

Josef Mlčěk

Approximations of  $\sigma$ -classes and  $\pi$ -classes

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 20 (1979), No. 4, 669--679

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/105960>

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1979

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

APPROXIMATIONS OF  $\mathcal{G}$ -CLASSES AND  $\mathcal{A}$ -CLASSES  
J. MLČEK

**Abstract:** This paper is a contribution to the development of the alternative set theory. We define  $\mathcal{A}$ -classes (and  $\mathcal{G}$ -classes similarly) relatively w.r.t. a codable class  $\mathcal{M}$  (so called  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -classes and  $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -classes). If  $Q$  is a  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class then there is a relation  $R \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $\text{dom}(R) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $Q = \bigcap \{R^n \{n\}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  (so called  $\mathcal{A}$ -string of  $Q$ ). This description of  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -classes enables us, in the case if  $\mathcal{M}$  is rich enough, to approximate a  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class  $Q$  in the following sense: if  $Q$  has a property of a certain type then there is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -string  $R \in \mathcal{M}$  of  $Q$  such that the classes  $R^n \{n\}$  have an analogous one. An exact form of this proposition can be found in the theorems 2.0.1, 2.0.2.

**Key words:**  $\mathcal{A}$ -class,  $\mathcal{G}$ -class, standard system, down-hereditary formula, up-hereditary formula, alternative set theory.

Classification: O2K10, O2K99

---

**Introduction.** If  $Q$  is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -semiset then  $Q$  is a "uniform  $\mathcal{A}$ "-class in the following sense: there is a set-relation  $r$  with  $\text{dom}(r) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $Q = \bigcap \{r^n \{n\}; n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ . (We say that  $r$  is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -string of  $Q$ .) This uniformity is very useful for a work with  $\mathcal{A}$ -semisets. There is a natural question whether every  $\mathcal{A}$ -class  $Q$  is a "uniform  $\mathcal{A}$ "-class in the sense that there is a set-theoretically definable  $\mathcal{A}$ -string of  $Q$ . We prove that there is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -class which is no "uniform  $\mathcal{A}$ "-class.

Moreover, we shall define a notion of  $\mathcal{A}$ -class relatively w.r.t. a codable class  $\mathcal{M}$  (so called  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class) so that each  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class will have a  $\mathcal{A}$ -string which is an element of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Specifying  $\mathcal{M}$  as a rich enough class (the so called standard system) we can treat  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -classes with advantage. Note that every  $\mathcal{A}$ -class is a  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class where  $\mathcal{M}$  is any revelation of the codable class  $Sd_{\mathcal{V}}$ . (See 0.0.1, 1.0.4.) Our description of  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -classes enables us to approximate each  $\mathcal{A}^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class  $Q$  in the following sense: if  $Q$  satisfies a property of a certain type then there is a  $\mathcal{A}$ -string of  $Q$  such that  $R \in \mathcal{M}$  and the classes  $R^{\alpha}$  satisfies an analogous one. (See 2.0.1, 2.0.2.)

#### § 0. Preliminaries

0.0.0. The class of all natural numbers (finite natural numbers resp.) is denoted by  $N$  (FN resp.). We use  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta, \xi, \psi$  ( $m, n, i, j, k$  resp.) as variables ranging over natural (finite natural resp.) numbers.  $\mathbb{R}N$  is the class of rational numbers. We shall use lower-case letters to denote sets.

The operation of composition of relations is denoted by  $\circ$ . The symbol  $Id$  denotes the identity mapping. Writing  $H: X \rightarrow Y$  we mean that  $H$  is a function with  $dom(H) = X$  and  $rng(H) \subseteq Y$ .

0.0.1.  $Sd_{\mathcal{V}}$  denotes the codable class of all set-theoretically definable classes. Writing  $Sd_{\mathcal{V}}^*$  we mean that  $Sd_{\mathcal{V}}^*$  is a revelation of  $Sd_{\mathcal{V}}$ . (See [S-V2].) The codable class of all classes set-theoretically definable without parameters is denoted by  $Sd_0$ .

