

Pregeometries and minimal types

Enrique Casanovas
Universidad de Barcelona

May 9, 2006. Revised*November 11, 2008

1 Pregeometries

Definition 1.1 Let Ω be a set (more generally, a class) and let cl be a mapping assigning to each $X \subseteq \Omega$ some $\text{cl}(X) \subseteq \Omega$. We say that cl is a closure operator if:

P1. $X \subseteq \text{cl}(X)$.

P2. If $X \subseteq Y$, then $\text{cl}(X) \subseteq \text{cl}(Y)$.

P3. $\text{cl}(\text{cl}(X)) \subseteq \text{cl}(X)$.

The operator cl is finitary if

P4. For all $a \in \text{cl}(X)$, there is some finite $X_0 \subseteq X$ such that $a \in \text{cl}(X_0)$.

A finitary closure operator is a pregeometry on Ω if additionally the exchange property holds:

P5. If $a, b \in \Omega$ and $a \in \text{cl}(Xb) \setminus \text{cl}(X)$, then $b \in \text{cl}(Xa)$.

Definition 1.2 Let (Ω, cl) be a closure operator. A subset $X \subseteq \Omega$ is called closed if $\text{cl}(X) = X$. Clearly $\text{cl}(X)$ is the smallest closed set containing X . The intersection of closed sets is closed because $\text{cl}(\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)) \subseteq \text{cl}(\text{cl}(X)) \cap \text{cl}(\text{cl}(Y)) = \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)$. The closed sets form a lattice with $\inf(X, Y) = X \cap Y$ and $\sup(X, Y) = \text{cl}(X \cup Y)$

Definition 1.3 Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry. We say that $a \in \Omega$ is independent of $X \subseteq \Omega$ if $a \notin \text{cl}(X)$. We say that $X \subseteq \Omega$ is independent if for all $a \in X$, a is independent of $X \setminus \{a\}$. A basis of $X \subseteq \Omega$ is a maximally independent subset of X . We will see that all bases of X have the same cardinality, which will be called the dimension of X and will be denoted by $\dim(X)$.

Lemma 1.4 Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry.

*Notes of talks given at the Model Theory Seminar. Thanks to Hans Adler, Silvia Barbina, Rafel Farré, Juan Franciso Pons and Joris Potier for their comments. Special thanks to Joris Potier for the careful reading

1. $X \subseteq \Omega$ is independent if and only if every finite subset of X is independent.
2. If X is independent and $a \notin \text{cl}(X)$, then $X \cup \{a\}$ is independent.
3. If $(a_i : i < \alpha)$ is an enumeration of $X \subseteq \Omega$ such that $a_i \notin \text{cl}(\{a_j : j < i\})$ for all $i < \alpha$, then X is independent.

Proof: 1 is clear since the closure operator is finitary. 2 follows from P5. By 1, to prove 3 it is enough to check that any finite subset A of X is independent and this can be done by induction on $n = |A|$. The case $n = 0$ is trivial. Assume $n = m + 1$ and let $A = \{a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_{m+1}}\}$ where $i_1 < \dots < i_{m+1} < \alpha$. By inductive hypothesis, $B = \{a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_m}\}$ is independent. Since $a_{i_{m+1}} \notin \text{cl}(B)$, by 2 $A = B \cup \{a_{i_{m+1}}\}$ also is independent. \square

Proposition 1.5 *Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry. Each of the following conditions is equivalent to $X \subseteq Z$ being a basis of Z :*

1. X is independent and $\text{cl}(X) = \text{cl}(Z)$.
2. X is a minimal subset of Z such that $\text{cl}(X) = \text{cl}(Z)$.

Proof: Let X be a basis of Z . Then $Z \subseteq \text{cl}(X)$ and hence $\text{cl}(Z) = \text{cl}(X)$. Thus X satisfies the conditions of 1. Such an X can not include a proper subset X' with $\text{cl}(X') = \text{cl}(Z)$ because any $a \in X \setminus X'$ belongs to $\text{cl}(X') \subseteq \text{cl}(X \setminus \{a\})$, contradicting the independency of X . Thus, 1 implies 2. Assume now X is as in 2. We will show it is a basis of Z . If $a \in X$ and $a \in \text{cl}(X \setminus \{a\})$ then $X \setminus \{a\}$ is a proper subset of X with $\text{cl}(X) = \text{cl}(X \setminus \{a\})$, a contradiction. Thus X is independent. If $a \in Z \setminus X$ and $X \cup \{a\}$ is independent, then $a \notin \text{cl}(X) = \text{cl}(Z)$, which is impossible. Therefore X is maximally independent and X is a basis. \square

