

CHARACTERIZATION OF \mathcal{L}_κ^1

SIIRI KIVIMÄKI AND BOBAN VELIČKOVIĆ

ABSTRACT. The logic \mathcal{L}_κ^1 was introduced by Shelah in [3]. In [4], he proved that for a strongly compact cardinal κ , it admits the following algebraic characterization: two structures are \mathcal{L}_κ^1 -equivalent if and only if they have isomorphic iterated ultrapowers via κ -complete ultrafilters. We give presentation of the logic \mathcal{L}_κ^1 and a simplified and slightly modified proof of this result.

1. THE LOGIC \mathcal{L}_κ^1

The logic \mathcal{L}_κ^1 is defined through a variation of an Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game. The *states* of this game will be triples (α, f, π) , where α is an ordinal, π is a partial isomorphism, and f is a partition function which partitions some subset of the field of π into countably many pieces.

Definition (The game G_θ^β). Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be structures of same signature, let β be an ordinal and let θ be a cardinal. The game

$$G_\theta^\beta(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$$

is played as follows.

Starting state: The starting state is $(\beta, \emptyset, \emptyset)$.

Further states: Assume that the game is at state (α, f, π) .

- The player I chooses some ordinal $\alpha' < \alpha$ and some set $X \in \mathcal{A}^{\leq \theta} \cup \mathcal{B}^{\leq \theta}$.
- The player II chooses a partial partition function $f' : \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \omega$ such that $\text{dom}(f), X \subseteq \text{dom}(f')$ and such that for all $a \in \text{dom}(f)$,

$$f'(a) := f(a) \dot{-} 1.$$

Then she chooses a partial isomorphism $\pi' \supseteq \pi$ such that

$$f'^{-1}\{0\} \subseteq \text{fld}(\pi').$$

The next state is (α', f', π') .

The player to first break the rules loses.

Date: March 2023.

Let \equiv_θ^β be the transitive closure of the relation

The player II has a winning strategy in the game $G_\theta^\beta(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

A *logic* is a class function associating to each signature τ a collection of sentences and a satisfaction relation, satisfying certain regularity properties, see [1].

Definition (The logic \mathcal{L}_κ^1). Let τ be a signature.

- (1) A τ -sentence in \mathcal{L}_κ^1 is a class of τ_0 -structures which is closed under the relation \equiv_θ^β , for some $\tau_0 \in [\tau]^{<\kappa}$ and some $\beta, \theta < \kappa$.
- (2) The satisfaction relation of \mathcal{L}_κ^1 is defined as

$$\mathcal{M} \models \varphi \quad : \iff \quad \mathcal{M} \upharpoonright \tau_0 \in \varphi,$$

where τ_0 is the signature such that φ consists of τ_0 -structures.

Fact. For cardinals of the form $\kappa = \beth_\kappa$, the logic \mathcal{L}_κ^1 is a regular logic strictly between the logics $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\omega}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$.

Proof. See [3]. □

Notice that for any τ -structures \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} ,

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \mathcal{B} \iff \forall \tau_0 \in [\tau]^{<\kappa} \quad \forall \beta, \theta < \kappa \quad \mathcal{A} \upharpoonright \tau_0 \equiv_\theta^\beta \mathcal{B} \upharpoonright \tau_0.$$

Proposition 1.1 (The Union Lemma for \mathcal{L}_κ^1). Assume that $\kappa = \beth_\kappa$. Assume that $\bar{\mathcal{A}} = \{\mathcal{A}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ is an $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary chain of structures. Then, for each n ,

$$\mathcal{A}_n \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \bigcup \bar{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Proof. See [3]. □

2. ULTRAPOWERS AND \mathcal{L}_κ^1 -THEORIES

If \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter on a set I and \mathcal{A} is a structure, the ultrapower $\mathcal{A}^I/\mathcal{U}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{A}^\mathcal{U}$. If $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = (\mathcal{U}_n)_n$ is a sequence of ultrafilters on some sets and \mathcal{A} is a structure, the iterated ultrapower of \mathcal{A} along the ultrafilters $(\mathcal{U}_n)_n$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$. In other words, $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$ is the direct limit of the system

$$(\mathcal{A}_n, j_{m,n})_{m < n < \omega},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_0 &:= \mathcal{A} \\ \mathcal{A}_{n+1} &:= \mathcal{A}_n^{\mathcal{U}_n}, \end{aligned}$$

and the maps $j_{m,n} : \mathcal{A}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n$ are compositions of the ultrapower embeddings. In case the ultrafilters are κ -complete, we have:

Theorem (Łos). *If \mathcal{U} is a κ -complete ultrafilter on a set I and \mathcal{A} is a structure, then the ultrapower embedding*

$$\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{U}}, \quad a \mapsto [(a)_{i \in I}]_{\mathcal{U}}$$

is $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary.

