THE LATTICE PROBLEM FOR MODELS OF PA

ATHAR ABDUL-QUADER AND ROMAN KOSSAK

ABSTRACT. The lattice problem for models of Peano Arithmetic (PA) is to determine which lattices can be represented as lattices of elementary submodels of a model of PA, or, in greater generality, for a given model \mathcal{M} , which lattices can be represented as interstructure lattices of elementary submodels \mathcal{K} of an elementary extension \mathcal{N} such that $\mathcal{M} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{K} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{N}$. The problem has been studied for the last 60 years and the results and their proofs show an interesting interplay between the model theory of PA, Ramsey style combinatorics, lattice representation theory, and elementary number theory. We present a survey of the most important results together with a detailed analysis of some special cases to explain and motivate a technique developed by James Schmerl for constructing elementary extensions with prescribed interstructure lattices. The last section is devoted to a discussion of lesser-known results about lattices of elementary submodels of countable recursively saturated models of PA.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article, all models are models of Peano Arithmetic (PA). We use $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{K}$... for models, and M, N, K, \ldots for their domains.

Elementary submodels of a model \mathcal{N} form a complete lattice under inclusion. The meet of any set of elementary submodels of \mathcal{N} is the intersection of all the models in the set, and the join is the Skolem closure of their union. This lattice is called the substructure lattice of \mathcal{N} and is denoted by $Lt(\mathcal{N})$.

We will write $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ if \mathcal{M} is a proper elementary submodel of \mathcal{N} , and $\mathcal{M} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{N}$ if we also allow $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{N}$. By $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ we denote the lattice of all \mathcal{K} such that $\mathcal{M} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{K} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{N}$. $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is referred to as the *interstructure lattice* between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} . $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}) = \operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{N}_{\min})$, where \mathcal{N}_{\min} is the minimal elementary submodel of \mathcal{N} , which is also the prime model of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{N})$.

The work on substructure and interstructure lattices of models of PA has turned out to be intimately connected with problems in lattice theory, Ramsey style combinatorics, and even some elementary number theory. Chapter 4 of [7] gives a comprehensive account of the main

results obtained prior to 2005. Our goal is to give a brief survey of the area, to review the main technique introduced by James Schmerl in [15], and to report on some more recent results. The paper ends with a list of open problems. For now, let us just mention the most outstanding one.

Problem 1. Can every finite lattice be represented as $Lt(\mathcal{N})$ for some model \mathcal{N} of PA?

2. Preliminaries

For a subset X of the domain of a model \mathcal{N} , $\mathrm{Scl}^{\mathcal{N}}(X)$ denotes the Skolem closure of X in \mathcal{N} . For $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ and $a \in N \setminus M$, we will denote the Skolem closure of $M \cup \{a\}$ by $\mathcal{M}(a)$. \mathcal{N}_{\min} is the Skolem closure of 0 in \mathcal{N} .

Each finite tuple in a model of PA is coded by a single element; hence, if $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$, for every finitely generated over \mathcal{M} model \mathcal{K} in $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ there is an $a \in N$ such that $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}(a)$.

Let L be a lattice. An element $x \in L$ is called *compact* if whenever $x \leq \bigvee X$ for $X \subseteq L$, then $x \leq \bigvee X'$ for some finite $X' \subseteq X$. It is easy to verify that the compact elements of $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ are the finitely generated over \mathcal{M} elementary submodels, and every element in the lattice is the supremum of the set of the compact elements below it.

The set of compact elements of $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ forms a join-semilattice, which we denote as $\operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ and $\operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N})$ will denote $\operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{N}_{\min})$. For $a, b \in N$, $\mathcal{M}(a) \vee \mathcal{M}(b) = \mathcal{M}(\langle a, b \rangle)$, where $\langle x, y \rangle$ is the pairing function. It is not obvious that the intersection of two finitely generated models may not be finitely generated. Various examples can be shown, one is given shortly below.

A model \mathcal{N} is a *cofinal extension* of \mathcal{M} , if for every $b \in N$ there is an $a \in M$ such that b < a. \mathcal{N} is an *end extension* of \mathcal{M} if for every $a \in M$ and $b \in N \setminus M$, $\mathcal{N} \models a < b$. We write $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{cof}} \mathcal{N}$ if \mathcal{N} is a cofinal elementary extension, and $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{N}$ if \mathcal{N} is an elementary end extension.

Let us note that $Lt(\mathcal{N})$ may be uncountable even if \mathcal{N} is finitely generated, i.e., it is finitely generated over \mathcal{N}_{\min} . To see this, let \mathcal{M} be a countable model with an uncountable substructure lattice (as an example, take \mathcal{M} to be a countable, recursively saturated model). By [7, Theorem 2.1.12], every countable model \mathcal{M} has a *superminimal* elementary end extension, i.e., an elementary end extension \mathcal{N} such that $\mathcal{N} = Scl(b)$ for every $b \in N \setminus M$. This result can also be used to prove one of the early results, due independently to Julia Knight [5]

 $\mathbf{2}$

and Jeff Paris [12], which says that every completion of PA has a model \mathcal{N} such that $Lt_0(\mathcal{N})$ is isomorphic to (ω_1, \leq) .

Example 1. We can use the technique of superminimal extension to provide an example showing that the intersection of two finitely generated submodels might not be finitely generated.

As mentioned above, every countable model has a superminimal elementary end extension. Moreover, if \mathcal{M} is countable, nonstandard, and is generated by a bounded set of generators, then it has a superminimal cofinal extension ([7, Exercise 2.5.2]). Suppose \mathcal{M} is countable, nonstandard, and has a bounded, but not finite, set of generators, and let \mathcal{N}_1 be a superminimal elementary end extension of \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{N}_2 a superminimal cofinal extension of \mathcal{M} , and let $\mathcal{N} = \operatorname{Scl}(a, b)$, where $a \in \mathcal{N}_1 \setminus \mathcal{M}$ and $b \in \mathcal{N}_2 \setminus \mathcal{M}$ (by superminimality, any such a and b will work). Then, in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N})$, \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_2 are compact (finitely generated), but their intersection is \mathcal{M} , not finitely generated.

A complete lattice L is *algebraic* if each element of L is the supremum of a set of compact elements. A lattice is κ -algebraic if it is algebraic and each compact element has less than κ many compact elements below it. For any $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$, $\mathrm{Lt}(\mathcal{M})$ is \aleph_1 -algebraic, and for every elementary extension \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} . $\mathrm{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is $|\mathcal{M}|^+$ -algebraic.

Every $\mathcal{K} \in \operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is the supremum of the set of compact elements below it in the lattice. It follows that if $\operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}_1/\mathcal{M}_1)$, then $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}_1/\mathcal{M}_1)$. Thus, in order to realize a lattice as an interstructure lattice, we need only to ensure that we have control over the compact elements. Of course, if $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is finite, all elements of it are compact.

Given an expansion \mathcal{L}' of the language of arithmetic, PA^* is the theory consisting of the axioms of PA along with the induction schema for all formulas in \mathcal{L}' . That is, PA^* is not a single theory, but many, one for each such expansion. With one notable exception [23, Theorems 3 and 4], all results about models of PA discussed in this article also hold for PA^* in any countable language.

3. Brief History I: Distributive lattices

Systematic study of substructure and interstructure lattices of models of PA begins with Haim Gaifman's seminal paper [3]. Gaifman introduced a powerful technique of end-extensional and minimal types, which he applied to construct models with some specific substructure and interstructure lattices. In particular, he proved that for every set I, every model \mathcal{M} has an elementary extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to the Boolean algebra of all subsets of I. A lattice D is *distibutive* if for some set X, D is isomorphic to a sublattice of the Boolean algebra of all subsets of X.

Soon after [3] appeared, Schmerl [14] confirmed Gaifman's conjecture that for every finite distributive lattice D, every model \mathcal{M} has an elementary end extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to D. George Mills [11] extended Gaifman's technique to types with arbitrary sets of variables and completely characterized all distributive lattices that can be represented as $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$. Almost at the same time Paris [13] and Alex Wilkie [26] applied different techniques to give examples of finite nondistributive substructure and interstructure lattices. We will give precise statements of all these results in the next section. The main result of [11] is the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Let D be a distributive lattice. Then the following are equivalent.

- (1) There exists a model \mathcal{M} such that $Lt(\mathcal{M}) \cong D$.
- (2) Every model \mathcal{M} has an elementary extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong D$.
- (3) D is \aleph_1 -algebraic.

The equivalence of (1) and (3) was proved independently by Paris [12]. The proof of Mills' theorem is difficult and it involves many technical details.

In [11], Mills follows the statement of Theorem 2 with an instructive example. Let L be the ordered unit interval $([0, 1], \leq)$. L is a complete distributive lattice, but it is not \aleph_1 -algebraic. Every element of L is compact; hence for every nonzero element, there are continuum many compact elements below it. Let L' be the closely related lattice of initial segments in the set of rational numbers in [0,1] ordered by inclusion. In L', the compact elements are closed intervals [0, p]. Because each [0, p]contains only countably many compact segments, by Mills' theorem, L' is isomorphic to a substructure lattice.

3.1. End-extensional and minimal types. Let T be a completion of PA and let \mathcal{M}_T be the prime model of T. When we say that p(x)is a type of T, we mean that p(x) is in the language of T and it is consistent with T. A type p(x) of T is unbounded if t < x is in p(x) for each constant Skolem term t of T.

