

## UNIVERSAL STRUCTURES

SAHARON SHELAH

ABSTRACT. We deal with the existence of universal members in a given cardinality for several classes. First we deal with classes of Abelian groups, specifically with the existence of universal members in cardinalities which are strong limit singular of countable cofinality. Second, we deal with (variants of) the oak property (from a work of Džamonja and the author), a property of complete first order theories, sufficient for the non-existence of universal models under suitable cardinal assumptions. Third, we prove that the oak property holds for the class of groups (naturally interpreted, so for quantifier free formulas) and deal more with the existence of universals.

---

*Date:* June 3, 2013.

*1991 Mathematics Subject Classification.* MSC 2010: Primary 03C45; Secondary: 03C55.

*Key words and phrases.* model theory, universal models, classification theory, the oak property, Abelian groups, groups.

This research was partially supported by the German-Israel Foundation for Scientific Research and Development. Publication 820 on author's list. I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing. First Typed - 98/June/10.

## Annotated Content

§0 Introduction, 3

§1 More on Abelian groups, 8

[We say more on some classes of Abelian groups. We get existence and non-existence results for the existence in cardinals like  $\aleph_\omega$ . We use a general criterion for existence.]

§2 The class of groups, 15

[We prove that the class of groups has the oak property (from [DjSh:710]).]

§3 On the oak property, 17

[We continue [DjSh:710], deal with singular cardinals and a weaker relative of the property.]

## § 0. INTRODUCTION

On the existence of universal structures see Kojman-Shelah [KjSh:409] and history there, and on more recent survey Džamonja [Mir05]. Of course, a first order theory  $T$  has a universal model in  $\lambda$  for “elementary embeddings” when  $\lambda = 2^{<\lambda>} > |T|$ ; this is true also for similar classes, i.e. for a.e.c. with amalgamation and the JEP. The question which interests us is whether there are additional cases (mainly for elementary classes and more generally a.e.c. as above). But here we deal with some specific classes and embeddability notion.

Now §1 deals mainly with Abelian groups; it continues Kojman-Shelah [KjSh:455] and [Sh:456], [Sh:552] and [Sh:622]. The second section deals with the class of groups; it continues Usvyatsov-Shelah [ShUs:789] but does not rely on it. The third section deals with the oak property continuing Džamonja-Shelah [DjSh:710], dealing with the case of singular cardinals.

The second section deals with the class of all groups, certainly an important one. Is this class complicated? Under several yard-sticks it certainly is: its first order theory is undecidable, etc., and it has the quantifier-free order property (even the class of (universal) locally finite groups, has this property, see Macintyre-Shelah [McSh:55]) and by [ShUs:789] it has the  $SOP_3$  (3-strong order property). But this does not exclude positive answers for other interpretations. By [ShUs:789] it has the  $NSOP_4$  (4-strong non-order property), however we do not know much about this class (though we have hopes).

A recent relevant work is [Sh:F1320], giving new sufficient conditions for “no universal”, in particular for groups.

Here we consider the oak property from Džamonja-Shelah [DjSh:710], a relative of the tree property, (hence the name). We prove that the class of groups has the oak property, hence it follows that in some cardinals it has no universal member.

There is reasonable evidence for the class of linear orders being complicated, practically maximal for the universal spectrum problem, see [KjSh:409]. The result says the class of groups is not as complicated as the class of linear orders, so is “simple” and not so complicated in this respect. So a specific conclusion is:

**Conclusion 0.1.** 1) *The class of groups has the oak property, see Definition 2.1.*  
 2) *If  $\lambda$  satisfies, e.g., (\*) below then there is no universal group of cardinality  $\lambda$  when:*

- (\*) (a)  $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) < \mu$
- (b)  $\lambda = \mu^{++} < \text{pp}_{J_{\kappa}^{\text{pd}}}(\mu)$
- (c)  $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow |\alpha|^{\kappa} < \mu$ .

*Proof.* 1) By 2.2.

2) By part (1) and [DjSh:710], more exactly by 0.1 which is proved as there.  $\square_{0.1}$

In §3 we deal with the oak property, continuing [DjSh:710], showing non-existence of universal in singular cardinals and dealing with a weaker relative, the weak oak property.

Concerning the first section note that strong limit singular cardinal  $\lambda$  is a case where it is easier to have a universal model, particularly when  $\lambda$  has cofinality  $\aleph_0$ . So the canonical case seems to be  $\beth_{\omega}$ . Examples of such positive (= existence) results are

- (a) [Sh:26, Th.3.1,p.266], where it is proved that:  
 if  $\lambda$  is strong limit singular, then  
 $\{G : G \text{ a graph with } \leq \lambda \text{ nodes each of valency } < \lambda\}$  has a universal member under embedding onto induced subgraphs
- (b) Grossberg-Shelah [GrSh:174]:
- ( $\alpha$ ) if  $\lambda$  is “large enough” then similar results hold for quite general classes (e.g. locally finite groups) where large enough means:  $\lambda$  (is strong limit, of cofinality  $\aleph_0$  and) is above a compact cardinal (which is quite large).  
 More specifically,
- ( $\beta$ ) if  $\mu$  is strong limit of cofinality  $\aleph_0$  above a compact cardinal  $\kappa$  and, e.g., the class  $\mathfrak{K}$  is the class of models of  $T \subseteq \mathbb{L}_{\kappa, \aleph_0}, |T| < \mu$  partially ordered by  $\prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\kappa, \omega}}$ , then we can split  $\mathfrak{K}$  to  $\leq 2^{|T|+\kappa}$  classes each has a universal model of cardinality in  $\mu$  under  $\prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\kappa, \aleph_0}}$ -embeddings.

Claim 1.11 below continues this, i.e., it deals with strong limit cardinal  $\mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$ , omitting the set theoretic assumption on compact cardinal at the expense of strengthening the model theoretic assumption.

There are natural examples where this can be applied; e.g. the class of torsion free Abelian groups  $G$  which are reduced (i.e., we cannot embed the rational into  $G$ ), but the order is  $G_1 \leq_{(n!:n<\omega)} G_2$  which means  $G_1 \subseteq G_2$  but  $G_1$  is closed inside  $G_2$  under the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -adic metric; so also  $G_2/G_1$  is reduced. The application of 1.11 to such classes is in 1.9(1)(2). Earlier in 1.2 we prove related positive results for the easier cases of complete members (for  $\lambda$  satisfying  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$  or  $\lambda$  the limit of such cardinals).

We also get some negative results, i.e., non-existence of universal members in 1.9(3) and 0.4.

Recall that classes of Abelian groups are related to the classes of trees with  $\omega + 1$  levels. The parallel of “Abelian groups under pure embedding” is the case of such trees, in fact, non-existence of universals from Abelian groups under pure embedding implies the existence of such universal trees.

Lastly, in the third section we continue [DjSh:710] by dealing also with the case of singular cardinals and proving that the weak oak property is sufficient.

*Notation* 0.2. 1) For a set  $A$ ,  $|A|$  is its cardinality but for a structure  $M$  its cardinality is  $\|M\|$  while its universe is  $|M|$ ; this apply e.g. to groups.

2)  $\bar{t}$  will denote an  $\omega$ -sequence of natural numbers  $\geq 2$ .

3) We use  $G, H$  for groups,  $M, N$  for general models.

4) Let  $\mathfrak{k}$  denote a pair  $(K_{\mathfrak{k}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{k}})$ , may say a class  $\mathfrak{k}$ , where:

- (a)  $K_{\mathfrak{k}}$  is a class of  $\tau_{\mathfrak{k}}$ -structures  
 (b)  $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$  is a partial order on  $K_{\mathfrak{k}}$  such that  $M \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N \Rightarrow M \subseteq N$   
 (c) both  $K_{\mathfrak{k}}$  and  $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$  are closed under isomorphisms.

4A) We say  $f : M \rightarrow N$  is a  $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$ -embedding when  $f$  is an isomorphism from  $M$  onto some  $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{k}} N$ .

5) If  $T$  is a first order theory then  $\text{Mod}_T$  is the pair  $(\text{mod}_T, \leq_T)$  where  $\text{mod}_T$  is the class of models of  $T$  and  $\leq_T$  is:  $\prec$  if  $T$  is complete,  $\subseteq$  if  $T$  is not complete.

6) We may write  $T$  instead of  $\text{Mod}_T$ , e.g. in Definition 0.3 below.

**Definition 0.3.** 1) For a class  $\mathfrak{k}$  and a cardinal  $\lambda$ , a set  $\{M_i : i < i^*\}$  of models from  $\mathfrak{k}$ , are jointly universal when for every  $N \in K_{\mathfrak{k}}$  of size  $\lambda$ , there is an  $i < i^*$  and an  $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}}$ -embedding of  $N$  into  $M_i$ .  
 2) For  $\mathfrak{k}$  and  $\lambda$  as above, let (if  $\mu = \lambda$  we may omit  $\mu$ )

$$\text{univ}(\mathfrak{k}, \mu, \lambda) := \min\{|\mathcal{M}| : \mathcal{M} \text{ is a family of members of } K_{\mathfrak{k}} \\ \text{of cardinality } \leq \mu \text{ which is jointly universal} \\ \text{for models of } \mathfrak{k} \text{ of size } \lambda\}.$$

To help understanding Definition 0.3, note that  $\text{univ}(T, \lambda) = 1$  iff there is a universal model of  $T$  of size  $\lambda$ .

