

# Pacific Journal of Mathematics

## **ELIMINATION OF MALITZ QUANTIFIERS IN STABLE THEORIES**

ANDREAS RAPP

# ELIMINATION OF MALITZ QUANTIFIERS IN STABLE THEORIES

ANDREAS RAPP

The main result of this paper is (a slightly stronger form of) the following theorem: let  $T$  be a countable complete first-order theory which is stable. If, for some  $\alpha \geq 1$ , the Malitz quantifier  $Q_\alpha^2$  is eliminable in  $T$  then all Malitz quantifiers  $Q_\beta^m$  ( $\beta \geq 0$ ,  $m \geq 1$ ) are eliminable in  $T$ . This complements results of Baldwin-Kueker [1] and Rothmaler-Tuschik [3].

**1. Introduction.** In this paper we consider various logics extending first-order logic that are obtained by adding quantifiers asserting the existence of a large homogeneous set of  $n$ -tuples. For  $\alpha \geq 0$ ,  $m, n \geq 1$ ,  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  is a quantifier binding  $m \cdot n$  variables whose semantics is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U} \models Q_\alpha^{m,n} \bar{x}_1 \cdots \bar{x}_m \varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m) \\ \text{iff there is a set } X \subset A^n \text{ of power } \geq \aleph_\alpha \\ \text{which is homogeneous for } \varphi, \text{ i.e., for all } n\text{-tuples} \\ \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_m \in X: \mathfrak{U} \models \varphi[\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_m]. \end{aligned}$$

The quantifiers  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  were introduced by Baldwin and Kueker in [1] and denoted by  $Q_\alpha^{*,m,n}$ . For  $n = 1$ ,  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  is the usual Malitz quantifier of order  $m$  in the  $\aleph_\alpha$ -interpretation, and  $Q_\alpha^{1,1}$  is just the cardinality quantifier  $Q_\alpha$  ("there are  $\aleph_\alpha$  many"). We shall also consider another family of quantifiers: for  $\alpha \geq 0$  and  $n \geq 1$ ,  $E_\alpha^n$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U} \models E_\alpha^n x_1 \cdots x_n y_1 \cdots y_n \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \\ \text{iff } \varphi \text{ is an equivalence relation on } A^n \text{ of index } \geq \aleph_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The statement on the right side is expressible by a sentence of  $L(Q_\alpha^{2,n})$ , but there is no  $L(Q_\alpha^{1,n})$ -sentence equivalent to it. So, being strictly stronger than  $Q_\alpha^{1,n}$ ,  $E_\alpha^n$  may be viewed as a weak form of  $Q_\alpha^{2,n}$ .

Adjoining a quantifier  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  to an elementary logic  $L$  results in an increase of expressive power. There are, however, first-order theories that admit elimination of  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$ : for each  $L$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m, \bar{y})$ , where  $l(\bar{x}_1) = \dots = l(\bar{x}_m) = n$ , there is another  $L$ -formula  $\delta(\bar{y})$  such that, for all models  $\mathfrak{U} \models T$  of power  $\geq \aleph_\alpha$  and all  $\bar{a} \in A$ ,

$$(\mathfrak{U}, \bar{a}) \models \delta \leftrightarrow Q_\alpha^{m,n} \bar{x}_1 \cdots \bar{x}_m \varphi.$$

Throughout this paper  $T$  always denotes a countable complete first-order theory with infinite models. For simplicity we assume that the language of  $T$  does not have function symbols.

If  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  is eliminable in  $T$ , this has interesting consequences. Firstly,  $T$  remains complete as an  $L(Q_\alpha^{m,n})$ -theory. Secondly, if  $T$  is decidable and the elimination of  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  can be carried out effectively, then it is also decidable whether a given  $L(Q_\alpha^{m,n})$ -sentence holds in some (all) model(s) of  $T$ . In many cases elimination procedures are known; for a survey see [2].

Aside from investigating particular examples, it is natural to look for purely first-order properties of  $T$  which imply or characterize eliminability of certain quantifiers  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$ . Another problem is to determine the relative strength of eliminability of various  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$ . Regarding the  $\aleph_0$ -interpretation Baldwin and Kueker [1] gave a solution to both problems if stability of  $T$  is assumed.

**THEOREM 1.1.** (a) *If  $T$  does not have the finite cover property (f.c.p.) then all quantifiers  $Q_0^{m,n}$  for  $m, n \geq 1$  are eliminable in  $T$ .*

(b) *If  $T$  is stable and  $E_0^1$  is eliminable in  $T$  then  $T$  does not have the f.c.p.*

Thus Theorem 1.1. shows that in the stable case the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $T$  does not have the f.c.p.,
- (ii) all quantifiers  $Q_0^{m,n}$  and  $E_0^n$  are eliminable in  $T$ ;
- (iii) any single quantifier  $Q_0^{m,n}$  or  $E_0^n$  ( $m \geq 2$ ) is eliminable in  $T$ .

