Set Theory for the Working Mathematician

Krzysztof Ciesielski

London Mathematical Society
Student Texts **39**

CAMBRIDGE

more information - www.cambridge.org/9780521594417

LONDON MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY STUDENT TEXTS

Managing Editor: C. M. SERIES, Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom

1 Introduction to combinators and λ-calculus, J.R. HINDLEY & J.P. SELDIN
2 Building models by games, WILFRID HODGES
3 Local fields, J.W.S. CASSELS
4 An introduction to twistor theory: 2nd edition, S.A. HUGGETT & K.P. TOD
5 Introduction to general relativity, L.P. HUGHSTON & K.P. TOD
6 Lectures on stochastic analysis: diffusion theory, DANIEL W. STROOCK
7 The theory of evolution and dynamical systems, J. HOFBAUER & K. SIGMUND
8 Summing and nuclear norms in Banach space theory, G.J.O. JAMESON
9 Automorphisms of surfaces after Nielsen and Thurston, A. CASSON & S. BLEILER
10 Nonstandard analysis and its applications, N. CUTLAND (ed)
11 Spacetime and singularities, G. NABER
12 Undergraduate algebraic geometry, MILES REID
13 An introduction to Hankel operators, J.R. PARTINGTON
14 Combinatorial group theory: a topological approach, DANIEL E. COHEN
15 Presentations of groups, D.L. JOHNSON
16 An introduction to noncommutative Noetherian rings, K.R. GOODEARL & R.B. WARFIELD, JR.
17 Aspects of quantum field theory in curved spacetime, S.A. FULLING
18 Braids and coverings: selected topics, YAGN LUNDSGAARD HANSEN
19 Steps in commutative algebra, R.Y. SHARP
20 Communication theory, C.M. GOLDIE & R.G.E. PINCH
21 Representations of finite groups of Lie type, FRANÇOIS DIGNE & JEAN MICHEL
22 Designs, graphs, codes, and their links, P.J. CAMERON & J.H. VAN LINT
23 Complex algebraic curves, FRANCES KIRWAN
24 Lectures on elliptic curves, J.W.S. CASSELS
25 Hyperbolic geometry, BIRGER IVERSEN
26 An introduction to the theory of L-functions and Eisenstein series, H. HIDA
27 Hilbert space: compact operators and the trace theorem, J.R. RETHERFORD
28 Potential theory in the complex plane, T. RANSFORD
29 Undergraduate commutative algebra, M. REID
30 Introduction to computer algebra, A. COHEN
31 Laplacian operators in differential geometry, S. ROSENBERG
32 Lectures on Lie groups and Lie algebras, R. CARTER, G. SEGAL & I. MACDONALD
33 A primer of algebraic D-modules, S.C. COUTINHO
34 Complex algebraic surfaces, A. BEAUVILLE
35 Young tableaux, W. FULTON
37 A mathematical introduction to wavelets, P. WOJTASZCZYK
38 Harmonic maps, Loop groups, etc., M. GUEST

London Mathematical Society Student Texts 39

Set Theory for the Working Mathematician

Krzysztof Ciesielski
West Virginia University

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, Sao Paulo

Cambridge University Press
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521594417

© Cambridge University Press 1997

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without the written
permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1997

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Ciesielski, Krzysztof, 1957-

Set theory for the working mathematician / Krzysztof Ciesielski.

p. cm. - (London Mathematical Society student texts: 39)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-59441-3 (hardback). - ISBN 0-521-59465-0 (paperback)

1. Set theory. I. Title. **II.** Series.
QA248.C475 1997
511.3'22 - dc21 97-10533
CIP

ISBN 978-0-521-59441-7 hardback
ISBN 978-0-521-59465-3 paperback

Transferred to digital printing 2008

To Monika, Agata, and Victoria
and to the memory of my Mother, who taught me mathematics

Contents

Preface ix

Part I Basics of set theory 1

1 Axiomatic set theory 3
1.1 Why axiomatic set theory? 3
1.2 The language and the basic axioms 6

2 Relations, functions, and Cartesian product 12
2.1 Relations and the axiom of choice 12
2.2 Functions and the replacement scheme axiom 16
2.3 Generalized union, intersection, and Cartesian product 19
2.4 Partial- and linear-order relations 21

3 Natural numbers, integers, and real numbers 25
3.1 Natural numbers 25
3.2 Integers and rational numbers 30
3.3 Real numbers 31

