# The Institute For Research In Cognitive Science

# **Preservation Theorems in Finite Model Theory**

(To appear in Daniel Leivant, editor, Logic and Computational Complexity, Springer-Verlag)

by

Eric Rosen Scott Weinstein


University of Pennsylvania 3401 Walnut Street, Suite 400C Philadelphia, PA 19104-6228

**March 1995** 

Site of the NSF Science and Technology Center for Research in Cognitive Science

N

 $\boldsymbol{E}$ 



*University of Pennsylvania*Founded by Benjamin Franklin in 1740

**IRCS Report 95-04** 

# Preservation Theorems in Finite Model Theory\*

Eric Rosen\*\* and Scott Weinstein\*\*\*

Department of Philosophy University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia PA 19104, USA

Abstract. We develop various aspects of the finite model theory of  $L^k(\exists)$  and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ . We establish the optimality of normal forms for  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  over the class of finite structures and demonstrate separations among descriptive complexity classes within  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ . We establish negative results concerning preservation theorems for  $L^k(\exists)$  and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ . We introduce a generalized notion of preservation theorem and establish some positive results concerning "generalized preservation theorems" for first-order definable classes of finite structures which are closed under extensions.

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we investigate the status of preservation theorems in finite model theory. We focus our attention on classes of finite structures which are closed under extensions and their definability in fragments of the infinitary language  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$ . The language  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  was introduced by Barwise [4] in connection with the investigation of inductive definability over infinite structures. Recently, the study of  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  has played a central role in analyzing the behavior of fixed-point logics over the class of finite structures (see [5, 13]). Of particular interest from the point of view of our current investigation are the works of Kolaitis and Vardi [12] and Afrati, Cosmadakis, and Yannakakis [1] which exploit existential fragments of  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  in analyzing the expressive power of Datalog.

The starting point for our investigation is the well-known failure of the preservation theorem of Los and Tarski over finite structures. Recall that the Los-Tarski Theorem states that any first-order definable class of structures which is closed under extensions is definable by a first-order existential sentence. Scott and Suppes conjectured that this theorem generalizes to the finite case, that is, if  $\mathrm{Mod}_f(\varphi)$  (the collection of finite models of the first-order sentence  $\varphi$ ) is closed under extensions, then  $\mathrm{Mod}_f(\varphi) = \mathrm{Mod}_f(\psi)$ , for some first-order existential sentence  $\psi$ . Tait [18] showed that this conjecture fails; Gurevich and Shelah [9, 10] gave simpler counterexamples employing universal-existential first-order sentences.

<sup>\*</sup> We would like to thank Maria Bonet, Yuri Gurevich, and Steven Lindell for valuable discussions on the subject of this paper.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Supported in part by NSF-STC SBR-8920230.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> Supported in part by NSF CCR-9403447.

In light of the failure of the Los-Tarski Theorem over finite structures, it is natural to inquire whether "generalized preservation theorems" might hold in the finite case. In this paper, we investigate the prospects for such a positive approach to preservation properties in the context of finite model theory. In particular, we examine generalized versions of ordinary preservation theorems where an algebraic restriction on a class of structures definable in a given language yields information about the syntactic structure of formulas which define that class in an extension of that language. In this spirit, we show that for certain classes of first-order sentences  $\Phi$ , if  $\varphi \in \Phi$  and  $\mathrm{Mod}_f(\varphi)$  is closed under extensions, then  $\mathrm{Mod}_f(\varphi) = \mathrm{Mod}_f(\psi)$  for some  $\psi$  in the existential fragment of  $L^\omega_{\infty\omega}$  (or even in  $\mathrm{Datalog}(\neq,\neg)$ ). In contrast, we also establish the failure of the analog of the Los-Tarski Theorem for  $L^\omega_{\infty\omega}$  itself, both over finite structures and over arbitrary structures. That is, we show that there is a sentence  $\varphi$  of  $L^\omega_{\infty\omega}$  such that both  $\mathrm{Mod}_f(\varphi)$  and  $\mathrm{Mod}(\varphi)$  are closed under extensions, but neither of these classes is definable by an existential sentence of  $L^\omega_{\infty\omega}$ .

The paper proceeds as follows. The next section introduces the languages we will study and establishes a simple proposition which characterizes the relative expressive power of their existential fragments. Section 3 develops some finite model theory for the existential fragments of  $L^k$  and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$ . In particular, we establish the optimality of a normal form for the existential fragment of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$  over finite structures and demonstrate separations among descriptive complexity classes within  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ . In Section 4, we prove the failure of existential preservation for  $L^\omega_{\infty\omega}$ . Section 5 is devoted to establishing positive results concerning generalized preservation theorems for fragments of first-order logic over finite structures. In the final section, we discuss a number of open problems and present without proof some related results concerning preservation under homomorphisms. A full treatment of these results will appear in [17].

# 2 Preliminaries

Let  $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$  be the collection of finite structures of signature  $\sigma$ . We will assume that the universe of any  $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$  is an initial segment of  $N = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ . We will often use  $A, B, \ldots$  etc. to denote both a structure and its universe when no confusion is likely to result. We assume that the signature  $\sigma$  is finite and contains no function symbols; we suppress mention of  $\sigma$  when no confusion is likely to result. A boolean query  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  is a class of finite structures that is closed under isomorphisms. We use  $\mathcal{C}$  to range over boolean queries. In what follows, we will focus attention on boolean queries which are closed under extensions.

**Definition 1.** EXT = { $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{F} \mid \forall A, B \in \mathcal{C}$ , if  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $A \subseteq B$ , then  $B \in \mathcal{C}$  }.

Let L be a logical language and let  $\varphi$  be a sentence of L.  $\operatorname{Mod}(\varphi) = \{A \mid A \models \varphi\}$  is the L-class determined by  $\varphi$  and  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi) = \{A \in \mathcal{F} \mid A \models \varphi\}$  is the boolean query expressed by  $\varphi$ . We say that  $\mathcal{C}$  is L-definable, just in case it is the boolean query expressed by some sentence  $\varphi \in L$ . We will often use L to denote the set of L-definable boolean queries. We let FO denote first-order logic,  $L_{\infty \omega}$ ,

the usual infinitary extension of first-order logic which allows conjunction and disjunction over arbitrary sets of formulas,  $L^k$ , the fragment of FO consisting of those formulas all of whose variables both free and bound are among  $x_1,\ldots,x_k$ , and similarly  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$ , the k-variable fragment of  $L_{\infty\omega}$ ;  $L^\omega_{\infty\omega} = \bigcup_{k\in\omega} L^k_{\infty\omega}$ . We let FO( $\exists$ ) denote the set of existential formulas of FO, that is, those formulas obtained by closing the set of atomic formulas and negated atomic formulas under the operations of conjunction, disjunction, and existential quantification. We define  $L_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ , the set of existential formulas of  $L_{\infty\omega}$ , similarly, but require, in addition, closure under infinitary conjunction and disjunction. We let  $L^k(\exists)$  consist of the formulas common to FO( $\exists$ ) and  $L^k$  and we define  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  similarly. A Datalog( $\neq$ ,  $\neg$ ) program P is a collection of rules of the form

$$\eta_0 \longleftarrow \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k.$$

Such a rule has a head,  $\eta_0$ , and a body,  $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k$ . Each of the  $\eta_i$  is either an inequality or a literal over the signature  $\sigma \cup \tau$  where  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are disjoint;  $\sigma$  consists of the extensional relations and constants of P and  $\tau$  consists of the intensional relations of P. The heads of all rules are built from intensional relations and intensional relations occur only positively throughout P. The program contains a distinguished intensional relation R of arity  $n \geq 0$  and determines an n-ary query over structures in  $\mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$ . The value of this query for a given  $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\sigma}$  is the value of R when the program is viewed as determining least-fixed points for each of the intensional relations with respect to a simultaneous induction associated with the program. The reader may consult [1, 12] for further details and discussion. As with logics, we use  $\text{Datalog}(\neq, \neg)$  to refer to the class of queries computed by  $\text{Datalog}(\neq, \neg)$  programs as well as to the class of programs themselves.  $\text{Datalog}(\neq, \neg)$  programs are defined similarly except that all the  $\eta_i$  are restricted to be positive literals, even those built from extensional relations. Observe that  $\text{Datalog}(\neq, \neg)$  is contained in the least fixed-point extension of first-order logic (FO+LFP).

In our current notation, the failure of the Los-Tarski Theorem over finite structures may be expressed as:

$$FO \cap EXT \not\subset FO(\exists)$$
.

This raises the question of whether  $FO \cap EXT$  is contained in the existential fragment of some stronger logic. The following proposition completely characterizes the relative expressive power of the existential fragments of the logics in which we are interested.

# Proposition 2.

$$FO(\exists) \subset Datalog(\neq, \neg) \subset L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists) \subset L_{\infty\omega}(\exists) = EXT.$$

*Proof.* It is easy to see that every query in FO( $\exists$ ) can be expressed by a program in Datalog( $\neq$ ,  $\neg$ ) which makes use of no recursion. It is well-known that this inclusion is strict, for example, the query (s,t)-connectivity is expressible in Datalog but not in FO. The inclusion of Datalog( $\neq$ ,  $\neg$ ) in  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  has been noted by Afrati, Cosmadakis, and Yannakakis [1] (see also [12]); the argument to show

this is a variant of the proof that least fixed-point logic is contained in  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  over the class of finite structures (see [14]). Afrati, Cosmadakis, and Yannakakis [1] also exhibit queries which witness the separation of  $\operatorname{Datalog}(\neq,\neg)$  and  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ , even over the class of polynomial time computable queries. The identity between  $L_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  and EXT has been noted by Kolaitis and independently by Lo (see [1] and [15]). Finally, it is easy to construct polynomial time computable boolean queries in EXT which are not in  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$ . For example, let  $\mathcal C$  be the query over the signature  $\{E,s,t\}$  of source-target graphs that says that there is an E-path from s to t whose length is less than half the cardinality of the structure. It is clear that  $\mathcal C \in \operatorname{EXT}$ . It is also easy to verify that  $\mathcal C$  is not in  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  (and therefore not in  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ ) by a straightforward application of the k-pebble Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game which we review below.

