

## ON PERTURBATIONS OF CONTINUOUS STRUCTURES

ITAI BEN YAACOV

ABSTRACT. We give a general framework for the treatment of perturbations of types and structures in continuous logic, allowing to specify which parts of the logic may be perturbed. We prove that separable, elementarily equivalent structures which are approximately  $\omega$ -saturated up to arbitrarily small perturbations are isomorphic up to arbitrarily small perturbations (where the notion of perturbation is part of the data). As a corollary, we obtain a Ryll-Nardzewski style characterisation of complete theories all of whose separable models are isomorphic up to arbitrarily small perturbations.

We also present a brief treatment of unbounded continuous structures, which is closer in spirit to Henson's logic for Banach space structures than that present in [BU]. We introduce single point compactification as an alternative method for bringing such structures back into the setting of bounded continuous first order logic. This allows us to obtain a proof of an unpublished theorem of Henson characterising theories of Banach spaces which are separably categorical up to small perturbation of the norm as a special case of the first result.

## INTRODUCTION

In this paper we define what we call perturbation systems and study their basic properties. These are objects which formalise the intuitive notion of perturbing chosen parts of a continuous logical structure by arbitrarily small amounts.

One motivation for this notion is an attempt to generalise an unpublished theorem of C. Ward Henson, giving a Ryll-Nardzewski style characterisation of complete continuous theories of pure Banach spaces which are separably categorical up to arbitrarily small perturbation of the norm (but not of the underlying linear structure). Unfortunately this result is stated in terms which are very specific to Banach space structures, and thus only serves as a limited guide to the general result (in hind sight it is even somewhat misleading). In Theorem 3.4 we give a general characterisation of countable complete

---

*Date:* March 5, 2019.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03C35,03C90,03C95.

*Key words and phrases.* continuous logic, metric structures, perturbation, categoricity.

Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0500172.

The author would like to thank the Isaac Newton Institute and the organisers of the programme on Model Theory and Applications to Algebra and Analysis, during which this work was initiated.

The author would like to thank C. Ward Henson for helpful discussions.

The author would like to thank Hernando Tellez for a careful reading of the manuscript.

continuous theories which are separably categorical up to arbitrarily small perturbation, where the precise notion of perturbation is part of the given data alongside the theory.

There is another hurdle though, lying in the way we treat unbounded structures such as Banach spaces in continuous logic. The method of splitting such a structure into a many-sorted structure, each sort consisting of a bounded ball, as suggested in [BU], is unsatisfactory when it is the norm (and therefore the partition into sorts) we wish to perturb. For this purpose we define unbounded continuous signatures and structures, and show that unbounded continuous logic is essentially the same as Henson’s logic of positive bounded formulae. To avoid repeating the same work twice, we show how to reduce problems concerning unbounded structures and theories to the bounded case through the addition of a single point at infinity. In particular, Theorem 3.4 holds as stated also for unbounded theories (Theorem 4.36).

With Henson’s permission we prove a result very similar to his as Corollary 4.39 to Theorem 3.4 (or rather, to Theorem 4.36).

A second motivation comes from some open problems concerning automorphism group of the separable model of an  $\omega$ -categorical continuous theory. Such problems could be addressed from a model-theoretic point of view as questions concerning the theory  $T_A$  (i.e.,  $T$  with a generic automorphism, or even several non-commuting ones). Just as the underlying metric of a continuous structure induces a natural metric on the space of types, it also induces one on its automorphism group, namely the metric of uniform convergence (and in both cases, if the structure is discrete, so are the induced metrics, so they do not present anything interesting in the classical discrete setting). Now the model theoretic counterpart of the consideration of small metric neighbourhoods of an automorphism is the consideration of  $(M, \sigma) \models T_A$  up to small perturbations of  $\sigma$ . While the present paper does not contain any results in this direction, it did serve well as an example towards the general setting, and in fact was the origin of the author’s interest in perturbations.

A common feature to these two instances is that we only allow to perturb part of the structure while keeping the rest untouched: In the first case the norm is perturbed while the linear structure is untouched, while in the second it is only the automorphism that we allow to perturb (and not the original structure). Thus a “notion of perturbation” should say what parts of the structure can be perturbed, and by how much. Also, in order to state a Ryll-Nardzewski style result concerning perturbations we need to consider on the one hand perturbations of (separable) models, and on the other perturbations of types.

In Section 1 we compare these two notions (perturbations of structures and of types): requiring them to be compatible yields the notion of a *perturbation radius*. In order to speak of “arbitrarily small perturbation” we need to consider a system of perturbation radii decreasing to the zero perturbation, which with some natural additional properties yields the notion of a *perturbation system*.

In Section 2 we study a variant of the notion of approximate  $\omega$ -saturation which takes into account a perturbation system, and show that separable models which are saturated in this sense are also isomorphic up to small perturbation.

In Section 3 we prove the main result (Theorem 3.4) and discuss various directions in which it may and may not be further generalised (Theorem 3.14 vs. Example 3.10).

In Section 4 we define unbounded signatures and structures, and show how to reduce problems in unbounded continuous logic to the classical bounded case through the addition of a point at infinity. In particular, the main theorem holds as stated for unbounded continuous theories (Theorem 4.36).

In Section 5 we conclude with a few questions concerning perturbations of automorphisms.

For an introduction to continuous logic we refer the reader to [BU].

## 1. PERTURBATIONS

**1.1. Perturbation pre-radii.** We start by formalising the notion of allowing structures and types to be perturbed “by this much”. We start by defining perturbation pre-radii, which tell us which types can be changed into which:

**Definition 1.1.** A *perturbation pre-radius*  $\rho$  is a family of closed subsets  $\{\rho_n \subseteq S_n(T)^2\}$  containing the diagonals. If  $X \subseteq S_n(T)$ , then the  $\rho$ -neighbourhood around  $X$  is defined as:

$$X^\rho = \{q : (\exists p \in X) (p, q) \in \rho_n\}.$$

Notice that if  $X$  is closed then so is  $X^\rho$ .

We will consider mappings which perturb structures: they need not be elementary, and are merely required to respect the perturbation pre-radius.

**Definition 1.2.** (i) Let  $\rho$  be a perturbation pre-radius,  $M, N \models T$ . A *partial  $\rho$ -perturbation* from  $M$  into  $N$  is a partial mapping  $f: M \dashrightarrow N$  such that for every  $\bar{a} \in \text{dom}(f)$ :

$$\text{tp}^N(f(\bar{a})) \in \text{tp}^M(\bar{a})^\rho.$$

If  $f$  is total then it is a  $\rho$ -perturbation of  $M$  into  $N$ . The set of all  $\rho$ -perturbations of  $M$  into  $N$  is denoted  $\text{Pert}_\rho(M, N)$ .

- (ii) If  $f \in \text{Pert}_\rho(M, N)$  is bijective, and  $f^{-1} \in \text{Pert}_\rho(N, M)$ , we say that  $f: M \rightarrow N$  is a  *$\rho$ -bi-perturbation*, in symbols  $f \in \text{BiPert}_\rho(M, N)$ .
- (iii) We say that two perturbation pre-radii  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  are *equivalent*, in symbols  $\rho \sim \rho'$ , if  $\text{Pert}_\rho(M, N) = \text{Pert}_{\rho'}(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \models T$ . We say they are *bi-equivalent*, in symbols  $\rho \approx \rho'$ , if  $\text{BiPert}_\rho(M, N) = \text{BiPert}_{\rho'}(M, N)$  for all  $M, N \models T$ .

Note that  $\rho \sim \rho' \implies \rho \approx \rho'$ .

- (iv) If  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  are two perturbation pre-radii, we write  $\rho \leq \rho'$  to mean that  $\rho_n \subseteq \rho'_n$  for all  $n$  (i.e.,  $\rho$  is *stricter* than  $\rho'$ ).

**Lemma 1.3.** *For every perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  there exists a minimal perturbation pre-radius equivalent to  $\rho$ , denoted  $\langle \rho \rangle$ , and a minimal perturbation pre-radius bi-equivalent to  $\rho$ , denoted  $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket$ .*

*If  $\rho = \langle \rho \rangle$  we say that  $\rho$  is reduced. If  $\rho = \llbracket \rho \rrbracket$  we say that  $\rho$  is bi-reduced.*

*Proof.* One just verifies that  $\langle \rho \rangle = \bigcap \{\rho' : \rho' \sim \rho\}$  and  $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket = \bigcap \{\rho' : \rho' \approx \rho\}$  are perturbation pre-radii which are equivalent and bi-equivalent, respectively, to  $\rho$ . ■<sub>1.3</sub>

Note that  $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket \leq \langle \rho \rangle \leq \rho$ , so if  $\rho$  is bi-reduced it is reduced.

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $\rho, \rho'$  be perturbation pre-radii. We define their *composition* as the pre-radius  $\rho' \circ \rho$  defined by:

$$(\rho' \circ \rho)_n = \{(p, q) : \exists r (p, r) \in \rho_n \text{ and } (r, q) \in \rho'_n\}.$$

It may be convenient to think of a perturbation pre-radius as the graphs of a family multi-valued mappings  $\rho_n : S_n(T) \rightarrow S_n(T)$ . In this case, our notion of composition above is indeed the composition of multi-valued mappings.

Notice that we also obtain a composition mapping for perturbations:

$$\circ : \text{Pert}_\rho(M, N) \times \text{Pert}_{\rho'}(N, L) \rightarrow \text{Pert}_{\rho \circ \rho'}(M, L).$$

The minimal perturbation pre-radius is  $\text{id} = \{\text{id}_n : n < \omega\}$ , where  $\text{id}_n$  is the diagonal of  $S_n(T)$ , i.e., the graph of the identity mapping. It is bi-reduced,  $\rho \circ \text{id} = \text{id} \circ \rho = \rho$  for all  $\rho$ , and an id-perturbation is synonymous with elementary embedding.

**1.2. Perturbation radii.** A perturbation pre-radius imposes a family of conditions saying which types may be perturbed to which. We may further require these conditions to be compatible with one another:

**Definition 1.5.** A *perturbation radius* is a pre-radius  $\rho$  satisfying that for any two types  $(p, q) \in \rho_n$  there exist models  $M$  and  $N$  and a  $\rho$ -perturbation  $f : M \rightarrow N$  sending some realisation of  $p$  to a realisation of  $q$ .

Notice that the identity perturbation pre-radius is a perturbation radius.

We now try to break down the notion of a perturbation radius into several technical properties and see what each of them means.

Recall that a (*uniform*) *continuity modulus* is simply a mapping  $\delta : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , and that a mapping between metric spaces  $f : (X, d) \rightarrow (X', d')$  *respects*  $\delta$  if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and all  $x, y \in X$ :

$$d(x, y) < \delta(\varepsilon) \implies d'(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Such a mapping  $f$  is uniformly continuous if and only if it satisfies some uniform continuity modulus.

**Definition 1.6.** Let  $\rho$  be a perturbation pre-radius.

(i) We say that  $\rho$  respects equality if

$$[x = y]^\rho = [x = y].$$

(I.e., if  $(p, q) \in \rho_2$ ,  $p \models x = y$ , then  $q \models x = y$  as well).

- (ii) We say that  $\rho$  respects a continuity modulus  $\delta$  if every  $\rho$ -perturbation does.  
 (iii) We say that  $\rho$  is uniformly continuous if it respects some continuity modulus  $\delta$ .  
 (iv) We say that  $\rho$  respects a continuity modulus  $\delta$  trivially if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ :

$$[d(x, y) < \delta(\varepsilon)]^\rho \subseteq [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon].$$

**Lemma 1.7.** *A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  respects equality if and only if there exists a continuity modulus  $\delta$  which  $\rho$  respects trivially.*

*Proof.* Assume first that  $\rho$  respects  $\delta$  trivially. For every  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have  $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ , whereby  $[x = y] \subseteq [d(x, y) < \delta(\varepsilon)]$  and thus  $[x = y]^\rho \subseteq [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon]$ . Therefore  $[x = y]^\rho \subseteq \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon] = [x = y]$ . As the other inclusion is always true, we obtain equality.

Conversely, assume that  $\rho$  respects no  $\delta$  trivially. Then there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that for all  $\delta > 0$  there is some pair  $(p_\delta, q_\delta) \in \rho_2$  such that  $p_\delta \in [d(x, y) < \delta]$  and  $q_\delta \in [d(x, y) > \varepsilon]$ . Since  $S_2(T)^2$  is compact this sequence has an accumulation point  $(p, q)$  as  $\delta$  goes to 0. Since  $\rho_2$  is closed we have  $(p, q) \in \rho_2$ , and clearly  $(p, q) \in [x = y] \times [d(x, y) \geq \varepsilon]$  as well, so  $[x = y]^\rho \neq [x = y]$ . ■<sub>1.7</sub>

**Lemma 1.8.** *Let  $\rho$  be a perturbation pre-radius,  $\delta$  a continuity modulus. If  $\rho$  respects  $\delta$  trivially then it respects  $\delta$ . Conversely, if  $\rho$  respects  $\delta$  then  $\langle \rho \rangle$  respects  $\delta$  trivially.*

*In particular, if  $\rho$  is reduced then it respects  $\delta$  if and only if it respects it trivially.*

*Proof.* The first statement is straightforward. For the converse, let:

$$\begin{aligned} X_\delta &= \{(p, q) \in S_2(T) : (\forall \varepsilon > 0)(d(x, y)^p < \delta(\varepsilon) \rightarrow d(x, y)^q \leq \varepsilon)\} \\ &= \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} ([d(x, y) \geq \delta(\varepsilon)] \times S_2(T) \cup S_2(T) \times [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon]). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\rho'$  be obtained from  $\rho$  by replacing  $\rho_2$  with  $\rho_2 \cap X_\delta$ . Notice that the identity mapping of any model of  $T$  is a  $\rho$ -perturbation and must therefore respect  $\delta$ , so  $X_\delta$  contains the diagonal and  $\rho'$  is a perturbation pre-radius. Clearly  $\rho' \sim \rho$ , so  $\langle \rho' \rangle = \langle \rho \rangle$ , and  $\rho'$  respects  $\delta$  trivially, whereby so does  $\langle \rho \rangle$ . ■<sub>1.8</sub>

Note that if  $\rho$  is uniformly continuous,  $M, N \models T$ , and  $A \subseteq M$ , then any partial  $\rho$ -perturbation  $f: A \rightarrow M$  is uniformly continuous. It therefore extends uniquely to a mapping  $\bar{f}: \bar{A} \rightarrow M$ . As  $\rho$  is given by closed sets, the completion  $\bar{f}$  is also a  $\rho$ -perturbation.

**Lemma 1.9.** *A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius if and only if it is uniformly continuous and reduced.*

*Proof.* Left to right is easy. For right to left, consider the family  $\mathcal{F} = \{(f, M, N) : M, N \models T, f \in \text{Pert}_\rho(M, N)\}$ . Since  $\rho$  is uniformly continuous, ultraproducts of families of triplets in  $\mathcal{F}$  exist, and since  $\rho$  as a perturbation pre-radius consists of closed sets,  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under ultraproducts. Define  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}}$  by:

$$\rho_{\mathcal{F},n} = \{(\text{tp}(\bar{a}), \text{tp}(\bar{b})) : (f, M, N) \in \mathcal{F}, \bar{a} \in M^n, \bar{b} = f(\bar{a})\}.$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is closed under ultraproducts and contains all the identity mappings,  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a perturbation pre-radius. It clearly satisfies  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}} \leq \rho$ ,  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}} \sim \rho$ , and as  $\rho$  is reduced we conclude that  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}} = \rho$ .

On the other hand, it is clear from the construction of  $\rho_{\mathcal{F}}$  that it is a perturbation radius. ■<sub>1.9</sub>

**Proposition 1.10.** *A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  is equivalent to a perturbation radius if and only if it is uniformly continuous, in which case  $\langle \rho \rangle$  is the unique perturbation radius equivalent to  $\rho$ .*

*Proof.* Immediate from Lemma 1.9. ■<sub>1.10</sub>

Recall that if  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  is a partial type, then the property  $\exists \bar{y} p(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  (where the existential quantifier varies over a sufficiently saturated elementary extension) is also definable by a partial type.

**Definition 1.11.** A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  *respects the existential quantifier*  $\exists$  if for every partial type  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$ :

$$[\exists \bar{y} p(\bar{x}, \bar{y})]^\rho = [\exists \bar{y} p^\rho(\bar{x}, \bar{y})].$$

**Lemma 1.12.** *A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  respects  $\exists$  if and only if for every two sufficiently saturated models  $M, N \models T$ , tuples  $\bar{a} \in M^n$ ,  $\bar{b} \in N^n$ , and  $c \in M$ :*

$$\text{tp}(\bar{b}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{a})^\rho \iff (\exists d \in N)(\text{tp}(\bar{b}d) \in \text{tp}(\bar{a}c)^\rho).$$

*Proof.* Easy. ■<sub>1.12</sub>

If  $\sigma$  is an  $n$ -permutation, it acts on  $S_n(T)$  by  $\sigma^*(p(x_{<n})) = p(x_{\sigma^{-1}(0)}, \dots, x_{\sigma^{-1}(n-1)})$  (so  $\sigma^*(\text{tp}(a_{<n})) = \text{tp}(a_{\sigma(0)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(n-1)})$ ).

**Definition 1.13.** A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  is *permutation-invariant* if for every  $n$ , and every permutation  $\sigma$  on  $n$  elements,  $\rho_n$  is invariant under the action of  $\sigma$ . In other words, for every  $p, q \in S_n(T)$ :

$$(p, q) \in \rho_n \iff (\sigma^*(p), \sigma^*(q)) \in \rho_n.$$

**Proposition 1.14.** *Let  $\rho$  be a perturbation pre-radius. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius.
- (ii)  $\rho$  respects  $=, \exists$  and is permutation-invariant.
- (iii) Whenever  $M, N \models T$ ,  $\bar{a} \in M^n$ ,  $\bar{b} \in N^n$ , and  $\text{tp}(\bar{b}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{a})^\rho$ , there exist an elementary extension  $N' \succeq N$  and a  $\rho$ -perturbation  $f: M \rightarrow N'$  sending  $\bar{a}$  to  $\bar{b}$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Straightforward.

