

# under Graduate Homework In Mathematics

## Set Theory 6

王胤雅

201911010205

201911010205@mail.bnu.edu.cn

2023 年 12 月 21 日



General fire extinguisher

**PROBLEM I** Assume  $A$  can be well-ordered, prove that  $\mathcal{P}(A)$  can be linear-ordered.

**SOLUTION.** Assume  $(A, <)$  is a well-ordered set. For  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}(A), X \neq Y$ , let  $X \prec Y \iff \min X \Delta Y \in X$ . Now we prove  $\prec$  is linear-order.

First by definition we get  $X \not\prec X, \forall X \subset A$ .

Second, for  $X, Y \in \mathcal{P}, X \neq Y$ , we have  $X \Delta Y \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $A$  is well-ordered, we get  $\min X \Delta Y$  exists. And  $\min X \Delta Y \in X \Delta Y \in X \cup Y$ . So we get  $X \prec Y \vee Y \prec X$ .

Finally, assume  $X \prec Y, Y \prec Z$ , now we prove  $X \prec Z$ . Let  $x = \min X \Delta Y \in X, y = \min Y \Delta Z \in Y$ . Easily we get  $X \Delta Z = (X \Delta Y) \Delta (Y \Delta Z)$ . Assume  $t = \min X \Delta Z$ . Only need to prove  $t \in X$ . If not, we get  $t \in Z$ . If  $t \in X \Delta Y$ , then  $t \geq x$ . Since  $t \notin X \wedge x \in X$ , we get  $t > x$ . So  $x \notin X \Delta Z$ , so  $x \in Z$ . Noting  $x \notin Y$ , we get  $x \in Y \Delta Z$ , so  $x > y$ . So  $y \notin X \Delta Y$ , so  $y \in X$ . Since  $y \notin Z$ , we get  $y \in X \Delta Z$ . So  $t < y$ . So  $t < y < x < t$ , contradiction! Else we get  $t \in Y \Delta Z$ . Since  $t \in Z$  we get  $t \notin Y$ . Then  $t > y$ . So  $y \notin X \Delta Z$ . Since  $y \notin Z$ , we get  $y \notin X$ . So  $y \in X \Delta Y$ , thus  $y > x$ . So  $t > x$ , thus  $x \notin X \Delta Z$ . So  $x \in Z$ , thus  $x \in Y \Delta Z$ . Then  $x > y$ , contradiction!

So we get  $\prec$  is a linear-order on  $\mathcal{P}(A)$ .  $\square$

**PROBLEM II** Assume  $\{X_i : i \in I\}$  and  $\{Y_i : i \in I\}$  are two disjoint families such that  $X_i \approx Y_i$ . Prove that  $\bigcup_{i \in I} X_i \approx \bigcup_{i \in I} Y_i$

**SOLUTION.** Since  $X_i \approx Y_i$ , we get  $\text{bij}(X_i, Y_i) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\theta : I \rightarrow \bigcup_{i \in I} \text{bij}(X_i, Y_i)$  is a choice function. i.e.,  $\theta(i) \in \text{bij}(X_i, Y_i)$ . Now consider  $\tau = \bigcup \text{ran}(\theta)$ . We will prove  $\tau$  is bijection from  $X := \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$  to  $\bigcup_{i \in I} Y_i$ .

First we prove  $\tau$  is a map. i.e.,  $\forall x \in X, \exists! y \in Y, (x, y) \in \tau$ . Since  $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset, \forall i \neq j$ , we get  $x \in X \rightarrow \exists! i \in I, x \in X_i$ . So  $(x, \theta(i)(x)) \in \tau$ . If  $(x, z) \in \tau$ , we get  $\exists j \in I, (x, z) \in \theta(j)$ . Since  $x \in \text{dom}(\theta(j)) = X_j$ , we get  $j = i$ . Since  $\theta(i)$  is a map, we get  $z = \theta(i)(x)$ .

Second we prove  $\tau$  is injection. Assume  $x, t \in X, \tau(x) = \tau(t)$ . Now we prove  $x = t$ . Since  $Y_i \cap Y_j = \emptyset, \forall i \neq j$ , we get  $\exists! i \in I, \tau(x) \in Y_i$ . Since  $\text{ran}(\theta(j)) = Y_j, \forall j \in I$ , we get  $(x, \tau(x)) \in \theta(i)$ . So  $\theta(i)(x) = \tau(x)$ . For the same reason we get  $\theta(i)(t) = \tau(t)$ . So  $\theta(i)(x) = \theta(i)(t)$ . Since  $\theta(i)$  is bijection, we get  $x = t$ .