Regarding  $\aleph_\alpha$ -interpretations for  $\alpha \geq 1$  one has to look for a first-order property different from “not f.c.p.” in order to characterize eliminability of  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  or  $E_\alpha^n$ . For example, put  $T := \text{Th}(A, R)$ , where  $R$  is an equivalence relation on  $A$  with infinitely many equivalence classes and each class infinite.  $T$  is  $\omega$ -categorical and  $\omega$ -stable. Hence, by Theorem 7 of [1], it admits elimination of all  $Q_0^{m,n}$ . Thus, by Theorem 1.1,  $T$  does not have the f.c.p. However, none of  $E_\alpha^n$  or  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  for  $\alpha \geq 1$  is eliminable in  $T$ .

In [3] Rothmaler and Tuschik introduced the notion of a regular theory and proved

**THEOREM 1.2.** *If  $T$  is regular then all quantifiers  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  ( $\alpha \geq 0, m \geq 1$ ) are eliminable in  $T$ .*

It is also mentioned in their paper (“added in proof”) that, for stable  $T$ , the converse of Theorem 1.2 is true. This suggests regularity as a

substitute for “not f.c.p.” when looking at all Malitz quantifiers  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$ . Yet, when this result is compared to Theorem 1.1, two questions remain open:

(1) Does regularity of  $T$  imply eliminability of  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  for  $n > 1$ ?

(2) Is there a single quantifier whose eliminability implies that of all  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$ ?

It will turn out (see Corollary 3.4) that, in the stable case, question 1 may be answered positively. When using a slightly more general concept than regularity, which we call strong regularity, the stability assumption can be dropped (cf. Definition 2.3 and Theorem 2.4):

**THEOREM 1.3.** *If  $T$  is strongly regular then all quantifiers  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  ( $\alpha \geq 0$ ;  $m, n \geq 1$ ) are eliminable in  $T$ .*

This theorem is also due to Rothmaler and Tuschik (compare the appendix of [3]).

With regard to question 2 the main result of the present paper shows that the situation closely parallels that of 1.1(b).

**MAIN THEOREM** (see 3.2). *Let  $T$  be stable and suppose some quantifier  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  or  $E_\alpha^n$  (where  $\alpha \geq 1$  and  $m \geq 2$ ) is eliminable in  $T$ . Then  $T$  is strongly regular.*

Hence, for stable  $T$ , the following are equivalent:

- (i)  $T$  is strongly regular;
- (ii) all quantifiers  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  are eliminable in  $T$ ,
- (iii) any single quantifier  $E_\alpha^n$  or  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  ( $m \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha \geq 1$ ) is eliminable in  $T$ .

The main theorem partially answers problems 2 and 3 of [2]. It will be proved in §3. Section 2 contains definitions and known results. Moreover it is shown that the connections among eliminability of  $E_\alpha^n$  for various  $\alpha$  are exactly the same as for the cardinality quantifiers  $Q_\alpha$ . We thus obtain a generalization of some of Tuschik's results in [5].

**2.** We shall sometimes abbreviate the statement that a quantifier  $Q$  is eliminable in a theory  $T$  by  $EL_T(Q)$ . If, for any generalized quantifier  $Q$  and  $Q'$ ,  $L(Q)$  is included in  $L(Q')$  then  $EL_T(Q')$  implies  $EL_T(Q)$ . We shall collect some facts that are based on this simple observation.

**PROPOSITION 2.1.**

- (i) If  $m \leq m'$  and  $n \leq n'$  then  $EL_T(Q_\alpha^{m',n'})$  implies  $EL_T(Q_\alpha^{m,n})$ ,
- (ii) If  $n \leq n'$  then  $EL_T(E_\alpha^{n'})$  implies  $EL_T(E_\alpha^n)$ ,

- (iii) If  $EL_T(E_\alpha^n)$  then  $EL_T(Q_\alpha^{1,n})$ ,  
 (iv)  $EL_T(Q_\alpha^{1,n})$  if and only if  $EL_T(Q_\alpha^{1,1})$ .

