

- [6] L. Fuchs, *Abelian groups*, Budapest 1958.  
 [7] P. Gabriel und U. Oberst, *Spektralkategorien und reguläre Ringe im Von-Neumannschen Sinn*, Math. Z. 92 (1966), pp. 389-395.  
 [8] A. W. Goldie, *Torsion-free modules and rings*, J. Algebra 1 (1964), pp. 268-287.  
 [9] E. Matlis, *Injective modules over noetherian rings*, Pacific J. Math. 8 (1958), pp. 511-528.  
 [10] O. Ore, *Galois connections*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 55 (1944), pp. 493-513.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Reçu par la Rédaction le 16. 1. 1968

## Some remarks on Hausdorff measure

by

R. B. Darst (Lafayette, Ind.)

Let us begin with some notation and terminology. Denote by  $\mathcal{F}$  the class of non-decreasing functions  $h$  on  $(0, \infty)$  with  $\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} h(\varepsilon) = 0$ . If  $h \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $E \subset I = [0, 1]$ , then the  $h$ -Hausdorff outer measure  $m_h(E)$  of  $E$  is the extended real number

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \sum h(b_i - a_i); E \subset \bigcup (a_i, b_i), \sup(b_i - a_i) < \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Denote by  $\mathcal{K}$  the collection of subsets  $E$  of  $I$  such that  $m_h(E) = 0$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{F}$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{P}$  the collection of regular non-atomic probability measures  $\mu$  on the Borel subsets  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $I$ , and denote by  $\mathcal{N}$  the collection of subsets  $E$  of  $I$  satisfying  $\sup\{\mu^*(E); \mu \in \mathcal{P}\} = 0$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{C}$  the set of concentrated subsets of  $I$  (i.e.,  $E \in \mathcal{C} \iff$  there is a sequence  $\{x_i\}$  of elements of  $I$  such that if  $\{\varepsilon_i\}$  is a sequence of positive numbers, then  $E - \bigcup N(x_i, \varepsilon_i)$  is, at most, a countable set, where  $N(x, \varepsilon) = (x - \varepsilon/2, x + \varepsilon/2)$ ). Finally, denote by  $\mathcal{D}$  the collection of enumerations  $\{x_i\}$  of countable, dense subsets of  $I$  and by  $\mathcal{E}$  the collection of sequences of positive numbers.

It is easy to show that  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ , and the author showed [1] that if the continuum hypothesis is satisfied, then  $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{N}$ . The purpose of this note is to show, assuming the continuum hypothesis, that  $\mathcal{C} \neq \mathcal{K}$ . To this end, let us begin by giving the following characterizations of the elements of  $\mathcal{K}$ .

LEMMA 1. *Each of the following conditions is necessary and sufficient in order that a subset  $E$  of  $I$  be an element of  $\mathcal{K}$ .*

- (i) *If  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$ , then there is a sequence  $\{x_i\}$  of points of  $I$  such that  $E - \bigcup N(x_i, \varepsilon_i)$  is countable.*
- (ii) *If  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$ , then there is  $\{x_i\} \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $E - \bigcup N(x_i, \varepsilon_i)$  is countable.*
- (iii) *If  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$ , then there is a sequence  $\{x_i\}$  of points of  $I$  such that  $E \subset \bigcup N(x_i, \varepsilon_i)$ .*
- (iv) *If  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$ , then there is  $\{x_i\} \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $E \subset \bigcup N(x_i, \varepsilon_i)$ .*

Proof. One checks without difficulty that conditions (i)-(iv) are equivalent and that they imply  $E \in \mathcal{K}$ . Suppose that (iii) is not satisfied. Under this supposition there exists a monotonic sequence  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$  such that (1)  $\lim \varepsilon_i = 0$  and (2) if  $\{x_i\} \subset I$ , then  $E \not\subset \bigcup N(x_i, \varepsilon_i)$ . Let  $h \in \mathcal{F}$  be defined as follows:  $h(\varepsilon_{2^n-1}) = 2^{-(n-1)}$ ,  $h(x) = 1$  if  $x > \varepsilon_1$ , and  $h$  is linear on  $[\varepsilon_{2^{n+1}-1}, \varepsilon_{2^n-1}]$ . Suppose that  $E \subset \bigcup (a_i, b_i)$  where the sequence  $\{b_i - a_i\}$  is non-increasing. Then there are a positive integer  $j$  and a positive integer  $n$  satisfying  $\varepsilon_i < b_i - a_i$  and  $2^{n+1} - 1 > i \geq 2^n - 1$ . Thus

$$b_j - a_j \geq \varepsilon_{2^{n+1}-1} \quad \text{for } j < 2^n - 1$$

and, hence,

$$\sum \bar{h}(b_j - a_j) \geq (2^n - 1)h(\varepsilon_{2^{n+1}-1}) = (2^n - 1)2^{-n} > 2^{-1}$$

which implies that  $m_h(E) > 0$ .

