

The Barwise-Schlipf Theorem

Ali Enayat¹ and James H. Schmerl²

¹University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

`ali.enayat@gu.se`

²University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269, USA

`james.schmerl@uconn.edu`

November 24, 2021

Abstract

In 1975 Barwise and Schlipf published a landmark paper whose main theorem asserts that a nonstandard model \mathcal{M} of PA (Peano arithmetic) is recursively saturated iff \mathcal{M} has an expansion that satisfies the subsystem $\Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ of second order arithmetic. In this paper we identify a crucial error in the Barwise-Schlipf proof of the right-to-left direction of the theorem, and additionally, we offer a correct proof of the problematic direction.

In their seminal paper [1], Barwise and Schlipf initiated the study of recursively saturated models of PA with the following theorem.

THEOREM: (Barwise-Schlipf [1]) *If $\mathcal{M} \models \text{PA}$ is nonstandard, then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{M} is recursively saturated.
- (2) There is \mathfrak{X} such that $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \models \Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$.
- (3) $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M})) \models \Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0 + \Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0$.

Their proof of (1) \implies (3) ([1, Theorem 2.2]) uses Admissible Set Theory. In a reprise of this theorem by Smoryński [6, Sect. 4], a more direct proof of this implication, attributed to Feferman and Stavi (independently), is presented. This same proof is essentially repeated by Simpson [5, Lemma IX.4.3]. The implication (3) \implies (2) is trivial. In the proof of the remaining implication (2) \implies (1), it is claimed [1, Theorem 3.1] that if \mathcal{M} is nonstandard and not recursively saturated and $\text{Def}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, then $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \not\models \Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ because the standard cut ω is Δ_1^1 -definable¹ in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$. To prove

We are grateful to Roman Kossak and Mateusz eyk for their help in improving our exposition.

¹All usages of *definable* in this paper should be understood as *definable with parameters*.

that, they let $\Phi = \{\varphi_n(x) : n < \omega\}$ be a finitely realizable type that is not realized in \mathcal{M} , where $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ is a recursive sequence (with the understanding that there is a finite set $F \subseteq M$ such that any parameter occurring in any $\varphi_n(x)$ is in F). Then they let $Y = \{a_m : m < \omega\}$, where a_m is the least $n < \omega$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models \neg \varphi_n(m)$. Their Σ_1^1 -definition of Y is correct, but their purported Π_1^1 -definition of Y does not work since it defines the set $Y \cup (M \setminus \omega)$. Murawski's exposition of the Barwise-Schlipf theorem [4] suffers from the same gap. Smoryński makes a similar error in his explicit claim [6, Lemma 4.2] that if \mathcal{M} is nonstandard and not recursively saturated and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \models \text{ACA}_0$, then ω is Δ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$. We will show in Theorem 2 that this approach is doomed since there are nonstandard models \mathcal{M} that are not recursively saturated even though ω is not Δ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$. Nevertheless, we are still able to give a proof (see Theorem 3) of $(2) \implies (1)$.

Suppose that $\mathcal{M} \models \text{PA}$ and $A \subseteq M$. Then, A is **recursively σ -definable** if there is a recursive sequence $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ of formulas (where for some finite set $F \subseteq M$ any parameter occurring in any $\varphi_n(x)$ is in F) such that each $\varphi_n(x)$ defines a subset $A_n \subseteq M$, with $A = \bigcup_{n < \omega} A_n$. For example, the standard cut ω is recursively σ -definable, and so is any finitely generated submodel of \mathcal{M} .

LEMMA 1: *Suppose that $\mathcal{M} \models \text{PA}$ and $A \subseteq M$.*

- (a) *If A is Σ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$, then A is recursively σ -definable.*
- (b) *If \mathcal{M} is not recursively saturated, $\text{Def}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M)$ and A is recursively σ -definable, then A is Σ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$.*

Proof. (a) Suppose that A is Σ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$ by the formula $\exists X \theta(x, X)$. Let $\langle \psi_n(x, y) : n < \omega \rangle$ be an enumeration of all formulas in exactly two free variables, and let $\varphi_n(x, y) = \theta(x, \{u : \psi_n(u, y)\})$, i.e., $\varphi_n(x, y)$ is the result of substituting every occurrence of subformulas of $\theta(x, X)$ of the form $t \in X$ (where t is a term) with $\varphi(t, y)$ (and re-naming variables to avoid unintended clashes). Then $\langle \exists y \varphi_n(x, y) : n < \omega \rangle$ is recursive, each formula $\exists y \varphi_n(x, y)$ defines a subset A_n of A , and $A = \bigcup_{n < \omega} A_n$. Hence A is recursively σ -definable.