**Claim 0.4.** [see [Sh:622]]

Assume  $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1} < \mu = \Sigma\{\lambda_m : m < \omega\}, \mu^+ < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) = \lambda_\omega < \mu^{\aleph_0}$  and  $\chi^{\aleph_0} \leq \mu, A^* \subseteq {}^\omega \chi, |A^*| \leq \mu$  and  $\mathbf{U}_{J_\chi^0 \upharpoonright A^*}(\lambda) < \mu^{\aleph_0}$  (see Definitions 0.5(7), 0.6 below), also  $\chi < \lambda_0$ . Then in  $\mathfrak{k}_\lambda^{\text{tr}} = (K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{k}_\lambda^{\text{tr}}})$  there is no universal member where (before the proof):

**Definition 0.5.**

- (1)  $K^{\text{tr}}$  is the class of  $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}, <)$ , trees with  $\omega + 1$  levels,
- (2)  $K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}$  is the class of  $\mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{T}, <) \in K^{\text{tr}}$  such that the number of elements of  $\mathcal{T}$  of level  $\alpha$  is  $\lambda_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \leq \omega$  where  $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_\alpha : \alpha \leq \omega \rangle$
- (3)  $K_{\leq \lambda}^{\text{tr}}$  is the class of  $\mathcal{T} \in K^{\text{tr}}$  of cardinality  $\leq \lambda$ ; similarly  $K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}$
- (4) an  $\leq_{\mathfrak{k}_\lambda^{\text{tr}}}$ -embedding of  $M_1 \in K^{\text{tr}}$  into  $M_2 \in K^{\text{tr}}$  means a one to one function from  $M_1$  to  $M_2$  which preserve  $t <_T s, \neg(t <_T s)$  and  $\text{lev}_T(x) = \alpha$  (for  $\alpha \leq \omega$ )
- (5) we say  $f$  is a weak embedding of  $M_1 \in K^{\text{tr}}$  to  $M_2^{\text{tr}}$  when:  $f$  is a function from  $M_1$  into  $M_2$ , is one-to-one on  $\{b \in M_1 : b \text{ of level } \omega\}$  and  $M_1 \models "a < b" \rightarrow M_2 \models "f(a) < f(b)"$
- (6) let  $\mathfrak{k}_\lambda^{\text{tr}} = (K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}, \leq_{\mathfrak{k}_\lambda^{\text{tr}}})$ , where  $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{k}_\lambda^{\text{tr}}} M_2$  iff the identity on  $M_1$  is a weak embedding of  $M_1$  into  $M_2$
- (7)  $J_\chi^0 = \{B \subseteq {}^\omega \chi : \text{for some } m, k \text{ we have } (\forall \eta \in {}^m \chi)(\exists \leq^k \rho)(\eta \triangleleft \rho \in B)\}$
- (8) (a)  $M$  is a standard member of  $K^{\text{tr}}$  when:
  - the set of members is included in  ${}^\omega \geq \text{Ord}$
  - it is closed under initial segments
  - the order is being initial segment
 (b)  $M$  is a standard member of  $K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}$  when
  - it is a standard member of  $K^{\text{tr}}$
  - its set of elements is  $\subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \leq \omega} \prod_{n < \alpha} \lambda_n$ .

Recall

**Definition 0.6.** For an ideal  $J$  on a set  $A$  and a set  $B$  let  $\mathbf{U}_J(B) = \text{Min}\{|\mathcal{P}| : \mathcal{P} \text{ is a family of subsets of } B, \text{ each of cardinality } \leq |A| \text{ such that for every function } f \text{ from } A \text{ to } B \text{ for some } u \in \mathcal{P} \text{ we have } \{a \in A : f(a) \in u\} \in J^+\}$ . Clearly only  $|B|$  matters so we normally write  $\mathbf{U}_J(\lambda)$  (see on it [Sh:589]).

*Proof. Proof of 0.4*

We can deal with standard members of  $K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}$ , see 0.5(8)(b).

Let  $S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0 \text{ and } \delta \text{ is divisible by } \mu^\omega, \text{ ordinal exponentiation}\}$  be stationary. By [Sh:g, Ch.III,§1] we can find  $\bar{C}$  such that:

- ⊗<sub>1</sub> (a)  $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$
- (b)  $C_\delta$  is a closed unbounded subset of  $\delta$
- (c)  $\text{otp}(C_\delta) = \chi \cdot \mu$
- (d)  $\bar{C}$  guess clubs, i.e for every club  $E$  of  $\lambda$  the set  $\{\delta \in S : C_\delta \subseteq E\}$  is a stationary subset of  $\lambda$ .

Let

- ⊗<sub>2</sub>  $\langle \alpha_{(\delta,i)} : i < \mu \rangle$  list  $C_\delta$  in increasing order.

We then let

- $\Xi_S = \{\bar{\eta} : \bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, \eta_\delta \text{ is an increasing } \omega\text{-sequence of ordinals } < \mu \text{ divisible by } \chi \text{ with limit } \mu\}$  and
- for each  $\bar{\eta} \in \Xi_S$  we define  $M_{\bar{\eta}}$  as the standard model with set of elements:  

$$\bigcup \left\{ \prod_{\ell < n} \lambda_\ell : n < \omega \right\} \cup \left\{ \langle \chi \times \eta_\delta(n) + \nu(n) : n < \omega \rangle : \delta \in S \text{ and } \nu \in A^* \right\},$$
noting that  $\chi \leq \chi^{\aleph_0} < \mu$  as  $\chi^{\aleph_0} \leq \mu < \mu^{\aleph_0}$  where  $A^*$  is from the claim and we naturally have assumed  $\chi < \lambda_0$ .

Now suppose  $M^* \in K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}$  is standard, choose  $\mathcal{P}$  such that:

- ⊗<sub>2</sub> (a)  $\mathcal{P}$  is a family of subsets of  $M^*$
- (b) each  $A \in \mathcal{P}$  is of cardinality  $\leq |A^*|$  hence  $\leq \mu$
- (c)  $\mathcal{P}$  has cardinality  $< \mu^{\aleph_0}$
- (d) if  $f : A^* \rightarrow M^*$  then for some  $u \in \mathcal{P}$  the set  $\{\nu \in A^* : f(\nu) \in u\}$  does not belong to  $J_\chi^0 \upharpoonright A^*$ .

Now such  $\mathcal{P}$  exists as  $\|M^*\| = \lambda$  and  $\mathbf{U}_{J_\chi^0 \upharpoonright A^*}(\lambda) < \mu^{\aleph_0}$ .

For each  $\delta \in S$  let

- ⊗<sub>3</sub> (a)  $B_\delta[u, M^*] := \{\min(C_\delta \setminus \nu(n)), n < \omega \text{ and } \nu \in u \text{ satisfies } \delta = \cup \{\nu(n) + 1 : n < \omega\}\}$  for  $u \in \mathcal{P}$
- (b)  $\mathcal{P}_\delta[M^*] := \{B_\delta[u, M^*] : u \in \mathcal{P}\}$  so  $\subseteq [C_\delta]^{\leq \chi^{\aleph_0}}$
- (c) for  $u \in \mathcal{P}_\delta[M^*]$  let  $\Omega_\delta(u) = \{\min(C_\delta \setminus \nu_1(n)) : n = \ell g(\nu_1 \cap \nu_2) \text{ where } \nu_1 \neq \nu_2 \in u\}$
- (d)  $\mathcal{S}_\delta[M^*] =: \{v \subseteq M : v \text{ countable and every } \alpha \in v \text{ is divisible by } \chi \text{ and for some } u \in \mathcal{P}_\delta[M^*] \text{ every } \alpha \in v \text{ satisfies } [\alpha, \alpha + \chi] \cap \Omega(u) \neq \emptyset\}$ .

So  $\mathcal{S}_\delta[M^*]$  is a subset of  $[\mu]^{\aleph_0}$  of cardinality  $\leq |\mathcal{P}| \times \chi^{\aleph_0}$  which is  $< \mu^{\aleph_0}$  recalling  $2^{\aleph_0} \leq \chi^{\aleph_0} < \mu^{\aleph_0}$ . Hence there is an unbounded  $v_\delta \subseteq \{\chi i : i < \mu\}$  of order type  $\omega$  which is almost disjoint to every  $v \in \mathcal{S}_\delta[M^*]$ . Let  $\eta_\delta$  enumerate  $v_\delta$  in increasing order so,  $\bar{\eta} =: \langle \eta_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$  belongs to  $\Xi_S$ , hence  $M_{\bar{\eta}}$  is well defined and belongs to  $K_\lambda^{\text{tr}}$ . It suffices to prove that  $M_{\bar{\eta}}$  is not embeddable into  $M^*$ . So assume toward contradiction that  $f$  is an embedding of  $M_{\bar{\eta}}$  into  $M^*$ , and let

$$E = \{\delta < \lambda : \begin{array}{l} \delta \text{ is a limit ordinal and for every } \nu \in {}^{\omega}>\delta, \\ f(\nu) \in {}^{\omega}>\delta \text{ and for every } \nu \in {}^{\omega}>\lambda, \\ \nu \in \text{Rang}(f) \Rightarrow \nu \in \text{Rang}(f \upharpoonright {}^{\omega}>\delta) \end{array}\}.$$

Clearly  $E$  is a club of  $\lambda$  hence there is  $\delta \in S$  which is an accumulation point of  $E$  and  $C_\delta \subseteq E$ . We define a function  $g$  from  $A^*$  into  $M^*$  by: for  $\nu \in A^*$  we let  $g(\nu) = f(\langle \chi \times \eta_\delta(n) + \nu(n) : n < \omega \rangle) \in M^*$ . Now apply the definition of  $\mathcal{P}_\delta$  to the mapping  $g$  hence  $A'_* := \{\nu \in A_* : g(\nu) \in u\} \in (J_\chi^0)^+$  for some  $u \in \mathcal{P}$ .