Part II Fundamental tools of set theory 35

4 Well orderings and transfinite induction 37
4.1 Well-ordered sets and the axiom of foundation 37
4.2 Ordinal numbers 44
4.3 Definitions by transfinite induction 49
4.4 Zorn's lemma in algebra, analysis, and topology 54

5 Cardinal numbers 61
5.1 Cardinal numbers and the continuum hypothesis 61
5.2 Cardinal arithmetic 68
5.3 Cofinality 74

Part III The power of recursive definitions 77

6 Subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ 79
6.1 Strange subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the diagonalization argument 79
6.2 Closed sets and Borel sets 89
6.3 Lebesgue-measurable sets and sets with the Baire property 98

7 Strange real functions 104
7.1 Measurable and nonmeasurable functions 104
7.2 Darboux functions 106
7.3 Additive functions and Hamel bases 111
7.4 Symmetrically discontinuous functions 118

Part IV When induction is too short 127

8 Martin's axiom 129
8.1 Rasiowa-Sikorski lemma 129
8.2 Martin's axiom 139
8.3 Suslin hypothesis and diamond principle 154

9 Forcing 164
9.1 Elements of logic and other forcing preliminaries 164
9.2 Forcing method and a model for $\neg$CH 168
9.3 Model for CH and $\diamondsuit$ 182
9.4 Product lemma and Cohen model 189
9.5 Model for MA+$\neg$CH 196

A Axioms of set theory 211

B Comments on the forcing method 215

C Notation 220

References 225

Index 229

Preface

The course presented in this text concentrates on the typical methods of modern set theory: transfinite induction, Zorn's lemma, the continuum hypothesis, Martin's axiom, the diamond principle $\diamondsuit$, and elements of forcing. The choice of the topics and the way in which they are presented is subordinate to one purpose – to get the tools that are most useful in applications, especially in abstract geometry, analysis, topology, and algebra. In particular, most of the methods presented in this course are accompanied by many applications in abstract geometry, real analysis, and, in a few cases, topology and algebra. Thus the text is dedicated to all readers that would like to apply set-theoretic methods outside set theory.

The course is presented as a textbook that is appropriate for either a lower-level graduate course or an advanced undergraduate course. However, the potential readership should also include mathematicians whose expertise lies outside set theory but who would like to learn more about modern set-theoretic techniques that might be applicable in their field.

The reader of this text is assumed to have a good understanding of abstract proving techniques, and of the basic geometric and topological structure of the n-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$. In particular, a comfort in dealing with the continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}^n$ into $\mathbb{R}$ is assumed. A basic set-theoretic knowledge is also required. This includes a good understanding of the basic set operations (union, intersection, Cartesian product of arbitrary families of sets, and difference of two sets), abstract functions (the operations of taking images and preimages of sets with respect to functions), and elements of the theory of cardinal numbers (finite, countable, and uncountable sets.) Most of this knowledge is included in any course in analysis, topology, or algebra. These prerequisites are also discussed briefly in Part I of the text.

The book is organized as follows. Part I introduces the reader to axiomatic set theory and uses it to develop basic set-theoretic concepts. In particular, Chapter 1 contains the necessary background in logic, discusses the most fundamental axioms of ZFC, and uses them to define basic set-

theoretic operations. In Chapter 2 the notions of relation, function, and Cartesian product are defined within the framework of ZFC theory. Related notions are also introduced and their fundamental properties are discussed. Chapter 3 describes the set-theoretic interpretation of the sets of natural numbers, integers, and real numbers. Most of the facts presented in Part I are left without proof.

Part II deals with the fundamental concepts of "classical set theory." The ordinal and cardinal numbers are introduced and their arithmetic is developed. A theorem on definition by recursion is proved and used to prove Zorn's lemma. Section 4.4 contains some standard applications of Zorn's lemma in analysis, topology, and algebra.

Part III is designed to familiarize the reader with proofs by transfinite induction. In particular, Section 6.1 illustrates a typical transfinite-induction construction and the diagonalization argument by describing several different constructions of subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with strange geometric properties. The two remaining sections of Chapter 6 introduce the basic elements of descriptive set theory and discuss Borel and Lebesgue-measurable sets and sets with the Baire property. Chapter 7 is designed to help the reader master the recursive-definitions technique. Most of the examples presented there concern real functions, and in many cases consist of the newest research results in this area.

