.

A 1-block on  $P$  is a subset of the form  $\Gamma(b) = \{a \in P : (a, b) \in \Gamma\}$ , where  $b \in P_1$ . Similarly we define 2-blocks as sets of blocs represented by elements of  $P_2$ , etc. Let  $\mathcal{G}_n$  be the *definable groupoid* given by the groupoid of bijections  $P \rightarrow P$  respecting the families of  $i$ -blocks for each  $i \leq n$ . Thus the associated definable MER  $\mathcal{E}_n$  makes  $M, N$  equivalent if the  $m$ -sets described above are equal for  $M$  and for  $N$ , for all  $m \leq n$ .

By definition,  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is  $(n + 1)$ -ydlept, indeed an  $(n + 1)$ -set reduct. As with any  $(n + 1)$  set over sort  $P_0$ , we can consider it as a MER with only one coupled sort,  $P_0$ , and the other sorts decoupled. Thus, in considering the class of models that can be considered equivalent, we do not restrict the universes of the sorts  $P_1 \dots P_n$ .

We conjecture that the  $\mathcal{E}_n$  cannot be expressed as an  $n$ -set MER. Or equivalently, by Lemma 4.7, that it separates  $(n + 1)$ -ydlept MERs from  $n$ -ydlept MERs. Below we present only a partial result, showing that it separates  $(n + 1)$ -ydlepts over the given  $P_0$  from  $n$ -ydlepts with the same  $P_0$ . Equivalently, the argument below will give an  $(n + 1)$ -ydlept MER over coupled sort  $P_0$  that is not an  $n$ -ydlept over coupled sort  $P_0$ .

**Lemma 15.1.** *Let  $T$  be a countable theory,  $\mathcal{E}$  an  $(n + 1)$ -set MER on  $T$  over coupled sort  $S_0$ . Let  $M \models T$  with  $|S_0|$  countable. Then there exists  $M' \prec M$ ,  $|M'| \leq \beth_n$ , such that  $M \mathcal{E} M'$ .*

*Proof.* The equivalence relation  $\mathcal{E}$  requires having the same  $n$ -set for a certain  $(n + 1)$ -ary relation  $R$ . By Löwenheim-Skolem, there exists  $M' \prec M$  with the same  $n$ -set as  $M$ , and  $|M'| \leq \beth_n$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 15.2.** *The MER  $\mathcal{E}_n$  defined cannot be induced by an  $n$ -set over coupled sort  $P_0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M \models T_n$  with  $|P_i(M)| = \beth_i$ . If  $\mathcal{E}_n$  were  $n$ -ydept, by Lemma 15.1 there would be  $M' \prec M$ ,  $|M'| \leq \beth_{n-1}$  with  $M \mathcal{E} M'$ . But this implies that  $M, M'$  have the same family of  $n$ -blocks, so  $|M'| \geq \beth_n$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

**Remark 15.3.** We give some additional observations on this family of examples:

- (1)  $T_1$  is the theory of random bipartite graphs. Any  $T_n$  is interpretable in  $T_2$ . Namely if  $M = (P_0, P_1, P_2; \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1) \models T_2$ , define  $P_3 := P_1, P_4 := P_0, P_5 = P_1 \dots$ . So  $P_i = P_1$  for  $i$  odd,  $P_{4j} = P_0$ , and  $P_{4j+2} = P_2$ . This is a model of  $T_\infty = \bigcup T_n$  since the axioms concern only consecutive triples of  $P_i$ 's, and are verified in  $T_2$ .
- (2) Similarly, the random graph with two edge colors — i.e. the model completion of the theory of two disjoint binary relations  $(P, E_1, E_2)$  — interprets each  $T_n$ . Let  $P_k = P$  for each  $k$ , and let the edge relation between  $P_k$  and  $P_{k+1}$  be  $E_1$  if  $k$  is even,  $E_2$  if  $k$  is odd.