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii). Let  $\bar{a} \in M$  and  $\bar{b} \in N$  be such that  $\bar{b} \models \text{tp}(\bar{a})^\rho$ . Let  $N' \succeq N$  realise every type of finite tuples over finite tuples in  $N$ .

Since  $\rho$  respects  $\exists$  and  $N'$  is sufficiently saturated, for every  $\bar{c} \in M$  there is  $\bar{d} \in N'$  such that  $\bar{b}\bar{d} \models \text{tp}(\bar{a}\bar{c})^\rho$ . Since  $\rho$  respects equality,  $(a_i \mapsto b_i) \cup (c_j \mapsto d_j)$  is a well-defined mapping, call it  $f: M \dashrightarrow N'$ . Since  $\rho$  respects  $\exists$  and is permutation-invariant,  $f$  is a partial  $\rho$ -perturbation.

Let  $I$  be the family of all partial  $\rho$ -perturbations  $f: M \dashrightarrow N'$  where  $\text{dom}(f)$  is finite containing  $\bar{a}$ , and  $f(\bar{a}) = \bar{b}$ . For any tuple  $\bar{c} \in M$ , let  $J_{\bar{c}} = \{f \in I: \bar{c} \subseteq \text{dom}(f)\}$ , and let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(I)$  be the filter generated by the  $J_{\bar{c}}$ . By the argument above  $\mathcal{F}$  is a proper filter, and therefore extends to an ultrafilter  $\mathcal{U}$ .

Let  $N'' = N'^{\mathcal{U}}$ . Let  $g: M \rightarrow N''$  be given by  $g = \prod_{f \in I} f / \mathcal{U}$ . In other words, for every  $c \in M$  we define  $g(c) \in N''$  to be  $[c_f: f \in I] \in N''$ , where  $c_f = f(c)$  if  $c \in \text{dom}(f)$ : since  $J_{\{c\}}$  is a large set, we need not care about  $c_f$  for other values of  $f$ . Identifying  $N'$  with its diagonal embedding in  $N''$  we have  $N \preceq N' \preceq N''$ , and clearly  $g(\bar{a}) = \bar{b}$ .

Finally, for every (finite) tuple  $\bar{c} \in M$  we have  $g(\bar{c}) = [\bar{c}_f: f \in I]$ , where  $\bar{c}_f = f(\bar{c})$  for every  $f$  in the large set  $J_{\bar{c}}$ . Since  $\text{tp}(\bar{c}_f) \in \text{tp}(\bar{c})^\rho$  for all  $f \in J_{\bar{c}}$ , and  $\text{tp}(\bar{c})^\rho$  is a closed set, we must have  $\text{tp}(g(\bar{c})) \in \text{tp}(\bar{c})^\rho$ .

We conclude that  $g: M \rightarrow N''$  is a  $\rho$ -perturbation as required.

(iii)  $\implies$  (i). Clear. ■<sub>1.14</sub>

It follows that the composition of perturbation radii is again one:

**Lemma 1.15.** *If  $\rho, \rho'$  are perturbation radii then  $\rho' \circ \rho$  is a perturbation radius as well.*

*Proof.* Assume that  $q \in p^{\rho' \circ \rho}$ . Then there is a type  $r \in p^\rho$  such that  $q \in r^{\rho'}$ . Let  $\bar{a} \models p$  in  $M$ . Then there is a model  $N$  and  $\rho$ -perturbation  $f: M \rightarrow N$  such that  $f(\bar{a}) \models r$ , and a  $\rho'$ -perturbation  $g: N \rightarrow L$  such that  $g \circ f(\bar{a}) \models q$ . ■<sub>1.15</sub>

Recall from [Ben03] that the *type-space functor* of  $T$  is a the contra-variant functor from  $\mathbb{N}$  to topological spaces, sending an object  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  to  $S_n(T)$ , and a mapping  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$  to the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^*: S_m(T) &\rightarrow S_n(T) \\ \text{tp}(a_i: i < m) &\mapsto \text{tp}(a_{\sigma(i)}: i < n). \end{aligned}$$

We obtain the following elegant characterisation of perturbation radii:

**Lemma 1.16.** *A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius if and only if for every  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and mapping  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$ , the induced mapping  $\sigma^*: S_m(T) \rightarrow S_n(T)$  satisfies that for all  $p \in S_m(T)$ :*

$$\sigma^*(p^\rho) = \sigma^*(p)^\rho.$$

*Viewing  $\rho$  as the family of graphs of multi-valued mappings, we could write this property more simply as  $\sigma^* \circ \rho_m = \rho_n \circ \sigma^*$ . Thus a perturbation pre-radius is a perturbation radius if and only if it commutes with the type-space functor structure on  $\{S_n(T): n < \omega\}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius, and let  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$  be a mapping. Let  $p \in \mathbb{S}_m(T)$ ,  $q \in \mathbb{S}_n(T)$ , and let  $a_{<m} \in M$  realise  $p$ . Then each of  $q \in \sigma^*(p^\rho)$  and  $q \in \sigma^*(p)^\rho$  is equivalent to the existence of a  $\rho$ -perturbation  $g: M \rightarrow N$  such that  $q = \text{tp}(g(a_{\sigma(i)}): i < n)$ .

Conversely, assume that  $\sigma^*(p^\rho) = \sigma^*(p)^\rho$  for all  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$  and  $p \in \mathbb{S}_m(T)$ . When restricted to the special case where  $\sigma: 2 \rightarrow 1$  is the unique such mapping, this is equivalent to  $\rho$  preserving equality; when restricted to the family of inclusions  $n \hookrightarrow n + 1$ , this is equivalent to  $\rho$  preserving  $\exists$ ; and when restricted to the permutations of the natural numbers, this is equivalent to  $\rho$  being permutation-invariant. Therefore  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius by Proposition 1.14. ■<sub>1.16</sub>

**Definition 1.17.** We say that a perturbation radius (or pre-radius) is *symmetric* if  $q \in p^\rho \iff p \in q^\rho$ .

**Lemma 1.18.** *Assume that  $\rho$  is a symmetric perturbation radius, and let  $f \in \text{Pert}_\rho(M, N)$ . Then there exist elementary extensions  $M' \succeq M$ ,  $N' \succeq N$ , and a bi-perturbation  $f' \in \text{BiPert}(M', N')$  extending  $f$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\rho$  is symmetric then  $f^{-1}: f(M) \rightarrow M$  is a partial  $\rho$ -perturbation, and as  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius it can be extended to a  $\rho$ -perturbation  $g: N \rightarrow M' \succeq M$ . Proceeding this way we may thus construct two elementary chains  $(M_i: i < \omega)$  and  $(N_i: i < \omega)$  such that  $M_0 = M$ ,  $N_0 = N$ , and two sequences of  $\rho$ -perturbations  $f_i: M_i \rightarrow N_i$  and  $g_i: N_i \rightarrow M_{i+1}$  such that  $f_0 = f$ ,  $g_i \circ f_i = \text{id}_{M_i}$ , and  $f_{i+1} \circ g_i = \text{id}_{N_i}$ . Then at the limit we obtain  $M_\omega \succeq M$  and  $N_\omega \succeq N$ ,  $\rho$ -perturbations  $f_\omega: M_\omega \rightarrow N_\omega$  and  $g_\omega: N_\omega \rightarrow M_\omega$  such that  $g_\omega = f_\omega^{-1}$ . Thus every  $\rho$ -perturbation can be extended by a back-and-forth argument to a  $\rho$ -bi-perturbation  $f_\omega \in \text{BiPert}_\rho(M_\omega, N_\omega)$ . ■<sub>1.18</sub>

**Lemma 1.19.** *A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  is a symmetric perturbation radius if and only if it is uniformly continuous and bi-reduced.*

*Proof.* If  $\rho$  is bi-reduced then it is reduced and symmetric, so one direction is by Lemma 1.9. For the other, assume  $\rho$  is a symmetric perturbation radius. Let  $f \in \text{Pert}_\rho(M, N)$ , and let  $f' \in \text{BiPert}_\rho(M', N')$  extend it as in Lemma 1.18. Then  $f' \in \text{BiPert}_{\llbracket \rho \rrbracket}(M', N')$  by definition, whereby  $f' \in \text{Pert}_{\llbracket \rho \rrbracket}(M', N')$  and  $f \in \text{Pert}_{\llbracket \rho \rrbracket}(M, N)$ . Therefore  $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket \sim \rho$ , and as both are reduced they are equal. ■<sub>1.19</sub>

**Proposition 1.20.** *A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  is bi-equivalent to a symmetric perturbation radius if and only if it is uniformly continuous, in which case  $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket$  is the unique symmetric perturbation radius bi-equivalent to  $\rho$ .*

*Proof.* Immediate from Lemma 1.19. ■<sub>1.20</sub>

Finally, we may find the following observation useful:

**Lemma 1.21.** *Let  $\rho^i$  be symmetric uniformly continuous perturbation pre-radii such  $\rho^1 \circ \rho^0 \leq \rho^2$ . Then  $\llbracket \rho^1 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \rho^0 \rrbracket \leq \llbracket \rho^2 \rrbracket$ .*



*Proof.* Let  $M_0, M_1 \models T$  and  $f \in \text{Pert}_{\llbracket \rho^1 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \rho^0 \rrbracket}(M_0, M_1)$ . Then every finite part of  $f$  can be decomposed by definition into a partial  $\llbracket \rho^0 \rrbracket$ -perturbation followed by a partial  $\llbracket \rho^1 \rrbracket$ -perturbation. We can glue these together by an ultraproduct argument to obtain  $M'_i \succeq M_i$  for  $i < 2$  and  $M'_2 \models T$ , such that  $f$  extends to  $f': M'_0 \rightarrow M'_1$ , which in turn decomposes into a  $\llbracket \rho^0 \rrbracket$ -perturbation  $g': M'_0 \rightarrow M'_2$  followed by a  $\llbracket \rho^1 \rrbracket$ -perturbation  $h': M'_2 \rightarrow M'_1$ .

Since  $\llbracket \rho^i \rrbracket$  are symmetric perturbation radii, we can construct through a back-and-forth argument as in the proof of Lemma 1.18 extensions  $M''_i \succeq M'_i$  for  $i < 3$  and  $g'' \in \text{BiPert}_{\llbracket \rho^0 \rrbracket}(M''_0, M''_2)$ ,  $h'' \in \text{BiPert}_{\llbracket \rho^1 \rrbracket}(M''_2, M''_1)$ . It follows that  $f'' = h'' \circ g'' \in \text{Pert}_{\rho^2}(M''_0, M''_1)$  is bijective. Since  $\rho^2$  is assumed to be symmetric,  $f''$  is a  $\rho^2$ -bi-perturbation and therefore a  $\llbracket \rho^2 \rrbracket$ -perturbation.

This shows that  $\llbracket \rho^1 \rrbracket \circ \llbracket \rho^0 \rrbracket \leq \llbracket \rho^2 \rrbracket$ . ■<sub>1.21</sub>

**1.3. Perturbation systems.** A single perturbation radius gives us certain leverage at perturbing types. But our goal is not to study perturbations by a single perturbation radius, but rather by “arbitrarily small” perturbation radii, where the notion of a small perturbation radius depends on the context. We formalise this through the notion of a perturbation system:

Let  $\mathfrak{R}^0$  denote the family of perturbation pre-radii, and  $\mathfrak{R}$  denote the family of perturbation radii.

**Definition 1.22.** A *perturbation pre-system* is a mapping  $\mathfrak{p}: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}^0$  satisfying:

- (i) *Downward continuity:* If  $\varepsilon_n \searrow \varepsilon$  then  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon) = \bigcap \mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon_n)$ .
- (ii) *Symmetry:*  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$  is symmetric for all  $\varepsilon$ .
- (iii) *Triangle inequality:*  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon) \circ \mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon') \leq \mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon + \varepsilon')$ .
- (iv) *Strictness:*  $\mathfrak{p}(0) = \text{id}$ .

If in addition its range lies in  $\mathfrak{R}$ , then  $\mathfrak{p}: \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  is a *perturbation system*.

Given a perturbation (pre-)system  $\mathfrak{p}$ , we may define the *perturbation distance* between two types  $p, q \in S_n(T)$  as:

$$d_{\mathfrak{p},n}(p, q) = d_{\mathfrak{p}}(p, q) = \inf\{\varepsilon \geq 0: (p, q) \in \mathfrak{p}_n(\varepsilon)\}.$$

Notice that by strictness and the triangle inequality this is indeed a  $[0, \infty]$ -valued metric, where infinite distance means one type can under no circumstances be perturbed one into the other.

**Lemma 1.23.** *Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a perturbation pre-system. Then the family of metrics  $(d_{\mathfrak{p},n}: n < \omega)$  has the following properties:*

- (i) *For every  $n$ , the set  $\{(p, q, \varepsilon) \in S_n(T)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^+: d_{\mathfrak{p},n}(p, q) \leq \varepsilon\}$  is closed.*
- (ii) *If  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a perturbation system, then for every  $n, m < \omega$  and mapping  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$ , the induced mapping  $\sigma^*: S_m(T) \rightarrow S_n(T)$  satisfies for all  $p \in S_m(T)$  and  $q \in S_n(T)$ :*

$$d_{\mathfrak{p},m}(p, (\sigma^*)^{-1}(q)) = d_{\mathfrak{p},n}(\sigma^*(p), q).$$

(Here we follow the convention that  $d_{\mathfrak{p},m}(p, \emptyset) = \inf \emptyset = \infty$ .)

Conversely, given a family of metrics with values in  $[0, \infty]$  satisfying the first property, and defining  $\mathfrak{p}_n(\varepsilon) = \{(p, q) \in S_n(T)^2 : d_{\mathfrak{p},n}(p, q) \leq \varepsilon\}$ , we obtain that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a perturbation pre-system, and it is a perturbation system if and only if the second property is satisfied as well.

*Proof.* This is merely a reformulation:

- Symmetry, triangle inequality and strictness correspond to each  $d_{\mathfrak{p},n}$  being a metric;
- Downward continuity corresponds to the set  $\{(p, q, \varepsilon) \in S_n(T)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^+ : d_{\mathfrak{p},n}(p, q) \leq \varepsilon\}$  being closed; and
- Each of the  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$  being a perturbation radius corresponds to  $d_{\mathfrak{p},m}(p, (f^*)^{-1}(q)) = d_{\mathfrak{p},n}(f^*(p), q)$ , by Lemma 1.16. ■<sub>1.23</sub>

We say that two perturbation systems  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $\mathfrak{p}'$  are *equivalent* if the perturbation metrics  $d_{\mathfrak{p}}$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{p}'}$  are uniformly equivalent on each  $S_n(T)$ .

We say that a perturbation pre-system  $\mathfrak{p}$  *respects equality* if  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$  does for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ . In this case, by Proposition 1.20 we can define  $\llbracket \mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon) \rrbracket = \llbracket \mathfrak{p} \rrbracket(\varepsilon)$  to be the symmetric perturbation radius generated by  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$ . By Lemma 1.21,  $\llbracket \mathfrak{p} \rrbracket$  satisfies the triangle inequality. One can verify that  $\llbracket \mathfrak{p} \rrbracket$  satisfies downward continuity, and it is clearly symmetric and strict, so it is a perturbation system. As expected, we call  $\llbracket \mathfrak{p} \rrbracket$  the perturbation system *generated* by  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

If  $\mathcal{L}$  consists of finitely many predicate symbols, a natural perturbation system for  $\mathcal{L}$  is the one allowing to perturb all symbols by “a little”. In order to construct it we first define a perturbation pre-system  $\mathfrak{p}$  by letting  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$  be the (symmetric) perturbation pre-radius allowing the distance symbol  $d$  to change by a multiplicative factor of  $e^{\pm\varepsilon}$ , and every other symbol to change by  $\pm\varepsilon$ . Then  $\mathfrak{p}$  respects equality, and thus generates a perturbation system  $\llbracket \mathfrak{p} \rrbracket$ . Similarly, if  $\mathcal{L}$  is an expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_0$  by finitely many symbols, we might want to require that all symbols of  $\mathcal{L}_0$  be preserved precisely, while allowing the new symbols to be perturbed as in the previous case.

A particularly interesting example of the latter kind is the case of adding a generic automorphism to a stable continuous theory. Consider for example the case of infinite dimensional Hilbert spaces: If  $\sigma, \sigma' \in U(H)$ , then  $(H, \sigma')$  is obtained from  $(H, \sigma)$  by a small perturbation of the automorphism (which keeps the underlying Hilbert space unmodified) if and only if the operator norm  $\|\sigma - \sigma'\|$  is small. Thus the notion of perturbation brings into the realm of model theory the uniform convergence topology on automorphism groups of structures. We will say a little more about this in the last section.

In case of a classical (i.e., discrete) first order theory  $T$  in a finite language, there are no non-trivial perturbation systems. Indeed, let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a perturbation system, and let  $P$  be an  $n$ -ary predicate symbol. Let

$$X_P = ([P(\bar{x})] \times [\neg P(\bar{y})]) \cup ([\neg P(\bar{x})] \times [P(\bar{y})]) \subseteq S_n(T)^2.$$

Then  $X_P \cap \mathfrak{p}_n(0) = \emptyset$ , but  $X$  is compact, so there is  $\varepsilon_P > 0$  such that  $X_P \cap \mathfrak{p}_n(\varepsilon_P) = \emptyset$ . Replacing function symbols with their graphs we may assume the language is purely relational, and as we assumed the language to be finite we can define  $\varepsilon_0 = \min\{\varepsilon_P : P \in \mathcal{L}\} > 0$ . By the construction every  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon_0)$ -perturbation is an elementary mapping, that is to say that a small enough perturbation, according to  $\mathfrak{p}$ , is not a perturbation at all. Another way of saying this is that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is equivalent to the identity perturbation system. In short, structures in a finite discrete language cannot really be perturbed. The same argument holds if we have a pair of languages  $\mathcal{L}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ , where we only allow to perturb symbols in  $\mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_0$  which are finite in number.

Thus, the notion of perturbation is a new feature of continuous logic which essentially does not exist in discrete logic.