(b) Let $\text{Sat}(x, X)$ be a formula asserting that X is a satisfaction class for all formulas of length at most x . Let A be recursively σ -definable by the recursive sequence $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$. We can assume that $\ell(\varphi_n(x)) < \ell(\varphi_{n+1}(x))$ for all $n < \omega$, where $\ell(\varphi(x))$ is the length of $\varphi(x)$ (by replacing $\varphi_n(x)$ with $\bigvee_{i \leq n} \varphi_i(x)$). The sequence $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ is coded in \mathcal{M} , so let $d \in M$ be nonstandard such that $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < d \rangle$ extends $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ and $\ell(\varphi_n(x))$ is standard iff n is. Then A is Σ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$ by the formula $\exists X \theta(x, X)$, where

$$\theta(x, X) = \exists z [\text{Sat}(z, X) \wedge \exists n < d (\ell(\varphi_n) \leq z \wedge \langle \varphi_n, x \rangle \in X)].$$

Thus, A is Σ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$. The same definition works in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$. \square

According to a definition in [3, Notation 2.1(b)], the standard cut ω is said to be *recursively definable* in a model \mathcal{M} of PA if there is a recursive type $\Sigma(x)$ that is finitely realizable in \mathcal{M} , and which has the property that for every elementary extension \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} that has an element b realizing $\Sigma(x)$, b fills the standard cut of \mathcal{M} , i.e., b is a nonstandard element of \mathcal{N} that is below all nonstandard elements of \mathcal{M} .

LEMMA 2: *If ω is not recursively definable in M , then ω is not Π_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$.*

Proof. If ω is not recursively definable in \mathcal{M} , then $M \setminus \omega$ is not recursively σ -definable. Thus by Lemma 1(a), ω is not Π_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$. \square

THEOREM 3: *Every consistent completion T of PA has a countable nonstandard model \mathcal{M} that is not recursively saturated and such that ω is not Δ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$. Moreover, \mathcal{M} can be arranged to be finitely generated.*

Proof. By Lemma 2, the proof of the first assertion of Theorem 2 is complete once we exhibit a nonstandard model \mathcal{M} of PA that is not recursively saturated, and in which ω is not recursively definable. Recall that a model \mathcal{M} of PA is *short recursively saturated* if \mathcal{M} realizes every recursive *short* type over \mathcal{M} , i.e., recursive types that include a formula of the form $x < m$ for some $m \in M$. It can be readily verified that ω is not recursively definable in any short recursively saturated model. On the other hand, given a completion T of PA, it is routine to construct a nonstandard model \mathcal{M} of T that is short recursively saturated but not saturated since if \mathcal{N} is a recursively saturated model of T , and $\mathcal{N}_0 \prec \mathcal{N}$ is nonstandard and finitely generated, then we can choose \mathcal{M} to be the submodel of \mathcal{N} consisting all those $b \in N$ that are less than some $a \in N_0$. This makes it evident that T has a countable nonstandard model that is not recursively saturated and such that ω is not Δ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$. Finally, in order to establish the moreover clause, we note that according to [3, Corollary 2.8] every consistent completion T of PA has a finitely generated $\mathcal{M} \models T$ such that ω is not recursively definable in \mathcal{M} . So by Lemma 2 we are done. \square

THEOREM 4: *If \mathcal{M} is nonstandard and $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \models \Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$, then \mathcal{M} is recursively saturated.*

Proof. We will show that if \mathcal{M} is nonstandard and not recursively saturated and $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M)$, then $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \not\models \Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. We can assume that $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \models \text{ACA}_0$. There are two cases depending on whether \mathcal{M} is short or tall.

