

PARTITION MODELS, PERMUTATIONS OF INFINITE SETS WITHOUT FIXED POINTS, VARIANTS OF CAC, AND WEAK FORMS OF AC

Amitayu Banerjee

ABSTRACT. We study new relations of the following statements with weak choice principles in ZF (Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory without the Axiom of Choice (AC)) and ZFA (ZF with the axiom of extensionality weakened to allow the existence of atoms).

- For every infinite set X , there exists a permutation of X without fixed points.
- There is no Hausdorff space X such that every infinite subset of X contains an infinite compact subset.
- If a field has an algebraic closure then it is unique up to isomorphism.
- For every cardinal \mathfrak{m} , there is a set A such that $2^{|A|^2} \geq \mathfrak{m}$ and there is a choice function on the collection of 2 element subsets of A .
- If in a poset all chains are finite and all antichains have size \aleph_α , then the set has size \aleph_α .
- Any infinite locally finite connected graph has a spanning subgraph omitting $K_{2,n}$ for any $2 < n \in \omega$.
- Any infinite locally finite connected graph has a spanning m -bush for any even integer $m \geq 4$.

We also study the new status of different weak choice principles in the finite partition model (a type of permutation model of ZFA + \neg AC) introduced by Bruce in 2016. Further, we prove that vDCP (Van Douwen's Choice Principle) holds in two recently constructed known permutation models.

1. INTRODUCTION AND ABBREVIATIONS

1.1. **Algebraic, topological, and set-theoretical weak choice forms.** Firstly, we study new relations of some algebraic, topological, and set-theoretical weak forms of AC with other weak forms of AC.

1.1.1. *Weak choice forms.* We recall the following weak forms of AC from [HR98].

- [HR98, **Form 269**]: For every cardinal \mathfrak{m} , there is a set A such that $2^{|A|^2} \geq \mathfrak{m}$ and there is a choice function on the collection of 2 element subsets of A (In the absence of AC, a set \mathfrak{m} is called a *cardinal* if it is the *cardinality* $|x|$ of some set x , where $|x|$ is the set $\{y : |y| = |x| \text{ and } y \text{ is of least rank}\}$ (cf. [Jec73, § 11.2])).
- [HR98, **Form 233**]: If a field has an algebraic closure then it is unique up to isomorphism.
- [HR98, **Form 304**]: There does not exist a Hausdorff space X such that every infinite subset of X contains an infinite compact subset.
- AC^{LO} [HR98, **Form 202**]: Every linearly ordered family of non-empty sets has a choice function.
- LW [HR98, **Form 90**]: Every linearly ordered set can be well-ordered.
- AC^{WO} [HR98, **Form 40**]: Every well-orderable set of non-empty sets has a choice function.
- AC_n^- for each $n \in \omega, n \geq 2$ [HR98, **Form 342(n)**]: Every infinite family \mathcal{A} of n -element sets has a partial choice function, i.e., \mathcal{A} has an infinite subfamily \mathcal{B} with a choice function.
- The *Chain/Antichain Principle*, CAC [HR98, **Form 217**]: Every infinite partially ordered set (poset) has an infinite chain or an infinite antichain.

1.1.2. *Introduction and known results.* Pincus proved that **Form 233** holds in the basic Fraenkel model (cf. [HR98, **Note 41**]). It is also known that in the basic Fraenkel model, **Form 269** fails, where as **Form 304** holds (cf. [HR98, **Notes 91, 116**]). Fix any natural number $2 \leq n \in \omega$. Tachtsis [Tac16a, **Theorem 2.1**] constructed a permutation model where AC_2^- fails but CAC holds. Halbeisen–Tachtsis [HT20, **Theorem 8**] constructed a similar permutation model (we denote by $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$) where AC_n^- fails but CAC holds.

1.1.3. *Results.* We prove the following.

- (1) AC^{LO} does not imply **Form 269** in ZFA. Hence, neither LW nor AC^{WO} implies **Form 269** in ZFA (cf. **Theorem 3.1**).
- (2) **Form 269** fails in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ (cf. **Theorem 3.2**).

Key words and phrases. Partition models, Existence of permutations of infinite sets without fixed points, Variants of Chain/Antichain principle, Van Douwen's Choice Principle, Spanning subgraphs, Fraenkel-Mostowski permutation models of ZFA + \neg AC.

- (3) **Form 233** and **Form 304** hold in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ (cf. **Theorem 3.2**). Consequently, for any integer $n \geq 2$, neither **Form 233** nor **Form 304** implies AC_n^- in ZFA.

1.2. Partition models and permutations of infinite sets. We study the status of different weak forms of AC in the finite partition model (a type of Fraenkel–Mostowski permutation model) introduced in [Bru16].

1.2.1. Weak choice forms and abbreviations. We recall the necessary weak forms of AC.

- AC_n for each $n \in \omega, n \geq 2$ [HR98, **Form 61**]: Every family of n -element sets has a choice function.
- [HR98, **Form 64**]: There are no amorphous sets (An infinite set X is *amorphous* if X cannot be written as a disjoint union of two infinite subsets).
- $\text{DF} = \text{F}$ [HR98, **Form 9**]: Every Dedekind-finite set is finite (A set X is called *Dedekind-finite* if $\aleph_0 \not\leq |X|$ i.e., if there is no one-to-one function $f : \omega \rightarrow X$. Otherwise, X is called *Dedekind-infinite*).
- W_{\aleph_α} (cf. [Jec73, **Chapter 8**]): For every X , either $|X| \leq \aleph_\alpha$ or $|X| \geq \aleph_\alpha$. We recall that W_{\aleph_0} is equivalent to $\text{DF} = \text{F}$ in ZF.
- DC_κ for an infinite well-ordered cardinal κ [HR98, **Form 87**(κ)]: Let κ be an infinite well-ordered cardinal (i.e., κ is an aleph). Let S be a non-empty set and let R be a binary relation such that for every $\alpha < \kappa$ and every α -sequence $s = (s_\epsilon)_{\epsilon < \alpha}$ of elements of S there exists $y \in S$ such that sRy . Then there is a function $f : \kappa \rightarrow S$ such that for every $\alpha < \kappa$, $(f \upharpoonright \alpha)Rf(\alpha)$. We note that DC_{\aleph_0} is a reformulation of DC (the principle of Dependent Choices [HR98, **Form 43**]). We denote by $\text{DC}_{<\lambda}$ the assertion $(\forall \eta < \lambda)\text{DC}_\eta$.
- [HR98, **Form 3**]: For every infinite cardinal \mathfrak{m} , $2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}$. We denote the above principle as ‘ \forall infinite \mathfrak{m} ($2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}$)’.
- $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ [HR98, **Form 231**]: The union of a well-ordered collection of well-orderable sets is well-orderable.
- The *Axiom of Multiple Choice*, MC [HR98, **Form 67**]: Every family \mathcal{A} of non-empty sets has a multiple choice function, i.e., there is a function f with domain \mathcal{A} such that for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$, $f(A)$ is a non-empty finite subset of A .
- $\leq \aleph_0\text{-MC}$ (cf. [HST16, §1]): For any family $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ of non-empty sets, there is a function F with domain I such that for all $i \in I$, $F(i)$ is a non-empty countable (i.e., finite or countably infinite) subset of A_i .

We recall the following abbreviations from [Tac19] and [Tac16].

- ISAE (cf. [Tac19, §2]): For every infinite set X , there is a permutation f of X without fixed points and such that $f^2 = \text{id}_X$.
- EPWFP (cf. [Tac19, §2]): For every infinite set X , there exists a permutation of X without fixed points.
- For a set A , $\text{Sym}(A)$, $\text{FSym}(A)$ and $\aleph_\alpha\text{Sym}(A)$ denote respectively the set of all permutations of A , the set of all $\phi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ such that $\{x \in A : \phi(x) \neq x\}$ is finite, and the set of all $\phi \in \text{Sym}(A)$ such that $\{x \in A : \phi(x) \neq x\}$ has cardinality at most \aleph_α (cf. [Tac19, §2]).
- $\text{MA}(\kappa)$ for a well-ordered cardinal κ (cf. [Tac16, §1]): If $(P, <)$ is a nonempty, c.c.c. quasi order and if \mathcal{D} is a family of $\leq \kappa$ dense sets in P , then there is a filter \mathcal{F} of P such that $\mathcal{F} \cap D \neq \emptyset$ for all $D \in \mathcal{D}$.

1.2.2. Introduction and known results. Bruce [Bru16] constructed the finite partition model \mathcal{V}_p , which is a variant of the basic Fraenkel model (labeled as Model \mathcal{N}_1 in [HR98]). Many, but not all, properties of \mathcal{N}_1 transfer to \mathcal{V}_p . In particular, Bruce proved that the set of atoms has no amorphous subset in \mathcal{V}_p unlike in \mathcal{N}_1 , where as $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$, $\neg\text{AC}_2$, and $\neg(\text{DF} = \text{F})$ hold in \mathcal{V}_p as in \mathcal{N}_1 . At the end of the paper, Bruce asked which other choice principles hold in \mathcal{V}_p (cf. [Bru16, §5]). We study the status of some weak choice principles in \mathcal{V}_p . We also study the status of some weak choice principles in a variant of the finite partition model mentioned in [Bru16, §5]. In particular, let A be an uncountable set of atoms, let \mathcal{G} be the group of all permutations of A , and let the supports be countable partitions of A . We call the corresponding permutation model \mathcal{V}_p^+ . At the end of the paper, Bruce asked about the status of different weak choice forms in \mathcal{V}_p^+ .

1.2.3. Results. Fix any integer $n \geq 2$. We prove the following.

- (1) $\text{W}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ implies ‘for any set X of size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \aleph_\alpha\text{Sym}(X)$ ’ in ZF (cf. **Proposition 4.1**).
- (2) If $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}), \text{ISAE}, \text{EPWFP}, \text{MA}(\aleph_0), \text{AC}_n, \text{MC}, \leq \aleph_0\text{-MC}\}$, then X fails in \mathcal{V}_p (cf. **Theorem 4.2**).
- (3) If $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}), \text{ISAE}, \text{EPWFP}, \text{AC}_n, \text{W}_{\aleph_1}, \text{DC}_{\aleph_1}\}$, then X fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ (cf. **Theorem 4.4**).

1.3. Variants of Chain/Antichain principle and permutations of infinite sets. Thirdly, we study new relations of EPWFP and two variants of CAC with weak forms of AC.

1.3.1. *Weak choice forms and abbreviations.* We recall the necessary weak choice principles.

- WOC_n^- for each $n \in \omega, n \geq 2$ (cf. [HT20, **Definition 1 (2)**]): Every infinite well-orderable family of n -element sets has a partial choice function.
- LOC_n^- for each $n \in \omega, n \geq 2$ (cf. [HT20, **Definition 1 (2)**]): Every infinite linearly orderable family of n -element sets has a partial choice function.
- LOKW_4^- (cf. [HT20, **Definition 1 (2)**]): Every infinite linearly orderable family \mathcal{A} of 4-element sets has a partial Kinna–Wagner selection function, i.e., there exists an infinite subfamily \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{A} and a function f such that $\text{dom}(f) = \mathcal{B}$ and for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\emptyset \neq f(B) \subsetneq B$.
- $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_1}$: Every family $\{A_i : i \in \aleph_1\}$ of non-empty finite sets has a choice function.
- $\text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_\alpha}$: Every \aleph_α -sized family \mathcal{A} of non-empty finite sets has an \aleph_α -sized subfamily \mathcal{B} with a choice function.

Fix any regular \aleph_α . We recall the following abbreviations from [Ban2], [BG1] and [HHK16].

- $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$: If in a poset all antichains are finite and all chains have size \aleph_α , then the set has size \aleph_α .
- $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$: If in a poset all chains are finite and all antichains have size \aleph_α , then the set has size \aleph_α .
- PUU (cf. [HHK16, §2]): For every infinite set X, Y , for every onto function $f : X \rightarrow Y$, for every ultrafilter \mathcal{F} of Y , $f^{-1}(\mathcal{F}) = \{f^{-1}(F) : F \in \mathcal{F}\}$ extends to an ultrafilter of X .
- $\text{BPI}(X)$ (cf. [HHK16, §1]): Every filterbase of X is included in an ultrafilter of X ($\text{BPI}(\omega)$ is [HR98, **Form 225**]).

1.3.2. *Introduction and known results.* The principle PUU was introduced in [HK15]. Later, Herrlich, Howard, and Keremedis [HHK16] investigated the deductive strength of PUU without AC. They proved that PUU fails in Jech’s Model, which is labeled as Model $\mathcal{N}_2(\aleph_1)$ in [HR98] (cf. proof of [HHK16, **Theorem 4 (vi)**]). We recall Erdős–Dushnik–Miller theorem and the fact that $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ and $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$ are applications of it in ZFC.

