

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 14, 2019

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 [5, Sect. 4], a more direct proof of this implication, attributed to Fefferman and Stavi (independently), is presented. This same proof is essentially repeated by Simpson [4, 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 $\text{Def}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(M)$, 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 this, they consider a specific infinite set $Y \subseteq \omega$ and then show that it is Σ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$. However, their purported Π_1^1 -definition of Y does not work as it actually defines the set $Y \cup (M \setminus \omega)$. Smoryński makes a similar error in his explicit claim [5, 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

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

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, each $\varphi_n(x)$ defining a subset $A_n \subseteq M$, such that $A = \bigcup_{n < \omega} A_n$. (For such a sequence to be recursive, it is necessary that there is a finite set $F \subseteq M$ such that any parameter occurring in any $\varphi_n(x)$ is in F .) For example, in every nonstandard $\mathcal{M} \models \text{PA}$, the standard cut ω is recursively σ -definable.

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 $\varphi_n(x)$ be the formula asserting: there is a Σ_n -definable subset X such that $\theta(x, X)$. Then $\langle \varphi_n(x) : n < \omega \rangle$ is recursive and shows that 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

THEOREM 2: *Every completion T of PA has a nonstandard, finitely generated (so not recursively saturated) model \mathcal{M} such that ω is not Δ_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$.*

Proof. Let T be a completion. According to [3, Corollary 2.8], there is a finitely generated $\mathcal{M} \models T$ such that, in the terminology of [3], ω is not recursively definable. Clearly, $M \setminus \omega$ is not recursively σ -definable. By Lemma 1(a), ω is not Π_1^1 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \text{Def}(\mathcal{M}))$. \square

THEOREM 3: *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 not definable from a by a Σ_n formula. Thus, $\langle d_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is a strictly increasing, unbounded sequence. Let $D = \{d_n : n < \omega\}$. 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], we can assume that each $\varphi_n(x)$ defines an interval $[a_n, b_n]$, where $a_n < a_{n+1} < b_{n+1} < b_n$. 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 [4, Lemma VII.6.6(1)]. Apparently, when Barwise and Schlipf were writing [1], they were unaware of this, but by the time Smoryński wrote [5], this became well known, as he describes as “evident” that $\Sigma_1^1\text{-AC}_0$ implies $\Delta_1^1\text{-CA}_0$.

Barwise and Schlipf go out of their way to 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 $(2) \implies (1)$.

It is rather ironic that the impression one gets from reading [1] is that $(1) \implies (3)$ is the deep direction of the Theorem, whereas $(2) \implies (1)$ is the straightforward one. In retrospect, the exact opposite is the case: the hard direction is $(2) \implies (1)$ while $(1) \implies (3)$ is fairly routine.

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.

- [4] Stephen G. Simpson, *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*, Perspectives in Mathematical Logic, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.
- [5] C. Smoryński, Recursively saturated nonstandard models of arithmetic, *J. Symbolic Logic* **46** (1981), 259–286.