

# HOMOGENEOUS ULTRAMETRIC STRUCTURES

WIESŁAW KUBIŚ, CHRISTIAN PECH, AND MAJA PECH

**ABSTRACT.** We develop the theory of homogeneous Polish ultrametric structures. Our starting point is a Fraïssé class of finite structures and the crucial tool is the universal homogeneous epimorphism. The new Fraïssé limit is an inverse limit, nevertheless its universality is with respect to embeddings and, contrary to the Polish metric Fraïssé theory of Ben Yaacov [2], homogeneity is strict. Our development can be viewed as the third step of building a Borel-like hierarchy of Fraïssé limits, where the first step was the classical setting of Fraïssé and the second step is the more recent theory, due to Irwin and Solecki [10], of pro-finite Fraïssé limits.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In 1953 Roland Fraïssé introduced the notion of an “age” as a tool to specify a class of (relational) structures [9].

If  $\mathbf{A}$  is a model-theoretic structure, then by  $\text{Age}(\mathbf{A})$  we denote the class of all finitely generated structures that embed into  $\mathbf{A}$ . Here a model-theoretic structure is specified through

- (1) a signature  $\Sigma = (\Phi, P, \text{ar})$  where  $\Phi$  and  $P$  are mutually disjoint sets of operational symbols and relational symbols, respectively, and where  $\text{ar}$  is a function that assigns to each element of  $\Phi \cup P$  its arity (0-ary operational symbols take the role of constant symbols),
- (2) a tuple  $\mathbf{A} = (A, (f^{\mathbf{A}})_{f \in \Phi}, (\rho^{\mathbf{A}})_{\rho \in P})$ , where for all  $f \in \Phi, \rho \in P$  we have that  $f^{\mathbf{A}}: A^{\text{ar}(f)} \rightarrow A$ , and  $\rho^{\mathbf{A}} \subseteq A^{\text{ar}(\rho)}$ .

A structure  $\mathbf{B}$  is said to be younger than  $\mathbf{A}$  if  $\text{Age}(\mathbf{B}) \subseteq \mathbf{A}$  (originally, Fraïssé used the notation  $\gamma_{\mathbf{A}}$  for  $\text{Age}(\mathbf{A})$  and denoted the class of structures younger than  $\mathbf{A}$  by  $\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}$ ).

Initially Fraïssé introduced ages for his famous characterization of countable homogeneous structures (recall that a structure  $\mathbf{A}$  is called *homogeneous* if every isomorphism between finitely generated substructures of  $\mathbf{A}$  extends to an automorphism of  $\mathbf{A}$ ):

**1.1. Theorem ([8]).** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of finitely generated structures of the same type. Then  $\mathcal{C}$  is the age of a countable homogeneous structure if and only if*

- (1) *up to isomorphism  $\mathcal{C}$  contains countably many structures,*
- (2)  *$\mathcal{C}$  has the hereditary property (HP), i.e.,*

$$\forall \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} : \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{C}, \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B} \implies \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C},$$

- (3)  *$\mathcal{C}$  has the joint embedding property (JEP), i.e.,*

$$\forall \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{C} \exists \mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C} : \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C},$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03C30; Secondary: 03C52, 03C68.

*Key words and phrases.* Fraïssé limit, ultrametric, metric structure, amalgamated extension property.

The research of the first and the second author was supported by GA ČR (Czech Science Foundation) grant EXPRO 20-31529X.

The third author was supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia through Grant No. 174018.

(4)  $\mathcal{C}$  has the amalgamation property (AP), i.e.,

$\forall \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2 \in \mathcal{C}, \iota_1: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_1, \iota_2: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_2 \exists \mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}, \kappa_1: \mathbf{B}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}, \kappa_2: \mathbf{B}_2 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$  :  
the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B}_1 & \xleftarrow{\kappa_1} & \mathbf{C} \\ \uparrow \iota_1 & & \uparrow \kappa_2 \\ \mathbf{A} & \xleftarrow{\iota_2} & \mathbf{B}_2 \end{array}$$

Moreover, any two countable homogeneous structures with the same age are isomorphic.

The proof of this theorem usually involves the construction of an  $\omega$ -tower

$$\mathbf{A}_0 \xrightarrow{\leq} \mathbf{A}_1 \xrightarrow{\leq} \mathbf{A}_2 \xrightarrow{\leq} \mathbf{A}_3 \xrightarrow{\leq} \dots$$

of structures from  $\mathcal{C}$ . Clearly, the union

$$\mathbf{A}_\infty := \bigcup_{i < \omega} \mathbf{A}_i$$

has age  $\mathcal{C}$  if and only if the family  $(\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}$  is *cofinal* in  $\mathcal{C}$ , i.e.,

$$\forall \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{C} \exists i < \omega : \mathbf{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{A}_i.$$

It was shown in [13] that if  $\text{Age}(\mathbf{A}_\infty) = \mathcal{C}$ , then  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  is homogeneous if and only if the tower  $(\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}$  has the *absorption property*:

$$\forall \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{C}, i < \omega, \iota: \mathbf{A}_i \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B} \exists k < \omega, \hat{\iota}: \mathbf{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{A}_k : \hat{\iota} \circ \iota = \iota_i^k,$$

where  $\iota_i^k$  is the inclusion homomorphism of  $\mathbf{A}_i$  into  $\mathbf{A}_k$ .

Starting with an age  $\mathcal{C}$  the existence of a cofinal  $\omega$ -tower  $(\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}$  with the absorption property may be proved using an abstract version of Banach-Mazur games (see [12]).

All this emphasizes the role of  $\omega$ -towers when studying countable structures. A class  $\mathcal{C}$  of finitely generated structures is called a *hereditary class* if it has the HP. Clearly, the class of all countably generated structures whose age is contained in a given hereditary class  $\mathcal{C}$  coincides with the class of all those structures that can be expressed as the union of an  $\omega$ -tower of elements from  $\mathcal{C}$ . This motivates the following definition:

**1.2. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of structures of the same type. Then we define

$$\sigma\mathcal{C} := \{\mathbf{A} \mid \mathbf{A} \text{ is the union of an } \omega\text{-tower of elements from } \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Classes of the shape  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  have been the subject of numerous investigations in model theory and in combinatorics. Questions of interest are, e.g., about the existence of universal structures, generic structures, Ramsey-structures, or homogeneous structures in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ .

## 2. FROM COLIMITS OF $\omega$ -CHAINS TO LIMITS OF $\omega$ -COCHAINS

The construction of structures as unions of towers of structures is a special case of a very general, category theoretical construction — colimits of functors (cf. [15]). In the present case we start with the category  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  that has as object-class the class  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  of all  $\Sigma$ -structures and as morphisms the homomorphisms between  $\Sigma$ -structures. In  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  we fix the subcategory  $\mathcal{C}$  induced by  $\mathcal{C}$ . In this setting an  $\omega$ -tower is simply a special case of a functor of  $\omega$  to  $\mathcal{C}$  (here  $\omega$  denotes the category that has finite ordinals as objects and morphisms  $i \rightarrow j$  for all  $i \leq j < \omega$ ). The  $\omega$ -tower  $(\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}$  corresponds

the functor  $F: \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ , where  $F(i) = \mathbf{A}_i$  and where  $F(i \rightarrow j)$  is the identical embedding of  $\mathbf{A}_i$  into  $\mathbf{A}_j$ . The union  $\mathbf{A}_\infty = \bigcup_{i < \omega} \mathbf{A}_i$  is a colimit of  $F$  in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  with limiting cocone  $(\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$ , where  $\alpha_i^\infty: \mathbf{A}_i \hookrightarrow \mathbf{A}_\infty$  is the identical embedding (in order for this to be precise we need to consider  $F$  as a functor from  $\omega$  to  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  which is not a problem since  $\mathcal{C}$  is a subcategory of  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ ).

It is not hard to see that for every hereditary class  $\mathcal{C}$  we have that  $\sigma^{\mathcal{C}}$  consists of all colimits of functors  $F: \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  for which  $F$  maps morphisms to embeddings. This motivates the following definition:

**2.1. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of structures of the same type. An  $\omega$ -chain in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a functor  $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}: \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  that maps morphisms of  $\omega$  to embeddings in  $\mathcal{C}$ . If  $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  acts like  $i \mapsto \mathbf{A}_i$  on objects and as  $(i \rightarrow j) \mapsto \alpha_i^j$  on morphisms then  $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  will be denoted also by  $((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . A simplified representation of  $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  as a diagram is given by:

$$\mathbf{A}_0 \xleftarrow{\alpha_1^0} \mathbf{A}_1 \xleftarrow{\alpha_2^1} \mathbf{A}_2 \xleftarrow{\alpha_3^2} \mathbf{A}_3 \xleftarrow{\alpha_4^3} \dots$$

By  $\sigma^{\mathcal{C}}$  we denote the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  that is induced by  $\sigma^{\mathcal{C}}$ . Thus  $\sigma^{\mathcal{C}}$  is the category of colimits of  $\omega$ -chains in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Each time when a notion is defined in terms of categories, we get for free other notions obtained by dualization. In the present case the most reasonable choice for a dual notion of colimits of  $\omega$ -chains is given by the notion of limits of  $\omega$ -cochains.

**2.2. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of structures of the same type. An  $\omega$ -cochain in  $\mathcal{C}$  is a functor  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}: \omega^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ . If  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  acts on objects like  $i \mapsto \mathbf{A}_i$  and on morphisms as  $(i \leftarrow j) \mapsto \alpha_i^j$ , then  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  will also be denoted by  $((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . A simplified representation of  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  as a diagram is given by:

$$\mathbf{A}_0 \xleftarrow{\alpha_0^1} \mathbf{A}_1 \xleftarrow{\alpha_1^2} \mathbf{A}_2 \xleftarrow{\alpha_2^3} \mathbf{A}_3 \xleftarrow{\alpha_3^4} \dots$$

A limit of the  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  is given by the substructure  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  of  $\prod_{i < \omega} \mathbf{A}_i$  that is induced by all those tuples  $\mathbf{c} = (c_i)_{i < \omega}$  for which holds:

$$\forall i < j < \omega : \alpha_i^j(c_j) = c_i.$$

The limiting cone witnessing this fact is given by the family  $(\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  of projection homomorphisms, where

$$\alpha_i^\infty: \mathbf{A}_\infty \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_i : \mathbf{c} \mapsto c_i.$$

This cone will be called the *canonical cone* of  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ . The structure  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  will be called the *canonical limit* of  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ .

For a better intuition it is helpful to envision  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  as a tree  $T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  as the set of its branches. The node set of  $T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}$  is given by the set  $\bigcup_{i < \omega} \{i\} \times \mathbf{A}_i$ . In  $T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}$  we define

$$(i, a_i) \sqsubseteq (j, a_j) : \iff i \leq j \text{ and } \alpha_i^j(a_j) = a_i.$$

**2.3. Observations.** For each  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  we have

- (1)  $(T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}, \sqsubseteq)$  is a tree, i.e.,  $\forall (j, a_j) \in T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}} : (j, a_j) \downarrow = \{(i, a_i) \in T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}} \mid (i, a_i) \sqsubseteq (j, a_j)\}$  is a chain,
- (2)  $(T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}, \sqsubseteq)$  is well-founded, i.e.,  $\forall (i, a_i) \in T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}} : (i, a_i) \downarrow$  is finite,
- (3)  $(T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}, \sqsubseteq)$  is pruned if and only if for all  $i \leq j < \omega$  we have that  $\alpha_i^j$  is surjective.

As usually, the maximal chains in  $(T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}, \sqsubseteq)$  are called *branches*. Coming back to the consideration of  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$ , an important observation is that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the elements of  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  and the branches of  $T_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}$ . It is obtained by assigning to each element  $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i < \omega} \in \mathbf{A}_\infty$  the set

$\{(i, a_i) \mid i < \omega\} \subseteq T_{\overleftarrow{A}}$ . With a convenient definition of families (as functions from an index set to a set) one could argue that  $(a_i)_{i < \omega}$ , is actually equal to a branch of  $T_{\overleftarrow{A}}$

The canonical cone  $(\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  of an  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{A} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  naturally induces an ultrametric  $\delta_{A_\infty}$  on  $A_\infty$  that may be defined through  $\delta_{A_\infty}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) := 2^{-\Delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})}$ , where

$$\Delta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) := \min\{i < \omega \mid \alpha_i^\infty(\mathbf{a}) \neq \alpha_i^\infty(\mathbf{b})\} = \min\{i < \omega \mid a_i \neq b_i\}.$$

**2.4. Observations.** *With the notions from above:*

- (1)  $(A, \delta_{A_\infty})$  is a complete metric space,
- (2) all basic operations of  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  are 1-Lipschitz with respect to  $\delta_{A_\infty}$ ,
- (3) all basic relations of  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  are closed (in the appropriate product topology).

Moreover, if for each  $i < \omega$  we have that the image of  $\alpha_i^\infty$  is countable, then  $(A_\infty, \delta_{A_\infty})$  is separable.

*Proof. about 1:* Let  $(\mathbf{a}_i)_{i < \omega}$  be a Cauchy-sequence in  $A_\infty$ . Then for every  $M < \omega$  there exists  $n_0 = n_0(M)$ , such that for all  $n, m > n_0$  we have that  $\alpha_M^\infty(\mathbf{a}_n) = \alpha_M^\infty(\mathbf{a}_m) =: b_M$ . Clearly, the family  $(b_i)_{i < \omega}$  forms a branch  $\mathbf{b}$  in  $T_{\overleftarrow{A}}$ . Hence it is an element of  $A_\infty$ . Moreover,  $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{b}$ .

*about 2:* Let  $f^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$  be an  $n$ -ary basic operation of  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$ . Let  $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = (\mathbf{a}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(n-1)})$ , and  $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = (\mathbf{b}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{(n-1)})$  be from  $(A_\infty)^n$ . Then

$$\delta_{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}) = \max_{0 \leq i < n} \delta_{A_\infty}(\mathbf{a}^{(i)}, \mathbf{b}^{(i)}) = 2^{-M},$$

for some  $M < \omega$ . In particular, for all  $m < M$  and for all  $0 \leq i < n$  we have

$$(*) \quad \alpha_m^\infty(\mathbf{a}^{(i)}) = \alpha_m^\infty(\mathbf{b}^{(i)}).$$

We go on computing

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{a}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(n-1)}) &= \mathbf{c}, & f^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{b}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{(n-1)}) &= \mathbf{d}, \text{ where} \\ f^{\mathbf{A}_i}(a_i^{(0)}, \dots, a_i^{(n-1)}) &= c_i, & f^{\mathbf{A}_i}(b_i^{(0)}, \dots, b_i^{(n-1)}) &= d_i, \text{ for all } i < \omega. \end{aligned}$$

By (\*) we have  $c_i = d_i$ , for all  $0 \leq i < M$ . Consequently  $\delta_{A_\infty}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}) \leq 2^{-M}$ .

**about 3:** Let  $\varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty} \subseteq (A_\infty)^n$  be a basic relation of  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$ . Let  $\sigma := (A_\infty)^n \setminus \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ . Let us show that  $\sigma$  is open: Let  $\bar{\mathbf{a}} = (\mathbf{a}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(n-1)}) \in \sigma$ . Let  $i_0 < \omega$  be minimal with the property that  $(a_{i_0}^{(0)}, \dots, a_{i_0}^{(n-1)}) \notin \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_{i_0}}$ . Let  $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = (\mathbf{b}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{b}^{(n-1)}) \in (A_\infty)^n$  be such, that  $\delta_{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{a}}, \bar{\mathbf{b}}) < 2^{-i_0}$ . Then  $(b_{i_0}^{(0)}, \dots, b_{i_0}^{(n-1)}) = (a_{i_0}^{(0)}, \dots, a_{i_0}^{(n-1)}) \notin \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_{i_0}}$ . Thus  $\bar{\mathbf{b}} \in \sigma$ . Consequently,  $\sigma$  is open.  $\square$

### 3. FROM $\omega$ -COCHAINS TO METRIC STRUCTURES

In the following let  $\overleftarrow{A} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  be an  $\omega$ -cochain in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ . Let  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  be its canonical limit and let  $(\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  be its canonical cone. With each basic relation  $\varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty} \subseteq (A_\infty)^n$  we may associate a function

$$\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty} : (A_\infty)^n \rightarrow [0, 1], \quad (\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & (\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty} \\ 2^{-M(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)})} & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where

$$M(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) = \min\{i < \omega \mid (x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)}) \notin \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i}\}.$$

**3.1. Observations.** *For each basic relation  $\varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$  of  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$ . we have that  $\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$  is 1-Lipschitz. Moreover, we have that*

$$\varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty} = \{\mathbf{x} \mid \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}.$$

*Proof.* The second claim follows directly from the definition of  $\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ . For the proof of the first claim take  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)})$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = (\mathbf{y}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(n-1)})$  from  $(A_\infty)^n$ , such that  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \neq \bar{\mathbf{y}}$ . Then, for some  $M < \omega$  we have that

$$\delta_{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) = \max_{0 \leq j < n} \delta_{A_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(j)}, \mathbf{y}^{(j)}) = 2^{-M}.$$

In particular for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$  and for all  $0 \leq i < M$  we have that  $x_i^{(j)} = y_i^{(j)}$ . Next we distinguish cases depending on whether  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  are in  $\varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$  or not.

**case 1:** Suppose that  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ . Then  $|\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})| = 0 < \delta_{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}})$ .

**case 2:** Suppose that  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}, \bar{\mathbf{y}} \notin \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ . Then  $|\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})| = \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = 2^{-\widehat{M}}$  for some  $\widehat{M} < \omega$ .

In particular,  $(y_{\widehat{M}}^{(0)}, \dots, y_{\widehat{M}}^{(n-1)}) \notin \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_{\widehat{M}}}$ . Since on the other hand we have that  $(x_{\widehat{M}}^{(0)}, \dots, x_{\widehat{M}}^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_{\widehat{M}}}$ , it follows that  $(x_{\widehat{M}}^{(0)}, \dots, x_{\widehat{M}}^{(n-1)}) \neq (y_{\widehat{M}}^{(0)}, \dots, y_{\widehat{M}}^{(n-1)})$ . Consequently,  $\widehat{M} \geq M$ .

