

ON MODEL THEORY OF SECOND-ORDER OBJECTS

TAPANI HYTTINEN, JONI PULJUJÄRVI, AND DAVIDE EMILIO QUADRELLARO

ABSTRACT. Motivated by team semantics and existential second-order logic, we develop a model-theoretic framework for studying second-order objects such as sets and relations. We introduce a notion of abstract elementary team categories that generalizes the standard notion of abstract elementary class, and show that it is an example of an accessible category. We apply our framework to show that the logic **FOT** introduced by Kontinen and Yang [17] satisfies a version of Lindström’s Theorem. Finally, we consider the problem of transferring categoricity between different cardinalities for complete theories in existential second-order logic (or independence logic) and prove both a downwards and an upwards categoricity transfer result.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
3. Team Maps	12
4. Abstract Elementary Classes for Team Semantics	22
5. Galois Types and the Monster Model	33
6. Application I – Lindström’s Theorem for FOT	42
7. Application II – Complete Theories in ESO	48
References	54

1. INTRODUCTION

Model theory is the study of general properties of mathematical structures. In traditional model theory, the center of attention—we could say the smallest unit of interest—are elements, or tuples of elements. One is often interested in whether certain types of elements or tuples exist, or how many different types there might be, or how elements get mapped when one moves from one structure to another via some mapping that preserves certain properties of structures.

On the other hand, often in mathematics one is interested in sets of elements, or sets of tuples (i.e. relations). While elements are first-order objects, sets and relations are second-order objects. Not much model theory has been done in a setting where the basic building block is, instead of an element, a set. The reason may be that second-order logic—the natural counterpart of first-order logic in this setting—is so strong that it lacks many properties that make elementary model theory interesting. For example, the second-order theory of many interesting structures—such as the ordered field of real numbers, the field of complex

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03C45, 03C48, 03C85.

Key words and phrases. abstract elementary classes, second-order logic, team semantics.

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 101020762). J. Puljujärvi was partially supported by the Academy of Finland, grant 322795. D. E. Quadrellaro was partially supported by the Academy of Finland, grant 336283.

numbers, or the semiring of natural numbers—are categorical, i.e. they have a unique model up to isomorphism. However, it may not be completely hopeless to study relations using simply first-order logic, or some other logic that lies between first and second order.

Our interest in the model theory of relations comes from the field of *team semantics*. Team semantics is an extension of the usual Tarski semantics of first-order logic that allows formulas to be evaluated over sets of assignments, called *teams*, rather than single assignments. Such a framework was originally introduced by Hodges [11] in order to provide a compositional semantics to Hintikka and Sandu’s IF-logic. In particular, Väänänen and Hodges [33] and Väänänen [31] used team semantics to extend first-order logic by means of the so-called *dependence atom*

$$=(x_1 \dots x_n, y),$$

which we read as saying “the value of x_1, \dots, x_n completely determines the value of y ”. The resulting logic, namely *dependence logic*, dramatically increases the expressive power of first-order logic and turns out to be equivalent both to IF-logic and to the existential fragment of second-order logic ESO (cp. Lemma 2.5).

Additionally, team semantics proved soon to be a very powerful and flexible framework, and it was noticed by Väänänen and others that it allows to consider several atoms characterizing various notions of dependence, e.g. the *independence atom* $x \perp y$ [10] or the *inclusion atom* $x \subseteq y$ [9]. Importantly, each of the logics that one obtains by extending the syntax of first-order logic by these new atomic formulas correspond to different fragments of existential second order logic ESO (with usual semantics) via a translation that goes both ways. More recently, however, Kontinen and Yang [17] have also introduced a logic over team semantics that corresponds to first-order logic in this way, i.e. it captures exactly the elementary properties of teams. From the perspective of the present work, the results from [17] represent a significant breakthrough. In our view, Kontinen and Yang’s work shows that the the most essential aspect of team semantics lies in this shift of attention from first-order to second-order objects, rather than the increase in expressive power.

In fact, since teams are essentially relations, it is very natural to adopt team semantics as a framework to study the model theory of sets and relations. Interestingly enough, there has not been much study of the model theory of logics in team semantics, with the exception of the seminal work of Väänänen [31] and the study of team ultraproducts by Lück [21]. In [24], the study of model theory for team semantics was initiated, in particular by proving a full version of the compactness theorem for independence logic and several of its fragments.

In this article we continue the work from [24] and develop a model-theoretic framework for team semantics. We further believe this framework provides the natural environment to study the elementary and higher-order properties of sets and relations. In particular, we apply the model-theoretic toolkit developed in this article to study the problem of transferring categoricity for complete theories in existential second-order logic. This provides an important example of how team semantics can be used to deliver results on the model theory of existential second order logic.

We shall now summarize the structure and the major contributions of this work. In Section 2 we review some basic notions from team semantics and existential second-order logic. In Section 3 we introduce the notion of team maps between structures and prove some of their basic properties. In Section 4, we discuss problems arising from trying to fit a class of structures together with elementary team embeddings into the framework of abstract elementary classes (AECs). We resolve these problems by defining a generalization of AECs that makes more sense in our setting. The objects of these so-called abstract elementary team classes

(AETCs) are reminiscent of general models (or Henkin models) of second-order logic. The main result of the section is Theorem 4.18, which states that AETCs, when treated as categories with team maps as morphisms, are examples of accessible categories [1], which are known to generalize AECs. In Section 5 we use the general framework of abstract elementary classes to show that one can build a suitable version of the monster model for independence logic and ESO.

We then consider two applications of this model-theoretic toolkit. First, in Section 6, we use the machinery introduced in the previous sections to show that the elementary team logic FOT introduced by Kontinen and Yang in [17] satisfies a version of Lindström's Theorem. Finally, we conclude the article in Section 7 by focusing on the problem of classifying models of complete existential second-order theories. We prove, in particular, two versions of categoricity transfer: one from uncountable to countable cardinals (Theorem 7.7) and one from countable to uncountable cardinals (Theorem 7.11). These two results also show how the spectrum function of an existential second-order theory depends in many cases on the stability properties of its first-order reduct, and it also displays that the present work has many potential connections to the standard elementary model theory.

Acknowledgements. We thank Åsa Hirvonen, Jonathan Kirby, Nicolás Nájar, Tapio Saarinen, Jouko Väänänen, Andrés Villaveces and Fan Yang for useful comments and discussions regarding this manuscript.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notational Conventions. We denote sets and relations with uppercase Roman letters such as A , B and C and elements by lowercase Roman letters such as a , b and c . We usually denote collections of sets A by calligraphic letters such as \mathcal{A} . By Fraktur letters such as \mathfrak{A} , \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{C} we denote first-order structures of a given signature.

If n is a natural number, an n -tuple is technically a function with domain n . We usually denote tuples by \vec{a} , \vec{b} etc. and often write $\vec{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$, where $a_i = \vec{a}(i)$ for $i < n$. We call n the length of \vec{a} and may denote it by $|\vec{a}|$. The empty set is the unique 0-tuple. An n -ary relation is a set of n -tuples. If A is an n -ary relation, we denote by $\text{ar}(A)$ the arity of A , i.e. the number n . The empty set is considered a relation of every arity. $\{\emptyset\}$ is the unique nonempty 0-ary relation. If f is a function from A^n to A for some $n < \omega$, then we say that it has arity n and denote this number by $\text{ar}(f)$.

If $\vec{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$ is an n -tuple and $\vec{b} = (b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$ is an m -tuple, the concatenation of \vec{a} and \vec{b} is the $n + m$ -tuple $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, b_0, \dots, b_{m-1})$, which we usually denote just by $\vec{a}\vec{b}$. If there is a risk of confusion, we may also denote the concatenation by $\vec{a} \smallfrown \vec{b}$. Often for our convenience, we also identify a pair (\vec{a}, \vec{b}) with the tuple $\vec{a}\vec{b}$. Note that $\emptyset\vec{a} = \vec{a}\emptyset = \vec{a}$ for any tuple \vec{a} . If A is an n -ary and B an m -ary relation, then we identify the Cartesian product $A \times B$ with the $n + m$ -ary relation

$$\{\vec{a}\vec{b} \mid \vec{a} \in A \text{ and } \vec{b} \in B\}.$$

Note that by this convention, $\{\emptyset\} \times A = A \times \{\emptyset\} = A$. Also, $\emptyset \times A = A \times \emptyset = \emptyset$.

If A is an $n + k$ -ary and B a $k + m$ -ary relation, then the natural k -join $A \bowtie_k B$ of A and B is the $n + k + m$ -ary relation

$$\{\vec{a}\vec{b}\vec{c} \mid |\vec{a}| = n, |\vec{b}| = k, |\vec{c}| = m \text{ and } \vec{a}\vec{b} \in A \text{ and } \vec{b}\vec{c} \in B\}.$$

Note that $A \times B = A \bowtie_0 B$. If A and B are n -ary relations, then $A \cap B = A \bowtie_n B$.

Let A be an n -ary relation, let $i_0, \dots, i_{m-1} < n$ and denote $\vec{i} = (i_0, \dots, i_{m-1})$. We then denote by $\text{Pr}_{\vec{i}}(A)$ the m -ary relation

$$\{(a_{i_0}, \dots, a_{i_{m-1}}) \mid \text{there is } (b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}) \in A \text{ with } b_{i_j} = a_{i_j} \text{ for } j < m\}.$$

This is a kind of projection, with the possibility of permuting and repeating coordinates. If π is a permutation of n , then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pr}_{(\pi(0), \dots, \pi(n-1))}(A) &= \{(a_{\pi(0)}, \dots, a_{\pi(n-1)}) \mid (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in A\} \\ &= \{(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \mid (a_{\pi^{-1}(0)}, \dots, a_{\pi^{-1}(n-1)}) \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

If α is a possibly infinite ordinal and a is a function with domain α , we call a an α -sequence and write $a = (a_i)_{i < \alpha}$, where $a(i) = a_i$, similar to tuples, even though when α is infinite, we usually do not call a an α -tuple, nor do we call a set of α -sequences an α -ary relation.

If \mathfrak{A} is a structure, we do not distinguish between \mathfrak{A} and the domain of \mathfrak{A} when there is no risk of confusion, i.e. we write e.g. $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ when a is an element of the domain of \mathfrak{A} and we write $|\mathfrak{A}|$ for the cardinality of the domain. We also denote the domain of \mathfrak{A} by $\text{dom}(\mathfrak{A})$ when necessary for clarity.

If τ is a signature and \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are elementarily equivalent τ -structures, i.e. satisfy the same τ -sentences of first-order logic, then we write $\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$. If L is another logic and \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} satisfy the same τ -sentences of L , we write $\mathfrak{A} \equiv_L \mathfrak{B}$.

We denote the powerset of a set I by $\mathcal{P}(I)$. By $\mathcal{P}^+(I)$ we mean $\mathcal{P}(I) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. By $\mathcal{R}(I)$ we mean the collection of all relations on I , i.e. the set $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}(I^n)$.

2.2. Existential Second-Order Logic. We assume the reader is familiar with the syntax and semantics of second-order logic (SO). We refer the reader to the last chapter of [6] and to [4] and [32] for an overview of basic definitions and results.

If $\phi \in \text{SO}$ does not contain any second-order quantifiers, we say that ϕ is first-order, even if it has free second-order variables. If no first-order variable occurs free in ϕ and ϕ is first-order, we say that ϕ is a first-order sentence; with this terminology, a first-order sentence (of SO) may contain free second-order variables. If ϕ does not contain free (first- or second-order) variables, we say that ϕ is a (second-order) sentence.

Fact. Every formula of SO is equivalent to a formula of the form

$$Q_0 X_0 \dots Q_{m-1} X_{m-1} \phi,$$

where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ for $i < m$, each X_i is either a relation or function variable and ϕ is first-order.

We denote by ESO the existential fragment of SO, i.e. the set of formulas of SO that are equivalent to a formula of the form

$$\exists X_0 \dots \exists X_{m-1} \phi$$

for first-order ϕ .

The following properties of ESO are well known.

Lemma 2.1.

- (i) Let X_0, \dots, X_{n-1} be second-order variables. Then there is a relation variable X such that for any first-order τ -sentence $\phi(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1})$, there is a first-order τ -sentence $\phi^*(X)$ such that

$$\exists X_0 \dots \exists X_{n-1} \phi \equiv \exists X \phi^*.$$

- (ii) ESO is closed under conjunction, disjunction and first-order quantifiers.

It is easy to show that **ESO** satisfies the compactness theorem and the following version of the Löwenheim–Skolem theorem: if T is an existential second-order theory with infinite models, then for any infinite $\kappa \geq |\tau|$, T has a model of cardinality κ . To see this, let T be an **ESO**-theory with infinite models, and let $\{\exists X_i \alpha_i(X_i) \mid i < |\tau| + \aleph_0\}$, for α_i first-order, axiomatize T . Fix an infinite cardinal $\kappa \geq |\tau|$, and let \mathfrak{A} be an infinite model of T . Then there are relations $R_i \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^{\text{ar}(X_i)}$ such that $\mathfrak{A} \models \alpha_i(R_i)$ for all $i < |\tau| + \aleph_0$. Let $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$ be an expansion of \mathfrak{A} by fresh predicate symbols S_i with $\text{ar}(S_i) = \text{ar}(R_i)$ such that $S_i^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}} = R_i$. Then $\text{Th}_{\text{FO}}(\hat{\mathfrak{A}})$ has, by the Löwenheim–Skolem theorem of first-order logic, a model $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ of cardinality κ . Then, letting $\mathfrak{B} = \hat{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright \tau$, we have $\mathfrak{B} \models \exists X_i \alpha_i(X_i)$ for every $i < |\tau| + \aleph_0$, as witnessed by $S_i^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}}$. We stress that this does not contradict Lindström’s theorem, as **ESO** is not closed under negation, which is a requirement imposed on an abstract logic in the statement of the theorem.

We wish to define the concept of completeness for theories in **ESO**. Usually, one would define a complete theory to be one that semantically (or syntactically if there is a proof system available) entails, for every sentence ϕ , either ϕ or $\neg\phi$. Since **ESO** is a positive logic, this option is not viable. We can, however, give a definition that does not use negation and is equivalent for logics that are closed under negation.

Definition 2.2. Let T be an existential second-order theory, i.e. a set of sentences of **ESO**. We say that T is *complete* if all of its models are **ESO**-equivalent, i.e. for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \models T$ and sentences ϕ of **ESO**, we have

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \phi.$$

It may well be that the set of **ESO**-sentences true in a structure \mathfrak{A} , which we denote by $\text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$, is not complete in the above sense. For instance, if \mathfrak{A} is a $\{P\}$ -structure, where P is a unary predicate, such that $|P^{\mathfrak{A}}| = \aleph_1$ and $|\mathfrak{A} \setminus P^{\mathfrak{A}}| = \aleph_0$, then $\text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$ does not contain the sentence expressing that there is a bijection between $P^{\mathfrak{A}}$ and its complement, but by the Löwenheim–Skolem theorem $\text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$ has a countable model, and such a model will satisfy said sentence. It turns out that a complete first-order theory has a unique **ESO**-completion, consisting of every **ESO**-sentence that is consistent with the first-order theory. We will discuss this in Section 7.1. We point out the following corollary on complete **ESO**-theories, which immediately follows by the previous Löwenheim–Skolem theorem.

Corollary 2.3. Let T be a complete τ -theory in **ESO**, with infinite models. Then T has infinite models in all cardinalities $\geq |\tau|$.

We conclude this section by making the following observation, akin to the Los–Vaught test of first-order logic.

Proposition 2.4. Let T be an existential second-order theory. If T does not have models of size $< |\tau| + \aleph_0$ and is categorical in every cardinality in which it has a model, then T is complete.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \models T$ and let $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$. Since $|\mathfrak{A}|, |\mathfrak{B}| \geq |\tau| + \aleph_0$, by Löwenheim–Skolem, there is \mathfrak{A}' with $|\mathfrak{A}'| = |\mathfrak{B}|$ and $\mathfrak{A}' \models T \cup \{\phi\}$. As T is $|\mathfrak{B}|$ -categorical, $\mathfrak{A}' \cong \mathfrak{B}$, and hence $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$. \square

2.3. Team Semantics. Next we recall the concept of a team and the team-semantic interpretations of first-order connectives and quantifiers. We refer the reader to Galliani [9], Grädel and Väänänen [10], and Väänänen [31] for an introduction to team semantics and proofs of the main facts recalled here.

Let τ be a vocabulary, \mathfrak{A} a τ -structure and $D \subseteq \{v_i \mid i < \omega\}$ a set of (first-order) variables. An *assignment* of \mathfrak{A} with domain D is a function $D \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$. A team of \mathfrak{A}

with domain D is a set of assignments of \mathfrak{A} with domain D , i.e. a subset of \mathfrak{A}^D . We usually take D to be finite, but sometimes teams with infinite domains may be of interest. When given a team X , we denote its domain by $\text{dom}(X)$, similarly to domains of functions.

If s is an assignment of \mathfrak{A} with $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \text{dom}(s)$ and $t(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is a τ -term, we write $s(t)$ as a shorthand for $t^{\mathfrak{A}}(s(x_0), \dots, s(x_{n-1}))$. If $\vec{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is a tuple of variables, we write $s(\vec{x})$ for $(s(x_0), \dots, s(x_{n-1}))$. If X is a team and $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \text{dom}(X)$, then we denote by $X[\vec{x}]$ the relation

$$\{s(\vec{x}) \mid s \in X\}.$$

Conversely, if R is an n -ary relation, we denote by $\text{team}(R)$ the team

$$\{\{(v_i, a_i) \mid i < n\} \mid (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in R\}$$

with domain $\{v_i \mid i < n\}$.

If s is an assignment of \mathfrak{A} , $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ and x is a variable, we denote by $s(a/x)$ the assignment s' with domain $\text{dom}(s) \cup \{x\}$ such that

$$s'(y) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } y = x, \\ s(y) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If X is a team of \mathfrak{A} , then by $X(a/x)$ we denote the team Y of \mathfrak{A} with domain $D := \text{dom}(X) \cup \{x\}$ such that

$$Y = \{s(a/x) \mid s \in X\}.$$

If F is a function $X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^+(\mathfrak{A})$, we denote by $X(F/x)$ the team

$$\{s(a/x) \mid s \in X \text{ and } a \in F(s)\}.$$

We call F a supplement function and $X(F/x)$ the *supplementation* of X by F . If $F(s) = \mathfrak{A}$ for all $s \in X$, then we denote the supplemented team by $X(\mathfrak{A}/x)$ and call it the *duplication* of X . If $D \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$, we denote by $X \upharpoonright D$ the team

$$\{s \upharpoonright D \mid s \in X\}.$$

Given a vocabulary τ , we consider the syntax of τ -formulas of first-order logic FO to be given by the grammar

$$\phi ::= t = t' \mid \neg t = t' \mid R(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) \mid \neg R(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}) \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid \exists x \phi \mid \forall x \phi,$$

where t, t' and t_i are τ -terms and $R \in \tau$ is an n -ary relation symbol. Note that we readily assume a negation normal form for our first-order formulas. The team semantics of the operators above is the following.

Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure and X a team of \mathfrak{A} with $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \text{dom}(X)$. For a first-order formula $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$, $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ is defined as follows.

- (i) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X t = t'$ if $s(t) = s(t')$ for all $s \in X$.
- (ii) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \neg t = t'$ if $s(t) \neq s(t')$ for all $s \in X$.
- (iii) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X R(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1})$ if $(s(t_0), \dots, s(t_{n-1})) \in R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ for all $s \in X$.
- (iv) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \neg R(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1})$ if $(s(t_0), \dots, s(t_{n-1})) \notin R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ for all $s \in X$.
- (v) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi \wedge \chi$ if $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi$ and $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \chi$.
- (vi) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi \vee \chi$ if there are $Y, Z \subseteq X$ such that $Y \cup Z = X$, $\mathfrak{A} \models_Y \psi$ and $\mathfrak{A} \models_Z \chi$.
- (vii) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \exists x \psi$ if there is a function $F: X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^+(\mathfrak{A})$ such that $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X(F/x)} \psi$.
- (viii) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \forall x \psi$ if $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X(\mathfrak{A}/x)} \psi$.

We stress that the team semantic definition of the classical connectives and quantifiers do not provide us with anything new when it comes to just first-order logic, in the sense that formulas of first-order logic are *flat*.

Fact (Flatness). For any \mathfrak{A} , X and $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \text{FO}$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \phi(s(x_0), \dots, s(x_{n-1})) \text{ for all } s \in X.$$

Hence for formulas of FO , team semantics is equivalent to the usual Tarski semantics.

2.4. Dependence Logic. When working with team semantics, we are generally interested in expanding the syntax of first-order logic by means of new atomic formulas encoding different relations of (in)dependence between variables. We recall here the semantics of the *dependence atom* $=(\vec{x}; \vec{y})$, the *independence atom* $\vec{x} \perp_{\vec{z}} \vec{y}$, the *inclusion atom* $\vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y}$ and the *exclusion atom* $\vec{x} \mid \vec{y}$.

- (ix) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X =(\vec{x}; \vec{y})$ if for all $s, s' \in X$, if $s(\vec{x}) = s'(\vec{x})$ then $s(\vec{y}) = s'(\vec{y})$, i.e. there is a function $f: \mathfrak{A}^{|\vec{x}|} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^{|\vec{y}|}$ such that $f(s(\vec{x})) = s(\vec{y})$ for all $s \in X$.
- (x) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y}$, where \vec{x} and \vec{y} are tuples of the same length, if for all $s \in X$ there is some $s' \in X$ such that $s(\vec{x}) = s'(\vec{y})$, i.e. $X[\vec{x}] \subseteq X[\vec{y}]$.
- (xi) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \vec{x} \mid \vec{y}$, where \vec{x} and \vec{y} are tuples of the same length, if for all $s, s' \in X$ we have $s(\vec{x}) \neq s'(\vec{y})$, i.e. $X[\vec{x}] \cap X[\vec{y}] = \emptyset$.
- (xii) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \vec{x} \perp_{\vec{z}} \vec{y}$ if for all $s, s' \in X$ such that $s(\vec{z}) = s'(\vec{z})$, there is $s'' \in X$ such that $s''(\vec{x}\vec{z}) = s(\vec{x}\vec{z})$ and $s''(\vec{y}) = s'(\vec{y})$, i.e. $X[\vec{x}\vec{z}\vec{y}] = X[\vec{x}\vec{z}] \bowtie_{|\vec{z}|} X[\vec{z}\vec{y}]$.

As a special case of the dependence atom, we have the *constancy atom* $=(\emptyset; \vec{x})$ that is true in a team X if for all $s, s' \in X$, $s(\vec{x}) = s'(\vec{x})$, i.e. $|X[\vec{x}]| \leq 1$. We denote the constancy atom simply by $=(\vec{x})$.

Note that adding any of the aforementioned atoms to the syntax of first-order logic results in a non-flat logic. If $C \subseteq \{=(\dots), \perp_c, \subseteq, |\}$, we denote by $\text{FO}(C)$ the logic resulting from adding the atoms in C to the syntax of FO . Below we list some well-known properties of these logics.

Fact. Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure and X and Y teams of \mathfrak{A} with the same domain.

- (i) *Locality:* For any formula ϕ of $\text{FO}(=(\dots), \perp_c, \subseteq, |)$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ if and only if $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X \upharpoonright \text{FV}(\phi)} \phi$.
- (ii) *The empty team property:* For any formula ϕ of $\text{FO}(=(\dots), \perp_c, \subseteq, |)$ we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_{\emptyset} \phi$.
- (iii) *Downwards closure:* For any formula ϕ of $\text{FO}(=(\dots), |)$, if $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ and $Y \subseteq X$, then $\mathfrak{A} \models_Y \phi$.
- (iv) *Union-closure:* For any formula ϕ of $\text{FO}(\subseteq)$, if $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ and $\mathfrak{A} \models_Y \phi$, then $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X \cup Y} \phi$.

By locality, whenever ϕ is a sentence of $\text{FO}(=(\dots), \perp_c, \subseteq, |)$, we have

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models_{X \upharpoonright \emptyset} \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models_{\{\emptyset\}} \phi$$

for any \mathfrak{A} and X . We write $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$ for $\mathfrak{A} \models_{\{\emptyset\}} \phi$ whenever ϕ is a sentence.

It is well known that in $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ one can define all the other aforementioned atoms, i.e. the logics $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ and $\text{FO}(=(\dots), \perp_c, \subseteq, |)$ are equiexpressive. In fact, any property of teams definable in ESO (modulo the empty team property) can be defined in $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ and, conversely, any formula of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ can be defined in ESO , in the following sense.

Lemma 2.5 (Galliani, Grädel–Väänänen [9, 10]). Fix a finite set $D = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ of variables.

- (i) For every τ -formula $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$, there is a τ -formula $\chi(R)$ of ESO with no free first-order variables and only one free n -ary second-order variable R , such that for every τ -structure \mathfrak{A} and team X of \mathfrak{A} with $D \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \chi(X[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]).$$

We call $\chi(R)$ a *translation* of ϕ to ESO.

- (ii) For every τ -formula $\chi(R)$ of ESO with no free first-order variables and only one free n -ary second-order variable R , there is a τ -formula $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ such that for every τ -structure \mathfrak{A} and team X of \mathfrak{A} with $D \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \chi^+(X[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]),$$

where $\chi^+(R) = \exists x_0 \dots \exists x_{n-1} R(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \rightarrow \chi(R)$. We call ϕ a *translation* of $\chi(R)$ to $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$.

Finally, we define what it means for a theory in $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ to be complete.

Definition 2.6. Let T be an $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ -theory.

- (i) We say that T is *first-order complete* if for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \models T$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$.
- (ii) We say that T is *complete* if its ESO-translation is, i.e. if for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \models T$ and sentences ϕ of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \phi.$$

2.5. The Logic FOT. First-order Team Logic, FOT, was introduced by Kontinen and Yang [17] to capture exactly the team properties definable in first-order logic (modulo the empty team property) the same way, i.e. FOT corresponds to $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ exactly the same way in which $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ corresponds to ESO. We can view FOT here as a small extension of first order logic whose expressive power lies between FO and $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$. In particular, since FOT captures all elementary team properties, it is powerful enough to express the most common dependence atoms, for instance those defined in the previous section.

Given a vocabulary τ , the syntax of τ -formulas of FOT is given by the grammar

$$\phi ::= \lambda \mid \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y} \mid =(\vec{x}) \mid \sim\phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid \exists^1 x \phi \mid \forall^1 x \phi,$$

where λ is a first-order atomic formula and the *weak classical negation* \sim , the *weak disjunction* \vee , and the *weak quantifiers* \exists^1 and \forall^1 are interpreted as follows:

- (xiii) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \vee \psi$ if $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ or $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi$.
- (xiv) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \sim\phi$ if $X = \emptyset$ or $\mathfrak{A} \not\models_X \phi$.
- (xv) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \exists^1 x \psi$ if there is an element $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X(a/x)} \psi$.
- (xvi) $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \forall^1 x \psi$ if for every element $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X(a/x)} \psi$.

In [17], the syntax of FOT excludes the constancy atom $=(\vec{x})$. However, our definition results in an equiexpressive logic, as the constancy atom can be defined via the equivalence

$$=(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \equiv \exists^1 y_0 \dots \exists^1 y_{n-1} \bigwedge_{i < n} x_i = y_i.$$

Note that as quantifiers seem to be required here, at the level of quantifier-free formulas there may be a difference in expressive power between the two versions of FOT.

We denote by $\phi \rightarrow \psi$ the formula $\sim\phi \vee \psi$ and call it the *weak classical implication* and by $\phi \leftrightarrow \psi$ the formula $(\phi \rightarrow \psi) \wedge (\psi \rightarrow \phi)$ and call it the *weak classical equivalence*. Clearly, for a nonempty team X , $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \rightarrow \psi$ if and only if

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \implies \mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi.$$

We also denote $\top := =(\emptyset)$ and $\perp := \sim\top$. Note that the empty constancy atom \top is true in any team, and hence its weak classical negation \perp is true only in the empty team.

The following is the FOT-counterpart of Lemma 2.5.

Lemma 2.7 (Kontinen–Yang [17]). Fix a finite set $D = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$ of variables.

- (i) For every τ -formula $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ of FOT, there is a first-order τ -sentence $\chi(R)$ with a single free n -ary second order variable R such that for every τ -structure \mathfrak{A} and team X of \mathfrak{A} with $D \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \chi(X[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]).$$

We call $\chi(R)$ a *translation* of ϕ to FO.

- (ii) For every first-order τ -sentence $\chi(R)$ with a single free n -ary second order variable R , there is a τ -formula $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ of FOT such that for every τ -structure \mathfrak{A} and team X of \mathfrak{A} with $D \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \chi^+(X[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]),$$

where $\chi^+(R) = \exists x_0 \dots \exists x_{n-1} R(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \rightarrow \chi(R)$. We call ϕ a translation of $\chi(R)$ to FOT.

We can conclude that the relationships of the logics mentioned so far when it comes to expressive power is the following:

$$\text{FO} \leq \text{FOT} \leq \text{FO}(\perp_c).$$

Next we prove some basic but useful facts about FOT.

Lemma 2.8. Let X be a team of \mathfrak{A} and Y a team of \mathfrak{B} , both with domain $\{v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$. Then

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_Y \phi$$

for all formulas $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ of FOT if and only if

$$(\mathfrak{A}, X[v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}]) \equiv (\mathfrak{B}, Y[v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}]).$$

Proof. Denote $\vec{x} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$. If $X = Y = \emptyset$, then clearly the claim holds. If $X = \emptyset$ and $Y \neq \emptyset$ (or vice versa), then we have that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \perp$ but $\mathfrak{B} \not\models_Y \perp$. On the other hand, clearly $(\mathfrak{A}, X[\vec{x}]) = (\mathfrak{A}, \emptyset) \neq (\mathfrak{B}, Y[\vec{x}])$, proving our claim. So we may assume that $X \neq \emptyset \neq Y$.