The random graph with two constants interprets the random four-partite graph, and thus interprets each  $T_n$ .

Can we combine the higher-ydept MERs  $\mathcal{E}_n$  on each  $T_n$  exhibited above to find a definable MER on the random graph that is not  $n$ -ydept for any  $n$ ?

- (3) Simon Thomas' conjecture [Tho91], that there are only finitely many reducts of certain theories  $T$ , would imply that there are only finitely many ydept MERs on such theories. Thomas proved it for the random graph, and Lu [Lu13] extended this to the bipartite random graph  $T_1$ . We are not sure if reducts of  $T_2$  have been looked at; in any case the example shows that  $T_2$  has an infinite chain of non-ydept MERs.

**15.5. A quasi-finite topology.** We give an example similar to the previous Example 15.4 for  $n = 2$ . But, like the example in Subsection 15.2, it can be formulated topologically. Let  $T$  be the theory of a vector space over  $\mathbb{F}_p$  with nondegenerate symplectic form.

Let  $V$  be a saturated model. For example, the unique countable model. We have a topology on  $V$  generated by the subgroups of finite index  $V_a$ , where  $V_a = \{v \in V : (a, v) = 0\}$ . Any open subgroup of index  $p$  can be shown to have the form  $V_a$  for some  $a$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be the group of homeomorphic vector space automorphisms. This contains  $\text{Aut}(V)$  and is definable, since any  $V_a$  must go to some  $V_b$ . By definition, this is the 2-ydleft equivalence relation generated by the definable family  $V_a : a \in M$ , along with the definable set  $+$ .

The first order structure preserved is just  $+$  which does not explain  $\mathcal{G}$ . So it is not yclept. Note that this example is quasi-finite, and thus quasi-finite theories can have definable MERs that are not yclept. Here the topology does not have a definable basis, but the homeomorphism groupoid turns out to be definable anyway.

**15.6. Definable differential geometry.** Let  $T$  be the theory with 2 sorts. One sort  $R$  supports a real closed field structure, and the other sort  $X$  being some fixed definable subset of  $n$ -space over a real closed field, with the induced structure: for example, the 2-sphere as a subset of 3-space.

Consider first the case that  $X$  is just the segment  $(0, 1)$  in 1-space. Let  $\mathcal{G}(\Psi)$  be the groupoid of bijections  $f$  that are isomorphisms on the  $R$  sort, and  $-$  identifying the two fields via the isomorphism  $-$  acting by  $k$ -times differentiable diffeomorphisms on the  $X$ -sort. Consider, for example,  $n = k = 1$ ,

$$(\forall x \in X)(\exists c \in R)(\forall \epsilon \in R')(\exists \delta \in R)(\forall y \in X) \\ (|x - y| < \delta) \implies (|f(y) - f(x) - c \cdot (y - x)| < \epsilon \cdot |y - x|)$$

There are many rich variations here, e.g. asking to preserve Riemannian structure. This may give a new way of thinking about them model-theoretically.

Many of these geometric structures can be presented either via (charts and local) isomorphisms of a specified type, or via sheaves, which can be thought of as higher-order reducts. For the differentiable structure above, invariants can be taken as the differentiable functions on  $X$  into  $R$ . See [Wik22a, Wik22b].

**15.7. Cofinal higher order set theory.** Here we assume, as above, that  $T$  has  $n$  disjoint predicates  $P = P_0, \dots, P_n$  and random graph structures  $\Gamma_i$  on  $P_i \times P_{i+1}$  for each  $0 \leq i < n$ . But now  $P$  is also assumed to carry a partial ordering  $\leq$ . We define partial orderings  $\leq_k$  on  $k$ -sets in  $P$  as follows: 0-sets are elements of  $P$  and we let  $\leq_0 = \leq$ .

If  $a, b$  are  $(k + 1)$ -sets, thus a set of  $k$ -sets, we define  $a \leq_{k+1} b$  iff  $(\forall u \in a)(\exists v \in b)(u \leq_k v)$ .