Part IV is designed to introduce the tools of "modern set theory": Martin's axiom, the diamond principle $\diamondsuit$, and the forcing method. The overall idea behind their presentation is to introduce them as natural refinements of the method of transfinite induction. Thus, based on the solid foundation built in Part III, the forcing notions and forcing arguments presented there are obtained as "transformed" transfinite-induction arguments. In particular, the more standard axiomatic approach to these methods is described in Chapter 8, where Martin's axiom and the diamond principle are introduced and discussed. Chapter 9 is the most advanced part of this text and describes the forcing method. Section 9.1 consists of some additional prerequisites, mainly logical, necessary to follow the other sections. In Section 9.2 the main theoretical basis for the forcing theory is introduced while proving the consistency of ZFC and the negation of CH. In Section 9.3 is constructed a generic model for ZFC+$\diamondsuit$ (thus, also for ZFC+CH). Section 9.4 discusses the product lemma and uses it to deduce a few more properties of the Cohen model, that is, the model from Section 9.2. The book finishes with Section 9.5 in which is proved the simultaneous consistency of Martin's axiom and the negation of the continuum hypothesis. This proof, done by iterated forcing, shows that even in the world of the "sophisticated recursion method" of forcing the "classical" recursion technique is still a fundamental method of set theory – the desired model is obtained by constructing forcing extensions by transfinite induction.

It is also worthwhile to point out here that readers with different backgrounds will certainly be interested in different parts of this text. Most advanced graduate students as well as mathematical researchers using this book will almost certainly just skim Part I. The same may be also true for some of these readers for at least some portion of Part II. Part III and the first chapter of Part IV should be considered as the core of this text and are written for the widest group of readers. Finally, the last chapter (concerning forcing) is the most difficult and logic oriented, and will probably be of interest only to the most dedicated readers. It certainly can be excluded from any undergraduate course based on this text.

Part I

Basics of set theory

Chapter 1

Axiomatic set theory

1.1 Why axiomatic set theory?

Essentially all mathematical theories deal with sets in one way or another. In most cases, however, the use of set theory is limited to its basics: elementary operations on sets, fundamental facts about functions, and, in some cases, rudimentary elements of cardinal arithmetic. This basic part of set theory is very intuitive and can be developed using only our "good" intuition for what sets are. The theory of sets developed in that way is called "naive" set theory, as opposed to "axiomatic" set theory, where all properties of sets are deduced from a fixed set of axioms.

Clearly the "naive" approach is very appealing. It allows us to prove a lot of facts on sets in a quick and convincing way. Also, this was the way the first mathematicians studied sets, including Georg Cantor, a "father of set theory." However, modern set theory departed from the "paradise" of this simple-minded approach, replacing it with "axiomatic set theory," the highly structured form of set theory. What was the reason for such a replacement?

Intuitively, a set is any collection of all elements that satisfy a certain given property. Thus, the following **axiom schema of comprehension,** due to Frege (1893), seems to be very intuitive.

> If φ is a property, then there exists a set $Y = \{X : \varphi(X)\}$ of all elements having property φ.

This principle, however, is false! It follows from the following theorem of Russell (1903) known as Russell's antinomy or Russell's paradox.

Russell's paradox There is no set $S = \{X : X \notin X\}$.

The axiom schema of comprehension fails for the formula $\varphi(X)$ defined as "$X \notin X$." To see it, notice that if S had been a set we would have had for every Y

$$Y \in S \Leftrightarrow Y \notin Y.$$

Substituting S for Y we obtain

$$S \in S \Leftrightarrow S \notin S,$$

which evidently is impossible.

This paradox, and other similar to it, convinced mathematicians that we cannot rely on our intuition when dealing with abstract objects such as arbitrary sets. To avoid this trouble, "naive" set theory has been replaced with axiomatic set theory.

The task of finding one "universal" axiomatic system for set theory that agrees with our intuition and is free of paradoxes was not easy, and was not without some disagreement. Some of the disagreement still exists today. However, after almost a century of discussions, the set of ten axioms/schemas, known as the Zermelo–Fraenkel axioms (abbreviated as ZFC, where C stands for the axiom of choice), has been chosen as the most natural. These axioms will be introduced and explained in the next chapters. The full list of these axioms with some comments is also included in Appendix A.