So by the definition of the ideal  $J_\chi^0$ , we know that  $(\exists^\infty n)(\exists \alpha \in \Omega_\delta(u))(\eta_\delta(n) + \mu = \alpha + \mu)$  recalling  $\otimes_3(c)$ . We get contradiction to the choice of  $\eta_\delta$ .  $\square_{0.4}$

## § 1. MORE ON ABELIAN GROUPS

This section originally was part of [Sh:622] and earlier of [Sh:552], but as the papers were too long, it was delayed.

Improving [Sh:522, 7.5] we get results on non-existence of universal for suitable trees.

From the following results on trees we can deduce results, e.g. on universal reduced separable Abelian  $p$ -group (under embeddings, not pure embeddings!), i.e.  $K_\lambda^{\text{rp}(p)}$ .

*Remark 1.1.* 1) So we can conclude the non-existence of universal member in classes which we can reduce to such trees, e.g., reduced separable  $p$ -groups, see [KjSh:455]. 2) In spite of all cases dealt with in [Sh:552], there are still some “missing” cardinals (see discussion in [Sh:622, §0]). Concerning  $\lambda$  singular satisfying  $2^{\aleph_0} < \mu^+ < \lambda < \mu^{\aleph_0}$ , clearly [Sh:622, 2.8=2.7t, 3.14=3.12t], [Sh:g] indicates that at least for most such cardinals there is no universal: as if  $\chi \in (\mu^+, \lambda)$  is regular, then  $\text{cov}(\lambda, \chi^+, \chi^+, \chi) < \mu^{\aleph_0}$ .

Let us mention concerning Case 1 (see [Sh:622, §0]), see Definition 1.3 below.

**Observation 1.2.** 1) If  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$  then in the class  $(K_\lambda^{\text{rtf}}, \leq_{\text{pr}})$ , defined in 1.3(5) below there is a universal member, in fact it is homogeneous universal.

2) If  $\lambda = \sum_{n < \omega} \lambda_n$  and  $\aleph_0 \leq \lambda_n = (\lambda_n)^{\aleph_0} < \lambda_{n+1}$  then in  $(\mathfrak{K}_\lambda^{\text{rtf}}, \leq_{\text{pr}})$  there is a universal member (the parallel of special models for first order theories). (See Fuchs [Fuc73] on such Abelian groups).

3)  $(K^{\text{rtf}}, \leq_{\text{pr}})$  has the amalgamation and JEP; is an a.e.c. (see [Sh:h]) and is stable in  $\lambda$  if  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$ .

Recalling

**Definition 1.3.** 1)  $K_\lambda^{\text{tf}}$  is the class of torsion-free Abelian groups of cardinality  $\lambda$ . Let  $K^{\text{tf}} = \cup \{K_\lambda^{\text{tf}} : \lambda \text{ a cardinal}\}$  and similarly  $K_{\leq \lambda}^{\text{tf}}$ .

1A)  $K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{rtf}}$  is the class of  $G \in K_\lambda^{\text{rtf}}$  such that there is no  $x \in G \setminus \{0\}$  divisible by  $\prod_{\ell < k} t_\ell$  for every  $k < \omega$  recalling 0.2(2).

1B) Let  $K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}} = \cup \{K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{rtf}} : \lambda \text{ a cardinal}\}$ .

1C)  $G \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$  is called  $\bar{t}$ -complete when every Cauchy sequence under  $d_{\bar{t}}$  in  $G$  has a limit where  $d_{\bar{t}}$  is defined in 1.3(3) below.

2) Let

$$(a) \mathfrak{T} = \{\bar{t} : \bar{t} = (t_n : n < \omega), 2 \leq t_n \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

(b) we call  $\bar{t} \in \mathfrak{T}$  full when  $(\forall k \geq 2)(\exists n)[k \text{ divide } \prod_{\ell < n} t_\ell]$ , equivalently  $(\forall n)(\exists m)[m >$

$$n \wedge n \mid \prod_{\ell=n}^m t_\ell], \text{ equivalently, every prime } p, \text{ divide infinitely many } t_n\text{'s}$$

(c) we say  $G$  is  $\bar{t}$ -divisible when every  $x \in G$  is divisible by  $\prod_{\ell < n} t_\ell$  for every  $n$ .

3) For  $G \in K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{rtf}}$  let  $G^{[\bar{t}]}$  be the  $d_{\bar{t}}$ -completion of  $G$  where  $d_{\bar{t}} = d_{\bar{t}}[G]$  is the metric defined by  $d_{\bar{t}}(x, y) = \inf\{2^{-k} : \prod_{\ell < k} t_\ell \text{ divides } x - y \text{ in the Abelian group } G\}$ , justify by 1.4(3), pedantically determined only up to isomorphism over  $G$ .

- 4) Let  $K_{\bar{t},\lambda}^{\text{crtf}}$  be the class of  $G \in K_{\bar{t},\lambda}^{\text{rtf}}$  which are  $\bar{t}$ -complete (i.e.  $G = G^{[\bar{t}]}$ ).  
 5) For those classes,  $\leq$  means being a subgroup and ( $\leq_{\text{pr}}$  means pure subgroup).  
 6) We say  $\bar{t}, \bar{s} \in \mathfrak{T}$  are equivalent when  $K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}} = K_{\bar{s}}^{\text{rtf}}$ .

**Observation 1.4.** 1)  $\bar{t}$  is full iff  $\bar{t}$  is equivalent to  $\langle n! : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$  iff for every  $m$  power of prime, for some  $n, m$  divides  $\prod_{\ell < n} t_\ell$ .

2) If  $\bar{t}$  is full then every  $G \in K^{\text{rtf}}$  can be represented in fact uniquely as the direct sum  $G_1 + G_2$  where  $G_1$  is divisible,  $G_2 \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$ .

3) For  $G \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$ ,  $d_{\bar{t}}$  is a metric on  $G$ .

4) If  $G \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$  then there is  $G'$ , called the  $\bar{t}$ -completion of  $G$ , such that

- (a)  $G \leq_{\text{pr}} G' \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$
- (b)  $G'$  is  $\bar{t}$ -complete
- (c)  $G$  is dense in  $G'$  by the metric  $d_{\bar{t}}$
- (d) if  $G''$  satisfies (a),(b),(c) then  $G'', G'$  are isomorphic over  $G$ .

Proof of 1.4:

Should be clear.

*Proof. Proof of 1.2*

Let  $t_n = n!$  for parts (1),(2),(3) and let  $\bar{t} = \langle t_n : n < \omega \rangle$ .

The point is

- (a) (α) for  $G \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}, G \leq_{\text{pr}} G^{[\bar{t}]} \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$  and  $G^{[\bar{t}]}$  has cardinality  $\leq \|G\|^{\aleph_0}$  and  $G^{[\bar{t}]}$  is  $d_{\bar{t}}$ -complete, remember  $G^{[\bar{t}]}$  is the  $d_{\bar{t}}$ -completion of  $G$ , it is unique up to isomorphism over  $G$
- (β) if  $G_1 \leq_{\text{pr}} G_2$  then  $G_1^{[\bar{t}]} \leq_{\text{pr}} G_2^{[\bar{t}]}$ , more pedantically: if  $G_1 \leq_{\text{pr}} G_2 \leq_{\text{pr}} G_3$  is  $\bar{t}$ -complete then  $G_1^{[\bar{t}]}$  can be embedded into  $G_3$ .

Recall  $K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{crtf}}$  is the class of  $d_{\bar{t}}$ -complete  $G \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$ .

