

This exam consists of 3 questions, worth a total of 40 points. Note that some subproblems are intentionally quite challenging, and you do not need to complete all questions in order to achieve a good grade. You may submit your answers in either English or Swedish. Write clearly and motivate your answers carefully.

Good luck! — Lycka till!

1. **Finiteness/infiniteness in permutation models.** Work in ZFU, with an countable set of atoms A . Consider HFS as we constructed it: the hereditarily finitely supported sets under the action of $\text{Sym}(A)$.

Recall that we defined a set to be *finite* if it admits a bijection to some $n \in \omega$, and infinite otherwise.

Say a set x is *Dedekind-infinite* if there is some injection $f : x \rightarrow x$ that is not surjective, and *Dedekind-finite* otherwise.

In some of the literature (especially older work), *Dedekind-(in)finite* is taken as the main definition of finiteness/infiniteness; the definition we've used may then be called *cardinal-(in)finite*, among other names. Under AC, they coincide; the goal of this problem is to show that without choice, they may diverge.

- (a) Show that any Dedekind-infinite set admits some injection from ω .
- (b) Assuming the axiom of choice, show that a set is infinite if and only if it is Dedekind-infinite.
- (c) Show that $\text{HFS} \models \text{"}A \text{ is infinite"} \text{"}$. (*Note any absoluteness results that you use.*)
- (d) Show that $\text{HFS} \models \text{"there is no injection } \omega \rightarrow A \text{"}$.

It follows that $\text{HFS} \models \text{"}A \text{ is Dedekind-finite, but not (cardinal-)finite"} \text{"}$, and hence that assuming "ZFU with a countable set of atoms" is consistent, ZFU does not prove that Dedekind-finiteness implies (cardinal-)finiteness.

2. **Cardinality calculations for the constructible universe.**

Recall the "definable power set" construction $\mathcal{D}(X)$, used in the definition of $\mathbf{L}_{\alpha+1} := \mathcal{D}(\mathbf{L}_\alpha)$.

- (a) Give the definition of $\mathcal{D}(X)$. (*We discussed a couple of different equivalent definitions of $\mathcal{D}$; any one of them is acceptable here.*)
- (b) Show that $|\mathcal{D}(X)| = |X|$ whenever $|X| \geq \aleph_0$.
- (c) Show that for each ordinal α , $\alpha \subseteq \mathbf{L}_\alpha$. (*Note any facts about absoluteness you use.*)
- (d) Show that for each ordinal $\alpha \geq \omega$, $|\mathbf{L}_\alpha| = |\alpha|$.
- (e) Show that assuming $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{L}$, the $\mathbf{L}$ -rank $\text{rk}_{\mathbf{L}}(x)$ of a set may differ from its ordinary rank $\text{rk}(x)$.

3. Failures of admissibility in Gentzen systems.

In class, we considered the classical Gentzen system **G3**. Write **G3**_→ for its *implicational fragment*: that is, the system generated just by the axiom rule, and the rules for $\rightarrow$:

$$\frac{}{P, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, P} \text{Ax} \quad (P \text{ atomic})$$

$$\frac{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \varphi \quad \psi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta}{\varphi \rightarrow \psi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta} L \rightarrow \quad \frac{\varphi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \psi}{\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \varphi \rightarrow \psi} R \rightarrow$$

We will also consider two variants of the AX rule, one more general, one weaker:

$$\frac{}{\varphi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \varphi} \text{Ax}_{\text{gen}} \quad \frac{}{P \Rightarrow P} \text{Ax}^- \quad (P \text{ atomic})$$

Write **G3**_→[−] for the system generated by Ax^- , $L \rightarrow$, and $R \rightarrow$. The goal in this problem is to show that **G3**_→[−] does not satisfy the admissibility properties of **G3**.

- Show that Ax_{gen} is admissible over **G3**_→.
- Show the inversion principle for $L \rightarrow$, for **G3**_→[−]: if a sequent $\varphi \rightarrow \psi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$ is derivable, then so are $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta, \varphi$ and $\psi, \Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$.

For the next parts, we use an auxiliary notion: we define the *polarity* (positive or negative) of occurrences of atomic formulas in a formula φ , by recursion on φ :

- when φ is itself an atom P , the only atom occurring in it is P itself, and that occurrence is positive;
- when φ is $\psi \rightarrow \chi$, an atom occurs positively overall if it occurs either positively in χ or negatively in ψ ; and negatively, if it occurs negatively in χ or positively in ψ . (More briefly: occurrences in χ keep the same polarity; occurrences in ψ get their polarity flipped.)

This is most easily understood by example. In the formula $P \rightarrow Q$, P occurs negatively and Q occurs positively. In $(P \rightarrow Q) \rightarrow (R \rightarrow Q)$, the P is positive, R is negative, and Q occurs both positively and negatively.

Generally, in a sequent $\Gamma \Rightarrow \Delta$, say atoms occur positively if they occur positively in some formula in Δ or negatively in Γ , and negatively if they occur negatively in Δ or positively in Γ . (So like in $\rightarrow$, occurrences in the antecedent get polarity flipped.)

- Show that in **G3**_→[−], if a sequent $\Gamma \rightarrow \Delta$ is derivable, then any atom that occurs positively must also occur negatively. (*Hint: work by induction on derivations.*)
- Show that the sequent $P \rightarrow Q \Rightarrow P \rightarrow Q$ is not derivable in **G3**_→[−], and hence Ax_{gen} is not admissible.
- Is there any non-atomic formula φ for which $\varphi \Rightarrow \varphi$ is derivable in **G3**_→[−]?

(As usual in such proofs, don't feel obliged to be pedantically thorough: when several cases in a proof are similar, feel free to say so and give just as many cases as you feel illustrate the issues involved.)

———— End of exam — Slut på provet —————