By the Łos Theorem, thus, if the ultrafilters \mathcal{U}_n are κ -complete, then the maps $j_{m,n} : \mathcal{A}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n$ are $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary.

The direct limit $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$ comes together with embeddings

$$j_{n,\omega} : \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}},$$

which are first-order elementary but not more in general. In particular, the limit embeddings might fail to be $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary, even if the ultrafilters were κ -complete. In this case, they might even fail to be \mathcal{L}_κ^1 -elementary, but by the Proposition 1.1, they still preserve the \mathcal{L}_κ^1 -theory.

For instance, any ultrapower of a well-founded model by a κ -complete ultrafilter is again well-founded, since well-foundedness is expressible in the logic $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1\omega_1}$, and thus preserved under $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary embeddings (in case κ is uncountable). However, it is easy to produce an ill-founded model from a well-founded one by iterating the ultrapower construction ω many times, as will be done in the proof of characterization of \mathcal{L}_κ^1 .

Strongly compact cardinals. For cardinals $\lambda \geq \kappa$, denote

$$\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda) := \{x \subseteq \lambda : |x| < \kappa\}.$$

An ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$ is *fine* if it is κ -complete and for each $x \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$, it contains the cone

$$C_x := \{y \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda) : x \subseteq y\}.$$

A cardinal κ is λ -compact if there exists a fine ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$. A cardinal κ is *strongly compact* if it is λ -compact for every $\lambda \geq \kappa$. The λ -compact cardinals have the following covering property:

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that κ is a λ -compact cardinal and \mathcal{U} is a fine ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda)$. Assume that (H, \in) is a transitive model of ZFC^- closed under $< \kappa$ -sequences such that $\kappa, \lambda \in H$. For any set $Y \subseteq H^{\mathcal{U}}$ of size at most λ , there is a set $X \in H^{\mathcal{U}}$ such that*

$$Y \subseteq X \quad \text{and} \quad H^{\mathcal{U}} \models |X| < j(\kappa),$$

where $j : H \rightarrow H^{\mathcal{U}}$ is the ultrapower embedding.

Proof. Let $Y \subseteq H^{\mathcal{U}}$ be a set of size at most λ . We find a set $X \in H^{\mathcal{U}}$ which covers Y and for which

$$H^{\mathcal{U}} \models |X| < j(\kappa).$$

Say $Y = \{[f_i]_{\mathcal{U}} : i < \lambda\}$. Define the function $F : \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda) \rightarrow H$,

$$F(x) = \{f_i(x) : i \in x\}.$$

As H is closed under $< \kappa$ -sequences, this function F has indeed its range inside H , thus $[F]_{\mathcal{U}} \in H^{\mathcal{U}}$. Let $X := [F]_{\mathcal{U}}$.

By fineness we have $Y \subseteq X$: for each $i < \lambda$,

$$C_{\{i\}} \subseteq \{x : f_i(x) \in F(x)\} \in \mathcal{U}.$$

Also $H^{\mathcal{U}} \models |X| < e(\kappa)$: simply because

$$\{x : |F(x)| < \kappa\} = \mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda) \in \mathcal{U}.$$

□

3. PROOF OF THE CHARACTERIZATION

We now give a proof of the following theorem.

Theorem (Shelah, Theorem 1.5 in [4]). *Assume that κ is a strongly compact cardinal. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \mathcal{B}$.
- (2) *There is a sequence $\bar{\mathcal{U}} = (\mathcal{U}_n)_{n < \omega}$ of κ -complete ultrafilters such that*

$$\mathcal{A}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}} \cong \mathcal{B}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}.$$

Proof.

(1) \Rightarrow (2): Assume that $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \mathcal{B}$. For simplicity, assume that the signature τ of the models \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is relational and of size $< \kappa$, and the domains of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are disjoint. For simplicity again, assume that for all $\beta, \theta < \kappa$, the player II has a winning strategy in the game

$$G_\theta^\beta(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}).$$

We will build a countable sequence of ultrafilters $\bar{\mathcal{U}}$ such that the iterated ultrapowers $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\bar{\mathcal{U}}}$ are isomorphic.

