

Pacific Journal of Mathematics

THE HANF NUMBER OF OMITTING COMPLETE TYPES

SAHARON SHELAH

THE HANF NUMBER OF OMITTING COMPLETE TYPES

SAHARON SHELAH

It is proved in this paper that the Hanf number m^c of omitting complete types by models of complete countable theories is the same as that of omitting not necessarily complete type by models of a countable theory.

Introduction. Morley [3] proved that if L is a countable first-order language, T a theory in L , p is a type in L , and T has models omitting p in every cardinality $\lambda < \beth_{\omega_1}$, then T has models omitting p in every infinite cardinality. He also proved that the bound \beth_{ω_1} cannot be improved, in other words the Hanf number is \beth_{ω_1} . He asked what is the Hanf number m^c when we restrict ourselves to complete T and p . Clearly $m^c \leq \beth_{\omega_1}$. Independently several people noticed that $m^c \geq \beth_\omega$ and J. Knight noticed that $m^c > \beth_\omega$.

Malitz [2] proved that the Hanf number for complete $L_{\infty, \omega}$ -theories with one axiom $\psi \in L_{\omega_1, \omega}$ is \beth_{ω_1} . We shall prove

THEOREM 1. $m^c = \beth_{\omega_1}$.

NOTATION. Natural numbers will be i, j, k, l, m, n , ordinals α, β, δ ; cardinals λ, μ . $|A|$ is the cardinality of A , $\beth_\alpha = \sum_{\beta < \alpha} 2^{2^\beta} + \aleph_0$.

M will be a model with universe $|M|$, with corresponding countable first-order language $L(M)$. For a predicate $R \in L(M)$, the corresponding relation is R^M or $R(M)$, and if there is no danger of confusion just R . Every M will have the one place predicate P and individual constants c_n such that $P = P^M = \{c_n : n < \omega\}$, $n \neq m \Rightarrow c_n \neq c_m$ (we shall not distinguish between the individual constants and their interpretation). A type p in L is a set of formulas $\varphi(x_0) \in L$; p is complete for T in L if it is consistent and for no $\varphi(x_0) \in L$ both $T \cup p \cup \{\varphi(x_0)\}$ and $T \cup p \cup \{\neg \varphi(x_0)\}$ are consistent.

An element $b \in |M|$ realizes p if $\varphi(x_0) \in p$ implies $M \models \varphi[b]$ (\models -satisfaction sign), and M realizes p if some $a \in |M|$ realizes it. A complete theory in L is a maximal consistent set of sentences of L . For every permutation θ of P , model M , and sublanguage L of $L(M)$ we define an Ehrenfeucht game $EG(M, L, \theta)$ between player I and II with ω moves as follows: in the n th move first player I chooses $i \in \{0, 1\}$ and $a_n^i \in |M|$ and secondly player II chooses $a_n^{1-i} \in |M|$. Player II wins if the extension θ^* of θ defined by $\theta^*(a_n^0) = a_n^1$ preserves all atomic formulas of L . That is if $R(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is an atomic formula in L , $\theta^*(b_i)$ is defined then $M \models R[b_1, \dots, b_n]$ iff $M \models R[\theta^*(b_1), \dots, \theta^*(b_n)]$.

REMARK. So if I chooses $a_n^i \in P$, II should choose $a_n^i = \theta(a_n^0)$.

Define $\Gamma(n_0) = \{\theta: \theta \text{ a permutation of } P, n < n_0 \Rightarrow \theta(c_n) = c_n \text{ and only for finitely many } n \theta(c_n) \neq c_n\}$.

$M|L$ is the reduct of M to the language $L \subseteq L(M)$, that is $M|L$ is M without the relations $R^M, R \in L(M), R \notin L$, and constants $c_n \in L(M), c_n \notin L$.