**case 3:** Suppose that  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}} \notin \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ . Then  $\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = 2^{-M_1}$  and  $\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{y}}) = 2^{-M_2}$ , for certain  $M_1, M_2 < \omega$ . let  $\widehat{M} := \min(M_1, M_2)$ .

**case 3.1:** Suppose that  $\widehat{M} < M$ . We claim that then  $M_1 = M_2$ , for suppose on the contrary that  $M_1 \neq M_2$ , say,  $M_1 < M_2$ . Then  $(y_{M_1}^{(0)}, \dots, y_{M_1}^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_{M_1}}$ . Since  $M_1 = \widehat{M} < M$ , it follows that  $(x_{M_1}^{(0)}, \dots, x_{M_1}^{(n-1)}) = (y_{M_1}^{(0)}, \dots, y_{M_1}^{(n-1)})$ . In particular,  $(x_{M_1}^{(0)}, \dots, x_{M_1}^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_{M_1}}$ , a contradiction.

**case 3.2:** Suppose that  $M \leq \widehat{M}$ . Suppose without loss of generality that  $M_1 \leq M_2$ . Then

$$|\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) - \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{y}})| = 2^{-M_1} - 2^{-M_2} \leq 2^{-M_1} = 2^{-\widehat{M}} \leq 2^{-M}.$$

□

There is a second natural way to measure how much a given tuple  $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$  is *not* contained in  $\varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ . In particular we might define

$$\overline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) := \delta_{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}) = \begin{cases} \inf\{\delta_{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}}) \mid \bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}\} & \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty} \neq \emptyset, \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Similarly as for  $\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$  it can be shown that  $\overline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$  is 1-Lipschitz, and that  $\overline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) = 0$  if and only if  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ . However, in general we have  $\overline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \geq \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ , as the following example demonstrates:

**3.2. Example.** Consider the complete graph  $K_2$  on two vertices  $a$  and  $b$ , and its complement graph, the empty graph  $\overline{K}_2$  as relational structures of the signature that consists of exactly one binary relational symbol  $\varrho$ . Define  $\mathbf{A}_0 := K_2$ , and  $\mathbf{A}_i := \overline{K}_2$ , for all  $0 < i < \omega$ . For all  $0 \leq i \leq j < \omega$  let  $\alpha_i^j: \{a, b\} \rightarrow \{a, b\}$  be the identity. Then  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{0 \leq i \leq j < \omega})$  is an  $\omega$ -cochain. Its canonical limit  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  is the empty graph with vertex set  $\{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}\}$ , where  $\mathbf{a} = (a, a, \dots)$  and where  $\mathbf{b} = (b, b, \dots)$ .

Note that  $\overline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 1$ , while  $\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{2}$ .

**3.3. Observation.** Given an  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{0 \leq i \leq j < \omega})$  of  $\Sigma$ -structures. Let  $(\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  be its canonical cone, where  $\alpha_i^\infty: \mathbf{A}_\infty \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_i$ , for each  $i < \omega$ . Then the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $\forall \rho \in \mathbf{P} : \overline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty} = \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ ,
- (2) for all  $i < \omega$  the homomorphism  $\alpha_i^\infty$  is strong, i.e., for all  $\varrho \in \mathbf{P}$  (say,  $\text{ar}(\varrho) = n$ ), whenever  $a^{(0)}, \dots, a^{(n-1)}$  are in the image of  $\alpha_i^\infty$  and  $(a^{(0)}, \dots, a^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i}$ , then there exist  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)} \in A_\infty$ , such that  $(a^{(0)}, \dots, a^{(n-1)}) = (x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)})$ , and such that  $(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}$ .

*Proof.* “1  $\implies$  2”: Let  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)} \in A_\infty$ , such that  $(x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{A_i}$ . Then

$$\overline{\varrho}^{A_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) = \underline{\varrho}^{A_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) < 2^{-i}.$$

Hence there exists  $(\bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(0)}, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{y}}^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{A_\infty}$ , such that  $\delta_{A_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(j)}, \mathbf{y}^{(j)}) < 2^{-i}$ , for all  $0 \leq j < n$ . In particular,  $x_i^{(j)} = y_i^{(j)}$ , for all  $0 \leq j < n$ . This shows that  $\alpha_i^\infty$  is strong.

“2  $\implies$  1”: Let  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)} \in A_\infty$ . Suppose that  $\underline{\varrho}^{A_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) < 2^{-i}$ . Then  $(x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{A_i}$ . Since  $\alpha_i^\infty$  is strong, there exists  $(\mathbf{y}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{A_\infty}$ , such that  $(x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)}) = (y_i^{(0)}, \dots, y_i^{(n-1)})$ . It follows that  $\delta_{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \rho^{A_\infty}) < 2^{-i}$ . Since  $i$  may be chosen arbitrarily large, it follows that  $\overline{\varrho}^{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \leq \underline{\varrho}^{A_\infty}(\bar{\mathbf{x}})$ . Hence equality holds.  $\square$

The previous observations show that

$$\underline{\mathcal{A}}_\infty := (A_\infty, \delta_{A_\infty}, (f^{A_\infty})_{f \in \Phi}, (\varrho^{A_\infty})_{\varrho \in \mathbb{P}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mathcal{A}}_\infty := (A_\infty, \delta_{A_\infty}, (f^{A_\infty})_{f \in \Phi}, (\overline{\varrho}^{A_\infty})_{\varrho \in \mathbb{P}})$$

are *metric structures* in the sense of [3]. Let us recall the basic definitions concerning metric structures:

**3.4. Definition.** Let  $\Sigma = (\Phi, \mathbb{P}, \text{ar})$  be a signature. A *metric  $\Sigma$ -structure*  $\mathcal{A}$  is a tuple  $(A, \delta, (f^{\mathcal{A}})_{f \in \Phi}, (\varrho^{\mathcal{A}})_{\varrho \in \mathbb{P}})$ , such that

- (1)  $(A, \delta)$  is a bounded complete metric space,
- (2)  $\forall f \in \Phi : f^{\mathcal{A}} : A^{\text{ar}(f)} \rightarrow A$  is uniformly continuous,
- (3)  $\forall \varrho \in \mathbb{P} : \varrho^{\mathcal{A}} : A^{\text{ar}(\varrho)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is bounded and uniformly continuous.

In case that  $\Sigma$  is clear from the context, or if it is no of importance, we are going to skip the “ $\Sigma$ -” from “metric  $\Sigma$ -structures”.

Metric substructures of metric structures are defined in the obvious way:

**3.5. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be metric  $\Sigma$ -structures. Then we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is a *metric substructure* of  $\mathcal{B}$  (designated by  $\mathcal{A} \leq \mathcal{B}$ ) if

- (1)  $A \subseteq B$ ,
- (2)  $\forall f \in \Phi \forall \bar{x} \in A^{\text{ar}(f)} : f^{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{x}) = f^{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{x})$ ,
- (3)  $\forall \varrho \in \mathbb{P} \forall \bar{x} \in A^{\text{ar}(\varrho)} : \varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{x}) = \varrho^{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{x})$ .

The definition of metric embeddings matches the definition of metric substructures:

**3.6. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be metric  $\Sigma$ -structures. A function  $h : A \rightarrow B$  is called a *metric embedding* of  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $\mathcal{B}$  if

- (1)  $h$  is injective,
- (2) for all  $f \in \Phi$  (say, of arity  $n$ ) the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^n & \xrightarrow{f^{\mathcal{A}}} & A \\ \downarrow h^n & & \downarrow h \\ B^n & \xrightarrow{f^{\mathcal{B}}} & B, \end{array}$$

- (3) For all  $\varrho \in \mathbb{P}$  (say, of arity  $n$ ) the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^n & \xrightarrow{\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathbb{R} \\ \downarrow h^n & & \parallel \\ B^n & \xrightarrow{\varrho^{\mathcal{B}}} & \mathbb{R}. \end{array}$$

Bijjective metric embeddings will be called *metric isomorphisms*.

Figure 1 recapitulates all our construction so far. For each  $\omega$ -cochain  $((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i<\omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{0\leq i\leq j<\omega})$  the




FIGURE 1. From structures to metric structures

metric structure  $\underline{\mathcal{A}}_\infty$  will be called the *canonical metric structure* of the  $\omega$ -cochain. Mark that the metric  $\delta_{A_\infty}$  of  $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{A}}$  is completely determined by the tree  $T_{\underline{\mathcal{A}}}^<-$ .

**3.7. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of  $\Sigma$ -structures. Then by  $\pi\mathcal{C}$  we denote the class of all those metric structures that are metrically isomorphic to the canonical metric structure of some  $\omega$ -cochain over  $\mathcal{C}$ .

#### 4. AN ADJUNCTION BETWEEN $\omega$ -COCHAINS AND ULTRAMETRIC STRUCTURES

The nature of the construction of the canonical metric structure out of an  $\omega$ -cochain suggests that it should be functorial in some way. Our next goal is to make this feeling concrete by turning  $\pi\mathcal{C}$  into a category. As of writing this paper the literature appears not to contain the definition of a concept of homomorphisms between metric structures. The definition that we are going to give does not pretend to fill this gap. However, for the very special case of metric structures relevant for us, we argue that our definition is the most natural one. Before actually defining homomorphisms, let us narrow down the class of metric structures under consideration:

**4.1. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{A} = (A, \delta_{\mathcal{A}}, (f^{\mathcal{A}})_{f \in \Phi}, (\varrho^{\mathcal{A}})_{\varrho \in P})$  be a metric  $\Sigma$ -structure. Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is called an *ultrametric  $\Sigma$ -structure* if

- (1)  $(A, \delta_{\mathcal{A}})$  is an ultrametric space of diameter at most 1,
- (2)  $f^{\mathcal{A}}$  is 1-Lipschitz, for each  $f \in \Phi$ ,
- (3)  $\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}: A^{\text{ar}(\varrho)} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is 1-Lipschitz, for each  $\varrho \in P$ .

If  $\mathcal{B} = (B, \delta_{\mathcal{B}}, (f^{\mathcal{B}})_{f \in \Phi}, (\varrho^{\mathcal{B}})_{\varrho \in P})$  is another ultrametric  $\Sigma$ -structure then a function  $h: A \rightarrow B$  is called a *metric homomorphism* from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  (formally:  $h: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ ) if

- (1)  $h: (A, \delta_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow (B, \delta_{\mathcal{B}})$  is 1-Lipschitz,
- (2) for all  $f \in \Phi$  (say, of arity  $n$ ) the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A^n & \xrightarrow{f^{\mathcal{A}}} & A \\ \downarrow h^n & & \downarrow h \\ B^n & \xrightarrow{f^{\mathcal{B}}} & B, \end{array}$$

(3) for all  $\varrho \in \mathbf{P}$  (say, of arity  $n$ ) and for all  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in A$  we have:

$$\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \geq \varrho^{\mathcal{B}}(h(x_0), \dots, h(x_{n-1})).$$

$h$  is called a *metric embedding* if it is isometric and if (3) holds with equality. If  $h$  is in addition bijective, then it is called a *metric isomorphism*. The category of all ultrametric  $\Sigma$ -structures with metric homomorphisms will be denoted by  $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ .

It is important to note that canonical metric structures of  $\omega$ -cochains over  $\mathcal{C}$  are always ultrametric structures. To make the correspondence between  $\omega$ -cochains and ultrametric structures functorial, we need still to define its action on morphisms. Let  $((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  and  $((\mathbf{B}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\beta_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  be  $\omega$ -cochains over  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  and  $\mathbf{B}_\infty$  be their respective canonical limits and let  $(\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  and  $(\beta_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  be the corresponding canonical cones. Let

$$(h_i)_{i < \omega} : ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}) \Longrightarrow ((\mathbf{B}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\beta_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$$

be a natural transformation. In other words, for all  $0 \leq i \leq j < \omega$  we would like the following diagram to be commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A}_i & \xleftarrow{\alpha_i^j} & \mathbf{A}_j \\ h_i \downarrow & & \downarrow h_j \\ \mathbf{B}_i & \xleftarrow{\beta_i^j} & \mathbf{B}_j. \end{array}$$

For each  $i < \omega$  let  $\tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty : \mathbf{A}_\infty \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_i$  defined by  $\tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty := \alpha_i^\infty \circ h_i$ . Then  $(\tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  is a compatible cone for  $((\mathbf{B}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\beta_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . I.e., for all  $0 \leq i \leq j < \omega$  we have that the following diagram is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty & \\ & \curvearrowright & \\ \mathbf{B}_i & \xleftarrow{\beta_i^j} & \mathbf{B}_j & \xleftarrow{\tilde{\alpha}_j^\infty} & \mathbf{A}_\infty. \end{array}$$

Since the canonical cone  $(\beta_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  is a limiting cone, it follows from the universal property of limits that there is a unique homomorphism  $h$  from  $\mathbf{A}_\infty$  to  $\mathbf{B}_\infty$  such that for all  $i < \omega$  we have  $\tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty = \beta_i^\infty \circ h$ .

**4.2. Observation.** *The above defined homomorphism  $h$  acts like*

$$h : (x_i)_{i < \omega} \mapsto (h_i(x_i))_{i < \omega}.$$

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of the identity  $\alpha_i^\infty \circ h_i = \beta_i^\infty \circ h$ . □

It is well-known that the mapping

$$\underline{\lim} : [\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\Sigma \quad ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}) \mapsto \mathbf{A}_\infty \quad (h_i)_{i < \omega} \mapsto h$$

defines a functor (see [11, Theorem 8.6]). We are going to use the action of this functor on morphisms in order to define a functor from  $[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]$  to  $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ .

**4.3. Observations.** *The above defined homomorphism  $h : \mathbf{A}_\infty \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_\infty$  is also a metric homomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}_\infty$  to  $\mathcal{B}_\infty$ . If  $(h_i)$  is a natural embedding then  $h$  is even a metric embedding.*

*Proof.* First we show that  $h : (\mathbf{A}_\infty, \delta_{\mathbf{A}_\infty}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{B}_\infty, \delta_{\mathbf{B}_\infty})$  is 1-Lipschitz: Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{A}_\infty$ , and let  $i < \omega$ . Then

$$(1) \quad x_i = y_i \implies h_i(x_i) = h_i(y_i) \iff \tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(\mathbf{x}) = \tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(\mathbf{y}) \iff \beta_i^\infty(h(\mathbf{x})) = \beta_i^\infty(h(\mathbf{y})).$$

This shows that  $\delta_{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \geq \delta_{\mathbf{B}_\infty}(h(\mathbf{x}), h(\mathbf{y}))$  and  $h$  is indeed 1-Lipschitz.



Let  $\varrho \in \mathbf{P}$  (say,  $\text{ar}(\varrho) = n$ ). Let  $(\mathbf{a}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(n-1)}) \in (A_\infty)^n$ , and let  $i < \omega$ . Then

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} (a_i^{(0)}, \dots, a_i^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}^i} &\implies (h_i(a_i^{(0)}), \dots, h_i(a_i^{(n-1)})) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{B}^i} \\ &\iff (\tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(\mathbf{a}^{(0)}), \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(\mathbf{a}^{(n-1)})) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{B}^i} \\ &\iff (\beta_i^\infty(h(\mathbf{a}^{(0)})), \dots, \beta_i^\infty(h(\mathbf{a}^{(n-1)}))) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{B}^i}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,  $\underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}^\infty}(\mathbf{a}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{a}^{(n-1)}) \geq \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{B}^\infty}(h(\mathbf{a}^{(0)}), \dots, h(\mathbf{a}^{(n-1)}))$ . It follows that  $h$  is a metric homomorphism.

Clearly, if  $(h_i)_{i < \omega}$  is a natural embedding, then the implications in (1) and (2) are equivalences. Consequently, in this case  $h$  is a metric embedding.  $\square$

The previous observation implies that the assignment

$$\underline{\text{Lim}}: ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}) \mapsto \mathcal{A}_\infty, \quad (h_i)_{i < \omega} \mapsto h$$

is a functor from  $[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]$  to  $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ .

**4.4. Observation.** *There is a natural forgetful functor  $\mathbf{U}: \mathcal{U}_\Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  that maps each ultrametric  $\Sigma$ -structure  $\mathcal{A}$  to its underlying  $\Sigma$ -structure  $\mathbf{A}$  where  $\mathbf{A}$  shares with  $\mathcal{A}$  the carrier set and the basic operations, and where the basic relations of  $\mathbf{A}$  are defined by*

$$\varrho^{\mathbf{A}} = \{\bar{a} \in A^{\text{ar}(\varrho)} \mid \varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{a}) = 0\}.$$

*The functor  $\mathbf{U}$  has a left-adjoint  $\text{Met}$  that maps every  $\Sigma$ -structure  $\mathbf{A}$  to an ultrametric structure  $\mathcal{A}$  that shares with  $\mathbf{A}$  the carrier set and the basic operations. The ultrametric  $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is the discrete metric given by*

$$\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(x, y) = \begin{cases} 0 & x = y \\ 1 & x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

*Moreover, for each relational symbol  $\varrho \in \mathbf{P}$ , say, of arity  $n$  we have that*

$$\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = \begin{cases} 0 & (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}} \\ 1 & (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \notin \varrho^{\mathbf{A}}. \end{cases}$$

*It is not hard to see that  $\text{Met}$  fully embeds  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  into  $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ .*

By now we showed that natural transformations between  $\omega$ -cochains give rise to metric homomorphisms between their canonical ultrametric structures. A relevant question is whether all metric homomorphisms between the canonical ultrametric structures are of this shape. In order to answer this question (and more) our goal is to define a functor  $\text{Seq}: \mathcal{U}_\Sigma \rightarrow [\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]$  that is a left-adjoint of  $\underline{\text{Lim}}$ .