Easily:

- (b)  $(K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{crtf}}, \leq_{\text{pr}})$  has amalgamation, the joint embedding property and the LST (= Löwenheim-Skolem-Tarski) property down to  $\lambda$  for any  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$
- (c) if  $G' \leq_{\text{pr}} G''$  are from  $K^{\text{crtf}}$  then we can find  $\leq_{\text{pr}}$ -increasing sequence  $\langle G_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha(*) \rangle$  of members of  $K^{\text{crtf}}$  such that
  - (α)  $G' = G_0, G'' = G_{\alpha(*)}$
  - (β)  $x_\alpha \in G_{\alpha+1} \setminus G_\alpha$
  - (γ)  $G_{\alpha+1}$  is the  $\bar{t}$ -completion inside  $G_{\alpha+1}$  of the pure closure of  $G_\alpha \oplus \mathbb{Z}x_\alpha$  so  $G_{\alpha+1}/G_\alpha$  has rank 1, i.e. is embeddable into  $(\mathbb{Q}, +)$
  - (δ) for  $\alpha$  limit,  $G_\alpha$  is the  $\bar{t}$ -completion of  $\cup\{G_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ .
- (d) for each  $G \in K_{\bar{t}, \leq \lambda}^{\text{crtf}}$ , we can find  $\langle (G_i, x_i) : i < \lambda^{\aleph_0} \rangle$  such that:
  - (i)  $G_0 = G, G_i$  is  $\leq_{\text{pr}}$ -increasing continuous,  $x_i \in G_{i+1} \in K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{crtf}}$
  - (ii) if  $G \leq_{\text{pr}} G', x \in G' \in K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{crtf}}$  and  $G'$  is the  $\bar{t}$ -completion of the pure closure of  $G + \mathbb{Z}x$  inside  $G'$  then we can find  $i < \lambda^{\aleph_0}$  and a pure embedding  $h$  of  $G'$  into  $G_{i+1}, h \upharpoonright G = \text{the identity}, h(x) = x_i$  (so  $h''(G_i) \leq_{\text{pr}} G$ ).

- (e) if  $\lambda, G, G_i, \lambda_i (i < \lambda^{\aleph_0})$  are as in (d) and we let  $G_* = \cup\{G_i : i < \lambda^{\aleph_0}\}$  then
- ( $\alpha$ )  $G \leq_{\text{pr}} G_* \in K_{\lambda^{\aleph_0}}^{\text{rtf}}$
  - ( $\beta$ ) if  $G \leq_{\text{pr}} G' \in K_{\lambda^{\aleph_0}}^{\text{tr}}$  then  $G'$  can be purely embedded into  $G_\lambda$  over  $G$
- (f) if  $G_\ell \in K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{ctrf}}$  and  $\langle G_i^\ell, \lambda_i^\ell : i < \lambda^{\aleph_0} \rangle, G_*^\ell$  are as in clauses (d),(e) for  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $\pi$  is an isomorphism from  $G_1$  onto  $G_2$  then there is an isomorphism  $\pi^+$  from  $G_*^1$  onto  $G_*^2$  extending  $\pi$
- (g) if  $\lambda = \Sigma\{\lambda_n : n < \omega\}, \lambda_n = \lambda_n^{\aleph_0} < \lambda_{n+1}$  and  $G \in K_\lambda^{\text{rtf}}$  then we can find  $G', G'_n$  such that
- ( $\alpha$ )  $G \leq_{\text{pr}} G' \in K_\lambda^{\text{rtf}}$
  - ( $\beta$ )  $G'_n \in K_{\lambda_n}^{\text{ctrf}}$
  - ( $\gamma$ )  $G'_n \leq_{\text{pr}} G'_{n+1}$ ; moreover there is  $\langle G'_{n,i}, x'_{n,i} : i < \lambda_n^{\aleph_0} \rangle$  as in (d) for  $G'_n$  such that  $G'_{n+1} = \cup\{G'_{n,i} : i < \lambda_n^{\aleph_0}\}$
  - ( $\delta$ )  $G' = \cup\{G'_n : n < \omega\}$ .
- (h) give  $\lambda, \lambda_n$  as in (g), if  $G', G''$  are as  $G'$  is in (g) then  $G', G''$  are isomorphic.

The result now follows. □<sub>1.2</sub>

In 1.6(2) below we prove no-universal in  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$ , using [Sh:309, Th.1.1], for the reader's convenience we quote the special case used.

**Fact 1.5.** If  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$  and  $X$  is a set of cardinality  $\leq \lambda$  then we can find a sequence  $\bar{f} = \langle f_\eta : \eta \in {}^\omega \lambda \rangle$  such that:

- (a)  $f_\eta$  is a function from  $\{\eta \upharpoonright n : n < \omega\}$  into  $X$
- (b) if  $f$  is a function from  ${}^{\omega >} \lambda$  to  $X$  then for some  $\eta \in {}^\omega \lambda$  we have  $f_\eta \subseteq f$ .

**Claim 1.6.** Assume  $\bar{t} \in \mathfrak{T}$  is not full.

- 1)  $(K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}, \leq_{\text{pr}})$  fails amalgamation and also  $(K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}, \leq)$  fails amalgamation.
- 2) If  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$  then in  $(K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{rtf}}, \leq)$  there is no universal member, even for the  $\aleph_1$ -free ones.

*Proof.* Let  $p$  be a prime witnessing  $\bar{t}$  is not full and  $n_* = \max\{n : p \text{ divide } t_n\}$ .

For every  $S \subseteq {}^\omega \lambda$  we let  $G_S$  the Abelian group generated by  $\{x_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\omega >} \lambda\} \cup \{y_{\eta,n} : \eta \in {}^\omega \lambda \text{ and } n < \omega\}$  freely except the equations:

- $t_n y_{\eta,n+1} = y_{\eta,n} - x_{\eta \upharpoonright (3n)}$  if  $n < \omega$  and  $n > n_*, \eta \in S$
- $t_n y_{\eta,n+1} = y_{\eta,n} + p x_{\eta \upharpoonright (3n+1)} - x_{\eta \upharpoonright (3n+2)}$  if  $n < \omega, \eta \notin S$  and  $n > n_*$ .

Now

- ▮ if  $S_0, S_1 \subseteq {}^\omega \lambda, \eta \in S_1 \setminus S_0$  and  $G = \Sigma_n \mathbb{Z} x_{\eta \upharpoonright n}$  then  $G \leq_{\text{pr}} G_{S_\ell}$  for  $\ell = 1, 2$  and  $G_{S_0}, G_{S_1}$  cannot be  $\leq_{\text{pr}}$ -amalgamated over  $G$ .

[Why? Toward contradiction assume  $G \leq_{\text{pr}} H \in K_{\bar{t}}^{\text{rtf}}$  and  $\pi_\ell$  is a pure embedding of  $G_{S_\ell}$  into  $H$  over  $G$ , for  $\ell = 1, 2$ . Let  $z_n = \pi_2(y_{\eta,n}) - \pi_1(y_{\eta,n})$  for  $n < \omega$ . Hence

- $n > n_* \Rightarrow t_n z_{n+1} = z_n$
- $n > n_* \Rightarrow p z_{n+1} = z_n + p x_{\eta \upharpoonright (3n+1)} - x_{\eta \upharpoonright (3n+2)}$ .

It follows that  $n_2 > n_1 \geq n_* \Rightarrow (\prod_{\ell=n_1}^{n_2} t_\ell)z_n = z_{n_1}$  hence  $z_{n_1} \in H$  is divisible by  $\prod_{\ell=n_1+1}^{n_2} t_\ell$  for every  $n_2 > n_1$  hence  $z_{n_1} = 0_H$ ; hence for  $n > n_*$ ,  $px_{\eta|(3n+1)} - x_{\eta|(3n+2)} = pz_{n+1} - z_n = 0$  so  $p$  divides  $x_{\eta|(3n+2)}$ , a contradiction.]

This is enough for part (1), for part (2) we apply the simple black box of [Sh:309, Th.1.1], i.e. 1.5.  $\square_{1.6}$

*Remark 1.7.* 1) See more in [Sh:300, Ch.II,§3] = [Sh:300b].

2) This holds also for  $K_\lambda^{\text{rs}(p)}$  the class of reduced separable Abelian  $p$ -groups see 1.10.

We may wonder whether the existence result of 1.2 holds for a stronger embeddability notion. A natural candidate is

**Definition 1.8.** Let  $G_0 \leq_{\bar{t}} G_1$  if:  $G_0, G_1$  are Abelian groups on which  $\| - \|_{\bar{t}}$  is a norm,  $G_0 \leq_{\text{pr}} G_1$  and  $G_0$  is a  $d_{\bar{t}}$ -closed subset of  $G_1$  (but  $G_\ell$  is not necessarily  $\bar{t}$ -complete!).

We prove below that for  $\mu$  strong limit of cofinality  $\aleph_0$  the answer is positive, but for cardinals like  $\aleph_\omega^+ < (\aleph_\omega)^{\aleph_0}$  the question on the existence of universals remain open.

**Fact 1.9.** 1) If  $\lambda$  is strong limit,  $\aleph_0 = \text{cf}(\lambda) < \lambda$ , then there is a universal member in  $K_\lambda^{\text{rtf}}$ .

2) Similarly in  $(K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{rtf}}, <_{\bar{t}})$  where  $\bar{t} = \langle t_\ell : \ell < \omega \rangle \in \mathfrak{T}$ .

3) For a prime number  $p$ , similarly for  $(K_\lambda^{\text{rs}(p)}, \leq_{\langle p: \ell < \omega \rangle})$ , see Definition 1.10 below.

**Definition 1.10.** For a prime number  $p$ , and cardinal  $\lambda$  we let  $K_\lambda^{\text{rs}(p)}$  be the class of Abelian  $p$ -groups which are reduced and separable of cardinality  $\lambda$ .