A type p(x) of $\text{Th}(\mathcal{M}, a)_{a \in M}$ is unbounded if $(a < x) \in p(x)$ for all $a \in M$.

For every model $\mathcal{M} \models T$, every unbounded type of T extends to an unbounded type of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M})$, i.e., it extends to a type that contains a < x for all $a \in M$ [3, Proposition 2.7]. Let \mathcal{L} be the language of PA. For a model \mathcal{M} , by $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ we will denote \mathcal{L} with added constant symbols for all elements of \mathcal{M} . The following definition turned out to be crucial not just in the model theory of arithmetic, but in general model theory as well.

Definition 3 ([3]). A complete type p(x) of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}, a)_{a \in M}$ is definable if for every formula $\varphi(x, y)$ of \mathcal{L} there exists a formula $\sigma_{\varphi}(y)$ of \mathcal{L} such that for all $a \in M$,

$$\varphi(x,a) \in p(x)$$
 iff $\mathcal{M} \models \sigma_{\varphi}(a)$.

A type of T is *definable* if it is definable over the \mathcal{M}_T , i.e., it is a definable type of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}_T, a)_{a \in M_T}$.

If p(x) is a complete type of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}, a)_{a \in M}$ then by $\mathcal{M}(p)$ we denote the unique up to isomorphism Skolem closure of $M \cup \{b\}$ in an elementary extension of \mathcal{M} in which b realizes p(x).

If p is a definable type of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}, a)_{a \in M}$, then the type over \mathcal{M} of every element a of N, $\operatorname{tp}(a/M)$, is definable.

Definition 4 ([3]). Let T be a completion of PA, and let p(x) be a type of T. Then,

- (1) p(x) is *end-extensional* if for every $\mathcal{M} \models T$ and every unbounded complete type q(x) of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}, a)_{a \in M}$, if $p(x) \subseteq q(x)$, then $\mathcal{M}(q)$ is an end extension of \mathcal{M} .
- (2) p(x) minimal if for every q(x) as above, $\mathcal{M}(q)$ is a minimal extension of \mathcal{M} , i.e. $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}(q)/\mathcal{M})$ has exactly two elements: bottom \mathcal{M} and top $\mathcal{M}(q)$.

Gaifman proved that every minimal type is end-extensional, that every end-extensional type is definable, and that minimal and endextensional types exist in abundance. In particular, for every completion T of PA there are continuum many independent minimal types of T.¹ If p and q are such types, then for all \mathcal{M} , $\mathcal{M}(p)$ and $\mathcal{M}(q)$ are not isomorphic.

Example 5. Let p(x) be a minimal type of T. For $\mathcal{M} \models T$, let $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}(a)(b)(c) = \mathcal{M}(\langle a, b, c \rangle)$, where a, b, c all realize p(x). Let \mathcal{K} be the supremum of $\mathcal{M}(a)$ in $\mathcal{M}(\langle a, c \rangle)$.

$$\underbrace{\widetilde{(a,c)}}_{\mathcal{M}(b)\setminus M} \underbrace{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathcal{M}(b)\setminus M} \underbrace{\mathcal$$

¹A type p(x) depends on a type q(x) if for some Skolem term t(x), for all formulas $\varphi(x)$ in p(x), $\varphi(t(x))$ is in q(x). Two types are independent if neither depends on the other.

Then, it follows from the facts about minimal types proved in [3] that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})\cong (\mathcal{P}(\{a, b, c\}), \subseteq), \operatorname{tp}(\langle a, b \rangle) = \operatorname{tp}(\langle a, c \rangle), \text{ and both types}$ are definable. The example shows that there are definable types which are not end-extensional. In particular, $\operatorname{tp}(\langle a, b \rangle)$ is such a type, because $\mathcal{M}(b)(\langle a, c \rangle)$ is not an end extension of $\mathcal{M}(b)$.

If $\mathcal{M} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{N}$, then we say that $X \subseteq N$ is \mathcal{M} -definable if it is defined in \mathcal{N} by an $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ -formula. If $X \subseteq M$ is \mathcal{M} -definable, we just say that it is definable.

If $\mathcal{M} \preccurlyeq \mathcal{N}$, then \mathcal{N} is a *conservative* extension of \mathcal{M} , if for every definable $X \subseteq N, X \cap M$ is \mathcal{M} -definable. This is equivalent to: for every $a \in N \setminus M$, $\operatorname{tp}(a/M)$ is definable.

If \mathcal{N} is a conservative extension of \mathcal{M} , then for each $c \in N$, $\{x \in M : x < c\}$ is definable in \mathcal{M} ; hence, if c < a for some $a \in M$, then c as the maximum of this set must be in M. Therefore, all conservative extensions are end extensions.

All results about end-extensional types and their applications to the lattice problem in [3] hold for PA^* in a countable language. Gaifman asked if they hold for uncountable languages as well. In response, Mills gave a construction of a model of PA^* in a language with \aleph_1 function symbols that has no elementary end extension [10].

In terminology of Mills [11], a definable type p(x) of T produces a lattice L if for every model \mathcal{M} of T, $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}(p)/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to L. For example, minimal types produce the two element lattice. It is a special feature of Gaiman's technique that his special types produce prescribed lattices for all models of T, not just the countable ones. This is reminiscent of the MacDowell-Specker theorem, which says that every model of PA has an elementary end extension. The proof of this fact for countable models follows by a relatively straightforward omitting types argument. The types that produce $\mathcal{M}(p)$ given \mathcal{M} and p(x) do it for all models \mathcal{M} regardless of the cardinality of their domains.

Gaifman conjectured that for every completion T of PA and every finite distributive lattice that has a unique atom, there is an endextensional type p(x) of T that produces D. The conjecture was confirmed by Schmerl [14] and by a different construction by Mills [11]. Mills also proved the following theorem fully characterizing all distributive lattices that can be produced by end-extensional types.

Theorem 6. Let T be a completion of PA^* in a countable language and let D be a distributive lattice. Then the following are equivalent:

(1) There is a definable (end-extensional) type p(x) of T which produces D.

(2) D is \aleph_1 -algebraic, $\bigvee D$ is compact (and for any nonzero $\alpha, \beta \in D, \alpha \land \beta$ is nonzero).

In conclusion, for every model \mathcal{M} and every distributive lattice D that can be realized as an interstructure lattice, D can be realized as $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, where \mathcal{N} is an elementary conservative end extension of \mathcal{M} . This completely solves the general representation problem for the distributive lattices, but one can still ask more specific questions about the extension \mathcal{N} for which $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to a give lattice D. In the distributive case this adds more depth to the subject. In the nondistributive case it turns out to be necessary, because there are nondistributive lattices which cannot be realized as $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, where \mathcal{N} is an end, or even mixed, extension of \mathcal{M} . Before giving examples we need a short survey on elementary extensions of models of PA.

4. End, cofinal, and mixed extensions

Recall that a model \mathcal{N} is a cofinal extension of \mathcal{M} if for every $b \in N$ there is an $a \in M$ such that b < a, and \mathcal{N} is an end extension of \mathcal{M} if for every $a \in M$ and $b \in N \setminus M$, $\mathcal{N} \models a < b$. We write $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{cof}} \mathcal{N}$ if \mathcal{N} is a cofinal elementary extension, $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{N}$ if \mathcal{N} is an elementary end extension of \mathcal{M} , and $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{mix}} \mathcal{N}$ if \mathcal{N} is neither an end nor a cofinal extension.

By Gaifman's Splitting Theorem, every elementary extension splits into a cofinal extension and an end extension: if $\mathcal{M} \leq \mathcal{N}$, then there there is a unique $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \leq_{cof} \overline{\mathcal{M}} \leq_{end} \mathcal{N}$. Accordingly, the task of constructing an elementary extension of a nonstandard model can be performed in two steps: first construct a cofinal extension, and then proceed by adding an end extension above it. Sometimes these steps are reversed, and they must be reversed when \mathcal{M} is the standard model.

The technique of minimal and end-extensional types uses infinitary combinatorics of unbounded definable sets in models of PA and does not apply to cofinal extensions. Cofinal extensions are obtained by realizing bounded types for which combinatorial arguments about unbounded definable sets are replaced by their analogs involving bounded sets satisfying suitable notions of largeness. This makes a difference. For example, every model \mathcal{M} has a minimal elementary end extension. We also know that every *countable* nonstandard model has a minimal cofinal extension, but it is a long-standing open question whether every model of PA has such an extension.

The example of minimal extensions shows that a lattice—in this example the two element lattice $L = \{\mathbf{0}_L, \mathbf{1}_L\}$ —can be realized as

 $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ in two much different ways. For a countable nonstandard \mathcal{M} , \mathcal{N} can be either an elementary end extension or elementary cofinal extension (by Gaifnan's splitting theorem, it cannot be a mixed extension).

