

Generalized Von Neumann Universe and Non-Well-Founded Sets

Eugene Zhang

April 4, 2023

Abstract

In this paper, a generalized version of the von Neumann universe known as the total universe is proposed to formally introduce non-well-founded sets that include infinitons, semi-infinitons and quasi-infinitons in Russell's paradox. All three infinitons are part of infinitely generated sets that are generators of non-well-founded sets. The total universe combines the well-founded sets with the non-well-founded ones and turns out to be a model of ZF minus the axiom of regularity, which can be shown invalid in defining the well-founded sets. Also, the total universe is shown to be free of Russell's paradox.

Key Word: Non-well-founded sets; Infiniton; Semi-infiniton; Quasi-infiniton; Infinitely generated set; Limit of formulas; Rank; Axiom of regularity; Nullity; Russell's paradox; Total universe.

Contents

List of Figures	2
1 Preliminaries	2
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Problems in Von Neumann Universe	3
1.3 Correct Rank in Von Neumann Universe	4
1.4 Unpacking Operator and Nullity	5
1.5 Membership Dimension	6
2 Limit of Structures and Formulas	8
2.1 Limit in General Language	8
2.2 Limit in Language of Set Theory	13
3 Non-Well-Founded Sets	16
3.1 Introduction	16
3.2 Infinitely Generated Set	17
3.3 Infiniton	19
3.4 Semi-Infiniton	23
3.5 Quasi-Infiniton	28

4	Total Universe	32
4.1	Definitions	32
4.2	Rank in Total Universe	36
4.3	Set Theory for Total Universe	39
4.4	Solution to Russell's paradox	41
4.5	Spectrum of Power Set Operations	44
5	Conclusion	48
	References	49

List of Figures

1	Diagrams of infinitons and a set of infinitons.	22
2	Diagram of a semi-infiniton.	26
3	Diagram of a quasi-infiniton.	31
4	Diagram of the total universe.	43

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Introduction

The investigation of non-well-founded sets began with the work of Mirimanoff in 1917 [12]. A number of axiomatic systems of non-well-founded sets such as AFA (by Aczel, Forti and Honsell [1]), SAFA (by Scott), FAFA (by Finsler), and BAFA (by Boffa), have been proposed thereafter. These systems introduce non-well-founded sets by replacing the axiom of regularity with separate anti-foundation axioms. The main problem with these systems is that they lack precise mathematical descriptions for non-well-founded sets. As the result, non-well-founded sets are not rigorously defined and the exact process to generate them is unclear.

In this paper, we will present a model for precisely defining the non-well-founded sets based on the notion of limit of formulas and generating them by enlarging the von Neumann universe. First, we show that V is incomplete because it does not have limit ordinal ranks, a fact that is of fundamental importance because it implies that non-well-founded sets are necessarily existent and should be added to V as the limit ordinal ranks. Furthermore, limits of finite structures and formulas along with an algebraic system to handle the limit operations are given to provide enough mathematical power for describing non-well-founded sets. Consequently, the new complete universe of sets known as the total universe (4.1) can be shown to be a model of ZF minus the axiom of regularity and free of Russell's paradox. The axiom of regularity is invalid even in defining the well-founded sets (section 5). Finally, we show that the total universe can be generated from the full spectrum of power set operations.

1.2 Problems in Von Neumann Universe

The von Neumann universe (also known as the cumulative hierarchy) is well known as the class of hereditary well-founded sets and is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 V_0 &= \emptyset; \\
 V_\alpha &= \mathcal{P}(V_{\alpha-1}), & \alpha \text{ is any successor ordinal;} \\
 V_\alpha &= \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} V_\beta, & \alpha \text{ is any limit ordinal;} \\
 V &= \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} V_\alpha.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

The structure of any set S can be represented by a **tree**, in which S can be regarded as the **root** and all the objects in the transitive closure of S form the **nodes** of the tree [6]. A **branch** (or path) of the tree is a sequence of nodes connected by “ \in ” from the root to an end node known as a **terminal**. Clearly, the only terminal in V is \emptyset . A finite branch consists of a finite number of nodes, while an infinite branch contains an infinite number of nodes.

A **transfinite sequence** $\gamma_\alpha = \langle \gamma_\xi : \xi \leq \alpha \rangle$ is a function with an ordinal domain where α is its **length** [4]. A **\in -sequence** is a transfinite sequence γ_α that $\gamma_0 \in \dots \in \gamma_\xi \in \gamma_{\xi+1} \in \dots \in \gamma_\alpha$. Obviously, any branch of S in V can be represented by a \in -sequence like $\emptyset = \gamma_0 \in \dots \in \gamma_\alpha = S$. As the result, well-founded and non-well-founded sets can be defined upon \in -sequences as follows.

Definition 1.1 *Suppose S is a set (with \emptyset as the only terminal) and $\gamma_\alpha = \langle \gamma_\xi : \xi \leq \alpha \rangle$ is a \in -sequence in S . Then S is **well-founded (WF)** if any γ_α of S has $\alpha < \omega$. S is **non-well-founded (NWF)** if one γ_α of S has $\alpha \geq \omega$. If all γ_α of S have $\alpha \geq \omega$, S is **totally non-well-founded (TNWF)**.*

From definition 1.1, it follows easily that V consists of only well-founded sets.

Lemma 1.2 *V is well-founded and no set in V is non-well-founded.*¹

Proof. By definition 1.1, we only need to prove (by transfinite induction) that any \in -sequence in V is of finite length. First, any \in -sequence in V_1 is of finite length for $V_1 = \{\emptyset\}$. Suppose any \in -sequence $Z_\xi \in V_\beta$ has length $\xi < \omega$ for $\beta < \alpha$. If α is a successor ordinal and $Z_\xi \in V_{\alpha-1}$ has $\xi < \omega$, then $Z_{\xi+1}$ is a \in -sequence in V_α and $\xi + 1 < \omega$. If α is a limit ordinal, for any $X \in V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} V_\beta$, there is a $\gamma < \alpha$ that $X \in V_\gamma$. Since any \in -sequence $Z_\xi \in V_\gamma$ has $\xi < \omega$, so is X . Thus V is WF.

If $X \in V$ is NWF, X has a \in -sequence Z_ξ with length $\xi \geq \omega$, contradicting V being WF. ■

Rank in V is defined as follows.

¹In this paper, an existing theorem in set and model theory is listed as a proposition, while a (mainly) new result is proved as a theorem. Lemmas, corollaries, conclusions and axioms can have both new and existing results.

Definition 1.3 *The rank of X in V is the least α that $X \in V_{\alpha+1}$ (or equivalently $X \subset V_\alpha$).²*

This definition of rank appears to be originated by Mirimanoff [12], developed by Bernays [2], and given its current form by Tarski [18]. Nonetheless, it is inadequate for the following reasons. Rank in a universe of the sets is a function R mapping each set to a unique ordinal number and satisfies the property of monotonicity, i.e. for any $Y \in X$, $R(Y) < R(X)$, and also $R(\{X\}) = R(X) + 1$.

First, it is reasonable to assume that a set with one infinite branch (rather than infinite splittings) has the rank of a limit ordinal. For example, suppose $I_n = \underbrace{\{\dots\{\emptyset\}\dots\}}_n$. Then we have an infinite \in -sequence as: $\emptyset \in \{\emptyset\} \in \dots \in I_n \in \dots \in I_\omega$.³ By the monotonicity of R , we have

$$R(I_{n+1}) = R(\{I_n\}) = R(I_n) + 1 = R(\emptyset) + n + 1 \quad \text{and so} \quad R(I_\omega) = \omega$$

On the other hand, a WF set with infinite splittings like ω should not have a rank of a limit ordinal because all of its branches are of finite length. More specifically, even if for any $n \in \omega$, $R(n) < R(\omega)$, we can not conclude that $R(\omega) = \omega$ because $\omega + 1$ also qualifies.

Furthermore, it is natural to define the rank of a set as the first layer in V to contain the set. For example, $\{\{\emptyset\}\}$ should have the rank of 3 for it is in V_3 and not in V_2 . As the result, definition 1.3 is fallacious because it enforces all sets to be contained only in layers of successor ordinals and never actually involves layers of limit ordinals.

1.3 Correct Rank in Von Neumann Universe

From the previous discussion, we adopt a more natural and correct version of rank in V as follows.

Definition 1.4 *The **rank** of X in V is defined as the least α that $X \in V_\alpha$ and denoted as $R_V(X)$.*

Lemma 1.5 *No set in V has a rank of a limit ordinal.*

Proof. Suppose α is a limit ordinal and $R_V(X) = \alpha$. Then there is a $\gamma < \alpha$ that $X \in V_\gamma$ or $R_V(X) < \alpha$, contradiction. ■

Corollary 1.6 *For any von Neumann ordinal $\alpha \in V$, $R_V(\alpha) = \alpha + 1$.*

Proof. We prove by transfinite induction. First, since $\emptyset \in V_1$, $R_V(\mathbf{0}) = 1$. If α is a successor ordinal, suppose $R_V(\alpha) = \alpha + 1$, i.e. $\alpha \in V_{\alpha+1}$ and $\alpha \notin V_\alpha$. Then $\alpha + 1 = \alpha \cup \{\alpha\} \in \mathcal{P}(V_{\alpha+1}) = V_{\alpha+2}$. Also, $\alpha + 1 \notin V_{\alpha+1}$ for otherwise $\alpha + 1 \subset V_\alpha$, which means $\alpha \in V_\alpha$, contradiction. So $R_V(\alpha + 1) = \alpha + 2$.

If α is a limit ordinal, for any $\gamma < \alpha$, $\gamma \in V_{\gamma+1} \subset V_\alpha$, i.e. $\alpha \subset V_\alpha$ and $\alpha \in V_{\alpha+1}$. If $\alpha \in V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} V_\beta$, there is a $\gamma < \alpha$, $\alpha \in V_\gamma$, contradiction. Thus $R_V(\alpha) = \alpha + 1$. ■

²A good survey on rank in set theory is given in [8].

³ I_ω is called an infiniton as in definition 3.14.

Remark 1.7 *Corollary 1.6 shows that the rank of any ordinal in V is a successor ordinal, which is consistent with the fact that V contains only well-founded sets and no set in V has a rank of a limit ordinal.*

Next, we will introduce the notion of the unpacking operator that is important for the rest discussion in this paper.

1.4 Unpacking Operator and Nullity

Definition 1.8 *Suppose $G = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$. The **unpacking operator** $*G$ of G is defined as $\{*G\} = G$, i.e. $*G = a_1, a_2, \dots$.*

Remark 1.9 *Intuitively, the unpacking operator can be considered as removing the curly brackets of a set, and $*G$ as the collection of a_i without the curly brackets.*

Example 1.10 *Let $S = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, b_1, b_2, \dots\}$, $G_1 = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ and $G_2 = \{b_1, b_2, \dots\}$. Then $S = \{*G_1, *G_2\}$.*

The unpacking of the empty set $*\emptyset$ is of particular importance because it represents “nothing” or “nullity”, a philosophical term that denotes the general state of void or nonexistence. The empty set \emptyset is not “nothing” because it is a set with nothing inside it. This can be understood by viewing a set as a bag — an empty bag is still a bag. Unpacking the empty set, nonetheless, removes the empty bag, and thus there is nothing left, or only nullity exists. Since $\emptyset = \{*\emptyset\}$ and $\emptyset \subset S$, $*\emptyset$ is a member of every set. So we have the following axiom.

Axiom 1.11 *$*\emptyset$ is known as **nullity**. Suppose S is any set. Then*

- (i) $\emptyset \iff (\forall X \in \emptyset) (X = *\emptyset)$
- (ii) $\forall S (*\emptyset \in S)$
- (iii) $\forall X (X \in *\emptyset \implies X = *\emptyset)$
- (iv) $\forall S ((S, *\emptyset) = (*\emptyset, S) = *\emptyset)$

Remark 1.12 *The definition of \emptyset is changed from containing nothing to containing nullity as its only member. In general, if nothing satisfies a sentence in the axiom of comprehension, then the solution is nullity.*

Remark 1.13 *$*\emptyset$ is a special object that permeates in every set, but is not involved in the general set operations. Since every set contains $*\emptyset$, most conclusions in set theory remain unchanged.*

Lemma 1.14 $\{S, *\emptyset\} = \{S\}$

Proof. By axiom 1.11, for any X

$$X \in \{S\} \iff X = S \vee X = *\emptyset \iff X \in \{S, *\emptyset\} \quad \blacksquare$$

Lemma 1.14 means that $*\emptyset$ can be omitted in any set.

Corollary 1.15 $S \times \emptyset = \emptyset \times S = \emptyset$

Proof. For any $(x, y) \in S \times \emptyset$, by axiom 1.11(iv), $(x, y) = (x, *\emptyset) = *\emptyset$. So $S \times \emptyset = \emptyset$. The second part is proved similarly. \blacksquare

1.5 Membership Dimension

Definition 1.16 The *membership dimension* of S (with \emptyset as the only terminal) is the measure that is defined by the recursive function from S to a cardinal number, i.e. $D: S \rightarrow \mathcal{K}$ and

$$D(S) = \sup\{D(X): X \in S\} + 1 \quad (1.2)$$

Where $D(\emptyset) = 1$ for \emptyset is the terminal and $\emptyset = \{*\emptyset\}$ (axiom 1.11).

Remark 1.17 Membership dimension is based on cardinal numbers rather than ordinal ones because it measures the maximum number of curly brackets in a set.

Example 1.18 Suppose \mathbf{n} is a finite von Neumann ordinal.

- (i) $D(\mathbf{2}) = D(\{\emptyset, \{\emptyset\}\}) = 3$ ($D(\{\emptyset\}) = 2$ and $D(\emptyset) = 1$).
- (ii) $D(\mathbf{n}) = n + 1$.
- (iii) $D(\omega) = \aleph_0$ ($D(\omega) > n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$).

The notion of membership dimension gives a necessary condition on when a set can be a member of itself.

Theorem 1.19 Suppose S_n are sets of finite membership dimension.

- (i) $S_1 \in S_2 \implies D(S_1) < D(S_2)$
- (ii) $S_1 \in S_2 \wedge \dots \wedge S_{n-1} \in S_n \implies D(S_1) < D(S_n)$
- (iii) $\neg(S_1 \in S_2 \wedge \dots \wedge S_{n-1} \in S_n \wedge S_n \in S_1)$

Proof. (i) By (1.2), $D(S_2) \geq D(S_1) + 1 > D(S_1)$.

(ii) By (i) and induction.

(iii) If it is true, then by (i) and (ii), $D(S_n) < D(S_1)$ and $D(S_1) < D(S_n)$, which is contradiction. $n = 1$ reduces to the case that there is no S_1 that $S_1 \in S_1$. ■

Corollary 1.20 That a set is a member of itself or contains a vicious cycle happens only if it has the infinite membership dimension.

Proof. By theorem 1.19(iii). $n = 1$ reduces to the case that $S_1 \in S_1$ means $D(S_1) = \aleph_0$.

Note that the converse is not true. For example, $D(\omega) = \aleph_0$, but $\omega \notin \omega$ for ω is WF. ■

Membership dimension allows non-well-founded sets like infinitons to be defined intuitively as follows.⁴ An infiniton is a set that contains itself as the only member,⁵ i.e.

$$I = \underbrace{\{\dots\{\emptyset\}\dots\}}_{\aleph_0} = \underbrace{\{\{\dots\{\emptyset\}\dots\}\}}_{\aleph_0+1} = \left\{ \underbrace{\{\dots\{\emptyset\}\dots\}}_{\aleph_0} \right\} = \{I\} \quad (1.3)$$

⁴In later sections, we will give a rigorous treatment of these sets based on the notion of limit for finite structures.

⁵In some literature, it is known as a Quine atom.

Generally, a set that is a member of itself is known as a semi-infiniton that takes on the following form. Suppose $G = \{a_1, a_2, \dots\}$ and $a_k \in V$. Then

$$Z = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, Z\} = \{*G, Z\}^6$$

By replacing Z with itself infinite times, we have

$$Z = \underbrace{\{*G, \{*G, \dots \{*G, \emptyset\} \dots\}}_{\aleph_0} \quad (1.4)$$

Then (1.4) is the solution to $Z = \{*G, Z\}$ for

$$Z = \underbrace{\{*G, \{*G, \dots \{*G, \emptyset\} \dots\}}_{\aleph_0+1} = \{*G, \underbrace{\{*G, \dots \{*G, \emptyset\} \dots\}}_{\aleph_0}\} = \{*G, Z\}$$

An infiniton is a special case of a semi-infiniton because $Z = \{*G, Z\}$ reduces to $Z = \{Z\}$ if $G = \emptyset$ (lemma 1.14).