Theorem 1.1. (ZFC; Erdős–Dushnik–Miller theorem) *If κ is an uncountable cardinal, then $\kappa \rightarrow (\kappa, \aleph_0)^2$, i.e., if $f : [\kappa]^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a coloring, then either there is a set of cardinality κ monochromatic in color 0 or else there is an infinite set monochromatic in color 1.*

We proved that neither $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ nor $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$ implies ‘there are no amorphous sets’ in ZFA, DC does not imply $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ in ZF, and $(\text{LOC}_2^- + \text{MC})$ does not imply $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ in ZFA (cf. [Ban2, BG1]).

1.3.3. *Results.* In this note, we observe the following.

- (1) Fix any $k \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$. A weaker version of $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$, namely the statement ‘If in a poset (P, \leq) with width k all chains are countable, then P is countable’, does not imply $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ in ZFA (cf. **Proposition 5.1**).
- (2) There is a model of ZFA where LOKW_4^- fails but the statement ‘If in a poset (P, \leq) all antichains have size 2 and all chains are countable, then P is countable’ holds (cf. **Proposition 5.2 (1)**).
- (3) Fix a natural number n such that $n > 4$. There is a model of ZFA where LOC_n^- fails but the statement ‘If in a poset (P, \leq) all antichains have size 2 and all chains are countable, then P is countable’ holds (cf. **Proposition 5.2 (2)**).
- (4) $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$ implies the statement ‘Every family $\mathcal{A} = \{(A_i, \leq_i) : i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ such that for each $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, A_i is finite and \leq_i is a linear order on A_i , has an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily with a choice function’ in ZF (cf. **Proposition 5.3(1)**).
- (5) Let X be a T_1 -space. Additionally, suppose X is either \mathcal{K} -Loeb or second-countable. Then $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$ implies the statement ‘Every family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ such that for each $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, A_i is a finite subset of X , has an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily with a choice function’ in ZF (cf. **Proposition 5.3(2)**).
- (6) $(\text{LOC}_2^- + \text{MC})$ neither imply EPWFP nor imply $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ in ZFA (cf. **Theorem 5.4**).
- (7) $(\text{LOC}_2^- + \text{MC})$ does not imply PUU in ZFA (cf. **Theorem 5.6**).
- (8) Let $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ be a successor aleph. We study a new model to prove that $\text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}} + \text{WOC}_2^-$ neither imply EPWFP nor imply $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ in ZF (cf. **Theorem 5.7**).

1.4. **Van Douwen’s Choice Principle in two recent permutation models.** Howard, Saveliev, and Tachtsis [HST16, p.175] gave an argument to prove that vDCP holds in the basic Fraenkel model. We modify the argument slightly to prove that vDCP holds in two recently constructed permutation models (cf. § 6).

1.4.1. *Weak choice forms and abbreviations.* We recall the following weak forms of AC.

- $\text{UT}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0, \text{cuf})$ [HR, **Form 420**]: Every countable union of countable sets is a cuf set (A set X is called *cuf set* if X is expressible as a countable union of finite sets).

- $\text{MC}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ [HR98, **Form 350**]: Every denumerable (i.e., countably infinite) family of denumerable sets has a multiple choice function.
- *Van Douwen's Choice Principle*, vDCP : Every family $X = \{(X_i, \leq_i) : i \in I\}$ of linearly ordered sets isomorphic with (\mathbb{Z}, \leq) (\leq is the usual ordering on \mathbb{Z}) has a choice function.

We recall the following abbreviation due to Keremedis, Tachtsis, and Wajch from [KTW21].

- M(IC, DI) : Every infinite compact metrizable space is Dedekind-infinite.

1.4.2. *Results.* Howard and Tachtsis [HT21, **Theorem 3.4**] proved that the statement $\text{LW} \wedge \neg \text{MC}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ has a permutation model, say \mathcal{M} . The authors of [CHHKR08, proof of **Theorem 3.3**] constructed a permutation model \mathcal{N} where $\text{UT}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0, \text{cuf})$ holds. Keremedis, Tachtsis, and Wajch [KTW21, **Theorem 13**] proved that LW holds and M(IC, DI) fails in \mathcal{N} . We prove the following.

- (1) vDCP holds in \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} (cf. **Proposition 6.1**).

1.5. **Spanning subgraphs and weak choice forms.** Fix any $2 < n \in \omega$ and any even integer $4 \leq m \in \omega$. Hőft and Howard [HH73] proved that AC is equivalent to ‘Every connected graph contains a partial subgraph which is a tree’. Delhommé–Morillon [DM06, **Proposition 1, Corollary 1, Remark 1**] proved that AC is equivalent to ‘Every connected graph has a spanning tree’, ‘Every bipartite connected graph has a spanning subgraph omitting $K_{n,n}$ ’ as well as ‘Every connected graph admits a spanning m -bush’. We study new relations between variants of the above statements and weak forms of AC .

1.5.1. *Weak choice forms and abbreviations.* We recall the following weak forms of AC .

- $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ [HR98, **Form 10**]: Every denumerable family of non-empty finite sets has a choice function. We recall an equivalent formulation of $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$.
 - $\text{UT}(\aleph_0, \text{fin}, \aleph_0)$ [HR98, **Form 10 A**]: The union of denumerably many pairwise disjoint finite sets is denumerable.
- Let $n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$. $\text{AC}_{\leq n}^\omega$: Every denumerable family of non-empty sets, each with at most n elements, has a choice function.
- $\text{AC}_{\text{WO}}^{\text{WO}}$ [HR98, **Form 165**]: Every well-orderable family of non-empty well-orderable sets has a choice function.

Fix any $2 < k, n \in \omega$ and any even integer $4 \leq m \in \omega$. We introduce the following abbreviations.

- $\mathcal{Q}_{lf,c}^n$: Any infinite locally finite connected graph has a spanning subgraph omitting $K_{2,n}$.
- $\mathcal{Q}_{lw,c}^{k,n}$: Any infinite locally well-orderable connected graph has a spanning subgraph omitting $K_{k,n}$.
- $\mathcal{P}_{lf,c}^m$: Any infinite locally finite connected graph has a spanning m -bush.

We denote by P_G , the class of those infinite graphs whose only components are G . For any graph $G_1 = (V_{G_1}, E_{G_1}) \in P_G$, we construct a graph $G_2 = (V_{G_2}, E_{G_2})$ as follows: Let $t \notin V_{G_1}$ and let $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ be the components of G_1 . Let $V_{G_2} = \{t\} \cup V_{G_1}$ and $E_{G_1} \subseteq E_{G_2}$. For each $i \in I$ and every element $x \in A_i$, let $\{t, x\} \in E_{G_2}$. We denote by P'_G , the class of graphs of the form G_2 .

1.5.2. *Results.* We prove the following in ZF .

- (1) $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^\omega + \mathcal{Q}_{lf,c}^n$ is equivalent to $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ for any $2 < n \in \omega$ (cf. **Proposition 7.1(1)**).
- (2) $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ implies $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^{\text{WO}} + \mathcal{Q}_{lw,c}^{k,n}$ and the later implies $\text{AC}_{\text{WO}}^{\text{WO}}$ for any $2 < k, n \in \omega$ (cf. **Proposition 7.1(2)**).
- (3) $\mathcal{P}_{lf,c}^m$ is equivalent to $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ for any even integer $m \geq 4$ (cf. **Proposition 7.1(3)**).
- (4) Fix any $2 < k \in \omega$. If each A_i is K_k , then $\text{AC}_{k^{k-2}}$ implies ‘Every graph from the class P'_{K_k} has a spanning tree’ (cf. **Proposition 7.2(1)**).
- (5) Fix any $2 < k \in \omega$. If each A_i is C_k , then AC_k implies ‘Every graph from the class P'_{C_k} has a spanning tree’ (cf. **Proposition 7.2(2)**).
- (6) Fix any $2 \leq p, q < \omega$. If each A_i is $K_{p,q}$, then $(\text{AC}_{p^{q-1}q^{p-1}} + \text{AC}_{p+q})$ implies ‘Every graph from the class $P'_{K_{p,q}}$ has a spanning tree’ (cf. **Proposition 7.2(3)**).

2. KNOWN RESULTS AND DEFINITIONS

Definition 2.1. (Topological definitions) Let $\mathbf{X} = (X, \tau)$ be a topological space. We say \mathbf{X} is *Baire* if for every countable family $\mathcal{O} = \{O_n : n \in \omega\}$ of dense open subsets of X , $\bigcap \mathcal{O} \neq \emptyset$. We say \mathbf{X} is *compact* if for every $U \subseteq \tau$ such that $\bigcup U = X$ there is a finite subset $V \subseteq U$ such that $\bigcup V = X$. The space \mathbf{X} is called a *T_1 -space* if given any two points $a \neq b$ in X , there is an open set containing a but not b , and there is an open set containing b but not a . The space \mathbf{X} is called a *Hausdorff (or T_2 -space)* if any two distinct points in X can be separated by disjoint open sets, i.e., if x and y are distinct points of X , then there exist disjoint open sets U_x and U_y such that $x \in U_x$ and $y \in U_y$. The space \mathbf{X} is called *second countable* if the topology of \mathbf{X} has a countable basis. Let $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X})$ be the collection of all compact subsets of \mathbf{X} , and $\mathcal{K}^*(\mathbf{X}) = \mathcal{K}(\mathbf{X}) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. We say \mathbf{X} is *\mathcal{K} -Loeb* if $\mathcal{K}^*(\mathbf{X})$ has a choice function.

Definition 2.2. (Algebraic definitions) A *permutation* on a finite set X is a one-to-one correspondence from X to itself. The set of all permutations on X , with operation defined to be the composition of mappings, is the *symmetric group* of X , denoted by $Sym(X)$. Fix $r \leq |X|$. A permutation $\sigma \in Sym(X)$ is a *cycle of length r* if there are distinct elements $i_1, \dots, i_r \in X$ such that $\sigma(i_1) = i_2, \sigma(i_2) = i_3, \dots, \sigma(i_r) = i_1$ and $\sigma(i) = i$ for all $i \in X \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_r\}$. In this case we write $\sigma = (i_1, \dots, i_r)$. A cycle of length 2 is called a *transposition*. We recall that $(i_1, \dots, i_r) = (i_1, i_r)(i_1, i_{r-1}) \dots (i_1, i_2)$. So, every permutation can be written as a product of transpositions. A permutation $\sigma \in Sym(X)$ is an *even permutation* if it can be written as the product of an even number of transpositions; otherwise it is an *odd permutation*. An *alternating group* of X , denoted by $Alt(X)$, is the group of all even permutations in $Sym(X)$. If \mathcal{G} is a group and X is a set, an *action of \mathcal{G} on X* is a group homomorphism $F : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow Sym(X)$. If a group \mathcal{G} acts on a set X , we say $Orb_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = \{gx : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is the orbit of $x \in X$ under the action of \mathcal{G} . We recall that different orbits of the action are disjoint and form a partition of X i.e., $X = \bigcup \{Orb_{\mathcal{G}}(x) : x \in X\}$. Let $\{G_i : i \in I\}$ be an indexed collection of groups. Define the following set.

$$(1) \quad \prod_{i \in I}^{weak} G_i = \left\{ f : I \rightarrow \bigcup_{i \in I} G_i \mid (\forall i \in I) f(i) \in G_i, f(i) = 1_{G_i} \text{ for all but finitely many } i \right\}.$$

The *weak direct product* of the groups $\{G_i : i \in I\}$ is the set $\prod_{i \in I}^{weak} G_i$ with the operation of component-wise multiplicative defined for all $f, g \in \prod_{i \in I}^{weak} G_i$ by $(fg)(i) = f(i)g(i)$ for all $i \in I$. A field \mathcal{K} is *algebraically closed* if every non-constant polynomial in $\mathcal{K}[x]$ has a root in \mathcal{K} .

Definition 2.3. (Combinatorial definitions) The *degree* of a vertex $v \in V_G$ of a graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ is the number of edges emerging from v . A graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ is *locally finite* if every vertex of G has finite degree. We say that a graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ is *locally well-orderable* if for every $v \in V_G$, the set of neighbors of v is well-orderable. Given a non-negative integer n , a *path of length n* in the graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ is a one-to-one finite sequence $\{x_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ of vertices such that for each $i < n$, $\{x_i, x_{i+1}\} \in E_G$; such a path joins x_0 to x_n . The graph G is *connected* if any two vertices are joined by a path of finite length. For each integer $n \geq 3$, an *n -cycle* of G is a path $\{x_i\}_{0 \leq i < n}$ such that $\{x_{n-1}, x_0\} \in E_G$ and an *n -bush* is any connected graph with no n -cycles. We denote by K_n the complete graph on n vertices. We denote by C_n the circuit of length n . A *forest* is a graph with no cycles and a *tree* is a connected forest. A *spanning subgraph* $H = (V_H, E_H)$ of $G = (V_G, E_G)$ is a subgraph that contains all the vertices of G i.e., $V_H = V_G$. A *complete bipartite graph* is a graph $G = (V_G, E_G)$ whose vertex set V_G can be partitioned into two subsets V_1 and V_2 such that no edge has both endpoints in the same subset, and every possible edge that could connect vertices in different subsets is a part of the graph. A complete bipartite graph with partitions of size $|V_1| = m$ and $|V_2| = n$, is denoted by $K_{m,n}$ for any natural number m, n . Let (P, \leq) be a partially ordered set or a poset. A subset $D \subseteq P$ is called a *chain* if $(D, \leq \upharpoonright D)$ is linearly ordered. A subset $A \subseteq P$ is called an *antichain* if no two elements of A are comparable under \leq . The size of the largest antichain of the poset (P, \leq) is known as its *width*. A subset $C \subseteq P$ is called *cofinal* in P if for every $x \in P$ there is an element $c \in C$ such that $x \leq c$.