This last statement is of course not 100% correct, as there was a finiteness assumption. Indeed, let  $\mathcal{L} = \{E_i : i < \omega\}$  and let  $T$  be the theory saying that each  $E_i$  is an equivalence relation with two equivalence classes, and every intersection of finitely many equivalence classes of distinct  $E_i$ 's is infinite. This is a classical example of a theory which is not  $\omega$ -categorical, but every restriction of  $T$  to a finite sub-language is. For  $\varepsilon > 0$ , let  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$  be the symmetric perturbation radius generated by requiring  $E_i$  to be fixed for all  $i < 1/\varepsilon$ , and  $\mathfrak{p}(0) = \text{id}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a perturbation system, and “a model of  $T$  up to a small  $\mathfrak{p}$ -perturbation” is the same as “a model of  $T$  restricted to a finite sub-language”. Thus  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical in the sense of Section 2 below.

## 2. SATURATION UP TO PERTURBATION

For the rest of this section, fix a perturbation system  $\mathfrak{p}$ .

**Notation 2.1.** If  $p(x)$  is any partial type and  $\varepsilon \geq 0$  then  $p(x^\varepsilon)$  denotes the partial type

$$\exists y (p(y) \wedge d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon).$$

We define  $p(x^\varepsilon, y^\delta, \dots)$  similarly. We follow the convention that the metric on finite tuples is the supremum metric, so if  $\bar{x}$  is a (finite) tuple of variables then  $p(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)$  means  $p(x_0^\varepsilon, x_1^\varepsilon, \dots)$ .

This notation can (and will) be used in conjunction with previous notation. If  $p(\bar{x})$  is a partial type and  $\rho$  a perturbation radius then  $p^\rho(\bar{x})$  is also a partial type, so we can make sense of  $p^\rho(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)$ :  $\bar{a} \models p^\rho(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)$  if and only if there are  $\bar{b}$  such that  $d(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) \leq \varepsilon$  and  $\bar{b} \models p^\rho$ . Similarly,  $\bar{a} \models p(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)^\rho$  if and only if there are  $\bar{b}$  and  $\bar{c}$  such that  $\bar{b} \models p$ ,  $d(\bar{b}, \bar{c}) \leq \varepsilon$ , and  $\text{tp}(\bar{a}) \in \text{tp}(\bar{c})^\varepsilon$ . The difference between the two examples is that in the first we first perturb  $p$  and then allow the realisation to move a little, while in the second we do it the other way around. Since  $\rho$  is uniformly continuous, this does not make much difference, as for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\delta = \delta_\rho(\varepsilon) > 0$ :

$$[p^\rho(\bar{x}^\delta)] \subseteq [p(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)]^\rho, \quad [p(\bar{x}^\delta)]^\rho \subseteq [p^\rho(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)].$$

**Definition 2.2.** A structure  $M$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated if for every finite tuple  $\bar{a} \in M$ , type  $p(x, \bar{a}) \in S_1(\bar{a})$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the partial type  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(x^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)$  is realised in  $M$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *The definition of  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximate  $\omega$ -saturation, which was given for a single free variable  $x$ , implies the same property with any finite tuple of variables  $x_{<n}$ .*

*Proof.* We do this by induction on  $n$ . For  $n = 0$  there is nothing to prove, so we assume for  $n$  and prove for  $n + 1$ .

So let  $p(x_{\leq n}, \bar{a}) \in S_{n+1}(\bar{a})$  for some finite tuple  $\bar{a} \in M$ , where  $p(x_{\leq n}, \bar{y})$  is a complete type without parameters, and let  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We need to find in  $M$  a realisation for  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(x_{\leq n}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)$ .

First, find  $\delta > 0$  such that  $[d(x, y) \leq \delta]^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)} \subseteq [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon/2]$ , so in particular,  $\delta \leq \varepsilon/2$ . Let  $q(x_{<n}, \bar{y}) = p(x_{\leq n}, \bar{y}) \upharpoonright_{(x_{<n}, \bar{y})}$ . By the induction hypothesis we can realise  $q^{\mathfrak{p}(\delta)}(x_{<n}^\delta, \bar{a}^\delta)$  in  $M$ : that is to say that we can find  $b_{<n} \in M$ , and  $b'_{<n}, \bar{a}'$  possibly outside  $M$ , such that  $d(b'_{<n} \bar{a}', b_{<n} \bar{a}) \leq \delta$  and  $\models q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(b'_{<n}, \bar{a}')$ . Since  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)$  is a perturbation radius we can find  $b'_n$  (still, possibly outside  $M$ ) such that  $\models p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(b'_{\leq n}, \bar{a}')$ . Thus in particular:

$$\models p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(b'_n, b_{<n}^\delta, \bar{a}^\delta).$$

Let  $r(x) = \text{tp}(b'_n/b_{<n}, \bar{a})$ . Using  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximate  $\omega$ -saturation, find  $b_n \in M$  such that  $\models r^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(b_n^{\varepsilon/2}, b_{<n}^{\varepsilon/2}, \bar{a}^{\varepsilon/2})$ . That is to say that there exist  $d_{\leq n}, \bar{c}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} d(b_{\leq n} \bar{a}, d_{\leq n}, \bar{c}) &\leq \varepsilon/2, \\ \models r^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(d_{\leq n}, \bar{c}), \end{aligned}$$

From which we conclude that:

$$\begin{aligned} \models p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(d_n, d_{<n}^\delta, \bar{c}^\delta)^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}, \\ \models p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(d_n, d_{<n}^{\varepsilon/2}, \bar{c}^{\varepsilon/2}), \\ \models p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(b_n^{\varepsilon/2}, b_{<n}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon), \\ \models p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(b_{\leq n}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

■<sub>2.3</sub>

*Remark 2.4.* Lemma 2.3 can be restated as saying that  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximate  $\omega$ -saturation is invariant under the adjunction of the sort of  $n$ -tuples (with the supremum metric). It follows that it is also invariant under the adjunction of any imaginary sort (with the natural metric), as well as of the sort of  $\omega$ -tuples (with the metric  $d(a_{<\omega}, b_{<\omega}) = \sum 2^{-n-1}d(a_n, b_n)$ ). Thus the following results can be extended to  $\omega$ -tuples and imaginary sorts as well.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Assume that  $M$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated. Then for every finite tuple  $\bar{a} \in M$ , type  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a})$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)$  is realised in  $M$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 2.3 we may assume that  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{a}$  are singletons.

Let  $\varepsilon_i = (1 - 2^{-i})\varepsilon$ , and choose  $\delta_i > 0$  small enough so that:

- (i)  $\delta_i \leq 2^{-i-2}\varepsilon$ .
- (ii)  $[d(x, y) \leq \delta_i]^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)} \subseteq [d(x, y) \leq 2^{-i}]$ .

$$(iii) [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon_i]^{\mathbf{p}(\delta_i)} \subseteq [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon_i + 2^{-i-2}\varepsilon].$$

Notice that the second is possible since  $\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)$  is uniformly continuous. The third is possible by a compactness argument using the facts that  $[d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon_i + 2^{-i-2}\varepsilon]$  contains a neighbourhood of  $[d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon_i]$ , and

$$[d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon_i] = [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon_i]^{\mathbf{p}(0)} = \bigcap_{\delta > 0} [d(x, y) \leq \varepsilon_i]^{\mathbf{p}(\delta)}.$$

Let us also agree that  $\delta_{-1} = \infty$ .

We now choose a sequence  $b_i \in M$  such that  $\models p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_i)}(b_i^{\delta_{i-1}}, a^{\varepsilon_i})$ :

– Since  $\delta_{-1} = \infty$  and  $p(x, a)$  is consistent, any  $b_0 \in M$  will do.

– Let  $b_i$  be given. Then possibly outside  $M$  there exists  $c$  such that  $d(c, b_i) \leq \delta_{i-1}$  and  $\models p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_i)}(c, a^{\varepsilon_i})$ . Let  $q(x, y, z) = \text{tp}(c, b_i, a)$ . By the saturation assumption there exists  $b_{i+1} \in M$  such that  $\models q^{\mathbf{p}(\delta_i)}(b_{i+1}^{\delta_i}, b_i^{\delta_i}, a^{\delta_i})$ . We know that  $q(x, y, z) \vdash p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_i)}(x, z^{\varepsilon_i})$ , so:

$$\begin{aligned} q^{\mathbf{p}(\delta_i)}(x, y, z) &\vdash p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_i + \delta_i)}(x, z^{\varepsilon_i + 2^{-i-2}\varepsilon}) \vdash p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_{i+1})}(x, z^{\varepsilon_i + 2^{-i-2}\varepsilon}) \\ q^{\mathbf{p}(\delta_i)}(x^{\delta_i}, y^{\delta_i}, z^{\delta_i}) &\vdash p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_{i+1})}(x^{\delta_i}, z^{\varepsilon_i + 2^{-i-2}\varepsilon + \delta_i}) \vdash p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_{i+1})}(x^{\delta_i}, z^{\varepsilon_{i+1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus  $\models p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon_{i+1})}(b_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}}, a^{\varepsilon_{i+1}})$  as required.

We also know that  $q(x, y, z) \vdash d(x, y) \leq \delta_{i-1}$ . It follows that  $q^{\mathbf{p}(\delta_i)}(x, y, z) \vdash d(x, y) \leq 2^{-i+1}$  (except when  $i = 0$ ), so  $d(b_i, b_{i+1}) \leq 2^{-i+1} + 2\delta_i \leq 2^{-i-1}(4 + \varepsilon)$ , so  $(b_i : i < \omega)$  is a Cauchy sequence in  $M$  and therefore converges to some  $b \in M$ . For all  $i < j < \omega$  we have  $\models p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(b_j^{\delta_j}, a^\varepsilon)$ , so  $\models p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(b^{\delta_i}, a^\varepsilon)$  for all  $i < \omega$ , and as  $\delta_i \rightarrow 0$  we conclude that  $\models p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(b, a^\varepsilon)$ , as required.  $\blacksquare_{2.5}$

**Proposition 2.6.** *Assume that  $M$  is  $\mathbf{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated. Then for every finite tuple  $\bar{a} \in M$ , type  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a})$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  there are  $\bar{b}, \bar{a}' \in M$  such that:*

- (i)  $d(\bar{a}, \bar{a}') \leq \varepsilon$ .
- (ii)  $\models p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{b}, \bar{a}')$ .

*Proof.* Let

$$q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{a}) := p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge \bar{y} = \bar{a}.$$

By Step II there are  $\bar{b}, \bar{a}' \in M$  such that  $\models q^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{b}, \bar{a}', \bar{a}^\varepsilon)$ . Since  $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$  implies that  $\bar{y} = \bar{z}$ , so does  $q^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}$ , so  $\models p(\bar{b}, \bar{a}')$  and  $d(\bar{a}', \bar{a}) \leq \varepsilon$ , as required.  $\blacksquare_{2.6}$

**Proposition 2.7.** *Any two elementarily equivalent separable  $\mathbf{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated structures are  $\mathbf{p}$ -isomorphic.*

*Proof.* Let  $M \equiv N$  be two separable  $\mathbf{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated models, and let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given. Let  $M_0 = \{a_i : i < \omega\}$  and  $N_0 = \{b_i : i < \omega\}$  be countable dense subsets of  $M$  and  $N$ , respectively.

Define for convenience  $\varepsilon_i = (1 - 2^{-i})\varepsilon$  for all  $i < \omega$ . As  $\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)$  is uniformly continuous, we may also choose  $\delta_i > 0$  such that  $[d(x, y) \leq \delta_i]^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)} \subseteq [d(x, y) \leq 2^{-i-1}]$  (so in particular,  $\delta_i \leq 2^{-i-1}$ ).

We will construct a sequence of mappings  $f_i: A_i \rightarrow N$  and  $g_i: B_i \rightarrow M$ , where  $A_i \subseteq M$  and  $B_i \subseteq N$  are finite, such that:

(i)  $A_0 = B_0 = \emptyset$ , and for  $i > 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned} A_{i+1} &= a_{\leq i} \cup A_i \cup g_i(B_i) \\ B_{i+1} &= b_{\leq i} \cup B_i \cup f_{i+1}(A_{i+1}). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) For all  $c \in A_i$ :  $d(c, g_i \circ f_i(c)) \leq \delta_i$ .

(iii) For all  $c \in B_i$ :  $d(c, f_{i+1} \circ g_i(c)) \leq \delta_i$ .

(iv) For each  $i$ ,  $f_i$  is a  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon_{2i})$ -perturbation and  $g_i$  is a  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon_{2i+1})$ -one.

We start with  $f_0 = \emptyset$ , which is 0-as we assume that  $M \equiv N$ .

Assume that  $f_i$  is given. Then  $A_i$  is given, and is finite by the induction hypothesis, and this determines  $B_i$  which is also finite. Fix enumerations for  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  as finite tuples, and let  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \text{tp}^N(B_i, f(A_i))$ .

As  $f_i$  is a  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon_{2i})$ -perturbation, there is a type  $q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon_{2i})}$  such that  $q(\bar{x}, A_i)$  is consistent. By  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximate  $\omega$ -saturation of  $M$  there are tuples  $B'_i, A'_i \subseteq M$  such that  $d(A_i, A'_i) \leq \delta_i$  and  $M \models q(B'_i, A'_i)^{\mathfrak{p}(2^{-2i-1}\varepsilon)}$ . Then  $g_i: B_i \mapsto B'_i$  is  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon_{2i+1})$ -elementary, so it will do.

We construct  $f_{i+1}$  from  $g_i$  similarly.

We now have for all  $c \in A_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} d(c, g_i \circ f_i(c)) \leq \delta_i &\implies d(f_{i+1}(c), f_{i+1} \circ g_i \circ f_i(c)) \leq 2^{-i-1} \\ &\implies d(f_{i+1}(c), f_i(c)) \leq 2^{-i}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the sequence of mappings  $f_i$  converges to a mapping  $f: A \rightarrow N$ , where  $A = \bigcup A_i$ . As  $f_i$  is an  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$ -perturbation for all  $i$  so is  $f$ . As  $M_0 \subseteq A$  we have  $\bar{A} = M$ , so  $f$  extends uniquely to a  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$ -perturbation  $\bar{f}: M \rightarrow N$ . An  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)$ -perturbation  $\bar{g}: N \rightarrow M$  is constructed similarly.

Finally, for  $i < j < \omega$  choose  $k \geq j$  such that  $2^{-k+2} \leq \delta_j$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned} d(a_i, \bar{g} \circ \bar{f}(a_i)) &\leq d(a_i, \bar{g} \circ f_k(a_i)) + 2^{-j} \\ &\leq d(a_i, g_{k+1} \circ f_k(a_i)) + 2^{-j+1} + 2^{-j} \\ &\leq 2^{-j} + 2^{-j+1} + 2^{-j} \leq 2^{-j+2}. \end{aligned}$$

By letting  $j \rightarrow \infty$  we see that  $\bar{g} \circ \bar{f}$  is the identity on  $M_0$ , and therefore on  $M$ . Similarly  $\bar{f} \circ \bar{g} = \text{id}_N$ . ■<sub>2.7</sub>

### 3. CATEGORICITY UP TO PERTURBATION

We now turn to the proof of a Ryll-Nardzewski style characterisation of separable categoricity up so small perturbations.

**Definition 3.1.** We say that a theory  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\kappa$ -categorical if every two models  $M, N \models T$  such that  $\|M\| = \|N\| = \kappa$  are  $\mathfrak{p}$ -isomorphic.

*Remark 3.2.* It is not difficult to verify a general converse to Proposition 2.7, i.e., that if  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a perturbation system and  $M$  and  $N$  are  $\mathfrak{p}$ -isomorphic then  $M \equiv N$ . Thus Vaught's Test holds just as well for perturbed categoricity: if  $T$  has no compact models and is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\kappa$ -categorical for some  $\kappa > |\mathcal{L}|$  then  $T$  is complete.

**Lemma 3.3.** *A complete countable theory  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical if and only if all separable models of  $T$  are  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated.*

*Proof.* Right to left follows from 2.7.

Conversely, assume that  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical, and let  $M \models T$  be separable. Let  $\bar{a} \in M^n$ ,  $q(\bar{x}) = \text{tp}(\bar{a})$ , and let  $q(y, \bar{a}) \in S_1(\bar{a})$ , where  $q(y, \bar{x}) \in S_{n+1}(T)$  is a complete pure type. Let also  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $\delta = \delta_p(\varepsilon) > 0$ .

By the downward Löwenheim-Skolem theorem there exists a separable model  $N \models T$  such that for every  $n$ -tuple  $\bar{b} \in N$ , if  $\bar{b}$  satisfies  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}$  then  $q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(y, \bar{b}^\delta)$  is realised in  $N$ . By assumption there exists a  $\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)$ -isomorphism  $f: M \rightarrow N$ . Then  $\bar{b} = f(\bar{a}) \models p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}$ , and let  $c \in N$  be such that  $\models q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)}(c, \bar{b}^\delta)$ . Letting  $d = f^{-1}(c)$  we get  $\models q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(d, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)$ .

Thus  $M$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated. ■<sub>3.3</sub>

We observe that if  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a perturbation system, then the topology on  $S_n(T)$  induced by  $d_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is finer than the logic topology. Indeed, if  $U$  is a neighbourhood of  $p$ , then  $\bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)} = \{p\} \subseteq U$ , and by compactness we must have  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)} \subseteq U$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

Unlike what the statement of Corollary 4.39 might lead one to think, this topology may be too fine: for example, in case of the identity perturbation (i.e., no perturbation allowed at all),  $d_{\mathfrak{p},n}$  is a discrete metric (with values in  $\{0, \infty\}$ ), while the standard Ryll-Nardzewski theorem for continuous logic does consider a much coarser topology, namely that induced by the metric  $d$ . We therefore need to combine the two metrics:

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $T$  be a complete countable theory,  $\mathfrak{p}$  a perturbation system for  $T$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The theory  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical.*
- (ii) *For every  $n < \omega$ , finite  $\bar{a}$ ,  $p \in S_n(\bar{a})$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the set  $[p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]$  has non-empty interior in  $S_n(\bar{a})$ .*
- (iii) *Same restricted to  $n = 1$ .*

*Proof.* (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Assume there is some finite tuple  $\bar{a}$ ,  $n < \omega$  and  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a})$ , such that for some  $\varepsilon > 0$  the set  $[p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]$  has empty interior in  $S_n(\bar{a})$ . Then it is nowhere dense in  $S_n(\bar{a})$ , and can be omitted in a dense subset of some separable model  $(M, \bar{a}) \models T_{\bar{a}}$ . Therefore  $[p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]$  is omitted in  $M$ , which is therefore not  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated. Therefore  $T$  cannot be  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical.

