

QUANTIFIERS IN LIMITS

H. JEROME KEISLER

An important advantage of the nonstandard approach to calculus is that it eliminates two quantifiers in the definition of a limit. The standard definition of $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} F(z) = \infty$ is an $\forall\exists\forall$ sentence. But Abraham Robinson showed that in the nonstandard setting, this is equivalent to the one quantifier statement that $F(z)$ is infinite for all infinite z .

In the standard setting, the number of quantifier blocks needed to define the limit depends on the underlying structure \mathcal{M} in which one is working. Given a first order structure \mathcal{M} with an ordering, we add a new function symbol F to the vocabulary of \mathcal{M} and ask for the minimum number of quantifier blocks needed to define the class of structures (\mathcal{M}, F) in which $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} F(z) = \infty$ holds.

Our main results show that in the standard setting the limit cannot be defined with fewer than three quantifier blocks, provided that the underlying structure \mathcal{M} is not too powerful. In the cases that \mathcal{M} is countable or saturated, the limit cannot be defined by an $\exists\forall\exists$ sentence. In the case that \mathcal{M} is an o-minimal expansion of the real ordered field, the problem is open for $\exists\forall\exists$, but we show that the limit cannot be defined by a Boolean combination of $\forall\exists$ sentences.

In the standard setting, there are also structures \mathcal{M} which are so powerful that the limit can be defined in both two-quantifier forms. We show that there is no structure \mathcal{M} over which the limit can be defined by a Boolean combination of universal sentences.

These results clarify the statement that nonstandard analysis reduces the quantifier complexity of the limit concept.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON, USA
E-mail address: keisler@math.wisc.edu