For \mathcal{K} in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, the rank of \mathcal{K} , $\rho(\mathcal{K})$, is the unique $\overline{\mathcal{K}}$ such that $\mathcal{K} \preccurlyeq_{\mathsf{cof}} \overline{\mathcal{K}} \preccurlyeq_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{N}$. The set of ranks of all models in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, called the rankset, is linearly ordered by inclusion. For \mathcal{K}_0 , \mathcal{K}_1 in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, if $\mathcal{K}_0 \prec \mathcal{K}_1$, then $\mathcal{K}_0 \preccurlyeq_{\mathsf{cof}} \mathcal{K}_1$ if and only if $\rho(\mathcal{K}_0) = \rho(\mathcal{K}_1)$, and $\mathcal{K}_0 \preccurlyeq_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{K}_1$ if and only if $\mathcal{K}_0 = \rho(\mathcal{K}_1) \cap \mathcal{K}_1$.

Ranked lattices were introduced by Schmerl in [15]. Here is a modified definition from [7]: A ranked lattice (L, ρ) is a lattice L equipped with a function $\rho: L \longrightarrow L$ such that for all x and y in L

- (1) $x \le \rho(x);$
- (2) $\rho(\rho(x)) = \rho(x);$
- (3) $\rho(x) \le \rho(y)$ or $\rho(y) \le \rho(x)$;
- (4) $\rho(x \lor y) = \rho(x) \lor \rho(y).$

The rankset of a ranked lattice (L, ρ) is $\{\rho(x) : x \in L\}$.

 $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ equipped with the rank function defined above is a ranked lattice, denoted by $\operatorname{Ltr}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$.

In general, a lattice can have many expansions to a ranked lattice. To be represented as rank functions in interstructure lattices of models of arithmetic those expansion have to satisfy certain additional conditions.

Andreas Blass [1] showed that the intersection of two finitely generated cofinal submodels of a model \mathcal{M} must be cofinal in \mathcal{M} . Thus, if $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$, and (L, ρ) is isomorphic to $\text{Ltr}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, then (L, ρ) must satisfy the Blass Condition: for all compact $x, y \in L$, if $\rho(x) = \rho(y)$, then $\rho(x) = \rho(x \land y)$.

Less perspicuous is the Gaifman Condition: for all $x, y, z \in L$, if $x < y < x \lor z$, $z = \rho(z)$, and $x \land z = y \land z$, then x = y. See [7, Proposition 4.2.12]. In the next section, we explain how these conditions are used to show that some finite lattices cannot be represented by interstructure lattices given by end extensions.

5. Brief History II: Nondistributive lattices

The following lattices play specific roles in the results we are going to discuss. \mathbf{B}_n is the Boolean algebra of all subsets of an *n*-element set. \mathbf{M}_n is a lattice with n + 2 elements that has a top, a bottom, and *n* incomparable elements in between. \mathbf{B}_2 and \mathbf{M}_3 are pictured in Figure 1. The *pentagon* lattice \mathbf{N}_5 and the *hexagon* lattice \mathbf{H} are pictured in Figure 2. A lattice L is distributive if an only if it has no sublattice that is isomorphic to either \mathbf{M}_3 or \mathbf{N}_5 .




FIGURE 1. The lattices \mathbf{B}_2 and \mathbf{M}_3 .




FIGURE 2. The lattices N_5 and H.

All lattices \mathbf{B}_n , as well as \mathbf{M}_3 , \mathbf{N}_5 and \mathbf{H} can be represented as interstructure lattices, but the general results about how this is achieved are strikingly different. Here they are:

- (1) (Gaifman [3]) For each n, every model \mathcal{M} has an elementary end extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbf{B}_n$;
- (2) (Wilkie [26]) Every *countable* model \mathcal{M} has an elementary end extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbf{N}_5$.
- (3) (Schmerl [15]) Let L be either \mathbf{M}_3 or \mathbf{H} . Then every countable nonstandard model \mathcal{M} has an elementary cofinal extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$.

Independently, Gaifman [3] and Paris [12] showed that if $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{N}$ then $\mathrm{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is not isomorphic to \mathbf{M}_3 . Here is a short proof. Let $L = \mathbf{M}_3$, and let ρ be a rank on L that satisfies the Blass Condition. We will show that $\rho(\mathbf{0}_L) = \rho(\mathbf{1}_L)$. Suppose a, b, c are the three incomparable elements of L. Because the rankset of a ranked lattice is linearly ordered, only one of these elements can be in the rankset of (L, ρ) . Suppose it is c. Then, by condition (1) in the definition of rank, $\rho(a) = \rho(b) = \mathbf{1}_L$. By the Blass Condition, $\rho(a) = \rho(a \wedge b) = \rho(\mathbf{0}_L)$; hence $\rho(\mathbf{0}_L) = \rho(\mathbf{1}_L)$. Thus, if \mathbf{M}_3 is represented as $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, then $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{cof}} \mathcal{N}$.

Wilkie [26] proved that if $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{N}$ then $\mathrm{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is not isomorphic to the hexagon lattice **H**. A short argument, due to Schmerl, using both the Blass and Gaifman conditions is given in [7, Proposition 4.2.13].

It is shown in [7, Theorem 4.6.5] that if $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{N}_5 , then \mathcal{N} is not a conservative extension of \mathcal{M} . Because there are uncountable models all of whose elementary end extensions are conservative (the *rather classless models*), this shows that Wilkie's theorem about \mathbf{N}_5 cannot be generalized to the uncountable case.

In the positive direction, much of what is known today about lattices that can be represented as $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ rests on applications of a powerful technique of representations of lattices introduced by Schmerl in [15]. Section 6 is devoted to such representations. Here let us just note that for all lattices \mathbf{M}_{q+1} , where $q = p^k$ for a prime p and $1 \leq k$, every nonstandard countable model \mathcal{M} has a cofinal extension \mathcal{N} such that L is isomorphic to $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$. Using this and other results on finite lattice representations, it can be shown that the smallest number n for which \mathbf{M}_n is not known to have an interstructure lattice representation is 16 [7, page 134].

Schmerl showed in [15] that if a finite lattice L can be represented as $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$, for some \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} , then every countable nonstandard model \mathcal{M}' that is elementarily equivalent to \mathcal{M} has a cofinal extension \mathcal{N}' such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}'/\mathcal{M}')$ is isomorphic to L.

5.1. The mysterious N_5 . Let us take a closer look at representations of N_5 as interstructure lattices.

From Wilkie's and Schmerl's theorems it follows that every nonstandard countable model \mathcal{M} has a cofinal extension extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{N}_5 .

Suppose now that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is a representation of \mathbf{N}_5 and \mathcal{M} is not cofinal in \mathcal{N} . Let $F : \mathbf{N}_5 \longrightarrow \operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ be an isomorphism. Using the labeling in Figure 2, let $F(r) = \mathcal{M}_r$, and let ρ be a rank function of \mathbf{N}_5 . Applying the Gaifman's condition with x = a and y = b we get that $\rho(c) = 1$, hence $\mathcal{M}_c \prec_{\operatorname{cof}} \mathcal{N}$.

Because $\rho(0) < 1$ and $c \wedge b = 0$, by the Blass condition $\rho(b) = b$. Hence $\mathcal{M}_b \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{N}$. Finally, by [7, Theorem 4.6.1], $\rho(0) \neq b$, and we get that $\rho(0)$ must be either 0 or a. In the first case we get that either $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{M}_a \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{M}_b$ or $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{M}_a \prec_{\mathsf{cof}} \mathcal{M}_b$. As observed by Schmerl in [23], Wilkie's proof shows that both these scenarios can be realized. If $\rho(0) = a$, \mathcal{N} is a mixed extension of \mathcal{M} . This case is surprisingly ruled out by the main result of [23].²

For $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$, $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is the set of all intersections $M \cap X$, where X ranges over all definable subsets of N. In the short proof of [7, Theorem 4.6.5], a contradiction is derived from the assumptions that the extension $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathsf{end}} \mathcal{N}$ is conservative and that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to \mathbf{N}_5 , but we do not get any information about the undefinable subsets of M that end up in $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$.

In a recent paper [23], Schmerl adds more mystery the story of representations of N_5 . As we mentioned earlier, model-theoretic techniques developed for models of PA often apply to models of PA^{*} in countable languages. It turns out to be not so in the case of N_5 . Schmerl proves that every countable recursively saturated model \mathcal{M} of PA can be expanded to a model \mathcal{M}^* of PA^{*} by adding countably many new sets so that \mathcal{M}^* has a mixed elementary extension \mathcal{N}^* such that $Lt(\mathcal{N}^*/\mathcal{M}^*)$ is isomorphic to N_5 .

6. Representations

Over the last 40 years, in several papers Schmerl developed a special technique of constructing elementary extensions with prescribed interstructure lattices. It is based on particular representations of lattices as lattices of equivalence relations. In this section we will give basic definitions and motivate them with examples.

Definition 7. Let A be any set and L a finite lattice.

- (1) The set Eq(A) is the set of all equivalence relations on A. This set forms a lattice under inclusion, with $\mathbf{0}_A$ being the discrete relation $\{(a, a) : a \in A\}$, and $\mathbf{1}_A$ the trivial relation $A \times A$.
- (2) Let L be a finite lattice and A a set. Then $\alpha : L \longrightarrow Eq(A)$ is a *pseudo-representation* of L if:
 - $\alpha(0_L) = \mathbf{1}_A$, ($\alpha(0_L)$ is trivial)
 - $\alpha(1_L) = \mathbf{0}_A$, ($\alpha(1_L)$ is discrete) and
 - $\alpha(x \lor y) = \alpha(x) \land \alpha(y).$
- (3) α is a *representation* if it is a pseudo-representation and is one-to-one.

