

ON  $n$ -FINITE FORCING COMPANIONS

*Milan Grulović*

*Prirodno-matematički fakultet, Institut za  
matematiku, 21000 Novi Sad, ul. dr Ilije  
Djurišića 4, Jugoslavija*

ABSTRACT

The main result of this paper is that for Peano arithmetic ( $T_{PA}$ ) holds that for each  $n$  there exists  $k > n$  such that  $T_{PA}^{f_n} \neq T_{PA}^{f_k}$  (3.3).

INTRODUCTION. This paper is directly attached to [5] and [6]. The generalization of (most of) the results from [8], as well as of some of the results from [10] (§ 1), which is, by the way, routine and easy job (like the one in [5]), is done here mainly because of the possible use of the new versions of these results in some coming papers. We are really interested in the relation between a given theory and  $n$ -finite forcing companion corresponding to it. This time we shall present some of the first observations on this subject (§ 2, § 3). Numerous open questions impose themselves, and we think there is no need to state them explicitly.

§0. We assume a familiarity with [5] and [6]. All the assumptions (and a main part of the notation) are as in [6], § 0. The following theorem, which, together with some other results from

---

AMS Mathematic Subject Classification(1980):03C25

Key words and phrases:  $n$ -finite forcing,  $n$ -finite forcing companion.

§ 1, should have been given in [5], will be used in § 2.

**THEOREM 0.1.** (a) *If a language  $L$  of a theory  $T$  is countable and  $T = T^{\text{fn}}$ , then for each sentence  $\phi$  of the language  $L$  consistent with  $T$  there exists a model  $M$  of  $T \cup \{\phi\}$ , such that  $T \cup D_n(M)$  is a complete theory (we shall also say that  $M$   $n$ -completes  $T$ ).*

(b) *Let  $T$  be a theory (defined in a language  $L$  of arbitrary cardinality), such that for each sentence  $\phi$  of the language  $L$  consistent with  $T$ , there exists a model of  $T \cup \{\phi\}$  which  $n$ -completes  $T$ . Then  $T = T^{\text{fn}}$  and, in general,  $T = T^{\text{fk}}$  for each  $k > n$ .*

§ 1. In this paragraph we follow [8] more or less consistently. The point is in the "translation for  $n$ " of the results of this paper. The proofs are, because of the same reasons as in [5], mainly omitted. We refer those interested in more details to the original [8].

For a given set of formulas  $\Psi$   $\text{fv}(\Psi) = \{\text{fv}(\psi) \mid \psi \in \Psi\}$ . A complete  $m$ -type  $\Gamma$  is a maximal set of formulas consistent with  $T$  such that  $|\text{fv}(\Gamma)| = m$ . (We can really demand:  $\text{fv}(\Gamma) = \{v_0, \dots, v_{m-1}\}$ ). An  $(n+1)$ -existential type is defined analogously, but this time elements are  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  formulas. We shall generally denote complete  $(m)$ -types by  $\Gamma(\tilde{v})$  (or just  $\Gamma$ ),  $(n+1)$ -existential  $(m)$ -types by  $E(\tilde{v})$  (or just  $E$ ), their elements by,  $\phi(\tilde{v})$  i.e.  $\sigma(\tilde{v})$  (or just  $\phi, \sigma$ ), respectively, the set of all the complete  $m$ -types by  $T_m$  and the set of  $(n+1)$ -existential  $m$ -types by  $E_m$ . We shall consider  $T_m$  and  $E_m$  topological spaces with bases, elements of which are in a succession  $A\phi(\tilde{v}) = \{\Gamma \mid \phi(\tilde{v}) \in \Gamma\}$  and  $A\sigma(\tilde{v}) = \{E \mid \sigma(\tilde{v}) \in E\}$ . For the space  $T_m$  it holds obviously that  $A\phi_1(\tilde{v}) = A\phi_2(\tilde{v})$  iff  $T \vdash \phi_1(\tilde{v}) \leftrightarrow \phi_2(\tilde{v})$ ;  $A\phi_1(\tilde{v}) \subseteq A\phi_2(\tilde{v})$  iff  $T \vdash \phi_1(\tilde{v}) \rightarrow \phi_2(\tilde{v})$ . Of course directions  $(+)$  hold for  $E_m$ , as well.

