PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 36, No. 3, 1971

ON THE NUMBER OF NON-ALMOST ISOMORPHIC MODELS OF T IN A POWER

SAHARON SHELAH

Let T be a first order theory. Two models are almost isomorphic if they are elementarily equivalent in the language $L_{\infty,\omega}$. We investigate the number of non almost-isomorphic models of T of power λ as a function of λ, $I(T, \lambda)$. We prove $\mu > \lambda \geqq |T|$, $I(T, \lambda) \leqq \lambda$ implies $I(T, \mu) \leqq I(T, \lambda)$. In fact, we generalize the downward Skolem-Lowenheim theorem for infinitary languages. Th. (1, 4, 5).

Let L be a set of predicates with finite number of places and sufficient number of variables. (We assume there are no function symbols in L for simplicity only.) $|L|$ will denote the number of predicates in L plus $\aleph_0$. Models will be denoted by M, N. The set of elements of M will be $|M|$, the cardinality of a set A by $|A|$ and so the cardinality of M by $||M||$. Unless specified otherwise, every model is an L-model. Cardinals will be denoted by $\lambda, \mu, \kappa, \chi$ ordinals i, j, α, β. T will denote a theory, i.e., set of sentences. We define $\mu^{(\lambda)} = \sum_{\kappa<\lambda} \mu^{\kappa}$. For cardinals λ, μ we define the language $L(\lambda, \mu)$ i.e., a set of formulas. This set is defined as the well known first-order language where we adjoin to its operations conjunction and disjunction on a set of $<\lambda$ formulas (i.e., $\bigwedge_{i \in I} \phi_i$, where $|I| < \lambda$) and existential or universal quantifications over a sequence of $<\mu$ variables. $L^*(\lambda, \mu)$ will be defined as $L(\lambda, \mu)$ where in addition we permit quantification of the form

$$[\forall \bar{x}^1)(\exists \bar{y}^1) \cdots (\forall \bar{x}^n)(\exists \bar{y}^n) \cdots]_{n<\omega}$$

if

$$|\{x_0^1, x_1^1, \cdots, y_0^1, y_1^1, \cdots, x_0^n \cdots\}| < \mu .$$

$RL^*(\lambda, \mu)$ will denote the subset of $L^*(\lambda, \mu)$ consisting of the formulas Φ of $L^*(\lambda, \mu)$ such that for every subformula ϕ of Φ, if $\phi = [(\forall \bar{x}^1)(\exists \bar{y}^1) \cdots]\psi$, then $\models \phi \leftrightarrow \neg[(\exists \bar{x}^1)(\forall \bar{y}^1) \cdots] \neg \psi$. Clearly $RL^*(\lambda, \mu) \supset L(\lambda, \mu)$. K will denote any of those languages. Satisfaction (i.e., if $\phi = \phi(\bar{x})$, and $\bar{a}$ is a sequence from $|M|$, then $M \models \phi[\bar{a}]$) is defined naturally. (See Hanf [2] and Henkin [3].) The only nontotally trivial case is

$$\psi(\bar{z}) = [(\forall \bar{x}^0)(\exists \bar{y}^0)(\forall \bar{x}^1)(\exists \bar{y}^1) \cdots]\phi(\bar{z}, \bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^1, \cdots, \bar{y}^0, \bar{y}^1 \cdots) .$$

$M \models \psi[\bar{a}]$ if and only if there are functions $f_i^n(\bar{x}^0, \cdots, \bar{x}^n)$ such that for every sequence $\bar{a}^0, \bar{a}^1, \cdots$ from M, $M \models \phi[\bar{a}, \bar{a}^0, \bar{a}^1, \cdots, \bar{b}^0, \bar{b}^1, \cdots]$ where $\bar{b}^n = \langle \cdots, f_i^n(\bar{a}^0, \bar{a}^1, \cdots, \bar{a}^n), \cdots \rangle$. For a sentence ψ, $\models \psi$ if for every M, $M \models \psi$. (Such languages were first defined in Henkin [3].)

