

# Notes and exercises from *Set Theory*

John Peloquin

## Introduction

This document contains notes and exercises from [1].

## Chapter 1

**Exercise (2).** There is no set  $X$  such that  $P(X) \subset X$ .

*Proof.* By the axiom of regularity (1.8),  $X$  is  $\in$ -minimal in  $\{X\}$ , so  $X \notin X$  and hence  $P(X) \not\subset X$ .  $\square$

**Exercise (3).** If  $X$  is inductive, then the set  $\{x \in X \mid x \subset X\}$  is inductive. Hence  $N$  is transitive and for each  $n \in N$ ,  $n = \{m \in N \mid m < n\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $S = \{x \in X \mid x \subset X\}$ . By inductivity of  $X$ ,  $\emptyset \in S$ , and if  $x \in S$ , then  $x \cup \{x\} \in S$ , so  $S$  is inductive. Taking  $X = N$ , it follows that  $S = N$  since  $N$  is the smallest inductive set. Hence  $n \in N$  implies  $n \subset N$ , so  $N$  is transitive and  $n = \{m \in N \mid m < n\}$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* We proved transitivity of  $N$  “by induction” on  $N$ :  $0 \subset N$  and if  $n \subset N$  then  $n + 1 \subset N$ , so  $n \subset N$  for all  $n \in N$ . The following exercises are similar.

**Exercise (4).** If  $X$  is inductive, then the set  $\{x \in X \mid x \text{ is transitive}\}$  is inductive. Hence every  $n \in N$  is transitive.

*Proof.* The class  $C$  of transitive sets is inductive. Indeed,  $\emptyset$  is transitive, and if  $x$  is transitive then  $x \cup \{x\}$  is transitive since  $y \in x \cup \{x\}$  implies  $y \subset x \subset x \cup \{x\}$ . It follows that  $\{x \in X \mid x \text{ is transitive}\} = X \cap C$  is inductive since the intersection of two inductive classes is inductive. Taking  $X = N$ , it follows as above that every  $n \in N$  is transitive.  $\square$

**Exercise (5).** If  $X$  is inductive, then the set  $\{x \in X \mid x \text{ is transitive and } x \not\in x\}$  is inductive. Hence  $n \not\in n$  and  $n \neq n + 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ .

*Proof.* The class  $C = \{x \mid x \text{ is transitive and } x \not\in x\}$  is inductive. Indeed,  $\emptyset \in C$ . If  $x \in C$ , then  $x \cup \{x\}$  is transitive (by inductivity of the class of transitive sets). Also  $x \cup \{x\} \not\in x$ , lest  $x \cup \{x\} \subset x$  by transitivity of  $x$  and hence  $x \in x$ —contradicting  $x \not\in x$ . Similarly  $x \cup \{x\} \neq x$ . Therefore  $x \cup \{x\} \notin x \cup \{x\}$ . So  $x \cup \{x\} \in C$ , and  $C$  is inductive. It follows as above that  $X \cap C$  is inductive, and taking  $X = \mathbf{N}$  that  $n \not\in n$  and hence  $n \neq n + 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ .  $\square$

*Remark.* In order to prove that  $n \not\in n$  for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  by induction on  $\mathbf{N}$ , we “loaded the induction hypothesis” with transitivity.

**Exercise (6).** If  $X$  is inductive, then the set  $\{x \in X \mid x \text{ is transitive and regular}\}$  is inductive, where a set  $x$  is called *regular* if every nonempty subset of  $x$  has an  $\in$ -minimal element.

*Proof.* The class  $C = \{x \mid x \text{ is transitive and regular}\}$  is inductive. Indeed,  $\emptyset \in C$ . If  $x \in C$ , then  $x \cup \{x\}$  is transitive. If  $y \subset x \cup \{x\}$  is nonempty, let  $z = y - \{x\} \subset x$ . If  $z = \emptyset$ , then  $y = \{x\}$ , and  $x$  is  $\in$ -minimal in  $y$  by regularity of  $x$ . If  $z \neq \emptyset$  and  $t$  is  $\in$ -minimal in  $z$ , then  $x \not\in t$  by transitivity and regularity of  $x$ , so  $t$  is  $\in$ -minimal in  $y$ . Therefore  $x \cup \{x\}$  is regular. So  $x \cup \{x\} \in C$ , and  $C$  is inductive. It follows as above that  $X \cap C$  is inductive.  $\square$

*Remark.* Taking  $X = \mathbf{N}$  it follows as above that every  $n \in \mathbf{N}$  is regular.

**Exercise (7).** Every nonempty  $X \subset \mathbf{N}$  has an  $\in$ -minimal element.

*Proof.* Choose  $n \in X$ . If  $n$  is not  $\in$ -minimal in  $X$ , then  $n \cap X$  is a nonempty subset of  $n$ , which has an  $\in$ -minimal element  $m$  (Exercise 6). By transitivity of  $n$  (Exercise 4),  $m$  is  $\in$ -minimal in  $X$ .  $\square$

**Exercise (8).** If  $X$  is inductive, then the set  $\{x \in X \mid x = \emptyset \text{ or } \exists y(x = y \cup \{y\})\}$  is inductive. Hence for all  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ ,  $n = 0$  or  $n = m + 1$  for some  $m \in \mathbf{N}$ .

