

Qualifying Exam  
Logic  
January 2008

**Instructions:**

If you signed up for Computability Theory, do two E and two C problems.  
If you signed up for Model Theory, do two E and two M problems.  
If you signed up for Set Theory, do two E and two S 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  $\beta$  be an ordinal. Assume that  $\beta = X \cup Y$  and that  $X, Y$  both have order type  $\alpha > 0$ .

- a. Prove that  $\beta < \alpha + \alpha + \alpha$ .
- b. Give an example where  $\alpha + \alpha < \beta$ .

**E2.** Prove that the following are equivalent for any consistent first order theory  $T$  in a finite  $\mathcal{L}$  which is not finitely axiomatizable:

- a.  $T$  has a computable set of independent axioms.
- b.  $T$  has a set of axioms which can be computably enumerated as  $\theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots$ , so that for every  $n$ ,  $\theta_{n+1} \rightarrow \theta_n$  is logically valid, but  $\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_{n+1}$  is not.
- c. Whenever  $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \dots$  is any computable enumeration of some set of axioms for  $T$ , there exists a strictly increasing computable function  $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$  such that for every  $n$ :

$$\bigwedge_{k \leq n} \rho_k \quad \text{does not imply} \quad \bigwedge_{k \leq f(n)} \rho_k .$$

In (a): a set of axioms  $\Sigma$  for  $T$  is “*independent*” if no  $\varphi \in \Sigma$  is provable from  $\Sigma \setminus \{\varphi\}$ .

**E3.** A *dense tree* is a model  $(T, \leq, \wedge)$  where  $\leq$  is a partial ordering and  $\wedge$  is a meet operation (i.e.,  $x \wedge y$  is the greatest lower bound of  $x$  and  $y$ ) with the following additional properties:

- (1) For each  $x \in T$ , the set of predecessors  $\{y \mid y < x\}$  is a dense linear order without endpoints.
- (2) For each  $x \in T$ , there are  $y, z > x$  with  $x = y \wedge z$ .
- (3) For any pairwise incomparable  $x, y, z \in T$ , exactly two of  $x \wedge y$ ,  $x \wedge z$ , and  $y \wedge z$  are equal.

Show that there is exactly one countable dense tree (up to isomorphism).

## Computability Theory

**C1.** A function  $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$  is an *order function* if it is total, nondecreasing and has unbounded range. Show that the set of all  $e \in \omega$  such that  $\varphi_e$  is an order function is  $\Pi_2^0$ -complete.

**C2.** Show that no computable set  $C$  can have the property that both it and its complement are the sets of fixed points of two computable functions  $f$  and  $g$ ; i.e., it is impossible that  $C = \{e \mid \varphi_e = \varphi_{f(e)}\}$  and  $\overline{C} = \{e \mid \varphi_e = \varphi_{g(e)}\}$ .

**C3.** An enumeration of a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of subsets of  $\omega$  is a set  $A$  such that  $\mathcal{C} = \{A^{[e]} \mid e \in \omega\}$  (where  $A^{[e]} = \{x \mid \langle x, e \rangle \in A\}$ ).

- (1) Show that there is no computable enumeration of the collection of all computable sets.
- (2) Show that there is a computably enumerable enumeration of the collection of all computable sets *without repetition* (i.e., the set  $A$  above satisfies  $A^{[e]} \neq A^{[i]}$  for all distinct  $e$  and  $i$ ).

## Model Theory

**M1.** Is the following situation possible? Either give an example, or give a proof that it's not possible:

1.  $\mathfrak{A}$  and  $\mathfrak{B}$  are  $\mathcal{L}$ -structures with  $\mathfrak{A} \prec \mathfrak{B}$ .
2.  $R \notin \mathcal{L}$  is a new  $n$ -place relation symbol (with  $1 \leq n < \omega$ ), and  $T$  is an  $\mathcal{L} \cup \{R\}$  theory.
3. There is a unique  $R_A \subseteq A^n$  such that  $(\mathfrak{A}; R_A) \models T$ .
4. There is a unique  $R_B \subseteq B^n$  such that  $(\mathfrak{B}; R_B) \models T$ .
5.  $R_B \cap A^n \neq R_A$ .