EXAMPLE 1. Assuming the continuum hypothesis, let  $\{x^\alpha\}$  and  $\{\varepsilon^\alpha\}$  be well orderings of  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\mathcal{E}$  such that each  $a$  has countably many predecessors. Let  $y = \{y_i\} \in \mathcal{D}$ , let  $U_\alpha = \bigcup N(y_i, \varepsilon_i^\alpha)$ , and let  $W_\alpha = \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} U_\beta$ .

Then  $W_\alpha$  is the complement in  $I$  of a first category  $F_\sigma$  subset of  $I$ . In what follows we shall use the fact that an uncountable Borel set  $B$  contains a perfect nowhere dense set  $P$  which in turn supports an element  $\mu$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  (i.e.,  $\mu(P) = 1$ ). We shall also use the fact (cf. [1]), assuming the continuum hypothesis, that any uncountable closed subset  $Q$  of  $I$  contains an uncountable Lusin subset  $S$  (i.e., if  $\{x_i\}$  is a sequence of points of  $Q$  which is dense in  $Q$  and  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$ , then  $S - \bigcup N(x_i, \varepsilon_i)$  is countable). Let  $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{F}$  with support  $P_0$ , a nowhere dense subset of  $U_0$ . Let  $\delta^0 \in \mathcal{E}$  satisfy  $\sum \mu_0(N(x_i^0, \delta_i^0)) < 1$ . Let  $S_0$  be an uncountable Lusin subset of a perfect nowhere dense subset  $Q_0$  of  $P_0 - \bigcup N(x_i^0, \delta_i^0)$ . Suppose that  $\mu_\beta, P_\beta, \delta^\beta, Q_\beta$ , and  $S_\beta$  have been defined for  $\beta < \alpha$ . Then  $X_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} (P_\beta \cup Q_\beta)$  is a first category  $F_\sigma$  subset of  $I$  and, hence,  $W_\alpha - X_\alpha$  contains a nowhere dense perfect set  $P_\alpha$  which supports  $\mu_\alpha \in \mathcal{F}$ . Let  $\delta^\alpha$  satisfy  $\mu_\alpha(\bigcup N(x_i^\alpha, \delta_i^\alpha)) < 1$ .

Then let  $S_\alpha$  be an uncountable Lusin subset of a perfect nowhere dense subset  $Q_\alpha$  of  $P_\alpha - \bigcup N(x_i^\alpha, \delta_i^\alpha)$ . Let  $E = \bigcup_\alpha S^\alpha$ , let  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$ , and let  $\{x_i\} \in \mathcal{D}$ . Then there exist indices  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  such that  $\{\varepsilon_{2i}\} = \varepsilon^\alpha$  and  $\{x_i\} = x^\beta$ . Since  $S_\beta$  is an uncountable subset of  $E - \bigcup N(x_i^\beta, \delta_i^\beta)$ ,  $E \notin \mathcal{C}$ . Moreover,  $\bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} S_\gamma \subset \bigcup N(y_i, \varepsilon_{2i})$ . Because a countable union  $T = \bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} S_\gamma$  of Lusin subsets is an element of  $\mathcal{C}$ , there exists a sequence  $\{z_i\}$  of points of  $I$  such that  $T_\alpha \subset \bigcup N(z_i, \varepsilon_{2i-1})$ . Let  $w_{2i} = y_i$  and  $w_{2i-1} = z_i$  to obtain  $E \subset \bigcup N(w_i, \varepsilon_i)$ :  $E \in \mathcal{K}$ .

Although a determination of whether  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{N}$  seems to be elusive, an example is given below to show that if  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{N}$  and the continuum hypothesis is satisfied, then there is a subset  $E$  of  $I$  such that  $E$  is not measurable with respect to Lebesgue measure  $m(0 = m_*(E) < m^*(E))$  but satisfies  $\mu(E) = 0$  for every element  $\mu$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  that is singular with respect to Lebesgue measure (i.e.,  $\mu \wedge m = 0$ ). In the course of constructing the example, it will be convenient to have the following lemma.

LEMMA 2. Suppose that  $v \in \mathcal{F}$  and that  $\{X_i\}$  is a sequence of elements of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Then there is a first category subset  $F$  of  $I$  satisfying

- (1)  $v(F) = 1$ , and
- (2)  $F \cap X_i$  is a first category subset of  $X_i$ ,  $i \geq 1$ .

Proof. Let  $p$  be a positive integer, and let  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  be closed and nowhere dense subsets of  $X_i$  and  $I - X_i$  satisfying  $v(A_i \cup B_i) > 1 - (p2^i)^{-1}$ . Let  $F_p = \bigcap (A_i \cup B_i)$ . Then  $F_p$  is nowhere dense in  $I, X_1, X_2, \dots$  and

$$v(I - F_p) = v\left(U(I - (A_i \cup B_i))\right) \leq \sum v(I - (A_i \cup B_i)) < p^{-1}.$$

It suffices to let  $F = \bigcup F_p$ .