Given an ultrametric structure  $\mathcal{A} = (A, \delta_{\mathcal{A}}, (f^{\mathcal{A}})_{f \in \Phi}, (\varrho^{\mathcal{A}})_{\varrho \in \mathbf{P}})$ . For each  $i < \omega$  define  $\approx_i \subseteq A \times A$  according to

$$x \approx_i y := \delta_{\mathcal{A}}(x, y) < 2^{-i}.$$

Since  $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is an ultrametric, we have that all  $\approx_i$  are equivalence relations on  $A$ . Next, for each  $i < \omega$  let us define  $A_i := A / \approx_i$ . Our goal is to make  $A_i$  the carrier of some  $\Sigma$ -structure  $\mathbf{A}_i$ . To this end, for each  $\varrho \in \mathbf{P}$ , say, of arity  $n$  we define  $\varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i} \subseteq A_i^n$  according to

$$([a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i} := \exists b_0 \in [a_0]_{\approx_i} \dots \exists b_{n-1} \in [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i} : \varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}) < 2^{-i}.$$

Next, for each operational symbol  $f \in \Phi$  (say,  $\text{ar}(f) = n$ ) and for all  $a_0, \dots, a_{n-1} \in A$  let us define

$$f^{\mathbf{A}_i}([a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i}) := [f^{\mathcal{A}}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})]_{\approx_i}.$$

In order to see that  $f^{A_i}$  is well-defined let  $b_0, \dots, b_{n-1} \in A$ , such that  $b_0 \in [a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, b_{n-1} \in [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i}$ . Let  $\bar{a} := (a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})$  and  $\bar{b} := (b_0, \dots, b_{n-1})$ . Then  $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) < 2^{-i}$ . Since  $f^{\mathcal{A}}$  is 1-Lipschitz, we also have  $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(f^{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{a}), f^{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{b})) < 2^{-i}$ . However, this directly implies that  $[f^{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{a})]_{\approx_i} = [f^{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{b})]_{\approx_i}$ .

Now we define  $\mathbf{A}_i := (A/\approx_i, (f^{A_i})_{f \in \Phi}, (\varrho^{A_i})_{\varrho \in \mathbb{P}})$ . Having done this, for every  $0 \leq i \leq j < \omega$  we define  $\alpha_i^j: A_j \rightarrow A_i$  according to  $\alpha_i^j: [x]_{\approx_j} \mapsto [x]_{\approx_i}$ . Since  $(\approx_i) \subseteq (\approx_j)$ , it follows that  $\alpha_i^j$  is well-defined, and we may define:

$$\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) := ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}).$$

**4.5. Observation.** For all  $0 \leq i \leq j < \omega$  we have that  $\alpha_i^j: \mathbf{A}_j \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_i$  is a surjective homomorphism.

*Proof.* Clear. □

By now we only defined the action of the functor  $\text{Seq}$  on objects. Next we define its action on morphisms. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be metric  $\Sigma$ -structures and let  $h: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a metric homomorphism. It is natural to define  $h_i: A_i \rightarrow B_i$  according to  $h_i: [a]_{\approx_i} \mapsto [h(a)]_{\approx_i}$ .

**4.6. Observations.**  $(h_i)_{i < \omega}: \text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Seq}(\mathcal{B})$  is a natural transformation. Moreover, if  $h$  is a metric embedding then  $(h_i)_{i < \omega}$  is a natural embedding.

*Proof.* First observe that the fact that  $h$  is 1-Lipschitz entails that the  $h_i$  are well-defined as functions.

Let  $f \in \Phi$ , say, of arity  $n$ . Let  $[a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i} \in A_i$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\mathbf{B}_i}(h_i([a_0]_{\approx_i}), \dots, h_i([a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i})) &= f^{\mathbf{B}_i}([h(a_0)]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [h(a_{n-1})]_{\approx_i}) \\ &= [f^{\mathcal{B}}(h(a_0), \dots, h(a_{n-1}))]_{\approx_i} \\ &= [h(f^{\mathcal{A}}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}))]_{\approx_i} \\ &= h_i([f^{\mathcal{A}}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1})]_{\approx_i}) \\ &= h_i(f^{A_i}([a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i})). \end{aligned}$$

Let now  $\varrho \in \mathbb{P}$ , say, of arity  $n$ , and let  $[a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i} \in A_i$ . Then

$$([a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i}) \in \varrho^{A_i} \iff \forall j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\} \exists b_j \in [a_j]_{\approx_i} \varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}) < 2^{-i}$$

Fix such a tuple  $(b_0, \dots, b_{n-1})$ . Then, by the definition of metric homomorphisms, we have that  $\varrho^{\mathcal{B}}(h(b_0), \dots, h(b_{n-1})) < 2^{-i}$ . Consequently,  $([h(b_0)]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [h(b_{n-1})]_{\approx_i}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{B}_i}$ . However,

$$([h(b_0)]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [h(b_{n-1})]_{\approx_i}) = ([h(a_0)]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [h(a_{n-1})]_{\approx_i}) = h_i([a_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [a_{n-1}]_{\approx_i})$$

Thus  $h_i$  is a homomorphism.

If  $h$  is a metric embedding, then in the paragraph above we have in addition that  $\varrho^{\mathcal{B}}(h(b_0), \dots, h(b_{n-1})) < 2^{-i}$  entails that  $\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}) < 2^{-i}$ . Together with  $h$  being an isometry, this has the consequence that  $h_i$  is an embedding.

It remains to check the naturality of  $(h_i)_{i < \omega}$ . Let  $0 \leq i \leq j < \omega$ , and let  $[a]_{\approx_j} \in A_j$ . Then

$$h_i(\alpha_i^j([a]_{\approx_j})) = h_i([a]_{\approx_i}) = [h(a)]_{\approx_i} = \beta_i^j([h(a)]_{\approx_j}) = \beta_i^j(h_j([a]_{\approx_j})). \quad \square$$

At this point the functor  $\text{Seq}$  is completely defined. The compatibility of  $\text{Seq}$  with the composition of morphisms follows directly from the definition of the  $h_i$ .

Our next goal is to show that the functor  $\text{Seq}$  is left-adjoint to  $\underline{\text{Lim}}$ . To this end let us define for each  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_{\Sigma}$  define a function  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}))$  according to

$$\eta_{\mathcal{A}}: x \mapsto ([x]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega}.$$

**4.7. Observation.** For each  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$  we have that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a bijective metric homomorphism.

*Proof.* First we show that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is 1-Lipschitz: Let  $x, y \in A$ . Then, by definition

$$\delta(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x), \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(y)) = \delta(( [x]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}, ([y]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}) = 2^{-M},$$

where

$$M = \min\{j < \omega \mid [x]_{\approx_j} \neq [y]_{\approx_j}\}.$$

Note that we have

$$[x]_{\approx_j} \neq [y]_{\approx_j} \iff y \notin [x]_{\approx_j} \iff \delta(x, y) \geq 2^{-j}.$$

As a consequence we obtain that

$$M = \min\{j < \omega \mid d(x, y) \geq 2^{-j}\}.$$

However, this entails that

$$\delta(x, y) \geq \delta(( [x]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}, ([y]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}) = \delta(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x), \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(y)).$$

Next we show that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is bijective: First note that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is injective because for each  $x \in A$  we have

$$\{x\} = \bigcap_{i < \omega} [x]_{\approx_i}.$$

Towards the proof of surjectivity, let  $(M_i)_{i < \omega}$  be an element of  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}))$ . For each  $i < \omega$ , choose some  $x_i \in M_i$ . Then  $(x_i)_{i < \omega}$  is a Cauchy-sequence in  $(A, \delta_{\mathcal{A}})$ . As  $(A, \delta_{\mathcal{A}})$  is complete, this sequence has a limit  $x$ . Clearly,  $M_i = [x]_{\approx_i}$ , for each  $i < \omega$ .

It remains to show that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  satisfies the compatibility conditions for basic operations and for basic relations: Let  $f \in \Phi$ , say of arity  $n$ . Let  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in A$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(f^{\mathcal{A}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})) &= ([f^{\mathcal{A}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega} = (f^{A_i}([x_0]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [x_{n-1}]_{\approx_i}))_{i < \omega} \\ &= f^{\mathcal{B}}(( [x_0]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}, \dots, ([x_{n-1}]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}) = f^{\mathcal{B}}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x_0), \dots, \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x_{n-1})). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\varrho \in \mathcal{P}$ , say, of arity  $n$ . Let  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} \in A$ . For reasons of brevity, denote  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}))$  by  $\mathcal{B}$ . Then

$$\varrho^{\mathcal{B}}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x_0), \dots, \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x_{n-1})) = \varrho^{\mathcal{B}}(( [x_0]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}, \dots, ([x_{n-1}]_{\approx_i} )_{i < \omega}) = 2^{-M},$$

where

$$M = \min\{j < \omega \mid ([x_0]_{\approx_j}, \dots, [x_{n-1}]_{\approx_j}) \notin \varrho^{A_j}\}.$$

Note that we have

$$([x_0]_{\approx_j}, \dots, [x_{n-1}]_{\approx_j}) \notin \varrho^{A_j} \iff \forall a_0 \in [x_0]_{\approx_j} \dots \forall a_{n-1} \in [x_{n-1}]_{\approx_j} : \varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(a_0, \dots, a_{n-1}) \geq 2^{-j}.$$

In particular

$$\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \geq 2^{-M} = \varrho^{\mathcal{B}}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x_0), \dots, \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(x_{n-1})).$$

□

Next we consider the family  $\eta = (\eta_{\mathcal{A}})_{\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma}$ .

**4.8. Observation.**  $\eta : 1_{\mathcal{U}_\Sigma} \Rightarrow \underline{\text{Lim}} \circ \text{Seq}$  is a natural transformation.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{U}_{\Sigma}$ , and let  $h: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ . We need to show that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{A}}} & \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})) \\ \downarrow h & & \downarrow \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(h)) \\ \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}} & \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{B})). \end{array}$$

For this we need to show that

$$\varprojlim(\text{Seq}(h))([x]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega} = ([h(x)]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega}.$$

Recall that  $\text{Seq}(h) = (h_i)_{i < \omega}: \text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Seq}(\mathcal{B})$  is defined through

$$h_i: \mathbf{A}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_i, \text{ where } [x]_{\approx_i} \mapsto [h(x)]_{\approx_i}.$$

Thus

$$\varprojlim(\text{Seq}(h))([x]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega} = (h_i([x]_{\approx_i}))_{i < \omega} = ([h(x)]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega},$$

as desired.  $\square$

Let now  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  be an  $\omega$ -cochain. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be its canonical ultrametric structure. Let  $\mathbf{A}_{\infty} := U(\mathcal{A})$  be the canonical limit of  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  and let  $(\alpha_i^{\infty})_{i < \omega}$  be the canonical limiting cone. Let  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{B}} := \text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) = ((\mathbf{B}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\beta_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  (recall that  $\mathbf{B}_i = \mathbf{A}_{\infty}/\approx_i$ ). We define  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}^{\leftarrow}: \text{Seq}(\varprojlim(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}})) \Rightarrow \overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  according to

$$\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}^{\leftarrow} = (\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}, i}^{\leftarrow})_{i < \omega} \text{ where } \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}, i}^{\leftarrow}: \mathbf{B}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_i \quad [\mathbf{a}]_{\approx_i} \mapsto \alpha_i^{\infty}(\mathbf{a}) = a_i.$$

**4.9. Observation.** Let  $\varepsilon := (\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}^{\leftarrow})_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} \in [\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_{\Sigma}]}$ . Then  $\varepsilon: \text{Seq} \circ \varprojlim \Rightarrow 1_{[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_{\Sigma}]}$  is a natural transformation.

*Proof.* Let  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{K}} = ((\mathbf{K}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\kappa_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}) \in [\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_{\Sigma}]$  with canonical structure  $\mathcal{K}$ , and let  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{L}} = ((\mathbf{L}_i, (\lambda_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}) := \text{Seq}(\mathcal{K})$ . Let  $(\zeta_i)_{i < \omega}: \overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} \Rightarrow \overleftarrow{\mathbf{K}}$ . Let  $\zeta := \varprojlim(\zeta_i)_{i < \omega}$  ( $\zeta: \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} \rightarrow \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{K}}$ ). We need to show that the following diagram commutes:

$$(3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \overleftarrow{\mathbf{B}} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}}^{\leftarrow}} & \overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} \\ \text{Seq}(\zeta) \Downarrow & & \Downarrow (\zeta_i)_{i < \omega} \\ \overleftarrow{\mathbf{L}} & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{K}}}^{\leftarrow}} & \overleftarrow{\mathbf{K}} \end{array}$$

On the one hand we compute that for each  $i < \omega$  we have

$$\zeta_i(\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}, i}^{\leftarrow}([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i})) = \zeta_i(x_i).$$

On the other hand we compute

$$\text{Seq}(\zeta)_i([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i}) = [\zeta(\mathbf{x})]_{\approx_i} = [(\zeta_j(x_j))_{j < \omega}]_{\approx_i}.$$

Thus

$$\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{K}}, i}^{\leftarrow}(\text{Seq}(\zeta)_i([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i})) = \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{K}}, i}^{\leftarrow}([( \zeta_j(x_j) )_{j < \omega}]_{\approx_i}) = \zeta_i(x_i).$$

Thus diagram (3) commutes.  $\square$

**4.10. Proposition.** The functor  $\text{Seq}$  is left adjoint to the functor  $\varprojlim$  with unit  $\eta$  and counit  $\varepsilon$ .

*Proof.* We are going to use the characterization of adjunctions from [15, Theorem IV.1.2(v)]: That is we show that  $\eta$  and  $\varepsilon$  satisfy the triangle identities:

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \underline{\text{Lim}} & \xrightarrow{\eta * \underline{\text{Lim}}} & \underline{\text{Lim}} \circ \text{Seq} \circ \underline{\text{Lim}}, \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \text{Lim} * \varepsilon \\ & & \underline{\text{Lim}} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Seq} & \xrightarrow{\text{Seq} * \eta} & \text{Seq} \circ \underline{\text{Lim}} \circ \text{Seq}. \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \varepsilon * \text{Seq} \\ & & \text{Seq} \end{array}$$

Here

$$\begin{array}{ll} \eta * \underline{\text{Lim}}: \underline{\text{Lim}} \Rightarrow \underline{\text{Lim}} \circ \text{Seq} \circ \underline{\text{Lim}} & (\eta * \underline{\text{Lim}})_{\overleftarrow{A}} = \eta_{\underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})}, \\ \underline{\text{Lim}} * \varepsilon: \underline{\text{Lim}} \circ \text{Seq} \circ \underline{\text{Lim}} \Rightarrow \underline{\text{Lim}} & (\underline{\text{Lim}} * \varepsilon)_{\overleftarrow{A}} = \underline{\text{Lim}}(\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}}), \\ \text{Seq} * \eta: \text{Seq} \Rightarrow \text{Seq} \circ \underline{\text{Lim}} \circ \text{Seq} & (\text{Seq} * \eta)_{\mathcal{A}} = \text{Seq}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}), \\ \varepsilon * \text{Seq}: \text{Seq} \circ \underline{\text{Lim}} \circ \text{Seq} \Rightarrow \text{Seq} & (\varepsilon * \text{Seq})_{\mathcal{A}} = \varepsilon_{\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})}, \end{array}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{l} \eta_{\underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})}: \mathbf{x} \mapsto ([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega}, \\ \underline{\text{Lim}}(\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}}): ([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega} \mapsto (\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}, i}([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i}))_{i < \omega} = \mathbf{x}, \\ \text{Seq}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}})_i: [x]_{\approx_i} \mapsto [([x]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega}]_{\approx_i} = \{([y]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega} \mid [x]_{\approx_i} = [y]_{\approx_i}\}, \\ \varepsilon_{\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}), i}: [([x]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega}]_{\approx_i} \mapsto [x]_{\approx_i}. \end{array}$$

In order to check that the left hand triangle in (4) commutes, let  $\overleftarrow{A} \in [\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_{\Sigma}]$ , and let  $\mathbf{x} \in \underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})$ . Now we may chase  $\mathbf{x}$  through the mentioned diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{x} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})}} & ([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \underline{\text{Lim}}(\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}}) \\ & & \mathbf{x}. \end{array}$$

Finally, to observe the commutativity of the right hand triangle of (4), let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_{\Sigma}$  and let  $x \in A$  and let  $i < \omega$  be arbitrary. Again, we may chase  $x$  through the right hand triangle of (4):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} [x]_{\approx_i} & \xrightarrow{\text{Seq}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}})_i} & [([x]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega}]_{\approx_i} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \varepsilon_{\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}), i} \\ & & [x]_{\approx_i}. \end{array}$$

This finishes the proof.  $\square$

The adjunction  $(\text{Seq}, \underline{\text{Lim}}, \varepsilon, \eta)$  induces an adjoint equivalence between certain full subcategories of  $[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_{\Sigma}]$  and  $\mathcal{U}_{\Sigma}$ , respectively. On the side of  $\omega$ -cochains this subcategory is spanned by all those  $\omega$ -cochains  $\overleftarrow{A}$ , for which  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}}$  is a natural isomorphism. On the side of ultrametric structures this subcategory is induced by all those  $\mathcal{A}$  for which  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a metric isomorphism. The following observations make this more precise:

- 4.11. Observations.** (1) Let  $\overleftarrow{A} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}) \in [\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]$ . Then  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}}^\leftarrow : \text{Seq}(\underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})) \Rightarrow \overleftarrow{A}$  is a natural embedding. It is a natural isomorphism if and only if for all  $i \leq j < \omega$  we have that  $\alpha_i^j$  is surjective.
- (2) Let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ . We already saw in 4.7 that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}))$  is a bijective metric homomorphism. Now we add to this the observation that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a metric isomorphism if and only if  $\mathcal{A}$  is metrically isomorphic to  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})$  for some  $\overleftarrow{A} \in [\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]$ . In other words,  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a metric isomorphism if and only if  $\mathcal{A} \in \pi \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ .

*Proof. about 1:* Let  $\mathcal{A}_\infty = \underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})$ , and let  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) = ((\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\tilde{\alpha}_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . Then  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}, i}^\leftarrow : \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_i$ , where  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}, i}^\leftarrow : [\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i} \mapsto x_i$ . Let  $\mathbf{y} \in A_\infty$ , such that  $x_i = y_i$ . Then  $\delta_{A_\infty}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) < 2^{-i}$ . Hence  $\mathbf{x} \approx_i \mathbf{y}$ . This shows that  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}, i}^\leftarrow$  is injective.

Let  $\varrho \in \mathbf{P}$ , say, of arity  $n$ . Let  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)} \in A_\infty$ , such that  $(x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i}$ . Then

$$\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) = \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) < 2^{-i}.$$

Hence, by the definition,

$$([\mathbf{x}^{(0)}]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}]_{\approx_i}) \in \varrho^{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i}.$$

Consequently,  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}, i}^\leftarrow$  is an embedding.

Note that by 4.5 we have that  $\tilde{\alpha}_i^j$  is surjective, for each  $i \leq j < \omega$ . Thus, if  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}}^\leftarrow$  is a natural isomorphism, then it follows that  $\alpha_i^j$  is surjective, for all  $i \leq j < \omega$ .

Suppose now that for all  $i \leq j < \omega$  we have that  $\alpha_i^j$  is surjective. We need to show that  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}, i}^\leftarrow$  is surjective. So let  $x_i \in A_i$ . For all  $k < i$  we define  $x_k := \alpha_k^i(x_i)$  and for all  $k \geq i$  the  $x_k$  are defined inductively: If  $x_k$  is defined for some  $k \geq i$  then we choose we choose  $x_{k+1} \in A_{k+1}$  in such a way that  $\alpha_k^{k+1}(x_{k+1}) = x_k$ . Define  $\mathbf{x} := (x_k)_{k < \omega}$ . Then, by construction we have that  $\mathbf{x} \in A_\infty$ . Moreover we have that  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}, i}^\leftarrow([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i}) = x_i$ , as desired. Thus  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{A}}^\leftarrow$  is indeed a natural isomorphism.

**about 2:** Note that  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})) \in \pi \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ . If  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a metric isomorphism, then also  $\mathcal{A} \in \pi \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ .

So suppose in the following that  $\mathcal{A} \in \pi \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_\infty = \underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{A})$ , for some  $\overleftarrow{A} \in [\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]$ . Then  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto ([\mathbf{x}]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega}$ .

Denote  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) = ((\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\tilde{\alpha}_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\infty := \underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}))$ . Let  $(\tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  be the canonical cone for  $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\infty = U(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\infty)$ .

First we show that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}} : (A_\infty, \delta_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_\infty, \delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\infty})$  is an isometry: Let  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in A_\infty$  ( $\mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b}$ ). Let  $i < \omega$ . Then

$$\alpha_i^\infty(\mathbf{a}) = \alpha_i^\infty(\mathbf{b}) \iff a_i = b_i \iff [\mathbf{a}]_{\approx_i} = [\mathbf{b}]_{\approx_i}$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{a})) = \tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{b})) \iff \tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(([\mathbf{a}]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega}) = \tilde{\alpha}_i^\infty(([\mathbf{b}]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega}) \iff [\mathbf{a}]_{\approx_i} = [\mathbf{b}]_{\approx_i}.$$

Thus,  $\delta_{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\infty}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{a}), \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{b}))$ .

Similarly, for  $\varrho \in \mathbf{P}$  of arity  $n$ , for  $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)} \in A_\infty$ , and for  $i < \omega$  we argue

$$(\alpha_i^\infty(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}), \dots, \alpha_i^\infty(\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)})) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i} \iff (x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i} \iff \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) < 2^{-i}.$$

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varrho^{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\infty}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}), \dots, \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)})) < 2^{-i} &\iff \varrho^{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\infty}([\mathbf{x}^{(0)}]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega}, \dots, ([\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}]_{\approx_j})_{j < \omega} < 2^i \\
&\iff ([\mathbf{x}^{(0)}]_{\approx_i}, \dots, [\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}]_{\approx_i}) \in \varrho^{\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_i} \\
&\iff \exists \mathbf{y}^{(0)} \in [\mathbf{x}^{(0)}]_{\approx_i}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(n-1)} \in [\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}]_{\approx_i} : \varrho^{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{y}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(n-1)}) < 2^{-i} \\
&\iff \exists \mathbf{y}^{(0)} \in [\mathbf{x}^{(0)}]_{\approx_i}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(n-1)} \in [\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}]_{\approx_i} : (y_i^{(0)}, \dots, y_i^{(n-1)}) \in \varrho^{\mathbf{A}_i}
\end{aligned}$$

Since for all  $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} \in [\mathbf{x}^{(0)}]_{\approx_i}, \dots, \mathbf{y}^{(n-1)} \in [\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}]_{\approx_i}$  we have that  $(y_i^{(0)}, \dots, y_i^{(n-1)}) = (x_i^{(0)}, \dots, x_i^{(n-1)})$ , the two chains of equivalences result in

$$\varrho^{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_\infty}(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}), \dots, \eta_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{x}^{(n-1)})) = \underline{\varrho}^{\mathbf{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)}) \quad (= \varrho^{\mathcal{A}_\infty}(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n-1)})). \quad \square$$

In the following, for every full subcategory  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ , by  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]]$  we denote the full subcategory of  $[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]$  that is induced by all such  $\omega$ -cochains  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  for which all  $\mathbf{A}_i$  are from  $\mathcal{C}$  and all  $\alpha_i^j$  are surjective (where  $i \leq j < \omega$ ). Moreover, by  $\pi\mathcal{C}$  we will denote the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$  that is induced by  $\pi\mathcal{C}$ . Observation 4.11 implies that  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]]$  and  $\pi\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  are equivalent categories (the adjoint equivalence is given by the restrictions of  $\underline{\text{Lim}}$  and  $\text{Seq}$  to  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{S}_\Sigma]]$  and  $\pi\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ ).

## 5. THE CASE OF HEREDITARY CLASSES

If we restrict our attention to such full subcategories  $\mathcal{C}$  of  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  for which  $\mathcal{C}$  is a hereditary class (i.e., it consists of finitely generated  $\Sigma$ -structures and it has the HP), then the mathematics of the operators  $\sigma$  and  $\pi$  becomes smoother. We already noted that for a hereditary class  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  we have that  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  consists of all countably generated  $\Sigma$ -structures whose age is contained in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Concerning the operator  $\pi$ , in this case we can get more out of the adjoint equivalence constructed in the previous section:

**5.1. Proposition.** *Let  $\mathcal{C} \leq \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ , such that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the hereditary property in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ . Then  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]]$  and  $\pi\mathcal{C}$  are equivalent categories. An adjoint equivalence is given by the appropriate restrictions of  $\underline{\text{Lim}}$  and  $\text{Seq}$ .*

*Proof.* We only need to show that the image of  $\underline{\text{Lim}} \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{C}}$  lies in  $\pi\mathcal{C}$ , and that the image of  $\text{Seq} \upharpoonright_{\pi\mathcal{C}}$  lies within  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]]$ . The former holds trivially. So let  $\mathcal{A} \in \pi\mathcal{C}$ . Without loss of generality,  $\mathcal{A} = \underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}})$ , for some  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} \in [[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]]$ . By Observation 4.11(1), we have that  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}} : \text{Seq}(\underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}})) \Rightarrow \overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  is a natural embedding. Since  $\mathcal{C}$  has the HP in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ , it follows with Observation 4.5 that  $\text{Seq}(\underline{\text{Lim}}(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}})) = \text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  is in  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]]$ .  $\square$

So far we considered the hereditary property only for classes of model theoretic structures. It is natural to extend this concept to metric structures and to examine under which conditions a class  $\pi\mathcal{C}$  has the generalized hereditary property.

**5.2. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  be a classes of metric  $\Sigma$ -structures. We say that  $\mathcal{D}$  has the hereditary property (HP) in  $\mathcal{M}$  if whenever  $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $\iota : \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is a metric embedding of  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{M}$  into  $\mathcal{B}$ , then we have that  $\mathcal{A}$  is also in  $\mathcal{D}$ .

**5.3. Observation.** *Let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  have the hereditary property in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ . Then  $\pi\mathcal{C}$  has the hereditary property in  $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{B} \in \pi\mathcal{C}$ , let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ , and let  $\iota: \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a metric embedding. Since  $\mathcal{C}$  has the HP in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ , it follows from Proposition 5.1 that  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{B}) \in [[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]]$ . By Observation 4.6,  $\text{Seq}(\iota): \text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Seq}(\mathcal{B})$  is a natural embedding. Again, since  $\mathcal{C}$  has the HP in  $\mathcal{S}_\Sigma$ , it follows that  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) \in [[\omega^{\text{op}}, \mathcal{C}]]$ . Consequently,  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})) \in \pi\mathcal{C}$ .

Since  $\eta$  is a natural transformation, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{B} \\ \eta_{\mathcal{A}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_{\mathcal{B}} \\ \underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\iota))} & \underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\mathcal{B})) \end{array}$$

By Observation 4.11(2),  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$  is a metric isomorphism. It follows that  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\iota)) \circ \eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a metric embedding, too. Since both,  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\iota))$  are 1-Lipschitz, it follows that both are actually isometries. Moreover, since  $\eta_{\mathcal{B}}$  preserves each basic relation  $\varrho^{\mathcal{A}}$ . So do  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\iota))$ . It follows that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  and  $\underline{\text{Lim}}(\text{Seq}(\iota))$  are both metric embeddings. Finally, from Observation 4.7 it follows that  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is bijective. Hence  $\eta_{\mathcal{A}}$  is a metric isomorphism. This implies that  $\mathcal{A} \in \pi\mathcal{C}$ . Thus,  $\pi\mathcal{C}$  has the HP in  $\mathcal{U}_\Sigma$ .  $\square$

## 6. NOTIONS OF SMALLNESS FOR ULTRAMETRIC STRUCTURES

In model theory, a structure is considered *small* if the cardinality of its carrier set is bounded from above by some (usually unspecified) cardinal. In Fraïssé-theory it is customary to call a relational structure small if it is finite and, more generally, to call a structure small if it is finitely generated. In the case of metric structures, given that they are equipped with a metric, we see at least four possible notions of smallness. A metric structure  $\mathcal{A}$  might be called *small* if one of the following conditions hold:

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  is finite,
- (2)  $\mathcal{A}$  is finitely generated,
- (3)  $\mathcal{A}$  is compact,
- (4)  $\mathcal{A}$  is compactly generated.

Here compactness is to be understood with respect to the topology induced on  $A$  by the metric of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*Remark.* Recall that a subset  $A$  of a metric space  $(M, \delta)$  is called *totally bounded* if for every  $\varepsilon > 0$  we have that  $A$  can be covered by finitely many open  $\varepsilon$ -balls.  $A$  is called *Cauchy-precompact* if every sequence in  $A$  admits a Cauchy subsequence. It is well-known that  $A$  is totally bounded if and only if it is Cauchy-precompact. Moreover,  $A$  is compact if and only if it is totally bounded and Cauchy-complete.

**6.1. Observation.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$  be a metric structure. A subset  $M \subseteq A$  is Cauchy-precompact if and only if for each  $i < \omega$  we have that  $M/\approx_i$  is finite.*

*Proof.* “ $\Rightarrow$ ”: Suppose that for some  $i < \omega$  the set  $M/\approx_i$  is infinite. Let  $([a_j]_{\approx_i})_{j < \omega}$  be a sequence of distinct elements of  $M/\approx_i$ . Then for all  $j_1 < j_2 < \omega$  we have that  $\delta_{\mathcal{A}}(a_{j_1}, a_{j_2}) \geq 2^{-i}$ . Thus, the sequence  $(a_j)_{j < \omega}$  in  $M$  has no Cauchy-subsequence. In other words,  $M$  is not Cauchy-precompact.

“ $\Leftarrow$ ”: Let  $(a_j)_{j < \omega}$  be a sequence in  $M$ . For each  $i < \omega$  let  $L_i := \{[a_j]_{\approx_i} \mid j < \omega\}$ , and  $N_i := \{[a]_{\approx_i} \in L_i \mid \{j < \omega \mid [a_j]_{\approx_i} = [a]_{\approx_i}\} \text{ is infinite}\}$ . Since  $M/\approx_i$  is finite,  $N_i$  is non-empty. Let  $N := \bigcup_{i < \omega} N_i$ . Then  $(N, \supseteq)$  is a tree. Since all  $N_i$  are finite and non-empty, by König’s tree-lemma,  $N$  has a branch  $([b_i]_{\approx_i})_{i < \omega}$ . Next, by induction, we define a sequence  $j_0 < j_1 < \dots < \omega$ , such that for all  $i < \omega$  we have that  $[a_{j_i}]_{\approx_i} = [b_i]_{\approx_i}$ . We start by defining  $j_0 := 0$ . Note that  $[b_0]_{\approx_0} = [a_0]_{\approx_0} = M$ .



Suppose that  $j_0, \dots, j_n$  are already fixed. Take  $j_{n+1} \in J_{n+1} := \{k < \omega \mid [a_k]_{\approx_{n+1}} = [b_{n+1}]_{\approx_{n+1}}\}$ , such that  $j_{n+1} > j_n$  (this is possible, since  $J_{n+1}$  is infinite). We claim that the sequence  $(a_{j_i})_{i < \omega}$  is Cauchy. Indeed, if  $i < k < \omega$ , then  $[a_{j_i}]_{\approx_i} = [b_i]_{\approx_i}$ , and  $[a_{j_k}]_{\approx_k} = [b_k]_{\approx_k}$ . Since  $[b_k]_{\approx_k} \subseteq [b_i]_{\approx_i}$ , we have  $[a_{j_k}]_{\approx_i} = [a_{j_i}]_{\approx_i}$  in other words  $\delta_{A_\infty}(a_{j_i}, a_{j_k}) < 2^{-i}$ . This proves the claim. Consequently,  $M$  is Cauchy-precompact.  $\square$

An immediate consequence is:

**6.2. Corollary.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$  be an ultrametric structure with  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is compact if and only if for all  $i < \omega$  the structure  $\mathbf{A}_i$  is finite.*

*Proof.* Clear.  $\square$

For compactly generated ultrametric structures a slightly weaker observation may be formulated:

**6.3. Corollary.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{U}_\Sigma$  be compactly generated. Suppose that  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A}) = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . Then for all  $i < \omega$  the structure  $\mathbf{A}_i$  is finitely generated.*

*Proof.* Let  $M \subseteq A$  be a compact generating system of  $\mathcal{A}$ . By Observation 6.1 we have that  $M/\approx_i$  is finite for each  $i < \omega$ . Let  $(\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega}$  be the canonical cone for  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$ . Since  $\alpha_i^\infty \circ U(\eta_{\mathcal{A}}): U(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_i$  is a surjective homomorphism, it follows that  $M/\approx_i$  is a generating set of  $\mathbf{A}_i$ , for each  $i < \omega$ .  $\square$

Note that in general it is not true that  $\omega$ -cochains of finitely generated structures have a compactly generated canonical ultrametric structure, as the following example shows:

**6.4. Example.** Consider the signature of monoids. It is given by  $\Sigma = (\Phi, P, \text{ar})$ , where  $P = \emptyset$  and where  $\Phi = \{\cdot, 1\}$  with  $\text{ar}(\cdot) = 2$  and  $\text{ar}(1) = 0$ . Our goal is to define an  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}} = ((\mathbf{A}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  of finitely generated monoids in such a way that  $\varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$  is not compactly generated.

Let  $X = \{x_i \mid i < \omega\}$  be a set of distinct letters. For each  $i < \omega$ , let  $X_i := \{x_0, \dots, x_{i-1}\}$ . Further let  $\mathbf{A}_i := X_i^*$  be the free monoid freely generated by  $X_i$  (in particular,  $X_i^*$  consists of all finite words over  $X_i$ , the concatenation of words is the monoid-multiplication, and the empty word  $\varepsilon$  is the neutral element). Note that  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \{\varepsilon\}$ . Define  $\alpha_0^1$  to be the unique homomorphism that maps  $x_0$  to  $\varepsilon$ . Similarly, for  $i > 0$  let  $\alpha_i^{i+1}$  be the unique monoid homomorphism that maps  $x_j$  to itself for all  $j < i$  and that maps  $x_i$  to  $x_0^i$  (the existence and uniqueness of all these homomorphisms is guaranteed by the fact that  $\mathbf{A}_{i+1}$  is freely generated by  $X_{i+1}$ ). Thus we have defined the  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ :

$$\mathbf{A}_0 \xleftarrow{\alpha_0^1} \mathbf{A}_1 \xleftarrow{\alpha_1^2} \mathbf{A}_2 \xleftarrow{\alpha_2^3} \mathbf{A}_3 \xleftarrow{\alpha_3^4} \dots$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}_\infty := \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{A}}$ . Let us show that  $\mathcal{A}_\infty$  is not compactly generated. A first important observation is that for each  $i < \omega$  we have that every generating set of  $\mathbf{A}_i$  has to contain  $X_i$  as a subset. Let  $M \subseteq A_\infty$  be any generating set of  $\mathcal{A}_\infty$ . Then for every  $i < \omega$  there exists  $\mathbf{a}^{(i)} \in A_\infty$ , such that  $a_{i+1}^{(i)} = x_i$ . But then  $a_1^{(i)} = x_1^i$ . A consequence is that  $\alpha_1^\infty(M) \supseteq \{x_1^i \mid 0 < i < \omega\}$ . Consequently, by Observation 6.1,  $M$  is not Cauchy-precompact.

The previous example suggests a weaker variant of smallness:

**6.5. Definition.** An ultrametric structure  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *pro-finitely generated* if in the image of  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{A})$  each structure is finitely generated.