It should be pointed out here that the ZFC axioms are far from "perfect." It could be expected that a "perfect" set of axioms should be *complete*, that is, that for any statement φ expressed in the language of set theory (which is described in the next section) either φ or its negation is a consequence of the axioms. Also, a "good" set of axioms should certainly be *consistent*, that is, should not lead to a contradiction. Unfortunately, we cannot prove either of these properties for the ZFC axioms. More precisely, we do *believe* that the ZFC axioms are consistent. However, if this belief is correct, we can't prove it using the ZFC axioms alone. Does it mean that we should search for a better system of set-theory axioms that would be without such a deficiency? Unfortunately, there is no use in searching for it, since no "reasonable" set of axioms of set theory can prove its own consistency. This follows from the following celebrated theorem of Gödel.

Theorem 1.1.1 (Gödel's second incompleteness theorem) *Let T be a set of axioms expressed in a formal language $\mathcal{L}$ (such as the language of set theory described in Section 1.2) and assume that T has the following "reasonable" properties.*

(1) *T is consistent.*

(2) *There is an effective algorithm that decides for an arbitrary sentence of the language $\mathcal{L}$ whether it is in T or not.*

(3) *T is complicated enough to encode simple arithmetic of the natural numbers.*

Then there is a sentence φ of the language $\mathcal{L}$ that encodes the statement "T is consistent." However, φ is not a consequence of the axioms T.

In other words, Theorem 1.1.1 shows us that for whatever "reasonable" systems of axioms of set theory we choose, we will always have to rely on our intuition for its consistency. Thus, the ZFC axioms are as good (or bad) in this aspect as any other "reasonable" system of axioms.

So what about the completeness of the ZFC axioms? Can we prove at least that much? The answer is again negative and once again it is a common property for all "reasonable" systems of axioms, as follows from another theorem of Gödel.

Theorem 1.1.2 (Gödel's first incompleteness theorem) *Let T be a set of axioms expressed in a formal language $\mathcal{L}$ (such as the language of set theory described in Section 1.2) and assume that T has the following "reasonable" properties.*

(1) *T is consistent.*

(2) *There is an effective algorithm that decides for an arbitrary sentence of the language $\mathcal{L}$ whether it is in T or not.*

(3) *T is complicated enough to encode simple arithmetic of the natural numbers.*

Then there is a sentence φ of the language $\mathcal{L}$ such that neither φ nor its negation $\neg\varphi$ can be deduced from the axioms T.

A sentence φ as in Theorem 1.1.2 is said to be *independent* of the axioms T. It is not difficult to prove that a sentence φ is independent of the consistent set of axioms T if and only if both $T \cup \{\varphi\}$ and $T \cup \{\neg\varphi\}$ are consistent too. Part of this course will be devoted to studying the sentences of set theory that are independent of the ZFC axioms.

The preceding discussion shows that there is no way to find a good complete set of axioms for set theory. On the other hand, we can find a set of axioms that reach far enough to allow encoding of all set-theoretic operations and all classical mathematical structures. Indeed, the ZFC axioms do satisfy this requirement, and the rest of Part I will be devoted to describing such encodings of all structures of interest.

1.2 The language and the basic axioms

Any mathematical theory must begin with undefined concepts. In the case of set theory these concepts are the notion of a "set" and the relation "is an element of" between the sets. In particular, we write "$x \in y$" for "x is an element of y."

The relation $\in$ is primitive for set theory, that is, we do not define it. All other objects, including the notion of a set, are described by the axioms. In particular, all objects considered in formal set theory are sets. (Thus, the word "set" is superfluous.)

In order to talk about any formal set theory it is necessary to specify first the language that we will use and in which we will express the axioms. The correct expressions in our language are called *formulas.* The basic formulas are "$x \in y$" and "$z = t$," where x, y, z, and t (or some other variable symbols) stand for the sets. We can combine these expressions using the basic logical connectors of negation $\neg$, conjunction &, disjunction $\vee$, implication $\rightarrow$, and equivalence $\leftrightarrow$. Thus, for example, $\neg\varphi$ means "not φ" and $\varphi\rightarrow\psi$ stands for "φ implies ψ." In addition, we will use two quantifiers: existential $\exists$ and universal $\forall$. Thus, an expression $\forall x\varphi$ is interpreted as "for all x formula φ holds." In addition, the parentheses "(" and ")" are used, when appropriate.