“ \implies ”: Suppose $(\mathfrak{A}, X[\vec{x}]) \neq (\mathfrak{B}, Y[\vec{x}])$. Then there is a first-order $\tau \cup \{R\}$ -sentence χ such that $(\mathfrak{A}, X[\vec{x}]) \models \chi$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, Y[\vec{x}]) \not\models \chi$. Since $X \neq \emptyset \neq Y$, we have $(\mathfrak{A}, X[\vec{x}]) \models \chi^+$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, Y[\vec{x}]) \not\models \chi^+$. Considering R a second-order variable and letting $\phi(\vec{x})$ be a translation of $\chi(R)$ to FOT, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ but $\mathfrak{B} \not\models_Y \phi$.

“ \impliedby ”: If $(\mathfrak{A}, X[\vec{x}]) \equiv (\mathfrak{B}, Y[\vec{x}])$ and $\phi(\vec{x})$ is a formula of FOT, let $\chi(R)$ be the translation of ϕ to FO. Consider R as a relation symbol so that $(\mathfrak{A}, X[\vec{x}])$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, Y[\vec{x}])$ are $\tau \cup \{R\}$ -structures. Then as X and Y are nonempty, we have

$$(\mathfrak{A}, X[\vec{x}]) \models \chi \iff (\mathfrak{B}, Y[\vec{x}]) \models \chi,$$

whence by Lemma 2.7,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_Y \phi. \quad \square$$

Lemma 2.9. For any n -ary relation symbol R and an n -tuple \vec{x} of variables, there is an $\{R\}$ -formula $\theta(R, \vec{x})$ of FOT such that for any $\{R\}$ -structure \mathfrak{A} and a *nonempty* team X of \mathfrak{A} ,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \theta \iff X[\vec{x}] = R^{\mathfrak{A}}.$$

Proof. Clearly $\theta = R(\vec{x}) \wedge \forall^1 y_0 \dots \forall^1 y_{n-1} (R(\vec{y}) \rightarrow \vec{y} \subseteq \vec{x})$ suffices. \square

2.6. Ultraproducts. Recall that given an index set I , an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on I and nonempty sets A_i , $i \in I$, the ultraproduct $\prod_{i \in I} A_i / \mathcal{U}$ of the sets A_i is the quotient set $\{f / \mathcal{U} \mid f \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i\}$ of $\prod_{i \in I} A_i$ by the equivalence relation

$$f \equiv_{\mathcal{U}} g \iff \{i \in I \mid f(i) = g(i)\} \in \mathcal{U},$$

where f / \mathcal{U} denotes the equivalence class of f . If even one of the sets A_i is empty, then the Cartesian product will also be empty and hence so will the ultraproduct. However, when one defines the ultraproduct $\prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U}$ of τ -structures \mathfrak{A}_i , $i \in I$, the interpretation of a predicate symbol $R \in \tau$ will be the set

$$\{(f_0 / \mathcal{U}, \dots, f_{n-1} / \mathcal{U}) \mid \{i \in I \mid (f_0(i), \dots, f_{n-1}(i)) \in R^{\mathfrak{A}_i}\} \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

This set, which we naturally think as the ultraproduct of the sets $R^{\mathfrak{A}_i}$, is empty only when $R^{\mathfrak{A}_i}$ is empty for \mathcal{U} -many indices i . Given a context of an ultraproduct structure $\mathfrak{A} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U}$, we generalize the notion of an ultraproduct of sets to correspond to the interpretation of relation symbols, i.e. if $A_i \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_i^n$ for all $i \in I$, then we denote by $\prod_{i \in I} A_i / \mathcal{U}$ the set

$$\{(f_0 / \mathcal{U}, \dots, f_{n-1} / \mathcal{U}) \in \mathfrak{A}^n \mid \{i \in I \mid (f_0(i), \dots, f_{n-1}(i)) \in A_i\} \in \mathcal{U}\}.$$

This leads to the definition of the ultraproduct of teams.

Definition 2.10 (Lück [21]). Let \mathfrak{A} be the ultraproduct of the structures \mathfrak{A}_i , $i \in I$, and let D be a set of first-order variables.

- (i) Given assignments $s_i: D \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_i$, $i \in I$, we denote by $(s_i)_{i \in I}$ the assignment $s: D \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ such that $s(x) = (s_i(x))_{i \in I}$ for all $x \in D$.
- (ii) Given an assignment $s: D \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$, we denote by s / \mathcal{U} the assignment $t: D \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $t(x) = s(x) / \mathcal{U}$ for all $x \in D$.
- (iii) Given a team X_i of \mathfrak{A}_i with domain D for each $i \in I$, we define their *team ultraproduct* $\prod_{i \in I} X_i / \mathcal{U}$ as the set of all assignments $s: D \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that there are $s_i: D \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_i$, $i \in I$, with $s = (s_i)_{i \in I} / \mathcal{U}$ and $\{i \in I \mid s_i \in X_i\} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Note that with these definitions, $(\prod_{i \in I} X_i / \mathcal{U})[\vec{x}] = \prod_{i \in I} X_i[\vec{x}] / \mathcal{U}$ for any variable tuple \vec{x} .

Recall that the classical fundamental theorem of ultraproducts, also known as Łoś' theorem, is the following: if $f_0, \dots, f_{n-1} \in \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ and $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ is a first-order formula, then

$$\{i \in I \mid \mathfrak{A}_i \models \phi(f_0(i), \dots, f_{n-1}(i))\} \in \mathcal{U} \iff \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U} \models \phi(f_0 / \mathcal{U}, \dots, f_{n-1} / \mathcal{U}).$$

It was proved by Lück [21] that first-order definable properties of teams are preserved in ultraproducts, which together with Lemma 2.7 gives the following theorem.

Theorem 2.11 (Łoś' Theorem of FOT). If X_i is a team of \mathfrak{A}_i with domain D for all $i \in I$ and ϕ is a formula of FOT with $\text{Fv}(\phi) \subseteq D$, then

$$\{i \in I \mid \mathfrak{A}_i \models_{X_i} \phi\} \in \mathcal{U} \iff \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U} \models_{\prod_{i \in I} X_i / \mathcal{U}} \phi.$$

A version for $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ was proved by Puljuri and Quadrellaro [24]:

Theorem 2.12 (Łoś' Theorem of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$). If X_i is a team of \mathfrak{A}_i with domain D for all $i \in I$ and ϕ is a formula of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ with $\text{Fv}(\phi) \subseteq D$, then

$$\{i \in I \mid \mathfrak{A}_i \models_{X_i} \phi\} \in \mathcal{U} \implies \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U} \models_{\prod_{i \in I} X_i / \mathcal{U}} \phi.$$

Note that in independence logic one does not obtain equivalence between a formula being satisfied \mathcal{U} -often and it being satisfied in the ultraproduct; this reflects the positive nature of ESO. In fact, a universal second-order sentence that is preserved under ultraproducts is actually definable in first-order logic [14]. Furthermore, a logic that satisfies the stronger form of Łoś' theorem is equiexpressive to first-order [26]. Fortunately, the missing direction of the equivalence is unnecessary for proving the compactness theorem, which we obtain as a corollary. We say that a set Γ of formulas of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ is satisfiable if there is a structure \mathfrak{A} , and a *nonempty* team X of \mathfrak{A} whose domain contains all the free variables of Γ , such that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \Gamma$.

Corollary 2.13. If Γ is a set of formulas of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ and each finite $\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma$ is satisfiable, then Γ is satisfiable.

In the sequel, the following classic result, usually dubbed the Keisler–Shelah theorem, will be of much use.

Theorem 2.14 (Keisler [14], Shelah [29]). Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be τ -structures. If $\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$, then there is a cardinal κ and an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on κ such that $\mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U} \cong \mathfrak{B}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$.

We conclude this section by reviewing the notion of a limit ultrapower, which was introduced by Keisler [15] as a kind of generalization of ultrapowers.

Definition 2.15. Let I be a set, \mathcal{F} an ultrafilter on I and \mathcal{G} a filter on I^2 .

- (i) For $f \in \mathfrak{A}^I$, we denote by $\text{eq}(f)$ the set of all pairs $(i, j) \in I^2$ such that $f(i) = f(j)$.
- (ii) Let A be a set and denote $B = A^I/\mathcal{F}$. By $B|\mathcal{G}$ we denote the set

$$\{f/\mathcal{F} \in B \mid \text{eq}(g) \in \mathcal{G} \text{ for some } g \equiv_{\mathcal{F}} f\}.$$

- (iii) Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure and let $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{A}^I/\mathcal{F}$. Then we denote by $\mathfrak{B}|\mathcal{G}$ the substructure of \mathfrak{B} generated by the set $\text{dom}(\mathfrak{B})|\mathcal{G}$ and call it a *limit ultrapower* of \mathfrak{A} .

The limit ultrapower $\mathfrak{B}|\mathcal{G}$ is a substructure of the ultrapower $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{A}^I/\mathcal{F}$ that consists of equivalence classes of those sequences $f \in \mathfrak{A}^I$ that are “almost constant” according to the filter \mathcal{G} . In the definition we do not require \mathcal{G} to be proper; if $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{P}(I^2)$, we have $\mathfrak{B}|\mathcal{G} = \mathfrak{B}$, so in this sense limit ultrapowers generalize ultrapowers. It is proved in [15] that $\mathfrak{B}|\mathcal{G}$ is always an elementary substructure of \mathfrak{B} , and that the ultrapower embedding $a \mapsto (a)_{i \in I}/\mathcal{F}$ is an elementary embedding $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}|\mathcal{G}$.

Limit ultrapowers are connected to complete embeddings, whose definition we now recall.

Definition 2.16. Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be τ -structures. An embedding $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is *complete* if for every $\tau' \supseteq \tau$ and τ' -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$ of \mathfrak{A} there is a τ' -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ of \mathfrak{B} such that f is an elementary embedding $\hat{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{B}}$.

Clearly the ultrapower embedding $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^I/\mathcal{F}$ is complete. It turns out that this is a special case of the more general fact that the ultrapower embedding to a limit ultrapower is complete. In fact, every complete embedding is essentially a limit ultrapower embedding.

Theorem 2.17 (Keisler [15]). The following are equivalent for $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$.

- (i) f is a complete embedding.
- (ii) There are I , \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} and an isomorphism $\pi: (\mathfrak{A}^I/\mathcal{F})|\mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $f = \pi \circ \iota$, where ι is the ultrapower embedding $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow (\mathfrak{A}^I/\mathcal{F})|\mathcal{G}$.

3. TEAM MAPS

In this section we introduce the notions of partial isomorphism and elementary map for team semantics and prove some of their basic characterisations. For the rest of the paper (except Section 6), we identify a relation X with the corresponding team $\text{team}(X)$ with domain $\{v_0, \dots, v_{\text{ar}(X)-1}\}$. If $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ is a formula of FOT or $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$ for a structure \mathfrak{A} , then by $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ we mean $\mathfrak{A} \models_{\text{team}(X)} \phi$. If $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$ and $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, then by $X(a/n)$ we denote the $n+1$ -ary relation $X \times \{a\}$. Note that $\text{team}(X(a/n)) = \text{team}(X)(a/v_n)$. Also note that $\emptyset(a/0) = \emptyset$ and $\{\emptyset\}(a/0) = \{a\}$. Given a structure \mathfrak{A} , we denote by $\Delta_{\mathfrak{A}}$ the diagonal set $\{(a, a) \mid a \in \mathfrak{A}\}$, i.e. the identity relation ($a = b$ if and only if $(a, b) \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{A}}$).

Definition 3.1. Let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be τ -structures.

- (i) Given a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$, we denote by $\text{cl}(\mathcal{X}; \mathfrak{A})$ the \subseteq -least set $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that
 - (C1) $\emptyset \in \mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathfrak{A}^n \in \mathcal{Y}$ for all $n < \omega$,
 - (C2) if $X, Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, then $X \cap Y \in \mathcal{Y}$,
 - (C3) if $X, Y \in \mathcal{Y}$, then $X \times Y \in \mathcal{Y}$,
 - (C4) if $X \in \mathcal{Y}$ is n -ary and $\vec{v} \in n^{<\omega}$, then $\text{Pr}_{\vec{v}}(X) \in \mathcal{Y}$, and
 - (C5) $\Delta_{\mathfrak{A}}, R^{\mathfrak{A}}, F^{\mathfrak{A}}, \{c^{\mathfrak{A}}\} \in \mathcal{Y}$ for all relation symbols $R \in \tau$, function symbols $F \in \tau$ and constant symbols $c \in \tau$.

If the structure \mathfrak{A} is clear from the context (which it almost always is), we simply write $\text{cl}(\mathcal{X})$ for $\text{cl}(\mathcal{X}; \mathfrak{A})$.

- (ii) We say that f is a (partial) team map $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ if it is a (partial) function $\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{B})$ such that
 - f preserves arities, i.e. if $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$, then $f(X) \subseteq \mathfrak{B}^n$, and
 - the domain and range of f satisfy the closure properties (C1)–(C5), i.e. $\text{dom}(f) = \text{cl}(\text{dom}(f); \mathfrak{A})$ and $\text{ran}(f) = \text{cl}(\text{ran}(f); \mathfrak{B})$.

If f maps all singletons from its domain to singletons and $\{\vec{a}\} \in \text{dom}(f)$, we write $f(\vec{a})$ for the unique element inhabiting the singleton $f(\{\vec{a}\})$. We write $f|_n$ for the function $f|(\text{dom}(f) \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{A}^n))$.

- (iii) We say that a partial team map $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a *partial team isomorphism* if the following conditions are satisfied:
 - (PI1) $X = \emptyset$ if and only if $f(X) = \emptyset$, and $X = \mathfrak{A}^n$ if and only if $f(X) = \mathfrak{B}^n$ for all $n < \omega$,
 - (PI2) for all $X \in \text{dom}(f)$, X is a singleton if and only if $f(X)$ is,
 - (PI3) for all $X, Y \in \text{dom}(f)$, $f(X \times Y) = f(X) \times f(Y)$,
 - (PI4) for all n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(f)$ and $\vec{v} \in n^{<\omega}$, $f(\text{Pr}_{\vec{v}}(X)) = \text{Pr}_{\vec{v}}(f(X))$,
 - (PI5) for all $X, Y \in \text{dom}(f)$, $X \subseteq Y$ if and only if $f(X) \subseteq f(Y)$, and
 - (PI6) $f(\Delta_{\mathfrak{A}}) = \Delta_{\mathfrak{B}}$, $f(R^{\mathfrak{A}}) = R^{\mathfrak{B}}$ for any relation or function symbol $R \in \tau$ and $f(c^{\mathfrak{A}}) = c^{\mathfrak{B}}$ for any constant symbol $c \in \tau$.

If f happens to be total, then we call f a *team embedding*. If f is such that for any $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, $\{a\} \in \text{dom}(f)$, then we call f *element-total*, and if for any $b \in \mathfrak{B}$, $\{b\} \in \text{ran}(f)$, then we call f *element-surjective*.

- (iv) We say that f is a *team isomorphism* if it is an element-surjective team embedding. If $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is an ordinary isomorphism, we denote by $\hat{\pi}$ the team isomorphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ defined by

$$\hat{\pi}(X) = \{\pi(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{a} \in X\}$$

for all relations X of \mathfrak{A} .

- (v) We say that a (partial) team map $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a (partial) *elementary team map* if it satisfies (PI3), and for all τ -formulas $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ of FOT and

n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$, we have

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi.$$

If ℓ happens to be total, then we call ℓ an *elementary team embedding*.

- (vi) We say that a (partial) elementary team map $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a (partial) *independence team map* if for all τ -formulas $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$, we have

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \implies \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi.$$

If ℓ happens to be total, then we call ℓ an *independence team embedding*.

Note that $\ell(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ vacuously holds for any team map ℓ : the empty set is the only relation of every arity, and ℓ preserves arity of relations. If ℓ is a partial team isomorphism and $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \text{dom}(\ell)$, then $\vec{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ and $\ell(\vec{a}) = (\ell(a_0), \dots, \ell(a_{n-1}))$.

Example 3.2. Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure, κ an infinite cardinal and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter on κ . Let $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U}$. Now $\iota: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ defined by $\iota(X) = X^\kappa / \mathcal{U}$ is an elementary team embedding by Theorem 2.11 and furthermore an independence team embedding by Theorem 2.12.

Lemma 3.3. Let ℓ be a partial team isomorphism. Then

- (i) ℓ is injective,
- (ii) $\ell(X(a/n)) = \ell(X)(\ell(a)/n)$ for an n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ and $\{a\} \in \text{dom}(\ell)$.
- (iii) $\ell(X \cap Y) = \ell(X) \cap \ell(Y)$ for all $X, Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$.

Proof. We show the third claim. Let $X, Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$. If they are of different arity, the intersection is empty and hence mapped to the empty set, so we may assume $\text{ar}(X) = \text{ar}(Y)$. By (PI5), as $X \cap Y \subseteq X, Y$, we have $\ell(X \cap Y) \subseteq \ell(X), \ell(Y)$ and hence $\ell(X \cap Y) \subseteq \ell(X) \cap \ell(Y)$. For the converse, note that as $\ell(X) \cap \ell(Y) \in \text{ran}(\ell)$, there is some $Z \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ such that $\ell(Z) = \ell(X) \cap \ell(Y)$. Since $\ell(Z) \subseteq \ell(X) \cap \ell(Y)$, we have $\ell(Z) \subseteq \ell(X), \ell(Y)$, so by (PI5) we have $Z \subseteq X, Y$. But then $Z \subseteq X \cap Y$. Thus $\ell(Z) \subseteq \ell(X \cap Y)$. But as $\ell(Z) = \ell(X) \cap \ell(Y)$, we have $\ell(X) \cap \ell(Y) \subseteq \ell(X \cap Y)$. \square

Lemma 3.4.

- (i) If ℓ is a partial team isomorphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, then ℓ^{-1} is a partial team isomorphism $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$. If ℓ is a partial elementary team map $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, then ℓ^{-1} is a partial elementary team map $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$.
- (ii) If $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ are partial team isomorphisms with $\text{ran}(\ell) = \text{dom}(g)$, then $g \circ \ell$ is a partial team isomorphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$. If ℓ and g are elementary, then so is $g \circ \ell$. If ℓ and g are independence team maps, then so is $g \circ \ell$.

Proof. Clear. \square

Lemma 3.5. Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be a partial team map. Then for any $n, m < \omega$ and n -ary and m -ary relations X and Y of \mathfrak{A} , respectively, the following holds: $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ and $Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ if and only if for all $k \leq n, m$, $X \bowtie_k Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$. Furthermore, if ℓ is a partial team isomorphism, then $\ell(X \bowtie_k Y) = \ell(X) \bowtie_k \ell(Y)$ for all k .

Proof. Let \mathfrak{C} be an arbitrary structure. We first show that for any $n < \omega$, the $2n$ -ary relation

$$\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^n := \{\vec{a}\vec{b} \mid |\vec{a}| = |\vec{b}| = n, \vec{a} = \vec{b}\}$$

is expressible in terms of products, projections and $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}$. Note that $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^0 = \{\emptyset\} = \text{Pr}_{\emptyset}(\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}})$ and $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^1 = \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}$. Suppose we have shown this for $\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^{n+1} &= \{\vec{a}\vec{b}\vec{b} \mid |\vec{a}| = |\vec{b}| = n, \vec{a} = \vec{b}, a = b\} \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}}(\{\vec{a}\vec{b}\vec{a}\vec{b} \mid |\vec{a}| = |\vec{b}| = n, \vec{a} = \vec{b}, a = b\}) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}}(\Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^n \times \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{i} = (0, \dots, n-1, 2n, n, \dots, 2n-1, 2n+1)$.

Now for any $n+k$ -ary and $k+m$ -ary relations X and Y of \mathfrak{C} , we have

$$\begin{aligned}X \bowtie_k Y &= \{\vec{a}\vec{b}\vec{c} \mid \vec{a}\vec{b} \in X, \vec{b}\vec{c} \in Y\} \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{j}}((X \times Y) \cap (\mathfrak{C}^n \times \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^k \times \mathfrak{C}^m)),\end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{j} = (0, \dots, n+k-1, n+2k, \dots, n+2k+m-1)$.

Now it is clear that $\Delta_{\mathfrak{A}}^k \in \text{dom}(\ell)$. It follows that $X \bowtie_k Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ whenever $X, Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$. On the other hand, if $X \bowtie_0 Y = X \times Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$, then X and Y are easily obtained as projections. If ℓ is a partial team isomorphism, then clearly $\ell(\Delta_{\mathfrak{A}}^k) = \Delta_{\mathfrak{B}}^k$, whence also $\ell(X \bowtie_k Y) = \ell(X) \bowtie_k \ell(Y)$. \square

The next proposition highlights a connection between partial elementary team maps and complete atomic Boolean algebras.

Proposition 3.6. Let ℓ be a partial elementary team map. Then

- (i) for all $X, Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ of the same arity,

$$\ell(X \cup Y) = \ell(X) \cup \ell(Y),$$

whenever $X \cup Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$, and

- (ii) for all $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$,

$$\ell(X^c) = \ell(X)^c,$$

whenever $X^c \in \text{dom}(\ell)$.

Furthermore, if ℓ is an elementary team embedding $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, then for any $n < \omega$, $\ell \upharpoonright_n$ is an (ordinary) elementary embedding between $(\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{A}^n), \cup, \cap, ^c, \emptyset, \mathfrak{A}^n)$ and $(\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B}^n), \cup, \cap, ^c, \emptyset, \mathfrak{B}^n)$ in the language $\{\vee, \wedge, \neg, \perp, \top\}$ of Boolean algebras.

Proof.

- (i) Denote $\vec{x} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$, $\vec{y} = (v_n, \dots, v_{2n-1})$, $\vec{z} = (v_{2n}, \dots, v_{3n-1})$ and $\vec{w} = (v_{3n}, \dots, v_{4n-1})$. Then it is straightforward to verify that for any structure \mathfrak{C} and nonempty $X, Y, Z \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^n$, $Z = X \cup Y$ if and only if

$$\mathfrak{C} \models_{X \times Y \times Z} \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{z} \wedge \vec{y} \subseteq \vec{z} \wedge \forall^1 \vec{w} (\vec{w} \subseteq \vec{z} \rightarrow (\vec{w} \subseteq \vec{x} \vee \vec{w} \subseteq \vec{y})),$$

whence the claim follows.

- (ii) Since $\ell(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $\ell(\mathfrak{A}^n) = \mathfrak{B}^n$, the claim holds whenever either of the sets X and Y is empty, so suppose that is not the case. Denote $\vec{x} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ and $\vec{y} = (v_n, \dots, v_{2n-1})$. Now let ϕ be the formula

$$\forall^1 z_0 \dots \forall^1 z_{n-1} (\vec{z} \subseteq \vec{x} \vee \vec{z} \subseteq \vec{y}) \wedge \vec{x} \mid \vec{y}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}X = Y^c &\iff \mathfrak{A} \models_{X \times Y} \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X \times Y)} \phi \\ &\iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X) \times \ell(Y)} \phi \iff \ell(X) = \ell(Y)^c.\end{aligned}$$

For the “furthermore” part, note that the structures in question are infinite atomic Boolean algebras. The atoms of $(\mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{A}^n), \cup, \cap, ^c, \emptyset, \mathfrak{A}^n)$ are singletons, and $\ell \upharpoonright_n$ maps singletons (and nothing else) to singletons, i.e. preserves the atoms of the Boolean algebra in both directions. Hence it is enough to show that whenever \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{D}

are infinite atomic Boolean algebras and $g: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ is an embedding that preserves atoms both ways, then g is an elementary embedding.

Claim. Suppose that \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{D} are infinite atomic Boolean algebras. Then $g: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ is an elementary embedding if and only if it is an embedding that preserves atoms.

Proof of claim. If g is elementary, then it preserves atoms, as being an atom is a first-order definable property. For the converse, let $\tau = \{\vee, \wedge, \neg, \perp, \top\} \cup \{P_n \mid n < \omega\}$, i.e. the signature of Boolean algebras augmented with infinitely many fresh unary predicates. Let T be the τ -theory consisting of the first-order theory of infinite atomic Boolean algebras and the additional sentences stating that $P_n(a)$ holds exactly when a is above at least n atoms in the Boolean algebra order. By [23, Theorem 6.20] we have that T admits quantifier elimination and so T is model complete. Now, if g is an atom-preserving embedding $\mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$, then it is easy to show that $\hat{\mathfrak{C}} \models P_n(a)$ if and only if $\hat{\mathfrak{D}} \models P_n(f(a))$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{C}$, where $\hat{\mathfrak{C}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{D}}$ are the unique τ -expansions of \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{D} , respectively, that satisfy T . This means that g is a τ -embedding $\hat{\mathfrak{C}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{D}}$, and as T is model complete, g is elementary. Hence g is also an elementary embedding between the reducts \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{D} . \square

3.1. Characterizations of Partial Isomorphisms and Elementary Maps.

Although we have defined partial team isomorphisms simply by requiring some specific commutativity conditions, the next lemma and the following proposition show that these are exactly those team maps which preserve the quantifier-free fragment of FOT.

Lemma 3.7. Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be a partial team isomorphism. Then ℓ preserves first-order atomic formulas, i.e. for any $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ and atomic first-order formula $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi.$$

Proof. One would guess this is relatively easy to see but it proves to be surprisingly tricky due to flatness of first-order logic.

We begin by showing that for any τ -term $t(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$, we have $G_n(t; \mathfrak{A}) \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ and $\ell(G_n(t; \mathfrak{A})) = G_n(t; \mathfrak{B})$, where

$$G_n(t; \mathfrak{C}) = \{(c_0, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^{n+1} \mid t^{\mathfrak{C}}(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) = c_n\}$$

is the graph of the function $\vec{c} \mapsto t^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c})$. We proceed by induction on t .