0.1.0. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a codable class. Writing  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$  we mean a language  $FL_K$  such that there is a relation  $S$  so that  $\langle S, K \rangle$  is a coding pair which codes the class  $\mathcal{M}$ . It is obvious, how is defined the satisfaction of the formulas of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$  (cf. [S1]). Let  $\varphi$  be a formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$ . Writing  $\varphi(x_0, \dots, x_m)$  we mean that the formula  $\varphi$  has no free variables distinct from  $x_0, \dots, x_m$ . Let  $T_0, \dots, T_k$  be terms of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$ . We let

$$\varphi \left( \frac{T_0}{X_{i_0}}, \dots, \frac{T_k}{X_{i_k}} \right)$$

designate the formula obtained from  $\varphi$  by replacing all free occurrences of  $X_{i_0}, \dots, X_{i_k}$  by  $T_0, \dots, T_k$  resp. We shall omit the subscripts  $X_{i_0}, \dots, X_{i_k}$  when they are immaterial or clear from the context. If there is no danger of confusion we shall not make a distinction between a class  $X \in \mathcal{M}$  and the constant denoting this class.

Let  $\varphi$  be a formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$ . The symbol  $\varphi^{(\mathcal{M})}$  denotes the formula resulting from  $\varphi$  by restriction of all quantifiers binding class-variables to elements of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Suppose that  $\varphi$  is a sentence of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$ . The sentence " $\varphi$  holds in the sense of  $\mathcal{M}$ " denotes that  $\varphi^{(\mathcal{M})}$  holds.

0.2.0. Recall that a class  $X$  is a  $\sigma'$ -class (a  $\sigma$ -class resp.) iff  $X$  is the union (the intersection resp.) of a countable sequence of set-theoretically definable classes.

### § 1. $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -classes and $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -classes and their basic properties

1.0.0. A codable class  $\mathcal{M}$  is called a standard system iff the following holds:

(1)  $\forall \subseteq \mathcal{M}$

(2) Let  $\varphi(x)$  be a normal formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$ .  
Then  $\{x; \varphi(x)\} \in \mathcal{M}$ .

(3) Let  $X \in \mathcal{M}$  be a class such that  $0 \neq X \subseteq N$ . Then there exists the least element of  $X$ .

Evidently, the codable class  $Sd_{\forall}$  of all set-theoretically definable classes is a standard system. Moreover,  $Sd_{\forall} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$  holds for every standard system  $\mathcal{M}$ .

Throughout this paper let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote a standard system.

1.0.1. Proposition. (1) No proper semiset is an element of  $\mathcal{M}$ .

(2) Each axiom of  $GB_{fin}$  holds in the sense of  $\mathcal{M}$ .  
( $GB_{fin}$  denotes the theory obtained from  $GB$  by substituting the axiom of infinity by its negation.)

(3) Each class of  $\mathcal{M}$  is fully revealed.

Proof. (1) Let  $X \neq 0$  be a semiset of  $\mathcal{M}$ . We put  $A = \{f; f \text{ is a one-one mapping \& } \text{dom}(f) \in N \text{ \& } \text{rng}(f) \subseteq X\}$ . Clearly,  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  holds. We define  $B = \{\alpha; (\exists f \in A)(\text{dom}(f) = \alpha)\}$ . We have  $B \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $B$  is a semiset. Let  $\gamma$  be the greatest element of  $B$ . Thus, there is a one-one mapping  $f$  such that  $\text{dom}(f) = \gamma$  and  $\text{rng}(f) \subseteq X$ . Suppose that  $\text{rng}(f) \subseteq X$ . Let  $x \in X - \text{rng}(f)$ . Thus, the function  $f \cup \{\langle x, \gamma \rangle\}$  is an element of  $A$ , which is a contradiction. Consequently,  $X = \text{dom}(f)$  and  $X$  is a set.