We can define a partial order relation on models of  $T$  with the same universe:  $M \leq M'$  iff the  $(n + 1)$ -set consisting of  $n$ -sets coded in  $P_n$  in  $M$  is  $\leq_{n+1}$  than the corresponding one of  $M'$ . This give rise to a MER defined by  $M \mathcal{E} M'$  exactly when  $M \leq M'$  and  $M' \leq M$ .

Already for the case  $n = 0$  this includes the example in Subsection 15.2: Start with the partial ordering on pairs  $(a, u)$  where  $a$  is a point and  $u$  an element of the definable basis, with  $a \in u$ ; where  $(a, u) \leq (b, v)$  iff  $a = b$  and  $u \subset v$ .

It would be interesting to see a natural set of invariants, for example, based on a notion of second order reduct, generalizing the way that a *topology* is the invariant of cofinal equivalence on bases.

This example cannot be captured by an  $n$ -ydlept higher set theory for any  $n$ , as in Example 15.4, since e.g. for the topology of the example in Subsection 15.2 on  $\mathbb{Q}$ , no definable family of definable sets can be invariant. It is not clear if analogues can exist for simple or even stable theories.

**15.8. Continuous logic fragments.** We give an example of a (stable) theory  $T$  and  $\bigwedge$ -definable equivalence relation on models of  $T$ , given by equality of certain continuous logic reducts, whose maximal *first-order* invariant reduct is trivial.

Let  $T$  be a theory with infinitely many independent unary predicates  $P_n$ ,  $n = 0, 1, \dots$ . Let  $a = (a_n)$  be a sequence of positive reals whose partial sums converges. Let  $\phi_n$  be the characteristic function of  $P_n$ , and define  $\psi_a(x) = \sum_n a_n \phi_n$ . Let  $\mathcal{G}_a$  be the groupoid preserving  $\psi_a$ . It can be checked to be  $\bigwedge$ -definable. E.g. for the  $b_n$  below, equivalence of a primed and unprimed model holds iff for each  $n$ , for all  $x$ ,  $|\sum_{i < n} \phi_n(x) - \sum_{i < n} \phi'_n| \leq 2^{-n}$ ; this last expression is just a certain Boolean combination of  $P_i(x)$  and  $P'_i(x)$  for  $i < n$ . Thus its maximal CL-approximation, as given by Proposition 5.1, is itself.

In case  $a_n = 3^{-n}$ , we have  $\mathcal{G}_a = Iso_T$ , i.e. the full structure can be recovered. But if  $b_n = 2^{-n}$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_b \neq Iso_T$ . Any permutation mixing up elements lying in  $P_0 \setminus (\cup_{k \geq 1} P_k)$  with elements lying in  $\cap_{k \geq 1} P_k \setminus P_0$  is an automorphism. It is clear that  $\mathcal{G}_b$  does not preserve any relations that are first-order definable in  $T$ .

**15.9. An yclept but not ydlept example over a stable theory.** Recall that in Section 7 we have given a stable theory with a definable MER that is yclept but not ydlept. Here we provide a much simpler example of something that is yclept but not ydlept in a stable theory – but one that is not a definable MER.

**Example 15.4.** Let  $T$  be the (stable) theory of equivalence relations  $E_q$  for  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ , with  $E_p \subset E_q$  if  $p < q$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the equivalence relation on models of  $T$  making two models  $(\Omega, E_p)_{p \in \mathbb{Q}}$  and  $(\Omega, E'_p)_{p \in \mathbb{Q}}$  equivalent if for any  $p < q < r \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $E_p \subset E'_q \subset E_r$ . This is  $\bigwedge$ -definable.

The maximal CL reduct of any finite sublanguage is just the equality. However, the example is still yclept. For any  $a, b$  the CL binary relation with value  $\inf\{p \in \mathbb{Q} : aE_p b\} \in \{-\infty\} \cup \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  is definable, and determines  $\mathcal{E}$ .