**M2.** Let  $\Sigma$  be the theory of infinite dimensional vector spaces over algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0. To formalize  $\Sigma$ , let  $\mathcal{L} = \{S, V, +, \cdot\}$ , where  $S, V$  are unary predicates and  $+, \cdot$  are binary functions. Then  $\Sigma$  says that  $S, V$  partition the universe into two disjoint non-empty sets, and that the scalars,  $S$ , form an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0, and the vectors,  $V$  form an infinite dimensional vector space over  $S$ . Models will then have both a zero scalar,  $0 \in S$ , and a zero vector,  $\vec{0} \in V$ . Define  $x + y$  and  $x \cdot y$  to be 0 when it would normally be nonsense; for example,  $x + y = 0$  when  $x \in S$  and  $y \in V$ , and  $x \cdot y = 0$  when  $x, y \in V$ . Then:

1. Prove that  $\Sigma$  is complete and  $\omega$ -stable.
2. Prove that  $\Sigma$  is not  $\kappa$ -categorical for any  $\kappa \geq \aleph_0$ .
3. Prove that  $\Sigma$  has  $\leq \kappa$  models of size  $\kappa$  for all  $\kappa \geq \aleph_0$ .
4. For which  $\kappa \geq \aleph_0$  does  $\Sigma$  have exactly  $\kappa$  models of size  $\kappa$ ?

**M3.** Assume that  $\mathcal{L}$  is countable and contains the symbol  $<$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be a complete  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory such that for some  $\mathfrak{A} \models \Sigma$ ,  $<_{\mathfrak{A}}$  well-orders  $A$  in type  $\omega_1$ . For any non-well-ordered  $\mathfrak{B} \models \Sigma$ , let the ordinal  $W(\mathfrak{B})$  be its well-ordered initial segment; so  $<_{\mathfrak{B}}$  consists of a well-order of type  $W(\mathfrak{B})$ , followed by a total order with no least element. Then prove:

1. For any non-well-ordered  $\mathfrak{B} \models \Sigma$ ,  $W(\mathfrak{B})$  is a limit ordinal.
2. The set of all  $W(\mathfrak{B})$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a countable non-well-ordered model of  $\Sigma$  is unbounded in  $\omega_1$ .

## Set Theory

**S1.** Assume  $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ , and let  $E$  be an uncountable subset of the plane,  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Prove that there is a Cantor set  $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$  such that  $K$  contains uncountably many points of  $E$ .

$K$  is a Cantor set iff  $K$  is homeomorphic to the standard middle-third Cantor set (or to  $2^\omega$ ).

**S2.** For this problem, a *nice tree* is a set  $T$  of non-empty closed subsets of  $[0, 1]$  such that for all  $H, K \in T$ :  $H \subseteq K$  or  $K \subseteq H$  or  $K \cap H = \emptyset$ . Note that then for each  $K \in T$ :  $\{H \in T : H \supset K\}$  is totally ordered by  $\supset$  (although not necessarily well-ordered). Prove that there is a nice tree which is an Aronszajn tree under the order  $\supset$  (that is,  $\not\cong$ ).

*Remarks.* So, now each  $\{H \in T : H \supset K\}$  will be well-ordered by  $\supset$  in some countable type. The root node, which is the largest set in  $T$ , could be  $[0, 1]$ , although it might be simpler to make all the nodes Cantor sets. Level  $\alpha$  of  $T$  is  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha := \{K \in T : \text{type}(\{H \in T : H \supset K\}) = \alpha\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$  must be countable (by the definition of “Aronszajn”). It is natural to construct  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$  inductively, but you have to be careful that the construction doesn’t die at limit ordinals.

**S3.** Use the following (standard) definition of the constructible sets:

$$\begin{aligned} L(0) &= \emptyset \\ L(\alpha + 1) &= \mathcal{D}(L(\alpha)) \\ L(\gamma) &= \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} L(\alpha) \text{ for limit } \alpha \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $\mathcal{D}(A)$  is the set of all subsets of  $A$  which are (first-order) definable in  $(A; \in)$  using finitely many elements of  $A$  as parameters. Let  $\mathcal{D}^-(A) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(A)$  be the set of those subsets of  $A$  which are definable in  $(A; \in)$  *without* using any parameters; so  $\mathcal{D}^-(A)$  is always countable. Prove that the set of all  $\alpha$  such that  $L(\alpha + 1) = \mathcal{D}^-(L(\alpha))$  is an unbounded subset of  $(\omega_1)^L$ .