(2) It follows from (1) that only the following proposition must be proved: If  $F \in \mathcal{M}$  is a function and  $u$  is a set then  $F''u$  is a set. Suppose that  $F \in \mathcal{M}$  is a function and  $u$  is a set. We put  $B = \{v \subseteq u; (\exists t)(F''v \subseteq t)\}$ . Clearly,  $B \in \mathcal{M}$  and consequently,  $B$  is a subset of  $P(u)$ . Let  $v$  be a  $\subseteq$ -maximal

element of B. We deduce from the maximality of  $v$  that  $v = u$ . Thus, there is a set  $t$  such that  $F^*u \subseteq t$ . Moreover,  $F^*u \in \mathcal{M}$  and, consequently,  $F^*u$  is a set.

(3) Let  $X$  be a class of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $S \subseteq X$  be a countable class. Then there is a function  $f$  such that  $f \wedge FN$  is a one-one mapping of  $FN$  on  $S$ . Put  $A = \{\alpha \in \text{dom}(f); f(\alpha) \in X\}$ . We have  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and, consequently,  $A$  is a set. Clearly,  $S \subseteq f^*A \subseteq X$ . We deduce from this that  $X$  is a revealed class. Thus each class of  $\mathcal{M}$  is revealed and the proposition (3) follows immediately from this.

1.0.2. A string is a relation  $R$  such that  $\text{dom}(R) \in N$ . A string  $R$  is called a  $\sigma$  ( $\sigma$  resp.)-string iff  $R^* \{\alpha\} \subseteq R^* \{\alpha+1\}$  ( $R^* \{\alpha+1\} \subseteq R^* \{\alpha\}$  resp.) holds for each  $\alpha+1 \in \text{dom}(R)$ . A  $\sigma$  ( $\sigma$  resp.)-string of a class  $X$  is a  $\sigma$  ( $\sigma$  resp.)-string  $R$  such that  $\bigcup \{R^* \{n\}; n \in FN\} = X$  ( $\bigcap \{R^* \{n\}; n \in FN\} = X$  resp.).

Let  $R$  be a string. We shall write  $R(\alpha)$  instead of  $R^* \{\alpha\}$ .

A class  $X$  is called  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class ( $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class resp.) iff there exists a string  $R \in \mathcal{M}$  such that  $X = \bigcup \{R(n); n \in FN\}$  ( $X = \bigcap \{R(n); n \in FN\}$  resp.).

The following is obvious:

- (a)  $X$  is a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class ( $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class resp.) iff there exists a  $\sigma$ -string ( $\sigma$ -string resp.)  $R$  of  $X$  and  $R \in \mathcal{M}$ .
- (b)  $X$  is a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class iff  $V - X$  is a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class.
- (c) Let  $X$  be a semiset.  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -class ( $\sigma$ -class resp.) iff  $X$  is a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class ( $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class resp.). (For the notion of the  $\sigma$ - ( $\sigma$ -resp.) class see 0.2.0.)

1.0.3. Proposition. (1) Each  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class is revealed.

(2) A  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -class iff  $X$  is a real class.

(3) A  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class  $X$  is a  $\sigma$ -class iff  $X$  is a real class.

**Proof.** (1) follows from the fact that each  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class is the intersection of a countable sequence of revealed classes. (2) The part "only if" follows from the fact that each  $\pi$ -class is real. The part "if" follows from (1) and from the following proposition: every real revealed class is a  $\pi$ -class. (3) follows immediately from (2).

**Remark.** For the notion of a real class and the facts used in the previous proof see [Č-V 1].

1.0.4. We shall write  $\sigma^{\circ}$  ( $\pi^{\circ}$  resp.) instead of the symbol  $\sigma^{Sd_V}$  ( $\pi^{Sd_V}$  resp.). Thus, a class  $X$  is a  $\sigma^{\circ}$  ( $\pi^{\circ}$  resp.)-class iff  $X$  is a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$  ( $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$  resp.)-class for each standard system  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $Sd_V^*$  be a revelation of  $Sd_V$  (see [S-V 2]). We have  $Sd_V \subseteq Sd_V^*$  and, for each sequence  $\{X_n; n \in FN\} \subseteq Sd_V^*$ , there is a relation  $R \in Sd_V$  with  $(\forall n)(R^*\{n\} = X_n)$  (see [S-V 2]). We deduce from this that each  $\sigma$  ( $\pi$  resp.)-class is a  $\sigma^{Sd_V^*}$  ( $\pi^{Sd_V^*}$  resp.)-class.