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii). Clear.

(iii)  $\implies$  (i). We will show that every  $M \models T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated. Indeed, let  $\bar{a} \in M$  be a finite tuple and  $p(x, \bar{a}) \in S_1(T)$ . As  $[p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(x^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]$  has non-empty interior in  $S_n(\bar{a})$  it must be realised in  $M$ . ■<sub>3.4</sub>

We may wish to combine the two metrics in a single one. While one may try to achieve this through various general approaches for the combination of two metrics, the specific situation in which we find ourselves suggest a specific construction as the “natural” one.

Fix  $m < \omega$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{c}} = \mathcal{L} \cup \{c_i : i < m\}$ , where each  $c_i$  is a new distinct constant symbol. Let  $T_{\bar{c}}$  be the (incomplete)  $\mathcal{L}_{\bar{c}}$ -theory generated by  $T$ . We extend  $\mathbf{p}$  into a perturbation system  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}$  for  $T_{\bar{c}}$  as explained in the end of Section 1, i.e., by allowing the constant symbols to move a little. It is more convenient to think in terms of a relational language, in which each of the constants  $c_i$  is represented by a unary predicate giving the distance to  $c_i$ . We therefore define  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}^0(\varepsilon)$  to be the perturbation pre-radius which, for  $p, q \in S_n(T_{\bar{c}})$ , allows to perturb  $p$  to  $q$  if and only if:

- (i)  $q \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{L}} \in (p \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{L}})^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}$ ; and
- (ii) For all  $i < m$  and  $j < n$ :  $|d(x_j, c_i)^p - d(x_j, c_i)^q| \leq \varepsilon$ .

It is easy to verify that  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}^0$  is a uniformly continuous perturbation pre-system, which generates a perturbation system  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}} = \llbracket \mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}^0 \rrbracket$ . Thus  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}$  can be roughly described as allowing to perturb models of  $T$  according to  $\mathbf{p}$ , and then move the new constants (i.e., change the distance to them) a little as well. If  $\bar{c} = \emptyset$  we changed nothing:  $\mathbf{p}_{\emptyset} = \mathbf{p}$ .

By definition of the bi-reduct  $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket$ , we have for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $(M, \bar{a}), (N, \bar{b}) \models T_{\bar{c}}$ :

$$\text{BiPert}_{\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}^0(\varepsilon)}((M, \bar{a}), (N, \bar{b})) = \text{BiPert}_{\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}(\varepsilon)}((M, \bar{a}), (N, \bar{b})) = \\ \{f \in \text{BiPert}_{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(M, N) : (\forall e \in M, i < m)(|d^M(e, a_i) - d^N(f(e), b_i)| \leq \varepsilon)\}.$$

The space  $S_0(T_{\bar{c}})$  is the set of completions of  $T_{\bar{c}}$  and can be naturally identified with  $S_m(T)$ . We define a metric  $\tilde{d}_{\mathbf{p}, m}$  on  $S_m(T)$  as the image of  $d_{\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}}$  under this identification. Equivalently:

**Definition 3.5.** For  $p, q \in S_n(T)$ , we define  $\tilde{d}_{\mathbf{p}}(p, q)$  as the infimum of all  $\varepsilon$  for which there exist models  $M, N \models T$ ,  $\bar{a} \in M^n$  and  $\bar{b} \in N^n$  and a mapping  $f : M \rightarrow N$  such that:

- (i)  $\bar{a} \models p$  and  $\bar{b} \models q$ .
- (ii)  $f \in \text{BiPert}_{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(M, N)$ .
- (iii) For all  $i < n$  and  $c \in M$ :  $|d^M(c, a_i) - d^N(f(c), b_i)| \leq \varepsilon$ .

Alternatively, we may wish to restrict  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}$  to a specific completion of  $T_{\bar{c}}$ . Any such completion is of the form  $T_{\bar{a}} = \text{Th}(M, \bar{a})$ , where  $M \models T$  and  $\bar{a} \in M^n$ . Let us denote the restriction of  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{c}}$  to  $T_{\bar{a}}$  by  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{a}}$ .

Of course, once we have constructed  $\mathbf{p}_{\bar{a}}$ , we can construct  $\tilde{d}_{\mathbf{p}_{\bar{a}}}$  as above, and it follows immediately from the definitions that:

**Lemma 3.6.** *The construction  $\mathbf{p} \mapsto \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{p}}$  commutes with the addition of parameters, in the sense that for all  $\bar{a}, \bar{b}$  and  $\bar{c}$ , if  $|\bar{b}| = |\bar{c}|$  then:*

$$\tilde{d}_{\mathbf{p}_{\bar{a}}}(\text{tp}(\bar{b}/\bar{a}), \text{tp}(\bar{c}/\bar{a})) = \tilde{d}_{\mathbf{p}}(\text{tp}(\bar{b}, \bar{a}), \text{tp}(\bar{c}, \bar{a})).$$

In an arbitrary metric space  $(X, d)$ , let  $B_d(x, \varepsilon)$  denote the closed  $\varepsilon$ -ball around a point  $x$ . The following result characterise the topology defined by  $\tilde{d}_{\mathbf{p}}$ :



**Lemma 3.7.** *Fix  $n < \omega$  and a finite tuple  $\bar{a} \in M \models T$ . The metric  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}\bar{a}}$  is coarser (i.e., smaller) on  $S_n(\bar{a})$  than both  $d$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{p}\bar{a}}$ , and finer than the logic topology.*

*Also, for every  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a})$ , the family  $\{[p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]: \varepsilon > 0\}$  forms a base of  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}\bar{a}}$ -neighbourhood for  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$ .*

*Proof.* Let us start by showing that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is  $\varepsilon' > 0$  such that:

$$[p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon')}(\bar{x}^{\varepsilon'}, \bar{a}^{\varepsilon'})] \subseteq B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}\bar{a}}}(p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}), \varepsilon) \subseteq [p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)].$$

Let us first consider the case without parameters. The set  $\{(q(x, y), q'(x, y)) \in S_2(T): |d(x, y)^q - d(x, y)^{q'}| \geq \varepsilon/2\}$  is closed and disjoint of the diagonal, so by compactness there is  $\varepsilon' > 0$  such for all  $(q, q') \in \mathfrak{p}_2(\varepsilon')$ :  $|d(x, y)^q - d(x, y)^{q'}| \leq \varepsilon/2$ . We may of course assume that  $\varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon/2$ , and the first inclusion follows. The second inclusion is immediate from the definition of  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ .

The case over parameters  $\bar{a}$  follows from the case without parameters and the fact that by Lemma 3.6:

$$B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}\bar{a}}}(p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}), \varepsilon) = \{q(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a}): q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}}(p, \varepsilon)\}.$$

Finally, let  $K \subseteq S_n(T)$  be closed in the logic topology and  $q \notin K$ . Then there is  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)} \cap K = \emptyset$ , and since  $q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}$  is closed in the logic topology there is also  $\varepsilon' > 0$  such that  $[q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^{\varepsilon'})] \cap K = \emptyset$ . Letting  $\varepsilon'' = \min\{\varepsilon, \varepsilon'\}$  we see that  $[q^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon'')}(\bar{x}^{\varepsilon''})] \cap K = \emptyset$ . Therefore  $K$  is  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -closed. This shows that  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  refines the logic topology. It is clearly coarser than both  $d$  and  $d_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . Substituting  $T_{\bar{a}}$  for  $T$  in the last argument we get the case with parameters. ■<sub>3.7</sub>

Thus we can restate Theorem 3.4 as:

**Theorem 3.8.** *Let  $T$  be a complete countable theory. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The theory  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical.*
- (ii) *For every  $n < \omega$ , finite  $\bar{a}$ ,  $p \in S_n(\bar{a})$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the  $\varepsilon$ -ball  $B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}\bar{a}}}(p, \varepsilon)$  has non-empty interior in the logic topology on  $S_n(\bar{a})$ .*
- (iii) *Same restricted to  $n = 1$ .*

The statement of the result in terms of non-empty interior may sound a little weird, as the non-perturbed Ryll-Nardzewski theorem tells us that  $T$  is  $\omega$ -categorical if and only if the metric  $d$  coincides with the logic topology. In order to explain this apparent discrepancy let us make a few more observations.

First, the coincidence of the logic topology with the metric  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is a sufficient condition for  $T$  to be  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical. In this case it suffices to check  $S_n(T)$  alone (i.e., no need to consider parameters).

**Proposition 3.9.** *Assume that  $T$  is countable and complete, and  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  coincides with the logic topology on  $S_n(T)$  for all  $T$ . Then  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical.*

*Proof.* Let  $M \models T$ , and let  $\bar{a} \in M$ ,  $p(x, \bar{a}) \in S_1(\bar{a})$ , and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . By assumption  $B_{\tilde{d}_p}(p(x, \bar{y}), \varepsilon)$  is a neighbourhood of  $p$ , so there is a formula  $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$  such that

$$p \in [\varphi = 0] \subseteq [\varphi < 1/2] \subseteq B_{\tilde{d}_p}(p(x, \bar{y}), \varepsilon') \subseteq [p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(x^\varepsilon, \bar{y}^\varepsilon)].$$

Therefore  $[\varphi(x, \bar{a}) < 1/2]$  is a non-empty open subset of  $S_1(\bar{a})$  (as it contains  $p(x, \bar{a})$ ), and is therefore realised in  $M$ . Thus  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(x^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)$  is realised in  $M$ .  $\blacksquare_{3.9}$

In case we only know that  $B_{\tilde{d}_p}(p, \varepsilon)$  has non-empty interior, which needs not necessarily contain  $p$ , it may happen that no  $q(x, \bar{y})$  in this interior is consistent with  $r(\bar{y}) = \text{tp}(\bar{a})$ , so pulling up to  $S_1(\bar{a})$  we may end up with an empty set. This is why in the proof of Theorem 3.4 we need to consider parameters.

The reader (that's you) may think that the condition in Proposition 3.9 is more natural and useful than that in Theorem 3.4, and will of course be perfectly right in doing so. The reader might further think that the author (that's me) should have proved an “if and only if” version of Proposition 3.9 and scrap Theorem 3.4. Unfortunately, that would be going a little too far, as we can show with a counter-example. Roughly speaking, this example says that if the “if and only if” variant of Proposition 3.9 were true, we could prove Vaught's no-2-models theorem, which fails in continuous first order logic.

*Example 3.10.* Let  $T$  be the theory of atomless  $L^p$ -Banach lattices for some fixed  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , studied in [BBH]. It is known that  $T$  is  $\omega$ -categorical, all of its separable models being isomorphic to  $L^p[0, 1]$ . However, if  $f$  is any positive function of norm 1 (which determines  $\text{tp}(f)$ ), say  $f = \chi_{[0,1]}$ , then  $T_f$  has precisely two non-isomorphic separable models, namely  $(L^p[0, 1], \chi_{[0,1]})$  and  $(L^p[0, 2], \chi_{[0,1]})$ . (Allowing to perturb the new named constant we see that  $T_f$  is perturbationally  $\omega$ -categorical, but that's not what we are looking at). Let  $g$  be another positive function of norm 1 such that  $f \wedge g = 0$  (this determines  $\text{tp}(f, g)$ ). Then again,  $T_{f,g}$  has precisely two separable models,  $(L^p[0, 2], \chi_{[0,1]}, \chi_{[1,2]})$  and  $(L^p[0, 3], \chi_{[0,1]}, \chi_{[1,2]})$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be the identity perturbation system for  $T_f$ , and thus  $\mathfrak{p}_g$  is the perturbation system for  $T_{f,g}$  that allows to perturb  $g$  while preserving all the rest untouched. Then the two models above are  $\mathfrak{p}_g$ -isomorphic, so  $T_{f,g}$  is  $\mathfrak{p}_g$ - $\omega$ -categorical. Let  $\pi_n: S_n(T_{f,g}) \rightarrow S_n(T_f)$  be the reduct projection. As  $\mathfrak{p}$  is the identity perturbation on  $T_f$ ,  $\tilde{d}_p = d$  on  $S_n(T_f)$ . Therefore, if  $U \subseteq S_n(T_f)$  is  $d$ -open then  $\pi_n^{-1}(U) \subseteq S_n(T_{f,g})$  is  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}_g}$ -open.

But  $T_f$  is not  $\omega$ -categorical, so the metric  $d$  defines a non-compact topology on  $S_n(T)$ , whereby  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}_g}$  defines a non-compact topology on  $S_n(T_{f,g})$ , which in particular cannot coincide with the logic topology, even though  $T_{f,g}$  is  $\mathfrak{p}_g$ - $\omega$ -categorical.

This may nevertheless leave our hypothetical reader with a somewhat bitter taste, since unperturbed  $\omega$ -categoricity is characterised by the coincidence of the logic topology with the metric, and thus does not seem to be follow as a special case from Theorem 3.4. To see that it actually does, we need to explore some further properties perturbation metrics may have.

Let us start by recalling properties of the standard metric  $d$  on  $S_n(T)$ . We observe in [BU] that the metric  $d$  has the following properties:

- (i) It refines the logic topology.
- (ii) If  $F = [p(\bar{x})] \subseteq S_n(T)$  is closed, then so is  $F^\varepsilon = \{p: d(p, F) \leq \varepsilon\} = [p(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)]$ .
- (iii) For every injective  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$ ,  $p \in S_n(T)$ ,  $q \in S_m(T)$ :

$$d(p, \sigma^*(q)) = d(\sigma^{*-1}(p), q).$$

A perturbation metric has all these properties as well, and in fact satisfies the last one also for  $\sigma$  which is not injective. One last interesting property of  $(S_n(T), d)$  is analogous to the second property:

**Lemma 3.11.** *If  $U \subseteq S_n(T)$  is open, then so is  $U^{<\varepsilon} = \{p: d(p, U) < \varepsilon\}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show this for a basis of open sets, i.e., for sets of the form  $U = [\varphi(\bar{x}) < \varepsilon]$ . But then  $U^{<\varepsilon} = [\inf_{\bar{y}}(\varphi(\bar{y}) \vee d(\bar{x}, \bar{y})) < \varepsilon]$  is open. ■<sub>3.11</sub>

For lack of a better name, let us call provisionally a metric on a topological space *open* if it satisfies the property of Lemma 3.11.

**Definition 3.12.** Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a perturbation system for  $T$ .

- (i) We say that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is *open* if  $d_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is open on  $S_n(T)$  for all  $n$ .
- (ii) We say that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is *weakly open* if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n < \omega$  there is  $\delta > 0$  such that for every open set  $U \subseteq S_n(T)$ :

$$U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \delta} \subseteq (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon})^\circ.$$

(Where  $U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \delta} = \{p: \tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}(p, U) < \delta\}$ .)

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a perturbation system.*

- (i)  $\mathfrak{p}$  is *weakly open* if and only if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $n < \omega$  there is  $\delta > 0$  such that for every open  $U \subseteq S_n(T)$ :

$$U^{\mathfrak{p}(\delta)} \subseteq (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon})^\circ.$$

- (ii) If  $\mathfrak{p}$  is *open* then it is *weakly open*.
- (iii) If  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is *open* on  $S_n(T)$  for all  $n$  then  $\mathfrak{p}$  is *weakly open*.

*Proof.* (i) For one direction use the fact that  $U^{\mathfrak{p}(\delta/2)} \subseteq U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \delta}$ . For the other, assume that  $U^{\mathfrak{p}(\delta)} \subseteq (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon/2})^\circ$  and  $\delta < \varepsilon/2$ . Then since the metric  $d$  is open:

$$U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \delta} \subseteq (U^{\mathfrak{p}(\delta)})^{d < \delta} \subseteq \left( (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon/2})^\circ \right)^{d < \delta} \subseteq \left( (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon/2})^{d < \delta} \right)^\circ \subseteq (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon})^\circ.$$

- (ii) We use the criterion from the previous item:

$$U^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon/2)} \subseteq U^{d_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon} = (U^{d_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon})^\circ \subseteq (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon})^\circ.$$

- (iii) Immediate from the definition. ■<sub>3.13</sub>

**Theorem 3.14.** *Let  $T$  be a complete countable theory,  $\mathfrak{p}$  a weakly open perturbation system. Then  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical if and only if for every  $n$ ,  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  coincides with the logic topology on  $S_n(T)$ .*

*Proof.* Right to left is by Proposition 3.9, so we prove left to right.

Assume that  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical. Fix  $p \in S_n(T)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then by definition there is  $\delta > 0$  such that for every open set  $U \subseteq S_n(T)$ :  $U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \delta} \subseteq (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon/2})^\circ$ . We may also assume that  $\delta < \varepsilon$ .

Let  $U = B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}}(p, \delta/2)^\circ$ , so  $U \neq \emptyset$  by Theorem 3.4. Then:

$$p \in U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \delta} \subseteq (U^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon/2})^\circ \subseteq (B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}}(p, \delta/2)^{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}} < \varepsilon/2})^\circ \subseteq (B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}}(p, \varepsilon))^\circ$$

Therefore  $B_{\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}}(p, \varepsilon)$  is a logic neighbourhood of  $p$  for all  $p$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Since  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$  refines the logic topology, they must coincide. ■<sub>3.14</sub>

*Example 3.15.* The identity perturbation system is open.

**Corollary 3.16.** *In the case where  $\mathfrak{p}$  is the identity perturbation system, we obtain from Theorem 3.14 the unperturbed Ryll-Nardzewski theorem: if  $T$  is complete and countable, then it is  $\omega$ -categorical if and only if  $d$  (which coincides with  $\tilde{d}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ ) coincides with the logic topology on  $S_n(T)$ , for all  $n < \omega$ .*

*Example 3.17.* Let  $\bar{a} = M \models T$ , and let  $p = \text{tp}(\bar{a})$  be isolated (i.e.,  $d(\bar{x}, p)$  is a definable predicate). Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be the identity perturbation for  $T$ , and  $\mathfrak{p}_{\bar{a}}$  as above be a perturbation system for  $T_{\bar{a}}$  allowing to move the named parameter. Then  $\mathfrak{p}_{\bar{a}}$  is open.