In further considerations of this paragraph, the language  $L$  is countable. We just note that this condition is superfluous in many of the propositions.

LEMMA 1.1. (a) A model  $M$  from  $\mu(T \cap \prod_{n+1})$  is  $n$ -existentially complete (of  $T$ ) if and only any  $m$  elements of  $M$  realize an  $(n+1)$ -existential  $m$ -type.

(b)  $E$  is an  $(n+1)$ -existential  $m$ -type if and only if it is realized by some  $m$  elements of some  $n$ -existentially complete model.

DEFINITION 1.2. A complete ( $m$ -) type is normal if it is an extension of an  $(n+1)$ -existential ( $m$ -) type.

A complete ( $m$ -) type is a complete  $(n+1)$ -existential  $m$ -type if it is the unique extension of an  $(n+1)$ -existential ( $m$ -) type.

LEMMA 1.3. (a) A model  $M \in \mu(T \cap \prod_{n+1})$  is an  $n$ -existentially complete model of  $T$  if and only if for each  $\prod_{n+1}$  formula  $\ulcorner \sigma_0(\vec{v}) \urcorner$  it omits a type (here, of course, the word type does not assume the maximality of the set of formulas)  $\{\ulcorner \sigma_0(\vec{v}) \urcorner\} \cup \{\ulcorner \sigma(\vec{v}) \urcorner \mid \text{fv}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{fv}(\sigma_0) \text{ and } T \vdash \sigma(\vec{v}) \rightarrow \ulcorner \sigma_0(\vec{v}) \urcorner\}$ ;

(b) A model  $M \in \mu(T)$   $n$ -completes  $T$  if and only if it omits all types of the form  $\{\phi(\vec{v})\} \cup \{\ulcorner \sigma(\vec{v}) \urcorner \mid \text{fv}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{fv}(\phi) \text{ and } T \vdash \sigma(\vec{v}) \rightarrow \phi(\vec{v})\}$ .

THEOREM 1.4. The following are equivalent:

(a) If  $\phi(\vec{v})$  is consistent with  $T$  then  $T \cup \{\phi\}$  has a model which is  $n$ -existentially complete;

(b) For each  $m \in \omega$  the set of all normal  $m$ -types is dense in  $T_m$ .

COROLLARY 1.5. A complete theory  $T$  has a model which is  $n$ -existentially complete if and only if the set of normal  $m$ -types is dense in  $T_m$  for each  $m \in \omega$ .

COROLLARY 1.6. If  $T$  is a complete theory such that  $T = T \cap \prod_{n+2}$  then for each  $m \in \omega$  the set of normal  $m$ -types is dense in  $T_m$ .

PROOF. By 2.5 and 1.5.

**THEOREM 1.7.** (a) *The class  $E_T^n$  (of all  $n$ -existentially complete models) is axiomatizable by a single sentence of the language  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$ ;*

(b) *The class  $F_T^n$  (of all  $n$ -finitely generic models) is axiomatizable by a single sentence of the language  $L_{\omega_1\omega}$ .*

**PROOF.** (a) From 1.3.(a) it follows directly that  $\Lambda(T \cap \Pi_{n+1}) \wedge \Lambda\{\psi_\phi \mid \phi \text{ is a } \Pi_{n+1} \text{ formula of } L\}$  where  $\psi_\phi \equiv \exists \exists \tilde{v}(\phi(\tilde{v}) \wedge \Lambda\{\exists \sigma(\tilde{v}) \mid T \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \phi\})$  is the axiom for  $E_T^n$ .

(b) Let us just recall that a model of  $T^{fn}$  is  $n$ -finitely generic iff it  $n$ -completes  $T^{fn}$ . Hence (and by 1.3.(b))  $\Lambda T^{fn} \wedge \Lambda\{\psi_\phi \mid \phi(\tilde{v}) \text{ is a formula of } L\}$  where  $\psi_\phi \equiv \exists \exists \tilde{v}(\phi(\tilde{v}) \wedge \Lambda\{\exists \sigma(\tilde{v}) \mid T^{fn} \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \phi\})$  is the axiom for  $F_T^n$ .