2.1. Permutation models. In this subsection, we provide a brief description of the construction of Fraenkel-Mostowski permutation models of ZFA from [Jec73, Chapter 4]. Let M be a model of ZFA + AC where A is a set of atoms or urelements. Let \mathcal{G} be a group of permutations of A . A set \mathcal{F}_1 of subgroups of \mathcal{G} is a normal filter on \mathcal{G} if for all subgroups H, K of \mathcal{G} , the following holds.

- (1) $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{F}_1$,
- (2) If $H \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $H \subseteq K$, then $K \in \mathcal{F}_1$,
- (3) If $H \in \mathcal{F}_1$ and $K \in \mathcal{F}_1$ then $H \cap K \in \mathcal{F}_1$,
- (4) If $\pi \in \mathcal{G}$ and $H \in \mathcal{F}_1$, then $\pi H \pi^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}_1$,
- (5) For each $a \in A$, $\{\pi \in \mathcal{G} : \pi(a) = a\} \in \mathcal{F}_1$.

Let \mathcal{F} be a normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} . For $x \in M$, we say

$$(2) \quad \text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : g(x) = x\} \text{ and } \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(x) = \{\phi \in \mathcal{G} : \forall y \in x(\phi(y) = y)\}.$$

We say x is *symmetric* if $\text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(x) \in \mathcal{F}$ and x is *hereditarily symmetric* if x is symmetric and each element of transitive closure of x is symmetric. We define the permutation model \mathcal{N} with respect to \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} , to be the class of all hereditarily symmetric sets. It is well-known that \mathcal{N} is a model of ZFA (cf. [Jec73, **Theorem 4.1**]). If $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A)$ is a normal ideal, then the set $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in \mathcal{I}\}$ generates a normal filter (say $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}$) over \mathcal{G} . Let \mathcal{N} be the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} , and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}$. We say $E \in \mathcal{I}$ *supports* a set $\sigma \in \mathcal{N}$ if $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) \subseteq \text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(\sigma)$.

Lemma 2.4. *The following hold.*

- (1) *An element x of \mathcal{N} is well-orderable in \mathcal{N} if and only if $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(x) \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{I}}$ (cf. [Jec73, **Equation (4.2)**, **p.47**]). Thus, an element x of \mathcal{N} with support E is well-orderable in \mathcal{N} if $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) \subseteq \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$.*
- (2) *For all $\pi \in \mathcal{G}$ and all $x \in \mathcal{N}$ such that E is a support of x , $\text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(\pi x) = \pi \text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(x)\pi^{-1}$ and $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(\pi E) = \pi \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)\pi^{-1}$ (cf. [Jec73, proof of **Lemma 4.4**]).*
- (3) **BPI(\aleph_1)** *holds in any Fraenkel–Mostowski permutation models (cf. [HHK16, **Theorem 4 (vi)**]).*

A *pure set* in a model M of ZFA is a set with no atoms in its transitive closure. The *kernel* is the class of all pure sets of M . In this paper,

- Fix an integer $n \geq 2$. We denote by $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ the permutation model constructed in [HT20, **Theorem 8**].
- We denote by \mathcal{N}_1 the basic Fraenkel model (cf. [HR98]).
- We denote by \mathcal{V}_p the finite partition model constructed in [Bru16].
- We denote by \mathcal{V}_p^+ the countable partition model mentioned in [Bru16, §5].
- We denote by \mathcal{N}_6 the Lévy’s permutation model (cf. [HR98]).
- Fix a natural number n such that $n = 3$ or $n > 4$ and an infinite well-ordered cardinal number κ . We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa, n}$ the permutation model constructed in [Ban2, **Theorem 5.3**].
- Fix an infinite well-ordered cardinal number κ . We denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa, 4}$ the permutation model constructed in [HT20, **Theorem 10(ii)**].

We refer the reader to [HR98, **Note 103**] for the definition of an injectively boundable statement.

Theorem 2.5. (Pincus’ Transfer Theorem; cf. [Pin72, **Theorem 3A3])** *If Φ is a conjunction of injectively boundable statements which hold in the Fraenkel–Mostowski model V_0 , then there is a ZF model $V \supset V_0$ with the same ordinals and cofinalities as V_0 , where Φ holds.*

2.2. Known results.

Lemma 2.6. (Keremedis–Herrlich–Tachtsis; cf. [Tac16, **Remark 2.7], [KH62, **Theorem 3.1**])** *The following hold.*

- (1) $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^{\omega} + \text{MA}(\aleph_0) \rightarrow$ ‘for every infinite set X , 2^X is Baire’.
- (2) ‘For every infinite set X , 2^X is Baire’ \rightarrow ‘For every infinite set X , $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is Dedekind-infinite’.

Lemma 2.7. (Lévy; [Lev62]) *MC if and only if every infinite set has a well-ordered partition into non-empty finite sets.*

Lemma 2.8. (Howard–Saveliev–Tachtsis; [HST16, **Lemma 1.3, **Theorem 3.1**])** *The following hold.*

- (1) $\leq \aleph_0$ -MC *if and only if every infinite set has a well-ordered partition into non-empty countable sets.*
- (2) $\leq \aleph_0$ -MC *implies “for every infinite set X , $\mathcal{P}(X)$ is Dedekind-infinite”, which in turn is equivalent to “for every infinite set P there is a partial ordering \leq on P such that (P, \leq) has a countably infinite disjoint family of cofinal subsets”.*

Lemma 2.9. (ZF; Delhomme–Morillon; [DM06, **Lemma 1])** *Given a set X and a set A which is the range of no mapping with domain X , consider a mapping $f : A \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(X) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. Then*

- (1) *There are distinct a and b in A such that $f(a) \cap f(b) \neq \emptyset$.*
- (2) *If the set A is infinite and well-orderable, then for every positive integer p , there is an $F \in [A]^p$ such that $\bigcap f[F] := \bigcap_{a \in F} f(a)$ is non-empty.*

Lemma 2.10. (Tachtsis; [Tac19, **Theorem 3.1])** *The following hold.*

- (1) *Each of the following statements implies the one beneath it:*
 - (a) \forall *infinite* $\mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m})$;

- (b) ISAE;
 - (c) EPWFP;
 - (d) For every infinite set X , $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \text{FSym}(X)$;
 - (e) there are no strictly amorphous sets.¹
- (2) $\text{DF} = \text{F}$ implies “For every infinite set X , $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \text{FSym}(X)$ ”.

Lemma 2.11. (Pincus; [HR98, Note 41]) If \mathcal{K} is an algebraically closed field, if π is a non-trivial automorphism of \mathcal{K} satisfying $\pi^2 = 1_{\mathcal{K}}$ (the identity on \mathcal{K}), and if $i \in \mathcal{K}$ is a square root of -1 , then $\pi(i) = -i \neq i$.

Lemma 2.12. (Herrlich–Howard–Keremedis; [HHK16, Theorem 4(v)]) $\text{PUU} \wedge \text{BPI}(\omega_1)$ implies $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_1}$ in ZF.

Lemma 2.13. (cf. [Ban2, Corollary 4.2]) The statement ‘If (P, \leq) is a poset such that P is well-ordered, and if all antichains in P are finite and all chains in P are countable, then P is countable’ holds in any Fraenkel–Mostowski model.

Lemma 2.14. (Cayley’s formula; ZF) The number of spanning trees in K_n is n^{n-2} for any $n \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Lemma 2.15. (Scoin’s formula; ZF) The number of spanning trees in $K_{m,n}$ is $n^{m-1}m^{n-1}$ for any $n, m \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$.

Lemma 2.16. (cf. [KT06, Chapter 30, Problem 5]) AC_m implies AC_n if m is a multiple of n .

3. Form 269, Form 233, AND Form 304

Theorem 3.1. AC^{LO} does not imply **Form 269** in ZFA. Hence, neither LW nor AC^{WO} implies **Form 269** in ZFA.

Proof. We present two known models.

First model: Fix a successor aleph $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$. We recall the permutation model \mathcal{V} given in the proof of [Jec73, Theorem 8.9]. In order to describe \mathcal{V} , we start with a model M of ZFA + AC with a set A of atoms of cardinality $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$. Let \mathcal{G} be the group of all permutations of A and let \mathcal{F} be the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}\}$. Let \mathcal{V} be the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{F} . In the proof of [Jec73, Theorem 8.9], Jech proved that AC^{WO} holds in \mathcal{V} .

We recall a variant of \mathcal{V} from [Tac19, Theorem 3.5(i)]. Let M and A as above, and let \mathcal{N} be the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G}' and \mathcal{F}' , where \mathcal{G}' is the group of permutations of A which move at most \aleph_{α} atoms, and \mathcal{F}' is the normal filter on \mathcal{G}' generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}\}$. Tachtsis [Tac19, Theorem 3.5(i)] proved that $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{V}$ and if $X \in \{\text{LW}, \text{AC}^{\text{LO}}\}$, then, X holds in \mathcal{N} . We slightly modify the arguments of [HR98, Note 91] to prove that **Form 269** fails in \mathcal{N} . We show that for any set X in \mathcal{N} if the set $[X]^2$ of two element subset of X has a choice function, then X is well orderable in \mathcal{N} . Assume that X is such a set and let E be a support of X and a choice function f on $[X]^2$. In order to show that X is well-orderable in \mathcal{N} , it is enough to prove that $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(E) \subseteq \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(X)$ (cf. Lemma 2.4(1)). Assume $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(E) \not\subseteq \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(X)$, then there is a $y \in X$ and a $\phi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(E)$ with $\phi(y) \neq y$. Under such assumptions, Tachtsis constructed a permutation $\psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(E)$ such that $\psi(y) \neq y$ but $\psi^2(y) = y$ (cf. the proof of LW in \mathcal{N} from [Tac19, Theorem 3.5(i)]). This contradict our choice of E as a support for a choice function on $[X]^2$ since ψ fixes $\{\psi(y), y\}$ but moves both of its elements. So **Form 269** fails in \mathcal{N} .

Second model: We consider the permutation model \mathcal{N} given in the proof of [Tac19a, Theorem 4.7] where LW and AC^{LO} hold. Following the above arguments and the arguments in [Tac19a, claim 4.10], we can see that **Form 269** fails in \mathcal{N} . \square

Theorem 3.2. Fix any regular \aleph_{α} and any $2 \leq n \in \omega$. There is a model \mathcal{M} of ZFA where $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_{\alpha}}$ and $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_{\alpha}}$ hold and AC_n^- fails. Moreover, the following hold in \mathcal{M} .

- (1) **Form 269** fails.
- (2) **Form 233** holds.
- (3) **Form 304** holds.

Proof. We consider the permutation model constructed by Halbeisen–Tachtsis [HT20, Theorem 8] where for arbitrary integer $n \geq 2$, AC_n^- fails but the statement “For every regular \aleph_{α} , $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_{\alpha}} + \text{CAC}^{\aleph_{\alpha}}$ ” holds (cf. [BG1, Ban2, HT20]). We fix an arbitrary integer $n \geq 2$ and recall the model constructed in the proof of [HT20,

¹Let \mathcal{U} be a finitary partition of an amorphous set X . Then all but finitely many elements of \mathcal{U} have the same cardinality, say $n(\mathcal{U})$. An amorphous set A is called *strictly amorphous* if there is no infinite partition of A with $n(\mathcal{U}) > 1$.

Theorem 8]. We start with a model M of $ZFA + AC$ where A is a countably infinite set of atoms written as a disjoint union $\bigcup\{A_i : i \in \omega\}$ where for each $i \in \omega$, $A_i = \{a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \dots, a_{i_n}\}$ and $|A_i| = n$. The group \mathcal{G} is defined in [HT20] in a way so that if $\eta \in \mathcal{G}$, then η only moves finitely many atoms and for all $i \in \omega$, $\eta(A_i) = A_k$ for some $k \in \omega$. Let \mathcal{F} be the filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\omega}\}$. We denote by $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ the Fraenkel–Mostowski permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{F} . If X is a set in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$, then without loss of generality we may assume that $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^m A_i$ is a support of X for some $m \in \omega$.

claim 3.3. *Suppose X is not a well-ordered set in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$, and let $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^m A_i$ be a support of X . Then there is a $t \in X$ with support $F \supseteq E$, such that the following hold.*

- (1) *There is a permutation ψ in $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}E$ and an element $y \in X$ such that $t \neq y$, $\psi(t) = y$ and $\psi(y) = t$.*
- (2) *There is a $k \in F \setminus E$ such that for all $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(F \setminus \{k\})$, $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t)$ iff $\phi_1(k) = \phi_2(k)$.*

Proof. Since X is not well-ordered, and E is a support of X , $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) \not\subseteq \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(X)$ by **Lemma 2.4(1)**. So there is a $t \in X$ and a $\psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$ such that $\psi(t) \neq t$. Let F be a support of t containing E . Without loss of generality we may assume that F is a union of finitely many A_i 's. We slightly modify the arguments of [Tac19a, **claim 4.10**] to prove (1).