Clearly, if an ultrametric structure is compactly generated, then it is also pro-finitely generated. As the example above shows, the opposite is not true. However, in case of pure relational signatures, there is no difference between compactness, compact generatedness and pro-finite generatedness. Our notion of choice for smallness among ultrametric structures is the notion of pro-finite generatedness.



**7.4. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of structures of the same type. We say that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the HAP if for all  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2$  from  $\mathcal{C}$ , for all  $f_1: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_1$ , and for all  $f_2: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_2$  there exist  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $g_1: \mathbf{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ , and  $g_2: \mathbf{B}_2 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B}_1 & \overset{g_1}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathbf{C} \\ \uparrow f_1 & & \uparrow g_2 \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{f_2} & \mathbf{B}_2. \end{array}$$

*Remark.* The acronym HAP is usually translated as *homo amalgamation property* stressing, that two morphisms in the commuting square are merely homomorphisms instead of embeddings. Given that in the definition of the HAP diverse sorts of morphisms are used, another legitimate translation would be *hetero amalgamation property*. We should mention that the HAP has been around in mathematical literature for quite a long time. We could trace it back to the paper [1] by Banaschewski, where it is called the *transferability property*. It appeared as the 1PHEP in [4], and as the *mixed amalgamation property* in [14]. Be it as it may, in this paper we will stick with the by now standard acronym HAP and leave it to the reader to decide what the letter H is standing for.

**7.5. Theorem.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite and purely relational signature, and let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  be an age with the AP, the AEP, and the HAP. Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the unique universal homogeneous metric structure in  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  postulated by Theorem 7.3. Then every isomorphism between finite substructure of its underlying structure  $\mathbf{U}$  extends to an automorphism of  $\mathbf{U}$ . Moreover, this extension is bi-Lipschitz with respect to the metric of  $\mathcal{U}$ .

At this point a formally correct and complete proof of these claims would be overwhelmingly technical and cumbersome. We chose to proceed in a couple a smaller, manageable steps. Let us start by giving a sketch of the general idea. We start from a hereditary class  $\mathcal{C}$ . Clearly then also  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  is hereditary. By Proposition 5.1 the appropriate restrictions of the functors  $\text{Seq}$  and  $\varprojlim$  induce a categorical equivalence between the category  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \sigma\mathcal{C}]]$  of surjective  $\omega$ -cochains over  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  and  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . So instead of constructing a universal homogeneous ultrametric structure  $\mathcal{U}$  in  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$ , we may construct an appropriate surjective  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$  over  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ , such that  $\varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}} \cong \mathcal{U}$ .

In order to obtain a universal ultrametric structure  $\mathcal{U} \in \pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  we need to construct an  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$  that is universal for  $[[\omega^{\text{op}}, \sigma\mathcal{C}]]$ . To this end, we use the notion of universal homomorphisms:

**7.6. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an age, and let  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ . A homomorphism  $\Omega: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$  is called *universal in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$*  if for all  $\mathbf{A} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ , and for all  $h: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$  there exists an embedding  $\iota: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{U}$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U} & & \\ \uparrow & \searrow \Omega & \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{h} & \mathbf{V}. \end{array}$$

A first simple but very useful observation about universal homomorphisms is:

**7.7. Observation.** Every universal homomorphism in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  is a retraction.

*Proof.* Let  $\Omega: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$  be universal in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Then there exists an embedding  $\iota$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U} & & \\ \uparrow & \searrow \Omega & \\ \mathbf{V} & & \mathbf{V} \\ \downarrow \iota & \nearrow 1_{\mathbf{V}} & \end{array}$$

In other words,  $1_{\mathbf{V}} = \Omega \circ \iota$ . That means that  $\iota$  is a section and that  $\Omega$  is a retraction.  $\square$

Let us postpone the question about the existence of universal homomorphisms for later. For now let us see, how they may be used for the construction of universal ultrametric structures:

**7.8. Observation.** Let  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}} = ((\mathbf{U}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\Omega_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  be an  $\omega$ -cochain over  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ , such that  $\mathbf{U}_0$  is universal for  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  and such that for all  $i < \omega$  we have that  $\Omega_i^{i+1}$  is universal in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} := \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is universal in  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{X} \in \pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}} := \text{Seq}(\mathcal{X}) = ((\mathbf{X}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\chi_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega}) \in [[\omega^{\text{op}}, \sigma\mathcal{C}]]$ . Let  $\iota_0: \mathbf{X}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{U}_0$  be an arbitrary embedding (this exists because  $\mathbf{U}_0$  is universal in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ ). Suppose that  $\iota_i$  has already been defined. Consider  $\iota_i \circ \chi_i^{i+1}: \mathbf{X}_{i+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_i$ . Since  $\Omega_i^{i+1}$  is universal, there exists  $\iota_{i+1}: \mathbf{X}_{i+1} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{U}_{i+1}$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1} \\ \uparrow \iota_i & & \uparrow \iota_{i+1} \\ \mathbf{X}_i & \xleftarrow{\chi_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{X}_{i+1} \end{array}$$

Thus,  $(\iota_i)_{i < \omega}: \overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}} \Rightarrow \overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$  is a natural embedding. Hence  $\varprojlim((\iota_i)_{i < \omega}): \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}} \hookrightarrow \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$  is a metric embedding. By Proposition 5.1 we have that  $\varprojlim(\overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}}) \cong \mathcal{X}$ . Thus the claim follows.  $\square$

For homogeneity a similar induction should do the trick. The proper mode of homomorphisms in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  is defined below:

**7.9. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an age, and let  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ . A homomorphism  $\Omega: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$  is called *skew-homogeneous* in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  if for each  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ , for all  $h: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ , for all  $\iota, \kappa: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{U}$ , and for all  $\psi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V})$  such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U} & \xrightarrow{\Omega} \twoheadrightarrow & \mathbf{V} \\ \uparrow \iota & & \parallel \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{h} & \mathbf{V} \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{h} & \mathbf{V} \\ \downarrow \kappa & & \cong \downarrow \psi \\ \mathbf{U} & \xrightarrow{\Omega} \twoheadrightarrow & \mathbf{V} \end{array}$$

commute, there exists  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{U})$ , such that the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U} & \xrightarrow{\cong} \varphi & \mathbf{U} \\ \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \kappa \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \mathbf{A} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U} & \xrightarrow{\Omega} \twoheadrightarrow & \mathbf{V} \\ \uparrow \varphi \cong & & \cong \downarrow \psi \\ \mathbf{U} & \xrightarrow{\Omega} \twoheadrightarrow & \mathbf{V} \end{array}$$

Again, let us not worry for now about the existence of skew homogeneous homomorphisms, but let us instead have a look onto their usefulness:

**7.10. Observation.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a Fraïssé-class. Let  $\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}} = ((\mathbf{U}_i)_{i < \omega}), (\Omega_i^h)_{i \leq j < \omega}$  be an  $\omega$ -cochain over  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ , such that  $\mathbf{U}_0$  is homogeneous and such that for all  $i < \omega$  we have that  $\Omega_i^{i+1}$  is skew homogeneous in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} := \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is homogeneous.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a pro-finitely generated ultrametric structure and let  $\iota, \kappa$  be metric embeddings of  $\mathcal{X}$  into  $\mathcal{U}$ . By Observation 5.3,  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  is hereditary. Since  $\mathcal{U} \in \pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  it follows that  $\mathcal{X} \in \pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Without loss of generality,  $\mathcal{X} = \varprojlim(\overleftarrow{\mathcal{X}})$ , where  $\overleftarrow{\mathcal{X}} = ((\mathbf{X}_i)_{i < \omega}, (x_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ .

Denote  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{U}) = ((\mathbf{V}_i)_{i < \omega}, (v_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ ,  $\text{Seq}(\mathcal{X}) = ((\mathbf{Y}_i)_{i < \omega}, (y_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ ,  $\text{Seq}(\iota) = (\iota_i)_{i < \omega}$ , and  $\text{Seq}(\kappa) = (\kappa_i)_{i < \omega}$ . By Observation 4.6,  $\text{Seq}(\iota)$  and  $\text{Seq}(\kappa)$  are natural embeddings. By Observation 4.11(1),  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}}: \text{Seq}(\mathcal{U}) \Rightarrow \overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}$  is a natural embedding. Thus,  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}} \circ \text{Seq}(\iota)$  and  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}} \circ \text{Seq}(\kappa)$  are natural embeddings, too. By induction we are going to construct a natural automorphism  $\varphi = (\varphi_i)_{i < \omega}$  of  $\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}$ , such that  $\varphi \circ \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}} \circ \text{Seq}(\iota) = \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}} \circ \text{Seq}(\kappa)$ .

Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is pro-finitely generated,  $\mathbf{Y}_0$  is finitely generated. Since  $\mathbf{U}_0$  is homogeneous, there exists  $\varphi_0 \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{U}_0)$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U}_0 & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\varphi_0} & \mathbf{U}_0 \\ \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}},0} \circ \iota_0 \uparrow & & \uparrow \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}},0} \circ \kappa_0 \\ \mathbf{Y}_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathbf{Y}_0 \end{array}$$

Suppose that  $\varphi_i \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{U}_i)$  is already constructed. In particular, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1} \\ \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}},i} \uparrow & & \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}},i+1} \uparrow \\ \mathbf{V}_i & \xleftarrow{v_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{V}_{i+1} \\ \iota_i \uparrow & & \iota_{i+1} \uparrow \\ \mathbf{Y}_i & \xleftarrow{y_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{Y}_{i+1} \\ \kappa_i \downarrow & & \kappa_{i+1} \downarrow \\ \mathbf{V}_i & \xleftarrow{v_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{V}_{i+1} \\ \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}},i} \downarrow & & \varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}},i+1} \downarrow \\ \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1} \end{array}$$

$\varphi_i \cong$  (curved arrow from top-left  $\mathbf{U}_i$  to bottom-left  $\mathbf{U}_i$ )

In particular, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1} \\
 \parallel & & \uparrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i+1}^{\circ \iota_{i+1}} \\
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i}^{\circ \iota_i \circ y_i^{i+1}}} & \mathbf{Y}_{i+1} \\
 \varphi_i \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i+1}^{\circ \kappa_{i+1}} \\
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1}.
 \end{array}$$

Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is pro-finitely generated,  $\mathbf{Y}_{i+1}$  is finitely generated. Since  $\Omega_i^{i+1}$  is skew homogeneous, there exists  $\varphi_{i+1} \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{U}_{i+1})$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1} \\
 \parallel & & \uparrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i+1}^{\circ \iota_{i+1}} \\
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i}^{\circ \iota_i \circ y_i^{i+1}}} & \mathbf{Y}_{i+1} \\
 \varphi_i \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i+1}^{\circ \kappa_{i+1}} \\
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1}.
 \end{array}
 \quad \varphi_{i+1}$$

In particular the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1} \\
 \uparrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i} & & \uparrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i+1} \\
 \mathbf{V}_i & \xleftarrow{v_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{V}_{i+1} \\
 \uparrow \iota_i & & \uparrow \iota_{i+1} \\
 \mathbf{Y}_i & \xleftarrow{y_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{Y}_{i+1} \\
 \downarrow \kappa_i & & \downarrow \kappa_{i+1} \\
 \mathbf{V}_i & \xleftarrow{v_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{V}_{i+1} \\
 \downarrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i} & & \downarrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}, i+1} \\
 \mathbf{U}_i & \xleftarrow{\Omega_i^{i+1}} & \mathbf{U}_{i+1}
 \end{array}
 \quad \varphi_i \cong \quad \varphi_{i+1}$$

Thus  $\varphi$  is completely specified. Applying the functor  $\varprojlim$  to this situation gives

$$\varprojlim(\varphi) \circ \varprojlim(\varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}}) \circ \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\iota)) = \varprojlim(\varepsilon_{\overline{\mathbf{U}}}) \circ \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\kappa)).$$

Note that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\varprojlim(\overline{X}))) & \xleftarrow{\varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\iota))} & \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\varprojlim(\overline{U}))) & \xrightarrow{(\varprojlim * \varepsilon)_{\overline{U}}} & \varprojlim(\overline{U}) \\
(\eta * \varprojlim)_{\overline{X}} \uparrow & & (\eta * \varprojlim)_{\overline{U}} \uparrow & \nearrow & \\
\varprojlim(\overline{X}) & \xleftarrow{\varprojlim(\iota)} & \varprojlim(\overline{U}) & & 
\end{array}$$

Here the left quadrangle commutes because  $(\eta * \varprojlim)$  is a natural transformation and the right hand triangle commutes because of one of the triangle identities. Analogously we have that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\varprojlim(\overline{X}))) & \xleftarrow{\varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\kappa))} & \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\varprojlim(\overline{U}))) & \xrightarrow{(\varprojlim * \varepsilon)_{\overline{U}}} & \varprojlim(\overline{U}) \\
(\eta * \varprojlim)_{\overline{X}} \uparrow & & (\eta * \varprojlim)_{\overline{U}} \uparrow & \nearrow & \\
\varprojlim(\overline{X}) & \xleftarrow{\varprojlim(\kappa)} & \varprojlim(\overline{U}) & & 
\end{array}$$

Thus, keeping in mind that  $(\varprojlim * \varepsilon)_{\overline{U}} = \varprojlim(\varepsilon_{\overline{U}})$ , we may compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\varprojlim(\varphi) \circ \iota &= \varprojlim(\varphi) \circ (\varprojlim * \varepsilon)_{\overline{U}} \circ \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\iota)) \circ (\eta * \varprojlim)_{\overline{X}} \\
&= (\varprojlim * \varepsilon)_{\overline{U}} \circ \varprojlim(\text{Seq}(\kappa)) \circ (\eta * \varprojlim)_{\overline{X}} = \varprojlim(\kappa)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{U}$  is homogeneous.  $\square$

## 8. UNIVERSAL HOMOGENEOUS HOMOMORPHISMS

Abstract Fraïssé-theory arose in a number of steps done in papers by Droste, Göbel, and Kubiś (see [6, 7, 13]). Let us recall some basic facts from abstract Fraïssé-theory needed in this paper.

An object  $A$  of a category  $\mathcal{X}$  is called  $\omega$ -small if for every  $\omega$ -chain  $((C_i)_{i < \omega}, (c_j^i)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  with limiting cocone  $(C_\infty, (c_\infty^i)_{i < \omega})$  and for every morphism  $h: A \rightarrow C_\infty$  there exists  $i < \omega$  and  $h': A \rightarrow C_i$ , such that  $h = c_\infty^i \circ h'$ . The full subcategory of  $\mathcal{X}$  that is induced by all  $\omega$ -small objects is denoted by  $\mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$ .

**8.1. Definition.** A category  $\mathcal{X}$  is called *semi-algebraic* if all  $\omega$ -chains in  $\mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$  have a colimit in  $\mathcal{X}$  and if every object of  $\mathcal{X}$  is the colimit of an  $\omega$ -chain in  $\mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$ .

**8.2. Definition.** A category  $\mathcal{X}$  is called a *Fraïssé-category* if

- (1) all its morphisms are monomorphisms,
- (2)  $\mathcal{X}$  has a *countable dominating subcategory*, i.e., it has a subcategory  $\mathcal{D}$  with countably many objects and morphisms such that
  - (a)  $\mathcal{D}$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e., for all  $A \in \mathcal{X}$  there exists  $B \in \mathcal{D}$ , such that  $\mathcal{X}(A, B) \neq \emptyset$ ,
  - (b) for all  $A \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{X}(A, B)$  there exists  $C \in \mathcal{D}$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{X}(B, C)$ , such that  $g \circ f \in \mathcal{D}(A, C)$ ,
- (3)  $\mathcal{X}$  is *directed*, i.e., for all  $A, B \in \mathcal{X}$  there exists  $C \in \mathcal{X}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}(A, C) \neq \emptyset$ , and  $\mathcal{X}(B, C) \neq \emptyset$ .

- (4)  $\mathcal{X}$  has the *amalgamation property* (AP), i.e., for all  $A, B_1, C_1 \in \mathcal{X}$  and for all  $f_1: A \rightarrow B_1$ ,  $f_2: A \rightarrow B_2$  there exist  $C \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $g_1: B_1 \rightarrow C$ , and  $g_2: B_2 \rightarrow C$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_1 & \overset{g_1}{\dashrightarrow} & C \\ f_1 \uparrow & & \uparrow g_2 \\ A & \xrightarrow{f_2} & B_2. \end{array}$$

One of the fundamental notions in abstract Fraïssé-theory is that of Fraïssé-sequences:

**8.3. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a category. An  $\omega$ -chain  $\vec{A} = ((A_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_j^i)_{i \leq j < \omega}) \in [\omega, \mathcal{X}]$  is called a *Fraïssé-sequence* if

- (1) the image of  $\vec{A}$  is cofinal in  $\mathcal{X}$ , i.e., for all  $B \in \mathcal{X}$  there exists  $i < \omega$ , such that  $\mathcal{X}(B, A_i) \neq \emptyset$ ,
- (2)  $\vec{A}$  has the *absorption property*, i.e., for all  $B \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $i < \omega$ ,  $f \in \mathcal{X}(A_i \rightarrow B)$  there exist  $j \geq i$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{X}(B, A_j)$  such that  $g \circ f = \alpha_j^i$ .

Note that if  $\mathcal{X}$  has a Fraïssé-sequence then the image of this  $\omega$ -chain forms a countable dominating subcategory of  $\mathcal{X}$ . Finally, let us formally introduce the notions of universality and homogeneity in the abstract setting of categories:

**8.4. Definition.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a category and let  $\mathcal{Y}$  be a full subcategory of  $\mathcal{X}$ . An object  $U$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  is called  *$\mathcal{Y}$ -universal* if for all  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$  we have  $\mathcal{X}(Y, U) \neq \emptyset$ . Moreover,  $U$  is called  *$\mathcal{Y}$ -homogeneous* if for all  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and for all morphisms  $f, g: Y \rightarrow U$  there exists  $\varphi \in \text{Aut}(U)$ , such that  $\varphi \circ g = f$ .