THEOREM 2. *For every ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$ there is a countable first-order language L_α a complete theory T_α in L , such that*

- (i) $p = \{P(x_0)\} \cup \{x_0 \neq c_n: n < \omega\}$ is a complete type for T_α .
- (ii) T_α has a model of cardinality \beth_α omitting p .
- (iii) T_α has no model of cardinality $> \beth_\alpha$ omitting p .

REMARK. Clearly Theorem 2 implies Theorem 1.

Proof. We shall define by induction on $\alpha < \omega_1$ models M_α such that

(1) $\|M_\alpha\|$, the cardinality of $|M_\alpha|$, is, \beth_α , and of course $P = P(M_\alpha) = \{c_n: n < \omega\}$ and except for the c_n 's $L(M_\alpha)$ has only predicates.

(2) There is no model elementarily equivalent to M_α of cardinality $> \beth_\alpha$ which omits p .

(3) If $(\exists \beta)(\alpha = \beta + 2)$ then $Q_\alpha \in L(M_\alpha)$ and $|Q_\alpha(M_\alpha)| = \beth_\alpha$

(4) For every finite sublanguage L of $L(M_\alpha)$ there is $n_L = n(L) < \omega$, such that for every permutation $\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)$ player II has a winning strategy in $EG(M_\alpha, L, \theta)$.

(5) In (4) if $(\exists \beta)(\alpha = \beta + 2)$ then in the winning strategy of II, if I chooses $a_n^i \in Q_\alpha(M_\alpha)$ then II chooses $a_n^{i-1} = a_n^i$.

The induction will go as follows. First we define M_0, M_1 , and M_2 ; later we define $M_{\alpha+1}$ by M_α when $(\exists \beta)(\alpha = \beta + 2)$; last for limit ordinal δ we define $M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}, M_{\delta+2}$ by M_α $\alpha < \delta$.

But before defining the M_α 's, let us show how this will finish the proof. We choose $L_\alpha = L(M_\alpha)$. T_α is the set of sentences of L_α that M_α satisfies. Clearly (ii), (iii) are satisfied. To prove (i) let $\varphi(x_0) \in L_\alpha$, so for some finite sublanguage L of L_α $\varphi(x_0) \in L$. By possibly interchanging $\varphi(x_0)$ and $\neg \varphi(x_0)$ we can assume $M_\alpha \models \varphi[c_{n(L)}]$. For $k \geq n(L)$ let θ_k be the permutation of P interchanging $c_{n(L)}c_k$, and leaving the other elements fixed.

Clearly $\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)$, hence player II has a winning strategy in $EG(M_\alpha, L, \theta)$. By Ehrenfeucht [1] this implies $c_{n(L)}$ and $c_k = \theta(c_{n(L)})$ satisfy the same formulas of L . Hence $M_\alpha \models \varphi[c_{n(L)}] \equiv \varphi[c_k]$, hence $M_\alpha \models \varphi[c_k]$. As this holds for any $k \geq n(L)$ $M_\alpha \models (\forall x)[P(x) \wedge \bigwedge_{i < n(L)} x \neq c_i \rightarrow \varphi(x)]$. Hence $T_\alpha \cup p \cup \{\neg \varphi(x_0)\}$ is inconsistent. So p is complete

(for T_α, L_α) and we finish.

So let us define

Case I. $\alpha = 0, 1, 2$

(A) Let us define M_0 :

$|M_0| = P$, and its only predicate is P (and of course the individual constants c_n , which we will not mention in later cases). Clearly (1), (2) are immediate. (3) and (5) are satisfied vacuously. As for (4), let $n_L = \max\{n + 1: c_n \in L\}$. Clearly θ is an automorphism of $M_0|L$ (the reduct of M_0 to L).

So player II will play by the automorphism: if I chooses a_n^0 , II will choose $a_n^1 = \theta(a_n^0)$, and if I chooses a_n^1 , II will choose $a_n^0 = \theta^{-1}(a_n^1)$.

