

Uncountably categorical approximations and Gromov-Hausdorff limits

Assaf Hasson Boris Zilber

Mathematical Institute
University of Oxford

July 18, 2007

Logically nice theories should be mathematically nice

Zilber's philosophy I: logically “perfect” theories are too good to have been totally missed by mathematicians.

Logically nice theories should be mathematically nice

Zilber's philosophy I: logically “perfect” theories are too good to have been totally missed by mathematicians.

A first attempt and a reformulation

Logically nice theories should be mathematically nice

Zilber's philosophy I: logically “perfect” theories are too good to have been totally missed by mathematicians.

A first attempt and a reformulation

1. The Trichotomy Conjecture: Every non-trivial uncountably categorical structure is a cover of an algebraic structure.

Logically nice theories should be mathematically nice

Zilber's philosophy I: logically “perfect” theories are too good to have been totally missed by mathematicians.

A first attempt and a reformulation

1. The Trichotomy Conjecture: Every non-trivial uncountably categorical structure is a cover of an algebraic structure.
2. Hrushovski's refutation: There is a whole zoo of non-trivial uncountably categorical structures of a non-algebraic nature.

Logically nice theories should be mathematically nice

Zilber's philosophy I: logically “perfect” theories are too good to have been totally missed by mathematicians.

A first attempt and a reformulation

1. The Trichotomy Conjecture: Every non-trivial uncountably categorical structure is a cover of an algebraic structure.
2. Hrushovski's refutation: There is a whole zoo of non-trivial uncountably categorical structures of a non-algebraic nature.
3. Zilber's reformulation: Uncountably categorical structures have analytic prototypes.

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are “axiomatised” by:

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are “axiomatised” by:

A Schanuel Condition: No over determined set of equations has a solution.

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are “axiomatised” by:

A Schanuel Condition: No over determined set of equations has a solution.

A dual condition: Every non over determined set of equations has a solution.

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are “axiomatised” by:

A Schanuel Condition: No over determined set of equations has a solution.

A dual condition: Every non over determined set of equations has a solution.

} The *free construction*

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are "axiomatised" by:

A Schanuel Condition: No over determined set of equations has a solution.

A dual condition: Every non over determined set of equations has a solution.

Cleaning up: Dealing with 0-dimensional sets.

} The *free construction*

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are “axiomatised” by:

A Schanuel Condition: No over determined set of equations has a solution.

A dual condition: Every non over determined set of equations has a solution.

Cleaning up: Dealing with 0-dimensional sets.

} *The free construction*

} *The collapse*

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are “axiomatised” by:

A Schanuel Condition: No over determined set of equations has a solution.

A dual condition: Every non over determined set of equations has a solution.

Cleaning up: Dealing with 0-dimensional sets.

} The *free construction*

} The *collapse*

This is modeled on *Schanuel's Conjecture*:

Zilber's observation

Hrushovski's constructions are “axiomatised” by:

A Schanuel Condition: No over determined set of equations has a solution.

A dual condition: Every non over determined set of equations has a solution.

} The *free construction*

Cleaning up: Dealing with 0-dimensional sets.

} The *collapse*

This is modeled on *Schanuel's Conjecture*:

$$\text{tr.d}(\mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_n, e^{x_1}, \dots, e^{x_n})) - \text{lin.d}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq 0$$

for all $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{C}$.

The free construction exists in “nature”

Years of work produced “analytic” models for Hrushovski’s free construction:

The free construction exists in “nature”

Years of work produced “analytic” models for Hrushovski’s free construction:

- ▶ The Liouville function (Wilkie).

The free construction exists in “nature”

Years of work produced “analytic” models for Hrushovski’s free construction:

- ▶ The Liouville function (Wilkie).
- ▶ The “black” and “green” coloured fields (Zilber).

The free construction exists in “nature”

Years of work produced “analytic” models for Hrushovski’s free construction:

- ▶ The Liouville function (Wilkie).
- ▶ The “black” and “green” coloured fields (Zilber).
- ▶ The differential equation of exponentiation (Ax , Crampin), and more generally

The free construction exists in “nature”

Years of work produced “analytic” models for Hrushovski’s free construction:

- ▶ The Liouville function (Wilkie).
- ▶ The “black” and “green” coloured fields (Zilber).
- ▶ The differential equation of exponentiation (Ax , Crampin), and more generally
- ▶ Exponential differential maps of semi-abelian varieties (Kirby),

The free construction exists in “nature”

Years of work produced “analytic” models for Hrushovski’s free construction:

- ▶ The Liouville function (Wilkie).
- ▶ The “black” and “green” coloured fields (Zilber).
- ▶ The differential equation of exponentiation (Ax , Crampin), and more generally
- ▶ Exponential differential maps of semi-abelian varieties (Kirby),

Leading to Zilber’s bold conjecture:

The free construction exists in “nature”

Years of work produced “analytic” models for Hrushovski’s free construction:

- ▶ The Liouville function (Wilkie).
- ▶ The “black” and “green” coloured fields (Zilber).
- ▶ The differential equation of exponentiation (Ax, Crampin), and more generally
- ▶ Exponential differential maps of semi-abelian varieties (Kirby),

Leading to Zilber’s bold conjecture:

$\mathbb{C}_{\text{exp}} := (\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \exp)$ satisfies a non first order version of Hrushovski’s free construction.

What about the collapse ?

