

Zeitschrift: L'Enseignement Mathématique
Herausgeber: Commission Internationale de l'Enseignement Mathématique
Band: 28 (1982)
Heft: 1-2: L'ENSEIGNEMENT MATHÉMATIQUE

Artikel: ON BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS WITH DISTINGUISHED SUBALGEBRAS
Autor: Koppelberg, Sabine
Kapitel: 4. Decidability and complétions of Th (K)
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-52239>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 01.07.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

has the form $\exists x \psi (xx_1 \dots x_n)$ and that $\| \psi [bb_1 \dots b_n] \|$ is clopen for fixed $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$ and arbitrary $b \in B$. For the rest of the proof, we omit the parameters b_1, \dots, b_n . Let

$$u = \cup \{ \| \psi [\beta] \| \mid \beta \in B \}.$$

By our inductive assumption, u is an open subset of X . Choose, by Zorn's lemma, a maximal family $F = \{ (b_i, c_i) \mid i \in I \}$ such that $b_i \in B$, c_i is a clopen subset of u , $c_i \subseteq \| \psi [b_i] \|$, $i \neq j$ implies $c_i \cap c_j = \phi$. It follows that c , the closure of $\bigcup_{i \in I} c_i$, includes u (by maximality of F). A is a cBA ,

hence X is extremally disconnected and c is clopen. By completeness of B , there is some $b \in B$ such that $b \cdot e(c_i) = b_i$ for $i \in I$. Thus, for $i \in I$, $c_i \subseteq \| \psi [b] \|$. So, for $\beta \in B$, $\| \psi [\beta] \| \subseteq u \subseteq c \subseteq \| \psi [b] \| = \| \exists x \psi (x) \|$.

Finally we show that B_p is separated for each $p \in X$. Let $\alpha(x)$ be the \mathcal{L}_{BA} -formula stating that x is an atom and let $\beta(x)$, $\gamma(x)$ be the \mathcal{L}_{BA} -formulas $\alpha(x) \vee x = 0$ resp. $\forall y (\alpha(y) \rightarrow y \leq x)$. Put $M = \{ f \in B \mid \| \beta [f] \| = 1 \|$ and let b be the supremum of M in B . We show that $b(p)$ is, for each $p \in X$, the supremum of the atoms of B_p .

First suppose $s \in B_p$ is an atom of B_p . There is some $f \in M$ such that $f(p) = s$ (note that $\| \alpha [f] \|$ is clopen for each $f \in B$). So $f \leq b$ and $s = f(p) \leq b(p)$. — On the other hand, suppose $t \in B_p$ and $s \leq t$ for every atom s of B_p . Choose $g \in B$ such that $g(p) = t$. Then $p \in c = \| \gamma [g] \|$. For $f \in M$, $e(c) \cdot f \leq g$, since $q \in c$ implies that $f(q)$ is zero or an atom of B_q and thus $f(q) \leq g(q)$. By the definition of b , $e(c) \cdot b \leq g$. This implies (by $p \in c$) $b(p) \leq g(p) = t$.

4. DECIDABILITY AND COMPLETIONS OF $Th(\mathbf{K})$

Call $T_{sBA} = T_{BA} \cup \{ \sigma \}$ the theory of separated BA s, where T_{BA} is the theory of BA s and σ was defined in section 3. We give a short review of the completions of T_{sBA} . Let, for $n \in \omega$, φ_n be the \mathcal{L}_{BA} -sentence stating that there are exactly n atoms and ψ the \mathcal{L}_{BA} -sentence stating that there is a non-zero atomless element. Let $\chi_n = \neg (\varphi_0 \vee \dots \vee \varphi_{n-1})$; so χ_n says that there are at least n atoms. Define, for $n \in \omega + 1$ and $i \in 2 = \{0, 1\}$, an \mathcal{L}_{BA} -theory T_{ni} by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{n0} &= T_{sBA} \cup \{ \varphi_n, \neg \psi \} \\ T_{n1} &= T_{sBA} \cup \{ \varphi_n, \psi \} \end{aligned}$$

for $n \in \omega$, and

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\omega 0} &= T_{sBA} \cup \{\chi_n \mid n \in \omega\} \cup \{\neg \psi\} \\ T_{\omega 1} &= T_{sBA} \cup \{\chi_n \mid n \in \omega\} \cup \{\psi\}. \end{aligned}$$

