Sh:284d

ISRAEL JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, Vol. 68, No. 3, 1989

MORE ON MONADIC LOGIC
PART D: A NOTE ON ADDITION OF THEORIES

BY

SAHARON SHELAH[†]

Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel; EECS and Mathematics Departments, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 USA; and Rutgers University, Department of Mathematics, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA

ABSTRACT

We improve somewhat some of the results from Baldwin and Shelah [BSh 156], closing a small gap therein (see [BSh 156], pages 248, lines 19 ff.; 255, second and third paragraphs; 256, following 3.2.10; and 257 following 3.2.12).

In [BSh 156], Baldwin and the author classified all theories of the form $(T, \mathscr{L})$ where $(T, \mathscr{L})$ is the collection of $\mathscr{L}$-sentences valid in models of the complete first-order theory T and $\mathscr{L}$ is one of the following: second-order logic, permutational logic, monadic logic. This classification necessitated in part the computation of bounds for certain kinds of Hanf numbers. For example, if $\alpha \geqq \omega$ and T is a countable $\aleph_1$-decomposable theory, then ([BSh 156] 3.2.9, p. 255)

$$(*) \qquad H^T_{L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})} \leqq (\beth_{1+\alpha+1}(\mu))^+,$$

where $H^T_{L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})}$ is the Hanf number of $L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})$ for theories relative to T. [In more detail, $H^T_{L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})}$ is the least cardinal κ such that for any $L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})$-theory Φ in the language of T, if $T \cup \Phi$ has a model of power κ, then $T \cup \Phi$ has models of arbitrarily large power. Again, see 3.2.9 in [BSh 156]: the logic $L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})$ is defined on page 245 (3.1.1(b)(iv)).]

Now in fact, as stated on pages 248, 255, 256 and 257 of [BSh 156], the author could improve the bound $(*)$, claiming the following theorem: *if $\alpha \geqq \omega$ and T is a countable, $|T|^+$-decomposable theory, then*

[†] The author would like to thank the United States–Israel Binational Science Foundation for partially supporting this research and Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing of the manuscript. Publication No. 284D.

Received April 12, 1988 and in revised form May 25, 1989

(**) $$H^T_{L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})} \leqq (\beth_{1+\alpha}(\mu)^{|T|})^+.$$

Theorem 3 of this note presents a proof of (**) in the notation and framework of [BSh 156] and [ShA 1]. Briefly put, the basic strategy of [BSh 156] in bounding $H^T_{L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})}$ is to bound first the total number of possible $mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(M)$; then the assumption that T is $\aleph_1$-decomposable — so that M has a tree decomposition as a free union of small models — allows one to blow up M to a model of arbitrarily large power. In Definition 1 of this note, we shall formulate a principle $(*)(L, \alpha, \bar{k}, \lambda, \mu)$ which asserts the existence of a certain Boolean algebra B of power at most λ such that $|mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(L)| \leqq 2^{|B|}$ (see 3.1.1(a) in [BSh 156] for the definitions of $mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(M)$, $mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(L)$). It suffices then to prove in Theorem 3 the appropriate instances of $(*)(L, \alpha, \bar{k}, \lambda, \mu)$ in order to deduce the bound (**) for $H^T_{L^\alpha_{\infty,\mu}(\mathrm{Mon})}$.

Now let us provide the details relevant to Theorem 3.

1. Definition. Let $(*)(L, \alpha, \bar{k}, \lambda, \mu)$ be the statement:

(A) there is a Boolean algebra B of subsets of $mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(L)$, $\| B \| \leqq \lambda$ (this defines a topology, generated by the members of the Boolean algebra as the family of clopen sets) such that the following holds:

(B) *if* for $l = 0, 1$, $M^l = \Sigma_{i \in I_l} M^l_i$, $g^l : B \to$ cardinals is defined by $g^l(b) = |\{i \in I^l : mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(M^l_i) \in b\}|$ and

$$(\forall b \in B)[\mathrm{Min}\{g^0(b), \mu\} = \mathrm{Min}\{g^1(b), \mu\}],$$

then $mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(M^0) = mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(M^1)$.

[For the relevant definition, see [BSh 156] 3.1.8.]

2. Remark. Using (B) for I_0, I_1 singletons we get that any two members of $mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(L)$ are separated by some $b \in B$, hence $|mT^\alpha_{\bar{k}}(L)| \leqq 2^{|B|}$ and the topology which B indexes is Hausdorff.