(B) $|M_1| = |M_0| \cup P_1(M_1)$, where $P_1(M_1) = \mathcal{P}(|M_0|)$, where $\mathcal{P}(A)$ = the power set of $A = \{B: B \subseteq A\}$.

The predicates of M_1 are those of M_0, P_1 and ε_1

$$\varepsilon_1(M_1) = \{\langle c, A \rangle: c \in |M_0|, A \in P_1, c \in A\} .$$

As in (A) it is clear that M_1 satisfies the induction conditions, as if $\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)$ $L \subseteq L(M_1)$, L finite, then θ can be extended to an automorphism of M_1 by

$$\theta(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\theta(c): c \in A\} .$$

(C) Let us define an equivalence relation E_1 on $P_1(M_1)$: AE_1B iff for some $\theta \in \Gamma(0)$ $A = \theta(B) = \{\theta(c): c \in B\}$.

This is an equivalence relation, as $\Gamma(0)$ is a group of permutations, and as $|\Gamma(0)| = \aleph_0$, each equivalence class is countable. Define

$$\begin{aligned} |M_2| &= |M_1| \cup Q_2(M_2) \\ Q_2(M_2) &= \{S: S \subseteq P_1(M_1), A, B \in P_1, AE_1B \Rightarrow A \in S \iff B \in S\} \\ \varepsilon_2(M_2) &= \{\langle A, S \rangle: A \in P_1, S \in Q_2, A \in S\} . \end{aligned}$$

The relations of M_2 will be the relations of M_1 , and Q_2, ε_2 . By the definition of Q_2 , each $\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)$ [L a finite sublanguage of $L(M_2)$] can be extended to an automorphism θ^* of $M_2|L$, which is the identity over Q_2 . As before (1), (2), (4) hold, and as θ^* is the identity over Q_2 , also (5) holds. As for (3) each E_1 -equivalence class is countable, and $|P_1(M_1)| = 2^{|P_1|} = 2^{\aleph_0}$, the number of E_1 -equivalence classes is \aleph_1 , so $|Q_2| = 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$.

Case II. We define $M_{\alpha+1}$, where M_α is defined, $(\exists \beta)(\alpha = \beta + 2)$. Let

$$|M_{\alpha+1}| = |M_\alpha| \cup \mathcal{P}(Q_\alpha(M_\alpha)) .$$

The relations of $M_{\alpha+1}$ will be those of M_α and in addition $Q_{\alpha+1}(M_{\alpha+1}) = \mathcal{P}(Q_\alpha(M_\alpha))$

$$\varepsilon_{\alpha+1}(M_{\alpha+1}) = \{ \langle a, A \rangle : a \in Q_\alpha(M_\alpha), A \in Q_{\alpha+1}(M_{\alpha+1}), \alpha \in A \} .$$

Clearly Conditions (1), (2), (3) are satisfied. As for (4), (5) the winning strategy of player II in $EG(M_{\alpha+1}, L, \theta)[\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)]$ will be as follows: when I chooses elements in $|M_\alpha|$ he will pretend all the game is in $|M_\alpha|$ and play accordingly; and if player I chooses $a_n^i \in Q_{\alpha+1}(M_{\alpha+1})$, then player II will choose $a_n^{1-i} = a_n^i$. As M_α satisfies (5) this is a winning strategy, and trivially it satisfies (5).

Case III. δ a limit ordinal, M_α is defined for $\alpha < \delta$; and we shall define $M_\delta, M_{\delta+1}, M_{\delta+2}$.