Put $\tau = \{T_{ni} \mid n \in \omega + 1, i \in 2\}$. It is then clear that each separated BA satisfies exactly one of the theories in τ , and for each $t \in \tau$ there is a cBA satisfying t . Moreover, any two models of any $t \in \tau$ are elementarily equivalent by 5.5.10 in [1]. Thus the theories $t \in \tau$ are just the completions of T_{sBA} and can be thought of as being the elementary equivalence types of separated BAs or $cBAs$. Moreover, an \mathcal{L}_{BA} -sentence holds in every separated BA iff it holds in every cBA . The following proposition is essential for the main theorems of this section:

4.1. PROPOSITION. *Let $s, t \in \tau$. Then there is a structure (B, A) in \mathbf{K} such that A is a model of s and each stalk B_p is a model of t .*

Proof. By the above remarks, choose $cBAs$ A and F which are models of s resp. t . Let $A * F$ be the free product of A and F . Thus A is relatively complete in $A * F$ and each stalk $(A * F)_p$, where p is an ultrafilter of A , is easily seen to be isomorphic to F , hence a model of t . Unfortunately, $A * F$ is incomplete unless A or F is finite. So let $B = (A * F)^*$ be the completion of $A * F$; note that $A * F$ is a dense subalgebra of B . $(B, A) \in \mathbf{K}$, since the inclusion maps from A to $A * F$ and from $A * F$ to B are complete. For $p \in X$ (the Stone space of A), B_p is a separated BA by 3.2 but in general a proper extension of $(A * F)_p$. We show, with the notations of section 1, that B_p is elementarily equivalent to F . For the following proof of this, recall that, for $f \in F \setminus \{0\}$ and $p \in X$, $\pi_p(f) = f(p) \neq 0$ since F is independent from A in $A * F \subseteq B$. Thus, the restriction of $\pi_p : B \rightarrow B_p$ to F is a monomorphism. The elementary equivalence of B_p and F is established by the following four claims.

Claim 1. For each atom f of F , $f(p)$ is an atom of B_p (hence, if F has at least n atoms, where $n \in \omega$, then B_p has at least n atoms): clearly, $f(p) > 0$ for $p \in X$. Assume that

$$u = \{p \in X \mid f(p) \text{ is not an atom of } B_p\}$$

is non-empty. By 3.2, u is a clopen subset of X . Choose, by the maximum principle stated in section 3, $b \in B$ such that $b(p) = 0$ for $p \notin u$ and $0 < b(p) < f(p)$ for $p \in u$. Since $b > 0$, choose $a \in A$ and $g \in F$ such that $0 < a \cdot g \leq b$; let $p \in X$ such that $a(p) \cdot g(p) \neq 0$. Thus $p \in u$, $a(p) = 1$, and

$0 < g(p) \leq b(p) < f(p)$. It follows that $0 < g < f$, contradicting the fact that f was an atom of F .

Claim 2. If B_p has at least n atoms, where $1 \leq n < \omega$, then F has at least n atoms: assume that M is a subset of $At(B_p)$, the set of atoms of B_p , such that M has exactly n elements but $At(F)$ has at most $n - 1$ elements. We prove:

(a) Let $x \in M$. Then there is $f_x \in At(F)$ such that $f_x(p) = x$.

Claim 2 follows from (a), since the assignment of f_x to x is injective. And (a) will follow from

(b) Let $x \in M$, u a clopen neighbourhood of p such that, w.l.o.g., for $q \in u$, B_q has at least one atom. Let $b \in B$ such that, for $q \notin u$, $b(q) = 0$ and for $q \in u$, $b(q)$ is an atom of B_q , and $b(p) = x$. Then there are $q \in u$ and $f \in At(F)$ such that $f(q) = b(q)$. (Hence $At(F)$ is non-empty).