Oftentimes, realizing a particular finite lattice as an interstructure lattice requires choosing an appropriate representation of the lattice,

²Section 4.6 of [7] is devoted to representations of N_5 . The claim there that it can be shown that N_5 can be realized as an interstructure lattice of a mixed extension turned out to be erroneous.

and proving some combinatorial lemmas about this representation. Before describing important properties of representations that are involved in these kinds of constructions, let us examine a motivating example.

Example 8. Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ such that $\mathrm{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbf{B}_2$. Then there are $a, b \in N$ such that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{M}(\langle a, b \rangle)$ and $\mathcal{M}(a) \neq \mathcal{M}(b)$ (see Figure 1). Let π_1 and π_2 be the projection functions, so that

$$\mathsf{PA} \vdash \forall x \forall y (\pi_1(\langle x, y \rangle) = x \land \pi_2(\langle x, y \rangle) = y).$$

Then for any $c \in N$, there is an \mathcal{M} -definable $f : N \longrightarrow N$ such that $\mathcal{N} \models f(\langle a, b \rangle) = c$. Let us fix such c and f and define a subset of M as follows. There are four possibilities:

- $c \in M$. In this case, let $X = \{\langle x, y \rangle : \mathcal{M} \models f(\langle x, y \rangle) = c\}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{M} \models \forall n, m \in X(f(n) = f(m))$.
- $c \in \mathcal{M}(a) \setminus \mathcal{M}$. In this case, there are \mathcal{M} -definable g_1, g_2 such that

$$\mathcal{N} \models g_1(a) = c \land g_2(c) = a.$$

Let $X = \{\langle x, y \rangle : \mathcal{M} \models f(\langle x, y \rangle) = g_1(x) \land g_2(f(\langle x, y \rangle)) = x\}$. Notice that $\mathcal{M} \models \forall n, m \in X(f(n) = f(m) \iff \pi_1(n) = \pi_1(m))$.

• $c \in \mathcal{M}(b) \setminus \mathcal{M}$. Similarly, there are \mathcal{M} -definable g_1, g_2 such that $\mathcal{N} \models q_1(b) = c \land q_2(c) = b.$

Let $X = \{\langle x, y \rangle : \mathcal{M} \models f(\langle x, y \rangle) = g_1(y) \land g_2(f(\langle x, y \rangle)) = y\}.$ Again, one observes that $\mathcal{M} \models \forall n, m \in X(f(n) = f(m) \iff \pi_2(n) = \pi_2(m)).$

• $c \in \mathcal{N} \setminus (\mathcal{M}(a) \cup \mathcal{M}(b))$. In this case, there is \mathcal{M} -definable g such that

$$\mathcal{N} \models g(c) = \langle a, b \rangle.$$

Let $X = \{\langle x, y \rangle : \mathcal{M} \models g(f(\langle x, y \rangle)) = \langle x, y \rangle\}$. Here we observe that $\mathcal{M} \models \forall n, m \in X(f(n) = f(m) \iff n = m)$; that is, f is one to one on X.

In each of these cases, X is an infinite, \mathcal{M} -definable, set and $\mathcal{N} \models \langle a, b \rangle \in X$. Let us refer to an infinite, \mathcal{M} -definable X such that $\langle a, b \rangle \in X^{\mathcal{N}}$ as *large*.

Given any set X, we define the pseudo-representation $\alpha_X : \mathbf{B}_2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Eq}(X)$:

- $\alpha_X(0)$ is trivial,
- $(n,m) \in \alpha_X(a)$ iff $\pi_1(n) = \pi_1(m)$,
- $(n,m) \in \alpha_X(b)$ iff $\pi_2(n) = \pi_2(m)$, and
- $\alpha_X(1)$ is discrete.

12

Notice that whenever f is an \mathcal{M} -definable function, we can find $r \in \mathbf{B}_2$ and a large set X such that

$$\mathcal{M} \models \forall n, m \in X(f(n) = f(m) \iff (n, m) \in \alpha_X(r)).$$

We summarize the above as follows. Suppose $p(x) = \operatorname{tp}(\langle a, b \rangle / \mathcal{M})$ and let f be an \mathcal{M} -definable function. Then there is $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ defining a "large" set X and $r \in \mathbf{B}_2$ such that $\phi(x) \in p(x)$ and

$$\mathcal{M} \models \forall x, y[(\phi(x) \land \phi(y)) \Longrightarrow (f(x) = f(y) \Longleftrightarrow (x, y) \in \alpha_X(r))].$$

Examples like this one provide the motivation for the following definitions. They were first introduced by Schmerl in [15], and they have been refined over the years.

Definition 9. Let *L* be a finite lattice, *X* a set, and $\alpha : L \longrightarrow Eq(X)$ a representation.

- (1) Let $Y \subseteq X$. Then $\alpha | Y : L \longrightarrow Eq(Y)$ is the pseudo-representation given by $(\alpha | Y)(r) = \alpha(r) \cap Y^2$ for each $r \in L$.
- (2) Let $\beta : L \longrightarrow \text{Eq}(Y)$ be a pseudo-representation. Then $\alpha \cong \beta$ (α is *isomorphic* to β) if there is a bijection $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ such that for each $r \in L$, $(x, y) \in \alpha(r)$ if and only if $(f(x), f(y)) \in \beta(r)$.
- (3) Let $\Theta \in \text{Eq}(X)$. Θ is canonical for α if there is $r \in L$ such that for all $x, y \in X$, $(x, y) \in \Theta$ if and only if $(x, y) \in \alpha(r)$.
- (4) α has the 0-canonical partition property, or is 0-CPP, if for each $r \in L$, $\alpha(r)$ does not have exactly two classes.
- (5) α is (n + 1)-*CPP* if, for each $\Theta \in \text{Eq}(X)$ there is $Y \subseteq X$ such that $\alpha | Y$ is an *n*-CPP representation and $\Theta \cap Y^2$ is canonical for $\alpha | Y$.

Using these definitions, let us examine Example 8 once more from the other direction. Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and $X = [M]^2 = \{\langle x, y \rangle : x < y\}$. Then the representation $\alpha : \mathbf{B}_2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Eq}(X)$ given in Example 8 is *n*-CPP for each $n \in \omega$. To see this, first recall the Canonical Ramsey Theorem for pairs (CRT²): for every $f : [\omega]^2 \longrightarrow \omega$, there is an infinite $X \subseteq \omega$ such that f is canonical on $[X]^2$. That is, one of the following holds:

- f is one to one on $[X]^2$,
- f is constant on $[X]^2$,
- for all $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle$, $\langle x_2, y_2 \rangle \in [X]^2$, $f(x_1, y_1) = f(x_2, y_2)$ if and only if $x_1 = x_2$, or
- for all $\langle x_1, y_1 \rangle, \langle x_2, y_2 \rangle \in [X]^2, f(x_1, y_1) = f(x_2, y_2)$ if and only if $y_1 = y_2$.

This result is due to Erdős and Rado [2], and is a consequence of Ramsey's Theorem for 4-tuples. One can formalize this result in PA^* , so that if $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and $f : [M]^2 \longrightarrow M$ is \mathcal{M} -definable, there is an \mathcal{M} -definable, unbounded Y such that f is canonical on $[Y]^2$. Notice, then, that for such a set Y, $\alpha |[Y]^2 \cong \alpha$.

Clearly, α is 0-CPP. Moreover, if α is *n*-CPP, then by CRT^2 , for each $\Theta \in \mathrm{Eq}(X)$, there is $Y \subseteq X$ such that $\alpha \cong \alpha | Y$ and $\Theta \cap Y^2$ is canonical for $\alpha | Y$. Since $\alpha | Y \cong \alpha$, then $\alpha | Y$ is *n*-CPP, and therefore α is (n + 1)-CPP.

Given this α , one can construct an elementary extension \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbf{B}_2$. The idea is to construct a type p(x) ensuring that, for each \mathcal{M} -definable function f, there is some definable $Y \subseteq X$ such that the equivalence relation induced by f is canonical for α on Y, and that the defining formula for Y is in p(x).

To construct this type, we will construct an infinite descending sequence of "large" sets. Let $X_0 = [M]^2$. Enumerate the \mathcal{M} -definable equivalence relations $\Theta_0, \Theta_1, \ldots$. Given $\alpha | X_i$ and Θ_i , we use CRT^2 to find $X_{i+1} \subseteq X_i$ such that $\alpha | X_{i_1} \cong \alpha | X_i$ and Θ_i is canonical for $\alpha | X_{i+1}$. Finally, we let p(x) be the type

 $\{\phi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}) : \text{there is } i \in \omega \text{ such that } \mathcal{M} \models \forall x (x \in X_i \to \phi(x)) \}.$

We show that that p(x) is a complete type. This is, essentially, due to the fact that each $\alpha | X_i$ is 0-CPP. That is, given $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$, consider the equivalence relation Θ given by $(x, y) \in \Theta$ iff $\mathcal{M} \models \phi(x) \iff \phi(y)$. Let $\Theta = \Theta_i$, and notice that since Θ is canonical for $\alpha | X_{i+1}$ and Θ has at most two equivalence classes, it must be the case that $\Theta \cap X_{i+1}^2$ is trivial.