PART A. By changing, when necessary, names of elements and relations, we can assume that for $\alpha < \beta < \delta$,

$$|M_\alpha| \cap |M_\beta| = P, \quad \text{and} \quad L(M_\alpha) \cap L(M_\beta) = \{P, c_n : n < \omega\} ,$$

but that if $(\exists \beta)(\alpha = \beta + 2)$ then still $Q_\alpha \in L(M_\alpha)$. Choose an increasing sequence of ordinals α_n $n < \omega$, $\delta = \bigcup_{n < \omega} \alpha_n$ and $(\exists \beta)(\alpha_n = \beta + 2)$. Define M_δ as follows

$$|M_\delta| = \bigcup_{n < \omega} M_{\alpha_n} .$$

The relations of M_δ will be those of M_{α_n} for each $n < \omega$ and $R_\delta^{M_\delta}$

$$R_\delta^{M_\delta} = \{ \langle c, a \rangle : c = c_n \in P, a \in (M_{\alpha_n} - P) \} .$$

It is easy to check that Conditions (1), (2) are satisfied. Conditions (3) and (5) are vacuous. So let us prove Condition (4) holds. Let L be a finite sublanguage of $L(M_\delta)$; then $L \cong \bigcup_{j < n_0} L_j \cup \{R\}$, where $L_j = L \cap L(M_{\alpha_j})$ is a finite sublanguage of $L(M_{\alpha_j})$. Define $n_L = \max [\{n_{L_j} : j < n_0\} \cup \{n_0\}]$. Let $\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)$. We shall describe now the winning strategy of player II in $EG(M_\delta, L, \theta)$. When player I will choose $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $a_n^i \in M_{\alpha_j}$, $j < n_0$, player II will pretend all the game is in the model M_{α_j} , and so play his winning strategy for $EG(M_{\alpha_j}, L \cap L(M_{\alpha_j}), \theta)$. If player I chooses $i \in \{0, 1\}$, $a_n^i \in M_{\alpha_j}$ $j \geq n_0$ then player II will choose $a_n^{1-i} \in M_{\alpha_k}$ [where $i = 0 \Rightarrow k = \theta(j)$, $i = 1 \Rightarrow j = \theta(k)$] such that for any $m < n$ $a_m^i = a_n^i \Leftrightarrow a_m^{1-i} = a_n^{1-i}$.

Note that for $j \geq n_0$, in $M_\delta | L$, every permutation of elements of M_{α_j} is an automorphism, as the only relation an $a \in |M_{\alpha_j}|$ satisfies is $R_\delta[c_j, a]$.

PART B. Here we define $M_{\delta+1}$. Let $A^* = \bigcup_{n < \omega} Q_{\alpha_n}(M_{\alpha_n})$, and $|M_{\delta+1}| = |M_\delta| \cup \mathcal{P}(A^*)$.

The relations of $M_{\delta+1}$ will be those of M_δ , and in addition

$$\begin{aligned} P_\delta(M_{\delta+1}) &= |M_\delta|, P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1}) = \mathcal{P}(A^*) \\ \varepsilon_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1}) &= \{\langle b, B \rangle : b \in A^*, B \in \mathcal{P}(A^*), b \in B\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that Conditions (1), (2) are satisfied, and (3), (5) are vacuous. So let us prove (4) — let L be a finite sublanguage of $L(M_{\delta+1})$. So

$$L \subseteq \bigcup_{i < n_0} L_i \cup \{R_\delta, P_\delta, P_{\delta+1}, \varepsilon_{\delta+1}\}, L_i = L \cap L(M_{\alpha_i}).$$

Define again

$$n_L = \max \{ \{n_{L_j} : j < n_0\} \cup \{n_0\} \}.$$

Let $\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)$ and we should describe player II's winning strategy in $EG(M_{\delta+1}, L, \theta)$. When player I chooses an element in M_{α_j} $j < n_0$, player II will ignore all elements chosen outside M_{α_j} , and play by his winning strategy in $EG(M_{\alpha_j}, L_j, \theta)$. In the other cases player II will play so that the following conditions are satisfied for every n