We shall prove that there is a  $\sigma$ -class which is not a  $\sigma^{\circ}$ -class. Let us recall that the following proposition holds: there is no relation  $R \in Sd_V$  such that  $(\forall Y \in Sd_0)(\exists y)(Y = R^*\{y\})$ . (See [S-V 2].) At first, we shall strengthen it.

1.0.5. **Proposition.** (1) There is no relation  $R$  such that (a)  $R$  is a  $\sigma^{\circ}$ -class, (b)  $(\forall Y \in Sd_0)(\exists y)(Y = R^*\{y\})$ .  
 (2) There is no relation  $R$  such that  
 (a)  $R$  is a  $\pi^{\circ}$ -class, (b)  $(\forall Y \in Sd_0)(\exists y)(Y = R^*\{y\})$ .

**Proof.** (1) Suppose that there is a relation  $R$  such that (a), (b) hold. Let  $\Phi(x, y, z)$  be a normal formula of the language  $FL_V$  such that  $\langle x, y \rangle \in R \equiv (\exists n)\Phi(x, y, n)$ . Let  $\{Y_n\}_{n \in FN}$  be a numbering of  $Sd_0$ . Let us choose, for each  $n \in FN$ , a set  $Y_n$  such that  $Y_n = R^*\{y_n\}$ . We have  $x \in Y_n \equiv (\exists n)\Phi(x, y_n, n)$ . We shall

prove that there is a  $m \in FN$  such that  $x \in Y_n \equiv (\exists \alpha \leq m)$   
 $\Phi(x, y_n, \alpha)$ . Suppose that  $(\forall m)(\exists x)(x \in Y_n \& (\forall \alpha \leq m)$   
 $\neg \Phi(x, y_n, \alpha))$ . Let  $H$  be a function on  $FN$  such that, for each  
 $m \in FN$ ,  $H(m) \in Y_n \& (\forall \alpha \leq m) \neg \Phi(H(m), y_n, \alpha)$  holds. Let  $h \supseteq H$   
be a function which is a set. Thus,  $(\forall m)(h(m) \in Y_n \&$   
 $\& (\forall \alpha \leq m) \neg \Phi(h(m), y_n, \alpha))$  holds. We deduce from this that  
there is a  $\gamma \in N - FN$ ,  $\gamma \in \text{dom}(h)$  and  $h(\gamma) \in Y_n \& (\forall \alpha \leq \gamma)$   
 $\neg \Phi(h(\gamma), y_n, \alpha)$ . Consequently,  $(\forall m) \neg \Phi(h(\gamma), y_n, m)$  holds.  
But this is a contradiction, because  $h(\gamma) \in Y_n$ . Thus,  
 $(\exists m)(\forall x)(x \in Y_n \rightarrow (\exists \alpha \leq m) \Phi(x, y_n, \alpha))$  holds and, finally,  
there is a  $m \in FN$  such that  $x \in Y_n \equiv (\exists \alpha \leq m) \Phi(x, y_n, \alpha)$ .

Let  $f$  be a function such that  $\text{dom}(f) \supseteq \{y_n\}_n$  and  $x \in Y_n \equiv$   
 $\equiv (\exists \alpha \leq f(y_n)) \Phi(x, y_n, \alpha)$  holds for each  $n \in FN$ . We define  
the relation  $S$  as follows:  $\langle x, y \rangle \in S \equiv (\exists \alpha \leq f(y)) \Phi(x, y, \alpha)$ .  
Obviously,  $S \in \text{Sd}_V$ . We deduce from the construction of  $S$  that  
 $(\forall Y \in \text{Sd}_0)(\exists y)(Y = S^* \{y\})$  holds, which is a contradiction.  
(2) follows from (1) immediately.