*Remark.* In case that  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}$ , then instead of “ $\mathcal{Y}$ -universal” we just say “universal”. Moreover if  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$ , then instead of “ $\mathcal{Y}$ -homogeneous” we just say “homogeneous”.

Of particular interest in abstract Fraïssé-theory are semi-algebroidal categories  $\mathcal{X}$  with all morphisms monic, for which  $\mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$  is a Fraïssé-category.

In the following we collect the results from abstract Fraïssé-theory that are needed in the present context:

**8.5. Theorem** (Droste, Göbel [6], Kubiś [13]). *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a semi-algebroidal category all of whose morphisms are monic. Suppose that  $\mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$  is a Fraïssé-category. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a countable dominating subcategory of  $\mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$ . Then*

- (1)  $\mathcal{X}_{< \omega}$  affords a Fraïssé-sequence  $\vec{F}$  whose image lies completely in  $\mathcal{D}$ ,
- (2) if  $U$  is a colimit of  $\vec{F}$  in  $\mathcal{X}$ , then it is universal and homogeneous in  $\mathcal{X}$ ,
- (3) any two universal homogeneous objects of  $\mathcal{X}$  are isomorphic.

*Proof.* (1) is (the proof of) [13, Corollary 3.8]. (3) is [6, Theorem 1.1].

For (2) is implicit in [13]. For the convenience of the reader, let us give the technical details: Suppose that  $\vec{F} = ((A_i)_{i < \omega}, (\alpha_j^i)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . Let  $(U, (\alpha_\infty^i)_{i < \omega})$  be a limiting cone.



First we show that  $U$  is homogeneous. Let  $B_0 \in \mathcal{X}_{<\omega}$ , and let  $\iota, \kappa: B \rightarrow U$ . By induction we are going to construct the following commuting diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & A_{n_0} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{n_1}^{n_0}} & A_{n_1} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{n_2}^{n_1}} & A_{n_2} \rightarrow \dots \\
 & \nearrow \kappa_0 & & \searrow \mu_1 & \nearrow \kappa_1 & \searrow \mu_2 & \nearrow \kappa_2 \\
 B_0 & \xrightarrow{\beta_1^0} & B_1 & \xrightarrow{\beta_2^1} & B_2 & \rightarrow & \dots \\
 & \searrow \iota_0 & & \nearrow \lambda_1 & \searrow \iota_1 & \nearrow \lambda_2 & \searrow \iota_2 \\
 & & A_{n_0} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{n_1}^{n_0}} & A_{n_1} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{n_2}^{n_1}} & A_{n_2} \rightarrow \dots
 \end{array}$$

Where  $(n_i)_{i<\omega}$  is a strictly increasing sequence of non-negative integers.

Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is semi-algebraical, there exists  $n_0 < \omega$ ,  $\iota_0, \kappa_0: B \rightarrow A_{n_0}$ , such that  $\iota = \alpha_\infty^{n_0} \circ \iota_0$  and  $\kappa = \alpha_\infty^{n_0} \circ \kappa_0$ . Define  $B_0 := B$ . Suppose that  $\iota_i, \kappa_i: B_i \rightarrow A_{n_i}$  are already constructed. By the AP there exists  $B_{i+1} \in \mathcal{X}_{<\omega}$ ,  $\mu_{i+1}: A_{n_i} \rightarrow B_{i+1}$ ,  $\lambda_{i+1}: A_{n_i} \rightarrow B_{i+1}$ , such that  $\mu_{i+1} \circ \kappa_i = \lambda_{i+1} \circ \iota_i$ . Define  $\beta_{i+1}^i := \lambda_{i+1} \circ \iota_i$ . Since  $\overline{F}$  is a Fraïssé-sequence, there exists  $n_{i+1} > n_i$  and  $k_{i+1}, \iota_{i+1}: B_{i+1} \rightarrow A_{n_{i+1}}$ , such that  $\alpha_{n_{i+1}}^{n_i} = \iota_{i+1} \circ \lambda_{i+1} = \kappa_{i+1} \circ \mu_{i+1}$ . Thus the diagram is constructed.

By [13, Proposition 3.3(a)], the chain  $((A_{n_i})_{i<\omega}, (\alpha_{n_j}^{n_i})_{i \leq j < \omega})$  is a Fraïssé-sequence, too. Without loss of generality we may assume that for each  $i < \omega$  we have that  $n_i = i$ . Under this assumption the commuting diagram from above looks as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & A_0 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1^0} & A_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_2^1} & A_2 \rightarrow \dots \\
 & \nearrow \kappa_0 & & \searrow \mu_1 & \nearrow \kappa_1 & \searrow \mu_2 & \nearrow \kappa_2 \\
 B_0 & \xrightarrow{\beta_1^0} & B_1 & \xrightarrow{\beta_2^1} & B_2 & \rightarrow & \dots \\
 & \searrow \iota_0 & & \nearrow \lambda_1 & \searrow \iota_1 & \nearrow \lambda_2 & \searrow \iota_2 \\
 & & A_0 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1^0} & A_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_2^1} & A_2 \rightarrow \dots
 \end{array}$$

Let  $(B_\infty, (\beta_i^\infty)_{i<\omega})$  be a limiting cone for  $\overrightarrow{B} = ((B_i)_{i<\omega}, (\beta_j^i)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ . Note that  $(U, (\alpha_\infty^i \circ \iota_i)_{i<\omega})$  and  $(U, (\alpha_\infty^i \circ \kappa_i)_{i<\omega})$  are compatible cones for  $\overrightarrow{B}$ . Let  $\iota_\infty, \kappa_\infty: B_\infty \rightarrow U$  be the respective mediating morphisms. In particular we have for each  $i < \omega$  that  $\iota_\infty \circ \beta_\infty^i = \alpha_\infty^i \circ \iota_i$ , and  $\kappa_\infty \circ \beta_\infty^i = \alpha_\infty^i \circ \kappa_i$ .

Similarly note that  $(B_\infty, (\beta_\infty^{i+1} \circ \mu_{i+1})_{i<\omega})$  and  $(B_\infty, (\beta_\infty^{i+1} \circ \lambda_{i+1})_{i<\omega})$  are compatible cones for  $\overrightarrow{F}$ . Let  $\mu_\infty, \lambda_\infty: U \rightarrow B_\infty$  be the respective mediating morphisms. In particular we have for each  $i < \omega$  that  $\mu_\infty \circ \alpha_\infty^i = \beta_\infty^{i+1} \circ \mu_{i+1}$ , and  $\lambda_\infty \circ \alpha_\infty^i = \beta_\infty^{i+1} \circ \lambda_{i+1}$ .

Next we compute for every  $i < \omega$  that

$$\lambda_\infty \circ \iota_\infty \circ \beta_\infty^i = \lambda_\infty \circ \alpha_\infty^i \circ \iota_i = \beta_\infty^{i+1} \circ \lambda_{i+1} \circ \iota_i = \beta_\infty^{i+1} \circ \beta_{i+1}^i = \beta_\infty^i.$$

Thus,  $\lambda_\infty \circ \iota_\infty = 1_{B_\infty}$ . Similarly we may compute for each  $i < \omega$  that

$$\iota_\infty \circ \lambda_\infty \circ \alpha_\infty^i = \iota_\infty \circ \beta_\infty^{i+1} \circ \lambda_{i+1} = \alpha_\infty^{i+1} \circ \iota_{i+1} \circ \lambda_{i+1} = \alpha_\infty^{i+1} \circ \alpha_{i+1}^i = \alpha_\infty^i.$$

Hence,  $\iota_\infty \circ \lambda_\infty = 1_U$ . It follows that both  $\iota_\infty$  and  $\lambda_\infty$  are mutually inverse isomorphisms. Similarly it can be shown that  $\kappa_\infty$  and  $\mu_\infty$  are mutually inverse isomorphisms. Define  $\varphi := \iota_\infty \circ \mu_\infty$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi \circ \kappa &= \varphi \circ \alpha_\infty^0 \circ \kappa_0 = \iota_\infty \circ \mu_\infty \circ \alpha_\infty^0 \circ \kappa_0 = \iota_\infty \circ \beta_\infty^1 \circ \mu_1 \circ \kappa_0 = \alpha_\infty^1 \circ \iota_1 \circ \mu_1 \circ \kappa_0 = \alpha_\infty^1 \circ \iota_1 \circ \beta_1^0 \\ &= \alpha_\infty^1 \circ \iota_1 \circ \lambda_1 \circ \iota_0 = \alpha_\infty^1 \circ \alpha_1^0 \circ \iota_0 = \iota_0 \circ \alpha_\infty^0 = \iota.\end{aligned}$$

Thus  $U$  is homogeneous. Homogeneity of  $U$  follows easily from the cofinality of the image of  $\overrightarrow{F}$  in  $\mathcal{X}_{<\omega}$ .  $\square$

The previous, Fraïssé-type theorem may be formulated even stronger:

**8.6. Observation.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be a category all of whose morphisms are monomorphisms, such that  $\mathcal{X}$  affords a Fraïssé-sequence. Then  $\mathcal{X}$  is a Fraïssé-category.*

*Proof.* [13, Proposition 3.1] entails that  $\mathcal{C}_{<\omega}$  is directed and has the AP. The image of a Fraïssé-sequence in  $\mathcal{X}_{<\omega}$  is a countable dominating subcategory of  $\mathcal{X}_{<\omega}$ .  $\square$

## 9. UNIVERSAL AND SKEW-HOMOGENEOUS HOMOMORPHISMS THROUGH COMMA-CATEGORIES

The question of existence of universal and/or homogeneous homomorphisms of various kinds was treated in [16], where, more generally, universal homogeneous objects in comma categories are studied.

In terms of comma categories the previously defined notions of universal and skew-homogeneous homomorphisms appear as follows: With  $(\sigma\mathcal{C}, \hookrightarrow)$  we denote the subcategory of  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  that is spanned by all embeddings. Moreover, for any  $\mathbf{V} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$  and for every subgroup  $H$  of  $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{V})$  we denote by  $(\mathbf{V}, H)$  the category with exactly one object  $\mathbf{V}$ , such that the morphisms are the elements of  $H$ . With  $F$  we will denote the identical embedding functor of  $(\sigma\mathcal{C}, \hookrightarrow)$  into  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . The identical embedding functor of  $(\mathbf{V}, H)$  into  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$  is denoted by  $G_{(\mathbf{V}, H)}$ . In the special case that  $H$  consists just of the identity automorphism of  $\mathbf{V}$ , instead of  $G_{(\mathbf{V}, \{1_{\mathbf{V}}\})}$  we just write  $G_{\mathbf{V}}$ .

**9.1. Observation.** *Let  $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\Omega: \mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ . Then*

- (1)  $\Omega$  is universal if and only if  $(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$  is a universal object in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$ ,
- (2)  $\Omega$  is skew-homogeneous if and only if  $(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$  is a homogeneous object in  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$ .

*Proof.* Clear.  $\square$

**9.2. Observation.** *The category  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$  is semi-algebraic. Moreover, an object  $(\mathbf{A}, h, \mathbf{V})$  of  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$  is  $\omega$ -small if and only if  $\mathbf{A}$  is finitely generated (i.e., it is  $\omega$ -small in  $\sigma\mathcal{C}$ ).*

*Proof.* This follows directly from [16, Proposition 4.4]. The conditions  $P1, \dots, P7$  from [16, Definition 4.1] are easily verified in the present case.  $\square$

For the comma-category  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$  a criterion for the AP is:

**9.3. Observation.** *The category  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$  has the AP if and only if for all  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $f_1: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_1$ ,  $f_2: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_2$ ,  $h_1: \mathbf{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ ,  $h_2: \mathbf{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ , if  $h_1 \circ f_1 = h_2 \circ f_2$ , then there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $g_1: \mathbf{B}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ,  $g_2: \mathbf{B}_2 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ,  $h: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ ,  $k \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V})$  such that the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & \mathbf{V} & \overset{k}{\dashrightarrow} \mathbf{V} \\ & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ & & & \text{---} & \text{---} \\ \mathbf{B}_1 & \overset{g_1}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathbf{C} & \text{---} & \mathbf{V} \\ & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{f_1} & \mathbf{B}_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \mathbf{V} \\ & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{f_2} & \mathbf{B}_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \mathbf{V} \\ & & & \uparrow & \uparrow \\ & & & \text{---} & \text{---} \\ & & & \mathbf{C} & \xrightarrow{h} \mathbf{V} \end{array}$$

*Proof.* This follows directly from the observation that for any subgroup  $H \leq \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V})$  the category  $(\mathbf{V}, H)$  has the AP, in conjunction with [16, Proposition 5.2(2)].  $\square$

*Remark.* Note how the formulation of the condition in Observation 9.3 is redundant. Since  $k$  is an automorphism of  $\mathbf{V}$ , it can be removed and  $h$  may be replaced by  $k^{-1} \circ h$ . The reformulation of the condition is then the following:

For all  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2 \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $f_1: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_1$ ,  $f_2: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_2$ ,  $h_1: \mathbf{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ ,  $h_2: \mathbf{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$ , if  $h_1 \circ f_1 = h_2 \circ f_2$ , then there exists  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $g_1: \mathbf{B}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ,  $g_2: \mathbf{B}_2 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ ,  $h: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \mathbf{V} \\
 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \nearrow h \\
 \mathbf{B}_1 & \xrightarrow{g_1} & \mathbf{C} \\
 \uparrow f_1 & & \uparrow g_2 \\
 \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{f_2} & \mathbf{B}_2 \\
 & & \searrow h_2
 \end{array}$$

If  $\mathcal{C}$  satisfies this condition for a given fixed  $\mathbf{V} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ , then we say that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued amalgamation property.

This leads us immediately to the next observation:

**9.4. Observation.** *The category  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$  has the AP if and only if  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued amalgamation property.*

*Proof.* This follows directly from the observation that any subgroup  $H \leq \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V})$  the category  $(\mathbf{V}, H)$  has the AP, in conjunction with [16, Proposition 5.2(2)].  $\square$

An immediate consequence is that  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$  has the AP if and only if  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$  does. Our next observation regards directedness.

**9.5. Observation.** *Suppose that  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$  has the AP. Then it is also directed. The same holds for  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is an age, it has in particular the JEP. Consequently, for any two structures  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{C}$  we have that  $\langle \emptyset \rangle_{\mathbf{A}} \cong \langle \emptyset \rangle_{\mathbf{B}}$ . Let us denote  $\langle \emptyset \rangle$  this unique (up to isomorphism) joint smallest substructure for all elements of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Clearly,  $\langle \emptyset \rangle$  is an initial object in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $h: \langle \emptyset \rangle \rightarrow \mathbf{V}$  be the unique homomorphism. Then  $(\langle \emptyset \rangle, h, \mathbf{V})$  is weakly initial in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V})})_{<\omega}$ . It is easy to see that under these circumstances the AP entails directedness.

The proof for  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$  goes completely analogously.  $\square$

It remains to check for the existence of a countable dominating subcategory:

**9.6. Observation.** *It should be noted that  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$  forms a subcategory of  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$ . Since  $\mathcal{C}$  is an age, It is not hard to see that any skeleton of  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$  is countable. However, every category is dominated by any of its skeletons. For  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$  we need to take care that the category of  $\omega$ -small objects may be uncountable, because  $|\text{Aut}(\mathbf{V})|$  might be uncountable. However,  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$  is a dominating subcategory of  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$ . Thus, clearly, every countable dominating subcategory of  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$  dominates  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$ , too.*

*Proof.* Since  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$  and  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$  have the same objects, cofinality is trivially given.

Let  $(f, \varphi): (\mathbf{A}_1, h_1, \mathbf{V}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{A}_2, h_2, \mathbf{V})$  be a morphism of  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$ . In particular the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A}_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \mathbf{V} \\ f \uparrow & & \cong \uparrow \varphi \\ \mathbf{A}_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \mathbf{V} \end{array}$$

Note that also the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A}_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-1} \circ h_2} & \mathbf{V} \\ 1_{\mathbf{A}_1} \uparrow \cong & & \cong \uparrow \varphi^{-1} \\ \mathbf{A}_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \mathbf{V} \\ f \uparrow & & \cong \uparrow \varphi \\ \mathbf{A}_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \mathbf{V}. \end{array}$$

In particular  $(1_{\mathbf{A}_1}, \varphi^{-1}) \circ (f, \varphi) = (f, 1_{\mathbf{V}})$  is a morphism of  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$ . □

**9.7. Corollary.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an age, and let  $\mathbf{V} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued AP,
- (2)  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$  is a Fraïssé-category,
- (3)  $(G \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$  is a Fraïssé-category.

*Proof.* “(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)”: By Observation 9.4,  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$  has the AP. By Observation 9.5,  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$  is directed. By Observation 9.6,  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})_{<\omega}$  has a countable dominating subcategory. Hence it is a Fraïssé-category.

“(2) $\Rightarrow$ (1)”: This is a direct consequence of Theorem 8.5, in conjunction with Observation 8.6.

“(1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3)”: This is proved analogously. □

Now we are ready to compare universal homogeneous objects in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$  and  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$ :

**9.8. Observation.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an age,  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{C}$ , such that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued AP. Let  $(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V}) \in (F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$ . Then  $(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$  universal, homogeneous in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$  if and only if it is universal homogeneous in  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$ .*

*Proof.* “ $\Leftarrow$ ”: Let  $(\mathbf{A}, h, \mathbf{V}) \in (F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$ , and let  $(\iota_1, 1_{\mathbf{V}}), (\iota_2, 1_{\mathbf{V}}): (\mathbf{A}, h, \mathbf{V}) \hookrightarrow (\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$ . Since  $(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$  is homogeneous in  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$ , there exists  $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$ , such that  $(\varphi, \psi) \circ (\iota_1, 1_{\mathbf{V}}) = (\iota_2, 1_{\mathbf{V}})$ . In particular,  $\psi = 1_{\mathbf{V}}$ . This shows that  $(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$  is homogeneous in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$ .


