Abstract. For a set $M$, $\text{fin}(M)$ denotes the set of all finite subsets of $M$, $M^2$ denotes the Cartesian product $M \times M$, $[M]^2$ denotes the set of all 2-element subsets of $M$, and $\text{seq}^{-1}(M)$ denotes the set of all finite sequences without repetition which can be formed with elements of $M$. Furthermore, for a set $S$, let $|S|$ denote the cardinality of $S$. Under the assumption that the four cardinalities $|[M]^2|$, $|M^2|$, $|\text{fin}(M)|$, $|\text{seq}^{-1}(M)|$ are pairwise distinct and pairwise comparable in ZF, there are six possible linear orderings between these four cardinalities. We show that at least five of the six possible linear orderings are consistent with ZF.
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1 Introduction

Let $M$ be a set. Then $\text{fin}(M)$ denotes the set of all finite subsets of $M$, $M^2$ denotes the Cartesian product $M \times M$, $[M]^2$ denotes the set of all 2-element subsets of $M$, and $\text{seq}^{-1}(M)$ denotes the set of all finite sequences without repetitions which can be formed with elements of $M$, and $\text{seq}(M)$ denotes the set of all finite sequences which can be formed with elements of $M$ (where repetitions are allowed).

Furthermore, for a set $A$, let $|A|$ denote the cardinality of $A$. We write $|A| = |B|$, if there exists a bijection between $A$ and $B$, and we write $|A| \leq |B|$, if there exists a bijection between $A$ and a subset $B' \subseteq B$ (i.e., $|A| \leq |B|$ if and only if there exists an injection from $A$ into $B$). Finally, we write $|A| < |B|$ if $|A| \leq |B|$ and $|A| \neq |B|$. By the CANTOR-BERNSTEIN THEOREM, which is provable in ZF only (i.e., without using the Axiom of Choice), we get that $|A| \leq |B|$ and $|A| \geq |B|$ implies $|A| = |B|$.

Let $m := |M|$, and let $[m]^2 := |[M]^2|$, $m^2 := |M^2|$, $\text{fin}(m) := |\text{fin}(M)|$, $\text{seq}^{-1}(m) := |\text{seq}^{-1}(M)|$, and $\text{seq}(m) := |\text{seq}(M)|$. Concerning these cardinalities, in ZF we obviously have $\text{seq}^{-1}(m) \leq \text{seq}(m)$, $[m]^2 \leq \text{fin}(m)$ and $m^2 \leq \text{seq}^{-1}(m)$, where the latter relations are visualized by the following diagram (in the diagram, $n_1$ is below $n_2$ if $n_1 \leq n_2$):

```
[fin(m)  seq^{-1}(m)]
|      |                |
|m^2   m^2         |
```
Moreover, for finite cardinals \(m\) with \(m \geq 5\) we have
\[
[m]^2 < m^2 < \text{fin}(m) < \text{seq}^{1-1}(m),
\]
and in the presence of the Axiom of Choice (i.e., in ZFC), for every infinite cardinal \(m\) we have
\[
[m]^2 = m^2 = \text{fin}(m) = \text{seq}^{1-1}(m).
\]

It is natural to ask whether some of these equalities can be proved also in ZF, i.e., without the aid of AC. Surprisingly, this is not the case. In [1], a permutation model was constructed in which for an infinite cardinal \(m\) we have \(\text{seq}(m) < \text{fin}(m)\) (see [1, Thm. 2] or [4, Prp. 7.17]). As a consequence we obtain that the existence of an infinite cardinal \(m\) for which \(\text{seq}^{1-1}(m) < \text{fin}(m)\) is consistent with ZF. This consistency result was modified to the existence of an infinite cardinal \(m\) for which \(m^2 < [m]^2\) (see [4, Prp. 7.18]), and later, it was strengthened to the existence of an infinite cardinal \(m\) for which \(\text{seq}(m) < [m]^2\) (see [3] or [5, Prp. 8.28]).

Consistency results as well as ZF-results concerning the relations between these cardinals with other cardinals can be found, for example, in [7, 8] or [2].

Concerning the four cardinalities \([m]^2\), \(m^2\), \(\text{fin}(m)\), and \(\text{seq}^{1-1}(m)\), a question which arises naturally is whether for some infinite cardinal \(m\), \(\text{fin}(m) < m^2\) is consistent with ZF (see [5, Related Result 20, p. 133]). Moreover, assuming that \(m\) is infinite and the four cardinalities \([m]^2\), \(m^2\), \(\text{fin}(m)\), \(\text{seq}^{1-1}(m)\) are pairwise distinct and pairwise comparable in ZF, one may ask which linear orderings on these four cardinalities are consistent with ZF.