Proof of (b). By $b > 0$, choose $a \in A$, $f \in F$ such that $0 < a \cdot f \leq b$. Since $b(q) = 0$ for $q \notin u$, there is some $q \in u$ such that $a(q) \cdot f(q) \neq 0$, which implies $0 < f(q) \leq b(q)$. $f(q) = b(q)$, since $b(q)$ is an atom of B_q . Finally $f \in At(F)$, since a splitting of f in F into two non-zero disjoint elements would give rise to a splitting of $b(q)$ in B_q .

Proof of (a). Let $x \in M$ and choose u and b as in (b). Assume (a) is false. Then, for each $f \in At(F)$, $f(p) \neq x = b(p)$; by finiteness of $At(F)$, there is a clopen neighbourhood v of p such that, for $q \in v$ and $f \in At(F)$, $b(q) \neq f(q)$. Let $c \in B$ such that $c(q) = 0$ for $q \notin v$ and $c(q) = b(q)$ for $q \in v$. This contradicts (b), applied to v and c instead of u and b .

Claim 3. If F has a non-zero atomless element f (which means that $F \restriction f$ is atomless), then each B_p has a non-zero atomless element x : let $x = \pi_p(f)$. $x > 0$, since π_p is one-one on F . $F \restriction f$ and hence, by Claim 2, $(B \restriction f)_p$ is atomless. So $B_p \restriction x = \pi_p(B \restriction f) = (B \restriction f)_p$ is atomless.

Claim 4. If B_p has a non-zero atomless element x , then F has a non-zero atomless element f : assume that F is atomic. Let

$$u = \{q \in X \mid B_q \text{ is not atomic}\}.$$

u is a clopen neighbourhood of p . By the maximum principle, choose $b \in B$ such that $b(q) = 0$ for $q \notin u$, $b(q)$ is a non-zero atomless element of

B_q for $q \in u$, $b(p) = x$. Choose $a \in A$, $g \in F$ such that $0 < a \cdot g \leq b$; w.l.o.g., g is an atom of F . Choose $q \in X$ such that $a(q) \cdot g(q) \neq 0$. Thus $q \in u$ and $g(q) \leq b(q)$. By Claim 1, $g(q)$ is an atom of B_q , contradicting the choice of $b(q)$.

4.2. REMARK. Suppose that, for every i in an index set I , $\mathcal{M}_i = (B_i, A_i)$ is an element of \mathbf{K} . Then $\mathcal{M} = (B, A)$, where $B = \prod_{i \in I} B_i$ and $A = \prod_{i \in I} A_i$, is in \mathbf{K} . Let $\varphi(x_1 \dots x_k)$ be an \mathcal{L} -formula and $b_1, \dots, b_k \in B$, $b_j = (b_{ij})_{i \in I}$. Put $a_i = e(\|\varphi[b_{i1} \dots b_{ik}]\|_{\mathcal{M}_i})$. Then

$$e(\|\varphi[b_1 \dots b_k]\|_{\mathcal{M}}) = (a_i)_{i \in I}.$$

Proof. By induction on the complexity of φ .

We shall need the following Feferman-Vaught theorem about sheaves over Boolean spaces from [2]:

4.3. THEOREM (Comer). *Let \mathcal{L} be an arbitrary language. There is an effective assignment*

$$\varphi(x_1 \dots x_k) \mapsto (\Phi; \vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_m)$$

for \mathcal{L} -formulas $\varphi(x_1 \dots x_k)$ such that

- a) $\vartheta_1, \dots, \vartheta_m$ are \mathcal{L} -formulas having at most the free variables $x_1 \dots x_k$, and

$$\models (\bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq m} \vartheta_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \neg(\vartheta_i \wedge \vartheta_j)$$

- b) Φ is an \mathcal{L}_{BA} -formula having at most the free variables $y_1 \dots y_m$;

- c) for each sheaf $\mathcal{S} = (S, \pi, X, \mu)$ of \mathcal{L} -structures such that X is a Boolean space and $\|\psi[f_1 \dots f_n]\|$ is a clopen subset of X for every $\psi(x_1 \dots x_n)$ in \mathcal{L} and $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \Gamma(\mathcal{S})$: if $b_1, \dots, b_k \in \Gamma(\mathcal{S})$, then

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{S}) \models \varphi[b_1 \dots b_k] \text{ iff } C \models \Phi[c_1 \dots c_m],$$

where C is the BA of clopen subsets of X and $c_i = \|\vartheta_i[b_1 \dots b_k]\|$.