*Proof.* Observe, for instance:

for (i):

$$\models Q_\alpha^{m,n} x_{11} \cdots x_{mn} \varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m) \leftrightarrow \exists u Q_\alpha^{m,n+1} \bar{x}_1 y_1 \cdots \bar{x}_m y_m \\ \left( \varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq m} u = y_i \right);$$

for (iii):

$$\models Q_\alpha^{1,n} \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow E_\alpha^n \bar{x} \bar{y} [(\varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{y}) \wedge “\bar{x} = \bar{y}”) \vee (\neg \varphi(\bar{x}) \wedge \neg \varphi(\bar{y}))];$$

for (iv):

$$\models Q_\alpha^{1,1} x \varphi(x) \leftrightarrow Q_\alpha^{1,n} \bar{x} \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq n} \varphi(x_i); \\ \models Q_\alpha^{1,n} \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow Q_\alpha^{1,1} y (“y \in \text{field}(\varphi)”).$$

If  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  is a first-order formula then  $\text{eq}(\varphi)$  stands for the first-order sentence expressing that  $\varphi$  is an equivalence relation on  $n$ -tuples. The number of equivalence classes is denoted by  $\text{ind}(\varphi)$ .

For  $m, n, k < \omega$  and a formula  $\delta(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m)$ , where  $l(\bar{x}_1) = \dots = l(\bar{x}_m) = n$ ,  $H_k^{m,n} \bar{x}_1 \cdots \bar{x}_m \delta$  stands for the first-order sentence asserting the existence of a homogeneous set of  $n$ -tuples for  $\delta$  that contains at least  $k$  such  $n$ -tuples.

The following lemma serves as a basic tool for eliminability investigations. In its general form it is due to Tuschik, for a proof see [2]. We state the lemma for the quantifiers  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  and  $E_\alpha^n$ : it shows that if they are eliminable in some theory  $T$ , then this can be done in a very simple way.

LEMMA 2.2 (*Definability lemma*).

(a)  $EL_T(Q_\alpha^{m,n})$  iff for each first-order formula  $\delta(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m, \bar{z})$  there is a number  $k < \omega$  such that

$$T \cup \{Q_\alpha y(y = y)\} \models \forall \bar{z} (H_k^{m,n} \bar{x}_1 \cdots \bar{x}_m \delta \rightarrow Q_\alpha^{m,n} \bar{x}_1 \cdots \bar{x}_m \delta).$$

(b)  $EL_T(E_\alpha^n)$  iff for each first-order formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ , where  $l(\bar{x}) = l(\bar{y}) = n$ , there is  $k < \omega$  such that

$$T \cup \{Q_\alpha y(y = y)\} \models \forall \bar{z} (\text{eq}(\varphi) \wedge (\varphi) \geq k \rightarrow E_\alpha^n \bar{x} \bar{y} \varphi).$$

DEFINITION 2.3. Let  $L$  be a first-order language.

(i) A structure  $\mathfrak{A}$  for  $L$  is called  $(m, n)$ -singular if there are

(a) an  $L$ -formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m, \bar{y})$  with  $l(\bar{x}_i) = n$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,

(b)  $\bar{a} \in A$  and  $C \subset A^n$ , where  $\aleph_0 \leq |C| < |A|$ ,  
such that  $C$  is maximally homogeneous for  $\varphi$  in  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ .

(ii)  $T$  is  $(m, n)$ -regular if it has no  $(m, n)$ -singular models.

(iii)  $T$  is regular if it is  $(m, 1)$ -regular for all  $m$ ;

$T$  is strongly regular if it is  $(m, n)$ -regular for all  $m, n \geq 1$ .

(iv)  $(\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B})$  is a generalized Vaughtian pair of index  $(m, n)$  if  $\mathfrak{A} < \mathfrak{B}$ ,  $A \neq B$ , and for some formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m, \bar{y})$  there are  $\bar{a} \in A$  and  $C \subset A^n$  such that  $C$  is an infinite maximally homogeneous set for  $\varphi$  in  $(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{a})$ .

A straightforward application of the arguments in [3] to sequences rather than elements yields

THEOREM 2.4 (*Rothmaler, Tuschik*).

(i) Let  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m, \bar{y})$  be an  $L$ -formula.  $T$  has a generalized Vaughtian pair of index  $(m, n)$  for  $\varphi$  iff  $T$  has an  $(m, n)$ -singular model of power  $\aleph_1$  for  $\varphi$  iff  $T$  has any  $(m, n)$ -singular model for  $\varphi$ .

(ii) If  $T$  is  $(m, n)$ -regular then  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  is eliminable in  $T$  for all  $\alpha \geq 0$ .

Clearly, (ii) entails Theorems 1.2 and 1.3. In general, a formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m)$  where  $m > 1$  may have maximal homogeneous sets of different cardinality in a model  $\mathfrak{A}$ . However, if  $m = 1$  then there is just one, namely  $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Similarly, if  $\delta(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  is an equivalence relation on  $A^n$ , then a maximally homogeneous set for  $\neg\delta$  is just a set of representatives, and, clearly, all such sets have the same cardinality.