A similar example with unary predicates is also possible.

**15.10. The Lipschitz groupoid.** We give an example of an equivalence relation which is definable by a  $\Sigma_2$  sentence, which we refer to as the *Lipschitz groupoid*. We have the theory of real closed fields, presented via the field sort  $R$  as well as another sort  $X$  which is just another copy of  $R$ .  $T$  knows about the identification of  $R$  with  $X$ , and in particular includes the function  $(x, y) \mapsto |x - y|$ , from  $X^2$  to  $R$ .

We consider the category whose objects are models of  $T$ , and whose morphisms are bijections  $g : M \rightarrow M' \models T$  that are field isomorphisms on  $R$ , and Lipschitz on  $X$ :

$$(\exists \delta \in R^{M'} \ \delta > 0)(\forall x, x' \in X^M)(|gx - gx'| \leq \delta \cdot g(|x - x'|))$$

The Lipschitz groupoid consists of the invertible maps in this category. We leave to the reader the verification that this is indeed a category: that is, closed under composition.

It is easy to see that the maximal yclept reduct has at most the ordering relation on  $X$ , by density: for any two increasing  $n$ -tuples in  $X$  there is a Lipschitz map taking one to the other, e.g. a continuous piecewise linear map, with finitely many slopes. But there are many non-Lipschitz maps that preserve the ordering: for example, a map with slope  $n$  on  $[n, n + 1]$ . Hence this relation is not yclept, and thus is not  $\Pi_2$ -definable by Theorem 10.1.

Note that two sorts  $X, R$  are needed since while they look the same to  $T$ , the identifying map and even the distance map  $X^2 \rightarrow R$  is not preserved by the groupoid.

**15.11. Quantifier complexity.** Let us summarize the examples from this section, keeping in mind that the non-yclept ones cannot be  $\Pi_2$  by Theorem 10.1. Some basic observations are:

- Every yclept MERs is universal; and we saw that conversely universal MERs are yclept.

- The basis-definable topologies example, as in 15.2 is  $\Pi_3$ . Witness the definition of continuity in metric space style:

$$(\forall x)(\forall \epsilon)(\exists \delta)(\forall y)(d(x, y) < \delta \rightarrow \dots)$$

Likewise uniform continuity (Example 15.3), as well as Example 15.5.

- As noted in Subsection 15.10, the Lipschitz example is  $\Sigma_2$ .
- The differential examples 15.6 are, as written,  $\Pi_5$ . Higher order differentiability, if written naively, leads to formulas of progressively higher complexity; however, using polynomial approximations, one stays at a bounded complexity level for any order of differentiability.
- The  $n$ -ydlept examples 15.4.n. are typically  $\Pi_{2n-1}$ .
- The cofinal set theory example in Example 15.7.n. have quantifier complexity at most  $\Pi_{2n+2}$

**15.12. Separating ydlept and higher ydlept in the finite.** We comment briefly on the case where we restrict to *finite structures*, with empty theory. In this context, we give a direct proof that there is a 2-ydlept equivalence relation that is not ydlept. We believe that the proof idea extends to separate  $(n+1)$ -ydlept from  $n$ -ydlept in the finite, but have not verified this.

Consider the theory with two sorts  $P$  and  $Q$ ,  $G(x, y)$  be a binary relation with  $x$  of sort  $P$  and  $y$  of sort  $Q$ , and  $T$  the theory of the random bipartite graph. Given  $x_0$  of sort  $P$  in some model of  $T$ , the *adjacency set of  $x_0$*  is the set of  $y$  such that  $G(x_0, y)$  holds. We can then talk about the adjacency sets of a model  $G$ : the set of adjacency sets of  $x$  as  $x$  ranges over sort  $P$  interpreted in  $G$ . We consider the 2-ydlept  $\mathcal{E}$  generated by the partitioned formula  $G(x; y)$ . That is, two models  $G$  and  $G'$  are equivalent if they have the same adjacency sets.

