



---

Weakly Compact Cardinals: A Combinatorial Proof

Author(s): S. Shelah

Source: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Dec., 1979), pp. 559-562

Published by: [Association for Symbolic Logic](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2273294>

Accessed: 13/06/2014 00:28

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Association for Symbolic Logic is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## WEAKLY COMPACT CARDINALS: A COMBINATORIAL PROOF

S. SHELAH

We give here a direct purely combinatorial proof that weak compactness is equivalent to a combinatorial property (2). This property (2) is apparently stronger, and from it, all other usual equivalent definitions and usual properties of weakly compact cardinals can be deduced. So this proof may be useful for books which want to present weakly compact cardinals, but not logic.

A direct simple proof of a weaker implication (e.g., weakly compact  $\mu$  is not the first inaccessible, and every stationary set has an initial segment which is stationary) was given by Kunen [K], and independently by the author [Sh]. Baumgartner [B] had another proof.

We were motivated by the manuscript of Erdős, Hajnal, Mate and Rado's book on partition calculus, and by conversations with A. Levi who was writing a book on naïve set theory.

*Notation.* Let  $i, j, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \eta, \sigma$  be ordinals,  $\mu$  be a cardinal,  $f, g$  be functions.

Let  $\text{cf } \alpha$  be the cofinality of  $\alpha$ .

A partially ordered set  $T$  is a tree if for any  $a \in T$ ,  $\{b : b < a, b \in T\}$  is well ordered; its order type (an ordinal) is called the level of  $a$ , and  $T_\alpha$  is the set of  $a \in T$  of level  $\alpha$ .

A tree  $T$  is a  $\mu$ -tree if:  $T$  has an element of level  $\alpha$  iff  $\alpha < \mu$  and  $|T_\alpha| < \mu$  for every  $\alpha < \mu$ .

A branch of a tree  $T$  is a maximal, totally ordered subset. A  $\mu$ -branch is a branch of order type  $\mu$ .

REMARK 1. For  $\mu$  the first inaccessible we can define a  $\mu$ -tree with no  $\mu$ -branch by:

$$T = \{h : \text{Dom } h \text{ an ordinal } \alpha < \mu, h(i) < 1 + i, \text{ and} \\ \text{for strong limit } i, j \in \text{Dom } h, h(i) \neq h(j)\}.$$

THEOREM 1. For  $\mu$  strongly inaccessible the following are equivalent:

(1)  $\mu$  is weakly compact, i.e., every  $\mu$ -tree has a  $\mu$ -branch.

(2) For every family of functions  $f_\alpha : \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$  ( $\alpha < \mu$ ) there is a function  $f : \mu \rightarrow \mu$  such that:  $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(\exists \beta)[\alpha \leq \beta < \mu \text{ and } f_\beta \upharpoonright \alpha = f \upharpoonright \alpha]$ .

REMARK 2. It is easy to prove (2) implies Baumgartner principle implies (1).

REMARK 3. We now show it is easy to deduce from the theorem that weakly compact cardinals are large.

Let  $I$  be the family of subsets  $S$  of  $\mu$  such that (2) is not satisfied if we replace " $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(\exists \beta) \dots$ " by " $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(\exists \beta \in S) \dots$ ". Clearly it suffices to define  $f_j$  for  $j \in S$ . So by the theorem,  $\mu \in I$  iff  $I$  is weakly compact. It is trivial that  $S' \subseteq S \in I \Rightarrow$

Received January 6, 1977; revised April 16, 1978.