- (i) If $t = v_i$, then the function $\vec{c} \mapsto t^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c})$ is the i^{th} projection. Let $\vec{i} = (0, \dots, n-1, i)$. Then

$$G_n(t; \mathfrak{C}) = \{(c_0, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^{n+1} \mid c_i = c_n\} = \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}}(\mathfrak{C}^{n+1}).$$

Hence

$$\ell(G_n(t; \mathfrak{A})) = \ell(\text{Pr}_{\vec{i}}(\mathfrak{A}^{n+1})) = \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}}(\ell(\mathfrak{A}^{n+1})) = \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}}(\mathfrak{B}^{n+1}) = G_n(t; \mathfrak{B}).$$

- (ii) If $t = c$ for a constant symbol $c \in \tau$, then the function $\vec{c} \mapsto t^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c})$ is the constant map $\vec{c} \mapsto c$. Then

$$G_n(t; \mathfrak{C}) = \{(c_0, \dots, c_n) \in \mathfrak{C}^{n+1} \mid c_n = c^{\mathfrak{C}}\} = \mathfrak{C}^n \times \{c^{\mathfrak{C}}\}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(G_n(t; \mathfrak{A})) &= \ell(\mathfrak{A}^n \times \{c^{\mathfrak{A}}\}) = \ell(\mathfrak{A}^n) \times \ell(\{c^{\mathfrak{A}}\}) \\ &= \mathfrak{B}^n \times \{c^{\mathfrak{B}}\} = G_n(t; \mathfrak{B}). \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) Finally suppose that $t = F(t_0(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}), \dots, t_{m-1}(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}))$ for τ -terms t_i and an m -ary function symbol $F \in \tau$. By the induction hypothesis, $\ell(G_n(t_i; \mathfrak{A})) = G_n(t_i; \mathfrak{B})$ for all $i < m$. First consider the relation

$$X_0(\mathfrak{C}) = \{(t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}), c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \mid c_0, \dots, c_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{C}\}.$$

Clearly $X_0(\mathfrak{C}) = \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_0}(G_n(t_0; \mathfrak{C}))$ for $\vec{i}_0 = (n, 0, \dots, n-1)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(X_0(\mathfrak{A})) &= \ell(\text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_0}(G_n(t_0; \mathfrak{A}))) = \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_0}(\ell(G_n(t_0; \mathfrak{A}))) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_0}(G_n(t_0; \mathfrak{B})) = X_0(\mathfrak{B}). \end{aligned}$$

Then consider the relation

$$X_1(\mathfrak{C}) = \{(t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), t_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \mid \vec{c} = (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{C}^n\}.$$

Denoting $\vec{i}_1 = (0, n+1, 1, \dots, n)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(\mathfrak{C}) &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_1}(\{(t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}, t_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c})) \mid \vec{c} = (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{C}^n\}) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_1}(X_0(\mathfrak{C}) \bowtie_n G_n(t_1; \mathfrak{C})). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(X_1(\mathfrak{A})) &= \ell(\text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_1}(X_0(\mathfrak{A}) \bowtie_n G_n(t_1; \mathfrak{A}))) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_1}(\ell(X_0(\mathfrak{A})) \bowtie_n \ell(G_n(t_1; \mathfrak{A}))) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{i}_1}(X_0(\mathfrak{B}) \bowtie_n G_n(t_1; \mathfrak{B})) \\ &= X_1(\mathfrak{B}). \end{aligned}$$

Continuing this way we obtain a description of the relation

$$X_{m-1}(\mathfrak{C}) = \{(t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), \dots, t_{m-1}^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \mid \vec{c} = (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{C}^n\}$$

as an element of the closure of $G_n(t_0; \mathfrak{C}), \dots, G_n(t_{m-1}; \mathfrak{C})$ under projections and join, whence $\ell(X_{m-1}(\mathfrak{A})) = X_{m-1}(\mathfrak{B})$. Then, denoting $\vec{j}_0 = (0, \dots, n-1, n+m)$ and $\vec{j}_1 = (m, \dots, m+n-1, 0, \dots, m-1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_n(t; \mathfrak{C}) &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_0}(\{(\vec{c}, t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), \dots, t_{m-1}^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), F^{\mathfrak{C}}(t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), \dots, t_{m-1}^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c})) \mid \vec{c} \in \mathfrak{C}^n \}) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_0} \left(\text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_1}(X_{m-1}(\mathfrak{C})) \bowtie_m F^{\mathfrak{C}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(G_n(t; \mathfrak{A})) &= \ell \left(\text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_0} \left(\text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_1}(X_{m-1}(\mathfrak{A}) \bowtie_m F^{\mathfrak{A}}) \right) \right) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_0} \left(\text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_1}(\ell(X_{m-1}(\mathfrak{A})) \bowtie_m \ell(F^{\mathfrak{A}})) \right) \\ &= \text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_0} \left(\text{Pr}_{\vec{j}_1}(X_{m-1}(\mathfrak{B}) \bowtie_m F^{\mathfrak{B}}) \right) \\ &= G_n(t; \mathfrak{B}). \end{aligned}$$

Now we show that ℓ preserves atomic formulas $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ of first-order logic. Suppose $\phi = R(t_0, \dots, t_{m-1})$ for some m -ary relation symbol $R \in \tau$ and τ -terms $t_i(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$, $i < m$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathfrak{C}) &:= \{(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{C}^n \mid \mathfrak{C} \models \phi(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1})\} \\ &= \{(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \mid (t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}), \dots, t_{m-1}^{\mathfrak{C}}(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1})) \in R^{\mathfrak{C}}\} \\ &= \text{Pr}_{(0, \dots, n-1)}(Y_n^m(\mathfrak{C}) \bowtie_m R^{\mathfrak{C}}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Y_n^m(\mathfrak{C}) := \{(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}, t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), \dots, t_{m-1}^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c})) \mid \vec{c} = (c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{C}^n\}.$$

If we can show that $Y_n^m(\mathfrak{A}) \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ and $\ell(Y_n^m(\mathfrak{A})) = Y_n^m(\mathfrak{B})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\phi(\mathfrak{A})) &= \ell \left(\Pr_{(0, \dots, n-1)} (Y_n^m(\mathfrak{A})) \bowtie_m R^{\mathfrak{A}} \right) = \Pr_{(0, \dots, n-1)} (\ell(Y_n^m(\mathfrak{A})) \bowtie_m \ell(R^{\mathfrak{A}})) \\ &= \Pr_{(0, \dots, n-1)} (Y_n^m(\mathfrak{B}) \bowtie_m R^{\mathfrak{B}}) \\ &= \phi(\mathfrak{B}). \end{aligned}$$

Then for any n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi &\iff X \subseteq \phi(\mathfrak{A}) \iff \ell(X) \subseteq \ell(\phi(\mathfrak{A})) \\ &\iff \ell(X) \subseteq \phi(\mathfrak{B}) \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. So left is to show that $Y_n^m(\mathfrak{C})$ can be presented in terms of products, projections, intersections and the sets $G(t_i; \mathfrak{C})$. We show this by induction on $m > 0$. If $m = 1$, then $Y_n^m(\mathfrak{C}) = G_n(t_0; \mathfrak{C})$, so we have already proved this. If we have already handled $Y_n^m(\mathfrak{C})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} Y_n^{m+1}(\mathfrak{C}) &= \Pr_{\vec{i}} (\{(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}, c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}, t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c}), \dots, t_m^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{c})) \mid \vec{c} \in \mathfrak{C}^n\}) \\ &= \Pr_{\vec{i}} (\Pr_{\vec{j}} (Y_n^m(\mathfrak{C}) \times G_n(t_m; \mathfrak{C})) \cap \Delta_{\mathfrak{C}}^n \times \mathfrak{C}^{m+1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{i} = (0, \dots, n-1, 2n, \dots, 2n+m)$ (skips the second batch of c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) and $\vec{j} = (0, \dots, n-1, n+m, \dots, 2n+m-1, n, \dots, n+m-1, 2n+m)$ (permutes the second batch of c_0, \dots, c_{n-1} to be after the first).

Then, finally, suppose that ϕ is the equation $t_0(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}) = t_1(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\mathfrak{C}) &= \{(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{C}^n \mid t_0^{\mathfrak{C}}(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1}) = t_1^{\mathfrak{C}}(c_0, \dots, c_{n-1})\} \\ &= \Pr_{(0, \dots, n-1)} (G_n(t_0; \mathfrak{C}) \cap G_n(t_1; \mathfrak{C})). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\ell(\phi(\mathfrak{A})) = \phi(\mathfrak{B})$. Then we obtain

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi,$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Proposition 3.8. Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be a team map. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i) ℓ is a partial team isomorphism.
- (ii) ℓ satisfies (PI3) and for all quantifier-free formulas $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ of FOT and n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi.$$

In particular, a partial elementary team map is a partial team isomorphism.

Proof. We first show that if ℓ satisfies (PI3) and preserves quantifier-free formulas of FOT, then it is a partial team isomorphism. We show (PI5), the rest are similar. Let $X, Y \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ be n -ary. If $X = \emptyset$, then $X \subseteq Y$ and $\ell(X) = \emptyset \subseteq \ell(Y)$. If $X \neq \emptyset = Y$, then $X \not\subseteq Y$ and $\emptyset \neq \ell(X) \not\subseteq \ell(Y) = \emptyset$. Otherwise denote $\vec{x} = (v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ and $\vec{y} = (v_n, \dots, v_{2n-1})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} X \subseteq Y &\iff \mathfrak{A} \models_{X \times Y} \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y} \\ &\iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X \times Y)} \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y} \\ &\stackrel{(\text{PI3})}{\iff} \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X) \times \ell(Y)} \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y} \\ &\iff \ell(X) \subseteq \ell(Y). \end{aligned}$$

Next we show that if ℓ is a partial isomorphism, then for all quantifier-free formulas $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ of FOT and n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi.$$

We proceed by induction on ϕ . The case for first-order atomic formulas follows from Lemma 3.7, and the connective cases are immediate consequences of the induction hypothesis. We show the case for dependence atoms. Suppose that $\phi = =(\vec{x})$ for some $\vec{x} \in \{v_0, \dots, v_{n-1}\}^{<\omega}$, and let \vec{i} be the corresponding index tuple. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi &\iff X \text{ is empty or } \text{Pr}(X) \text{ is a singleton} \\ &\iff \ell(X) \text{ is empty or } \ell(\text{Pr}(X)) \text{ is a singleton} \\ &\iff \ell(X) \text{ is empty or } \text{Pr}(\ell(X)) \text{ is a singleton} \\ &\iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

We conclude this section by pointing out some equivalent characterisations of elementary team maps. The usual Tarski–Vaught test applies immediately also in this context.

Proposition 3.9 (The Tarski–Vaught Test for FOT). Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be a team map. The following are equivalent.

- (i) ℓ is an elementary team embedding.
- (ii) ℓ is a team embedding and satisfies the following condition:
For any formula $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_n)$ of FOT and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$,
if $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \exists^1 v_n \phi$, there is $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)(\ell(a)/n)} \phi$.

Proof. After the observation that $\ell(X(a/n)) = \ell(X)(\ell(a)/n)$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, the proof is identical to its first-order counterpart. \square

Proposition 3.10. Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be a team map. The following are equivalent.

- (i) ℓ is a partial elementary team map.
- (ii) For any first-order sentence $\phi(R_0, \dots, R_{n-1})$ with free second-order variables R_i , and for any nonempty $\text{ar}(R_i)$ -ary $X_i \in \text{dom}(\ell)$, $i < n$,
$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \phi(\ell(X_0), \dots, \ell(X_{n-1})).$$
- (iii) For any $n < \omega$ and n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$, let \underline{X} be a new n -ary relation symbol and denote $\tau' = \tau \cup \{\underline{X} \mid X \in \text{dom}(\ell)\}$. Then the (partial) function $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, $f(a) = \ell(a)$ for all $\{a\} \in \text{dom}(\ell)$, is a partial elementary map between the τ' -structures $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$, where $\hat{\mathfrak{A}} \upharpoonright \tau = \mathfrak{A}$, $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright \tau = \mathfrak{B}$, $\underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}} = X$ and $\underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}} = \ell(X)$.

Proof. The equivalence of (ii) and (iii) follows immediately by the following observation. For any first-order $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, \vec{R})$ and elements a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} such that $\{a_0\}, \dots, \{a_{n-1}\} \in \text{dom}(\ell)$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, \vec{X}) \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \phi^*(\{a_0\}, \dots, \{a_{n-1}\}, \vec{X}),$$

where $\phi^*(S_0, \dots, S_{n-1}, \vec{R})$ is the formula

$$\exists x_0 \dots \exists x_{n-1} \left(\phi \wedge \bigwedge_{i < n} (S_i(x_i) \wedge \forall y (S_i(y) \rightarrow y = x_i)) \right)$$

and S_i are fresh unary second-order variables. We next show the equivalence of (ii) and (i).

(ii) \implies (i): The fact that ℓ preserves formulas of FOT follows directly from Lemma 2.7. We show that ℓ satisfies (PI3). Let $X, X' \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ be an n -ary and

m -ary nonempty relation, respectively, and let R and R' be an n -ary and an m -ary and S an $n + m$ -ary second-order variable. We let $\phi(S, R, R')$ be the sentence

$$\forall x_0 \dots \forall x_{n-1} \forall y_0 \dots \forall y_{m-1} (S(\vec{x}\vec{y}) \leftrightarrow (R(\vec{x}) \wedge R'(\vec{y})),$$

expressing that “ S is the cartesian product of R and R' ”. Denote $Y = X \times X'$. Then $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi(Y, X, X')$, whence $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi(\ell(Y), \ell(X), \ell(X'))$. Now $\ell(Y) = \ell(X) \times \ell(X')$ as desired.

(i) \implies (ii): Let $\phi(R_0, \dots, R_{n-1})$ be a first-order sentence with free second-order variables R_i of arity n_i . The first observation is that whenever X_i is empty, so is $\ell(X_i)$. Let $\phi^*(R_0, \dots, R_{i-1}, R_{i+1}, \dots, R_{n-1})$ be the formula obtained by replacing in ϕ each occurrence of formulas of the form $X_i(\vec{t})$ by \perp . Then, whenever $X_i = \emptyset$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \phi^*(X_0, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_{n-1}),$$

and the same holds for \mathfrak{B} and $\ell(X_j)$. Hence we only need to consider nonempty X_i .

Now let $\psi(R)$ be the sentence one obtains by replacing in ϕ formulas of the form $R_i(t_0, \dots, t_{n_i-1})$ by

$$\exists \vec{x} \exists \vec{y} R(\vec{x}, t_0, \dots, t_{n_i-1}, \vec{y}),$$

where \vec{x} and \vec{y} are variable tuples of length $\sum_{j < i} n_j$ and $\sum_{i < j < n} n_j$, respectively, and R is a $\sum_{i < n} n_i$ -ary second order variable. Now for any structure \mathfrak{C} and $X_i \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{n_i}$,

$$\mathfrak{C} \models \phi(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) \iff \mathfrak{C} \models \psi\left(\prod_{i < n} X_i\right).$$

Denote $N = \sum_{i < n} n_i$. By Lemma 2.7 there is a formula $\chi(v_0, \dots, v_{N-1})$ of FOT such that for any structure \mathfrak{C} and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^N$,

$$\mathfrak{C} \models \exists \vec{x} R(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \psi(X) \iff \mathfrak{C} \models_X \chi.$$

Now, let $X_i \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ be nonempty and denote $X = \prod_{i < n} X_i$. As ℓ is an elementary team embedding, we have $\ell(X) = \prod_{i < n} \ell(X_i)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{A} \models \phi(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1}) &\iff \mathfrak{A} \models \psi(X) \iff \mathfrak{A} \models_X \chi \\ &\iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \chi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \psi(\ell(X)) \\ &\iff \mathfrak{B} \models \psi\left(\prod_{i < n} \ell(X_i)\right) \\ &\iff \mathfrak{B} \models \phi(\ell(X_0), \dots, \ell(X_{n-1})). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Corollary 3.11. If $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a partial elementary team map, then $\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$.

3.2. Elementary Team Embeddings and Isomorphisms. Earlier we noticed that the ultrapower embedding $\iota: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$, $\iota(X) = X^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$, is not just an elementary team embedding but an independence team embedding as well. This is actually a general phenomenon: in fact, all elementary team embeddings preserve $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ to the direction of the map, as demonstrated by the next result. The true difference between elementary and independence team maps shows up at the level of partial maps.

Proposition 3.12. If $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is an elementary team embedding, then it is an independence team embedding.

Proof. Let $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ be a formula of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$, let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$ and suppose that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$. If $X = \emptyset$, then also $\ell(X) = \emptyset$ (and vice versa) and hence trivially $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi$. So we may assume that $X \neq \emptyset \neq \ell(X)$.

By the translation of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ to ESO and Lemma 2.1, there exists a first-order τ -sentence $\alpha(R, R')$ such that for any structure \mathfrak{C} and $Y \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^n$,

$$\mathfrak{C} \models_Y \phi \iff \mathfrak{C} \models \exists R' \alpha(Y, R'),$$

where R' is some m -ary relation symbol. Hence $\mathfrak{A} \models \exists R' \alpha(X, R')$. Now, there is $X' \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^m$ such that $\mathfrak{A} \models \alpha(X, X')$. Now either $X' = \emptyset$ or $X' \neq \emptyset$. We look at the two cases separately.

- (i) Suppose that $X' = \emptyset$. Let $\alpha^*(R)$ be the formula one obtains from α by replacing every occurrence of R' by \perp . Then for any \mathfrak{C} and $Y \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^n$,

$$\mathfrak{C} \models \alpha(Y, \emptyset) \iff \mathfrak{C} \models \alpha^*(Y).$$

Now $\mathfrak{A} \models \alpha^*(X)$. By the translation of FO to FOT , there is a τ -formula ψ of FOT such that for any structure \mathfrak{C} and $Y \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^n$,

$$\mathfrak{C} \models \exists \vec{x} Y(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \alpha^*(Y) \iff \mathfrak{C} \models_Y \psi.$$

Since $\mathfrak{A} \models \exists \vec{x} X(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \alpha^*(X)$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi$. Since ℓ is an elementary team embedding, we obtain $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \psi$. Then $\mathfrak{B} \models \exists \vec{x} \ell(X)(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \alpha^*(\ell(X))$, and as $\ell(X)$ is nonempty, we have $\mathfrak{B} \models \alpha^*(\ell(X))$. Hence $\mathfrak{B} \models \alpha(\ell(X), \emptyset)$, and so $\mathfrak{B} \models \exists R' \alpha(\ell(X), R')$. Thus $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi$.

- (ii) If $X' \neq \emptyset$, then let $X'' = X \times X'$. Let α^* be the formula one obtains from α by replacing each occurrence of $R(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1})$ by

$$\exists x_0 \dots \exists x_{m-1} R''(t_0, \dots, t_{n-1}, x_0, \dots, x_{m-1})$$

and each $R'(t_0, \dots, t_{m-1})$ by

$$\exists x_0 \dots \exists x_{n-1} R''(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, t_0, \dots, t_{m-1}),$$

where x_i are fresh variables. By the translation of FO to FOT , there is a τ -formula ψ of FOT such that for all \mathfrak{C} and $Y \subseteq \mathfrak{C}^{n+m}$,

$$\mathfrak{C} \models \exists \vec{x} R''(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \alpha^*(Y) \iff \mathfrak{C} \models_Y \psi.$$

Now as $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X''} \psi$, and as ℓ is an elementary team embedding, we have $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X'')} \psi$. Hence $\mathfrak{B} \models \exists \vec{x} R''(\vec{x}) \rightarrow \alpha^*(\ell(X''))$. As X and X' are both nonempty, so is X'' and thus so is $\ell(X'')$. Therefore $\mathfrak{B} \models \alpha^*(\ell(X''))$. As ℓ is an elementary team embedding, we have $\ell(X'') = \ell(X) \times \ell(X')$. As $\mathfrak{B} \models \alpha^*(\ell(X) \times \ell(X'))$, we have $\mathfrak{B} \models \alpha(\ell(X), \ell(X'))$ and thus $\mathfrak{B} \models \exists R' \alpha(\ell(X), R')$. But then $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi$.

Thus $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi$, which finishes the proof. \square

Next, we show that element-total and element-surjective partial team isomorphisms and all only those arising from usual isomorphism.

Proposition 3.13. Suppose that $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is an element-total and element-surjective partial team isomorphism. Then there is an (ordinary) isomorphism $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\ell \subseteq \hat{\pi}$.

Proof. Define $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ by setting $\pi(a) = \ell(a)$ (i.e. $\pi(a)$ is the unique element of $\ell(\{a\})$) for all $a \in \mathfrak{A}$. By Proposition 3.8, π is an embedding, and as π is surjective by assumption, it is an isomorphism.

Let $X \in \text{dom}(\ell)$ be n -ary. Then for any $\vec{b} \in \ell(X)$ we have $\{\vec{b}\} \in \text{ran}(\ell)$. By (PI2), there is $\vec{a} \in \mathfrak{A}^n$ such that $\pi(\vec{a}) = \vec{b}$. Hence $\ell(X) \subseteq \{\pi(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{a} \in X\}$. Then note that given any $\vec{a} \in \mathfrak{A}^n$, by (PI5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{a} \in X &\implies \{\vec{a}\} \subseteq X \implies \ell(\{\vec{a}\}) \subseteq \ell(X) \implies \{\ell(\vec{a})\} \subseteq \ell(X) \\ &\implies \ell(\vec{a}) \in \ell(X) \implies \pi(\vec{a}) \in \ell(X). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\ell(X) \supseteq \{\pi(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{a} \in X\}$. Thus $\ell(X) = \hat{\pi}(X)$. It follows that $\ell \subseteq \hat{\pi}$. \square

Corollary 3.14. Suppose that $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a team map. Then ℓ is a team isomorphism if and only if there is an (ordinary) isomorphism $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\ell = \hat{\pi}$.

Proposition 3.15. Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ be a team embedding, and let \mathfrak{B} be a structure such that $\text{dom}(\mathfrak{B}) = \{\ell(a) \mid a \in \mathfrak{A}\}$, if $R \in \tau$ is a relation or function symbol, then $R^{\mathfrak{B}} = \ell(R^{\mathfrak{A}}) \cap \mathfrak{B}^{\text{ar}(R)}$, and $c^{\mathfrak{B}} = \ell(c^{\mathfrak{A}})$ for constant symbols $c \in \tau$. Then

- (i) \mathfrak{B} is a substructure of \mathfrak{C} ,
- (ii) $g: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, $g(X) = \ell(X) \cap \mathfrak{B}^n$ for $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$, is a team isomorphism, and
- (iii) if ℓ is elementary, then also $\ell \circ g^{-1}$ is elementary and \mathfrak{B} is an elementary substructure of \mathfrak{C} .

Proof. We show that \mathfrak{B} is a substructure of \mathfrak{C} . The other claims are proved in a similar fashion.

First of all, note that $g(a) = \ell(a)$ for all elements $a \in \mathfrak{A}$. Additionally,

$$\ell(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) = (\ell(a_0), \dots, \ell(a_{n-1})) = (g(a_0), \dots, g(a_{n-1})) = g(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}),$$

whence $g(\vec{a}) = \ell(\vec{a})$ for all $\vec{a} \in \mathfrak{A}^n$. If $R \in \tau$ is an n -ary relation symbol, then $R^{\mathfrak{B}} = \ell(R^{\mathfrak{A}}) \cap \mathfrak{B}^n = R^{\mathfrak{C}} \cap \mathfrak{B}^n$. If $F \in \tau$ is a function symbol, the same holds for F , i.e. $F^{\mathfrak{B}} = F^{\mathfrak{C}} \cap \mathfrak{B}^n$. We show that \mathfrak{B} is closed under $F^{\mathfrak{C}}$. Let $\vec{b} \in \mathfrak{B}^n$. Then $\vec{b} = \ell(\vec{a})$ for some $\vec{a} \in \mathfrak{A}^n$. Let $a = F^{\mathfrak{A}}(\vec{a})$. Then $\vec{a}a \in F^{\mathfrak{A}}$, so $\ell(\vec{a}a) \in \ell(F^{\mathfrak{A}}) = F^{\mathfrak{C}}$, so $\ell(a) = F^{\mathfrak{C}}(\ell(\vec{a})) = F^{\mathfrak{C}}(\vec{b})$. But by the definition of \mathfrak{B} , $\ell(a) \in \mathfrak{B}$. Hence \mathfrak{B} is closed under $F^{\mathfrak{C}}$, and thus $F^{\mathfrak{B}}$ is well defined. Finally, \mathfrak{B} contains $c^{\mathfrak{C}}$ for all constant symbols $c \in \tau$, as $c^{\mathfrak{C}} = \ell(c^{\mathfrak{A}})$. Hence \mathfrak{B} is a substructure of \mathfrak{C} . \square

3.3. Diagrams. In this section, we give a simple condition to check if there is an elementary team embedding from a structure \mathfrak{A} to a structure \mathfrak{B} . Such condition is the obvious team-semantic extension of the methods of elementary diagrams used to test for elementary embeddings in first-order logic. In turn, this provides us with a connection between elementary team embeddings and complete (first-order) embeddings.

Definition 3.16. Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure, $A \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ and $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$.

- (i) By $\tau(A)$ we denote the expansion of τ by names for all elements of A , i.e. the signature $\tau \cup \{\underline{a} \mid a \in A\}$, where each \underline{a} is a fresh constant symbol. By $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ we mean the expansion of τ by names for all possible *nonempty* elements of \mathfrak{X} , i.e. the signature $\tau \cup \bigcup_{n < \omega} \{\underline{X} \mid \emptyset \neq X \in \mathfrak{X}\}$, where \underline{X} is a fresh $\text{ar}(X)$ -ary relation symbol for any $X \in \mathfrak{X}$.
- (ii) By \mathfrak{A}_A we mean the $\tau(A)$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$ of \mathfrak{A} such that $\underline{a}^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}} = a$ for all $a \in A$. By $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ we mean the $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}$ of \mathfrak{A} with $\underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}} = X$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}$.
- (iii) The (*elementary*) *team diagram* of $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X})$, denoted by $\text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X})$, is the complete FOT-theory of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{X}}$.

Lemma 3.17. Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure and $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$. Then every $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -structure \mathfrak{B} with $\mathfrak{B} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X})$ has a unique $\tau(\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ such that $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$.

Proof. Clearly \mathfrak{A}^n , $\Delta_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $s^{\mathfrak{A}}$ for all symbols $s \in \tau$ are each definable by a first-order τ -sentence. Likewise, given relations $X, Y \in \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$, the relations $X \cap Y$, $X \times Y$ and $\text{Pr}_{\vec{r}}(X)$ for any $\vec{r} \in \text{ar}(X)^{<\omega}$ are each definable by a first-order sentence with only second-order parameters X and Y . Hence the relations $\underline{\mathfrak{A}}^n$, $\underline{\Delta}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, $\underline{s}^{\mathfrak{A}}$ for $s \in \tau$, $\underline{X \cap Y}$, $\underline{X \times Y}$ and $\underline{\text{Pr}_{\vec{r}}(X)}$ are each definable by a $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -sentence of first-order logic. Hence each of them is also definable by a $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -sentence of FOT. The claim clearly follows. \square

Lemma 3.18. For τ -structures \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} , the following are equivalent.

- (i) There is a $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ of \mathfrak{B} with $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X})$.
- (ii) There is a partial elementary team map $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ with $\text{dom}(\ell) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Proof. Suppose first that $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a partial elementary team map with $\text{dom}(\ell) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})$. Then by Proposition 3.10, the map $a \mapsto \ell(a)$ is a partial elementary map $\mathfrak{A}_{\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{B}}$, where $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is the $\tau(\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$ -expansion of \mathfrak{B} satisfying $\underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}} = \ell(X)$. Then $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$. Then $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright \tau(\mathfrak{X})$ is the desired expansion of \mathfrak{B} .

For the converse, suppose there is some $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ of \mathfrak{B} such that $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A})$. By Lemma 3.17, there is a unique $\tau(\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^*$ of $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ such that $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^* \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$. Let Γ be the set of FO-translations of sentences of $\text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$. Now Γ is the complete first-order $\tau(\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}))$ -theory of $\mathfrak{A}_{\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^* \models \Gamma$. Define a team map $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ by setting $\ell(X) = \underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^*}$ for all $X \in \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})$. Let $\phi(R_0, \dots, R_{n-1})$ be a first-order τ -sentence, let $X_0, \dots, X_{n-1} \in \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})$ with $\text{ar}(X_i) = \text{ar}(R_i)$ and suppose that $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi(X_0, \dots, X_{n-1})$. Then $\mathfrak{A}_{\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})} \models \phi(\underline{X}_0, \dots, \underline{X}_{n-1})$, whence $\phi(\underline{X}_0, \dots, \underline{X}_{n-1}) \in \Gamma$ and so $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^* \models \phi(\underline{X}_0, \dots, \underline{X}_{n-1})$. Then, since $\underline{X}_i^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^*} = \ell(X_i)$, we have $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi(\ell(X_0), \dots, \ell(X_{n-1}))$. By Proposition 3.10 it follows that ℓ is an elementary team embedding. \square

As a corollary of Proposition 3.10, we obtain a connection between complete embeddings in first-order logic and elementary team embeddings in our setting: every elementary team embedding is a complete embedding on the level of elements, and conversely every complete embedding gives rise to an elementary team embedding.

Corollary 3.19.

- (i) Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be an elementary team embedding. Then the function $a \mapsto \ell(a)$ is a(n ordinary) complete embedding $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$.
- (ii) Let $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be a(n ordinary) complete embedding. Then there is an elementary team embedding $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\ell(a) = f(a)$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{A}$.

Proof.

- (i) Follows immediately from Proposition 3.10.
- (ii) As f is complete, there is a $\tau(\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A}))$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ of \mathfrak{B} such that f is elementary between $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$. For all $X \in \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$, define $\ell(X) = \underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}}$. Then by Proposition 3.10, ℓ is an elementary team embedding. Now, for every $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, we have $a \in \{a\} = \{a\}^{\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})}$, whence, as f is elementary, we obtain $f(a) \in \{a\}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}} = \ell(\{a\})$, yielding $f(a) = \ell(a)$. \square

As every complete embedding is essentially a limit ultrapower embedding, the same holds for elementary team embeddings.

Proposition 3.20. Suppose that $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is an elementary team embedding. Then there is a cardinal κ , an ultrafilter \mathcal{F} on κ and a filter \mathcal{G} on κ^2 such that, denoting $\mathfrak{C} = (\mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{F}) \upharpoonright \mathcal{G}$, there is an isomorphism $\pi: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ with

$$(\hat{\pi} \circ \ell)(X) = \underline{g}(X) \cap \mathfrak{C}^n$$

for all $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$, where $\underline{g}: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{F}$ is the ultrapower team embedding $X \mapsto X^\kappa / \mathcal{F}$.

Proof. Straightforwardly follows from Theorem 2.17 and Corollary 3.19. \square

4. ABSTRACT ELEMENTARY CLASSES FOR TEAM SEMANTICS

Abstract elementary classes (AECs) were introduced by Shelah in [27] and provide an important tool to adapt several techniques of elementary model theory

beyond the scope of first-order logic. It is, thus, very natural to consider whether we can introduce a suitable AEC to study (complete) theories in independence logic, or, equivalently, existential second-order logic. We start by recalling the definition of abstract elementary class.

Definition 4.1. Let \mathcal{K} be a class of τ -structures and \preceq a partial order on \mathcal{K} extending the substructure relation. We say that (\mathcal{K}, \preceq) is an abstract elementary class if the following hold.

- (i) *Closure under isomorphism:* If $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is an isomorphism, then $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$, and if $\mathfrak{C} \preceq \mathfrak{A}$, then $\pi(\mathfrak{C}) \preceq \mathfrak{B}$.
- (ii) *Coherence:* If $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \preceq \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$, then $\mathfrak{A} \preceq \mathfrak{B}$.
- (iii) *Unions of chains:* If α is an ordinal and $(\mathfrak{A}_i)_{i < \alpha}$ is a \preceq -increasing continuous sequence of elements of \mathcal{K} , i.e. $\mathfrak{A}_i \preceq \mathfrak{A}_j$ for $i < j$ and $\mathfrak{A}_\beta = \bigcup_{i < \beta} \mathfrak{A}_i$ for $\beta < \alpha$ a limit, then
 - (a) $\bigcup_{i < \alpha} \mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathcal{K}$,
 - (b) for all $j < \alpha$, $\mathfrak{A}_j \preceq \bigcup_{i < \alpha} \mathfrak{A}_i$, and
 - (c) *Smoothness:* if $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ is such that $\mathfrak{A}_i \preceq \mathfrak{B}$ for all $i < \alpha$, then $\bigcup_{i < \alpha} \mathfrak{A}_i \preceq \mathfrak{B}$.
- (iv) *Löwenheim–Skolem property:* There is a cardinal $\kappa \geq |\tau| + \aleph_0$ such that such that for all $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ with $|X| \leq \kappa$, there is $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that $X \subseteq \mathfrak{B} \preceq \mathfrak{A}$ and $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq \kappa$.