Let c realize p(x). We show why $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}(c)/\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbf{B}_2$. Because the pairing function is one to one, there are a and b such that $\mathcal{M}(c) \models c = \langle a, b \rangle$. We use the same names as in the lattice \mathbf{B}_2 (see Figure 1) suggestively. For each $d \in \mathcal{M}(c)$, let f be an \mathcal{M} -definable function such that $\mathcal{M}(c) \models f(c) = d$, and let Θ be the equivalence relation induced by f. Then there is a simple argument that exactly one of the following must hold:

- $\mathcal{M}(d) = \mathcal{M},$
- $\mathcal{M}(d) = \mathcal{M}(a),$
- $\mathcal{M}(d) = \mathcal{M}(b)$, or
- $\mathcal{M}(d) = \mathcal{M}(c).$

This is proved case by case by finding r and i such that $\Theta \cap X_i^2 = \alpha(r) \cap X_i^2$ (by canonicity). Moreover, it is clear that $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{M}(a), \mathcal{M}(b) \prec \mathcal{M}(c)$. One checks that $\mathcal{M}(a) \cap \mathcal{M}(b) = \mathcal{M}$.

The definitions used above relativize to a model $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$. Suppose $X \subseteq M$ is \mathcal{M} -definable and $\alpha : L \longrightarrow \mathrm{Eq}(X)$ is a representation. Then α is an \mathcal{M} -representation if α is \mathcal{M} -definable. If $X \in \mathrm{Def}(\mathcal{M})$, then by $\mathrm{Eq}^{\mathcal{M}}(X)$ we mean the lattice of \mathcal{M} -definable equivalence relations on X. Similarly, the notion of *n*-CPP representations formalizes in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{PA}}$ as well; in such cases, one only considers representations over \mathcal{M} -finite sets, and we quantify over the equivalence relations $\Theta \in \mathrm{Eq}^{\mathcal{M}}(X)$. That is, there is an $\mathcal{L}_{\mathsf{PA}}$ -formula $cpp_L(x)$ asserting that L has an (\mathcal{M} -finite) x-CPP representation.

In the construction of the type p(x) above, the two important ingredients needed at each step are:

- ensure that each $\alpha | X_i$ is 0-CPP, and
- ensure that each Θ_i is canonical for $\alpha | X_{i+1}$.

This observation naturally leads to the following definitions and results in [23] by James Schmerl, further refining the technique.

Definition 10 ([23, Definition 1.3]). Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and L a finite lattice. \mathcal{C} is an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of L if each \mathcal{C} is a nonempty set of 0-CPP \mathcal{M} -representations of L and whenever α : $L \longrightarrow \mathrm{Eq}(X) \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\Theta \in \mathrm{Eq}^{\mathcal{M}}(X)$, there is $Y \subseteq X$ such that $\alpha | Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\Theta \cap Y^2$ is canonical for $\alpha | Y$.

Returning to Example 8, we notice that if \mathcal{C} is the collection of $\alpha|Y$ such that Y is infinite, \mathcal{M} -definable and $\alpha|Y \cong \alpha$, then \mathcal{C} is an \mathcal{M} correct set of representations of \mathbf{B}_2 . Additionally, one observes that $\mathsf{PA} \vdash cpp_{\mathbf{B}_2}(n)$ for each $n \in \omega$. If $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ is nonstandard, by overspill there is a nonstandard c such that $\mathcal{M} \models cpp_{\mathbf{B}_2}(c)$. Then the collection of all \mathcal{M} -representations of \mathbf{B}_2 that are x-CPP for some nonstandard x is also \mathcal{M} -correct.

Theorem 11 ([23, Theorem 1.4]). Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and L be a finite lattice. Then:

- (1) If there is \mathcal{N} such that $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ and $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$, then there is an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of L.
- (2) If \mathcal{M} is countable and there is an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of L, then there is $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$.

7. RANKED LATTICES

In this section, we extend the definition of \mathcal{M} -correct sets of representations of a lattice to ranked lattices as in Section 4. Let us first consider Example 8 in the context of ranked lattices.

Let $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ be such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbf{B}_2$, and let $a, b \in N$ be such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = \{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}(a), \mathcal{M}(b), \mathcal{M}(a, b) = \mathcal{N}\}$ (as we did previously, we use a and b suggestively to correspond with $a, b \in \mathbf{B}_2$). Because the rankset is linearly ordered, it must be the case that either $\mathcal{M}(a) \prec_{\mathrm{cof}} \mathcal{N}$ or $\mathcal{M}(b) \prec_{\mathrm{cof}} \mathcal{N}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathcal{M}(b) \prec_{\mathrm{cof}} \mathcal{N}$. Therefore, the possible ranksets of $\mathrm{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ are:

- $\{\mathcal{N}\}$ (if $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathrm{cof}} \mathcal{N}$),
- $\{\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{M}(a), \mathcal{N}\}$ (if $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\text{end}} \mathcal{M}(a) \prec_{\text{end}} \mathcal{N}$), or,
- $\{\mathcal{M}(a), \mathcal{N}\}$ (if $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\mathrm{cof}} \mathcal{M}(a) \prec_{\mathrm{end}} \mathcal{N}$).

To study an example of a mixed extension, we consider the case where $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\text{cof}} \mathcal{M}(a) \prec_{\text{end}} \mathcal{N}$, and $\mathcal{M}(b) \prec_{\text{cof}} \mathcal{N}$. Recall that we referred to a set X as *large* if it is infinite, \mathcal{M} -definable, and $\langle a, b \rangle \in X^{\mathcal{N}}$. We look for properties to motivate a notion of "largeness" in a mixed extension.

Let $X = \{\langle x, y \rangle : x < y\}$ and α_X be as defined in Example 8. That is, $\alpha_X : \mathbf{B}_2 \to \mathrm{Eq}(A)$ is defined so that $\alpha_X(a)$ is the equivalence relation induced by π_1 (the projection onto the first coordinate, i.e. $\langle x, y \rangle \mapsto x$), and $\alpha_X(b)$ is the equivalence relation induced by π_2 (projection onto the second coordinate). Then there is an infinite, \mathcal{M} -definable $Y \subseteq A$ such that, letting α_Y be $\alpha_X | Y$:

- (1) There is a bounded set of representatives of the collection of all $\alpha_Y(a)$ -classes.
- (2) There is an unbounded $\alpha_Y(a)$ -class (that is, a class which contains unboundedly many $\alpha_Y(1)$ -classes).
- (3) Every $\alpha_Y(b)$ -class is \mathcal{M} -finite.

To see these, notice that since $\mathcal{M} \prec_{\text{cof}} \mathcal{M}(a)$, then there is $m \in M$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models a < m$. Let $Y = \{\langle x, y \rangle : x < m \text{ and } x < y\}$. The following statements are easily verified:

- There are (exactly) $m \alpha_Y(a)$ -classes (one for each x < m),
- each $\alpha_Y(a)$ -class is unbounded, and,
- each $\alpha_Y(b)$ -class has at most m elements.

Moreover, since $\mathcal{N} \models a < m$ and a < b, then $\mathcal{M} \models \langle a, b \rangle \in Y^{\mathcal{N}}$. Similarly to Example 8, if we define a set Y to be large if it is \mathcal{M} -definable, satisfies properties (1) - (3) and $\mathcal{N} \models \langle a, b \rangle \in Y^{\mathcal{N}}$, then whenever Y is large and $\Theta \in \operatorname{Eq}^{\mathcal{M}}(Y)$, there is large $Z \subseteq Y$ such that Θ is canonical for α_Z .

We point out here some specific features of this representation that follow from properties (1)-(3). These features, it turns out, need to be present for any representation of the ranked lattice (\mathbf{B}_2, ρ), where the rankset of ρ is $\{a, 1\}$. First, $0 < a = \rho(0)$. In every representation, $\alpha(0)$ is trivial. In this case, notice that, in a sense, the lone $\alpha_Y(0)$ class (Y) splits into boundedly many $\alpha_Y(a)$ -classes; we will make this notion more precise in the below definition. It is easy to see that each $\alpha_Y(a)$ -class is of the form $\{\langle x, y \rangle : x < y\}$ for some fixed $x \in M$ such that $\mathcal{M} \models x < m$ and that Y is the union of all of these classes.

Secondly, 0 < b but $b \not< \rho(0)$. Notice now that Y is not the union of an \mathcal{M} -bounded set of $\alpha_Y(b)$ -classes. Again, we can see this because each $\alpha_Y(b)$ -class is of the form $\{\langle x, y \rangle : x < y\}$ for some fixed $y \in M$.

Lastly, $b < 1 = \rho(b)$; again, see that each $\alpha_Y(b)$ -class splits into boundedly many $\alpha_Y(1)$ -classes; in other words, each $\alpha_Y(b)$ -class is \mathcal{M} finite.

Definition 12 ([23, Definition 1.6]). Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and (L, ρ) a finite ranked lattice.

- (1) If $A \in \text{Def}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\Theta \in \text{Eq}(A)$ is \mathcal{M} -definable, a set \mathcal{E} of Θ classes is \mathcal{M} -bounded if there is a bounded $I \in \text{Def}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $I \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for each $X \in \mathcal{E}$.
- (2) $\alpha: L \to \text{Eq}(A)$ is an \mathcal{M} -representation of (L, ρ) if α is an \mathcal{M} representation of L (that is, α is \mathcal{M} -definable) and whenever $r \leq s \in L, s \leq \rho(r)$ if and only if every $\alpha(r)$ -class is the union
 of an \mathcal{M} -bounded set of $\alpha(s)$ -classes.
- (3) C is an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of (L, ρ) if C is an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of L and each $\alpha \in C$ is an \mathcal{M} -correct representation of (L, ρ) .