Since for cardinals \(m \geq 5\), we cannot have \([m]^2 > \text{fin}(m)\) or \(m^2 > \text{seq}^{1-1}(m)\), there are only the following six linear orderings on these four cardinalities which might be consistent with ZF (where for two cardinals \(n_1\) and \(n_2\), \(n_1 \rightarrow n_2\) means \(n_1 < n_2\)).

Below we show that each of the five diagrams \(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{V}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{S}\) is consistent with ZF.
2 Permutation Models

In order to show, for example, that for some infinite cardinals \( m \) and \( n \), \( m < n \) is consistent with \( \text{ZF} \), by the Jech-Sochor Embedding Theorem (see, for example, [6, Thm. 6.1] or [5, Thm. 17.2]), it is enough to construct a permutation model in which this statement holds. The underlying idea of permutation models, which will be models of set theory with atoms (\( \text{ZFA} \)), is the fact that a model \( \mathcal{V} \models \text{ZFA} \) does not distinguish between the atoms, where atoms are objects which do not have any elements but which are distinct from the empty set. The theory \( \text{ZFA} \) is essentially the same as that of \( \text{ZF} \) (except for the definition of ordinals, where we have to require that an ordinal does not have atoms among its elements). Let \( A \) be a set. Then by transfinite recursion on the ordinals \( \alpha \in \Omega \) we can define the \( \alpha \)-power \( P^\alpha(A) \) of \( A \) and \( P^\infty(A) := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Omega} P^\alpha(A) \). Like for the cumulative hierarchy of sets in \( \text{ZF} \), one can show that if \( M \) is a model of \( \text{ZFA} \) and \( A \) is the set of atoms of \( M \), then \( M := P^\infty(A) \). The class \( M_0 := P^\infty(\emptyset) \) is a model of \( \text{ZF} \) and is called the kernel. Notice that all ordinals belong to the kernel. By construction we obtain that every permutation of the set of atoms induces an automorphism of \( \mathcal{V} \), where the sets in the kernel are fixed.

Permutation models were first introduced by Adolf Fraenkel and, in a precise version (with supports), by Andrzej Mostowski. The version with filters, which we will follow below, is due to Ernst Specker (a detailed introduction to permutation models can be found, for example, in [5, Ch. 8] or [6]).

In order to construct a permutation model, we usually start with a set of atoms \( A \) and then define a group \( G \) of permutations or automorphisms of \( A \).

The permutation models we construct below are of the following simple type: For each finite set \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \), let
\[
\text{Fix}_G(E) := \{ \pi \in G : \forall a \in E \ (\pi a = a) \},
\]
and let \( \mathcal{F} \) be the filter of subgroups on \( G \) generated by the subgroups \( \{ \text{Fix}_G(E) : E \in \text{fin}(A) \} \).

In other words, \( \mathcal{F} \) is the set of all subgroups \( H \leq G \), such that the there exists a finite set \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \), such that \( \text{Fix}_G(E) \leq H \).

For a set \( x \), let
\[
\text{sym}_G(x) := \{ \pi \in G : \pi x = x \}
\]
where
\[
\pi x = \begin{cases} 
\emptyset & \text{if } x = \emptyset, \\
\pi a & \text{if } x = a \text{ for some } a \in A, \\
\{\pi y : y \in x\} & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]

Then, a set \( x \) is symmetric if and only if there exists a set of atoms \( E_x \in \text{fin}(A) \), such that
\[
\text{Fix}_G(E_x) \leq \text{sym}_G(x).
\]

We say that \( E_x \) is a support of \( x \). Finally, let \( \mathcal{V} \) be the class of all hereditarily symmetric objects; then \( \mathcal{V} \) is a transitive model of \( \text{ZFA} \). We call \( \mathcal{V} \) a permutation model. So, a set \( x \) belongs to the permutation model \( \mathcal{V} \) (with respect to \( G \) and \( \mathcal{F} \)), if and only if \( x \) has a finite support \( E_x \in \text{fin}(A) \). Because every \( a \in A \) is symmetric, we get that each atom \( a \in A \) belongs to \( \mathcal{V} \).
2.1 A Model for Diagram \( \mathbb{N} \)

We first show that in every model for Diagram \( \mathbb{N} \), we have that the cardinality \( \mathfrak{m} \) is transfinite.