(1). Let $W = \{a \in A : \psi(a) \neq a\}$. We note that W is finite since if $\eta \in \mathcal{G}$, then η only moves finitely many atoms. Let U be a finite subset of A which is disjoint from $F \cup W$ and such that there exists a bijection $H : \text{tr}(U) \rightarrow \text{tr}((F \cup W) \setminus E)$ (where for a set $x \subseteq A$, $\text{tr}(x) = \{i \in \omega : A_i \cap x \neq \emptyset\}$) with the property that if $i \in \text{tr}((F \cup W) \setminus E)$ is such that $A_i \subseteq (F \cup W) \setminus E$ then $A_{H^{-1}(i)} \subseteq U$; otherwise if $A_i \not\subseteq (F \cup W) \setminus E$, which means that $A_i \cap F = \emptyset$ and $A_i \not\subseteq W$, then $|W \cap A_i| = |U \cap A_{H^{-1}(i)}|$. Let $f : U \rightarrow (F \cup W) \setminus E$ be a bijection such that $\forall i \in \text{tr}(U)$, $f \upharpoonright U \cap A_i$ is a one-to-one function from $U \cap A_i$ onto $((F \cup W) \setminus E) \cap A_{H(i)}$. Let $f' : \bigcup_{i \in \text{tr}(U)} A_i \setminus (U \cap A_i) \rightarrow \bigcup_{i \in \text{tr}(U)} A_{H(i)} \setminus (((F \cup W) \setminus E) \cap A_{H(i)})$ be a bijection such that $\forall i \in \text{tr}(U)$, $f' \upharpoonright (A_i \setminus (U \cap A_i))$ is a one-to-one function from $A_i \setminus (U \cap A_i)$ onto $A_{H(i)} \setminus (((F \cup W) \setminus E) \cap A_{H(i)})$. Let

$$\delta = \prod_{u \in U} (u, f(u)) \prod_{u \in \bigcup_{i \in \text{tr}(U)} A_i \setminus (U \cap A_i)} (u, f'(u))$$

be a product of disjoint transpositions. It is clear that δ only moves finitely many atoms, and for all $i \in \omega$, $\delta(A_i) = A_k$ for some $k \in \omega$. Moreover, $\delta \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$, $\delta^2(t) = t$, and $\delta(t) \neq t$ by the arguments in [Tac19a, **claim 4.10**].

(2). Let $U' = \bigcup_{A_i \subseteq F \setminus E} A_{H^{-1}(i)}$. Let $F_u = (u, f(u))$ be a transposition for all $u \in U'$ and let $\delta' = \prod_{u \in U'} F_u$. We can slightly modify the arguments of [Tac19a, **claim 4.10**] to see that $\delta'(t) \neq t$.² Thus there is at least one $u \in U'$ such that $F_u(t) \neq t$. Define $\phi := F_u$. We prove that for $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(F \setminus \{f(u)\})$, $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t)$ iff $\phi_1(f(u)) = \phi_2(f(u))$; If $\phi_1(f(u)) = \phi_2(f(u))$, then ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 agree on a support of t and therefore $\phi_1(t) = \phi_2(t)$. Let $\phi_1(f(u)) \neq \phi_2(f(u))$. Let

$$\beta = (f(u), \phi_1(f(u)))(\phi(f(u)), \phi_2(f(u)))$$

be the product of the two transpositions that fixes $F \setminus \{f(u)\}$ pointwise. We can see that β agrees with ϕ_1 on a support of t , and agrees with $\phi_2 \phi^{-1}$ on a support of $\phi(t)$. Since $t \neq \phi(t)$, $\beta(t) \neq \beta(\phi(t))$. Consequently, $\phi_1(t) = \beta(t) \neq \beta(\phi(t)) = \phi_2 \phi^{-1}(\phi(t)) = \phi_2(t)$. \square

claim 3.4. *In $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$, the following hold.*

- (1) **Form 269** fails.
- (2) **Form 233** holds.
- (3) **Form 304** holds.

Proof. (1). Following **claim 3.3(1)** and the arguments in the proof of **Theorem 3.1** we can see that **Form 269** fails in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$.

(2). We follow the arguments due to Pincus from [HR98, **Note 41**] and use **claim 3.3(1)** to prove that **Form 233** holds in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$. For reader's convenience, we write down the proof. Let $(\mathcal{K}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ be a field in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ with finite support $E \subset A$ and assume that \mathcal{K} is algebraically closed. Without loss of generality assume that $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^m A_i$. We show that every element of \mathcal{K} has support E which implies that \mathcal{K} is well orderable in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ and therefore the standard proof of the uniqueness of algebraic closures (using AC) is valid in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$. For

²For reader's convenience, we write down the proof. Assume on the contrary that $\delta'(t) = t$. Since F is a support of t , we have that $\delta'(F)$ is a support of $\delta'(t) = t$. Now $\delta'(F) = \delta'((F \setminus E) \cup E) = \delta'(F \setminus E) \cup \delta'(E) = U' \cup E$. So, $U' \cup E$ is a support of t . Now $\psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(U') \cap \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$ (since $U' \cap W = \emptyset$). So, ψ fixes $U' \cup E$ pointwise and thus $\psi(t) = t$ since $U' \cup E$ is a support of t . This contradicts the assumption that $\psi(t) \neq t$.

the sake of contradiction, assume that $x \in \mathcal{K}$ does not have support E . Let $F = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m+k} A_i$ be a support of x containing E . By **claim 3.3(1)**, there is a permutation ψ in $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}} E$ such that $\psi(x) \neq x$ and ψ^2 is the identity. The permutation ψ induces an automorphism of $(\mathcal{K}, +, \cdot, 0, 1)$ and we can therefore apply **Lemma 2.11** to conclude that $\psi(i) = -i \neq i$ for some square root i of -1 in \mathcal{K} . We can follow the arguments from [HR98, **Note 41**] to see that for every permutation π of A that fixes E pointwise, $\pi(i) = i$ for every square root i of -1 in \mathcal{K} . Hence we arrive at a contradiction.

(3). We slightly modify the arguments of [HR98, **Note 116**] and use **claim 3.3** to prove that **Form 304** holds in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$. Let X be an infinite Hausdorff space in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$, and $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^m A_i$ be a support of X and its topology. We show there is an infinite $Y \subseteq X$ in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ such that Y has no infinite compact subsets in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$. If X is well orderable then we can use transfinite induction without using any form of choice to finish the proof. Assume that X is not well orderable in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$. By **claim 3.3(1)**, there is a $x \in X$ with support $F = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m+k} A_i$, a permutation $\phi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}} E$ and an element $y \in X$ such that $x \neq y$, $\phi(x) = y$ and $\phi(y) = x$. By **claim 3.3(2)**, there is a $k \in F \setminus E$ such that for all $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(F \setminus \{k\})$, $\phi_1(x) = \phi_2(x)$ iff $\phi_1(k) = \phi_2(k)$. Then $f = \{(\psi(x), \psi(k)) : \psi \in \mathcal{G}, \psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(F \setminus \{k\})\}$ is a bijection in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ from $\{\psi(x) : \psi \in \mathcal{G}, \psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(F \setminus \{k\})\}$ to $A - (F \setminus \{k\})$. Define $Y := \{\psi(x) : \psi \in \mathcal{G}, \psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(F \setminus \{k\})\}$. Since $\phi(x) \neq x$ and X is an infinite Hausdorff space, we can choose open sets C and D so that $x \in C$, $\phi(x) \in D$ and $C \cap D = \emptyset$. Since Y can be put in a one to one correspondence with a subset of the atoms in the model and A is **amorphous** in $\mathcal{N}_{HT}^1(n)$ (cf. [HT20]), every subset of Y in the model must be finite or cofinite. Thus at least one of $Y \cap C$ or $Y \cap D$ is finite. We may assume that $Y \cap C$ is finite. Then we can conclude that $C = \{\psi(C) \cap Y : \psi \in \mathcal{G}, \psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(F \setminus \{k\})\}$ is an open cover for Y and each element of C is finite. So for any infinite subset Z of Y , C is an open cover for Z without a finite subcover. \square

4. PARTITION MODELS, WEAK CHOICE FORMS, AND PERMUTATIONS OF INFINITE SETS

Tachtsis [Tac19, **Theorem 3.1(2)**] proved that $\text{DF} = \text{F}$ implies “For every infinite set X , $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \text{FSym}(X)$ ” in ZF . Inspired from that idea we may observe the following.

Proposition 4.1. (ZF) *The following hold.*

- (1) $W_{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ implies ‘for any set X of size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \aleph_{\alpha}\text{Sym}(X)$ ’.
- (2) Each of the following statements implies the one beneath it:
 - (a) \forall infinite $\mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m})$;
 - (b) ISAE;
 - (c) EPWFP;
 - (d) for any X of size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \aleph_{\alpha}\text{Sym}(X)$.

Proof. (1). Let X be a set of size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ and let us assume $\text{Sym}(X) = \aleph_{\alpha}\text{Sym}(X)$. We prove that there is no injection f from $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ into X . Assume there exists such an f . Let $\{y_n\}_{n \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ be an enumeration of the elements of $Y = f(\aleph_{\alpha+1})$. We can use transfinite recursion, without using any form of choice, to construct a bijection $f : Y \rightarrow Y$ such that $f(x) \neq x$ for any $x \in Y$. Define $g : X \rightarrow X$ as follows: $g(x) = f(x)$ if $x \in Y$, and $g(x) = x$ if $x \in X \setminus Y$. Clearly $g \in \text{Sym}(X) \setminus \aleph_{\alpha}\text{Sym}(X)$, and hence $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \aleph_{\alpha}\text{Sym}(X)$, a contradiction.

(2). (a) \implies (b) \implies (c) follows from **Lemma 2.10(1)** and (c) \implies (d) is straightforward. \square

4.1. Weak choice forms in the finite partition model. We recall the finite partition model \mathcal{V}_p from [Bru16]. In order to describe \mathcal{V}_p , we start with a model M of $\text{ZFA} + \text{AC}$ where A is a countably infinite set of atoms. Let \mathcal{G} be the group of all permutations of A . Let S be the set of all finite partitions of A and let $\mathcal{F} = \{H : H \text{ is a subgroup of } \mathcal{G}, H \supseteq \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) \text{ for some } P \in S\}$ be the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} where $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}} P = \{\phi \in \mathcal{G} : \forall y \in P(\phi(y) = y)\}$. The model \mathcal{V}_p is the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} . In \mathcal{V}_p there is a set, which has no infinite amorphous subset.

Theorem 4.2. *The following hold in \mathcal{V}_p .*

- (1) If $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m})\}$, ISAE, EPWFP, then X fails.
- (2) AC_n fails for any integer $n \geq 2$.
- (3) $\text{MA}(\aleph_0)$ fails.
- (4) If $X \in \{\text{MC}, \leq \aleph_0\text{-MC}\}$, then X fails.

Proof. (1). By **Lemma 2.10**, it is enough to show that $(\text{Sym}(A))^{\mathcal{V}_p} = \text{FSym}(A)$. For the sake of contradiction, assume that f is a permutation of A in \mathcal{V}_p , which moves infinitely many atoms. Let $P = \{P_j : j \leq k\}$ be a

support of f for some $k \in \omega$. Without loss of generality, assume that P_0, \dots, P_n are the singleton and tuple blocks for some $n < k$. Then there exist $n < i \leq k$ where $a \in P_i$ and $b \in \bigcup P \setminus (P_0 \cup \dots \cup P_n \cup \{a\})$ such that $b = f(a)$.

Case (i): Let $b \in P_i$. Consider $\phi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P)$ such that ϕ fixes all the atoms in all the blocks other than P_i and ϕ moves every atom in P_i except b . Thus, $\phi(b) = b$, $\phi(a) \neq a$, and $\phi(f) = f$ since P is the support of f . Thus $(a, b) \in f \implies (\phi(a), \phi(b)) \in \phi(f) \implies (\phi(a), b) \in f$. So f is not injective; a contradiction.

Case (ii): Let $b \notin P_i$. Consider $\phi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P)$ such that ϕ fixes all the atoms in all the blocks other than P_i and ϕ moves every atom in P_i . Then again we can obtain a contradiction as in Case (i).