The above proposition together with the failure of the Los-Tarski Theorem in the finite case suggests the following questions.

```
1. Is FO \cap EXT \subseteq L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)?
2. Is FO \cap EXT \subseteq Datalog(\neq, \neg)?
3. Is L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega} \cap EXT \subseteq L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)?
```

Clearly a positive answer to the second or third question would imply a positive answer to the first. In Section 4, we provide a negative answer to the third question. In Section 5, we provide partial positive answers to the first and second questions. Before proceeding to these results, we develop some of the finite model theory of  $L^k(\exists)$  and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  in the next section.

# **3** Basic Finite Model Theory for $m{L}^k(\exists)$ and $m{L}^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$

In this section, we present some basic model theory for  $L^k$ ,  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$ ,  $L^k(\exists)$ , and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ . After a brief discussion of game-theoretic characterizations of equivalence and definability in these languages, we proceed to consider questions of finite axiomatizability and normal forms.

Let L be one of the logical languages we consider. Given a structure A, the L-theory of A is the collection of sentences of L which are satisfied by A. We say that A is L-equivalent to B, if and only if, the L-theory of A is equal to the L-theory of B and we say that A is L-compatible with B, if and only if, the L-theory of A is contained in the L-theory of B. Note that if L is closed under negation, then the relations of L-equivalence and L-compatibility coincide, whereas for languages like  $L^k(\exists)$  and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  these relations are distinct. We use the notations  $\equiv^k$ ,  $\equiv^k_{\infty\omega}$ ,  $\preceq^k$ , and  $\preceq^k_{\infty\omega}$  for  $L^k$ -equivalence,  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$ -equivalence,  $L^k(\exists)$ -compatibility, and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ -compatibility, respectively. The main tool for studying these relations are refinements of the Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game. Barwise [4] characterized  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$ -equivalence in terms of partial isomorphisms, while Immerman [11] and Poizat [16] provided related pebble game characterizations of  $L^k$ -equivalence. Kolaitis and Vardi [12] characterized compatibility in the negation free fragment of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  both in terms of collections of partial homomorphisms as well as in

terms of a one-sided, positive version of the pebble game. Below we use a minor variant of the approach in [12] to characterize  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ -compatibility.

A collection I of partial isomorphisms from A to B is said to have the k- $[back-and-]forth\ property$  if for all  $f \in I$  such that the domain of f has cardinality < k, and all  $a \in A$   $[b \in B]$ , there is a function  $g \in I$  such that  $f \subseteq g$  and  $a \in \text{dom}(g)[b \in \text{rng}(g)]$ . (That is, the k-forth property is the one-sided version, going forth from A, of the k-back-and-forth property.)

Barwise [4] proved the following proposition which gives an algebraic characterization of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$ -equivalence.

**Proposition 3 (Barwise [4]).** Let A and B be structures of signature  $\sigma$  and let h be the map with dom $(h) = \{c^A \mid c \in \sigma\}$  such that  $h(c^A) = c^B$  for all  $c \in \sigma$ . The following conditions are equivalent.

- 1.  $A \equiv_{\infty \omega}^k B$ .
- 2. There is a non-empty set I of partial isomorphisms from A to B such that
  (a) I is closed under subfunctions;
  - (b) I has the k-back-and-forth property;
  - (c) for all  $f \in I$ ,  $f \cup h$  is a partial isomorphism from A to B.

In a similar spirit, Kolaitis and Vardi [12] gave an algebraic characterization of the compatibility relation for the negation free fragment of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  in terms of collections of partial homomorphisms with the k-forth property. We adapt their approach to the case of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  in the following theorem.

**Proposition 4** (Kolaitis and Vardi [12]). Let A and B be structures of signature  $\sigma$  and let h be the map with  $dom(h) = \{c^A \mid c \in \sigma\}$  such that  $h(c^A) = c^B$  for all  $c \in \sigma$ . The following conditions are equivalent.

- 1.  $A \leq_{\infty \omega}^k B$ .
- 2. There is a non-empty set I of partial isomorphisms from A to B such that
  (a) I is closed under subfunctions;
  - (b) I has the k-forth property;
  - (c) for all  $f \in I$ ,  $f \cup h$  is a partial isomorphism from A to B.

Both Propositions 3 and 4 can be expressed more colorfully in terms of pebble games. This approach to  $L^k$ -equivalence was introduced by Immerman [11] and Poizat [16] and as an approach to  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ -compatibility by Kolaitis and Vardi [12]. In order to state the relevant results in a suitably refined form, we require the notion of the quantifier rank of a formula. We state this definition for formulas of  $L_{\infty\omega}$  since all the languages we consider are fragments of it.

**Definition 5.** The quantifier rank of  $\varphi \in L_{\infty\omega}$  (qr( $\varphi$ )) is defined by the following induction.

- 1.  $qr(\varphi) = 0$  if  $\varphi$  is atomic;
- 2.  $qr(\neg \varphi) = qr(\varphi)$ ;
- 3.  $\operatorname{qr}(\bigwedge \Phi) = \operatorname{qr}(\bigvee \Phi) = \sup(\{\operatorname{qr}(\varphi) \mid \varphi \in \Phi\});$

```
4. qr(\exists x\varphi) = qr(\forall x\varphi) = qr(\varphi) + 1.
```

The n-round, k-pebble Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game on A and B is played between two players, Spoiler and Duplicator, with k pairs of pebbles,  $(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \ldots$  $(\alpha_k, \beta_k)$ . The Spoiler begins each round by choosing a pair of pebbles  $(\alpha_i, \beta_i)$ that may or may not be in play on the boards A and B. He (by convention, the Spoiler is male, the Duplicator female) either places  $\alpha_i$  on an element of A, or  $\beta_i$ on an element of B. The Duplicator then plays the remaining pebble on the other model. The Spoiler wins the game if after any round  $m \leq n$  the function f from A to B, which sends the element pebbled by  $\alpha_i$  to the element pebbled by  $\beta_i$  and preserves the denotations of constants, is not a partial isomorphism; otherwise, the Duplicator wins the game. The n-round  $\exists^k$ -game is the one-sided version of the n-round, k-pebble Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game in which the Spoiler is restricted to play a pebble  $\alpha_i$  into A at every round while the Duplicator responds by playing  $\beta_i$  into B; the winning condition remains the same. Both the k-pebble Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game and its one-sided variant have infinite versions, which we call the eternal k-pebble Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game and the eternal  $\exists^k$ -game. In these games, the play continues through a sequence of rounds of order type  $\omega$ . The Spoiler wins the game, if and only if, he wins at the  $n^{\text{th}}$ -round for some  $n \in \omega$  as above; otherwise, the Duplicator wins. In describing the play of pebble games below, we will often use S to refer to the Spoiler and D to refer to the Duplicator. We will also often use  $\alpha_i, \beta_i$ , etc. to refer to both pebbles and the elements they pebble at a given round of play.

The foregoing n-round games may be used to characterize equivalence and compatibility of structures with respect to  $L^k$  sentences and  $L^k(\exists)$  sentences of quantifier rank n, and the eternal games may be used to characterize equivalence and compatibility of structures with respect to  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$  sentences and  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  sentences. Given structures A and B we let  $A\equiv^{k,n}B$ , if and only if, A and B satisfy the same sentences of  $L^k$  of quantifier rank  $\leq n$  and we let  $A\preceq^{k,n}B$ , if and only if, every sentence of  $L^k(\exists)$  of quantifier rank  $\leq n$ , which is true in A, is also true in B. The following two propositions use the n-round pebble games to characterize these relations. The first is due to Immerman [11] and Poizat [16] and the second is essentially due to Kolaitis and Vardi [12].

**Proposition 6** (Immerman [11], Poizat [16]). For all structures A and B, the following conditions are equivalent.

- 1.  $A \equiv^{k,n} B$ .
- 2. The Duplicator has a winning strategy for the n-round, k-pebble Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game on A and B.

**Proposition 7** (Kolaitis and Vardi [12]). For all structures A and B, the following conditions are equivalent.

- 1.  $A \prec^{k,n} B$ .
- 2. The Duplicator has a winning strategy for the n-round  $\exists^k$ -game on A and B, with the Duplicator playing on B.

The next proposition gives a characterization of the infinitary equivalence and compatibility relations in terms of the eternal games. It is essentially due to Kolaitis and Vardi [14, 12].

Proposition 8 (Kolaitis and Vardi [14, 12]). 1. For all structures A and

- B, the following conditions are equivalent.
- (a)  $A \equiv_{\infty}^k B$ .
- (b) The Duplicator has a winning strategy for the eternal k-pebble Ehrenfeucht-Fraisse game on A and B.
- 2. For all structures A and B, the following conditions are equivalent.
  - (a)  $A \preceq_{\infty \omega}^k B$ .
  - (b) The Duplicator has a winning strategy for the eternal  $\exists^k$ -game on A and B, with the Duplicator playing on B.

Kolaitis and Vardi [14, 12] observed that over finite structures infinitary equivalence and compatibility coincide with their finitary analogs.

Proposition 9 (Kolaitis and Vardi [14, 12]). 1. Let A or B be a finite structure. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.

- (a)  $A \equiv_{\infty \omega}^k B$ .
- (b)  $A \equiv^k B$ .
- 2. Let B be a finite structure. Then, the following conditions are equivalent.
  - $\begin{array}{ccc} (a) & A \preceq_{\infty \omega}^k B \,. \\ (b) & A \preceq^k B \,. \end{array}$

The foregoing propositions yield the following corollaries concerning definability.

**Proposition 10** (Kolaitis and Vardi [12]). For all  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ , the following conditions are equivalent.

- 1. C is  $L_{\infty\omega}^k(\exists)$ -definable.
- 2. For all  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $B \notin \mathcal{C}$ ,  $A \not\preceq_{\infty \omega}^k B$ .
- 3. For all  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $B \notin \mathcal{C}$ ,  $A \not\preceq^{k} B$ .
- 4. For all  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $B \notin \mathcal{C}$ , there is an  $n \in \omega$  such that the Spoiler has a winning strategy for the n-round  $\exists^k$ -game on A and B with the Spoiler playing on A.