For two separated BAs A and A' , let I be the set of partial functions f from A to A' such that $\text{dom}(f) = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is a finite partition of A (where some of the a_i may be zero), $\text{rge}(f) = \{a'_1, \dots, a'_n\}$ where $a'_i = f(a_i)$ is a partition of A' , and every $A \restriction a_i$ is elementarily equivalent

to $A' \models a_i'$. If A, A' are \aleph_1 -saturated or σ -complete, the following conditions are equivalent:

- a) $A \equiv A'$;
- b) I is non-empty;
- c) I has the back-and-forth property.

Moreover, if $f \in I$ is as above and A, A' are arbitrary separated BA s, then $(A, a_1, \dots, a_n) \equiv (A', a_1', \dots, a_n')$.

Let T_{sBA2} be the \mathcal{L} -theory

$$T_{sBA2} = T_{sBA} \cup \{ \forall x (U(x) \leftrightarrow x = 0 \vee x = 1) \}.$$

Since T_{BA} is decidable, T_{sBA} and T_{sBA2} are decidable.

4.4. THEOREM. *There is an effective procedure deciding for every \mathcal{L} -sentence φ whether $T \vdash \varphi$. Moreover, $T \vdash \varphi$ if and only if φ holds in every model \mathcal{M} in \mathbf{K} .*

Proof. Let φ be given. Construct $(\Phi(y_1 \dots y_m); \mathfrak{g}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{g}_m)$ by 4.3. For every i such that $1 \leq i \leq m$, decide whether $T_{sBA2} \vdash \neg \mathfrak{g}_i$. W.l.o.g., assume that $T_{sBA2} \cup \{\mathfrak{g}_i\}$ is consistent for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and inconsistent for $r+1 \leq i \leq m$. By $\vdash \mathfrak{g}_1 \vee \dots \vee \mathfrak{g}_m$, we have $1 \leq r$ (it is possible that $r = m$). Next, construct the formula

$$\Phi'(y_1 \dots y_m) = \left(\bigwedge_{r+1 \leq i \leq m} (y_i = 0) \rightarrow \Phi(y_1 \dots y_m) \right).$$

We show the equivalence of

- a) $T \vdash \varphi$;
- b) $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$ for every $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbf{K}$;
- c) $T_{sBA} \vdash \forall y_1 \dots \forall y_m \Phi'(y_1 \dots y_m)$.

Then, by decidability of T_{sBA} , T is decidable and 4.4 is proved. *a) implies b)* by 3.2. To prove that *c) implies a)*, assume there is $\mathcal{M} \models T$ such that $\mathcal{M} \not\models \varphi$, e.g. $\mathcal{M} = (B, A)$. Put $a_i = e(\|\mathfrak{g}_i\|^{\mathcal{M}})$. By 4.3 and $\mathcal{M} \not\models \varphi$, we see $A \not\models \Phi[a_1 \dots a_m]$. By our choice of $r \leq m$, we get $a_{r+1} = \dots = a_m = 0$. Thus $A \not\models \Phi'[a_1 \dots a_m]$ and c) is false. Now assume c) does not hold; we show that b) is false. Let A' be a separated BA and $a_1', \dots, a_m' \in A'$ such that $a_{r+1}' = \dots = a_m' = 0$ and $A' \not\models \Phi[a_1' \dots a_m']$. W.l.o.g., $a_i' \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. By choice of r , there are $t_1, \dots, t_r \in \tau$ such that $t_i \models \mathfrak{g}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$.