(2). Fix any integer $n \geq 2$. We show that the set $S = \{x : x \in [A]^n\}$ has no choice function in \mathcal{V}_p . Assume that f is a choice function of S and let P be a support of f . Since A is countably infinite and P is a finite partition of A , there is a $p \in P$ such that $|p|$ is infinite. Let $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n \in p$ and $\pi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P)$ be such that $\pi a_1 = a_2$, $\pi a_2 = a_3, \dots, \pi a_{n-1} = a_n$, $\pi a_n = a_1$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = a_1$. Thus, $\pi f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = \pi a_1 \implies f(\pi(a_1), \pi(a_2), \dots, \pi(a_n)) = a_2 \implies f(a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n, a_1) = a_2$. Thus f is not a function; a contradiction.

(3). It is known that $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is Dedekind-finite and $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ holds in \mathcal{V}_p (cf. [Bru16, **Proposition 4.9, Theorem 4.18**]). So $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^{\omega}$ holds as well. Thus by **Lemma 2.6(2)**, the statement “for every infinite set X , 2^X is Baire” is false in \mathcal{V}_p . Hence by **Lemma 2.6(1)**, $\text{MA}(\aleph_0)$ is false in \mathcal{V}_p .

(4). Follows from **Lemmas 2.7, 2.8(1)** and the fact that $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ holds in \mathcal{V}_p . Alternatively, we can also use **Lemma 2.8(2)**, to see that $\leq \aleph_0$ -MC fails in \mathcal{V}_p since $\mathcal{P}(A)$ is Dedekind-finite in \mathcal{V}_p . So we may also conclude by **Lemma 2.8(2)** that the statement “for every infinite set P there is a partial ordering \leq on P such that (P, \leq) has a countably infinite disjoint family of cofinal subsets” fails in \mathcal{V}_p . \square

4.2. Weak choice forms in the countable partition model. Let M be a model of $\text{ZFA} + \text{AC}$ where A is an uncountable set of atoms and \mathcal{G} is the group of all permutations of A .

Lemma 4.3. *Let S be the set of all countable partitions of A . Then $\mathcal{F} = \{H : H \text{ is a subgroup of } \mathcal{G}, H \supseteq \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) \text{ for some } P \in S\}$ is the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. We modify the arguments of [Bru16, **Lemma 4.1**] slightly and verify the clauses 1-5 of a normal filter (cf. §2.1).

- (1) We can see that $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (2) Let $H \in \mathcal{F}$ and K be a subgroup of \mathcal{G} such that $H \subseteq K$. Then there exist $P \in S$ such that $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) \subseteq H$. So, $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) \subseteq K$ and $K \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (3) Let $K_1, K_2 \in \mathcal{F}$. Then there exist $P_1, P_2 \in S$ such that $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P_1) \subseteq K_1$ and $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P_2) \subseteq K_2$. Let $P_1 \wedge P_2$ denote the coarsest common refinement of P_1 and P_2 , given by $P_1 \wedge P_2 = \{p \cap q : p \in P_1, q \in P_2, p \cap q \neq \emptyset\}$. Clearly, $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P_1 \wedge P_2) \subseteq \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P_1) \cap \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P_2) \subseteq K_1 \cap K_2$. Since the product of two countable sets is countable, $P_1 \wedge P_2 \in S$. Thus $K_1 \cap K_2 \in \mathcal{F}$.
- (4) Let $\pi \in \mathcal{G}$ and $H \in \mathcal{F}$. Then there exists $P \in S$ such that $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) \subseteq H$. Since $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(\pi P) = \pi \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) \pi^{-1} \subseteq \pi H \pi^{-1}$ by **Lemma 2.4(2)**, it is enough to show $\pi P \in S$. Clearly, πP is countable, since P is countable. Following the arguments of [Bru16, **Lemma 4.1(iv)**] we can see that πP is a partition of A .
- (5) Fix any $a \in A$. Consider any countable partition P of A where $\{a\}$ is a singleton block of P . We can see that $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}} P \subseteq \{\pi \in \mathcal{G} : \pi(a) = a\}$. Thus, $\{\pi \in \mathcal{G} : \pi(a) = a\} \in \mathcal{F}$.

\square

We call the permutation model (denoted by \mathcal{V}_p^+) determined by M , \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{F} , the countable partition model. We recall the following variant of the basic Fraenkel model (the model $\mathcal{N}_{12}(\aleph_1)$ in [HR98]): Let A be an uncountable set of atoms, \mathcal{G} be the group of all permutations of A , and the supports are countable subsets of A .

Theorem 4.4. *The following hold.*

- (1) $\mathcal{N}_{12}(\aleph_1) \subset \mathcal{V}_p^+$.
- (2) if $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}), \text{ISAE}, \text{EPWFP}\}$, then X fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ .
- (3) AC_n fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ for any integer $n \geq 2$.
- (4) if $X \in \{\text{W}_{\aleph_1}, \text{DC}_{\aleph_1}\}$, then X fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ .

Proof. (1). Let $x \in \mathcal{N}_{12}(\aleph_1)$ with support E . So $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) \subseteq \text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$. Then $P = \{\{a\}\}_{a \in E} \cup \{A \setminus E\}$ is a countable partition of A , and $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) = \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$. Thus $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P) \subseteq \text{sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$ and so $x \in \mathcal{V}_p^+$ with support P .

(2). Similarly to the proof of \neg EPWFP in \mathcal{V}_p (cf. the proof of **Theorem 4.2(1)**), one may verify that if f is a permutation of A in \mathcal{V}_p^+ , then the set $\{x \in A : f(x) \neq x\}$ has cardinality at most \aleph_0 . Since A is uncountable, it follows that ‘for any uncountable X , $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \aleph_0 \text{Sym}(X)$ ’ fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ . Consequently, if $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m})\}$, ISAE, EPWFP, then X fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ by **Proposition 4.1(2)**.

(3). Fix any integer $n \geq 2$. Similarly to the proof of **Theorem 4.2(2)**, one may verify that the set $S = \{x : x \in [A]^n\}$ has no choice function in \mathcal{V}_p^+ . Consequently, AC_n fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ .

(4). We can use the arguments in (2) and **Proposition 4.1(1)** to show that W_{\aleph_1} fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ . The rest follows from the fact that DC_{\aleph_1} implies W_{\aleph_1} in ZF (cf. [Jec73, **Theorem 8.1(b)**]). However, we write a different argument. In order to show that W_{\aleph_1} fails in \mathcal{V}_p^+ , we prove that there is no injection f from \aleph_1 into A . Assume there exists such an f with support P , and let $\pi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(P)$ be such that π moves every atom in each non-singleton block of P . Since P contains only countably many singletons, π fixes only countably many atoms. Fix $n \in \aleph_1$. Since n is in the kernel (the class of all pure sets), we have $\pi(n) = n$. Thus $\pi(f(n)) = f(\pi(n)) = f(n)$. But f is one-to-one, and thus, π fixes \aleph_1 many values of f in A , a contradiction. \square

5. VARIANTS OF CHAIN/ANTICHAIN PRINCIPLE AND PERMUTATIONS OF INFINITE SETS

Proposition 5.1. *Fix any $k \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$. There is a model of ZFA where $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ fails but the statement ‘If in a poset (P, \leq) with width k all chains are countable, then (P, \leq) is countable’ holds.*

Proof. We recall Lévy’s permutation model (labeled as Model \mathcal{N}_6 in [HR98]) whose description is as follows: We start with a model M of ZFA + AC with a countably infinite set A of atoms which is written as a disjoint union $\bigcup\{P_n : n \in \omega\}$, where $P_n = \{a_1^n, a_2^n, \dots, a_{p_n}^n\}$ such that p_n is the n^{th} -prime number. Let \mathcal{G} be the group generated by the following permutations π_n of A .

$$\pi_n : a_1^n \mapsto a_2^n \mapsto \dots \mapsto a_{p_n}^n \mapsto a_1^n \text{ and } \pi_n(x) = x \text{ for all } x \in A \setminus P_n.$$

Let \mathcal{F} be the filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\omega}\}$. The model \mathcal{N}_6 is the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{F} . In \mathcal{N}_6 , $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ fails (cf. [Jec73, proof of **Theorem 7.11, p.110**]). Fix any $k \in \omega \setminus \{0, 1\}$. Let (P, \leq) be a poset in \mathcal{N}_6 with width k and all chains in (P, \leq) are countable. By [Tac19b, **claim 3.6**], (P, \leq) can be well-ordered. The rest follows from **Lemma 2.13**. \square

Proposition 5.2. *The following hold.*

- (1) *There is a model of ZFA where LOKW_4^- fails but the statement ‘If in a poset (P, \leq) all antichains have size 2 and all chains are countable, then P is countable’ holds.*
- (2) *Fix a natural number n such that $n > 4$. There is a model of ZFA where LOC_n^- fails but the statement ‘If in a poset (P, \leq) all antichains have size 2 and all chains are countable, then P is countable’ holds.*

Proof. (1). We recall the permutation model from the second assertion of [HT20, **Theorem 10(ii)**] (we denote by $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,4}$) whose description is as follows: Let κ be any infinite well-ordered cardinal number. We start with a model M of ZFA + AC where A is a κ -sized set of atoms written as a disjoint union $A = \bigcup\{A_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$, where for all $\alpha < \kappa$, $A_\alpha = \{a_{\alpha,1}, a_{\alpha,2}, a_{\alpha,3}, a_{\alpha,4}\}$ such that $|A_\alpha| = 4$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$. Let \mathcal{G} be the weak direct product of $\text{Alt}(A_\alpha)$ ’s where $\text{Alt}(A_\alpha)$ is the alternating group on A_α for each $\alpha < \kappa$. Thus every element $\eta \in \mathcal{G}$ moves only finitely many atoms. Let \mathcal{F} be the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\omega}\}$. The model $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,4}$ is the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} . In $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,4}$, LOKW_4^- fails (cf. proof of the second assertion of [HT20, **Theorem 10(ii)**]). Let (P, \leq) be a poset in $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,4}$ where all antichains have size 2 and all chains are countable. Let $E \in [A]^{<\omega}$ be a support of (P, \leq) . Following the arguments of [Tac19b, **claim 3.5**] we can see that for each $p \in P$, the set $\text{Orb}_E(p) = \{\phi(p) : \phi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)\}$ is an antichain in P since every element $\eta \in \mathcal{G}$ moves only finitely many atoms. Following the arguments of [Tac19b, **claim 3.6**] we can see that $\mathcal{O} = \{\text{Orb}_E(p) : p \in P\}$ is a well-ordered partition of P . We note that all antichains in P have size 2, thus $|\text{Orb}_E(p)| = 2$ for each $p \in P$. Following the arguments of [HT20, **Theorem 10(ii)**], $P = \bigcup_{p \in P} \text{Orb}_E(p)$ is well-orderable (cf. the proof of LOC_2^- in [HT20, **Theorem 10(ii)**]). The rest follows from **Lemma 2.13**.

(2). Let n be a natural number such that $n > 4$ and κ be any infinite well-ordered cardinal number. Consider the permutation model $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,n}$ constructed in [Ban2, **Theorem 5.3**] whose description is as follows: We start with a model M of ZFA + AC where A is a κ -sized set of atoms written as a disjoint union $A = \bigcup\{A_\beta : \beta < \kappa\}$, where for all $\beta < \kappa$, $A_\beta = \{a_{\beta,1}, a_{\beta,2}, \dots, a_{\beta,n}\}$ such that $|A_\beta| = n$ for all $\beta < \kappa$. Let \mathcal{G} be the weak direct product of $\text{Alt}(A_\beta)$ ’s where $\text{Alt}(A_\beta)$ is the alternating group on A_β for each $\beta < \kappa$. Consequently, every element $\eta \in \mathcal{G}$ moves only finitely many atoms. Let \mathcal{F} be the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\omega}\}$. The model $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,n}$ is the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} . In [Ban2, **Theorem 5.3**], we observed that

LOC_n^- fails in $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,n}$. Let (P, \leq) be a poset in $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,n}$ where all antichains have size 2 and all chains are countable. By the arguments of (1), P can be written as a well-ordered disjoint union $\bigcup \{W_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ of antichains, hence as a well-ordered disjoint union of 2-element sets. Applying the group-theoretic facts from [HHT12, **Theorem 11, Case 1**], we may observe that P is well-orderable in $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,n}$. The rest follows from **Lemma 2.13**. \square

Proposition 5.3. (ZF) *Let \aleph_α and $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ be regular alephs. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$ implies the statement ‘Every family $\mathcal{A} = \{(A_i, \leq_i) : i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ such that for each $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, A_i is finite and \leq_i is a linear order on A_i , has an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily with a choice function’.
- (2) Let X be a T_1 -space. Additionally, suppose X is either \mathcal{K} -Loeb or second-countable. Then $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$ implies the statement ‘Every family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ such that for each $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, A_i is a finite subset of X , has an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily with a choice function’.
- (3) $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ implies $\text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ and $\text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ does not imply $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$.