Let L and L' be logical languages and let T be a collection of sentences of L. We say that T is finitely axiomatizable in L', if and only if, there is a sentence  $\varphi \in L'$  such that  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(T) = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi)$ . Dawar, Lindell and Weinstein [5] prove that the  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$ -theory of any finite model is finitely axiomatizable in  $L^k$ . As a corollary, they obtain a simple normal form for  $L_{\infty\omega}^k$  over  $\mathcal{F}$ , in particular, they show that every sentence of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}$  is equivalent to a countable disjunction of sentences of  $L^k$  and is also equivalent to a countable conjunction of sentences of  $L^k$ . In contrast, we show below that there are finite models whose  $L^k(\exists)$ -theories are not finitely axiomatizable in  $L^k(\exists)$ . Building on this result, we prove that the normal form for  $L_{\infty\omega}^k$  over  $\mathcal{F}$  (every sentence of  $L_{\infty\omega}^k$  is equivalent over  $\mathcal{F}$  to a

countable disjunction of countable conjunctions of sentences of  $L^k$ ) exhibited by Kolaitis and Vardi [14] is optimal when considered as a normal form for  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  sentences over  $L^k(\exists)$ .

We begin by proving that there are models whose  $L^k(\exists)$ -theories are not finitely axiomatizable in  $L^k(\exists)$ . Our argument exploits the k-extension axioms, which we now describe briefly. Let  $\sigma$  be a purely relational, finite signature. A basic k-type  $\pi$  over the signature  $\sigma$  is a maximal consistent set of literals over  $\sigma$  in the variables  $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ . A k-extension axiom of signature  $\sigma$  is a sentence of the form  $\forall x_1 \dots x_{k-1} \exists x_k (\bigwedge \pi \to \bigwedge \pi')$ , where  $\pi$  is a basic (k-1)-type of signature  $\sigma, \pi'$  is a basic k-type of signature  $\sigma$ , and  $\pi \subseteq \pi'$ . Over a fixed signature  $\sigma$ , the k-Gaifman theory,  $\Gamma_k$ , is the set of all k-extensions axioms of signature  $\sigma$ . It is easy to see that, for each k, there are only finitely many k-extension axioms. Gaifman [7] showed that the theory  $T = \bigcup_k \Gamma_k$  axiomatizes an  $\omega$ -categorical model called the random structure. Fagin [6] proved the 0-1 law for first-order logic by showing that every extension axiom is almost surely true over  $\mathcal{F}$ . Fagin's result implies that almost every  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  satisfies the k-Gaifman theory. Immerman [11] showed that any two models of the k-Gaifman theory are  $L^k$ -equivalent and Kolaitis and Vardi [14] made use of the k-Gaifman theory in their proof of the 0-1 law for  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$ . We make the following easy observation.

**Proposition 11.** Let  $A \models \Gamma_k$ , and let B be any (finite or infinite) model. Then  $B \preceq_{\infty\omega}^k A$ . Equivalently, for all  $\varphi \in L_{\infty\omega}^k(\exists)$ , if  $\varphi$  is satisfiable, then  $A \models \varphi$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows easily from Proposition 8 by considering the eternal  $\exists^k$ -game on B and A with the Duplicator playing on A. The k-Gaifman axioms essentially say that D can extend a partial isomorphism with domain of size < k in every possible way. Therefore, she has a winning strategy for the game.

We observe that this result yields a compactness theorem over finite structures and a finitary analog of the Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem for  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ .

**Corollary 12.** For every  $k \in \omega$ , there is an  $n_k \in \omega$  such that for every set  $\Phi$  of sentences of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ ,  $\Phi$  is satisfiable, if and only if, every finite subset of  $\Phi$  is satisfiable, if and only if,  $\Phi$  is satisfied in a model of size  $n_k$ .

The next proposition establishes that there are finite structures whose  $L^k(\exists)$ -theory is not finitely axiomatizable in  $L^k(\exists)$ .

**Proposition 13.** For all  $k \geq 2$ , there is a model  $A_k \in \mathcal{F}$  such that the  $L^k(\exists)$ -theory of  $A_k$  is not finitely axiomatizable in  $L^k(\exists)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $A_k$  be any finite model of the k-Gaifman theory over the language of graphs. We show that for any  $n \in \omega$ , there is a  $B_k^n$  such that  $A_k \leq^{k,n} B_k^n$  and  $A_k \nleq^{k,n+1} B_k^n$ . This implies that the theory of  $A_k$  cannot be axiomatized by  $L^k(\exists)$  sentences of quantifier rank  $\leq n$  and, therefore, that it is not finitely axiomatizable in  $L^k(\exists)$ .

For the purpose of defining the models  $B_k^n$ , we require the following notion and notation. A basic k-type  $\pi$  satisfies the distinctness condition if for every

l < k, the formula  $x_l \neq x_k \in \pi$ . Let  $\{\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_s\}$  be a set of basic (k-1)-types such that

- 1. every basic (k-1)-type is equivalent to some  $\pi_i$  and
- 2. if  $i \neq j$ , then  $\pi_i$  is not equivalent to  $\pi_i$ .

Similarly, for each  $1 \le i \le s$ , let  $\{\pi_{i,1}, \ldots, \pi_{i,n(i)}\}$  be a set of basic k-types each of which extends  $\pi_i$  and satisfies the distinctness condition such that

- 1. every basic k-type which extends  $\pi_i$  and satisfies the distinctness condition is equivalent to some  $\pi_{i,j}$  and
- 2. if  $j \neq j'$ , then  $\pi_{i,j}$  is not equivalent to  $\pi_{i,j'}$ .

We proceed to define the models  $B_k^n$ . Let  $B_k^1$  be the graph on two vertices with exactly one loop and no other edges. Thus  $B_k^1$  realizes both basic 1-types. Given that  $B_k^n$  has been defined, we now define  $B_k^{n+1}$  as an extension of  $B_k^n$ . For each (k-1)-tuple  $\overline{b}$  of elements of  $B_k^n$ , let  $\tau(\overline{b})$  be the unique i such that  $B_k^n \models \pi_i[\overline{b}]$ , and let  $X_{\overline{b}} = \{b_{i,j}^{n+1} \mid 1 \leq j \leq n(\tau(\overline{b}))\}$  be a set of distinct objects disjoint from  $B_k^n$ . We suppose that for any distinct pair of (k-1)-tuples  $\overline{a}$  and  $\overline{b}$  of elements of  $B_k^n$ ,  $X_{\overline{a}} \cap X_{\overline{b}} = \emptyset$ . Let X be the union of all the sets  $X_{\overline{b}}$ . We let the universe of  $B_k^{n+1} = B_k^n \cup X$ . The edge relation of  $B_k^{n+1}$  is obtained from that of  $B_k^n$  by adding the minimal number of edges so that each k-tuple  $\overline{b} * b_{i,j}^{n+1}$  satisfies  $\pi_{\tau(\overline{b}),j}$ . It is easy to see that each  $B_k^{n+1}$  is well-defined. We say that the height of an element b introduced in this construction is the least n such that  $b \in B_k^n$ .

We first show that  $A_k \leq^{k,n} B_k^n$ . By Proposition 7, it suffices to describe a winning strategy for D in the n-round  $\exists^k$ -game with D playing on  $B_k^n$  and S playing on  $A_k$ . The strategy we describe for D will allow her to play her  $m^{th}$ move on some  $b \in B_k^m$ , for each  $m \leq n$ . In round 1, D answers the first move of S by playing her pebble on the appropriate element of  $B_k^1 \subseteq B_k^n$  to create a partial isomorphism. Suppose that D has played only onto elements of  $B_k^m$ through round m, where m < n. Let S choose pebble pair  $(\alpha_l, \beta_l)$  to play in round (m+1). We consider two cases. If S plays  $\alpha_l$  on the same element as some  $\alpha_{l'}$ , for  $l \neq l'$ , then D must play  $\beta_l$  onto the element pebbled by  $\beta_{l'}$ . Doing so, she obviously maintains a partial isomorphism and succeeds in playing within  $B_k^{m+1}$ . On the other hand, suppose that S plays  $\alpha_l$  on a distinct element such that the elements pebbled by  $\overline{\alpha} * \alpha_l$  on A after the round satisfy  $\pi_{i,j}$  (we may need to pad the tuple pebbled by  $\overline{\alpha}$  to a tuple of length (k-1) by repeating its last element, if all the pebbles are not in play at this round). Before D plays her  $(m+1)^{st}$  move, the pebbles  $\overline{\beta}$  are on a tuple  $\overline{b}$  (similarly padded, if necessary) that satisfies  $\pi_i$ . She then plays  $\beta_l$  on the element  $b_{\overline{b},i}^{m+1} \in B_k^{m+1}$ , thereby maintaining a partial isomorphism. This strategy enables her to win the n-round game.

Next, we show that  $A_k \not\preceq^{k,n+1} B_k^n$ . By Proposition 7, it suffices to show that S can win the (n+1)-round game with D playing on  $B_k^n$  and S playing on  $A_k$ . We describe a strategy for play by S which forces D to pebble an element of height at least m by the end of round m to avoid losing at that round. It follows

that S wins the (n+1)-round game since all elements of  $B_k^n$  have height  $\leq n$ . S plays as follows. He first places his k-pebbles on a set of k distinct elements which form a k-clique, that is, for every pair of distinct pebbled elements a and a',  $A_k \models E(a,a')$ . S may play in this way since  $A_k \models \Gamma_k$ . By our construction above, if  $b,b' \in B_k^n$  are distinct elements of the same height,  $B_k^n \not\models E(b,b')$ . It follows immediately that any r-clique in  $B_k^n$  contains an element of height at least r. Therefore, if S has not won by round k, D has pebbled an element of height at least k by the end of that round. Note that in case  $(n+1) \leq k$ , we are done, since at round (n+1), D will be unable to play onto an element of height at least (n+1) to form an (n+1)-clique.