## Answers

**E1.** For (b), let  $\beta = \omega + \omega + 2$  and  $\alpha = \omega + 1$ .

For (a): Find an ordinal  $\delta$  and positive integer  $n$  such that

$$\omega^\delta \cdot n \leq \beta < \omega^\delta \cdot (n + 1).$$

Ordinals of the form  $\omega^\delta$  are strongly indecomposable, i.e, if  $X \cup Y = \omega^\delta$ , then at least one of  $X$  or  $Y$  has order type  $\omega^\delta$ . Write

$$\omega^\delta \cdot n = L_1 + L_2 + \cdots + L_n$$

where each  $L_i$  has order type  $\omega^\delta$ . Then for each  $i$  either  $X \cap L_i$  or  $Y \cap L_i$  has order type  $\omega^\delta$ . So there exists  $\Sigma \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $|\Sigma| \geq n/2$  such that either

- (1)  $X \cap L_i$  has order type  $\omega^\delta$  for all  $i \in \Sigma$  or
- (2)  $Y \cap L_i$  has order type  $\omega^\delta$  for all  $i \in \Sigma$ .

Then since  $3|\Sigma| \geq n + 1$  we have the result.

**E2.** (a)  $\rightarrow$  (b): Given an independent set of axioms  $\{\varphi_n : n < \omega\}$  take

$$\theta_n = \bigwedge_{k \leq n} \varphi_k.$$

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (c): Recall that there is an effective enumeration of all logical validities. For any  $n$  we can effectively find some  $\theta_m$  such that

$$\theta_m \rightarrow \bigwedge_{k \leq n} \rho_k$$

is a validity. Since the  $\rho$ 's are axioms for  $T$  we can effectively find some  $f(n)$  such that

$$\bigwedge_{k \leq f(n)} \rho_k \rightarrow \theta_{m+1}.$$

(c)  $\rightarrow$  (b): Take a sequence  $l_{n+1} = f(l_n)$  and put  $\theta_n = \bigwedge_{k \leq l_n} \rho_k$ .

(b)  $\rightarrow$  (a): Put  $\varphi_0 = \theta_0$  and  $\varphi_{n+1} = (\theta_n \rightarrow \theta_{n+1})$ .

**E3.** A representation of a countable dense tree is the set of all functions of the form  $f : \mathbb{Q} \cap (-\infty, r) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  which take the value 1 for only finitely many arguments and where  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$ , ordered by extension.

Uniqueness follows by a Cantor-style back-and-forth argument: Suppose you have a finite partial isomorphism  $p$  from a countable dense tree  $T_1$  to a countable dense tree  $T_2$ . Fix  $a \in T_1 - \text{dom}(p)$ . (The argument for  $b \in T_2 - \text{ran}(p)$  is symmetric.) Then there are two cases:

*Case 1:* There is some (least)  $t \in \text{dom}(p)$  with  $a < t$ : Then the collection  $U = \{t' \wedge t \mid t' \in \text{dom}(p) \text{ and } t' \not\geq t\}$  is linearly ordered, and we can use the density of  $T_2$  and clause (3) to find an image for  $a$  among or between the images of  $p(U)$ .

*Case 2:* Otherwise and there is some (greatest)  $t \in \text{dom}(p)$  with  $a > t$ : Then use clause (2) to find an image for  $a$ .

*Case 3:* Otherwise: Then  $a$  is incomparable with all of  $\text{dom}(p)$ , so fix an element below the meet of  $\text{ran}(p)$  and use clause (2) to find an image for  $a$ .

**C1.** Let  $I$  be the set of all  $e$  such that  $\varphi_e$  is an order function. Then  $I$  is clearly  $\Pi_2^0$ . Now, let  $A \subseteq \omega$  be any  $\Pi_2^0$  set; we show that  $A \leq_m I$ . Write  $A$  as  $\{x : \forall y \exists z P(x, y, z)\}$ , where  $P$  is computable. Then there is a computable  $\Gamma : \omega \rightarrow \omega$  such that for all  $x$ ,  $\varphi_{\Gamma(x)}$  is the (partial) function

$$t \mapsto \sum_{y \leq t} [1 + \mu z P(x, y, z)] .$$

If  $x \in A$ , then  $\varphi_{\Gamma(x)}$  is total and  $\Gamma(x) \in I$ . If  $x \notin A$ , then  $\Gamma(x) \notin I$  because  $\varphi_{\Gamma(x)}$  is not total (and has finite domain).