$S' \in I$ . Now,  $I$  is closed under union of  $< \mu$  elements. Because if  $S_\xi \in I$  ( $\xi < \alpha < \mu$ ), let  $f_j^\xi$  ( $j < \lambda$ ) exemplify  $S_\xi \in I$  [i.e., there is no  $f: \mu \rightarrow \mu$  such that  $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(\exists \beta \in S_\xi) \cdot [(\alpha \leq \beta < \mu \text{ and } f_\beta^\xi \uparrow \alpha = f \uparrow \alpha)]$ ]. Define:  $f_j$  is  $f_j^\xi$  if  $j \in S_\xi - \bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} S_\zeta$ , and  $f_j^0$  otherwise. If  $\bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} S_\xi \notin I$  then there are  $f: \mu \rightarrow \mu$  and, for each  $\alpha < \mu$ ,  $\beta(\alpha) \in \bigcup_{\xi < \alpha} S_\xi$ ,  $\alpha \leq \beta(\alpha) < \mu$ ,  $f_{\beta(\alpha)} \uparrow \alpha = f \uparrow \alpha$ . As  $\mu$  is regular there is an unbounded  $A \subset \mu$ , and  $\xi < \alpha$  such that  $\alpha \in A \Rightarrow \beta(\alpha) \in S_\xi - \bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} S_\zeta$ . Defining  $\beta'(\alpha)$  as  $\beta(\alpha')$  for the first  $\alpha'$ ,  $\alpha \leq \alpha' \in A$ , we see that  $f, \beta'(\alpha)$  contradict the choice of  $f_j = f_j^\xi$  (for  $j \in S_\xi - \bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} S_\zeta$ ). In fact  $I$  is normal, i.e.,  $S_\xi \in I$  ( $\xi < \mu$ ) implies  $S = \{\alpha: \alpha \in \bigcup_{\zeta < \alpha} S_\zeta\} \in S$ . [Let  $f_\alpha^\xi$  ( $\alpha \in S_\xi$ ) exemplify  $S_\xi \in I$ ,  $\zeta(\alpha) < \alpha$  ( $\alpha \in S$ ) be such that  $\alpha \in S_{\zeta(\alpha)}$ . Define  $f_\sigma$  ( $\sigma \in S$ ) by:  $f_\sigma(0) = \zeta(\sigma)$ ,  $f_\sigma(1+i) = f_\sigma^{\zeta(\sigma)}(i)$ .]

Suppose  $\mu$  is weakly compact. Then  $I$  is a  $\mu$ -complete filter over  $I$ . If  $S \subseteq \mu$  is closed unbounded, define  $f_\sigma$  ( $\sigma \notin S$ ) by  $f_\sigma(\alpha) = \max(S \cap \sigma)$ , hence for every  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta < \mu$ ,  $\{\sigma: f_\sigma(\alpha) = \beta, \sigma \in S\}$  is a bounded subset of  $\mu$ , hence the  $f_\sigma$ 's exemplify  $\mu - S \in I$ . Let  $S$  be the set of singular ordinals  $< \mu$ , and for each  $\sigma \in S$  let  $\sigma = \sum_{i < \text{cf } \sigma} \sigma_i$ , where  $\text{cf } \sigma, \sigma_i < \sigma$ , and define  $f_\sigma(1+\alpha) = \min\{\sigma_i: \sigma_i \leq \alpha\}$  (for  $\alpha < \sigma \in S$ ) and  $f_\sigma(0) = \text{cf } \sigma$ .

From the above it is clear that any closed unbounded subset of  $\mu$  contains an inaccessible cardinal, i.e.,  $\mu$  is Mahlo. Also, the not-Mahlo cardinals etc. are in  $I$ .

**Conclusion 4.** (1) If  $\mu$  is strongly inaccessible,  $S \subseteq \mu$  is stationary but  $\delta \cap S$  is not stationary for every  $\delta < \mu$  then  $\mu$  is not weakly compact.

(2) If  $\mu$  is strongly inaccessible,  $S_\alpha \subseteq \mu$  stationary (for  $\alpha < \mu$ ) and for every strongly inaccessible  $\sigma < \mu$  for some  $\beta < \sigma$ ,  $S_\beta \cap \sigma$  is not stationary then  $\mu$  is not weakly compact.

**PROOF OF 4.** (1) Let  $f_\sigma: \sigma \rightarrow \sigma$  enumerate a closed unbounded subset of  $\sigma$  disjoint to  $S$ ,  $f_\sigma$  monotonic. If  $\mu$  is weakly compact, by (3) we have  $f$  as in 1(2), which shows  $S$  is not stationary.

(2) Similar.

**PROOF OF THEOREM 1.** Trivially (2) implies (1). Let us prove the other direction. Let for  $\alpha \leq \mu$ ,  $T_\alpha^1 = \{\langle g_i: i < \alpha \rangle: g_i \text{ is a function from } i \text{ into } i\}$ .

