## Qualifying Exam Logic January 16, 1997

Instructions: If you signed up for Recursion Theory, do two E and two R problems. If you signed up for Model Theory, do two E and two M problems. If you think that a problem has been stated incorrectly, mention this to the proctor and indicate your interpretation in your solution. In such cases, do not interpret the problem in such a way that it becomes trivial.

E1. Let  $\mathcal{L} = \{f, E\}$ , where f is a unary function symbol and E is a binary relation symbol. Let T be the theory in  $\mathcal{L}$  whose axioms say that E is an equivalence relation with exactly three equivalence classes,  $\forall x E(x, f(x)), f$  is a one-one onto function, and f has no finite cycles (that is, for n = 1, 2, ..., T has the axiom  $\forall x (x \neq f^n(x))$ . Prove that T is complete but not finitely axiomatizable.

E2. If  $f: \omega \times \omega \to \{0, 1\}$ , define  $r = r_f: \omega \to \mathbb{R}$  by:  $r(e) = \sum_{n < \omega} f(e, n) \cdot 2^{-n} \quad .$ 

Prove that there is a computable f such that  $\{e : r_f(e) \in \mathbb{Q}\}$  is undecidable.  $\mathbb{R}$  is the set of real numbers and  $\mathbb{Q}$  is the set of rational numbers.

E3. *Without* using the Axiom of Choice, prove that there is a bijection from the set of real numbers onto the set of irrational numbers.

In the Recursion Theory problems,  $\varphi_e$  is the  $e^{\text{th}}$  partial recursive function of one variable, using some standard enumeration.

R1. Prove that there are sets  $A_n \subseteq \omega$ , for  $n \in \omega$ , such that each  $A_n$  is recursive in  $A_m$ , but no  $A_n$  is primitive recursive in any  $A_m$  unless n = m.

R2. Let S be the set of all  $e \in \omega$  such that  $dom(\varphi_e)$  is an initial segment of  $\omega$  (possibly, all of  $\omega$ ). Prove that S is not recursive in 0'.

R3. Prove that there is a total recursive function f such that each  $\varphi_{f(x)}$  is total and  $\varphi_{f(x)}(x) = f(x) + x$ .

M1. Without assuming the Continuum Hypothesis, do the following:

1. Describe two structures,  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$ , for a finite language, such that:  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  are elementarily equivalent,  $|A| = |B| = \aleph_2$ , and such that there are no ultrafilters  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  on  $\omega$  with  $\mathfrak{A}^{\omega}/\mathcal{U}$  isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{B}^{\omega}/\mathcal{V}$ .

2. Describe two structures,  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$ , for a finite language, such that:  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  are not isomorphic,  $|A| = |B| = \aleph_2$ , and such that  $\mathfrak{A}^{\omega}/\mathcal{U}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{B}^{\omega}/\mathcal{V}$  whenever  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  are any non-principal ultrafilters on  $\omega$ .

M2. Let  $\mathfrak{M}$  be an infinite saturated  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure. Assume  $X \subseteq M$  is definable with parameters  $\vec{a} \in M^{<\omega}$ ; that is, for some  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\theta(x, \vec{y})$ :

$$X = \{ m \in M : \mathfrak{M} \models \theta(m, \vec{a}) \} .$$

Assume also that every automorphism f of  $\mathfrak{M}$  satisfies f(X) = X. Prove that X is definable without parameters; that is, for some  $\mathcal{L}$ -formula  $\psi(x)$ :

$$X = \{ m \in M : \mathfrak{M} \models \psi(m) \} .$$

M3. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  contain the symbol <, and let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be an  $\mathcal{L}$ -structure in which  $<_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is a total order with no largest element. Prove that  $\mathfrak{A}$  has an elementary extension,  $\mathfrak{B}$  such that:

1.  $\mathfrak{B}$  has a non-trivial automorphism.

2.  $<_{\mathfrak{B}}$  has uncountable cofinality (that is, every countable subset of *B* is bounded).

Answers to Logic Qual January 1997

E1. Completeness: Let  $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$  be any two models of T. By the Löwenheim-Skolem Theorem, there are countable models  $\mathfrak{A}', \mathfrak{B}'$  elementarily equivalent to  $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$ . By the Compactness Theorem, there are elementary extensions  $\mathfrak{A}'', \mathfrak{B}''$  which each have  $\aleph_0$  orbits in each equivalence class. Therefore,  $\mathfrak{A}''$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{B}''$ . Thus,  $\mathfrak{A}, \mathfrak{B}$  are elementarily equivalent, so T is complete. Not finitely axiomatizable: Use the fact that every finite subset of T has a finite model.

E2. Fix any irrational  $x \in (0, 1)$ . Let  $A \subseteq \omega \times \omega$  be any decidable set such that  $\{e : \exists n[(e, n) \in A]\}$  is undecidable. Let f(e, n) be the  $e^{\text{th}}$  bit in the binary expansion of x if  $(e, n) \in A$  and f(e, n) = 0 otherwise.

E3. Apply the Schröder-Bernstein Theorem. Prove that  $|\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}| \leq |\mathbb{R}| \leq |\mathcal{P}(Q)| = |2^{\omega}| \leq |\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}|$ . Here,  $|X| \leq |Y|$  means that there is an injection from X into Y. For the last  $\leq$ , just use the standard construction of a perfect set of irrational numbers.

R1. Just let all the  $A_n$  be recursive, and construct them in  $\omega$  steps to defeat all possible primitive recursive computations of one from another.

R2. S is a complete  $\Pi_2^0$  set.

R3. f can be a constant function.

M1. For 1: Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  both code three total orders. In  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the orders have cofinalities  $\omega, \omega_1, \omega_2$ . In  $\mathfrak{B}$ , they all have cofinality  $\omega$ .

For 2: Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  consist of just a set (unary relation). In  $\mathfrak{A}$ , the set has size  $\aleph_0$ . In  $\mathfrak{B}$ , the set has size  $\aleph_1$ .

M2. Let  $\Gamma$  be the complete  $\mathcal{L}$ -type of  $\vec{a}$  in  $\mathfrak{M}$ . Consider the set of formulas in  $\mathcal{L}_{\vec{a}}$ :

$$\Sigma(\vec{y}) = \Gamma(\vec{y}) \cup \Gamma(\vec{a}) \cup \{ \exists x [\theta(x, \vec{y}) \leftrightarrow \neg \theta(x, \vec{a})] \}.$$

If  $\Sigma(\vec{y})$  is consistent, then by saturation, it is realized in  $\mathfrak{M}$  by some  $\vec{d}$ , and by saturation again, there is an automorphism f which satisfies  $f(\vec{a}) = \vec{d}$ . By the definition of  $\Sigma$ ,  $f(X) \neq X$ . Therefore,  $\Sigma$  is inconsistent. Thus, there is a  $\varphi(\vec{y}) \in \Gamma(\vec{y})$  such that

$$\mathfrak{M} \models \forall x \vec{y} \vec{z} [[\varphi(\vec{y}) \land \varphi(\vec{z})] \to [\theta(x, \vec{y}) \leftrightarrow \theta(x, \vec{z})]] \quad .$$

 $\mathbf{SO}$ 

$$X = \{ m \in M : \mathfrak{M} \models \exists \vec{y} [\varphi(\vec{y}) \land \theta(m, \vec{y})] \}$$

M3. By the usual Eherenfeuct-Mostowski argument, get an elementary extension with a non-trivial automorphism. Then, add a name for the automorphism to the language and take elementary extensions  $\omega_1$  times to construct  $\mathfrak{B}$ .