DEFINITION 2.5.  $T$  is  $n$ -regular for equivalence relations if whenever  $\mathfrak{A} \models T$ ,  $\bar{a} \in A$  and  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}) = \text{eq}(\delta(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \bar{z}))$ , where  $l(\bar{x}_1) = l(\bar{x}_2) = n$ , then either  $\text{ind}(\delta^{\mathfrak{A}}) < \omega$  or  $\text{ind}(\delta^{\mathfrak{A}}) = |A|$ .

COROLLARY 2.6.  $T$  is  $n$ -regular for equivalence relations if and only if  $E_\alpha^n$  is eliminable in  $T$  for all  $\alpha \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* The direction from left to right is shown exactly like Theorem 2.4(ii). For the other one use the remark preceding Definition 2.5.

The remainder of this section is devoted to generalizing Tuschik's result on the relative strength of eliminability of  $Q_\alpha$  to the quantifiers  $E_\alpha^1$ . Recall that, by Lemma 2.1(iv),  $EL_T(Q_\alpha^{1,n})$  if and only if  $EL_T(Q_\alpha)$ ; so the situation does not change if  $Q_\alpha$  is replaced by  $Q_\alpha^{1,n}$  for some  $n > 1$ . The

same is true for  $E_\alpha^1$  and  $E_\alpha^n$  although this is not so obvious at first sight (see Proposition 3.1).

**PROPOSITION 2.7.**

- (i)  $EL_T(E_\alpha^1)$  for some  $\alpha > 0$  implies  $EL_T(E_0^1)$ ,
- (ii)  $EL_T(E_1^1)$  implies  $EL_T(E_\alpha^1)$  for all  $\alpha$ .

*Proof.* (i) By the definability Lemma 2.2, for each formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$  there is a number  $k$  such that, for all  $\mathfrak{A} \models T$  of power  $\geq \aleph_\alpha$  and all  $\bar{a} \in A$ , the following holds:

$$\text{if } \text{ind}(\varphi^{(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})}) \geq k \text{ then } \text{ind}(\varphi^{(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})}) \geq \aleph_\alpha.$$

Suppose there are  $\mathfrak{B} \models T$ ,  $\bar{b} \in B$  such that  $(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b}) \models \text{eq}(\varphi)$  and  $k \leq \text{ind}(\varphi^{(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})}) < \aleph_0$ . By hypothesis  $|B| < \aleph_\alpha$ . But  $(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$  has an elementary extension  $(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{b})$  of power  $\aleph_\alpha$ . Now  $k \leq \text{ind}(\varphi^{(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})}) = \text{ind}(\varphi^{(\mathfrak{C}, \bar{b})}) < \aleph_0 < \aleph_\alpha$ , a contradiction.

(ii) By (i),  $EL_T(E_0^1)$ . Assuming that  $E_\alpha^1$  is not eliminable in  $T$  for some  $\alpha > 1$ , we can conclude that there are a model  $\mathfrak{A} \models T$ , such that  $|A| \geq \aleph_\alpha$ , and a singular equivalence relation on  $A$  defined by some formula  $\varphi(x, y, \bar{z})$  in an expansion  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . Put  $T' := \text{Th}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, P^\mathfrak{A})$ , where the new predicate symbol  $P$  is interpreted in  $\mathfrak{A}$  by a set of representatives for  $\varphi$ . By Vaught's two-cardinal theorem,  $T'$  has a singular model of power  $\aleph_1$ , whence  $E_1^1$  is not eliminable in  $T$ .

Thus  $EL_T(E_1^1)$  is the strongest notion,  $EL_T(E_0^1)$  the weakest, and  $EL_T(E_\alpha^1)$  for  $\alpha > 1$  is somewhere in between. Under additional assumptions we can say more:

**COROLLARY 2.8 (GCH).** *If  $\aleph_\alpha$  is regular and  $EL_T(E_{\alpha+1}^1)$  then  $EL_T(E_1^1)$ .*

*Proof.* Use Chang's two-cardinal theorem in the proof of 2.7(ii).

**THEOREM 2.9.** *Let  $T$  be stable. If  $EL_T(E_\alpha^1)$  for some  $\alpha > 1$  then  $EL_T(E_1^1)$ .*

*Proof.* Again, the hypothesis together with the negation of the claim imply that there is  $\mathfrak{A} \models T$ , and some formula  $\varphi(x, y, \bar{z})$  defines a singular equivalence relation in some expansion  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . We may assume that  $|A| = \aleph_1$ .