(REMARK. In case the language  $L$  of  $T$  is of cardinality  $\lambda$ , the axioms of the classes  $E_T^n$  and  $F_T^n$  are sentences of  $L_{\lambda, \omega}$ ).

**THEOREM 1.8.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  *$T$  is  $n$ -model complete;*
- (b)  *$\{A\sigma(\tilde{v}) \mid |fv(\sigma)| \leq m\}$  is a base of  $T_m$  for each  $m \in \omega$ , where, now, of course,  $A\sigma(\tilde{v}) = \{\Gamma \in T_m \mid \sigma(\tilde{v}) \in \Gamma\}$*
- (c) *Every complete type is a complete  $(n+1)$ -existential type.*
- (d) *Every complete type is normal.*

**THEOREM 1.9.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $T = T^{fn}$
- (b) *For each  $m \in \omega$  and for each open set  $O$  in  $T_m$  there exists a  $(\Sigma_{n+1})$  formula  $\sigma(\tilde{v})$  such that  $A\sigma(\tilde{v}) \subseteq O$ ;*
- (c) *For each  $m \in \omega$  the set of complete  $(n+1)$ -existential  $m$ -types is dense in  $T_m$ .*

**PROOF.** Let us show, firstly, that (b) is equivalent to (b'):  $T$  is an  $f_n$ -complete theory (for each formula  $\phi$  consistent with  $T$  there exists a  $(\Sigma_{n+1})$  formula  $\sigma(\tilde{v})$  such that  $fv(\sigma) \subseteq fv(\phi)$  and  $T \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \phi$ ).

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (b'). Let  $\phi(\vec{v})$  be consistent with  $T$ . Then  $A\phi(\vec{v}) \neq \emptyset$ , thus for some  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  formula  $\sigma(\vec{v})$   $A\sigma(\vec{v}) \subseteq A\phi(\vec{v})$ , consequently also  $T \vdash \sigma(\vec{v}) \rightarrow \phi(\vec{v})$ .

(b')  $\rightarrow$  (b). If  $O$  is an empty set then  $A(\exists v(v \neq v)) = O$ . In case  $O$  is nonempty and  $O = \bigcup_{i \in I} A\phi_i(\vec{v})$  then for some  $i \in I$   $A\phi_i(\vec{v}) \neq \emptyset$  and so for  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  formula  $\sigma(\vec{v})$  consistent with  $T$  and such that  $T \vdash \sigma(\vec{v}) \rightarrow \phi_i(\vec{v})$   $A\sigma(\vec{v}) \subseteq A\phi_i(\vec{v}) (\subseteq O)$ .

Since we have already been given (a)  $\leftrightarrow$  (b') (see [5]), we shall prove only (a)  $\rightarrow$  (c) and (c)  $\rightarrow$  (b').

(a)  $\rightarrow$  (c). Let  $A\phi(\vec{v})$  be a nonempty set. By 0.1.(a) there exists a model  $M$  of  $T \cup \{\exists \vec{v}\phi(\vec{v})\}$  such that  $T \cup D_n(M)$  is a complete theory. If  $M \models \phi[\vec{a}]$ ,  $\Gamma = \{\psi(\vec{v}) \mid M \models \psi[\vec{a}]\}$  and  $E = \{\sigma(\vec{v}) \mid M \models \sigma[\vec{a}]\}$  then  $E$  is an  $(n+1)$ -existential type (1.1.(b)) and because of the completeness of  $T \cup D_n(M)$   $\Gamma$  is its unique extension, hence, a complete  $(n+1)$ -existential type and  $\Gamma \in A\phi(\vec{v})$ . It follows that the set of complete  $(n+1)$ -existential types has a nonempty intersection with any (nonempty) open set, in other words, it is dense in  $T_m$ .