If Γ is a set of formulas (for example one of the languages defined above), M is a Γ elementary submodel of N, if the set of elements of M, $|M|$ is included in the set of elements of N, $|N|$, and for every formula $\phi(\bar{x})$, $\phi(\bar{x}) \in \Gamma$, and sequence $\bar{a}$ from $|M|$, $M \models \phi[\bar{a}]$ if and only if $N \models \phi[\bar{a}]$, M, N are Γ-elementarily equivalent if for every sentence $\phi \in \Gamma$, $M \models \phi$ if and only if $N \models \phi$.

THEOREM 1. *Let $\lambda > \mu$, λ regular and T be a theory in $RL^*(\lambda, \mu)$ [i.e., $T \subset RL^*(\lambda, \mu)$] and Γ be the set of subformulas of the formulas in T. Then for every model M we can add $< \lambda + |T|^+$ functions of $< \mu$ places such that: If $A \subset M$, and A is closed under those functions, then there exists a Γ-elementary submodel N of M, $|N| = A$. So if $\kappa \geqq \lambda + |T|$ (or $\kappa \geqq$ the number of those functions) and $\kappa^{(\mu)} = \kappa$, and T has a model of power $\geqq \kappa$, then T has a model of power κ.*

Proof. This theorem is proved in [9], and is a straight-forward generalization of a theorem of Hanf in [2].

DEFINITION 1.

$$L(\infty, \mu) = \bigcup_{\lambda} L(\lambda, \mu),\ L^*(\infty, \mu) = \bigcup_{\lambda} L^*(\lambda, \mu),$$
$$RL^*(\infty, \mu) = \bigcup_{\lambda} RL^*(\lambda, \mu)\ .$$

DEFINITION 2. (1) M and N are μ-almost isomorphic, $M \sim_{\mu} N$ if M, N are $L(\infty, \mu)$-elementarily equivalent. We say M and N are almost isomorphic if $M \sim_{\aleph_0} N$, and we write $M \sim N$.

(2) $I(T, \lambda, \mu)$, is the number of non-μ-almost-isomorphic models of T of power λ. We assume always λ is $\geqq$ then $|T|$.

See footnote 1.

THEOREM 2. *If T is a theory in $RL^*(\lambda, \mu)$, $\mu = \aleph_0$ or $\mu = \mu_1^+$, $\kappa \geq \chi = \chi^{(\mu)} + \lambda + |T|$ and $I(T, \chi, \mu) \leqq \chi$ then $I(T, \kappa, \mu) \leqq I(T, \chi, \mu)$.*

The proof is broken into a series of lemmas.

REMARKS. (1) It is not hard to show that if $T \subset L(\lambda, \aleph_0)$, $I(T, \chi, \aleph_0) \leqq \chi$, then for every $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 \geqq \beth_{(2^{\lambda+\chi})^+}$, $I(T, \kappa_1, \aleph_0) = I(T, \kappa_2, \aleph_0)$. (See Makkai [7] and Eklof [15].)

[1] The results here appear in the notices [10] Th. 5 [11] Th. 3. The lemma has other uses: see [12] Th. 2.5 and Remark (4): in [11] their consequences are better formulated. In Th. 2 we can replace $T \subset RT^*(\lambda, \mu)$ by $T \subset RL^*(\lambda^+, \mu)$ and similarly in other cases.

(2) Let $\lambda = \mu = \aleph_0$ and suppose $|T| \leqq \kappa_0$. Then as the class of such theories is a set, there is a number $\kappa = HAI_{\kappa_0}$ (Hanf number of almost isomorphism) such that: for all T, $|T| \leqq \kappa_0$, $I(T, \kappa, \aleph_0) \leqq \kappa$ if and only if there is a χ, $I(T, \chi, \aleph_0) \leqq \chi$, and κ is the first such cardinality. (The existence of such numbers for a wide class of cases was proved by Hanf in [2].)

Question 1. What is HAI_{κ_0}? (Clearly if $\lambda \to (\kappa_0^+)^{<\omega}_{2^{\kappa_0}}$ then $HAI_{\kappa_0} < \lambda$).

(3) It is known that $M \sim N$, $\aleph_0 = \|M\| = \|N\|$ implies that M, N are isomorphic (see Scott [8]).