In order to finish the proof by contradiction, we have to verify that there is a model  $\mathfrak{B} \models T$  of power  $\aleph_\alpha$  such that, for some  $\bar{b} \in B$ ,  $\varphi$  defines a singular equivalence relation in  $(\mathfrak{B}, \bar{b})$ . We would like to apply Shelah's

two-cardinal theorem [4, p. 287] to  $T' = \text{Th}(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a}, P^{\mathfrak{A}})$  as above, but due to new dependencies caused by  $P^{\mathfrak{A}}$ ,  $T'$  may not be stable any longer. However, Shelah's method of "imaginary elements" provides a means to overcome this difficulty.

First, we may assume w.l.o.g. that the singular equivalence relation in  $\mathfrak{A}$  is defined (without parameters) by a two-place relation symbol  $R$ , where  $R \in L$  and  $L$  is the language of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Now let  $L^+ := L \cup \{P, E\}$  and  $\mathfrak{A}^+$  be the following model for  $L^+$ :

(a) as domain  $A \cup X$ , where  $X \cap A = \emptyset$  and  $X$  contains exactly one element for each equivalence class of  $R^{\mathfrak{A}}$ ,

(b)  $P^{\mathfrak{A}^+} = A$  and the relations of  $L$  are restricted to  $P^{\mathfrak{A}^+}$ ,

(c)  $E^{\mathfrak{A}^+} = \{(a, x) \mid a \in A, x \in X, a \text{ is in the } R^{\mathfrak{A}}\text{-class coded by } x\}$ . Put  $T^+ := \text{Th}(\mathfrak{A}^+)$ . Some obvious facts about  $T^+$  are the following:

(1) each  $\mathfrak{A} \models T$  has, up to isomorphism, a unique extension  $\mathfrak{A}^+ \models T^+$ ;

(2) if  $\mathfrak{B} \models T^+$  then  $\mathfrak{B}^{-1} \models T$ , where  $\mathfrak{B}^{-1} = P^{\mathfrak{B}} \upharpoonright L$ .

Hence  $(\mathfrak{B}^{-1})^+ = \mathfrak{B}$ .

Moreover, we have

LEMMA 2.10.  $T^+$  is stable.

From this, Theorem 2.9 is proved as follows: apply Shelah's two-cardinal theorem to  $T^+$ .  $(\mathfrak{A}^+, (\neg P)^{\mathfrak{A}^+})$  is a model of type  $(\aleph_1, \aleph_0)$ , so there exists  $\mathfrak{B} \models T^+$ , where  $\mathfrak{B}$  is of type  $(\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_0)$ . Now  $\mathfrak{B}^{-1}$  is the required model of  $T$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.10 (sketch).* The first step is to show that  $T^+$  is a conservative extension of  $T$ : for each  $L^+$ -formula  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  there is an  $L$ -formula  $\pi(\bar{x})$  such that

$$T^+ \models \forall \bar{x} \left( \bigwedge_{i \leq n} Px_i \rightarrow (\varphi \leftrightarrow \pi) \right),$$

$$(*) \quad T^+ \models \forall \bar{x} \left( \pi(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \bigwedge_{i \leq n} Px_i \right),$$

$$\text{for all } \mathfrak{B} \models T^+ : \mathfrak{B} \models \pi[\bar{c}] \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathfrak{B}^{-1} \models \pi[\bar{c}].$$

$\pi$  is defined by induction on  $L^+$ -formulas. The idea is that quantification over elements in  $(\neg P)$  can be replaced by quantification over the corresponding  $R$ -equivalence classes.

Now assume  $T^+$  is not stable in  $\lambda$ . Then, for some  $\mathfrak{M} \models T^+$ , there is a subset  $N \subset M$ ,  $|N| \leq \lambda$  and  $\mathfrak{M}$  realizes  $\lambda^+$   $L^+$ -types over  $N$ . W.l.o.g.  $N \subset P^{\mathfrak{M}}$ . By  $(*)$  one can conclude that  $\mathfrak{M}^{-1}$  realizes  $\lambda^+$   $L$ -types over  $N$ , whence  $T$  is not stable in  $\lambda$ .



3. In this section we prove the main theorem of this paper. We need another fact about the quantifiers  $E_\alpha^n$ .

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** *For all  $n > 1$ :*

- (i)  $L(E_0^n)$  is included in  $L(E_0^1)$ ;
- (ii) for all  $\alpha \geq 0$ ,  $EL_T(E_\alpha^1)$  implies  $EL_T(E_\alpha^n)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$  be a first-order formula with  $l(\bar{x}_1) = l(\bar{x}_2) = n$ . We define

$$\pi(y_1, y_2) := \forall \bar{w} [\exists \bar{v}_1 \varphi(y_1 \cap \bar{v}_1, \bar{w}) \leftrightarrow \exists \bar{v}_2 \varphi(y_2 \cap \bar{v}_2, \bar{w})].$$

Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a model of  $T \cup \{\text{eq}(\varphi)\}$  and let  $K(\varphi^\mathfrak{A})$  be the set of all  $\varphi^\mathfrak{A}$ -equivalence classes. For  $b \in A$  put

$$\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A} := \{(\bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2) \mid \bar{a}_1, \bar{a}_2 \in A^{n-1}; \mathfrak{A} \models \varphi[b \cap \bar{a}_1, b \cap \bar{a}_2]\}.$$

Then:

(1)  $\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A}$  is an equivalence relation on  $A^{n-1}$  and  $K(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A})$  consists essentially of all those  $k \in K(\varphi^\mathfrak{A})$  that contain some  $n$ -tuple  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  with  $a_1 = b$ . Therefore,  $\text{ind}(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A}) \leq \text{ind}(\varphi^\mathfrak{A})$ .

(2)  $K(\varphi^\mathfrak{A}) = \bigcup_{b \in A} K(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A})$ .

(3)  $\pi^\mathfrak{A}$  is an equivalence relation on  $A$ . For  $b \in A$  the  $\pi^\mathfrak{A}$ -equivalence class of  $b$  is completely determined by the set  $K(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A})$ . Hence,  $\text{ind}(\pi^\mathfrak{A}) \leq 2^{\text{ind}(\varphi^\mathfrak{A})}$ .

Now we claim

$$(*) \quad T \models E_0^n \bar{x}_1 \bar{x}_2 \varphi \leftrightarrow [\text{eq}(\varphi) \wedge (\exists z E_1^{n-1} \bar{v}_1 \bar{v}_2 \varphi(z \cap \bar{v}_1, z \cap \bar{v}_2) \vee E_0^1 y_1 y_2 \pi(y_1, y_2))].$$

Let  $\mathfrak{A} \models E_0^n \bar{x}_1 \bar{x}_2 \varphi$ . Then  $\text{ind}(\varphi^\mathfrak{A}) = |K(\varphi^\mathfrak{A})| \geq \aleph_0$ . Now either some  $K(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A})$  is infinite or otherwise (2) implies  $K(\pi^\mathfrak{A})$  to be infinite.

For the other direction, suppose  $\varphi^\mathfrak{A}$  is an equivalence relation of finite index. By (1),  $\text{ind}(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{A}) < \aleph_0$  for each  $b \in A$ . By (3),  $\text{ind}(\pi^\mathfrak{A}) \leq 2^{\text{ind}(\varphi^\mathfrak{A})} < \aleph_0$ . So the right side of  $(*)$  is false in  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

From  $(*)$  it follows by induction on  $n$  that (i) of the proposition holds. Also, (ii) is clear for  $\alpha = 0$ . Now assume that, for some  $\alpha \geq 1$ ,  $EL_T(E_\alpha^1)$  holds and  $EL_T(E_\alpha^n)$  does not, where  $n > 1$  is minimal with this property. By 2.7(i) and 3.1(i) above,  $EL_T(E_0^n)$ . Hence, there is a model  $\mathfrak{B} \models T$ ,  $|B| = \aleph_\alpha$  and  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$  defines a singular equivalence relation on  $B^n$ . Therefore  $\mathfrak{B} \models E_0^n \bar{x}_1 \bar{x}_2 \varphi$  and we may apply  $(*)$  again.

*Case 1.* For some  $b \in B$ ,  $\text{ind}(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{B}) \geq \aleph_0$ . Since  $\text{ind}(\varphi_b^\mathfrak{B}) \leq \text{ind}(\varphi^\mathfrak{B}) < \aleph_\alpha$ , there is a definable singular equivalence relation on  $B^{n-1}$ , whence  $E_\alpha^{n-1}$  is not eliminable in  $T$ .

*Case 2.*  $\text{ind}(\varphi_b^{\mathfrak{B}})$  is finite for all  $b \in B$ . But then  $\text{ind}(\pi^{\mathfrak{B}}) \geq \aleph_0$ . Also,  $\text{ind}(\pi^{\mathfrak{B}}) \leq (\text{ind}(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}))^{\omega} = \text{ind}(\varphi^{\mathfrak{B}}) < \aleph_\alpha$  and, therefore,  $EL_T(E_\alpha^1)$  fails.

In either case this contradicts our original assumption and the proof is complete.

**REMARK.** To prove (\*), regularity of  $\aleph_0$  is needed for  $\rightarrow$  and inaccessibility for  $\leftarrow$ . So the stronger statement in (i) also holds for all  $\alpha$  such that  $\aleph_\alpha$  is a strongly inaccessible cardinal; we do not know if it is true, e.g., for  $\alpha = 1$ .