(c)  $\rightarrow$  (b'). Let  $\phi(\vec{v})$  be a formula consistent with  $T$ ,  $\Gamma(\vec{v})$  a complete  $(n+1)$ -existential type from  $A\phi(\vec{v})$  and  $E(\vec{v})$  the  $(n+1)$ -existential type contained in  $\Gamma$ . Then for some formula  $\sigma(\vec{v}) \in E$   $T \vdash \sigma \rightarrow \phi$  (in the opposite  $T \cup E \cup \{\neg\phi(\vec{v})\}$  would be consistent and the type  $\Gamma$  would not be the unique extension of  $E$ ).

**THEOREM 1.10.** *The following are equivalent:*

- (a)  $T$  has  $n$ -model companion;
- (b) For each  $m \in \omega$   $E_m$  is a compact (topological) space.

**THEOREM 1.11.** *If  $T = T \cap \prod_{n+2}$  and  $T = T^{\mathbb{F}^n}$  then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) Every model of  $T$  is an  $n$ -elementary submodel of some  $n$ -finitely generic model;
- (b) Every  $n$ -existentially complete model is  $n$ -finitely generic;
- (c)  $T \cup E(c_0, \dots, c_{m-1})$ , where  $c_0, \dots, c_{m-1}$  are new

constants, is a complete theory for each  $(n+1)$ -existential type  $E$  (of course, we shall use  $E(\check{c})$  instead of  $E(c_0, \dots, c_{m-1})$ ).

PROOF. (a)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (b). Already known.

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (c). Let  $E(\check{v})$  be an  $(n+1)$ -existential type and  $M$  an  $n$ -existentially complete model in which  $E(\check{c})$  is realized. By (b),  $T \cup D_n(M)$  is complete, hence also  $TUE(\check{c})$ . (For any sentence  $\psi(\check{c})$  either  $T \cup D_n(M) \vdash \psi(\check{c})$  or  $T \cup D_n(M) \vdash \neg\psi(\check{c})$ , let us say,  $T \cup D_n(M) \vdash \psi(\check{c})$ . Then for some sentence  $\sigma(\check{c}, \check{d}) \in D_n(M)$   $T \vdash \sigma(\check{c}, \check{d}) \rightarrow \psi(\check{c})$  whence  $T \vdash \exists \check{v} \sigma(\check{c}, \check{v}) \rightarrow \psi(\check{c})$  while  $\exists \check{v} \sigma(\check{c}, \check{v}) \in E(\check{c})$ ).

(c)  $\rightarrow$  (b). Let  $M$  be an  $n$ -existentially complete model,  $\psi(\check{c})$  a sentence of the language  $L(M)$  and  $E(\check{v})$  the  $(n+1)$ -existential type which is realized in  $M$  by (images of constants)  $c_0, \dots, c_{m-1}$ . By (c),  $T \cup E(\check{c})$  is a complete theory, thus either  $T \cup E(\check{c}) \vdash \psi(\check{c})$  or  $T \cup E(\check{c}) \vdash \neg\psi(\check{c})$ , let us suppose  $T \cup E(\check{c}) \vdash \neg\psi(\check{c})$ . But then also  $T \cup D_n(M) \vdash \psi(\check{c})$  for if for  $\exists \check{v} \sigma(\check{c}, \check{v}) \in E(\check{c})$   $T \vdash \exists \check{v} \sigma(\check{c}, \check{v}) \rightarrow \psi(\check{c})$  the hypothesis of consistency of  $T \cup D_n(M) \cup \{ \neg\psi(\check{c}) \}$  would imply the consistency of  $T \cup \{ \exists \check{v} \sigma(\check{c}, \check{v}) \} \cup \{ \neg\psi(\check{c}) \}$ .

LEMMA 1.12. If  $T = T \cap \prod_{n+2}$  and  $T^{fn} = T^{fn} \cap \prod_{n+2}$ , and if every  $(n+1)$ -existential type of  $T$  completes  $T$  (condition (c) from previous theorem) then every model of  $T$  can be  $n$ -elementary embedded in some  $n$ -finitely generic model.

PROOF. By the condition of the lemma  $T \subseteq T^{fn}$ , while every  $n$ -existentially complete model is  $n$ -finitely generic too.