Proof. (1). Let $\mathcal{A} = \{(A_i, \leq_i) : i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ be a family such that for each $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, A_i is finite and \leq_i is a linear order on A_i . Without loss of generality, we may assume that \mathcal{A} is pairwise disjoint. Let $P = \bigcup_{i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}} A_i$. We partially order P by requiring $x < y$ if and only if there exists an index $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$ such that $x, y \in A_i$ and $x \leq_i y$. We can see that P has size at least $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ and the only chains of $(P, <)$ are the finite sets A_n and subsets of A_n where $n \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$. By $\text{CAC}^{\aleph_\alpha}$, P has an antichain of size at least $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, say C . Let $M = \{m \in \aleph_{\alpha+1} : C \cap A_m \neq \emptyset\}$. Since C is an antichain and \mathcal{A} is the family of all chains of $(P, <)$, we have $M = \{m \in \aleph_{\alpha+1} : |C \cap A_m| = 1\}$. Clearly, $f = \{(m, c_m) : m \in M\}$, where for $m \in M$, c_m is the unique element of $C \cap A_m$, is a choice function of the subset $\mathcal{B} = \{A_m : m \in M\}$ of \mathcal{A} of size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$. Thus \mathcal{B} is an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily of \mathcal{A} with a choice function.

(2). Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ be a family such that for each $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, A_i is a finite subset of X . Then there exists a family $\{\leq_n : n \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ such that, for every $n \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, \leq_n is a well-ordering on A_n (cf. the arguments in the proof of [KW, **Proposition 2.2**]). The rest follows from the arguments of (1).

(3). We can slightly modify the arguments of [Ban2, **Theorem 4.5 & Corollary 4.6**] to obtain the results. For the sake of convenience of the reader we write down the arguments. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_n : n \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ be a family of non-empty finite sets. Without loss of generality, we assume that \mathcal{A} is disjoint. Define a binary relation \leq on $A = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$ as follows: for all $a, b \in A$, let $a \leq b$ if and only if $a = b$ or $a \in A_n$ and $b \in A_m$ and $n < m$. Clearly, \leq is a partial order on A . Also, A has size at least $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$. The only antichains of (A, \leq) are the finite sets A_n and subsets of A_n where $n \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$. By $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$, A has a chain of size at least $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, say C . Let $M = \{m \in \aleph_{\alpha+1} : C \cap A_m \neq \emptyset\}$. Since C is a chain and \mathcal{A} is the family of all antichains of (A, \leq) , we have $M = \{m \in \aleph_{\alpha+1} : |C \cap A_m| = 1\}$. Clearly, $f = \{(m, c_m) : m \in M\}$, where for $m \in M$, c_m is the unique element of $C \cap A_m$, is a choice function of the subset $\mathcal{B} = \{A_m : m \in M\}$ of \mathcal{A} of size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$. Thus \mathcal{B} is an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily of \mathcal{A} with a choice function. Consequently, $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ implies $\text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ in ZF.

In order to prove that $\text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ does not imply $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$, we refer the reader to Jech [Jec73, **Theorem 8.3**] by noting that \aleph_α therein can be replaced by $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ since we assumed that $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ is a regular aleph. We can see that $\text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ fails in the modified model. \square

Theorem 5.4. *Fix a natural number n such that $n \geq 4$. Let \aleph_α and $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ be regular alephs. Then there is a model \mathcal{M} of ZFA where the following hold.*

- (1) If $X \in \{\text{LOC}_2^-, \text{MC}\}$, then X holds and LOC_n^- fails.
- (2) If $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}), \text{ISAE}, \text{EPWFP}, \text{DF} = \text{F}\}$, then X fails.
- (3) $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ fail.

Proof. We divide into two cases.

Case (1): Let n be a natural number such that $n > 4$. Consider the permutation model $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa,n}$ from **Proposition 5.2(2)** by letting the infinite well-ordered cardinal number κ to be $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$. In [Ban2, **Theorem 5.3**], we observed that if $X \in \{\text{LOC}_2^-, \text{MC}\}$, then X holds in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1},n}$ and LOC_n^- fails in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1},n}$. We can see that the well-ordered family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_\beta : \beta < \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ of n -element sets does not have a partial choice function in the model. Thus $\text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$, and hence $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_\alpha}$ fails in the model by **Proposition 5.3(3)**.

claim 5.5. *If $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}), \text{ISAE}, \text{EPWFP}, \text{DF} = \text{F}\}$, then X fails in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1},n}$.*

Proof. We show that $(\text{Sym}(A))^{\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1},n}} = \text{FSym}(A)$. The rest follows from **Lemma 2.10**. For the sake of contradiction, assume that f is a permutation of A in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1},n}$, which moves infinitely many atoms. Let $E \subset A$ be a finite support of f , and without loss of generality assume that $E = \bigcup_{i=0}^k A_i$ for some $k \in \omega$. Then there exist $i \in \aleph_{\alpha+1}$ with $i > k$, $a \in A_i$ and $b \in A \setminus (E \cup \{a\})$ such that $b = f(a)$.

Case (i): Let $b \in A_i$, and let $c, d \in A_i \setminus \{a, b\}$. Consider $\phi \upharpoonright A_i = (a, c, d) = (a, d)(a, c)$ which is the member of the alternating group on A_i and $\phi \upharpoonright A \setminus A_i = 1_{A \setminus A_i}$. Clearly, ϕ moves only finitely many atoms and $\phi \in \mathcal{G}$. Also, $\phi(b) = b$, $\phi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$, and hence $\phi(f) = f$. Thus $(a, b) \in f \implies (\phi(a), \phi(b)) \in \phi(f) \implies (c, b) \in \phi(f) = f$. So f is not injective; a contradiction.

Case (ii): If $b \in A \setminus (E \cup A_i)$, then let $x, y \in A_i \setminus \{a\}$, $\phi \upharpoonright A_i = (a, x, y)$ and $\phi \upharpoonright A \setminus A_i = 1_{A \setminus A_i}$. Again ϕ moves only finitely many atoms and $\phi \in \mathcal{G}$. Then again we easily obtain a contradiction. \square

Case (2): Let $n = 4$. Consider the permutation model $\mathcal{M}_{\kappa, 4}$ from **Proposition 5.2(1)** by letting the infinite well-ordered cardinal κ to be $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$. In $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1}, 4}$, LOC_2^- holds (cf. proof of the second assertion of [HT20, **Theorem 10(ii)**]). We note that MC is true in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1}, 4}$. The proof is similar to the one that MC holds in the Second Fraenkel Model (cf. [Jec73]). Following the arguments in the proof of Case (1), we can see that if $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m})', \text{ISAE}, \text{EPWFP}, \text{DF} = \text{F}, \text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}\}$, then X fails in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1}, 4}$. \square

Theorem 5.6. ($\text{LOC}_2^- + \text{MC}$) *does not imply PUU in ZFA.*

Proof. Let $n > 4$. Consider the permutation model $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_1, n}$ where $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_1}$ fails and $(\text{LOC}_2^- + \text{MC})$ holds. Since $\text{BPI}(\aleph_1)$ holds in any permutation model (cf. **Lemma 2.4(3)**), it holds in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_1, n}$. Thus PUU fails in $\mathcal{M}_{\aleph_1, n}$ by **Lemma 2.12**. \square

Theorem 5.7. (ZF) *Let $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ be a successor aleph. Then there is a model of ZF where $\text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ and WOC_2^- hold but $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ and EPWFP fail.*

Proof. Fix $n = 4$. First, we exhibit a new permutation model \mathcal{V} to establish the result in ZFA, and then transfer into ZF via **Theorem 2.5**. We start with a ground model M of ZFA + AC where A is an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized set of atoms written as a disjoint union $A = \bigcup \{A_{\beta} : \beta < \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$, where $A_{\beta} = \{a_{\beta,1}, a_{\beta,2}, \dots, a_{\beta,n}\}$ such that $|A_{\beta}| = n$ for all $\beta < \aleph_{\alpha+1}$. Let $\text{Alt}(A_{\beta})$ be the alternating group on A_{β} for each $\beta < \aleph_{\alpha+1}$. Let \mathcal{G} be the group of permutations η of A such that for every $\beta < \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, $\eta \upharpoonright A_{\beta} \in \text{Alt}(A_{\beta})$. Let \mathcal{F} be the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}\}$. Consider the permutation model \mathcal{V} determined by M , \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{F} . We observe the following.

- (1) In \mathcal{V} , $\text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ holds by a standard argument since the normal ideal \mathcal{I} is closed under $< \aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -unions (cf. [Jec73, the arguments in the proof of **Theorem 8.3 (i)**]).
- (2) Following the arguments in the proof of [HT20, **Theorem 10(ii)**] we can see that WOC_2^- holds in \mathcal{V} .
- (3) We can see that in \mathcal{V} , the well-ordered family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_{\beta} : \beta < \aleph_{\alpha+1}\}$ of n -element sets does not have any $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily \mathcal{B} with a choice function.³ Thus $\text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ fails in the model.
- (4) Similar to the proof of **claim 5.5** one may verify that if f is a permutation of A in \mathcal{V} , then the set $\{x \in A : f(x) \neq x\}$ has cardinality at most \aleph_{α} . Since A has size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, it follows that ‘for any set X of size $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$, $\text{Sym}(X) \neq \aleph_{\alpha} \text{Sym}(X)$ ’ fails in \mathcal{V} . Consequently, if $X \in \{\forall \text{ infinite } \mathfrak{m}(2\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m})', \text{ISAE}, \text{EPWFP}, \text{W}_{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}\}$, then X fails in \mathcal{V} by **Proposition 4.1**.

Next, we can see that WOC_2^- , $\text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$, $\neg \text{EPWFP}$, and $\neg \text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ are injectively boundable statements. Since $\Phi := (\text{WOC}_2^- \wedge \text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}} \wedge \neg \text{EPWFP} \wedge \neg \text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}})$ is a conjunction of injectively boundable statements and has a ZFA model, it follows by **Theorem 2.5** that Φ has a ZF model \mathcal{N} . Since $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ implies $\text{PAC}_{\text{fin}}^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ in ZF (cf. **Proposition 5.3(3)**), $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ fails in \mathcal{N} . Thus, $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ and EPWFP fail but $\text{DC}_{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ and WOC_2^- hold in \mathcal{N} . \square

Remark 5.8. Let M and A as above. Let \mathcal{G}' be the group of permutations η of A such that for every $\beta < \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, $\eta \upharpoonright A_{\beta} \in \text{Alt}(A_{\beta})$ and η moves at most \aleph_{α} atoms and let \mathcal{F}' be the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G}' generated by $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}'}(E) : E \in [A]^{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}\}$. Consider the permutation model \mathcal{V}' determined by M , \mathcal{G}' , and \mathcal{F}' . Following the arguments of [Tac19, **Claim 3.6**] due to Tachtsis, we can prove $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}'$.

6. VAN DOUWEN’S CHOICE PRINCIPLE IN TWO PERMUTATION MODELS

Proposition 6.1. The following hold.

- (1) The statement $\text{vDCP} \wedge \text{UT}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0, \text{cuf}) \wedge \neg \text{M}(\text{IC}, \text{DI})$ has a permutation model.
- (2) The statement $\text{vDCP} \wedge \neg \text{MC}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ has a permutation model.

³For reader’s convenience, we write down the proof. For the sake of contradiction, let \mathcal{B} be an $\aleph_{\alpha+1}$ -sized subfamily of \mathcal{A} with a choice function $f \in \mathcal{V}$. Let $E \in [A]^{<\aleph_{\alpha+1}}$ be a support of f . Since $|E| < \aleph_{\alpha+1}$, there is an $i < \aleph_{\alpha+1}$ such that $A_i \in \mathcal{B}$ and $A_i \cap E = \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, let $f(A_i) = a_{i,1}$. Consider the permutation π which is the identity on A_j , for all $j \in \aleph_{\alpha+1} \setminus i$, and let $(\pi \upharpoonright A_i)(a_{i,1}) = a_{i,2} \neq a_{i,1}$. Then π fixes E pointwise, hence $\pi(f) = f$. So, $f(A_i) = a_{i,2}$ which contradicts the fact that f is a function.

Proof. (1) We recall the permutation model \mathcal{N} which was constructed in [CHHKR08, proof of **Theorem 3.3**] where $\text{UT}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0, \text{cuf})$ holds. In order to describe \mathcal{N} , we start with a model M of $\text{ZFA} + \text{AC}$ with a set A of atoms such that A has a denumerable partition $\{A_i : i \in \omega\}$ into denumerable sets, and for each $i \in \omega$, A_i has a denumerable partition $P_i = \{A_{i,j} : j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ into finite sets such that, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $|A_{i,j}| = j$. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\phi \in \text{Sym}(A) : (\forall i \in \omega)(\phi(A_i) = A_i) \text{ and } |\{x \in A : \phi(x) \neq x\}| < \aleph_0\}$, where $\text{Sym}(A)$ is the group of all permutations of A . Let $\mathbf{P}_i = \{\phi(P_i) : \phi \in \mathcal{G}\}$ for each $i \in \omega$ and let $\mathbf{P} = \bigcup\{\mathbf{P}_i : i \in \omega\}$. Let \mathcal{F} be the normal filter of subgroups of \mathcal{G} generated by the filter base $\{\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) : E \in [\mathbf{P}]^{<\omega}\}$. Then \mathcal{N} is the permutation model determined by M , \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{F} . Keremedis, Tachtsis, and Wajch proved that $\text{M}(\text{IC}, \text{DI})$ fails in \mathcal{N} (cf. [KTW21, proof of **Theorem 13(i)**]). We follow steps (1), (2) and (4) from the proof of [Ban2, **Lemma 5.1**] to see that vDCP holds in \mathcal{N} . For the sake of convenience, we write down the proof.

