

## SOLUTIONS TO HOMEWORK #13

4. Suppose  $\text{Mod}(T_1 \cup T_2) = \emptyset$ . By compactness, there is a finite subset of  $T_1 \cup T_2$  that has no model. In other words, there is a set  $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k\}$  of sentences in  $T_1$ , and another set  $\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_l\}$  of sentences in  $T_2$ , such that  $\{\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_k, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_l\}$  has no model.

Let  $\sigma = \varphi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \varphi_k$ . Since each  $\varphi_i$  is in  $T_1$ , it is easy to see that  $T_1 \models \sigma$ . But any structure that satisfies  $T_2$  has to satisfy  $\{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_l\}$ , so it can't satisfy all of the  $\varphi_i$ 's. So  $T_2 \models \neg\sigma$ .

5. Suppose  $T_1 \neq T_2$ . Then there is a sentence that is in one but not the other. Without loss of generality, suppose  $\varphi$  is a sentence in  $T_1$  but not  $T_2$ . Since  $T_2$  is a theory,  $T_2 \not\models \varphi$ , and so  $T_2 \cup \{\neg\varphi\}$  is consistent.

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a model of  $T_2 \cup \{\neg\varphi\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{A} \models \neg\varphi$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is a model of  $T_2$  but not  $T_1$ .

8. a. It is easy to verify that the map  $f(x) = x + 1$  is an isomorphism.  
 b. By Lemma 3.3.3, any two isomorphic structures are elementarily equivalent.  
 c. Clearly  $|\mathcal{A}| \subseteq |\mathcal{B}|$ , and the ordering is the same on both universes.  
 d.  $\mathcal{A} \models \exists x (x < \bar{1})$ , but not  $\mathcal{B}$ .

10. It is easy to verify that  $f(x) = 2x$  is an automorphism of this structure. But  $1 \times 1 = 1$ , while

$$f(1) \times f(1) = 2 \times 2 = 4 \neq f(1).$$

13. Here is the algorithm: on input  $\varphi$ , in parallel look for a proof of  $\varphi$  and a proof of  $\neg\varphi$  from the axioms of  $T$ . Since  $T$  is complete, you are bound to find one or the other. If it is a proof of  $\varphi$ , answer "yes,"  $\varphi \in T$ ; otherwise, answer "no,"  $\varphi \notin T$ .

15. I cancelled this question because we did not cover second-order logic in time. But just FYI, note that being well ordered is naturally a second-order property, since we can use a second-order variable to range over subsets:

$$\forall S(\exists x S(x) \rightarrow \exists x (S(x) \wedge \forall y (y < x \rightarrow \neg S(y)))).$$