A set that contains a vicious cycle is called a quasi-infiniton and is illustrated as follows. Suppose

$$S_1 = \{*G_1, S\}, S_2 = \{*G_2, S_1\}, \dots, S_{n-1} = \{*G_{n-1}, S_{n-2}\}, S = \{*G_n, S_{n-1}\}$$

Then $S \in S_1, \dots, S_{n-2} \in S_{n-1}, S_{n-1} \in S$ form a vicious cycle. Let

$$S = \underbrace{\underbrace{\{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, \dots \{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, \emptyset\} \dots\}}\}}_n}_{\aleph_0} \quad (1.5)$$

Then S is the solution to $Q = \{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, Q\} \dots\}$ for

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \underbrace{\underbrace{\{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, \dots \{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, \emptyset\} \dots\}}\}}_n}_{\aleph_0+n}} \\ &= \underbrace{\{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, \underbrace{\{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, \dots \{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, \emptyset\} \dots\}}\}}_n}\} \dots\}}_{\aleph_0} \\ &= \underbrace{\{*G_n, \{*G_{n-1}, \dots, \{*G_1, S\} \dots\}}_n \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, generators of a quasi-infiniton form a finite cycle, and a quasi-infiniton (1.5) is reduced to a semi-infiniton (1.4) if all G_k ($1 \leq k \leq n$) are identical.

⁶*G is the unpacking operator as in definition 1.8.

2 Limit of Structures and Formulas

In this section, we will investigate limits of (finitely generated) structures and formulas which provide a rigorous mathematical foundation for understanding non-well-founded sets (3.2). The limit of finite structures is an infinite structure that can be described by an infinitely long formula of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega_1}$ involving countably many conjunctions, disjunctions and quantifiers. An infinitely long formula involving countably many quantifiers may be undecidable [5] but is always decidable in $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ with only a finite number of quantifiers [16]. First, we discuss the limit of structures in a general language of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$.

2.1 Limit in General Language

We begin with a brief review of some background knowledge in model theory. A (finitary) **formula** is a finite well-formed sequence of symbols from a given alphabet that is part of a formal language. A **sentence** is a formula that contains no free variables. A **theory** is a set of sentences in a first-order language \mathcal{L} that is closed under logical implication. A **model** of a theory T is a **structure** (a set along with relations, functions and constants) that satisfies the sentences of T . A **consistent theory** T is a theory in which there is no sentence φ that $T \vdash \varphi$ and $T \vdash \neg\varphi$. A **complete theory** T is a theory in which for any sentence φ , either $\varphi \in T$ or $\neg\varphi \in T$.

Furthermore, given a \mathcal{L} -structure \mathfrak{M} of a consistent theory T and a n -tuple $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathfrak{M}$, a set of formulas $\gamma(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of \mathcal{L} satisfied by a_1, \dots, a_n is a **n -type** of T . A **complete type** in T is a maximal consistent set $\Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of formulas in the variables x_1, \dots, x_n . Any non-complete type of T is called a **partial type**. A **type** of T refers to either a n -type, a complete type or a partial type in T . The theory of \mathfrak{M} (denoted as $\text{Th}(\mathfrak{M})$) is the set of the sentences satisfied by \mathfrak{M} . In a complete theory T , a formula φ is called **complete** in T if for every formula ϕ , $T \models \varphi \rightarrow \phi$ or $T \models \varphi \rightarrow \neg\phi$. A type $\Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is called an **isolated type** in T if, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, there is a complete formula φ that $T \models \varphi \rightarrow \gamma$ ([3] and [11]).

An **atomic theory** T is a theory in which every formula γ that is consistent with T can be derived from a complete formula φ in T , i.e. $T \models \varphi \rightarrow \gamma$. A \mathcal{L} -structure \mathfrak{A} is an **atomic structure** if every n -tuple $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathfrak{A}$ satisfies a complete formula in $\text{Th}(\mathfrak{A})$. Obviously, every type in an atomic theory is isolated. A \mathcal{L} -structure \mathfrak{M} is called **κ -saturated** if for all subsets $A \subset \mathfrak{M}$ of cardinality less than κ , \mathfrak{M} realizes all complete types over A . \mathfrak{M} is called **countably saturated** if it is \aleph_0 -saturated. A countable \mathcal{L} -structure \mathfrak{M} is **homogeneous** if any isomorphism between its two finite substructures can be extended to an automorphism of \mathfrak{M} . More precisely, for any two tuples $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\vec{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ in \mathfrak{M} that realize the same types, there is an automorphism of \mathfrak{M} taking \vec{a} to \vec{b} . An atomic or saturated structure is always homogeneous. ([3] and [19])

A **\aleph_0 -categorical theory** in \mathcal{L} has exactly one countable structure up to isomorphism. A **\aleph_0 -categorical structure** is a countable structure whose theory is \aleph_0 -categorical. We list the following theorems without proof. Proposition 2.3 states that a \aleph_0 -categorical structure is made up of only finitely many countable atomic structures. It is central to \aleph_0 -categorical theories and is essentially due to Engeler, Ryll-Nardzewski, Svenonius and Vaught.

Proposition 2.1 *Any atomic structure is homogeneous.*

Proposition 2.2 *Two countable homogeneous structures that realize the same types are isomorphic.*

Proposition 2.3 [3, Theorem 2.3.13] *Let T be a complete theory. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i) T is \aleph_0 -categorical.
- (ii) T has a structure that is both atomic and countably saturated.
- (iii) For each $n < \omega$, each type $\Gamma(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of T has a complete formula.
- (iv) For each $n < \omega$, T has only finitely many types in x_1, \dots, x_n .
- (v) For each $n < \omega$, there are only finitely many formulas $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ up to equivalence with respect to T .
- (vi) All structures of T are atomic.

Now we discuss the limit of structures and formulas in an infinitary language of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ for a \aleph_0 -categorical theory. First, we define the neighborhood of ω based on the cofinite topology.

Definition 2.4 *The **cofinite topology** on ω is defined as $\mathfrak{T} = \{y \subset \omega : y = \emptyset \vee \omega - y \text{ is finite}\}$. A **neighborhood of ω** (ω -neighborhood) \mathfrak{H} is a member of \mathfrak{T} , i.e. $\mathfrak{H} \in \mathfrak{T}$.*

Lemma 2.5 *\mathfrak{H} is a neighborhood of ω if and only if $\exists N \in \omega$ such that $\forall n > N, n \in \mathfrak{H}$.*

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{H} is a neighborhood of ω and for any $N \in \omega$, there is $n > N, n \notin \mathfrak{H}$. Then $\omega - \mathfrak{H}$ is not finite, contradicting definition 2.4. On the other hand, if there is a $N \in \omega$ such that for any $n > N, n \in \mathfrak{H}$, then $\omega - \mathfrak{H}$ is finite and $\mathfrak{H} \in \mathfrak{T}$. ■

Definition 2.6 *Suppose \mathcal{L} is an infinitary language of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ and T is a \aleph_0 -categorical theory of \mathcal{L} . Let ϕ_n be n -types in T and \mathfrak{M}_n be \mathcal{L} -structures that $\mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n$. If there exists a ω -neighborhood \mathfrak{H} that for any $k, n \in \mathfrak{H}$ ($k > n$), $\mathfrak{M}_k \models \phi_n$, then $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n) : \mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n \wedge n < \omega\}$ is known as a **homogeneous sequence of structures described by ϕ_n in T** .⁷*

Theorem 2.7 *Suppose T is a \aleph_0 -categorical theory of \mathcal{L} and $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n) : \mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n \wedge n < \omega\}$ is a homogeneous sequence of structures in T . Then there is a unique formula ϕ in \mathcal{L} (up to equivalence) and a unique countable atomic structure \mathfrak{M} (up to isomorphism) for $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n)\}$ such that $\mathfrak{M} \models \phi$. In addition, there is a $N \in \omega$ such that $\phi = \bigwedge_{N < n < \omega} \phi_n$ which is the complete formula of \mathfrak{M} .*

Proof. By lemma 2.5, $\exists N \in \omega$ such that $\forall k > n > N, \mathfrak{M}_k \models \phi_n$. Let $\Sigma = \{\phi_n : n > N\}$. Clearly, Σ is consistent and any finite subset of Σ has a model. So by the compactness theorem, Σ has a model. Since arbitrary large number of ϕ_n can be realized by \mathfrak{M}_k , Σ has an infinite model. Let

⁷In the rest discussion, we assume \mathcal{L} is an infinitary language of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$, T is a \aleph_0 -categorical theory of \mathcal{L} , ϕ_n and φ_n are formulas in T , \mathfrak{M}_n and \mathfrak{N}_n are \mathcal{L} -structures, and \mathfrak{H} is a neighborhood of ω unless further specified.

\mathfrak{M} be a countable structure that satisfies Σ . Then $\mathfrak{M} \models \bigwedge_{N < n < \omega} \phi_n = \phi$. Since Σ is in a type of T , by proposition 2.3(vi), \mathfrak{M} is a countable atomic structure. Since any ϕ_n can be derived from ϕ , ϕ is the complete formula of \mathfrak{M} .

Suppose \mathfrak{N} is another countable atomic structure satisfying Σ . By proposition 2.1, both \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{N} are homogeneous. And by proposition 2.2, $\mathfrak{M} \simeq \mathfrak{N}$. So \mathfrak{M} is unique. \blacksquare

Corollary 2.8 *Suppose in a sequence of structures $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n): \mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n \wedge n < \omega\}$ of a \aleph_0 -categorical theory T , there are finitely many homogeneous subsequences of structures $\{(\mathfrak{M}_{n_i}, \phi_{n_i}): \mathfrak{M}_{n_i} \models \phi_{n_i} \wedge n_i < \omega\}$. Then there is a unique formula $\tilde{\phi}_i$ in \mathcal{L} (up to equivalence) and a unique countable atomic structure $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_i$ (up to isomorphism) for each $\{(\mathfrak{M}_{n_i}, \phi_{n_i})\}$ such that $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_i \models \tilde{\phi}_i$. In addition, there is a $N_i \in \omega$ such that $\tilde{\phi}_i = \bigwedge_{N_i < n_i < \omega} \phi_{n_i}$ which is the complete formula of $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_i$.*

Proof. Let $\Sigma_i = \{\phi_{n_i}: n_i > N_i\}$. By the proof in theorem 2.7, Σ_i is consistent and belongs to a type of T . So by proposition 2.3, it is satisfied by a unique countable atomic structure $\tilde{\mathfrak{M}}_i$ described by a complete formula $\tilde{\phi}_i$. \blacksquare

From definition 2.6, theorem 2.7 and corollary 2.8, we have the following definitions.

Definition 2.9 *Suppose $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n): \mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n \wedge n < \omega\}$ is a homogeneous sequence of structures in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory. The unique countable atomic structure \mathfrak{M} (up to isomorphism) in $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n)\}$ is known as the **limit** of \mathfrak{M}_n and is denoted as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{M}$. The unique formula ϕ (up to equivalence) is known as the **limit** of ϕ_n and is denoted as $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n = \phi$. In both cases, we also say that the limit of ϕ_n or the limit of \mathfrak{M}_n is unique.*

Definition 2.10 *Suppose in a sequence of structures $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n): \mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n \wedge n < \omega\}$ in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory, there are finitely many homogeneous subsequences of structures $\{(\mathfrak{M}_{n_i}, \phi_{n_i}): \mathfrak{M}_{n_i} \models \phi_{n_i} \wedge n_i < \omega\}$. Then each $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_{n_i}$ is known as a **sublimit** of \mathfrak{M}_n , and each $\lim_{i \rightarrow \omega} \phi_{n_i}$ is known as a **sublimit** of ϕ_n . If some sublimits of \mathfrak{M}_n/ϕ_n are different, we say $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n / \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$ exist (but not unique).*

In the rest discussion, we will not distinguish “=” and “ \Leftrightarrow ” for formulas. So we have

Lemma 2.11 $\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \right) \Leftrightarrow \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \Leftrightarrow \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \right)$

Corollary 2.12 *Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n$ are unique. Then*

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi = \phi$
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_{n-p} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$ ($p < \omega$)
- (iii) $(\forall n \in \aleph) (\phi_n = \varphi_n) \implies \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \right)$

Proof. By theorem 2.7 and definition 2.9. \blacksquare

Corollary 2.13 *Suppose $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n$ are unique. Then*

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M} = \mathfrak{M}$
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_{n-p} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$ ($p < \omega$)
- (iii) $(\forall n \in \mathfrak{H})(\mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{N}_n) \implies \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right)$

Corollary 2.14 *Suppose $\mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n$ and for any $n \in \omega$, $\models \phi_{n+1} \rightarrow \phi_n$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{m \leq n} \phi_m = \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \phi_n$$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{H} = \omega$. By lemma 2.5, for any $1 \leq n < k < \omega$, $\models \phi_k \rightarrow \phi_n$. Since $\mathfrak{M}_k \models \phi_n$ for any $k > n \geq 1$, $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n)\}$ is a homogeneous sequence. Thus by theorem 2.7, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n = \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \phi_n$. Since for any $1 \leq m < n$, $\models \phi_n \rightarrow \phi_m$, $\bigwedge_{m \leq n} \phi_m \Leftrightarrow \phi_n$. So by theorem 2.7 again, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{m \leq n} \phi_m = \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \phi_n$. ■

In addition, the following axiom holds for the limit operations.

Axiom 2.15 *Suppose ϕ_n and φ_n are consistent, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n$ are unique in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory. Then*

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\phi_n \wedge \varphi_n)$ is unique and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\phi_n \wedge \varphi_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \wedge \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n$$

- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \neg \phi_n$ is unique and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \neg \phi_n = \neg \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$$

- (iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \exists x \phi_n$ is unique (x is a variable in ϕ_n), and

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \exists x \phi_n = \exists x \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$$

Lemma 2.16 *Suppose ϕ_n and φ_n are consistent, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n$ are unique in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory. Then*

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\phi_n \vee \varphi_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \vee \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n$
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\phi_n \implies \varphi_n) = \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \right)$
- (iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\phi_n \iff \varphi_n) = \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \right)$
- (iv) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \forall x \phi_n = \forall x \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$

Proof. (i) By axiom 2.15

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\phi_n \vee \varphi_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \neg (\neg \phi_n \wedge \neg \varphi_n) \\ &= \neg \left(\neg \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \wedge \neg \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \vee \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \end{aligned}$$

(ii) and (iii) follow from (i).

(iv) By axiom 2.15

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \forall x \phi_n &= \neg \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \exists x \neg \phi_n \\ &= \neg \exists x \neg \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \\ &= \forall x \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.17 Suppose $\mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n$ and for any $n \in \omega$, $\models \phi_{n-1} \rightarrow \phi_n$. Then ■

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigvee_{m \leq n} \phi_m = \bigvee_{n < \omega} \phi_n$$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{H} = \omega$. Then for any $n \in \mathfrak{H}$, $\models \neg \phi_n \rightarrow \neg \phi_{n-1}$. So by corollary 2.14

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \neg \phi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{m \leq n} \neg \phi_m = \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \neg \phi_n$$

Thus by axiom 2.15

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigvee_{m \leq n} \phi_m &= \neg \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{m \leq n} \neg \phi_m \\ &= \neg \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \neg \phi_n \\ &= \bigvee_{n < \omega} \phi_n \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.18 Suppose \mathfrak{M}_n are ascending \mathcal{L} -structures that $\mathfrak{M}_n \models \phi_n$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$. ■

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{M}_k \supset \mathfrak{M}_n$ for any $k > n$, $\mathfrak{M}_k \models \phi_n$, $\{(\mathfrak{M}_n, \phi_n)\}$ is a homogeneous sequence. So by theorem 2.7, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$ is unique. Also, since for any $1 \leq m < n$, $\models \phi_m \rightarrow \phi_n$, $\bigvee_{m \leq n} \phi_m \Leftrightarrow \phi_n$. Thus by corollary 2.17

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigvee_{m \leq n} \phi_m = \bigvee_{n < \omega} \phi_n$$

Since $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \models \bigvee_{n < \omega} \phi_n$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$. ■

Proposition 2.19 Suppose $\phi_n = \exists x \bigwedge_{m \leq n} (x > m)$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n = \exists x \bigwedge_{m < \omega} (x > m)$.

Proof. Let $\varphi_n = (x > n)$. Then $\forall n \in \omega, \models \varphi_{n+1} \rightarrow \varphi_n$. So it follows by corollary 2.14 and axiom 2.15. This confirms that there is an arbitrary large number in nonstandard number theory. ■

Now we give the limit of formula for the $\epsilon - N$ formula.