**C2.** Given  $C, f, g$ , let  $h(e, x)$  be the partial computable function such that if  $e \in C$ , then  $h(e, x) = \varphi_{g(e)}(x)$  for all  $x$ ; and if  $e \notin C$ , then  $h(e, x) = \varphi_{f(e)}(x)$  for all  $x$ . By the Recursion Theorem, fix  $e$  such that  $\varphi_e$  is the (partial) function  $x \mapsto h(e, x)$ . If  $e \in C$ , then  $\varphi_e = \varphi_{g(e)}$ , but then  $e \in \overline{C}$ , a contradiction. If  $e \in \overline{C}$ , then  $\varphi_e = \varphi_{f(e)}$ , but then  $e \in C$ , also a contradiction.

**C3.**

- (1) By simple diagonalization.
- (2) See Odifreddi I for the proof of the Friedberg theorem of an enumeration of all c.e. sets without repetition and its variations.

**M1.** This question is due to J.Millar.

There are many examples here, all revolving around the observation that a relation implicitly definable in a given model need not be explicitly definable. Note that Beth's Theorem requires that the relation be implicitly defined in all models of a theory.

Specifically, let  $\mathcal{L} = \{<\}$ , and let  $R$  be unary. Let  $T_0$  be the theory of dense total orders without first or last elements. Then  $T_0$ , as an  $\mathcal{L}$ -theory, is complete and model-complete. Let  $T$  be  $T_0$  plus the statement that  $R$  is an un-realized Dedekind cut; so  $T$  says of a model  $(\mathfrak{A}; R_A)$  that  $R_A$  and  $A \setminus R_A$  are both non-empty,  $R_A$  is an initial segment with no largest element and  $A \setminus R_A$  is a final segment with no smallest element.

A given dense total order may have no subsets satisfying  $T$  (e.g,  $\mathbb{R}$ ) or infinitely many subsets satisfying  $T$  (e.g,  $\mathbb{Q}$ ).

Now, let  $A = (-\infty, 0) \cup (1, 2) \cup [4, \infty) \subset \mathbb{R}$ , with the usual order of real numbers. Then there is a unique  $R_A \subseteq A$  such that  $(\mathfrak{A}; R_A) \models T$ ; namely,  $R_A = (-\infty, 0)$ ; note that  $(1, 2) \cup [4, \infty) \cong \mathbb{R}$  has no unrealized

Dedekind cuts. Let  $B = \mathbb{R} \setminus \{3\}$ . Then there is a unique  $R_B \subseteq B$  such that  $(\mathfrak{B}; R_B) \models T$ ; namely,  $R_B = (-\infty, 3)$ . Clearly,  $R_B \cap A \neq R_A$ .

**M2.** First note that every  $\mathfrak{A} \models \Sigma$  of size  $\aleph_0$  or  $\aleph_1$  has an elementary extension  $\mathfrak{B}$  of size  $\aleph_1$  whose  $S$  has transcendence degree  $\aleph_1$  and whose  $\dim(V) = \aleph_1$ . Since such a  $\mathfrak{B}$  is unique up to isomorphism,  $\Sigma$  must be complete. Also, if  $\Sigma$  failed to be  $\omega$ -stable, there would be a countable  $E \subset B$  such that  $\mathfrak{B}$  realizes  $\aleph_1$  1-types over  $E$ ; but this is impossible because the group of automorphisms of  $\mathfrak{B}$  pointwise fixing  $E$  has only countably many orbits.

For (2)(3): Note that the  $\mathfrak{A} \models \Sigma$  of size  $\kappa = \aleph_\alpha$  are characterized by the transcendence degree  $\lambda$  of  $S$ , which is some (possibly finite) cardinal  $\leq \kappa$ , and  $\dim(V)$ , which is some infinite cardinal  $\leq \kappa$ ; of course,  $\max(\lambda, \dim(V), \aleph_0) = \kappa$ . There are exactly  $\max(\alpha, \aleph_0) \leq \kappa$  such models.

Now (4) follows:  $\max(\alpha, \aleph_0) = \kappa$  iff  $\kappa = \aleph_0$  or  $\kappa = \aleph_\kappa$ .