*Proof.* Let  $K$  be the class and  $\leq_*$  the partial order. Let  $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1} < \lambda = \sum \lambda_n$  and  $2^{\lambda_n} < \lambda_{n+1}$ . The idea in both cases is to analyze  $M \in K_\lambda$  as the union of increasing chain  $\langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle$ ,  $M_n \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\lambda_n^+, \lambda_n^+}} M$ ,  $\|M_n\| = 2^{\lambda_n}$ ,  $\lambda_n < \lambda$ .

Specifically, we shall apply 1.11, 1.13 below with:

$$\mathfrak{K} = K^{\text{rtf}}$$

$$\mu_n = (2^{\lambda_n})^+$$

$$\leq_1 = \leq_0 \text{ is : } M_1 \leq_1 M_2 \text{ iff } (M_1, M_2 \in \mathfrak{K} \text{ and}) M_1 \leq_* M_2$$

$$\begin{aligned} \leq_2 \text{ is : } M_1 \leq_2 M_2 \text{ iff } & M_1 \leq_1 M_2 \text{ and} \\ & M_1 \prec_{\mathbb{L}_{\aleph_1, \aleph_2}} M_2, \text{ or just :} \\ & \text{if } G_1 \subseteq M_1, G_1 \subseteq G_2 \subseteq M_2, \\ & \text{and } G_2 \text{ is countable then there is an} \\ & \leq_1 \text{-embedding } h \text{ of } G_2 \text{ into } M_1 \text{ over } G_1. \end{aligned}$$

We should check the conditions in 1.11 which we postpone.

We shall finish the proof after 1.13 below.  $\square_{1.9}$

**Claim 1.11.** *Assume*

- (a)  $K$  is a class of models of a fixed vocabulary closed under isomorphism,  $K_\lambda \neq \emptyset$
- (b)  $\lambda = \sum_{n < \omega} \mu_n$ ,  $\mu_n < \mu_{n+1}$ ,  $2^{\mu_n} < \mu_{n+1}$ ,  $\mu_n$  is regular and the vocabulary of  $\mathfrak{K}$  has cardinality  $< \mu_0$ .
- (c)  $\leq_1$  is a partial order on  $K$ , (so  $M \leq_1 M$ ) preserved under isomorphisms, and if  $\langle M_i : i < \delta \rangle$  is  $\leq_1$ -increasing and continuous then  $M_\delta = \bigcup_{i < \delta} M_i \in \mathfrak{K}$  and  $i < \delta \Rightarrow M_i \leq_1 M_\delta$  (so  $(K, \leq_1)$  satisfies a quite weak version of a.e.c. see [Sh:88r] = [Sh:88])
- (d) (α)  $\leq_2$  is a two-place relation on  $K$ , preserved under isomorphisms  
 (β) [weak LST] if  $M \in K_\lambda$  then we can find  $\langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle$  such that:  
 $M_n \in K_{< \mu_n}$ ,  $M_n <_2 M_{n+1}$  and  $M = \bigcup_{M < \omega} M_n$
- (e) [non-symmetric amalgamation] if  $M_0 \in K_{< \mu_n}$ ,  $M_0 \leq_1 M_1 \in K_{< \mu_{n+2}}$ ,  $N^1 \leq_2 N^2 \in K_{< \mu_{n+1}}$ ,  $h^1$  an isomorphism from  $M_0$  onto  $N^1$ , then we can find  $M_2 \in \mathfrak{K}_{< \mu(n+2)}$  such that  $M_1 \leq_1 M_2$  and there is an embedding  $h^2$  of  $N^2$  into  $M$  extending  $h^1$  satisfying  $h(N^2) \leq_1 M_2$ .

Then we can find  $\langle M_n^\alpha : n \leq \omega \rangle$  for  $\alpha < 2^{< \mu_0}$  such that:

- (α)  $M_n^\alpha \in \mathfrak{K}_{< \mu_n}$ ,  $M_n^\alpha \leq_1 M_{n+1}^\alpha$ ,  $M_\omega^\alpha = \bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n^\alpha$
- (β) if  $M \in K_\lambda$  and the sequence  $\langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle$  is as in clause (d)(β) then for some  $\alpha < 2^{< \mu_0}$  we can find an embedding  $h$  of  $M$  into  $M_\omega^\alpha$  satisfying  $h(M_n) \leq_1 M_{n+2}^\alpha$  (if  $\mathfrak{K} = (K, \leq_1)$  is an a.e.c. we get that  $h$  is a  $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of  $M$  into  $M_\omega^\alpha$ ).

*Proof.* Let

$$\mathfrak{K}'_0 = \left\{ M : \begin{array}{l} M \in \mathfrak{K} \text{ has universe an ordinal} \\ < \mu_0, \text{ and there is } \langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle \text{ as in clause (d)(\beta)} \\ \text{with } M_0 \cong M \end{array} \right\}.$$

Clearly  $K'_0$  has cardinality  $\leq 2^{< \mu_0}$ , and let us list it as  $\langle M_0^\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  with  $\alpha^* \leq 2^{< \mu_0}$ . We now choose, for each  $\alpha < \alpha^*$ , by induction on  $n < \omega$ ,  $M_n^\alpha$  such that:

- (i)  $M_n^\alpha \in \mathfrak{K}$  has universe an ordinal  $< \mu_n$
- (ii)  $M_n^\alpha \leq_1 M_{n+1}^\alpha$
- (iii) if  $N^1 \leq_2 N^2$ ,  $N^1 \in K_{< \mu_n}$ ,  $N^2 \in K_{< \mu_{n+1}}$ ,  $h^1$  is an embedding of  $N^1$  into  $M_{n+1}^\alpha$  satisfying  $h^1(N^1) \leq_1 M_{n+1}^\alpha$  then we can find  $h^2$ , an embedding of  $N^2$  into  $M_{n+2}^\alpha$  extending  $h^1$  such that  $h^2(N^2) \leq_1 M_{n+2}^\alpha$ .

For  $n = 0, 1$  we do not have much to do. (If  $n = 0$  use  $M_0^\alpha$ ; if  $n = 1$  let  $\langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle$  be as in clause (c),  $M_0 \cong M_0^\alpha$  and use  $M_1^\alpha$  such that  $(M_1, M_0) \cong (M_1^\alpha, M_0^\alpha)$ ). Assume  $M_{n+1}^\alpha$  has been defined, and we shall define  $M_{n+2}^\alpha$ , let  $\{(h_{n,\zeta}^1, N_{n,\zeta}^1, N_{n,\zeta}^2) : \zeta < \zeta_n^*\}$  where  $\zeta_n^* \leq 2^{< \mu_{n+1}}$  list the cases of clause (iii) that need to be taken care of, with the set of elements of  $N_{n,\zeta}^2$  being an ordinal. We shall choose  $\langle N_{n+1,\zeta} : \zeta \leq \zeta_n^* \rangle$  which is  $\leq_1$ -increasing continuous satisfying  $N_{n+1,\zeta} \in \mathfrak{K}_{< \mu_{n+2}}$ . We choose  $N_{n+1,\zeta}$

by induction on  $\zeta$ . Let  $N_{n+1,0} = M_{n+1}^\alpha$ , for  $\zeta$  limit let  $N_{n+1,\zeta} = \bigcup_{\xi < \zeta} N_{n+1,\xi}$  and use clause (c) of the assumption.

Lastly, for  $\zeta = \xi + 1$  use clause (e) of the assumption with  $h_{n,\zeta}^1(N_{n,\xi}^1), N_{n+1,\xi}, N_{n,\xi}^1, N_{n,\xi}^2, h_{n,\xi}^1, N_{n+1,\xi+1}$  here standing for  $M_0, M_1, N^1, N^2, h^1, h^2, M_2$  there.

Having carried the induction on  $\zeta \leq \zeta_n^*$  we let  $M_{n+1}^\alpha = N_{n+1,\zeta_n^*}$ ; so we have carried the induction on  $n$ .

Having chosen the  $\langle \langle M_n^\alpha : n < \omega \rangle : \alpha < 2^{<\mu_0} \rangle$  let  $M_\omega^\alpha = \bigcup \{M_n^\alpha : n < \omega\}$  hence by clause (c) of the assumption,  $M_\omega^\alpha \in K_\lambda$  and  $n < \omega \Rightarrow M_n^\alpha \leq_1 M_\omega^\alpha$ . Clearly clause (α) of the desired conclusion is satisfied. For clause (β) let  $M \in \mathfrak{K}_\lambda$ . By clause (d) of the assumption we can find a sequence  $\langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle$  such that  $M_n \in \mathfrak{K}_{<\mu_n}, M_n \leq_2 M_{n+1}$  and  $M = \bigcup \{M_n : n < \omega\}$ . By the choice of  $\langle M_0^\alpha : \alpha < 2^{<\mu_0} \rangle$  there is  $\alpha < 2^{<\mu_0}$  such that  $M_0 \cong M_0^\alpha$ , and let  $h_0$  be an isomorphism from  $M_0$  onto  $M_0^\alpha$ . Now by induction on  $n < \omega$  we choose  $h_n$ , an embedding of  $M_n$  into  $M_{n+1}^\alpha$  such that  $h_n(M_n) \leq_1 M_{n+1}^\alpha$  and  $h_n \subseteq h_{n+1}$ . For  $n = 0$  this has already been done as  $h_0(M_0) = M_0^\alpha \leq_1 M_1^\alpha$ . For  $n + 1$  we use clause (iii).

