

# Herbrand's Theorem: a short statement and a model-theoretic proof

Mariana Badano

Facultad de Matemática, Astronomía, Física y Computación  
(FAMAF), Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina.  
[marianabadano@unc.edu.ar](mailto:marianabadano@unc.edu.ar)

## Abstract

Herbrand's Theorem is a fundamental result in mathematical logic which provides a reduction of first-order formulas satisfied by a universal class to formulas free of existential quantifiers. In this work, a simpler and self-contained formulation of Herbrand's Theorem is presented, along with a model-theoretic proof of its general version.

## 1 Introduction

Herbrand's Theorem was first stated by Herbrand in his 1930 thesis [1]. It is a fundamental result in mathematical logic and has served as the theoretical foundation for many proof procedures.

The theorem commonly referred to as “Herbrand's Theorem” in modern logic courses is typically a weaker version, restricted to formulas that, in prenex form, contain only existential quantifiers. In contrast, the full version of Herbrand's Theorem applies to all first-order formulas. The simpler version has a well-known model-theoretic proof, whereas the proof of the general theorem is a highly complex syntactic proof. Furthermore, there is no simple statement of the general theorem, making it inaccessible to many researchers.

In this work, we provide a semantic proof of the theorem; more significantly, we present a simple statement that enables its application to various areas where the definability of objects by first-order formulas with an arbitrary number of quantifiers is employed. This occurs, for example, in the theory of central elements, where the definability of factor congruences may be achieved using formulas which—although preserved by products and direct factors—can include arbitrary quantifiers. In the final section, we present two results obtained by the direct application of this presentation of the Theorem.

## 2 Main Theorem

We consider first-order formulas in prenex normal form with an alternating quantifier structure that starts with an existential quantifier, i.e., formulas of the form

$$\exists y_1 \forall z_1 \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \varphi(y_1, \dots, y_k, z_1, \dots, z_k)$$

with  $k \geq 1$  and  $\varphi$  an open formula. The reader should easily be convinced that any first-order formula is logically equivalent to a formula of the form above (once the formula is in prenex form, we simply add the necessary extra quantifiers.)

Let  $X = \{x_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$  be a set of variables. For a fixed language  $\mathcal{L}$  let  $T(X)$  be the set of terms over  $X$ .

To state our version of Herbrand's Theorem we introduce a special kind of functions.

**Definition 1.** For a given set of  $k$ -tuples of terms  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq T^k(X)$  we say that  $\kappa : \{\langle t_1, \dots, t_j \rangle : \vec{t} \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq k\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is a *sound function* for  $\mathcal{T}$  if

- (i)  $\kappa$  is injective,
- (ii)  $\kappa(t_1, \dots, t_j) < \kappa(t_1, \dots, t_{j+1})$  and
- (iii) if  $x_m$  occurs in  $t_j$  then  $m < \kappa(t_1, \dots, t_j)$ .

It is easy to construct a sound function for a finite set  $\mathcal{T}$ . For example, let  $k = 3$  and  $\mathcal{T} = \{\vec{t}, \vec{s}\}$  where

$$\vec{t} = (t_1(x_1, x_3), t_2(x_1), t_3(x_6)) \text{ and } \vec{s} = (s_1(x_1, x_3), s_2(x_2, x_9), s_3(x_2)).$$

Assuming the terms are all different, a possible sound function for  $\mathcal{T}$  is the function defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(t_1) &= 4, & \kappa(t_1, t_2) &= 5, & \kappa(t_1, t_2, t_3) &= 7 \\ \kappa(s_1) &= 6, & \kappa(s_1, s_2) &= 10, & \kappa(s_1, s_2, s_3) &= 11. \end{aligned}$$

The statement of Herbrand's theorem to be proved is as follows.

**Theorem 2** (Herbrand's Theorem). *Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be a universal class,  $k > 0$  and  $\varphi(y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k)$  an open formula. The following are equivalent:*

1.  $\mathcal{K} \models \exists y_1 \forall z_1 \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \varphi(y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k)$ .
2. There are  $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N \in T^k(X)$  and a sound function  $\kappa$  for  $\{\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N\}$  such that

$$\mathcal{K} \models \bigvee_{i=1}^N \varphi(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{ik}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ik})}).$$

Furthermore,  $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N$  and the sound function  $\kappa$  can be taken in such a manner that  $\{\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N\} \subseteq T^k(x_1, \dots, x_{kN})$  and  $\text{Im}(\kappa) \subseteq \{2, \dots, kN + 1\}$ .

The primary significance of the theorem lies in the direction  $1 \Rightarrow 2$ , as it establishes the reduction of the scope of existential quantifiers to a finite set of terms. We will give a model-theoretic proof of this implication.