We proceed to describe the strategy for S's continuing play under the assumption that k < (n+1). Suppose that through round  $m, k \le m < (n+1)$ , D has played a pebble onto an element of height at least m, and that the k pebbles S has played lie on distinct elements of  $A_k$  which form a k-clique. We show how S can play to ensure that D must play onto an element of height at least (m+1) at round (m+1), if she is to prevent S from winning at this round, and leave the round with a k-clique pebbled. Suppose that  $\beta_i$  is pebbling an element b of height greater than the height of any other element pebbled in  $B_k^n$  at round m. By our hypothesis, the height of b is at least m. Pick  $j \ne i$  (recall that  $1 \le k$ ) and let  $1 \le k$ 1 and let  $1 \le k$ 2 be the element pebbled by  $1 \le k$ 3. S picks up  $1 \le k$ 4 such that

- 1.  $A_k \models E(a,a) \leftrightarrow \neg E(a',a')$  and
- 2. for every  $a'' \in A_k$  on which one of the remaining (k-1) pebbles lies,  $a' \neq a''$  and  $A_k \models E(a', a'') \land E(a'', a')$ .

The existence of such an a' follows from the fact that  $A_k \models \Gamma_k$ . We claim that to avoid losing at this round, D must play her pebble  $\beta_j$  onto an element b' of height greater than the height of b, and hence of height at least (m+1). Let b'' be the element pebbled by  $\beta_j$  at round m. By our construction, each element of  $B_k^n$  is connected to at most (k-1) elements of lesser height. Therefore, from the hypotheses that S had pebbled a k-clique at round m, and that b is an element of maximal height pebbled by D at that round, we may conclude that the only element of height  $\leq$  the height of b adjacent to b onto which D could play  $\beta_j$  is b'' itself. But this play would fail to maintain a partial isomorphism with the elements S has now pebbled at round (m+1) by the first condition we have imposed on the choice of a' above. Therefore, to avoid losing at round (m+1), D must pebble an element of height at least (m+1).

The next result follows immediately.

**Corollary 14.** There are infinitely many formulas of  $L^k(\exists)$  which are pairwise inequivalent over  $\mathcal{F}$ .

We now consider  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ -theories and normal forms for  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  sentences over  $\mathcal{F}$ . We let  $\mathrm{Th}^k_{\exists}(A)$  denote the  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ -theory of A. Before proceeding, we define the following fragments of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ .

```
1. Let \bigwedge L^k(\exists) = \{\theta \mid \theta = \bigwedge \Phi, \text{ for some } \Phi \subseteq L^k(\exists)\}.
```

- 2. Let  $\bigvee L^k(\exists) = \{\theta \mid \theta = \bigvee \Phi, \text{ for some } \Phi \subseteq L^k(\exists)\}.$
- 3. Let  $\bigwedge(\bigvee L^k(\exists)) = \{\theta \mid \theta = \bigwedge \Phi, \text{ for some countable } \Phi \subseteq \bigvee L^k(\exists)\}.$
- 4. Let  $\bigvee (\bigwedge L^k(\exists)) = \{\theta \mid \theta = \bigvee \Phi, \text{ for some countable } \Phi \subseteq \bigwedge L^k(\exists)\}.$

**Proposition 15.** For all finite structures A, there is a  $\theta \in \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  such that  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta) = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\operatorname{Th}_{\exists}^k(A))$ .

Proof. Observe that  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\operatorname{Th}_{\exists}^k(A)) = \{B \in \mathcal{F} \mid A \preceq_{\infty \omega}^k B\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}_A = \mathcal{F} - \operatorname{Mod}_f(\operatorname{Th}_{\exists}^k(A))$ . By Proposition 9, for each  $B \in \mathcal{C}_A$ , there is a sentence  $\varphi_B \in L^k(\exists)$  such that  $A \models \varphi_B$  and  $B \not\models \varphi_B$ . Let  $\theta = \bigwedge_{B \in \mathcal{C}_A} \varphi_B$ . It is easy to verify that  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta) = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\operatorname{Th}_{\exists}^k(A))$ .

Kolaitis and Vardi [12] obtained a normal form for the negation free fragment of  $L_{\infty\omega}^k(\exists)$  over  $\mathcal{F}$ . It is easy to extend their result to  $L_{\infty\omega}^k(\exists)$  and to provide a dual normal form as well. We codify these normal forms in the next proposition.

**Proposition 16 (Kolaitis and Vardi [12]).** For each  $\varphi \in L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ , there is  $a \ \theta \in \bigvee(\bigwedge L^k(\exists))$  and  $a \ \zeta \in \bigwedge(\bigvee L^k(\exists))$  such that  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi) = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta) = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\zeta)$ .

Proof. Let  $C = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi)$ . By Proposition 10, for each  $A \in C, B \in \mathcal{F} - C$ , there is a sentence  $\theta_{A,B} \in L^k(\exists)$  such that  $A \models \theta_{A,B}$  and  $B \not\models \theta_{A,B}$ . Let  $\theta = \bigvee_{A \in C} (\bigwedge_{B \notin C} \theta_{A,B})$  and let  $\zeta = \bigwedge_{B \notin C} (\bigvee_{A \in C} \theta_{A,B})$ . It is easy to verify that the proposition holds for this choice of  $\theta$  and  $\zeta$ .

Next we show that the fragments  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  and  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$  are closed under finite conjunction, finite disjunction, and existential quantification over  $\mathcal{F}$ . This means that if an  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ -definable query cannot be expressed in either  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  or  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$ , then it is only definable using both an infinitary conjunction and an infinitary disjunction.

**Proposition 17.** The languages  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  and  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$  are both closed under finite conjunction, finite disjunction, and existential quantification over  $\mathcal{F}$ .

Proof. Let  $\Phi = \{ \varphi_i(x, \overline{y}) \mid i \in \omega \}$  be a set of formulas of  $L^k(\exists)$ . We show that if  $\theta(\overline{y}) = \exists x \bigwedge \Phi$ , then  $\theta(\overline{y})$  is equivalent over  $\mathcal{F}$  to some formula  $\theta'(\overline{y}) \in \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$ . (The other closure conditions may be easily verified.) Let  $\psi_m = \bigwedge_{0 \leq l \leq m} \varphi_l(x, \overline{y})$  and let  $\theta'(\overline{y}) = \bigwedge_{m \in \omega} \exists x \psi_m$ . We show  $\theta'$  is equivalent to  $\theta$ . It is obvious that  $\theta$  implies  $\theta'$ . Let  $A \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\overline{a} \in A$  be such that  $A \models \theta'[\overline{a}]$ . Because A is finite, there is some  $a' \in A$  such that for arbitrarily large m,  $A \models \psi_m[a', \overline{a}]$ . Therefore  $A \models \bigwedge_{m \in \omega} \psi_m[a', \overline{a}]$ , and  $\theta'$  implies  $\theta$ .

Below we show that the query classes  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  and  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$  are proper subsets of  $\bigwedge(\bigvee L^k(\exists))$  and that neither of  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  and  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$  is a subset of the other. We first give necessary and sufficient conditions for classes to be definable in  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  and  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$ .

**Proposition 18.** 1. A class C is definable in  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  iff for all  $B \notin C$ , there is a  $\varphi_B \in L^k(\exists)$  such that  $B \not\models \varphi_B$  and for all  $A \in C$ ,  $A \models \varphi_B$ .

2. A class C is definable in  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$  iff for all  $A \in C$ , there is a  $\varphi_A \in L^k(\exists)$  such that  $A \models \varphi_A$  and for all  $B \notin C$ ,  $B \not\models \varphi_A$ .

*Proof.* To prove 1., suppose that  $\mathcal{C}$  is defined by the sentence  $\bigwedge_{n\in\omega}\psi_n$ , and that  $B\notin\mathcal{C}$ . Then there is some  $\psi_m$  such that  $B\not\models\psi_m$ . Let  $\varphi_B$  be this  $\psi_m$ . In the other direction, observe that the sentence  $\varphi=\bigwedge_{B\not\in\mathcal{C}}\varphi_B$  defines  $\mathcal{C}$ . The proof of 2. is similar.

**Proposition 19.** For each  $k \geq 2$ , there is a polynomial time computable boolean query  $C \in \bigwedge L^k(\exists) - \bigvee L^k(\exists)$ .

Proof. Let  $k \geq 2$  be given and let the graph  $A_k$  be a model of the k-Gaifman theory. Let T be the  $L^k(\exists)$ -theory of  $A_k$  and let  $\theta = \bigwedge T$ . Clearly,  $\theta \in \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$ . Let  $\mathcal{C} = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta)$ . It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{C} = \{B \in \mathcal{F} \mid A_k \preceq^k B\}$ . It then follows immediately from the fact that the relation  $\preceq^k$  is polynomial time computable (see Kolaitis and Vardi [12]), that  $\mathcal{C}$  is polynomial time computable. In the proof of Proposition 13, we showed that for every satisfiable  $\varphi \in L^k(\exists)$ ,  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi) \not\subseteq \mathcal{C}$ . It follows immediately that  $\mathcal{C} \neq \operatorname{Mod}_f(\psi)$  for every sentence  $\psi \in \bigvee L^k(\exists)$ .

**Proposition 20.** There is a polynomial time computable boolean query  $C \in \bigvee L^2(\exists)$  such that for all  $k \in \omega$ ,  $C \notin \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$ . In consequence, for each  $k \geq 2$ , there is a class  $C \in \bigvee L^k(\exists) - \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$ .

Proof. Over the signature  $\sigma = \{E, s, t\}$ , let  $\mathcal{C} = \{A \mid \text{there is a path from } s \text{ to } t\}$ , the class of (s,t)-connected graphs. This class is clearly in  $\bigvee L^2(\exists)$ . As noted earlier, it is in Datalog, and, hence, polynomial time computable. From Proposition 18, to show that  $\mathcal{C} \not\in \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$ , it suffices to show that there is a  $B \not\in \mathcal{C}$  such that for all  $n \in \omega$ , there is an  $A_n \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $A_n \preceq^{k,n} B$ . This latter condition is equivalent to D's possessing a winning strategy for the n-round  $\exists^k$ -game on  $A_n$  and B. We construct B to give her the greatest possible freedom in choosing her moves. Let M be any graph such that  $M \models \Gamma_{k+1}$ , and let  $M_s$  (resp.  $M_t$ ) be obtained from M by requiring that s (resp. t) denote a loop-free element. We define t0 be the disjoint union of t1 and t2.