(4) Ehrenfeucht in [1] defined a model to be rigid if it has no nontrivial automorphisms and tried to investigate what can be the class of cardinals in which a certain theory has a rigid model. He gives some examples, but does not prove any theorem of the form: If T has a rigid model of one power, then it has a rigid model in another power.

DEFINITION. M is μ-rigid if there do not exist two different sequences of length $<\mu$, $\bar{a}$, $\bar{b}$, such that $(M, \bar{a}) \sim_\mu (M, \bar{b})$. ($(M, \bar{a})$ is the model M when we adjoin the a's as individual constants.) See footnote 2. Clearly

THEOREM. *If $\mu < \lambda$, and M is μ-rigid, then it is λ-rigid and also rigid. By a proof similar to that of Theorem 2, we can prove:*

THEOREM. *If a first-order theory T has a μ-rigid model of power λ, $|T| + \aleph_0 \leqq \kappa = \kappa^{(\mu)} \leqq \lambda$, $\mu = \mu_1^+$ or $\mu = \aleph_0$, then T has a μ-rigid model of power κ.*

Proof of Theorem 2.

DEFINITION 3. (1) Let L_1 be L where we adjoin to it one two-place predicate E and variables $y, y_0, y_1, \cdots$ we assume $E, y, y_0 \cdots \neq L$. We shall write xEy instead $E(x, y)$.

(2) If $R \in L$ then R^M will denote the relation of M corresponding to R.

(3) Let $\{M_i: i \in I\}$ be a set of L-models and we define their sum $N = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$, (or $\bigoplus\{M_i: i \in I\}$). For simplicity we assume that the sets $|M_i|$ are pairwise disjoint. N will be an L_1-model $|N| = \bigcup_{i \in I} |M_i|$, $R^N = \bigcup_{i \in I} R^{M_i}$ for every $R \in L$, and $E^N = \{\langle a, b\rangle: (\exists i)[a, b \in |M_i|]\}$.

(4) For every formula ϕ of any language, we define by induction

[2] Barwise [14] suggests a similar definition and argues its naturality.

$\bar{\phi}$: if ϕ is atomic $\bar{\phi} = \phi$; $\overline{\neg\phi} = \neg\bar{\phi}$, $\overline{\phi \vee \psi} = \bar{\phi} \vee \bar{\psi}$, (likewise for the other connectives), $\overline{\exists(\exists\bar{x})\phi} = (\exists\bar{x})[\bar{\phi} \wedge \bigwedge_i x_i E y]$, (where $\bar{x} = \langle \cdots x_i \cdots \rangle$) $\overline{(\forall\bar{x})\phi} = (\forall \bar{x})[\bigwedge_i x_i E y \rightarrow \bar{\phi}]$, and

$$\overline{[(\forall\bar{x}^1)(\exists\bar{y}^1)\cdots]\phi} = [(\forall\bar{x}^1)(\exists\bar{y}^1)\cdots](\bigwedge_{i,n} x_i^n E y \rightarrow \bar{\phi} \wedge \bigwedge_{i,n} y_i^n E y)$$

if the language contains such formulas. Clearly for any language K, $\phi \in K \Rightarrow \bar{\phi} \in K$. Also, if ϕ is a sentence $(\forall y)\bar{\phi}$ is a sentence.

(5) Define

$$\bar{T} = \{(\forall y)\bar{\phi}\colon \phi \in T\} \cup \{(\forall x) x E x,\ (\forall x_0 x_1 x_2)(x_0 E x_1 \wedge x_0 E x_2 \rightarrow x_1 E x_2)\}\ .$$

LEMMA 3. *Each M_i is an L-model of T if and only if $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ is an L_1-model of $\bar{T}$.*

Proof. Immediate

DEFINITION 4.