Formally, the formulas can be created only as just described. However, for convenience, we will also often use some shortcuts. For example, an expression $\exists x \in A\varphi(x)$ will be used as an abbreviation for $\exists x(x \in A \ \& \ \varphi(x))$, and we will write $\forall x \in A\varphi(x)$ to abbreviate the formula $\forall x(x \in A\rightarrow\varphi(x))$. Also we will use the shortcuts $x \neq y$, $x \notin y$, $x \subset y$, and $x \not\subset y$, where, for example, $x \subset y$ stands for $\forall z(z \in x\rightarrow z \in y)$.

Finally, only variables, the relations $=$ and $\in$, and logical symbols already mentioned are allowed in formal formulas. However, we will often use some other constants. For example, we will write $x = \emptyset$ (x is an empty set) in place of $\neg\exists y(y \in x)$.

We will discuss ZFC axioms throughout the next few sections as they are needed. Also, in most cases, we won't write in the main text the formulas representing the axioms. However, the full list of ZFC axioms together with the formulas can be found in Appendix A.

Let us start with the two most basic axioms.

Set existence axiom There exists a set: $\exists x(x = x)$.

Extensionality axiom If x and y have the same elements, then x is equal to y.

The set existence axiom follows from the others. However, it is the most basic of all the axioms, since it ensures that set theory is not a trivial

theory. The extensionality axiom tells us that the sets can be distinguish only by their elements.

Comprehension scheme (or schema of separation) For every formula $\varphi(s,t)$ with free variables s and t, set x, and parameter p there exists a set $y = \{u \in x \colon \varphi(u,p)\}$ that contains all those $u \in x$ that have the property φ.

Notice that the comprehension scheme is, in fact, the scheme for infinitely many axioms, one for each formula φ. It is a weaker version of Frege's axiom schema of comprehension. However, the contradiction of Russell's paradox can be avoided, since the elements of the new set $y = \{u \in x \colon \varphi(u,p)\}$ are chosen from a fixed *set* x, rather than from an undefined object such as "the class of all sets."

From the set existence axiom and the comprehension scheme used with the formula "$u \neq u$," we can conclude the following stronger version of the set existence axiom.

Empty set axiom There exists the *empty set* $\emptyset$.

To see the implication, simply define $\emptyset = \{y \in x \colon y \neq y\}$, where x is a set from the set existence axiom. Notice that by the extensionality axiom the empty set is unique.

An interesting consequence of the comprehension scheme axiom is the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2.1 *There is no set of all sets.*

Proof If there were a set S of all sets then the following set

$$Z = \{X \in S \colon X \notin X\}$$

would exist by the comprehension scheme axiom. However, with S being the set of all sets, we would have that $Z = \{X \colon X \notin X\}$, the set from Russell's paradox. This contradiction shows that the set S of all sets cannot exist. □

By the previous theorem all sets do not form a set. However, we sometimes like to talk about this object. In such a case we will talk about a *class* of sets or the set-theoretic *universe*. We will talk about classes only on an intuitive level. It is worth mentioning, however, that the theory of classes can also be formalized similarly to the theory of sets. This, however, is far beyond the scope of this course. Let us mention only that there are other proper classes of sets (i.e., classes that are not sets) that are strictly smaller than the class of all sets.

The comprehension scheme axiom is a conditional existence axiom, that is, it describes how to obtain a set (subset) from another set. Other basic conditional existence axioms are listed here.

Pairing axiom For any a and b there exists a set x that contains a and b.

Union axiom For every family $\mathcal{F}$ there exists a set U containing the *union* $\bigcup \mathcal{F}$ of all elements of $\mathcal{F}$.

Power set axiom For every set X there exists a set P containing the set $\mathcal{P}(X)$ (the *power set*) of all subsets of X.

In particular, the pairing axiom states that for any a and b there exists a set x such that $\{a, b\} \subset x$. Although it does not state directly that there exists a set $\{a, b\}$, the existence of this set can easily be concluded from the existence of x and the comprehension scheme axiom:

$$\{a, b\} = \{u \in x \colon u = a \vee u = b\}.$$

Similarly, we can conclude from the union and power set axioms that for every sets $\mathcal{F}$ and X there exist the union of $\mathcal{F}$

$$\bigcup \mathcal{F} = \{x \colon \exists F \in \mathcal{F}\ (x \in F)\} = \{x \in U \colon \exists F \in \mathcal{F}\ (x \in F)\}$$

and the power set of X

$$\mathcal{P}(X) = \{z \colon z \subset X\} = \{z \in P \colon z \subset X\}.$$

It is also easy to see that these sets are defined uniquely. Notice also that the existence of a set $\{a, b\}$ implies the existence of a singleton set $\{a\}$, since $\{a\} = \{a, a\}$.

