

A Note on Superamorphous Sets and Dual Dedekind-Infinity

Martin Goldstern

April 3, 1995

1 Introduction

In the absence of the axiom of choice there are several possible nonequivalent ways of translating the intuitive idea of “infinity” into a mathematical definition.

In [10], Tarski investigated some natural infinity notions, and his research was continued by Levy [8], Truss [12], Spišiak and Vojtas [9], Howard and Yorke [4] and others.

The most prominent definitions of finiteness are the *true finiteness* (equipotent to a bounded set of natural numbers), which is equivalent to *Tarski-finiteness* (every family of subsets has a maximal element), and the much weaker *Dedekind-finiteness* (not equipotent to any proper subset).

In a recent survey paper [1], Degen recalled the notions of “weak Dedekind infinity” and “dual Dedekind infinity” (see below for definitions) and asked if they were in fact equivalent. A forcing construction of a weakly Dedekind set which is not dually Dedekind is given by Truss in [12], and also announced by Diel [2].

We give here an alternate and more elementary construction of such a set, which does not use the methods of forcing but instead relies on (the consistency of) the existence of a superamorphous set.

Answering another question posed in [1], we also show that “inexhaustibility” is not a notion of infinity unless the axiom of choice is assumed.

Notation 1.1 1. For any set A we let $A + 1$ be any set of the form $A \cup \{a\}$ with $a \notin A$.

2. $A \leq B$ means that there is an injective (i.e., 1-to-1) function from A into B .
3. $A \leq^* B$ means that there is a surjective function from B onto A .
4. $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is the power set of A .
5. $[A]^k$ is the set of k -element subsets of A , for $k \in \omega$. ($\omega = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.)
6. For a finite set s we let $|s|$ be the cardinality of s .
7. $[A]^{<\omega} = \bigcup_{k \in \omega} [A]^k$ is the set of finite subsets of A .

Definition 1.2 We call an infinite set A

- Dedekind infinite (D-infinite) if there is a injective nonsurjective map from A into A .
- dually Dedekind infinite (dD-infinite), if there is a surjective noninjective map from A onto A .
- weakly Dedekind infinite (wD-infinite), if there is a surjective map from A onto the natural numbers.

Remark 1.3 D-finite sets are the sets that are finite in the IV-th sense [10], [8], [9] or Δ -infinite in [12]. It follows easily from the definitions that

$$* \quad A \text{ is D-infinite} \quad \text{iff} \quad A + 1 \leq A \quad \text{iff} \quad \omega \leq A$$

dD-finite sets are those in Δ_5 in [12], or “not strongly Dedekind finite” in the sense of [2]. Trivially,

$$* \quad A \text{ is dD-infinite} \quad \text{iff} \quad A + 1 \leq^* A$$

wD-finite sets are those sets that are finite in the III-rd sense in [10] etc, Δ_4 in [12], and “almost finite” in [2]. It is well-known and not hard to show that

$$* \quad A \text{ is wD-infinite} \quad \text{iff} \quad \omega \leq^* A \quad \text{iff} \quad \omega \leq \mathcal{P}(A)$$

We have D-infinite \Rightarrow dD-infinite \Rightarrow wD-infinite, and none of these implications can be reversed in ZF. For example, if A is amorphous (see 2.1) then the set of injective finite sequences from A is a set that is dD-infinite but not D-infinite.

The following definition appears to be new:

Definition 1.4 A set A is *wD*-infinite* if there is a finite-to-one map from a subset of A onto ω (or equivalently, onto an infinite subset of ω).

Fact 1.5 For any set A the following are equivalent:

1. A is wD*-infinite.
2. $[A]^{<\omega}$ is D-infinite.
3. $[A]^{<\omega}$ is wD*-infinite.
4. There is a sequence $(A_i : i \in \omega)$, $A_i \in [A]^{<\omega}$, $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} A_i$ infinite.
5. There is a strictly increasing sequence $(A_i : i \in \omega)$, $A_i \in [A]^{<\omega}$, $\bigcup_{i \in \omega} A_i$ infinite.