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_\alpha^n = \psi_\alpha^n(\bar{x}^0, \bar{x}^1, \cdots, \bar{x}^n, \bar{y}^0, \cdots, \bar{y}^n) = \bigwedge \{&R(x_{j_1}^{i_1}, \cdots, x_{j_k}^{i_k} \cdots) \\ &\leftrightarrow R(y_{j_1}^{i_1}, \cdots, y_{j_k}^{i_k} \cdots)\colon i_1, \cdots, i_k \cdots \in \{0, \cdots, n\}, \\ &R \in L, j_1, \cdots, j_k \cdots < \alpha\}\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\bar{x}^n = \langle \cdots x_i^n \cdots \rangle_{i<\alpha},\ \bar{y}^n = \langle \cdots y_i^n \cdots \rangle_{i<\alpha}\ .$$

Also let

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_\alpha^m = [\bigwedge_{\substack{i<\alpha \\ 2n<m}} x_i^{2n} E x \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{i<\alpha \\ 2n+1<m}} y_i^{2n+1} E y] \rightarrow [\bigwedge_{\substack{i<\alpha \\ 2n+1<m}} x_i^{2n+1} E x \wedge \bigwedge_{\substack{i<\alpha \\ 2n<m}} y_i^{2n} E y \\ \wedge \bigwedge_{n<m} \psi_\alpha^n(\bar{x}^0, \cdots, \bar{x}^n, \bar{y}^0, \cdots, \bar{y}^n)]\ :\end{aligned}$$

$$\phi_\alpha^\omega = \bigwedge_{m<\omega} \Phi_\alpha^m = \phi_\alpha^\omega(x, y, \bar{x}^0, \bar{y}^0, \bar{x}^1, \bar{y}^1, \cdots)\ .$$

For even n

$$\phi_\alpha^n = \phi_\alpha^n(x, y, \bar{x}^0, \bar{y}^0, \cdots, \bar{x}^{n-1}, \bar{y}^{n-1}) = [(\forall\bar{x}^n)(\exists\bar{y}^n)(\forall\bar{y}^{n+1})(\exists\bar{y}^{n+1})\cdots]\phi_\alpha^\omega\ .$$

For odd n

$$\phi_\alpha^n(x, y, \bar{x}^0, \bar{y}^0, \cdots, \bar{x}^{n-1}, \bar{y}^{n-1}) = [(\forall\bar{y}^n)(\exists\bar{x}^n)(\forall\bar{x}^{n+1})(\exists\bar{y}^{n+1})(\forall\bar{y}^{n+2})\cdots]\phi_\alpha^\omega\ .$$

LEMMA 4. *If*

$$a \in |M|,\ b \in |N|,\ M, N \in \{M_i\colon i \in I\},\ M^* = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i\ ,$$

and $\mu = \kappa^+$ or $\mu = \aleph_0$, and κ is finite, then $M \sim_\mu N$ if and only if $M^* \models \phi_\kappa^0[a, b]$.

REMARK. Keisler in [5] used sentences similar to ϕ_α^n. These sentences can be seen as asserting something about an appropriate game (between a player choosing $\bar{x}^0, y^1, x^2, \cdots$ and a player choosing $\bar{y}^0$, $\bar{x}^1, \cdots$). In this presentation a similar theorem appears in Karp [4].

Added in proof. See also Benda [13].

Proof.

Part A- Suppose $M \sim_\mu N$.

For every two sequences $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$ of elements of M, either there is a formula $\phi_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(\bar{x})$ of $L(\infty, \mu)$ such that $M \models \phi_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}[\bar{a}]$, $M \models \neg\, \phi_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}[\bar{b}]$, or there is no such ϕ and in this case, we let $\phi_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(\bar{x}) = (x_0 = x_0)$.

Let $\phi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x}) = \bigwedge_{\bar{b}} \phi_{\bar{a},\bar{b}}(\bar{x}) \in L(\infty, \mu)$. Let $\overline{\phi_{\bar{a}}(\bar{x})} = \phi'_{\bar{a}}(y, \bar{x})$. Let $\alpha < \mu$. We define the functions

$$f_i^{2n}(\bar{x}^0, \bar{y}^0, \bar{y}^1, \bar{x}^1, \bar{x}^2, \cdots, \bar{y}^{2n-1}, \bar{x}^{2n-1}, \bar{x}^{2n}) ,$$
$$f_i^{2n+1}(\bar{x}^0, \bar{y}^0, \bar{y}^1, \bar{x}^1, \bar{x}^2, \cdots, \bar{x}^{2n}, \bar{y}^{2n}, \bar{y}^{2n+1})$$