Regarding the direction  $2 \Rightarrow 1$ , it is quite evident if one understands how sound functions operate, but the proof is notationally and technically complex. For this reason, we define a more compact notation that simplifies the reading and isolate the central result of that proof in a separate lemma.

Given  $k \geq 0$  and a formula  $\varphi$  let

$$\langle \varphi \rangle_m^k := \begin{cases} \exists y_{m+1} \forall z_{m+1} \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \varphi & \text{if } 0 \leq m < k \\ \varphi & \text{if } m = k. \end{cases}$$

Notice that if the free variables of  $\varphi$  are in  $\{y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k\}$  then the free variables of  $\langle \varphi \rangle_m^k$  are in  $\{y_1, z_1, \dots, y_m, z_m\}$  for  $m > 0$  and  $\langle \varphi \rangle_0^k$  has no free variables. We will omit the superscript  $k$  from the notation as it is fixed hereafter.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\varphi(y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k)$  be a first-order formula,  $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N \in T^k(X)$ , and  $\kappa$  be a sound function for  $\{\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N\}$ . Then, for any  $m_1, \dots, m_N \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ ,*

$$\forall x_1 \dots x_r \bigvee_{i=1}^N \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_i}(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{im_i}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})}) \vdash \langle \varphi \rangle_0,$$

where  $r = \max\{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i}) : m_i > 0\}$ .

*Proof.* We assume that no  $x_i$  occurs in  $\varphi$ , this is obvious if  $\varphi$  is open. Otherwise, we substitute the bounded  $x_i$  by suitable variables.

We will prove this by induction on  $M = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$ . If  $M = 0$ , then  $m_i = 0$  for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , and the result trivially follows. Now suppose  $M > 0$ , define

$$I = \{i : \kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i}) = r\}$$

and fix  $e \in I$ . Note that if  $i \in I$ , then  $\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i}) = \kappa(t_{e1}, \dots, t_{em_e}) = r$  and then, by injectivity of sound functions,  $m_i = m_e$  and  $(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i}) = (t_{e1}, \dots, t_{em_e})$ .

Thus, from  $\forall x_1 \dots x_r \bigvee_{i=1}^N \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_i}(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{im_i}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})})$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1 \dots x_r \Big( & \big( \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_e}(t_{e1}, x_{\kappa(t_{e1})}, \dots, t_{em_e}, x_r) \vee \\ & \bigvee_{i \notin I} \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_i}(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{im_i}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})}) \big) \Big). \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

If  $i \notin I$ , then  $r > \kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})$  and by (ii) and (iii) of sound function's definition it follows that  $x_r$  does not occur in  $\langle \varphi \rangle_{m_i}(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{im_i}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})})$ . Therefore, (1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1 \dots x_{r-1} \Big( & \big( \forall x_r \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_e}(t_{e1}, x_{\kappa(t_{e1})}, \dots, t_{em_e}, x_r) \big) \vee \\ & \bigvee_{i \notin I} \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_i}(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{im_i}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})}) \big) \Big). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

By (ii) and (iii),  $\kappa(t_{e1}, \dots, t_{ej}) < r$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, m_e-1\}$  and  $x_r$  does not occur in  $t_{ej}$  for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, m_e\}$  and, since no variable in  $t_{em_e}$  occurs bounded in  $\varphi$ ,  $\forall x_r \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_e}(t_{e1}, x_{\kappa(t_{e1})}, \dots, t_{em_e}, x_r)$  yields

$$\exists y_{m_e} \forall z_{m_e} \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_e}(t_{e1}, x_{\kappa(t_{e1})}, \dots, y_{em_e}, z_{m_e}).$$

Hence, as  $\exists y_{m_e} \forall z_{m_e} \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_e} = \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_e-1}$ , from (2) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1 \dots x_{r-1} \Big( & \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_e-1}(t_{e1}, x_{\kappa(t_{e1})}, \dots, t_{e(m_e-1)}, x_{\kappa(t_{e1}, \dots, t_{e(m_e-1)})}) \vee \\ & \bigvee_{i \notin I} \langle \varphi \rangle_{m_i}(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{im_i}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{im_i})}) \Big). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Since  $(m_e-1) + \sum_{i \notin I} m_i < M$ , by the inductive hypothesis we have that (3) implies  $\langle \varphi \rangle_0$  and we have proved Lemma 3.  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove the main theorem.

