

# Regularity of Successor Cardinals in Naproche

Steffen Frerix, Adrian De Lon, Marcel Schütz

2025

This is a formalization of a theorem of Felix Hausdorff stating that successor cardinals are always regular.

In lack of a formalization in Naproche of a proof of *Hessenberg's Theorem* [2], i.e. the fact that  $|X \times X| = |X|$  for every infinite set  $X$ , which is required by the subsequent proof of Hausdorff's Theorem, we postulate it as an axiom:

**Axiom (Hessenberg's Theorem).**  $|X \times X| = |X|$  for every infinite set  $X$ .

The following result appears in [1, p. 443], where Hausdorff mentions that the proof of the regularity of successor cardinals is “*ganz einfach*” (“*very simple*”) and can be skipped.

**Theorem (Hausdorff).** Let  $\kappa$  be a cardinal. Then  $\kappa^+$  is regular.

*Proof by contradiction.*

*Case  $\kappa$  is finite.*  $\square$

*Case  $\kappa$  is infinite.* Assume the contrary. Take a cofinal subset  $x$  of  $\kappa^+$  such that  $|x| \neq \kappa^+$ . Then  $|x| \leq \kappa$ . Take a surjective map  $f$  from  $\kappa$  onto  $x$  (by existence condition for surjections). Indeed  $x$  and  $\kappa$  are nonempty and  $|\kappa| = \kappa$ . Then  $f(\xi) \in \kappa^+$  for all  $\xi \in \kappa$ .

Let us show that for all  $z \in \kappa^+$  if  $z$  is nonempty then there exists a surjective map from  $\kappa$  onto  $z$ . Let  $z \in \kappa^+$ . Assume that  $z$  is nonempty.  $\kappa$  is nonempty. Hence the thesis (by existence condition for surjections). Indeed  $|\kappa| \geq |z|$ . End.

Define

$$g(z) := \begin{cases} \text{choose } h : \kappa \rightarrow z \text{ in } h & : z \text{ has an element} \\ \text{const}_{\kappa}^0 & : z \text{ has no element} \end{cases}$$

for  $z \in \kappa^+$ .

Let us show that for all  $\xi, \zeta \in \kappa$   $g(f(\xi))$  is a map such that  $\zeta \in \text{dom}(g(f(\xi)))$ . Let  $\xi, \zeta \in \kappa$ . If  $f(\xi)$  has an element then  $g(f(\xi))$  is a surjective map from  $\kappa$  onto  $f(\xi)$ . If  $f(\xi)$  has no element then  $g(f(\xi)) = \text{const}_{\kappa}^0$ . Hence  $\text{dom}(g(f(\xi))) = \kappa$ . Therefore  $\zeta \in \text{dom}(g(f(\xi)))$ . End.

[prover vampire] For all objects  $\xi, \zeta$  we have  $\xi, \zeta \in \kappa$  iff  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \kappa \times \kappa$ . Define  $h(\xi, \zeta) := g(f(\xi))(\zeta)$  for  $(\xi, \zeta) \in \kappa \times \kappa$ . [prover eprover]

Let us show that  $h$  is surjective onto  $\kappa^+$ .

Every element of  $\kappa^+$  is an element of  $h[\kappa \times \kappa]$ .

*Proof by contradiction.* Let  $n$  be an element of  $\kappa^+$ . Take an element  $\xi$  of  $\kappa$  such that  $n < f(\xi)$ . Take an element  $\zeta$  of  $\kappa$  such that  $g(f(\xi))(\zeta) = n$ . Indeed  $g(f(\xi))$  is a surjective map from  $\kappa$  onto  $f(\xi)$ . Then  $n = h(\xi, \zeta)$ .  $\square$

Every element of  $h[\kappa \times \kappa]$  is an element of  $\kappa^+$ .

*Proof by contradiction.* Let  $n$  be an element of  $h[\kappa \times \kappa]$ . We can take elements  $a, b$  of  $\kappa$  such that  $n = h(a, b)$ . Indeed  $h[\kappa \times \kappa] = \{h(a, b) \mid a, b \in \kappa\}$ . Indeed  $\kappa \times \kappa = \{(a, b) \mid a, b \in \kappa\}$ . Then  $n = g(f(a))(b)$ . Indeed  $(a, b) \in \kappa \times \kappa$  and  $h(a, b) = g(f(a))(b)$ .  $f(a)$  is an element of  $\kappa^+$ . Every element of  $f(a)$  is an element of  $\kappa^+$ .

*Case  $f(a)$  has an element.* Then  $g(f(a))$  is a surjective map from  $\kappa$  onto  $f(a)$ . Hence  $n \in f(a) \in \kappa^+$ . Thus  $n \in \kappa^+$ .  $\square$

*Case  $f(a)$  has no element.* Then  $g(f(a)) = \text{const}_{\kappa}^0$ . Hence  $n$  is the empty set. Thus  $n \in \kappa^+$ .  $\square$

$\square$

Hence  $\text{range}(h) = h[\kappa \times \kappa] = \kappa^+$ . End.

Therefore  $|\kappa^+| \leq |\kappa \times \kappa|$  (by existence condition for surjections). Indeed  $\kappa \times \kappa$  and  $\kappa^+$  are nonempty sets and  $h$  is a surjective map from  $\kappa \times \kappa$  to  $\kappa^+$ . Consequently  $\kappa^+ \leq \kappa$ . Contradiction.  $\square$

■

## References

- [1] Felix Hausdorff. “Grundzüge einer Theorie der geordneten Mengen”. In: *Mathematische Annalen* 65 (1908), pp. 435–505.
- [2] Gerhard Hessenberg. *Grundbegriffe der Mengenlehre*. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1906.

## Copyright

© Steffen Frerix (2018), Adrian De Lon (2021), Marcel Schütz (2024–2025).