We call the least cardinal κ that satisfies the Löwenheim–Skolem property for \mathcal{K} the Löwenheim–Skolem number of \mathcal{K} and denote it by $\text{LS}(\mathcal{K})$.

The relation \preceq in the above definition is often called “strong embedding”. So far, we have seen two possible candidates for a notion of strong embedding in the context of team semantics:

- (i) a team embedding, and
- (ii) an elementary team embedding (which is the same thing as an independence team embedding).

In this section we shall study all the properties of abstract elementary classes in the context of team semantics. In particular, we shall see that one has to modify the definition of an AEC to fit the context of team maps. In fact, in this context it is more natural to consider just embeddings and strong embeddings, rather than to bother with substructures and strong substructures.

We shall see that all key properties of abstract elementary classes essentially hold in our setting, though a major issue is that we have to drop the requirement that strong maps “extend” the substructure relation. We will consider this issue at length in the following section. We begin by studying the properties of coherence, closure under direct limits and Löwenheim–Skolem. Then in Section 4.4 we conclude our discussion describing a “quasi-AEC” for team semantics, namely an accessible category of models of elementary team embeddings.

4.1. Coherence. The following example shows why the traditional substructure relation is not a good basis for our study of structures in ESO and $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$.

Example 4.2. Let $\tau = \{P\}$, where P is a unary predicate, and let \preceq be the relation

$$\mathfrak{A} \preceq \mathfrak{B} \text{ if and only if } \mathfrak{A} \subseteq \mathfrak{B} \text{ and there is an elementary team embedding } \ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B} \text{ with } \ell(a) = a \text{ for all } a \in \mathfrak{A}.$$

We show that coherence fails for this relation. For this, let \mathfrak{B} be a τ -structure with $|\mathfrak{B}| = |P^{\mathfrak{B}}| = \aleph_1$ and $|\mathfrak{B} \setminus P^{\mathfrak{B}}| = \aleph_0$. Now \mathfrak{B} has a countable elementary substructure \mathfrak{A} . As $\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$, by the Keisler–Shelah theorem there is κ and an ultrafilter \mathcal{U}

on κ such that $\mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U} \cong B^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$. Let $\pi: \mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ be an isomorphism, let $\iota_{\mathfrak{A}}: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ and $\iota_{\mathfrak{B}}: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ be the ultrapower embeddings, and denote $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$. Now $\ell = \iota_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $g = \pi \circ \iota_{\mathfrak{B}}$ are elementary team embeddings $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$, respectively. Let ϕ be a sentence of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ expressing that P and the complement of P have the same cardinality. Now, suppose that there is an elementary team embedding $h: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ (such that $h(a) = a$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{A}$). Now, as \mathfrak{A} is countable, we have $|P^{\mathfrak{A}}| = |\mathfrak{A} \setminus P^{\mathfrak{A}}| = \aleph_0$, whence $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$. By Proposition 3.12, h is an independence team embedding and hence $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$. But this is impossible, since $|P^{\mathfrak{B}}| > |\mathfrak{B} \setminus P^{\mathfrak{B}}|$. Hence no such h can exist.

The fault in the above example seems to lie in the fact that if $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is an independence team embedding, \mathfrak{B} may satisfy more sentences of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ than \mathfrak{A} , due to the positive nature of ESO. But even in the case that there exist elementary team embeddings $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and a team embedding $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ that do not move elements, there is no guarantee that these map commute in a nice way. We take this as an argument in favour of a more category-theoretic approach. In particular, the following form of coherence works.

Proposition 4.3. If $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ are elementary team embeddings and $h: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a team embedding such that $\ell = g \circ h$, then h is elementary.

Proof. Let $\phi(v_0, \dots, v_{n-1})$ be a formula of FOT and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$. Then

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{C} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi \iff \mathfrak{C} \models_{g(h(X))} \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{h(X)} \phi.$$

Hence h is elementary. \square

4.2. Direct Limits. Since we are considering (elementary) team embeddings and not so interested in substructures, we want to also consider the natural generalization of unions of chains, that is, direct limits.

If I is a set and \leq is a binary relation on I , we say that (I, \leq) is a κ -directed set if \leq is a preorder (i.e. reflexive and transitive) and every $J \subseteq I$ of power $< \kappa$ has a \leq -upperbound. (I, \leq) is a *directed set* if it is an \aleph_0 -directed set. A set $J \subseteq I$ is an *upset* if it is upwards closed, i.e. if $i \in I$, $j \in J$ and $i \geq j$, then $i \in J$. For an element $i \in I$, the *upward closure* $\uparrow i$ of i is the upset $\{j \in I \mid j \geq i\}$. For a subset $J \subseteq I$, the upward closure $\uparrow J$ is the upset $\bigcup_{j \in J} \uparrow j$. A subset $J \subseteq I$ is *cofinal* if for every $i \in I$ there is $j \in J$ with $i \leq j$, i.e. it meets all upsets.

Definition 4.4.

- (i) Let (I, \leq) be a directed set. A directed system of τ -structures and team maps based on (I, \leq) is a sequence $(\mathfrak{A}_i, \ell_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$ such that
 - (a) each \mathfrak{A}_i is τ -structure and $\ell_{i,j}: \mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_j$ a team map,
 - (b) for all $i, j \in I$ with $j \geq i$, we have $\text{dom}(\ell_{i,j}) = \text{dom}(\ell_{i,i})$ and $\ell_{i,i} = \text{id} \upharpoonright \text{dom}(\ell_{i,i})$, and
 - (c) for all $i, j, k \in I$ with $i \leq j \leq k$, we have $\text{ran}(\ell_{i,j}) \subseteq \text{dom}(\ell_{j,k})$ and $\ell_{i,k} = \ell_{j,k} \circ \ell_{i,j}$.

We say that a directed system is κ -directed if (I, \leq) is a κ -directed set.

- (ii) Let $\mathcal{A} = (\mathfrak{A}_i, \ell_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$ be a directed system of τ -structures and partial team isomorphisms. We define a structure $\mathfrak{B} := \lim \mathcal{A}$, called the *direct limit* of the system \mathcal{A} , as follows. The domain of \mathfrak{B} is the set of functions η such that
 - (a) $\text{dom}(\eta)$ is a nonempty upset of (I, \leq) ,
 - (b) $\eta(i) \in \mathfrak{A}_i$ for all $i \in \text{dom}(\eta)$,
 - (c) for all $i, j \in \text{dom}(\eta)$, if $i \leq j$, then $\ell_{i,j}(\eta(i)) = \eta(j)$, and
 - (d) if $i \in I$, $j \in \text{dom}(\eta)$, $i \leq j$ and there is $a \in \mathfrak{A}_i$ with $\ell_{i,j}(a) = \eta(j)$, then $i \in \text{dom}(\eta)$.

For all $i \in I$, we define team maps $g_i: \mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ as follows: given $X \in \text{dom}(f_{i,i})$, we let $g_i(X)$ be the set of all $(\eta_0, \dots, \eta_{n-1}) \in \mathfrak{B}^n$ such that there is some $j \in \bigcap_{k < n} \text{dom}(\eta_k)$ with $j \geq i$ such that $(\eta_0(j), \dots, \eta_{n-1}(j)) \in f_{i,j}(X)$. Then the interpretations of relation and function symbols $R \in L$ are defined by setting $R^{\mathfrak{B}} = g_i(R^{\mathfrak{A}_i})$, and for constant symbols $c \in \tau$, $c^{\mathfrak{B}} = g_i(c^{\mathfrak{A}_i})$, where $i \in I$ is arbitrary.

When there is no risk of confusion, we write simply $\lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ instead of $\lim \mathfrak{A}$. We call the maps g_i the direct limit maps of the system \mathfrak{A} .

We immediately make the following observations. In particular, this shows that the direct limit is well defined.

Lemma 4.5.

- (i) If $\eta, \xi \in \lim_i \mathfrak{A}_i$ and $\eta(i) = \xi(i)$ for some $i \in \text{dom}(\eta) \cap \text{dom}(\xi)$, then $\eta = \xi$. Hence for any $i \in I$ and $a \in \mathfrak{A}_i$, there is a unique $\eta \in \lim_i \mathfrak{A}_i$ with $\eta(i) = a$.
- (ii) For all $i \leq j$, $g_i = g_j \circ f_{i,j}$.
- (iii) The interpretations of symbols $R \in \tau$ in $\lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ are well defined.
- (iv) Each g_i is a well-defined team map.
- (v) For any $i \in I$, n -ary $X \in \text{dom}(g_i)$ and $\vec{a} \in X$, there is unique $\vec{\eta} \in g_i(X)$ with $\eta_k(i) = a_k$ for all $k < n$. Furthermore, $\vec{\eta} = g_i(\vec{a})$.
- (vi) If each $f_{i,j}$ is (element-)total, then so is each g_i .
- (vii) If $J \subseteq I$ is a cofinal subset such that (J, \leq) is also directed, then there is an isomorphism $\pi: \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \lim_{j \in J} \mathfrak{A}_i$ such that if g_j^J and g_i^I are the direct limit maps in the systems based on J and I , respectively, then for all $j \in J$, $g_j^J = \hat{\pi} \circ g_j^I$.

Proof. We prove the last claim and leave the rest to the reader.

Define π by setting $\pi(\eta) = \eta \upharpoonright (\text{dom}(\eta) \cap J)$ for all $\eta \in \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$. We show that this is an isomorphism. For injectivity, let $\eta, \xi \in \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ and suppose that $\pi(\eta) = \pi(\xi)$. Let $j \in \text{dom}(\pi(\eta)) = \text{dom}(\pi(\xi))$. Now $\eta(j) = \pi(\eta)(j) = \pi(\xi)(j) = \xi(j)$, whence by item (i) we have that $\eta = \xi$.

For surjectivity, let $\eta \in \lim_{j \in J} \mathfrak{A}_j$. Pick some $j \in \text{dom}(\eta)$. Now there is a unique $\xi \in \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ with $\xi(j) = \eta(j)$. Let $i \in \text{dom}(\eta)$. Letting $k \in J$ be an upper bound of $\{i, j\}$, we have $\xi(k) = f_{j,k}(\xi(j)) = f_{j,k}(\eta(j)) = \eta(k) = f_{i,k}(\eta(i))$, whence $i \in \text{dom}(\xi)$. Hence $\text{dom}(\eta) \subseteq \text{dom}(\xi)$, and by uniqueness of all the values, this means that $\eta \subseteq \xi$. Then let $i \in \text{dom}(\xi) \cap J$. Let again $k \in J$ be an upper bound of $\{i, j\}$. Now $f_{i,k}(\xi(i)) = \xi(k) = \eta(k)$, so we have $i \in \text{dom}(\eta)$. Hence $\text{dom}(\eta) = \text{dom}(\xi) \cap J$ and for all $i \in \text{dom}(\eta)$, $\xi(i) = \eta(i)$. Thus $\eta = \xi \upharpoonright (\text{dom}(\xi) \cap J) = \pi(\xi)$.

Since the interpretations of symbols of τ are defined via g_i^I and g_j^J , the isomorphism condition of π will follow from $g_j^J = \hat{\pi} \circ g_j^I$. So we show this final fact. Let $X \in \text{dom}(g_j^I) = \text{dom}(g_j^J)$, and let $\vec{\eta} \in \hat{\pi}(g_j^I(X)) = \pi[g_j^I(X)]$. Then $\vec{\eta} = \pi(\vec{\xi})$ for some $\vec{\xi} \in g_j^I(X)$. Let $i \in \uparrow j \cap J \cap \bigcap_{k < n} \text{dom}(\xi_k)$ be such that $(\xi_0(i), \dots, \xi_{n-1}(i)) \in f_{j,i}(X)$. Now $\eta_k(i) = \xi_k(i)$ for all $k < n$, whence $\vec{\xi} \in g_j^J(X)$. Hence $\hat{\pi}(g_j^I(X)) \subseteq g_j^J(X)$.

Then let $\vec{\eta} \in g_j^J(X)$ and denote $\vec{\xi} = \pi(\vec{\eta})$. Now there is $i \in \uparrow j \cap J \cap \bigcap_{k < n} \text{dom}(\eta_k)$ such that $(\eta_0(i), \dots, \eta_{n-1}(i)) \in f_{j,i}(X)$. As $i \in \text{dom}(\xi_k)$ and $\eta_k(i) = \xi_k(i)$ for all $k < n$, we have $\vec{\xi} \in g_j^I(X)$ and so $\vec{\eta} \in \pi[g_j^I(X)] = \hat{\pi}(g_j^I(X))$. Hence $g_j^J(X) \subseteq \hat{\pi}(g_j^I(X))$. This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.6. Each g_i is a partial team isomorphism $\mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$.

Proof. Denote $\mathfrak{B} = \lim_i \mathfrak{A}_i$. We prove (PI2), the rest are similar although tedious.

Let $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_i^n$. We show that X is a singleton if and only if $g_i(X)$ is. We consider the case $n = 1$, the rest follows from (PI3). Suppose $X = \{a\}$. Let

$\eta, \xi \in \mathfrak{g}_i(X)$. Now there are $j \in \text{dom}(\eta)$ and $k \in \text{dom}(\xi)$ such that $j, k \geq i$, $\eta(j) \in \ell_{i,j}(X)$ and $\xi(k) \in \ell_{i,k}(X)$. Let l be an upper bound of $\{j, k\}$. Now $\eta(l) = \ell_{j,l}(\eta(j)) \in \ell_{j,l}(\ell_{i,l}(X)) = \ell_{i,l}(X)$, and similarly $\xi(l) \in \ell_{i,l}(X)$. As $\ell_{i,l}$ is a team embedding, $\ell_{i,l}(X)$ is a singleton, whence $\eta(l) = \xi(l)$. But then $\eta = \xi$. Hence $\mathfrak{g}_i(X)$ is a singleton.

On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{g}_i(X) = \{\eta\}$, let $j \in \text{dom}(\eta)$ be such that $j \geq i$ and $\eta(j) \in \ell_{i,j}(X)$. Now, if $a \in \ell_{i,j}(X)$ is such that $a \neq \eta(j)$, then the unique $\xi \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\xi(j) = a$ is different from η , but this is not possible, since then ξ would be an element of $\mathfrak{g}_i(X)$. Hence $\ell_{i,j}(X)$ is a singleton, and as $\ell_{i,j}$ is a partial team isomorphism, so is X . \square

Proposition 4.7. If each $\ell_{i,j}$ is elementary, then so is each \mathfrak{g}_i .

Proof. Denote $\mathfrak{B} = \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$, and let ϕ be a formula of FOT. We show by induction on ϕ that for any $i \in I$ and $X \in \text{dom}(\mathfrak{g}_i)$ of arity $|\text{Fv}(\phi)|$,

$$\mathfrak{A}_i \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\mathfrak{g}_i(X)} \phi.$$

If ϕ is atomic, this follows from the fact that \mathfrak{g}_i is a partial team isomorphism, and the connective cases follow directly from the induction hypothesis. So suppose that $\phi = \exists^1 v_n \psi(v_0, \dots, v_n)$. If $\mathfrak{A}_i \models_X \phi$, then there is $a \in \mathfrak{A}_i$ with $\mathfrak{A}_i \models_{X(a/n)} \psi$, whence the induction hypothesis gives $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\mathfrak{g}_i(X(a/n))} \psi$. Since \mathfrak{g}_i is a team embedding, we have $\mathfrak{g}_i(X(a/n)) = \mathfrak{g}_i(X)(\mathfrak{g}_i(a)/n)$, whence $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\mathfrak{g}_i(X)} \phi$.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\mathfrak{g}_i(X)} \phi$. Then there is some $\eta \in \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\mathfrak{g}_i(X)(\eta/n)} \psi$. Let $j \in \text{dom}(\eta)$ be such that $j \geq i$. Then as \mathfrak{g}_j is a team embedding, we have $\mathfrak{g}_i(X)(\eta/n) = \mathfrak{g}_j(\ell_{i,j}(X))(\mathfrak{g}_j(\eta(j))/n) = \mathfrak{g}_j(\ell_{i,j}(X)(\eta(j)/n))$. Now by the induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{A}_j \models_{\ell_{i,j}(X)(\eta(j)/n)} \psi$, whence $\mathfrak{A}_j \models_{\ell_{i,j}(X)} \phi$. Since $\ell_{i,j}$ is elementary, this means that $\mathfrak{A}_i \models_X \phi$.

The case $\phi = \forall^1 v_n \psi$ is dual to the existential quantifier case. \square

The previous results show that direct limits are well defined in the setting of team semantics. We conclude this section by pointing out how a directed limit comes naturally equipped with a specific set of relations, which we shall call admissible.

Definition 4.8. Let $\mathcal{A} = (\mathfrak{A}_i, \ell_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$ be a directed system of τ -structures and team embeddings, and let $\mathfrak{B} = \lim \mathcal{A}$. We say that a relation $R \subseteq \mathfrak{B}^n$ is *admissible* (in the system \mathcal{A}) if there is $i \in I$ and $S \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_i^n$ such that $R = \mathfrak{g}_i(S)$.

Now, if $\mathfrak{B} = \lim \mathfrak{A}_i$ and \mathfrak{C} is another structure with (elementary) team embeddings $\mathfrak{h}_i: \mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$, $i \in I$, such that

$$\mathfrak{h}_i = \mathfrak{h}_j \circ \ell_{i,j},$$

then we may define a partial map $\mathfrak{k}: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ such that for any admissible $X \subseteq \mathfrak{B}^n$, $\mathfrak{k}(X) = \mathfrak{h}_i(X)$ for any $i \in I$ such that $X \in \text{ran}(\mathfrak{h}_i)$, and this will satisfy

$$\mathfrak{k}(\mathfrak{g}_i(X)) = \mathfrak{h}_i(X)$$

for all admissible X . However, there is no obvious way to extend the map to non-admissible sets. Hence it is unclear whether it is possible for our direct limits to satisfy the smoothness property of the unions of chains axiom of AECs (which corresponds to the universal mapping property of direct limit in category theory). However, we shall solve this problem in Section 4.4 by transitioning to work with something reminiscent of general models of second-order logic.

4.3. The Löwenheim–Skolem Property. In the definition of an AEC, the Löwenheim–Skolem number $\text{LS}(\mathcal{K})$ of an AEC \mathcal{K} is the least $\kappa \geq |\tau| + \aleph_0$ such that for any $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$, whenever $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ has power $\leq \kappa$, there is $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ with power $\leq \kappa$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{B} \preceq \mathfrak{A}$. This is equivalent to the seemingly stronger claim that for every $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$, whenever $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$, then there is $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $X \subseteq \mathfrak{B} \preceq \mathfrak{A}$ and $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq |X| + \kappa$. However, this seems to be too much to ask in our context, as even the weaker property where the set X of objects is required to be strictly smaller than κ has enormous consistency strength: we observe that the existence of this weaker notion of a Löwenheim–Skolem number, even in the model class of the empty theory, requires the existence of a supercompact cardinal. We show this using a theorem of Magidor [22].

Definition 4.9. For a class \mathcal{K} of τ -structures, denote by $\text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K})$ the least infinite cardinal $\kappa > |\tau|$ such that the following holds and call it the weak Löwenheim–Skolem number of \mathcal{K} . For any $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$ with $|\mathcal{X}| < \kappa$, there is $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ and an elementary team embedding $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $|\mathfrak{B}| < \kappa$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{ran}(\iota)$.

We fix some notation. We denote by \mathbf{V} the universe of sets. We denote other models of set theory by boldface letters such as \mathbf{M} . If $j: \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ is an elementary embedding in the language of set theory, the critical point of j is the least ordinal α such that $j(\alpha) > \alpha$.

Definition 4.10. A cardinal κ is supercompact if for every $\lambda \geq \kappa$ there is a transitive model \mathbf{M} of set theory with $\mathbf{M}^\lambda \subseteq \mathbf{M}$, and an elementary embedding $j: \mathbf{V} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ with critical point κ , such that $j(\kappa) > \lambda$.

Theorem 4.11 (Magidor [22]). The first supercompact cardinal is the least κ such that the following holds: for any finite τ , a τ -structure \mathfrak{A} with $|\mathfrak{A}| \geq \kappa$ and a τ -sentence ϕ of universal second-order logic with $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$, there exists $\mathfrak{B} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ with $|\mathfrak{B}| < |\mathfrak{A}|$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$.

Theorem 4.12. Suppose that for any finite signature τ , if \mathcal{K}_τ is the class of all τ -structures, then $\text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K}_\tau)$ exists. Then there exists a supercompact cardinal.

Proof. Denote $\kappa = \sup_{|\tau| < \aleph_0} \text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K}_\tau)$. Here note that if τ and τ' are finite signatures and $f: \tau \rightarrow \tau'$ is a bijection such that $\text{ar}(R) = \text{ar}(f(R))$ for all relation or function symbols $R \in \tau$, then $\text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K}_\tau) = \text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K}_{\tau'})$, so κ is well defined (the class of finite signatures is set-sized modulo renaming of symbols). By the definition of the weak LS-number, if τ is finite and $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}_\tau$ has power $\geq \kappa$, then, as \mathfrak{A} has power $\geq \text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K}_\tau)$, there exists $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}_\tau$ of power $< \text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K}_\tau) \leq \kappa$ and an elementary team embedding $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$. Let $\mathfrak{C} = \iota(\mathfrak{B})$. Now \mathfrak{C} is a substructure of \mathfrak{A} that is isomorphic with \mathfrak{B} , and by Proposition 3.12, for all formulas ϕ of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ and relations X of \mathfrak{B} ,

$$\mathfrak{C} \models_{\iota(X) \cap \mathfrak{C}^{\text{ar}(X)}} \phi \implies \mathfrak{B} \models_X \phi \implies \mathfrak{A} \models_{\iota(X)} \phi.$$

In particular, for every sentence ϕ of ESO, we have

$$\mathfrak{C} \models \phi \implies \mathfrak{A} \models \phi.$$

Taking the contrapositive, this means that for every sentence ϕ of ESO,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \neg \phi \implies \mathfrak{C} \models \neg \phi,$$

i.e. for every sentence ϕ of universal second-order logic,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi \implies \mathfrak{C} \models \phi.$$

But then κ is such that for every finite τ , a τ -structure \mathfrak{A} with $|\mathfrak{A}| \geq \kappa$ and a universal second-order τ -sentence ϕ with $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$, there exists $\mathfrak{C} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$ with $|\mathfrak{C}| < |\mathfrak{A}|$

and $\mathfrak{C} \models \phi$. Hence the class of cardinals with this property is nonempty. By Theorem 4.11, the first cardinal of this class is supercompact. \square

Certainly enough, a supercompact cardinal also suffices as our weak Löwenheim–Skolem number. The proof for said fact, which uses standard techniques involving supercompacts, also would suggest that the stronger form of the LS-property with non-strict inequalities would be too much to ask.

Theorem 4.13. Suppose $\kappa > |\tau|$ is supercompact and $\mathcal{K} = \text{Mod}(T)$ for some first-order complete τ -theory in $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$. Then $\text{LS}_w(\mathcal{K}) \leq \kappa$.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure and $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{A}^n)$, $|\mathfrak{X}| < \kappa$. If $|\mathfrak{A}| \leq \kappa$, we are done, so assume that $|\mathfrak{A}| > \kappa$. We augment τ into a signature τ' by adding fresh relation symbols for elements of \mathfrak{X} . Then denote $\mu = |\mathfrak{A}|$ and let $\lambda = 2^\mu$. Note that $|\tau'| \leq \kappa < \mu$. Let j be an elementary embedding of \mathbf{V} into a transitive model \mathbf{M} with critical point κ such that $\mathbf{M}^\lambda \subseteq \mathbf{M}$ and $j(\kappa) > \lambda$. Note that as τ' has power $< \kappa$, we may assume that $\tau' \in \mathbf{V}_\kappa$ and hence $j(\tau') = \tau'$. Let \mathfrak{B} be the τ' -structure with domain $j[\text{dom}(\mathfrak{A})] := \{j(a) \mid a \in \mathfrak{A}\}$ and with the interpretation of symbols of τ' induced by j . We make the following claims.

Claim.

- (i) $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{M} \models |\mathfrak{B}| \leq \lambda$.
- (ii) For any $R \subseteq \mathfrak{B}^n$, we have $R \in \mathbf{M}$ and $R = j[S] := \{j(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{a} \in S\}$ for some $S \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$.
- (iii) The map $X \mapsto j(j^{-1}[R])$, $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{B})$, is in \mathbf{M} .

Proof. (i) First notice that in \mathbf{V} we have $|\mathfrak{B}| = \mu \leq \lambda$, so there exists a surjection $f: \lambda \rightarrow \text{dom}(\mathfrak{B})$. As $\text{dom}(\mathfrak{B}) \subseteq \mathbf{M}$ and since \mathbf{M} is closed under λ -sequences, we have that $f \in \mathbf{M}$. Thus also $\text{dom}(\mathfrak{B}) \in \mathbf{M}$, and a similar argument works for $R^\mathfrak{B}$ for any $R \in \tau'$. As $|\tau'| \leq \lambda$ we obtain, again by closure under λ -sequences, that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{M}$. As being a surjection is absolute, we have $\mathbf{M} \models “f \text{ is a surjection } \lambda \rightarrow \text{dom}(\mathfrak{B})”$, so $\mathbf{M} \models |\mathfrak{B}| \leq \lambda$.

(ii) Since $\mathfrak{B}^n = j[\mathfrak{A}^n]$, we have for any $R \subseteq \mathfrak{B}^n$ that $R = j[S]$ for some $S \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$. Now $R \in \mathbf{M}$ for the same reason that $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathbf{M}$.

(iii) For the third claim, first notice that

$$|\mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{B})| = \left| \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}(\mathfrak{B}^n) \right| = \aleph_0 \cdot 2^{|\mathfrak{B}|} = 2^\mu \leq \lambda.$$

Hence the map $R \mapsto j(j^{-1}[R])$ also has cardinality $\leq \lambda$, and as it is a set of elements of \mathbf{M} , it is in itself in \mathbf{M} . \square Claim

Now, suppose for a moment that for any τ -formula ϕ of FOT and any $S \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$ for $n < \omega$, we have managed to prove that

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_{j[S]} \phi” \iff \mathfrak{A} \models_S \phi.$$

By claim (ii) above, relations of the form $j[S]$ exhaust all relations of \mathfrak{B} . Now for any $R \subseteq \mathfrak{B}^n$, by elementarity of j , we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_R \phi” &\iff \mathfrak{A} \models_{j^{-1}[R]} \phi \\ &\iff \mathbf{V} \models “\mathfrak{A} \models_{j^{-1}[R]} \phi” \\ &\iff \mathbf{M} \models “j(\mathfrak{A}) \models_{j(j^{-1}[R])} \phi”, \end{aligned}$$

By claim (iii) above, the map $R \mapsto j(j^{-1}[R])$ is an element of \mathbf{M} . Hence,

$$\mathbf{M} \models “R \mapsto j(j^{-1}[R]) \text{ is an elementary team map } \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow j(\mathfrak{A})”.$$

Now, note that by claim (i) above, in \mathbf{M} we have $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq \lambda < j(\kappa)$. Thus, \mathbf{M} satisfies the statement “there is \mathfrak{B} and an elementary team embedding $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow j(\mathfrak{A})$ such that $|\mathfrak{B}| < j(\kappa)$ ”. By elementarity of j , we have (in \mathbf{V}) that there exists \mathfrak{B} and an elementary team embedding $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $|\mathfrak{B}| < \kappa$. Additionally, each $X \in \mathfrak{X}$ is in the range of ι , as ι is, in particular, a partial team isomorphism in the signature τ' and X is the interpretation of $\underline{X} \in \tau'$ in \mathfrak{A} . This is enough to prove the theorem.

Therefore, left to show is that (1) holds. We prove it by induction on the complexity of $\phi \in \text{FOT}$.

- (i) Suppose first that $\phi = R(\vec{t})$ for $R \in \tau' \cup \{=\}$ and \vec{t} a tuple of τ' -terms. Fix $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$ with the free variables of ϕ contained in $\{v_i \mid i \leq n\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_{j[X]} \phi” &\iff \mathbf{M} \models “\forall s \in j[X], s(\vec{t}) \in R^{\mathfrak{B}}” \\ &\iff \forall s \in j[X], s(\vec{t}) \in j[R^{\mathfrak{A}}] \text{ (absoluteness)} \\ &\iff \forall s \in X, s(\vec{t}) \in R^{\mathfrak{A}} \text{ (elementarity)} \\ &\iff \mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi. \end{aligned}$$

Nothing changes if one considers $\phi = \neg R(\vec{t})$ instead.

- (ii) Next suppose that $\phi = \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y}$ and again fix X . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_{j[X]} \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y}” &\iff \mathbf{M} \models “\forall s \in j[X] \exists s' \in j[X] s(\vec{x}) = s'(\vec{y})” \\ &\iff \forall s \in j[X] \exists s' \in j[X] s(\vec{x}) = s'(\vec{y}) \text{ (absoluteness)} \\ &\iff \forall s \in X \exists s' \in X s(\vec{x}) = s'(\vec{y}) \text{ (elementarity)} \\ &\iff \mathfrak{A} \models_X \vec{x} \subseteq \vec{y}. \end{aligned}$$

- (iii) The case of the constancy atom $\phi = (\vec{x})$ follows analogously to the previous one. The cases $\phi = \psi \wedge \theta$, $\phi = \psi \vee \theta$ and $\phi = \sim \psi$ follow immediately from the induction hypothesis.