Proof: The implications $(4) \Rightarrow (5) \Rightarrow (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3)$ are trivial. For $(3) \Rightarrow (4)$, let f be a map with domain $\subseteq [A]^{<\omega}$ and range $= \omega$ such that the preimage of any natural number is finite. For $n \in \omega$ let $B_n := \{s : f(s) = n\}$, and let $A_n := \bigcup_{s \in B_n} s$. Then the domain of f is contained in $[\bigcup_n A_n]^{<\omega}$, so $\bigcup_n A_n$ must be infinite, whereas all the sets A_n are finite.

Remark 1.6 D-infinite \Rightarrow wD*-infinite \Rightarrow wD-infinite, but none of these implications can be reversed. Moreover, there is (in ZF) no implication between dD and wD*: The set of finite injective sequences from an amorphous set is dD-infinite but not wD*-infinite, and the set U in the model \mathbf{N}_2 of [12] (a union of countably many “pairs of socks”) is clearly wD*-infinite but not dD-infinite.

Slightly more generally, if $(U_n : n \in \omega)$ is a sequence of pairwise disjoint unordered pairs such that $\bigcup_n U_n$ is Dedekind-finite, (or equivalently, such that no infinite subsequence $(U_{n_i} : i \in \omega)$ has a choice function) then it is easy to see that $\bigcup_n U_n$ is dD-finite.

2 Superamorphous sets

Definition 2.1 A set A is called *amorphous*, if A is infinite and all its subsets are either finite or cofinite.

A set A is called *superamorphous*, if A is infinite and for all k , all subsets of A^k are first order definable from finitely many parameters in the language of equality.

Remark 2.2 It is consistent with ZF that there are superamorphous sets. The consistency of the existence of superamorphous sets with a nonwellfounded set theory or with ZFU (=ZF with urelements) can already be seen in the basic Fraenkel-Mostowski model (see [3] and [7, Exercise IV.24]). The consistency with ZF then follows from the Jech-Sochor theorem (see [6, Theorem 47], [5]).

Using a superamorphous set, we give an elementary example of a wD-infinite set that is not dD-infinite by the following theorem:

Theorem 2.3 *If A is a superamorphous set, then the set $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is wD-infinite but not dD-infinite.*

Before we prove the theorem, we collect some facts about $[A]^{<\omega}$. The following fact will allow us to work with $[A]^{<\omega}$ instead of $\mathcal{P}(A)$.

Fact 2.4 Let A be (super)amorphous. Then also $A + 1$ is (super)amorphous, and there is a bijection from $\mathcal{P}(A)$ onto $[A + 1]^{<\omega}$.

We will need a “normal form” for subsets of $[A]^k$.

Definition 2.5 Fix a set A and a natural number k . Let $p, q \in [A]^{<\omega}$. We let

$$A^{+p-q}(k) := \{s \in [A]^k : p \subseteq s, q \cap s = \emptyset\}$$

Fact 2.6 Assume that A is infinite. Then:

1. $A^{+p-q}(k) \neq \emptyset$ iff $p \cap q = \emptyset$ and $|p| \leq k$.
2. $A^{+p-q}(k) \cap A^{+p'-q'}(k) = A^{+p \cup p' - q \cup q'}(k)$.
3. $A^{+p-q}(k)$ is infinite iff $p \cap q = \emptyset$ and $|p| < k$.
4. If $A^{+r-s}(k)$ is infinite, then there are $p, p' \in A^{+r-s}(k)$ with $|p \cup p'| = k + 1$.

Fact and Definition 2.7 Let A be an infinite set. Assume that $B \subseteq A^k$ is definable. Then the set

$$B^* := \{s \in [A]^{<\omega} : B \text{ is definable from parameters in } s\}$$

has a smallest element $\cap B^*$. We call this smallest element the “support” of B , $\text{supp}(B)$.

Fact 2.8 [normal form] Let $C \subseteq [A]^k$ and assume that $\bar{C} := \{(x_1, \dots, x_k) : \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \in C\}$ is definable. Let

$$H_C := \{(p, q) : p \cup q = \text{supp}(\bar{C}), p \cap q = \emptyset, A^{+p-q}(k) \subseteq C\}$$

Then $C = \bigcup_{(p,q) \in H_C} A^{+p-q}(k)$. (Notice that H_C is a finite set.)