Lastly,  $h = \bigcup \{h_n : n < \omega\}$  is an embedding of  $M$  into  $M_\omega^\alpha$  as required.  $\square_{1.11}$

*Remark 1.12.* 1) We can choose  $\langle M_0^\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \rangle$  just to represent  $\mathfrak{K}_{<\mu_0}$ , and similarly later (and so ignore the “with the universe being an ordinal”).

2) Actually, the family of  $\langle M_n : n < \omega \rangle$  as in clause (c) such that  $M_n$  has set of elements an ordinal, forms a tree  $T$  with  $\omega$  levels with the  $n$ -th level having  $\leq 2^{<\mu_n}$  members, and we can use some free amalgamations of it. This gives a variant of 1.11.

3) We can put into the axiomatization the stronger version of (d) from 1.11 proved in the proof of 1.9 so we can weaken (β) of 1.13 below.

4) E.g., in (d) we can add  $M_n <_* M$  and so weaken clause (β) of 1.11.

**Conclusion 1.13.** 1) In 1.11 we can add  $\bigwedge_n \bigwedge_\alpha [M_n^\alpha = M_n^0]$  provided that:

(f)<sup>+</sup> there is  $M_* \in K_{<\lambda}$  such that in clause (d)(β) we can add “ $M_0$  is  $\leq_1$ -embeddable into  $M_*$ ”.

2) In 1.11 there is in  $K_\lambda$  a universal member under  $\leq_1$ -embedding if in addition we add to the assumptions of 1.11:

(f)<sup>+</sup> as in part (1)

(g) if  $M_n \leq_1 M_{n+1}, M_n \leq_1 N_n, N_n \leq_2 N_{n+1}$  and  $M_n \in K_{<\mu_{n+2}}$  and  $N_n \in K_{<\mu_{n+1}}$  for  $n < \omega$  then  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n \leq_0 \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$ .

*Proof.* Easy.

Continuation of the proof of 1.9

We have to check the demands in 1.13 and 1.11.

The least trivial clause to check is (e).

Clause (e): (non-symmetric amalgamation)

Without loss of generality  $h_1$  = the identity,  $N^1 \cap M_1 = M_0 = N_0$ . Just take the free amalgamation  $M = N^1 *_{M_0} M_1$  (in the variety of Abelian groups) and note that naturally  $M_1 \leq_1 M$ .  $\square_{1.13}$

\* \* \*

**Discussion 1.14.** 1) Can we in 1.11, 1.13 replace  $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \aleph_0$ , by  $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \theta > \aleph_0$ ? If increasing union of chains in  $K_{<\lambda}$  of length  $< \theta$  behaves nicely then yes, with no real problem.

More elaborately

- (i) in 1.11(c), we get  $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$  such that  $M_\varepsilon \in K_{<\mu_\varepsilon}$ ,  $\langle M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta \rangle$  is  $\subseteq$ -increasing continuous,  $M_\varepsilon <_2 M_{\varepsilon+1}$ ,  $M = \cup\{M_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \theta\}$
- (ii) we add: if  $\langle M_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$  is  $\leq_1$ -increasing continuous,  $M_i \in K_{<\lambda}$  and  $i < \delta \Rightarrow M_i \leq_1 N$  then  $M_\delta \leq_i N$ .

Otherwise we seem to be lost.

2) Suppose  $\lambda = \sum_{n < \omega} \lambda_n$ ,  $\lambda_n = (\lambda_n)^{\aleph_0} < \lambda_{n+1}$ , and  $\mu < \lambda_0$ ,  $\lambda < 2^\mu$  (i.e., Case 6b of [Sh:622, §0]). For  $\bar{t} \in \mathfrak{T}$  which is not weakly full, is there a universal member in  $(\mathfrak{K}_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{rtf}}, <_{\bar{t}})$ ?

Assume  $\mathbf{V} \models \text{“}\mu = \mu^{<\mu}, \mu < \chi\text{”}$  and  $\mathbb{P}$  is the forcing notion of adding  $\chi$  Cohen subsets to  $\mu$  (that is  $\mathbb{P} = \{f : f \text{ a partial function from } \chi \text{ to } 2, |\text{Dom}(f)| < \mu\}$  ordered by inclusion). So we have in  $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}} : \lambda < \lambda^{\aleph_0}$  and  $\mu < \lambda < \chi \Rightarrow$  in  $(K_{\bar{t}, \lambda}^{\text{rtf}}, \subseteq_{\bar{t}})$  there is no universal member. Proof is easy so consistently the answer is no.

Maybe continuing [Sh:E59, §2] = [Sh:e, Ch.III, §2] we can get consistency of the existence.

3) Now if  $\lambda = \lambda^{\aleph_0}$  then in  $(K_\lambda^{\aleph_1\text{-free}}, \subseteq)$  there is no universal member; see [Sh:309] = [Sh:e, Ch.IV], [Sh:622] because amalgamation fails badly. Putting together those results clearly there are few cardinals which are candidates for consistency of existence. In (2), if there is a regular  $\lambda' \in (\mu, \lambda)$  with  $\text{cov}(\lambda, \lambda^+, \lambda^+, \lambda') < 2^\mu$  then contradict 1.2.

4) Considering consistency of existence of universal in (2), it is natural to try to combine the independent results in [Sh:309] = [Sh:e, Ch.IV] and [DjSh:614].

## § 2. THE CLASS OF GROUPS

We know ([ShUs:789]) that the class of groups has NSOP<sub>4</sub> and SOP<sub>3</sub> (from [Sh:500, §2]). We shall prove a result on the place of the class of groups in the model theoretic classification. We know that it falls on “the complicated side” for some division: it has the oak property (see on it [DjSh:710]), and of course is unstable. This is formally not well defined as the definition there was for complete first order theories. But its meaning (and “no universal” consequences) are clear in a more general context, see below. Amenability is a condition on a theory (or class) which gives sufficient condition for existence of somewhat universal structures and in suitable models of set theory (see [DjSh:614]).

**Definition 2.1.**

- (1) A theory  $T$  is said to satisfy the oak property as exhibited by (or just by) a formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$  iff for any  $\lambda, \kappa$  there are  $\bar{b}_\eta (\eta \in {}^\kappa\lambda)$  and  $\bar{c}_\nu (\nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda)$  and  $\bar{a}_i (i < \kappa)$  in some model  $\mathfrak{C}$  of  $T$  such that
  - (a)  $\eta \triangleleft \nu$  and  $\nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda$  then  $\mathfrak{C} \models \varphi[\bar{a}_{\ell g(\eta)} \bar{b}_\eta, \bar{c}_\nu]$
  - (b) if  $\eta \in {}^{\kappa>}\lambda$  and  $\eta \hat{\ } \langle \alpha \rangle \in \nu_1 \in {}^\kappa\lambda$  and  $\eta \hat{\ } \langle \beta \rangle \in \nu_2 \in {}^\kappa\lambda$ , while  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and  $i > \ell g(\eta)$ , then  $\neg \exists \bar{y} [\varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{y}, \bar{c}_{\nu_1}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{a}_i, \bar{y}, \bar{c}_{\nu_2})]$  and in addition  $\varphi$  satisfies
    - (c)  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_1, \bar{z}) \wedge \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}_2, \bar{z})$  implies  $\bar{y}_1 = \bar{y}_2$ .
- (2) A theory  $T$  has the  $\Delta$ -oak property if it is exhibited by some  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}) \in \Delta$ .

**Claim 2.2.** *The class of groups has the oak property by some quantifier free formula.*

*Remark 2.3.* The original proof goes as follows.

Let  $w(x, y)$  be a complicated enough word, say of length  $k^* = 100$ , see demands below.

For cardinals  $\kappa, \lambda$  let  $G = G_{\lambda, \kappa}$  be defined as follows:

Let  $G$  be the group generated by  $\{x_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{y_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\kappa>}\lambda\} \cup \{z_\nu : \nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda\}$  freely except the set of equations

$$\Gamma = \{y_{\nu \upharpoonright i} = w(z_\nu, x_i) : \nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda, i < \kappa\}.$$

Clearly it suffices to show that

$$(*)_1 \text{ if } \nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda, i < \kappa \text{ and } \rho \in {}^i\lambda \setminus \{\nu \upharpoonright i\} \text{ then } G \models y_\rho \neq w(z_\nu, x_i).$$

Now

- (\*)<sub>2</sub> each word  $y_{\nu \upharpoonright i}^{-1} w(z_\nu, x_i)$  is so-called cyclically reduced [see [Sh:576, Ch.IV], i.e. both  $w_1 = y_{\nu \upharpoonright i}^{-1} w(z_\nu, x_i)$  and  $w_2 = w(z_\nu, x_i) y_{\nu \upharpoonright i}^{-1}$  are reduced, i.e. we do not have a generator and its inverse in adjacent places]
- (\*\*\*) for any two such words or cyclical permutations of them which are not equal, any common segment has length  $< k^*/6$ .

Explanation and why this is enough see [LS77], no point to elaborate as this is not used.

But we prefer to use the more ad-hoc but accessible proof.