*Proof.* Exercise. ■<sub>3.17</sub>

Of course, in Example 3.10 the type of the new parameter  $\text{tp}(g/f)$  was not isolated.

#### 4. UNBOUNDED STRUCTURES, NON-COMPACT THEORIES AND THEIR COMPACTIFICATION

While we tend to claim that continuous first order logic generalises Henson’s logic for Banach space structures (see for example [HI02]), this statement should be taken with a grain of salt. After all, a Banach space cannot be a continuous structure, since a continuous structure is by definition bounded. What we actually do (e.g., in [BU, Example 4.5] and the discussion that follows it) is decompose a Banach space into a multi-sorted structure, where each closed ball of radius  $n < \omega$  forms a sort, and thus on each sort or tuple of sorts everything is bounded and can be rescaled into  $[0, 1]$ . Furthermore, we can actually rescale all such sorts into the sort of the unit ball, which therefore suffices as a single sorted structure. This translation from Banach space structures in Henson’s logic to “unit ball structures” in continuous logic preserves such notions as elementary classes and extensions, of type-definability of subsets of the unit ball, etc.

This technique allowed us so far to reduce every question about Banach space structures in Henson’s sense to continuous logic. However, this may fail when dealing with

perturbations. Indeed, this approach would require the set of all elements of norm  $\leq 1$  to remain the same, precluding perturbations of the norm we may be interested in (this is not an issue for Example 3.10, though, since there the norm is not perturbed).

So another approach is needed.

**4.1. Unbounded structures (and non-compact theories).** We would like to allow unbounded structures, while at the same time making sure that bounded parts of the structure behave as ordinary bounded continuous structures. The “bounded parts” of a structure are given by means of a *gauge*.

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $(X, d)$  be a metric space,  $\nu: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  any function. We define  $X^{\nu \leq r} = \{x \in X: \nu(x) \leq r\}$  and similarly  $X^{\nu \geq r}$ ,  $X^{\nu < r}$ , etc.

- (i) We call  $X^{\nu \leq r}$  and  $X^{\nu < r}$  the *closed* and *open  $\nu$ -balls* of radius  $r$  in  $X$ , respectively.
- (ii) We say that  $\nu$  is a *gauge* on  $(X, d)$ , and call the triplet  $(X, d, \nu)$  a *( $\nu$ -)gauged space* if  $\nu$  is 1-Lipschitz in  $d$  and every  $\nu$ -ball (of finite radius) is bounded in  $d$ . Note that this implies that the bounded subsets of  $(X, d)$  are precisely those contained in some  $\nu$ -ball.
- (iii) Let  $\delta: (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  be a continuity modulus, and  $f: (X, d) \rightarrow (X', d')$  a mapping of metric spaces. We say that  $f$  *respects  $\delta$   $\nu$ -uniformly* if for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ :

$$x, y \in X^{\nu < \varepsilon^{-1}} \wedge d(x, y) < \delta(\varepsilon) \implies d'(f(x), f(y)) \leq \varepsilon.$$

While respecting a given  $\delta$   $\nu$ -uniformly depends on the choice of  $\nu$ , the fact that some  $\delta$  is respected  $\nu$ -uniformly does not:

**Fact 4.2.** *Let  $(X, d, \nu)$  be a gauged space. Then a function  $f: (X, d, \nu) \rightarrow (X', d')$  is uniformly continuous on every bounded set if and only if it respects some continuity modulus  $\delta$   $\nu$ -uniformly.*

*Remark 4.3.* We could have given a somewhat more general definition, replacing the 1-Lipschitz condition with the weaker condition that the gauge  $\nu$  should be bounded and uniformly continuous on every bounded set. This does not cause any real loss of generality, since in that case we could define

$$d'(x, y) = d(x, y) + |\nu(x) - \nu(y)|.$$

Then a set is bounded in  $(X, d)$  if and only if it is bounded in  $(X, d')$ , and on every bounded set the two metrics are uniformly equivalent. (And of course,  $\nu$  is 1-Lipschitz with respect to  $d'$ .)

**Definition 4.4.** An *unbounded continuous signature* is defined as a continuous signature, with the following addition:

- (i) On every sort  $S$  there is a distinguished unary predicate symbol  $\nu_S$  called the *gauge symbol* (which will usually be just denoted  $\nu$  as the sort is always clear from the context).

- (ii) To every  $n$ -ary symbol  $s$  there is an associated continuous function  $\beta_s: (\mathbb{R}^+)^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ , usually increasing, which we call the *bound function* of  $s$ .
- (iii) Uniform continuity moduli are specified for each symbol as usual (but see below concerning their satisfaction).

**Definition 4.5.** Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be an unbounded signature. An (*unbounded*)  $\mathcal{L}$ -*structure*  $M$  is defined as a bounded structure, with the following differences:

- (i) Predicate symbols are no longer required to have bounded range, and may take any value in  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . Instead, we only require that if  $P$  is an  $n$ -ary predicate symbol and  $\bar{a} \in M^n$  then:

$$P^M(\bar{a}) \leq \beta_P(\nu^M(a_0), \dots, \nu^M(a_{n-1})).$$

- (ii) Similarly, if  $f$  is an  $n$ -ary function symbol then:

$$\nu^M(f^M(\bar{a})) \leq \beta_f(\nu^M(a_0), \dots, \nu^M(a_{n-1})).$$

- (iii) The gauge symbol  $\nu^M$  is 1-Lipschitz. All other symbols respect their prescribed uniform continuity moduli  $\nu^M$ -uniformly.
- (iv) Bounded structures are allowed to be empty.

Thus, restricted to a  $\nu$ -ball, everything is bounded and uniformly continuous as in bounded continuous logic, and closed  $\nu$ -balls are moreover complete.

As the most common bound function for  $n$ -ary symbols is the sum  $\beta(\bar{x}) = \sum_{i < n} x_i$ , we call it the *standard* bound function.

*Remark 4.6.* If the language contains a constant symbol  $0$  then the formula  $\nu'(x) = d(x, 0)$  can act as an alternative gauge. Indeed, if  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$  then  $M^{\nu' \leq r} \subseteq M^{\nu \leq r + \nu(0)}$ , since  $\nu$  is 1-Lipschitz, and conversely  $M^{\nu \leq r} \subseteq M^{\nu' \leq \beta_d(r, \nu(0))}$  by definition of an unbounded structure. Thus we can pass between  $\nu$ -balls and  $\nu'$ -balls in a way which depends only on  $\mathcal{L}$ .

In most cases,  $\nu$  will indeed be equal to  $d(x, 0)$ .

*Example 4.7.* Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be a standard continuous signature, i.e., all predicate symbols take values in  $[0, 1]$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}'$  be the unbounded signature obtained from  $\mathcal{L}$  by adding a gauge symbol  $\nu_S$  for each sort  $S$ , and by setting  $\beta_s$  to be the constant 1 for all symbols. Then every  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $M$  can be naturally viewed as an unbounded  $\mathcal{L}'$ -structure by interpreting all gauges as the constant 1.

*Example 4.8* (Banach spaces). We would like to view Banach spaces as unbounded structures. Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{0, +, m_r: r \in \mathbb{Q}\}$ , where  $m_r$  is unary scalar multiplication by  $r$ . We view  $\|x\|$  as shorthand for  $d(x, 0)$ , and take it to be the gauge. Let  $\beta_{m_r}$  be multiplication by  $|r|$ , and for every other symbol  $s$  let  $\beta_s$  be standard. Then every real Banach space is naturally an (unbounded)  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure.

This can be extended to additional structure on the Banach space. For example a complex Banach space also has a function symbol for multiplication by  $i$ , while a Banach lattice is given by binary function symbols  $\vee, \wedge$  (again the bound functions are standard).

Connectives are continuous functions from  $(\mathbb{R}^+)^n$  to  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , or any convenient family of such functions which is dense in the compact-open topology, i.e., in the topology of uniform convergence on every compact set. We will use the system  $\{1, x \div y, x + y, x/2\}$  which generates such a dense set through composition (while alternative systems may be legitimate, we will always require the presence of 1 and  $\div$  in what follows).

When defining quantifiers we need to be careful. First,  $\sup_x \varphi$  could be infinite, and even if  $\varphi$  is bounded we may still have witnesses with arbitrarily high gauges, causing trouble with ultraproducts and compactness. In Henson's logic of positive bounded formulae [HI02], where the truth values are True/False, one gets around this by restricting quantifiers to bounded balls (and then again, one needs to play around with the radii of the balls when considering approximations...). If we tried to do the same thing with continuous quantifiers we could run into trouble if, say,  $\sup_{\nu(x) < r} \varphi < \sup_{\nu(x) \leq r} \varphi$ . We will follow a different path, looking for the simplest *syntactic* conditions on a formula  $\varphi$  that ensure that  $\inf_x \varphi$  and  $\sup_x \varphi$  are *semantically* legitimate. This approach will allow us nonetheless to recover approximate versions of bounded quantifiers later on.

We define formulae by induction, and at the same time we define whether a formula is (syntactically) eventually constant in a variable  $x$  and/or bounded.

- Atomic formulae are defined as usual.
  - If  $\varphi$  is atomic and  $x$  does not appear in  $\varphi$ , then  $\varphi$  is eventually constant in  $x$ .
  - No atomic formula is bounded.
- – Every combination by connectives of formulae which are bounded (eventually constant in  $x$ ) is bounded (eventually constant in  $x$ ).
  - If  $\varphi$  is bounded then  $\varphi \div \psi$  is bounded for any  $\psi$  and  $\varphi \div \nu(x)$  is eventually constant in  $x$ .
- If  $\varphi$  is eventually constant in  $x$  then  $\inf_x \varphi$  and  $\sup_x \varphi$  are formulae (but not otherwise).
  - If  $\varphi$  is bounded or eventually constant in  $y$  (for any variable  $y$ ) then so are  $\sup_x \varphi$  and  $\inf_x \varphi$ .

Terms are interpreted in the usual manner. We interpret formulae in structures with two minor twists. The first twist is that we define  $\varphi(\bar{a})$  where  $\bar{a} \in M \cup \{\infty\}$ , allowing  $a_i = \infty$  if  $\varphi$  is eventually constant in  $x$ . If  $\psi(\bar{x})$  is bounded then  $\psi(\bar{a}) \div \nu(\infty)$  is zero regardless of  $\bar{a}$ . All the other cases follow the usual rules. The second twist is that when interpreting quantifiers we also take the value at infinity into account:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_x \varphi(x, \bar{a}) &= \sup \{ \varphi(b, \bar{a}) : b \in M \cup \{\infty\} \} \\ \inf_x \varphi(x, \bar{a}) &= \inf \{ \varphi(b, \bar{a}) : b \in M \cup \{\infty\} \}. \end{aligned}$$

We leave it to the reader to observe that formulae which are syntactically bounded are indeed bounded in this interpretation. Similarly, if  $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$  is syntactically eventually constant in  $x$  then it is constant in  $x$  when  $\nu(x)$  is large enough, equal to  $\varphi(\infty, \bar{y})$ . Our interpretation makes therefore sense.

Considering the values at infinity is superfluous for unbounded structures which are of course the kind of structures one would usually consider in unbounded logic. Still, in some pathological situations bounded and even empty structures may arise. For things to run smoothly in such situations it is necessary to take the value at infinity into account. See Remark 4.10 below.

Notice that with our choice of connectives every formula is equivalent to one in prenex normal form. Notice also that for every formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  we can construct by induction a bound function  $\beta_\varphi(\bar{x})$  in a natural manner (we do not claim in any way that it is an optimal bound function – it is just the syntactically obvious one).

The formula 1 is both bounded and constant. It follows that for natural (or even dyadic) constant  $k$  the formula  $\varphi \wedge k = k \div (k \div \varphi)$  is bounded.

Let us see how to obtain approximate versions of the bounded quantifier  $\sup_{\nu(x) \leq r} \varphi$ . We will assume  $\varphi$  to be bounded with (minimal) syntactic bound  $k$ . We observe that  $\varphi \div (\nu(x) \div r)$  is bounded as well (for dyadic  $r$ ). It is further equivalent to  $(\varphi + (\nu(x) \wedge r)) \div \nu(x)$  which is both bounded and eventually constant in  $x$ . It follows that for every natural  $m > 0$  the formula  $\varphi \div m(\nu(x) \div r)$  is equivalent to one which is bounded and eventually constant in  $x$ . Let  $0 < r < r'$ , and find the least  $m$  such that we can write  $r \leq s = \ell 2^{-m} < (\ell + 1)2^{-m} \leq r'$ , and choose the minimal possible  $s$ . Define:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi \downarrow^{x \leq r, r'} &= \varphi \div k 2^m (\nu(x) \div s), \\ \varphi \uparrow^{x \leq r, r'} &= k \div (k \div \varphi) \downarrow^{x \leq r, r'}.\end{aligned}$$

Both formulae are bounded and eventually constant in  $x$ . Moreover,  $\varphi \downarrow^{x \leq r, r'} \leq \varphi$ , it coincides with  $\varphi$  when  $\nu(x) \leq r$  and is equal to zero when  $\nu(x) \geq r'$ . Thus  $\sup_x \varphi \downarrow^{x \leq r, r'}$ , which we will abbreviate by  $\sup_x^{r, r'} \varphi$ , is also a formula, approximating (when  $r'$  is close enough to  $r$ ) the expression  $\sup_{\nu(x) \leq r} \varphi$ . Similarly,  $\inf_x^{r, r'} \varphi = \inf_x \varphi \uparrow^{x \leq r, r'}$  approximates  $\inf_{\nu(x) \leq r} \varphi$ .

We may further extend these abbreviations to the case where  $\varphi$  is not bounded by truncating it at 1, defining  $\varphi \downarrow^{x \leq r, r'} = (\varphi \wedge 1) \downarrow^{x \leq r, r'}$  (and proceeding as above). This will only be used in conditions of the form  $\sup_x^{r, r'} \inf_y^{s, s'} \dots \varphi = 0$ , whose satisfaction does not depend on our particular choice of constant at which we truncate.

Now let  $\mathcal{L}$  be an unbounded signature, and let  $\{M_i : i \in I\}$  be a family of  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures and  $\mathcal{U}$  an ultrafilter on  $I$ . Let  $N_0$  be the set:

$$N_0 = \left\{ (a_i) \in \prod M_i : \lim_{\mathcal{U}} \nu^{M_i}(a_i) < \infty \right\}.$$

For a function symbol  $f$  or predicate symbol  $P$ , and arguments  $(a_i), (b_i), \dots \in N_0$ , define:

$$\begin{aligned}f^{N_0}((a_i), (b_i), \dots) &= (f^{M_i}(a_i, b_i, \dots)) \\ P^{N_0}((a_i), (b_i), \dots) &= \lim_{\mathcal{U}} P^{M_i}(a_i, b_i, \dots).\end{aligned}$$



Note that by definition of  $N_0$ , the values of  $P^{M_i}(a_i, b_i, \dots)$  are bounded on a large set of indexes, so  $\lim_{\mathcal{U}} P^{M_i}(a_i, b_i, \dots) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . It is now straightforward verification that  $N_0$  is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -pre-structure, i.e., that it verifies all the properties of a structure with the exception that  $d^{N_0}$  might be a pseudo-metric and needs not be complete. Then the completion  $N = \hat{N}_0$  is called the *ultraproduct of the  $M_i$  modulo  $\mathcal{U}$* , denoted  $\prod M_i/\mathcal{U}$ . As we quotient by “ $d((a_i), (b_i)) = 0$ ”, the image in  $N$  of  $(a_i) \in N_0$  will be denoted  $[a_i]$ . (Compare with the construction of ultraproducts of Banach spaces in [HI02] and of bounded continuous structures in [BU].)

By induction on the structure of a formula we prove:

**Fact 4.9** (Łoś’s Theorem). *For every formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  and  $[a_i], [b_i], \dots \in \prod M_i/\mathcal{U}$ :*

$$\varphi([a_i], [b_i], \dots) \prod M_i/\mathcal{U} = \lim_{\mathcal{U}} \varphi(a_i, b_i, \dots)^{M_i}.$$

*Proof.* Mostly as for bounded logic. When calculating  $\inf_x \varphi(x, a_i, b_i, \dots)$  witnesses can always be assumed to be taken from a uniformly bounded  $\nu$ -ball or to be the point at infinity. One of the cases must hold on a large set of indexes and a corresponding witness, either finite in the same bounded  $\nu$ -ball or  $\infty$ , exists in the ultraproduct. ■<sub>4.9</sub>

*Remark 4.10.* Łoś’s Theorem may fail if our semantic interpretation does not take the value at infinity into account. For example, consider the sentence  $\varphi = \inf_x (1 \div \nu(x))$ . Let  $M_n$  be the structure consisting of two points,  $\nu(a_{n,0}) = 0$ ,  $\nu(a_{n,1}) = n$ . Then  $\varphi^{M_n} = 0$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . On the other hand the ultraproduct contains a single point,  $\nu(a_0)$ , so  $\varphi \prod M_n/\mathcal{U} = 1$ .

Worse still, if  $M_n$  consisted only of  $a_{n,1}$  then their ultraproduct would be empty. This can also be obtained with unbounded structures, for example  $M_n = E \setminus B(n)$  where  $E$  is a Banach space and  $B(n)$  is its open ball of radius  $n$ . (These and other pathological examples were pointed out to the originally over-optimistic author by C. Ward Henson.)

**Definition 4.11.** Say that a family of conditions  $\Sigma = \{\varphi_i \leq r_i : i \in \lambda\}$  is *approximately finitely satisfiable* if for every finite  $w \subseteq \lambda$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the family  $\Sigma_0 = \{\varphi_i \leq r_i + \varepsilon : i \in w\}$  is satisfiable.

**Corollary 4.12.** *If a set of sentential conditions (i.e., conditions without free variables) is approximately finitely satisfied in a family of structures, then it is satisfied in some ultraproduct of these structures.*

*Proof.* Standard. ■<sub>4.12</sub>

**Corollary 4.13** (Bounded compactness for unbounded continuous logic). *Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be an unbounded signature,  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$ , and let  $\Sigma$  be a family of conditions in the free variables  $x_{<n}$ . Then  $\Sigma \cup \{\nu(x_i) \leq r : i < n\}$  is satisfiable if and only if it is approximately finitely satisfiable.*

As usual, a theory is a set of sentential conditions. The complete theory of a structure  $M$ , elementary equivalence and elementary embeddings are defined as usual.

