

## Problem 4

**Problem:** Let  $\sim$  be a relation on  $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$  under the lexicographical order. We say  $(a, b)$  is a child of  $(c, d)$  if  $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$  and  $(a, b) < (c, d)$ , where  $<$  is the lexicographical order.

We have two definitions for “descendant” below. Which one is the correct one?

- (1) We say  $(a, b)$  is a descendant of  $(c, d)$  if  $(a, b)$  is a child of  $(c, d)$  or  $(a, b)$  is a descendant of a child of  $(c, d)$ .
- (2) We say  $(a, b)$  is a descendant of  $(c, d)$  if  $(a, b)$  is a child of  $(c, d)$  or  $(a, b)$  is a child of a descendant of  $(c, d)$ .

**Solution.** Definition (1) is the correct definition. We let

$$C((m, n)) = \{(a, b) \mid (a, b) \text{ is a child of } (m, n)\}.$$

Define

$$D : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}), D((m, n)) = C((m, n)) \cup \bigcup_{((a, b)) \in C((m, n))} D((a, b)) \quad (*)$$

We want to show that there exists a unique function  $D$  that satisfies condition  $(*)$ .

If this is not the case, pick the smallest  $(m, n)$  for which there is no such  $D$ . So, for every  $(a, b) \in C(m, n)$ ,  $D(a, b)$  is defined and satisfies  $(*)$ .

Define

$$D(m, n) = C(m, n) \cup \bigcup_{(a, b) \in C((m, n))} D((a, b)).$$

## Problem 5

**Problem:** Let  $S$  be well-ordered by  $<$ . Then, for every  $x \in S$ , if  $x$  is non-maximal, then  $x$  has a successor. The successor is defined by

$$\exists y > x \text{ s.t. } \neg \exists z \ x < z < y.$$

**Solution.** Let  $x \in S$  be nonmaximal. Set

$$T = \{y \in S \mid x < y\}.$$

Since  $x$  is nonmaximal,  $T$  is nonempty, meaning there exists a least element  $z$ . Then,  $z$  is a successor of  $x$ , because for all  $y$ ,  $x < y$ , then  $y \in T$ , meaning  $y = z$  or  $z < y$ , since  $z$  is the least element of  $T$ .

## Problem 6

**Problem:** Every  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  well-ordered by the traditional  $<$  relation is countable.

**Solution.** Let  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  be well-ordered. It is enough to show that  $S \cap [z, z + 1]$  is countable for every  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ , as

$$S = \bigcup_{z \in \mathbb{Z}} S \cap [z, z + 1]$$

is a countable union of countable sets.

For every  $x \in S$ , let  $f(x) = x^+ - x$ , where  $x^+$  is the successor of  $x$  in  $S$ . If  $x$  has no successor, we let  $f(x) = 0$ .

It is enough to show that  $S_0 = S \cap [0, 1]$  is countable. We have  $S_0$  is well-ordered.

For every  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , define

$$A_k = \left\{ x \in S_0 \mid f(x) > \frac{1}{k} \right\}.$$

Notice that  $|A_k| \leq k$  for all  $k$ , since  $S$  is well-ordered by  $<$ .

**Remark** (“Converse” to Problem 6): The previous problem states that we cannot embed an uncountable well-ordered set into  $\mathbb{R}$ . Here, an embedding means that there is a function  $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $f$  is injective and  $f$  preserves order. In other words,  $S$  and  $f(S) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$  are order-isomorphic.

A question we may be interested in is if every countable ordinal can be embedded into  $\mathbb{R}$ .