for $i < \alpha$ such that: If $\bar{a}^0, \bar{b}^0, \bar{a}^1, \bar{b}^1 \cdots$ are sequences of length α, $\bar{a}^{2n}$ a sequence of elements of M, and $\bar{b}^{2n+1}$ a sequence of elements of N, and for every n

$$\bar{b}^{2n} = \langle \cdots f_i^{2n}(\bar{a}^0, \bar{b}^0, \cdots, \bar{a}^{2n}) \cdots \rangle_{i<\alpha}$$
$$\bar{a}^{2n+1} = \langle \cdots f_i^{2n+1}(\bar{a}^0, \cdots, \bar{b}^{2n+1}) \cdots \rangle_{i<\alpha}$$

then $M^* \models \phi_\alpha^\omega[a, b, \bar{a}^0, \bar{b}^0, \cdots]$.

Suppose we have defined f_i^n for $n < 2m$, and let us define f_i^{2m} for $i < \alpha$. (f_i^{2m+1} are defined similarly.)

If for some $n < 2m$, $i < \alpha$ $b_i^n \notin |N|$, or for some $i < \alpha$, $n \leqq 2m$ $a_i^n \notin |M|$, then $f_i^{2m}(\bar{a}^0, \cdots, a^{2m})$ is defined as an arbitrary element of M^*. Also if there exists a formula $\psi(\bar{z}^1, \cdots, \bar{z}^n) \in L(\infty, \mu)$ such that

$$M \models \psi[\bar{a}^0, \bar{a}^1, \cdots, \bar{a}^{2m-1}] N \models \neg\, \psi[\bar{b}^0, \cdots, \bar{b}^{2m-1}] ,$$

we define $f_i^{2m}(\bar{a}^0 f^0 \cdots \bar{a}^{2m})$ arbitrarily.

So assume none of the previous cases occur. Define $\bar{a}[n] = \bar{a}^0 \frown \bar{a}^1 \frown \cdots \frown \bar{a}^n$ (the concatenation of $\bar{a}_1, \cdots, \bar{a}^n$) and $\bar{b}[n] = \bar{b}^0 \frown \cdots \frown \bar{b}^n$. Clearly

$$M \models (\forall \bar{x})(\phi_{\bar{a}[2m-1]}(\bar{x}) \rightarrow (\exists \bar{z})\phi_{\bar{a}[2m]}(\bar{x}, \bar{z})) .$$

As $M \sim_\mu N$, N also satisfies the above sentence; so there exists $\bar{b}^{2m}$ such that for every $\phi \in L(\infty, \mu)$, $M \models \phi[\bar{a}^0, \cdots, \bar{a}^{2m}]$ if and only if $N \models \phi[\bar{b}^0, \cdots, \bar{\phi}^{2m}]$. Let $f_i^{2m}(\bar{a}^0, \bar{b}^0, \cdots, \bar{a}^{2m}) = \bar{b}_i^{2m}$.

Clearly this shows that $M^* \models \phi^0_\alpha[a, b]$ for every $\alpha < \mu$, and in particular for κ.

Part B. We now assume that $M^* \models \phi^0_1[a, b]$, and $\mu = \aleph_0$. The proof in the case $\mu = \kappa^+$ or $1 < \kappa < \aleph_0$ is similar. For simplicity, we shall not distinguish between $\bar{a} = \langle a_0 \rangle$ and a_0.

Two sequences, $\bar{a}$ from M and $\bar{b}$ from N, of length n, $n < \omega$, will be called equivalent if $M^* \models \phi^n_1[a, b, \bar{a}, \bar{b}]$. If $n = 2m$, clearly for every $b^{n+1} \in |N|$ there exists $a^{n+1} \in |M|$ such that $\bar{a} \frown \langle a^{n+1} \rangle$ and $\bar{b} \frown \langle b^{n+1} \rangle$ are equivalent, and similarly for $n = 2m + 1$.