For each n, let  $A_n$  be the simple chain from s to t of length  $2^{n+2}$ . The basic idea is that by choosing the chain to be long enough, S will not be able to witness the existence of a path from s to t in only n moves. Let d(x,y) be the natural distance function on  $A_n$ .

We now describe D's strategy. In each round m, D chooses to play on an element of  $M_s$  iff S just played a pebble on  $a \in A_n$  such that either (i)  $d(s,a) \le 2^{(n+2)-m}$ ; or (ii) there is a j such that  $\beta_j$  is on an element of  $M_s$  and  $d(\alpha_j,a) \le 2^{(n+2)-m}$ . She then plays her pebble on an element of the appropriate component of B so that she maintains a partial isomorphism among the pebbles on that component. It is easy to see that this is possible because  $M_s$  and  $M_t$  are models of  $\Gamma_{k+1}$ .

In order to establish that this is a winning strategy, it suffices to verify the following two claims.

- 1. In each round  $l \leq n$ , if D plays a pebble  $\beta_i$  on  $M_s$ , then  $\alpha_i$  is not adjacent to t on  $A_n$ . Similarly for  $M_t$  and s.
- 2. After each round l, for all pairs of pebbles  $\{\alpha_i, \alpha_j\}$ , if  $A_n \models E(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)$ , then  $\beta_i$  and  $\beta_j$  are on the same component of B.

We argue, by induction, that if D plays  $\beta_i$  on  $M_s$  in round m, then  $d(s,\alpha_i) \leq (2^{(n+2)-1}+2^{(n+2)-2}+\ldots+2^{(n+2)-m}) < 2^{n+2}-1$ . Since  $d(s,t)=2^{n+2}$ , this establishes that  $A_n \not\models E(\alpha_i,t)$ . In round 1, D plays  $\beta_i$  on  $M_s$  iff  $d(s,\alpha_i) \leq 2^{(n+2)-1}$ . Suppose that in round m+1 D plays  $\beta_i$  on  $M_s$ . Then either  $d(s,\alpha_i) \leq 2^{(n+2)-m}$  or there is an  $\alpha_j$  such that  $\beta_j$  is on  $M_s$ ,  $d(\alpha_i,\alpha_j) \leq 2^{(n+2)-(m+1)}$ , and, by induction hypothesis,  $d(s,\alpha_j) \leq (2^{(n+2)-1}+2^{(n+2)-2}+\ldots+2^{(n+2)-m})$ . In both cases, the induction condition is maintained. The second part of Claim 1 follows from the fact that in round m, if D plays  $\beta_i$  on  $M_t$ , then S must have played  $\alpha_i$  such that  $d(s,\alpha_i) > 2^{(n+2)-m} > 1$ . To prove Claim 2, observe that at each round m, if  $\beta_i \in M_s$ , and  $\beta_j \in M_t$ , then  $d(\alpha_i,\alpha_j) \geq 2^{(n+2)-m} > 1$ . The details are similar to the previous argument.

The next result shows that the normal form for  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  over  $\mathcal{F}$  given in Proposition 16 is optimal.

**Proposition 21.** For all  $k \geq 2$ , there is a class  $C \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  such that  $C \in \bigvee (\bigwedge L^k(\exists)) - (\bigwedge L^k(\exists) \cup \bigvee L^k(\exists))$ .

*Proof.* The proof of this proposition is a synthesis of the proofs of the preceding two results. We define a set of models  $\{A_1, A_2, \ldots\}$  which are pairwise  $L^k(\exists)$ -incompatible such that for each i, the  $L^k(\exists)$ -theory of  $A_i$  is not finitely axiomatizable in  $L^k(\exists)$ . We then let  $\mathcal{C} = \{B \mid \exists i(A_i \preceq^k B)\}$ . The arguments to show that this class is neither in  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$  nor in  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists)$  are minor variants of the proofs of Propositions 19 and 20.

We define each model  $A_i$  as an expansion of a homeomorphic image of a graph which is a model of the (k+1)-Gaifman theory. Let R be a finite graph that satisfies  $\Gamma_{k+1}$ ; observe that R also verifies  $\Gamma_k$ . Each  $A_i$  is obtained from R by replacing all edges which are not loops by pairwise disjoint paths of length i. Where there is a two-way, undirected edge, a single undirected path is inserted, rather than two directed paths. To clarify the exposition, we also add a unary predicate V to the signature to label the original 'vertices' of R.

To verify that  $\mathcal{C}$  is not in  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$ , it suffices to show that there is a model  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and a sequence  $B^1, B^2, \ldots$ , disjoint from  $\mathcal{C}$ , such that for each  $n, A \preceq^{k,n} B^n$ . Let A be  $A_1$ , and let each  $B^n$  be obtained from the model  $B^n_k$  from the proof of Proposition 13 by putting every element into the extension of the predicate V. From that proof it is immediate that, for all  $n, A_1 \preceq^{k,n} B^n$  but  $A_1 \not\preceq^k B^n$ . For all  $2 \leq i, A_i \models \exists x \neg Vx$  and, consequently,  $A_i \not\preceq^k B^n$ . This establishes that each  $B^n$  is not in  $\mathcal{C}$ 

In order to show that  $\mathcal{C} \not\in \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$ , we now define a single  $B' \not\in \mathcal{C}$  such that for all n, there is an  $A_{f(n)}$  such that  $A_{f(n)} \preceq^{k,n} B'$ . By Proposition 18, this will establish that  $\mathcal{C} \not\in \bigwedge L^k(\exists)$ . Let  $R^+$  be an expansion of R obtained by labeling exactly one looped element with the predicate V; and let  $R^-$  be

obtained similarly by labeling a loop-free element. Here the predicate V plays the same role as the constants s and t in the proof of Proposition 20. We define B' to be the disjoint union of k copies of both  $R^+$  and  $R^-$ , and let  $f(x) = 2^{x+2}$ . It is easy to see that  $B' \notin \mathcal{C}$ . As in the proof of Proposition 20, the Duplicator wins the n-move  $\exists^k$ -game on  $A_{2^{n+2}}$  and B' because the labeled vertices of  $A_{2^{n+2}}$  are too far apart for S to distinguish the models by witnessing that they are actually connected.

Finally, we prove the following separation.

**Proposition 22.** Over  $\mathcal{F}$ , for  $k \geq 3$ ,  $L^k(\exists) \subset (\bigwedge L^k(\exists)) \cap (\bigvee L^k(\exists))$ .

Proof. Let Path(x,y) express the binary query 'there is an E-path from x to y.' For signature  $\sigma = \{E, s\}$ , we define  $\mathcal{C} = \{A \mid \exists x ( \text{Path}(s, x) \text{ and Path}(x, x)) \}$ . Let  $\theta_n(x,y)$  be an  $L^3(\exists)$  formula that defines the binary query 'there is a path of length n from x to y.' It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{C}$  is in  $\bigvee L^k(\exists)$ . Also observe that  $\varphi = \bigwedge_{n \in \omega} \exists x \exists y (s = x \land \theta_n(x,y))$  defines  $\mathcal{C}$ . Finally, there are arbitrarily large minimal models in  $\mathcal{C}$ , that is, models  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  such that for all proper submodels  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  such that for all proper submodels  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  are fortion, not in  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ .

# 4 The Failure of Existential Preservation for $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$

In this section we prove that  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}\cap\operatorname{EXT}\not\subseteq L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ . Indeed, we establish that there is a sentence  $\theta\in L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  such that  $\operatorname{Mod}(\theta)$  is closed under extensions, but there is no  $\psi\in L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  such that  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta)=\operatorname{Mod}_f(\psi)$ . Thus,  $\theta$  witnesses the failure of existential preservation for  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  simultaneously over the class of finite structures and over the class of all structures. The central lemma on which this result relies is of interest in itself. It says that for all  $k\geq 3$ , the finitary language  $L^k$  fails in a strong way to satisfy an existential preservation property. Andreka, van Benthem, and Nemeti [3] showed that for every  $k\geq 3$ , there is a sentence  $\varphi_k\in L^k$  which is preserved under extensions, but which is not equivalent to any sentence of  $L^k(\exists)$ . For  $k\geq 3$ , the sentence  $\varphi_k$  they construct uses a relation symbol of arity k-1 and has the property that it is equivalent to a sentence of  $L^{k+1}(\exists)$ . They state the following open problems.

- For any  $k \geq 3$  and  $n \in \omega$ , find sentences  $\varphi_n \in L^k$  which are preserved under extensions, but which are not equivalent to any sentence of  $L^{k+n}(\exists)$ .
- For k > 3, is there a formula of  $L^k$  containing only (one) binary relation symbols which is preserved under extensions, but is not equivalent to any sentence of  $L^k(\exists)$ ?

The next proposition settles both these open problems. The main result of the section follows easily from the proof of this proposition.

**Proposition 23.** For each  $k < \omega$ , there is a sentence  $\theta_k \in L^3$ , containing a single binary relation, such that

- 1.  $\operatorname{Mod}(\theta_k)$  is closed under extensions, but
- 2.  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta_k) \neq \operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi)$  for all  $\varphi \in L^k(\exists)$ .

*Proof.* Before presenting the full proof, we sketch the basic outline. Let the k-pyramid of B,  $\mathcal{P}^k(B)$ , be the smallest class of (finite and infinite) models containing B that is closed under substructures and  $L^k$ -equivalence. For each  $k \geq 3$ , we define finite structures  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  with the following properties:

- 1.  $A_k \preceq_{\infty \omega}^k B_k$ ;
- 2.  $\mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  is  $L^3$ -definable;
- 3.  $A_k \notin \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$ .

Let  $\varphi_k \in L^3$  be such that  $\operatorname{Mod}(\varphi_k) = \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$ , and let  $\theta_k = \neg \varphi_k$ . It is obvious that  $\operatorname{Mod}(\theta_k)$  is closed under extensions, that  $A_k \models \theta_k$ , and that  $B_k \not\models \theta_k$ . Suppose  $\varphi \in L^k(\exists)$  is such that  $A_k \models \varphi$ . Since  $A_k \preceq_{\infty\omega}^k B_k$ , this implies that  $B_k \models \varphi$ , and therefore that  $\varphi$  is not equivalent to  $\theta_k$ .