Lemma 1.6 *Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry.*

1. If X is minimal such that $a \in \text{cl}(X)$, then for each $b \in X$, $(X \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}$ is a basis of $\text{cl}(X)$.
2. If $X = Y \dot{\cup} Z$ is independent and Y' is a basis of $\text{cl}(Y)$ then $Y' \cup Z$ is a basis of $\text{cl}(X)$.
3. If X is a basis of Z , $X' \subseteq X$ and $a \in Z \setminus \text{cl}(X')$, then there is some $b \in X \setminus X'$ such that $(X \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}$ is a basis of Z .

Proof: 1. By minimality, X is independent. Also by minimality of X , $a \notin \text{cl}(X \setminus \{b\})$ and therefore $(X \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}$ is independent. By P5 we know that $b \in \text{cl}((X \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\})$ and this implies $\text{cl}((X \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}) = \text{cl}(X)$.

2. For the independence of $Y' \cup Z$ apply point 3 of Lemma 1.4. On the other hand $\text{cl}(X) = \text{cl}(Y \cup Z) = \text{cl}(\text{cl}(Y) \cup Z) = \text{cl}(\text{cl}(Y') \cup Z) = \text{cl}(Y' \cup Z)$.

We prove 3. Clearly, $a \in \text{cl}(X)$ and therefore there is some finite $X_0 \subseteq X$ of minimal size such that $a \in \text{cl}(X_0)$. Since $a \notin \text{cl}(X')$, $X_0 \not\subseteq X'$ and we can pick $b \in X_0 \setminus X'$. By point 1 $(X_0 \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}$ is a basis of $\text{cl}(X_0)$. By point 2 $((X_0 \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}) \cup (X \setminus X_0)$ is a basis of $\text{cl}(X) = \text{cl}(Z)$. But $(X \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\} = ((X_0 \setminus \{b\}) \cup \{a\}) \cup (X \setminus X_0)$. \square

Proposition 1.7 *Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry.*

1. Any independent subset X of Z can be extended to a basis X' of Z .

2. If X is a basis of Z and Y is an independent subset of Z , then there is some $X' \subseteq X$ such that $|X'| = |Y|$ and $(X \setminus X') \cup Y$ is a basis of Z .

3. If X, Y are bases of Z , then $|X| = |Y|$.

Proof: 1 can be obtained as an application of Zorn's Lemma using only properties P_4 and P_2 . 2 can be easily proven using point 3 from Lemma 1.6. 3 is a direct consequence of point 2. \square

Definition 1.8 If (Ω, cl) is a pregeometry and $A \subseteq \Omega$, we define the localization of cl at A , cl_A , by

$$\text{cl}_A(X) = \text{cl}(A \cup X)$$

It is easy to check that (Ω, cl_A) is also a pregeometry. Let $X \subseteq \Omega$. We say that X is independent over A (in (Ω, cl)) if X is independent in (Ω, cl_A) . A basis of X over A (in (Ω, cl)) is a basis of X in (Ω, cl_A) . We use the notation $\dim(X/A)$ for the dimension of $X \subseteq \Omega$ in (Ω, cl_A) .

Remark 1.9 Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry and $X \subseteq \Omega$.

1. Any basis of X is also a basis of $\text{cl}(X)$ and therefore

$$\dim(X) = \dim(\text{cl}(X))$$

2. Since localizing at A or at $\text{cl}(A)$ gives the same pregeometry,

$$\dim(X/A) = \dim(X/\text{cl}(A))$$

3. For any $A \subseteq \Omega$, any basis of A can be completed with any basis of X over A to obtain a basis of $X \cup A$, and therefore

$$\dim(X \cup A) = \dim(X/A) + \dim(A)$$

4. If $Y \subseteq \Omega$ then any basis Z of $X \cap Y$ can be completed to a basis Z_1 of X and also to a basis Z_2 of Y and therefore

$$\dim(X \cup Y) + \dim(X \cap Y) \leq \dim(X) + \dim(Y).$$

Moreover equality holds if $Z_1 \setminus Z$ is independent over Z_2 .