**Corollary 4.14.** *Two structures  $M$  and  $N$  are elementarily equivalent if and only if  $M$  embeds elementarily into an ultrapower of  $N$ .*

*Proof.* One direction is clear. For the other we observe that if  $M$  and  $N$  are elementarily equivalent, then the elementary diagram of  $M$  is approximately finitely satisfiable in  $N$ . ■<sub>4.14</sub>

We could prove an analogue of the Shelah-Keisler theorem that if  $N$  and  $M$  are elementarily equivalent then they have isomorphic ultrapowers. We will give a more elementary proof of a lesser result, which will suffice just as well later on:

**Lemma 4.15.** (i) *Two models  $M$  and  $N$  are elementarily equivalent if and only if there are sequences  $M = M_0 \preceq M_1 \preceq \dots$  and  $N = N_0 \preceq N_1 \preceq \dots$  where each  $M_{n+1}$  ( $N_{n+1}$ ) is an ultrapower of  $M_n$  ( $N_n$ ) and  $\bigcup_{n < \omega} M_n \simeq \bigcup_{n < \omega} N_n$  (so their completions are isomorphic as well).*  
(ii) *A class of structures  $\mathcal{K}$  is elementary if and only if it is closed under elementary equivalence and ultraproducts.*

*Proof.* For the first item, right to left by the elementary chain lemma, which is proved as usual. For left to right, assume that  $M \equiv N$ . Then there is an ultrapower  $N_1 = N^{\mathcal{U}}$  and an elementary embedding  $f_0: M \rightarrow N_1$ . Then  $(M, M) \equiv (N_1, f_0(M))$  (in a language with all elements of  $M$  named) so there exists an ultrapower  $M_1 = M^{\mathcal{U}'}$  and an elementary embedding  $g_0: N_1 \rightarrow M_1$  such that  $g_0 \circ f_0 = \text{id}_M$ . Proceed in this manner to obtain the sequences.

The second item is standard. ■<sub>4.15</sub>

It is easily verified that any theory is logically equivalent to one which only consists of conditions of the form  $\varphi = 0$ . A *universal* theory is one which only consists of conditions of the form  $\sup_{\bar{x}} \varphi(\bar{x}) = 0$  where  $\varphi$  is quantifier-free (and bounded, and eventually constant in each  $x_i$ ). Observe that:

- We may express  $\forall \bar{x} \varphi(\bar{x}) = 0$  by the universal axiom scheme  $\sup_{\bar{x}}^{n, n+1} \varphi(\bar{x}) = 0$ .
- If  $t$  and  $s$  are terms we can express  $\forall \bar{x} t = s$  by  $\forall \bar{x} d(t, s) = 0$ .
- If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are formulae we can express  $\forall \bar{x} \varphi \geq \psi$  by  $\forall \bar{x} \psi \dot{-} \varphi = 0$ .

*Example 4.16.* We can continue Example 4.8 and give the (universal) theory of the class of Banach spaces:

*⟨Universal equational axioms of a vector space⟩*

$$\forall x s \|x\| \leq \|m_r(x)\| \leq s' \|x\| \qquad s, s' \text{ dyadic, } s \leq |r| \leq s'$$

$$\forall xy \|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$$

$$\forall xy d(x, y) = \|x + m_{-1}(y)\|.$$

*Example 4.17* (Measure algebras). Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{0, \vee, \wedge, \searrow\}$ , where  $0$  is a constant symbol,  $\vee, \wedge, \searrow$  are binary function symbols. We use  $\mu(x)$  as shorthand for  $d(x, 0)$ , and take it to be the gauge. All symbols are 1-Lipschitz and all the bound functions are standard.

The universal theory of measure algebras (which are the topic of [Fre04]) consists of:

*⟨Universal equational axioms of relatively complemented distributive lattices⟩*

$$\forall xy \mu(x) + \mu(y) = \mu(x \wedge y) + \mu(x \vee y)$$

$$\mu(0) = 0$$

$$\forall xy d(x, y) = \mu(x \setminus y) + \mu(y \setminus x).$$

We can further say that a measure algebra is *atomless* by the axiom scheme:

$$\sup_x^{n, n+1} \inf_y^{n+1, n+2} |\mu(x \wedge y) - \mu(x)/2| = 0.$$

(This holds indeed in every atomless measure algebra: the only witnesses relevant to  $\sup_x^{n, n+1}$  have measure  $\leq n + 1$ , and for those there are witnesses  $y$  such that  $\mu(y) \leq (n + 1)/2 \leq n + 1$ . Conversely, if this holds then the algebra is atomless.)

We can define type spaces more or less as usual:

**Definition 4.18.** Fix an unbounded signature  $\mathcal{L}$ .

- (i) Given an  $n$ -tuple  $\bar{a}$ , we define its type as usual as the set of all  $\mathcal{L}$ -conditions in the variables  $x_{<n}$  satisfied by  $\bar{a}$ .
- (ii) A complete  $n$ -type (in  $\mathcal{L}$ ) is the type of some  $n$ -tuple. By Corollary 4.13, this is the same as a maximal finitely consistent set of conditions  $p(x_{<n})$  such that for some  $r \geq 0$  we have  $\nu(x_i) \leq r \in p$  for all  $i < n$ .
- (iii) The set of all  $n$ -types is denoted  $S_n$ . The set of all  $n$ -types containing a theory  $T$  (equivalently: realised in models of  $T$ ) is denoted  $S_n(T)$ .
- (iv) For every condition  $s$  in the free variables  $x_{<n}$ ,  $[s]^{S_n(T)}$  (or just  $[s]$ , if the ambient type space is clear from the context) denotes the set of types  $\{p \in S_n(T) : s \in p\}$ .
- (v) The family of all sets of the form  $[s]^{S_n(T)}$  forms a base of closed sets for the *logic topology* on  $S_n(T)$ . It is easily verified to be Hausdorff.

For each  $n < \omega$ , we can define  $\nu : S_n(T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $\nu(p) = \bigvee_{i < n} \nu(x_i)^p$ . With this definition,  $(S_n(T), d, \nu)$  is a gauged space. Applying previous definitions we have:

$$S_n^{\nu \leq r}(T) = \bigcap_{i < n} [\nu(x_i) \leq r] = [(\bigvee_{i < n} \nu(x_i)) \leq r].$$

By Corollary 4.13,  $S_n^{\nu \leq r}(T)$  is compact. If  $S_n(T) = S_n^{\nu \leq r}(T)$  for some  $r$ , then  $S_n(T)$  is compact. Conversely, if  $S_n(T)$  is compact for  $n \geq 1$ , then  $\nu$  is necessarily bounded on models of  $T$ , so there is some  $r$  such that  $T \vdash \sup_x \nu(x) \wedge (r+1) \leq r$  and  $S_m(T) = S_m^{\nu \leq r}(T)$  for all  $m < \omega$ . In this case all the other symbols are also bounded in models of  $T$ , so up to re-scaling everything into  $[0, 1]$  we are in the case of standard continuous first order logic.

In the non-compact case we still have  $S_n(T) = \bigcup_r S_n^{\nu \leq r}(T)$ . Thus each  $p \in S_n(T)$  there is  $r$  such that  $p \in S_n^{\nu \leq r}(T)$ , and  $S_n^{\nu \leq r+1}(T)$  is a compact neighbourhood of  $p$  (since it contains the open set  $[(\bigvee \nu(x_i)) < r + 1]$ ). Therefore  $S_n(T)$  is locally compact.

**4.2. On the relation with Henson’s positive bounded logic.** We sketch out here how unbounded continuous logic generalises, in an appropriate sense, Henson’s logic of approximate satisfaction positive bounded formulae in Banach space structures. For this purpose we will assume familiarity with the syntax and semantics of Henson’s logic (see for example [HI02]).

The classical presentation of Henson’s logic involves a purely functional signature  $\mathcal{L}_H$  with a distinguished sort for  $\mathbb{R}$ . There is no harm in assuming that the distinguished sort only appears as the target sort of some function symbols (otherwise we can add a second copy and a single function symbol for the identity mapping into the copy, and treat the copy as the distinguished sort). Also, there is no harm in replacing  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathbb{R}^+$ .

We can therefore define an unbounded continuous signature  $\mathcal{L}$  by dropping the distinguished sort and replacing all function symbols into it with  $\mathbb{R}^+$ -valued predicate symbols. As every sort is assumed to be normed, we identify  $\nu$  with  $\|\cdot\|$ . While a signature in Henson’s logic does not specify continuity moduli and their likes, every class under consideration implies continuity moduli and bounding functions for the symbols (or else the logic would fail to describe them), and we can use those. It is a known fact that there exists a (universal)  $\mathcal{L}_H$ -theory, call it  $T_0$ , whose models are precisely the structures satisfying these continuity moduli and bounds.

From now on by “structure” we mean a model of  $T_0$ , or equivalently a  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure (as these can be identified). The ambiguity concerning whether a structure is a Henson or unbounded continuous structure is further justified by the fact that the definitions of isomorphism and ultraproducts in either logic coincide. As we can moreover prove Lemma 4.15 for Henson’s logic just as well, we conclude:

**Fact 4.19.** *A class of structures  $\mathcal{K}$  is elementary in Henson’s logic if and only if it is elementary in unbounded continuous logic.*

**Fact 4.20.** *Let  $X = \bigcup_{n < \omega} X_n$  be a topological space where each  $X_n$  is closed and  $X_{n+1}$  is a neighbourhood of  $X_n$ . Then a subset  $F \subseteq X$  is closed if and only if  $F \cap X_n$  is for all  $n$ .*

As the space of  $n$ -types is just the space of complete theories with  $n$  new constant symbols, we conclude:

**Theorem 4.21.** *Two  $n$ -tuples in a structure have the same type in one logic if and only if they have the same type in the other, and this identification induces a homeomorphism  $S_n^{\mathcal{L}_H}(T_0) \simeq S_n^{\mathcal{L}}$ .*

*Proof.* The first statement is by Fact 4.19. Also, a set  $X \subseteq S_n^{\|\cdot\| \leq r}$  is closed if and only if the class  $\{(M, \bar{a}) : \text{tp}(\bar{a}) \in X\}$  is elementary: the bounds on the norm are needed since we need to impose bounds on the norms of constant symbols. It follows from Fact 4.19 that the bijection  $S_n^{\mathcal{L}_H}(T_0) \simeq S_n^{\mathcal{L}}$  is a homeomorphism when restricted to  $S_n^{\|\cdot\| \leq n}$ . Now use Fact 4.20 and the fact that  $S_n^{\|\cdot\| \leq r}$  is compact and  $S_n^{\|\cdot\| < r}$  is open in both topologies to conclude that this is a global homeomorphism. ■<sub>4.21</sub>

This can be restated as:

**Theorem 4.22.** *For every set  $\Sigma(\bar{x})$  of  $\mathcal{L}_H$ -formulae there exists a set  $\Gamma(\bar{x})$  of  $\mathcal{L}$ -conditions, and for every set  $\Gamma(\bar{x})$  of  $\mathcal{L}$ -conditions there exists a set  $\Sigma(\bar{x})$  of  $\mathcal{L}_H$ -formulae, such that for every structure  $M$  and  $\bar{a} \in M$ :*

$$M \models_a \Sigma(\bar{a}) \iff M \models \Gamma(\bar{a}).$$

*Remark 4.23.* In Henson's logic, the bounded quantifier  $\forall^{\leq r} x$  ( $\exists^{\leq r} x$ ) mean "for all (there exists)  $x$  such that  $\|x\| \leq r$ ". Thus Henson's logic coincides with unbounded continuous logic of normed structures where  $\nu = \|\cdot\|$ . One may generalise Henson's logic to allow an arbitrary  $\nu$  and obtain full equivalence of the two logics.

For the benefit of the reader who finds this proof a little too obscure, let us give one direction explicitly. We know that every in Henson's logic is equivalent to one in prenex form. Thus, every  $\mathcal{L}_H$ -formula can be assumed to be of the form:

$$\forall^{\leq r_0} x_0 \exists^{\leq r_1} x_1 \dots \varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$$

Where  $\varphi$  is a positive Boolean combination of atomic formulae of the form  $t_i(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \geq r_i$  or  $t_i \leq r_i$ , and every term  $t_i$  can be identified with an atomic  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula. Replacing  $t_i$  with  $t_i \div r_i$  or with  $r_i \div t_i$ , we may assume all these atomic formulae are of the form  $t_i \leq 0$ . As  $(t_i \leq 0) \wedge (t_j \leq 0) \iff (t_i \vee t_j) \leq 0$  and  $(t_i \leq 0) \vee (t_j \leq 0) \iff (t_i \wedge t_j) \leq 0$ , we can find a single  $t$  such that  $\varphi(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  is equivalent to  $t \leq 0$ . We thus reduced to:

$$\forall^{\leq r_0} x_0 \exists^{\leq r_1} x_1 \dots (t(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \leq 0).$$

We can view  $t$  as a quantifier-free  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula, in which case the above holds approximately if and only if the following holds for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ :

$$\left( \sup_{x_0}^{r_0 - \varepsilon, r_0} \inf_{x_1}^{\leq r_1, r_1 + \varepsilon} \dots t(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \wedge 1 \right) \leq 0.$$

Thus the approximate satisfaction of a  $\mathcal{L}_H$ -formula, and therefore of a partial type, are equivalent to the satisfaction of a partial type in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

**4.3. Compactification.** As we mentioned earlier, the multi-sorted approach to unbounded structures allows us to reduce many issues concerning unbounded structures to their well-established analogues in bounded continuous logic, but this does not work well for perturbations if we wish to perturb  $\nu$  itself.

We could of course generalise everything we did to the unbounded case, but that would be extremely tedious and boring. Instead, we will look for a reduction to the bounded case in which the entire structure fits in a single sort.

One naïve way would be to choose a continuous function mapping  $\mathbb{R}^+$  into  $[0, 1]$ , say  $\theta(x) = \frac{x}{x+1}$ , and apply it to all the predicate symbol: for every  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $M$  we define  $M^\theta$  as having the same underlying set, and for every predicate symbol  $P$  we define  $P^{M^\theta}(\bar{a}) = \theta(P^M(\bar{a}))$ . It can be verified that for  $x, y \geq 0$ :  $\theta(x + y) \leq \theta(x) + \theta(y)$ : for

example, this is true when  $x = 0$ , and the partial derivative with respect to  $x$  of the left hand side is smaller. It follows that  $d^{M^\theta}$  is a metric:

$$\begin{aligned} d^{M^\theta}(a, b) &= \theta(d^M(a, b)) \leq \theta(d^M(a, c) + d^M(c, b)) \\ &\leq \theta(d^M(a, c)) + \theta(d^M(c, b)) = d^{M^\theta}(a, c) + d^{M^\theta}(c, b). \end{aligned}$$

Of course  $d^{M^\theta}$  needs not be a complete metric, so we obtain new elements. Similarly, if  $T^\theta = \text{Th}\{M^\theta : M \models T\}$ , then we have a natural embedding of  $S_n(T)$  in  $S_n(T^\theta)$ , and it can be verified that the latter is the Stone-Ćech compactification of the former. This is essentially the same thing as allowing  $\infty$  as a legitimate truth value (as  $\theta$  extends to a homeomorphism  $[0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ). As usual with Stone-Ćech compactification, this adds too many new types and while it does work, it is quite unmanageable. In fact even the following is not clear (to the author):

*Question 4.24.* Is every model of  $T^\theta$  of the form  $M^\theta$ , where  $M \models T$ ?

As we pointed out earlier, the type spaces are locally compact, so we might try and look for a single-point compactification. More precisely, we will add a unique ‘‘point at infinity’’ to the structures, such that a sequence  $(a_i : i < \omega)$  in the original structure converges to  $\infty$  if and only if  $\nu(a_i) \rightarrow \infty$ . Of course the modified structures will not be compact, but they will be bounded and complete, and the type spaces  $S_n(T)$  will be compactified (although with the exception of  $n = 1$  this will not be by a single point). There is one drawback to this approach, namely that this can only be done in a purely relational language (indeed, when performing this process on a Banach space we must give up the function symbol  $+$  as we cannot give meaning to  $\infty + \infty$ ).

The trick is as follows: First, we define a new language

$$\mathcal{L}^\infty = \{d\} \cup \{P_\varphi \text{ } n\text{-ary predicate symbol: } \varphi(x_{<n}) \in \mathcal{L}_{\omega,\omega}\}.$$

Note that the language is purely relational, and we introduce a new distance relation (as  $P_{d(x,y)}$  will not be a metric). We will not specify at this point the uniform continuity moduli, but we do show below that such moduli can be chosen that would fit our purpose.

For every  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $M$  we define an  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ -structure  $M^\infty$ . Its domain is the set  $M \cup \{\infty\}$ . For elements coming from  $M$  we interpret the symbols as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\varphi^{M^\infty}(\bar{a}) &= \frac{\theta \circ \varphi(\bar{a})^M}{1 + \sum_{i < n} \nu^M(a_i)} \\ d^{M^\infty}(a, b) &= \sup \left\{ \left| \frac{\theta \circ d^M(a, c)}{1 + \nu^M(a)} - \frac{\theta \circ d^M(b, c)}{1 + \nu^M(b)} \right| : c \in M \right\} \end{aligned}$$

With the convention that  $\nu(\infty) = \infty$ , this extends naturally to:

$$\begin{aligned} P_\varphi^{M^\infty}(\dots, \infty, \dots) &= 0 \\ d^{M^\infty}(a, \infty) &= \sup \left\{ \frac{\theta \circ d^M(a, c)}{1 + \nu^M(a)} : c \in M \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,  $d^{M^\infty}$  is a metric. Moreover, if  $(a_i : i < \omega) \subseteq M$  then  $a_i \rightarrow^{M^\infty} \infty$  if and only if  $\nu^M(a_i) \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Lemma 4.25.** *The bijection  $\iota : (M, d^M) \rightarrow (M, d^{M^\infty})$  is  $\nu$ -uniformly continuous in both directions, and for every  $r' > r$  the  $\nu$ -ball  $M^{\nu \leq r'}$  contains a uniform  $d^{M^\infty}$ -neighbourhood of  $M^{\nu \leq r}$ .*

*Proof.* Saying that  $\iota$  is  $\nu$ -uniformly continuous is (by definition of  $d^{M^\infty}$ ) the same as saying that  $\frac{\theta \circ d(x, y)}{1 + \nu(x)}$  is  $\nu$ -uniformly continuous in the argument  $x$ , which is true as it is a continuous combination of  $\nu$ -uniformly continuous predicate symbols.