Notice in the above example, that whenever $X \subseteq A$ is large, α_X is an \mathcal{M} -representation of (\mathbf{B}_2, ρ) , where ρ is the ranking whose rankset is $\{a, 1\}$.

Theorem 13 ([23, Theorem 1.7]). Suppose $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and (L, ρ) is a finite ranked lattice.

- (1) If there is \mathcal{N} such that $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ and $\operatorname{Ltr}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong (L, \rho)$, then there is an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of (L, ρ) .
- (2) If \mathcal{M} is countable and there is an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of (L, ρ) , then there is $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Ltr}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong (L, \rho)$.

We turn now to an example of an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of \mathbf{M}_3 (see Figure 1). First we define a representation $\alpha : \mathbf{M}_3 \to \mathrm{Eq}(3)$, where 3 is the set $\{0, 1, 2\}$. Define this representation as follows:

- the equivalence classes of $\alpha(a)$ are $\{0\}$ and $\{1, 2\}$,
- the equivalence classes of $\alpha(b)$ are $\{0, 2\}$ and $\{1\}$, and,
- the equivalence classes of $\alpha(c)$ are $\{0,1\}$ and $\{2\}$.

Let \mathcal{M} be a countable, nonstandard model and $m \in \mathcal{M}$ (standard or nonstandard). Let 3^m refer to the set of (codes of) \mathcal{M} -finite sequences s whose length is m and, for each i < m, $(s)_i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Define $\alpha^m : \mathbf{M}_3 \to \mathrm{Eq}(3^m)$ by letting $(s,t) \in \alpha^m(r)$ if and only if $((s)_i, (t)_i) \in \alpha(r)$ for each i < m. Notice that each of these representations is a representation of (\mathbf{M}_3, ρ) where $\rho(r) = 1$ for each $r \in \mathbf{M}_3$ (that is, there are \mathcal{M} -boundedly many $\alpha^m(a)$ classes, each one is \mathcal{M} -bounded, etc).

It turns out that the set of α^m when m is nonstandard forms an \mathcal{M} -correct set of representations of (\mathbf{M}_3, ρ) . This is not obvious: one appeals to a generalization of the Hales-Jewett Theorem due to Prömel and Voigt. In fact, this phenomenon can be generalized to any finite lattice L which can be represented as a congruence lattice of a finite algebra.

7.1. Congruence Lattices. An algebra is a structure of the form $(A, \langle f_i : i \in I \rangle)$, where A is a set, I is an index set, and for each $i \in I$, there is some $n \in \omega$ such that $f_i : A^n \to A$ (we allow for n to be 0, in which case such an f_i is a constant).

If $\mathcal{A} = (A, \langle f_i : i \in I \rangle)$ is an algebra, then a *congruence* is an equivalence relation θ on A which commutes with all of the f_i . That is, for each $i \in I$, if $f_i : A^n \to A$ and \bar{a}, \bar{b} are tuples of length n such that $(a_j, b_j) \in \theta$ for all j < n, then $(f_i(\bar{a}), f_i(\bar{b})) \in \theta$. The set of all congruences on an algebra \mathcal{A} is denoted $\operatorname{Cg}(\mathcal{A})$, and forms a sublattice of Eq(\mathcal{A}).

In the definition below, for a lattice L, we let L^d be its dual, i.e., L with its ordering reversed.

Definition 14. [7, Definition 4.5.7] Let L be a finite lattice and α : $L \to \text{Eq}(A)$ a representation. α is a *congruence representation* if there is an algebra \mathcal{A} such that α is an isomorphism of L and $\text{Cg}(\mathcal{A})^d$.

Every algebraic lattice is isomorphic to a congruence algebra [4]. It is a well-known open question in universal algebra whether every finite lattice has a *finite* congruence representation; that is, if it can be represented as $Cg(\mathcal{A})$ for a finite algebra \mathcal{A} . This problem is referred to as the *finite lattice representation problem*. In conjunction with the next result due to Schmerl ([16]), a positive result to the finite lattice representation of the lattice problem for models of PA to finite lattices.

Theorem 15. Let *L* be a finite lattice which has a finite congruence representation. Then every countable nonstandard $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ has a cofinal elementary extension \mathcal{N} such that $\mathrm{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$.

As mentioned before, the proof of this is a generalization of the result for \mathbf{M}_3 given above. For details, see [7, Section 4.5], and, in particular, [7, Theorem 4.5.27 and Corollary 4.5.28].

8. Diversity

The early results of Gaifman and Mills mentioned in Section 3 relied heavily on applications of minimal and end extensional types. For a given \mathcal{M} if \mathcal{N} is generated over \mathcal{N} by a set A of elements realizing the same minimal type of $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}, a)_{a \in \mathcal{M}}$, then $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomorphic to the Boolean algebra of subsets of A and the isomorphism type over \mathcal{M} of each model in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is determined by the cardinality of its set of generators. In particular, if A is finite of cardinality n, then there are exactly n + 1 isomorphism types of models in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$. If \mathcal{N} is generated over \mathcal{M} by a finite set of elements realizing mutually independent minimal types then no distinct models in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ are isomorphic.

In [17] Schmerl asked if there is more that can be said about the diversity of isomorphism types in $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$. He called a model *diverse* if no two of its elementary submodels are isomorphic, and called an extension \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} diverse if no two models in $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ are isomorphic over \mathcal{M} .

All results in the rest of this section are from [17]. Schmerl notes that the first theorem suggests that constructing models that are not diverse is more difficult than constructing diverse ones.

- (1) If \mathcal{M} is not an elementary extension of the standard model and $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M})$ is finite, then there is a diverse \mathcal{N} such that $\mathcal{M} \equiv \mathcal{N}$ and $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}) \cong \operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N})$.
- (2) Let L be a finite lattice. If \mathcal{M} is nonstandard and has an elementary extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})\cong L$, then \mathcal{M} has a cofinal diverse extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})\cong L$.

Because a model is diverse just in case it is a diverse extension of its prime elementary submodel, the first theorem above is an easy consequence of the second. The proof of the second theorem is not easy, invoking, at one point, a canonical partition theorem of Prömel and Voigt.

If E is an equivalence relation on a lattice L, then (L, E) is an equivalenced lattice. Lt⁺(\mathcal{M}) is (Lt(\mathcal{N}), E), where E is the isomorphism relation, and Lt⁺(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) is (Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}), E), where E is the isomorphism relation for the isomorphisms that fix M pointwise. With this notation, the basic lattice problem gets generalized to **Problem 2.** For which finite equivalenced lattices (L, E) are there models \mathcal{M} such that $Lt^+(\mathcal{M})\cong (L, E)$ and for which finite equivalenced lattices L are there models \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} such that $Lt^+(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})\cong (L, E)$?

Right from the start one can see that some equivalenced lattices cannot be represented as substructure and interstructure lattices for obvious reasons. For example if L is N_5 and $(b, c) \in E$ (Figure 2), then, as Schmerl writes: "it would not be at all reasonable to expect such models." This leads to the definition of reasonable equivalenced lattice.

Before giving the definition, let us observe that by Ehrenfeucht's lemma, each finitely generated \mathcal{K} in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is rigid over \mathcal{M} , i.e., if $a \in N$ generates \mathcal{K} , then for all $b \in K$ if $\operatorname{tp}(a/M) = \operatorname{tp}(b/M)$ then a = b. It follows that if \mathcal{K}_1 and \mathcal{K}_2 in $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ are isomorphic over \mathcal{M} , for $i = 1, 2, \mathcal{K}_i$ is the Skolem closure of $M \cup \{a_i\}$, and $\operatorname{tp}(a_1/M) =$ $\operatorname{tp}(a_2/M)$, then there is a unique isomorphism $F : \mathcal{K}_1 \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}_2$ such that $F(a_1) = a_2$.

If (L, E) is a finite equivalenced lattice and $F : L \longrightarrow Lt^+(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is an isomorphism, then we can define a linear order \triangleleft of L as follows. For each $r \in L$ select a generator a_r of F(r) over \mathcal{M} so that for all rand s, if $(r, s) \in E$, then $tp(a_r/\mathcal{M}) = tp(a_s/\mathcal{M})$ and define $r \triangleleft s$ iff $a_r < a_s$.

Schmerl calls an equivalenced lattice (L, E) reasonable if there is a linear ordering \lhd on L such that whenever $(a, b) \in E$ and I and J are the principal ideals of L generated by a and b respectively, then there is an isomorphism $f : (I, \lhd \cap I^2) \longrightarrow (J, \lhd \cap J^2)$ such that $(x, f(x)) \in E$ for all $x \in I$. One can directly check that if $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is finite, then $Lt^+(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is reasonable.

The definition given above is from the later Schmerl's paper [19]. Under a less restrictive definition given in [17], Schmerl proves that for every reasonable equivalenced Boolean lattice (\mathbf{B}_n, E) , every nonstandard model \mathcal{M} has a cofinal extension such that $\mathrm{Lt}^+(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomoprhic to (\mathbf{B}_n, E) . In [19] this is generalized to: under the revised definition given above, for every reasonable equivalenced distributive lattice (L, E), every nonstandard model \mathcal{M} has a cofinal extension such that $\mathrm{Lt}^+(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is isomoprhic to (L, E).