We can look at  $\langle g_i: i < \alpha \rangle$  as a sequence of approximations to the desired  $f$ . We call  $j$  a failure of  $\bar{g} = \langle g_i: i < \alpha \rangle$  if

( $\alpha$ )  $j < \alpha$ .

( $\beta$ ) (A) or (B) where

(A) for arbitrarily large  $\gamma < j$ ,  $\langle g_i(\gamma): \gamma < i < j \rangle$  is not eventually  $g_j(\gamma)$ .

(B) there is no  $\beta < \mu$  satisfying:

(i)  $f_\beta \uparrow j, g_j$  are eventually equal (i.e.,

$$(\exists \xi < j) (\forall i) [\xi \leq i < j \rightarrow f_\beta(i) = g_j(i)]) \quad \text{and}$$

(ii)  $f_\beta$  maps bounded subsets of  $j$  to bounded subset of  $j$  (i.e.,

$$(\forall \xi < j) (\exists \zeta < j) [(\forall i < \xi) f_\beta(i) < \zeta]).$$

( $\gamma$ )  $j$  is a strong limit cardinal.

Let, for  $\alpha < \mu$ ,  $T_\alpha = \{(\bar{g}, h) : \bar{g} \in T_\alpha^1, h \text{ is one-to-one, regressive (i.e., } h(j) < j) \text{ and } \text{Dom } h = \{j : j \text{ is a failure of } \bar{g}\}\}$ .

Naturally  $(\bar{g}, h) \leq (\bar{g}_\alpha^1, h^1)$  if  $\bar{g}$  is an initial segment of  $\bar{g}_\alpha^1$  and  $h = h^1 \uparrow \text{Dom } h$ , so  $T = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} T_\alpha$  is a tree with  $T_\alpha$  its  $\alpha$ th level.

Note that if  $\bar{g}^1 = \bar{g} \upharpoonright \alpha$  and  $j < \alpha$  then  $j$  is a failure of  $\bar{g}$  iff it is a failure of  $\bar{g}^1$ . It clearly is sufficient to prove the following two assertions:

*Assertion 1.* If  $T$  has a  $\mu$ -branch, the required  $f$  exists.

Let  $(\bar{g}^\alpha, h^\alpha) \in T$  ( $\alpha < \mu$ ) be the member of the branch in level  $\alpha$ , so  $\bar{g}^\alpha = \langle g_i : i < \alpha \rangle$  and let  $\bar{g} = \langle g_i : i < \mu \rangle$ ,  $h = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} h_\alpha$ , so clearly  $\text{Dom } h$  is the set of failures of  $\bar{g}$ , and  $h$  is one-to-one. As  $h$  is one-to-one, for some closed and unbounded  $S \subseteq \mu$  for every  $\alpha \in S$  and  $j \in \text{Dom } h$ ,  $j < \alpha$  iff  $h(j) < \alpha$ , and w.l.o.g. every  $\alpha \in S$  is a strong limit cardinal. So each  $\alpha \in S$  does not belong to  $\text{Dom } h$  (as then  $h(\alpha) < \alpha$ ) hence is not a failure of  $\bar{g}$ . So (by condition  $\beta(\mathbf{A})$ ) there is  $\gamma_0(\alpha) < \alpha$  (for  $\alpha \in S$ ) such that  $\gamma_0(\alpha) \leq \gamma < \alpha$  implies  $\langle g_i(\gamma) : i < \alpha \rangle$  is eventually  $g_\alpha(\gamma)$  and there are (by  $\beta(\mathbf{B})$ ) ordinals  $\beta(\alpha)$ ,  $\gamma_1(\alpha)$ ,  $\gamma_2(\alpha)$  such that:  $\gamma_1(\alpha) \leq \gamma < \alpha \Rightarrow f_{\beta(\alpha)}(\gamma) = g_\alpha(\gamma)$  and  $\gamma < \gamma_1(\alpha) \Rightarrow f_{\beta(\alpha)}(\gamma) < \gamma_2(\alpha)$ , and  $\gamma_1(\alpha)$ ,  $\gamma_2(\alpha) < \alpha$ ,  $\gamma_0(\alpha) \leq \gamma_1(\alpha)$ .