Proof: If $s \in C$, then let $p := s \cap \text{supp}(\bar{C})$, $q := \text{supp}(\bar{C}) \setminus p$. Then $s \in A^{+p-q}(k) \subseteq C$.

Lemma 2.9 *Let A be amorphous. Then:*

1. $[A]^{<\omega}$ is wD^* -infinite.
2. If $B \subseteq [A]^{<\omega}$ is infinite, then there is some k such that $B \cap [A]^k$ is infinite.

Proof: (1) follows from 1.5. If (2) were false, then the map $s \mapsto |s|$, would witness that B and hence also $[A]^{<\omega}$ is wD^* -infinite, which is impossible.

Definition 2.10 For $R \subseteq X \times Y$, $x \in X$, $y \in Y$ we let $R^x := \{z \in Y : (x, z) \in R\}$, and similarly we let $R_y := \{z \in X : (z, y) \in R\}$.

Lemma 2.11 *Assume that A is superamorphous, $k, l \in \omega$, $R \subseteq [A]^k \times [A]^l$ is infinite, and for all $(p, q) \in R$ we have $p \cap q = \emptyset$.*

Then either there is some $p \in [A]^k$ such that R^p is infinite, or there is some $q \in [A]^l$ such that R_q is infinite (or both).

Proof of the theorem

By fact 2.4 it is enough to show that for any superamorphous set A , every surjective map from $[A]^{<\omega}$ onto $[A]^{<\omega}$ is injective.

Let $f : [A]^{<\omega} \rightarrow [A]^{<\omega}$ be onto. We will show that for all $s \in [A]^{<\omega}$ there is $\exists n > 0$ such that $f^n(s) = s$. (This easily yields that f is injective.)

We will proceed indirectly and assume that

$$(*) \text{ there is } s \text{ such that } \forall n \in \omega \ f^n(s) \neq s.$$

Claim 1: If $\forall n \in \omega$ $f^n(s) \neq s$, then there is s' with $f^{-1}[\{s'\}]$ infinite, and $\exists n$ $f^n(s') = s$.

Proof: Let $X := [A]^{<\omega}$. If there is no s' as claimed, then for each $i \in \omega$ the set

$$X_i := \{t \in X : f^i(t) = s\}$$

would be in $[X]^{<\omega}$, and all these sets would be (nonempty and) distinct. Hence the function $i \mapsto X_i$ would witness that $[X]^{<\omega}$ is D-infinite. Applying 1.5 twice we would get that X and hence A is wD^* -infinite, a contradiction.

Claim 2: If for all n we have $f^n(s) \neq s$, then there are infinitely many s' as in claim 1.

Proof: Apply Claim 1 repeatedly.

Claim 3: If $f^{-1}[\{s'\}]$ is infinite, then there is some k such that $f^{-1}[\{s'\}] \cap [A]^k$ is infinite.

Proof: By 2.9.

Claim 4: For some k , there are infinitely many $s \in [A]^{<\omega}$ such that the set $f^{-1}[\{s\}] \cap [A]^k$ is infinite.

Proof: Let $B_k := \{s' : f^{-1}[\{s'\}] \cap [A]^k \text{ is infinite}\}$. By claims 2 and 3, $\bigcup_{k \in \omega} B_k$ is infinite, so some B_k must be infinite.

Claim 5: For some k there is an infinite set $R \subseteq [A]^{<\omega} \times [A]^{<\omega}$ such that for all $(p, q) \in R$ the set $A^{+p-q}(k)$ is infinite, but any two such sets are disjoint.

Proof: Fix k as in claim 4. Replace each infinite set of the form $f^{-1}[\{s\}] \cap [A]^k$ by those components $A^{+p-q}(k)$ in its normal form (see 2.8) that are infinite.

Claim 6: There are n_1 and n_2 such that we can find R as in claim 5, additionally satisfying $|p| = n_1$ and $|q| = n_2$ for all $(p, q) \in R$. (By 2.6 we must then have $n_1 < k$.)

Proof: Easy.