1.0.6. Proposition. Let  $\{Y_n\}_{n \in FN}$  be a numbering of  $\text{Sd}_0$   
and let  $A = \cup \{Y_n \times \{n\}; n \in FN\}$ . Then  $A$  is a  $\sigma$ -class which is  
not a  $\sigma^0$ -class.

Proof. Clearly,  $A$  is a  $\sigma$ -class. We have  $(\forall Y \in \text{Sd}_0)$   
 $(\exists y)(Y = A^* \{y\})$ . We deduce from the previous proposition  
that  $A$  is not a  $\sigma^0$ -class.

1.0.7. The equivalence  $\equiv$  on  $V$  is defined as follows:  
 $x \equiv y$  iff for each set-formula  $\varphi(z)$  in FL we have  $\varphi(x) \equiv$   
 $\equiv \varphi(y)$ .  $\equiv$  is an indiscernibility equivalence and each  
 $Y \in \text{Sd}_0$  is a clopen figure in the equivalence  $\equiv$ . (See [V].)

Proposition. The equivalence  $\equiv$  is not a  $\pi^0$ -class.

Proof. Suppose that  $\equiv$  is a  $\pi^0$ -class. Let  $\varphi(x, y, z)$



be a set-formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{Y}}$  satisfying:  $x \stackrel{\circ}{=} y \equiv (\forall n) \varphi(x, y, n)$ . We put  $\langle x, y \rangle \in S \equiv (\exists z \in y)(x \stackrel{\circ}{=} z)$ . We have  $\langle x, y \rangle \in S \equiv (\exists z \in y)(\forall n) \varphi(x, z, n) \equiv (\forall n)(\exists z \in y)(\forall \alpha \leq n) \varphi(x, z, \alpha)$  and, consequently,  $S$  is a  $\pi^0$ -class. The  $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$  is an indiscernibility equivalence. We deduce from this that for each closed figure  $Y$  exists a set  $y$  such that  $Y = S''\{y\}$ . Each class  $Y \in Sd_0$  is a closed figure in  $\stackrel{\circ}{=}$ . Thus,  $(\forall Y \in Sd_0)(\exists y)(Y = S''\{y\})$  holds, which is a contradiction. (See 1.0.5.)

## § 2. Approximations of $\sigma\mathcal{M}$ -classes and $\pi\mathcal{M}$ -classes

2.0.0. A formula  $\varphi$  of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$  is down-hereditary (up-hereditary resp.) in a variable  $Z$  iff the general closure of the following formula holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\forall X, Y)((X \subseteq Y \ \& \ \varphi(\frac{Y}{Z})) \rightarrow \varphi(\frac{X}{Z})) \\ & ((\forall X, Y)((Y \subseteq X \ \& \ \varphi(\frac{Y}{Z})) \rightarrow \varphi(\frac{X}{Z})) \text{ resp.} \end{aligned}$$

Let  $\varphi(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  be a formula of the language  $FL$  and let  $A$  be a constant denoting a class of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Writing  $\varphi^{\textcircled{A}}(X_1, \dots, X_k)$  we mean the formula  $\varphi(A-X_1, \dots, A-X_k)$ . Obviously, for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , the formula  $\varphi$  is down-hereditary (up-hereditary resp.) in the variable  $X_i$  iff  $\varphi^{\textcircled{A}}$  is up-hereditary (down-hereditary resp.) in the variable  $X_i$ .

Proposition. Let  $\varphi(Z)$  be a normal formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$  down (up resp.)-hereditary in the variable  $Z$ . Let  $R \in \mathcal{M}$  be a  $\sigma$ -string ( $\pi$ -string resp.) of  $Q$ . Suppose that  $\varphi(Q)$  holds. Then there is a  $n \in FN$  such that  $\varphi(R(n))$  holds.