We define structures  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  in terms of simpler submodels. For  $f \leq t$ , let the [t,f]-flag, F[t,f], be the directed chain of length t with one additional vertex attached to the  $f^{th}$  link. That is, the vertex set of F[t,f] is  $\{0,1,\ldots,t,t+1\}$ , and the edge relation is  $\{(i,i+1) \mid i < t\} \cup \{(f,t+1)\}$ .  $A_k$  is the disjoint union of the k+1 flags—F[2k+2,k+1], F[2k+2,k+2], ..., F[2k+2,2k+1]. Let the [k,j]-tree, T[k,j], be the tree obtained from  $A_k$  by fusing the  $i^{th}$  nodes of each flag, for all  $i \leq j$ . This tree has height 2k+2 and the node at height j has outdegree k+1. Then  $B_k$  is the disjoint union of the k trees— $T[k,0],T[k,1],\ldots,T[k,k-1]$ .

First we show that  $A_k \leq_{\infty \omega}^k B_k$  by describing a winning strategy for D in the eternal  $\exists^k$ -game on  $A_k$  and  $B_k$ . A component of a model is a maximal connected submodel. Observe that every component of  $A_k$  is embeddable in every component of  $B_k$ . Call a component of either  $A_k$  or  $B_k$  vacant at round n if there is no pebble located on any element of that component before the players make their  $n^{th}$  moves. We consider two cases of moves for S. First, suppose that in some round n, S plays pebble  $\alpha_i$  on a vacant component  $A^n$ of  $A_k$ . Since there are only k pairs of pebbles, and since pebble  $\beta_i$  is not on the board, there is a vacant component  $B^n$  of  $B_k$ , and an isomorphic injection  $h_n:A^n\mapsto B^n$ . D will play pebble  $\beta_i$  on  $h_n(\alpha_i)$ . In the other case, S plays on a non-vacant component  $A^n$ . There is some m < n such that  $A^n$  has been occupied continuously since round m and either m = 1 or  $A^n$  was vacant at round m - 1. Thus  $A^n = A^m$ , and there are previously defined  $B^m$  and  $h_m$ . D now plays  $\beta_i$  on  $h_m(\alpha_i)$ . By this condition, every pair of pebbles  $(\alpha_l, \beta_l)$  on components  $A^m$  and  $B^m$  satisfies the condition that  $h_m(\alpha_l) = \beta_l$ . In both cases, it is clear that D has maintained a partial isomorphism. By Proposition 8, it now follows immediately that  $A_k \preceq_{\infty\omega}^k B_k$ .

Next, we show that  $\mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  is definable in  $L^3$ . Consider the following properties:

- 1. A contains no chains of length  $\geq 2k + 2$ .
- 2. A contains no cycles of length < 2k + 2.

3. No element  $a \in A$  has indegree  $\geq 2$ , that is,  $A \models \neg \exists x \exists y \exists z (x \neq y \land Exz \land Eyz)$ .

It is easy to show that each property is expressible in  $L^3$ , is closed under substructures, and holds of  $B_k$ . From this it follows immediately that each  $B' \in \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  possesses all three properties. Consequently, every member of  $\mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  is a forest consisting of directed trees of height  $\leq 2k + 2$ .

Next we note the following facts:

**Lemma 24.** Let A and B be the disjoint unions of components  $\{A_1, \ldots, A_m\}$  and  $\{B_1, \ldots, B_n\}$ , respectively. For  $k \geq 3$ ,  $A \equiv_{\infty}^k B$  if and only if for each component  $A_i$   $[B_i]$ , either the number of components of A that are  $L^k$ -equivalent to it is equal to the number of components of B that are  $L^k$ -equivalent to it or both numbers are  $k \geq k$ .

This result can be proved by a simple pebble game argument.

**Lemma 25.** For each h, and each  $k \geq 3$ , up to equivalence in  $L^k$  there are only finitely many trees of height  $\leq h$ .

The proof proceeds by induction on h. The case where h=1 is obvious. Given a tree T, call a proper subtree that contains a node t of height 1 and all of its descendents a 1-tree of T. For h>1, we claim that two trees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  of height at most h are  $L^k$ -equivalent if and only if for each 1-tree  $T' \subset T_i$ , the number of 1-trees of  $T_1$  that are  $L^k$ -equivalent to T' equals the number of 1-trees of  $T_2$  that are  $L^k$ -equivalent to T', or both numbers are  $\geq k$ . The argument is just like the proof of the preceding lemma. From the claim, the lemma follows immediately.

**Corollary 26.** For each h, and each  $k \geq 3$ , up to equivalence in  $L^k$  there are only finitely many forests of height  $\leq h$ .

This is an immediate consequence of the preceding lemmas.

These observations establish that there are only finitely many complete  $L^k$ -theories that are satisfiable in  $\mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$ . Moreover, each such theory has a finite model. By [5], every such theory is axiomatized by a single  $L^k$  sentence. Hence, if we let  $\varphi_k$  be the disjunction of these sentences, we have  $\operatorname{Mod}(\varphi_k) = \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  as desired.

Finally, we argue that  $A_k \notin \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$ . By the definition of  $\mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$ , for every  $B' \in \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$ , there is an  $m \in \omega$  and a sequence  $(E_0, D_1, E_1, \ldots, D_m, E_m)$  of structures, with  $B_k = E_0$  and  $B' = E_m$ , such that:

- 1. For all  $1 \leq i \leq m, D_i \subseteq E_{i-1}$ .
- 2. For all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $D_i \equiv^3 E_i$ .

It suffices to show that for any such sequence,  $A_k$  cannot be embedded in any  $E_i$ . Let  $g: \mathcal{P}^3(B_k) \mapsto \{0, 1, \dots, k+1\}$  be the function such that g(D) is the maximum number of components of  $A_k$  that can be embedded in D pairwise disjointly. We show that for each  $i \leq m, g(E_i) < k+1$ . In fact, we show that g is

monotonically decreasing on the aforementioned sequence. Because each  $D_i$  is a submodel of  $E_{i-1}$ , it is clear that  $g(D_i) \leq g(E_{i-1})$ . It remains to establish that  $g(B_k) < k+1$  and that  $g(E_i) \leq g(D_i)$ .

Observe that any embedding of a flag F[2k+2, f] into a component C of any  $B' \in \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  must map the root of the flag to the root of C. This implies that no two flags of  $A_k$  can be disjointly embedded into any such component and, since  $B_k$  has only k components, that  $g(B_k) < k + 1$ .

From Lemma 24, it follows that every  $E_i$  can be obtained from  $D_i$  by repeated application of the following three operations. First, replace some component with a component that is  $L^3$ -equivalent to it. Second, add a disjoint copy of a tree that is  $L^3$ -equivalent to at least 3 components. Third, remove a component that is  $L^3$ -equivalent to at least 3 other components. Thus, it suffices to argue that no such operation performed on some  $B' \in \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  can yield a B'' such that g(B'') > g(B'). It is obvious that removing a component cannot increase the value of g.

We claim that it suffices to consider the effect of the other two operations on components of height = 2k + 2. If trees T and T' are  $L^3$ -equivalent, then they have the same height. Also, no component F[2k+2,f] of  $A_k$  can be embedded in any tree of height < 2k + 2. This establishes that the presence of shorter components in a model B does not affect the value of g(B).

Observe that for all trees T and T' such that  $T \equiv^3 T'$ , F[t, f] can be embedded in T iff it can be embedded in T'. This is because the following property can be expressed in  $L^3$ : there is an element x such that (i) there is a y such that there is a path of length f from y to x; (ii) x has outdegree 2; (iii) there is a y such that there is a path of length t - f from x to y. Over trees, this property says that the model embeds F[t, f]. Consequently the operation of replacement cannot increase the value of g.

It remains to establish that adding an additional component to a model  $B' \in \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$  does not change the value of g. We observe that  $B_k$  has the following properties:

- 1. For each (2k+2)-chain contained in  $B_k$  there is at most one  $j, 0 \le j \le k-1$ , such that the  $j^{th}$  link of the chain has outdegree > 1.
- 2. For each (2k+2)-chain contained in  $B_k$  there is at most one  $j, k+1 \le j \le 2k+1$ , such that the  $j^{th}$  link of the chain has outdegree > 1.

These properties are closed under substructures and  $L^3$ -equivalence; consequently, they hold of every model  $B' \in \mathcal{P}^3(B_k)$ . Let  $C_1, C_2$ , and  $C_3$  be  $L^3$ -equivalent components of B' of height 2k+2. The above argument establishes that each  $C_i$  is either some F[2k+2,f], or the simple (2k+2)-chain. Let B'' be the extension of B' obtained by adding a component  $C_4$ . Observe that, in fact, all four components must be isomorphic, and embed at most one isomorphism type of flag. Therefore, the image of any embedding  $h: A_k \mapsto B''$  can contain vertices from at most one of these four components. This demonstrates that g(B') = g(B''), and completes the proof.

The following result establishes the failure of existential preservation for  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$ .

**Theorem 27.** There is a sentence  $\theta \in L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$  such that both

- 1.  $\operatorname{Mod}(\theta)$  is closed under extensions.
- 2. For all  $\varphi \in L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists), \operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta) \neq \operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi)$ .

*Proof.* We claim that it suffices to show that for each  $k \in \omega$  there is a sentence  $\theta_k \in L^3$  and a pair of finite models  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  such that

- 1.  $Mod(\theta_k)$  is closed under extensions.
- 2.  $A_k \models \theta_k$  and  $B_k \not\models \theta_k$ .
- 3.  $A_k \preceq_{\infty\omega}^k B_k$ .
- 4. For all  $j, A_j \models \theta_k$ .

Let  $\theta = \bigwedge_k \theta_k$ . It is clear that  $\theta$  is closed under extensions and that it has finite models, since it is true in each  $A_k$ . Suppose that  $\varphi$  is a sentence in  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  such that  $\theta$  implies  $\varphi$ . Then  $A_k \models \varphi$ , and therefore  $B_k \models \varphi$ . But for all l,  $B_l \not\models \theta$ . Therefore,  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\theta) \neq \operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi)$ .

