

3. A little universal algebra.

Let us elucidate the notion of substructure.

Fix a similarity type $\sigma = \langle I, J, K, \rho, \mu \rangle$ as before.

Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{L} \in K_\sigma$ be as in 2.4, and assume $A \subseteq B$.

Then, according to 2.4 with $\pi = \text{id}_A$ we have that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ iff

- 3.1 (1) for each $i \in I$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ (where $n = \rho(i)$)
 $\langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle \in R_i$ iff $\langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle \in S_i$.
 I.e. $R_i = A^n \cap S_i$ ----- (*)

- (2) for each $j \in J$ and all $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A$ (where $m = \mu(j)$)
 $f_j(a_1, \dots, a_m) = g_j(a_1, \dots, a_m)$.

I.e. f_j is the restriction of g_j to A^n : $f_j = g_j \upharpoonright A^m$ (xxx)
 (In particular, if $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A$, then $g_j(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in A$.)

- (3) for each $k \in K$, $d_k = d_k$... (xxx) (In particular, $d_k \in A$.)

- 3.2 Now suppose that $\mathcal{L} \in K_\sigma$ (as above) and that A is a subset of B . We ask the question: what conditions on A ensure that A is the domain of a substructure of \mathcal{L} ? By the comments above we must have that whenever $a_1, \dots, a_m \in A$ then $g_j(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in A$ (for each $j \in J$, where $m = \mu(j)$) - i.e. A is closed under g_j - and for each $k \in K$, $d_k \in A$.

3.3 Theorem

With the notation above, A is the domain of a substructure of \mathcal{L} if and only if A is closed under each g_j (for $j \in J$) and contains each d_k (for $k \in K$).

Proof.

The "only if" is proved in 3.2. For the "if" direction, suppose that A satisfies the stated condition. Then we simply define R_i by $(*)$ (for each $i \in I$), f_j by $(**)$ (for each $j \in J$) and e_k by $(***)$ (for each $k \in K$), thus defining the substructure $\langle A; \{R_i\}_{i \in I}; \{f_j\}_{j \in J}; \{e_k\}_{k \in K} \rangle$ of \mathcal{L} .

□

3.4 Remark

(a) It follows from 3.3 that if σ is a purely relational type, i.e. $J=K=\emptyset$, then every subset of the domain of a σ -structure is the domain of a substructure of that structure.

(b) It of course follows from 3.1 (1), (2) and (3) that a subset of the domain of a σ -structure can be the domain of at most one substructure.

3.5 Theorem

Let $\mathcal{L} \in K_\sigma$ (in above notation) and let S be any non-empty subset of B . Then there exists a smallest substructure $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ with $S \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A})$. (This means that if $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ and $S \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$, then $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}'$.) Further, \mathcal{A} is unique with this property.

Proof.

Let $S_0 := S \cup \{d_k : k \in K\}$ and, for each $n \geq 0$, let $S_{n+1} := S_n \cup \{g_j(a_1, \dots, a_{\mu(j)}) : j \in J, a_1, \dots, a_{\mu(j)} \in S_n\}$.

Let $S_\omega := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} S_n$.

Clearly $d_k \in S_\omega$ for each $k \in K$.

Also, $S_0 \subseteq S_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq S_n \subseteq S_{n+1} \subseteq \dots \subseteq S_\omega$. (+)

Further, if $j \in J$ then S_ω is closed under g_j . For if $m = \mu(j)$ and $a_1, \dots, a_m \in S_\omega$, then by (+), there exists n such that $a_1, \dots, a_m \in S_n$. So $g_j(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in S_{n+1}$ (by definition of S_{n+1}). Since $S_{n+1} \subseteq S_\omega$ (by (+)) we have $g_j(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in S_\omega$, as required.

Thus, by 3.3, S_ω is the domain of a substructure, or say, of \mathcal{L} . Since $S \subseteq S_0 \subseteq S_\omega$ we have $S \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A})$.

Now suppose that \mathcal{A}' is any substructure of \mathcal{L} with $S \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$. By 3.1(3) we also have $d_k \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$ (for each $k \in K$), so $S_0 \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$. We now prove by induction that for all n , $S_n \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$.

So suppose (for the inductive step) that $S_n \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$. Since $\text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$ is closed under g_j (for each $j \in J$) by 3.1(2), it follows that $g_j(a_1, \dots, a_{\mu(j)}) \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$ for each $a_1, \dots, a_{\mu(j)} \in S_n$ (and each $j \in J$). Thus $S_{n+1} \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$ as required.

Thus $\text{dom}(\mathcal{A}) = S_\omega = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} S_n \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$. The required result now follows from 3.6 below. □

3.6 Exercise

Let $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{L} \in K_\sigma$. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ and $\text{dom}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \text{dom}(\mathcal{A}')$. Then $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}'$.

3.7 Definition

A similarity type $\sigma = \langle I, J, K, \rho, \mu \rangle$ is called countable if I, J, K are each countable sets.

3.8 Exercise (Downward Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem: weak form.)

By inspecting the proof of 3.5, prove that if

σ is countable and S is countable, then $\text{dom}(G_\sigma)$ is countable.

3.9 Exercise

Let $G_\sigma, L_0, L_1 \in K_\sigma$ and suppose that $\pi: G_\sigma \hookrightarrow L_0$ and $\gamma: L_0 \hookrightarrow L_1$. Prove that $\gamma \circ \pi: G_\sigma \hookrightarrow L_1$.

3.10 Exercise

Prove that any embedding can be decomposed into an isomorphism and identity embedding. I.e. show that if $G_\sigma, L_0 \in K_\sigma$ and $\pi: G_\sigma \hookrightarrow L_0$, then there exists $G_\sigma^* \in K_\sigma$ such that $G_\sigma^* \subseteq L_0$ and $\pi: G_\sigma \cong G_\sigma^*$.