Proof. 1. Let  $R$  be a  $\sigma$ -string of  $Q$  and let  $\text{dom}(Q) = \mathfrak{F}$ . We have  $(\forall \alpha \in \mathfrak{F} - FN) \varphi(R(\alpha))$ . Put  $B = \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{F}; \varphi(R(\alpha))\}$ . We deduce that  $B \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathfrak{F} - FN \subseteq B$ . Thus  $B \cap FN \neq \emptyset$  and, con-

sequently, there is a  $n \in B \cap FN$  such that  $\varphi(R(n))$  holds.

2. Let  $R$  be a  $\pi$ -string of  $Q$ . Let  $\langle x, \alpha \rangle \in S \equiv \langle x, \alpha \rangle \notin R$ . Then  $S \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $S$  is a  $\sigma$ -string of  $V-Q$ . We deduce from  $\varphi^{\text{V}}$  ( $V-Q$ ) and from 1. that there is a  $n \in FN$  such that  $\varphi^{\text{V}}$  ( $V-R(n)$ ) and, consequently,  $\varphi(R(n))$  holds.

We say that a formula  $\varphi$  of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$  is  $\langle X, Y \rangle$ -hereditary iff  $\varphi$  is down-hereditary in the variable  $X$  and up-hereditary in the variable  $Y$ . Evidently,  $\varphi$  is  $\langle X, Y \rangle$ -hereditary iff  $\varphi^{\text{A}}$  is  $\langle Y, X \rangle$ -hereditary.

2.0.1. Theorem. Let  $\varphi(X, Y)$  be a normal formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$  which is  $\langle X, Y \rangle$ -hereditary. Let  $Q$  be a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class and suppose  $\varphi(Q, Q)$ .

Then there is a  $\sigma$ -string  $R$  of  $Q$ ,  $R \in \mathcal{M}$ , such that the formula  $\varphi(R(\alpha), (\alpha+1))$  holds for each  $\alpha+1 \in \text{dom}(R)$ .

Proof. Let  $S$  be a  $\sigma$ -string of  $Q$ ,  $S \in \mathcal{M}$  and let  $\text{dom}(S) = \xi$ . We deduce from the previous proposition that  $(\forall m)(\exists n)(n > m \ \& \ \varphi(S(m), S(n)))$ . (\*)

Thus, there is a  $\mathcal{V} \subset N-FN$  with  $(\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{V})(\exists \beta \in \xi)(\beta > \alpha \ \& \ \varphi(S(\alpha), S(\beta)))$ . We put for each  $\alpha \in \mathcal{V}$ :  $G(\alpha) = \min\{\beta \in \xi; \beta > \alpha \ \& \ \varphi(S(\alpha), S(\beta))\}$ .

The  $G$  is a function,  $G: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \xi$ , and  $G \in \mathcal{M}$ . Thus,  $G$  is a set. We deduce from (\*) that  $G^{\text{N}}FN \subseteq FN$ . Let  $H$  be a function defined recursively on  $FN$  as follows:  $H(0) = 0$ ,  $H(n+1) = G(H(n))$ . Let  $h \supseteq H$  be a function. We have  $(\forall n)(h(n+1) = G(h(n)) \ \& \ h(n) \in \mathcal{V})$ . Thus there is a  $\alpha \in N-FN$  such that  $(\forall \alpha \in \mathcal{D})(h(\alpha+1) = G(h(\alpha)) \ \& \ h(\alpha) \in \mathcal{V})$ . We obtain from this that, for each  $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$ ,

$$\varphi(S(h(\alpha)), S(h(\alpha+1))) \quad (**)$$

holds. Put  $\langle x, \alpha \rangle \in R \equiv \alpha \in \mathcal{D} \ \& \ \langle x, h(\alpha) \rangle \in S$ .  $R$  is a  $\sigma$ -

string and  $R \in \mathcal{M}$ . We have  $G^*FN \subseteq FN$  and, consequently,  $h^*FN \subseteq FN$  holds. We deduce from this that  $R$  is a  $\sigma$ -string of  $Q$ . Finally, we deduce  $\varphi(R(\alpha), R(\alpha+1))$ , for each  $\alpha+1 \in \text{dom}(R)$ , from (\*\*).