Let, for these i, s_i be the element of τ such that $A' \restriction a_i' \models s_i$. By 4.1, there are $\mathcal{M} = (B, A) \in \mathbf{K}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_r \in A$ such that $1 = a_1 + \dots + a_r$, $a_i \cdot a_j = 0$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq r$, $A \restriction a_i \models s_i$ and $(B \restriction a_i)_p \models t_i$ for those $p \in X$ satisfying $a_i(p) = 1$. So $e(\| \mathfrak{g}_i \|^\mathcal{M}) = a_i$ by 4.2. Put $a_{r+1} = \dots = a_m = 0$. It follows that $(A, a_1, \dots, a_m) \equiv (A', a_1', \dots, a_m')$, $A \not\models \Phi[a_1 \dots a_m]$ and $\mathcal{M} \not\models \varphi$ by 4.3.

In the next theorem, we characterize elementary equivalence of models of T . Call the following sentences in \mathcal{L}_{BA} basic sentences: $\varphi_n \wedge \psi$, $\varphi_n \wedge \neg \psi$, $\chi_n \wedge \psi$, $\chi_n \wedge \neg \psi$ (where $n \in \omega$). It follows by the analysis of the completions of T_{sBA} given in the beginning of this section that for each \mathcal{L}_{BA} -sentence \mathfrak{g} there are basic sentences β_1, \dots, β_n such that

$$T_{sBA} \vdash (\mathfrak{g} \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \neg (\beta_i \wedge \beta_j).$$

This fact is easily extended to T_{sBA2} : by replacing each atomic formula $U(t)$ where t is a term in \mathcal{L}_{BA} by " $t = 0 \vee t = 1$ ", we see that for each \mathcal{L} -sentence \mathfrak{g} there are basic sentences β_1, \dots, β_n satisfying

$$T_{sBA2} \vdash (\mathfrak{g} \leftrightarrow \bigvee_{i=1}^n \beta_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \neg (\beta_i \wedge \beta_j).$$

Now, if β, γ are basic sentences, let $\sigma_{\beta\gamma}$ be the following \mathcal{L} -sentence:

$$\sigma_{\beta\gamma} = \exists y (\gamma^y \wedge s_\beta(y)),$$

where $s_\beta(y)$ is the \mathcal{L} -formula assigned to β in 3.1 and γ^y is the result of relativizing the quantifiers $\exists x \varphi \dots$ in γ to $\exists x (U(x) \wedge x \leq y \wedge \varphi^y \dots)$. A model (B, A) of T satisfies $\sigma_{\beta\gamma}$ iff $A \restriction a \models \gamma$, where $a = e(c)$ and $c = \|\beta\|$.

4.5. THEOREM. Let $\mathcal{M} = (B, A)$, $\mathcal{M}' = (B', A')$ be models of T . Then \mathcal{M} is elementarily equivalent to \mathcal{M}' if and only if, for any basic sentences β, γ ,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \sigma_{\beta\gamma} \text{ iff } \mathcal{M}' \models \sigma_{\beta\gamma}.$$

Proof. The only-if-part is clear. Suppose that \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}' satisfy the same sentences of the form $\sigma_{\beta\gamma}$. Let φ be an \mathcal{L} -sentence and $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$; we want to show that $\mathcal{M}' \models \varphi$. Let $(\Phi(y_1 \dots y_m); \mathfrak{g}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{g}_m)$ be the sequence assigned to φ by 4.3; every \mathfrak{g}_i is an \mathcal{L} -sentence. Put $a_i = e(\|\mathfrak{g}_i\|^\mathcal{M})$; by 4.3 and $e: C \rightarrow A$ being an isomorphism, we have that $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$

is a partition of A and $A \models \Phi [a_1 \dots a_m]$. In the same way, put $a'_i = e'(\|\mathcal{G}_i\|^{\mathcal{M}'})$; $\{a'_1, \dots, a'_m\}$ is a partition of A' . It is sufficient to show that $(A, a_1, \dots, a_m) \equiv (A', a'_1, \dots, a'_m)$, for this implies $A' \models \Phi [a'_1 \dots a'_m]$ and finally $\mathcal{M}' \models \varphi$ by 4.3.