Now let R be as above. R satisfies the assumptions of lemma 2.11. We distinguish two cases:

Case 1: For some $p \in [A]^{n_1}$, R^p is infinite. In particular this means that there are $q \neq q'$ in R^p . But then $\emptyset \neq A^{+p-(q \cup q')}(k) \subseteq A^{+p-q}(k) \cap A^{+p-q'}(k)$, a contradiction.

Case 2: For some $q \in [A]^{n_1}$, R_q is infinite. By fact 2.6 we can find $p, p' \in R_q$ with $|p \cup p'| = n_1 + 1 \leq k$. So we have $\emptyset \neq A^{+p \cup p' - q}(k) \subseteq A^{+p - q}(k) \cap A^{+p' - q}(k)$, again a contradiction to what we have found in claim 5.

3 Inexhaustibility

Finally we answer another question from Degen's paper:

Definition 3.1 An set A is called "inexhaustible" if A contains more than one element, and for any decomposition $A = B \cup C$ we have that A can be injectively mapped into B or C .

It is clear that if AC holds, then inexhaustible sets are exactly the infinite sets. However, without AC it is not clear if supersets of inexhaustible sets are also inexhaustible. We show that this property actually characterizes AC:

Theorem 3.2 *Assume that every set that contains an inexhaustible set is itself inexhaustible. Then the axiom of choice holds.*

If we call a property a "notion of infinity" (as in [1]) iff it is closed under equivalences and supersets, and holds for ω but no finite set, then we can rephrase the above theorem as follows:

"Inexhaustibility" is a notion of infinity only if the axiom of choice holds, or equivalently, only if it coincides with true infinity.

Proof: We will show that every set can be well-ordered. This is clear for finite sets, so consider some infinite B .

Let κ be the least ordinal number such that B cannot be mapped onto κ . Let A be the disjoint union of κ and B :

$$A = B + \kappa$$

Clearly $\omega \subseteq \kappa$, hence A contains an inexhaustible set and is therefore itself inexhaustible.

So either we have $B + \kappa \leq B$ or $B + \kappa \leq \kappa$. The first alternative would imply $\kappa \leq B$, hence $\kappa \leq^* B$ which is impossible by the definition of κ .

Hence we have $B + \kappa \leq \kappa$, so also $B \leq \kappa$. Hence B can be well-ordered.

Remark 3.3 The use of ordinals, and hence of the replacement axiom, can be avoided. Instead of κ , take the set of all quasiorders on B such that the quotient p.o. is a well-ordering. This set is naturally well-ordered and can play the role of κ in the above proof.

References

- [1] J. W. Degen. Some aspects and examples of infinity notions. *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 40:111–124, 1994.
- [2] Joseph H. Diel. Two definitions of finiteness. *Notices of the AMS*, 21:554–555, 1974.
- [3] Abraham Fraenkel. Über den Begriff “definit” und die Unabhängigkeit des Auswahlaxioms. *Sitz. Berlin*, pages 250–273, 1922.
- [4] Paul E. Howard and Mary F. Yorke. Definitions of finite. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 133:169–177, 1989.
- [5] T. J. Jech and A. Sochor. On θ -models of the set theory. *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci.*, 14:297–303, 1966.
- [6] Thomas Jech. *Set Theory*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Academic Press, New York, San Francisco, London, 1978.
- [7] Kenneth Kunen. *Set Theory: An Introduction to Independence Proofs*, volume 102 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North Holland, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1988, 1992.
- [8] Azriel Levy. The independence of various notions of finiteness. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 46:1–13, 58.
- [9] Ladislav Spišiak and Peter Vojtáš. Dependences between definitions of finiteness. *Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal*, 38:389–397, 1988.
- [10] Alfred Tarski. Sur les ensembles finis. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 6:45–95, 1924.
- [11] Alfred Tarski. Ein Überdeckungssatz für endliche Mengen nebst einigen Bemerkungen für die Definitionen der Endlichkeit. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 30:156–163, 1938.
- [12] John Truss. Classes of Dedekind finite cardinals. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 48:187–208, 1974.

Martin Goldstern, Department of Algebra, Technische Universität,
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10/118.2, A-1040 Wien, Austria, Europe
`martin.goldstern@tuwien.ac.at`