Let now  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \tilde{\Omega}, \mathbf{V})$  be universal homogeneous in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$  (this exists by Corollary 9.7 in conjunction with Theorem 8.5). Since  $(\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$  is universal in  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$ , there exists  $(\iota, \varphi): (\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \tilde{\Omega}, \mathbf{V}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$ .

Let  $(\mathbf{A}, h, \mathbf{V}) \in (F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})_{<\omega}$ . Since  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \tilde{\Omega}, \mathbf{V})$  is universal in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$ , there exists  $(\kappa, 1_{\mathbf{V}}): (\mathbf{A}, \varphi^{-1} \circ h, \mathbf{V}) \rightarrow (\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \tilde{\Omega}, \mathbf{V})$ . Note that then  $(\iota \circ \kappa 1_{\mathbf{V}}): (\mathbf{A}, h, \mathbf{V}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{U}, \Omega, \mathbf{V})$ .

“ $\Rightarrow$ ”: Let  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \tilde{\Omega}, \mathbf{V})$  be universal homogeneous in  $(F \downarrow G_{(\mathbf{V}, \text{Aut}(\mathbf{V}))})$  (this exists by Corollary 9.7 in conjunction with Theorem 8.5). By the other part of the proof,  $(\tilde{\mathbf{U}}, \tilde{\Omega}, \mathbf{V})$  is homogeneous in  $(F \downarrow G_{\mathbf{V}})$ .




Since  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued AP, there exist  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}$ , and  $g_1, g_2, h$ , such that the following diagram commutes:



Without loss of generality,  $\mathbf{C} = \langle g_1(B_1) \cup g_2(B_2) \rangle_{\mathbf{C}}$ . Let  $\mathbf{D} := \langle h_1(B_1) \cup h_2(B_2) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}}$ . Now we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(\mathbf{D}) &= \iota(\langle h_1(B_1) \cup h_2(B_2) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}}) = \langle \iota(h_1(B_1)) \cup \iota(h_2(B_2)) \rangle_{\mathbf{V}} \\ &= \langle h(g_1(B_1)) \cup h(g_2(B_2)) \rangle_{\mathbf{V}} = h(\langle g_1(B_1) \cup g_2(B_2) \rangle_{\mathbf{C}}) = h(\mathbf{C}). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}} := \iota(\mathbf{D})$ , and let  $\tilde{\iota}$  be the image restriction of  $\iota$  to  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ . Then, in particular,  $\tilde{\iota}$  is an isomorphism. Let  $\tilde{h}$  be the image restriction of  $h$  to  $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}$ . Then for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  the following diagram commutes:



Define  $h' := \kappa \circ \tilde{\iota}^{-1} \circ \tilde{h}$ . Then we may compute:

$$\iota \circ h' \circ g_i = \iota \circ \kappa \circ \tilde{\iota}^{-1} \circ \tilde{h} \circ g_i = \lambda \circ \tilde{\iota} \circ \tilde{\iota}^{-1} \circ \tilde{h} \circ g_i = \lambda \circ \tilde{h} \circ g_i = h \circ g_i = \iota \circ h_i.$$

Since  $\iota$  is injective, it follows that  $h' \circ g_i = h_i$ , for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{U}$ -valued AP.  $\square$


Now we can sum up all our findings concerning the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued amalgamation property:

**10.2. Proposition.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be an Fraïssé-class with Fraïssé-limit  $\mathbf{V}$ . Then the following are equivalent*


- (1)  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AEP,
- (2)  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued AP.
- (3)  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{U}$ -valued AP, for every  $\mathbf{U} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ ,
- (4)  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{A}$ -valued AP, for every  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

*Proof.* “(1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)”: Given  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}_1, \mathbf{B}_2, f_1, f_2, h_1, h_2$  as required in the definition of the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued AP (see page 27). Let  $\mathbf{T} := \langle B_1 \cup B_2 \rangle_{\mathbf{V}}$ , and let  $\tilde{h}_1$  and  $\tilde{h}_2$  be the image restrictions of  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  to  $\mathbf{T}$ ,


respectively. By the AEP there exist  $\mathbf{T}'$ ,  $g_1, g_2, h, k$ , such that the following diagram commutes:



Since  $\mathbf{V}$  is the Fraïssé limit of  $\mathcal{C}$ , there exists  $\iota: \mathbf{T}' \hookrightarrow \mathbf{V}$ , such that



commutes. Together this gives the following commuting diagram:



This shows that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued AP.

“(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3)”: This follows from the universality of  $\mathbf{V}$  in conjunction with Observation 10.1.

“(3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) $\Rightarrow$ (1)”: Clear. □

## 11. PROOF OF THEOREM 7.3

For the convenience, let us repeat the formulation of Theorem 7.3:

**Theorem 7.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\Sigma$  be an age. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AP and the AEP,
- (2)  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  contains a universal and homogeneous ultrametric structure.

Moreover, any two universal and homogeneous structures in  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  are metrically isomorphic.

*Proof of existence.* Suppose that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AP and the AEP.

Let  $\mathbf{U}_0$  be a Fraïssé-limit of  $\mathcal{C}$ . It follows from Proposition 10.2 that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the  $\mathbf{V}$ -valued AP, for every  $\mathbf{V} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$ . By Corollary 9.9, there exists a universal, skew-homogeneous homomorphism  $\omega_0^1: \mathbf{U}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_0$ . By induction, this may be extended into an  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}} = ((\mathbf{U}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\Omega_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$ , such that for all  $i < \omega$  we have that  $\Omega_i^{i+1}$  is universal and skew-homogeneous. The other homomorphisms  $\Omega_i^{i+k}$  are defined naturally by a suitably composing homomorphisms of the shape  $\Omega_i^{i+1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{U} := \varprojlim_i \overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ . By Observations 7.8 and 7.10, we have that  $\mathcal{U}$  is universal in  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  and homogeneous. □

Before giving the proof of uniqueness of Theorem 7.3, we need move a standard observation from Fraïssé-theory to the context of ultrametric structures:

**11.1. Observation.** *Let  $\mathcal{V} \in \pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  be universal and homogeneous. Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  be profinitely generated, and suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  is an isometric substructure of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\iota: \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$  be a metric embedding. Then there is a metric embedding  $\hat{\iota}: \mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$  that makes the following diagram commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B} & \xleftarrow{\hat{\iota}} & \mathcal{V} \\ \uparrow \lrcorner & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{A} & \xleftarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{V}. \end{array}$$

*Proof.* By universality, there exists an isometric embedding  $\kappa$  of  $\mathcal{B}$  into  $\mathcal{V}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a metric substructure of  $\mathcal{V}$ . By isometric homogeneity, there exists an metric automorphism  $f$  of  $\mathcal{V}$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B} & \xleftarrow[\leq]{\kappa} & \mathcal{V} \\ \uparrow \lrcorner & & \downarrow f \\ \mathcal{A} & \xleftarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{V}. \end{array}$$

With  $\hat{\iota} := f \circ \kappa$  the claim follows. □

*Proof of uniqueness in Theorem 7.3.* Let  $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  be universal homogeneous ultrametric structures. Without loss of generality, suppose that  $\mathcal{A} = \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathcal{A}}$  where  $\overleftarrow{\mathcal{A}}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{A}_0 \xleftarrow{\alpha_0^1} \mathbf{A}_1 \xleftarrow{\alpha_1^2} \mathbf{A}_2 \xleftarrow{\alpha_2^3} \mathbf{A}_3 \xleftarrow{\alpha_3^4} \dots$$

Let  $(\mathbf{A}_\infty, (\alpha_i^\infty)_{i < \omega})$  be the corresponding canonical cone (in particular, the carrier of  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $A_\infty$ ).

In the same way we may assume that  $\mathcal{B} = \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathcal{B}}$ , where  $\overleftarrow{\mathcal{B}}$  is given by

$$\mathbf{B}_0 \xleftarrow{\beta_0^1} \mathbf{B}_1 \xleftarrow{\beta_1^2} \mathbf{B}_2 \xleftarrow{\beta_2^3} \mathbf{B}_3 \xleftarrow{\beta_3^4} \dots$$

Let  $(\mathbf{B}_\infty, (\beta_i^\infty)_{i < \omega})$  be the corresponding canonical cone (in particular, the carrier of  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $B_\infty$ ).

Using a back and forth argument, we construct a metric isomorphism between countable dense incomplete metric substructures of  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ .

Let us formulate the construction as a game between two players. The game is identical to the classical Ehrenfeucht-Fraïssé game of length  $\omega$  with a twist concerning the winning condition. A play  $((\mathbf{a}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\mathbf{b}_i)_{i < \omega})$  is a win for player 2 if the assignment  $\varphi: \mathbf{a}_i \mapsto \mathbf{b}_i$  induces a metric isomorphism  $\hat{\varphi}$  from  $\langle \mathbf{a}_i \mid i < \omega \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$  to  $\langle \mathbf{b}_i \mid i < \omega \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ .

Let us describe a winning strategy for player 2. Suppose that after  $n$  rounds the position of the game is  $(\mathbf{a}_0, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n-1}; \mathbf{b}_0, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n-1})$ , such that the assignment  $\mathbf{a}_i \mapsto \mathbf{b}_i$  ( $0 \leq i < n$ ) induces an isomorphism  $\iota$  from  $\mathcal{A}_n := \langle \mathbf{a}_0, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$  to  $\mathcal{B}_n := \langle \mathbf{b}_0, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n-1} \rangle_{\mathcal{B}}$ .

Suppose further that player 1 chooses  $\mathbf{a}_n \in A_\infty$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_{n+1} := \langle \mathbf{a}_0, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \rangle_{\mathcal{A}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}$  is universal and homogeneous, by Observation 11.1, there exists an isometric embedding  $\hat{\iota}: \mathcal{A}_{n+1}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  that makes



the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A}_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{\hat{\iota}} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \uparrow \leq & & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{A}_n & \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{B}_n \xrightarrow{\leq} & \mathcal{B}.
 \end{array}$$

Now player 2 answers with  $\mathbf{b}_n := \hat{\iota}(\mathbf{a}_n)$ .

On the other hand, if player 1 chooses  $\mathbf{b}_n$  from  $B_\infty$ , then the choice of  $\mathbf{a}_n$  from  $A_\infty$  for player 2 goes analogously, using the universality and homogeneity of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

It is not hard to see that the described strategy is a winning strategy for player 2.

It remains to show that player 1 has a strategy to enforce each game  $((\mathbf{a}_i)_{i < \omega}, (\mathbf{b}_i)_{i < \omega})$  has the property that  $\{\mathbf{a}_i \mid i < \omega\}$  is dense in  $A_\infty$  and that  $\{\mathbf{b}_i \mid i < \omega\}$  is dense in  $B_\infty$ . For this we fix bijections  $\chi: \omega \rightarrow \bigcup_{i < \omega} \{i\} \times A_i$  and  $\xi: \omega \rightarrow \bigcup_{i < \omega} \{i\} \times B_i$ . Suppose again that after  $n$  rounds the position of the game is  $(\mathbf{a}_0, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{n-1}; \mathbf{b}_0, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{n-1})$ . If  $n$  is even, then player 1 chooses the smallest  $j < \omega$ , such that with  $\chi(j) = (k, x)$  we have that  $x \notin \{\alpha_k^\infty(\mathbf{a}_i) \mid i < n\}$ , and goes on to take any  $\mathbf{a}_n \in A_\infty$  with  $\alpha_k^\infty(\mathbf{a}_n) = x$ .

If  $n$  is odd, then player 1 chooses  $\mathbf{b}_n \in B_\infty$  in an analogous way, using  $\xi$ .

If players 1 and 2 each play their respective strategy, then the resulting game defines an isometric isomorphism from a dense isometric substructure of  $\mathcal{A}$  to a dense isometric substructure of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Using the completion functor, this isomorphism extends to an isometric isomorphism from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$ , as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of the backwards-implication in Theorem 7.3.* Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be a universal homogeneous ultrametric structure in  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Without loss of generality,  $\mathcal{U} = \varprojlim \overline{\mathcal{U}}$ , where  $\overline{\mathcal{U}} = ((\mathbf{U}_i)_{i < \omega}, (u_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  and where all  $u_i^j$  are surjective. We are going to show that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AP and the AEP.

Consider any  $\omega$ -cochain  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}}$  of the shape

$$\mathbf{X} \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{X}}} \mathbf{X} \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{X}}} \mathbf{X} \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{X}}} \dots$$

This is a surjective  $\omega$ -cochain. By Observation 4.11(1) we have that  $\varepsilon_{\overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}}}$  is a natural isomorphism. By universality of  $\mathcal{U}$  there exists a natural embedding  $(\kappa_i)_{i < \omega}$  from  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{X}}$  to  $((\mathbf{U}_i)_{i < \omega}, (u_i^j)_{i \leq j < \omega})$  in other words, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathbf{U}_0 & \xleftarrow{u_0^1} & \mathbf{U}_1 & \xleftarrow{u_1^2} & \mathbf{U}_2 & \xleftarrow{u_2^3} & \dots \\
 \uparrow \kappa_0 & & \uparrow \kappa_1 & & \uparrow \kappa_2 & & \\
 \mathbf{X} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{X}}} & \mathbf{X} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{X}}} & \mathbf{X} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{X}}} & \dots
 \end{array}$$

Let us now show that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AP. Let  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{C}$ , and let  $\iota: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}$ ,  $\lambda: \mathbf{A} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ . With the same reasoning as above, there exist natural embeddings  $(\iota_i)_{i < \omega}$  and  $(\lambda_i)_{i < \omega}$ , such that the following

diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathbf{U}_0 & \xleftarrow{u_0^1} & \mathbf{U}_1 & \xleftarrow{u_1^2} & \mathbf{U}_2 & \xleftarrow{u_2^3} & \dots \\
 \uparrow \iota_0 & & \uparrow \iota_1 & & \uparrow \iota_2 & & \\
 \mathbf{B} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{B}}} & \mathbf{B} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{B}}} & \mathbf{B} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{B}}} & \dots \\
 \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \iota & & \\
 \mathbf{A} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{A}}} & \mathbf{A} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{A}}} & \mathbf{A} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{A}}} & \dots \\
 \downarrow \lambda & & \downarrow \lambda & & \downarrow \lambda & & \\
 \mathbf{C} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{C}}} & \mathbf{C} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{C}}} & \mathbf{C} & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{C}}} & \dots \\
 \downarrow \lambda_0 & & \downarrow \lambda_1 & & \downarrow \lambda_2 & & \\
 \mathbf{U}_0 & \xleftarrow{u_0^1} & \mathbf{U}_1 & \xleftarrow{u_1^2} & \mathbf{U}_2 & \xleftarrow{u_2^3} & \dots
 \end{array}$$

By the homogeneity of  $\mathcal{U}$ , there exists a natural automorphism  $(\varphi_i)_{i < \omega}$  of  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ , such that for all  $i < \omega$  we have  $\varphi_i \circ \iota_i \circ \iota = \lambda_i \circ \lambda$ . Let  $\mathbf{D} := \langle \varphi_0(\iota_0(\mathbf{B})) \cup \lambda_0(\mathbf{C}) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_0}$ . Let  $\tilde{\lambda}_0: \mathbf{C} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{D}$  be the image restriction of  $\lambda_0$  to  $\mathbf{D}$  and let  $\tilde{\iota}_0: \mathbf{B} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{D}$  be the image restriction of  $\varphi_0 \circ \iota_0$  to  $\mathbf{D}$ . Then the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathbf{U}_0 & & & & \\
 \uparrow \iota_0 & \searrow \varphi_0 & & & \\
 \mathbf{B} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{\iota}_0} & \mathbf{D} & \xrightarrow{=} & \mathbf{U}_0 \\
 \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \tilde{\lambda}_0 & \nearrow = & \\
 \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \mathbf{C} & & 
 \end{array}$$

In particular,  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AP.

Our next step is to show that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AEP. To this end we consider the comma-category  $(\mathbf{F} \downarrow \mathbf{F})$  (see the beginning of Section 9 for a definition of  $\mathbf{F}$ ). The objects of  $(\mathbf{F} \downarrow \mathbf{F})$  are triples  $(\mathbf{A}, h, \mathbf{B})$ , where  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \sigma\mathcal{C}$  and where  $h: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ . The homomorphisms from  $(\mathbf{A}_1, h_1, \mathbf{B}_1)$  to  $(\mathbf{A}_2, h_2, \mathbf{B}_2)$  are of the shape  $(\iota, \kappa)$ , where  $\iota: \mathbf{A}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{A}_2$  and  $\kappa: \mathbf{B}_1 \hookrightarrow \mathbf{B}_2$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{A}_2 & \xrightarrow{h_2} & \mathbf{B}_2 \\
 \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \kappa \\
 \mathbf{A}_1 & \xrightarrow{h_1} & \mathbf{B}_1
 \end{array}$$

With the same argument as in the proof Observation 9.2 (namely, observing that the premises of [16, Proposition 4.4]) are trivially satisfied in this case), we observe that  $(\mathbf{F} \downarrow \mathbf{F})$  is semi-algebroidal, and that the objects of  $(\mathbf{F} \downarrow \mathbf{F})_{< \omega}$  are of the shape  $(\mathbf{A}, h, \mathbf{B})$ , where  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{C}$ .

Next we are going to show that  $(\mathbf{F} \downarrow \mathbf{F})_{< \omega}$  has the AP. When this is done, then we may use [16, Proposition 5.2(2)] in order to conclude that  $\mathcal{C}$  has the AEP.