Lemma 6.2. *If (X, \leq) is a poset in \mathcal{N} , then X can be written as a well-ordered disjoint union $\bigcup\{W_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ of antichains.*

Proof. Let (X, \leq) be a poset in \mathcal{N} and $E \in [\mathbf{P}]^{<\omega}$ be a support of (X, \leq) . We can write X as a disjoint union of $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$ -orbits, i.e., $X = \bigcup\{\text{Orb}_E(p) : p \in X\}$, where $\text{Orb}_E(p) = \{\phi(p) : \phi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)\}$ for all $p \in X$. The family $\{\text{Orb}_E(p) : p \in X\}$ is well-orderable in \mathcal{N} since $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E) \subseteq \text{Sym}_{\mathcal{G}}(\text{Orb}_E(p))$ for all $p \in X$ (cf. the arguments of [Tac16a, **claim 4**]). We prove that $\text{Orb}_E(p)$ is an antichain in (X, \leq) for each $p \in X$ following the arguments of [Tac16a, **claim 3**]. For the sake of contradiction, suppose there is a $p \in X$, such that $\text{Orb}_E(p)$ is not an antichain in (X, \leq) . Thus, for some $\phi, \psi \in \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$, $\phi(p)$ and $\psi(p)$ are comparable. Without loss of generality we may assume $\phi(p) < \psi(p)$. Let $\pi = \psi^{-1}\phi$. Consequently, $\pi(p) < p$. Now each $\eta \in \mathcal{G}$, moves only finitely many atoms by the definition of \mathcal{G} . So for some $k < \omega$, $\pi^k = 1$. Thus, $p = \pi^k(p) < \pi^{k-1}(p) < \dots < \pi(p) < p$. By transitivity of $<$, $p < p$, which is a contradiction. \square

We recall the arguments from the 1st-paragraph of [HST16, p.175] to give a proof of vDCP in \mathcal{N} . Let $\mathcal{A} = \{(A_i, \leq_i) : i \in I\}$ be a family as in vDCP . Without loss of generality, we assume that \mathcal{A} is pairwise disjoint. Let $R = \bigcup \mathcal{A}$. We partially order R by requiring $x < y$ if and only if there exists an index $i \in I$ such that $x, y \in A_i$ and $x \leq_i y$. By **Lemma 6.2**, R can be written as a well-ordered disjoint union $\bigcup\{W_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ of antichains. For each $i \in I$, let $\alpha_i = \min\{\alpha < \kappa : A_i \cap W_\alpha \neq \emptyset\}$. Since for all $i \in I$, A_i is linearly ordered, it follows that $A_i \cap W_{\alpha_i}$ is a singleton for each $i \in I$. Consequently, $f = \{(i, \bigcup(A_i \cap W_{\alpha_i})) : i \in I\}$ is a choice function of \mathcal{A} . Thus, vDCP holds in \mathcal{N} .

(2). We recall the permutation model (say \mathcal{M}) which was constructed in [HT21, proof of **Theorem 3.4**]. In order to describe \mathcal{M} , we start with a model M of $\text{ZFA} + \text{AC}$ with a denumerable set A of atoms which is written as a disjoint union $\bigcup\{A_n : n \in \omega\}$, where $|A_n| = \aleph_0$ for all $n \in \omega$. For each $n \in \omega$, we let \mathcal{G}_n be the group of all permutations of A_n which move only finitely many elements of A_n . Let \mathcal{G} be the weak direct product of the \mathcal{G}_n 's for $n \in \omega$. Consequently, every permutation of A in \mathcal{G} moves only finitely many atoms. Let \mathcal{I} be the normal ideal of subsets of A which is generated by finite unions of A_n 's. Let \mathcal{F} be the normal filter on \mathcal{G} generated by the subgroups $\text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}}(E)$, $E \in \mathcal{I}$. Let \mathcal{M} be the Fraenkel–Mostowski model, which is determined by M , \mathcal{G} , and \mathcal{F} . Howard and Tachtsis proved that $\text{MC}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ fails in \mathcal{M} (cf. [HT21, proof of **Theorem 3.4**]). Since every permutation of A in \mathcal{G} moves only finitely many atoms, following the arguments in the proof of (1), vDCP holds in \mathcal{M} . \square

Remark 6.3. In every Fraenkel–Mostowski permutation model, CS (Every poset without a maximal element has two disjoint cofinal subsets) implies vDCP (cf. [HST16, **Theorem 3.15(3)**]). We can also see that in the above mentioned permutation models (i.e., \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M}) CS and CWF (Every poset has a cofinal well-founded subset) hold applying **Lemma 6.2** and following the methods of [HST16, **Theorem 3.26**] and [Tac18, proof of **Theorem 10 (ii)**].

7. SPANNING SUBGRAPHS AND WEAK CHOICE FORMS

Proposition 7.1. (ZF) *The following hold.*

- (1) $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^\omega + \mathcal{Q}_{lf,c}^n$ is equivalent to $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ for any $2 < n \in \omega$.
- (2) $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ implies $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^{\text{WO}} + \mathcal{Q}_{lw,c}^{n,k}$ and the later implies $\text{AC}_{\text{WO}}^{\text{WO}}$ for any $2 < n, k \in \omega$.
- (3) $\mathcal{P}_{lf,c}^m$ is equivalent to $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ for any even integer $m \geq 4$.
- (4) $\mathcal{Q}_{lf,c}^n$ fails in \mathcal{N}_6 .

Proof. (1). (\Leftarrow) We assume $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$. Fix any $2 < n \in \omega$. We know that $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ implies $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^\omega$ in ZF and claim that $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ implies $\mathcal{Q}_{lf,c}^n$ in ZF. We recall the fact that $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ implies the statement ‘Every infinite locally finite connected graph is countably infinite’; Let $G = (V_G, E_G)$ be some infinite locally finite connected graph. Consider

some $r \in V_G$. Let $V_0 = \{r\}$. For each integer $n \geq 1$, define $V_n = \{v \in V_G : d_G(r, v) = n\}$ where ‘ $d_G(r, v) = n$ ’ means there are n edges in the shortest path joining r and v . Each V_n is finite by locally finiteness of G , and $V_G = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} V_n$ by connectedness of G . By $\text{UT}(\aleph_0, \text{fin}, \aleph_0)$ (which is equivalent to $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ (cf. § 1.5.1)), V_G is countable. Consequently, V_G is well-ordered. The rest follows from the facts that every well-ordered graph has a spanning tree in ZF, and any spanning tree is a spanning subgraph omitting $K_{2,n}$.

(\Rightarrow) Fix any $2 < n \in \omega$. We show that $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^\omega + \mathcal{Q}_{lf,c}^n$ implies $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ in ZF. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in \omega\}$ be a countably infinite set of non-empty finite sets. Without loss of generality, we assume that \mathcal{A} is disjoint. Let $A = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} A_i$. Consider a countably infinite family $(B_i, <_i)_{i \in \omega}$ of well-ordered sets such that $|B_i| = |A_i| + k$ for some fixed $1 \leq k \in \omega$, for each $i \in \omega$, B_i is disjoint from A and the other B_j ’s, and there is no mapping with domain A_i and range B_i (cf. [DM06, **Theorem 1, Remark 6**]). Let $B = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} B_i$. Consider another countably infinite sequence $T = \{t_i : i \in \omega\}$ disjoint from A and B . We construct a graph $G_1 = (V_{G_1}, E_{G_1})$.

Constructing G_1 : Let $V_{G_1} = A \cup B \cup T$. For each $i \in \omega$, let $\{t_i, t_{i+1}\} \in E_{G_1}$ and $\{t_i, x\} \in E_{G_1}$ for every element $x \in A_i$. Also for each $i \in \omega$, join each $x \in A_i$ to every element of B_i .

Clearly, the graph G_1 is connected and locally finite. By assumption, G_1 has a spanning subgraph G'_1 omitting $K_{2,n}$. For each $i \in \omega$, let $f_i : B_i \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A_i) \setminus \emptyset$ map each element of B_i to its neighbourhood in G'_1 . We can see that for any two distinct ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 in B_i , $f_i(\epsilon_1) \cap f_i(\epsilon_2)$ has at most $n-1$ elements, since G'_1 has no $K_{2,n}$. By **Lemma 2.9(1)**, there are tuples $(\epsilon'_1, \epsilon'_2) \in B_i \times B_i$ s.t. $f_i(\epsilon'_1) \cap f_i(\epsilon'_2) \neq \emptyset$. Consider the first such tuple $(\epsilon''_1, \epsilon''_2)$ w.r.t. the well-ordering on $B_i \times B_i$. Let $A'_i = f_i(\epsilon''_1) \cap f_i(\epsilon''_2)$. By $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^\omega$, we can obtain a choice function of $\mathcal{A}' = \{A'_i : i \in \omega\}$, which is a choice function of \mathcal{A} .

(2). For the first implication, we know that $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ implies $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^{\text{WO}}$ as well as the statement ‘Every locally well-orderable connected graph is well-orderable’ in ZF. The rest follows from the fact that every well-ordered graph has a spanning tree in ZF.

We show that $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^{\text{WO}} + \mathcal{Q}_{lw,c}^{n,k}$ implies $\text{AC}_{\text{WO}}^{\text{WO}}$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_n : n \in \kappa\}$ be a well-orderable set of non-empty well-orderable sets. Without loss of generality, we assume that \mathcal{A} is disjoint. Let $A = \bigcup_{i \in \kappa} A_i$. Consider an infinite well-orderable family $(B_i, <_i)_{i \in \kappa}$ of well-orderable sets such that for each $i \in \kappa$, B_i is disjoint from A and the other B_j ’s, and there is no mapping with domain A_i and range B_i (cf. [DM06, **Theorem 1, Remark 6**]). Let $B = \bigcup_{i \in \kappa} B_i$. Consider another κ sequence $T = \{t_n : n \in \kappa\}$ disjoint from A and B .

Constructing G_2 : Let $V_{G_2} = A \cup B \cup T$. For each $n \in \kappa$, let $\{t_n, t_{n+1}\} \in E_{G_2}$ and $\{t_n, x\} \in E_{G_2}$ for every element $x \in A_n$. Also for each $n \in \kappa$, join each $x \in A_n$ to every element of B_n .

Clearly, the graph G_2 is connected and locally well-orderable. By assumption, G_2 has a spanning subgraph G'_2 omitting $K_{k,n}$. For each $i \in \kappa$, let $f_i : B_i \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(A_i) \setminus \emptyset$ map each element of B_i to its neighbourhood in G'_2 . We can see that for any finite k -subset $H_i \subseteq B_i$, $\bigcap_{\epsilon \in H_i} f_i(\epsilon)$ has at most $n-1$ elements, since G'_2 has no $K_{k,n}$. Since each B_i is infinite and well-orderable, by **Lemma 2.9(2)**, there are tuples $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_k) \in B_i^k$ s.t. $\bigcap_{i < k} f_i(\epsilon_i) \neq \emptyset$. Consider the first such tuple $(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_k)$ w.r.t. the well-ordering on B_i^k . Let $A'_i = \bigcap_{i < k} f_i(\epsilon_i)$. By $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^{\text{WO}}$, we can obtain a choice function of $\mathcal{A}' = \{A'_n : n \in \kappa\}$, which is a choice function of \mathcal{A} .

(3). (\Rightarrow) Fix any even integer $m = 2(k+1) \geq 4$. We prove that $\mathcal{P}_{lf,c}^m$ implies $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i : i \in \omega\}$ be a countably infinite set of non-empty finite sets and $A = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} A_i$.

Let $G_3 := (\bigcup_{i \in \omega} \bigcup_{x \in A_i} \{\{r_i, (x, 1)\}, \{(x, 1), (x, 2)\}, \dots, \{(x, k-1), (x, k)\}, \{(x, k), t_i\}\}) \cup (\bigcup_{i \in \omega} \{r_i, r_{i+1}\})$ where the t_i ’s are pair-wise distinct and belong to no $A_j \times \{1, \dots, k\}$, and r_i ’s are pair-wise distinct and belong to no $(A_j \times \{1, \dots, k\}) \cup \{t_j\}$ for any $i, j \in \omega$.

Clearly, G_3 is locally finite and connected. By assumption, G_3 has a spanning m -bush ζ . We can see that ζ generates a choice function of \mathcal{A} : for each $i \in I$, there is a unique $x \in A_i$, say x_i , such that $(t_i, (x_i, k), \dots, (x_i, 1), r_i)$ is a path in ζ .

(\Leftarrow) Fix any even integer $m \geq 4$. We prove that $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ implies $\mathcal{P}_{lf,c}^m$. We know that $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ implies the statement ‘Every infinite locally finite connected graph is countably infinite’ in ZF. The rest follows from the fact that every well-ordered graph has a spanning tree in ZF and any spanning tree is a spanning m -bush.