*Proof.* Proof of 2.2 Let  $G = G_0$  be the group generated by

$$Y = \{x_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{z_\nu : \nu \in {}^\kappa\mu\}$$

freely except (recalling  $[xy] = xyx^{-1}y^{-1}$ , the commutator) the set of equations  $\Gamma_2 = \{[z_\nu, x_i] = [z_\eta, x_i] : i < \kappa, \nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda, \eta \in {}^\kappa\lambda \text{ satisfy } \nu \upharpoonright i = \eta \upharpoonright i\}$ . So for  $i < \kappa, \rho \in {}^i\lambda$  we can choose  $y_\rho \in G$  such that  $\eta \in {}^\kappa\lambda, \eta \upharpoonright i = \rho \Rightarrow y_\rho = [z_\eta, x_i]$ . Let  $G_1$  be the group generated by set  $Y$  freely, let  $h$  be the homomorphism from  $G_1$  onto  $G$  mapping the members of  $Y$  to themselves (using Abelian groups no two members of  $Y$  are identified in  $G_1$ ). Let  $N = \text{Kernel}(h)$ .

Clearly it suffices to prove

$$\odot \text{ in } G = G_1/N \text{ if } \nu, \eta \in {}^\kappa\lambda \text{ and } i < \kappa \text{ then } [z_\nu, x_i] = [z_\eta, x_i] \Leftrightarrow \nu \upharpoonright i = \eta \upharpoonright i.$$

The implication  $\Leftarrow$  holds trivially. For the other direction let  $j < \kappa$  and  $\eta, \nu \in {}^\kappa\lambda$  be such that  $\eta \upharpoonright j \neq \nu \upharpoonright j$  and we shall prove that  $G \models "y_{\eta \upharpoonright j} \neq y_{\nu \upharpoonright j}"$ .

Let  $N_1$  be the normal subgroup of  $G_1$  generated by

$$\begin{aligned} X_* = \{x_i : i < \kappa \text{ and } i \neq j\} & \cup \{z_\rho : \rho \in {}^\kappa\lambda \text{ and } \rho \upharpoonright j \notin \{\eta \upharpoonright j, \nu \upharpoonright j\}\} \\ & \cup \{z_\rho z_\eta^{-1} : \rho \in {}^\kappa\lambda \text{ and } \rho \upharpoonright j = \eta \upharpoonright j\} \\ & \cup \{z_\rho z_\nu^{-1} : \rho \in {}^\kappa\lambda \text{ and } \rho \upharpoonright j = \nu \upharpoonright j\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly  $N_*$  includes  $N$ . Let  $N_0 = h(N_*)$ , clearly  $N_1$  is a normal subgroup of  $G_1$  and  $h$  induces a homomorphism  $\hat{h}$  from  $G_1/N_1$  onto  $G_0/N_0$ . Now looking at the equations in  $\Gamma_*$ ,  $G_1/N_1$  is generated by  $\{x_i\} \cup \{z_\eta, z_\nu\}$ . Checking the equations clearly  $G_1/N_1$  is generated by  $\{x_i\} \cup \{z_\eta, z_\nu\}$  freely, hence  $G_1/N_1 \models "[z_\eta, x_i] \neq [z_\nu, x_i]"$  which means  $[z_\eta, x_i]^{-1}[z_\nu, x_i] \notin N_1$  hence  $\notin N$ . So recalling the choice of  $G_1$  and the  $Y$ 's, we have  $G \models "y_{\eta \upharpoonright j} \neq y_{\nu \upharpoonright j}"$  as required.  $\square_{2.2}$

## § 3. MORE ON THE OAK PROPERTY

We can in the “no universal” results in [DjSh:710] deal also with the case of singular cardinal.

**Claim 3.1.** *We have  $\text{univ}(\lambda_1, T) \geq \lambda_2$  when:*

- (a)  *$T$  is a complete first order theory with the oak property,  $\mathfrak{K} = (\text{Mod}_T, \prec)$  or at least*
- (a)'  *$\mathfrak{K}$  is an a.e.c. which has the  $\varphi$ -oak property, see Definition 2.1*
- (b) (i)  $\kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) \leq \sigma < \mu < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) \leq \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$   
(ii)  $\kappa \leq \sigma \leq \lambda_1, |T| \leq \lambda_2$   
(iii)  $\mu^\kappa \geq \lambda_2$
- (c) *let  $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, C_\delta \subseteq \delta, \text{otp}(C_\delta) = \mu, S \subseteq \lambda$  stationary,  $J =: \{A \subseteq \lambda : \text{for some club } E \text{ of } \lambda, \delta \in S \cap A \Rightarrow C_\delta \not\subseteq E\}, \lambda \notin J$  and  $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow \lambda > |\{C_\delta \cap \alpha : \alpha \in \text{nacc}(C_\delta), \delta \in S\}|$*
- (d)  $\mathbf{U}_J(\lambda_1) < \lambda_2$
- (e) *for some  $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2$  we have*
  - (i)  $\mathcal{P}_1 \subseteq [\lambda_1]^\kappa, \mathcal{P}_2 \subseteq [\sigma]^\kappa$
  - (ii) *if  $g : \sigma \rightarrow \lambda_1$  is one to one then for some  $X \in \mathcal{P}_2$ , we have  $\{g(i) : i \in X\} \in \mathcal{P}_1$*
  - (iii)  $|\mathcal{P}_1| \leq \lambda_2$
  - (iv)  $|\mathcal{P}_2| \leq \lambda_1$ .

Recall

**Definition 3.2.** 1) For  $\bar{N} = \langle N_\gamma : \gamma < \lambda \rangle$  an elementary-increasing continuous sequence of models of  $T$  of size  $< \lambda$  and for  $a, c \in N_\lambda = \bigcup_{\gamma < \lambda} N_\gamma$  and  $\delta \in S$ , we let  $\text{inv}_{\varphi, \bar{N}}(c, C_\delta, a) = \{\zeta < \mu : (\exists b \in N_{\alpha(\delta, \zeta+1)} \setminus N_{\alpha(\delta, \zeta)}) N_\lambda \models \varphi[a, b, c]\}$ .  
2) For a set  $A$  and  $\delta, \bar{N}$  as above, let  $\text{inv}_{\varphi, \bar{N}}^A(c, C_\delta) = \bigcup \{\text{inv}_{\varphi, \bar{N}}(c, C_\delta, a) : a \in A\}$ .

*Proof.* Step A: Assume toward contradiction  $\theta =: \text{univ}(\lambda_1, T) < \lambda_2$ , so let  $\langle N_j^* : j < \theta \rangle$  exemplifies this and  $\theta_1 = \theta + \lambda_1 + |T| + \mathbf{U}_J(\lambda_1)$ .

Without loss of generality the universe of  $N_j^*$  is  $\lambda_1$ .

Step B: By the definition of  $\mathbf{U}_J(\lambda_1)$  there is  $\mathcal{A}$  such that:

- (a)  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\lambda_1]^\lambda$
- (b)  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \mathbf{U}_J(\lambda_1)$
- (c) if  $f : \lambda \rightarrow \lambda_1$  then for some  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  we have  $\{\delta \in S : f(\delta) \in A\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } J$ .

For each  $X \in \mathcal{P}_1, j < \theta$  and  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  let  $M_{j, X, A}$  be an elementary submodel of  $N_j^*$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  which includes  $X \cup A \subseteq \lambda_1$ , and let  $\bar{M}_{j, X, A} = \langle M_{j, X, A, \varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$  be a filtration of  $M_{j, X, A}$ .

Lastly, consider

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\text{inv}_{\bar{M}_{j, X, A}}^X(a, C_\delta) : j < \theta, X \in \mathcal{P}_1, A \in \mathcal{A}, \delta \in S \text{ and } a \in M_{j, X, A}\}.$$

Step C: Easily we have  $|\mathcal{B}| \leq \theta_1 < \lambda_2$ , hence there is  $B^* \in [\mu]^\kappa \setminus \mathcal{B}$ . Now let  $M^*$  be a  $\lambda^+$ -saturated model of  $T$ , in which  $a_i, b_\eta (\eta \in {}^\kappa > (\lambda_2)), c_\nu (\nu \in {}^\kappa (\lambda_2)), \varphi$  are as in the definition of the oak property and for each  $Y \in \mathcal{P}_2$ , choose  $\langle N_{Y,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle, \langle c_{Y,\varepsilon,\delta} : \delta \in S \rangle$  as in 3.1.

Let  $N \prec M^*, \|N\| = \lambda_1$  such that  $\{a_i : i < \sigma\} \cup \cup \{N_{y,\varepsilon} : y \in \mathcal{P}_2, \varepsilon < \lambda\} \subseteq N$ .

Step D: By our choice of  $\langle N_j^* : j < \sigma \rangle$ , there is  $j(*) < \theta$  and elementary embedding  $f : N \rightarrow N_{j(*)}^*$ . By an assumption there are  $Y \in \mathcal{P}_1$  such that  $\{f(a_i) : i \in Y\} = X \in \mathcal{P}_2$ . Also by the choice of  $\mathcal{A}$  there is  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\{\delta \in S : f(a_{Y,\delta}) \in A\} \neq \emptyset \pmod D$ .