Finally we prove  $\tau$  is surjection. Assume  $y \in Y$ , then  $\exists i \in I, y \in Y_i$ . So  $\exists x \in X_i, \theta(i)(x) = y$ . So  $\tau(x) = y$ . So  $\tau$  is surjective.  $\square$

**PROBLEM III** Prove that  $\prod_{0 < n < \omega} n = 2^{\aleph_0}$ .

**SOLUTION.** Obviously  $\prod_{0 < n < \omega} n = \prod_{n < \omega} (n + 1) = (\sup_{n < \omega} (n + 1))^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_0^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\aleph_0}$ .  $\square$

**PROBLEM IV** Prove that  $\prod_{n < \omega} \aleph_n = \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0}$ .

**SOLUTION.** Obviously  $\aleph_n > 0$ , so we get  $\prod_{n < \omega} \aleph_n = (\sup_{n < \omega} \aleph_n)^\omega = \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0}$ .  $\square$

**PROBLEM V** Prove that  $\prod_{n < \omega + \omega} \aleph_n = \aleph_{\omega + \omega}^{\aleph_0}$ .

**SOLUTION.** Let  $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega + \omega$  be a bijection. Then  $\prod_{n < \omega + \omega} \aleph_n = \prod_{n < \omega} \aleph_{f(n)}$ . So we get  $\prod_{n < \omega + \omega} = (\sup_{n < \omega} \aleph_{f(n)})^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_{\omega + \omega}^{\aleph_0}$ .  $\square$

**PROBLEM VI** For every ordinal  $\alpha$  less than  $\omega_1$ , prove that  $\exists X : \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$  such that  $\text{ordertype}(X(n)) \leq \alpha^n$  and  $\alpha = \bigcup \text{ran } X$ .

**SOLUTION**. If not, assume  $\beta$  is the least ordinal less than  $\omega_1$  don't meet the requirement. If  $\beta = \alpha + 1$ , Since  $\alpha < \beta$ , we get  $\exists X \in {}^\omega \mathcal{P}(\alpha)$  meet the requirement. Now we let  $Y : \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\beta)$  and  $Y(0) = \{\alpha\}, Y(n+1) = X(n)$ . Then easily  $Y$  meet the requirement, contradiction! Else,  $\beta$  is limit ordinal. Since  $\beta < \omega_1$  we get  $\text{cf}(\beta) \leq \omega$ . Since  $\beta$  is limit ordinal we get  $\text{cf}(\beta) = \omega$ . Consider  $\theta : \text{cf}(\beta) \rightarrow \beta$  is unbounded, then  $\beta = \bigcup \text{ran } \theta$ . For  $n \in \text{cf}(\beta)$ , we have  $\theta(n) < \beta$ , so by AC,  $\exists X : \text{cf}(\beta) \times \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\beta)$  such that  $\text{ordertype}(X(n, m)) \leq \theta(n)^m$  and  $\theta(n) = \bigcup_{m \in \omega} X(n, m)$ . Now let  $Y : \omega \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\beta)$  and  $Y(2^n(2m+1)-1) = X(n, m)$ . Then easily  $\text{ordertype}(Y(k)) \leq \beta^k$  and  $\beta = \bigcup \text{ran } \theta = \bigcup_{n, m \in \omega} X(n, m) = \bigcup_{k \in \omega} Y(k)$ . contradiction! So such  $\beta$  doesn't exist.  $\square$

**PROBLEM VII** If  $\kappa$  is a cardinal and  $\lambda < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ , then  $\kappa^\lambda = \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} |\alpha|^\lambda$ .

**SOLUTION**. When  $\lambda = 0$  it's obvious, now we assume  $\lambda > 0$ . Easily  $\kappa \geq \omega$  is a cardinal, so we get  $\sum_{\alpha < \kappa} |\alpha|^\lambda = \kappa \sup_{\alpha < \kappa} |\alpha|^\lambda \leq \kappa \cdot \kappa^\lambda = \kappa^\lambda$ . Now consider  $f \in {}^\lambda \kappa$ , we get  $f$  is bounded. So  ${}^\lambda \kappa = \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} {}^\lambda \alpha$ . So we get  $\kappa^\lambda \leq \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} |\alpha|^\lambda$ . Finally we get  $\kappa^\lambda = \sum_{\alpha < \kappa} |\alpha|^\lambda$ .  $\square$

**PROBLEM VIII** Prove that  $\aleph_\omega^{\aleph_1} = 2^{\aleph_1} \cdot \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0}$ .

**SOLUTION**. Since  $2^{\aleph_1}, \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0} \leq \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_1}$ , we get  $\aleph_\omega^{\aleph_1} \geq 2^{\aleph_1} \cdot \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0}$ . Since  $\aleph_\omega = \sup_{n < \omega} \aleph_n$ , we get  $\aleph_\omega = \prod_{n < \omega} \aleph_n^{\aleph_1}$ . By Hausdorff formula we get  $\aleph_{n+1}^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_n^{\aleph_1} \cdot \aleph_{n+1}$ . By MI we can easily get  $\aleph_n^{\aleph_1} \leq \aleph_\omega \cdot \aleph_0^{\aleph_1}$ . So finally we get  $\aleph_\omega^{\aleph_1} \leq \prod_{n < \omega} \aleph_\omega \cdot \aleph_0^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0} \cdot \aleph_0^{\aleph_1 \cdot \aleph_0}$ . Easily we get  $\aleph_0^{\aleph_1 \cdot \aleph_0} = \aleph_0^{\aleph_1} = 2^{\aleph_1}$ , so finally we get  $\aleph_\omega^{\aleph_1} = 2^{\aleph_1} \cdot \aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0}$ .  $\square$