**Proof of Theorem 2.**

1  $\Rightarrow$  2. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the language of  $\mathcal{K}$ . We assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{L}$  is finite. This is justified by Completeness and Compactness, as there exists a proof witnessing  $Th^{\forall}(\mathcal{K}) \vdash \varphi$  (where  $Th^{\forall}(\mathcal{K})$  is the universal theory of  $\mathcal{K}$ ). This proof involves only a finite number of universal sentences and, consequently, a finite number of symbols in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

To develop this proof, we require a sound function for  $T^k(X)$ . Let  $\beta: T(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be a Gödel numbering for terms in  $\mathcal{L}$ . This function is injective and satisfies

$$\text{if } x_m \text{ occurs in } t \text{ then } m < \beta(t)$$

for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Next, define the function  $\kappa: \bigcup_{j=1}^k T^j(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  by

$$\kappa(t_1, \dots, t_j) = 2^{\beta(t_1)} \dots p_j^{\beta(t_j)}$$

where  $p_j$  is the  $j$ -th prime number. Note that  $\kappa$  is a sound function for  $T^k(X)$  and, when properly restricted, for any  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq T^k(X)$ .

Let  $\{c_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  be a set of distinct constant symbols not in  $\mathcal{L}$ , and let  $\mathcal{L}^* = \mathcal{L} \cup \{c_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ . Given a term  $t(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_m}) \in T(X)$ , denote  $t^* := t(c_{i_1}, \dots, c_{i_m})$  and define in  $\mathcal{L}^*$  the class

$$\mathcal{K}^* = \{\langle \mathbf{A}, \bar{a} \rangle: \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K} \text{ and } \bar{a} \in A^{\mathbb{N}}\}.$$

Clearly,  $\mathcal{K}^*$  is also a universal class.

Consider an arbitrary algebra  $\mathbf{A}$  in  $\mathcal{K}^*$ , and let  $\mathbf{C}$  be the subalgebra of  $\mathbf{A}$  generated by  $\emptyset$ . Since  $\mathcal{K}^*$  is a class closed under subalgebras, we have that  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathcal{K}^*$ , and consequently,

$$\mathbf{C} \models \exists y_1 \forall z_1 \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \varphi(y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k).$$

If we consider  $\varphi$  as an arbitrary formula, it is easy to prove by induction on  $k$  that there exist terms  $t_1, \dots, t_k \in T(X)$  such that

$$\mathbf{C} \models \varphi(t_1^*, c_{\kappa(t_1)}, t_2^*, c_{\kappa(t_1, t_2)}, \dots, t_k^*, c_{\kappa(t_1, \dots, t_k)}).$$

Because the above is an open formula,

$$\mathbf{A} \models \varphi(t_1^*, c_{\kappa(t_1)}, t_2^*, c_{\kappa(t_1, t_2)}, \dots, t_k^*, c_{\kappa(t_1, \dots, t_k)})$$

and since the algebra  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}^*$  under consideration is arbitrary,

$$\mathcal{K}^* \models \bigvee_{\vec{t} \in T^k(X)} \varphi(t_1^*, c_{\kappa(t_1)}, t_2^*, c_{\kappa(t_1, t_2)}, \dots, t_k^*, c_{\kappa(t_1, \dots, t_k)}).$$

By completeness and compactness, there exists  $N > 0$  and  $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N \in T^k(X)$  such that

$$\mathcal{K}^* \models \bigvee_{i=1}^N \varphi(t_{i1}^*, c_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, t_{i2}^*, c_{\kappa(t_{i1}, t_{i2})}, \dots, t_{ik}^*, c_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ik})}).$$

Since the constants  $c_i$  are not in  $\mathcal{L}$ , we conclude that

$$\mathcal{K} \models \bigvee_{i=1}^N \varphi(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, t_{i2}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, t_{i2})}, \dots, t_{ik}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ik})})$$

and we have proved 2.

$2 \Rightarrow 1$ . Let  $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N \in T^k(X)$  and  $\kappa$  be a sound function for  $\{\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N\}$  such that

$$\mathcal{K} \models \bigvee_{i=1}^N \varphi(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, t_{i2}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, t_{i2})}, \dots, t_{ik}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ik})}).$$

The result easily follows from Lemma 3 by taking  $m_i = k$  for every  $i$ .

For the proof of the furthermore assertion, we perform suitable substitutions on the terms and redefine the corresponding sound function.

Let  $I = \text{Im}(\kappa) = \{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ij}) : 1 \leq i \leq N \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq k\}$  and let  $M = \max(I)$ . Note that all the variables involved in the formula

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^N \varphi(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, t_{i2}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, t_{i2})}, \dots, t_{ik}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ik})}) \tag{4}$$

belong to the set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_M\}$ .