Corollary 2.20 Suppose $a_\omega = \langle a_m : m < \omega \rangle$ is a sequence in a separable space and

$$\varphi_n = \exists x \exists N_n \forall m (m > N_n \implies |a_m - x| < 1/n)$$

Then the limit of formula for $\lim_{m \rightarrow \omega} a_m = x$ is:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{p \leq n} \varphi_p = \exists x \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \exists N_n \forall m (m > N_n \implies |a_m - x| < 1/n)$$

Proof. For any $n \in \omega$ and any $m > N_n$, since $|a_m - x| < 1/(n+1) \implies |a_m - x| < 1/n$, $\models \varphi_{n+1} \rightarrow \varphi_n$ for any $n < \omega$. So it follows by corollary 2.14 and axiom 2.15. ■

Note that a \aleph_0 -categorical theory (or atomic theory) is absolutely necessary in the above definitions of limit and axiom 2.15 because of the following example.⁸ Suppose $I_0 = G_0$ and $I_{n+1} = \{I_n\}$ where $G_0 \neq \{G_0\}$. Let $\chi = \forall x (x \neq \{x\})$ and $\varphi_n = \phi_n \wedge \chi$ where ϕ_n is given in theorem 3.13(iii). Since $I_n \models \phi_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n$ is unique, by theorem 3.16(i), $I_\omega = \{I_\omega\}$. So $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n$ is unique but it must also satisfy χ , which is a contradiction. This can be avoided by the fact that $\text{Th}(I_n)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical (theorem 3.13(ii)). So by theorem 3.16(iv), I_ω is atomic and there is a complete formula φ_ω for $\text{Th}(I_\omega)$ such that $\chi \notin \text{Th}(I_\omega)$ for $\varphi_\omega \Rightarrow \neg \chi$.

2.2 Limit in Language of Set Theory

Next, we will study the limit of structures in the (infinitary) language of set theory $\mathcal{L}' = \{\in\}$.

Axiom 2.21 Suppose \mathfrak{M}_n are \mathcal{L}' -structures in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$ is unique. Then the atomic formula of \mathcal{L}' is:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{A} \in \mathfrak{M}_n) \iff \left(\mathfrak{A} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right)$$

All formulas of \mathcal{L}' involving the limit operations are formed recursively based upon the atomic formula above satisfying axiom 2.15.

Theorem 2.22 Suppose \mathfrak{M}_n and \mathfrak{N}_n are \mathcal{L}' -structures in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n$ are unique.⁹

⁸This example is suggested by Martin Goldstern.

⁹In the rest of discussion of this section, we assume \mathfrak{M}_n and \mathfrak{N}_n are \mathcal{L}' -structures in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n$ are unique unless further specified.

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n \cup \mathfrak{N}_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \cup \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n$
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n \cap \mathfrak{N}_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \cap \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n$
- (iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n - \mathfrak{N}_n) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n - \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n$

Proof. We only prove (i). By axiom 2.21 and lemma 2.16

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall \mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n \cup \mathfrak{N}_n) &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\forall \mathfrak{B} \in (\mathfrak{M}_n \cup \mathfrak{N}_n)) \\
&\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \forall \mathfrak{B} (\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{M}_n \vee \mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{N}_n) \\
&\iff \forall \mathfrak{B} \left(\mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \vee \mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right) \\
&\iff \forall \mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \cup \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.23 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{A}) \iff \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{A} \right)$ ■

Proof. By axioms 2.21 and lemma 2.16

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{A}) &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \forall \mathfrak{B} (\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{M}_n \iff \mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{A}) \\
&\iff \forall \mathfrak{B} \left(\mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \iff \mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{A} \right) \\
&\iff \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{A} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.24 ■

- (i) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{N}_n) \iff \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right)$
- (ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n \in \mathfrak{N}_n) \iff \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right)$

Proof. (i) is proved similar to theorem 2.23.

(ii) By theorem 2.23

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\mathfrak{M}_n \in \mathfrak{N}_n) &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \exists \mathfrak{Z} (\mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{Z} \wedge \mathfrak{Z} \in \mathfrak{N}_n) \\
&\iff \exists \mathfrak{Z} \left(\left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{Z} \right) \wedge \left(\mathfrak{Z} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right) \right) \\
&\iff \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.25 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \{\mathfrak{M}_n\} = \{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \}$ ■

Proof. By theorem 2.23

$$\begin{aligned}
\forall \mathfrak{B} \left(\mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \{\mathfrak{M}_n\} \right) &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \forall \mathfrak{B} (\mathfrak{B} \in \{\mathfrak{M}_n\}) \\
&\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \forall \mathfrak{B} (\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{M}_n) \\
&\iff \forall \mathfrak{B} \left(\mathfrak{B} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) \\
&\iff \forall \mathfrak{B} \left(\mathfrak{B} \in \left\{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right\} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.26 Suppose ϕ_n are \mathcal{L}' -formulas in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory. ■

$$(i) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\forall \mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{M}_n) \phi_n \iff \left(\forall \mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$$

$$(ii) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\exists \mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{M}_n) \phi_n \iff \left(\exists \mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$$

Proof. We only prove (i) and (ii) follows easily.

(i) By lemma 2.16

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\forall \mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{M}_n) \phi_n &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \forall \mathfrak{B} (\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{M}_n \implies \phi_n) \\
&\iff \forall \mathfrak{B} \left(\mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \implies \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \right) \\
&\iff \left(\forall \mathfrak{B} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n
\end{aligned}$$

Corollary 2.27 $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\exists \mathfrak{M}_n \in \mathfrak{N}_n) \phi_n \iff \left(\exists \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n$ ■

Proof. By corollary 2.24 and theorem 2.23

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (\exists \mathfrak{M}_n \in \mathfrak{N}_n) \phi_n &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \exists \mathfrak{Z} (\mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{Z} \wedge \mathfrak{Z} \in \mathfrak{N}_n \wedge \phi_n) \\
&\iff \exists \mathfrak{Z} \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \mathfrak{Z} \wedge \mathfrak{Z} \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \wedge \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n \right) \\
&\iff \left(\exists \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{N}_n \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n
\end{aligned}$$

Lastly, we show that the theory of dense linear order without endpoints can be obtained through the limit of formulas. ■

Corollary 2.28 Suppose T is the theory of DLO without endpoints and $\mathfrak{M}_n = \bigcup_{1 \leq j < n} \left(\mathbb{Z} + \frac{j}{n} \right)$.

Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \mathbb{Q}$ and $T = Th(\mathbb{Q})$.

Proof. Suppose $\varphi_n, \phi_n, \delta_n$ are sentences specifying the properties of linear ordering, a dense subset and set without endpoints for \mathfrak{M}_n . Then

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_n &\iff (\forall x, y, z \in \mathfrak{M}_n) (x \leq x \wedge (x \leq y \wedge y \leq x \implies x = y) \wedge (x \leq y \wedge y \leq z \implies x \leq z)) \\ \phi_n &\iff (\forall x, y \in \mathfrak{M}_n) (x < y \implies (\exists z \in \mathfrak{M}_l) (l > n \wedge x < z < y)) \\ \delta_n &\iff (\forall x \in \mathfrak{M}_n) ((\exists y \in \mathfrak{M}_n) (y < x) \wedge (\exists y \in \mathfrak{M}_n) (x < y))\end{aligned}$$

For any $x, y \in \mathfrak{M}_n$ ($x < y$), set $N_n = 2n$. Then $\forall k > N_n, \exists z \in \mathfrak{M}_k$ that $x < z < y$, i.e. $\mathfrak{M}_k \models \phi_n$. Since $\mathbb{Z} \models \varphi_n \wedge \delta_n$, $\mathfrak{M}_k \models \varphi_n \wedge \phi_n \wedge \delta_n$. So $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n$ is unique. By corollary 2.26

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n &\iff \left(\forall x, y, z \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) (x \leq x \wedge (x \leq y \wedge y \leq x \implies x = y) \wedge (x \leq y \wedge y \leq z \implies x \leq z)) \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n &\iff \left(\forall x, y \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) \left(x < y \implies \left(\exists z \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) (x < z < y) \right) \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \delta_n &\iff \left(\forall x \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) \left(\left(\exists y \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) (y < x) \wedge \left(\exists y \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n \right) (x < y) \right)\end{aligned}$$

Since T is \aleph_0 -categorical and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n, \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \phi_n, \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \delta_n$ are axioms of $\text{Th}(\mathbb{Q})$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathfrak{M}_n = \mathbb{Q}$ and $T = \text{Th}(\mathbb{Q})$. \blacksquare

3 Non-Well-Founded Sets

3.1 Introduction

In this section, we will study infinitely generated sets and three of their types known as infinitons, semi-infinitons and quasi-infinitons. First, let's review existing theories of non-well-founded sets.

The investigation of non-well-founded sets was initiated by Mirimanoff in 1917 [12], in which he formulated the distinction between well-founded and non-well-founded sets. A number of axiomatic systems of non-well-founded sets have been proposed thereafter. Since the Zermelo–Fraenkel set theory bans \in -sequences of infinite length by the axiom of regularity¹⁰ (also known as the axiom of foundation), most of these systems incorporate non-well-founded sets by replacing the axiom of regularity with distinct anti-foundation axioms and are essentially models of ZF minus the axiom of regularity. A notable exception is New Foundations by Quine [13] that allows non-well-founded sets without a specific axiom and avoids Russell's paradox by permitting only stratified formulas.

There are mainly four anti-foundation axioms by far — AFA (by Aczel, Forti and Honsell [1]), SAFA (by Scott), FAFA (by Finsler), and BAFA (by Boffa). Each of them defines a different notion of equality for non-well-founded sets. For example, AFA bases hypersets (including non-well-founded sets) on accessible pointed graphs (APG) that two hypersets are equal if and only if they can be pictured by the same APG. In the universe of AFA, a Quine atom (called infiniton in this paper) is shown to be existent and unique. The anti-foundation axioms of AFA, SAFA, FAFA and BAFA specify an increasing sequence of universes over the von Neumann universe, i.e. $V \subset A \subset S \subset F \subset B$. In the universe of BAFA which is the largest of the four, the Quine atoms form a proper class.

¹⁰This is actually fallacious because the axiom of regularity can also hold for many non-well-founded sets. See section 5.

The main problem of the above axiomatic systems, however, is that they lack precise mathematical descriptions for non-well-founded sets. For instance, a non-well-founded set such as a Quine atom in AFA is an APG that can be unfolded into an infinite tree. As we learn later, a tree with an infinite branch is a countable structure that must be handled by the limit of finite structures and formulas. Consequently, AFA only describes countable structures intuitively and does not provide enough mathematical rigor for depicting their structures and operations.

Furthermore, there have been efforts to introduce non-well-founded sets by enlarging the von Neumann universe (through removing the axiom of regularity). For examples, in [15], V is modified through the iterative conception of a set that includes some non-well-founded sets; in [20], V is expanded through the process of bisimulation. However, these attempts are inadequate because they fail to identify exactly why V needs be enlarged, as well as precisely how the non-well-founded sets are generated.

In this paper, we will present a new way to generate non-well-founded sets by enlarging the von Neumann universe along with the precise reason why V needs be enlarged as well as the exact process to generate these sets. First, we can see that V is incomplete because it does not have the limit ordinal ranks (lemma 1.5). This fact is of fundamental importance because it implies that non-well-founded sets are necessarily existent and should take on the limit ordinal ranks in a complete universe of sets.¹¹ Then non-well-founded sets are added to V as infinitely generated sets with limit ordinal ranks to form the total universe (4.1). Furthermore, limits of finite structures and formulas discussed in the previous section can provide rigorous analysis for three types of infinitely generated sets as infinitons, semi-infinitons and quasi-infinitons that appear in Russell's paradox. Consequently, the total universe is a model of ZF minus the axiom of regularity and free of Russell's paradox.

3.2 Infinitely Generated Set

An infinitely generated set is a generator of non-well-founded sets and contains only one infinite branch. It is the limit of well-founded sets known as finitely generated sets. As discussed in a previous section, an infinitely generated set is an infinite structure that is (generally) described by an infinitely long formula of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega_1}$ involving countably many quantifiers. A $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega_1}$ formula may be undecidable but is always decidable in a language of finitely many quantifiers $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$ ([5] and [16]). First, we introduce the notion of a finitely generated set.

Definition 3.1 *Suppose $G_k \in V_\omega$ ($0 \leq k \leq n$). A **finitely generated set** is a finite \mathcal{L}' -structure that is defined as:*

$$H_n(G_n, \dots, G_0) = \{ *G_n, \{ *G_{n-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, G_0 \} \dots \} \}^{12} \quad (3.1)$$

Where G_n ($1 \leq k \leq n$) are **principal generators** and G_0 is a **base generator** of H_n . It can also be defined recursively as:

$$H_n(G_n, \dots, G_0) = \{ *G_n, H_{n-1}(G_{n-1}, \dots, G_0) \}$$

¹¹More precisely, only generators of non-well-founded sets known as infinitely generated sets take on the rank of limit ordinals in the total universe. However, (many) non-well-founded sets can have the rank of successor ordinals.

¹² $*G$ is the unpacking operator as in definition 1.8.

An infinitely generated set is defined as the limit (definition 2.9) of finitely generated sets in V_ω . In a later section, we will extend it to well-founded sets of higher ranks in the total universe.

Definition 3.2 *Suppose H_n is defined in (3.1) and $\mathcal{G} = \{G_n: G_n \in V_\omega, n < \omega\}$. An **infinitely generated set (IGS)** (at ω) is defined as:*

$$H_\omega(\mathcal{G}) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} H_n(G_n, \dots, G_0) \quad (3.2)$$

Where $G_n (n \geq 1)$ are **principal generators** and G_0 is a **base generator** of H_ω .

Remark 3.3 *Each IGS has one infinite branch. A non-well-founded set with multiple infinite branches can be formed from IGS through power set operations. So IGS are generators of the non-well-founded sets.*

From definition 2.9, we can see that the limit of finitely generated sets exists if H_n is a homogeneous sequence in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory. As the result, it is essential to find out conditions for $\text{Th}(H_n)$ to be \aleph_0 -categorical and homogeneous. First, let's review more background knowledge in model theory.

A countable \mathcal{L} -structure \mathfrak{M} is **homogeneous** if any isomorphism between its two finite substructures can be extended to an automorphism of \mathfrak{M} . A first-order theory T has **quantifier elimination** if, for every formula $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ there is a quantifier-free formula $\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that $T \vdash \forall x_1 \dots \forall x_n (\varphi(\bar{x}) \leftrightarrow \phi(\bar{x}))$ [10]. The **skeleton** (or **age**) of a countable \mathcal{L} -structure \mathfrak{M} is the class of all finite \mathcal{L} -structures, each of which is isomorphic to a substructure of \mathfrak{M} . An **amalgamation class** (or **Fraisse class**) is a class of finite \mathcal{L} -structures with the hereditary, the joint embedding and the amalgamation properties ([10]). We summarize the above in the following propositions without proof.

Proposition 3.4 [10, Corollary 3.1.3] *Let \mathfrak{M} be a countable \mathcal{L} -structure which is homogeneous in a finite relational language. Then $\text{Th}(\mathfrak{M})$ is \aleph_0 -categorical.*

Proposition 3.5 [10, Proposition 3.1.6] *Let \mathfrak{M} be a \aleph_0 -categorical structure in a relational language. Then \mathfrak{M} is homogeneous if and only if $\text{Th}(\mathfrak{M})$ has quantifier elimination.*

Proposition 3.6 *A countable class of \mathcal{L} -structures is an amalgamation class if and only if it is the skeleton of a countable homogeneous \mathcal{L} -structure \mathfrak{M} . The amalgamation class is unique and is the Fraisse limit of \mathfrak{M} .*

Now we apply the above results to study the limit of H_n in the language of set theory $\mathcal{L}' = \{\in\}$. First, we need the notion of an amalgamation class in V_ω .

Definition 3.7 *An **amalgamation class** \mathcal{K} of V_ω is a collection of finitely generated sets in V_ω that satisfies the following properties.*

- (i) (**Hereditiy**) *If $H \in \mathcal{K}$, then any J that is isomorphic to a finitely generated subset of H is in \mathcal{K} .*

- (ii) (**Joint embedding**) If $H_1, H_2 \in \mathcal{K}$, then there is a $J \in \mathcal{K}$ and embeddings $f: H_1 \rightarrow J$ and $g: H_2 \rightarrow J$.
- (iii) (**Amalgamation**) If $H_1, H_2, J_1 \in \mathcal{K}$ and embeddings $f_0: H_1 \rightarrow H_2$ and $f_1: H_1 \rightarrow J_1$, then there is a $J_2 \in \mathcal{K}$ and embeddings $g_0: H_2 \rightarrow J_2$ and $g_1: J_1 \rightarrow J_2$ with $g_0 \circ f_0 = g_1 \circ f_1$.

Lemma 3.8 Suppose H_n is defined in (3.1) and $\mathcal{G} = \{G_n: G_n \in V_\omega, n < \omega\}$. If $\{H_n: n < \omega\}$ is an amalgamation class, then $\text{Th}(H_n)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical.

Proof. Since H_n is the only (isomorphic) copy of finite \mathcal{L}' -structures (finitely generated sets) of rank n , its skeleton is $\{H_n: n < \omega\}$. By proposition 3.6, $\{H_n\}$ is homogeneous. So by proposition 3.4, $\text{Th}(H_n)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical. ■

Corollary 3.9 Suppose H_n is an amalgamation class.

- (i) If H_n is a homogeneous sequence, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} H_n$ is unique.
- (ii) If H_n consists only of finitely many homogeneous subsequences, then there are finitely many sublimits for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} H_n$.

Proof. By lemma 3.8, definition 2.9 and 2.10. ■

The axiom of extensionality for infinitely generated sets is as follows.