Let $\phi(\bar{x}) \in L(\infty, \mu)$, $\bar{x}$ a finite sequence of variables. We shall prove that if $\bar{a}$, $\bar{b}$ are equivalent then $M \models \phi[\bar{a}]$ if and only if $N \models \phi[\bar{b}]$. As subformulas of formulas with $< \aleph_0$ free variables have $< \aleph_0$ free variables we can prove it by induction. For atomic formulas it follows from the definition of ϕ^n_1. For $\neg \phi$, $\phi \vee \psi$, it is immediate, and so also for the other connectives. For quantification it follows by the fact mentioned above after the definition of equivalent sequences.

So we have proved that if $\bar{a}$, $\bar{b}$ are equivalent sequences, $\phi(\bar{x}) \in L(\infty, \mu)$, then $M \models \phi[\bar{a}]$ if and only if $N \models \phi[\bar{b}]$. Since the sequences of length zero from M and N are equivalent (by our hypotheses $M^* \models \phi^0_1(a, b)$), we get our conclusion that $M \sim N$. This proves Lemma 4.

LEMMA 5. $\phi^0_\alpha(x, y) \in RL^*(\infty, \mu)$. See footnote 3.

Proof. It is easily seen that the only thing we have to prove is:

$$\models [(\forall \bar{x}^0)(\exists \bar{y}^0)(\forall y^1)(\exists x^1) \cdots] \bigwedge_{n<\omega} \phi^n_\alpha \leftrightarrow \neg [(\exists \bar{x}^0)(\forall \bar{y}^0)(\exists \bar{y}^1)(\forall x^1) \cdots] \bigvee_{n<\omega} \neg \phi^n_\alpha .$$

For simplicity, let $\alpha = 1$.

It is not hard to see that if $M \models [(\forall x^0)(\exists y^0) \cdots] \bigwedge_{n<\omega} \phi^n_1$, then $M \models \neg [(\exists x^0)(\forall y^0) \cdots] \bigvee_{n<\omega} \neg \phi^n_1$. (See, for example, Keisler [6].)

So suppose $M \models \neg [(\exists \bar{x}^0)(\forall y^0) \cdots] \bigvee_{n<\omega} \neg \phi^n_1$. It is not hard to see that for every $n < \omega$, and formula ϕ

$$\models \neg [(\forall z_1)(\exists z_2)(\forall z_3) \cdots]\phi \leftrightarrow (\exists z_1) \neg [(\exists z_2)(\forall z_3) \cdots]\phi$$
$$\models (\exists z_1) \neg [(\exists z_2)(\forall z_3) \cdots]\phi \leftrightarrow (\exists z_1)(\forall z_2) \neg [(\forall z_3) \cdots]\phi , \qquad \text{etc.}$$

Now let us define functions $g_n(x^0, y^0, y^1, \cdots, x^i \cdots y^j \cdots)_{i,j<n}$. Let

$$\theta_n(x, y, x^0, y^0, x^1, y^1, \cdots, x^n, y^n) = \neg [\forall x^n)(\exists y^n)(\forall y^{n+1})(\exists x^{n+1}) \cdots] \bigvee_{n<\omega} \neg \phi^n_1 .$$

[3] This lemma is, in fact, a translation of a well known theorem from game theory.

(This is for even n, the definition for odd n is clear.) The functions will be such that if $a^0, \cdots, a^n \in |M|, b^0, \cdots, b^n \in |N|$, and for every $2m \leqq n b^{2m} = g_{2m}(a^0, b^0, \cdots)$, and for every $2m + 1 \leqq n a^{2m+1} = g_{2m+1}(a^0, b^0, \cdots)$; then $M^* \models \theta_n[a, b, a^0, b^0 \cdots]$. The definition is self-evident. Let $a^0 \cdots a^n \cdots \in |M|, b^0 \cdots b^n \cdots \in |N|$ be such that for every $2m b^{2m} = g_{2m}(a^0, b^0 \cdots)$ and for every $2m + 1\ a^{2m+1} = g_{2m+1}(a^0, b^0 \cdots)$ and let $n < \omega$. As $M^* \models \theta_{n+1}[a, b, a^0, b^0 \cdots a^n, b^n]$, clearly $M^* \models \phi_1^n(a, b, a^0, b^0 \cdots a^n, b^n)$.

