# Equivalence of a problem of set theory to a hypothesis concerning the powers of cardinal numbers

## By G. FODOR in Szeged

### To Professor Béla Szőkefalvi-Nagy on his 50th birthday

Let *E* be an arbitrary set of power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  and suppose that with every element *x* of *E* is associated a non empty set f(x) such that for any  $x \in E$  the power of the set f(x) is smaller than a given cardinal number  $\aleph_{\beta}$  which is smaller than  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  and  $f(x) \neq f(y)$  ( $x \neq y$ ). We say that the subset  $\Gamma$  of *E* has the property T(q, p), where q and p are two cardinal numbers such that  $p \leq q \leq \aleph_{\alpha}$ , if

$$\overline{\bigcup_{x\in\Gamma} f(x)} = \mathfrak{q} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\bigcup_{\substack{x,y\in\Gamma\\x\neq y}} (f(x)\cap f(y))} < \mathfrak{p}.$$

We define the ordinal number  $\beta_0$  as follows:

Let  $\beta_0$  be the smallest ordinal number  $\rho < \beta$  such that the set  $E^{(\rho)}$  of the elements  $x \in E$  for which  $\overline{f(x)} < \aleph_{\rho}$  has the power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$ .

Consider now the following propositions.

(I) Under the above conditions E has a subset  $\Gamma$  with the property  $T(\aleph_a, \aleph_a)$ . (II) For every ordinal number  $\gamma, \beta < \gamma < \alpha$ , the inequality

$$(\chi^{\underline{\aleph}_{\beta_0}})^{\underline{\aleph}_{\beta_0}} < \chi_{\alpha}$$

holds, where  $\aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_0}} = \sum_{\varrho < \beta_0} \aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\varrho}}$ .

We shall prove in this paper the following

Theorem. The propositions (I) and (II) are equivalent.

We shall use the following notations. For any subset  $\Gamma$  of E let

$$\Pi_{\Gamma} = \bigcup_{\substack{x, y \in \Gamma \\ x \neq y}} (f(x) \cap f(y)).$$

For any cardinal number r we denote by  $r^+$  the cardinal number immediately following r. The symbols  $\overline{S}$  and  $\overline{\gamma}$  denote the cardinal numbers of the set S and of the ordinal number  $\gamma$ , respectively. For every ordinal number  $\tau$ ,  $\aleph_{cf(\tau)}$  denotes the least cardinal number n such that  $\aleph_{\tau}$  can be expressed as the sum of n cardinal numbers each  $<\aleph_{\tau}$ . If  $\mathfrak{m}$  and  $\mathfrak{n}$  cardinal numbers, then we define  $\mathfrak{m}^n = \sum_{r < n} \mathfrak{m}^r$ . Put, for every ordinal number  $\gamma$ ,  $W(\gamma) = \{\xi: \xi < \gamma\}$ . In the proof of the theorem we shall use the following theorems:

Theorem 1. If  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  is regular and  $\bigcup_{x \in E} f(x)$  has the power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$ , then E has a subset with the property  $T(\aleph_{\alpha}, \aleph_{\alpha})$ . (See [1], theorem 1.)

Theorem 2. Let  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  be a singular cardinal number,  $\mathfrak{r}_0$  a cardinal number which is smaller then  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  and  $\{\aleph_{\xi}\}_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}}$  a sequence of regular cardinal numbers such that  $\aleph_{\sigma} > \aleph_{\tau} (\sigma > \tau)$ ; max  $\{\aleph_{cf(\alpha)}, \aleph_{\beta}, \mathfrak{r}_0\} < \aleph_{\xi} < \aleph_{\alpha}$  and  $\aleph_{\alpha} = \sum_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} \aleph_{\xi}$ . If for every  $\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}$ ,  $E_{\xi}$  is a subset of power  $\geq \aleph_{\xi}$  of E such that  $E_{\xi}$  has a subset  $E_{\xi}'$  with the property  $T(\aleph_{\xi}, \mathfrak{r}_0)$ , then E has a subset with the property  $T(\aleph_{\alpha}, [\aleph_{cf(\alpha)} \mathfrak{r}_0]^+)$ . (See [1], theorem 4.)

Theorem 3. If M. is an infinite set of power m, and if  $n \le m$ , then the set S of subsets  $X \subset M$  with  $\overline{X} < n$  has the power  $\overline{S} = \sum_{r < n} m^r$ . (See for example the theorem.) 3 of § 34 in [2].)