Axiom 3.10 Suppose $H_\omega(\mathcal{G}_1)$ and $H_\omega(\mathcal{G}_2)$ are unique where $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{G_n^1: G_n^1 \in V_\omega, n < \omega\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{G_n^2: G_n^2 \in V_\omega, n < \omega\}$. Then

$$(\forall n < \omega) (G_n^1 = G_n^2) \implies H_\omega(\mathcal{G}_1) = H_\omega(\mathcal{G}_2)$$

The following concept is significant for the rest discussion.

Definition 3.11 Suppose $H_{\omega+\gamma} = \{*G_{\omega+\gamma}, H_{\omega+\gamma-1}\}$ where $G_{\omega+\gamma} \in V_\omega$ ($\gamma \geq 1$). If for any $\alpha > \omega$, there is a (successor ordinal) $\beta > \alpha$ that $H_\beta = H_\omega$, then H_ω is called ω -**invariant**.

Remark 3.12 Generally, an IGS does not have an immediate member, i.e. there is no $z \in H_\omega$. The significance of ω -invariance is that a ω -invariant set always has an immediate member. For example, if H_ω is ω -invariant, i.e. there is a $\beta > \omega$ that $H_\beta = H_\omega$, then $H_{\beta-1} \in H_\beta = H_\omega$.

Next, we will study three types of infinitely generated sets that are fundamental in Russell's paradox.

3.3 Infiniton

An infiniton is a set that contains itself as the only member, i.e. $I = \{I\}$, a fact that will be proved rigorously next.

Theorem 3.13 Suppose for each $n < \omega$, I_n is a finitely generated set and $I_n = \{I_{n-1}\}$ with $I_0 = G_0 \in V_\omega$. Then

$$(i) \quad I_n = \underbrace{\{\cdots\{G_0\}\cdots\}}_n.$$

(ii) $Th(I_n)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical and has quantifier elimination.

(iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n$ is unique.

Proof. (i) follows easily by replacing I_n recursively n times.

(ii) For any $i, j < \omega$, suppose I_i is mapped to I_j . Since this can be extended to an automorphism of I_n , $\{I_n : n < \omega\}$ is homogeneous. So by proposition 3.4 and 3.5, $Th(I_n)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical and has quantifier elimination.

(iii) Suppose $\phi_n(S)$ means there exists a unique \in -sequence of length n in S , i.e.

$$\phi_n(S) \iff \left((Y_n = S) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \exists! Y_j \exists! Y_{j-1} (Y_{j-1} \in Y_j) \right)^{13}$$

Clearly, for any $n < \omega$, $I_n \models \phi_n$. Furthermore, for any $n < \omega$ and any $k > n$, $I_k \models \phi_n$. So I_n is a homogeneous sequence. By (ii) and definition 2.9, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n$ is unique. \blacksquare

Definition 3.14 In theorem 3.13, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n$ is known as the **infiniton** generated by G_0 and is denoted as:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n = I_\omega = \underbrace{\{\cdots\{G_0\}\cdots\}}_{\aleph_0} = \{G_0\}_{\mathcal{I}}$$

Where G_0 is a **base generator** of I_ω .

Definition 3.15 $S|_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\{G_0\}_{\mathcal{I}} : G_0 \in S\}$ is known as the **set of the infinitons** from S .

Theorem 3.16 Suppose for each $n < \omega$, $I_n = \{I_{n-1}\}$ and $I_0 = G_0 \in V_\omega$. Then¹⁴

$$(i) \quad I_\omega = \{I_\omega\}.$$

(ii) I_ω is ω -invariant.

(iii) A type of I_ω is that there exists a unique \in -sequence of length ω in I_ω .

(iv) I_ω is atomic and there is a complete formula for $Th(I_\omega)$.

Proof. (i) By theorem 3.13, I_ω is unique. So by corollary 2.13 and 2.25

$$I_\omega = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \{I_{n-1}\} = \left\{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_{n-1} \right\} = \{I_\omega\}$$

¹³The symbol $\exists!$ means there exists only one.

¹⁴In the rest discussion, I or I_ω is presumed to be an infinton generated from G_0 unless further specified.

(ii) Obviously, for any α that $\omega < \alpha < \omega^2$

$$I_\alpha = \{I_{\alpha-1}\} = \cdots = \underbrace{\{\cdots \{I_\omega\} \cdots\}}_{\alpha-\omega} = I_\omega$$

Then it follows by transfinite induction that for any α , $I_\alpha = I_\omega$.

(iii) Let $\gamma_n = \langle I_j : j \leq n \rangle$ be the unique \in -sequence of length n in I_n . Then I_n satisfies

$$\varphi_n \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \exists! I_j \exists! I_{j-1} (I_{j-1} \in I_j) \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n-1} \exists! I_j \exists! I_{j-1} (I_{j-1} \in I_j) \wedge \exists! I_n \exists! I_{n-1} (I_{n-1} \in I_n)$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n = I_\omega$, by axiom 2.15, corollary 2.14 and 2.27

$$\varphi_\omega \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \varphi_n \iff \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \exists! I_n \exists! I_{n-1} (I_{n-1} \in I_n) \wedge \exists! I_\omega (I_\omega \in I_\omega)$$

By theorem 2.7, $I_\omega \models \varphi_\omega$ where φ_ω describes $\gamma_\omega = \langle I_n : n \leq \omega \rangle$, the unique \in -sequence of length ω in I_ω .

(iv) Since $\text{Th}(I_\omega)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical, by proposition 2.3, I_ω is atomic and φ_ω is a complete formula since any tuple of I_0, \dots, I_n satisfies φ_ω . Furthermore, any (finite) type of $\text{Th}(I_\omega)$ can be derived from φ_ω . ■

Corollary 3.17 Suppose $I'_0 = \underbrace{\{\cdots \{G_0\} \cdots\}}_k$ and $I'_n = \{I'_{n-1}\}$ for each $n < \omega$. Then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I'_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n$.

Proof. Since $I_n = \underbrace{\{\cdots \{G_0\} \cdots\}}_n$, $I'_n = I_{n+k}$. So it follows by corollary 2.13. ■

Remark 3.18 Corollary 3.17 shows that different base generators could generate the same infiniton. By choosing the one with the least rank, an infiniton is unique to its base generator.

Definition 3.19 The **base generator** G_0 of an infiniton I_ω is the one with the least rank (in V_ω).

Corollary 3.20 2 infinitons are identical if and only if their base generators are the same.

Proof. Suppose $I_n = \underbrace{\{\cdots \{G_0\} \cdots\}}_n$ and $I'_n = \underbrace{\{\cdots \{G'_0\} \cdots\}}_n$. If $G_0 = G'_0$, then $I_n = I'_n$ for any $n < \omega$. So by corollary 2.13, $I_\omega = I'_\omega$. Conversely, by theorem 3.16, if $I_\omega = I'_\omega$, then I_ω and I'_ω have the same \in -sequence of length ω . Thus by definition 3.19, $G_0 = G'_0$. ■

Corollary 3.21 Suppose I is an infiniton and $S|_{\mathcal{I}}$ a set of infinitons.

(i) $I \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) $D(I) = D(S|_{\mathcal{I}}) = \aleph_0$.

(iii) Any infiniton and set of infinitons are TNWF.

(iv) $I \notin V$.

Proof. (i) Since $I \in I$ and $\emptyset \notin \emptyset$, $I \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) If $D(I) < \aleph_0$, then by (1.2), $D(I) < D(\{I\}) = D(I)$, contradiction. And by definition 3.15, $D(S|_I) \geq D(I) = \aleph_0$.

(iii) By definition 1.1, 3.14 and 3.15.

(iv) By lemma 1.2 and (iii). ■

The tree structures for infinitons and a set of infinitons are shown in Figure 1. Intuitively, any infiniton consists of one infinite (broken) branch, and all branches of a set of infinitons are infinite.




Figure 1: Diagrams of infinitons and a set of infinitons.

Theorem 3.22

- (i) $S_1 \subset S_2 \implies S_1|_I \subset S_2|_I$
- (ii) $(S_1 \cup S_2)|_I = S_1|_I \cup S_2|_I$
- (iii) $(S_1 \cap S_2)|_I \subset S_1|_I \cap S_2|_I$
- (iv) $S_1|_I - S_2|_I \subset (S_1 - S_2)|_I$
- (v) $\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha \right) \Big|_I = \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_I$

Proof. (i) is obvious.

(ii) “ \supset ” follows from (i) for $(S_1 \cup S_2)|_{\mathcal{I}} \supset S_1|_{\mathcal{I}}$ and $(S_1 \cup S_2)|_{\mathcal{I}} \supset S_2|_{\mathcal{I}}$. For any $\{G_0\}|_{\mathcal{I}} \in (S_1 \cup S_2)|_{\mathcal{I}}$, $G_0 \in S_1 \cup S_2$. So $\{G_0\}|_{\mathcal{I}} \in S_1|_{\mathcal{I}}$ or $\{G_0\}|_{\mathcal{I}} \in S_2|_{\mathcal{I}}$. This proves “ \subset ”.

(iii) By (i).

(iv) For any $\{G_0\}|_{\mathcal{I}} \in S_1|_{\mathcal{I}} - S_2|_{\mathcal{I}}$, $G_0 \in S_1$ and $G_0 \notin S_2$. So $\{G_0\}|_{\mathcal{I}} \in (S_1 - S_2)|_{\mathcal{I}}$.

(v) By (i), for any $\alpha \in D$

$$S_\alpha|_{\mathcal{I}} \subset \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{I}} \quad \text{and so} \quad \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\mathcal{I}} \subset \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{I}}$$

For any $\{G_0\}|_{\mathcal{I}} \in \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha \right) \Big|_{\mathcal{I}}$, there is a $\beta \in D$ that $G_0 \in S_\beta$. So

$$\{G_0\}|_{\mathcal{I}} \in S_\beta|_{\mathcal{I}} \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\mathcal{I}}$$

Thus (v) follows. ■

Corollary 3.23 *The axiom of regularity fails for any infiniton and set of infinitons.*

Proof. Suppose $I = \{I\}$ and $S|_{\mathcal{I}} = \{I_k : I_k = \{I_k\} \wedge k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. AR fails for I since $I \in I$. For each $I_k \in S|_{\mathcal{I}}$, $I_k \cap S|_{\mathcal{I}} = I_k$ for $I_k \in I_k$. Since no $y \in S|_{\mathcal{I}}$ satisfies $y \cap S|_{\mathcal{I}} = \emptyset$, AR fails for $S|_{\mathcal{I}}$ too. ■

Corollary 3.24 *Any set of infinitons is not a member of itself.*

Proof. Let $S = \{I_1, I_2, \dots\}$ where I_k are distinct infinitons. If $S \in S$, then $S = I_j = \{I_j\}$. This leads to $I_1 = I_2 = \dots = I_j$, contradiction. ■

Corollary 3.24 can be extended to any set like $\{\{\{I_1, I_2\}, I_3\}, I_4\}$, i.e. all sets of infinitons, all subset of sets of infinitons and so on (corollary 4.36).

3.4 Semi-Infiniton

A semi-infiniton is a set that is a member of itself, i.e. $X \in X$. From (1.4) and (3.2), we can see that an infinitely generated set with only one principal generator is a semi-infiniton.

Theorem 3.25 *Suppose for each $n < \omega$, Z_n is a finitely generated set and $Z_n = \{*G, Z_{n-1}\}$ with $Z_0 = G_0 \in V_\omega$ and $G \in V_\omega$. Then*

$$(i) \quad Z_n = \underbrace{\{*G, \{*G, \dots \{*G, G_0\} \dots\}}_n$$

(ii) *Th(Z_n) is \aleph_0 -categorical and has quantifier elimination.*

(iii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Z_n$ is unique.

Proof. (i) follows easily by replacing Z_n recursively n times.

(ii) For any $i, j < \omega$, suppose Z_i is mapped to Z_j . Since this can be extended to an automorphism of Z_n , $\{Z_n : n < \omega\}$ is homogeneous. So by proposition 3.4 and 3.5, $\text{Th}(Z_n)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical and has quantifier elimination.

(iii) Suppose $\phi_n(S)$ means there exists a unique \in -sequence of length n in S and with each sublevel of S containing the members of G , i.e.

$$\phi_n(S) \iff \left((Y_n = S) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \exists! Y_j (\exists! Y_{j-1} (Y_{j-1} \in Y_j) \wedge (\forall z \in G) (z \in Y_j)) \right)$$

Clearly, for any $n < \omega$, $Z_n \models \phi_n$. Furthermore, for any $n < \omega$ and any $k > n$, $Z_k \models \phi_n$. So Z_n is a homogeneous sequence. By (ii) and definition 2.9, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Z_n$ is unique. \blacksquare

Definition 3.26 In theorem 3.25, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Z_n$ is known as the **semi-infiniton** generated by G ($G \neq \emptyset$) and G_0 , and is denoted as:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Z_n = Z_\omega = \underbrace{\{\dots \{ *G, \{ *G, G_0 \} \dots \}}_{\aleph_0} = \{G, G_0\} | \in$$

Where G is the **principal generator** and G_0 is a **base generator** of Z_ω .

Theorem 3.27 Suppose for each $n < \omega$, $Z_n = \{ *G, Z_{n-1} \}$ with $Z_0 = G_0 \in V_\omega$ and $G \in V_\omega$. Then¹⁵

- (i) $Z_\omega = \{ *G, Z_\omega \}$.
- (ii) Z_ω is ω -invariant.
- (iii) A type of Z_ω is that there exists a unique \in -sequence of length ω in Z_ω with each sublevel n ($n \leq \omega$) of Z_ω containing the members of G .
- (iv) Z_ω is atomic and there is a complete formula for $\text{Th}(Z_\omega)$.

Proof. (i) By corollary 2.13, 2.25 and theorem 2.22

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\omega &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \{ *G, Z_{n-1} \} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (G \cup \{ Z_{n-1} \}) \\ &= G \cup \{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Z_{n-1} \} \\ &= \{ *G, Z_\omega \} \end{aligned}$$

¹⁵In the rest discussion, Z_ω is presumed to be a semi-infiniton generated from G and G_0 unless further specified.

(ii) Obviously, for any α that $\omega < \alpha < \omega^2$

$$Z_\alpha = \{ *G, Z_{\alpha-1} \} = \dots = \underbrace{\{ *G, \dots \{ *G, \{ *G, Z_\omega \} \} \dots \}}_{\alpha-\omega} = Z_\omega$$

Then it follows by transfinite induction that for any α , $Z_\alpha = Z_\omega$. Also for any $z \in G$, $z \in Z_\omega$.

(iii) Let $\gamma_n = \langle Z_j : j \leq n \rangle$ be the unique \in -sequence of length n in Z_n with each sublevel j ($j < n$) of Z_n containing the members of G . Then Z_n satisfies

$$\delta_n \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \exists! Z_j (\exists! Z_{j-1} (Z_{j-1} \in Z_j) \wedge (\forall z \in G) (z \in Z_j))$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Z_n = Z_\omega$, by axiom 2.15, corollary 2.14 and 2.27

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\omega &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \exists! Z_j (\exists! Z_{j-1} (Z_{j-1} \in Z_j) \wedge (\forall z \in G) (z \in Z_j)) \\ &\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n-1} \exists! Z_j (\exists! Z_{j-1} (Z_{j-1} \in Z_j) \wedge (\forall z \in G) (z \in Z_j)) \wedge \\ &\quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \exists! Z_n (\exists! Z_{n-1} (Z_{n-1} \in Z_n) \wedge (\forall z \in G) (z \in Z_n)) \\ &\iff \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \exists! Z_n (\exists! Z_{n-1} (Z_{n-1} \in Z_n) \wedge (\forall z \in G) (z \in Z_n)) \wedge \\ &\quad \exists! Z_\omega ((Z_\omega \in Z_\omega) \wedge (\forall z \in G) (z \in Z_\omega)) \end{aligned}$$

By theorem 2.7, $Z_\omega \models \delta_\omega$ where δ_ω describes $\gamma_\omega = \langle Z_n : n \leq \omega \rangle$, the unique \in -sequence of length ω in Z_ω with each sublevel n ($n \leq \omega$) of Z_ω containing the members of G .

(iv) Since $\text{Th}(Z_\omega)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical, by proposition 2.3, Z_ω is atomic and δ_ω is a complete formula since any tuple of Z_0, \dots, Z_n satisfies δ_ω . Furthermore, any (finite) type of $\text{Th}(Z_\omega)$ can be derived from δ_ω . \blacksquare

Now we give another condition for an IGS to be a semi-infiniton.

Corollary 3.28 *Suppose H_n is a finitely generated set (3.1). If $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} H_n = H_\omega$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} G_n = G_\omega$, then*

(i) $H_\omega = \{ *G_\omega, H_\omega \}$.

(ii) H_ω is ω -invariant.