\mathcal{M} is short: Let $a \in M$ be such that the elementary submodel of \mathcal{M} generated by a is cofinal in \mathcal{M} . Let $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ be a recursive sequence of formulas (with a as the only parameter) such that $\varphi_n(x)$ defines $d_n \in M$, where d_n is the least element x above all elements that are definable from a by a formula of length at most n . Let $D = \{d_n : n < \omega\}$. D is unbounded in \mathcal{M} and $d_n \leq d_{n+1}$ for all $n < \omega$. Since

$(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \models \text{ACA}_0$, then $D \notin \mathfrak{X}$ as otherwise $\omega \in \mathfrak{X}$. Clearly, D is recursively σ -definable; its complement also is (using the recursive sequence $\langle \psi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$, where $\psi_0(x)$ is $x < d_0$ and $\psi_{n+1}(x)$ is $d_n < x < d_{n+1}$). By Lemma 1(b), D is Δ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$.

\mathcal{M} is tall: Since \mathcal{M} is tall and not recursively saturated, there is a recursive sequence $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ of formulas, among which is a formula $x < b$, that is finitely realizable in \mathcal{M} but not realizable in \mathcal{M} . According to [2, Lemma 2.4]², we can assume that each $\varphi_n(x)$ defines an interval $[a_n, b_n]$, where $a_n \leq a_{n+1} \leq b_{n+1} \leq b_n$. Then, the cut $I = \sup\{a_n : n < \omega\} = \inf\{b_n : n < \omega\}$, so both I and its complement are recursively σ -definable. Lemma 1 implies I is Δ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$. Since $I \notin \mathfrak{X}$, then $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X}) \not\models \Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$. \square

We conclude with several remarks concerning the Theorem.

It is well known that $\Sigma_k^1\text{-AC}_0$ implies $\Delta_k^1\text{-CA}_0$ for all $k < \omega$. An easy proof can be found in [5, Lemma VII.6.6(1)].

Barwise and Schlipf point out [1, Remark, p. 52] that their (erroneous) proof of (2) \implies (1) shows the slightly stronger implication in which $\Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$ is replaced by its counterpart $\Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0^-$ in which there are no set parameters. The same is true of our proof of (2) \implies (1).

The impression one might get from reading [1] is that (1) \implies (3) is the deep direction of the Theorem (since it relies on the technology of admissible sets), and (2) \implies (1) is the fairly straightforward one. Now, prospering from a 45 year hindsight, one can say that the exact opposite is the case: the hard direction is (2) \implies (1) while (1) \implies (3) can be handled by a short proof based on first principles.

References

- [1] Jon Barwise and John Schlipf, On recursively saturated models of arithmetic, in: *Model theory and algebra (A memorial tribute to Abraham Robinson)*, Lecture Notes in Math., **498**, pp. 42–55, Springer, Berlin, 1975.
- [2] Matt Kaufmann and James H. Schmerl, Saturation and simple extensions of models of Peano arithmetic, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* **27** (1984), 109–136.
- [3] Matt Kaufmann and James H. Schmerl, Remarks on weak notions of saturation in models of Peano arithmetic, *J. Symbolic Logic* **52** (1987), 129–148.

²More explicitly, Lemma 2.4 of [2] directly implies that if $\Sigma(x, \bar{a})$ is a recursive finitely realizable type over a model \mathcal{M} , and $\Sigma(x, \bar{a})$ includes $\{x < a_0\}$, then there is a finitely realizable recursive type $\Gamma(x, \bar{a}, d)$, where d can be chosen to be any nonstandard element of \mathcal{M} , such that: (1) If \mathcal{M} does not realize $\Sigma(x, \bar{a})$, then \mathcal{M} does not realize $\Gamma(x, \bar{a}, d)$; (2) $\Gamma(x, \bar{a}, d)$ consists of formula of the form $s_n(\bar{a}, d) \leq x \leq t_n(\bar{a}, d)$, where both sequences $\langle s_n(\bar{a}, y) : n < \omega \rangle$ and $\langle t_n(\bar{a}, y) : n < \omega \rangle$ are recursive, and for all $n < \omega$, $\mathcal{M} \models s_n(\bar{a}, d) \leq s_{n+1}(\bar{a}, d) \leq t_{n+1}(\bar{a}, d) \leq t_n(\bar{a}, d)$.

- [4] Roman Murawski, On expandability of models of Peano arithmetic I, *Studia Logica*, **35** (1976) 409–419.
- [5] Stephen G. Simpson, *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [6] Craig Smoryński, Recursively saturated nonstandard models of arithmetic, *J. Symbolic Logic* **46** (1981), 259–286.