**Lemma 1.** If \( \text{fin}(\mathfrak{m}) \leq \mathfrak{m}^2 \) for some \( \mathfrak{m} \geq 5 \), then \( \aleph_0 \leq \mathfrak{m} \).

**Proof.** Let \( A \) be a set of cardinality \( \mathfrak{m} \geq 5 \) and assume that \( h : \text{fin}(A) \to A^2 \) is an injection. First we choose a 5-sequence \( S_5 := \langle a_1, \ldots, a_5 \rangle \) of pairwise distinct elements of \( A \). The ordering of \( S_5 \) induces an ordering on \( P_5 := \text{fin}(\{a_1, \ldots, a_5\}) \), and since \( |h[P_5]| = 2^5 \) and \( 2^5 > 5^2 \), there exists a first set \( u \in P_5 \) such that for \( \langle x, y \rangle = h(u) \), the set \( D_6 := \{x, y\} \setminus \{a_1, \ldots, a_5\} \) is non-empty. If \( x \in D_6 \), let \( a_6 := x \), otherwise, let \( a_6 := y \). Now, let \( S_6 := \langle a_1, \ldots, a_6 \rangle \) and \( P_6 := \text{fin}(\{a_1, \ldots, a_6\}) \). As above, we find a \( u \in P_6 \) such that for \( \langle x, y \rangle = h(u) \), the set \( D_7 := \{x, y\} \setminus \{a_1, \ldots, a_7\} \) is non-empty. If \( x \in D_7 \), let \( a_7 := x \), otherwise, let \( a_7 := y \). Proceeding this way, we finally have an injection from \( \omega \) into \( A \), which shows that \( \aleph_0 \leq \mathfrak{m} \). \( \dashv \)

**Proposition 2.** If \( \aleph_0 \leq \mathfrak{m} \) for some infinite cardinal \( \mathfrak{m} = |A| \), then there exists a finite-to-one function \( g : \text{seq}(A) \to \text{fin}(A) \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 1, there exists an injection \( h : \omega \to A \), and for each \( i \in \omega \), let \( x_i := h(i) \), let \( B = \{x_i : i \in \omega \} \), and let \( C := \{x_{2i} : i \in \omega \} \). Notice that

\[
\iota(a) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \in A \setminus B, \\ x_{2i+1} & \text{if } a = x_i, 
\end{cases}
\]

is a bijection between \( A \) and \( A \setminus C \). Thus, it is enough to construct a finite-to-one function \( g : \text{seq}(A \setminus C) \to \text{fin}(A) \). Let \( s = \langle a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1} \rangle \in \text{seq}(A \setminus C) \) and let \( \text{ran}(s) := \{a_0, \ldots, a_{n-1}\} \). The sequence \( s \) gives us in a natural way an enumeration of \( \text{ran}(s) \), and with respect to this enumeration we can encode the sequence \( s \) by a natural number \( i_s \in \omega \). Now, let \( g(s) := \text{ran}(s) \cup \{x_{2i_s}\} \). Then, since there are just finitely many enumerations of \( \text{ran}(s) \), \( g \) is a finite-to-one function.

The following result is just a consequence of Proposition 2 and Lemma 1.

**Corollary 3.** If \( \text{fin}(\mathfrak{m}) \leq \mathfrak{m}^2 \) for some \( \mathfrak{m} = |A| \geq 5 \), then there exists a finite-to-one function \( g : \text{seq}(A) \to \text{fin}(A) \).

We now introduce the technique we intend to use in order to build a permutation model from which it will follow that for some infinite cardinal \( \mathfrak{m} \), the relation \( \text{fin}(\mathfrak{m}) < \mathfrak{m}^2 \) is consistent with \( \text{ZF} \). Notice that this relation is the main feature of Diagram \( \mathbb{N} \) and that this relation implies that \( \aleph_0 \leq \mathfrak{m} \). In the next section, we shall use a similar permutation model in order to show the consistency of Diagram \( \mathbb{Z} \) with \( \text{ZF} \).

Let \( K \) be the class of all the pairs \( (A, h) \) such that \( A \) is a (possibly empty) set and \( h \) is an injection \( h : \text{fin}(A) \to A^2 \). We will also refer to the elements of \( K \) as models. We define a partial ordering \( \leq \) on \( K \) by stipulating

\[
(A, h) \leq (B, f) \iff A \subseteq B \land h \subseteq f \land \text{ran}(f|_{\text{fin}(B) \setminus \text{fin}(A)}) \subseteq (B \setminus A)^2.
\]

The following result is just a consequence of Proposition 2 and Lemma 1.