- (iv) Next suppose that $\phi = \exists^1 v_n \psi$ and fix $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^n$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_{j[X]} \phi” &\iff \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_{j[X](b/n)} \psi \text{ for some } b \in \mathfrak{B}” \\ &\iff \exists a \in \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_{j[X](j(a)/n)} \psi” \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\iff} \exists a \in \mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{M} \models “\mathfrak{B} \models_{j[X(a/n)]} \psi” \\ &\stackrel{\text{i.h.}}{\iff} \exists a \in \mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{A} \models_{X(a/n)} \psi \\ &\iff \mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi. \end{aligned}$$

The step $(*)$ follows by the fact that

$$j[X(a/n)] = j[X](j(a)/n).$$

To see this, let $(b_0, \dots, b_n) \in j[X(a/n)]$. Then $b_i = j(a_i)$ for some $a_i \in X$, $i < n$, $b_n = j(a)$ and $(b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}) = j(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in j[X]$, so

$$(b_0, \dots, b_n) = j(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \frown j(a) \in j[X](j(a)/x).$$

Conversely, we have that every $(b_0, \dots, b_n) \in j[X](j(a)/x)$ is of the form $j(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, a)$ for $(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in X$.

- (v) The remaining case $\phi = \forall^1 x \psi$ is similar.

This completes the proof of (1) and thus of our theorem. \square

Even while having a traditional Löwenheim–Skolem property in general seems hopeless, in the framework of Section 4.4, the following very weak formulation of the Löwenheim–Skolem theorem, following essentially from the LS theorem of first-order logic, seems to suffice.

Proposition 4.14. Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$. Then there is a τ -structure \mathfrak{B} of power $\leq |\mathcal{X}| + |\tau| + \aleph_0$ and an (element-total) partial elementary team map $\iota: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{ran}(\iota)$.

Proof. By the Löwenheim–Skolem theorem of ESO, there is an elementary substructure $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathcal{X}}$ with $|\hat{\mathfrak{B}}| \leq |\tau(\mathcal{X})| + \aleph_0 = |\mathcal{X}| + |\tau| + \aleph_0$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$. Now let $\mathfrak{B} = \hat{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright \tau$. Then, by Lemma 3.18, the conditions $\ell(\underline{X}^{\mathfrak{B}}) = X$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\ell(b) = b$ for all $b \in \mathfrak{B}$ uniquely determine a partial elementary team map $\ell: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ with $\text{ran}(\ell) = \text{cl}(\mathcal{X} \cup \{\{b\} \mid b \in \mathfrak{B}\})$. \square

4.4. A Category-theoretic Framework. We solve all of our AEC problems introduced in the previous sections by moving to work inside a framework where structures come with a predetermined set of relations of interest, much resembling general models, or Henkin models, of second-order logic. General models in the setting of team semantics were investigated in [8], but our definition will be slightly different. We define our framework as a category and show that it is an example of an *accessible category* [1], which are known to generalize abstract elementary classes (see e.g. [3]).

Definition 4.15.

- (i) Given a signature τ , a *general τ -structure* is a pair $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$, where \mathfrak{A} is a τ -structure and $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$ is a set of relations such that $\text{cl}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$ and for every $a \in \mathfrak{A}$, $\{a\} \in \mathcal{X}$.
- (ii) If $\mathcal{A} = ((\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathcal{X}_i), \ell_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$ is a directed system of general models and partial team isomorphisms $\ell_{i,j}: \mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_j$ such that $\text{dom}(\ell_{i,j}) = \mathcal{X}_i$ and $\text{ran}(\ell_{i,j}) \subseteq \mathcal{X}_j$ for all $i \leq j$, then the direct limit $\lim \mathcal{A}$ of \mathcal{A} is the general model $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$, where $\mathfrak{A} = \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ and \mathcal{X} is the collection of all admissible sets of \mathfrak{A} , i.e. all relations $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A})$ such that there is $i \in I$ with $R \in \text{ran}(\ell_i)$, where $\ell_i: \mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$, $i \in I$, are the direct limit maps. Like before, when the maps $\ell_{i,j}$ are clear from the context, we simply write $\lim_{i \in I} (\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathcal{X}_i)$ for the direct limit.
- (iii) An *abstract elementary team category* (AETC) is a category \mathcal{C}
 - whose objects are general τ -structures $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$ for some fixed τ ,
 - morphisms $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ are partial team isomorphisms $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\text{dom}(\ell) = \mathcal{X}$ and $\text{ran}(\ell) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$, and
 - composition of morphisms is simply function composition,

satisfying the following conditions.

- (a) *Closure under isomorphisms:* If $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a τ -isomorphism, then $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y}) \in \mathcal{C}$ for $\mathcal{Y} = \hat{\pi}[\mathcal{X}] := \{\hat{\pi}(R) \mid R \in \mathcal{X}\}$ and $\hat{\pi} \upharpoonright \mathcal{X}$ is a morphism $\ell: (\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y})$.
- (b) *Closure under inverses:* If $\ell: (\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ is a morphism such that $\text{ran}(\ell) = \mathcal{Y}$, then ℓ^{-1} is a morphism $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$ (and hence ℓ is an isomorphism in the category \mathcal{C}).
- (c) *Coherence:* If $\ell: (\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C}, \mathcal{Z})$ and $g: (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{C}, \mathcal{Z})$ are morphisms and $h: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a partial team isomorphism with $\ell = g \circ h$, then h is a morphism $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y})$.
- (d) *Direct limits of directed systems:* \mathcal{C} is closed under direct limits, i.e. if $((\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathcal{X}_i), \ell_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$ is a directed system such that each $(\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathcal{X}_i)$ is an object of \mathcal{C} and each $\ell_{i,j}$ is a morphism of \mathcal{C} , then $\lim_{i \in I} (\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathcal{X}_i) \in \mathcal{C}$, and the direct limit maps g_i are morphisms $(\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathcal{X}_i) \rightarrow \lim_{j \in I} (\mathfrak{A}_j, \mathcal{X}_j)$. Furthermore, this direct limit is a colimit of the category \mathcal{C} and hence satisfies the universal property of colimits (*smoothness*).
- (e) *Löwenheim–Skolem property:* There is a cardinal κ such that for any $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, there is $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y}) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\mathfrak{B}| \leq |\mathcal{X}'| + \kappa$

and $|\mathcal{Y}| \leq |\mathcal{X}'| + \aleph_0$, and a morphism $f: (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$ such that $\text{cl}(\mathcal{X}') \subseteq \text{ran}(f)$. The least such κ will be denoted by $\text{LS}(\mathcal{C})$.

The identity morphism id of an object $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$ is such that $\text{dom}(\text{id}) = \text{ran}(\text{id}) = \mathcal{X}$. Therefore the requirement that $\text{cl}(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$ is necessary.

Observe that in an AETC, an automorphism of an object $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$ is a partial team isomorphism $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $\text{dom}(f) = \text{ran}(f) = \mathcal{X}$. We denote by $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$ the set of all automorphisms of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$. If $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, we denote by $\text{Aut}((\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})/\mathcal{X}')$ the set of all $f \in \text{Aut}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$ such that $f(X) = X$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}'$.

If $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$ and $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ are general structures, we say that f is a partial team map $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ if $\text{dom}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ and $\text{ran}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.

Next we recall some preliminary notions from category theory.

Definition 4.16.

- (i) Let κ be a regular cardinal. An object X in some category \mathcal{C} is κ -presentable if the functor $\text{Hom}(X, -)$ preserves all κ -directed colimits, i.e. for every κ -directed system $(Y_i, f_{i,j})_{i \in I, i \leq j}$ of objects and morphisms of \mathcal{C} , for every object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and morphism $h: X \rightarrow \text{colim}_{i \in I} Y_i$ there is $i \in I$ and a morphism $h_i: X \rightarrow Y_i$ such that $h = g_i \circ h_i$, where $g_i: Y_i \rightarrow \text{colim}_{i \in I} Y_i$ are the colimit morphisms.
- (ii) Let κ be a regular cardinal. A category \mathcal{C} is κ -accessible if
 - (a) \mathcal{C} has κ -directed colimits, and
 - (b) there is a set \mathcal{A} of κ -presentable objects such that every object in \mathcal{C} is (isomorphic to) a κ -directed colimits of objects from \mathcal{A} .
- (iii) A category is *accessible* if it is κ accessible for some regular cardinal κ .

There are many examples of accessible categories which are relevant to model theory. Among the most natural ones are the following [13, Def. 2.2].

Example 4.17.

- (i) Let T be a complete first-order theory. The category $\text{Mod}(T)$ of all models of T with elementary embeddings is accessible.
- (ii) Given a complete first-order theory T , let $\text{SubMod}(T)$ be the category of pairs (\mathcal{A}, X) , where $X \subseteq \mathcal{A} \models T$, and morphisms $(\mathcal{A}, X) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}, Y)$ are partial elementary maps $f: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ with $\text{dom}(f) = X$ and $\text{ran}(f) \subseteq Y$. Then $\text{SubMod}(T)$ is also an accessible category.

Theorem 4.18. Abstract elementary team categories are accessible.

Proof. Let \mathcal{C} be an abstract elementary team category and $\kappa = \text{LS}(\mathcal{C})^+$. We show that \mathcal{C} is κ -accessible. Since \mathcal{C} has colimits, in particular it has κ -directed colimits.

Let $\mathcal{C}_{<\kappa}$ be the full subcategory of \mathcal{C} whose objects are all $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathcal{C}$ with $|\mathcal{A}|, |\mathcal{X}| < \kappa$. We claim that objects of $\mathcal{C}_{<\kappa}$ are κ -presentable. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathcal{C}_{<\kappa}$ and consider the colimit $(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ of a κ -directed system $((\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i), f_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$, where we denote by $g_i: (\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ the colimit morphisms. We claim that we can factor any morphism $h: (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ through some $(\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i)$. First, notice that since $|\mathcal{X}| < \kappa$ and κ is regular, the fact that I is κ -directed entails that there is some $i \in I$ such that $h(X) \in \text{ran}(g_i)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Define a partial team isomorphism $h_i: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_i$ by letting

$$h_i(X) = g_i^{-1}(h(X))$$

for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Notice that $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{dom}(h_i)$ and $\text{ran}(h_i) \subseteq \text{dom}(g_i) = \text{ran}(f_{i,i}) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_i$. Thus $h = g_i \circ h_i$, so by coherence, h_i is a morphism $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i)$. Clearly, such factorization is unique. Now by e.g. taking in only pairs $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$, where the domain of \mathcal{A} is a cardinal, we can make $\mathcal{C}_{<\kappa}$ a set.

Left is to show that every object in \mathcal{C} can be obtained as a κ -directed colimit of objects of $\mathcal{C}_{<\kappa}$. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathcal{C}$. Let $(\mathcal{X}_i)_{i \in I}$ list all $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ of power $< \kappa$ such

that $\text{cl}(\mathcal{Y}) = \mathcal{Y}$. By letting $i \leq j$ whenever $\mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathcal{X}_j$, we make (I, \leq) a directed set. Since κ is regular, (I, \leq) is also κ -directed.

Now, by the Löwenheim–Skolem property, for each $i \in I$, we obtain a general model $(\mathfrak{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i)$ with $|\mathfrak{B}_i| \leq |\mathcal{X}_i| + \text{LS}(\mathcal{C}) < \kappa$ and a morphism $\iota_i: (\mathfrak{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$ such that $\text{ran}(\iota_i) = \mathcal{X}_i$. As both \mathfrak{B}_i and \mathcal{Y}_i have power $< \kappa$, we have $(\mathfrak{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i) \in \mathcal{C}_{<\kappa}$.

Now, given $i, j \in I$ with $i \leq j$, we define a partial team isomorphism $\ell_{i,j}: \mathfrak{B}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_j$ by letting, for every $X \in \mathcal{Y}_i$,

$$\ell_{i,j}(X) = \iota_j^{-1}(\iota_i(X)),$$

which is well defined since for $i \leq j$ we have $\mathcal{X}_i \subseteq \mathcal{X}_j$. Additionally, we have

$$\mathcal{Y}_i = \text{dom}(\ell_{i,j}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ran}(\ell_{i,j}) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}_j.$$

Now clearly $\iota_i(X) = \iota_j(\ell_{i,j}(X))$ for all $X \in \mathcal{Y}_i$, so by coherence $\ell_{i,j}$ is a morphism $(\mathfrak{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B}_j, \mathcal{Y}_j)$. It follows that $((\mathfrak{B}_i, \mathcal{X}_i), \ell_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$ forms a κ -directed system, so we can consider its colimit $(\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y})$. Let $g_i: (\mathfrak{B}_i, \mathcal{Y}_i) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ be the colimit maps and notice that, by construction, we have

$$\iota_j \circ \ell_{i,j} = \iota_i$$

for every $i \leq j$. Therefore, by the universal property of colimit, there is a unique morphism $u: (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$ such that, for all $i \in I$,

$$u \circ g_i = \iota_i.$$

Now, for every $X \in \mathcal{X}$, there is by construction some $i \in I$ such that $X \in \mathcal{X}_i$. Then $X = \iota_i(Y)$ for some $Y \in \mathcal{Y}_i$, so $u(g_i(Y)) = X$. This shows that u is surjective with respect to \mathcal{X} and so it is an isomorphism in the category \mathcal{C} . Finally, this shows $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$ can be obtained as a colimit of κ -presentable objects. \square

Definition 4.19. Let T be a first-order complete theory in $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$. We denote by $\text{GMod}(T)$ the category whose objects are general models of T and morphisms $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{Y})$ are elementary team maps ℓ with $\text{dom}(\ell) = \mathcal{X}$ and $\text{ran}(\ell) \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$.

Corollary 4.20. $\text{GMod}(T)$ is an abstract elementary team category.

Proof. Closure under isomorphisms and inverses are clear. Coherence follows from Proposition 4.3. By Proposition 4.7, $\text{GMod}(T)$ has direct limits and since the limit object $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathcal{X})$ of a directed system is such that \mathcal{X} contains only admissible sets, we have the universal property of colimits (note that all singletons are admissible). Finally, by Proposition 4.14, $\text{LS}(\text{GMod}(T)), \text{LS}(\text{GSubMod}(T)) \leq |\tau| + \aleph_0$. \square

As we remarked before, the setting of accessible categories is known to generalize the notion of abstract elementary class. The above results thus show that our setting of general models and (elementary) team maps fits this categorical framework to study the model theory of independence logic and existential second-order logic. Additionally, we remark a further connection with another categorification of AECs, namely *abstract elementary categories* (AECat), which were introduced by Kirby and Kamsma [13, 16]. These are pairs of accessible categories with some further structure, the prototypical example of which are $(\text{SubMod}(T), \text{Mod}(T))$ and $(\text{Mod}(T), \text{Mod}(T))$.

Definition 4.21 ([13]). An abstract elementary category (AECat) is a pair $(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{M})$ of accessible categories such that

- (i) \mathcal{M} is a full subcategory of \mathcal{C} ,
- (ii) all morphisms of \mathcal{C} are mono, and
- (iii) \mathcal{M} has directed colimits, which are preserved by the inclusion functor $\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$.

Corollary 4.22. The pair $(\text{GMod}(T), \text{GMod}(T))$ is an AECat.

We also remark that one could introduce in a category $\text{GSubMod}(T)$ analogously to $\text{SubMod}(T)$, but we shall not pursue this in the present paper, as we required general models of an AETC to contain all singleton relations.

5. GALOIS TYPES AND THE MONSTER MODEL

In this section we continue the study of the model-theoretic properties of AETCs and, in particular, of the model categories of first-order complete theories in $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$ (or ESO). For notational convenience, when given a general structure $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X})$, we often omit the set \mathfrak{X} from the notation and denote it by $\text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})$, i.e. if we say that \mathfrak{A} is a general structure, we mean the structure $(\mathfrak{A}, \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A}))$.

Definition 5.1. Let \mathcal{K} be an AETC.

- (i) We say that \mathcal{K} has *arbitrarily large models* (ALM) if for every cardinal κ there is $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $|\mathfrak{A}| \geq \kappa$.
- (ii) We say that \mathcal{K} has the *joint embedding property* (JEP) if for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$, there is $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$.
- (iii) We say that \mathcal{K} has the *amalgamation property* (AP) if for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ and $g: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$, there is $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $h_0: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ and $h_1: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ such that $h_0 \circ f = h_1 \circ g$.

Remark. Notice that if \mathcal{K} has AP and contains a prime model \mathfrak{A} , i.e. for all $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ there is a morphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, then \mathcal{K} also has JEP.

We start by showing some sufficient conditions for an AETC to satisfy the above versions of ALM, JEP and AP.

Definition 5.2.

- (i) Given general structures $(\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathfrak{X}_i)$, $i \in I$, and an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on I , the ultraproduct $\prod_{i \in I} (\mathfrak{A}_i, \mathfrak{X}_i) / \mathcal{U}$ of \mathfrak{A}_i is the general structure $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X})$ such that $\mathfrak{A} = \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathfrak{X} = \{\prod_{i \in I} X_i / \mathcal{U} \mid X_i \in \mathfrak{X}_i \text{ for all } i \in I\}$.
- (ii) We say that an AETC \mathcal{K} is *closed under ultrapowers* if for all $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$, for all infinite cardinals κ and for all ultrafilters \mathcal{U} on κ , $\mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{K}$ and the ultrapower embedding $\iota: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U}$ is a morphism of \mathcal{K} . We say that \mathcal{K} is *closed under ultraproducts* if for all infinite κ , for all $\mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathcal{K}$, $i < \kappa$, and for all ultrafilters \mathcal{U} on κ , $\prod_{i < \kappa} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{K}$.
- (iii) We say that an AETC \mathcal{K} is first-order complete if for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ we have $\mathfrak{A} \equiv \mathfrak{B}$.

Proposition 5.3. Let \mathcal{K} be an AETC.

- (i) If \mathcal{K} has infinite models and is closed under ultrapowers, then \mathcal{K} has ALM.
- (ii) If \mathcal{K} is first-order complete and closed under ultrapowers, then \mathcal{K} has JEP.
- (iii) If \mathcal{K} is closed under ultrapowers and morphisms of \mathcal{K} are elementary team maps, then \mathcal{K} has AP.

Proof.

- (i) Let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ and κ be infinite. By a theorem of Frayne, Morel, and Scott [7], there is an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on κ such that $|\mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U}| \geq 2^\kappa > \kappa$. By closure under ultrapowers, $\mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{K}$.
- (ii) Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$. As \mathcal{K} is first-order complete, \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} are elementarily equivalent. By the Keisler–Shelah theorem, there is a cardinal κ and an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on κ such that $\mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U} \cong \mathfrak{B}^\kappa / \mathcal{U}$. Let π be an isomorphism $\mathfrak{B}^\kappa / \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U}$, and denote $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{A}^\kappa / \mathcal{U}$. Now π lifts to a team isomorphism $\hat{\pi}: \mathfrak{B}^\kappa / \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ in the obvious way. Since \mathcal{K} is closed under ultrapowers,

we have $\mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}, \mathfrak{B}^\kappa/\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{K}$ and the ultrapower embeddings $\iota_{\mathfrak{A}}: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ and $\iota_{\mathfrak{B}}: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ are morphisms. Hence $\hat{\pi} \circ \iota_B$ is also a morphism. Thus may take $\ell = \iota_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and $g = \hat{\pi} \circ \iota_{\mathfrak{B}}$ as our desired joint embeddings, which finishes the proof.

- (iii) Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{C}, \ell$ and g be as in the definition of AP. Let $\mathfrak{X} = \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})$ and let $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{C}}$ be the $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -expansions of \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{C} , respectively, by interpreting $\underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}} = \ell(X)$ and $\underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{C}}} = g(X)$ for all $X \in \mathfrak{X}$. We first show that $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \equiv \hat{\mathfrak{C}}$.

Suppose that this is not the case. Then there is a first-order $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -sentence ϕ such that $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \phi$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{C}} \models \neg\phi$. Let R_0, \dots, R_{n-1} enumerate all $R \in \mathfrak{X}$ such that \underline{R} occurs in ϕ . Without loss of generality, each R_i is nonempty (otherwise replace the symbol \underline{R}_i in ϕ by \perp whenever $R_i = \emptyset$). Then, coding the relation symbols $\underline{R}_0, \dots, \underline{R}_{n-1}$ into one $\sum_{i < n} \text{ar}(R_i)$ -ary relation symbol S as in the proof of Proposition 3.10, we obtain a $\tau \cup \{S\}$ -sentence ψ such that $(\mathfrak{B}, \prod_{i < n} R_i^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}}) \models \psi$ and $(\mathfrak{C}, \prod_{i < n} R_i^{\hat{\mathfrak{C}}}) \models \neg\psi$. Since \mathfrak{X} is closed under Cartesian products, we have $\prod_{i < n} R_i \in \mathfrak{X}$, and by (PI3) we additionally obtain

$$\ell \left(\prod_{i < n} R_i \right) = \prod_{i < n} \ell(R_i) \quad \text{and} \quad g \left(\prod_{i < n} R_i \right) = \prod_{i < n} g(R_i).$$

Then, let χ be the FOT-translation of ψ . Now $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(\prod_{i < n} R_i)} \chi$ and $\mathfrak{C} \not\models_{g(\prod_{i < n} R_i)} \chi$. As ℓ and g are elementary team maps, it follows that $\mathfrak{A} \models_{\prod_{i < n} R_i} \chi$ but $\mathfrak{A} \not\models_{\prod_{i < n} R_i} \chi$, which is a contradiction.

Next, since $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \equiv \hat{\mathfrak{C}}$, it follows by Keisler–Shelah that the structures have isomorphic ultrapowers $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{C}}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$. Let π be an isomorphism $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}^\kappa/\mathcal{U} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{C}}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$, denote $\hat{\mathfrak{D}} = \hat{\mathfrak{C}}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ and let $\mathfrak{D} = \hat{\mathfrak{D}} \upharpoonright \tau$. As \mathcal{K} is closed under ultrapowers, $\mathfrak{B}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}, \mathfrak{C}^\kappa/\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{K}$ and the ultrapower embeddings $\iota_{\mathfrak{B}}: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ and $\iota_{\mathfrak{C}}: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}^\kappa/\mathcal{U}$ are morphisms. Let $\hbar_0 = \hat{\pi} \circ \iota_B$ and $\hbar_1 = \iota_{\mathfrak{C}}$. Since \hbar_0 and \hbar_1 are elementary team maps even in the signature $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$, we have

$$\hbar_0(\ell(R)) = \hbar_0(\underline{R}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}}) = \underline{R}^{\hat{\mathfrak{D}}} = \hbar_1(\underline{R}^{\hat{\mathfrak{C}}}) = \hbar_1(g(R))$$

for all $R \in \mathfrak{X}$. Hence \mathfrak{D} with $\hbar_0: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ and $\hbar_1: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ suffices as an amalgam of \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{C} over \mathfrak{A} . \square

Note that the amalgamation property holds in a tiny bit stronger form in the category $\text{GMod}(T)$.

Proposition 5.4. Let $\mathcal{K} = \text{GMod}(T)$ for some first-order complete theory T of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$. Then for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ and partial elementary team maps $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ and $g: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$, there is $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $\hbar_0: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ and $\hbar_1: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ such that $\hbar_0(\ell(X)) = \hbar_1(g(X))$ for all $X \in \text{dom}(\ell) \cap \text{dom}(g)$.

Proof. The proof is essentially same as that of Proposition 5.3. \square

Amalgamation is a fundamental property in the context of abstract elementary classes as it grants a good behaviour to so-called Galois types. Here we define Galois types of relations and show that also in our context they induce a natural equivalence relation.

Definition 5.5 (Galois Types). Let \mathcal{K} be an AETC.

- (i) We define a relation $\equiv_{\mathcal{K}}^g$ on the class of all pairs (\mathfrak{A}, \vec{X}) , where $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\vec{X} = (X_i)_{i < \alpha} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})^\alpha$ for some ordinal α , as follows. If $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$, $\vec{X} = (X_i)_{i < \alpha} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})^\alpha$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_i)_{i < \beta} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})^\beta$, then

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \vec{X}) \equiv_{\mathcal{K}}^g (\mathfrak{B}, \vec{Y})$$

- if $\alpha = \beta$, $\text{ar}(X_i) = \text{ar}(Y_i)$ for all $i < \alpha$ and there are $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $\hbar_0: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $\hbar_1: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ such that $\hbar_0(X_i) = \hbar_1(Y_i)$ for all $i < \alpha$.
- (ii) Given (\mathfrak{A}, \vec{X}) , we denote the class of all (\mathfrak{B}, \vec{Y}) such that $(\mathfrak{A}, \vec{X}) \equiv_g (\mathfrak{B}, \vec{Y})$ by $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A})$ and call it the *Galois type* of \vec{X} (over \emptyset , in \mathfrak{A}).

The following lemma shows that the notion of Galois type is well defined and, in the presence of AP, having the same type is an equivalence relation.

Lemma 5.6. Suppose \mathcal{K} has AP. Then

- (i) $\equiv_g^{\mathcal{K}}$ is an equivalence relation, and
(ii) for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$, $\vec{X} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})^\alpha$ and morphism $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, we have

$$\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \text{tp}_g(\ell(\vec{X})/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B}).$$

Proof.

- (i) Reflexivity and symmetry are clear, so we verify that transitivity holds. Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$, $\vec{X} = (X_i)_{i < \alpha} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})^\alpha$, $\vec{Y} = (Y_i)_{i < \alpha} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})^\alpha$ and $\vec{Z} = (Z_i)_{i < \alpha} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{C})^\alpha$ and suppose that

$$(\mathfrak{A}, \vec{X}) \equiv_g^{\mathcal{K}} (\mathfrak{B}, \vec{Y}) \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathfrak{B}, \vec{Y}) \equiv_g^{\mathcal{K}} (\mathfrak{C}, \vec{Z}).$$

Then there are $\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{E} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $\hbar_0: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$, $\hbar_1: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$, $\hbar_2: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ and $\hbar_3: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ such that $\hbar_0(X_i) = \hbar_1(Y_i)$ and $\hbar_2(Y_i) = \hbar_3(Z_i)$ for all $i < \alpha$. Apply AP to the morphisms $\hbar_1: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ and $\hbar_2: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{E}$ to obtain $\mathfrak{F} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $\hbar_0: \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$ and $\hbar_1: \mathfrak{E} \rightarrow \mathfrak{F}$ such that $\hbar_0 \circ \hbar_1 = \hbar_1 \circ \hbar_2$. It follows that for all $i < \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\hbar_0 \circ \hbar_1)(X_i) &= \hbar_0(\hbar_1(X_i)) = \hbar_0(\hbar_1(Y_i)) = (\hbar_1 \circ \hbar_2)(Y_i) \\ &= \hbar_1(\hbar_2(Y_i)) = \hbar_1(\hbar_3(Z_i)) = (\hbar_1 \circ \hbar_3)(Z_i), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $(\mathfrak{A}, \vec{X}) \equiv_g^{\mathcal{K}} (\mathfrak{C}, \vec{Z})$.

- (ii) Trivial. □

We have defined Galois types for arbitrary ordinal-length sequences. The next proposition shows that, when we restrict to finite tuples, we can show that FOT actually provides an alternative, syntactic way to define types in $\text{GMod}(T)$.

Definition 5.7 (Syntactic Types). Let \mathfrak{A} be a general τ -structure, $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})$ with $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{X}$ and $n > 0$ a natural number.

- (i) An FOT-type over \mathcal{X} in variables $\vec{x}^0, \dots, \vec{x}^{n-1}$, where each \vec{x}^i is a finite tuple of variables and \vec{x}^i and \vec{x}^j do not share variables for $i \neq j$, is a nonempty set of $\tau(\mathcal{X})$ -formulas of FOT with free variables among $\vec{x}^0, \dots, \vec{x}^{n-1}$.
(ii) A type $p(\vec{x}^0, \dots, \vec{x}^{n-1})$ over \mathcal{X} is consistent if there is a general τ -structure \mathfrak{B} and a morphism $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ with $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\prod_{i < n} Y_i} \phi$ for all $\phi \in p$ for some $Y_0, \dots, Y_{n-1} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{B}) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, where $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ is the $\tau(\mathcal{X})$ -extension of \mathfrak{B} with $\underline{X}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}} = \ell(X)$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. We say that the tuple $\vec{Y} = (Y_0, \dots, Y_{n-1})$ realizes p .
(iii) A type p is complete if for all τ -formulas ϕ with the proper free variables, we have either $\phi \in p$ or $\sim\phi \in p$.
(iv) We denote by $\text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}(\vec{Y}/\mathcal{X}; \mathfrak{A})$ the unique complete type realized by $\vec{Y} \in (\text{rel}(\mathfrak{A}) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^n$. In particular,

$$\text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}((X_0, \dots, X_{n-1})/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \{\phi \in \text{FOT} \mid \mathfrak{A} \models_{\prod_{i < n} X_i} \phi\}.$$

Proposition 5.8. Suppose that \mathcal{K} is closed under ultrapowers and morphisms are elementary. Let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$, $\vec{X} = (X_i)_{i < n} \in (\text{rel}(\mathfrak{A}) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^n$ and $\vec{Y} = (Y_i)_{i < n} \in (\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B}) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^n$. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i) $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$.
- (ii) $\text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$.

Proof. First suppose that $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$. Then there is $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ such that $f(X_i) = g(Y_i)$ for all $i < n$. Then $f(\prod_{i < n} X_i) = g(\prod_{i < n} Y_i)$, which entails $\text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$ by elementarity of the morphisms.