The sentences  $\theta_k$  and the models  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  from the proof of Proposition 23 fail to meet condition 4 because for j < k,  $A_j \not\models \theta_k$ . To see this, observe that  $A_j$  will always be a submodel of  $B_k$ . To fix this defect, it suffices to construct  $A'_k, B'_k$ , and  $\theta'_k$  as in the proof of Proposition 23 that also satisfy the additional condition that, for all j and k,  $A'_j \not\in \mathcal{P}^3(B'_k)$ . In order to accomplish this, we add simple 'gadgets' to the models. Let the k-cycle,  $C_k$ , be the graph on k vertices whose edge relation forms a simple, directed cycle of length k. Then let  $A'_k$  and  $B'_k$  be obtained from  $A_k$  and  $B_k$ , respectively, by adding a disjoint copy of  $C_k$ . By slightly modifying the proof of Proposition 23, we can show that  $A'_k \preceq_{\infty\omega}^k B'_k$ , and that there is a  $\theta'_k \in L^3$  satisfied by exactly the models in the complement of  $\mathcal{P}^3(B'_k)$  such that  $A'_k \models \theta'_k$ . Finally, it is easy to verify that for  $j \neq k$ , the j-cycle cannot be embedded in any  $B \in \mathcal{P}^3(B'_k)$  and, therefore,  $A'_i \models \theta'_k$ .

### 5 Generalized Preservation Theorems in the Finite Case

In this section, we prove some generalized preservation theorems for fragments of FO. Our results are of the form

$$L \cap \text{EXT} \subseteq L'$$

for certain quantifier prefix classes  $L \subset FO$  and  $L' = L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  or  $Datalog(\neq, \neg)$ . Recall that Tait [18] showed

$$FO \cap EXT \not\subseteq FO(\exists)$$
,

and that Gurevich and Shelah [9, 10] gave examples showing that

$$FO[\forall^*\exists^*] \cap EXT \not\subset FO(\exists).$$

Compton observed that

$$FO[\exists^* \forall^*] \cap EXT \subset FO(\exists),$$

which shows that these examples are best possible in terms of quantifier alternation prefix (see [9]). Kolaitis and Vardi (see [2]) observed that the example of Gurevich and Shelah [9] can be defined in  $Datalog(\neq, \neg)$ . Theorem 29 below establishes that

$$FO[\exists^* \forall \exists] \cap EXT \subseteq Datalog(\neq, \neg).$$

It follows that all the examples in the literature witnessing the failure of the Los-Tarski Theorem in the finite case are definable in  $\mathrm{Datalog}(\neq, \neg)$ , since all these examples are in the prefix class  $\mathrm{FO}[\exists^* \forall \exists]$  (a sequence of existential quantifiers followed by one universal quantifier followed by one existential quantifier). The next theorem establishes a slightly more general result with  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  in place of  $\mathrm{Datalog}(\neq, \neg)$ .

**Theorem 28.** FO[ $\exists^* \forall \exists^*$ ]  $\cap \text{EXT} \subseteq L^{\omega}_{\infty w}(\exists)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\varphi \in FO[\exists^* \forall \exists^*] \cap EXT$ . That is,  $\varphi \in FO[\exists^* \forall \exists^*]$  and  $Mod_f(\varphi) \in EXT$ . Let  $\mathcal{C} = Mod_f(\varphi)$ . We proceed to show that  $\mathcal{C} \in L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ . By Proposition 10, it suffices to show that there is a k such that, for each  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $B \notin \mathcal{C}$ , there is a  $\theta_{A,B} \in L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  such that  $A \models \theta_{A,B}$  and  $B \not\models \theta_{A,B}$ .

a  $\theta_{A,B} \in L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  such that  $A \models \theta_{A,B}$  and  $B \not\models \theta_{A,B}$ . Let  $\varphi = \exists x_1 \dots x_i \forall y \exists z_1 \dots z_j \psi(\overline{x}, y, \overline{z})$ , where  $\psi$  is quantifier free, and let k = i + j + 1 (we suppose, without loss of generality, that i > 0). We now describe a winning strategy for S in the eternal  $\exists^k$ -game on A and B, for  $A \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $B \not\in \mathcal{C}$ , which establishes, by Proposition 8, the existence of  $\theta_{A,B} \in L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  with the desired properties. There are two stages. Let  $\overline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_i)$  be a sequence of elements of A such that  $A \models \forall y \exists \overline{z} \psi(\overline{a}, y, \overline{z})$ . If D has not lost after h rounds, for h < i, S plays pebble  $\alpha_{h+1}$  on element  $a_{h+1}$ . If S has not won after i moves, and D has played her pebbles on  $\overline{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_i)$ , then  $B \models \exists y \forall \overline{z} \neg \psi(\overline{b}, y, \overline{z})$  (since  $B \not\models \varphi$ ).

The goal of the second part of S's strategy is to force D to play a pebble on some element b' such that  $B \models \forall \overline{z} \neg \psi(\overline{b}, b', \overline{z})$ , without removing any of the pebbles  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_i$  which 'fix the interpretation' of the variables  $x_1, \ldots, x_i$  on both A and B. Regardless of the element a' on which S will have played his corresponding pebble,  $A \models \exists \overline{z} \psi(\overline{a}, a', \overline{z})$ , so that he can then win easily. In order to describe S's strategy, we first define a sequence of subsets of the universe of B. Let  $\Gamma_0 = \{b' \mid b' \in B \text{ and } B \models \forall \overline{z} \neg \psi(\overline{b}, b', \overline{z})\}$ . Observe that  $B \models \exists y \forall \overline{z} \neg \psi(\overline{b}, y, z)$ , and therefore  $\Gamma_0$  is non-empty. Given  $\Gamma_0, \ldots, \Gamma_m$ , if  $(\bigcup_{1 \leq m} \Gamma_1) \cap \overline{b} = \emptyset$ , then let  $B_{m+1}$  be the submodel of B whose universe is  $(B - \bigcup_{1 \leq m} \Gamma_1)$ . Let  $\Gamma_{m+1} = \{b' \mid b' \in B_{m+1} \text{ and } B_{m+1} \models \forall \overline{y} \neg \psi(\overline{b}, b', \overline{y})\}$ . For each  $B_m$ , since  $B_m \subseteq B$ , we have that  $B_m \models \forall \overline{x} \exists y \forall \overline{z} \neg \psi(\overline{x}, y, \overline{z})$ . In particular,  $B_m \models \exists y \forall \overline{z} \neg \psi(\overline{b}, y, \overline{z})$  and thus, as above,  $\Gamma_{m+1}$  is non-empty. Since B is finite, there is some n such that  $\Gamma_n \cap \overline{b} \neq \emptyset$ , and some element  $b_f \in \Gamma_n \cap \overline{b}$  pebbled by  $\beta_f$ . Then B is partitioned into the sets  $\Gamma_0, \ldots, \Gamma_{n-1}, B_n$ . We also have that  $A \models \exists \overline{z} \psi(\overline{a}, a_f, \overline{z})$ , and  $B_n \models \forall \overline{z} \neg \psi(\overline{b}, b_f, \overline{z})$ .

The Spoiler can win by executing a substrategy that compels D to play in sets  $\Gamma_m$  of successively smaller index. Let  $\overline{c}$  be a sequence of elements of length j such that,  $A \models \psi(\overline{a}, a_f, \overline{c})$ . S plays his next j moves on this sequence, until D makes a losing move or plays a pebble  $\beta_g$  onto an element in  $\Gamma_m$ , for  $m \le n - 1$ .

We claim that one of these two possibilities must occur. For suppose that D plays on a sequence  $\overline{d} \subseteq B_n$ . Then  $B_n \models \neg \psi(\overline{b}, b_j, \overline{d})$ , and  $\psi(\overline{x}, y, \overline{z})$  witnesses that the function that takes  $\overline{a} * a_j * \overline{c}$  to  $\overline{b} * b_j * \overline{d}$  and preserves the denotations of constants is not a partial isomorphism.

Suppose that D has played some pebble  $\beta_g$  into some set  $\Gamma_m$ . By the same argument as above, reusing pebbles  $\{\alpha_{i+1},\ldots,\alpha_k\}-\{\alpha_g\}$ , S can either win or force D to play into some  $\Gamma_{m'}$ , for some m' < m. Iterating this procedure, S can force D to play into  $\Gamma_0$ , and then win by using the same procedure one more time.

We remark the following two refinements of the foregoing theorem.

- 1. For each  $B \notin \mathcal{C}$ , there is a number  $m_B$  such that for all  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ , S wins the  $m_B$ -round  $\exists^k$ -game on A and B. (Here,  $m_B$  is determined by the maximum number of sets  $\Gamma$  that get defined on B, for any choice of D's first i moves.) It follows easily from Proposition 7 that this condition is equivalent to there being a  $\theta_B \in L^k(\exists)$ , with quantifier rank  $\leq m_B$ , such that for all  $A \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $A \models \theta_B$ , and  $B \not\models \theta_B$ . Then  $\theta' = \bigwedge_{B \notin \mathcal{C}} \theta_B$  is equivalent to  $\varphi$  and is a single infinite conjunction of  $L^k(\exists)$  sentences. We know by Proposition 20 that not all sentences of  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  can be expressed in this form. Indeed, it follows from Theorem 29 below that if  $\varphi \in FO[\exists^* \forall \exists] \cap EXT$ , then  $\varphi$  is equivalent to a formula in  $\bigwedge L^k(\exists) \cap \bigvee L^k(\exists)$  for some k.
- 2. Suppose that  $\varphi$  is an  $L^k$  sentence with quantifier type  $\forall \exists^*$  (this notion of quantifier type may be defined straightforwardly, and is distinct from the notion of prefix class). In this case, we can show, by a modification of the proof of Theorem 28, that  $\varphi$  is equivalent to an  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  sentence. This contrasts with Proposition 23 above which established that for all k, there is a sentence  $\varphi_k \in L^3$  such that  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi_k) \in \operatorname{EXT}$ , but  $\varphi_k$  is not equivalent over  $\mathcal F$  to any sentence in  $L^k_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$ .