**Corollary 3.** If \( \text{fin}(\mathfrak{m}) \leq \mathfrak{m}^2 \) for some \( \mathfrak{m} = |A| \geq 5 \), then there exists a finite-to-one function \( g : \text{seq}(A) \to \text{fin}(A) \). \( \dashv \)
When the functions involved are clear from the context, with a slight abuse of notation we will just write \( A \leq B \) instead of \((A, h) \leq (B, f)\) and \( A \in K \) instead of \((A, h) \in K\). Notice that the last condition in the definition of \((A, h) \leq (B, f)\) implies that \((B \setminus A) \in K\).

**Proposition 4 (CH).** There is a model \( M_* \) of cardinality \( \aleph \) in \( K \) such that:

- \( M_* \) is \( \aleph_1 \)-universal, i.e., if \( N \in K \) is countable then \( N \) is isomorphic to some \( N_\leq M_* \).
- \( M_* \) is \( \aleph_1 \)-homogeneous, i.e., if \( N_1, N_2 \leq M_* \) are countable and \( \pi : N_1 \to N_2 \) is an isomorphism then there exists an automorphism \( \pi_* \) of \( M_* \) such that \( \pi \subseteq \pi_* \).
- If \( N \leq M_* \) and \( A \subseteq M_* \) are countable, then there is an automorphism \( \pi \) of \( M_* \) that fixes \( N \) pointwise, such that \( \pi(A) \setminus N \) is disjoint from \( A \).

**Proof.** We construct the model \( M_* \) by induction on \( \omega_1 \), where we assume that \( \omega_1 = \aleph \). Let \( M_0 = \emptyset \). When \( M_\alpha \) is already defined for some \( \alpha \in \omega_1 \), we can define

\[
C_\alpha := \{ N \leq M_\alpha : N \in K \text{ and } N \text{ is countable} \}.
\]

The construction of \( M_{\alpha+1} \), starting from \( M_\alpha \), consists of a disjoint union of two differently built sets of models. First, for each element \( N \in C_\alpha \), let \( S_N \) be a system of representatives for the strong isomorphism classes of all the models \( M \in K \) such that \( N \leq M \), \( M \) is countable, and for all \( M_1, M_2 \in S_N \) we have \( M_1 \cap M_2 = N \). Here, by *strong* we mean that, for two models \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) with \( N \leq M_1, M_2 \), it is not enough to be isomorphic in order to belong to the same class, but we require that there exists an isomorphism between \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) that fixes \( N \) pointwise, which we can express by saying that \( M_1 \) is *isomorphic* to \( M_2 \) over \( N \). We first extend \( M_\alpha \) by the set

\[
M'_\alpha = \bigsqcup_{N \in C_\alpha} \bigsqcup_{M \in S_N} M \setminus N,
\]

where \( \bigsqcup \) indicates that we have a *disjoint union*. Now, we extend \( M_\alpha \) by a second set \( M''_\alpha \), where \( M''_\alpha \) is defined as follows: for each pair \( \{M_1, M_2\} \in [C_\alpha]^2 \), we fix a way of constructing a common extension \( M_1 * M_2 \) with \( M_1, M_2 \leq M_1 * M_2 \). Let \( f^{M_1} \) and \( f^{M_2} \) be the functions coming with the models \( M_1, M_2 \), let \( N_0 = M_1 \cup M_2 \), let \( f_0 = f^{M_1} \cup f^{M_2} \), and, for each finite set \( E \) in \( \mathcal{E}_0 := \text{fin}(N_0) \setminus \text{dom}(f_0) \), choose a pair \( p_E = \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \) such that \( \{a_1, a_2\} \cap N_0 = \emptyset \) and for all \( E, E' \in \mathcal{E}_0 \), either \( E = E' \) or \( \text{ran}(p_E) \cap \text{ran}(p_E') = \emptyset \), where for \( p_E = \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle \), \( \text{ran}(p_E) := \{a_1, a_2\} \). Now, by induction on \( \omega \), define

\[
N_i+1 = N_i \cup \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}_i} \text{ran}(p_E),
\]

together with

\[
f_{i+1} = f_i \cup \bigcup_{E \in \mathcal{E}_i} \langle E, p_E \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_{i+1} = \text{fin}(N'_i) \setminus \text{dom}(f_{i+1}),
\]

and set \( M_1 * M_2 := \bigcup_{i \in \omega} N_i \) with \( f^{M_1 * M_2} := \bigcup_{i \in \omega} f_i \). Now, let

\[
M''_\alpha := \bigsqcup_{\{M_1, M_2\} \in [C_\alpha]^2} M_1 * M_2 \setminus (M_1 \cup M_2).
\]
Finally, let \( M_{a+1} = M_a \cup M'_a \cup M''_a \), for non-empty limit ordinals \( \delta \) define \( M_\delta = \cup_{a \in \delta} M_a \), and let

\[
M_* = \bigcup_{a \in \omega_1} M_a.
\]