**THEOREM 3.2.** *Let  $T$  be stable. Suppose some quantifier  $Q_\alpha^{m,n}$  or  $E_\alpha^n$  (where  $\alpha \geq 1$  and  $m \geq 2$ ) is eliminable in  $T$ . Then  $T$  is strongly regular and, hence, all  $Q_\beta^{m,n}$  for  $m, n \geq 0$  and  $\beta \geq 0$  are eliminable in  $T$ .*

*Proof.* By 2.1 and 2.7(i) we have

$$(1) \quad EL_T(E_\alpha^1), \quad EL_T(E_0^1).$$

As  $T$  is stable it follows from Baldwin's and Kueker's Theorem 1.1 that

$$(2) \quad T \text{ does not have the finite cover property.}$$

Now assume, for contradiction, that  $T$  is not strongly regular. That is, for some  $m$  and  $k$ ,  $T$  has an  $(m, k)$ -singular model. So let  $Y$  be a  $\lambda$ -powered maximally homogeneous set of  $k$ -tuples for  $\varphi(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_m, \bar{y})$  in  $(\mathfrak{A}, \bar{a})$ . Suppose  $|A| = \aleph_\beta$ ,  $\aleph_0 \leq \lambda < \aleph_\beta$ . For notational simplicity we suppress  $\bar{y}$  and  $\bar{a}$ .

Let  $\delta(\bar{u}, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_{m-1})$  be the following formula, where  $l(\bar{u}) = l(\bar{y}_i) = k$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} \delta := & \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < m} " \bar{u} \neq \bar{y}_i " \\ & \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{f: \{1, \dots, m\} \\ \rightarrow \{\bar{u}, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_{m-1}\} \\ \bar{u} \in \text{range}(f)}} \varphi(\bar{x}_1 \setminus f(1), \dots, \bar{x}_m \setminus f(m)). \end{aligned}$$

Put  $\Sigma := \{ \delta(\bar{u}, \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{m-1}) \mid \bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_{m-1} \in Y \}$ .

As  $Y$  is infinite,  $\Sigma$  is consistent in  $\mathfrak{A}$ , i.e., for every finite  $\Sigma_0 \subset \Sigma$ :  $\mathfrak{A} \models \exists \bar{u} \wedge_{\pi \in \Sigma_0} \pi$ . Also,  $\Sigma$  is omitted in  $\mathfrak{A}$  since  $Y$  maximally homogeneous.

Now, much like Baldwin and Kueker made use of the f.c.p.-theorem, we shall apply another result of Shelah:

**THEOREM 3.3** ([4, p. 80]). *Suppose  $T$  does not have the f.c.p. and some  $\mathfrak{M} \models T$  omits a  $\Delta$ - $m$ -type of cardinality  $\lambda$ , where  $\Delta$  is finite. Then there are*

$p < \omega$ , a formula  $\gamma(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \bar{z})$  with  $l(\bar{x}_1) = l(\bar{x}_2) = p$  and  $\bar{c} \in M$  such that

- (i)  $(\mathfrak{M}, \bar{c}) \models \text{eq}(\gamma)$ ;
- (ii)  $\aleph_0 \leq \text{ind}(\gamma^{(\mathfrak{M}, \bar{c})}) \leq \lambda$ .

By (2) and the previous remarks, the hypotheses of 3.3 are satisfied with  $\mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{A}$ ,  $m = k$  and  $\Delta = \{\delta\}$ .

Now the conclusion of 3.3 implies that, for some number  $p < \omega$ ,  $EL_T(E_\beta^p)$  fails. Although  $p$  may be very large (as a proof of 3.3 would show), it follows from Proposition 3.1(ii) that

$$(3) \quad E_\beta^1 \text{ is not eliminable in } T.$$

But this leads to a contradiction: by (3) and 2.7(ii),  $EL_T(E_1^1)$  fails. On the other hand, as  $T$  is stable, (1) together with Theorem 2.9 imply  $EL_T(E_1^1)$ .

**COROLLARY 3.4.** *Let  $T$  be stable. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $T$  is strongly regular;
- (ii)  $T$  is regular;
- (iii)  $T$  is 1-regular for equivalence relations.

*Proof* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) is trivial.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): If  $\varphi(x, y)$  defines a singular equivalence relation on  $A$  in some model  $\mathfrak{A}$ , then  $\neg\varphi$  shows that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a  $(2, 1)$ -singular model.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): By (the proofs of) 3.3 and 3.1 (i).