3. Theorem. *For a sequence $\bar{k}$ of ordinals, a cardinal κ and an ordinal α, we define by induction on α (for all $\bar{k}$, L) the cardinals*

$$\lambda^\alpha_{\kappa,\bar{k}} \geqq \mu^\alpha_{\kappa,\bar{k}},$$

$\alpha = 0$, $$\lambda^\alpha_{\kappa,\bar{k}} = 2^{|L|} + \aleph_0, \qquad \mu^\alpha_{\kappa,\bar{k}} = \aleph_0,$$

$\alpha + 1$, $$\lambda^{\alpha+1}_{\kappa,\bar{k}} = 2^{\lambda^\alpha_{\kappa+|k(\alpha)|,\bar{k}}}, \qquad \mu^{\alpha+1}_{k,\bar{k}} = (\lambda^\alpha_{\kappa+|k(\alpha)|,\bar{k}})^+,$$

$\alpha = \delta$ *limit*, $$\lambda^\alpha_{\kappa,\bar{k}} = \sum_{\beta<\alpha} \lambda^\beta_{\kappa,\bar{k}}, \qquad \mu^\alpha_{\kappa,\bar{k}} = \sum_{\beta<\alpha} \mu^\beta_{\kappa,\bar{k}}.$$

Then $(*)(L, \alpha, \bar{k}, \lambda^{\alpha}_{|L|,\bar{k}}, \mu^{\alpha}_{|L|,\bar{k}})$.

PROOF. By induction on α. The case $\alpha = 0$ is Claim 5. The case α successor is Claim 4 and the case α limit is Claim 7.

4. LEMMA. *Suppose* $(*)(L + \bar{P}, \alpha, \bar{k}, \lambda, \mu)$ *holds and this is exemplified by the Boolean algebra* B, $\mu \leqq \lambda$ *and* $\bar{P} = \langle P_i : i < \bar{k}(\alpha)\rangle$. *Then* $(*)(L, \alpha + 1, \bar{k}, 2^{\lambda}, \lambda^{+})$ *holds.*

PROOF. Let $X = mT^{\alpha}_{\bar{k}}(L + \bar{P})$, $Y = mT^{\alpha+1}_{\bar{k}}(L)$. So B is a Boolean algebra of subsets of X, $\| B \| \leqq \lambda$ and, by 2, $|X| \leqq 2^{\lambda}$. We define a Boolean algebra C of subsets of Y. It is the closure by intersection of $\leqq \lambda$ many elements and by complements of the family of basic elements, where the basic elements are $\{t \in Y : s \in T\}$ (for $s \in X$) or $\{t \in Y : (\exists s \in S) s \in t\}$ where S is a closed or open subset of X.

We now prove that $(*)(L, \alpha + 1, \bar{k}, 2^{\lambda}, \lambda^{+})$ is exemplified by C.

First note that $|C| \leqq 2^{\lambda}$: the number of clopen subsets of X (by the topology which B induces) is exactly $\| B \| \leqq \lambda$, hence the number of open subsets is $\leqq 2^{\lambda}$, hence the number of closed subsets is $\leqq 2^{\lambda}$ and the closure under intersection of $\leqq \lambda$ and complementation does not change this.

Secondly, for $l = 0, 1$ let $M^l = \Sigma_{i \in I^l} M^l_i$, and let $g^l : C \rightarrow$ cardinals be defined by $g^l(c) = |\{i \in I^l : mT^{\alpha}_{\bar{k}}(M^l_i) \in b\}|$ and suppose that

$$(\forall c \in C)[\mathrm{Min}\{g^0(c), \lambda^{+}\} = \mathrm{Min}\{g^1(c), \lambda^{+}\}].$$

We shall prove that $mT^{\alpha+1}_{\bar{k}}(M^0) = mT^{\alpha+1}_{\bar{k}}(M^1)$.