By Fodor's theorem, as  $\gamma_l(\alpha) < \alpha$ , for some stationary set  $S_1 \subseteq S$  for every  $\alpha \in S_1$ ,  $\gamma_l(\alpha) = \gamma_l$  ( $l = 0, 1, 2$ ), and (by  $\beta(\mathbf{B})(i)$ ) for some stationary set  $S_2 \subseteq S_1$ ,  $f_{\beta(\alpha)} \upharpoonright \gamma_1$  is equal for every  $\alpha \in S_2$ . So we can define a function  $g$  by: for  $\gamma_0 \leq \gamma < \mu$ ,  $g(\gamma)$  is the eventual value of  $\langle g_i(\gamma) : i < \mu \rangle$  (exists as  $\langle g_i(\gamma) : i < \alpha \rangle$  is eventually constant for every  $\alpha \in S_2$ , so for some  $i^0(\alpha) < \alpha$ ,  $g_i(\gamma) = g_{i^0(\alpha)}(\gamma)$  for every  $i$ ,  $i^0(\alpha) \leq i < \alpha$ , so for some stationary  $S'_3 \subseteq S_2$ ,  $\alpha \in S'_3 \Rightarrow i^0(\alpha) = i^0$  so  $g_i(\gamma) = g_{i^0}(\gamma)$  for every  $i \geq i^0$ ). Now for  $\gamma < \gamma_1$ ,  $g(\gamma)$  is  $f_{\beta(\alpha)}(\gamma)$  for every  $\alpha \in S_2$ . So  $g$  is as required.

*Assertion 2.*  $T$  is a  $\mu$ -tree. As clearly the number of elements in level  $\alpha$  is  $< \mu$  (in fact  $\leq 2^{|\alpha|}$ ), we have to prove that there are elements in level  $\alpha$  for each  $\alpha < \mu$ .

For levels before the first strong limit it is trivial, so it suffices to prove:

(\*) if  $(\bar{g}, h) \in T_{\alpha+1}$ ,  $\bar{g} = \langle g_i : i < \alpha \rangle$ ,  $\alpha < \beta$  then there is  $(\bar{g}^1, h^1) \in T_\beta$  such that

(A)  $i \in \text{Dom } h^1$ ,  $\alpha < i < \beta$  implies  $h^1(i) \geq \alpha$ .

(B)  $(\bar{g}, h) \leq (\bar{g}^1, h^1)$ .

(C)  $\alpha < i < \beta$  implies  $g_i^1 \upharpoonright \alpha = g_\alpha$ .

We prove (\*) by induction on  $\beta$ , and let  $\beta = \delta + n$ ,  $n < \omega$ ,  $\delta$  limit.

*Case (a).*  $\delta < \aleph_\omega$ .

No problems as there are no failures.

*Case (b).*  $\delta$  not strong limit.

Choose  $\gamma + 1 < \delta$ , such that there is no strong limit  $\sigma$ ,  $\gamma \leq \sigma \leq \delta$ . By the induction hypothesis there is  $(\bar{g}^1, h^1) \in T_{\gamma+1}$ ,  $(\bar{g}, h) \leq (\bar{g}^1, h^1)$  as in (\*). Now choose any  $\bar{g}^2 \in T_\beta^1$  such that  $\bar{g}^2 \upharpoonright (\gamma + 1) = \bar{g}^1$  and  $(\bar{g}^2, h^1)$  satisfies (B) and (C). Then  $(\bar{g}^2, h^1)$  is as required.

*Case (c).*  $\delta$  strong limit singular.