- $P(1)$ $a_n^0 \in P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1}) \Leftrightarrow a_n^1 \in P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1})$
- $P(2)$ if $c_j = \theta(c_k)$, then $a_n^0 \in |M_{\alpha_k}| \Leftrightarrow a_n^1 \in |M_{\alpha_j}|$
- $P(3)$ if $m < n$ then $a_m^0 = a_n^0 \Leftrightarrow a_m^1 = a_n^1$
- $P(4)$ if $m, l \leq n$ and $a_m^0 \in A^*$, $a_l^1 \in P_{\delta+1}$ then $a_m^0 \in a_l^1 \Leftrightarrow a_m^1 \in a_l^1$
- $P(5)$ if $a_m^0 \in P_{\delta+1}$, $l < \omega$, $c_l = \theta(c_i)$ then $a_m^0 \cap Q_{\alpha_l}(M_{\alpha_l}) = a_m^1 \cap Q_{\alpha_l}(M_{\alpha_l})$
- $P(6)$ if $c_j = \theta(c_k) j \neq k < \omega$, then $\langle a_m^0 : m \leq n, a_m^0 \in P_{\delta+1} \rangle$ and $\langle a_m^1 : m \leq n, a_m^1 \in P_{\delta+1} \rangle$ generate corresponding finite Boolean algebras of subsets of $Q_{\alpha_k}(M_{\alpha_k})$ and $Q_{\alpha_j}(M_{\alpha_j})$ correspondingly; then the corresponding atoms in those algebras are both infinite, or have the same power.

It is easy to see that this can be done, and it is a winning strategy.

PART C. Here we define $M_{\delta+2}$.

Define equivalence relations $E_{\delta+1}, E_{\delta+1}^n$ on $P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1})$: if $A, B \in P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1})$, then $A, B \subseteq A^* = \bigcup_{n < \omega} Q_{\alpha_n}(M_{\alpha_n})$; define $AE_{\delta+1}^n B$ iff $A \cap [\bigcup_{\omega > m > n} Q_{\alpha_m}(M_{\alpha_m})] = B \cap [\bigcup_{\omega > m > n} Q_{\alpha_m}(M_{\alpha_m})]$; $AE_{\delta+1} B$ iff for some n $AE_{\delta+1}^n B$.

Clearly each $E_{\delta+1}^n$ is an equivalence relation, $E_{\delta+1}^n$ refines $E_{\delta+1}^{n+1}$, hence $E_{\delta+1}$ is an equivalence relation.

It is clear that

$$|P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1})| = \beth_{\delta+1}$$

but for every $n < \omega$, $A \in P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1})$

$$\begin{aligned} |\{B: B \in P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1}), BE_{\delta+1}^n A\}| &\leq |\mathcal{P}(\bigcup_{m \leq n} Q_{\alpha_m}(M_{\alpha_m}))| \\ &= 2^{\aleph_{\alpha_n}} = \aleph_{\alpha_{n+1}} \leq \aleph_{\delta} \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$|\{B: B \in P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1}), BE_{\delta+1} A\}| \leq \sum_{n < \omega} \aleph_{\delta} = \aleph_{\delta}.$$

So each $E_{\delta+1}$ -equivalence class has cardinality $\leq \aleph_{\delta}$, hence there are $\aleph_{\delta+1}$ $E_{\delta+1}$ -equivalence classes.

Define $M_{\delta+2}$:

$$|M_{\delta+2}| = |M_{\delta+1}| \cup Q_{\delta+2}(M_{\delta+2})$$

where

$$Q_{\delta+2}(M_{\delta+2}) = \{S: S \subseteq P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1}), A, B \in S, AE_{\delta+1}B \implies A \in S \longleftrightarrow B \in S\}.$$

Clearly $|Q_{\delta+2}(M_{\delta+2})| = \aleph_{\delta+2}$.