Let μ be a regular cardinal large enough such that the models \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , κ , and all the winning strategies are in $H(\mu)$. For all $\beta, \theta < \kappa$, fix some winning strategy $\sigma_{\beta, \theta}$ for the player II in the game $G_\theta^\beta(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. Choose new unary predicate symbols A and B and a new binary function symbol σ . Define the structure

$$\mathcal{H} := (H(\mu), \epsilon, A^{\mathcal{H}}, B^{\mathcal{H}}, \sigma^{\mathcal{H}}, R^{\mathcal{H}})_{R \in \tau}$$

where

- $A^{\mathcal{H}} = \text{dom}(\mathcal{A})$
- $B^{\mathcal{H}} = \text{dom}(\mathcal{B})$

- $\sigma^{\mathcal{H}}(\beta, \theta) = \begin{cases} \sigma_{\beta, \theta}, & \text{if } \beta, \theta \in \kappa \\ \emptyset & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$
- For each symbol $R \in \tau$, $R^{\mathcal{H}} = R^{\mathcal{A}} \cup R^{\mathcal{B}}$.

We will now build structures $(\mathcal{H}_n)_n$, $(\mathcal{A}_n)_n$, $(\mathcal{B}_n)_n$, ultrafilters $(\mathcal{U}_n)_n$ and sets $(X_n)_n$, by recursion on ω .

Step 0: Let $\mathcal{H}_0 := \mathcal{H}$, $\mathcal{A}_0 := \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}_0 := \mathcal{B}$.

Step $n + 1$: Assume that \mathcal{H}_m , \mathcal{A}_m and \mathcal{B}_m have been defined for all $m \leq n$. For each $m \leq n$, denote

$$\lambda_m := |\mathcal{A}_m| + |\mathcal{B}_m| + \kappa.$$

Furthermore, assume that for all $m < n$, we have defined (using the fact that κ is strongly compact)

- A fine ultrafilter \mathcal{U}_m on the set $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda_m)$.
- Its corresponding ultrapower embedding

$$e_m : \mathcal{H}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_m^{\mathcal{U}_m} =: \mathcal{H}_{m+1}.$$

- A set $X_m \in \mathcal{H}_{m+1}$ such that the pointwise images $e_m[\mathcal{A}_m]$ and $e_m[\mathcal{B}_m]$ are subsets of X_m and

$$\mathcal{H}_{m+1} \models |X_m| < e_m(\kappa),$$

using the covering property of compact cardinals as in Lemma 2.1. We now define the ultrafilter \mathcal{U}_n , the model \mathcal{H}_{n+1} , an embedding e_n , the set X_n , and the models \mathcal{A}_{n+1} and \mathcal{B}_{n+1} .

- Let \mathcal{U}_n be any fine ultrafilter on $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\lambda_n)$. This is possible because κ is strongly compact.
- Let $\mathcal{H}_{n+1} := \mathcal{H}_n^{\mathcal{U}_n}$.
- Let $e_n : \mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ be the ultrapower embedding. Notice that this embedding is $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary and its critical point is κ .
- Let $X_n \in \mathcal{H}_{n+1}$ be a set such that

$$e_n[\mathcal{A}_n], e_n[\mathcal{B}_n] \subseteq X_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}_{n+1} \models |X_n| < e_n(\kappa).$$

This is possible by the covering properties of λ_n -compact cardinals, by Lemma 2.1.

- Finally, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{n+1} &:= \mathcal{A}_n^{\mathcal{U}_n} \\ \mathcal{B}_{n+1} &:= \mathcal{B}_n^{\mathcal{U}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

We have the directed system

$$(\mathcal{H}_n, e_{m,n})_{m < n < \omega},$$

where each $e_{m,n} : \mathcal{H}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_n$ is an $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary embedding, obtained by composing the ultrapower embeddings. Let $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}$ be the direct limit of this system.

The restricted maps

$$\begin{aligned} e_{m,n}^A &:= e_{m,n} \upharpoonright \mathcal{A}_m : \mathcal{A}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_n \\ e_{m,n}^B &:= e_{m,n} \upharpoonright \mathcal{B}_m : \mathcal{B}_m \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_n, \end{aligned}$$

are also $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary. We get the directed systems

$$\left(\mathcal{A}_n, e_{m,n}^A\right)_{m < n < \omega} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\mathcal{B}_n, e_{m,n}^B\right)_{m < n < \omega},$$

and we can take the direct limits of these systems, denote them by $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{u}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\bar{u}}$, respectively.

We have the first-order elementary limit embeddings:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{n,\omega} &: \mathcal{H}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}} \\ e_{n,\omega}^A &: \mathcal{A}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\bar{u}} \\ e_{n,\omega}^B &: \mathcal{B}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{\bar{u}}. \end{aligned}$$

Claim. *The models $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{u}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\bar{u}}$ are isomorphic.*

Proof of Claim. Notice first that for each n , the n th iterates \mathcal{A}_n and \mathcal{B}_n are isomorphic to the structures $A^{\mathcal{H}_n}$ and $B^{\mathcal{H}_n}$, respectively. Thus also

$$\mathcal{A}^{\bar{u}} \cong A^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{B}^{\bar{u}} \cong B^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}}.$$

It is thus enough to show that $A^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}}$ and $B^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}}$ are isomorphic.