Proof. (i) By corollary 2.25 and theorem 2.22

$$\begin{aligned} H_\omega &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \{ *G_n, H_{n-1} \} \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (G_n \cup \{ H_{n-1} \}) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} G_n \cup \{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} H_{n-1} \} \\ &= \{ *G_\omega, H_\omega \} \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Obviously, for any α that $\omega < \alpha < \omega^2$

$$H_\alpha = \{ *G_\omega, H_{\alpha-1} \} = \cdots = \underbrace{\{ *G_\omega, \cdots \{ *G_\omega, \{ *G_\omega, H_\omega \} \} \cdots \}}_{\alpha-\omega} = H_\omega$$

Then it follows by transfinite induction that for any α , $H_\alpha = H_\omega$. In addition, for any $z \in G_\omega$, $z \in H_\omega$. ■

The tree structure for a semi-infiniton is shown in Figure 2. Intuitively, a semi-infiniton has one infinite (broken) branch.




Figure 2: Diagram of a semi-infiniton.

Corollary 3.29 *Suppose Z is a semi-infiniton.*

- (i) $Z \neq \emptyset$
- (ii) $Z \neq \{Z\}$
- (iii) $D(Z) = \aleph_0$
- (iv) $Z \notin V$

Proof. (i) Since $\emptyset \notin \emptyset$, $Z \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) If $Z = \{Z\}$, Z is an infiniton, contradicting definition 3.26.

(iii) If $D(Z) < \aleph_0$, then by (1.2), $D(Z) < D(\{Z\}) = D(Z)$, contradiction.

(iv) Since Z has an infinite branch, it is NWF. By lemma 1.2, $Z \notin V$. ■

Definition 3.30 $S|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \{\{G, G_0\}|_{\mathfrak{E}} : G_0, G \in S\}$ is known as the *set of the semi-infinitons* from S .

Corollary 3.31

- (i) $S_1 \subset S_2 \implies S_1|_{\mathfrak{E}} \subset S_2|_{\mathfrak{E}}$
- (ii) $(S_1 \cup S_2)|_{\mathfrak{E}} \supset S_1|_{\mathfrak{E}} \cup S_2|_{\mathfrak{E}}$
- (iii) $(S_1 \cap S_2)|_{\mathfrak{E}} \subset S_1|_{\mathfrak{E}} \cap S_2|_{\mathfrak{E}}$
- (iv) $\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha\right)\Big|_{\mathfrak{E}} \supset \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{E}}$
- (v) $S_\alpha \uparrow \implies \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha\right)\Big|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{E}}$

Proof. (i) is obvious. (ii), (iii) and (iv) follow from (i).

(v) For any $\{G, G_0\}|_{\mathfrak{E}} \in \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha\right)\Big|_{\mathfrak{E}}$, there are $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in D$ that $G \in S_{\gamma_1}$ and $G_0 \in S_{\gamma_2}$. Let $\gamma = \max\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$. Then $G, G_0 \in S_\gamma$ and $\{G, G_0\}|_{\mathfrak{E}} \in S_\gamma|_{\mathfrak{E}} \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{E}}$. This proves “ \subset ” and it follows by (iv). ■

The following shows that an infiniton is a special case of a semi-infiniton.

Corollary 3.32

- (i) $\{G_0\}_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\emptyset, G_0\}|_{\mathfrak{E}}$
- (ii) $S|_{\mathcal{I}} \subset S|_{\mathfrak{E}}$

Proof. (i) Suppose for each $n < \omega$, $I_n = \{I_{n-1}\}$, $Z_n = \{\emptyset, Z_{n-1}\}$, and $I_0 = Z_0 = G_0 \in V_\omega$. By lemma 1.14, $I_n = Z_n$ for all n . So by corollary 2.13, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} I_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Z_n$, or $\{G_0\}_{\mathcal{I}} = \{\emptyset, G_0\}|_{\mathfrak{E}}$.

(ii) follows from (i). ■

A semi-infiniton is also related to an infiniton in the following result.

Corollary 3.33 $Z \in Z \wedge Z$ is transitive $\iff Z = \{Z\}$

Proof. If $Z = \{Z\}$, then $Z \in \{Z\} = Z$. Also, $Z \in Z$ means $\{Z\} \subset Z$. So $Z \subset Z$, i.e. Z is transitive. Conversely, $Z \in Z$ means $\{Z\} \subset Z$. Since Z is transitive, $Z \in \{Z\}$ means $Z \subset \{Z\}$. So $Z = \{Z\}$. ■

3.5 Quasi-Infiniton

A quasi-infiniton is a set that contains a vicious cycle, i.e. $Q \in X_1, X_1 \in X_2, \dots, X_{n-1} \in Q$. From (1.5) and (3.2), we can see that an infinitely generated set whose principal generators form a finite cycle is a quasi-infiniton.

Theorem 3.34 *Suppose for each $n < \omega$, Q_n is a finitely generated set and $Q_n = \{ *G_n, Q_{n-1} \}$ with $Q_0 = G_0 \in V_\omega$, and its principle generators G_n form a finite cycle, i.e. there are only l ($l > 1$) distinct $G_j \in V_\omega$ ($1 \leq j \leq l$) and $|G_1| < |G_2| < \dots < |G_l|$. Then there are l sublimits for Q_n which are decided by formulas as:*

$$\phi_n(S) \iff \left((Y_{pl+q} = S) \bigwedge_{q \leq j \leq q+l-1} \exists! Y_{(p-1)l+j+1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists! Y_{(p-1)l+j} (Y_{(p-1)l+j} \in Y_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \\ \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Y_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \end{array} \right) \right)$$

Where $n = pl + q$ ($p, l, q < \omega$, $0 \leq q < l$), $G_{j+1} = G_r$, $j + 1 \equiv r \pmod{l}$ for $r \neq 0$, and $j + 1 = l$ for $r = 0$. The l sublimits of Q_n are distinct and are as follows ($0 \leq q < l$):

$$Q_{\omega,q} = \{ *G_{l+q}, \{ *G_{l+q-1}, \dots \{ *G_{q+1}, Q_{\omega,q} \} \dots \} \}$$

Proof. First, we prove the case of $q = 0$. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} Q_l &= \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, G_0 \} \dots \} \} \\ Q_{2l} &= \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_l \} \dots \} \} \\ &\vdots \\ Q_{pl} &= \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{(p-1)l} \} \dots \} \} \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $i, j < \omega$, the mapping from Q_{il} to Q_{jl} can be extended to an automorphism, Q_{pl} is homogeneous. So by proposition 3.4, $\text{Th}(Q_{pl})$ is \aleph_0 -categorical. In addition, Q_{pl} is satisfied by the following formula ($n = pl$):

$$\phi_n(S) \iff \left((Y_{pl} = S) \bigwedge_{0 \leq j \leq l-1} \exists! Y_{(p-1)l+j+1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists! Y_{(p-1)l+j} (Y_{(p-1)l+j} \in Y_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \\ \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Y_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \end{array} \right) \right)$$

Since for any $p < \omega$ and any $k > p$, $Q_{kl} \models \phi_{pl}$, Q_{pl} is a homogeneous subsequence of Q_n . So by definition 2.9, $\lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} Q_{pl}$ is unique. Consequently, by corollary 2.13, 2.25 and theorem 2.22

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\omega,0} &= \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{(p-1)l} \} \dots \} \} \\ &= \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} Q_{(p-1)l} \} \dots \} \} \\ &= \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{\omega,0} \} \dots \} \} \end{aligned}$$

For $q = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{l+1} &= \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_2, Q_1 \} \dots \} \} \\ &\vdots \\ Q_{pl+1} &= \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_2, Q_{(p-1)l+1} \} \dots \} \} \end{aligned}$$

So the subsequence Q_{pl+1} of Q_n has the unique limit as:

$$Q_{\omega,1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} Q_{pl+1} = \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_2, Q_{\omega,1} \} \dots \} \}$$

Since $G_1 \neq G_l$, $Q_{\omega,0} \neq Q_{\omega,1}$. The above proof can easily be extended to any Q_{pl+q} . Thus there are l distinct sublimits for Q_n in total. \blacksquare

Definition 3.35 Suppose for each $n < \omega$, $Q_n = \{ *G_n, Q_{n-1} \}$ with $Q_0 = G_0 \in V_\omega$, whose principle generators form a finite cycle, i.e. there are only l ($l > 1$) distinct $G_j \in V_\omega$ ($1 \leq j \leq l$), and $|G_1| < |G_2| < \dots < |G_l|$. By theorem 3.34, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Q_n$ has l distinct values, each of which is known as a **quasi-infiniton** generated by $\mathcal{G} = \{ G_k : G_k \in V_\omega, 0 \leq k \leq l, |G_1| < \dots < |G_l| \}$ and is denoted as ($0 \leq q < l$):

$$Q_{\omega,q} = \{ *G_{l+q}, \{ *G_{l+q-1}, \dots \{ *G_{q+1}, Q_{\omega,q} \} \dots \} = \{ G_k, l \} |_\Omega$$

Where for $1 \leq j \leq l$, $G_{l+j} = G_j$. The collection of the limits of Q_n is denoted as:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} Q_n = Q_\omega = \{ Q_{\omega,q} : 0 \leq q < l \}$$

Where G_k ($1 \leq k \leq l$) are **principal generators** and G_0 is a **base generator** of Q_ω . Each quasi-infiniton contains a vicious cycle of length l known as the **length** of Q_ω .

Theorem 3.36 Suppose Q_ω is defined in definition 3.35. Then¹⁶

- (i) Each $Q_{\omega,q}$ of Q_ω is ω -invariant.
- (ii) For each $0 \leq q < l$, $Q_{\omega,q+1} = \{ *G_{q+1}, Q_{\omega,q} \}$.
- (iii) The type for each $Q_{\omega,q}$ of Q_ω is that there exists a vicious cycle of length l with each sublevel j ($1 \leq j \leq l$) containing the members of G_j .
- (iv) Q_ω is a \aleph_0 -categorical structure with l atomic substructures.

Proof. (i) WLOG, suppose $Q_{\omega,0} = \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{\omega,0} \} \dots \} \}$. For any α that $\omega < \alpha < \omega 2$, if $(m-1)l \leq \alpha - \omega < ml$, let $\beta = \omega + ml$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\beta &= \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{(m-1)l} \} \dots \} \} \\ &= \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{(m-2)l} \} \} \dots \} \} \dots \} \} \\ &\vdots \\ &= \underbrace{\{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{\omega,0} \} \} \dots \} \}}_{\beta - \omega} \\ &= Q_{\omega,0} \end{aligned}$$

¹⁶In the rest discussion, Q_ω is presumed to be the collection of quasi-infinitons, and Q a quasi-infiniton from the base generator of G_0 and l principal generators of G_k ($1 \leq k \leq l$) unless further specified.

Then it follows by transfinite induction. Other quasi-infinitons of Q_ω can be proved similarly.

(ii) We only prove $Q_{\omega,1} = \{ *G_1, Q_{\omega,0} \}$. By corollary 2.25 and theorem 3.34

$$\begin{aligned} \{ *G_1, Q_{\omega,0} \} &= \{ *G_1, \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} Q_{pl} \} \\ &= \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_2, Q_{(p-1)l+1} \} \dots \} \} \\ &= \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_2, Q_{\omega,1} \} \dots \} \} \\ &= Q_{\omega,1} \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Since ($n = pl$)

$$Q_{pl} = \{ *G_l, \{ *G_{l-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_{(p-1)l} \} \dots \} \} = \underbrace{\{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_1, \{ *G_l, \dots \{ *G_1, Q_0 \} \} \dots \} \}}_p$$

The type for Q_{pl} is:

$$\chi_{pl} \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq p} \bigwedge_{0 \leq j \leq l-1} \exists! Q_{(i-1)l+j+1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists! Q_{(i-1)l+j} (Q_{(i-1)l+j} \in Q_{(i-1)l+j+1}) \\ \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Q_{(i-1)l+j+1}) \end{array} \right)$$

In general, the type for Q_{pl+q} ($n = pl + q$, $0 \leq q < l$) is:

$$\chi_{pl+q} \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq p} \bigwedge_{q \leq j \leq q+l-1} \exists! Q_{(i-1)l+j+1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists! Q_{(i-1)l+j} (Q_{(i-1)l+j} \in Q_{(i-1)l+j+1}) \\ \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Q_{(i-1)l+j+1}) \end{array} \right)$$

By theorem 3.34, each Q_{pl+q} ($0 \leq q < l$) is homogeneous and has a unique limit. So by corollary 2.14, 2.27 and theorem 3.34

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{\omega,q} &\iff \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} \chi_{pl+q} \\ &\iff \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} \bigwedge_{q \leq j \leq q+l-1} \exists! Q_{(i-1)l+j+1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists! Q_{(i-1)l+j} (Q_{(i-1)l+j} \in Q_{(i-1)l+j+1}) \\ \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Q_{(i-1)l+j+1}) \end{array} \right) \\ &\quad \wedge \lim_{p \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{q \leq j \leq q+l-1} \exists! Q_{(p-1)l+j+1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists! Q_{(p-1)l+j} (Q_{(p-1)l+j} \in Q_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \\ \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Q_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \end{array} \right) \\ &\iff \bigwedge_{p < \omega} \bigwedge_{q \leq j \leq q+l-1} \exists! Q_{(p-1)l+j+1} \left(\begin{array}{l} \exists! Q_{(p-1)l+j} (Q_{(p-1)l+j} \in Q_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \\ \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Q_{(p-1)l+j+1}) \end{array} \right) \\ &\quad \wedge \bigwedge_{q \leq j \leq q+l-1} \exists! Q_{\omega,j+1} (\exists! Q_{\omega,j} (Q_{\omega,j} \in Q_{\omega,j+1}) \wedge (\forall z \in G_{j+1}) (z \in Q_{\omega,j+1})) \end{aligned}$$

By theorem 2.7, $Q_{\omega,q} \models \chi_{\omega,q}$ where $\chi_{\omega,q}$ describes a vicious cycle of length l with each sublevel j ($1 \leq j \leq l$) containing the members of G_j .

(iv) From the above results, we can see that each Q_n satisfies one and only one of χ_{pl+q} . So there are only finitely many (l) n -types. By proposition 2.3, $\text{Th}(Q_\omega)$ is \aleph_0 -categorical with l atomic substructures of $Q_{\omega,q}$, each having a complete formula of $\chi_{\omega,q}$. \blacksquare

The tree structure for a quasi-infiniton is shown in Figure 3. Intuitively, a quasi-infiniton has one infinite branch and the nodes of the infinite branch form a finite cycle.

$$Q = \{ *G_1, Q_1 \} = \{ *G_1, \{ *G_2, Q \} \}, \quad G_1 = \{ X_{11}, X_{12}, \dots \}, G_2 = \{ X_{21}, X_{22}, \dots \}$$




Figure 3: Diagram of a quasi-infiniton.

Corollary 3.37

- (i) $Q \notin Q$ and $Q \neq \emptyset$.
- (ii) $D(Q) = \aleph_0$ and $Q \notin V$.

Proof. (i) If $Q \in Q$, the length of Q is 1 and Q is a semi-infiniton. Also, no $Q_1 \in \emptyset$. So $\emptyset \in Q_1$ and $Q_1 \in \emptyset$ are impossible.

(ii) By theorem 3.36(i) and (1.2), $D(Q) = \aleph_0$. Since Q has an infinite branch, it is NWF. So $Q \notin V$. ■

Definition 3.38 $S|_{\Omega} = \{ \{ G_k, l \} : G_k \in S, 0 \leq k \leq l, l > 1 \}$ is known as the **set of the quasi-infinitons** from S .

Corollary 3.39

- (i) $S_1 \subset S_2 \implies S_1|_{\Omega} \subset S_2|_{\Omega}$
- (ii) $(S_1 \cup S_2)|_{\Omega} \supset S_1|_{\Omega} \cup S_2|_{\Omega}$
- (iii) $(S_1 \cap S_2)|_{\Omega} \subset S_1|_{\Omega} \cap S_2|_{\Omega}$
- (iv) $\left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_{\alpha} \right) \Big|_{\Omega} \supset \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_{\alpha}|_{\Omega}$

$$(v) S_\alpha \uparrow \implies \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha \right) \Big|_{\Omega} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\Omega}$$

Proof. (i) is obvious. (ii), (iii) and (iv) follow from (i).

(v) For any $\{G_k, l\}|_{\Omega} \in \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha \right) \Big|_{\Omega}$, there is a $\gamma \in D$ that $G_k \in S_\gamma$ for $0 \leq k \leq l$. Thus $\{G_k, l\}|_{\Omega} \in S_\gamma|_{\Omega} \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\Omega}$. This proves “ \subset ” and it follows by (iv). ■

4 Total Universe

In this section, we will present and investigate a hierarchy for combining the well-founded sets with the non-well-founded sets known as the total universe. We will also show that the total universe is free of Russell’s paradox.

4.1 Definitions

First, we need to generalize the ω -neighborhood and the limit of formulas.