2.0.2. Theorem. Let  $\varphi(X, Y)$  be a normal formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$  which is  $\langle X, Y \rangle$ -hereditary. Let  $Q$  be a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class such that  $\varphi(Q, Q)$  holds.

Then there is a  $\pi$ -string  $R$  of  $Q$ ,  $R \in \mathcal{M}$ , such that the formula  $\varphi(R(\alpha+1), R(\alpha))$  holds for each  $\alpha+1 \in \text{dom}(R)$ .

This follows from the previous theorem considering the class  $V-Q$  and the formula  $\varphi^{\textcircled{V}}(X, Y)$ .

2.1.0. Let  $k \in FN$ . Let, for each  $i \leq k$ ,  $R_i$  be a  $a(i)+1$ -ary relation,  $R_i \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $a(i) \in FN$ . We denote by  $\llbracket R_i \rrbracket_{i \leq k}(X, Y)$  the formula

$$R_0^*X^{a(0)} \subseteq Y \& \dots \& R_k^*X^{a(k)} \subseteq Y.$$

Obviously,  $\llbracket R_i \rrbracket_{i \leq k}(X, Y)$  is a normal formula of the language  $FL_{\mathcal{M}}$ , which is  $\langle X, Y \rangle$ -hereditary.

Proposition. Let  $k, R_i, i \leq k$ , be as above and let  $B \subseteq Q \subseteq A$  be classes such that  $B \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{M}$  and  $\llbracket R_i \rrbracket_{i \leq k}(Q, Q)$  holds.

(1) Let  $Q$  be a  $\sigma^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class. Then there exists a  $\sigma$ -string  $S$  of  $Q$  such that  $S \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $S(0) = B$ ,  $S(\text{dom}(S)-1) = A$  and  $\llbracket R_i \rrbracket_{i \leq k}(S(\alpha), S(\alpha+1))$  holds for each  $\alpha+1 \in \text{dom}(S)$ .

(2) Let  $Q$  be a  $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$ -class. Then there exists a  $\pi$ -string  $S$  of  $Q$  such that  $S \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $S(0) = A$ ,  $S(\text{dom}(S)-1) = B$  and  $\llbracket R_i \rrbracket_{i \leq k}(S(\alpha+1), S(\alpha))$  holds for each  $\alpha+1 \in \text{dom}(S)$ .

Proof. (1) Let  $\varphi(X, Y)$  designate the formula  $\llbracket R_i \rrbracket_{i \leq k}(X, Y) \& B \subseteq X \& Y \subseteq A$ . We deduce from 2.0.1 that there exist a number  $\xi \in N$  and a  $\sigma$ -string  $R$  of  $Q$  such that  $R \in \mathcal{M}$ ,

$\xi = \text{dom}(R)$  and  $\varphi(R(\alpha), R(\alpha+1))$  holds for each  $\alpha+1 \in \xi$ .  
 Let  $S$  be a relation with the following properties:  $\text{dom}(S) = \xi$ ,  
 $S^*\{0\} = B$ ,  $S^*\{\xi-1\} = A$  and, for each  $1 \leq \alpha < \xi-1$ ,  $S^*\{\alpha\} =$   
 $= R^*\{\alpha+1\}$ . The  $\mathcal{G}$ -string in question is the  $S$ . (2) follows  
 similarly as (1).

#### R e f e r e n c e s

- [Č-V 1] K. ČUDA and P. VOPĚNKA: Real and imaginary classes in the alternative set theory, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 20(1979), 639-653.
- [S-V 2] A. SOCHOR and P. VOPĚNKA: Revealmets, to appear in Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 21(1980).
- [V] P. VOPĚNKA: Mathematics in the alternative set theory, Teubner-Texte, Leipzig, 1979.

Matematický ústav  
 Universita Karlova  
 Sokolovská 83, 18600 Praha 8  
 Československo

(Oblatum 4.6. 1979)