Among many open problems about diversity, this is probably the simplest:

Question 1. Let \mathcal{M} be countable and nonstandard. Is there a nondiverse extension \mathcal{N} such that either $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = N_5$ or $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = M_3$?

9. Coded sets and distributive lattices

Recall that if \mathcal{N} is an end extension of \mathcal{M} , then $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is $\{X \cap M : X \in \operatorname{Def}(\mathcal{N})\}$. We referred to this as the family of *coded sets* in the extension. Schmerl [21] characterized exactly which families of subsets of a model of PA (of arbitrary cardinality) can appear as $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ when \mathcal{N} is a minimal elementary end extension of \mathcal{M} ; i.e. an extension where $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong \mathbf{2}$.

Theorem 16 ([21, Theorem 3]). If $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, the following are equivalent:

- (1) There is a countably generated extension $\mathcal{N} \succ_{end} \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}$ and every set that is Π_1^0 -definable in $(\mathcal{M}, \mathfrak{X})$ is the union of countably many Σ_1^0 -definable sets.
- (2) There is a minimal extension $\mathcal{N} \succ_{end} \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}$.

Previously, Schmerl [20] characterized the families of sets that can appear as $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ is any countably generated elementary end extension \mathcal{N} of a model \mathcal{M} , so this result completes the picture for minimal extensions.

A simple construction³ shows that the same characterization of those coded sets holds for any finite distributive lattice D. That is:

Proposition 17. Let $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ and $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$. The following are equivalent:

- (1) There is a minimal elementary end extension \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{M} such that $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}.$
- (2) For any finite distributive lattice D, there is $\mathcal{N} \succ_{end} \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong D$ and $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}$.

Before we describe Schmerl's proof of this result, we need the following facts about finite distributive lattices (see [7, Section 4.3]). Let Lbe a lattice and $a \in L$. The *a*-doubling extension of L is the sublattice L' of $L \times \mathbf{2}$ (ordered lexicographically; i.e., $(r, i) \leq (s, j)$ iff $r \leq s$ and $i \leq j$) defined as $\{(r, i) \in L \times \mathbf{2} : i = 0 \text{ or } r \geq a\}$. [7, Theorem 4.3.6] states that a finite lattice L is distributive if and only if there is sequence L_0, \ldots, L_n of lattices such that L_0 is the one-element lattice, $L_n \cong L$, and each L_{i+1} is a doubling extension of L_i .

Proof. (2) \implies (1) is clear since **2** is a finite distributive lattice, so assume that $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ is a minimal elementary end extension and D

 $^{^{3}}$ Schmerl (2017) via private communication

is a finite distributive lattice. Then let $L_0, \ldots, L_n \cong D$ be the finite sequence of doubling extensions as stated above.

We show that whenever $\mathcal{M}_1 \prec_{\text{end}} \mathcal{M}_2$ is such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}_2/\mathcal{M}_1)$ is finite, then for any $\mathcal{K} \in \operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}_2/\mathcal{M}_1)$, \mathcal{M}_2 has an elementary end extension \mathcal{N}' such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}'/\mathcal{M}_1)$ is isomorphic to the \mathcal{K} -doubling extension of $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}_2/\mathcal{M}_1)$. The conclusion to (2) follows, since if $\mathcal{M}_1 \prec_{\text{end}}$ $\mathcal{M}_2 \prec_{\text{end}} \mathcal{N}'$, then $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}'/\mathcal{M}_1) = \operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{M}_2/\mathcal{M}_1)$.

To find such an \mathcal{N}' , first notice that since $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}_2/\mathcal{M}_1)$ is finite, then $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{M}_1(a)$ for some $a \in K$. Let $\mathcal{M}_0 = \operatorname{Scl}(a)$. By [7, Theorem 4.3.2], since \mathcal{M}_0 is countable, \mathcal{M}_2 has an elementary end extension \mathcal{N}' such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}')$ is isomorphic to the \mathcal{M}_0 -doubling extension of $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}_2)$. This \mathcal{N}' is as required; that is, $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}'/\mathcal{M}_1)$ is isomorphic to the \mathcal{K} -doubling extension of $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}_2/\mathcal{M}_1)$. This follows immediately because $\mathcal{M}_0 \vee \mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{K}$.

Note that if \mathcal{M} is countable and $\mathfrak{X} = \text{Def}(\mathcal{M})$, the conclusion to (1) holds since every countable model has conservative minimal elementary end extensions. Since the pentagon lattice \mathbf{N}_5 cannot be realized as the interstructure lattice of a conservative end extension, we do not have the same characterization for non-distributive lattices.

10. Countable recursively saturated models

In this survey we are mostly concerned with the problem of finding, for a given lattice L, a substructure or interstructure lattice representation of L with or without some additional properties. In this section we will briefly discuss a dual problem for a particular class of models. Given a countable recursively saturated model, what can we say about its substructure lattice?

A model \mathcal{M} is recursively saturated if it is saturated with the respect to computable types with finite numbers of parameters. The *standard system* of a model \mathcal{M} , $SSy(\mathcal{M})$, is the set of standard parts of the definable subsets of \mathcal{M} , i.e., $SSy(\mathcal{M}) = Cod(\mathcal{M}/\mathbb{N})$, where \mathbb{N} is the standard model. It is not difficult to prove that any two countable recursively saturated models are isomorphic if and only if they are elementarily equivalent and they have the same standard system.

For the rest of this section, let \mathcal{M} be countable and recursively saturated.

The lattice $Lt(\mathcal{M})$ is immense. If the domain of a model \mathcal{K} in $Lt(\mathcal{M})$ is an initial segment of \mathcal{M} we call \mathcal{K} an *elementary cut*. Henryk Kotlarski proved that the set of elementary cuts of \mathcal{M} ordered by inclusion is isomorphic to 2^{ω} with the lexicographic ordering. Moreover, he proved that the set of elementary cuts that are recursively saturated is uncountable, dense, and is closed under infinite unions but not under infinite intersections [9]. All recursively saturated elementary cuts have the same standard system; hence, they are isomorphic to one another. Yet, there are continuum many first-order theories of pairs (\mathcal{M}, K) , where \mathcal{K} is a recursively saturated elementary cut [24].

An elementary cut of \mathcal{M} is not recursively saturated if and only if it is a closure under initial segment of the Skolem closure of single element of \mathcal{M} . Every recursively saturated model realizes countably many mutually independent minimal types. It follows that there are countably many isomorphism types of elementary cuts that are not recursively saturated. Moreover, each cut that is not recursively saturated, except for the closure under initial segment of Scl(0), has countably many automorphic images; hence the isomorphism relation of Lt(\mathcal{M}) restricted to such cuts has countably many countable equivalence classes.

Elementary cuts are linearly ordered by inclusion; hence they form a distributive sublattice of $Lt(\mathcal{M})$. To show that $Lt(\mathcal{M})$ is not distributive one needs to find out more about $Lt_0(\mathcal{M})$. This requires heavier artillery.

Theorem 18. If $\mathcal{M} \models \mathsf{PA}$ is countable and recursively saturated, then $Lt(\mathcal{M})$ is not distributive.

Proof. As mentioned before, if a finite lattice L is isomorphic to $Lt(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M})$ for some \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} , then every countable nonstandard $\mathcal{M}_0 \equiv \mathcal{M}$ has a cofinal extension \mathcal{N}_0 such that $Lt(\mathcal{N}_0/\mathcal{M}_0) \cong L$ (see [7, Corollary 4.5.23]).⁴ In [18], Schmerl shows that the conclusion of the above corollary can be strengthened by adding that $SSy(\mathcal{M}_0) = SSy(\mathcal{N}_0)$.

Let \mathcal{M} be countable and recursively saturated and \mathcal{M}_0 be the prime model of $T = \text{Th}(\mathcal{M})$. First, we assume that \mathcal{M}_0 is nonstandard. If Lis one of the finite lattices that can be represented as an interstucture lattice of models of T, then it follows that \mathcal{M}_0 has a cofinal extension \mathcal{N}_0 such that $\text{Lt}(\mathcal{N}_0/\mathcal{M}_0) \cong L$ and $\text{SSy}(\mathcal{M}_0) = \text{SSy}(\mathcal{N}_0)$. Let \mathcal{N}_0 be such an extension. Then, \mathcal{N}_0 elementarily embeds into every recursively saturated model of T, so there is \mathcal{K} in $\text{Lt}(\mathcal{M})$ such that $\text{Lt}(\mathcal{K})$ is isomorphic to L. In particular there are such \mathcal{K} for $L = \mathbf{N}_5$ and $L = \mathbf{M}_3$; hence $\text{Lt}(\mathcal{M})$ is not distributive.

If T is True Arithmetic, i.e., the theory of the standard model, then \mathcal{M}_0 is standard. In this case, the argument above can be repeated after first extending \mathcal{M}_0 to a conservative minimal extension \mathcal{M}_1 and then extending \mathcal{M}_1 cofinally to \mathcal{N}_0 as above. Then $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}_0)$ is isomorphic to L with one new element appended at the bottom of L.

⁴This was proved earlier by S. F. Soprunov [25].

