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# A HETEROGENEOUS INTERPOLANT 

WALTER TAYLOR

In this note we exhibit an interpolant for a certain valid implication $\vDash \varphi \rightarrow \psi$, where $\varphi$ and $\psi$ come from the infinitary language $L_{\omega_{1} \omega_{1}}$. The existence of this interpolant follows from Takeuti's heterogeneous interpolation theorem [5], but unfortunately the proof in [5] is not explicit enough to allow one to find the interpolant explicitly. Takeuti's theorem asserts the existence of an interpolant in the class $\bar{L}_{\omega_{1} \omega_{1}}$ of heterogeneous formulas, which admits the rules of formation of $L_{\omega_{1} \omega_{1}}$ plus the following additional rule: if $\varphi \in \bar{L}_{\omega_{1} \omega_{1}}$ and $\left\langle Q_{\alpha}\right\rangle_{\alpha<\beta}$ is a sequence of quantifiers (i.e. $Q_{\alpha}=\exists$ or $Q_{\alpha}=\forall$ ) then $Q_{0} x_{i_{0}} \cdots Q_{\alpha} x_{i_{\alpha}} \cdots_{(\alpha<\beta)} \varphi \in \bar{L}_{\alpha_{1} \omega_{1}}$. (The semantic interpretation is the obvious one ; consult [2, § C] or [4].)

The present interpolation example (whose investigation was suggested by J. Malitz) will be presented as a definability theorem. Namely we give a formula explicitly defining an isomorphism between two isomorphic well-founded extensional relations.

We take unary predicates $A_{1}, A_{2}$ and binary predicates $E_{1}, E_{2}, F$ (written medially). Let $\sigma$ be the conjunction of the following sentences.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \forall x\left[\left(A_{1} x \vee A_{2} x\right) \wedge \neg\left(A_{1} x \wedge A_{2} x\right)\right] \\
& \forall x \forall y\left[x E_{i} y \rightarrow A_{i} x \wedge A_{i} y\right] \quad(i=1,2) \\
& \forall x \forall y\left[A_{i} x \wedge A_{i} y \rightarrow\left[x \simeq y \leftrightarrow \forall z\left(z E_{i} x \leftrightarrow z E_{i} y\right)\right]\right] \quad(i=1,2) \\
& \forall x_{0} \forall x_{1} \cdots\left[\neg \bigwedge_{j \in \omega} x_{j+1} E_{i} x_{j}\right] \quad(i=1,2) \\
& \forall x \forall y\left[x F y \rightarrow A_{1} x \wedge A_{2} y\right] \\
& \forall x\left[A_{1} x \rightarrow \exists!y(x F y)\right] \\
& \forall y\left[A_{2} y \rightarrow \exists!x(x F y)\right] \\
& \forall u \forall v \forall x \forall y\left[x F y \wedge u F v \rightarrow\left(u E_{1} x \leftrightarrow v E_{2} y\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

One may easily check that if

$$
\left\langle U ; A_{1}, A_{2}, E_{1}, E_{2}, F\right\rangle \vDash \sigma
$$
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and

$$
\left\langle U ; A_{1}, A_{2}, E_{1}, E_{2}, F^{\prime}\right\rangle \vDash \sigma,
$$

then $F=F^{\prime}$. Thus $F$ is implicitly defined by $\sigma$, and hence by Takeuti's theorem together with the usual argument for Beth's theorem, there is a (heterogeneous) formula $\Phi(x, y)$ such that $\sigma \vDash x F y \leftrightarrow \Phi(x, y)$, with $F$ not appearing in $\Phi$. (Such $\Phi$ cannot be in any $L_{x \lambda}$, as follows from the proof of Malitz [3, Theorem 4.2].) The aim of this note is to explicitly exhibit $\Phi$.