Now we can finish (note that we use here again the last clause in the definition of the oak property).  $\square_{3.1}$

**Definition 3.3.** 1) The formula  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$  has the weak oak property in  $T$  (the first order complete theory) if: as in Definition 2.1 omitting clause (c) (i.e. in [DjSh:710, 1.8]).

2) A complete first order theory  $T$  has the weak oak property when some  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$  has it in  $T$ .

3) For non-complete first order property  $T$  (or class  $K$ ) we mean  $\varphi$  is quantifier free.

**Claim 3.4.** *Assume*

- (a)  $T$  has the weak oak property,  $|T| \leq \lambda$
- (b)  $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle, J$  are as in (c) of 3.1.

Then for each  $B^* \in [\mu]^\kappa$ ,  $T$  has a model  $N^*$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  and sequence  $\langle a_i : i < \kappa \rangle$  of member of  $N^*$  satisfying:

- ⊛ if  $N$  is a model of  $T$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  with filtration  $\bar{N} = \langle N_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$  and  $f$  is an elementary embedding of  $N^*$  into  $N$  then

$$\{\delta \in S : \text{for some } a \in N^* \text{ we have } B^* = \text{inv}_{\varphi, \bar{N}}^{\{f(a_i) : i < \kappa\}}(C_\delta, a)\} = S \pmod J.$$

*Proof.* As usual, there is  $N^* \models T$  with filtration  $\bar{N}^* = \langle N_i^* : i < \lambda \rangle$  and  $I \subseteq {}^\kappa > \lambda$  of cardinality  $\lambda$ ,  $\langle b_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{T} \rangle$  and  $\nu_\delta \in {}^\kappa (C_\delta) \cap \lim_\kappa(T)$  for  $\delta \in S$  and  $\langle c_{\nu_\delta} : \delta \in S \rangle$  such that

- (a)  $\langle a_i : i < \kappa \rangle, \langle b_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{T} \rangle, \langle c_{\nu_\delta} : \delta \in S \rangle$  are as in the Definition 3.3
- (b)  $(\nu_\delta(i) \cap C_\delta) = (\text{the } i\text{-th member of } B^*) + 1$ .

So let  $N, \langle N_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle, f$  be as in the claim. Without loss of generality the universes of  $N^*$  and  $N$  are  $\lambda$ .

Let

$$E_* = \{\delta < \lambda : \delta \text{ limit, } f''(\delta) = \delta, |N_\delta| = \delta = |N_\delta^*| \text{ and } (N_\delta^*, N_\delta^*, f) \prec (N^*, N^*, f)\}$$

it is a club of  $\lambda$ . For each  $i < \kappa$  let

$$W_i = \{ \alpha : \text{for some } \delta \in S, \alpha \in C_{\delta_1} \subseteq E, \nu_\delta(i) > \alpha, \\ \text{but } \varphi(f(a_i), y, f(c_{\nu_\delta})) \text{ is satisfied (in } N) \\ \text{by some } b \in N_\alpha \}$$

⊗  $W_i$  is not stationary.

[Why? Let  $\mathfrak{B} \prec (\mathcal{H}(\lambda^+), \in, <^*)$  be such that  $\bar{N}, \bar{N}^*, \langle a_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa \rangle, \langle b_\eta : \eta \in \mathcal{I} \rangle, \langle c_{\nu_\delta} : \delta \in S \rangle$  belong and  $\mathfrak{B} \cap \lambda = \alpha \in W_i$  and assume  $b \in \mathfrak{B} \cap \alpha, N \models \varphi(f(a_i), b, f(c_{\nu_\delta}))$ . So there is  $\delta' \in S \cap \delta$  such that  $N \models \varphi[f(a_1), b, f(c_{\nu_\delta})]$ . But  $\nu_\delta(i) \geq \alpha > \nu_{\delta'}(i)$  hence  $\varphi(a_i, y, c_{\nu_\delta}), \varphi(a_i, y, c_{\nu_{\delta'}})$  are incompatible (in  $N^*$ ) hence their images by  $f$  are incompatible in  $N$  by  $b$  satisfies both contradictions, so  $W_i$  is not stationary.]

So there is a club  $E^*$  of  $\lambda$  included in  $E_\kappa$  and disjoint to  $W_i$  for each  $i < \kappa$ . So there is  $\delta^* \in S$  such that  $C_\delta \subseteq E^*$  and we get contradiction as usual.  $\square_{3.4}$

*Question 3.5.* Can we combine 3.1, 3.4?

(For many singular  $\lambda_2$ 's, certainly yes).

## REFERENCES

- [Fuc73] Laszlo Fuchs, *Infinite Abelian Groups*, vol. I, II, Academic Press, New York, 1970, 1973.
- [LS77] Roger C. Lyndon and Paul E. Schupp, *Combinatorial group theory*, *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*, vol. 89, Springer-Verlag, Berlin–Heidelberg–New York, 1977.
- [Mir05] Džamonja Mirna, *Club guessing and the universal models*, *Notre Dame J. Formal Logic* **46** (2005), 283–300.
- [Sh:e] Saharon Shelah, *Non-structure theory*, vol. accepted, Oxford University Press.
- [Sh:g] ———, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, *Oxford Logic Guides*, vol. 29, Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh:h] ———, *Classification Theory for Abstract Elementary Classes*, *Studies in Logic: Mathematical logic and foundations*, vol. 18, College Publications, 2009.
- [Sh:26] ———, *Notes on combinatorial set theory*, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **14** (1973), 262–277.
- [McSh:55] Angus Macintyre and Saharon Shelah, *Uncountable universal locally finite groups*, *Journal of Algebra* **43** (1976), 168–175.
- [Sh:E59] Saharon Shelah, *General non-structure theory and constructing from linear orders*, 1011.3576.
- [Sh:88] ———, *Classification of nonelementary classes. II. Abstract elementary classes*, *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1292, Springer, Berlin, 1987, *Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory*, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T., pp. 419–497.
- [Sh:88r] ———, *Abstract elementary classes near  $\aleph_1$* , Chapter I. 0705.4137. 0705.4137.
- [GrSh:174] Rami Grossberg and Saharon Shelah, *On universal locally finite groups*, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **44** (1983), 289–302.
- [Sh:300] Saharon Shelah, *Universal classes*, *Classification theory (Chicago, IL, 1985)*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, vol. 1292, Springer, Berlin, 1987, *Proceedings of the USA–Israel Conference on Classification Theory*, Chicago, December 1985; ed. Baldwin, J.T., pp. 264–418.
- [Sh:300b] ———, *Universal Classes: Axiomatic Framework [Sh:h]*, Chapter V (B).
- [Sh:309] ———, *Black Boxes*, , 0812.0656. 0812.0656. 0812.0656.
- [KjSh:409] Menachem Kojman and Saharon Shelah, *Non-existence of Universal Orders in Many Cardinals*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* **57** (1992), 875–891, math.LO/9209201.
- [KjSh:455] ———, *Universal Abelian Groups*, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **92** (1995), 113–124, math.LO/9409207.
- [Sh:456] Saharon Shelah, *Universal in  $(< \lambda)$ -stable abelian group*, *Mathematica Japonica* **43** (1996), 1–11, math.LO/9509225.
- [Sh:500] ———, *Toward classifying unstable theories*, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **80** (1996), 229–255, math.LO/9508205.
- [Sh:522] ———, *Borel sets with large squares*, *Fundamenta Mathematicae* **159** (1999), 1–50, math.LO/9802134.
- [Sh:552] ———, *Non-existence of universals for classes like reduced torsion free abelian groups under embeddings which are not necessarily pure*, *Advances in Algebra and Model Theory*. Editors: Manfred Droste and Ruediger Goebel, *Algebra, Logic and Applications*, vol. 9, Gordon and Breach, 1997, math.LO/9609217, pp. 229–286.
- [Sh:576] ———, *Categoricity of an abstract elementary class in two successive cardinals*, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **126** (2001), 29–128, math.LO/9805146.
- [Sh:589] ———, *Applications of PCF theory*, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* **65** (2000), 1624–1674, math.LO/9804155.
- [DjSh:614] Mirna Džamonja and Saharon Shelah, *On the existence of universal models*, *Archive for Mathematical Logic* **43** (2004), 901–936, math.LO/9805149.
- [Sh:622] Saharon Shelah, *Non-existence of universal members in classes of Abelian groups*, *Journal of Group Theory* **4** (2001), 169–191, math.LO/9808139.
- [DjSh:710] Mirna Džamonja and Saharon Shelah, *On properties of theories which preclude the existence of universal models*, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* **139** (2006), 280–302, math.LO/0009078.
- [ShUs:789] Saharon Shelah and Alex Usvyatsov, *Banach spaces and groups - order properties and universal models*, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **152** (2006), 245–270, math.LO/0303325.
- [Sh:F1320] Saharon Shelah, *No universal in a cardinal: sufficient conditions*.

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, GIVAT RAM, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, JERUSALEM, 91904, ISRAEL, AND, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HILL CENTER - BUSCH CAMPUS, RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY, 110 FRELINGHUYSEN ROAD, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-8019 USA

*E-mail address:* `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

*URL:* `http://shelah.logic.at`