Definition 4.1 Suppose α is a limit ordinal ($\alpha > \omega$) and α_0 the limit ordinal immediately below α . The **cofinite topology** on α is defined as: $\mathfrak{T} = \{y \subset \alpha : y = \emptyset \vee (\alpha_0 \subset y \wedge \alpha - y \text{ is finite})\}$. A **neighborhood of α** (α -neighborhood) \mathfrak{H} is a member of \mathfrak{T} .

Lemma 4.2 \mathfrak{H} is a neighborhood of α if and only if $\exists \beta \in \alpha - \alpha_0$ that $\forall \gamma (\beta < \gamma < \alpha) \implies \gamma \in \mathfrak{H}$.

Proof. Suppose \mathfrak{H} is a neighborhood of α and for any $\beta \in \alpha - \alpha_0$, there is a γ that $\beta < \gamma < \alpha$ and $\gamma \notin \mathfrak{H}$. Then $\alpha - \mathfrak{H}$ is not finite, contradicting definition 4.1. On the other hand, if there is a $\beta \in \alpha - \alpha_0$ such that for any γ of $\beta < \gamma < \alpha$, $\gamma \in \mathfrak{H}$, then $\alpha - \mathfrak{H}$ is finite and $\mathfrak{H} \in \mathfrak{T}$. ■

Definition 4.3 Suppose \mathcal{L} is an infinitary language of $\mathcal{L}_{\omega_1, \omega}$, T is a \aleph_0 -categorical theory of \mathcal{L} and α is a limit ordinal ($\alpha > \omega$). Let ϕ_γ be types in T and \mathfrak{M}_γ be \mathcal{L} -structures that $\mathfrak{M}_\gamma \models \phi_\gamma$. If there exists a α -neighborhood \mathfrak{H} that for any $\beta, \gamma \in \mathfrak{H}$ ($\beta > \gamma$), $\mathfrak{M}_\beta \models \phi_\gamma$, then $\{(\mathfrak{M}_\gamma, \phi_\gamma) : \mathfrak{M}_\gamma \models \phi_\gamma \wedge \gamma < \alpha\}$ is known as a **homogeneous sequence of structures described by ϕ_γ** in T .

Definition 4.4 Suppose $\{(\mathfrak{M}_\gamma, \phi_\gamma) : \mathfrak{M}_\gamma \models \phi_\gamma \wedge \gamma < \alpha\}$ is a homogeneous sequence of structures in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory. The unique countable atomic structure \mathfrak{M} (up to isomorphism) in $\{(\mathfrak{M}_\gamma, \phi_\gamma)\}$ is known as the **limit** of \mathfrak{M}_γ and is denoted as $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} \mathfrak{M}_\gamma = \mathfrak{M}$. The unique formula ϕ (up to equivalence) is known as the **limit** of ϕ_γ and is denoted as $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} \phi_\gamma = \phi$. In both cases, we also say that the limit of ϕ_γ or the limit of \mathfrak{M}_γ is unique.

Definition 4.5 Suppose in a sequence of structures $\{(\mathfrak{M}_\gamma, \phi_\gamma) : \mathfrak{M}_\gamma \models \phi_\gamma \wedge \gamma < \alpha\}$ in a \aleph_0 -categorical theory, there are finitely many homogeneous subsequences of structures $\{(\mathfrak{M}_{\gamma_i}, \phi_{\gamma_i}) : \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma_i} \models \phi_{\gamma_i} \wedge \gamma_i < \alpha\}$. Then each $\lim_{\gamma_i \rightarrow \alpha} \mathfrak{M}_{\gamma_i}$ is known as a **sublimit** of \mathfrak{M}_γ , and each $\lim_{\gamma_i \rightarrow \alpha} \phi_{\gamma_i}$ is known as a **sublimit** of ϕ_γ . If some sublimits of $\mathfrak{M}_\gamma/\phi_\gamma$ are different, we say $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} \mathfrak{M}_\gamma / \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} \phi_\gamma$ exist (but not unique).

(Almost) all conclusions in section 2 hold for the limit ordinals as well. We can simply replace n with γ (γ is any successor ordinal in a neighborhood of a limit ordinal α above ω), and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega}$ with $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha}$. Now we define the total universe based upon the von Neumann universe.

Definition 4.6 *The total universe is:*

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0 &= \emptyset; \\
T_\alpha &= \mathcal{P}(T_{\alpha-1}), & \alpha \text{ is any successor ordinal;} \\
T_\alpha &= \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}, & \alpha \text{ is any limit ordinal;} \\
T &= \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} T_\alpha.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Remark 4.7 *Note that (4.1) is based on the generalization of definition 3.2 and 4.9. Since the total universe contains the well-founded sets, it is similar to (1.1). The key difference is that the infinitely generated sets are created at each limit ordinal in addition to the von Neumann universe.*

Definition 4.8 *Suppose α is a limit ordinal and H_γ is the same as H_n in (3.1) and (3.2) except $G_\gamma \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$ ($\gamma < \omega$) and $\mathcal{G} = \{G_\gamma : G_\gamma \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta, \gamma < \omega\}$. An **infinitely generated set** (at α) is defined as:*

$$H_\alpha(\mathcal{G}) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} H_\gamma(G_\gamma, \dots, G_0) \tag{4.2}$$

Definition 4.9 $S|_{\aleph_0} = \{H_\alpha(\mathcal{G}) : \mathcal{G} = \{G_\gamma : G_\gamma \in S, \gamma < \omega\}\}$ is known as the **set of the infinitely generated sets** from S .

Remark 4.10 *All $G_n \in V_\omega$ in definition 3.14, 3.26 and 3.35 are changed to $G_\gamma \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$ ($\gamma < \omega$).*

The axiom of extensionality for IGS can be modified from axiom 3.10.

Axiom 4.11 *Suppose $\mathcal{G}_1 = \{G_\gamma^1 : G_\gamma^1 \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta, \gamma < \omega\}$ and $\mathcal{G}_2 = \{G_\gamma^2 : G_\gamma^2 \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta, \gamma < \omega\}$. Then*

$$(\forall \gamma < \omega) (G_\gamma^1 = G_\gamma^2) \implies H_\alpha(\mathcal{G}_1) = H_\alpha(\mathcal{G}_2)$$

Corollary 4.12

- (i) $S_1 \subset S_2 \implies S_1|_{\aleph_0} \subset S_2|_{\aleph_0}$
- (ii) $S_1|_{\aleph_0} \cup S_2|_{\aleph_0} \subset (S_1 \cup S_2)|_{\aleph_0}$
- (iii) $(S_1 \cap S_2)|_{\aleph_0} \subset S_1|_{\aleph_0} \cap S_2|_{\aleph_0}$
- (iv) $\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha|_{\aleph_0} \subset \left(\bigcup_{\alpha \in D} S_\alpha \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$

Proof. (i) By definition 4.9, for any $H_\alpha(\mathcal{G}) \in S_1|_{\aleph_0}$ and any $G_\gamma \in S_1, G_\gamma \in S_2$. So $H_\alpha(\mathcal{G}) \in S_2|_{\aleph_0}$. The rest follow from (i). ■

Corollary 4.13

$$\left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\mathfrak{E}} \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\Omega} \subset \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$$

Proof. By definition 3.30, 3.38, 4.9 and (4.1). ■

Rank in the total universe is the same as that of the von Neumann universe (definition 1.4).

Definition 4.14 The *rank* of S in T is defined as the least α that $S \in T_\alpha$ and denoted as $R_T(S)$.

The notion of ω -invariance (definition 3.11) can be extended to any limit ordinal.

Definition 4.15 Suppose α is a limit ordinal, H_α is an IGS and $H_{\alpha+\xi} = \{ *G_{\alpha+\xi}, H_{\alpha+\xi-1} \}$, where $G_{\alpha+\xi} \in \bigcup_{\delta < \alpha} T_\delta$ ($\xi \geq 1$). If for any $\gamma > \alpha$, there is a (successor ordinal) $\beta > \gamma$ that $H_\beta = H_\alpha$, then H_α is called ω -*invariant*.

Lemma 4.16 Suppose α is a limit ordinal, H_α is ω -invariant and $G_\xi \in \bigcup_{\delta < \alpha} T_\delta$ ($\xi \leq \beta$). Then

$$H_\alpha = \{ *G_\beta, \{ *G_{\beta-1}, \dots \{ *G_{\alpha+1}, H_\alpha \} \dots \} \}$$

Proof. Suppose α' is the limit ordinal immediately above α . WLOG, by definition 4.15, assume for any γ ($\alpha < \gamma < \alpha'$), there is a β ($\gamma < \beta < \alpha'$) that $H_\beta = H_\alpha$. Then

$$H_\beta = \{ *G_\beta, H_{\beta-1} \} = \{ *G_\beta, \{ *G_{\beta-1}, \dots \{ *G_{\alpha+1}, H_\alpha \} \dots \} \} = H_\alpha$$

where $G_\xi \in \bigcup_{\delta < \alpha} T_\delta$ for $\xi \leq \beta$. ■

Remark 4.17 Lemma 4.16 shows that a ω -invariant set always has an immediate member, while (in general) an IGS does not have one.

Furthermore, the union operator and transitive closure need be extended to the transfinite case.

Definition 4.18 Suppose $\bigcup S = \{ z : \exists y (y \in S \wedge z \in y) \}$. The α^{th} *union operator* is defined (recursively) as:

(i) If α is a successor ordinal, then

$$\bigcup^\alpha S = \bigcup \bigcup^{\alpha-1} S \quad (\bigcup^0 S = S)$$

(ii) If α is a limit ordinal, then

$$\bigcup^\alpha S = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \bigcup^\beta S$$

Definition 4.19 Suppose α_0 is the least ordinal α that $\bigcup^\alpha S = \bigcup^{\alpha+1} S$. Then the **transitive closure** of S is:

$$TC(S) = \bigcup_{\alpha \leq \alpha_0} \bigcup^\alpha S \quad (4.3)$$

Corollary 4.20

- (i) For any $\alpha < \omega$, $V_\alpha = T_\alpha$. Otherwise, $V_\alpha \subsetneq T_\alpha$.
- (ii) $V \subsetneq T$.
- (iii) T_α contains all ordinals less than α . T contains all ordinals.

Proof. (i) By (1.1) and (4.1), for any $\alpha < \omega$, $V_\alpha = T_\alpha$. Clearly

$$T_\omega = \bigcup_{\beta < \omega} T_\beta \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \omega} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} \supseteq \bigcup_{\beta < \omega} T_\beta = V_\omega$$

Suppose $V_\beta \subsetneq T_\beta$ for any β , $\omega < \beta < \alpha$. Then if α is a successor ordinal

$$T_\alpha = \mathcal{P}(T_{\alpha-1}) \supseteq \mathcal{P}(V_{\alpha-1}) = V_\alpha$$

If α is a limit ordinal, then

$$T_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} \supseteq \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \supseteq \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} V_\beta = V_\alpha$$

(ii) By (i), (1.1) and (4.1).

(iii) By definition 4.8, $\left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$ contains no ordinals since any set in it is NWF, but all ordinals are WF. So T_α has the same ordinals as V_α and by corollary 1.6, T_α contains all ordinals less than α . By (4.1), T contains all ordinals. ■

Corollary 4.21

- (i) Each T_α is transitive.
- (ii) T is transitive.

Proof. (i) We prove by the transfinite induction. First, since $T_1 = \{\emptyset\}$ and $\emptyset \subset T_1$, T_1 is transitive. Suppose it is true for any $\beta < \alpha$. Then if α is a successor ordinal, for any $X \in T_\alpha = \mathcal{P}(T_{\alpha-1})$, $X \subset T_{\alpha-1}$. So for any $Y \in X$, $Y \in T_{\alpha-1}$. Since $T_{\alpha-1}$ is transitive, $Y \subset T_{\alpha-1}$ and $Y \in T_\alpha$. Thus T_α is transitive.

If α is a limit ordinal, then for any $X \in T_\alpha$, if $X \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$, there is a $\gamma < \alpha$ that $X \in T_\gamma$. Since T_γ is transitive, $X \subset T_\gamma \subset T_\alpha$. If $X \in \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$ and X is ω -invariant, then by lemma 4.16

$$X = \{ *G_\eta, \{ *G_{\eta-1}, \dots \} \dots \}, G_\xi \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \subset T_\alpha \text{ for } \xi \leq \eta.$$

Then there is a $\gamma < \alpha$ that $G_\eta \in T_\gamma$. Since T_γ is transitive, for any $z \in G_\eta$, $z \in T_\gamma \subset T_\alpha$. Furthermore, $\{ *G_{\eta-1}, \{ *G_{\eta-2}, \dots \} \dots \}$ is also ω -invariant and

$$\{ *G_{\eta-1}, \{ *G_{\eta-2}, \dots \} \dots \} \in \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} \subset T_\alpha$$

So $X \subset T_\alpha$. If X is not ω -invariant, then X does not have immediate members. Both cases show that T_α is transitive if α is a limit ordinal.

(ii) By (i) and (4.1). ■

Corollary 4.22

(i) For any α , $T_\alpha \subset \mathcal{P}(T_\alpha)$

(ii) $\alpha < \beta \implies T_\alpha \subset T_\beta$

Proof. (i) By corollary 4.21, T_α is transitive. So for any $X \in T_\alpha$, $X \subset T_\alpha$. Thus $X \in \mathcal{P}(T_\alpha)$ and (i) follows.

(ii) Suppose it is true for any $\alpha < \gamma < \beta$. If β is a successor ordinal, then by (i)

$$T_\beta = \mathcal{P}(T_{\beta-1}) \supset T_{\beta-1} \supset T_\alpha$$

If β is a limit ordinal, then

$$T_\beta = \bigcup_{\gamma < \beta} T_\gamma \cup \left(\bigcup_{\gamma < \beta} T_\gamma \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} \supset \bigcup_{\gamma < \beta} T_\gamma \supset T_\alpha$$

■

4.2 Rank in Total Universe

Now we investigate more on rank in the total universe.

Lemma 4.23 *Suppose $X \in T$. Then*

$$Y \in X \implies R_T(Y) \leq R_T(X)$$

Proof. Suppose $R_T(X) = \alpha$. Then by definition 4.14, $X \in T_\alpha$. By corollary 4.21, T_α is transitive. Thus for $Y \in X$, $Y \in T_\alpha$, i.e. $R_T(Y) \leq \alpha$. ■

Lemma 4.24 *If $R_T(X)$ is a successor ordinal, then*

$$Y \in X \implies R_T(Y) < R_T(X)$$

Proof. Suppose $R_T(X) = \alpha$ is a successor ordinal. Then $X \in T_\alpha = \mathcal{P}(T_{\alpha-1})$ and $X \subset T_{\alpha-1}$. Thus $Y \in T_{\alpha-1}$ and $R_T(Y) \leq \alpha - 1 < R_T(X)$. ■

Corollary 4.25 *If $R_T(X)$ is a limit ordinal, then X is an infinitely generated set.*

Proof. Suppose $R_T(X) = \alpha$ is a limit ordinal. If $X \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$, then there is a $\gamma < \alpha$ that $X \in T_\gamma$, i.e. $R_T(X) \leq \gamma < \alpha$, contradiction. So $X \in \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$. ■

Corollary 4.26 *Suppose α is a limit ordinal and H is ω -invariant. Then $R_T(H) = \alpha$.*

Proof. By lemma 4.16, $H = \{ *G_\gamma, \{ *G_{\gamma-1}, \dots \{ *G_{\alpha+1}, H \} \dots \} \}$, where $G_\xi \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$ for $\xi \leq \gamma$. Let $H_1 = \{ *G_{\gamma-1}, \dots \{ *G_{\alpha+1}, H \} \dots \}$. If $R_T(H) > \alpha$, then by lemma 4.24, $R_T(H) < R_T(H_1) < R_T(H)$, contradiction. Thus $R_T(H) = \alpha$. ■

Note that there are sets that appear to have successor ranks, but actually have limit ordinal ranks.

Example 4.27 *Suppose $a, b \in V_\omega$ and $Q = \{a, b, 2\} \Big|_{\Omega}$. Then $R_T(\{b, Q\}) = \omega$.*

At first sight, $\{b, Q\} \in T_{\omega+1}$ for $\{b, Q\} \subset T_\omega$. But by theorem 3.34, $\{a, \{b, Q\}\} = Q$. So $\{b, \{a, \{b, Q\}\}\} = \{b, Q\}$, i.e. $\{b, Q\}$ is ω -invariant. By corollary 4.26, $R_T(\{b, Q\}) = \omega$.

The total universe can be partitioned by rank as follows.

Theorem 4.28 (Partition Formula by Rank)¹⁷ *Suppose $A_\alpha = \{X : R_T(X) = \alpha \wedge X \in T\}$.*

(i) *If α is a successor ordinal, then $A_\alpha = T_\alpha - T_{\alpha-1}$*

(ii) *If α is a limit ordinal, then*

$$A_\alpha = T_\alpha - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta = \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta = \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} (T_\alpha - T_\beta)$$

¹⁷*SOrd* is the set of all successor ordinals and *LOrd* is the set of all limit ordinals.

