## Solutions to Homework #12

2.

3.

a.

b.

$$\underbrace{ \begin{array}{c} [\psi(x)]_1 \\ \hline \varphi \to \psi(x) \\ \hline \exists x \ (\varphi \to \psi(x)) \\ \hline \exists x \ (\varphi \to \psi(x)) \end{array} 1 \\
 \end{array}}_{} 1$$

c.

d. This is just the  $\vee$  elimination rule:

$$\begin{array}{cccc} [\exists x \ \psi(x)]_1 & [\neg \exists x \ \psi(x)]_1 & \varphi \to \exists x \ \psi(x) \\ & \vdots(b) & \vdots & \vdots(c) \\ \hline \exists x \ \psi(x) \lor \neg \exists x \ \psi(x) & [\exists x \ (\varphi \to \psi(x))]_2 & \exists x \ (\varphi \to \psi(x)) \\ \hline & \frac{\exists x \ (\varphi \to \psi(x))}{(\exists x \ (\varphi \to \psi(x)) \to \exists x \ (\varphi \to \psi(x)))} \ 1 \end{array}$$

5. Suppose T is a maximally consistent theory.

For the forwards direction, suppose  $\varphi$  is in T. Since T is consistent,  $\neg \varphi$  is not in T.

For the other direction, suppose  $\neg \varphi$  is not in T. By maximality,  $T \cup \{\neg \varphi\}$  is inconsistent. So there is a proof of  $\bot$  from T and  $\neg \varphi$ . Using RAA, we get a proof of  $\varphi$  from T. Since T is a theory,  $\varphi$  is in T.

11. Suppose  $T_1$  is a conservative extension of  $T_2$ , and  $T_2$  is a conservative extension of  $T_3$ . I need to show that  $T_1$  is a conservative extension of  $T_3$ . In other words, I need to show that if  $\varphi$  is any sentence in  $L_3$ , then  $\varphi$  is in  $T_1$  if and only if it is in  $T_3$ .

Since  $T_1$  contains  $T_2$  and  $T_2$  contains  $T_3$ , it is clear that every sentence  $\varphi$  in  $T_3$  is in  $T_1$ . For the other direction, suppose  $\varphi$  is some sentence in the language  $L_3$  that is in  $T_1$ . Since  $L_3$  is a smaller language than  $L_2$ ,  $\varphi$  is also a sentence in  $L_2$ . Since  $T_1$  is a conservative extension of  $T_2$ ,  $\varphi$  is in  $T_2$ . And since  $T_2$  is a conservative extension of  $T_3$ , then  $\varphi$  is in  $T_3$ , as required.

- 13. a. Let f(x) = 1 x. This is an isomorphism of the two structures, as follows. f is injective: if 1 x = 1 y then x = y. f is surjective: Given any z in (0, 1), z = f(1 z). f is an isomorphism: If a < b then 1 a > 1 b.
  - b. Let f(x) = x/(1-x). f is injective: if x/(1-x) = y/(1-y), then (cross multiplying) we have x - xy = y - xy and so x = y. f is surjective: if z is any positive real number, let x = z/(1+z). Then x is an element of (0, 1), and it is easy to check that f(x) = z. f is an isomorphism: Assuming x and y are in (0, 1), 1-x and 1-y are both positive. So we have x/(1-x) < y/(1-y) iff x - xy < y - xyiff x < y.
  - c. [0,1] satisfies "there is a smallest element,"  $\exists x \ \forall y \ (x \leq y)$ , while (0,1) does not.
- 14. a. The structure  $\mathcal{B}$  in the problem mentioned ordered the natural numbers so that all the even numbers come first, followed by the odd numbers:

$$0, 2, 4, 6, \ldots, 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 \ldots$$

Let X be any nonempty subset of the universe of  $\mathcal{B}$ . If X has any even numbers, take the smallest even number in X, under the usual ordering on  $\mathbb{N}$ ; this is the least element of X in the ordering on  $\mathcal{B}$ . Otherwise, if there are no even numbers in X, there is at least one odd number in X. In that case, the smallest odd number in X, under the usual ordering on  $\mathbb{N}$ , is the least element of X in the ordering on  $\mathcal{B}$ .

b. Let  $\Gamma$  be a set of sentences, such that every well-ordering is a model of  $\Gamma$ . Using compactness, I will show that there is a structure that is *not* a well-ordering, but is also a model of  $\Gamma$ .

Add constants  $c_0, c_1, c_2, \ldots$  to the language. Let  $\Gamma'$  be the set of sentences

$$\Gamma \cup \{c_1 < c_0, c_2 < c_1, c_3 < c_2, \ldots\}.$$

I claim that every finite subset of  $\Gamma'$  is consistent. Let  $\Delta$  be any such finite subset, and notice that for some  $n, \Delta$  is a subset of

$$\Gamma \cup \{c_1 < c_0, c_2 < c_1, c_3 < c_2, \dots, c_n < c_{n-1}\}.$$

In other words, only finitely many of the sentences  $c_{i+1} < c_i$  can be in  $\Delta$ . Since  $\langle \mathbb{N}, < \rangle$  is a model of  $\Gamma$ , the structure

$$\langle \mathbb{N}, <, n, n-1, n-2, \dots, 3, 2, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0 \dots \rangle$$

is a model of  $\Delta$  (that is, the structure that assigns n to  $c_0$ , n-1 to  $c_1$ , and so on). Note that the constants from  $c_{n+1}$  don't appear in  $\Delta$ , so we can just assign 0 to them.

Since every finite subset of  $\Gamma'$  has a model,  $\Gamma'$  also has a model  $\mathcal{A}'$  (in the language with the new constants). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the reduct of  $\Gamma'$  to the original language. Then  $\mathcal{A}$  is a model of  $\Gamma$ , but  $\mathcal{A}$  has elements  $a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots$  such that  $a_1 < a_0, a_2 < a_1$ , and so on. Then the set

$$\{a_0, a_1, a_2, \ldots, \}$$

doesn't have a least element, so  $\mathcal{A}$  is not a well-ordering.