The other basic operations on sets can be defined as follows: the union of two sets x and y by

$$x \cup y = \bigcup \{x, y\};$$

the difference of sets x and y by

$$x \setminus y = \{z \in x \colon z \notin y\};$$

the arbitrary intersections of a family $\mathcal{F}$ by

$$\bigcap \mathcal{F} = \left\{z \in \bigcup \mathcal{F} \colon \forall F \in \mathcal{F}\ (z \in F)\right\};$$

and the intersections of sets x and y by

$$x \cap y = \bigcap \{x, y\}.$$

The existence of sets $x \setminus y$ and $\bigcap \mathcal{F}$ follows from the axiom of comprehension.

We will also sometimes use the operation of *symmetric difference* of two sets, defined by

$$x \triangle y = (x \setminus y) \cup (y \setminus x).$$

Its basic properties are listed in the next theorem. Its proof is left as an exercise.

Theorem 1.2.2 *For every x, y, and z*

(a) $x \triangle y = y \triangle x$,

(b) $x \triangle y = (x \cup y) \setminus (x \cap y)$,

(c) $(x \triangle y) \triangle z = x \triangle (y \triangle z)$.

We will define an ordered pair $\langle a, b \rangle$ for arbitrary a and b by

$$\langle a, b \rangle = \{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}. \tag{1.1}$$

It is difficult to claim that this definition is natural. However, it is commonly accepted in modern set theory, and the next theorem justifies it by showing that it maintains the intuitive properties we usually associate with the ordered pair.

Theorem 1.2.3 *For arbitrary a, b, c, and d*
$\langle a, b \rangle = \langle c, d \rangle$ *if and only if* $a = c$ *and* $b = d$.

Proof Implication $\Leftarrow$ is obvious.

To see the other implication, assume that $\langle a, b \rangle = \langle c, d \rangle$. This means that $\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\} = \{\{c\}, \{c, d\}\}$. In particular, by the axiom of extensionality, $\{a\}$ is equal to either $\{c\}$ or $\{c, d\}$.

If $\{a\} = \{c\}$ then $a = c$. If $\{a\} = \{c, d\}$, then c must belong to $\{a\}$ and we also conclude that $a = c$. In any case, $a = c$ and we can deduce that $\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\} = \{\{a\}, \{a, d\}\}$. We wish to show that this implies $b = d$.

But $\{a, b\}$ belongs to $\{\{a\}, \{a, d\}\}$. Thus we have two cases.

Case 1: $\{a, b\} = \{a, d\}$. Then $b = a$ or $b = d$. If $b = d$ we are done. If $b = a$ then $\{a, b\} = \{a\}$ and so $\{a, d\} = \{a\}$. But d belongs then to $\{a\}$ and so $d = a$. Since we had also $a = b$ we conclude $b = d$.

Case 2: $\{a, b\} = \{a\}$. Then b belongs to $\{a\}$ and so $b = a$. Hence we conclude that $\{a, d\} = \{a\}$, and as in case 1 we can conclude that $b = d$. $\square$

Now we can define an ordered triple $\langle a, b, c\rangle$ by identifying it with $\langle\langle a, b\rangle, c\rangle$ and, in general, an ordered n-tuple by

$$\langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-1}, a_n\rangle = \langle\langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-1}\rangle, a_n\rangle.$$

The agreement of this definition with our intuition is given by the following theorem, presented without proof.

Theorem 1.2.4 *$\langle a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-1}, a_n\rangle = \langle a'_1, a'_2, \ldots, a'_{n-1}, a'_n\rangle$ if and only if $a_i = a'_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.*

Next we will define a *Cartesian product* $X \times Y$ as the set of all ordered pairs $\langle x, y\rangle$ such that $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. To make this definition formal, we have to use the comprehension axiom. For this, notice that for every $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ we have

$$\langle x, y\rangle = \{\{x\}, \{x, y\}\} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(X \cup Y)).$$

Hence, we can define

$$X \times Y = \{z \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(X \cup Y)) \colon \exists x \in X\ \exists y \in Y\ (z = \langle x, y\rangle)\}. \tag{1.2}$$

The basic properties of the Cartesian product and its relation to other set-theoretic operations are described in the exercises.