**Proposition 15.5.**  *$\mathcal{E}$  is not ydlept over finite models.*

Given first-order open formula  $\psi$ , let  $C_\psi$  be the class of graphs that satisfy sufficiently many axioms for the random graph. We will need the number of axioms to be high enough that  $\psi$  is equivalent to a quantifier-free formula  $\phi$  for all graphs in  $C_\phi$ .

We write  $\phi$  as  $\bigvee_i A_i$  where  $A_i = \bigwedge_j \phi_{ij}$  where  $\phi_{ij}$  is an equality atom, a relational atom, or the negation of a relational or equality axiom. We further decompose the  $A_i$  into a subset  $A$  that include a relational atom and a subset  $B$  that do not include a relational atom.

We also can assume:

- the  $A_i$  are pairwise contradictory
- each  $A_i$  specifies the equalities among  $\vec{x}$

The first case to consider is where  $A$  is empty.

**Lemma 15.6.** *If  $A$  is empty, there are  $G, G'$  that agree on the  $\phi$  reduct and disagree on some adjacency set.*

*Proof.* Take any  $G$  and  $G'$  with the same domain but differing on some adjacency set.  $\square$

Note that if  $A$  is non-empty, there will be witnesses to disjuncts in  $A$  in sufficiently large models. And since disjuncts are disjoint, no disjuncts in  $E$  will be satisfied by these tuples.

**Lemma 15.7.** *For each  $G$  in  $C_\phi$ , for each  $\vec{x}_0$  in  $G$  satisfying a disjunct of  $A$  in  $\phi$ , there is  $G'$  containing  $\vec{x}_0$  with the same adjacency sets as  $G$ , with  $\vec{x}_0$  not satisfying  $\phi$  in  $G'$ .*

*Proof.* For each  $A_i$  in  $A$  satisfied by  $\vec{x}_0$  in  $G$  we choose  $B_i$  a relational atom or the negation of such in  $A_i$  such that  $\vec{x}_0$  satisfies  $B_i$ , and let  $B'_i$  be the corresponding ground atom with  $\vec{x}_0$  substituted. We will construct  $G'$  so that  $\vec{x}_0$  does not satisfy  $B_i$  in  $G'$ . Since the disjuncts of  $E$  are not satisfied in  $G$ , they will not be satisfied in  $G'$ .

We let  $c_1 \dots c_k$  be the elements of  $P$  occurring as the first elements of such an atom. Let  $S_i$  be the adjacency set of  $c_i$ . For each  $c_i$ , we let  $D_i$  be the set of elements  $d$  such that  $G(c_i, d)$  occurs as an atom in  $B_i$  and  $E_i$  be the elements  $e$  such that  $\neg G(c_i, e)$  occurs as an atom of  $B_i$ . Thus  $S_i$  contains  $D_i$  and is disjoint from  $E_i$ .

We claim that there is  $c'_i$  whose adjacency set contains each  $E_i$  and is disjoint from  $D_i$ . This follows easily from the fact that  $G$  is sufficiently random. Let  $G'$  be formed from  $G$  by swapping the adjacency sets of each  $c_i$  and each  $c'_i$ . By construction, the adjacency sets represented in  $G'$  are the same as those in  $G$ .  $\square$

Putting the two lemmas together proves Proposition 15.5.

## 16. SOME ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

While we have examined examples of definable equivalence relations that are not ydlept, and not even yclept or  $k$ -ydlept. But we know little about which theories admit such examples. Even with very strong hypotheses on the theories we cannot say anything about all definable MERs.

**Question 16.1.** Are totally categorical theories  $\forall$ -ydlept? Or  $\forall$ -yclept? Or even “ $\forall$ - $\omega$ -ydlept: every definable MER is an  $n$ -ydlept for some  $n$ .”