By the first-order elementarity of the map $e_{0,\omega}$,

$$\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}} \models \text{''}\forall \beta, \theta < e_{0,\omega}(\kappa) \quad \sigma^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}}(\beta, \theta) \text{ is a winning strategy for the player II in the game } G_{\theta}^{\beta}(A^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}}, B^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}})\text{''}.$$

We now fix some parameters β and θ below $e_{0,\omega}(\kappa)$ in order to consider the game $G_{\theta}^{\beta}(A^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}}, B^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}})$, computed in $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}$.

Let $\beta := e_{1,\omega}(\kappa)$ and for each n , denote

$$\beta_n := e_{n+2,\omega}(\kappa).$$

The sequence $(\beta_n)_n$ is a descending sequence of ordinals of $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}$ below β .

For each n , denote

$$\bar{X}_n := e_{n+1,\omega}(X_n).$$

By construction, the sets $(\bar{X}_n)_n$ cover the domains of the models $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{u}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\bar{u}}$. Let

$$\theta := \max\{|\bar{X}_n|^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{u}}}, \beta\}.$$

Both β and θ are below $e_{0,\omega}(\kappa)$, and each \bar{X}_n has size $\leq \theta$ in $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{U}}$.

Then we describe a play of the player I in the game $G_\theta^\beta(\mathcal{A}^{\bar{U}}, \mathcal{B}^{\bar{U}})$:

- At the $(2n+1)$ th step, he plays the ordinal β_{2n+1} and the set $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{U}} \cap \bar{X}_{2n+1}$.
- At the $(2n+2)$ th step, he plays the ordinal β_{2n+2} and the set $\mathcal{B}^{\bar{U}} \cap \bar{X}_{2n+2}$.

Every finite initial segment of this play is as an element in the model $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{U}}$. Hence, the player II must be able to win against this play; otherwise, there would be some finite play of the player I which the player II loses and this would contradict the fact that in the model $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{U}}$, the player II has a winning strategy in the game $G_\theta^\beta(\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{U}}}, \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{U}}})$.

She can thus win, and eventually, after ω many steps, she will have produced a chain of partial isomorphisms $(\pi_n)_n$ such that

$$\bigcup_n \pi_n : \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{U}}} \cong \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{H}^{\bar{U}}}.$$

This ends the proof of the Claim. □

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Assume that $\bar{U} = (\mathcal{U}_n)_n$ are κ -complete ultrafilters, each \mathcal{U}_n on some set I_n , and $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{U}} \cong \mathcal{B}^{\bar{U}}$. We show that $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \mathcal{B}$.

Denote

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{A}_0 := \mathcal{A} \\ \mathcal{A}_{n+1} := \mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{U}_n} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_0 := \mathcal{B} \\ \mathcal{B}_{n+1} := \mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{U}_n}. \end{cases}$$

Without loss of generality we may identify each \mathcal{A}_n with its image under the embedding into the direct limit and get that for each n ,

$$\mathcal{A}_n \preceq_{\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}} \mathcal{A}_{n+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}^{\bar{U}} \cong \bigcup_n \mathcal{A}_n.$$

and similarly for the models \mathcal{B}_n . The chains $(\mathcal{A}_n)_n$ and $(\mathcal{B}_n)_n$ are thus $\mathcal{L}_{\kappa\kappa}$ -elementary, and by the Union Lemma 1.1,

$$\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \mathcal{A}^{\bar{U}} \cong \mathcal{B}^{\bar{U}} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \mathcal{B}.$$

This shows that, indeed, $\mathcal{A} \equiv_{\mathcal{L}_\kappa^1} \mathcal{B}$, as wanted. □

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Barwise and S. Feferman. *Model-Theoretic Logics*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- [2] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite: large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
- [3] Saharon Shelah. Nice infinitary logics. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 25(2):395–427, 2012.

- [4] Saharon Shelah. Isomorphic limit ultrapowers for infinitary logic. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 246(1):21–46, 2021.

(S. Kivimäki) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI, FINLAND

Email address: `siiri.kivimaki@helsinki.fi`

(B. Veličković) INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE JUSSIEU - PARIS RIVE GAUCHE (IMJ-PRG), UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ, BÂTIMENT SOPHIE GERMAIN, 8 PLACE AURÉLIE NEMOURS, 75013 PARIS, FRANCE

Email address: `boban@math.univ-paris-diderot.fr`

URL: <http://www.logique.jussieu.fr/~boban/>