Then suppose that $\text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \text{tp}_{\text{FOT}}(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$. Then in particular the structures $(\mathfrak{A}, \prod_{i < n} X_i)$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \prod_{i < n} Y_i)$ are elementary equivalent by Lemma 2.8. By applying Keisler–Shelah exactly as in Proposition 5.3, we find $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ such that $f(X_i) = g(Y_i)$ for all $i < n$. Hence $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{A}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$. \square

Remark. For the *aficionados* of topology, we allow ourselves a short excursion in this otherwise very concise article. In fact, we would like to remark that, in the case where $\mathcal{K} = \text{GMod}(T)$, we can provide a natural Stone space topology to the set of types. In fact, since they have a syntactical representation as FOT-types by Proposition 5.8, we can use formulas to define a clopen basis. Write $G(\mathfrak{A})$ for the set of all Galois types consistent with \mathfrak{A} , i.e. all $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$, where $\vec{X} \in (\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B}) \setminus \{\emptyset\})^{<\omega}$ for some $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ such that there is a morphism $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$. We provide a topology to $G(\mathfrak{A})$ by taking as basic opens the sets induced by formulas of FOT:

$$\llbracket \phi \rrbracket := \{\text{tp}_g((X_i)_{i < n}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B}) \mid \mathfrak{B} \models_{\prod_{i < n} X_i} \phi \text{ and there is } f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}\}.$$

We verify that the resulting topological space is a Stone space, namely that it is totally disconnected, Hausdorff and compact.

- (i) $G(\mathfrak{A})$ is *totally disconnected*. In fact if a set $Z \subseteq G(\mathfrak{A})$ contains two distinct types $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$ and $\text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{C})$, then by Proposition 5.8 there is a formula $\phi \in \text{FOT}$ such that $Z \cap \llbracket \phi \rrbracket$ and $Z \cap \llbracket \sim \phi \rrbracket$ split Z into two nonempty opens.
- (ii) $G(\mathfrak{A})$ is *Hausdorff*. If $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B}) \neq \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{C})$ then again by Proposition 5.8 we can find a FOT-formula ϕ such that $\mathfrak{B} \models_{\prod_{i < n} X_i} \phi$ but $\mathfrak{C} \not\models_{\prod_{i < n} Y_i} \phi$.
- (iii) $G(\mathfrak{A})$ is *compact*. Without loss of generality an open cover is of the form $\{\llbracket \phi_i \rrbracket \mid i \in I\}$, thus $\bigcap_{i \in I} \llbracket \sim \phi_i \rrbracket = \emptyset$ and in particular $\{\sim \phi_i \mid i \in I\} \models \perp$. Since FOT is compact, we obtain that $\{\sim \phi_i \mid i \in I_0\} \models \perp$ for a finite set $I_0 \subseteq I$. This is equivalent to say that $\{\llbracket \phi_i \rrbracket \mid i \in I_0\}$ is an open cover, showing that the topology is compact.

Now let $S(\mathfrak{A})$ be the subset of $G(\mathfrak{A})$ whose types are determined by tuples, i.e. they are of the form $\text{tp}_g(\{\vec{a}\}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$. Then $S(\mathfrak{A})$ with the induced subspace topology is a Stone subspace of $G(\mathfrak{A})$ and, additionally, it is exactly (up to homeomorphism) the standard Stone space of first-order types. Interestingly, the above inclusion induces via Stone’s duality a homomorphism from the algebra of FOT-formulas to the algebra of FO-formulas. This homomorphism is given by the quotient map that sends every FOT-formula to the FO-formulas it is equivalent to when evaluated in singleton teams. Finally, we also remark that, using amalgamation, it is easy to verify that the Stone space $G(\mathfrak{A})$ does not depend on \mathfrak{A} but only on its first-order theory. Thus we can meaningfully speak of the Stone space of Galois types (or FOT-types) of relations of any theory which is first-order complete

We now work towards building a version of the monster model in our setting. We notice this follows the general idea of the usual construction of the monster model in AECs. However, we remark that one can construct monster-like objects

in any accessible category which is closed under colimits and has the amalgamation property – we refer the reader to [25, Thm.1] and to [18] for an extensive discussion of this result.

Definition 5.9. Let \mathcal{K} be an AETC and κ an infinite cardinal.

- (i) We say that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ is κ -universal if for every $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $|\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})| < \kappa$, there is a morphism $f: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$.
- (ii) We say that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ is κ -model-homogeneous if for all $\mathfrak{B}, \mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $|\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})| = |\text{rel}(\mathfrak{C})| < \kappa$, for all morphisms $f: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ and $g: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ and all \mathcal{K} -isomorphisms $h: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$, there is $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$ with $\pi \circ f = g \circ h$, i.e. the below diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{A} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathfrak{A} \\ \uparrow f & & \uparrow g \\ \mathfrak{B} & \xrightarrow{h} & \mathfrak{C} \end{array}$$

Then suppose further that $\mathcal{K} = \text{GMod}(T)$ for a first-order complete theory T of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$.

- (iii) We say that $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ is *strongly κ -homogeneous* if for any partial elementary team map $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ with $|\text{dom}(f)| < \kappa$, there is $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{A})$ with $\pi \supseteq f$.

Proposition 5.10. Suppose \mathcal{K} has JEP. Then for every cardinal κ there exists a κ -universal structure $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{B}_i , $i < \mu$, list all models of \mathcal{K} of power $< \kappa$ up to isomorphism. We define a chain $(\mathfrak{A}_i, f_{i,j})_{i < j \leq \mu}$ of models $\mathfrak{A}_i \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $f_{i,j}: \mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_j$ recursively as follows.

- (i) For $i = 0$, we let $\mathfrak{A}_i = \mathfrak{B}_0$ and $f_{0,0} = \text{id}$.
- (ii) If $i = j + 1$, then we let \mathfrak{A}_i be a structure into which \mathfrak{A}_j and \mathfrak{B}_j joint embed. We let $f_{j,i}: \mathfrak{A}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_i$ and $g_j: \mathfrak{B}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_i$ be the respective joint embeddings. For $l < j$, we let $f_{l,i} = f_{j,i} \circ f_{l,j}$.
- (iii) If i is limit, then we let $\mathfrak{A}_i = \lim_{j < i} \mathfrak{A}_j$ and let $f_{j,i}: \mathfrak{A}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_i$, for $j < i$ be the direct limit morphisms.

Now consider any model \mathfrak{B} of size $\leq \kappa$. Then $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}_i$ for some $i < \mu$. By construction, $f_{i+1,\mu} \circ g_i: \mathfrak{B}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_\mu$ is a morphism, which shows that $\mathfrak{A} := \mathfrak{A}_\mu$ is κ -universal. \square

Lemma 5.11.

- (i) Let \mathcal{K} be an AETC with AP and κ an infinite cardinal. Then for any $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$, there is $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ and a morphism $\iota: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that for any $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D} \in \mathcal{K}$ of power $< \kappa$, morphisms $f: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ and $g: \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$, and a \mathcal{K} -isomorphism $h: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$, there is a morphism $k: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that $\iota \circ g \circ h = k \circ f$, i.e. the below diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathfrak{B} & & \\ & \nearrow k & & \nwarrow \iota & \\ \mathfrak{A} & & & & \mathfrak{A} \\ \uparrow f & & & & \uparrow g \\ \mathfrak{C} & \xrightarrow{h} & \mathfrak{D} & & \end{array}$$

- (ii) Suppose that $\mathcal{K} = \text{GMod}(T)$ for first-order complete T . Then for any $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$, there is $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ and a morphism $\iota: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ such that for any partial elementary team map $f: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ there is a morphism $g: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ with $\iota(f(X)) = g(X)$ for all $X \in \text{dom}(f)$.

Proof.

- (i) Let \mathfrak{C}_i , $i < \mu_0$, list all $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ of power $< \kappa$ such that there is a morphism $\mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$, up to \mathcal{K} -isomorphism. For each $i < \mu_0$, let $f_{i,j}$, $j < \mu_1$, list all morphisms $\mathfrak{C}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$. Then let $\mu = \mu_0 \cdot \mu_1$ and fix a bijection $\theta: \mu \rightarrow \mu_0 \times \mu_1 \times \mu_1$. Denote by θ_i for $i \leq 2$ the functions such that $\theta(\alpha) = (\theta_0(\alpha), \theta_1(\alpha), \theta_2(\alpha))$ for all $\alpha < \mu$.

We define by recursion a directed system $(\mathfrak{B}_i, i_{i,j})_{i \leq j \leq \mu}$ of objects and morphisms of \mathcal{K} . We begin by letting $\mathfrak{B}_0 = \mathfrak{A}$. At a limit i , we let $\mathfrak{B}_i = \lim_{j < i} \mathfrak{B}_j$ and let $i_{j,i}$ be the direct limit morphisms. When $i = j + 1$, we amalgamate the morphisms $i_{0,j} \circ f_{\theta_0(j), \theta_1(j)}: \mathfrak{C}_{\theta_0(j)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_j$ and $f_{\theta_0(j), \theta_2(j)}: \mathfrak{C}_{\theta_0(j)} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ to obtain $\mathfrak{D} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $k_0: \mathfrak{B}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ and $k_1: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ with

$$k_0 \circ i_{0,j} \circ f_{\theta_0(j), \theta_1(j)} = k_1 \circ f_{\theta_0(j), \theta_2(j)}.$$

We let $\mathfrak{B}_i = \mathfrak{D}$ and $i_{j,i} = k_0$ and define the other $i_{k,i}$ in the obvious way via composition.

Finally, we let $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{B}_\mu$ and $\iota = i_{0,\mu}$. Now, let $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D} \in \mathcal{K}$ have power $< \kappa$, $h: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{D}$ be a \mathcal{K} -isomorphism, and $f: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ and $g: \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ be morphisms. Then there is $i < \mu_0$ and an isomorphism $\pi: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_i$. Since $g \circ h \circ \pi$ and $f \circ \pi$ are morphisms $\mathfrak{C}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$, there are $j, k < \mu_1$ such that $f_{i,j} = g \circ h \circ \pi$ and $f_{i,k} = f \circ \pi$. Let $\alpha < \mu$ be such that $\theta(\alpha) = (i, j, k)$. By construction, there is $k: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_{\alpha+1}$ such that

$$i_{\alpha, \alpha+1} \circ i_{0, \alpha} \circ f_{\theta_0(\alpha), \theta_1(\alpha)} = k \circ f_{\theta_0(\alpha), \theta_2(\alpha)}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \iota \circ g \circ h &= i_{0, \mu} \circ f_{i, j} \circ \pi^{-1} = i_{\alpha+1, \mu} \circ i_{0, \alpha+1} \circ f_{i, j} \circ \pi^{-1} \\ &= i_{\alpha+1, \mu} \circ (i_{0, \alpha} \circ i_{\alpha, \alpha+1} \circ f_{\theta_0(\alpha), \theta_1(\alpha)}) \circ \pi^{-1} \\ &= k \circ f_{\theta_0(\alpha), \theta_2(\alpha)} = k \circ f_{i, k} \circ \pi^{-1} \\ &= k \circ f, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

- (ii) Similar. □

Theorem 5.12.

- (i) Let \mathcal{K} be an AETC with JEP and AP. Then for every cardinal $\kappa > \text{LS}(\mathcal{K})$ there is a κ -universal, κ -model-homogeneous $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{K}$.
(ii) Suppose that $\mathcal{K} = \text{GMod}(T)$ for first-order complete T . Then there is a κ -universal, strongly κ -homogeneous $\mathfrak{M} \in \mathcal{K}$.

Proof. We prove the theorem in the case that \mathcal{K} is an AETC with JEP and AP. The other case is similar. We define a directed system $(\mathfrak{M}_i, i_{i,j})_{i \leq j \leq \kappa^+}$ as follows.

- (i) \mathfrak{M}_0 is a κ -universal structure whose existence is guaranteed by Proposition 5.10.
(ii) We let \mathfrak{M}_{i+1} and $i_{i, i+1}$ be the structure \mathfrak{B} and the morphism ι given by Lemma 5.11 for $\mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{M}_i$. All the other maps $i_{k, i+1}$ are defined via composition.
(iii) For i limit, we let $\mathfrak{M}_i = \lim_{j < i} \mathfrak{M}_j$ and $i_{j, i}$ be the direct limit embeddings.

We show that $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}_{\kappa^+}$ is as wanted.

For κ -universality, let $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ have cardinality $< \kappa$. As \mathfrak{M}_0 is κ -universal, we can find a morphism $\hbar: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_0$. Now, i_{0, κ^+} is a morphism $\mathfrak{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$. Hence $\iota := i_{0, \kappa^+} \circ \hbar$ is a morphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$.

For κ -model-homogeneity, let $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ be such that $|\mathfrak{A}|, |\mathfrak{B}| < \kappa$ and $|\text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})| = |\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})| < \kappa$, let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ be morphisms, and let $\hbar: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be a \mathcal{K} -isomorphism. Now by the definition of the direct limit, $\text{rel}(\mathfrak{M}) = \bigcup_{i < \kappa^+} \text{ran}(i_{i, \kappa^+})$. Since $|\text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})| = |\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})| < \kappa$ and κ^+ is regular, there is $\alpha < \kappa^+$ such that $\ell[\text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})] \cup g[\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})] \subseteq \text{ran}(i_{\alpha, \kappa^+})$. For all $i \geq \alpha$, let $\ell_i = i_{i, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ \ell$ and $g_i = i_{i, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ g$. By coherence, ℓ_i is a morphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_i$ and g_i a morphism $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_i$. Note that $\ell_{\kappa^+} = \ell$ and $g_{\kappa^+} = g$. We now define, by recursion on $i \geq \alpha$, partial team isomorphisms $\hbar_i: \mathfrak{M}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_i$ such that whenever $j \leq i$, we have $\text{ran}(\ell_i) \subseteq \text{dom}(\hbar_i)$ and $\hbar_i \circ \ell_i = g_i \circ \hbar$.

- (i) Suppose $i = \alpha$. We let $\hbar_i = g_i \circ \hbar \circ \ell_i^{-1}$. Then

$$\hbar_i \circ \ell_i = (g_i \circ \hbar \circ \ell_i^{-1}) \circ \ell_i = g_i \circ \hbar,$$

as desired.

- (ii) Suppose $i = j+1$ and i is odd. By the induction hypothesis, $\hbar_j \circ \ell_j = g_j \circ \hbar$, whence $g_j^{-1} \circ \hbar_j \circ \ell_j$ is a \mathcal{K} -isomorphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$. By the choice of \mathfrak{M}_i and $i_{j, i}$, there is a morphism $\hbar: \mathfrak{M}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_i$ such that

$$i_{j, i} \circ g_j \circ (g_j^{-1} \circ \hbar_j \circ \ell_j) = \hbar \circ \ell_j,$$

i.e. $i_{j, i} \circ \hbar_j \circ \ell_j = \hbar \circ \ell_j$. We let $\hbar_i = \hbar \circ i_{j, i}^{-1}$. Now notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ran}(\ell_i) &= \text{ran}(i_{i, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ \ell) = \text{ran}(i_{j, i} \circ i_{j, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ \ell) \\ &\subseteq \text{ran}(i_{j, i}) = \text{dom}(i_{j, i}^{-1}) = \text{dom}(\hbar \circ i_{j, i}^{-1}) \\ &= \text{dom}(\hbar_i). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar_i \circ \ell_i &= (\hbar \circ i_{j, i}^{-1}) \circ (i_{i, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ \ell) = \hbar \circ (i_{j, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ \ell) = \hbar \circ \ell_j \\ &= i_{j, i} \circ \hbar_j \circ \ell_j = i_{j, i} \circ g_j \circ \hbar \\ &= i_{j, i} \circ (i_{j, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ g) \circ \hbar = (i_{i, \kappa^+}^{-1} \circ g) \circ \hbar \\ &= g_i \circ \hbar, \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

- (iii) If $i = j+1$ is even, then similarly to above, we find a morphism $\hbar: \mathfrak{M}_j \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_i$ such that $\hbar \circ g_j = i_{j, i} \circ \hbar_j^{-1} \circ g_j$ and let $\hbar_i = i_{j, i} \circ \hbar^{-1}$.
- (iv) If i is a limit, we let \hbar_i be the partial team isomorphism $\mathfrak{M}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_i$ with $\text{dom}(\hbar_i) = \bigcup_{\alpha \leq j < i} \{X \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M}_i) \mid i_{j, i}^{-1}(X) \in \text{dom}(\hbar_j)\}$ such that

$$\hbar_i(X) = i_{j, i}(\hbar_j(i_{j, i}^{-1}(X)))$$

for the least j such that $i_{j, i}^{-1}(X) \in \text{dom}(\hbar_j)$. It is straightforward to check that \hbar_i is a partial isomorphism. Now let $X \in \text{ran}(\ell_i)$. Then $X = \ell_i(Y) = i_{\alpha, i}(\ell_\alpha(Y))$ for some $Y \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})$. By the induction hypothesis $\text{ran}(\ell_\alpha) \subseteq \text{dom}(\hbar_\alpha)$, so $i_{\alpha, i}^{-1}(X) = \ell_\alpha(Y) \in \text{dom}(\hbar_\alpha)$. By the definition of $\text{dom}(\hbar_i)$, we have $X \in \text{dom}(\hbar_i)$.

Let $X \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})$. By the above, α is the least $j < i$ such that $i_{j, i}^{-1}(\ell_j(X)) \in \text{dom}(\hbar_j)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \hbar_i(\ell_i(X)) &= i_{\alpha, i}(\hbar_\alpha(i_{\alpha, i}^{-1}(\ell_i(X)))) = i_{\alpha, i}(\hbar_\alpha(\ell_\alpha(X))) \\ &= i_{\alpha, i}(g_\alpha(\hbar(X))) = g_i(\hbar(X)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\hbar_i \circ \ell_i = g_i \circ \hbar$.

Finally, we let $\pi = \hbar_{\kappa+}$. We show that $\text{dom}(\pi) = \text{ran}(\pi) = \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M})$. By definition,

$$\text{dom}(\pi) = \bigcup_{\alpha \leq i < \kappa^+} \{X \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M}) \mid i_{i, \kappa^+}^{-1}(X) \in \text{dom}(\hbar_i)\}.$$

Let $X \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M})$. Let γ be the least even $i \in [\alpha, \kappa^+)$ such that $X \in \text{ran}(i_{i, \kappa^+})$. Let \hbar be the morphism $\mathfrak{M}_\gamma \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma+1}$ from the construction of $\hbar_{\gamma+1}$. As $\text{dom}(\hbar) = \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M}_\gamma)$, we have $i_{\gamma, \kappa^+}^{-1}(X) \in \text{dom}(\hbar)$. Then

$$\hbar(i_{\gamma, \kappa^+}^{-1}(X)) = \hbar(i_{\gamma, \gamma+1}^{-1}(i_{\gamma+1, \kappa^+}^{-1}(X))) = \hbar_{\gamma+1}(i_{\gamma+1, \kappa^+}^{-1}(X)),$$

whence $i_{\gamma+1, \kappa^+}^{-1}(X) \in \text{dom}(\hbar_{\gamma+1})$. But this means that $X \in \text{dom}(\pi)$. Using a symmetric argument, and odd γ , one can show that π is surjective. Moreover, by construction,

$$\pi \circ \ell = \hbar_{\kappa+} \circ \ell_{\kappa+} = g_{\kappa+} \circ \hbar = g \circ \hbar.$$

Finally, since \mathfrak{M} is a general model and contains all singleton relations, we have that π is element-total and element-surjective. Therefore, by Proposition 3.13 there is a τ -automorphism π' of \mathfrak{M} such that $\hat{\pi}' \supseteq \pi$. Hence $\pi (= \hat{\pi}' \upharpoonright \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M}))$ is an automorphism of the category \mathcal{K} by closure under isomorphisms. \square

The above κ -monster model \mathfrak{M} is κ -saturated in the following sense.

Proposition 5.13. Let \mathcal{K} be an AETC with JEP and AP, and let \mathfrak{M} be a κ -universal and κ -homogeneous model of \mathcal{K} . Suppose that $g : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is a morphism. Then for any $\alpha, \beta < \kappa$, $\vec{Y} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})^\alpha$ and $\vec{D} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M})^\beta$, there is $\vec{X} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M})^\alpha$ such that

$$\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}\vec{D}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{M}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}g(\vec{D})/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B}).$$

Proof. Let $\mu = |\alpha| + |\beta| < \kappa$, and denote $\vec{B} = g(\vec{D})$. By the Löwenheim–Skolem property, there is $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $|\mathfrak{A}| \leq \mu + \text{LS}(\mathcal{K}) < \kappa$ and $|\text{rel}(\mathfrak{A})| \leq \mu + \aleph_0 < \kappa$ and a morphism $\ell : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ such that $\vec{D} \in \text{ran}(\ell)^\beta$. Now, let $\vec{A} = \ell^{-1}(\vec{D})$.

Again, by the Löwenheim–Skolem property, there is $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $|\mathfrak{C}| \leq \mu + \text{LS}(\mathcal{K}) < \kappa$ and $|\text{rel}(\mathfrak{C})| \leq \mu + \aleph_0 < \kappa$, and a morphism $\hbar : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, such that

$$\text{cl}(\text{ran}(g \circ \ell) \cup \{Y_i \mid i < \alpha\}) \subseteq \text{ran}(\hbar).$$

Let $\vec{Z} = \hbar^{-1}(\vec{Y})$ and $\vec{C} = \hbar^{-1}(\vec{B})$, and denote $\hbar = \hbar^{-1} \circ g \circ \ell$. Now $g \circ \ell = \hbar \circ \hbar$, so by coherence \hbar is a morphism $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$. By κ -universality of \mathfrak{M} , there is a morphism $i : \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$. By κ -model-homogeneity, there is $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$ such that $\pi \circ \ell = (i \circ \hbar) \circ \text{id}_{\mathfrak{A}} = i \circ \hbar$. Now, let $\vec{X} = \pi^{-1}(i(\vec{Z}))$. Notice that $\hbar(\vec{A}) = \vec{C}$, so

$$\vec{D} = \pi^{-1}(\pi(\ell(\vec{A}))) = \pi^{-1}(i(\hbar(\vec{A}))) = \pi^{-1}(i(\vec{C})).$$

Now, as $\pi^{-1} \circ i$ is a morphism $\mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ and $(\pi^{-1} \circ i)(\vec{Z}\vec{C}) = \vec{X}\vec{D}$, it follows that $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}\vec{D}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{M}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Z}\vec{C}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{C})$. On the other hand, as \hbar is a morphism $\mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ and $\hbar(\vec{Z}\vec{C}) = \vec{Y}\vec{B}$, we have $\text{tp}_g(\vec{Z}\vec{C}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{C}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}\vec{B}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$. By transitivity of Galois types, we then have $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}\vec{D}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{M}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}\vec{B}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{B})$, as desired. \square

Like classically, the monster model makes it easier to deal with Galois types: instead of amalgamating into a third model, having the same type can be now witnessed by an automorphism of the monster.

Proposition 5.14. Let $\alpha < \kappa$ and $\vec{X}, \vec{Y} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M})^\alpha$. Then $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{M}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{M})$ if and only if there is $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$ such that $\pi(\vec{X}) = \vec{Y}$.

Proof. If \vec{X} and \vec{Y} are conjugates by $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$, then the morphisms $\text{id}_{\mathfrak{M}}$ and π witness that \vec{X} and \vec{Y} have the same type.

Suppose that \vec{X} and \vec{Y} have the same type. Then there is $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{K}$ and morphisms $f_0: \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ and $f_1: \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that $f_0(\vec{X}) = f_1(\vec{Y})$. By the Löwenheim–Skolem property, there is $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $|\mathfrak{B}|, |\text{rel}(\mathfrak{B})| < \kappa$ and a morphism $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$ such that $\vec{X}, \vec{Y} \in \text{ran}(g)^\alpha$. There is also $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{K}$ with $|\mathfrak{C}|, |\text{rel}(\mathfrak{C})| < \kappa$ and a morphism $h: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ such that

$$\text{cl}(\text{ran}(f_0 \circ g) \cup \text{ran}(f_1 \circ g)) \subseteq \text{ran}(h).$$

Now by coherence, the maps $k_i := h^{-1} \circ f_i \circ g$, $i < 2$, are morphisms $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$. By κ -universality of \mathfrak{M} , there is a morphism $i: \mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$. Now $i \circ k_0$, g and $i \circ k_1$ are morphisms $\mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}$, so by κ -model-homogeneity, there are $\pi_0, \pi_1 \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$ such that $\pi_0 \circ g = (i \circ k_0) \circ \text{id}_{\mathfrak{B}} = i \circ k_0$ and $\pi_1 \circ (i \circ k_1) = g \circ \text{id}_{\mathfrak{B}} = g$. Let $\pi = \pi_1 \circ \pi_0$. Then $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\vec{X}) &= \pi_1(\pi_0(\vec{X})) = \pi_1(\pi_0(g(g^{-1}(\vec{X})))) = \pi_1(i(k_0(g^{-1}(\vec{X})))) \\ &= \pi_1(i(h^{-1}(f_0(g(g^{-1}(\vec{X})))))) = \pi_1(i(h^{-1}(f_0(\vec{X})))) \\ &= \pi_1(i(h^{-1}(f_1(\vec{Y})))) = \pi_1(i(h^{-1}(f_1(g(g^{-1}(\vec{Y})))))) \\ &= \pi_1(i(k_1(g^{-1}(\vec{Y})))) = g(g^{-1}(\vec{Y})) \\ &= \vec{Y}. \end{aligned}$$

□

In particular, the previous lemma allows one to extend the notion of Galois type and take parameters into account. For a small set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M})$ and given two sequences $\vec{X}, \vec{Y} \in \text{rel}(\mathfrak{M})^\alpha$, we can define

$$\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\mathcal{X}; \mathfrak{M}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\mathcal{X}; \mathfrak{M})$$

if there is $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M}/\mathcal{X})$ such that $\pi(\vec{X}) = \vec{Y}$. One can then verify that $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}/\mathcal{X}; \mathfrak{M}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}/\mathcal{X}; \mathfrak{M})$ if and only if $\text{tp}_g(\vec{X}\vec{Z}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{M}) = \text{tp}_g(\vec{Y}\vec{Z}/\emptyset; \mathfrak{M})$, where \vec{Z} enumerates \mathcal{X} .

Remark. To recap, in this section we introduced a notion of Galois type of a tuple of relations in an abstract elementary team category and built a monster model which is sufficiently saturated with respect to these types. However, we shall now see why this notion of type is not, in fact, a good basis for the definition of stability. Instead, it would seem that in the concrete example $\text{GMod}(T)$ for a complete ESO-theory T (cf. Section 7.2), the stability properties of the first-order reduct of T are a more useful measure of complexity.

More precisely, to see that Galois types in team semantics are ill-behaved from the stability-theoretic point of view, we consider the formula $\phi := x \subseteq y$ in the context of an arbitrary ESO-theory T with infinite models. We show that this formula has both a version of the *independence property* (IP) and the *strict order property* (SOP) in our context (see [30, p.134] for the standard definition of IP and SOP in first-order logic).

First, consider any model \mathfrak{A} of T and let $A = \{a_i \mid i < \omega\}$ be an enumeration of some countable subset thereof. Then for every $I \subseteq \omega$ consider the set of formulas

$$\Gamma_I := \{y_i \subseteq x \mid i \in I\} \cup \{\sim(y_i \subseteq x) \mid i \notin I\}.$$

Then consider a team X_I with domain $\text{dom}(X_I) = \{x\} \cup \{y_i \mid i < \omega\}$ and such that $X_I[x] = \{a_i \mid i \in I\}$ and $X_I[y_i] = \{a_i\}$ for all $i < \omega$. Then we obtain $\mathfrak{A} \models_{X_I} \Gamma_I$, showing that any theory T with infinite models satisfies this version of IP.

Similarly, we can also show that any theory T with infinite model has the strict order property. Let again \mathfrak{A} be an arbitrary infinite model and $A = \{a_i \mid i < \omega\}$

a countable subset of it. For every $i < \omega$, we let $A_i = \{a_j \mid i \leq j\}$. Consider the formula $\phi := x \subseteq y$ and let X_i be the team with domain $\{x_i\}$ such that $X_i[x_i] = A_i$. Then it is easy to verify that, for all $i < j < \omega$

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_{X_i \times X_j} \forall y (y \subseteq x_i \rightarrow y \subseteq x_j) \iff i \leq j.$$

Which shows that any theory T with infinite models has this version of SOP for team semantics.

The two observations above hint at the fact that a robust classification theory for (complete) theories in ESO (or $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$) cannot rely exclusively on the notion of Galois types introduced in this section. In particular, we obtain as a consequence that for any set of size κ of parameters the number of resulting Galois types is 2^κ , showing that the cardinality of the space of types does not allow to track any information about the underlying theory.

For these reasons, we take later in Section 7.2 a different approach. In particular, given a complete ESO-theory T , we shall consider the (standard) stability properties of its first-order reduct T^* . We shall apply this approach especially to the problem of transferring categoricity among different cardinals, and prove two results in this direction. We take these preliminary findings as a hint that the standard notions of stability and independence also have a key role in the present higher-order context, and may be the correct ones to study the model theory of complete theories in ESO or $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$.

6. APPLICATION I – LINDSTRÖM’S THEOREM FOR FOT

A celebrated result by Lindström [20] characterises first-order logic as the maximal abstract logic satisfying both the compactness and the downwards Löwenheim-Skolem theorems. Moreover, he also proved in [19] that first-order logic is maximal among the abstract logics which are both compact and have the so-called Tarski union property. A similar result by Sgro [26] shows that first-order logic is also the maximal abstract logic to satisfy the Łoś’ theorem.

Motivated by these results, we provide a first application of the abstract machinery of the previous sections and prove two maximality results for FOT in terms of its model-theoretic properties. We believe our results could also be obtained from the classical Lindström’s theorem via Lemma 2.7 with a clever translation, but here we merely demonstrate the use of our newly acquired tools. We start by defining a suitable notion of abstract logic in the setting of team semantics, which we call *abstract team logic*. Given a signature τ , we denote by $\text{Str}(\tau)$ the class of all τ -structures.

