

**Instructions: Do all six 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.

If you are unable to solve a problem completely, you may receive partial credit by weakening a conclusion or strengthening a hypothesis. In this case, include such information in your solution, so the graders know that you know that your solution is not complete.

If you want to ask a grader a question during the exam, write out your question on an  $8\frac{1}{2}$  by 11 sheet of paper. Give it to the proctor. The proctor will contact one of the logic graders who will retrieve your written question, write a response, copy the sheet of paper, and return it to the proctor.

**E1.** (Work in ZF, i.e., **without the axiom of choice**.) Show the following:

1. There is a function mapping  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  onto  $\omega_1$ .
2. If  $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$  is a countable union of countable sets, then  $\text{cf}(\omega_1) = \omega$ .

**E2.** Let  $M$  be a model of PA that is not elementarily equivalent to  $(\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot)$ . Show that there is an infinite element of  $M$  that is definable.

**E3.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a class of  $L$ -structures (for some signature  $L$ ) defined as follows: there is a set  $T$  of  $L$ -formulas with free variables among  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  such that if  $\mathfrak{A}$  is an  $L$ -structure, then  $\mathfrak{A} \in \mathcal{C}$  if and only if there is a tuple  $\vec{a} \in A^k$  such that for every  $\varphi \in T$  we have that  $\mathfrak{A} \models \varphi[\vec{a}]$ . Prove that if  $\mathcal{C}$  is elementary, then it is axiomatized by the collection of sentences of the form  $(\exists x_1 \dots x_k) \bigwedge_{\varphi \in T'} \varphi$ , where  $T'$  ranges over finite subsets of  $T$ .

## Computability Theory

**C1.** A pair of disjoint c.e. sets  $A$  and  $B$  are *effectively inseparable* if there is a partial computable function  $\psi$  (called a *productive function* for the pair) such that for every pair of c.e. indices  $u, v$ ,

$$A \subseteq W_u, B \subseteq W_v, \text{ and } W_u \cap W_v = \emptyset \Rightarrow \psi(u, v) \downarrow \text{ and } \psi(u, v) \notin W_u \cup W_v.$$

Show that every effectively inseparable pair has a total productive function.

An infinite set  $X$  is *r-cohesive* (*recursively cohesive*) if for every computable set  $C$ , either  $X \subseteq^* C$  or  $X \subseteq^* \overline{C}$ .

**C2.** Prove that if  $X$  is r-cohesive, then it has hyperimmune degree (i.e.,  $X$  computes a function that is not dominated by any computable function).

**C3.** Prove that if  $D$  is high (i.e.,  $D' \geq_T \emptyset''$ ), then  $D$  computes an r-cohesive set. *Hint.* Since  $D$  is high, there are  $\Delta_2^0[D]$  approximations to the sets  $\{e : \varphi_e \text{ is total and 0-1 valued}\}$  and  $\{e : (\exists^\infty n) \varphi_e(n) = 1\}$ .

## Sketchy Answers or Hints

**E1 ans.**

1. Since  $\omega \approx \omega \times \omega$ , we have  $\mathcal{P}(\omega) \approx \mathcal{P}(\omega \times \omega)$ . So it is enough to define a surjective function  $h: \mathcal{P}(\omega \times \omega) \rightarrow \omega_1$ . Fix  $R \in \mathcal{P}(\omega \times \omega)$ . If  $(\omega, R)$  is a well-order, let  $h(R)$  be its order-type. Otherwise, let  $h(R) = 0$ . Every countable well-order is of the form  $(\omega, R)$  for some  $R \in \mathcal{P}(\omega \times \omega)$ , so  $h$  is surjective.
2. Suppose  $\mathcal{P}(\omega) = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} X_i$ , where each  $X_i$  is countable. Let  $f: \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \omega_1$  be the surjective function that we proved to exist in the first part. There are two cases. If some  $f[X_i]$  is cofinal in  $\omega_1$ , then it witnesses that  $\text{cf}(\omega_1) \leq \omega$ . Otherwise, each  $\alpha_i = \sup_{n \in X_i} f(n)$  is less than  $\omega_1$ . But then  $\{\alpha_i\}_{i \in \omega}$  is countable and witnesses that  $\text{cf}(\omega_1) \leq \omega$ . (It is clear that  $\text{cf}(\omega_1) \geq \omega$ .)

**E2 ans.** Let  $\varphi$  be a formula (in prenex normal form) of lowest quantifier-complexity so that  $M \models \varphi$  and  $\mathbb{N}$  does not. We observe that  $\varphi$  must begin with an  $\exists$ . In particular,  $\varphi$  cannot begin with a  $\forall$ . Otherwise,  $\mathbb{N} \models \neg\varphi$ , and  $\neg\varphi = \exists x\psi$  where  $\psi$  is of lower quantifier-complexity. But then  $\mathbb{N} \models \psi(x)$  for some  $x$ . Let  $\hat{x} = 1 + 1 + \dots + 1$  (i.e. the term which represents the element  $x$ ). Then  $\mathbb{N} \models \psi(\hat{x})$ . But then this is a sentence of lower quantifier-complexity than  $\varphi$ , and thus  $M \models \psi(\hat{x})$ . Thus  $M \models \varphi$ . So,  $\varphi$  must be  $\exists_n$  for some  $n$ . Let  $\varphi = \exists x\psi$ . Let  $a \in M$  be the least witness for  $\psi$ . The induction axioms in PA give us that there is a least witness. This witness is definable. We need only conclude that it is infinite. Suppose towards a contradiction that  $x$  is finite. Then  $x$  is represented by a term  $\hat{x} = 1 + 1 + \dots + 1$ . But then  $M \models \psi(\hat{x})$ . Since  $\psi$  is of lower quantifier-complexity than  $\varphi$ , we can conclude that  $\mathbb{N} \models \psi(\hat{x})$ , so  $\mathbb{N} \models \varphi$ , a contradiction.