Theorem 4.

$$(\mathfrak{m}^{\aleph_{\varrho}})^{\aleph_{\mu}} = \begin{cases} \mathfrak{m}^{\aleph_{\varrho}} & for \quad \mu \leq \mathrm{cf}(\varrho), \\ \mathfrak{m}^{\aleph_{\varrho}} & for \quad \mathrm{cf}(\varrho) < \mu \leq \varrho + 1, \\ \mathfrak{m}^{\aleph_{\mu}} & for \quad \mu > \varrho. \end{cases}$$

(See theorem 7 of  $\S$  34 in [2].)

Theorem 5. Let  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  be a singular cardinal number and  $\eta$  an ordinal number smaller than  $\omega_{\alpha}$ . If to every element  $\gamma$  of  $W(\omega_{\alpha})$  there corresponds an ordinal number  $h(\gamma) < \eta$ , then there exists a subset M of power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  of  $W(\omega_{\alpha})$  such that

$$\overline{h[M]} \leq \aleph_{\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)}.$$

Proof. Let  $\{\alpha_{\xi}\}_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}}$  be an increasing sequence of ordinal numbers such that  $\lim_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} \alpha_{\xi} = \alpha$  for every  $\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}, \ \omega_{\alpha_{\xi}} > \eta$  and  $\omega_{\alpha_{\xi}}$  is regular. It is clear that

$$W(\omega_{\alpha}) = \bigcup_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} W(\omega_{\alpha\xi}).$$

Let us define  $g_{\xi}(\gamma)$  on  $W(\omega_{\alpha\xi})$  as follows:

$$g_{\xi}(\gamma) = h(\gamma) \quad (\gamma \in W(\omega_{\alpha_{\xi}})).$$

Since  $\omega_{\alpha_{\xi}}$  is regular and  $\omega_{\alpha_{\xi}} > \eta$ , there exists an ordinal number  $\pi_{\xi} \in W(\eta)$  and a subset  $M_{\xi}$  of power  $\aleph_{\alpha_{\xi}}$  of  $W(\omega_{\alpha_{\xi}})$  such that

$$g_{\xi}[M_{\xi}] = \{\pi_{\xi}\}.$$
$$M = \bigcup_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} M_{\xi}.$$

Let

Clearly the power of M is  $\aleph_{\alpha}$ . Let further N be the set of all distinct elements of the sequence  $\{\pi_{\xi}\}_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}}$ . It is clear that

$$h[M] = N$$

Since  $N \leq \bigotimes_{cf(\alpha)}$ , theorem 5 is proved.

# G. Fodor

Corollary. If  $\eta$  is an ordinal number of the second kind and  $cf(\eta) \neq cf(\alpha)$ , then there exists a subset M' of power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  of M and an ordinal number  $\eta' < \eta$  such that

$$h[M'] \subseteq W(\eta').$$

Proof. (i) If  $\overline{N} < \aleph_{cf(\alpha)}$ , then it follows from the regularity of  $\omega_{cf(\alpha)}$  that there exists an increasing sequence  $\{\xi_{\nu}\}_{\nu < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}}$  of the type  $\omega_{cf(\alpha)}$  of ordinal numbers smaller than  $\omega_{cf(\alpha)}$  such that

$$\pi_{\xi_0} = \pi_{\xi_1} = \ldots = \pi_{\xi_v} = \ldots \quad (v < \omega_{\mathrm{cf}(\alpha)}).$$

But then 
$$\overline{\{\gamma \in M : h(\gamma) = \pi_{\xi_0}\}} = \sum_{\xi_{\nu} < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} \aleph_{\xi_{\nu}} = \aleph_{\alpha}.$$

$$h[M'] = h[\{\gamma \in M : h(\gamma) = \pi_{\xi_0}\}] \subseteq W(\pi_{\xi_0} + 1).$$

(j) If  $\overline{N} = \bigotimes_{cf(x)}$ , then let  $\{\eta_{\nu}\}_{\nu < \omega_{cf(\eta)}}$  be an increasing sequence of ordinal numbers for which  $\lim_{\nu < \omega_{cf(\eta)}} \eta_{\nu} = \eta$ .

(j<sub>1</sub>) If  $cf(\alpha) < cf(\eta)$ , then it follows from the inequality  $N \subset W(\eta)$  that there exists an ordinal number  $v_0 < \omega_{cf(\eta)}$ , for which

$$N \subseteq W(\eta_{y_0}) \subset W(\eta).$$

(j<sub>2</sub>) If  $cf(\alpha) > cf(\eta)$ , then let  $N_{\nu} = N \cap W(\eta_{\nu})$ . It is clear that

$$\bigcup_{<\omega_{cf(\eta)}} N_{v} = N.$$

Since  $\omega_{cf(a)}$  is regular, there exists an ordinal number  $v_0 < \omega_{cf(n)}$  such that