*Proof.* The class  $C = \{x \mid x = \emptyset \text{ or } \exists y(x = y \cup \{y\})\}$  is obviously inductive, so  $X \cap C$  is inductive. Taking  $X = \mathbf{N}$ , the rest follows, with  $m \in \mathbf{N}$  by transitivity of  $\mathbf{N}$  (Exercise 3).  $\square$

**Exercise (9).** Let  $A \subset \mathbf{N}$  be such that  $0 \in A$ , and if  $n \in A$  then  $n + 1 \in A$ . Then  $A = \mathbf{N}$ .

*Proof.*  $A$  is inductive, so  $A = N$  since  $N$  is the smallest inductive set.

Alternately, if  $A \neq N$ , let  $m$  be  $\in$ -minimal in  $N - A$  (Exercise 7). Then  $m \neq 0$ , and  $m \neq n + 1$  for any  $n \in N$ , which is impossible (Exercise 8).  $\square$

**Exercise (10).** Each  $n \in N$  is T-finite.

*Proof.* By induction on  $N$ . First,  $n = 0$  is T-finite since  $P(\emptyset) = \{\emptyset\}$  and  $\emptyset$  is  $\subset$ -maximal in  $\{\emptyset\}$ . If  $n$  is T-finite, suppose  $X \subset P(n \cup \{n\})$  is nonempty. Let

$$X' = \{u - \{n\} \mid u \in X\}$$

Then  $X' \subset P(n)$  is nonempty and has a  $\subset$ -maximal element  $u - \{n\}$  for some  $u \in X$  by T-finiteness of  $n$ , where we may assume  $n \in u$  if  $u \cup \{n\} \in X$ . We claim  $u$  is  $\subset$ -maximal in  $X$ . Indeed, if  $v \in X$  and  $u \subset v$ , then  $u - \{n\} \subset v - \{n\}$ , so  $u - \{n\} = v - \{n\}$  by  $\subset$ -maximality of  $u - \{n\}$  in  $X'$ , so  $u = v$  by the assumption about  $u$ . Therefore  $n + 1$  is T-finite.  $\square$

**Exercise (11).**  $N$  is T-infinite. In fact,  $N \subset P(N)$  has no  $\subset$ -maximal element.

*Proof.* We know  $N \subset P(N)$  by transitivity of  $N$  (Exercise 3), and for all  $n \in N$  we have  $n \subset n + 1 \in N$  but  $n \neq n + 1$  (Exercise 5).  $\square$

*Remark.* If  $A$  is T-finite and  $\pi : A \rightarrow B$  is surjective (onto), then  $B$  is T-finite.

*Proof.* By pullback. If  $X \subset P(B)$  is nonempty, let

$$X_{-1} = \pi_{-1}(X) = \{u_{-1} = \pi_{-1}(u) \mid u \in X\}$$

Then  $X_{-1} \subset P(A)$  is nonempty and has a  $\subset$ -maximal element  $u_{-1}$  for some  $u \in X$  by T-finiteness of  $A$ . We claim  $u$  is  $\subset$ -maximal in  $X$ . Indeed, if  $v \in X$  and  $u \subset v$ , then  $u_{-1} \subset v_{-1}$ , so  $u_{-1} = v_{-1}$  by  $\subset$ -maximality of  $u_{-1}$  in  $X_{-1}$ , so  $u = v$  by surjectivity of  $\pi$ . Therefore  $B$  is T-finite.  $\square$

**Exercise (12).** Every finite set is T-finite.

*Proof.* By definition, every finite set is the image of a T-finite natural number (Exercise 10), so is T-finite by the previous remark.

Alternately, if  $S$  is T-infinite, choose  $X \subset P(S)$  nonempty with no  $\subset$ -maximal element. By induction on  $N$ , for each  $n \in N$  there is a properly ascending chain  $u_0 \subset \cdots \subset u_n \subset S$  of length  $n + 1$  in  $X$ , and hence an injection  $n \rightarrow S$  sending  $m \in n$  into  $u_{m+1} - u_m$ . If  $S$  had  $k$  elements for some  $k \in N$ , there would then be an injection  $k + 1 \rightarrow k$ , which is impossible by an easy induction on  $k$ . Therefore  $S$  is infinite.  $\square$

**Exercise (13).** Every infinite set is T-infinite.

*Proof.* If  $S$  is infinite, let  $X$  be the set of finite subsets of  $S$ . Clearly  $X$  is nonempty since  $\emptyset \in X$ . Also  $X$  has no  $\subset$ -maximal element. Indeed, if  $u \in X$  then there is  $s \in S - u$  since  $S$  is infinite, and  $u \cup \{s\}$  is finite (if  $u$  has  $k$  elements, then  $u \cup \{s\}$  has  $k + 1$  elements), so  $u \subset u \cup \{s\} \in X$  where the inclusion is proper. Therefore  $S$  is T-infinite.  $\square$

*Remark.* The previous two exercises show that (Cantor) finiteness is equivalent to Tarski finiteness in ZF.

## References

- [1] Jech, Thomas. *Set Theory*, 3rd ed. Springer, 2002.