We do not know the answer for a single non-disintegrated strictly minimal set. Nor do we know it for the Morley rank two theory, interpretable over pure equality, of pairs of elements from an infinite



set. In the opposite direction, we do not know a counterexample even for superstable  $T$ . For stable theories, we know from Proposition 9.5 that higher ydlepts are ydlept. And we know it is possible to have yclept equivalence relations that are not ydlept: see Example 15.9, for  $\bigwedge$ -definable MERs, and the example from Section 7. But at this level too we do not know if non-yclept definable equivalence relations are possible.

We do not have example with definable MERs that are not  $n$ -ydlept for any  $n$  even weakening the hypotheses on the theories considerably.

For example, moving out to NSOP theories, for all we know every definable MER could be  $n$ -ydlept for some  $n$ .

**Question 16.2.** Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a nontrivial definable MER on the models of an NSOP,  $\aleph_0$ -categorical theory  $T$ . Must  $\mathcal{E}$  preserve a definable family of definable sets, not definable in pure equality?

We do not know the answer for the random graph. Without  $\aleph_0$ -categoricity, 15.9 is a counterexample.

We also know almost nothing about what happens over finite structures. In particular, our examples of definable MERs that are not  $n$ -ydlept for any  $n$  are all on infinite structures.

We can show that for every definable MER there is an ydlept MER that agrees with it on finite structures “modulo some small distortion”.

Let  $Mod_{fin}(T)$  denote the category of finite models of  $T$ , with morphisms being isomorphisms.

**Proposition 16.3.** *Let  $L$  be a finite language, let  $T$  be an  $L$ -theory and let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER. Then there is an ydlept MER  $(T_1, \mathcal{E}_1)$  and an interpretation  $\psi$  taking models of  $T_1$  to models of  $T$  such that for every pair of models  $M_1, M'_1$  of  $T_1$ ,  $\psi(M_1)\mathcal{E}\psi(M'_1)$  iff  $M_1\mathcal{E}_1M'_1$ , and  $\psi$  induces an isomorphism between  $Mod_{fin}(T_1)$  and  $Mod_{fin}(T)$ .*

*Proof.* We know that  $T$  is bi-interpretable with a theory of graphs; so we may assume  $L$  consists of a single sort and a single binary relation  $R$ .  $L_1$  will have a new predicate  $A$ , the relation symbol  $R$  on  $A^2$ , and defining  $B$  to be the complement of  $A$ , also a ternary relation  $\epsilon \subset A^2 \times B$ . The theory  $T_1$  says  $\epsilon$  is a “membership” relation on  $A^2 \times B$ , in the sense that extensionality holds, any singleton set exists, and the union of two sets exists. That is, denoting  $ext(b) = \{a \in A^2 : a \epsilon b\}$ , we have  $(\forall a \in A^2)(\exists b \in B)(ext(b) = \{a\})$ , etc. If  $N \models T$ , we write  $A(N)$  for the set defined by  $A$ , but also for the  $L$ -structure  $(A^N, R^N)$ .

We now give the definition of  $\mathcal{E}_1$ . Let

$$D = \{b \in B : (A, ext(b)) \mathcal{E} (A, R)\}$$

This is a definable subset of  $B$  in  $N$ . Given two models  $N, N'$  of  $T'$  and a bijection  $g : N \rightarrow N_1$  the pair  $(N, gN')$  is in the groupoid  $\mathcal{G}$  corresponding to  $\mathcal{E}_1$  iff  $g$  preserves the 0-definable sets  $A, B, \epsilon, D$ .

The interpretation  $\psi$  is just the forgetful functor, forgetting about  $B$  and  $\epsilon$ . On finite models, it is clear that this functor is an equivalence, i.e. any finite  $M \models T$  is obtained in this way, and if  $N_1, N_2 \in \text{Mod}_{fin}(T_1)$  then any isomorphism between  $\psi N_1$  and  $\psi N_2$  lifts to an isomorphism  $N_1 \rightarrow N_2$ .