So $M^* \models \bigwedge_{n<\omega} \phi_1^n(a, b, a^0, b^0, \cdots, a^n b^n)$, and hence $M^* \models \phi_1^\omega[a, b, a^0, b^0 \cdots]$. So $M^* \models \phi_1^0[a, b]$ (as this is true for every $a^0, b^1, a^2, b^3 \cdots$) and this is the desired conclusion.

LEMMA 6. *Let* $\mu = \kappa^+$ or $\mu = \aleph_0$, $\kappa = 1$, *T a theory in $RL^*(\lambda, \mu)$, $\chi = \chi^{(\mu)} + \lambda + |T|$, and $I(T, \chi, \mu) \leqq \chi$. Then for every model N of T of power $>\chi$, there exists a model M of T of power χ such that $M \sim_\mu N$.*

REMARK. This clearly proves Theorem 2.

Proof. Let $\{M_i: i \in I\}$ be a maximal set of non-μ-almost-isomorphic models of T of power χ, and let N be a model of T of power $>\chi$ such that for no $i \in I, N \sim_\mu M_i$.

Let $M^* = \bigoplus(\{N\}\{M_i: i \in I\})$. Clearly M^* is a model of $T_1 = \bar{T} \cup \{(\forall x, y)[\neg xEy \rightarrow \neg \phi_\kappa^0(x, y)]\}$. Let $a \in |N|$, and $A = \{a\} \cup \bigcup \{|M_i|: i \in I\}$. Clearly, $|A| = \chi$.

Let Γ be the set of subformulas of formulas $\in T_1$. By Theorem 1, it follows that M^* has a Γ-elementary submodel $N^*, |N^*| \supset A, \chi = ||N^*|| =$ (the power of N^*), such that every equivalence class (of E) in N^* has exactly χ elements. Clearly, $N^* = \bigoplus(\{N_1\} \cup \{M_i: i \in I\})$, and for every i, N_1, M_i are models of T, and they are non-μ-almost-isomorphic. So N_1 contradicts the definition of $\{M_i: i \in I\}$, thus proving Lemma 6.

This ends the proof of Theorem 2.

REFERENCES

TM will denote the Proc. 1963 Berkeley Symposium on Theory of models, North Holland Publ. Co., 1965.

1. A. Ehrenfeucht, *Elementary Theories with Models Without Automorphisms*, TM, pp. 70–76.
2. W. Hanf, *Doctoral Dissertation*, University of California, 1962.
3. L. Henkin, *Some Remarks on Infinitely Long Formulas, Infinitistic Methods*, Warsaw, (1961), 167–183.

4. C. Karp, *Finite Quantifier Equivalence*, TM, pp. 407-412.

5. H. J. Keisler, *Some applications of infinitely long formulas*, J. Symbolic Logic **30** (1965), 339-349.

6. ———, *Formulas With Linearly Ordered Quantifiers*, Lecture Notes in Math. 72. The Syntex and Semantics of Infinitary Languages, (1968), 96-131.

7. M. Makkai, Notices of A.M.S., vol. **16** (1964), p. 322.

8. D. Scott, *Logic with denumerable long formulas and finite strings of quantifiers*, TM, pp. 329-341.

9. S. Shelah, Master's thesis written under the guidence of Professor H. Gaifman. The Hebrew Univ. Jerusalem 1967.

10. *On the number of the non-isomorphic models of a theory in a cardinality*, Notices of Amer. Math. Soc., **17** (1970), 576.

11. ———, *Some unconnected results in model theory*, Notices of the Amer. Math. Soc., **18** (1971), 576. April.

12. ———, *A combinatorial problem, stability and order for models and theories in infinitary languages*, to appear (Pacific J. Math.)

13. M. Benda, *Reduced products and nonstandard logics*, J. Symbolic Logic, **34** (1969), 424-436.

14. J. Barwise, *Back and forth thru infinitary logic*, in a forthcoming book edited by Morley.

15. P. C. Eklof, *On the existence of $L_{\infty,k}$-indiscernibles*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **25** (1970), 798-800.

Received August 19, 1969.

THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY
AND
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES