

A bit of model theory

10.1

Thm (Tarski-Vaught criterion) Suppose $N \subseteq M$ are L -structures with N a substructure of M . Then $N \models M$ is an elementary substructure of M if and only if for any L -formula $A[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in N$,

$$(*) \quad \begin{cases} \text{if there is } b \in M \text{ with } M \models A[b, a_1, \dots, a_n] \\ \text{then there is } b \in N \text{ with } M \models A[b, a_1, \dots, a_n]. \end{cases}$$

Proof Suppose first that $N \trianglelefteq M$ and that for some $b \in M$, $M \models A[b, \bar{a}]$. Then $M \models \exists x A[x, \bar{a}]$, whence also $N \models \exists x A[x, \bar{a}]$. It follows that for some $b \in N$, $N \models A[b, \bar{a}]$, and hence $M \models A[b, \bar{a}]$ for some $b \in N$.

Conversely, suppose that for any formula $A[x, \bar{v}]$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in N$, $(*)$ holds. By induction on formulas, we show that if $B[\bar{v}]$ is an L -formula and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in N$, then $(**)$ $N \models B[\bar{a}]$ if and only if $M \models B[\bar{a}]$.

Since \mathcal{N} is a substructure of \mathcal{M} , we know this holds for all quantifier free formulas.

Also if the induction hypothesis holds for formulas $B[\bar{v}]$ and $C[\bar{w}]$, then it holds for $\neg B$, $B \wedge C$, $B \vee C$, $B \rightarrow C$, $B \leftrightarrow C$.

Now, suppose the induction hypothesis (***) holds for $B[x, \bar{v}]$ and consider $\exists x B[x, \bar{v}]$.

Then, if $\mathcal{M} \models \exists x B[x, \bar{a}]$, by (*) there is some $b \in N$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models B[b, \bar{a}]$. Applying (****) to B , we have $\mathcal{N} \models B[b, \bar{a}]$ and so $\mathcal{N} \models \exists x B[x, \bar{a}]$.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{N} \models \exists x B[x, \bar{a}]$, then for some $b \in N \subseteq M$, $\mathcal{N} \models B[b, \bar{a}]$. By the induction hypothesis applied to B , also $\mathcal{M} \models B[b, \bar{a}]$, i.e., $\mathcal{M} \models \exists x B[x, \bar{a}]$.

Finally, note that for any formula B ,

$$\mathcal{M} \models \forall x B \text{ iff } \mathcal{M} \models \neg \exists x \neg B \text{ and similarly}$$

$$\mathcal{N} \models \forall x B \text{ iff } \mathcal{N} \models \neg \exists x \neg B, \text{ so}$$

\models can be illustrated using \sim , \exists .

This finishes the induction. \square

Theorem (Löwenheim - Skolem)

Let L be a language with only countably many symbols. Suppose M is an infinite L -structure and $X \subseteq M$ is a countable subset. Then there is an elementary substructure $N \trianglelefteq M$ such that $X \subseteq N$ and N is countable.

Proof We begin by noticing that since the language is countable there are only countably many finite strings of symbols from L and hence only countably many formulas of L .

Fix an arbitrary element $a_0 \in M$.

For every L -formula $B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]$, we define a function

$$\psi_{B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]} : M^n \rightarrow M$$

by letting

$$\psi_{B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \begin{cases} a_0 & \text{if } d \models \exists x B[x, a_1, \dots, a_n] \\ b & \text{for some term } b. \\ d \models B[b, a_1, \dots, a_n] \\ \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Now, if $Y \subseteq M$ is a countable subset, let

$$Y' = Y \cup \left\{ \psi_{B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mid a_1, \dots, a_n \in Y \text{ &} B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n] \text{ is a formula?} \right\}.$$

Also, set

$$Y'' = \left\{ t[a_1, \dots, a_n]^d \mid a_1, \dots, a_n \in Y' \text{ &} t[a_1, \dots, a_n] \text{ is an } L\text{-term} \right\}$$

Note that as v_i is a term $t[v_i]$, $a_i = t[a_i]^d \in Y''$ for any $a_i \in Y'$.

Claim Y'' is countable.

For since L is countable there are only countably many functions $\psi_{B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]}$ and terms

$t[v_1, \dots, v_n]$. Thus, applying the ψ_B to Y only gives us countably many new points and then applying the t^d to Y' again only adds countably many points.

Claim γ'' is the domain of a substructure.

We only need to notice that if $f \in L$ is an n -ary function symbol and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \gamma''$, then also $f^{all}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \gamma''$.

So suppose $a_1 = t_1[\bar{b}_1]^{dl}, \dots, a_n = t_n[\bar{b}_n]^{dl}$, where t_1, \dots, t_n are L-terms, then

$$\begin{aligned} f^{all}(a_1, \dots, a_n) &= f^{all}(t_1[\bar{b}_1]^{dl}, \dots, t_n[\bar{b}_n]^{dl}) \\ &= s[\bar{b}_1, \dots, \bar{b}_n]^{dl} \in \gamma'' \end{aligned}$$

where $s[\bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_n]$ is the term $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$.

Now, define inductively,

$$X \subseteq X'' = X_0 \subseteq X''_0 = X_1 \subseteq X''_1 = X_2 \subseteq \dots$$

and note that each X_n is countable.

It follows that $N = \bigcup_n X_n$ is countable too.

Claim $\mathcal{N} = \langle N, \dots \rangle$ is an elementary substructure of \mathcal{M} .

First, to see that N is the domain of a substructure, assume $a_1, \dots, a_n \in N$ and f is an n -ary fct. symbol. Since $N = \bigcup_m X_m^u$, there is some m s.t. $a_1, \dots, a_n \in X_m = X_m^u$. So since X_{m+1}^u is the domain of a substructure, also $f^{al}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in X_{m+1}^u \subseteq N$. Thus, also N is the domain of a substructure.

To see $d\ell$ is an elementary substructure, suppose $B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]$ is any L -formula and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in N$. Suppose also $d\ell \models \exists x B[x, a_1, \dots, a_n]$. Then, in particular, $d\ell \models B[b, a_1, \dots, a_n]$, where $b = \psi_{B[x, v_1, \dots, v_n]}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and as above $b \in N$. Thus $d\ell \models \exists x B[x, a_1, \dots, a_n]$. So, by Tarski-Vaught, $d\ell \preceq d\ell$. \square

Thm $(\mathbb{Q}, <) \equiv (\mathbb{R}, <)$. $\forall A$, for any sentence A of the language $L = \{<\}$, we have

$$(\mathbb{Q}, <) \models A \iff (\mathbb{R}, <) \models A.$$

Proof We note first that any two countable, dense linear orders w/o endpoints are isomorphic.

Also, $(\mathbb{R}, <)$ has a countable elementary substructure $\mathcal{N} = (N, <) \preccurlyeq (\mathbb{R}, <)$ by Löwenheim-Skolem. So as $(\mathbb{R}, <)$ is a dense linear order w/o endpoints, so is \mathcal{N} .

Thus $(\mathbb{Q}, <) \cong \mathcal{N} \preccurlyeq (\mathbb{R}, <)$, whence

$$(\mathbb{Q}, <) \equiv \mathcal{N} \equiv (\mathbb{R}, <).$$

□