For finite  $N_1, N_2 \models T_1$ , a bijection  $g : N_1 \rightarrow N_2$  lies in the groupoid corresponding to  $\mathcal{E}_1$  iff it preserves  $A, B, \epsilon$  and the restriction to  $A(N_1) \rightarrow A(N_2)$  is in the groupoid of  $\mathcal{E}$ . □

Note that the size increase in applying  $\psi^{-1}$  is simply exponential in a polynomial of  $n$ . More precisely, for some  $k$ , for a finite model of  $T$  with  $n$  elements,  $\psi^{-1}(M)$  has size  $\leq 2^{n^k}$ ; even in case the MER is 4-ydlept, say.

**Question 16.4.** Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable MER over the empty theory. Is  $\mathcal{E}$  equivalent over finite structures to an  $n$ -ydlept model equivalence relation?

Note that the hypothesis can be weakened to:

$\mathcal{E}$  is given by an  $(L, =, L')$  sentence that defines an equivalence relation over finite models, or over all models.

In either case, we do not know the answer.

And the same question for a quite different, highly structured world:

**Question 16.5.** Let  $M$  be smoothly approximable. Let  $C$  be the class of finite homogeneous substructures of  $M$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be a definable model equivalence relation on  $C$ . Is  $\mathcal{E}$  equivalent on  $C$  to an  $n$ -ydlept one?

Compare Example 15.5; the topological equivalence relation there is not ydlept, but is equivalent to an ydlept equivalence relation over finite structures, namely, the one preserving  $+$ .

**Remark 16.6.** Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be definable MER whose maximal CL reduct  $R$  is essentially DL. Must the MER generated by  $R$  be definable?

We outline a construction that, we believe will give a negative answer. Construct a bipartite graph  $(D, Q, I)$  such that infinitely many elements of  $Q$  are 0-definable. One way to do this would be to ensure there is a unique  $c_n \in Q$  with  $|D(c_n)| = n$ . Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the 2-ydlept definable MER that makes  $M, N$  equivalent iff  $\{D^M(c) : c \in Q(M)\} =$

$\{D^N(c) : c \in Q(N)\}$ . Then for each  $n$ ,  $\mathcal{E}$  refines the ydlept MER corresponding to the 0-definable set  $D(c_n)$ . Thus the maximal CL reduct  $R$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  contains the definable sets  $D(c_n)$ . We expect that making  $(D, Q, I)$  as generic as possible subject to the above,  $R$  will be generated by the  $D(c_n)$ , but no finite set of these will generate  $R$ .

**Question 16.7.** Can a construction similar to 16.6, with suitable  $I$ , provide a 2-yclept  $\mathcal{E}$  such that the maximal CL reduct preserved by  $\mathcal{E}$  does not generate an ydlept equivalence relation?

