## A NOTE ON ULTRAPOWER CARDINALITY

## Aleksandar Jovanović

(Communicated August 5, 1977)

Here we give some evaluations of ultrapower cardinality, obtained by generalising techniques developed in [1] and [2]. Filter regularity definition is from [2].

We say that a filter D is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -regular if D contains a family E such that

$$|E|=\beta$$
 and

$$X \subset E \& |X| \geqslant \alpha \rightarrow \bigcap X = \emptyset.$$

Ultrafilters D and E are equally regular if for all  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  D is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -regular iff E is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -regular.

In the following text we assume that D is an uniform ultrafilter over an arbitrary cardinal  $\gamma$ .

Proposition. If D is  $(\alpha, \beta)$  regular and  $\nu$ , k are cardinals such that

$$\alpha \leqslant \nu \leqslant \beta \quad \alpha \leqslant k \leqslant \beta \quad and$$

$$k \stackrel{\nu}{\smile} = k, \qquad then$$

$$\left| \prod_{D} k \right| \geqslant 2^{\beta} \quad and$$

$$\left| \prod_{D} k \right|^{\nu} = \left| \prod_{D} k \right|.$$

Corollary.

3. If 
$$(cf\gamma)^{cf\gamma} = cf\gamma$$
 then  $\left| \prod_{D} cf\gamma \right|^{cf\gamma} = \left| \prod_{D} cf\gamma \right|$ .

4. If 
$$\gamma$$
 is strongly inaccessible or  $(\gamma = \lambda^+ \text{ and } 2^{\lambda} = \lambda^+)$  then  $\left| \prod_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i \right| = 2^{\gamma_i}$ .

Proof.

I. By assumption, k = k, what implies that  $\left| \prod_{D} k \right| = \left| \prod_{D} k \right|$  and  $v \le k$ . Since D is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -regular and  $v \in [\alpha, \beta]$ , D is  $(v, \beta)$ -regular too. Let  $E \subset D$  be such that

a) 
$$|E| = \beta$$

b) if 
$$X \subset E$$
 and  $|X| \geqslant \nu$  then  $\bigcap X = \emptyset$ .

Let E be well ordered by  $\leq$ . For all  $i \in \bigcup E \in D$  we define:

$$X(i) = \{e \in E: i \in e\}$$
 and

seq (i) to be the sequence of  $e \in X(i)$  ordered by  $\leq$ . Given any  $g \in {}^{E_{\nu}}$ , we define g'

if 
$$seq(i) = \langle e_{\varepsilon} | \xi \langle v_i \langle v \rangle$$
 then

$$g'(i) = \langle g(e_{\xi}) | \xi < v_i < v \rangle.$$

 $X(i) \subset E$  and  $i \in \cap X(i)$ , hence by b),  $|X(i)| < \nu$  and thus  $g'(i) \in k^{\vee}$ . Define  $\pi: E_{V \to D} \prod k^{\vee}$  with  $\pi g = g'_{D}$ . We prove that  $\pi$  is 1-1. Let  $g, h \in E_{V}$  and  $g \neq h$ .

That means that for some  $e \in E$   $g(e) \neq h(e)$ . Let e be  $e_{\lambda}$  in seq(i). Hence, for all  $i \in e$ 

$$g'(i) = \langle g(e_i) \cdots g(e_{\lambda}) \cdots g(e_{\xi}) \cdots | \xi < v_i < v \rangle \neq \langle h(e_i) \cdots h(e_{\lambda}) \cdots h(e_{\xi}) \cdots | \xi < v_i < v \rangle = h'(i).$$

Since  $e \in D$ , we have that  $g'_D \neq h'_D$ . Hence

$$\big|\prod_{n} k\big| \geqslant \big|^{E_{\mathsf{V}}}\big| = 2^{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

- 2.  $k^{\nu} = k$  is assumed. So,  $\left| \prod_{D} k \right| = \left| \prod_{D} k^{\nu} \right|$ . We shall prove that  $\left| \prod_{D} k \right|^{\nu} \le \left| \prod_{D} k^{\nu} \right|$ . To do that it is sufficient to find  $\tau$ , which maps a subset of  $\prod_{D} k^{\nu}$  onto  $\binom{\tau}{D} k$ . For this, it is sufficient to find a  $\sigma$ :  $\binom{\tau}{V} \to \binom{V}{V}$  such that
- (+) if  $g, h \in {}^{v}({}^{\gamma}k)$  and  $\sigma g = {}_{D}\sigma h$ , then for all  $\xi < v$ ,  $g(\xi) = {}_{D}h(\xi)$ . Since then  $\tau$  can be defined by:

if 
$$\sigma g = f$$
 then  $\tau (f_D) = \langle g(\xi) | \xi < v \rangle$ .