(iii) In general, T can be partitioned by rank as:

$$T = \bigcup_{\alpha \in SOrd} (T_\alpha - T_{\alpha-1}) \cup \bigcup_{\alpha \in LOrd} \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} (T_\alpha - T_\beta)$$

Proof. (i) If α is a successor ordinal, then by definition 4.14, $R_T(X) = \alpha$ if and only if $X \in T_\alpha$ and $X \notin T_{\alpha-1}$.

(ii) If α is a limit ordinal, by definition 4.14, $R_T(X) = \alpha$ if and only if $X \in T_\alpha$ and for any $\beta < \alpha$, $X \notin T_\beta$. So by (4.1)

$$A_\alpha = T_\alpha - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta = \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$$

On the other hand, clearly we have

$$T_\alpha - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta = \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} (T_\alpha - T_\beta)$$

(iii) For any $X \in T$ and $R_T(X) = \alpha$, if α is a successor ordinal, then by (i)

$$X \in T_\alpha - T_{\alpha-1} \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in SOrd} (T_\alpha - T_{\alpha-1})$$

If α is a limit ordinal, then by (ii)

$$X \in T_\alpha - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in LOrd} \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} (T_\alpha - T_\beta)$$

Obviously, each category is disjoint from others. ■

We also have the following theorems for rank in the total universe.

Theorem 4.29 Suppose $X \in T$.

- (i) If $R_T(X)$ is a successor ordinal, then there is either a $Y \in X$ that $R_T(Y) = R_T(X) - 1$, or a sequence $Y_n \in X$ that $R_T(Y_n) \rightarrow R_T(X) - 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- (ii) If $R_T(X)$ is a limit ordinal and X is ω -invariant, then there is one and only one $Y \in X$ that $R_T(Y) = R_T(X)$.

Proof. (i) Suppose $R_T(X) = \alpha$ is a successor ordinal. By lemma 4.24, for any $Y \in X$, $R_T(Y) \leq \alpha - 1$. If there is a $Y \in X$ that $R_T(Y) = \alpha - 1$, then done. So suppose there is no $Y \in X$ that $R_T(Y) = \alpha - 1$.

If $\alpha - 1$ is a successor ordinal, then for any $Y \in X$, $Y \in T_{\alpha-2}$. So $X \subset T_{\alpha-2}$ and $X \in T_{\alpha-1}$, i.e. $R_T(X) \leq \alpha - 1$, contradiction. If $\alpha - 1$ is a limit ordinal, then there is a sequence $Y_n \in X$ that $R_T(Y_n) \rightarrow \alpha - 1$. Otherwise suppose there is a $\beta < \alpha - 1$ that for any $Y \in X$, $R_T(Y) \leq \beta$, i.e. $Y \in T_\beta$. So $X \subset T_\beta$ and $X \in T_{\beta+1}$, i.e. $R_T(X) \leq \beta + 1 < \alpha$, contradiction.

(ii) Suppose $R_T(X) = \alpha$ is a limit ordinal. Then by lemma 4.16, $X = \{ *G_\gamma, \{ *G_{\gamma-1}, \dots \} \dots \}$, where $G_\xi \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$ for $\xi \leq \gamma$. Let $Y = \{ *G_{\gamma-1}, \{ *G_{\gamma-2}, \dots \} \dots \}$. Then Y is ω -invariant and by corollary 4.26, $R_T(Y) = \alpha$. Furthermore, since $G_\gamma \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$, $R_T(G_\gamma) < \alpha$. So by lemma 4.23, for any $a \in G_\gamma$, $R_T(a) < \alpha$, i.e. Y is the only one in X that $R_T(Y) = \alpha$. ■

Corollary 4.30 *Suppose $X \in T$.*

(i) *If $R_T(X)$ is a successor ordinal, then*

$$R_T(X) = \sup\{R_T(Y) : Y \in X\} + 1$$

(ii) *If $R_T(X)$ is a limit ordinal and X is ω -invariant, then*

$$R_T(X) = \sup\{R_T(Y) : Y \in X\}$$

Proof. (i) By lemma 4.24, for any $Y \in X$, $R_T(Y) \leq R_T(X) - 1$. Then it follows by theorem 4.29(i).

(ii) By theorem 4.29(ii). ■

4.3 Set Theory for Total Universe

In this section, we will introduce an expanded theory of Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory known as **EZF** to handle both the well-founded and non-well-founded sets. The language of **EZF** is the language of ZF with the primitive symbol of “ \in ”. The axioms of **EZF** are similar to those of ZF [4] with modifications in the axioms of extensionality and union. The main result is that the total universe is a model of **EZF**. First, we list the axioms of **EZF** as follows.

I. Extensionality.

(i) If X and Y are IGS (an IGS $A(\mathcal{G}_A)$ is generated by $\mathcal{G}_A = \{G_\gamma^A : G_\gamma^A \in S, \gamma < \omega\}$), then¹⁸

$$(\forall \gamma < \omega) (G_\gamma^X = G_\gamma^Y) \implies X(\mathcal{G}_X) = Y(\mathcal{G}_Y)$$

(ii) If X and Y are any other sets, then

$$\forall z (z \in X \iff z \in Y) \implies X = Y$$

II. Non-well-foundedness. Suppose $\alpha \geq \omega$ is a limit ordinal and α_0 is the limit ordinal immediately below α . Then

$$\exists X \left(\bigwedge_{\alpha_0 \leq \gamma \leq \alpha} \exists X_\gamma \exists X_{\gamma-1} (X_{\gamma-1} \in X_\gamma) \wedge \bigwedge_{\gamma < \alpha_0} \exists X_\gamma \exists X_{\gamma-1} (X_{\gamma-1} \in X_\gamma) \wedge X_\alpha = X \right)$$

¹⁸This is the same as axiom 4.11.

III. Union. Suppose $\bigcup^\alpha X$ is given in definition 4.18. Then for any $\alpha \geq 1$

$$\forall X \exists Y \left(Y = \bigcup^\alpha X \right)$$

IV. Pairing.

$$\forall x \forall y \exists S \forall z (z \in S \iff z = x \vee z = y)$$

V. Power Set.

$$\forall X \exists Y \forall y (y \in Y \iff y \subset X)$$

VI. Infinity.

$$\exists S (\emptyset \in S \wedge (\forall x \in S) (x \cup \{x\} \in S))$$

VII. Replacement. Suppose ϕ is a formula and p is a tuple. Then

$$\forall x \forall y \forall z (\phi(x, y, p) \wedge \phi(x, z, p) \implies y = z) \implies \forall X \exists Y \forall y (y \in Y \iff (\exists x \in X) \phi(x, y, p))$$

VIII. Separation. Suppose ϕ is a formula and p is a tuple. Then

$$\forall X \forall p \exists Y \forall y (y \in Y \iff y \in X \wedge \phi(y, p))$$

Since infinitely generated sets (generally) do not have immediate members, the axiom of extensionality for **EZF** must be modified to handle IGS. As the result, I(i) is added to decide if two IGS are equal. For all other sets, the axiom of extensionality in ZF applies. II means that there are sets in **EZF** that have infinite \in -sequences (non-well-founded sets). The axiom of regularity is dropped in **EZF** because it can not even define the well-founded sets (corollary 5.2).

Since non-well-founded sets contain infinite \in -sequences, the union axiom in ZF must be modified as well. III is based on definition 4.18 and means that the result of any union operation is a set. The rest axioms (IV, \dots , VIII) of **EZF** remain the same as those of ZF. Consequently, **EZF** is essentially ZF minus the axiom of regularity. We have the following conclusion.

Corollary 4.31 *T is a model of EZF.*

Proof. *Extensionality.* All sets in T are either WF or NWF. For a NWF set, it either has immediate members or not. I(ii) applies for all WF and NWF sets with immediate members. For two IGS without immediate members, I(i) can decide if they are equal by checking the equality of their generators, which can be either WF or NWF sets at lower ranks. Thus by transfinite recursion, I holds for all sets in T .

Non-well-foundedness. By theorem 3.16, I_ω contains an infinite \in -sequence. (By corollary 3.23, I_ω also fails the axiom of regularity.) Thus II holds in T .

Union. Suppose $X \in T$ and $R_T(X) = \gamma$. If γ is a successor ordinal, $X \subset T_{\gamma-1}$. By corollary 4.21 and theorem 4.29, for any $y \in X$ and $z \in y$, $z \in T_{\gamma-1}$ and so $\bigcup X \in T_\gamma$. Suppose for any $\beta < \alpha$, $\bigcup^\beta X \in T_\gamma$. By definition 4.18, $\bigcup^\alpha X \in T_\gamma$. If γ is a limit ordinal, suppose X is ω -invariant. By lemma 4.16, $\bigcup^\alpha X \in T_{\gamma+\omega}$. In both cases, we have $\bigcup^\alpha X \in T$. Thus III holds in T .

Pairing. For any sets $a, b \in T$, $a, b \in T_\alpha$. So $\{a, b\} \subset T_\alpha$ and $\{a, b\} \in T_{\alpha+1}$. Thus IV holds in T .

Power set. For any set $X \in T$, $X \in T_\alpha$. By corollary 4.21, $X \subset T_\alpha$. So for any $Y \subset X$, $Y \subset T_\alpha$ and $Y \in \mathcal{P}(T_\alpha) = T_{\alpha+1}$. Thus $\mathcal{P}(X) \subset T_{\alpha+1}$ and $\mathcal{P}(X) \in T_{\alpha+2}$, and V holds in T .

Infinity. Since $\omega \in T$, VI holds in T .

Replacement. Suppose $f = \{(x, y) \in T : \phi(x, y, p)\}$. Then the first part of VII implies f is a function. Let $Y = f(X)$. Then there is a (least) α that $f \in T_\alpha$ and $X \in T_\alpha$. So $f(X) = \{f(x) : x \in X\} \in T_\alpha$. Thus

$$\forall y (y \in Y \iff (\exists x \in X) ((x, y) \in f) \iff (\exists x \in X) (\phi(x, y, p)))$$

And VII holds in T .

Separation. Let $\varphi(x, y, p) = (x = y \wedge \phi(x, p))$. Clearly, φ is a functional formula. So for $X \in T$, by VII, $Y = \{y : (\exists x \in X) \varphi(x, y, p)\} \in T$ and

$$\forall y (y \in Y \iff (\exists x \in X) (x = y \wedge \phi(x, p)) \iff (y \in X \wedge \phi(y, p)))$$

Thus VIII holds in T . ■

4.4 Solution to Russell's paradox

In this section, we will show that the total universe is free of Russell's paradox. First, we have the following conclusion.

Lemma 4.32

$$(i) \quad T|_{\mathfrak{S}} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} T_\alpha|_{\mathfrak{S}}$$

$$(ii) \quad T|_{\Omega} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} T_\alpha|_{\Omega}$$

Proof. By (4.1), corollary 3.31(v), 4.22(ii) and 3.39(v). ■

Definition 4.33 *The **infiniton class** \mathcal{I} of the total universe includes all the semi-infinitons and quasi-infinitons in T . The **non-infiniton class** \mathcal{N} of T is the complement of \mathcal{I} in T , i.e. $\mathcal{N} = T - \mathcal{I}$.*

Theorem 4.34 *Suppose $X \in T$.*

- (i) *If $X \in \mathcal{I}$, then $R_T(X)$ is a limit ordinal.*
- (ii) *If $R_T(X)$ is a successor ordinal, then $X \in \mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose $X \in \mathcal{I}$ and $R_T(X) = \alpha$ is a successor ordinal. Then $X \in T_\alpha = \mathcal{P}(T_{\alpha-1})$ and $X \subset T_{\alpha-1}$. If $X \in X$, then $X \in T_{\alpha-1}$ and $R_T(X) \leq \alpha - 1 < \alpha$, contradiction.

If X is a quasi-infiniton, suppose $X \in Y_1, Y_1 \in Y_2, \dots, Y_n \in X$. Then by lemma 4.24, $R_T(Y_n) < R_T(X)$. Thus by lemma 4.23, $R_T(X) \leq R_T(Y_1) \leq \dots \leq R_T(Y_n) < R_T(X)$, contradiction again.

(ii) If $X \notin \mathcal{N}$, then $X \in \mathcal{I}$. By (i), $R_T(X)$ is a limit ordinal. ■

From theorem 4.34, lemma 1.2 and 1.5, we can see that no well-founded sets are in the infiniton class, i.e. no well-founded set is a member of itself or contains a vicious cycle.

Corollary 4.35 $V \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$

Corollary 4.36 *Suppose $X \in T$. Then*

(i) *X is not a semi-infiniton except $X \in T|_{\mathfrak{S}}$.*

(ii) *X is not a quasi-infiniton except $X \in T|_{\Omega}$.*

Proof. We prove by transfinite induction.

(i) First, for any $X \in V_\omega$, $R_T(X) < \omega$. So by theorem 4.34(ii), $X \notin X$. Suppose it is true for $R_T(X) < \alpha$. Then for $R_T(X) = \alpha$, if α is a successor ordinal, $X \notin X$. If α is a limit ordinal, by corollary 4.25, $X \in \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$. Thus $X \in X$ if and only if $X \in \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta \right) \Big|_{\mathfrak{S}} \subset T|_{\mathfrak{S}}$.

(ii) is similar to (i). ■

Remark 4.37 *Corollary 4.36 shows that all semi-infinitons and quasi-infinitons in T are infinitely generated. Thus all semi-infinitons and quasi-infinitons in T are precisely determined.*

Corollary 4.38

(i) $\mathcal{I} = T|_{\mathfrak{S}} \cup T|_{\Omega}$

(ii) $\mathcal{I} \subset \bigcup_{\alpha \in LOrd} \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} (T_\alpha - T_\beta) \subset T$

(iii) $T = \mathcal{N} \cup \mathcal{I}$ and $\mathcal{N} \cap \mathcal{I} = \emptyset$

(iv) $\mathcal{N} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in Ord} (T_\alpha - \mathcal{I}) = \bigcup_{\alpha \in Ord} \mathcal{N}_\alpha$

(v) \mathcal{I} contains no ordinals. \mathcal{N}_α contains all ordinals less than α . \mathcal{N} contains all ordinals.

Proof. (i) By definition 4.33 and corollary 4.36.

(ii) By theorem 4.28 and 4.34.

(iii) By definition 4.33.

(iv) By (iii) and (4.1).

(v) Since all ordinals are WF and all sets in \mathcal{I} are NWF, \mathcal{I} contains no ordinals. So $\mathcal{N}_\alpha = T_\alpha - \mathcal{I}$ and \mathcal{N} contain the same ordinals as T_α and T . And it follows by corollary 4.20(iii). ■

The total universe is shown in Figure 4. The non-infiniton class is not a member of itself and the total universe, a key fact which enables us to show that the total universe is free of Russell's paradox.




Figure 4: Diagram of the total universe.

Theorem 4.39

- (i) $\mathcal{N} \notin \mathcal{N}$
- (ii) $\mathcal{N} \notin T$
- (iii) $T \notin T$
- (iv) $T \notin \mathcal{N}$
- (v) *There is no vicious cycle for \mathcal{N} in T .*
- (vi) *T is free of Russell's paradox.*

Proof. (i) By corollary 4.38(v), \mathcal{N} contains all ordinals, but no \mathcal{N}_α contains all ordinals. For any $X \in \mathcal{N}$, suppose $X \in \mathcal{N}_\alpha$. So X contains the ordinals less than α . Hence $\mathcal{N} \neq X$, i.e. $\mathcal{N} \notin \mathcal{N}$.

(ii) By corollary 4.20(iii), T contains all ordinals, but no T_α contains all ordinals. So $\mathcal{N} \notin T$ for no $X \in T$ containing all ordinals.

(iii) and (iv) are similar to (ii) and (i).

(v) Since \mathcal{N} contains all ordinals and no T_α contains all ordinals, there are no $\mathcal{M}_k \in T$ that $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_2, \dots, \mathcal{M}_n \in \mathcal{N}$.

(vi) In the axiom of separation, $\neg(x \in y_1, y_1 \in y_2, \dots, y_n \in x)$ must be considered along with $x \notin x$ because it can also lead to contradiction (p129 - 131, [13]). By definition 4.33 and corollary 4.38(i), \mathcal{N} contains all the non-semi-infinitons and non-quasi-infinitons in T . Thus ($n = 0$ reduces to $x \in x$)

$$x \in \mathcal{N} \iff x \in T \wedge \neg(x \in y_1 \wedge y_1 \in y_2 \wedge \dots \wedge y_n \in x) \quad (1)$$

For $n = 0$, set $x = \mathcal{N}$ and $x = T$ in (1)

$$\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{N} \iff \mathcal{N} \in T \wedge \mathcal{N} \notin \mathcal{N} \quad \text{and} \quad T \in \mathcal{N} \iff T \in T \wedge T \notin T$$

By (i) to (iv), in both cases, the left and right side are false. So there is no contradiction.