By the symmetry it is enough to prove the following: we are given $\bar{P}^0_i$ $(i \in I^0)$ (a sequence of $k(\alpha)$ subsets of M^0_i); and we shall find $\bar{P}^1_i$ $(i \in I^1)$ such that

$$mT^{\alpha}_{\bar{k}}\left(\sum_{i \in I^0} (M^0_i \bar{P}^0_i)\right) = mT^{\alpha}_{\bar{k}}\left(\sum_{i \in I^1} (M^1_i, \bar{P}^1_i)\right).$$

Let $S = \bigcap \{b \in B$: there are $\leqq \lambda$ elements $i \in I^0$ such that $mT^{\alpha}_{\bar{k}}(M^0_i, \bar{P}^0_i)$ is not in $b\}$ (remember B is a family of subsets of X). Clearly S is a closed subset of X. Now

$$\{i \in I^0 : mT^{\alpha+1}_{\bar{k}}(M^0_i) \cap S = \varnothing\}$$

$$\subseteq \{i \in I^0 : mT_{\bar{k}}(M^0_i, \bar{P}^0_i) \notin S\}$$

$$\subseteq \bigcup_{b \in B} \{i \in I^0 : mT^{\alpha}_{\bar{k}}(M^0_i, \bar{P}^0_i) \in b \text{ and } (\exists^{\leqq \lambda} j \in I^0)[mT^{\alpha}_{\bar{k}}(M^0_j, \bar{p}^0_1) \in b]\}$$

Sh:284d

which has power $\leqq \lambda$ (as $\| B \| \leqq \lambda$).

Let

$$A_0 = \{i \in I^0 : mT_k^\alpha(M_i^0, \bar{P}_i^0) \notin S\} \qquad (\text{so } |A_0| \leqq \lambda).$$

Let $A_1 = \{i \in I^0 : mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0) \cap S = \varnothing\}$ so $A_1 \subseteq A_0$. We can choose for each $i \in A_1$ a member c_i of C such that $mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0) \in c_i$, and $t \in c_i \Rightarrow t \cap S = \varnothing$ (remember that members of Y are subsets of X). If $i, j \in A_1$, $mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_j^0) \neq mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0)$ *then* for some $x_{i,j} \in X$, $[x_{i,j} \in mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0) \Leftrightarrow x_{i,j} \notin mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_1^0)]$. So we can replace c_i by

$$c_i^1 \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{y \in Y : y \in c_i \text{ and if } x_{i,j} \text{ is defined } x_{i,j} \in y \Leftrightarrow x_{i,j} \in mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0)\}.$$

So if $i, j \in A_1$, $mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_j^0) \neq mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0)$ implies $mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_j^0) \notin c_i$ and even $c_j \cap c_i = 0$ (remember the definition of C). So for $c \leqq c_i$, $g^1(c) \leqq g^1(c_i) \leqq \lambda$ and $g^1(c) > 0$ iff $g^1(c) = g^1(c_i)$ iff $mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0) \in c$.

As we have assumed $(\forall c \in C)[\text{Min}(g^0(c), \lambda^+) = \text{Min}\{g^1(c), \lambda^+\}]$ the same holds for g^1, so we can find a one-to-one mapping h from A_1 onto

$$A_1^1 = \{i \in I^1 : mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^1) \cap S = \varnothing\}$$

such that

$$mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0) = mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_{h(i)}^2).$$

Hence we can find $\bar{P}_j^1$ (for $j \in A_1^1$) such that

$$mT_k^\alpha(M_i^0, \bar{P}_i^0) = mT_k^\alpha(M_{h(i)}^1, \bar{P}_{h(i)}^1).$$

We (similarly to the above choice) can now define $c_i \in C$ for $i \in A_0 - A_1$ such that: $[i \in A_0 - A_1 \wedge j \in A_1 \wedge i \neq j \Rightarrow c_i \cap c_j = 0]$,

$$[mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^0) \neq mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_j^0) \wedge i \in A_1 - A_0 \Rightarrow c_i \cap c_j = 0]$$

and $(\forall i \in A_0 - A_1)(\forall t \in c_i)[t - S \neq \varnothing]$ ($t \in c_i$ implies $t \in Y$ hence $t \subseteq X$) and $(\forall t \in c_i)[mT_k^\alpha(M_i^0, \bar{P}_i^0) \in t]$. Now we can find a one-to-one function f from $A_0 - A_1$ into $I^1 - A_1^1$ such that $mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_{f(i)}^1) \in c_i$ for $i \in A_0 - A_1$; then we can define $\bar{P}_{f(i)}^1$, such that $mT_k^\alpha(M_{f(i)}^1, \bar{P}_{f(i)}^1) = mT_k^\alpha(M_i^0, \bar{P}_i^0)$.

