# application: Löwenheim–Skolem–Tarski

## **lemma** (*≼*-criterion)

 $A \subseteq B$  in  $\sigma$ -structure  $\mathfrak{B}$  is the universe of an elementary substructure  $\mathfrak{A} \preccurlyeq \mathfrak{B}$  (i.e.,  $\mathfrak{B} \upharpoonright A \preccurlyeq \mathfrak{B}$ ) if, and only if

for every  $\varphi(\mathbf{x}, x) \in FO(\sigma)$  and **a** over *A*: ex.  $b \in B$  s.t.  $\mathfrak{B}, \mathbf{a}, b \models \varphi \Rightarrow$  ex.  $a \in A$  s.t.  $\mathfrak{B}, \mathbf{a}, a \models \varphi$ 

#### theorem (Löwenheim–Skolem–Tarski)

for any  $\sigma$ -structure  $\mathfrak{B}$  and  $A_0 \subseteq B$ , there is some A,  $A_0 \subseteq A \subseteq B$ , such that:

- $\mathfrak{A} := \mathfrak{B} \upharpoonright A \preccurlyeq \mathfrak{B}$
- $|A| \leq \max(\omega, |A_0|, |FO(\sigma)|)$

Summer 13

NB: obtain new proof of Löwenheim–Skolem  $\downarrow$  as a corollary

Model Theory

M Otto

elementary chains: Tarski union property

## limits of chains

a family of  $\sigma$ -structures  $(\mathfrak{A}_{lpha})_{lpha\in\lambda}$  indexed by an ordinal  $\lambda$  is

- a chain if  $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}_{\beta}$  for all  $\alpha \in \beta \in \lambda$
- an elementary chain if  $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha} \preccurlyeq \mathfrak{A}_{\beta}$  for all  $\alpha \in \beta \in \lambda$

the limit of the chain  $(\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  is the unique  $\sigma$ -structure  $\mathfrak{A} := \bigcup_{\alpha} \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha}$  on  $\bigcup_{\alpha} A_{\alpha}$  for which  $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha} \subseteq \mathfrak{A}$  for all  $\alpha \in \lambda$ 

# elementary chain lemma (Tarski union property, TUP)

for any elementary chain  $(\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \lambda}$  with limit  $\mathfrak{A} := \bigcup_{\alpha} \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha}$ :

 $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha} \preccurlyeq \mathfrak{A} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \lambda;$ 

hence, any elementary class is closed under limits of elementary chains 19/24

# applications of elementary chain constructions

#### preservation under chain limits:

while every  $\varphi \in FO$  is preserved under limits of elementary chains,  $\varphi \in \forall^* \exists^*$ -FO (the prenex  $\forall^* \exists^*$  fragment of FO) is preserved under arbitrary unions of chains, and in fact, t.f.a.e. for  $\varphi \in FO(\sigma)$ :

(i)  $\varphi$  is preserved under limits of chains

(ii) 
$$\varphi \equiv \varphi' \in \forall^* \exists^* - FO(\sigma)$$

 $\varphi$  preserved under limits (unions) of chains:

for any chain of  $\sigma$ -structures  $(\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha})_{\alpha < \lambda}$ , if  $\mathfrak{A}_{\alpha} \models \varphi$  for all  $\alpha < \lambda$ , then  $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi$  for the limit  $\mathfrak{A} = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} \mathfrak{A}_{\alpha}$ 

M Otto

## further examples of expressive completeness results

positive FO is preserved in homomorphic images, positive existential FO under arbitrary homomorphisms ....

#### Łos–Lyndon–Tarski Theorems

Summer 13

- (A) t.f.a.e. for  $\varphi \in FO(\sigma)$ :
- (i)  $\varphi$  is preserved under surjective homomorphisms
- (ii)  $\varphi \equiv \varphi' \in FO_{pos}(\sigma)$  (the positive fragment of FO)

(B) t.f.a.e. for 
$$\varphi \in FO(\sigma)$$
:

- (i)  $\varphi$  is preserved under homomorphisms
- (ii)  $\varphi \equiv \varphi' \in \exists$ -FO<sub>pos</sub>( $\sigma$ ) (existential positive fragment of FO)

21/24

## **Robinson consistency**

yet another powerful application of elementary chains proves the

#### Robinson consistency theorem

in signatures  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  and  $\tau_0 := \tau_1 \cap \tau_2$ :

if  $\Phi_i \subseteq FO_0(\tau_i)$  are such that

- $\Phi_0$  is a complete theory (in FO<sub>0</sub>( $\tau_0$ )), and
- $\Phi_1 \supseteq \Phi_0$  and  $\Phi_2 \supseteq \Phi_0$  are both satisfiable,

then also  $\Phi_1\cup\Phi_2$  is satisfiable.

#### Model Theory

MC

# corollaries: Craig interpolation and Beth

#### corollary: Craig interpolation

Summer 13

if  $\varphi_1 \models \varphi_2$  for  $\varphi_i \in FO(\tau_i)$ , then there is some  $\chi \in FO(\tau_1 \cap \tau_2)$  such that  $\varphi_1 \models \chi$  and  $\chi \models \varphi_2$ 

### corollary: Beth definability

implicit FO-definability implies explicit FO-definability

terminology: a relation  $R \notin \sigma$  is *implicitly defined* by  $\Sigma(R) \subseteq FO_0(\sigma \cup \{R\})$  if, for renaming  $R \rightsquigarrow R'$  by fresh R',  $\Sigma(R) \cup \Sigma(R') \models \forall \mathbf{x}(R\mathbf{x} \leftrightarrow R'\mathbf{x});$ 

an explicit definition (relative to  $\Sigma$ ) then has the form

 $\Sigma \models \forall \mathbf{x} (R\mathbf{x} \leftrightarrow \xi(\mathbf{x})) \text{ for some } \xi(\mathbf{x}) \in FO(\sigma)$ 

23/24