Proof: In the case of 4, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(X) + \dim(Y) &= |Z_1| + |Z_2| \\ &= |Z| + (|Z_1 \setminus Z| + |Z_2|) \\ &= \dim(X \cap Y) + (|Z_1 \setminus Z| + |Z_2|) \end{aligned}$$

Now $X \cup Y \subseteq \text{cl}((Z_1 \setminus Z) \cup Z_2)$, and hence $\dim(X \cup Y) \leq (|Z_1 \setminus Z| + |Z_2|)$. If $Z_1 \setminus Z$ is independent over Z_2 then $(Z_1 \setminus Z) \cup Z_2$ is a basis of $X \cup Y$ and since $(Z_1 \setminus Z) \cap Z_2 = \emptyset$ we get

$$\dim(X \cup Y) = |(Z_1 \setminus Z) \cup Z_2| = |Z_1 \setminus Z| + |Z_2|.$$

\square

Proposition 1.10 *Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry and $A, B \subseteq \Omega$. If A is finite, then there exist some finite $B_0 \subseteq B$ such that $\dim(A/B) = \dim(A/B_0)$*

Proof: Let $X \subseteq A$ be a basis of A over B . Clearly X is independent over B' for all $B' \subseteq B$. For each $a \in A$, since $a \in \text{cl}(XB)$ there is a finite subset $B_a \subseteq B$ such that $a \in \text{cl}(XB_a)$. Let $B_0 = \bigcup_{a \in A} B_a$. For each $a \in A$, $a \in \text{cl}(XB_0)$ and hence X is a basis of A over B_0 . We conclude then that $\dim(A/B_0) = |X| = \dim(A/B)$. \square

Definition 1.11 *A geometry (Ω, cl) is a pregeometry such that*

1. $\text{cl}(\emptyset) = \emptyset$.
2. $\text{cl}(\{a\}) = \{a\}$ for every $a \in \Omega$.

Definition 1.12 *If (Ω, cl) is a pregeometry, we define in $\Omega' = \Omega \setminus \text{cl}(\emptyset)$ an equivalence relation*

$$a \sim b \text{ if and only if } \text{cl}(a) = \text{cl}(b).$$

Note that by the exchange property, for $a, b \in \Omega'$,

$$a \in \text{cl}(b) \Leftrightarrow b \in \text{cl}(a) \Leftrightarrow \text{cl}(a) = \text{cl}(b)$$

and therefore $\text{cl}(a) \setminus \text{cl}(\emptyset) = a / \sim$. Let us define for $X \subset \Omega' / \sim$

$$\text{cl}'(X) = \{a / \sim : a \in \text{cl}(\bigcup X) \cap \Omega'\}$$

Then $(\Omega' / \sim, \text{cl}')$ is a geometry and it will be called the canonical geometry associated to the pregeometry (Ω, cl) .

Definition 1.13 *An isomorphism between the pregeometries (Ω_1, cl_1) and (Ω_2, cl_2) is a bijection f from Ω_1 onto Ω_2 which respects the closure operators: $\text{cl}_2(f(X)) = f(\text{cl}_1(X))$ for all $X \subseteq \Omega_1$. In other words: X is closed in (Ω_1, cl_1) if and only if $f(X)$ is closed in (Ω_2, cl_2) . If they are the same pregeometry we talk of an automorphism of the pregeometry. A pregeometry (Ω, cl) is homogeneous if for each closed $X \subseteq \Omega$, for each $a, b \in \Omega \setminus X$ there is an automorphism of (Ω, cl) which fixes pointwise X and sends a to b .*

Remark 1.14 1. *If a pregeometry (Ω, cl) is homogeneous, its localization (Ω, cl_A) at $A \subseteq \Omega$ is homogeneous.*

2. *If a pregeometry (Ω, cl) is homogeneous, its associated canonical geometry $(\Omega' / \sim, \text{cl}')$ is homogeneous.*

Proof: It is an easy verification. \square

Definition 1.15 *Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry. For $A, B, C \subseteq \Omega$, we say that A is independent from C over B if for all finite $A_0 \subseteq A$, $\dim(A_0/BC) = \dim(A_0/B)$. We write $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$ for this.*

Remark 1.16 *Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry and let $A, B, C \subseteq \Omega$. Then $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$ if and only if every $X \subseteq A$ independent over B is also independent over BC .*