## REFERENCES

- [AA14] Hans Adler and Isolde Adler. Interpreting nowhere dense graph classes as a classical notion of model theory. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 36:322–330, 2014.
- [AH78] Fred G. Abramson and Leo A. Harrington. Models without indiscernibles. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 43(3):572–600, 1978.
- [BK96] Howard Becker and Alexander S. Kechris. *The Descriptive Set Theory of Polish Group Actions*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [Cam90] Peter Cameron. *Oligomorphic permutation groups*, volume 152 of *Lecture notes of the London Mathematical Society*. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [CH99] Zoe Chatzidakis and Ehud Hrushovski. Model Theory of difference fields. *AMS Transactions*, 351(8):2997–3071, 1999.
- [Cha64] C. C. Chang. Some New Results in Definability. *Bull. of the AMS*, 70(6):808 – 813, 1964.
- [CK66] C. C. Chang and H. Jerome Keisler. *Continuous Model Theory*, volume 58. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1966.
- [DH23] Jamshid Darakshan and Ehud Hrushovski. Imaginariess, Products, and the Adele Ring. In *Model Theory and Groups - A conference on the occasion of Katrin Tent's 60th birthday*, 2023.
- [Dri98] L. P. D. van den Dries. *Tame Topology and O-minimal Structures*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [Fis77] Edward R. Fisher. Abelian structures I. In *Abelian Group Theory*, pages 270–322. Springer, 1977.
- [FZ80] J. Flum and M. Ziegler. *Topological Model Theory*. Springer, 1980.
- [Gri75] Serge Grigorieff. Intermediate Submodels and Generic Extensions in Set Theory. *Annals of Mathematics*, 101(3), May 1975.
- [Hru02] Ehud Hrushovski. Computing the Galois group of a linear differential equation. In *Differential Galois Theory*, volume 58. Banach Center Publications, 2002.
- [Jec03] Thomas Jech. *Set Theory*. Springer, third edition, 2003.
- [Las82] Daniel Lascar. On the category of models of a complete theory. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 47(2):249–266, 1982.
- [Lu13] Yun Lu. Reducts of the random bipartite graph. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 54(1):33–46, 2013.

- [Mak64] Michael Makkai. On a generalization of a theorem of E. W. Beth. *Acta Math. Ac. Sci. Hung.*, 15:227–235, 1964.
- [Mos52] Andrzej Mostowski. On direct products of theories. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 17(1):1–31, 1952.
- [Pet50] B. J. Pettis. On continuity and openness of homomorphisms in topological groups. *Annals of Mathematics*, 52(2):293–308, 1950.
- [Pil11] Anand Pillay. Stable embeddedness and NIP. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 76(2):665–672, 2011.
- [Poi00] Bruno Poizat. *A Course in Model Theory*. Springer, 2000.
- [Sim13] Pierre Simon. Distal and non-distal NIP theories. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164(3):294–318, 2013.
- [Sim15] Pierre Simon. *A Guide to NIP Theories*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [Sko30] Thoralf Skolem. Über einige Satzfunktionen in der Arithmetik. *Skrifter Videnskapsakademiet*, 7, 1930.
- [Tho91] Simon Thomas. Reducts of the random graph. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 56(1):176–181, 1991.
- [Wik22a] Wikipedia. Cartan connection, 2022. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cartan\\_connection#Pseudogroups](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cartan_connection#Pseudogroups).
- [Wik22b] Wikipedia. Cartan Geometry, 2022.
- [YBHU08] Itai Ben Yaacov, Alexander Berenstein, C. Ward Henson, and Alexander Usvyatsov. *Model theory for metric structures*, volume 2 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, page 315–427. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Definition of model equivalences and basic properties	4
3.1. Correspondence with definable groupoids	5
4. Special classes of equivalence relations	8
5. The maximal CL reduct	11
6. DL and CL reducts	15
7. An yclept, non-ydlept definable MER, and chaotic dynamics.	19
8. Higher ydlept equivalence relations that are yclept	24
9. Intrinsically stably embedded theories and higher ydlepts	27
10. MERs of low quantifier complexity	32
11. Smoothness and ycleptness	34
11.1. Smoothness of definable equivalence relations on products	38
12. MERs with small classes and few classes	39
13. Towards a basis for nontrivial MERs	44
14. NSOP and $\forall$ -ydleptness	47
15. Examples	48
15.1. First-order reducts	49
15.2. Definable topologies	49
15.3. Uniform continuity	49
15.4. Higher-order internal set theory	50
15.5. A quasi-finite topology	51
15.6. Definable differential geometry	52
15.7. Cofinal higher order set theory	52
15.8. Continuous logic fragments	53
15.9. An yclept but not ydlept example over a stable theory	53
15.10. The Lipschitz groupoid	54
15.11. Quantifier complexity	54
15.12. Separating ydlept and higher ydlept in the finite	55
16. Some additional questions	56
References	59