

1. Let  $\sigma$  be a signature with one binary relation symbol,  $R$ , and no other symbols. We will show that there are exactly  $2^\kappa$  nonisomorphic  $\sigma$ -structures of cardinality  $\kappa$  for each infinite  $\kappa$ . Since  $\sigma$  contains only a single binary relation,  $R$ , and no functions, a structure,  $(M, R)$ , with signature  $\sigma$  is uniquely determined by the pairs of elements contained in  $R$ . Since  $\kappa$  is infinite,  $|M^2| = \kappa^2 = \kappa$ , and any element of  $M^2$  is either contained in  $R$  or  $M^2 \setminus R$ . Therefore, we can think of each structure as a function from  $\kappa$  to 2, corresponding to whether each pair is in the structure's interpretation of  $R$ , and thus  $2^\kappa$  is the maximal number of structures we could define.

It remains to be shown that there are exactly  $2^\kappa$  distinct structures up to isomorphism. We do this by encoding the subsets of  $\kappa$  and the well-ordering of  $\kappa$  into a binary relation. Let  $<$  denote the standard well-ordering of the elements of  $\kappa$ . We consider structures of the form  $\mathcal{M} = (\kappa, R_A)$ , where  $R_A$  is a shorthand convention indicating that for some  $A \subseteq \kappa$ ,

$$R_A^{\mathcal{M}} = \{(\alpha, \alpha) : \alpha \in A\} \cup \{(\gamma, \delta) : \gamma < \delta\}.$$

Clearly, all such  $\mathcal{M}$  are of size  $\kappa$  – it therefore remains to be shown that there are  $2^\kappa$  such structures which are not isomorphic.

It will be sufficient to demonstrate that if  $A \neq B$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_A = (\kappa, R_A) \not\cong \mathcal{M}_B = (\kappa, R_B)$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $\gamma \in A$  with  $\gamma \notin B$ . In anticipation of a contradiction, assume  $\phi : \mathcal{M}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_B$  is an isomorphism. We claim that  $\phi$  can be thought of as an order isomorphism from  $\kappa$  to  $\kappa$  – by construction  $\phi$  is bijective, so it will suffice to show that, given  $\alpha, \beta \in \kappa$ ,  $\alpha < \beta$  if and only if  $\phi(\alpha) < \phi(\beta)$ . Suppose  $\alpha < \beta$  – then  $(\alpha, \beta) \in R_A^{\mathcal{M}_A}$  and thus  $(\phi(\alpha), \phi(\beta)) \in R_B^{\mathcal{M}_B}$ . Since  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and  $\phi$  is a bijection, we must have that  $\phi(\alpha) \neq \phi(\beta)$ . Consequently,  $(\phi(\alpha), \phi(\beta)) \in R_B^{\mathcal{M}_B}$  implies that  $\phi(\alpha) < \phi(\beta)$ . Suppose instead that  $\phi(\alpha) < \phi(\beta)$  – then  $(\phi(\alpha), \phi(\beta)) \in R_B^{\mathcal{M}_B}$  and thus  $(\alpha, \beta) \in R_A^{\mathcal{M}_A}$ . Since  $\phi(\alpha) \neq \phi(\beta)$  and  $\phi$  is a bijection, we must have that  $\alpha \neq \beta$ . Consequently,  $(\alpha, \beta) \in R_A^{\mathcal{M}_A}$  implies that  $\alpha < \beta$ . It therefore is indeed the case that  $\phi$  can be thought of as an order isomorphism. Consequently,  $\gamma$  is the unique element of height  $\gamma$  in  $A$ , and so  $\phi(\gamma)$  must be the unique element of height  $\gamma$  in  $B$ . Therefore,  $\phi(\gamma) = \gamma$ , and so  $\gamma \in B$ . This is a contradiction, and thus if  $A \neq B$ ,

then  $\mathcal{M}_A = (\kappa, R_A) \not\cong \mathcal{M}_B = (\kappa, R_B)$ . Since there are  $2^\kappa$  distinct subsets of  $\kappa$ , we have produced  $2^\kappa$  structures which are not isomorphic.