Let $C$ be the set of finite sequences of 0 's and 1 's (including the empty sequence $\square$ ). For $\square \neq \sigma=a_{0} a_{1} \cdots a_{n-1} a_{n} \in C$, we let $\hat{\sigma}=a_{0} \cdots a_{n-1}$. For all $\sigma \in C$ we take variables $x_{\sigma}$ and $y_{\sigma}$. For all $\sigma \in C$, let $Q_{\sigma}$ stand for ${ }^{1}$

$$
\left(\forall x_{\sigma 0} \in A_{1}\right)\left(\exists y_{\sigma 0} \in A_{2}\right)\left(\forall y_{\sigma 1} \in A_{2}\right)\left(\exists x_{\sigma 1} \in A_{1}\right) .
$$

Now let $\Phi(x, y)$ be

$$
\left(A_{1} x\right) \wedge\left(A_{2} y\right) \wedge Q_{\square} \cdots \underset{\substack{\sigma, \sigma \in C \\|\sigma| \leq|\tau|}}{Q_{\sigma}} \cdots Q_{\tau} \cdots \bigwedge_{\substack{\sigma \in \sigma \\ \sigma \neq \square}}\left(x_{\sigma} E_{1} x_{\hat{\sigma}} \leftrightarrow y_{\sigma} E_{2} y_{\hat{\sigma}}\right),
$$

where $|\sigma|$ denotes the length of $\sigma$. We claim that $\sigma \vDash(\Phi(x, y) \leftrightarrow x F y)$. To see this, let $\mathfrak{A}=\left\langle U ; A_{1}, A_{2}, E_{1}, E_{2}, F\right\rangle$ be any model of $\sigma$. We then need to see that for $a, b \in U, \mathfrak{V} \vDash \Phi[a, b]$ if and only if $(a, b) \in F$. Certainly if $(a, b) \in F$, then we may obviously use the isomorphism $F$ to continue to establish the satisfaction of $\Phi$ in $\mathfrak{U}$. Conversely suppose that for some $a$ and $b, a \in A_{1}$ and $b \in A_{2}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{A} \vDash \Phi[a, b] \quad \text { but }(a, b) \notin F . \tag{*}
\end{equation*}
$$

We let $a$ be $E_{1}$-minimal among those $a$ for which such $b$ exists, and let $b$ be $E_{2}$-minimal such that (*) holds for $b$ and this value of $a$. Notice that $\Phi(x, y)$ is logically equivalent to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \forall x_{0} \exists y_{0}\left[\left(x_{0} E_{1} x \leftrightarrow y_{0} E_{2} y\right) \wedge \Phi\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right] \wedge \\
& \forall y_{1} \exists x_{1}\left[\left(x_{1} E_{1} x \leftrightarrow y_{1} E_{2} y\right) \wedge \Phi\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus we know that

$$
\mathfrak{U} \vDash\left[\begin{array}{l}
\forall x_{0} \exists y_{0}\left[\left(x_{0} E_{1} a \leftrightarrow y_{0} E_{2} b\right) \wedge \Phi\left(x_{0}, y_{0}\right)\right] \wedge \\
\forall y_{1} \exists x_{1}\left[\left(x_{1} E_{1} a \leftrightarrow y_{1} E_{2} b\right) \wedge \Phi\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right)\right]
\end{array}\right]
$$

[^0]By the minimality of $a$ and $b$, we know that therefore

$$
\mathfrak{U} \vDash\left[\begin{array}{l}
\left.\forall x_{0} \exists y_{0}\left[\left(x_{0} E_{1} a \leftrightarrow y_{0} E_{2} b\right) \wedge x_{0} F y_{0}\right] \wedge\right] . \\
\forall y_{1} \exists x_{1}\left[\left(x_{1} E_{1} a \leftrightarrow y_{1} E_{2} b\right) \wedge x_{1} F y_{1}\right]
\end{array}\right] .
$$

But since $F$ is an isomorphism and since $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ are each extensional, we see that $(a, b) \in F$.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ We express the quantifiers $Q_{\sigma}$ with " $\epsilon$ " for cognitive purposes. Clearly it is possible to write $\Phi$ in strict accordance with the formation rule mentioned above.