D is  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -regular and hence  $(\alpha, \nu)$ -regular, so there is an  $E \subset D$  such that:  $|E| = \nu$ , and for all  $X \subset E$ ,  $|X| \geqslant \alpha$  implies that  $\cap X = \varnothing$ . Let E be well ordered with  $\leqslant$ . From here  $E = \{e_{\xi} \mid \xi < \nu\}$ . By choice of E, for any  $i \in \bigcup E$  there is  $\nu_i < \nu$  such that  $i \in e_{\nu_i}$  but for all  $\xi > \nu_i$ ,  $i \notin e_{\xi}$ . Now we define  $\sigma$ :

if 
$$g \in {}^{\vee}({}^{\gamma}k)$$
 then  $(\sigma g)(i) = \langle g(\varnothing)(i) \cdots g(\xi)(i) \cdots | \xi \leqslant v_i \rangle$ .  
 $\sigma g \in {}^{\gamma}(k, \underline{v})$ . We prove  $(+)$ . Let  $\sigma g = {}_{D}\sigma h$  and let  $X = \{i \in \gamma: (\sigma g)(i) = (\sigma h)(i)\}$ .  
 $X \in D$ . For all  $\xi < v$  we define  $d_{\xi} = \{i \in \gamma: v_i > \xi\}$ . Since  $\{i \in \gamma: v_i > \xi\} = \bigcup_{\lambda > 2} e_{\lambda}$ , we

see that for any  $\xi < v$ ,  $d_{\xi} \in D$ , and  $\gamma \setminus d_{\xi} \in D$ . Hence, for all  $\xi < v$ ,  $d_{\xi} \cap X \in D$ . However, for all  $i \in d_{\xi} \cap X$  we have that  $v_i > \xi$  and  $(\sigma g)(i) = (\sigma h)(i)$ . Thus,

$$\{i \in \gamma: g(\xi)(i) = h(\xi)(i)\} \supset d_{\xi} \cap X \in D,$$

which implies that  $g(\xi) = ph(\xi)$ .

3. D is a uniform ultrafilter over  $\gamma$  therefore it is  $(cf(\gamma), cf(\gamma))$ -regular.  $cf(\gamma)^{cf(\gamma)} = cf(\gamma)$  is assumed, thus we can apply 2. to obtain

$$\Big| \prod_{D} cf(\gamma) \Big|^{cf(\gamma)} = \Big| \prod_{D} cf(\gamma) \Big|.$$

4. a) if  $\gamma$  is strongly inaccessible then  $cf \gamma = \gamma$  and  $\gamma \mathcal{I} = \gamma$ . Thus, we have

$$\left| \prod_{p} \gamma \right| = \left| \prod_{p} \gamma \right|^{\gamma} = 2^{\gamma}.$$

b) if  $\gamma$  is a successor cardinal, say  $\gamma = \lambda^+$ , then  $cf \gamma = \gamma$ . Suppose that continuum hypothesis is true on  $\lambda$  i.e.  $2^{\lambda} = \lambda^+ = \gamma$ . Then we have  $\gamma^{[M]} = \gamma^{\lambda} = 2^{\lambda} = \gamma$ , and, by 3.

$$\Big|\prod_{D} \gamma\Big| = \Big|\prod_{D} \gamma\Big|^{\gamma} = 2^{\gamma}.$$

From Frayne, Morell and Scott Theorem we know that  $\left|\prod_{D}\gamma\right| > \gamma$ . Now we see that in the cases a) and b) we have  $\left|\prod_{D}\gamma\right| = 2^{\gamma}$  or, equally  $\left|\prod_{D}\gamma\right|$  does not depend on the continuum hypothesis at  $\gamma$ .

We could not answer the following question.

Is it possible that for some cardinal k and some equally regular ultrafilters D and E

$$\left|\prod_{D} k\right| \neq \left|\prod_{E} k\right|$$
 ?

## REFERENCES

- [1] Chang, Keisler, Model theory, North Holland, 1973.
- [2] Comfort, Negrepontis, The theory of ultrafilters, Springer Verlag 1974.