 $\overline{N}_{v_0} = \aleph_{cf(\alpha)}.$ 

It follows that there exists an increasing sequence  $\{\xi_{\varrho}\}_{\varrho < \omega_{cf(z)}}$  of the type  $\omega_{ct(z)}$  such that

$$N_{v_0} = \{\pi_{\xi_{\varrho}}\}_{\varrho < \omega_{cf(z)}}.$$

Thus we get from the definition of  $\{\pi_{\xi}\}_{\xi < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}}$  that  $M' = \bigcup_{\nu < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} M_{\xi_{\nu}}$  has the power  $\aleph_{\alpha} = \sum \aleph_{\alpha_{\xi_{\nu}}}$  and

$$h[M'] \subset W(\eta_{y_0}).$$

Theorem 6. Let  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  be a singular cardinal number and  $\eta$  an ordinal number smaller than  $\omega_{\alpha}$ . If to every element  $\gamma$  of  $W(\omega_{\alpha})$  there corresponds an ordinal number  $h(\gamma) < \eta$ , then the smallest ordinal number  $\eta_0$ , for which there exists a subset M of power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  of  $W(\omega_{\alpha})$  such that

$$h[M] \subset W(\eta_0) \subseteq W(\eta),$$

is either of the first kind, i. e.  $\eta_0 = \tau_0 + 1$  or of the second kind with  $cf(\eta_0) = cf(\alpha)$ .

Proof. (i)  $W(\eta_0)$  has a greatest element. In this case the power of the set M', for which  $h[M'] = {\pi_0}$ , is  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  and the power of the set M'', for which

$$h[M''] \subseteq W(\tau_0),$$

is smaller than  $\aleph_{\alpha}$ . Thus  $\eta_0 = \tau_0 + 1$ .

#### A problem of set theory

(ii)  $W(\eta_0)$  does not contain a greatest element. Then  $\eta_0$  is of the second kind. It follows from the definition of  $\eta_0$  and the corollary of theorem 5 that  $cf(\eta_0) = cf(\alpha)$ . Theorem 6 is proved. With the aid of theorem 6 we get

Theorem 7. The ordinal number  $\beta_0$  is either of the first kind or of the second kind with  $cf(\beta_0) = cf(\alpha)$ .

Proof of the theorem. (A) First we prove that (I) follows from (II). Suppose also that the proposition (II) holds. Put

$$(\aleph_{\gamma}^{\underline{\aleph}\beta_{0}})^{\underline{\aleph}\beta_{0}} = \aleph_{\beta_{0}(\gamma)}.$$

It follows from theorem 4, that

$$\aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)} = \begin{cases} \aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_0}} & \text{for } cf(\beta_0) = \beta_0 \\ \aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_0}} & \text{for } cf(\beta_0) < \beta_0. \end{cases}$$

This implies that

$$\aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)}^{\aleph_{\beta_0}} = (\aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_0}})^{\aleph_{\beta_0}} = \aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_0}} = \aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)}$$

for cf  $(\beta_0) = \beta_0$  and

$$\aleph_{\beta_{0}(\gamma)}^{\aleph_{\beta_{0}}} = \sum_{\varrho < \beta_{0}} \aleph_{\beta_{0}(\gamma)}^{\aleph_{\varrho}} = \sum_{\varrho < \beta_{0}} (\aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_{0}}})^{\aleph_{\varrho}} = \sum_{\varrho < \beta_{0}} \aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_{0}} \cdot \aleph_{\varrho}} = \sum_{\varrho < \beta_{0}} \aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_{0}}} = \aleph_{\gamma}^{\aleph_{\beta_{0}}} \cdot \aleph_{\beta_{0}} = \aleph_{\beta_{0}(\gamma)}$$

for  $cf(\beta_0) < \beta_0$ , i. e. in both cases  $\aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)}^{\underline{\aleph},\underline{\theta}_0} = \aleph_{\beta(\gamma_0)}$  holds. As the sets f(x) are distinct it follows from this that the set  $\bigcup_{x \in E} f(x)$  has the power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$ . Thus, if  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  is regular, we get by theorem 1, that E has a subset with the property  $T(\aleph_{\alpha}, \aleph_{\alpha})$ . Suppose now that  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  is singular. Then  $E^{(\beta_0)}$  has for every  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta < \gamma < \alpha$ , a subset  $E_{\gamma}$  with the property  $T(\aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)+1}, \aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)+1})$ , i. e.

$$\Pi_{E_{\gamma}} \leq \aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)} < \aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)+1}.$$