In this section, we make a distinction between teams and their underlying relations, to allow teams with infinite domains. However, results about team maps are only applied in the case where the argument of the map is a finitary relation.

Definition 6.1. An *abstract team logic* is a pair $L = (\text{Fml}_L, \text{Sat}_L)$, where

- Fml_L is a class of pairs $\phi = (i, \text{Fv}(\phi))$ such that i is an identifier and $\text{Fv}(\phi)$ a set of variables, and
- Sat_L is a class of triples (\mathfrak{A}, X, ϕ) , where $\phi \in \text{Fml}_L$, \mathfrak{A} is a structure (of some signature) and X is a team of \mathfrak{A} with $\text{dom}(X) \supseteq \text{Fv}(\phi)$,

satisfying the following.

- (i) L is *closed under isomorphisms*, i.e. if $\pi: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ is an isomorphism between τ -structures \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} , then for all $\phi \in \text{Fml}_L$, $D \supseteq \text{Fv}(\phi)$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$,

$$(\mathfrak{A}, X, \phi) \in \text{Sat}_L \iff (\mathfrak{B}, \pi^*(X), \phi) \in \text{Sat}_L,$$

where $\pi^*(X) = \{\pi \circ s \mid s \in X\}$.

- (ii) L satisfies the *occurrence condition*, i.e. for any $\phi \in \text{Fml}_L$ there is a signature σ such that for any τ and $\mathfrak{A} \in \text{Str}(\tau)$, $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ implies $\tau \supseteq \sigma$, and for any $\tau \supseteq \sigma$, $D \supseteq \text{Fv}(\phi)$, $\mathfrak{A} \in \text{Str}(\tau)$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$,

$$(\mathfrak{A}, X, \phi) \in \text{Sat}_L \iff (\mathfrak{A} \upharpoonright \sigma, X, \phi) \in \text{Sat}_L.$$

- (iii) L is *closed under renaming*, i.e. if τ and τ' are signatures and $\pi: \tau \rightarrow \tau'$ is a bijection that preserves the type and the arity of symbols, then for any $\phi \in \text{Fml}_L$ there is $\psi \in \text{Fml}_L$ with $\text{Fv}(\psi) = \text{Fv}(\phi)$ such that for all D , $\mathfrak{A} \in \text{Str}(\tau)$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$, we have

$$(\mathfrak{A}, X, \phi) \in \text{Sat}_L \iff (\pi(\mathfrak{A}), X, \psi) \in \text{Sat}_L,$$

where $\pi(\mathfrak{A})$ is the τ' -structure with $\text{dom}(\pi(\mathfrak{A})) = \text{dom}(\mathfrak{A})$ and $\pi(R)^{\pi(\mathfrak{A})} = R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ for any symbol $R \in \tau$.

If $\phi \in \text{Fml}_L$, we simply write $\phi \in L$. We say that ϕ is a σ -formula if σ is as in the occurrence condition. If $(\mathfrak{A}, X, \phi) \in \text{Sat}_L$, we write $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$. If $\Sigma \subseteq \text{Fml}_L$, we write $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \Sigma$ if $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ for all $\phi \in \Sigma$. We write $\text{Mod}_L(\phi)$ for the class of all (\mathfrak{A}, X) such that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ and $X \neq \emptyset$. If \mathfrak{A} is a τ -structure, we also denote by $\text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A}, X)$ the set of all τ -formulas $\phi \in L$ such that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$. We write $\text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A})$ for $\text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A}, \{\emptyset\})$. Note that if $\phi \in \text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A}, X)$, then $\text{Fv}(\phi) \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$. We write $(\mathfrak{A}, X) \equiv_L (\mathfrak{B}, Y)$ if $\text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A}, X) = \text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{B}, Y)$. We say that a set $\Sigma \subseteq \text{Fml}_L$ is *consistent* if $\bigcap_{\phi \in \Sigma} \text{Mod}_L(\phi) \neq \emptyset$. We say that ϕ is consistent if $\{\phi\}$ is, and ϕ is consistent with Σ if $\Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$ is consistent. We define the following properties of abstract team logics.

Definition 6.2. We say that an abstract team logic L is *regular* if the following hold.

- (i) L is *closed under conjunction*, i.e. for all $\phi, \psi \in L$ there is $\chi \in L$ such that for all $D \supseteq \text{Fv}(\phi), \text{Fv}(\psi), \text{Fv}(\chi)$, and for all \mathfrak{A} and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \chi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \text{ and } \mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi.$$

Furthermore, if ϕ and ψ are σ -formulas, also χ can be chosen to be a σ -formula. We denote this χ by $\phi \wedge \psi$.

- (ii) L is *closed under (weak classical) negation*, i.e. for all $\phi \in L$ there is $\psi \in L$ such that for all D , \mathfrak{A} and *nonempty* $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \psi \iff \mathfrak{A} \not\models_X \phi.$$

Furthermore, if ϕ is a σ -formula, also ψ can be chosen to be a σ -formula. We denote this ψ by $\sim \phi$.

We say that L is *positive* if it is closed under conjunction but not necessarily under weak classical negation.

We say that L is *team-finitary* if

- (iii) for any $\phi \in L$ there is a finite set $D \supseteq \text{Fv}(\phi)$ such that if there are \mathfrak{A} and nonempty X with $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$, then there is a team Y such that $\text{dom}(Y) = D$, and for all teams Z such that $Z \upharpoonright D = Y$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_Z \phi$. In particular, $\text{Fv}(\phi)$ is finite.

Definition 6.3. Let L be an abstract team logic.

- (i) We say that L is *compact* if for any $\Sigma \subseteq \text{Fml}_L$, Σ is consistent if and only if every finite subset of Σ is.
- (ii) We say that a team embedding $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ preserves $\phi \in L$ if for all $D \supseteq \text{Fv}(\phi)$ and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi.$$

We say that L has *direct limits* if the following holds. Let $(\mathfrak{A}_i, f_{i,j})_{i,j \in I, i \leq j}$ be a directed system of τ -structures, let $\mathfrak{B} = \lim_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i$ and denote for all $i \in I$ by g_i the direct limit embedding $\mathfrak{A}_i \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$. Then for all $\phi \in L$, if $f_{i,j}$ preserves ϕ for all $i, j \in I, i \leq j$, then g_i preserves ϕ for all $i \in I$. This is the team logic counterpart of the Tarski union property.

- (iii) We say that L has a *Loś' theorem* if for any set I , τ -structures \mathfrak{A}_i , teams $X_i \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_i^D$ and ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on I , for any formula $\phi \in L$:

$$\{i \in I \mid \mathfrak{A}_i \models_{X_i} \phi\} \in \mathcal{U} \implies \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U} \models_{\prod_{i \in I} X_i / \mathcal{U}} \phi.$$

We say that L has a *strong Loś' theorem* if the above holds in both directions:

$$\{i \in I \mid \mathfrak{A}_i \models_{X_i} \phi\} \in \mathcal{U} \iff \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{A}_i / \mathcal{U} \models_{\prod_{i \in I} X_i / \mathcal{U}} \phi.$$

We define a partial order among abstract team logics as follows.

Definition 6.4. Let L, L' be two abstract team logics. We write $L \leq L'$ if for any τ -formula $\phi \in L$ there is a τ -formula $\phi' \in L'$ such that $\phi \equiv \phi'$, i.e. for all $\mathfrak{A} \in \text{Str}(\tau)$ and all teams X of \mathfrak{A} ,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi'.$$

We write $L \equiv L'$ if $L \leq L'$ and $L' \leq L$.

If $\phi, \psi \in L$ and $\text{Mod}_L(\phi) \subseteq \text{Mod}_L(\psi)$, then we write $\phi \models \psi$. We write $\phi \models \psi$ even if $\phi \in L, \psi \in L'$ and $\text{Mod}_L(\phi) \subseteq \text{Mod}_{L'}(\psi)$. We write $\phi \equiv \psi$ if $\phi \models \psi$ and $\psi \models \phi$. Note that if ϕ and ψ are consistent and $\phi \equiv \psi$, we must have $\text{Sig}(\phi) = \text{Sig}(\psi)$. If $\Sigma \subseteq \text{Fml}_L$ and $\phi \in L'$, we write $\Sigma \models \phi$ if $\bigcap_{\psi \in \Sigma} \text{Mod}_L(\psi) \subseteq \text{Mod}_{L'}(\phi)$.

Lemma 6.5. Let L be a regular abstract team logic.

- (i) Let \mathfrak{A} be a τ -structure and $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$ nonempty. Then $\text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A}, X)$ is complete with respect to τ -formulas of L whose free variables are contained in D , i.e. if $\phi \in L$ is a τ -formula and $\text{Fv}(\phi) \subseteq D$, then either $\phi \in \text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A}, X)$ or $\sim\phi \in \text{Th}_L(\mathfrak{A}, X)$.
- (ii) For any $\phi \in L, \phi \equiv \sim\sim\phi$.
- (iii) Let $\Sigma \cup \{\phi\} \subseteq L$. Then $\Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$ is inconsistent if and only if $\Sigma \models \sim\phi$.

Proof.

- (i) Since X is nonempty, for any $\phi \in L$ we have

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \sim\phi \iff \mathfrak{A} \not\models_X \phi.$$

Clearly exactly one of the options $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \phi$ and $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \sim\phi$ is true.

- (ii) Trivial.
- (iii) Suppose that $\Sigma \models \sim\phi$. Then for any \mathfrak{A} and X such that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \Sigma$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \sim\phi$. This means that for such \mathfrak{A} and X , whenever X is nonempty, $\mathfrak{A} \not\models_X \phi$, which means that there are no \mathfrak{A} and nonempty X such that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$. Hence $\Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$ is inconsistent.

On the other hand, if $\Sigma \cup \{\phi\}$ is inconsistent, then $\bigcap_{\psi \in \Sigma} \text{Mod}_L(\psi) \cap \text{Mod}_L(\phi) = \bigcap_{\psi \in \Sigma \cup \{\phi\}} \text{Mod}_L(\psi) = \emptyset$. Hence for any \mathfrak{A} and nonempty X , if $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \Sigma$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \not\models_X \phi$. But this means that $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \sim\phi$. Hence $\Sigma \models \sim\phi$. \square

We can now prove two characterisations of FOT in abstract terms. We notice that the first one characterises FOT in the context of abstract team logics and adapts [19] in our context. The second result applies to all positive abstract team logic and adapts [26].

Theorem 6.6.

- (i) The logic FOT is maximal among all regular abstract team logics that are team-finitary, compact and closed under direct limits.
- (ii) The logic FOT is maximal among all positive abstract team logics that are team-finitary and have a strong Łoś' theorem.

Proof.

- (i) Suppose this is not the case. Then there is a regular abstract team logic L such that $\text{FOT} \leq L \not\leq \text{FOT}$ and L is team-finitary, compact and closed under direct limits. Let $\phi \in L$ be such that $\phi \not\equiv \psi$ for all $\psi \in \text{FOT}$. By the occurrence condition, there is τ such that ϕ is a τ -formula, and by team-finitarity there is a finite $D \supseteq \text{Fv}(\phi)$ such that whenever ϕ is satisfied in a team, it is satisfied in a team with domain D . Let Σ be the set of all τ -formulas $\psi \in \text{FOT}$ such that $\phi \models \psi$ and $\text{Fv}(\psi) \subseteq D$. We show that $\Sigma \cup \{\sim\phi\}$ is consistent. Let $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ be finite. Now if $\Sigma' \cup \{\sim\phi\}$ were inconsistent, then we would have $\Sigma' \models \sim\sim\phi$, whence $\bigwedge \Sigma' \models \phi$. As Σ is clearly closed under conjunction, we would also have $\bigwedge \Sigma' \in \Sigma$, whence $\phi \models \bigwedge \Sigma'$. But then $\phi \equiv \bigwedge \Sigma'$, contradicting the choice of ϕ . Hence we conclude that $\Sigma' \cup \{\sim\phi\}$ is consistent. Thus by compactness of L , $\Sigma \cup \{\sim\phi\}$ is consistent. Thus there is a τ -structure \mathfrak{A} and nonempty $X \subseteq \mathfrak{A}^D$ with $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \Sigma \cup \{\sim\phi\}$.

Let $\mathfrak{X} = \{\{a\} \mid a \in \mathfrak{A}\} \cup \{X[\vec{x}]\}$, where \vec{x} lists D . Now we consider the set $\text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X}) \cup \{\phi, \theta(X[\vec{x}], \vec{x})\}$, where θ is as in Lemma 2.9, and show that it is consistent. Let $\Sigma' \subseteq \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X})$ be finite. Let a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} enumerate such $a \in \mathfrak{A}$ that $\{a\}$ occurs in a formula of Σ' . Now there is a first-order τ -formula $\psi(y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}, R)$, where R is a second-order variable with arity $|D|$, such that for any τ -structure \mathfrak{B} and its $\tau \cup \{\{a_0\}, \dots, \{a_{n-1}\}, X\}$ -expansion $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$, we have

$$\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \bigwedge \Sigma' \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \psi(b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}, X[\vec{x}]^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}}),$$

where b_i is the unique element inhabiting $\{a_i\}^{\hat{\mathfrak{B}}}$. Let $\psi^*(\vec{x})$ be an FOT-translation of $\exists y_0 \dots \exists y_{n-1} \psi(y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}, R)$, i.e. such a τ -formula of FOT that for any τ -structure \mathfrak{B} and $Y \in \mathfrak{B}^D$,

$$\mathfrak{B} \models \exists y_0 \dots \exists y_{n-1} \psi(y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}, Y[\vec{x}]) \iff \mathfrak{B} \models_Y \psi^*.$$

Now suppose for a contradiction that $\Sigma' \cup \{\phi, \theta(X[\vec{x}], \vec{x})\}$ is inconsistent. Then so is $\{\psi^*, \phi\}$. This means that $\phi \models \sim\psi^*$, whence $\sim\psi^* \in \Sigma$. As $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \Sigma$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models_X \sim\psi^*$. Since $X \neq \emptyset$, we obtain $\mathfrak{A} \not\models_X \psi^*$. Thus $\mathfrak{A} \not\models \exists y_0 \dots \exists y_{n-1} \psi(y_0, \dots, y_{n-1}, X[\vec{x}])$, which is a contradiction since $\mathfrak{A} \models \psi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, X[\vec{x}])$. Therefore $\Sigma' \cup \{\phi, \theta(X[\vec{x}], \vec{x})\}$ is consistent and, by compactness of L , so is $\text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X}) \cup \{\phi, \theta(X[\vec{x}], \vec{x})\}$. Thus there is a $\tau(\mathfrak{X})$ -structure $\hat{\mathfrak{B}}$ such that $\hat{\mathfrak{B}} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{X}) \cup \{\phi, \theta(X[\vec{x}], \vec{x})\}$.


Let $\mathfrak{B} = \hat{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright \tau$. Then by Lemma 3.18, there is partial elementary team map $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ with $\text{dom}(\ell) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X})$. Now notice that \mathfrak{A} , \mathfrak{B} , X and ℓ are such that

$$\mathfrak{A} \models_X \sim\phi \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{B} \models_{\ell(X)} \phi.$$

Now we define, by recursion on $n < \omega$, τ -structures \mathfrak{A}_n and \mathfrak{B}_n , sets $\mathfrak{X}_n \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{A}_n)$ and $\mathfrak{Y}_n \subseteq \mathcal{R}(\mathfrak{B}_n)$, teams $X_n \in \mathfrak{X}_n$ and $Y_n \in \mathfrak{Y}_n$, and partial elementary team maps $i_n: \mathfrak{A}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{n+1}$, $j_n: \mathfrak{B}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_{n+1}$, $\ell_n: \mathfrak{A}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_n$ and $g_n: \mathfrak{B}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_{n+1}$, satisfying the following.

- (a) $\mathfrak{X}_n = \{X_n\} \cup \{\{a\} \mid a \in \mathfrak{A}_n\}$ and $\mathfrak{Y}_n = \{Y_n\} \cup \{\{b\} \mid b \in \mathfrak{B}_n\}$.

- (b) $\mathfrak{A}_n \models_{X_n} \sim\phi$ and $\mathfrak{B}_n \models_{Y_n} \phi$.
- (c) $\text{dom}(i_n) = \text{dom}(f_n) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}_n)$ and $\text{dom}(j_n) = \text{dom}(g_n) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{Y}_n)$.
- (d) $\text{ran}(i_n) \cup \text{ran}(g_n) \subseteq \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}_{n+1})$ and $\text{ran}(j_n) \cup \text{ran}(f_n) \subseteq \text{cl}(\mathfrak{Y}_{n+1})$.
- (e) $Y_n = f_n(X_n)$, $Y_{n+1} = j_n(Y_n)$ and $X_{n+1} = i_n(X_n) = g_n(Y_n)$.
- (f) The resulting diagram commutes.



We start by letting $\mathfrak{A}_0 := \mathfrak{A}$, $X_0 := X$, $\mathfrak{B}_0 := \mathfrak{B}$ and $Y_0 := f(X)$. Then we let $\mathfrak{X}_0 = \mathfrak{X} = \{X_0\} \cup \{\{a\} \mid a \in \mathfrak{A}_0\}$, $\mathfrak{Y}_0 = \{Y_0\} \cup \{\{b\} \mid b \in \mathfrak{B}_0\}$, and $f_0 = f$. These are all clearly as desired.

Suppose we have constructed \mathfrak{A}_i , \mathfrak{B}_i , \mathfrak{X}_i , \mathfrak{Y}_i , X_i , Y_i and f_i for $i \leq n$ and i_i , j_i and g_i for $i < n$. We now construct \mathfrak{A}_{n+1} , \mathfrak{B}_{n+1} , f_{n+1} , i_n , j_n and g_n . Let Γ be the set

$$\{\sim\phi, \theta(X_n, \vec{x})\} \cup \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}_n, \mathfrak{X}_n) \cup \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{B}_n, \mathfrak{Y}_n) \cup \{ \text{"}\underline{f_n(R)} = \underline{R}\text{"} \mid R \in \mathfrak{X}_n \},$$

where " $S = S'$ " is a shorthand for $\forall^1 \vec{w} (S(\vec{w}) \leftrightarrow S'(\vec{w}))$. We use compactness of L to show that Γ is consistent. By the induction hypothesis, $\mathfrak{A}_n \models_{X_n} \sim\phi$, and clearly $\mathfrak{A}_n \models_{X_n} \{\theta(X_n, \vec{x})\} \cup \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}_n, \mathfrak{X}_n)$. Now, look at a finite $\Gamma' \subseteq \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{B}_n, \mathfrak{Y}_n)$. Then $\bigwedge \Gamma'$ is equivalent to a first-order $\tau(\mathfrak{Y}_n)$ -sentence of the form $\psi(\underline{f_n(\{a_0\})}, \dots, \underline{f_n(\{a_{k-1}\})}, \{b_0\}, \dots, \{b_{m-1}\}, Y_n)$ for some $a_0, \dots, a_{k-1} \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ and $b_0, \dots, b_{m-1} \in \mathfrak{B}_n$ such that $\{b_i\} \notin \text{ran}(f_n)$ for all $i < m$. Now

$$\mathfrak{B}_n \models \exists y_0 \dots \exists y_{k-1} \psi(f_n(a_0), \dots, f_n(a_{k-1}), y_0, \dots, y_{m-1}, f_n(X_n)),$$

so as f_n is elementary, we have

$$\mathfrak{A}_n \models \exists y_0 \dots \exists y_{k-1} \psi(a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}, y_0, \dots, y_{m-1}, X_n),$$

so we can find $a_k, \dots, a_{m+k-1} \in \mathfrak{A}_n$ such that $\bigwedge \Gamma'$ is satisfied in an expansion of \mathfrak{A}_n that interprets $\{b_i\}$ as $\{a_{k+i}\}$, $f(\{a_i\})$ as $\{a_i\}$ and Y_n as X_n . Such an expansion clearly also satisfies the sentences " $\underline{f_n(R)} = \underline{R}$ ". Then by compactness, Γ has a model, so we let $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1}$ be one such. As $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{A}_n, \mathfrak{X}_n)$, we can find a partial elementary team map $i_n: \mathfrak{A}_n \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1}$ with $\text{dom}(i_n) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}_n)$ and $\underline{R}^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1}} = i_n(R)$ for all $R \in \mathfrak{X}_n$. As $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1} \models \text{Diag}(\mathfrak{B}_n, \mathfrak{Y}_n)$, we can find a partial elementary team map $g_n: \mathfrak{B}_n \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1}$ with $\text{dom}(g_n) = \text{cl}(\mathfrak{Y}_n)$ and $\underline{R}^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1}} = g_n(R)$ for all $R \in \mathfrak{Y}_n$. As $\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1} \models \text{"}\underline{f_n(R)} = \underline{R}\text{"}$ for all $R \in \mathfrak{X}_n$, we have

$$g_n(f_n(R)) = \underline{f_n(R)}^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1}} = \underline{R}^{\hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1}} = i_n(R)$$

for all $R \in \mathfrak{X}_n$, and hence $i_n = g_n \circ f_n$. Then we can let $\mathfrak{A}_{n+1} = \hat{\mathfrak{A}}_{n+1} \upharpoonright \tau$ and $\mathfrak{X}_{n+1} = \{X_n\} \cup \{\{a\} \mid a \in \mathfrak{A}_{n+1}\}$ as desired.

The model \mathfrak{B}_{n+1} , the set \mathfrak{Y}_{n+1} and the maps j_n and f_{n+1} are constructed in a similar manner, using \mathfrak{B}_n , \mathfrak{Y}_n , \mathfrak{A}_{n+1} , \mathfrak{X}_{n+1} and g_n .

In the end, we let $\mathfrak{A}_\omega = \lim_{i < \omega} \mathfrak{A}_i$, $X_\omega = i_\omega(X_0)$, where i_ω is the direct limit map $\mathfrak{A}_0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_\omega$ of the system $(\mathfrak{A}_i)_{i < \omega}$, and $\mathfrak{B}_\omega = \lim_{i < \omega} \mathfrak{B}_i$ and $Y_\omega = j_\omega(Y_0)$, where j_ω is the direct limit map $\mathfrak{B}_0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}_\omega$ of the system $(\mathfrak{B}_i)_{i < \omega}$. Now, since L has direct limits, we have $\mathfrak{A}_\omega \models_{X_\omega} \sim\phi$ and

$\mathfrak{B}_\omega \models_{Y_\omega} \phi$. But as both $(\mathfrak{A}_i)_{i < \omega}$ and $(\mathfrak{B}_i)_{i < \omega}$ are cofinal in the directed system, we must have $\mathfrak{A}_\omega \cong \mathfrak{B}_\omega$ and furthermore, the isomorphism maps X_ω to Y_ω , which is impossible.

- (ii) Suppose this is not the case. Then there is an abstract positive team-finitary team logic L which has a strong Loś' theorem with the following property: there exists a formula $\phi \in L$ such that for all $\psi \in \text{FOT}$ either

(a) there is a model \mathfrak{A}_ψ and a team X_ψ such that $\mathfrak{A}_\psi \not\models_{X_\psi} \phi$ and $\mathfrak{A}_\psi \models_{X_\psi} \psi$,
or

(b) there is a model \mathfrak{B}_ψ and a team Y_ψ such that $\mathfrak{B}_\psi \models_{Y_\psi} \phi$ and $\mathfrak{B}_\psi \not\models_{Y_\psi} \psi$.

We also remark that since L has a strong Loś' theorem then it is also compact, as the usual ultraproduct proof works in this setting (see [24, Theorem 3.14]).

Let D be a set of variables satisfying the team-finitarity condition for ϕ and τ a signature satisfying the occurrence condition for ϕ . Consider the set Γ of all τ -formulas $\psi \in \text{FOT}$ such that $\phi \models \psi$ and $\text{Fv}(\psi) \subseteq D$. Also, we let \mathcal{S} be the family of finite subsets of Γ . Since $\phi \models \Gamma$, it follows by the choice of ϕ that for every $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ there are a model \mathfrak{A}_Σ and a team X_Σ on \mathfrak{A}_Σ such that $\text{dom}(X_\Sigma) = D$, $\mathfrak{A}_\Sigma \models_{X_\Sigma} \Sigma$ and $\mathfrak{A}_\Sigma \not\models_{X_\Sigma} \phi$. For every $\psi \in \Gamma$, we let $[\psi] = \{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S} \mid \psi \in \Sigma\}$ and $F = \{[\psi] \mid \psi \in \Gamma\}$. Then, given $\psi_0, \dots, \psi_{n-1} \in \Gamma$ we have that $\{\psi_i \mid i < n\} \in \bigcap_{i < n} [\psi_i]$, showing that F has the finite intersection property. It follows that we can extend F to an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on \mathcal{S} .

Consider now the ultraproduct $\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}$. For every formula $\psi \in \Gamma$ we have that $[\psi] \in \mathcal{U}$ and for every $\Sigma' \supseteq \{\psi\}$ we have that $\mathfrak{A}_{\Sigma'} \models_{X_{\Sigma'}} \psi$. It follows by the Loś' Theorem of FOT that $\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U} \models_{\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}} \psi$, and so that $\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U} \models_{\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}} \Gamma$. Moreover, for any $\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}$ we have that $\mathfrak{A}_\Sigma \not\models_{X_\Sigma} \phi$, thus by the strong Loś' theorem of L we obtain that $\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U} \not\models_{\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}} \phi$.

Now consider the theory $T = \text{Th}_{\text{FOT}}(\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}, \prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U})$, we claim this is consistent with ϕ . If not, there is a finite sets of formulas $\Delta \subseteq \text{Th}_{\text{FOT}}(\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}, \prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U})$ such that $\Delta \cup \{\phi\}$ is not consistent, whence $\phi \models \bigvee \{\sim \delta \mid \delta \in \Delta\}$. It follows that $\bigvee \{\sim \delta \mid \delta \in \Delta\} \in \Gamma$ and so

$$\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U} \models_{\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}} \bigvee \{\sim \delta \mid \delta \in \Delta\}$$

which contradicts $\Delta \subseteq T$.

We conclude that there are a τ -structure $\mathfrak{B} \equiv_{\text{FOT}} \prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}$ and a team Y on \mathfrak{B} such that $\text{Th}_{\text{FOT}}(\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}, \prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}) = \text{Th}_{\text{FOT}}(\mathfrak{B}, Y)$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models_Y \phi$. Notice that, by the choice of D and the fact that $D = \text{dom}(\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U})$, we have that both these teams are finitary. Then, by the translation from FOT to FO it follows that

$$(\mathfrak{B}, Y) \equiv_{\text{FO}} (\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U}, \prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U})$$

and so, by Keisler–Shelah, there are two elementary maps $\pi_0: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $\pi_1: \prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{A}_\Sigma / \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ into some common ultrapower \mathfrak{C} (up to isomorphism). By assumption, L has a strong Loś' theorem, and so does FOT. Thus it follows that $\mathfrak{C} \models_{\pi_0(Y)} \phi$ and $\mathfrak{C} \not\models_{\pi_1(\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U})} \phi$, which contradicts $\pi_0(Y) = \pi_1(\prod_{\Sigma \in \mathcal{S}} X_\Sigma / \mathcal{U})$. \square

7. APPLICATION II – COMPLETE THEORIES IN ESO

In this last section, we apply the techniques and the methodology developed so far to the context of complete theories in existential second-order logic (or equivalently of $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$). In Section 7.1, we study some basic properties of complete ESO-theories and relate them to so-called resplendent models. In Section 7.2, we use stability theory to prove some versions of categoricity transfer for complete theories in ESO.

7.1. Complete Theories & Resplendent Models. In this section, we study complete theories in ESO and their models. As we are always dealing with sentences, in all results one may replace first-order logic by FOT and ESO by $\text{FO}(\perp_c)$.

Recall that a theory T of ESO is complete if for all $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B} \models T$ and sentences ϕ of ESO,

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \phi.$$

Proposition 7.1. Let T be a complete first-order τ -theory. Then there is a unique ESO-theory \bar{T} such that

- (i) $\bar{T} \supseteq T$,
- (ii) \bar{T} is closed under logical consequence and
- (iii) \bar{T} is complete.

Proof. Let $\kappa = |\tau| + \aleph_0$, and let $\phi_i, i < \kappa$, enumerate all τ -sentences of ESO. We define \bar{T} by recursion. Let $T_0 = T$ and $T_i = \bigcup_{j < i} T_j$ for i limit. For $i = j + 1$, we let $T_i = T_j \cup \{\phi_j\}$ if it is consistent and $T_i = T_j$ otherwise. Then we let $\bar{T} = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} T_i$. By compactness of ESO, \bar{T} is consistent, and as such it is clearly a maximal consistent extension of T and hence closed under logical consequence. Now, let \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{B} be models of \bar{T} and ϕ a sentence of ESO. Now if $\phi \in \bar{T}$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$, as both are models of \bar{T} . On the other hand, if $\phi \notin \bar{T}$, then $\bar{T} \cup \{\phi\}$ is inconsistent, whence $\mathfrak{A} \not\models \phi$ and $\mathfrak{B} \not\models \phi$. Hence \bar{T} is complete.