Proposition 1.17 *Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry and let $A, B, C \subseteq \Omega$. Then*

1. $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} \text{cl}(B)$
2. *Normality:* If $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$ then $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} BC$.
3. *Base monotonicity:* If $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$ then $A \downarrow_{BD}^{\text{cl}} C$ for all $D \subseteq C$.
4. *Monotonicity:* If $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$ then $A' \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C'$ for all $A' \subseteq A$ and all $C' \subseteq C$.
5. *Finite character:* If $A_0 \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$ for all finite $A_0 \subseteq A$, then $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$.
6. *Transitivity:* If $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$ and $A \downarrow_{BC}^{\text{cl}} D$, then $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} CD$.
7. *Symmetry:* If $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$, then $C \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} A$.
8. *Local character:* If A is finite, then for each C there is a finite $B \subseteq C$ such that $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$.
9. *Anti-reflexivity:* If $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} A$, then $A \subseteq \text{cl}(B)$.

Proof: 1 to 4 are straightforward. 5 and 8 follow from Proposition 1.10. 6 and 9 are also clear.

7. Note that the righthand version of finite character also holds: if $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C_0$ for all finite $C_0 \subseteq C$, then $A \downarrow_B^{\text{cl}} C$. By this and 4 we may assume that A, C are finite. Working over B , we may assume that $B = \emptyset$. Now, if $A \downarrow^{\text{cl}} C$, then $\dim(A) = \dim(A/C)$. Then

$$\dim(C/A) = \dim(CA) - \dim(A) = (\dim(C) + \dim(A/C)) - \dim(A) = \dim(C)$$

and hence $C \downarrow^{\text{cl}} A$. □

2 Modularity

Definition 2.1 Let (Ω, cl) be a pregeometry.

1. (Ω, cl) is trivial or degenerate or disintegrated if $\text{cl}(X) = \bigcup_{a \in X} \text{cl}(a)$ for all nonempty $X \subseteq \Omega$.
2. (Ω, cl) is modular if the modularity law
$$\dim(X) + \dim(Y) = \dim(X \cup Y) + \dim(X \cap Y)$$
holds for any closed sets X, Y .
3. (Ω, cl) is locally modular if for some $a \in \Omega$ the localization (Ω, cl_a) is modular.
4. (Ω, cl) is projective if it is nontrivial and modular.
5. (Ω, cl) is locally projective if for some $a \in \Omega$ the localization (Ω, cl_a) is projective.
6. (Ω, cl) is locally finite if for any finite $X \subseteq \Omega$, $\text{cl}(X)$ is finite.

Proposition 2.2 Each one of the defined properties of pregeometries (triviality, modularity,...) is possessed by (Ω, cl) if and only if it is possessed by its associated canonical geometry.

Remark 2.3 *Trivial pregeometries are modular.*

Proposition 2.4 (Ω, cl) is modular if and only if for all closed $X, Y: X \downarrow_{X \cap Y}^{\text{cl}} Y$

Proof: As in point 4 of Remark 1.9 fix Z a basis of $X \cap Y$, and $Z_1 \supseteq Z$ a basis of X , and $Z_2 \supseteq Z$ a basis of Y . If $X \downarrow_{X \cap Y}^{\text{cl}} Y$ then $Z_1 \setminus Z$ (which is independent over Z) is independent over Z_2 and hence

$$\dim(X \cup Y) = |Z_1 \setminus Z| + |Z_2|$$

and

$$\dim(X) + \dim(Y) = \dim(X \cap Y) + \dim(X \cup Y).$$

Thus modularity is implied by this new condition. For the other direction we can clearly assume X, Y have finite dimension. In this case the modularity law implies

$$\dim(X \cup Y) = \dim(X) - \dim(X \cap Y) + \dim(Y) = \dim(X/X \cap Y) + \dim(Y).$$

Since also $\dim(X \cup Y) = \dim(X/Y) + \dim(Y)$ we conclude $\dim(X/Y) = \dim(X/X \cap Y)$ and hence $X \downarrow_{X \cap Y}^{\text{cl}} Y$. \square

Corollary 2.5 (Ω, cl) is modular if and only if for all closed finite dimensional X, Y :

$$\dim(X \cup Y) = \dim(X) + \dim(Y) - \dim(X \cap Y).$$

Proposition 2.6 (Ω, cl) is modular if and only if for all X, Y, A such that $A \subseteq X \cap Y$:

$$X \downarrow_A^{\text{cl}} Y \text{ if and only if } \text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) \subseteq \text{cl}(A).$$

Proof: Each implication will be based on Proposition 2.4. We first prove that this new condition implies modularity. Let X, Y be closed and let $A = X \cap Y$. Then $X \downarrow_A^{\text{cl}} Y$.