(4). In \mathcal{N}_6 , $\text{AC}_{\text{fin}}^\omega$ fails, where as $\text{AC}_{\leq n-1}^\omega$ holds for any natural number $n > 2$. By **Proposition 7.1(1)**, $\mathcal{Q}_{lf,c}^n$ fails in the model. \square

We recall the definition of P'_G for a graph G from §1.5.1.

Proposition 7.2. (ZF) Fix any $2 < k \in \omega$ and any $2 \leq p, q < \omega$.

- (1) If each A_i is K_k , then AC_{k^k-2} implies ‘Every graph from the class P'_{K_k} has a spanning tree’.
- (2) If each A_i is C_k , then AC_k implies ‘Every graph from the class P'_{C_k} has a spanning tree’.

- (3) If each A_i is $K_{p,q}$, then $(\text{AC}_{p^{q-1}q^{p-1}} + \text{AC}_{p+q})$ implies ‘Every graph from the class $P'_{K_{p,q}}$ has a spanning tree’.

Proof. (1). Let $G_2 = (V_{G_2}, E_{G_2})$ be a graph from the class P'_{K_k} . Then there is a $G_1 \in P_{K_k}$ (an infinite graph whose only components are K_k) such that $V_{G_2} = V_{G_1} \cup \{t\}$ for some $t \notin V_{G_1}$. Let $\{A_i : i \in I\}$ be the components of G_1 . By AC_k (which follows from $\text{AC}_{k^{k-2}}$ (cf. **Lemma 2.16**)), we choose a sequence of vertices $\{a_i : i \in I\}$ such that $a_i \in A_i$ for all $i \in I$. By **Lemma 2.14**, the number of spanning trees in A_i is k^{k-2} for any $i \in I$. By $\text{AC}_{k^{k-2}}$, we choose a sequence $\{s_i : i \in I\}$ such that s_i is a spanning tree of A_i for all $i \in I$. Then the graph $\bigcup_{i \in I} s_i \cup \{t, c_i\}$ is a spanning tree of G_2 .

(2). Following the arguments of the proof of (1), we can prove that AC_κ implies the statement ‘Every graph from the class P'_{C_k} has a spanning tree’ since the number of spanning trees in A_i is k for any $i \in I$ in ZF.

(3). Following the arguments of the proof of (1), we can prove that $(\text{AC}_{p^{q-1}q^{p-1}} + \text{AC}_{p+q})$ implies the statement ‘Every graph from the class $P'_{K_{p,q}}$ has a spanning tree’ since the number of spanning trees in A_i is $p^{q-1}q^{p-1}$ for any $i \in I$ in ZF (cf. **Lemma 2.15**). \square

8. QUESTIONS AND FURTHER STUDIES

Question 8.1. Which other choice principles hold in \mathcal{V}_p ? In particular does CAC, the infinite Ramsey’s Theorem (RT) [HR98, **Form 17**], and **Form 233** hold in \mathcal{V}_p ?

We proved that $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ and CAC^{\aleph_0} hold in \mathcal{N}_1 (cf. [Ban2, BG1]). We know that RT is true in both \mathcal{N}_1 and Mostowski’s linearly ordered model (labeled as Model \mathcal{N}_3 in [HR98]) (cf. [Bla77, **Theorem 2**], [Tac16a, **Theorem 2.4**]). Consequently, CAC holds in both \mathcal{N}_1 and \mathcal{N}_3 (since RT implies CAC (cf. [Tac16a, **Theorem 1.6**])).

Question 8.2. Does $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ and CAC^{\aleph_0} hold in \mathcal{N}_3 ?

Question 8.3. (asked by Lajos Soukup) What is the relationship between $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ and CAC^{\aleph_0} in ZF? In particular, can we say whether $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ and CAC^{\aleph_0} are equivalent in ZF? Otherwise, is there any model of ZF where either $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ holds and CAC^{\aleph_0} fails or CAC^{\aleph_0} holds and $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ fails?

Bruce [Bru16] proved that $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ holds in \mathcal{V}_p .

Question 8.4. Does $\text{UT}(\text{WO}, \text{WO}, \text{WO})$ and DC hold in \mathcal{V}_p^+ ?

We know that DC implies CAC in ZF.

Question 8.5. Does DC_{\aleph_1} imply both $\text{CAC}_1^{\aleph_0}$ and CAC^{\aleph_0} in ZF?

We recall that every symmetric extension (symmetric submodel of a forcing extension where AC can consistently fail) is given by a symmetric system $\langle \mathbb{P}, \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{F} \rangle$, where \mathbb{P} is a forcing notion, \mathcal{G} is a group of permutations of \mathbb{P} , and \mathcal{F} is a normal filter of subgroups over \mathcal{G} . We recall the definition of Feferman–Lévy’s symmetric extension from Dimitriou’s Ph.D. thesis (cf. [Dim11, **Chapter 1**, §2]).

Forcing notion \mathbb{P}_1 : Let $\mathbb{P}_1 = \{p : \omega \times \omega \rightarrow \aleph_\omega; |p| < \omega \text{ and } \forall (n, i) \in \text{dom}(p), p(n, i) < \omega_n\}$ be a forcing notion ordered by reverse inclusion, i.e., $p \leq q$ iff $p \supseteq q$ (We denote by $p : A \rightarrow B$ a partial function from A to B).

Group of permutations \mathcal{G}_1 of \mathbb{P}_1 : Let \mathcal{G}_1 be the full permutation group of ω . Extend \mathcal{G}_1 to an automorphism group of \mathbb{P}_1 by letting an $a \in \mathcal{G}_1$ act on a $p \in \mathbb{P}_1$ by $a^*(p) = \{(n, a(i), \beta); (n, i, \beta) \in p\}$. We identify a^* with $a \in \mathcal{G}_1$. We can see that this is an automorphism group of \mathbb{P}_1 .

Normal filter \mathcal{F}_1 of subgroups over \mathcal{G}_1 : For every $n \in \omega$ define the following sets.

$$(3) \quad E_n = \{p \cap (n \times \omega \times \omega_n); p \in \mathbb{P}_1\}, \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}_1} E_n = \{a \in \mathcal{G}_1; \forall p \in E_n (a(p) = p)\}.$$

We can see that $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{X \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1; \exists n \in \omega, \text{fix}_{\mathcal{G}_1} E_n \subseteq X\}$ is a normal filter of subgroups over \mathcal{G}_1 .

Feferman–Lévy’s symmetric extension is the symmetric extension obtained by $\langle \mathbb{P}_1, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{F}_1 \rangle$ where $\text{UT}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ (The union of denumerably many pairwise disjoint denumerable sets is denumerable) fails. It is known that the following statements follow from ‘ \aleph_1 is regular’ as well as from $\text{UT}(\aleph_0, \aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ in ZF (cf. [Ban2, BG1]).

(*): If P is a poset such that the underlying set has a well-ordering and if all antichains in P are finite and all chains in P are countable, then P is countable.

(**): If P is a poset such that the underlying set has a well-ordering and if all antichains in P are countable and all chains in P are finite, then P is countable.

Question 8.6. Does any of (**) and (*) is true in Feferman–Lévy’s symmetric extension?

REFERENCES

- [Ban2] A. Banerjee, Maximal independent sets, variants of chain/antichain principle and cofinal subsets without AC, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. Accepted, arXiv preprint: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.05368v2>.
- [BG1] A. Banerjee and Z. Gyenis, Chromatic number of the product of graphs, graph homomorphisms, Antichains and cofinal subsets of posets without AC, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. Accepted, arXiv preprint: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.00434v3>.
- [Bla77] A. Blass, Ramsey's theorem in the hierarchy of choice principles, J. Symb. Log. **42**, 387–390 (1977), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2272866>.
- [Bru16] B. B. Bruce, A Permutation Model with Finite Partitions of the Set of Atoms as Supports, Rose-Hulman Undergraduate Mathematics Journal **17**, (2016), url: <https://scholar.rose-hulman.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1003&context=rhumj>.
- [CHHKR08] O. De la Cruz, E.J. Hall, P. Howard, K. Keremedis, and J.E. Rubin, Unions and the axiom of choice, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **54**, 652–665 (2008), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.200710073>.
- [DM06] C. Delhommé and M. Morillon, Spanning Graphs and the Axiom of Choice, Rep. Math. Logic **40**, 165–180 (2006).
- [Dim11] I. Dimitriou, Symmetric Models, Singular Cardinal Patterns, and Indiscernibles, Ph.D. thesis (Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, 2011), url: <https://d-nb.info/1020630655/34>.
- [HK15] H. Herrlich and K. Keremedis, On the metric reflection of a pseudometric space in ZF, Comment.Math.Univ.Carolin. **56**, 77–88 (2015), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14712/1213-7243.015.107>.
- [HHK16] H. Herrlich, P. Howard, and K. Keremedis, On preimages of ultrafilters in ZF, Comment.Math.Univ.Carolin. **57**, 241–252 (2016), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14712/1213-7243.2015.159>.
- [HHT12] H. Herrlich, P. Howard, and E. Tachtsis, On Special Partitions of Dedekind- and Russell-Sets, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin. **53**(1), 105–122 (2012).
- [HR98] P. Howard and J. E. Rubin, Consequences of the Axiom of Choice, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Vol. **59** (American Mathematical Society, 1998), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/surv/059>.
- [HR] P. Howard and J. E. Rubin, Other forms added to the ones from [HR98], I Dimitriou web page <https://cgraph.inters.co/>.
- [HST16] P. Howard, D.I. Saveliev, and E. Tachtsis, On the set-theoretic strength of the existence of disjoint cofinal sets in posets without maximal elements, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **62**(3), 155–176 (2016). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.201400089>.
- [HT21] P. Howard and E. Tachtsis, On metrizable and compactness of certain products without the Axiom of Choice, Topology and its Applications **290**(1), (2021), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2021.107591>.
- [HH73] H. Höft and P. Howard, A graph theoretic equivalent to the axiom of choice, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **19**(11–12), 191–191 (1973), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.19730191103>.
- [HT20] L. Halbeisen and E. Tachtsis, On Ramsey Choice and Partial Choice for infinite families of n -element sets, Arch. Math. Logic **59**, 583–606 (2020), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00153-019-00705-7>.
- [Jec73] T. Jech, The Axiom of Choice, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics Vol. 75 (North-Holland, 1973), MR 0396271.
- [KH62] K. Keremedis and H. Herrlich, Powers of 2, Notre Dame J. Form. Log. **40**(3), 346–351 (1999), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1305/ndjfl/1022615615>.
- [KTW21] K. Keremedis, E. Tachtsis, and E. Wajch, Several results on compact metrizable spaces in ZF, Monatsh Math (2021), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00605-021-01582-0>.
- [KW] K. Keremedis and E. Wajch, k -spaces, sequential spaces and related topics in the absence of the axiom of choice, arXiv preprint: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2108.01195>.
- [KT06] P. Komjáth and V. Totik, *Problems and Theorems in Classical Set Theory*, Springer (2006).
- [Lev62] A. Lévy, Axioms of multiple choice, Fundam. Math. **50**, 475–483 (1962), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4064/fm-50-5-475-483>.
- [Pin72] D. Pincus, Zermelo–Fraenkel consistency results by Fraenkel–Mostowski methods, J. Symb. Log. **37**(4), 721–743 (1972), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2272420>.
- [Tac19] E. Tachtsis, On the existence of permutations of infinite sets without fixed points in set theory without choice, Acta Math. Hungar. **157**, 281–300 (2019), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10474-018-0869-9>.
- [Tac19a] E. Tachtsis, Łoś's theorem and the axiom of choice, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **65**(3), 280–292 (2019), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.201700074>.
- [Tac19b] E. Tachtsis, Dilworth's decomposition theorem for posets in ZF, Acta Math. Hungar. **159**, 603–617 (2019), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10474-019-00967-w>.
- [Tac18] E. Tachtsis, On the Minimal Cover Property and Certain Notions of Finite, Arch. Math. Logic **57** (5–6), 665–686, (2018), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00153-017-0595-y>.
- [Tac17] E. Tachtsis, On variants of the principle of consistent choices, the minimal cover property and the 2-compactness of generalized Cantor cubes, Topology and its Applications **219**, 122–140 (2017), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.topol.2017.01.009>.
- [Tac16] E. Tachtsis, On Martin's Axiom and Forms of Choice, MLQ Math. Log. Q. **62**(3), 190–203 (2016), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/malq.201400115>.
- [Tac16a] E. Tachtsis, On Ramsey's Theorem and the existence of Infinite Chains or Infinite Anti-Chains in Infinite Posets, J. Symb. Log. **81**(1), 384–394 (2016), DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/jsl.2015.47>.

DEPARTMENT OF SET THEORY, LOGIC AND TOPOLOGY, ALFRÉD RÉNYI INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, REÁLTANODA UTCA 13-15, BUDAPEST-1053, HUNGARY

Email address: banerjee.amitayu@gmail.com