For uniqueness, let T' be another complete theory in ESO extending T . If $T' \cup \bar{T}$ is consistent, then $T' \subseteq \bar{T}$, as \bar{T} is a maximal consistent theory, whence the closure of T' under logical consequence is exactly \bar{T} . Thus it suffices to show that $T' \cup \bar{T}$ is consistent. Let $\mathfrak{A} \models T'$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \bar{T}$. As T is first-order complete, it has the joint embedding property. Hence there is \mathfrak{C} and elementary team embeddings $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$. Since elementary team embeddings are independence team embeddings, $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$ implies $\mathfrak{C} \models \phi$ and $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$ implies $\mathfrak{C} \models \phi$ for all $\phi \in \text{ESO}$. Hence $\mathfrak{C} \models T' \cup \bar{T}$. \square

Definition 7.2. We say that a τ -structure \mathfrak{A} is *complete* if for any other τ -structure \mathfrak{B} such that there is an elementary team embedding $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, satisfies

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \phi$$

for all sentences $\phi \in \text{ESO}$.

Proposition 7.3. For a first-order complete theory T of ESO and a structure \mathfrak{A} , the following are equivalent.

- (i) $\mathfrak{A} \models \bar{T}$.
- (ii) \mathfrak{A} is a complete model of T .

Proof. Suppose first that $\mathfrak{A} \models \bar{T}$. Let $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ be an elementary team embedding. Then, in particular, for all sentences $\phi \in \text{ESO}$ we have that $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$ entails $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$. It follows that $\mathfrak{B} \models \bar{T}$. But then, as \bar{T} is complete, we have

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \phi \iff \mathfrak{B} \models \phi$$

for all sentences $\phi \in \text{ESO}$. Hence \mathfrak{A} is complete.

Then, suppose that \mathfrak{A} is a complete model of T . Let $\mathfrak{B} \models \text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$. By joint embedding, there is \mathfrak{C} and elementary team embeddings $\ell: \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$. Let ϕ be a sentence of ESO . Now, if $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$, then $\phi \in \text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$, whence $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$. On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{A} \not\models \phi$, since ℓ is an elementary team embedding, by completeness of \mathfrak{A} we have $\mathfrak{C} \not\models \phi$. If it were the case that $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$, since g is an independence team embedding, we would have $\mathfrak{C} \models \phi$, a contradiction. Hence $\mathfrak{B} \not\models \phi$. Therefore $\text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$ is complete, whence $\bar{T} = \text{Th}_{\text{ESO}}(\mathfrak{A})$. \square

We conclude this section by highlighting a connection between complete structures and so-called resplendent models. The following can be found in e.g. [23, Ch. 9.3].

Definition 7.4. A τ -structure \mathfrak{A} is *resplendent* if for any elementary extension \mathfrak{B} of \mathfrak{A} and a τ -formula $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ of ESO , we have

$$\mathfrak{B} \models \phi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \iff \mathfrak{A} \models \phi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$$

for all $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{A}$.

For the proof of the following fact, we refer the reader again to [23, Ch. 9.3].

Fact. Let T be a first-order theory. Then every model of T with cardinality $\geq |T|$ has a resplendent elementary extension of the same cardinality.

Proposition 7.5. The following are equivalent for a structure \mathfrak{A} .

- (i) $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is complete.
- (ii) \mathfrak{A} is resplendent.

Proof. Suppose first that \mathfrak{A} is resplendent. To show that $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is complete, let \mathfrak{B} be a $\tau(\mathfrak{A})$ -structure and $\ell: \mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$ an elementary team embedding, and let ϕ be a $\tau(\mathfrak{A})$ -sentence of ESO such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$. By Proposition 3.15, we may assume that \mathfrak{B} is an elementary extension of $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ and ℓ is the identity on singletons. Now $\phi = \psi(\underline{a}_0, \dots, \underline{a}_{n-1})$ for some τ -formula $\psi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \text{ESO}$ and $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{A}$, so as $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi$, we have $\mathfrak{B} \upharpoonright \tau \models \psi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$. Now $\mathfrak{B} \upharpoonright \tau$ is an elementary extension of \mathfrak{A} , so by the resplendence of \mathfrak{A} , we obtain $\mathfrak{A} \models \psi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$, whence $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}} \models \phi$. Hence $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is complete.

Conversely, suppose that $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is complete. Let \mathfrak{B} be an elementary extension of \mathfrak{A} and let $\phi(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \text{ESO}$ be such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \phi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$ for some $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{A}$. Since \mathfrak{B} is an elementary extension of \mathfrak{A} , we have $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}} \equiv \mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{A}}$, so by the joint embedding property there is a $\tau(\mathfrak{A})$ -structure \mathfrak{C} and elementary team embeddings $\ell: \mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$ and $g: \mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{A}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}$. Now $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathfrak{A}} \models \phi(\underline{a}_0, \dots, \underline{a}_{n-1})$, so as g is an independence team embedding, we have $\mathfrak{C} \models \phi(\underline{a}_0, \dots, \underline{a}_{n-1})$. As $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ is complete and ℓ is an elementary team embedding, we have $\mathfrak{A}_{\mathfrak{A}} \models \phi(\underline{a}_0, \dots, \underline{a}_{n-1})$. But then $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$. Thus \mathfrak{A} is resplendent. \square

7.2. Categoricity Transfer. In this section we prove two results concerning the transfer of categoricity between countable and uncountable cardinals for complete ESO -theories. We assume the reader is familiar with the standard notions from classification theory and refer to [2, 28, 30] for the basic definitions.

We also remark that the following results provide a first study of the spectrum function for existential second order theories. In connection to this topic, we remark the following fact.

Fact. Let T be a complete theory in ESO and T^* its first-order reduct. If T^* is unstable, then T has 2^κ models in any cardinal $\kappa > |T|$.

If T is a complete ESO -theory, the class of its models is clearly pseudoelementary, as it is the class of models of the theory T^1 obtained by adding to the signature

witnesses for every existential second-order statement in T . It follows that the fact above is an immediate corollary of Shelah's general result on the number of models of pseudoelementary classes [28, Ch. VIII, Thm.2.1].

7.2.1. Downwards Categoricity. We show in this section that if the first-order reduct of an ESO theory T in a finite signature is uncountably categorical, then the theory T is also \aleph_0 -categorical. It follows that T is quasi-categorical, i.e. it has a unique model in all cardinals for which it has a model to begin with.

The proof of this fact is essentially a corollary of Baldwin and Lachlan's study of uncountably categorical theories (see e.g. [30, Section 6.3]). In particular, recall that if T is an uncountably categorical first-order theory, then

- (i) T is totally transcendental and thus has a (countable) prime model \mathfrak{A}_0 ,
- (ii) there are a formula $\phi(x, \vec{y})$ and $\vec{a} \in \mathfrak{A}_0$ such that $\phi(x, \vec{b})$ is strongly minimal for every $\vec{b} \models \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(\vec{a}/\emptyset)$, and
- (iii) since \mathfrak{A}_0 is atomic, the type $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(\vec{a}/\emptyset)$ is isolated by some $\psi(\vec{y})$.

Then $\phi(x, \vec{a})$ determines a pregeometry whose dimension does not depend on the choice of \vec{a} as long as it realizes ψ . For $\mathfrak{A} \models T$, we shall write $\dim_{\phi, \psi}(\mathfrak{A})$ for the dimension of the pregeometry $(\phi(\mathfrak{A}, a), \text{acl})$. We denote the dimension of \mathfrak{A}_0 by m_0 . The following well-known theorem due to Baldwin and Lachlan [30, Theorem 6.3.7] classifies all countable models of uncountably categorical theories.

Theorem 7.6 (Baldwin–Lachlan). Let T be an uncountably categorical first-order theory in a countable signature. Then for each cardinal $\kappa \geq m_0$ there is a unique model \mathfrak{A}_κ with $\dim_{\phi, \psi}(\mathfrak{A}_\kappa) = \kappa$.

In particular, since $m_0 \leq \aleph_0$, this means that either T is countably categorical, or it has \aleph_0 -many countable models up to isomorphism. We shall see now how its ESO-completions is satisfied only by the countable model of dimension \aleph_0 .

Theorem 7.7. If T is a complete theory in ESO in a finite signature and its first-order reduct T^* is uncountably categorical, then T is categorical in all infinite cardinalities.

Proof. First, notice that since the signature τ of T is finite, ESO can talk about automorphisms of a τ -structure. In particular, for any second-order function variable f , there is a τ -formula $\text{aut}(f)$ such that

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \text{aut}(\pi) \iff \pi \text{ is a } \tau\text{-automorphism of } \mathfrak{A}.$$

Also, ESO can express when a set is infinite, namely there is a formula $\text{inf}(X)$ in ESO such that:

$$\mathfrak{A} \models \text{inf}(A) \iff |A| \geq \aleph_0.$$

Let \mathfrak{A}_0 be a prime model of T^* , and let $\phi(x, a^*)$, $a^* \in \mathfrak{A}_0$, be strongly minimal. Let $\theta(v)$ isolate $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a^*/\emptyset)$. Now, for all $n < \omega$, let Φ_n be the following sentence of SO:

$$\forall v (\theta(v) \rightarrow \forall x_0 \dots \forall x_{n-1} \exists X (\text{inf}(X) \wedge \forall y (X(y) \rightarrow \phi(y, v)) \wedge \psi)),$$

where $\psi(v, x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, X)$ is the formula

$$\forall y \forall z \left((X(y) \wedge X(z)) \rightarrow \exists f \left(\text{aut}(f) \wedge f(y) = z \wedge f(v) = v \wedge \bigwedge_{i < n} f(x_i) = x_i \right) \right).$$

In other words, Φ_n expresses that whenever a is such that $\phi(x, a)$ is strongly minimal, then for any a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} there are infinitely many elements of the strongly minimal set such that any two of them are conjugates over a, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} . One can easily check that $\Phi_n \in \text{ESO}$.

First of all, we show that $T \models \Phi_n$ for all $n < \omega$. Let \mathfrak{B} be an uncountable elementary extension of \mathfrak{A}_0 . As T has a model in every infinite cardinality but T^* is uncountably categorical, we must have $\mathfrak{B} \models T$. Now it is enough to show that $\mathfrak{B} \models \Phi_n$ for all n . For this, fix n , let $b^* \in \mathfrak{B}$ be such that $\mathfrak{B} \models \theta(b^*)$ and let $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in \mathfrak{B}$ be arbitrary. Now $\varphi(x, b^*)$ is strongly minimal, so it has a unique non-forking extension $p \in S(\{b^*, b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\})$. In particular, p is not algebraic. Hence, as \mathfrak{B} is \aleph_0 -saturated, p is realized in \mathfrak{B} , and as p is not algebraic, there are actually infinitely many $b \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $b \models p$. Let B be the set of them. Now $B \subseteq \phi(\mathfrak{B}, b^*)$ and any two elements of B are conjugates over $\{b^*, b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}\}$. Hence $\mathfrak{B} \models \Phi_n$.

In order to show that T is \aleph_0 -categorical, it is enough to show that any countable model \mathfrak{A} of T has dimension \aleph_0 . Let \mathfrak{A} be a countable model of T . We now construct by recursion an independent sequence a_i , $i < \omega$, in the pregeometry $(\phi(\mathfrak{A}, a^*), \text{acl})$. Suppose that we have already found independent a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} . As $T \models \Phi_n$, we have $\mathfrak{A} \models \Phi_n$. Hence there is an infinite set $A \subseteq \phi(\mathfrak{A}, a^*)$ such that any two elements of A are conjugates over $\{a^*, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$. Now all elements of A have the same type over $\{a^*, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$, and since A is infinite, it must be that $A \subseteq \phi(\mathfrak{A}, a^*) \setminus \text{acl}(\{a^*, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}\})$. Now any element of A is algebraically independent of a^*, a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} and hence suffices as a_n . \square

Example 7.8. The motivating example for the result above is given by the theories in algebraically closed fields. In particular, let T_{ACF_0} be the theory of algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0 and let $T_{\text{ACF}_0}^1$ be its (unique) ESO-completion. Then the previous theorem shows that $T_{\text{ACF}_0}^1$ is \aleph_0 -categorical and its only countable model is the algebraic closure of the field $\mathbb{Q}(t_0, t_1, \dots)$ of polynomial fractions over the rational numbers.

7.2.2. Upwards Categoricity. We prove in this section an upwards categoricity result for complete theories in existential second-order logic. In particular, we show that under the assumptions of ω -stability and 1-basedness, \aleph_0 -categoricity entails uncountable categoricity.

We follow in this section the standard notation and terminology from classification theory. In particular, we use the symbol \perp to refer to forking independence and we identify the strong type $\text{stp}(\vec{a}/C)$ of a tuple \vec{a} over parameters C with the set of all equivalence classes $E(\vec{x}, \vec{a})$, where E is any finite equivalence relation definable over C . The set of finite equivalence relations over C we denote by $\text{FE}(C)$. We refer the reader to [2] for these and the related notions from classification theory.

As the notion of 1-based theory is less standard, we recall its definition and one of its key properties. We stress this is a folklore result and refer the reader to [5, Fact 3.1] for a proof. The converse of the lemma is also true, but we shall not need it.

In this subsection, \mathfrak{M} denotes the ordinary elementary monster model which is suitably universal, homogeneous and saturated.

Definition 7.9. A first-order theory T is 1-based if for all $A, B \subseteq \mathfrak{M}^{\text{eq}}$, we have $A \perp_{\text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(A) \cap \text{acl}^{\text{eq}}(B)} B$.

Lemma 7.10. Suppose T is 1-based and C is finite. If $(a_i)_{i \in I}$ is C -indiscernible, then for all $0 < i < j$ we have $a_i \perp_{C a_0} (a_j)_{i \neq j \in I}$.

Many steps in the proof of the following theorem are well-known results among stability theorists but we include them for completeness.

Theorem 7.11. Let T be a complete ESO-theory and let T^* be its first-order reduct. If T^* is ω -stable, \aleph_0 -categorical and 1-based, then T is uncountably categorical.

Proof. Let λ be an uncountable cardinal. We show that all models of T of cardinality λ are saturated, from which λ -categoricity follows. Let \mathfrak{A} be such a model, and let p be a type over some parameter set of cardinality $< \lambda$. The general strategy of the proof is to show that p is realised in \mathfrak{A} . Without loss of generality, $p \in S_1(\mathfrak{B})$ for some elementary submodel $\mathfrak{B} \preceq \mathfrak{A}$ of power $< \lambda$. We denote $\kappa = |\mathfrak{B}|$.

Let $\mathfrak{M} \succeq \mathfrak{A}$ be the (first-order) monster model of T^* . Since T^* is ω -stable, we may have \mathfrak{M} be saturated. Note that a saturated structure is resplendent: as it has a resplendent elementary extension of the same cardinality and is itself saturated, it must be isomorphic to the extension. It thus follows from Proposition 7.3 and Proposition 7.5 that $\mathfrak{M} \models T$.

Let $a \in \mathfrak{M}$ realize p , by superstability of T^* , there is a finite $B \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$ such that $a \downarrow_B \mathfrak{B}$. Since T^* is \aleph_0 -categorical, by Ryll-Nardzewski, there are only finitely many non-equivalent formulas with free variables x, y and parameters from B . In particular, there is a finite list of formulas $\delta_i(x, y, \vec{d}_i)$, $i < n$, defining all finite equivalence relations over B . We let $E_i \in \text{FE}(B)$ be the relation defined by δ_i . Now, for each $i < n$, pick $c_i \in \mathfrak{M}$ such that $(a, c_i) \in E_i$. The type $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/B \cup \{c_i \mid i < n\})$ has a finite number of parameters, so by \aleph_0 -categoricity it is isolated by some formula and thus realised in \mathfrak{B} by some element b . Then we clearly have, for all $i < n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (a, c_i) \in E_i &\iff \delta_i(x, c_i, \vec{d}_i) \in \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/B \cup \{c_i \mid i < n\}) \\ &\iff \delta_i(x, c_i, \vec{d}_i) \in \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(b/B \cup \{c_i \mid i < n\}) \\ &\iff (b, c_i) \in E_i, \end{aligned}$$

and so we obtain that $\text{stp}(a/B) = \text{stp}(b/B)$.

Let $C = B \cup \{b\}$. We claim that $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$ ($= p \upharpoonright C$) is stationary, i.e. has a unique non-forking extension to \mathfrak{B} . To this end, suppose that $c, d \models \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$, $c \downarrow_C \mathfrak{B}$ and $d \downarrow_C \mathfrak{B}$. Since $a \downarrow_B \mathfrak{B}$, by monotonicity $a \downarrow_B C$. As $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(c/C) = \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$, we then obtain $c \downarrow_B C$. But then from $c \downarrow_B C$ and $c \downarrow_C \mathfrak{B}$, transitivity gives $c \downarrow_B \mathfrak{B}$. Similarly $d \downarrow_B \mathfrak{B}$. Now, for every $E \in \text{FE}(B)$, if $\delta(x, y, \vec{d})$ is the defining formula of E , then since $(a, b) \in E$, we have $\delta(x, b, \vec{d}) \in \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$ and so $\delta(x, b, \vec{d}) \in \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(c/C), \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(d/C)$. Hence $(c, b), (d, b) \in E$. It follows that $(c, d) \in E$. Hence $\text{stp}(c/C) = \text{stp}(d/C)$. Thus, as c and d have the same strong type over C and both of them are independent of \mathfrak{B} over C , by stationarity of strong types this means that $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(c/\mathfrak{B}) = \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(d/\mathfrak{B})$. Hence $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$ is stationary. In particular, we have so far found an element a and a finite $C \subseteq \mathfrak{B}$ such that $a \downarrow_C \mathfrak{B}$, $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$ is stationary and $a \models p$.

Now, since \mathfrak{M} is saturated, we can find a sequence $(b_i)_{i < |\mathfrak{M}|}$ such that $b_i \models p \upharpoonright C$ for all $i < |\mathfrak{M}|$ and $b_i \downarrow_C b_j$ for all $i, j < |\mathfrak{M}|$. We claim that the existence of such sequence can be expressed via a sentence of ESO. First we define the the following formulas:

- (i) We write $\text{max}(X)$ for the formula saying that there is a bijection between the background structure and X . This is clearly expressible in ESO.
- (ii) We let $\psi(x, \vec{y})$ be a formula isolating $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(aC/\emptyset)$ and $\chi(\vec{y})$ be a formula isolating $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(C/\emptyset)$. The existence of such formulas follows from \aleph_0 -categoricity.
- (iii) We let $\theta(x, y, \vec{z})$ be a first-order formula such that $\mathfrak{M} \models \theta(d_0, d_1, \vec{e})$ if and only if $d_0 \downarrow_{\vec{e}} d_1$. The reason why such a formula exists is the following. First of all, if $d_0 \downarrow_{\vec{e}} d_1$ and $\pi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{M})$, then $\pi(d_0) \downarrow_{\pi(\vec{e})} \pi(d_1)$. Hence the property of d_0 being independent of d_1 over \vec{e} only depends on the type

$\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(d_0 d_1 \vec{e}/\emptyset)$. By Ryll-Nardzewski, there are only finitely many $|\vec{e}| + 2$ -types over \emptyset , so in particular there are only finitely many q such that if $d_0 d_1 \vec{e} \models q$, then $d_0 \downarrow_{\vec{e}} d_1$, so let q_i , $i < m$, list all of them. For each $i < m$, let $\theta_i(x, y, \vec{z})$ isolate q_i . Now clearly

$$d_0 \downarrow_{\vec{e}} d_1 \iff \mathfrak{M} \models \bigvee_{i < m} \theta_i(d_0, d_1, \vec{e}).$$

So we may choose $\theta = \bigvee_{i < m} \theta_i$.

We then let ϕ be the sentence

$$\begin{aligned} \forall \vec{z} \left(\chi(\vec{z}) \rightarrow \exists X \left(\max(X) \wedge \forall x (X(x) \rightarrow \psi(x, \vec{z})) \wedge \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \forall x \forall y ((X(x) \wedge X(y) \wedge \neg x = y) \rightarrow \theta(x, y, \vec{z})) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The sequence $(b_i)_{i < |\mathfrak{M}|}$ witnesses that $\mathfrak{M} \models \phi$, whence $T \models \phi$, and so $\mathfrak{A} \models \phi$. Then in \mathfrak{A} , we can find a sequence of length $|\mathfrak{A}|$ of elements that are independent of each other over C and realize the type $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(aC/\emptyset)$. Hence they also realize the type $\text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$. It follows that, in \mathfrak{A} , there is a sequence of distinct elements $(a_i)_{i < \kappa^+}$ such that $a_i \models p \upharpoonright C$ for all $i < \kappa^+$ and $a_i \downarrow_C a_j$ for all $i, j < \kappa^+$.

We use some combinatorics to turn the former into a C -indiscernible sequence. By the locality property of non-forking and superstability of T^* , for any limit ordinal $i < \kappa^+$, there is $\alpha_i < i$ such that $a_i \downarrow_{C \cup \{a_j \mid j < \alpha_i\}} \{a_j \mid j < i\}$. Since the set of all limit ordinals below κ^+ is stationary in κ^+ , we may apply Fodor's Lemma (see e.g. [12, Thm. 8.7]) to find $\alpha < \kappa^+$ and a stationary $X \subseteq \kappa^+$ such that $a_i \downarrow_{C \cup \{a_j \mid j \in \alpha \cap X\}} \{a_j \mid j \in i \cap X\}$ for all $i \in X$. Now, by locality, for every $i \in X$ there is a finite set $C_i \subseteq C \cup \{a_j \mid j \in \alpha \cap X\}$ such that $a_i \downarrow_{C_i} \{a_j \mid j \in i \cap X\}$. Since $|(\alpha \cap X)^{<\omega}| \leq \kappa$, there are at most κ -many such finite sets C_i , so by the pigeonhole principle there is $Y \subseteq X$ of power κ^+ and a finite set $D \subseteq C \cup \{a_j \mid j < \alpha\}$ such that $C \subseteq D$ and for all $i \in Y$ we have $a_i \downarrow_D \{a_j \mid j \in i \cap Y\}$. Furthermore, we can choose Y so that $\text{stp}(a_i/D) = \text{stp}(a_j/D)$ for all $i \in Y$ because the number of strong types over a finite set of parameters is countable. Then, by the stationarity of strong types, we obtain in particular that $(a_i)_{i \in Y}$ is indiscernible over C .

By reindexing, we may assume that $Y = \kappa^+$, so $(a_i)_{i < \kappa^+}$ is C -indiscernible. Since T^* is 1-based, it follows from Lemma 7.10 that $a_1 \downarrow_{Ca_0} (a_i)_{1 < i < \kappa^+}$. Since we also have that $a_1 \downarrow_C Ca_0$, it follows by the transitivity of non-forking that $a_1 \downarrow_C (a_i)_{1 < i < \kappa^+}$.

By locality of non-forking, for all finite tuples $\vec{b} \in \mathfrak{B}^{<\omega}$, there is an ordinal $\gamma_{\vec{b}}$ such that $\vec{b} \downarrow_{C \cup \{a_j \mid 0 < j < \gamma_{\vec{b}}\}} (a_j)_{0 < j < \kappa^+}$. Let $\gamma = \sup\{\gamma_{\vec{b}} \mid \vec{b} \in \mathfrak{B}^{<\omega}\}$. Now, as κ^+ is regular and $|\mathfrak{B}^{<\omega}| = \kappa < \kappa^+$, it follows that $\gamma < \kappa^+$. Then $\vec{b} \downarrow_{C \cup \{a_j \mid 0 < j < \gamma\}} (a_j)_{0 < j < \kappa^+}$ for all $\vec{b} \in \mathfrak{B}^{<\omega}$, which means by definition that $\mathfrak{B} \downarrow_{C \cup \{a_j \mid 0 < j < \gamma\}} (a_j)_{0 < j < \kappa^+}$. By symmetry and monotonicity of non-forking, this yields $a_\gamma \downarrow_{C \cup \{a_j \mid 0 < j < \gamma\}} \mathfrak{B}$. Moreover, by the fact that $(a_i)_{0 < i < \kappa^+}$ is independent over C , we also have that $a_\gamma \downarrow_C C \cup \{a_i \mid 0 < i < \gamma\}$. It follows by the transitivity of non-forking that $a_\gamma \downarrow_C \mathfrak{B}$. Finally, since we showed that $p \upharpoonright C = \text{tp}_{\text{FO}}(a/C)$ is stationary, we obtain that $a_\gamma \models p$. As $a_\gamma \in \mathfrak{A}$, this means that p is realized in \mathfrak{A} , which concludes the proof. \square

Example 7.12. Let T_E be the first-order theory of a single equivalence relation $E(x, y)$ that partitions the domain into infinitely many infinite equivalence classes. Let T_E^1 be its unique ESO-completion. Obviously T_E is \aleph_0 -categorical and it is straightforward to verify that it is also ω -stable and 1-based. Then the previous theorem shows that T_E^1 is also uncountably categorical.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Adámek and J. Rosický. *Locally presentable and accessible categories*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [2] J. T. Baldwin. *Fundamentals of stability theory*. Vol. 12. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [3] T. Beke and J. Rosický. “Abstract elementary classes and accessible categories”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 163.12 (2012), pp. 2008–2017.
- [4] J. van Benthem and K. Doets. “Higher-order logic”. In: *Handbook of philosophical logic*. Vol. 1. Springer, Dordrecht, 2001, pp. 189–243.
- [5] T. De Piro and B. Kim. “The geometry of 1-based minimal types”. In: *Transactions of The American Mathematical Society* 355.10 (2003), pp. 4241–4263.
- [6] H. B. Enderton. *A mathematical introduction to logic*. Academic Press, Burlington (MA), 2001.
- [7] T. Frayne, A. C. Morel, and D. S. Scott. “Reduced direct products”. In: *Fundamenta Mathematicae* 51 (1962), pp. 195–228.
- [8] P. Galliani. “General models and entailment semantics for independence logic”. In: *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 54.2 (2013), pp. 253–275.
- [9] P. Galliani. “Inclusion and exclusion dependencies in team semantics—on some logics of imperfect information”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 163.1 (2012), pp. 68–84.
- [10] E. Grädel and J. Väänänen. “Dependence and independence”. In: *Studia Logica* 101.2 (2013), pp. 399–410.
- [11] W. Hodges. “Compositional Semantics for a Language of Imperfect Information”. In: *Logic Journal of the IGPL* 5.4 (1997), pp. 539–563.
- [12] T. Jech. *Set Theory*. Berlin: Springer, 2014.
- [13] M. Kamsma. “The Kim–Pillay theorem for abstract elementary categories”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 85.4 (2020), pp. 1717–1741.
- [14] H. J. Keisler. “Ultraproducts and elementary classes”. PhD thesis. University of California, Berkeley, 1961.
- [15] H. J. Keisler. “Limit ultrapowers”. In: *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 107 (1963), pp. 382–408.
- [16] J. Kirby. *Abstract Elementary Categories*. Unpublished. Aug. 2008.
- [17] J. Kontinen and F. Yang. “Complete logics for elementary team properties”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 88.2 (2023), pp. 579–619.
- [18] M. Lieberman and J. Rosický. “Classification theory for accessible categories”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 81.1 (2016), pp. 151–165.
- [19] P. Lindström. “On characterizing elementary logic”. In: *Logical Theory and Semantic Analysis: Essays Dedicated to Stig Kanger on His Fiftieth Birthday*. Springer, 1974, pp. 129–146.
- [20] P. Lindström. “On extensions of elementary logic”. In: *Theoria* 35.1 (1969), pp. 1–11.
- [21] M. Lück. “Team logic: axioms, expressiveness, complexity”. PhD thesis. Hannover: Institutionelles Repositorium der Leibniz Universität Hannover, 2020.
- [22] M. Magidor. “On the role of supercompact and extendible cardinals in logic”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 10 (1971), pp. 147–157.
- [23] B. Poizat. *A course in model theory: an introduction to contemporary mathematical logic*. Springer, 2012.
- [24] J. Puljuri and D. E. Quadrellaro. *Compactness in Team Semantics*. 2022. arXiv: 2212.03677 [math.LO].
- [25] J. Rosický. “Accessible categories, saturation and categoricity”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 62.3 (1997), pp. 891–901.

- [26] J. Sgro. “Maximal logics”. In: *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* 63.2 (1977), pp. 291–298.
- [27] S. Shelah. “Classification of non elementary classes II. Abstract elementary classes”. In: *Classification Theory: Proceedings of the US-Israel Workshop on Model Theory in Mathematical Logic held in Chicago, Dec. 15–19, 1985*. Springer. 2006, pp. 419–497.
- [28] S. Shelah. *Classification theory: and the number of non-isomorphic models*. Elsevier, 1990.
- [29] S. Shelah. “Every two elementarily equivalent models have isomorphic ultrapowers”. In: *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 10 (1971), pp. 224–233.
- [30] K. Tent and M. Ziegler. *A Course in Model Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [31] J. Väänänen. *Dependence Logic: A New Approach to Independence Friendly Logic*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [32] J. Väänänen. “Second-order and Higher-order Logic”. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by E. N. Zalta. Fall 2021. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2021.
- [33] J. Väänänen and W. Hodges. “Dependence of variables construed as an atomic formula”. In: *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 161.6 (2010). The proceedings of the IPM 2007 Logic Conference, pp. 817–828.

(TAPANI HYTTINEN) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI,
P.O. BOX 68 (PIETARI KALMIN KATU 5), 00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND.

Email address: `tapani.hyttinen@helsinki.fi`

(JONI PULJUJÄRVI) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI,
P.O. BOX 68 (PIETARI KALMIN KATU 5), 00014 HELSINKI, FINLAND.

Email address: `joni.puljujarvi@helsinki.fi`

(DAVIDE EMILIO QUADRELLARO) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS “GIUSEPPE PEANO”, UNIVERSITY OF TORINO, VIA CARLO ALBERTO 10, 10123 TORINO, ITALY.

Email address: `davideemilio.quadrellaro@unito.it`