Assume now that  $a \in M^{\nu \leq r}$ . Then for every  $b \in M$  we have, by substituting  $c = b$  in the definition of  $d^{M^\infty}$ :

$$d^{M^\infty}(a, b) \geq \frac{\theta(d^M(a, b))}{1 + \nu(a)} \geq \frac{\theta(d^M(a, b))}{1 + r},$$

Whereby:

$$d^M(a, b) \leq \theta^{-1}((1 + r)d^{M^\infty}(a, b)).$$

As  $\lim_{x \searrow 0} \theta^{-1}(x) = 0$ , it follows that  $\iota^{-1}$  is  $\nu$ -uniformly continuous.

Also, for every  $r' > r$ :

$$B_{d^{M^\infty}} \left( M^{\nu \leq r}, \frac{\theta(r' - r)}{1 + r} \right) \subseteq B_d(M^{\nu \leq r}, r' - r) \subseteq M^{\nu \leq r'}. \quad \blacksquare_{4.25}$$

**Proposition 4.26.** *For every  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $M$ ,  $M^\infty$  as defined above is an  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ -structure. That is to say that  $M^\infty$  is complete, and that we can complete the definition of  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$  choosing uniform continuity moduli for its symbols which are satisfied in every  $M^\infty$ .*

*Proof.* Consider an  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula of the form  $\varphi(x, \bar{y})$  and a corresponding predicate symbol  $P_\varphi(x, \bar{y})$  in  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  be given, and we need to find  $\delta > 0$  such that for all  $a, b \in M^\infty$ :

$$d^{M^\infty}(a, b) \leq \delta \implies \sup_{\bar{x}} |P_\varphi(a, \bar{x}) - P_\varphi(b, \bar{x})|^{M^\infty} \leq \varepsilon.$$

First, if  $\nu(a), \nu(b) \geq 1/\varepsilon - 1$  (where  $\nu(\infty) = \infty$ ) then the above is satisfied regardless of  $d^{M^\infty}(a, b)$ . Otherwise, without loss of generality we have  $\nu(a) < 1/\varepsilon - 1$ , so if  $d^{M^\infty}(a, b)$  is small enough we have  $\nu(b) \leq 1/\varepsilon$ . As  $\iota^{-1}$  is uniformly continuous on  $(M^{\nu \leq 1/\varepsilon}, d^{M^\infty})$  we conclude using the fact that  $\varphi$  and  $\nu$  are uniformly continuous on  $(M^{\nu \leq 1/\varepsilon}, d^M)$ .

Since the results of Lemma 4.25 are uniform in  $M$ , the continuous predicates  $P_\varphi^{M^\infty}$  are uniformly continuous, and uniformly so in all  $M$ .

Let us now show completeness. Let  $(a_i : i < \omega)$  be a Cauchy sequence in  $M^\infty$ . If  $\nu(a_i) \rightarrow \infty$  then  $a_i \rightarrow \infty$  (again,  $\nu(\infty) = \infty$ ). Otherwise, there is  $r$  such that  $a_i \in M^{\nu \leq r}$  infinitely often. Passing to a sub-sequence, we may assume that the entire sequence fits inside  $M^{\nu \leq r}$ . We now conclude using Lemma 4.25 and completeness of  $(M, d^M)$ .  $\blacksquare_{4.26}$

It is straightforward to verify that the point-at-infinity construction commutes with the ultraproduct construction, as everything is continuous:

$$\left( \prod M_i / \mathcal{U} \right)^\infty = \prod M_i^\infty / \mathcal{U}.$$

(In particular, all the tuples  $(a_i)$  such that  $\lim_{\mathcal{U}} \nu^{M_i}(a_i) = \infty$ , which were dropped during the construction of  $\prod M_i / \mathcal{U}$ , satisfy  $[a_i] = [\infty^{M_i}] = \infty$  in  $\prod M_i^\infty / \mathcal{U}$ .) Also, assume that  $M$  is an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure,  $\tilde{N}$  is an  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ -structure, and  $\tilde{N} \preceq M^\infty$ . Then we can recover an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $N$  on  $\tilde{N} \setminus \{\infty\}$  such that  $\tilde{N} = N^\infty$ , and then necessarily  $N \preceq M$ .

**Proposition 4.27.** *Assume  $\mathcal{K}$  is an elementary class of  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures, and let*

$$\mathcal{K}^\infty = \{M^\infty : M \in \mathcal{K}\}.$$

*Then  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$  is elementary.*

*Proof.* Assume  $\mathcal{K}$  is elementary. Then, by the arguments above,  $\mathcal{K}^\infty$  is closed under ultraproducts, isomorphism and elementary substructures. It is therefore elementary.  $\blacksquare_{4.27}$

By Proposition 4.27 we may replace every (unbounded)  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory  $T$  with its (bounded) single point compactification (or maybe *boundedification*?)  $T^\infty = \text{Th}_{\mathcal{L}^\infty}(\text{Mod}(T)^\infty)$ . By naming constants we further see that  $\mathcal{L}$ -types of tuples in  $M$  are in bijection with  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ -types of tuples in  $M^\infty \setminus \{\infty\}$  (i.e., in  $M$  again, but this time viewed as a subset of a  $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ -structure).

Given a tuple  $\bar{a} \in M^\infty$ , let  $w = w(\bar{a}) = \{i < n : a_i \neq \infty\}$ . Then we may identify  $\text{tp}^{M^\infty}(\bar{a})$  with the pair  $(w, \text{tp}^M(a_{\in w}))$ . We can therefore express the set of types  $S_n(T^\infty)$  as  $\bigcup_{w \subseteq n} \{w\} \times S_{|w|}(T)$ . For  $w \subseteq n$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and  $\varphi(x_{\in w}) \in \mathcal{L}$ , define:

$$V_{n,w,r,\varphi} = \left\{ (v, q(x_{\in v})) \in S_n(T^\infty) : \begin{array}{l} w \subseteq v \subseteq n, \varphi^q < 1/2, \\ \bigwedge_{i \in v \setminus w} \nu(x_i)^q > r \end{array} \right\}.$$

Given a type  $(w, p) \in S_n(T^\infty)$ , one can verify that the family of all sets of the form  $V_{n,w,r,\varphi}$  where  $\varphi^p = 0$  forms a base of neighbourhoods for  $(w, p)$ . In particular, the natural inclusion  $S_n(T) \hookrightarrow S_n(T^\infty)$ , consisting of sending  $p \mapsto (n, p)$ , is an open topological embedding. In case  $T$  is complete (so  $|S_0(T)| = 1$ ), this embedding for  $n = 1$  is indeed a single point compactification of  $S_1(T)$  obtained by adding the type at infinity.

Once we understand types we know what saturation means. Among other things we have:

**Lemma 4.28.** *An  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure  $M$  is approximately  $\omega$ -saturated if and only if  $M^\infty$  is.*



*Proof.* Follows from the facts that there is a unique point at infinity, which belongs to  $M^\infty$ , and that in the neighbourhood of every other point  $d^M$  and  $d^{M^\infty}$  are equivalent. ■<sub>4.28</sub>

Finally, we point out that the theory  $T$  is bounded to begin with if and only if the point at infinity in models of  $T^\infty$  is isolated, in analogy with what happens when one attempts to add a point at infinity to a space which is already compact.

**4.4. Perturbations of unbounded structures.** We may now define perturbation radii and systems for unbounded theories by a *correct* reduction to the bounded case. We fix an unbounded theory  $T$  and its compactification  $T^\infty$ .

**Definition 4.29.** A *perturbation pre-radius* for  $T$  is defined as for a bounded theory, i.e., as a family  $\rho = \{\rho_n \subseteq S_n(T) : n < \omega\}$  containing the diagonals. We define  $X^\rho$ ,  $\text{Pert}_\rho(M, N)$ ,  $\text{BiPert}_\rho(M, N)$ ,  $\langle \rho \rangle$ ,  $\llbracket \rho \rrbracket$  as usual.

Let  $\rho$  be a perturbation pre-radius for  $T$ . We can always extend it to a perturbation radius  $\rho^*$  for  $T^\infty$  by:

$$\rho_n^\infty = \overline{\{(w, p), (w, q) \in S_n(T^\infty) : w \subseteq n, (p, q) \in \rho_{|w|}\}}.$$

Clearly, this is a perturbation pre-radius for  $T^\infty$ . Conversely, if  $\rho'$  is a perturbation pre-radius for  $T^\infty$  then its restriction to  $S(T)$ , denoted  $\rho' \upharpoonright_{S(T)}$ , is a perturbation pre-radius for  $T$ , and as the inclusion  $S_n(T) \subseteq S_n(T^\infty)$  is open we have the identity:

$$\rho^\infty \upharpoonright_{S(T)} = \rho.$$

Also, as every  $f \in \text{Pert}_\rho(M, N)$  extends to  $f \cup (\infty \mapsto \infty) \in \text{Pert}_{\rho^\infty}(M^\infty, N^\infty)$ , we also have  $\langle \rho^\infty \rangle \upharpoonright_{S(T)} \geq \langle \rho \rangle$ .

We define perturbation radii for  $T$  directly by reduction to  $T^\infty$ :

**Definition 4.30.** (i) Let  $\rho'$  be a perturbation pre-radius for  $T^\infty$ . We say that  $\rho'$  *separates infinity* if for all  $f \in \text{Pert}_{\rho'}(M^\infty, N^\infty)$  and  $a \in M^\infty$ :

$$a = \infty \iff f(a) = \infty.$$

(ii) A perturbation pre-radius  $\rho$  for  $T$  is a *perturbation radius* if  $\rho^\infty$  is a perturbation radius for  $T^\infty$  which separates infinity.

We define a *perturbations pre-system* for  $T$  as a decreasing family  $\mathbf{p}$  of perturbation pre-radii satisfying downward continuity, symmetry, triangle inequality and strictness as in Definition 1.22. It is a *perturbation system* if  $\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)$  is a perturbation radius for all  $\varepsilon$ , i.e., if  $\mathbf{p}^\infty$  is a perturbation system separating infinity for  $T^\infty$ .

The first thing is to characterise perturbation radii as in Section 1, and establish more precisely the relation between perturbations of  $T$  and of  $T^\infty$ .

**Definition 4.31.** Let  $\rho$  a perturbation pre-radius for  $T$ .

(i) We say that  $\rho$  *respects infinity* if for all  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$  there exists  $r' \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that

$$[\nu(x) \geq r']^\rho \subseteq [\nu(x) \geq r] \quad \text{and} \quad [\nu(x) \leq r]^\rho \subseteq [\nu(x) \leq r'].$$

(ii) We define when  $\rho$  *respects equality*, *respects  $\exists$* , or is *permutation-invariant* as in the bounded case.

**Proposition 4.32.** *Let  $\rho$  be a perturbation pre-radius for  $T$ . The the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius.
- (ii)  $\rho$  respects infinity, and for every  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  and mapping  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$ , the induced mapping  $\sigma^*: S_m(T) \rightarrow S_n(T)$  satisfies that for all  $p \in S_m(T)$ :

$$\sigma^*(p^\rho) = \sigma^*(p)^\rho.$$

(I.e.,  $\sigma^* \circ \rho_m = \rho_n \circ \sigma^*$  as multi-valued functions).

- (iii)  $\rho$  respects  $\infty$ ,  $=$ ,  $\exists$ , and is permutation-invariant.
- (iv)  $\rho^\infty$  separates  $\infty$ , respects  $=$  and  $\exists$  and is permutation-invariant.

*Proof.* (i)  $\implies$  (ii). Assume  $\rho$  is a perturbation radius, so  $\rho^\infty$  is a perturbation radius respecting infinity. If  $\rho$  does not respect infinity, then by definition of  $\rho^\infty$  we will have in  $\rho_1^\infty$  a pair  $(p, q)$  where  $p$  is the type of a finite elements and  $q = \text{tp}(\infty)$  or vice versa, contradicting the assumption on  $\rho^\infty$ .

Since  $\rho^\infty$  is a perturbation radius, for all  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$  we have in  $S(T^\infty)$ :  $\sigma^* \circ \rho_m^\infty = \rho_n^\infty \circ \sigma^*$ . As  $\rho^\infty$  also separates infinity we can restrict this to  $S(T)$  and obtain  $\sigma^* \circ \rho_m = \rho_n \circ \sigma^*$ .

(ii)  $\implies$  (iii). By restricting to the case where  $\sigma$  is the mapping  $2 \rightarrow 1$ ,  $n \hookrightarrow n+1$ , or a permutation of  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(iii)  $\implies$  (iv). By a mirror-image to the argument above, if  $\rho$  respects  $\infty$  then  $\rho^\infty$  must separate  $\infty$ .

We claim that since  $\rho$  respects  $\infty$  and  $\exists$  and is permutation-invariant, we have for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$$\rho_n^\infty = \{((w, p), (w, q)) \in S_n(T^\infty) : w \subseteq n, (p, q) \in \rho_{|w|}\}$$

(i.e., the right hand side is a closed set). Indeed, assume we have pairs  $((w_i, p_i), (w_i, q_i))$  for  $i \in I$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  is an ultrafilter on  $I$ , and let  $((v, p), (u, q)) = \lim_{\mathcal{U}} ((w_i, p_i), (w_i, q_i))$ . We need to show that  $v = u$  and  $(p, q) \in \rho_{|v|}$ . First, as there are finitely many possibilities for  $w_i \subseteq n$  we may assume that  $w_i = w \subseteq n$  for all  $i$ . Then we might as well assume  $w = n$  throughout.

For  $s \subseteq n$ , let  $p_i^s$  and  $q_i^s$  be the restrictions of  $p_i$  and  $q_i$ , respectively, to  $x_{\in s}$ . As  $\rho$  respect  $\exists$  and is permutation-invariant,  $(p_i^s, q_i^s) \in \rho_{|s|}$ . As  $\rho$  respects infinity we have:

$$k \notin v \iff p_i^{\{k\}} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{U}} \text{tp}(\infty) \iff q_i^{\{k\}} \rightarrow_{\mathcal{U}} \text{tp}(\infty) \iff k \notin u.$$

Therefore  $v = u$ , and as  $\rho_{|v|}$  is closed  $(p, q) = \lim_{\mathcal{U}} (p_i^v, q_i^v) \in \rho_{|v|}$ . This proves our claim.

It is now immediate that as  $\rho$  respects  $=$  and  $\exists$  and is permutation-invariant, the same holds of  $\rho^\infty$ .

(iv)  $\implies$  (i). Since then  $\rho^\infty$  is a perturbation radius. ■<sub>4.32</sub>

**Corollary 4.33.** *Giving of a perturbation system  $\mathbf{p}$  for  $T$  is the same as giving a family  $\{d_{\mathbf{p},n}: n < \omega\}$ , each  $d_{\mathbf{p},n}$  being a metric on  $S_n(T)$  for which the infinite distance is admissible, such that:*

- (i) *For every  $n$ , the set  $\{(p, q, \varepsilon) \in S_n(T)^2 \times \mathbb{R}^+ : d_{\mathbf{p},n}(p, q) \leq \varepsilon\}$  is closed.*
- (ii) *For every  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$  there is  $r' \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that if  $p, q \in S_1(T)$  and  $d_{\mathbf{p},1}(p, q) \leq r$ , then*

$$\nu(x)^p \geq r' \implies \nu(x)^q \geq r$$

- (iii) *For every  $n, m < \omega$  and mapping  $\sigma: n \rightarrow m$ , the induced mapping  $\sigma^*: S_m(T) \rightarrow S_n(T)$  satisfies for all  $p \in S_m(T)$  and  $q \in S_n(T)$ :*

$$d_{\mathbf{p},m}(p, (f^*)^{-1}(q)) = d_{\mathbf{p},n}(f^*(p), q).$$

(Here we follow the convention that  $d_{\mathbf{p},m}(p, \emptyset) = \inf \emptyset = \infty$ .)

Similarly, the giving of a perturbation pre-system is the same as a family of metrics satisfying the first condition alone.

*Proof.* Same as Lemma 1.23, where the new condition corresponds to the requirement that every  $\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)$  respect infinity. ■<sub>4.33</sub>

Let us fix a perturbation system  $\mathbf{p}$  for  $T$ , and let  $\mathbf{p}^\infty$  be the corresponding perturbation system for  $T^\infty$ . As for plain approximate  $\omega$ -saturation, we have

**Lemma 4.34.** *A model  $M \models T$  is  $\mathbf{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated if and only if  $M^\infty$  is  $\mathbf{p}^\infty$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated.*

*Proof.* As for Lemma 4.28. ■<sub>4.34</sub>

In particular, and two separable  $\mathbf{p}$ -approximately  $\omega$ -saturated models of  $T$  must be  $\mathbf{p}$ -isomorphic.

Similarly:

**Lemma 4.35.** *Two models  $M, N \models T$  are  $\mathbf{p}$ -isomorphic if and only if  $M^\infty$  and  $N^\infty$  are  $\mathbf{p}^\infty$ -isomorphic.*

*The theory  $T$  is  $\mathbf{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical if and only if  $T^\infty$  is  $\mathbf{p}^\infty$ - $\omega$ -categorical.*

We conclude that Theorem 3.4 holds as stated:

**Theorem 4.36.** *Let  $T$  be a complete countable unbounded theory,  $\mathbf{p}$  a perturbation system for  $T$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The theory  $T$  is  $\mathbf{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical.*
- (ii) *For every  $n < \omega$ , finite  $\bar{a}$ ,  $p \in S_n(\bar{a})$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the set  $[p^{\mathbf{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]$  has non-empty interior in  $S_n(\bar{a})$ .*
- (iii) *Same restricted to  $n = 1$ .*

*Proof.* The idea is to reduce to Theorem 3.4. Most of the reduction is in the preceding results:  $T$  is complete if and only if  $T^\infty$  is,  $T$  is  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categorical if and only if  $T^\infty$  is  $\mathfrak{p}^\infty$ - $\omega$ -categorical, etc. The last thing to check is that the property

$$(*) \quad p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a}), \varepsilon > 0 \quad \implies \quad [p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]^\circ \neq \emptyset$$

holds for  $T, \mathfrak{p}$  if and only if it holds for  $T^\infty, \mathfrak{p}^\infty$ .