The first step is to replace every variable  $x_i$  with  $i \notin I$  by  $x_1$ . Note that, by the definition of  $\kappa$ , we have  $1 \notin I$ . Given a term  $t \in T(X)$ , we define  $t'$  as the result of replacing in  $t$  every occurrence of a variable  $x_i$ , with  $i \notin I$ , by  $x_1$ . Observe that different  $t$  and  $s$  may produce the same  $t'$  and  $s'$ . With this in mind, let  $\lambda$  be defined by

$$\lambda(t'_{i1}, \dots, t'_{ij}) = \min\{\kappa(t_{u1}, \dots, t_{uj}) : (t'_{u1}, \dots, t'_{uj}) = (t'_{i1}, \dots, t'_{ij})\}.$$

It is easy to see that  $\lambda$  is a sound function for  $\{\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{K}$  satisfies 4, by instantiation we have

$$\mathcal{K} \models \bigvee_{i=1}^N \varphi(t'_{i1}, x_{\lambda(t'_{i1})}, \dots, t'_{ik}, x_{\lambda(t'_{i1}, \dots, t'_{ik})}). \quad (5)$$

Now let  $J = \{\lambda(t'_{i1}, \dots, t'_{ij}) : 1 \leq i \leq N \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq k\}$  and let  $\alpha : \{1, \dots, |J|\} \rightarrow J$  be the strictly increasing enumeration of  $J$ .

Since  $|J| \leq kN$ , by substituting  $x_i$  with  $x_{\alpha^{-1}(i)+1}$  for every  $i \in J$ , we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

### 3 Some Applications

The following corollary provides an equational characterization for positive formulas satisfied in a quasivariety (i.e., a universal class closed under direct products). We shall consider formulas in prenex disjunctive normal form.

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be a quasivariety and let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  be conjunctions of atomic formulas with variables in  $\{y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k\}$ . The following are equivalent:*

1.  $\mathcal{Q} \models \exists y_1 \forall z_1 \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \bigvee_{j=1}^n \alpha_j(y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k)$ .
2. *There are terms  $t_1(x_1), t_2(x_1, x_2), \dots, t_k(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  and  $j_0 \leq n$  such that*

$$\mathcal{Q} \models \alpha_{j_0}(t_1, x_2, \dots, t_k, x_{k+1}).$$

*Proof.* 1  $\Rightarrow$  2. From Theorem 2, there are  $\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N \in T^k(x_1, \dots, x_{kN})$  and a sound function  $\kappa$  for  $\{\vec{t}_1, \dots, \vec{t}_N\}$  such that  $\text{Im}(\kappa) \subseteq \{2, \dots, kN+1\}$  and

$$\mathcal{Q} \models \bigvee_{i=1}^N \bigvee_{j=1}^n \alpha_j(t_{i1}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1})}, \dots, t_{ik}, x_{\kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{ik})}). \quad (6)$$

Let  $n_{il} := \kappa(t_{i1}, \dots, t_{il})$  for notational convenience. Clearly  $2 \leq n_{il} \leq kN+1$ .

Suppose there are no  $i$  and  $j$  such that  $\mathcal{Q} \models \alpha_j(t_{i1}, x_{n_{i1}}, \dots, t_{ik}, x_{n_{ik}})$ . Then, for every  $i$ , with  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , and every  $j$ , with  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , there are  $\mathbf{A}^{i,j} \in \mathcal{Q}$  and  $a_1^{i,j}, \dots, a_{N \cdot k+1}^{i,j} \in A^{i,j}$  such that

$$\mathbf{A}^{i,j} \models \neg \alpha_j(t_{i1}[a_1^{i,j}, \dots, a_{kN}^{i,j}], a_{n_{i1}}^{i,j}, \dots, t_{ik}[a_1^{i,j}, \dots, a_{N \cdot k}^{i,j}], a_{n_{ik}}^{i,j}). \quad (7)$$

Let  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{A}^{1,1} \times \dots \times \mathbf{A}^{1,n} \times \dots \times \mathbf{A}^{N,1} \times \dots \times \mathbf{A}^{N,n}$ . Since  $\mathcal{Q}$  is closed under products,  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathcal{Q}$ .