The relations of $M_{\delta+2}$ will be those of $M_{\delta+1}$, and $Q_{\delta+2}$, and

$$\varepsilon_{\delta+2}(M_{\delta+2}) = \{\langle A, S \rangle: A \in P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1}), S \in Q_{\delta+2}(M_{\delta+2}), A \in S\}.$$

It is easy to prove all conditions are satisfied as in Case II, if we notice that by Condition P (5) if for any instance of any game $EG(M_{\delta+1}, L, \theta)[\theta \in \Gamma(n_L)]$ in which player II plays his strategy, if a_n^i, a_n^{1-i} are chosen for some n and they belong to $P_{\delta+1}(M_{\delta+1})$ then they are $E_{\delta+1}$ -equivalent (as $\{n: \theta(c_n) \neq n\}$ is finite).

REFERENCES

1. A. Ehrenfeucht, *Application of games to completeness problem for formalized theories*, Fund. Math., **49** (1961), 129-141.
2. J. Malitz, *On the Hanf Number of Complete $L_{\omega_1, \omega}$ Sentences*; The syntax and semantics of infinitary languages, edited by J. Barwise, Lecture notes in Mathematics 72, Springer, Berlin.
3. M. Morley, *Omitting Classes of Elements*; *The Theory of Models*, Proc. of the 1962 Symp. in Berkeley, Editors J. Addison, L. Henkin, and A. Tarski, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1965, 265-273.

Received May 18, 1972.

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

EDITORS

RICHARD ARENS (Managing Editor)
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

J. DUGUNDJI*
Department of Mathematics
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California 90007

R. A. BEAUMONT
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98105

D. GILBARG AND J. MILGRAM
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

E. F. BECKENBACH

B. H. NEUMANN

F. WOLF

K. YOSHIDA

SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONS

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA
NEW MEXICO STATE UNIVERSITY
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
OSAKA UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
* * *
AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY
NAVAL WEAPONS CENTER

* C. R. DePrima California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91109, will replace J. Dugundji until August 1974.

Printed in Japan by International Academic Printing Co., Ltd., Tokyo, Japan

Gail Atneosen, <i>Sierpinski curves in finite 2-complexes</i>	1
Bruce Alan Barnes, <i>Representations of B^*-algebras on Banach spaces</i>	7
George Benke, <i>On the hypergroup structure of central $\Lambda(p)$ sets</i>	19
Carlos R. Borges, <i>Absolute extensor spaces: a correction and an answer</i>	29
Tim G. Brook, <i>Local limits and tripleability</i>	31
Philip Throop Church and James Timourian, <i>Real analytic open maps</i>	37
Timothy V. Fossum, <i>The center of a simple algebra</i>	43
Richard Freiman, <i>Homeomorphisms of long circles without periodic points</i>	47
B. E. Fullbright, <i>Intersectional properties of certain families of compact convex sets</i>	57
Harvey Charles Greenwald, <i>Lipschitz spaces on the surface of the unit sphere in Euclidean n-space</i>	63
Herbert Paul Halpern, <i>Open projections and Borel structures for C^*-algebras</i>	81
Frederic Timothy Howard, <i>The numer of multinomial coefficients divisible by a fixed power of a prime</i>	99
Lawrence Stanislaus Husch, Jr. and Ping-Fun Lam, <i>Homeomorphisms of manifolds with zero-dimensional sets of nonwandering points</i>	109
Joseph Edmund Kist, <i>Two characterizations of commutative Baer rings</i>	125
Lynn McLinden, <i>An extension of Fenchel's duality theorem to saddle functions and dual minimax problems</i>	135
Leo Sario and Cecilia Wang, <i>Counterexamples in the biharmonic classification of Riemannian 2-manifolds</i>	159
Saharon Shelah, <i>The Hanf number of omitting complete types</i>	163
Richard Staum, <i>The algebra of bounded continuous functions into a nonarchimedean field</i>	169
James DeWitt Stein, <i>Some aspects of automatic continuity</i>	187
Tommy Kay Teague, <i>On the Engel margin</i>	205
John Griggs Thompson, <i>Nonsolvable finite groups all of whose local subgroups are solvable, V</i>	215
Kung-Wei Yang, <i>Isomorphisms of group extensions</i>	299