COROLLARY 1.13. If  $T^{fn} = T^{fn} \cap \prod_{n+2}$  the following are equivalent:

- (a) Every model of  $T$  can be  $n$ -elementary embedded in some  $n$ -finitely generic model;
- (b) Every  $(n+1)$ -existential type completes  $T^{fn}$ .

PROOF. A direct consequence of Theorem 1.11 ( $T$  and

$T^{fn}$  have the same  $(n+1)$ -existential types,  $T^{fn}$  is  $n$ -forcing complete and every model of  $T^{fn}$  is an  $n$ -elementary substructure of some model of  $T$ ).

**THEOREM 1.14.** *Let  $I_n(T) = \{\phi \mid \phi \text{ is } \Pi_{n+2} \text{ sentence such that } (T \cap \Pi_{n+1}) \cup \{\phi\} \text{ and } T \text{ have a common } \Pi_{n+1} \text{ segment}\}$  and let  $T$  be the theory generated by  $I_n(T)$ . Then:*

(a)  $(-)^0$  is an  $n$ -companion operator, and, that, the smallest one (in the sense of inclusion);

(b) If  $T^* = T^* \cap \Pi_{n+2}$  and  $T \cap \Pi_{n+1} = T^* \cap \Pi_{n+1}$  then  $T^* \subseteq T^0$ . (In case  $n = 0$   $T^0$  is the so-called inductive hull of  $T$ ).

**THEOREM 1.15.**  $I_n(T) = \{\forall \tilde{v} \sigma(\tilde{v}) \mid A\sigma(\tilde{v}) = E_m, m = 0, 1, \dots\}$ .

**THEOREM 1.16.** *If  $T^{fn} = T^{fn} \cap \Pi_{n+2}$  then  $T^{fn}$  is generated by  $\{\forall \tilde{v} \sigma(\tilde{v}) \mid A\sigma(\tilde{v}) = E_m, m = 0, 1, \dots\}$ .*

§ 2. The next three corollaries are the immediate consequences of 0.1.

**COROLLARY 2.1.** *For a complete theory  $T$  to be  $n$ -forcing complete, the sufficient condition is that there exists a model  $M \in \mu(T)$  which  $n$ -completes  $T$ . If the language  $L$  of  $T$  is countable this condition is necessary too.*

**COROLLARY 2.2.** *If the language  $L$  of  $T$  is countable and for some  $n$   $T = T^{fn}$  then also  $T = T^{fk}$  for each  $k > n$ .*

**COROLLARY 2.3.** *If  $T$  is  $n$ -model complete, then  $T = T^{fk}$  for each  $k > n$ .*

One can also give the proof of 2.3 using the following facts:  $T \cap \Pi_{n+2} \subseteq T^{fn} \cap \Pi_{n+2}$ ; an  $n$ -model complete theory is equal to its  $\Pi_{n+2}$  segment and two  $n$ -model complete theories with the common  $\Pi_{n+1}$  segment coincide.

LEMMA 2.4. (a) If  $T$  is complete and  $T = T \cap \bigcap_{n+2}$ , then  $T = T^{fk}$  for each  $k > n$ ;

(b) If for some  $n$   $T^{fn} = T^{fk}$  for each  $k > n$  then also  $T = T^{fn}$ .

COROLLARY 2.5. If  $T$  is a complete theory of the countable language  $L$  and  $T = T \cap \bigcap_{n+2}$ , there exists a model  $M \in \mu(T)$  which  $n$ -completes  $T$ .

LEMMA 2.6. If for some  $n (> 0)$   $T^{fn}$  is a complete theory then for each  $k < n$   $T^{fk}$  is complete as well.

PROOF. Clearly,  $T^{fn}$  is a complete theory if and only if  $T$  has the  $n$ -joint embedding property.

LEMMA 2.7. For each theory  $T$  of a language  $L$  there exists an extension  $T_1$  defined in a suitable expansion of  $L$  such that  $T_1 = T_1^{fn}$  for each  $n > 0$ .

