Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic
Volume III, Number 3, July 1962

A SET-THEORETICAL FORMULA EQUIVALENT TO THE AXIOM OF CHOICE

BOLESŁAW SOBOCIŃSKI

It is obvious that the following set-theoretical formula:[1]

S1 *For any cardinal numbers* $\mathfrak{m}$ *and* $\mathfrak{n}$ *which are not finite, if* $\aleph(\mathfrak{m})$ *and* $\aleph(\mathfrak{n})$ *are the least Hartogs' alephs with respect to* $\mathfrak{m}$ *and* $\mathfrak{n}$ *respectively, and such that* $\aleph(\mathfrak{m}) = \aleph(\mathfrak{n})$, *then there is no cardinal* $\mathfrak{p}$ *such that* $\mathfrak{m} < \mathfrak{p} < \mathfrak{n}$.

is a simple consequence of the theorem:

$\mathfrak{A}$. *For any cardinal numbers* $\mathfrak{m}$ *and* $\mathfrak{n}$ *which are not finite, if* $\aleph(\mathfrak{m})$ *and* $\aleph(\mathfrak{n})$ *are the least Hartogs' alephs with respect to* $\mathfrak{m}$ *and* $\mathfrak{n}$ *respectively, and such that* $\aleph(\mathfrak{m}) = \aleph(\mathfrak{n})$, *then* $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{n}$.

which, as it is proved in [3], p. 230, is inferentially equivalent to the axiom of choice. Although at first glance it appears that formula **S1** is weaker than $\mathfrak{A}$, in fact, as I shall show in this note, the former formula implies the axiom of choice, and, therefore, it is inferentially equivalent to $\mathfrak{A}$. For, a proof is given here that the following theorem:

A. *For any cardinal number* $\mathfrak{m}$ *which is not finite, if* $\aleph(\mathfrak{m})$ *is the least Hartogs' aleph with respect to* $\mathfrak{m}$, *then there is no cardinal* $\mathfrak{p}$ *such that* $\aleph(\mathfrak{m}) < \mathfrak{p} < \mathfrak{m} + \aleph(\mathfrak{m})$.

which is inferentially equivalent to the axiom of choice, as it is proved in [2], follows from **S1** without the aid of the said axiom.

Proof: Let us assume **S1** and consider that

(i) $\mathfrak{m}$ *is an arbitrary cardinal number which is not finite,*

and that

(ii) $\aleph(\mathfrak{m})$ *is the least Hartogs' aleph with respect to* $\mathfrak{m}$.

Then, obviously, we have

Received November 23, 1961