It remains to show that the model \( M_* \) has the required properties: First we notice that \( M_* \) has cardinality \( |M_*| = \aleph \), as required, and since, by construction, \( M_1 \) is \( \aleph_1 \)-universal, \( M_* \) is also \( \aleph_1 \)-universal. In order to show that \( M_* \) is \( \aleph_1 \)-homogeneous, let \( N_1, N_2 \leq M_* \) be countable models and \( \pi : N_1 \to N_2 \) an isomorphism. Let \( \{ x_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1 \} \) be an enumeration of the elements of \( M_* \) and let \( I_0 := N_1 \). If \( x_\delta_1 \) is the first element (w.r.t. this enumeration) in \( M_* \setminus I_0 \), then, by construction, there exists a model \( I_1 \leq M_* \) such that \( I_0 \leq I_1 \) and \( x_\delta_1 \in I_1 \). Again by construction, there is a model \( J_1 \) with \( N_2 \leq J_1 \leq M_* \) such that there exists an isomorphism \( \pi_1 : I_1 \to J_1 \) with \( \pi \subseteq \pi_1 \). In fact, we have that \( J_1 \) and \( I_1 \) are isomorphic over \( N_2 \). Proceed inductively with \( x_\delta_{\alpha+1} \) being the first element in \( M_* \setminus I_\alpha \), we find models \( I_\alpha \leq I_{\alpha+1} \leq M_* \), \( J_\alpha \leq J_{\alpha+1} \leq M_* \) and isomorphisms \( \pi_{\alpha+1} : I_{\alpha+1} \to J_{\alpha+1} \), and finally we obtain \( \pi_* = \cup_{\alpha \in \omega_1} \pi_\alpha \), which is the required automorphism.

To show the last property of the theorem, let \( N \leq M_* \) and \( A \subseteq M_* \) be both countable. Since the cofinality of \( \omega_1 \) is greater than \( \omega \), we can find by construction both a countable model \( M \) satisfying the properties \( A \subseteq M, N \leq M \leq M_* \) and a further model \( M' \) with \( N \leq M' \leq M_* \) such that \( M' \cap (A \setminus N) = \emptyset \), and such that there exists an isomorphism \( i : M \to M' \) with \( i \) fixing \( N \) pointwise. Now, by \( M_* \) being \( \aleph_1 \)-homogeneous we obtain an automorphism \( i_* \) extending \( i \), as required.

As anticipated, the construction of the previous theorem does not exploit any particular property of the functions \( h: \text{fin}(A) \to A^2 \). In fact, the construction is an analogue of a Fraïssé limit as it relies on similar properties, like, for example, a modified version of the Disjoint Amalgamation Property (DAP) of \( K \), where we require that embeddings between structures \( f: (A,h) \to (B,g) \) are allowed only when, according to our previous definition, \( A \leq B \). Indeed, exactly the same construction can be carried out in the alternative framework of models \( (A,f,g,h) \), where \( A \) is a set and we have three injections \( f: A^2 \to [A]^2, g: [A]^2 \to \text{seq}^{-1}(A) \) and \( h: \text{seq}^{-1}(A) \to \text{fin}(A) \), which will be used below to show the consistency of Diagram \( \mathbf{Z} \) with \( \text{ZF} \).

Given Proposition \[\text{we consider the permutation model } \mathcal{V}_N \text{ that arises naturally by considering the elements of the } \aleph_1 \text{-universal and } \aleph_1 \text{-homogeneous model } M_* \text{ as the set of atoms and its automorphisms } \text{Aut}(M_*) \text{ as the group } G \text{ of permutations. In particular, each permutation of } M_* \text{ preserves the injection } h: \text{fin}(M_*) \to M_*^2 \text{ that the model } (M_*, h) \text{ comes with.} \]

We are now ready to prove the following result.