**M3.** For (1), just note that  $\mathfrak{A}$  satisfies the statement that every element has a successor.

For (2): WLOG,  $A = \omega_1$ , with  $<_{\mathfrak{A}}$  the usual order. Let  $C$  be the set of  $\gamma < \omega_1$  such that the ordinals  $< \gamma$  form an elementary submodel of  $\mathfrak{A}$ ; then  $C$  is unbounded in  $\omega_1$  (and also closed). It is sufficient to show that for each  $\gamma \in C$ , there is a countable non-well-ordered  $\mathfrak{B} \models \Sigma$  with  $W(\mathfrak{B}) \geq \gamma$ ; in fact, one can get  $W(\mathfrak{B}) = \gamma$ , but that's not required by the problem. Fix  $\gamma \in C$ , and let  $\mathfrak{G} \prec \mathfrak{A}$  be the model built on  $\gamma$ . Since  $\mathfrak{G}$  is countable and satisfies the axioms that the ordering of its universe is regular, a standard argument produces an elementary end extension  $\mathfrak{H}$  of  $\mathfrak{G}$ .  $\mathfrak{H}$  is usually built using the elementary diagram of  $\mathfrak{G}$ , together with one new constant  $c$  which is larger than all elements of  $G$ . The Omitting Types Theorem is used to guarantee that  $\mathfrak{H}$  is really an end extension. This  $\mathfrak{H}$  could conceivably be well-ordered. To avoid this, modify the standard argument to use new constants  $c_n$  for  $n \in \omega$ , where each  $c_n$  is larger than all elements of  $G$  and  $c_0 > c_1 > c_2 > \dots$ .

**S1.** Note that you cannot simply quote the fact that  $E$  must be of first category, since a closed nowhere dense subset of the plane might be connected.

*Proof 1.* (specific to the plane): WLOG,  $|E| = \aleph_1$ . By changing coordinates, we may assume that the coordinate axes are not parallel to any of the  $\aleph_1$  lines through pairs of points in  $E$ . Then, the coordinate projections  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  are 1-1 on  $E$ . In the line, every first category set is covered by countably many Cantor sets, so choose a Cantor set  $K_1 \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  such that  $E \cap \pi_1^{-1}(K_1)$  is uncountable. Repeat the argument and choose a Cantor set  $K_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  such that  $(E \cap \pi_1^{-1}(K_1)) \cap \pi_2^{-1}(K_2)$  is uncountable. Let  $K = K_1 \times K_2$ .

*Proof 2.* (works in any Polish space  $X$ ). Force a generic Cantor set  $K$  using a finitely branching tree of basic open sets.

**S2.** As indicated in the Remarks, we construct  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$  inductively, with all nodes in the tree Cantor subsets of  $[0, 1]$ .  $\mathcal{L}_0$  can be a singleton (the root node), and each node will have  $\aleph_0$  children. Note that the tree will automatically be Aronszajn because there cannot be a decreasing  $\omega_1$ -sequence of closed sets. The problem is that the construction doesn't die at a limit ordinal.

Say  $\gamma < \omega_1$  is a limit and we have  $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha < \gamma$ . Let  $T_\gamma = \bigcup_{\alpha < \gamma} \mathcal{L}_\alpha$ , which is a countable tree of height  $\gamma$ . Whenever  $\mathcal{C}$  is a maximal chain in  $T_\gamma$ ,  $\bigcap \mathcal{C}$  is a closed subset of  $2^\omega$ , and is non-empty by compactness, although it may be a singleton. If all these  $\bigcap \mathcal{C}$  are singletons (or countable), the construction cannot proceed.

To ensure that suitably many of the  $\bigcap \mathcal{C}$  are Cantor sets, we inductively maintain the following condition: Whenever  $\alpha < \beta < \omega_1$  and  $F \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$  and  $\mathcal{P}$  is a finite family of non-empty clopen subsets of  $F$ , there is a  $G \in \mathcal{L}_\beta$  such that  $G \subset F$  and  $G \cap P \neq \emptyset$  for all  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .

**S3.** We can work within  $L$ ; so WLOG  $V = L$ , and we're proving that  $S := \{\alpha : L(\alpha + 1) = \mathcal{D}^-(L(\alpha))\}$  is an unbounded subset of  $\omega_1$ . Now  $S \subseteq \omega_1$  since  $L(\alpha) \subset L(\alpha + 1)$  and  $\mathcal{D}^-(L(\alpha))$  must be countable. If  $S$  is bounded, let  $\beta = \sup\{\alpha + 1 : \alpha \in S\} < \omega_1$ . Let  $M \prec L(\omega_1) = H(\omega_1)$  be the Skolem hull of  $\emptyset$  in  $L(\omega_1)$  using the definable Skolem functions. Then  $M$  is transitive and of the form  $L(\gamma)$ . Each element of  $M$  is definable in  $M$  (without parameters), so  $\gamma \in S$  and hence  $\gamma < \beta$ . But  $\beta$  is definable in  $L(\omega_1)$ , so  $\beta \in L(\gamma)$ , a contradiction.