The last axiom we would like to discuss in this section is the infinity axiom. It states that there exists at least one infinite set. This is the only axiom that implies the existence of an infinite object. Without it, the family $\mathcal{F}$ of all finite subsets of the set of natural numbers would be a good "model" of set theory, that is, $\mathcal{F}$ satisfies all the axioms of set theory except the infinity axiom.

To make the statements of the infinity axiom more readable we introduce the following abbreviation. We say that y is a successor of x and write $y = S(x)$ if $y = x \cup \{x\}$, that is, when

$$\forall z[z \in y \leftrightarrow (z \in x \vee z = x)].$$

Infinity axiom (Zermelo 1908) There exists an infinite set (of some special form):

$$\exists x\,[\forall z(z = \emptyset \rightarrow z \in x)\ \&\ \forall y \in x \forall z(z = S(y) \rightarrow z \in x)]\,.$$

Notice that the infinity axiom obviously implies the set existence axiom.

EXERCISES

1 Prove that if $F \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \subset F \subset \bigcup \mathcal{F}$.

2 Show that for every family $\mathcal{F}$ and every set A

(a) if $A \subset F$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ then $A \subset \bigcap \mathcal{F}$, and

(b) if $F \subset A$ for every $F \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\bigcup \mathcal{F} \subset A$.

3 Prove that if $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$ then $\bigcap \mathcal{F} \cap \bigcap \mathcal{G} \subset \bigcap(\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G})$. Give examples showing that the inclusion cannot be replaced by equality and that the assumption $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{G} \neq \emptyset$ is essential.

4 Prove Theorem 1.2.2.

5 Show that $\langle\langle a, b\rangle, c\rangle = \langle\langle a', b'\rangle, c'\rangle$ if and only if $\langle a, \langle b, c\rangle\rangle = \langle a', \langle b', c'\rangle\rangle$ if and only if $a = a'$, $b = b'$, and $c = c'$. Conclude that we could define an ordered triple $\langle a, b, c\rangle$ as $\langle a, \langle b, c\rangle\rangle$ instead of $\langle\langle a, b\rangle, c\rangle$.

6 Prove that $X \times Y = \emptyset$ if and only if $X = \emptyset$ or $Y = \emptyset$.

7 Show that for arbitrary sets X, Y, and Z the following holds.

(a) $(X \cup Y) \times Z = (X \times Z) \cup (Y \times Z)$.

(b) $(X \cap Y) \times Z = (X \times Z) \cap (Y \times Z)$.

(c) $(X \setminus Y) \times Z = (X \times Z) \setminus (Y \times Z)$.

8 Prove that if $X \times Z \subset Y \times T$ and $X \times Z \neq \emptyset$ then $X \subset Y$ and $Z \subset T$. Give an example showing that the assumption $X \times Z \neq \emptyset$ is essential.

Chapter 2

Relations, functions, and Cartesian product

2.1 Relations and the axiom of choice

A subset R of a Cartesian product $X \times Y$ is called a *(binary) relation.*

For a relation R of a Cartesian product $X \times Y$, we usually write aRb instead of $\langle a, b\rangle \in R$ and read: *a is in the relation R to b*, or *the relation R between a and b holds.*

The *domain* $\mathrm{dom}(R)$ of a relation R is defined as the set of all x such that $\langle x, y\rangle \in R$ for some $y \in Y$, that is,

$$\mathrm{dom}(R) = \{x \in X : \exists y \in Y\ (\langle x, y\rangle \in R)\};$$

the *range* $\mathrm{range}(R)$ of a relation R is defined as the set of all y such that $\langle x, y\rangle \in R$ for some $x \in X$, that is,

$$\mathrm{range}(R) = \{y \in Y : \exists x \in X\ (\langle x, y\rangle \in R)\}.$$

The set $Z = \mathrm{dom}(R) \cup \mathrm{range}(R)$ for relation R is called a *field* of R. Notice that $R \subset Z \times Z$. In this case we often say that R is defined on Z.

Examples 1. The relation $R_<$ on the set of real numbers $\mathbb{R}$ defined as $\langle x, y\rangle \in R_<$ if and only if $x < y$ is usually denoted by $<$.[1] Notice that

[1]In the examples we will often use notions that you supposedly know from other courses, even if we have not yet defined them within the framework of set theory (such as the set of real numbers $\mathbb{R}$ in this example). This will be used only to help you develop the right intuition. We will try to avoid this kind of situation in the main stream of the course.