Let  $\vec{b}_l := (a_l^{1,1}, \dots, a_l^{1,n}, \dots, a_l^{N,1}, \dots, a_l^{N,n})$  for  $l = 1, \dots, kN+1$ . By (6) we have

$$\mathbf{B} \models \bigvee_{i=1}^N \bigvee_{j=1}^n \alpha_j(t_{i1}[\vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_{N \cdot k}], \vec{b}_{n_{i1}}, \dots, t_{ik}[\vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_{N \cdot k}], \vec{b}_{n_{ik}}),$$

which implies there are  $i_0$  and  $j_0$  such that

$$\mathbf{B} \models \alpha_{j_0}(t_{i_01}[\vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_{N.k}], \vec{b}_{n_{i_01}}, \dots, t_{i_0k}[\vec{b}_1, \dots, \vec{b}_{N.k}], \vec{b}_{n_{i_0k}}).$$

Since  $\alpha_{j_0}$  is preserved by factors, this contradicts (7) for  $i_0$  and  $j_0$ . Therefore, there are  $i_0$  and  $j_0$  such that

$$\mathcal{Q} \models \alpha_{j_0}(t_{i_01}, x_{n_{i_01}}, \dots, t_{i_0k}, x_{n_{i_0k}}).$$

Finally, we substitute the variables not in  $\{x_{n_{i_01}}, \dots, x_{n_{i_0k}}\}$  with  $x_1$  and replace every  $x_{n_{i_0l}}$  with  $x_{l+1}$ . This yields the desired result.

2  $\Rightarrow$  1. This is trivial.  $\square$

It is worth noting that the previous corollary generalizes straightforwardly to positive formulas in prenex disjunctive normal form that need not be in an alternating quantifier form starting with an existential quantifier. For example, if the formula is  $\forall z_1 \exists w_1 \exists w_2 \forall z_2 \bigvee_{i=1}^n \alpha_i(z_1, w_1, w_2, z_2)$  then there are terms  $t_1(x_1)$  and  $t_2(x_1)$  such that

$$\mathcal{Q} \models \bigvee_{i=1}^n \alpha_i(x_1, t_1, t_2, x_2).$$

This observation will be useful in the proof of the final corollary.

For a given class  $\mathcal{K}$  and a  $\mathcal{K}$ -indexed family of  $n$ -ary functions  $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{\mathbf{A}}: A^n \rightarrow A : \mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}\}$ , we say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is a *function definable in  $\mathcal{K}$*  if there is a first-order formula  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y)$  such that for every  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  and every  $a_1, \dots, a_n, b \in A$

$$b = f_{\mathbf{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \text{ if and only if } \mathbf{A} \models \varphi[a_1, \dots, a_n, b].$$

We say that  $\mathcal{F}$  is defined by a term  $t$  in  $\mathcal{K}$  if for every  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{K}$  and every  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$

$$f_{\mathbf{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = t^{\mathbf{A}}(a_1, \dots, a_n).$$

**Corollary 5.** *If  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a quasivariety and  $\mathcal{F}$  is a function definable by a positive first-order formula in  $\mathcal{Q}$  then  $\mathcal{F}$  is definable by a term in  $\mathcal{Q}$ .*

*Proof.* We will prove the case for 1-ary functions, the generalization is straightforward. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a  $\mathcal{Q}$ -indexed family of  $n$ -ary functions defined by a positive formula  $\varphi(v, w)$  in  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Without loss of generality we assume

$$\varphi(v, w) = \exists y_1 \forall z_1 \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \bigvee_{j=1}^n \alpha_j(v, w, y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k),$$

where  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  are conjunctions of atomic formulas.

Since  $\varphi$  defines a function, we have that  $\mathcal{Q} \models \forall v \exists w \varphi(v, w)$ , i.e.,

$$\mathcal{Q} \models \forall v \exists w \exists y_1 \forall z_1 \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \bigvee_{j=1}^n \alpha_j(v, w, y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k).$$

Hence, from Corollary 4 and the observation below, we have that there are terms  $t_1(x_1), t_2(x_1), t_3(x_1, x_2), \dots, t_{k+1}(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  and  $j_0 \leq n$  such that

$$\mathcal{Q} \models \alpha_{j_0}(x_1, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{k+1}, x_{k+1}).$$

This implies  $\mathcal{Q} \models \exists y_1 \forall z_1 \dots \exists y_k \forall z_k \bigvee_{j=1}^n \alpha_j(x_1, t_1, y_1, z_1, \dots, y_k, z_k)$  and therefore

$$\mathcal{Q} \models \varphi(x_1, t_1).$$

The result follows from the uniqueness of functional values.  $\square$

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by Secyt-UNC project 33620230100751CB.

## Author Contributions Statement

The author confirms being the sole contributor of this work and has approved it for publication.

## Competing Interests

The author declares that there are no competing interests.

## References

- [1] J. Herbrand, *Recherches sur la théorie de la démonstration*, PhD thesis, Institut de Mathématique de l'Université de Paris, Paris, 1930. Travaux de l'Institut de Mathématique de l'Université de Paris.