For every \mathcal{G}_i , choose basic sentences $\beta_{i1}, \dots, \beta_{in_i}$ such that

$$T_{sBA2} \vdash (\mathcal{G}_i \leftrightarrow \bigvee_j \beta_{ij} \wedge \bigwedge_{j < l} \neg (\beta_{ij} \wedge \beta_{il}).$$

Put $\alpha_{ij} = e(\|\beta_{ij}\|^{\mathcal{M}})$, $\alpha'_{ij} = e'(\|\beta_{ij}\|^{\mathcal{M}'})$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$, $1 \leq j \leq n_i$. Then a_i is the disjoint sum of the α_{ij} ($1 \leq j \leq n_i$), a'_i is the disjoint sum of the α'_{ij} ($1 \leq j \leq n_i$). For every i, j ,

$$A \restriction \alpha_{ij} \equiv A' \restriction \alpha'_{ij} :$$

let γ be any basic sentence of \mathcal{L}_{BA} and assume $A \restriction \alpha_{ij} \models \gamma$; we want to show that $A' \restriction \alpha'_{ij} \models \gamma$. But $A \restriction \alpha_{ij} \models \gamma$ means that $\mathcal{M} \models \sigma_{\beta_{ij}\gamma}$. By our main assumption, $\mathcal{M}' \models \sigma_{\beta_{ij}\gamma}$ and $A' \restriction \alpha'_{ij} \models \gamma$.

We have shown that the partial function f mapping α_{ij} to α'_{ij} is an element of the set of back-and-forth-isomorphisms defined after 4.3. Hence,

$$(A, \alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{mn_m}) \equiv (A', \alpha'_{11}, \dots, \alpha'_{mn_m})$$

and

$$(A, a_1, \dots, a_m) \equiv (A', a'_1, \dots, a'_m).$$

We shall finally describe the completions of T by giving a one-one correspondance between a set P (consisting of pairs of mappings from $\omega \times 2$ to $(\omega+1) \times 2$) and these completions. For $m, m' \in \omega+1$ and $j, j' \in 2$, define

$$(m, j) + (m', j') = (m'', j'')$$

where m'' is the cardinal sum of m and m' and j'' is the maximum of j and j' . Let

$$P = \{(\alpha, \rho) \mid \alpha, \rho : \omega \times 2 \rightarrow (\omega+1) \times 2 \text{ and, for } (n, i) \in \omega \times 2, \rho(n, i) = \rho(n+1, i) + \alpha(n, i)\}.$$

In the following definition, we refer to the \mathcal{L}_{BA} -theories T_{ni} defined in the beginning of this section. For $(\alpha, \rho) \in P$, let $T_{\alpha\rho}$ the \mathcal{L} -theory

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\alpha\rho} = T \cup & \{ \exists x (\sigma_{(\varphi_n \wedge \neg \psi)}(x) \wedge \gamma^x) \mid n \in \omega, \gamma \in T_{\alpha(n,0)} \} \\ & \cup \{ \exists x (\sigma_{(\chi_n \wedge \neg \psi)}(x) \wedge \gamma^x) \mid n \in \omega, \gamma \in T_{\rho(n,0)} \} \\ & \cup \{ \exists x (\sigma_{(\varphi_n \wedge \psi)}(x) \wedge \gamma^x) \mid n \in \omega, \gamma \in T_{\alpha(n,1)} \} \\ & \cup \{ \exists x (\sigma_{(\chi_n \wedge \psi)}(x) \wedge \gamma^x) \mid n \in \omega, \gamma \in T_{\rho(n,1)} \}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{M} = (B, A)$ is a model of T , then $\mathcal{M} \models T_{\alpha\rho}$ iff, for $a_1 = e(\|\varphi_n \wedge \neg \psi\|^{\mathcal{M}})$ $A \restriction a_1 \models T_{\alpha(n,0)}$, ..., for $a_4 = e(\|\chi_n \wedge \psi\|^{\mathcal{M}})$, $A \restriction a_4 \models T_{\rho(n,1)}$.