# **Theorem 29.** $FO[\exists^* \forall \exists] \cap EXT \subseteq Datalog(\neq, \neg).$

Proof. Let  $\varphi = \exists x_1 \dots x_j \forall y \exists z \beta(\overline{x}, y, z)$ , with  $\beta(\overline{x}, y, z)$  quantifier free. Let  $\overline{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_p)$  be the sequence of constants in the signature of  $\varphi$  and let  $\mathcal{C} = \operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi)$ . For  $a \in A$ , we say that a closes with parameters  $\overline{a}$  iff there is a sequence  $a_0(=a), a_1, \dots, a_n$  such that for all  $l < n, A \models \beta(\overline{a}, a_l, a_{l+1})$  and there is an  $m \leq n$  such that  $A \models \beta(\overline{a}, a_n, a_m)$ . Note that this is equivalent to there being an a' such that there is a  $\beta(\overline{a}, y, z)$ -path from a to a', and a  $\beta(\overline{a}, y, z)$ -cycle including a'.

We claim that  $A \models \varphi$  iff there is a j-tuple  $\overline{a}$  such that every element of  $\overline{a} \cup \overline{c}$  closes with parameters  $\overline{a}$ . Suppose that A does not satisfy these conditions. We prove that  $A \models \forall \overline{x} \exists y \forall z \neg \beta(\overline{x}, y, z))$  where the latter sentence is equivalent to  $\neg \varphi$ . Let  $\overline{a} \subseteq A$  be a sequence of length j. By hypothesis, there is an  $a' \in \overline{a} \cup \overline{c}$  such that a' does not close with parameters  $\overline{a}$ . Since A is finite, this implies that there is an  $m \geq 0$  and a sequence  $a' = a'_0, \ldots, a'_m$  such that for all l < m,  $A \models \beta(\overline{a}, a'_l, a'_{l+1})$  and  $A \models \forall z \neg \beta(\overline{a}, a'_m, z)$ , as desired.

In the other direction, let  $\overline{a}$  be such that every member of  $\overline{a} \cup \overline{c}$  closes with parameters  $\overline{a}$ . Let  $\overline{s}_h = \langle a_{h0}(=a_h), \ldots, a_{hm_h} \rangle$  and  $\overline{t}_h = \langle e_{h0}(=c_h), \ldots, e_{hn_h} \rangle$  be sequences witnessing that each element of  $\overline{a} \cup \overline{c}$  closes with parameters  $\overline{a}$ . Let B be the submodel of A with universe  $\bigcup_i \overline{s}_i \cup \bigcup_j \overline{t}_j$ . Then it is easy to verify that  $B \models \varphi$  and, since  $\operatorname{Mod}_f(\varphi) \in \operatorname{EXT}$ , it follows that  $A \models \varphi$ .

The following program, with  $\overline{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_i)$ , computes  $\varphi$ :

```
P(\overline{x}, y, z) \longleftarrow \beta(\overline{x}, y, z) 
P(\overline{x}, y, z) \longleftarrow P(\overline{x}, y, w), P(\overline{x}, w, z) 
Q \longleftarrow P(\overline{x}, x_1, y_1), P(\overline{x}, y_1, y_1), \dots, P(\overline{x}, x_j, y_j), P(\overline{x}, y_j, y_j), 
P(\overline{x}, c_1, w_1), P(\overline{x}, w_1, w_1), \dots, P(\overline{x}, c_p, w_p), P(\overline{x}, w_p, w_p)
```

This can be easily converted into a Datalog( $\neq$ ,  $\neg$ ) program. Let  $\beta(\overline{x}, y, z) = \bigvee_i \delta_i$ , where each  $\delta_i$  is a conjunction of literals. Replace the clause  $P(\overline{x}, y, z) \longleftarrow \beta(\overline{x}, y, z)$  with the clauses  $P(\overline{x}, y, z) \longleftarrow \delta_i$ , for all i.

# 6 Conclusion

In this section we discuss some open problems that are naturally suggested by our investigations and we present some further results bearing on the problem of preservation under homomorphisms in the finite case.

### 6.1 Open Problems

The first and most obvious question is the extent to which our results can be generalized from fragments of FO to the entire language. In this connection, we restate two of the problems mentioned earlier which remain open in light of our study.

```
Problem 1. Is FO \cap EXT \subseteq Datalog(\neq, \neg)?
Problem 2. Is FO \cap EXT \subseteq L^{\omega}_{\infty u}(\exists)?
```

Obviously, a positive answer to the first of these questions implies a positive answer to the second. Should the answer to these questions be negative, it would be of interest to characterize the classes  $FO \cap Datalog(\neq, \neg)$  and  $FO \cap L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}(\exists)$  in some informative way. An example of a characterization of this kind is the following theorem of Ajtai and Gurevich [2].  $FO^+(\exists)$  denotes the positive existential fragment of FO.

**Proposition 30** (Ajtai and Gurevich [2]).  $FO \cap Datalog = FO^+(\exists)$ .

As remarked above, the Gurevich-Shelah counterexample to the Los-Tarski Theorem in the finite case witnesses that  $FO \cap Datalog(\neq, \neg) \neq FO(\exists)$ . Might  $FO \cap Datalog(\neq, \neg)$  be contained in some level of the first-order quantifier alternation hierarchy, be it not the lowest level? Should, on the other hand, the answer to Problem 1 be positive, we might try to establish even stronger results such as a positive answer to

```
Problem 3. Is (FO+LFP) \cap EXT \subseteq Datalog(\neq, \neg)?
```

### 6.2 Preservation under Homomorphisms

In this subsection we briefly turn our attention to a different preservation property. A homomorphism from A to B is a map  $h:A\mapsto B$  such that for all n-ary relation symbols  $R(\overline{x})$ , and for all n-tuples  $\overline{a}\subseteq A$ , if  $A\models R(\overline{a})$ , then  $B\models R(h(\overline{a}))$ . A class of models  $\mathcal C$  is closed under homomorphisms iff for all A and B such that there is a homomorphism from A to B, if  $A\in \mathcal C$ , then  $B\in \mathcal C$ . Let HOM denote the set of classes in  $\mathcal F$  that are closed under homomorphisms. A sentence  $\varphi$  in FO,  $L^{\omega}_{\infty\omega}$ , etc. is positive, if and only if, it does not contain any negations. The following well-known classical result is a direct consequence of the Los-Tarski Theorem: for all  $\varphi\in FO$ ,  $\operatorname{Mod}(\varphi)$  is closed under homomorphisms, if and only if,  $\varphi$  is equivalent to a positive existential sentence. This theorem is one of a few classical results whose validity over  $\mathcal F$  remains unknown. In our current notation, we can formulate the question as the following open problem, the interest of which has been emphasized by Gurevich [10] and Kolaitis (see [8]).

Problem 4. Is  $FO \cap HOM \subseteq FO^+(\exists)$ ?

(To avoid confusion, it should be remarked that although [10] announces a solution to Problem 4, this claim has been withdrawn.)

The following proposition yields some information about the homomorphism preservation question. We direct the reader to [17] for its proof.

**Proposition 31.** Datalog( $\neq$ ,  $\neg$ )  $\cap$  HOM  $\subseteq$  Datalog.

Propositions 29, 30, and 31 yield as an immediate corollary the following special case of the homomorphism preservation theorem.

Corollary 32.  $FO[\exists^* \forall \exists] \cap HOM = FO^+(\exists)$ .

### References

- F. Afrati, S. Cosmadakis, and M. Yannakakis. On datalog vs. polynomial time. In Proceedings of the 10th ACM Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, 1991.
- M. Ajtai and Y. Gurevich. Datalog vs. first-order logic. In Proceedings of the 30th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, pages 142-146, 1989.
- H. Andreka, J. van Benthem, and I. Nemeti. Submodel preservation theorems in finite variable fragments. In A. Ponse, M. de Rijke, and Y. Venema, editors, Modal Logic and Process Algebra. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- 4. J. Barwise. On Moschovakis closure ordinals. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 42:292-296, 1977.
- 5. A. Dawar, S. Lindell, and S. Weinstein. Infinitary logic and inductive definability over finite structures. *Information and Computation*, to appear.
- R. Fagin. Probabilities on finite models. Journal of Symbolic Logic, 41(1):50-58, March 1976.
- H. Gaifman. Concerning measures in first-order calculi. Israel Journal of Mathematics, 2:1-18, 1964.
- 8. E. Grädel and J. Tyszkiewicz, editors. *Problems in Finite Model Theory*. Available via anonymous ftp from ftp.informatik.rwth-aachen.de, version of May 25, 1994.

- Y. Gurevich. Toward logic tailored for computational complexity. In M. Richter et al., editors, Computation and Proof Theory, pages 175-216. Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1984.
- Y. Gurevich. On finite model theory (extended abstract). In S. R. Buss and P. J. Scott, editors, Feasible Mathematics, pages 211-219. Birkhauser, 1990.
- N. Immerman. Upper and lower bounds for first-order expressibility. Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 25:76-98, 1982.
- Ph. G. Kolaitis and M. Y. Vardi. On the expressive power of datalog: tools and a case study. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM Symposium on Principles of Database* Systems, pages 61-71, 1990.
- 13. Ph. G. Kolaitis and M. Y. Vardi. Fixpoint logic vs. infinitary logic in finite-model theory. In *Proceedings of the 7th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 46-57, 1992.
- 14. Ph. G. Kolaitis and M. Y. Vardi. Infinitary logics and 0-1 laws. *Information and Computation*, 98(2):258-294, 1992.
- Libo Lo. Preservation theorems of finite models (abstract). Journal of Symbolic Logic, 58:376, 1993.
- 16. B. Poizat. Deux ou trois choses que je sais de  $L_n$ . Journal of Symbolic Logic,  $47(3):641-658,\ 1982.$
- 17. E. Rosen. Finite model theory and finite variable logics, 1995. In preparation.
- W. Tait. A counterexample to a conjecture of Scott and Suppes. Journal of Symbolic Logic, 24(1):15-16, 1959.