So far, no natural model has been found for the collapse.

What about the collapse ?

So far, no natural model has been found for the collapse.
Zilber's philosophy II: See what physicists are doing.

What about the collapse ?

So far, no natural model has been found for the collapse.

Zilber's philosophy II: See what physicists are doing.

Fact Model theoretically, the collapse of a structure \mathcal{M} can be viewed as a smooth approximation thereof by sub-structures $\{\mathcal{M}_\mu\}_{\mu \in I}$ (usually) of finite rank.

What about the collapse ?

So far, no natural model has been found for the collapse.

Zilber's philosophy II: See what physicists are doing.

Fact Model theoretically, the collapse of a structure \mathcal{M} can be viewed as a smooth approximation thereof by sub-structures $\{\mathcal{M}_\mu\}_{\mu \in I}$ (usually) of finite rank.

Question Does this approximation have an extra model theoretic interpretation ?

What about the collapse ?

So far, no natural model has been found for the collapse.

Zilber's philosophy II: See what physicists are doing.

Fact Model theoretically, the collapse of a structure \mathcal{M} can be viewed as a smooth approximation thereof by sub-structures $\{\mathcal{M}_\mu\}_{\mu \in I}$ (usually) of finite rank.

Question Does this approximation have an extra model theoretic interpretation ?

Idea In “natural” models, can this approximation be interpreted as a *metric approximation* ?

What about the collapse ?

So far, no natural model has been found for the collapse.

Zilber's philosophy II: See what physicists are doing.

Fact Model theoretically, the collapse of a structure \mathcal{M} can be viewed as a smooth approximation thereof by sub-structures $\{\mathcal{M}_\mu\}_{\mu \in I}$ (usually) of finite rank.

Question Does this approximation have an extra model theoretic interpretation ?

Idea In “natural” models, can this approximation be interpreted as a *metric approximation* ?

But what are metric approximations of model theoretic structures ?

A tentative definition

Definition

Given two metric \mathcal{L} -structures \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 embedded in a common metric space

$$d(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2) = \sup\{d_H(R(\mathcal{M}_1), R(\mathcal{M}_2)) : R \in \mathcal{L} \text{ a basic relation}\}$$

where $d_H(X, Y)$ is the *Hausdorff distance*.

A tentative definition

Definition

Given two metric \mathcal{L} -structures \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 embedded in a common metric space

$$d(\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2) = \sup\{d_H(R(\mathcal{M}_1), R(\mathcal{M}_2)) : R \in \mathcal{L} \text{ a basic relation}\}$$

where $d_H(X, Y)$ is the *Hausdorff distance*.

Definition

Given an index set I , and ultrafilter \mathcal{D} on I a collection of \mathcal{L} -substructures $\{\mathcal{M}_i\}_{i \in I}$ of \mathcal{M} *metrically approximate* \mathcal{M} if

$$\lim_{\mathcal{D}} d(\mathcal{M}_i, \mathcal{M}) = 0$$

Some examples

Structures metrically approximable by their collapses

Some examples

Structures metrically approximable by their collapses

1. The Liouville function $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, f)$.

Some examples

Structures metrically approximable by their collapses

1. The Liouville function $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, f)$.
2. The “Black field” $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, N)$ of rank 2ω .

Some examples

Structures metrically approximable by their collapses

1. The Liouville function $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, f)$.
2. The “Black field” $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, N)$ of rank 2ω .
3. Assuming Schanuel's conjecture: The “Green field” $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \Gamma)$ of rank 2ω .

Some examples

Structures metrically approximable by their collapses

1. The Liouville function $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, f)$.
2. The “Black field” $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, N)$ of rank 2ω .
3. Assuming Schanuel's conjecture: The “Green field” $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \Gamma)$ of rank 2ω .

Remark

- ▶ The Liouville function has a natural approximation by polynomials.

Some examples

Structures metrically approximable by their collapses

1. The Liouville function $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, f)$.
2. The “Black field” $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, N)$ of rank 2ω .
3. Assuming Schanuel's conjecture: The “Green field” $(\mathbb{C}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \Gamma)$ of rank 2ω .

Remark

- ▶ The Liouville function has a natural approximation by polynomials.
- ▶ This *is not* metric approximations.

But: many, many problems with this definition

But: many, many problems with this definition

- ▶ Metric approximations depend crucially on the language. They are preserved under projections and disjunctions but not under complements and conjunctions.

But: many, many problems with this definition

- ▶ Metric approximations depend crucially on the language. They are preserved under projections and disjunctions but not under complements and conjunctions.
- ▶ What is the connection between the metric and the logic in such approximations. Is the property of being metrically approximable model theoretically meaningful.

But: many, many problems with this definition

- ▶ Metric approximations depend crucially on the language. They are preserved under projections and disjunctions but not under complements and conjunctions.
- ▶ What is the connection between the metric and the logic in such approximations. Is the property of being metrically approximable model theoretically meaningful.
- ▶ What should be the model theoretic restrictions on metric approximations.

But: many, many problems with this definition

- ▶ Metric approximations depend crucially on the language. They are preserved under projections and disjunctions but not under complements and conjunctions.
- ▶ What is the connection between the metric and the logic in such approximations. Is the property of being metrically approximable model theoretically meaningful.
- ▶ What should be the model theoretic restrictions on metric approximations.
- ▶ Are there more interesting, more natural, examples of metric approximations.
- ▶ ...