**Acknowledgment.** I would like to thank H.-D. Ebbinghaus, J. Flum and M. Ziegler for valuable comments on the subject and the presentation of this paper.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Baldwin and D. Kueker, *Ramsey-quantifiers and the finite cover property*, Pacific J. Math., **90** (1980), 11–19.
- [2] A. Baudisch, D. Seese, H. P. Tuschik and M. Weese, *Decidability and quantifier elimination*, Chapter XIX of “Higher Model Theory” (to appear).
- [3] P. Rothmaler and H. P. Tuschik, *A two-cardinal theorem for homogeneous sets and the elimination of Malitz quantifiers*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **269** (1982), 273–283.
- [4] S. Shelah, *Classification Theory*, North Holland, 1978.
- [5] H. P. Tuschik, *Elimination of cardinality quantifiers*, ZMLG **28** (1982), 75–81.

Received October 22, 1982.

MATH. INSTITUT DER UNIVERSITÄT  
ABTEILUNG FÜR LOGIK  
ALBERTSTR. 23b  
D-7800 FREIBURG, WEST GERMANY

# PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

## EDITORS

DONALD BABBITT (Managing Editor)  
University of California  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

CHARLES R. DEPRIMA  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, CA 91125

R. FINN  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

HERMANN FLASCHKA  
University of Arizona  
Tucson, AZ 85721

RAMESH A. GANGOLLI  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA 98195

ROBION KIRBY  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

C. C. MOORE  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720

HUGO ROSSI  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

H. SAMELSON  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305

HAROLD STARK  
University of California, San Diego  
La Jolla, CA 92093

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

R. ARENS

E. F. BECKENBACH  
(1906–1982)

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

## SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO  
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY  
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON  
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII  
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO  
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH  
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

---

The Supporting Institutions listed above contribute to the cost of publication of this Journal, but they are not owners or publishers and have no responsibility for its content or policies.

---

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced (not dittoed), double spaced with large margins. Please do not use built up fractions in the text of the manuscript. However, you may use them in the displayed equations. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. In particular it should contain no bibliographic references. Please propose a heading for the odd numbered pages of less than 35 characters. Manuscripts, in triplicate, may be sent to any one of the editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Reviews, Index to Vol. 39. Supply name and address of author to whom proofs should be sent. All other communications should be addressed to the managing editor, or Elaine Barth, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

There are page-charges associated with articles appearing in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*. These charges are expected to be paid by the author's University, Government Agency or Company. If the author or authors do not have access to such Institutional support these charges are waived. Single authors will receive 50 free reprints; joint authors will receive a total of 100 free reprints. Additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is issued monthly as of January 1966. Regular subscription rate: \$190.00 a year (5 Vols., 10 issues). Special rate: \$66.00 a year to individual members of supporting institutions.

Subscriptions, orders for numbers issued in the last three calendar years, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924, U.S.A. Old back numbers obtainable from Kraus Periodicals Co., Route 100, Millwood, NY 10546.

---

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* at P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924 (ISSN 0030-8730) publishes 5 volumes per year. Application to mail at Second-class postage rates is pending at Carmel Valley, California, and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, P.O. Box 969, Carmel Valley, CA 93924.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Copyright © 1985 by Pacific Journal of Mathematics

<b>Robert Walter Bagley, Ta-Sun Wu and J. S. Yang, On a class of topological groups more general than SIN groups</b>	209
<b>Bruce Alan Barnes, Algebraic elements of a Banach algebra modulo an ideal</b>	219
<b>Howard D. Fegan and Peter Gilkey, Invariants of the heat equation</b>	233
<b>Erica Flapan, Necessary and sufficient conditions for certain homology 3-spheres to have smooth <math>Z_p</math>-actions</b>	255
<b>Philip R. Heath, Product formulae for Nielsen numbers of fibre maps</b>	267
<b>Derbiau Frank Hsu and A. Donald Keedwell, Generalized complete mappings, neofields, sequenceable groups and block designs. II</b>	291
<b>Taqdir Husain, Orthogonal primitive idempotents and Banach algebras isomorphic with <math>l_2</math></b>	313
<b>Gary M. Lieberman, Regularized distance and its applications</b>	329
<b>William W. Menasco, Determining incompressibility of surfaces in alternating knot and link complements</b>	353
<b>Benjamin Muckenhoupt, Weighted reverse weak type inequalities for the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function</b>	371
<b>John Dacey O'Neill, Direct summands of direct products of slender modules</b>	379
<b>Andreas Rapp, Elimination of Malitz quantifiers in stable theories</b>	387
<b>Francisco José Ruiz, A unified approach to Carleson measures and <math>A_p</math> weights</b>	397
<b>Hanamatagouda Pandappa Sankappanavar, Heyting algebras with dual pseudocomplementation</b>	405
<b>Annette Sinclair, Strong Carleman and strong uniform approximation</b>	417
<b>Masaaki Suzuki, The generalized Schwarz lemma for the Bergman metric</b>	429
<b>Brian Thorpe and Ludwig Tömm, Universal approximation by regular weighted means</b>	443