**E3 ans.** First note that if  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$  is an  $L$ -formula,  $\psi$  is an  $L$ -formula, and  $c_1, \dots, c_k$  are constants not in  $L$ , then  $\varphi(c_1, \dots, c_k) \models \psi$  if and only if  $(\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_k) \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k) \models \psi$ . Let  $T(\vec{c}) = \{\varphi(x_1/c_1, \dots, x_k/c_k) : \varphi \in T\}$ , where  $c_1, \dots, c_k$  are new constants. The  $L$ -reducts of models of  $T(\vec{c})$  are in  $\mathcal{C}$ ,

hence if  $\psi$  is a sentence that is true in all models from  $\mathcal{C}$  then  $T(\vec{c}) \models \psi$ . By compactness there is a finite set  $T' \subseteq T$  such that  $T'(\vec{c}) \models \psi$ , or equivalently  $(\exists x_1 \cdots \exists x_k) \bigwedge_{\varphi \in T'} \varphi \models \psi$ .

**C1 ans.** Let  $f$  and  $g$  be computable functions such that  $W_{f(u)} = W_u \cup A$  and  $W_{g(v)} = W_v \cup B$ . Now wait until  $\psi(f(u), g(v))$  converges or  $W_{f(u)} \cap W_{g(v)} \neq \emptyset$ , one of which must occur by assumption. Then set  $p(u, v)$  to equal  $\psi(f(u), g(v))$  or 0, respectively.

**C2 ans.** We prove the contrapositive. Consider the  $X$ -computable function  $g$  such that  $g(n)$  is the least element of  $X$  that is  $\geq n$ . If  $X$  does not have hyperimmune degree, then there is a computable function  $f$  that majorizes  $g$  (i.e.,  $(\forall n) g(n) \leq f(n)$ ). Now let  $F(0) = 0$  and  $F(n+1) = f(F(n)) + 1$ . So for each  $n$ , there is an element of  $X$  in the interval  $[F(n), F(n+1))$ , namely  $g(F(n))$ . Let

$$C = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} [F(2n), F(2n+1)).$$

It should be clear that  $C$  is computable, but that  $X \cap C$  and  $X \cap \overline{C}$  are both infinite. Hence  $X$  isn't r-cohesive.<sup>1</sup>

**C3 ans.** First, we construct  $\Delta_2^0[D]$  approximations to indices  $e_0, e_1, e_2, \dots$ , such that

- $\varphi_{e_i}$  is the characteristic function of an infinite computable set  $X_i$ ,
- $X_0 \supseteq X_1 \supseteq X_2 \supseteq \dots$ ,
- If  $\varphi_i$  is the characteristic function of a computable set  $C$ , then either  $X_i \subseteq C$  or  $X_i \subseteq \overline{C}$ .

To find  $e_{i,s}$  at stage  $s$ , we assume that we have already determined  $e_{i-1,s}$  (where  $e_{-1}$  is a fixed index for the characteristic function of  $\omega$ ). If we are not currently guessing that  $\varphi_i$  is total and 0-1 valued, then let  $e_{i,s} = e_{i-1,s}$ . Otherwise, check our current guess as to whether  $X_{i-1,s} \cap C$  is infinite, where

---

<sup>1</sup>Actually, if  $X$  is r-cohesive, then  $X$  is a hyperimmune set. This is because we can compute a function that majorizes  $g$  from any function that majorizes the principal function of  $X$ .

$\varphi_i$  is the characteristic function of  $C$  and  $\varphi_{e_{i-1,s}}$  is the characteristic function of  $X_{i-1,s}$ . If so, let  $e_{i,s}$  be an index of the characteristic function of  $X_{i-1,s} \cap C$ . Otherwise, let  $e_{i,s}$  be an index for  $X_{i-1,s} \cap \overline{C}$ . Note that for all  $i$ , as long as we choose indices consistently,  $e_i = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} e_{i,s}$  exists. These indices clearly satisfy our requirements.

Now, we are ready to define the r-cohesive set  $X$ . For each  $s$ , search for a stage  $t \geq s$  and an  $n \geq s$  such that for all  $i \leq s$ , either  $\varphi_{e_{i,s,t}}(n) \downarrow = 1$  or  $e_{i,s} \neq e_{i,t}$ . Note that this search must be successful. Put  $n$  into  $X$ . Note that  $X \leq_T D$  because  $n$  cannot be put into  $X$  after stage  $n$  of the enumeration of  $X$ . Also note that  $X \subseteq^* X_i$  because all of our guesses eventually stabilize. So if  $C$  is computable with characteristic function  $\varphi_i$ , then either  $X \subseteq^* X_i \subseteq C$  or  $X \subseteq^* X_i \subseteq \overline{C}$ .