PROOF. Let  $M$  be a model of  $T$  and  $\Gamma_M$  its elementary diagram (the set of all sentences of  $L(M)$  which hold in  $M$ ).  $M$ , clearly, completes (the complete) theory  $\Gamma_M$ , whence, according to 2.1.,  $\Gamma_M = \Gamma_M^{fn}$  for each  $n > 0$  (compare this assertion with 3.8 from [6]).

§ 3. The set  $\{T^{fn} | n \in \omega\}$  is not linearly ordered. In truth, this holds for the set of the sets of conditions ( $C_m \subseteq C_n$  for  $m < n$ ) but from  $p \Vdash_n (p \in C_m)$  it does not necessarily follow that  $p \Vdash_m$  whence  $T^{fn} \subseteq T^m$  does not have to hold.

THEOREM 3.1. Let  $T_{DL0M}$  be the theory of dense linear order with maximal and minimal element defined in the language  $L = \{R\}$ . Then  $T_{DL0M} = T_{DL0M}^{fk}$  for  $k > 1$  ( $T_{DL0M}^f$  is the theory of dense linear order without endpoints).



PROOF.  $T_{DLOM}$  is a complete theory and none of its models completes it (moreover, none of its models is existentially complete). (By 2.1 and 2.5  $T_{DLOM} \neq T_{DLOM} \cap \Pi_2$  and  $T_{DLOM}^f \neq T_{DLOM}$ ). Clearly,  $T_{DLOM} = T_{DLOM} \cap \Pi_3$  and so  $T_{DLOM} = T_{DLOM}^{fk}$  for each  $k \geq 1$  (2.4.(a)).

The proof can also be based on the fact that  $T_{DLOM}$  is 1-model complete. For, let  $M$  be its countable model,  $M \prec_1 N \models T_{DLOM}$  and  $K$  a countable elementary submodel of  $N$  such that  $M \subseteq K$ . Of course,  $M \prec_1 K$ , so also  $M \prec K$  (using Cantor's argument, one can easily show that if  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  are (arbitrarily chosen) elements of  $M$  and  $b$  any element of  $K$ , then there exists an isomorphic mapping from  $K$  onto  $K$ , which element  $b$  maps onto some element from  $M$  while it leaves  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  fixed - for the proof of 1-model completeness, it is sufficient to consider just countable models). Hence  $M \prec N$ .

REMARK. If we defined the theory  $T_{DLOM}$  in a language which, besides a binary relation symbol, also contains two constants (the notions for the minimal and maximal element), we would obtain a complete theory which coincides with its  $\Pi_2$  segment and therefore coincides with n-finite forcing for each  $n \in \omega$  (such a theory would be model complete too, and this case is (in some way) analogous to the example of the theory of dense order without endpoints).

THEOREM 3.2. Let  $T_N$  be the complete arithmetic (of the first order) (the set of all sentences of the language  $L = \{+, x, =, 0, 1, \}$  which hold in the model  $N = \langle N, +, x, =, 0, 1 \rangle$ , where  $N$  is the set of natural numbers). Then  $T_N = T_N^{fk}$  for each  $k \geq 0$ . ( $N$  is the only generic model).

PROOF. Since all elements of  $N$  are definable, we can consider  $T_N$  to be the elementary diagram of  $N$ .  $N$ , clearly, completes  $T_N$  (at the same time it is the only model which completes  $T_N$ ) and so  $T_N = T_N^{fk}$  for each  $k \geq 0$ .

**THEOREM 3.3.** *Let  $T_{PA}$  be Peano arithmetic (defined in the language  $L = \{+, x, =, 0, 1\}$ ). Then the following hold:*

- (a) *For each  $n$  there exists  $k > n$  such that  $T_{PA}^{fn} \neq T_{PA}^{fk}$ ;*
- (b) *None of the theories  $T_{PA}^{fk}$ ,  $k > 0$  is complete;*
- (c)  *$N$  is not finitely generic model;*
- (d) *None of the theories  $T_{PA}^{fk}$ ,  $k > 0$  is model complete; in particular,  $T_{PA}^f$  is not a model companion of  $T_{PA}$ .*

**PROOF.** (a) Let us suppose that for some  $n$   $T_{PA}^{fn} = T_{PA}^{fk}$  for each  $k > n$ . Then, by 2.4.(b)  $T_{PA}^f = T_{PA}^{fn} = T(F_{T_{PA}}^n)$ . Therefore there exists a nonstandard model of the Peano arithmetic which  $n$ -completes it. But this is in contradiction with theorem 5 from [3].