Let  $(\mathbf{A}_1, \alpha_0^1, \mathbf{A}_0)$ ,  $(\mathbf{B}_1, \beta_0^1, \mathbf{B}_0)$ ,  $(\mathbf{C}_1, c_0^1, \mathbf{C}_0) \in (\mathbf{F} \downarrow \mathbf{F})$ . In the first step let us assume that  $\alpha_0^1$ ,  $\beta_0^1$ , and  $c_0^1$  are surjective. Like above, by the universality of  $\mathcal{U}$ , there exist natural embeddings  $(\nu_i)_{i < \omega}$  and  $(\kappa_i)_{i < \omega}$ , such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathbf{U}_0 & \xleftarrow{u_0^1} & \mathbf{U}_1 & \xleftarrow{u_1^2} & \mathbf{U}_2 & \xleftarrow{u_2^3} & \mathbf{U}_3 & \xleftarrow{u_3^4} & \dots \\
 \uparrow \nu_0 & & \uparrow \nu_1 & & \uparrow \nu_2 & & \uparrow \nu_3 & & \\
 \mathbf{B}_0 & \xleftarrow{\beta_0^1} & \mathbf{B}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{B}_1}} & \mathbf{B}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{B}_1}} & \mathbf{B}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{B}_1}} & \dots \\
 \uparrow \iota_0 & & \uparrow \iota_1 & & \uparrow \iota_1 & & \uparrow \iota_1 & & \\
 \mathbf{A}_0 & \xleftarrow{\alpha_0^1} & \mathbf{A}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{A}_1}} & \mathbf{A}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{A}_1}} & \mathbf{A}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{A}_1}} & \dots \\
 \uparrow \lambda_0 & & \uparrow \lambda_1 & & \uparrow \lambda_1 & & \uparrow \lambda_1 & & \\
 \mathbf{C}_0 & \xleftarrow{c_0^1} & \mathbf{C}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{C}_1}} & \mathbf{C}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{C}_1}} & \mathbf{C}_1 & \xleftarrow{1_{\mathbf{C}_1}} & \dots \\
 \uparrow \kappa_0 & & \uparrow \kappa_1 & & \uparrow \kappa_2 & & \uparrow \kappa_3 & & \\
 \mathbf{U}_0 & \xleftarrow{u_0^1} & \mathbf{U}_1 & \xleftarrow{u_1^2} & \mathbf{U}_2 & \xleftarrow{u_2^3} & \mathbf{U}_3 & \xleftarrow{u_3^4} & \dots
 \end{array}$$

By the homogeneity of  $\mathcal{U}$ , there exists a natural automorphism  $(\varphi_i)_{i < \omega}$  of  $\overleftarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ , such  $\varphi_0 \circ \nu_0 \circ \iota_0 = \kappa_0 \circ \lambda_0$  and for all  $1 \leq i < \omega$  we have  $\varphi_i \circ \nu_i \circ \iota_i = \kappa_i \circ \lambda_i$ .

Let  $\mathbf{D}_1 := \langle \varphi_1(\nu_1(B_1)) \cup \kappa_1(C_1) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_1}$ , and let  $\mathbf{D}_0 := \langle \varphi_0(\nu_0(B_0)) \cup \kappa_0(C_0) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_0}$ . Then  $u_0^1(D_1) = D_0$ . Indeed:

$$\begin{aligned}
 u_0^1(D_1) &= u_0^1(\langle \varphi_1(\nu_1(B_1)) \cup \kappa_1(C_1) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_1}) = \langle u_0^1(\varphi_1(\nu_1(B_1)) \cup \kappa_1(C_1)) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_0} \\
 &= \langle u_0^1(\varphi_1(\nu_1(B_1))) \cup u_0^1(\kappa_1(C_1)) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_0} = \langle \varphi_0(u_0^1(\nu_1(B_1))) \cup \kappa_0(c_0^1(C_1)) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_0} \\
 &= \langle \varphi_0(\nu_0(\beta_0^1(B_1))) \cup \kappa_0(c_0^1(C_1)) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_0} = \langle \varphi_0(\nu_0(B_0)) \cup \kappa_0(C_0) \rangle_{\mathbf{U}_0} = D_0
 \end{aligned}$$


Let  $d_0^1$  be the unique homomorphism that makes the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbf{U}_1 & \xrightarrow{u_0^1} & \mathbf{U}_0 \\
 \uparrow = & & \uparrow = \\
 \mathbf{D}_1 & \xrightarrow{d_0^1} & \mathbf{D}_0
 \end{array}$$


For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  let  $\tilde{\kappa}_i$  be the image restriction of  $\kappa_i$  to  $D_i$ , and let  $\tilde{\nu}_i$  be the image restriction of  $\varphi_0 \circ \nu_i$  to  $D_i$ . In particular, the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathbf{U}_0 & \\
 \varphi_0 \circ \nu_0 \nearrow & \uparrow = & \nwarrow \kappa_0 \\
 \mathbf{B}_0 & & \mathbf{C}_0 \\
 \tilde{\nu}_0 \longleftarrow & \mathbf{D}_0 & \longleftarrow \tilde{\kappa}_0
 \end{array}
 \quad \text{and} \quad
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathbf{U}_1 & \\
 \varphi_1 \circ \nu_1 \nearrow & \uparrow = & \nwarrow \kappa_1 \\
 \mathbf{B}_1 & & \mathbf{C}_1 \\
 \tilde{\nu}_1 \longleftarrow & \mathbf{D}_1 & \longleftarrow \tilde{\kappa}_1
 \end{array}$$

Then the following diagram commutes, too:



This shows the amalgamation property for surjective objects of  $(F \downarrow F)_{<\omega}$ . The general case bases on this one as follows: Let  $(A_1, \alpha_0^1, A_0)$ ,  $(B_1, \beta_0^1, B_0)$ ,  $(C_1, c_0^1, C_0) \in (F \downarrow F)_{<\omega}$ , let  $(\iota_1, \iota_0): (A_1, \alpha_0^1, A_0) \hookrightarrow (B_1, \beta_0^1, B_0)$ , and  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_0): (A_1, \alpha_0^1, A_0) \hookrightarrow (C_1, c_0^1, C_0)$ . Consider the epi-mono factorizations of  $\alpha_0^1$ ,  $\beta_0^1$ , and  $c_0^1$ :



Here the dashed arrows exist and are unique because

$$\iota_1(\tilde{A}_1) = \iota_1(\alpha_0^1(A_0)) = \beta_0^1(\iota_0(A_0)) \subseteq \beta_0^1(B_0) = \tilde{B}_1, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\lambda_1(\tilde{A}_1) = \lambda_1(\alpha_0^1(A_0)) = c_0^1(\lambda_0(A_0)) \subseteq c_0^1(C_0) = \tilde{C}_1.$$



know we have that  $\mathcal{U}_\infty := \varprojlim \overleftarrow{\mathcal{U}}$  is a universal homogeneous metric structure in  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$ . Let  $\mathbf{U}_\infty$  be its underlying structure.

On  $\mathbf{U}_\infty$  we may introduce two shift-operators  $T_L$  and  $T_R$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_L &: (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \mapsto (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots), \text{ and} \\ T_R &: (x_0, x_1, x_2, \dots) \mapsto (\Omega(x_0), x_0, x_1, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

**12.1. Lemma.**  *$T_L$  and  $T_R$  are mutually inverse Lipschitz-continuous automorphisms of  $\mathbf{U}_\infty$  with respect to the metric  $\delta$  of  $\mathcal{U}_\infty$ .*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $T_L$  and  $T_R$  are well defined self-mappings of  $\mathbf{U}_\infty$ . It is also clear that  $T_L$  is a homomorphism. Moreover,  $T_R$  is a homomorphism because  $\Omega$  is.

$T_L \circ T_R = 1_{\mathbf{U}_\infty} = T_R \circ T_L$  follows from the definition of  $T_L$  and  $T_R$ .

It remains to observe Lipschitz continuity. Suppose that  $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 2^{-n}$ . If  $n > 0$ , then  $\delta(T_R(\mathbf{x}), T_R(\mathbf{y})) = 2^{-(n+1)}$  and  $\delta(T_L(\mathbf{x}), T_L(\mathbf{y})) = 2^{-(n-1)}$ . If we suppose that  $n = 0$ , then we have at least that  $\delta(T_R(\mathbf{x}), T_R(\mathbf{y})) \leq 1$  and  $\delta(T_L(\mathbf{x}), T_L(\mathbf{y})) = 1$ . In other words  $T_R$  is non-expansive and  $T_L$  is 2-Lipschitz.  $\square$

**12.2. Lemma.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  be finite structures of  $\mathbf{U}_\infty$  and let  $\alpha: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$  be an isomorphism. Then there exists an  $l < \omega$ , such that  $T_L^l \circ \alpha \circ T_R^l: \langle T_L^l(A) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_\infty} \rightarrow \langle T_L^l(B) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_\infty}$  is a metric isomorphism.*

*Proof.* As  $A$  is finite, for every relational symbol  $\varrho$  of arity  $n$  there are just finitely many  $n$ -tuples  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \in A^n$ , such that  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin \varrho^A$ . Let  $m_\varrho < \omega$  be minimal, such that  $\Omega_{m_\varrho}^\infty(\bar{\mathbf{x}}) \notin \varrho^{U_{m_\varrho}}$ , for all  $\bar{\mathbf{x}} \notin \varrho^A$ . Let  $m$  be the maximum over all  $m_\varrho$ . Further, let  $n < \omega$  be minimal, such that  $\Omega_n^\infty \upharpoonright_{A \cup B}$  is one to one. Let  $l = \max\{m, n\}$ . Then for all  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in A$  we have

$$\rho(T_L^l(\mathbf{a}), T_L^l(\mathbf{b})) = \rho(T_L^l(\alpha(\mathbf{a})), T_L^l(\alpha(\mathbf{b}))) = 1.$$

From this the claim follows at once.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 7.5.* Let  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  be finite substructures of  $\mathbf{U}_\infty$ . Let  $l < \omega$  be such that  $T_L^l \circ \alpha \circ T_R^l: \langle T_L^l(A) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_\infty} \rightarrow \langle T_L^l(B) \rangle_{\mathcal{U}_\infty}$  is a metric isomorphism (exists by Lemma 12.2). By homogeneity there exists a metric automorphism  $h$  of  $\mathcal{U}_\infty$  that extends  $T_L^l \circ \alpha \circ T_R^l$ . Considered as automorphism of  $\mathbf{U}_\infty$ ,  $h$  is an isometry. Consider now the mapping  $\tilde{h} := T_R^l \circ h \circ T_L^l$ . By Lemma 12.1,  $\tilde{h}$  is bi-Lipschitz. We claim that  $\tilde{h}$  extends  $\alpha$ . Most easily this is seen through the following commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{U}_\infty & \xrightarrow{h} & \mathbf{U}_\infty \\ \uparrow T_R^l \cong & & \uparrow T_R^l \cong \\ \mathbf{U}_\infty & \xrightarrow{\tilde{h}} & \mathbf{U}_\infty \\ \swarrow \leq & & \nearrow \alpha \\ & \mathbf{A} & \end{array}$$

$\square$

### 13. EXAMPLES

Now that we have a criterion for  $\pi\sigma\mathcal{C}$  to contain a universal homogeneous ultrametric structure, it is high time to give a couple of examples. Very many Fraïssé-classes are known and we need to decide which of the “known suspects” have the AEP. Unfortunately, checking the AEP directly is not

a pleasant task. Fortunately, Proposition 10.2 gives us some hints. Namely, to mind spring Fraïssé-classes that have in one way or the other canonical amalgams. Here “canonical” can be understood as a uniform method for the construction of amalgams. In the language of category theory this amounts to looking for Fraïssé-classes in which for every span  $\mathbf{B} \xleftarrow{\iota} \mathbf{A} \xrightarrow{\kappa} \mathbf{C}$  in  $(\mathcal{C}, \hookrightarrow)$  there exists a cospan  $\mathbf{B} \xrightarrow{\lambda} \mathbf{D} \xrightarrow{\nu} \mathbf{C}$  in  $(\mathcal{C}, \hookrightarrow)$ , such that the square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B} & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \mathbf{D} \\ \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \nu \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{\kappa} & \mathbf{C} \end{array}$$

is a pushout-square in  $\mathcal{C}$ . This means, for all  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{C}$  and for all homomorphisms  $f: \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ ,  $g: \mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$ , such that  $f \circ \iota = g \circ \kappa$  there exists a unique homomorphism  $h: \mathbf{D} \rightarrow \mathbf{X}$  that makes the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathbf{X} \\ & \xrightarrow{f} & \uparrow \\ \mathbf{B} & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \mathbf{D} \\ \uparrow \iota & & \uparrow \nu \\ \mathbf{A} & \xrightarrow{\kappa} & \mathbf{C} \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \nearrow h \\ \searrow g \end{array}$$

Fraïssé-classes with this property are sometimes called *strict* (cf. [5, Page 638]). Bearing in mind Proposition 10.2 it is quite obvious that any strict Fraïssé-class has the AEP. Moreover, every free amalgamation class has the strict amalgamation property. Some examples of strict Fraïssé-classes are given by the classes of

- finite simple graphs,
- $K_n$ -free graphs, for every  $n \geq 3$ ,
- finite non-strict posets,
- finite rational metric spaces,
- finite semilattices,
- finite distributed lattices,
- finite Boolean algebras,
- ....


An example of an age that has the AEP but that does not have the strict amalgamation property is given by the class of finite total orders (with strict or with reflexive order relation).

Finding natural examples of Fraïssé-classes that fail to have the AEP appears do be more difficult. Here we give a somewhat artificial example just to make the point:

**13.1. Example.** Consider the signature  $\Sigma = (\Phi, P)$ , where  $\Phi$  is empty and where  $P$  consists of one binary relational symbol  $\rho$  and of two unary symbols  $P$  and  $Q$ . We may see  $\Sigma$ -structures as some kind of vertex-colored directed graphs. Consider the  $\Sigma$ -structure  $\Gamma$  on the set  $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$  given in the figure below: It is clear, that  $\Gamma$  has no non-trivial local isomorphisms. Therefore it is homogeneous. Let

$$\mathbf{A} := \langle x_1 \rangle_{\Gamma}, \quad \mathbf{B}_1 := \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle_{\Gamma}, \quad \mathbf{B}_2 := \langle x_1, x_3 \rangle_{\Gamma}, \quad \mathbf{T} := \langle x_4 \rangle_{\Gamma}.$$

For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$  let  $h_i : \mathbf{B}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{T}$  to be the unique mapping. Clearly,  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  are homomorphisms. Moreover, the following diagram is commutative:



The unique minimal amalgam of  $\mathbf{B}_1$  and  $\mathbf{B}_2$  with respect to  $\mathbf{A}$  in  $\Gamma$  is  $\mathbf{C} = \langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle_\Gamma$ . Any joint extension of  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  to  $\mathbf{C}$  within  $\Gamma$  maps  $x_2$  and  $x_3$  to  $x_4$ . However,  $(x_2, x_3) \in \varrho^\Gamma$ , while  $(x_4, x_4) \notin \varrho^\Gamma$ . This shows that  $\text{Age}(\Gamma)$  does not have the AEP.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. Banaschewski. Injectivity and essential extensions in equational classes of algebras. In *Proc. Conf. on Universal Algebra (Queen's Univ., Kingston, Ont., 1969)*, pages 131–147. Queen's Univ., Kingston, Ont., 1970.
- [2] I. Ben Yaacov. Fraïssé limits of metric structures. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 80(1):100–115, 2015.
- [3] I. Ben Yaacov, A. Berenstein, C. W. Henson, and A. Usvyatsov. Model theory for metric structures. In *Model theory with applications to algebra and analysis. Vol. 2*, volume 350 of *London math. Soc. Lecture note ser.*, pages 315–427. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [4] I. Dolinka. The Bergman property for endomorphism monoids of some Fraïssé limits. *Forum Mathematicum*, pages –, Dec. 2011.
- [5] I. Dolinka and D. Mašulović. A universality result for endomorphism monoids of some ultrahomogeneous structures. *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society. Series II*, 55(3):635–656, 2012.
- [6] M. Droste and R. Göbel. Universal domains in the theory of denotational semantics of programming languages. In *Fifth Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (Philadelphia, PA, 1990)*, pages 19–34. IEEE Comput. Soc. Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1990.
- [7] M. Droste and R. Göbel. A categorical theorem on universal objects and its application in Abelian group theory and computer science. In L. A. Bokut', Y. L. Ershov, and A. I. Kostrikin, editors, *Proc. Int. Conf. Memory A. I. Mal'cev, Novosibirsk/USSR 1989*, volume 131(3) of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 49–74, Providence, RI, 1992. AMS.
- [8] R. Fraïssé. Sur certaines relations qui généralisent l'ordre des nombres rationnels. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 237:540–542, 1953.
- [9] R. Fraïssé. Sur l'extension aux relations de quelques propriétés connues des ordres. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 237:508–510, 1953.
- [10] T. Irwin and S. Solecki. Projective Fraïssé limits and the pseudo-arc. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 358(7):3077–3096, 2006.
- [11] D. M. Kan. Adjoint functors. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 87:294–329, 1958.
- [12] A. Krawczyk and W. Kubiś. Games with finitely generated structures. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 172(10):Paper No. 103016, 13, 2021.
- [13] W. Kubiś. Fraïssé sequences: category-theoretic approach to universal homogeneous structures. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 165(11):1755–1811, 2014.
- [14] W. Kubiś. Injective objects and retracts of Fraïssé limits. *Forum Mathematicum*, 27(2):807–842, 2015.
- [15] S. Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5 of *Graduate texts in mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2 edition, 1998.
- [16] C. Pech and M. Pech. Fraïssé limits in comma categories. *Applied Categorical Structures*, Feb. 2018.



INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, CZECH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, ŽITNÁ 25, 115 67 PRAGUE, CZECH REPUBLIC

*Email address:* [kubis@math.cas.cz](mailto:kubis@math.cas.cz)

*URL:* <https://users.math.cas.cz/~kubis/>

*Email address:* [pech@math.cas.cz](mailto:pech@math.cas.cz)

*URL:* [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christian\\_Pech2](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Christian_Pech2)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOVI SAD, 21000 NOVI SAD, SERBIA

*Email address:* [maja@dmf.uns.ac.rs](mailto:maja@dmf.uns.ac.rs)

*URL:* <http://people.dmf.uns.ac.rs/~maja/>