Now for every $b \in B$, $b \subseteq S$, we know that $E_b = \{i \in I^0 : mT_k^\alpha(M_i^0, \bar{P}_i^0) \in b\}$ has power $\geqq \lambda^+$ and $|B| \leqq \lambda$, so it is well known that we can find $E_b' \subseteq E_b$, $|E_b'| = \lambda$, $E_b' \cap A_1 = \varnothing$, $E_{b_1}' \cap E_{b_2}' = \varnothing$ for $b_1 \neq b_2$. By the hypothesis on g_1 each

$$E_b^1 = \{i \in I^1 : mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M_i^1) \cap b = \varnothing\}$$

has power $\geqq \lambda^+$ for $b \subseteq S (b \in B)$; so we can find a one-to-one mapping f_1 from $\bigcup \{E_b' : b \in B, b \subseteq S\}$ to I^1-(Rang $f \cup$ Rang h) such that:

$$i \in E'_b \Rightarrow mT_k^{\alpha+1}(M^1_{f_1(i)}) \cap b \neq \varnothing.$$

So we can define $\bar{P}^1_{f_1(i)}$ such that for $i \in E'_b$ where $b \in B$, $b \subseteq S$ such that $mT_k^\alpha(M_i^1, \bar{P}_i^1) \in b$.

We define $\bar{P}_i^1$ for $i \in I^1 - \bigcup \operatorname{Rang}(f \cup f_1 \cup h)$ such that $mT_k^\alpha(M_i^1, \bar{P}_i^1) \in S$ (not hard as $i \notin A_1^1$).

Now we apply the induction hypothesis.

5. Claim. $(*)(L, 0, \bar{k}; \lambda, \mu)$ holds with λ being the power of the Boolean algebra generated by the relevant $\exists \bar{x}\varphi$, φ conjunction of atomic and negation of atomic formulas, $\mu = \aleph_0$ (so for $k(-1) = \aleph_0$, L countable, $|mT_k^0(L)| = 2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$, $|B| = 2^{\aleph_0}$).

6. Remark. Claim 5 raises the thought that it may be better to define $mT_k^0(M)$ as $\{\exists \bar{x}\varphi : \varphi$ q.f. finite, $l(\bar{x}) < k(-2)\}$. So for L countable $|mT_k^0(L)| = 2^{\aleph_0}$, $|B| = \aleph_0$ which seems more reasonable and I do not see any bad effect.

7. Claim. If δ is limit and $(*)(L, \alpha, \bar{k}, \lambda_\alpha, \mu_\alpha)$ is exemplified by B_α for $\alpha < \delta$, then $(*)(L, \delta, \bar{k}, \Sigma_\alpha \lambda_\alpha, \Sigma \mu_\alpha)$ is true (assuming $\Sigma_\alpha \lambda_\alpha$ is infinite, a triviality).

Proof. For $\alpha < \beta$ and L, let $\pi^{L,\bar{k}}_{\alpha,\beta}$ be the function from $mT_k^\beta(L)$ to $mT_k^\alpha(L)$ such that: if $x = mT_k^\beta(M)$ then $\pi^{L,\bar{k}}_{\alpha,\beta}(x) = mT_k^\alpha(M)$. Let B be the Boolean algebra of subsets of mT_k^δ generated by

$$\{(\pi^{L,\bar{k}}_{\alpha,\delta})^{-1}(b) : \alpha < \delta, b \in B_\alpha\}$$

where B_α exemplifies $(*)(L, \alpha, \bar{k}, \lambda_\alpha, \mu_\alpha)$.

8. Discussion. (a) Is it worthwhile to make the general addition theory (i.e., I a structure) like what we do here?

(b) We can waive "B is a Boolean subalgebra"; for the finitary cases this saves us from meaninglessness (as B is necessarily the family of all subsets).

(c) We can also try to make mT_k^α "grow" more slowly with α, e.g., in the case we look at partitions, we first take any coarser division with an *a priori* bounded number of parts. We shall still have addition theorems.

References

[ShA 1] S. Shelah, *Classification Theory and the Number of Non-isomorphic Models*, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1978, 542 pp. +xvi.

[BSh 156] J. Baldwin and S. Shelah, *Classification of theories by second order quantifiers*, Proc. 1980/1 Jerusalem Model Theory Year, Notre Dame J. Formal Logic **26** (1985), 229–303.