Choose  $\gamma < \delta$ ,  $\gamma > \alpha$ ,  $\gamma > \text{cf } \delta$ , and let  $\delta = \sum_{\eta < \text{cf } \delta} \sigma(\eta)$ ,  $\sigma(\eta)$  ( $\eta < \text{cf } \delta$ ) increasing and continuous,  $\sigma(0) = \alpha + 1$ ,  $\sigma(1) > \gamma$ ,  $\sigma(2) > \sigma(1) + \gamma$ , but no  $\sigma$ ,  $\sigma(1) \leq \sigma \leq \sigma(2)$  is strong limit. Let  $\sigma(\text{cf } \delta) = \delta$ . Now we define by induction on  $\eta \leq \text{cf } \delta$ ,  $(\bar{g}^\eta, h^\eta) \in T_{\sigma(\eta)+1}$ , increasing in the tree so that  $\text{Range } h^\eta$  is disjoint to  $\{i: \sigma(1) + \eta < i < \sigma(2)\}$ . Then it is easy to prove (\*).

For  $\eta = 0$ .  $(\bar{g}^0, h^0) = (\bar{g}, h)$ .

For  $\eta$  a successor ordinal  $\neq 2$ . Use the induction hypothesis.

For  $\eta = 2$ . Use Case (b), hence  $\text{Dom } h^2 \subseteq \sigma(1)$ .

For  $\eta$  limit. In  $\bar{g}^\eta = \langle g_i^\eta : i \leq \sigma(\eta) \rangle$  we already determine  $g_i^\eta$  for  $i < \sigma(\eta)$  and  $g_{\sigma(\eta)}^\eta$  will be any appropriate function extending  $g^\alpha$ .

As for  $h^\eta$ , we already essentially define  $h^\eta \upharpoonright \sigma(\eta)$ , and if we have to define  $h^\eta(\sigma(\eta))$ ,

we define it as  $\sigma(1) + \eta$  (by a demand on the construction,  $h^\eta$  is one-to-one).

Case (d).  $\delta$  is strong limit and inaccessible.

There is a closed unbounded set  $S \subseteq \delta$  such that for  $\sigma \in S$ ,  $\eta < \sigma \Rightarrow f_\delta^\eta(\eta) < \sigma$ . Let  $\langle \sigma(\eta) : \eta < \delta \rangle$  be an enumeration of the limit points of  $S$  ( $\sigma(\eta)$  increasing and continuous) and  $\alpha < \sigma(0)$ .

The proof is essentially like Case (c). We define by induction on  $\eta$   $(\bar{g}^\eta, h^\eta)$ , increasing in the tree  $\bar{g}^\eta = \langle g_i^* : i \leq \sigma(\eta) + 1 \rangle$  such that for  $i > \sigma(\eta)$ ,  $\alpha \leq \gamma < \sigma(\eta)$ ,  $g_i^*(\gamma) = g_\sigma(\gamma)$ .

For  $\eta$  a successor. By the induction hypothesis we can find  $(\bar{g}_1^\eta, h^\eta) \geq (\bar{g}^{\eta-1}, h^{\eta-1})$  in  $T_{\sigma(\eta)+1}$  as in (\*). Now define  $g_i^*$  for  $i = \sigma(\eta) + 1$  by:

$$g_i^*(j) = \begin{cases} g_\alpha(j) & \text{when } j < \alpha, \\ f_\delta^\alpha(j) & \text{when } \alpha \leq j < \sigma(\eta), \\ 0 & \text{when } j = \alpha(\eta). \end{cases}$$

Let  $\bar{g}_1^\eta = \langle g_i^* : i < \sigma(\eta) + 1 \rangle$ , so  $\bar{g}^\eta$  is defined.

For  $\eta$  limit. We define  $g_i^*$  for  $i = \sigma(\eta)$ ,  $\sigma(\eta) + 1$  as above and no failure occurs in  $\sigma(\eta)$ .

Now it is easy to define the required  $(\bar{g}^1, h^1) \in T_\beta$ .

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. The author would like to thank the United States-Israel Binational Foundation (Grant 1110) and the N.S.F. (Grant MCS-08979) for partially supporting his research.

#### REFERENCES

- [B] J. BAUMGARTNER, *Ineffability properties of cardinals*. II.  
 [K] K. KUNEN, *Combinatorics, Handbook of Mathematical Logic* (J. Barwise, Editor), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977, pp. 430–445.  
 [Sh] S. SHELAH, *Remarks to the book on partition calculus of Erdős, Hajnal, Mate and Rado*, mimeograph, January 1976.

HEBREW UNIVERSITY  
 JERUSALEM, ISRAEL

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY  
 BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA, 94720