EXAMPLE 2. Let  $\{\varepsilon_i\} \in \mathcal{E}$  such that  $\sum \varepsilon_i < 2^{-1}$ . Let  $P$  be a nowhere dense perfect subset of  $I$  satisfying  $m(P) > 2^{-1}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}_1$  be a maximal collection of mutually singular elements of  $\mathcal{F}$  with  $m \in \mathcal{F}_1$ . Suppose that  $\{\mu_\alpha\}$  is a well ordering of  $\mathcal{F}_1$  such that  $\mu_0 = m$  and each  $a$  has countably many predecessors. If  $\mu \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $\mu = \sum_{\nu \in \mathcal{F}_1} \mu \wedge \nu$ : if  $\mu_\alpha(E) = 0$  for  $\alpha > 0$ , then  $\mu(E) = 0$  for  $\mu \wedge m = 0$ .

If  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\{\nu_i^\alpha\}^{\aleph_\alpha}$  is an enumeration of  $\{\mu_\beta\}_{\beta < \alpha}$  where  $n_\alpha$  is a positive integer or "infinity", then  $\mu_\alpha$  is singular with respect to

$$v_\alpha = (1 - 2^{-n_\alpha})^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} 2^{-1} \nu_i^\alpha.$$

Hence, employing Lemma 2, there is a first category subset  $H_\alpha$  of  $I$  such that

- (1)  $H_\alpha \cap P$  and  $H_\alpha - P$  are first category  $F_\sigma$  subsets of  $P$  and  $I - P$ ,
- (2)  $\mu_\beta(H_\alpha) = 0$ ,  $\beta < \alpha$ , and
- (3)  $\mu_\alpha(H_\alpha) = 1$ .

For  $\alpha > 0$ , let  $K_\alpha = \bigcup_{0 < \beta < \alpha} H_\beta$ . Then  $\mu_0(K_\alpha) = 0$ . Suppose that  $\{x^\alpha\}$  is a corresponding well ordering of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Let  $U_\alpha = \bigcup N(x_i^\alpha, \varepsilon_i)$ , and let  $T_\alpha = I - U_\alpha$ . Then  $\mu_0(T) > 2^{-1}$  and, since  $\mu_0(P) > 2^{-1}$ ,  $\mu_0(T_\alpha \cap P) = \mu_0(T_\alpha \cap P - K_\alpha) > 0$ . Let  $S_\alpha$  be an uncountable Lusin subset of

$(T_\alpha \cap P - K_\alpha)$ . Let  $S_0$  be an uncountable Lusin subset of  $T_0$ . Finally, let  $E = \bigcup S_\alpha$ . Then, since  $S_\alpha \subset E \cap T_\alpha$ ,  $E \notin \mathcal{K}$ . Moreover, recalling that a countable union of Lusin sets is an element of  $\mathcal{C}$  and, a fortiori, of  $\mathcal{N}$ , it follows that for  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$\mu_\alpha(E) \leq \mu_\alpha\left(\bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} S_\beta\right) + \mu_\alpha(I - K_\alpha) = 0.$$

Therefore, assuming the continuum hypothesis, if  $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{N}$ , then  $\mu_0^*(E) > 0$ .

#### References

- [1] R. B. Darst, *A universal null set which is not concentrated*, *Fund. Math.* 62 (1968), pp. 47-48.

*Reçu par la Rédaction le 20. 1. 1968*

## Novak's result by Henkin's method

by

H. C. Doets\* (Bussum)

1. In [1], Novak proved among other things that, if Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory (ZF) is consistent, so is von Neumann-Bernays-Gödel set theory (NBG). Mostowski extended the result (see [2]) by noting that any theorem of NBG which speaks about sets only can already be derived in ZF. By making use of the method of Henkin's proof of the completeness theorem for first order theories [3] we show how a very simple proof of the above-stated fact may be obtained. Essentially, this is done as in [1] by showing that, assuming the consistency of a ZF-like theory, a model may be obtained for a related NBG-like theory.

However, professor Mostowski notified me of the fact that J. R. Shoenfield's proof of the theorem (JSL 19 (1954), pp. 21-28) remains the best result by showing that a primitive recursive function exists yielding proofs in ZF from proofs in NBG for ZF-sentences, while from our proof (as well as from Novak's and Rosser-Wang's, JSL 15 (1950), pp. 113-129) there results a *general* recursive function only (cf. Shoenfield's introduction to his paper).

2. Our symbolism will be one of the usual kinds and accordingly will not be explained. Free variables are indicated between brackets as usual; the same for substitution of terms in formulas; it is assumed that the necessary changes always are made to avoid clash of variables. Semantical notions like satisfaction (a finite sequence of a model  $M$  may satisfy a formula without indicating the relation between objects and variables too precisely) and ( $M$ -) truth are assumed to be known but use will be made of very elementary properties of these notions only (as in [3]). For NBG, refer to [4]. We make however the following slight change: let  $S(x)$  be the formula  $\forall y(x \in y)$ ; erase axioms A1 and A2; rewrite all axioms in one kind of variables relativizing former set variables to  $S$ . We denote axioms of the new system by the names of the corresponding axioms in the old system.

\* Institute for Foundational Research, Amsterdam