Much can be said about cofinal submodels of \mathcal{M} . It follows from [8, Theorem 7.1] that \mathcal{M} has continuum many cofinal submodels \mathcal{K} such that each is isomorphic to \mathcal{M} , $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{K})$ is the three-element lattice **3**, and for distinct \mathcal{K}_1 , \mathcal{K}_2 , $\operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K}_1) \neq \operatorname{Th}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{K}_2)$. In the recent paper [22], after much work, Schmerl improves this by replacing **3** by **2**, i.e., for each \mathcal{K} , \mathcal{M} is a minimal extension of \mathcal{K} .

At the end of [9], Kotlarski posed a general problem to describe the structure of $Lt(\mathcal{M})$ for countable recursively saturated \mathcal{M} . In particular, he asked whether $Lt(\mathcal{M})$ depends on \mathcal{M} . The results about finite sublattices of $Lt(\mathcal{M})$ apply to all such models. So to try to answer Kotlarski's question, the next step is to consider other compact elements of $Lt(\mathcal{M})$, i.e., finitely generated $\mathcal{K} \prec \mathcal{M}$ such that $Lt(\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{K})$ is infinite.

A partial answer to Kotlarski's question is given in [6, Section 5]. It solves the problem for arithmetically saturated models. A recursively saturated model of PA is *arithmetically saturated* if its standard system is closed under arithmetic comprehension. It is shown in [6] that if \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} are countable arithmetically saturated models of the same completion of PA, then $\mathcal{M} \cong \mathcal{N}$ if and only if $Lt(\mathcal{M}) \cong Lt(\mathcal{N})$. For the proof, Schmerl introduced a family of countably infinite, distributive lattices D(X), one for each set of natural numbers X, such that:

- (1) if X and Y are distinct then D(X) and D(Y) are not isomorphic;
- (2) if \mathcal{M} is arithmetically saturated and D(X) is isomorphic to an ideal of $Lt(\mathcal{M})$, then X is in the standard system of \mathcal{M} ; and,
- (3) if \mathcal{M} is recursively saturated and X is in the standard system of \mathcal{M} , then D(X) is isomorphic to an ideal of $Lt(\mathcal{M})$.

For arithmetically saturated models, the Lemmas in items (2) and (3) could be stated as an equivalence. The reason for their separation is that while the proof of (2) is relatively easy, it seems to require the full strength of arithmetic saturation. Lemma (3) holds for all recursively saturated models, but its proof heavily depends on the methods developed by Schmerl in [15] and [16] and is not easy.

In another direction, it is observed in [8, Lemma 7.2] that for all \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{K} , if \mathcal{K} is cofinal in \mathcal{N} , then $\mathrm{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{K})$ is interpretable in (\mathcal{N}, K) . This follows from the fact that for all a, b in N,

$$\mathcal{K}(a) \preccurlyeq \mathcal{K}(b) \text{ iff } (\mathcal{N}, K) \models \forall u \in K \exists v \in K[(u)_a = (v)_b],$$

where $(c)_x$ is the *x*-th term of the sequence coded by *c* in \mathcal{N} . It follows that if for $i = 1, 2, \mathcal{K}_i$ is cofinal in \mathcal{N}_i , and $(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{K}_1)$ and $(\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$

are elementarily equivalent, then $\operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}_1/K_1)$ and $\operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}_2/K_2)$ are elementarily equivalent, and it was asked if in this statement Lt_0 can be replaced by Lt. It turns out not to be the case. A counterexample, in which $\operatorname{Lt}_0(\mathcal{N}_1, \mathcal{K}_1)$ is an $\omega + 1$ chain and $(\mathcal{N}_2, \mathcal{K}_2)$ is a recursively saturated pair elementarily equivalent to (\mathcal{N}_1, K_1) , is given in [18].

11. Open Questions

There are several questions which remain open about the lattice problem. The following were posed by Schmerl via private communication. All relevant definitions can be found in [7, Chapter 4].

- (1) Is every finite lattice L which can appear as an interstructure lattice the congruence lattice of some finite algebra? That is, if L is a finite lattice for which there are $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$, is L a congruence lattice of a finite algebra?
- (2) Is there a finite lattice L for which there are countable, nonstandard \mathcal{M}_0 and \mathcal{M}_1 for which there is $\mathcal{N}_0 \succ \mathcal{M}_0$ such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}_0/\mathcal{M}_0) \cong L$, but for no $\mathcal{N}_1 \succ \mathcal{M}_1$ is $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}_1/\mathcal{M}_1) \cong L$?
- (3) It is known that if L is a finite lattice that is the congruence lattice of a finite algebra, then so is its dual L^d . Does the same result hold for finite lattices L such that there are $\mathcal{M} \prec \mathcal{N}$ where $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$? That is, if L is a finite interstructure lattice, is its dual also an interstructure lattice?
- (4) Every finite lattice in the variety generated by \mathbf{M}_3 is the congruence lattice of a finite algebra. For every \aleph_0 -algebraic lattice L in this variety and every countable, nonstandard \mathcal{M} , is there $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$?
- (5) For countable \mathcal{M} , what are the possible $\mathfrak{X} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ for which there is an elementary end extension \mathcal{N} such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong$ \mathbf{N}_5 and $\operatorname{Cod}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) = \mathfrak{X}$?
- (6) Is the set of finite lattices for which given (some, all, or a specific) countable, nonstandard \mathcal{M} , there is $\mathcal{N} \succ \mathcal{M}$ such that $\operatorname{Lt}(\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}) \cong L$ computable?

References

- Andreas Blass. The intersection of nonstandard models of arithmetic. J. Symbolic Logic, 37:103–106, 1972.
- [2] P. Erdős and R. Rado. A combinatorial theorem. J. London Math. Soc., 25:249– 255, 1950.
- [3] Haim Gaifman. Models and types of Peano's arithmetic. Ann. Math. Logic, 9(3):223–306, 1976.
- [4] George Grätzer and Elégius T Schmidt. Characterizations of congruence lattices of abstract algebras. Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged), 24(3):34–59, 1963.

- [5] Julia F. Knight. Hanf numbers for omitting types over particular theories. J. Symbolic Logic, 41(3):583–588, 1976.
- [6] Roman Kossak and James H. Schmerl. Arithmetically saturated models of arithmetic. Notre Dame J. Formal Logic, 36(4):531–546, 1995. Special Issue: Models of arithmetic.
- [7] Roman Kossak and James H. Schmerl. The structure of models of Peano arithmetic, volume 50 of Oxford Logic Guides. The Clarendon Press Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006. Oxford Science Publications.
- [8] Roman Kossak and James H. Schmerl. On cofinal submodels and elementary interstices. Notre Dame J. Form. Log., 53(3):267–287, 2012.
- [9] Henryk Kotlarski. On elementary cuts in recursively saturated models of Peano arithmetic. Fund. Math., 120(3):205-222, 1984.
- [10] George Harlow Mills. A model of Peano arithmetic with no elementary end extension. J. Symbolic Logic, 43(3):563–567, 1978.
- [11] George Harlow Mills. Substructure lattices of models of arithmetic. Ann. Math. Logic, 16(2):145–180, 1979.
- [12] J. B. Paris. On models of arithmetic. In Conference in Mathematical Logic— London '70 (Proc. Conf., Bedford Coll., London, 1970), Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 255, pages 251–280. Springer, Berlin, 1972.
- [13] J. B. Paris. Models of arithmetic and the 1 3 1 lattice. Fund. Math., 95(3):195–199, 1977.
- [14] James H. Schmerl. Extending models of arithmetic. Ann. Math. Logic, 14:89– 109, 1978.
- [15] James H. Schmerl. Substructure lattices of models of Peano arithmetic. In Logic colloquium '84 (Manchester, 1984), volume 120 of Stud. Logic Found. Math., pages 225–243. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1986.
- [16] James H. Schmerl. Finite substructure lattices of models of Peano arithmetic. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 117(3):833–838, 1993.
- [17] James H. Schmerl. Diversity in substructures. In Nonstandard models of arithmetic and set theory, volume 361 of Contemp. Math., pages 145–161. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.
- [18] James H. Schmerl. Substructure lattices and almost minimal end extensions of models of Peano arithmetic. MLQ Math. Log. Q., 50(6):533–539, 2004.
- [19] James H. Schmerl. Nondiversity in substructures. J. Symbolic Logic, 73(1):193– 211, 2008.
- [20] James H Schmerl. Subsets coded in elementary end extensions. Archive for Mathematical Logic, 53(5-6), 2014.
- [21] James H. Schmerl. Minimal elementary end extensions. Archive for Mathematical Logic, 56(5):541–553, 2017.
- [22] James H. Schmerl. The diversity of minimal cofinal extensions. Notre Dame J. Form. Log., 63(4):493–514, 2022.
- [23] James H. Schmerl. The pentagon as a substructure lattices of models of Peano arithmetic. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, page 1–25, 2024.
- [24] C. Smoryński. A note on initial segment constructions in recursively saturated models of arithmetic. Notre Dame J. Formal Logic, 23(4):393–408, 1982.
- [25] S. F. Soprunov. Lattices of nonstandard arithmetics. In Studies in nonclassical logics and set theory (Russian), pages 146–173. "Nauka", Moscow, 1979.

[26] A. J. Wilkie. On models of arithmetic having non-modular substructure lattices. Fund. Math., 95(3):223–237, 1977.