Indeed, assume first  $(*)$  holds for  $T^\infty, \mathfrak{p}^\infty$ . Let  $\bar{a} \in M \models T$ ,  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a})$ . Then  $\bar{a}$  can be viewed also as a tuple in  $M^\infty \models T^\infty$ , and we can identify  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$  with a type  $p^\infty(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n^{\mathcal{L}^\infty}(\bar{a})$ . Then  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  and  $p^{\infty \mathfrak{p}^\infty(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  coincide more or less by definition, and fit in  $S^{\nu \leq r}(T)$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . It is not true that  $p^{\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{y}^\varepsilon)$  and  $p^{\infty \mathfrak{p}^\infty(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{y}^\varepsilon)$  coincide since in the metrics on models of  $T$  and  $T^\infty$  differ. But as everything fits inside some  $\nu$ -ball, and the two metrics are uniformly equivalent on every  $\nu$ -ball, we can still find  $\varepsilon' > 0$  such that

$$[\mathfrak{p}(\varepsilon)(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{y}^\varepsilon)]^\circ \supseteq [p^{\infty \mathfrak{p}^\infty(\varepsilon')}(\bar{x}^{\varepsilon'}, \bar{y}^{\varepsilon'})]^\circ \neq \emptyset.$$

For the converse, consider a finite tuple  $\bar{a} \in M^\infty \models T^\infty$ , and a type  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n^{\mathcal{L}^\infty}(\bar{a})$ . As  $\infty$  is definable in  $T^\infty$  (it is the unique element satisfying  $P_1(x) = 0$ , for example) we never need it as a parameter, so we may assume that  $\bar{a} \in M$ . Assume first that  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a})$  says that all  $x_i$  are finite as well. Then in fact  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n^{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{a})$ , and we conclude as above by the uniform equivalence of the metric. In the general case we may need to write  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$  as  $(w, q)$  where  $w \subseteq |\bar{x}, \bar{y}|$ , and  $q \in S_{|w|}(T)$ . Then  $q$  is a type of finite elements and is taken care of by the previous case, while the infinite coordinates are taken care of by the fact that  $\infty$  is definable, so  $[d^{\mathcal{L}^\infty}(x, \infty) < \varepsilon]$  defines an open set in  $S^{\mathcal{L}^\infty}(\bar{a})$ . ■<sub>4.36</sub>

The discussion at the end of Section 3, and in particular the characterisation of  $\mathfrak{p}$ - $\omega$ -categoricity for an open perturbation system  $\mathfrak{p}$  by coincidence of topologies (Theorem 3.14), can be transferred to an unbounded theory  $T$  via reduction to  $T^\infty$  in precisely the same way.

**4.5. An example: Henson's categoricity theorem.** Let  $T_0$  be the (unbounded) theory of pure Banach spaces as given in Example 4.16.

**Definition 4.37.** Let  $E$  and  $F$  be Banach spaces (i.e., models of  $T_0$ ). Say that a mapping  $f: E \rightarrow F$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -isomorphism if it is an isomorphism of the underlying vector spaces, and satisfies in addition:

$$\forall v \in E \quad e^{-\varepsilon} \|v\| \leq \|f(v)\| \leq e^\varepsilon \|v\|.$$

**Definition 4.38.** Let  $\bar{a} \in E_0 \models T_0$ . Define the *Banach-Mazur distance* between two types  $p, q \in S_n(\bar{a})$ , denoted  $d_{BM,n}(p, q)$ , as the minimal  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that there exist models  $(E, \bar{a}), (F, \bar{a}) \models \text{Th}(E_0, \bar{a})$ , and tuples  $\bar{b} \in E, \bar{c} \in F$  realising  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively, and an  $\varepsilon$ -isomorphism  $f: E \rightarrow F$  fixing  $\bar{a}$  and sending  $\bar{b}$  to  $\bar{c}$ . If no such  $\varepsilon > 0$  exists then  $d_{BM,n}(p, q) = \infty$ .

The following result is very similar to an unpublished result communicated to the author by C. Ward Henson and published here with his permission:

**Corollary 4.39** (Henson, unpublished). *Let  $T$  be a complete theory of Banach spaces with no additional structure (i.e., a completion of  $T_0$ ). Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *If  $E$  and  $F$  are two separable models of  $T$ , then for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists an  $\varepsilon$ -isomorphism (i.e., a bijective  $\varepsilon$ -embedding) from  $E$  to  $F$ .*
- (ii) *For  $n < \omega$  and finite tuple  $\bar{a} \in E \models T$ , let  $S_n^*(\bar{a})$  be the space of types of  $n$ -tuples which are linearly independent over  $\bar{a}$ . Then every Banach-Mazur ball in  $S_n^*(\bar{a})$  has non-empty interior in the logic topology on  $S_n^*(\bar{a})$ .*

*Proof.* First we observe that the Banach-Mazur distance defines a perturbation system  $BM$  by Corollary 4.33. Therefore, by Theorem 4.36, the first condition is equivalent to the one saying that for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n(\bar{a})$ :  $[p^{BM(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{a}^\varepsilon)]^\circ \neq \emptyset$  in  $S_n(\bar{a})$ . We need to show that this is equivalent to the second condition. Since the Banach-Mazur perturbation preserves linear dependencies we may drop superfluous parameters and always assume that the tuple  $\bar{a}$  is linearly independent. Thus, if  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S^*(\bar{a})$  then  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in S^*(T)$ .

Observe also that  $S_n^*(\bar{a})$  is a dense open subset of  $S_n(\bar{a})$  (indeed, it is metrically dense there in the usual metric on types). It follows that a subset  $X \subseteq S_n^*(\bar{a})$  has the same interior in  $S_n(\bar{a})$  and in  $S_n^*(\bar{a})$ , so we may simply speak of its interior. Moreover, a subset  $X \subseteq S_n(\bar{a})$  has non-empty interior if and only if  $X \cap S_n^*(\bar{a})$  has.

For left to right, let us show that if  $p \in S_n^*(T)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  then there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that  $[p(\bar{x}^\delta)] \subseteq [p^{BM(\varepsilon)}]$ . So let  $\Lambda = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{F}^n : \sum |\lambda_i| = 1\}$ , i.e., the (compact) space of all formal linear combinations of  $n$  variables of  $\|\cdot\|_1$ -norm 1, and let  $s = \min\{\|\lambda(\bar{x})\|^{p(\bar{x})} : \lambda \in \Lambda\} > 0$ . We claim that  $\delta = \frac{s\varepsilon}{2n} > 0$  will do.

Indeed, let  $q \in [p(\bar{x}^\delta)]$ . Let  $E$  be a model,  $\bar{b}, \bar{c} \in E$  such that  $\bar{b} \models p$ ,  $\bar{c} \models q$  and  $\|b_i - c_i\| \leq \delta$  for all  $i < n$ . For  $i < n$  define a linear functional  $\eta_i : \text{Span}(\bar{b}) \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  by  $\eta_i(\sum \lambda_j b_j) = \lambda_i$ . Then  $\|\eta_i\| \leq s^{-1}$ , and by the Hahn-Banach Theorem we may extend them to  $\tilde{\eta}_i : E \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$  such that  $\|\tilde{\eta}_i\| \leq s^{-1}$ . Define a linear operator  $S : E \rightarrow E$  by  $S(x) = \sum_i \tilde{\eta}_i(x)(b_i - c_i)$ . Then a simple calculation shows that  $S(b_i) = b_i - c_i$  and  $\|S\| \leq \varepsilon/2$ . Assuming  $\varepsilon$  was small enough to begin with (which we may),  $I - S$  is invertible, its inverse being  $I + S + S^2 + \dots$ . Finally, for all  $v \in E$ :

$$e^{-\varepsilon}\|v\| \leq (1 - \varepsilon/2)\|v\| \leq \|v - S(v)\| \leq (1 + \varepsilon/2)\|v\| \leq e^\varepsilon\|v\|.$$

We conclude that  $I - S$  is an  $\varepsilon$ -automorphism sending  $\bar{b}$  to  $\bar{c}$ , so  $q \in p^{BM(\varepsilon)}$ .

Re-choosing our numbers we find  $\varepsilon/2 > \delta > 0$  such that that  $[p(\bar{x}^\delta)] \subseteq [p^{BM(\varepsilon/2)}(\bar{x})]$ , so  $[p(\bar{x}^\delta)]^{BM(\delta)} \subseteq [p^{BM(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x})]$ . As the former has non-empty interior so does the latter (in  $S_n(T)$  as well as when restricted to  $S_n^*(T)$ ). When considering parameters we have  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{a}) \in S_n^*(\bar{a})$  such that  $p(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in S_{n+m}^*(T)$ , so we find  $\delta > 0$  such that  $[p(\bar{x}^\delta, \bar{y}^\delta)]^{BM(\delta)} \subseteq [p^{BM(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}, \bar{y})]$ , and thus  $[p(\bar{x}^\delta, \bar{a}^\delta)]^{BM(\delta)} \subseteq [p^{BM(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}, \bar{a})]$ , concluding as above.

For the other direction, let us show that for all  $p \in S_n(T)$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $[p^{BM(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon)]^\circ \neq \emptyset$ . Assume first that  $p \in S_n^*(T)$ . Then  $[p^{BM(\varepsilon)}]^\circ \neq \emptyset$  in  $S_n^*(T)$ , and therefore in  $S_n(T)$ , as  $S_n^*(T)$  is open in  $S_n(T)$ . In case  $p \notin S_n^*(T)$  we need to be more delicate. Up to a permutation of the variables we may assume that  $p$  is of the form  $p(x_{< m}, y_{< k})$ , where  $m + k = n$ ,  $q(\bar{x}) = p \upharpoonright_{\bar{x}} \in S_m^*(T)$ , and  $p \vdash \bigwedge_{i < k} (y_i = \lambda_i(\bar{x}))$  for some linear combinations  $\lambda_i$ .

Then we know there is a formula  $\varphi(\bar{x})$  such that  $\emptyset \neq [\varphi < 1/2] \subseteq q^{BM(\varepsilon)}$ . Then in  $S_n(T)$  we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \emptyset \neq [\varphi(\bar{x}) < 1/2] \cap \bigcap_{i < k} [d(y_i, \lambda_i(\bar{x})) < \varepsilon] \\ \subseteq [p^{BM(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}, \bar{y}^\varepsilon)] \\ \subseteq [p^{BM(\varepsilon)}(\bar{x}^\varepsilon, \bar{y}^\varepsilon)]. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, if  $p' \in [\varphi(\bar{x}) < 1/2] \cap \bigcap_{i < k} [d(y_i, \lambda_i(\bar{x})) < \varepsilon]$ , then there is  $p'' \in [p'(\bar{x}, \bar{y}^\varepsilon)]$  such that  $p' \upharpoonright_{\bar{x}} = p'' \upharpoonright_{\bar{x}}$ , and  $p'' \vdash \bigwedge_{i < k} (y_i = \lambda_i(\bar{x}))$ . As  $\varphi(\bar{x})^{p''} < 1/2$ , we have  $p'' \upharpoonright_{\bar{x}} \in q^{BM(\varepsilon)}$ . We by variable-invariance we may find  $p''' \in (p'')^{BM(\varepsilon)}$  such that  $p''' \upharpoonright_{\bar{x}} = q$ . As the linear structure is left untouched by the Banach-Mazur perturbation we must have  $p'''(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \vdash \bigwedge_{i < k} (y_i = \lambda_i(\bar{x}))$ , so in fact  $p''' = p$ , as required.

The case with parameters is proved identically (with each  $y_i$  being equal to a linear combination of  $\bar{x}$  and  $\bar{a}$ ). ■<sub>4.39</sub>

## 5. PERTURBATIONS OF AUTOMORPHISMS

We conclude with a few problems concerning perturbations of automorphisms which motivated the author's initial interest in perturbations, and which the author therefore finds worthy of future study.

One such problem comes from the study of the properties of automorphism groups of classical (i.e., discrete) countable structures, and in particular of ones whose first order theory is  $\omega$ -categorical, viewed as topological groups. There are many results of Lascar, Shelah, Kechris, Rosendal (and possibly others) concerning such groups, and one naturally asks what of these results can be generalised to the automorphism groups of separable continuous structures (with a separably categorical theory). The simplest instance would be the unitary group  $U(H)$  where  $H$  is a separable infinite-dimensional Hilbert space. Indeed,  $U(H)$  is a polish group in the pointwise convergence topology, also known as the strong operator topology, but it is fairly quickly clear that none of the properties that Kechris and Rosendal were looking for (e.g., existence of ample generics) can possibly occur there: this group is just way too big.

That is definitely not a new phenomenon: we already know that the type spaces of a continuous theory are “too big”. Thus, in order to define properly notions such as superstability and local  $\varphi$ -stability, one needs to take into account some underlying metric structure. In fact, having stared at those spaces long enough one gets the impression that

these are not merely spaces with two distinct structures, a topological one and a metric one, but in fact these are metric spaces with additional topological structure (in the case of the discrete metric, these are simply ordinary topological spaces). Single points in the underlying metric space are just “too small” to see, so one must always consider balls of some positive radius.

As in the case of the space of types, there is a natural metric on the automorphism group of a continuous structure which would indeed be the discrete metric in the classical case, namely the metric of uniform convergence. For example, in the case of  $U(H)$ , this is the operator norm metric (we only consider some bounded ball of  $H$  as the actual structure, so this is indeed uniform convergence). So for example, one can (and should) restate the question of the existence of ample generics as follows:

*Question 5.1.* Let  $M$  be a separable structure, and view  $G = \text{Aut}(M)$  as a topological group (pointwise convergence topology) on top of a metric space (uniform convergence). Under what assumptions on  $M$  can we find, for each  $n < \omega$ , a tuple  $\bar{g} \in G^n$  such that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the  $G$ -conjugacy class of the  $\varepsilon$ -ball (in the sense of the metric) around  $\bar{g}$  is co-meagre (in the sense of the topology)? In other words can we find  $\bar{g}$  such that the metric closure of the orbit of  $\bar{g}$  is co-meagre?

In particular, can one prove this is the case if  $\text{Th}(M)$  is  $\omega$ -categorical and  $\omega$ -stable?

For the special case of  $U(H)$  this essentially follows from [Dav96, Theorem II.5.8]. What about the automorphism group of the unique separable atomless probability algebra?

Another question leading to similar considerations is raised by Berenstein and Henson [BH]. In this paper they consider the theory of probability algebras with an automorphism, and ask whether it is superstable (equivalently, supersimple, as the theory is known to be stable). The author answered this negatively in [Ben], in striking contrast with the classical situation (i.e., discrete logic) where if  $T$  is superstable then  $T_A$  is supersimple: see Chatzidakis and Pillay [CP98] for the case where  $T_A$  exists as a first order theory. This may seem surprising at first, but in fact it shouldn't: after all, when dealing with superstability (or supersimplicity) in continuous logic one always allows moving things by arbitrarily small positive distances, so in light of the considerations above, when dealing with supersimplicity in  $T_A$  one should also allow arbitrarily small (yet non-zero) modifications of the automorphism:

*Question 5.2.* Let  $T$  be a superstable continuous theory. Let

$$T_\sigma = T \cup \{\text{“}\sigma \text{ is an automorphism”}\}.$$

Assume furthermore that  $T_\sigma$  has a model companion  $T_A$ . Is  $T_A$  supersimple up to small perturbations of  $\sigma$ ?

And actually:

*Question 5.3.* What should it mean precisely for a theory to be supersimple up to small perturbations?

Regarding the last question it should be pointed out that there are several natural candidates for the definition of “ $a$  is independent up to distance  $\varepsilon$  from  $B$  over  $A$ ” (denoted usually  $a^\varepsilon \perp_A B$ ). While these notions of approximate independence are not equivalent, they all give rise to the same notion of supersimplicity (see for example in [Ben06]). In a stable theory this is further equivalent to Iovino’s definition of superstability (which goes through counting the metric density character of types). One should therefore look for a notion of supersimplicity/superstability up to small perturbations which shares this robustness.

## REFERENCES

- [BBH] Itai Ben Yaacov, Alexander Berenstein, and C. Ward Henson, *Model-theoretic independence in the Banach lattices  $L^p(\mu)$* , submitted.
- [Ben] Itai Ben Yaacov, *Probability algebras with an automorphism are not superstable*, unpublished notes.
- [Ben03] ———, *Positive model theory and compact abstract theories*, Journal of Mathematical Logic **3** (2003), no. 1, 85–118.
- [Ben06] ———, *On supersimplicity and lovely pairs of cats*, Journal of Symbolic Logic **71** (2006), no. 3, 763–776.
- [BH] Alexander Berenstein and C. Ward Henson, *Model theory of probability spaces with an automorphism*, submitted.
- [BU] Itai Ben Yaacov and Alexander Usvyatsov, *Continuous first order logic and local stability*, Transactions of the AMS, to appear.
- [CP98] Zoé Chatzidakis and Anand Pillay, *Generic structures and simple theories*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **95** (1998), 71–92.
- [Dav96] Kenneth R. Davidson,  *$C^*$ -algebras by example*, Fields Institute Monographs, vol. 6, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [Fre04] D. H. Fremlin, *Measure theory volume 3: Measure algebras*, Torres Fremlin, 25 Ireton Road, Colchester CO3 3AT, England, 2004, <http://www.essex.ac.uk/maths/staff/fremlin/mt3.2004/index.htm>.
- [HI02] C. Ward Henson and José Iovino, *Ultraproducts in analysis*, Analysis and Logic (Catherine Finet and Christian Michaux, eds.), London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series, no. 262, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

ITAÏ BEN YAACOV, UNIVERSITÉ DE LYON, UNIVERSITÉ LYON 1, INSTITUT CAMILLE JORDAN, CNRS, UMR 5208, 43 BOULEVARD DU 11 NOVEMBRE 1918, F-69622 VILLEURBANNE CEDEX, FRANCE

URL: <http://math.univ-lyon1.fr/~begnac/>