4.6. THEOREM. $\{T_{\alpha\rho} \mid (\alpha, \rho) \in P\}$ is the set of completions of T . Moreover, each $T_{\alpha\rho}$ has a model in \mathbf{K} .

Proof. If (α, ρ) and (α', ρ') are different elements of P , then $T_{\alpha\rho} \cup T_{\alpha'\rho'}$ is inconsistent (recall that every T_{mj} , where $m \in \omega + 1$, $j \in 2$, is complete in \mathcal{L}_{BA}). If \mathcal{M} is a model of T , there is some $(\alpha, \rho) \in P$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models T_{\alpha\rho}$ (e.g., put $a_1 = e(\|\varphi_n \wedge \neg \psi\|^{\mathcal{M}})$ and let $\alpha(n, 0)$ be the pair $(k, j) \in (\omega + 1) \times 2$ such that $A \restriction a_1 \models T_{kj}$, etc.). If $(\alpha, \rho) \in P$ and $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}'$ are models of $T_{\alpha\rho}$, then \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}' are elementarily equivalent by 4.5, since $T_{\alpha\rho}$ says which sentences of the form $\sigma_{\beta\gamma}$ are satisfied in \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{M}' . So it is sufficient to prove that each $T_{\alpha\rho}$ has a model which lies even in \mathbf{K} .

For simplicity, we construct $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbf{K}$ satisfying the part of $T_{\alpha\rho}$ which refers to $T_{\alpha(n,0)}$ and $T_{\rho(n,0)}$ — for, if $\mathcal{N} \in \mathbf{K}$ satisfies the part of $T_{\alpha\rho}$ which refers to $T_{\alpha(n,1)}$ and $T_{\rho(n,1)}$, then $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{N} \in \mathbf{K}$ is a model of $T_{\alpha\rho}$. Abbreviate $\alpha(n, 0)$ by t_n , $\rho(n, 0)$ by s_n . We first construct a complete BA A and a sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \omega}$ in A such that the a_n are pairwise disjoint and

$$(*) \quad A \restriction a_n \models t_n, \quad A \restriction r_n \models s_n$$

where $r_n = -(a_0 + \dots + a_{n-1})$. Let A be a complete BA which is a model of s_0 . Suppose $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$ are pairwise disjoint and a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}, r_n satisfy (*). Since $s_n = s_{n+1} + t_n$, $A \restriction r_n \models s_n$ and A is complete, there are a_n and $r_{n+1} \in A$ such that $r_n = a_n + r_{n+1}$, $a_n \cdot r_{n+1} = 0$, $A \restriction a_n \models t_n$ and $A \restriction r_{n+1} \models s_{n+1}$. — Finally, let $a_\omega = -\sum_{n \in \omega} a_n$. By the proof of 4.1,

there is, for $n \in \omega$, $\mathcal{M}_n = (B_n, A_n) \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $A_n = A \restriction a_n$ and each stalk $(B_n)_p$ of the sheaf representation of \mathcal{M}_n is a model of $\varphi_n \wedge \neg \psi$. Moreover there is $\mathcal{M}_\omega = (B_\omega, A_\omega) \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $A_\omega = A \restriction a_\omega$ and each stalk $(B_\omega)_p$ of the sheaf representation of \mathcal{M}_ω is a model of $T_{\omega 0}$. Put $\mathcal{M} = (B, A)$ where B is a complete BA which lies over A as $\prod_{n \in \omega} B_n$ lies over $\prod_{n \in \omega} A_n$. By 4.2, $e(\|\varphi_n \wedge \neg \psi\|^{\mathcal{M}}) = a_n$ and $e(\|\chi_n \wedge \neg \psi\|^{\mathcal{M}}) = r_n$; so \mathcal{M} is a model of the part of $T_{\alpha\rho}$ referring to $T_{\alpha(n,0)}$ and $T_{\rho(n,0)}$.