(b)  $T_{PA}$  does not have the joint embedding property (one can construct two existential sentences, both consistent with  $T_{PA}$  but whose conjunction is not consistent with  $T_{PA}$ ). Thus  $T_{PA}^f$ , and hence, of course, no theory  $T_{PA}^{fk}$ ,  $k > 0$ , is complete.

(c) is a direct consequence of Gödel's result that for each subtheory  $T$  of  $T_N$  with an effectively given recursively enumerable set of axioms, there exists a universal sentence  $\phi$  such that  $N \models \phi$  (i.e.  $\phi \in T_N$ ) but  $\phi \notin T$ .

And (d) follows from the result from [4]: no theory  $T$  of the language  $L$  such that  $T_{PA} \cap \Pi_2 \subseteq T$  is model complete.

## REFERENCES

- [1] K.J. Barwise, A. Robinson: *Completing Theories by Forcing*, *Annals of Mathematical Logic*, vol. 2, No. 2 (1970), 119 - 142.
- [2] C.C. Chang, H.J. Keisler: *Model Theory*, North-Holland (Amsterdam), 1973.
- [3] H. Gaifman: *A Note on Models and Submodels of Arithmetic*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 255, Springer-Verlag, 1972, 128-144.
- [4] D.C. Goldrei, A. Macintyre, H. Simmons: *The Forcing Companions of Number Theories*, *Israel J. Math.* vol. 14, 1973, 317 - 332.

- [5] M. Grulović: *Primedba o forsinu*, Univ. u Novom Sadu, Zb. rad. Prir.-mat. fak., Ser. mat., 10(1980), 161-171.
- [6] M. Grulović: *On  $n$ -Finite Forcing*, Univ. u Novom Sadu, Zb. rad. Prir.-mat. fak., Ser. mat., 13(1983), 405-421.
- [7] M. Grulović: *A Note on Forcing and Weak Interpolation Theorem for Infinitary Logic*, Univ. u Novom Sadu, Zb. rad. Prir.-mat. fak., Ser. mat., 12(1982), 327-348.
- [8] J. Hirschfeld: *Finite Forcing, Existential Types and Complete Types*, J. Symb. Logic, vol. 45, No. 1, 1980, 93 - 102.
- [9] J. Hirschfeld, W.H. Wheeler: *Forcing, Arithmetic, Division Rings, Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 454, Springer-Verlag, 1975.
- [10] H. Simmons: *Companion Theories, Seminaires de Mathematique pure*, Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain, 1975.

Received by the editors December 9, 1984.

#### REZIME

#### O $n$ -KONAČNIM FORSING PRIDRUŽENJIMA

Ovaj rad se neposredno nadovezuje na [5] i [6]. Generalizacija (većine) rezultata iz [8] i nekih iz [10] (§1), uzgred rutinski i lak posao (kakav je već obavljen u [5] sa rezultatima iz [1]) ovde je data više zbog eventualne primene u nekim budućim radovima. Zapravo, više nas interesuje odnos date teorije i njoj korespondentnog  $n$ -konačnog forsin g pridruženja ( $n \in \omega$ ). Ovom prilikom iznosimo neka od prvih zapažanja na tu temu (§2, §3). Medju njima izdvajamo 3.1: za teoriju gustog linearnog uređenja bez krajnjih tačaka ( $T_{DLOM}$ ) važi:  $T_{DLOM} = T_{DLOM}^{f_k}$  za svako

$k \geq 1$ ; i 3.3 - za Peanovu aritmetiku  $T_{PA}$  važi: za svako  $n$  postoji  $k > n$  takvo da  $T_{PA}^{fn} \neq T_{PA}^{fk}$ .