For the other direction, it is always the case that $X \downarrow_A^{\text{cl}} Y$ implies $\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) \subseteq \text{cl}(A)$. Now assume modularity and $\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) \subseteq \text{cl}(A)$. By modularity $X \downarrow_{\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y)}^{\text{cl}} Y$ and since $\text{cl}(X) \cap \text{cl}(Y) \subseteq \text{cl}(A) \subseteq \text{cl}(Y)$, $X \downarrow_{\text{cl}(A)}^{\text{cl}} Y$. This clearly implies $X \downarrow_A^{\text{cl}} Y$. \square

Proposition 2.7 For any pregeometry (Ω, cl) , those following are equivalent.

1. (Ω, cl) is modular.
2. If $a \in \text{cl}(Xc)$, then $a \in \text{cl}(bc)$ for some $b \in \text{cl}(X)$.
3. If $a \in \text{cl}(XY)$ then $a \in \text{cl}(bc)$ for some $b \in \text{cl}(X), c \in \text{cl}(Y)$.

Proof: $1 \Rightarrow 2$. Assume the pregeometry is modular. Let $a \in \text{cl}(Xc)$. We may assume X has finite dimension. Choosing X minimal if necessary, we may assume $a, c \notin \text{cl}(X)$. If $Y = \text{cl}(ac)$, $\dim(Y/X) = 1$. If $a \in \text{cl}(c)$ we are done. In other case $\dim(ac) = 2$. By modularity $\dim(\text{cl}(X) \cap Y) = 1$. Hence there is some $b \in \text{cl}(X) \cap Y \setminus \text{cl}(\emptyset)$. Since $c \notin \text{cl}(X)$, $c \notin \text{cl}(b)$ and by exchange $b \notin \text{cl}(c)$. Since $b \in \text{cl}(ac) \setminus \text{cl}(c)$, again by exchange, $a \in \text{cl}(bc)$.

$2 \Rightarrow 3$. We prove the claim for finite dimensional X, Y by induction on $\dim(XY)$. Let $a \in \text{cl}(XY)$. By changing X, Y for minimal subsets if necessary, we may assume that for some closed $Z \subseteq Y$, for some $c \in Y, Y = \text{cl}(Zc), a \notin \text{cl}(XZ)$ and $c \notin \text{cl}(XZ)$. By 1 there

is some $b \in \text{cl}(XZ)$ such that $a \in \text{cl}(bc)$. Since $XZ \subseteq XY$, $c \in Y$, and $c \notin \text{cl}(XZ)$, we see that $\dim(XZ) < \dim(XY)$. By the inductive hypothesis there are $d \in X$, $e \in Z$ such that $b \in \text{cl}(de)$. Then $a \in \text{cl}(cde)$. Since $c, e \in Y$, by 2 $a \in \text{cl}(df)$ for some $f \in Y$.

3 \Rightarrow 1. If modularity fails then there are closed finite dimensional X, Y such that $X \not\downarrow_{X \cap Y}^{\text{cl}} Y$. Then there is some $Y' \subseteq Y$ independent over $X \cap Y$ and not independent over X . For some $a \in Y'$, $a \in \text{cl}((Y' \setminus \{a\}) \cup X)$. If $Z = (Y' \setminus \{a\}) \cup (X \cap Y)$, then $a \in \text{cl}(Z \cup X)$ and $a \notin \text{cl}(Z)$. By 3 $a \in \text{cl}(bc)$ for some $b \in \text{cl}(Z)$, $c \in X$. If $a \in \text{cl}(b)$, then $a \in \text{cl}(Z)$, which is not the case. Hence $a \in \text{cl}(bc) \setminus \text{cl}(b)$ and by exchange $c \in \text{cl}(ab) \subseteq Y$. Therefore $c \in X \cap Y \subseteq Z$, and then $a \in \text{cl}(Z)$, a contradiction. \square

Proposition 2.8 *If (Ω, cl) is an homogeneous pregeometry, the following are equivalent to the local modularity of (Ω, cl) :*

1. For all closed X, Y , if $\dim(X \cap Y) > 0$, then $\dim(X \cup Y) + \dim(X \cap Y) = \dim(X) + \dim(Y)$.
2. For all finite dimensional closed sets X, Y , if $\dim(X \cap Y) > 0$, then $\dim(X \cup Y) = \dim(X) + \dim(Y) - \dim(X \cap Y)$.
3. For all closed X, Y if $\dim(X \cap Y) > 0$, then $X \downarrow_{X \cap Y}^{\text{cl}} Y$.
4. For any $a \in \Omega \setminus \text{cl}(\emptyset)$, the localization (Ω, cl_a) is modular.

Proof: The proof of Proposition 2.4 shows that in fact conditions 1, 2 and 3 are equivalent.

Let $a \in \text{cl}(\emptyset)$. Then every independent set X is also independent over a , $\text{cl}_a(X) = \text{cl}(X)$ and $\dim(X) = \dim(X/a)$.

Let $a \notin \text{cl}(\emptyset)$. If $a \in \text{cl}(X)$, then $\dim(X/a) + 1 = \dim(X)$. The reason is that we may find a basis Z of $\text{cl}(X)$ with $a \in Z$ and then $Z \setminus \{a\}$ is a basis of $\text{cl}_a(X) = \text{cl}(X)$ over a . In case $a \notin \text{cl}(X)$ we have $\dim(X/a) = \dim(X)$. The reason now is that if Z is a basis of $\text{cl}(X)$ then $Z \cup \{a\}$ is independent and hence Z is independent over a and therefore Z is also a basis of $\text{cl}_a(X) = \text{cl}(Xa)$ over a .

1 \Rightarrow 4. Let X, Y be two closed sets in (Ω, cl_a) . Since $a \in X \cap Y$ and $a \notin \text{cl}(\emptyset)$, $\dim(X \cap Y) > 0$. Then we can apply 1 to obtain $\dim(X \cup Y) + \dim(X \cap Y) = \dim(X) + \dim(Y)$. In this situation, \dim coincides with $\dim(\ /a) + 1$ for all the sets involved and hence $\dim(X \cup Y/a) + \dim(X \cap Y/a) = \dim(X/a) + \dim(Y/a)$. This shows the modularity of (Ω, cl_a) .

It is clear that 4 implies local modularity. Now we assume the localization (Ω, cl_a) is modular for some a and we prove 4. If $a \in \text{cl}(\emptyset)$, any closed set in (Ω, cl) is also closed in (Ω, cl_a) and the dimensions \dim and $\dim(\ /a)$ coincide. Hence the geometry (Ω, cl) is modular in this case. Thus all its localizations are also modular. If $a \notin \text{cl}(\emptyset)$, by homogeneity the localization at any other $b \notin \text{cl}(\emptyset)$ is also modular.

4 \Rightarrow 1. Let X, Y be closed sets with $\dim(X \cap Y) > 0$. Then we can choose $a \in X \cap Y \setminus \text{cl}(\emptyset)$. Then X and Y are also closed in (Ω, cl_a) and $\dim(Z) = \dim(Z/a) + 1$ for $Z = X, Y, X \cap Y, X \cup Y$. By modularity of (Ω, cl_a) , $\dim(X \cup Y/a) + \dim(X \cap Y/a) = \dim(X/a) + \dim(Y/a)$. It follows then that $\dim(X \cup Y) + \dim(X \cap Y) = \dim(X) + \dim(Y)$. \square

3 Minimal types

Definition 3.1 Let $A \subseteq M$ and let $\pi(x)$ be a type over A , where x is a single variable. We say that π is minimal in M if $\pi(M)$ is infinite and any relatively definable (in M) $X \subseteq \pi(M)$ is finite or cofinite. We say that $\pi(x)$ is minimal if it is minimal in the monster model \mathfrak{C} .

Remark 3.2 Let $A, M, \pi(x)$ be as above. Assume M is $|A|^+ + \omega$ -saturated. Then π is minimal in M if and only if there is exactly one nonalgebraic extension $p(x) \in S(M)$ of π . Therefore, π is minimal in M if and only if it is minimal.

Remark 3.3 1. If $\varphi(x) \in L(A)$ axiomatizes the partial type $\pi(x)$ over A , then π is minimal if and only if φ is a strongly minimal formula.

2. A complete type $p(x) \in S(A)$ is minimal if and only if $\text{SU}(p) = 1$ and it is stationary.

Proof: For 2, assume first p is minimal. Since p is not algebraic, $\text{SU}(p) \geq 1$. Suppose $\text{SU}(p) \geq 2$. Then p has a forking extension q over some set $B \supseteq A$ such that $\text{SU}(q) \geq 1$, that is, q is nonalgebraic. Note that $\{\varphi(x) \in L(\mathfrak{C}) : |\varphi(\mathfrak{C}) \cap p(\mathfrak{C})| \geq \omega\}$ is a global extension of p that does not fork over A (for example because it does not split over A). Hence p has a nonforking extension q' over B . Again, it is nonalgebraic and hence we obtain two nonalgebraic extensions of p . Similarly for the stationarity of p since nonforking extensions of p are nonalgebraic.

Assume now p is a stationary type of SU-rank one. It is nonalgebraic. If p has two nonalgebraic extensions over $B \supseteq A$, by stationarity one of them is a forking extension and hence $\text{SU}(p) \geq 2$, a contradiction. \square

Remark 3.4 For any sets A, B , the operator defined by $\text{cl}(X) = \text{acl}(XA) \cap B$ is a finitary closure operator on B .

Definition 3.5 Let $A \subseteq M$ and let $\pi(x)$ be a type over A , where x is a single variable. We say that $\pi(x)$ is pregeometrical in M if the closure operator defined in $\Omega = \pi(M)$ by $\text{cl}(X) = \text{acl}(XA) \cap \Omega$ for any $X \subseteq \Omega$ is a pregeometry. In the case $M = \mathfrak{C}$ we say that π is pregeometrical.

Remark 3.6 Let $\pi(x)$ be a partial type over A .

1. If π is pregeometrical, then it is pregeometrical in any model $M \supseteq A$.
2. If π is pregeometrical in some $|A|^+ + \omega$ -saturated model $M \supseteq A$, then π is pregeometrical.

Lemma 3.7 Let $\pi(x)$ be a minimal type over A . For all $B \supseteq A$, if a, b, a', b' are realizations of π such that $a, a' \notin \text{acl}(B)$, $b \notin \text{acl}(Ba)$, and $b' \notin \text{acl}(Ba')$, then $ab \equiv_B a'b'$.

Proof: Note first that for any $B \supseteq A$ there is only one nonalgebraic type $p(x) \in S(B)$ extending π . Therefore, if $a, a' \notin \text{acl}(B)$ realize π then $a \equiv_B a'$. Now let b, b' as indicated and choose b'' such that $ab \equiv_B a'b''$. Since $b', b'' \notin \text{acl}(Ba')$ are realizations of π , they have the same type over Ba' . Hence $ab \equiv_B a'b'' \equiv_B a'b'$. \square

Proposition 3.8 Any minimal type is pregeometrical.

Proof: Let π be over A . Assume the exchange property does not hold. Then for some $X \subseteq \pi(\mathfrak{C})$, there are realizations a, b of π such that $a \notin \text{acl}(AX)$, $a \in \text{acl}(AXb)$, and $b \notin \text{acl}(AXa)$. Clearly, there is a sequence $(b_i : i < \omega)$ of different realizations $b_i \notin \text{acl}(AX)$ of π for which there is some $c \models \pi$ such that $c \notin \text{acl}(AX(b_i : i < \omega))$. Since $c \equiv_{AX} a$, there are also infinitely many realizations b' of π such that $b' \notin \text{acl}(AX)$ and $a \notin \text{acl}(AXb')$. By Lemma 3.7, all such b' have the same type over AXa and therefore are not algebraic over AXa . Again by Lemma 3.7 if b' is one of them, $ab \equiv_{AX} b'a$ and hence $a \notin \text{acl}(AXb)$. \square

Lemma 3.9 *Let T simple and let $\pi(x)$ be a partial type over A in the single variable x . Assume for all $a \models \pi$, for all B, C such that $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$, $a \not\downarrow_B C$ iff $a \in \text{acl}(C) \setminus \text{acl}(B)$. Then π is pregeometrical.*

Proof: The exchange property follows from the hypothesis and the symmetry of forking independence in simple theories. \square