For $n > 0$, set $x = \mathcal{N}$ in (1)

$$\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{N} \iff \mathcal{N} \in T \wedge \neg(\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{M}_1 \wedge \mathcal{M}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \mathcal{M}_n \in \mathcal{N})$$

Again both sides are false and there is no contradiction. Thus T is free of Russell's paradox. ■

4.5 Spectrum of Power Set Operations

In this section, we will introduce the notion of the power set spectrum from which the total universe (4.1) can be derived. First, we have the following definitions.

Definition 4.40 Suppose $\mathcal{P}(S) = \{x : x \subset S\}$. Then the α^{th} **power set operation** (on S) is defined (recursively) as:

(i) If α is a successor ordinal, then

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(S) = \mathcal{P}\left(\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha-1)}(S)\right) \quad \left(\mathcal{P}^{(0)}(S) = S\right)$$

(ii) If α is a limit ordinal, then

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(S) = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{(\gamma)}(S)$$

Definition 4.41 A **spectrum of power set operations** is defined as:

$$\mathfrak{Sp} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Omega} \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset) \quad (4.4)$$

Where Ω is a collection of ordinals and is known as a **domain** of the spectrum.

First, we show that the von Neumann universe is the power set spectrum at the successor ordinals.

Lemma 4.42 $V = \bigcup_{\alpha \in SOrd} \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$

Proof. We prove for any successor ordinal α , $V_\alpha = \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$. Clearly, $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\emptyset) = V_1$. Suppose it is true for any successor ordinal $\beta < \alpha$. Then by definition 4.40 and (1.1)

$$V_\alpha = \mathcal{P}(V_{\alpha-1}) = \mathcal{P}\left(\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha-1)}(\emptyset)\right) = \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$$

If α is a limit ordinal, let $V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{(\beta)}(\emptyset)$. Since V_α is transitive, $V_\alpha \subset V_{\alpha+1}$. Thus

$$V = \bigcup_{\alpha \in Ord} V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in SOrd} V_\alpha \cup \bigcup_{\alpha \in LOrd} V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in SOrd} V_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in SOrd} \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$$

In order to prove that the total universe is the power set spectrum at all (limit) ordinals, we need the following results. ■

Theorem 4.43 *Suppose $n < \omega$ and $H_n(G_n, \dots, G_0)$ is defined in (3.1), where $G_i \in V_\omega$. Then*

- (i) $(\exists X \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)) (X = H_n)$.
- (ii) $(\forall n < k < \omega) (\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(k)}(\emptyset))$.
- (iii) $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ is homogeneous.
- (iv) $\mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$ is unique.
- (v) $(\exists X \in \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)) \left(X = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} H_n \right)$.
- (vi) $(\forall n < \omega) (\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset))$.
- (vii) A type of $\mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$ is that there exists a unique \in -sequence of length ω in $\mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$ with each member of $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ ($n \leq \omega$) being a subset of $\mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset)$.

Proof. (i) We prove by induction. Since $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\emptyset) = \{\emptyset\}$, let $G_0 = *\emptyset$ and $G_1 = \emptyset$. Then $X = H_1(\emptyset, *\emptyset) = \emptyset$. Suppose it is true for $n \leq k$, i.e. there is a $H_k \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}(\emptyset)$ that

$$H_k = \{ *G_k, \{ *G_{k-1}, \dots \{ *G_1, G_0 \} \dots \} \}$$

Then for any $G_{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}(\emptyset)$, $X = \{ *G_{k+1}, H_k \} \subset \mathcal{P}^{(k)}(\emptyset)$. So $X \in \mathcal{P}^{(k+1)}(\emptyset)$ and $X = H_{k+1}$.

(ii) For any $n < \omega$, $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \in \mathcal{P}^{(n+1)}(\emptyset)$. Since $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ is transitive, $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(n+1)}(\emptyset)$. So (ii) follows.

(iii) We prove $\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ is an amalgamation class. Then (iii) follows from proposition 3.6.

First heredity is obvious. For joint embedding, suppose $X_i, X_j \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$. Since for $X_k \supset X_i \cup X_j$, there are embeddings $f_0: X_i \rightarrow X_k$, $f_1: X_j \rightarrow X_k$ and $X_k \in \mathcal{P}^{(n+1)}(\emptyset)$, joint embedding holds. For amalgamation, suppose $X_i, X_j, X_k \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ and embeddings $f_0: X_i \rightarrow X_j$ and $f_1: X_i \rightarrow X_k$. Then there is $X_l \supset X_j \cup X_k$, $g_0: X_j \rightarrow X_l$, $g_1: X_k \rightarrow X_l$ and $g_0 \circ f_0 = g_1 \circ f_1$. Since $X_l \in \mathcal{P}^{(n+1)}(\emptyset)$, amalgamation property holds.

(iv) Let $\phi_n(S)$ be a formula that there exists a unique \in -sequence $Y_1 \in \dots \in Y_n = S$ with each Y_{j+1} containing all the members Z of Y_j and $Z \subset Y_j$, i.e.

$$\phi_n(S) \iff \left((Y_n = S) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \exists! Y_j \exists! Y_{j-1} (Y_{j-1} \in Y_j \wedge (\forall Z \in Y_j) (Z \subset Y_{j-1})) \right)$$

Clearly for any $n < \omega$, $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \models \phi_n$. Since for any $n < \omega$ and any $k > n$, $\mathcal{P}^{(k)}(\emptyset) \models \phi_n$, $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ is a homogeneous sequence. So by (iii), proposition 3.4 and definition 2.9, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ is unique.

(v) By (i), (iv), theorem 2.23 and corollary 2.26

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \left(\exists X \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \right) (X = H_n) &\iff \left(\exists X \in \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \right) \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} (X = H_n) \\ &\iff \left(\exists X \in \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \right) \left(X = \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} H_n \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $n < \omega$, $(\exists X \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)) (X = H_n)$ is true, (v) follows.

(vi) By (ii), (iv) and corollary 2.26

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \omega} \forall X \left(X \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \implies X \in \mathcal{P}^{(k)}(\emptyset) \right) \iff \forall X \left(X \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \implies X \in \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \right)$$

Since the left side holds, $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$.

(vii) Clearly, $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ satisfies

$$\xi_n \iff \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n} \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(j)}(\emptyset) \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(j-1)}(\emptyset) \left(\mathcal{P}^{(j-1)}(\emptyset) \in \mathcal{P}^{(j)}(\emptyset) \wedge \left(\forall Z \in \mathcal{P}^{(j)}(\emptyset) \right) \left(Z \subset \mathcal{P}^{(j-1)}(\emptyset) \right) \right)$$

Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) = \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$

$$\xi_\omega \iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \xi_n$$

$$\iff \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \bigwedge_{1 \leq j \leq n-1} \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(j)}(\emptyset) \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(j-1)}(\emptyset) \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{P}^{(j-1)}(\emptyset) \in \mathcal{P}^{(j)}(\emptyset) \wedge \\ (\forall Z \in \mathcal{P}^{(j)}(\emptyset)) (\forall z \in Z) (z \in \mathcal{P}^{(j-1)}(\emptyset)) \end{array} \right)$$

$$\wedge \lim_{n \rightarrow \omega} \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset) \left(\begin{array}{c} \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset) \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \wedge \\ (\forall Z \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)) (\forall z \in Z) (z \in \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset)) \end{array} \right)$$

$$\iff \bigwedge_{n < \omega} \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset) \left(\mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset) \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \wedge \left(\forall Z \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \right) \left(Z \subset \mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset) \right) \right)$$

$$\wedge \exists! \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \left(\mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \in \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \wedge \left(\forall Z \in \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \right) \left(Z \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \right) \right)$$

By theorem 2.7, $\mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \models \xi_\omega$ where ξ_ω describes $\gamma_\omega = \langle \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) : n \leq \omega \rangle$, the unique \in -sequence of length ω in $\mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$ with the members of each $\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ ($n \leq \omega$) being subsets of $\mathcal{P}^{(n-1)}(\emptyset)$. ■

Theorem 4.43 can be easily extended to any limit ordinal and we omit the proof.

Corollary 4.44 *Suppose α is a limit ordinal and $H_\xi(G_\xi, \dots, G_0)$ is defined in (4.2) with $G_\xi \in \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} T_\beta$ ($\xi < \alpha$). Let γ be a successor ordinal. Then*

- (i) $(\forall \gamma < \alpha) (\exists X \in \mathcal{P}^{(\gamma)}(\emptyset)) (X = H_\gamma)$.
- (ii) $(\forall \gamma < \eta < \alpha) (\mathcal{P}^{(\gamma)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\eta)}(\emptyset))$.
- (iii) $\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{(\gamma)}(\emptyset)$ is homogeneous.
- (iv) $\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$ is unique.
- (v) $(\exists X \in \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)) \left(X = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} H_\gamma \right)$.
- (vi) $(\forall \gamma < \alpha) (\mathcal{P}^{(\gamma)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset))$.
- (vii) A type of $\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$ is that there exists a unique \in -sequence of length α in $\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$ with each member of $\mathcal{P}^{(\gamma)}(\emptyset)$ ($\gamma \leq \alpha$) being a subset of $\mathcal{P}^{(\gamma-1)}(\emptyset)$.

Theorem 4.45 $T = \bigcup_{\alpha \in Ord} \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$

Proof. First, we prove for any successor ordinal α , $T_\alpha = \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$. Clearly, $\mathcal{P}^{(1)}(\emptyset) = T_1$. Suppose it is true for any $\beta < \alpha$. Then by definition 4.40 and (4.1)

$$T_\alpha = \mathcal{P}(T_{\alpha-1}) = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}^{(\alpha-1)}(\emptyset)) = \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$$

If α is a limit ordinal, we prove the following.

$$T_\alpha = \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset) = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{(\beta)}(\emptyset) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{(\beta)}(\emptyset) \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} \quad (1)$$

By corollary 4.44(v), let

$$\left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} \mathcal{P}^{(\beta)}(\emptyset) \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} = \{X : X \in \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset) \wedge X = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \alpha} H_\gamma\} \quad (2)$$

First, consider $\alpha = \omega$. For any $n < \omega$, by theorem 4.43(vi)

$$\mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \quad \text{and so} \quad \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$$

So by (2), we have

$$\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \cup \left(\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0} \subset \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$$

On the other hand, for any $X \in \mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset)$, either $X \in \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset)$ or $X \in \left(\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$. So

$$\mathcal{P}^{(\omega)}(\emptyset) \subset \bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \cup \left(\bigcup_{n < \omega} \mathcal{P}^{(n)}(\emptyset) \right) \Big|_{\aleph_0}$$

Thus (1) holds for ω . The general case of (1) can be proved by corollary 4.44 and transfinite induction. Hence by (4.1)

$$T = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} T_\alpha = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \text{Ord}} \mathcal{P}^{(\alpha)}(\emptyset)$$

Remark 4.46 *Theorem 4.45 shows that the total universe and the non-well-founded sets are the results of the power set spectrum at the limit ordinals. The von Neumann universe only involves the power set spectrum at the successor ordinals (lemma 4.42) and thus has only well-founded sets.* ■

5 Conclusion

First, we discuss the validity of the axiom of regularity. Suppose $Z = \{\emptyset, Z\}$ is a semi-infiniton. Then \emptyset is the \in -minimum element of Z . So the axiom of regularity holds for Z , but $Z \in Z$. This example suggests that the axiom of regularity not only can not exclude non-well-founded sets but rather holds for a (large) number of them. As a matter of fact, a well-known result that proves no set being member of itself by the axiom of regularity is actually erroneous.

Conclusion 5.1 *The standard theorem which uses the axiom of regularity to prove that there is no set being a member of itself is flawed.*

Proof. The proof is by contradiction [17, p54]. First suppose $A \in A$ and $A = \{a, b, \dots, A\}$. Then $A \in A \cap \{A\}$ for $A \in \{A\}$. Since A is the only member of $\{A\}$, by AR, $A \cap \{A\} = \emptyset$, contradiction. So we get $A \notin A$.

The problem in the proof is that if $A \in A$, $\{A\} \subset A$. Then $A \cap \{A\} = \{A\} \neq \emptyset$ since $A \neq \emptyset$. Thus we can not prove $A \cap \{A\} = \emptyset$, which means that AR actually can not prove that no set can be a member of itself. ■

Conclusion 5.1 can also be understood in the following way. Suppose $\mathcal{S} = \{X : \text{AR holds for } X\}$ and $T|_{\mathfrak{E}}$ is the semi-infiniton class in T (lemma 4.32(i)). If the axiom of regularity implies no X that $X \in X$, then $\mathcal{S} \cap T|_{\mathfrak{E}} = \emptyset$. But clearly, $\mathcal{S} \cap T|_{\mathfrak{E}} \neq \emptyset$ for $Z = \{\emptyset, Z\} \in \mathcal{S} \cap T|_{\mathfrak{E}}$. Consequently, AR can not imply that no set is a member of itself.

In addition, the claim to prove that every set belongs to the von Neumann universe based on the axiom of regularity is also flawed [4, lemma 6.3] because the axiom of regularity holds for (many) non-well-founded sets and V only has well-founded sets.

As the result, we conclude that the axiom of regularity is not valid even in defining the well-founded sets and so is dropped in this paper. All well-founded sets are defined in definition 1.1, which is stronger than the axiom of regularity as in the following result.

Corollary 5.2 *If every branch of S is finite, then there is a $x \in S$ that $x \cap S = \emptyset$. The converse is not true.*

Proof. Suppose $x \in \{y: y \in S, R_V(y) = \min\}$. Then $x \cap S = \emptyset$. Conversely, let $S = \{\emptyset, S\}$. Then $S \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$, but S has an infinite branch. ■

In this paper, a new model is proposed to define non-well-founded sets rigorously upon limits of structures and formulas. In addition, the expansion of the von Neumann universe is shown to be necessary because it lacks the limit ordinal ranks. As a result, non-well-founded sets that are initially added to V as limit ordinal ranks become an integral part of well-founded sets, forming a new complete universe of sets. The three types of infinitely generated sets are rigorously investigated based on the limit of formulas. The new universe of sets known as the total universe is shown to be a model of ZF minus the axiom of regularity and free of Russell's paradox. Furthermore, the spectrum of power set operations can offer a new perspective on the nature of non-well-founded sets (and well-founded sets).

References

- [1] Aczel, P. *Non-well-founded Sets*. CSLI, 1988.
- [2] Bernays, P. "A System of Axiomatic Set Theory – Part VI", *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 13(2): 65–79, 1948.
- [3] Chang, C.C. and Keisler, H.J. *Model Theory*. Dover, New York, 2012.
- [4] Jech, T. *Set Theory, The Third Millennium Edition, revised and expanded*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2003.
- [5] Karp, C. "Independence Proofs in Predicate Logic with Infinitely Long Expressions", *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 27(2): 171–188, 1962.
- [6] Kechris, A. *Classical Descriptive Set Theory*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [7] Keisler, H.J. "Finite approximations of infinitely long formulas", *The Theory of Models, Proceedings of the 1963 International Symposium at Berkeley*, edited by Addison, Henkin, and Tarski, Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 158–169, 1965.
- [8] Knoche, C. "A study of the concept of rank in set theory", *Master thesis*, Lehigh University, 1973.
- [9] Kunen, K. *Set Theory: An Introduction to Independence Proofs*. North-Holland, New York, 1980.

- [10] Macpherson, D. “A survey of homogeneous structures”, *Discrete Mathematics*, 311(15): 1599–1634, 2011.
- [11] Marker, D. *Model Theory: An Introduction*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.
- [12] Mirimanoff, D. “Les antinomies de Russell et de Burali-Forti et le probleme fondamental de la theorie des ensembles”, *L’Enseignement Mathematique*, 19: 37–52, 1917.
- [13] Quine, W.V. *Mathematical Logic*. Harvard University Press, 1981.
- [14] Rathjen, M. “Predictability, Circularity, and Anti-Foundation”, in Link, Godehard (eds), *One Hundred Years of Russell’s Paradox: Mathematics, Logic, Philosophy*. Walter de Gruyter, 2004.
- [15] Sharlow, M. “Broadening the Iterative Conception of Set”, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 42(3): 149–170, 2001.
- [16] Scott, D. “Logic with denumerably long formulas and finite strings of quantifiers”, *The Theory of Models, Proceedings of the 1963 International Symposium at Berkeley*, edited by Addison, Henkin, and Tarski, Studies in logic and the foundations of mathematics, North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 329–341, 1965.
- [17] Suppes, P. *Axiomatic Set Theory*. Dover, New York, 1972.
- [18] Tarski, A. “The notion of rank in set theory and some of its applications”, *Abstract 628, Bulletin of American Mathematical Society*, 61(5): 443, 1955.
- [19] Vaught, R. “Denumerable models of complete theories”, *Infinitistic Methods (Proc. Symp. Foundations Math, Warsaw, 1959)*, Warsaw/Pergamon Press, 303–321, 1961.
- [20] Viale, M. “The cumulative hierarchy and the constructible universe of ZFA”, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly*, 50(1): 99–103, 2004.

Email address: ejz5166@psu.edu and ezhang7337@gmail.com