Let  $S(\gamma)$  be the set of subsets  $X \subset \Pi_{E_{\gamma}}$  with  $\overline{X} < \aleph_{\beta_0}$ . It follows from theorem 3 that  $\overline{S(\gamma)} \leq \aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)}^{\aleph_{\beta_0}} = \aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)}$ . Hence, since for given  $\gamma$  the sets  $f^{(\gamma)}(x) = f(x) - \Pi_{E_{\gamma}}$  ( $x \in E_{\gamma}$ ) are mutually disjoint, we obtain that there exists an element  $X_0$  of  $S(\gamma)$  and to this a subset  $E'_{\gamma}$  of power  $\aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)+1}$  of  $E_{\gamma}$  such that  $f^{\gamma}(x) \neq 0$  and

$$f(x) = f^{(\gamma)}(x) \cup X_0$$

for every  $x \in E'_{\gamma}$ , i. e.  $E'_{\gamma}$  has the property  $T(\aleph_{\beta_0(\gamma)+1}, \aleph_{\beta_0})$ . It follows from theorem 2 that E has a subset with the property  $T(\aleph_{\alpha}, \aleph_{\beta_0} \aleph_{cf(\alpha)+1})$ .

(B) We prove now that from the proposition (I) follows the proposition (II). Suppose therefore that (II) does not hold. Then we prove that the proposition (I) is false.

Let  $\beta_0$  is an ordinal number of the first kind, i. e.  $\beta_0 = \tau_0 + 1$ . If (II) does not hold, then there exists an ordinal number  $\gamma_0$ ,  $\beta < \gamma_0 < \alpha$  for which

$$\aleph_{\gamma_0}^{\aleph_{\tau_0}} \geqq \aleph_{\alpha}.$$

Let  $E_1$  be a subset of power  $\aleph_{\gamma_0}$  of E and  $T_1$  a set of power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$  of subsets of power  $\aleph_{\tau_0}$  of  $E_1$ . Let further f(x) be a one-to-one mapping of E into  $T_1$ . It follows that if  $\Gamma$  is a subset of E with the property T(q, p) then  $q \leq \aleph_{\gamma_0}$ , because the sets

$$f'(x) = f(x) - \prod_{\Gamma} \subset E_1$$

must be not empty and mutually disjoint for q elements x of  $\Gamma$ .

Let  $\beta_0$  be an ordinal number of the second kind. Then  $cf(\beta_0) = cf(\alpha)$  by the theorem 7. Let  $\{\alpha_\eta\}_{\eta < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}}$  and  $\{\beta_\eta\}_{\eta < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}}$  be two increasing sequences of ordinal numbers such that  $\lim_{\eta < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} \alpha_\eta = \alpha$  and  $\lim_{\eta < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} \beta_\eta = \beta_0$ . We have two cases:

(i) there exists a smallest ordinal number  $\eta_0 < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}$  and an ordinal number  $\gamma_0$ ,  $\beta < \gamma_0 < \alpha$ , such that  $\aleph_{\alpha}^{\aleph, \rho_0} \ge \aleph_{\alpha}$ ;

(ii) for every  $\rho < \beta_0$  there exists an  $\rho' < \beta_0$  such that  $\aleph_{\gamma_0}^{\aleph_{\rho'}} > \aleph_{\gamma_0}^{\aleph_{\rho'}}$ . In this case we assume that, for every  $\eta < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}$ ,  $\beta_{\eta}$  is the smallest ordinal number such that

$$\aleph_{\gamma_0}^{\alpha\beta_\eta} \geq \aleph_{\alpha_\eta}.$$

Let  $T_{\eta}$  be in both cases (but in the case (i) we assume that  $\eta_0 \leq \eta < \beta_0$  holds) a set of power  $\aleph_{\alpha_{\eta}}$  of subsets of power  $\aleph_{\beta_{\eta}}$  of  $E_1$ , where  $\overline{E}_1 = \aleph_{\gamma_0}$ . It is clear that the set

$$T = \bigcup_{\eta < \omega_{cf(\alpha)}} T_{\eta}$$

has the power  $\aleph_{\alpha}$ . Let f(x) be a one-to-one mapping of E into T. If  $\Gamma$  is a subset of E with the property T(q, p), then  $q \leq \aleph_{\gamma_0}$ , because the sets  $f'(x) = f(x) - \prod_{\Gamma} \subset E_1$  must be non empty and mutually disjoint for q elements x of  $\Gamma$ . The theorem is proved.

## References

 G. FODOR, Some results concerning a problem in set theory, Acta Sci. Math., 16 (1955), 232-240.
H. BACHMANN, Transfinite Zahlen, Ergebnisse der Math. und ihrer Grenzgebiete. Neue Folge, Heft 1 (Berlin-Heidelberg-Göttingen, 1955).

(Received July 15, 1962)