Definition 3.10 *A formula $\varphi(x)$ is weakly minimal if $D(\varphi(x)) = 1$. Recall that (i) $D(\varphi(x)) = 0$ iff $\varphi(x)$ is algebraic and (ii) if $\varphi(x) \in L(A)$ then $D(\varphi(x)) \geq \alpha + 1$ iff $D(\psi(x)) \geq \alpha$ for some $\psi(x) \vdash \varphi(x)$ which divides over A . D -rank coincides with Shelah continuous rank if T is stable.*

Remark 3.11 1. *Strongly minimal formulas are weakly minimal.*

2. *Assuming T is stable, a nonalgebraic formula $\varphi(x) \in L(A)$ is weakly minimal if and only if for every $B \supseteq A$ there are at most $2^{|T|}$ nonalgebraic complete types $p(x) \in S(B)$ containing $\varphi(x)$.*

Proof: 1. A strongly minimal formula has Morley rank 1 and hence also D -rank 1.

2. In a stable theory every type has multiplicity bounded by $2^{|T|}$ and when a global type forks over a set A it has unboundedly many A -conjugates. \square

Proposition 3.12 *Let T be simple. Weakly minimal formulas and types of SU-rank 1 are pregeometrical.*

Proof: By Lemma 3.9. Let $A \subseteq B \subseteq C$. Note that in any case (i) if $a \not\downarrow_B C$, then $a \notin \text{acl}(B)$ and (ii) if $a \in \text{acl}(C) \setminus \text{acl}(B)$, then $a \not\downarrow_B C$. Hence it only remains to show that (iii) if $a \not\downarrow_B C$, then $a \in \text{acl}(C)$. This is clear in the case of SU-rank 1. Let us consider the case of a weakly minimal formula $\varphi(x) \in L(A)$. Assume $a \not\downarrow_B C$ where $\models \varphi(a)$ and $a \notin \text{acl}(C)$. There is some $\psi(x) \in \text{tp}(a/C)$ which forks over B . We can assume $\psi(x) \vdash \varphi(x)$. Since $a \notin \text{acl}(C)$, $\psi(x)$ is not algebraic and hence $D(\psi(x)) > 0$. It follows that $D(\varphi(x)) > 1$. \square

Proposition 3.13 *Let $\pi(x)$ be a pregeometrical type over A and let us consider the pregeometry (Ω, cl) , where $\Omega = \pi(\mathfrak{C})$ and $\text{cl}(X) = \text{acl}(XA) \cap \Omega$. Assume $\text{SU}(a/A) \leq 1$ for all $a \in \Omega$.*

1. *$\dim(a_1, \dots, a_n/B) = \text{SU}(a_1, \dots, a_n/AB)$ for any $B \subseteq \Omega$ and for any $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \Omega$.*

2. *If T is simple, then for all subsets B, C, D of Ω , $B \downarrow_{AC} D$ iff $B \downarrow_C^{\text{cl}} D$.*

Proof: 1. By induction on n , using the assumption and Lascar inequalities.

2. For any $B, C, D \subseteq \Omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}
B \downarrow_{AC} D & \text{ iff } \text{SU}(\bar{b}/AC) = \text{SU}(\bar{b}/ACD) & \text{ for all finite } \bar{b} \in B \\
& \text{ iff } \dim(\bar{b}/C) = \dim(\bar{b}/CD) & \text{ for all finite } \bar{b} \in B \\
& \text{ iff } B \downarrow_C^{\text{cl}} D
\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.14 1. *The assumption of Proposition 3.13 is satisfied when π is minimal or it is a weakly minimal formula or it is a complete type of SU-rank 1.*

2. *This section can be easily generalized to partial types $\pi(x)$ where x is an n -tuple of variables instead of being a single variable. The closure operator has to be defined as $\text{cl}(X) = \text{acl}(XA)^n \cap \Omega$.*

References

- [1] E. Bouscaren. An introduction to independence and local modularity. In B. T. Hart, A. H. Lachlan, and M. A. Valeriote, editors, *Algebraic Model Theory*, NATO ASI Series, pages 1–24, Dordrecht, 1996. Kluwer.
- [2] S. Buechler. The geometry of weakly minimal types. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 50:1044–1053, 1985.
- [3] S. Buechler. *Essential Stability Theory*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.
- [4] W. Hodges. *Model Theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [5] D. Marker. *Model Theory: an Introduction*, volume 217 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2002.
- [6] A. Pillay. *Geometric Stability Theory*. Oxford University Press, 1996.