**Theorem 5.** Let \( M_* \) be the set of atoms of \( \mathcal{V}_N \) and let \( m = |M_*| \). Then
\[
\mathcal{V}_N \models |m|^2 < \text{fin}(m) < m^2 < \text{seq}^{-1}(m).
\]

**Proof.** The existence of an injection \( h: \text{fin}(M_*) \to M_*^2 \) in \( \mathcal{V}_N \) follows directly from the definition of the specific permutation model. So, we only need to prove that in \( \mathcal{V}_N \), there is no reverse injection from \( M_*^2 \) into \( \text{fin}(M_*) \), and that there are no injections from \( \text{fin}(M_*) \) into \( [M_*]^2 \) or from \( \text{seq}^{-1}(M_*) \) into \( M_*^2 \).
In order to show that there is neither an injection from $M^2_2$ into $\text{fin}(M_*)$, nor an injection from $\text{seq}^{-1}(M_*)$ into $M^2_2$, assume towards a contradiction that $\mathbf{V}_N$ contains an injection $f_1: M^2_2 \to \text{fin}(M_*)$ or an injection $f_2: \text{seq}^{-1}(M_*) \to M^2_2$. Let $S$ be a finite support of both functions $f_1$ and $f_2$ (if they exist). In other words, $S \in \text{fin}(M_*)$ and for each automorphism $\pi \in \text{Fix}_G(S)$ we have $\pi(f_1) = f_1$ and $\pi(f_2) = f_2$, respectively. Let $N_1$ be a countable model in $K$ with $S \subseteq N_1 \leq M_*$. Let $(N_2, g)$ be a countable model in $K$ such that $(N_1, h|_{N_1}) \leq (N_2, g)$, constructed as follows: The domain of $N_2$ is the disjoint union
\[ N_2 = N_1 \cup \{x, y, z\} \cup \{a_i : i \in \omega\}. \]

Furthermore, we define the injection $g: \text{fin}(N_2) \to N_2^2$ such that $g \supseteq h|_{N_1}$ and for $E \in \text{fin}(N_2) \setminus \text{fin}(N_1)$ we define $g(E) = \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle$ such that $g$ is injective and satisfies the following conditions (recall the since $N_2$ is countable, also $\text{fin}(N_2)$ is countable):

- If $E \cap \{x, y, z\} = \emptyset$ then $\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = \langle a_n, a_m \rangle$ for some $n, m \in \omega$.
- If $|E \cap \{x, y, z\}| = 1$, then $\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = \langle u, a_k \rangle$ for some $k \in \omega$, where $u$ is the unique element in $E \cap \{x, y, z\}$.
- If $|E \cap \{x, y, z\}| = 2$, then $\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = \langle v, a_k \rangle$ for some $k \in \omega$, where $v$ is the unique element in $\{x, y, z\} \setminus (E \cap \{x, y, z\})$.
- If $|E \cap \{x, y, z\}| = 3$ then $\langle e_1, e_2 \rangle = \langle a_n, a_m \rangle$ for some $n, m \in \omega$.

Notice that there are automorphisms of $(N_2, g)$ that just permute $x, y, z$ and fix all other elements of $N_2$ pointwise. By construction of $M_*$, we find a model $N_2^1 \in K$ such that $N_1 \leq N_2^1 \leq M_*$ and $N_2^1$ is isomorphic to $N_2$ over $N_1$. For this reason we can refer to $N_2$ as a legitimate submodel of $M_*$ that extends $N_1$ in the way we described. Let us now consider $f_1(\langle x, y \rangle)$, where we assumed in $\mathbf{V}_N$ the existence of an injection $f_1: M^2_2 \to \text{fin}(M_*)$ with finite support $S$. If $f_1(\langle x, y \rangle) \not\subseteq N_2^1 \setminus N_1$, then we can apply the third property of PROPOSITION\[ with respect to $f_1(\langle x, y \rangle)$ and $N_1$ and $N_2$, which gives us a contradiction. If $\{x, y\} \subseteq f_1(\langle x, y \rangle)$ or $\{x, y\} \cap f_1(\langle x, y \rangle) = \emptyset$, we could swap $x$ and $y$ while fixing every other element of $N_2$ pointwise and get $f_1(\langle x, y \rangle) = f_1(\langle y, x \rangle)$, which would imply that $f_1$ is not injective. So, assume that $|\{x, y\} \cap f_1(\langle x, y \rangle)| = 1$ and without loss of generality assume that $\{x, y\} \cap f_1(\langle x, y \rangle) = \{x\}$. Now, if $z \in f_1(\langle x, y \rangle)$, i.e., $\{x, z\} \subseteq f_1(\langle x, y \rangle)$, we similarly obtain a contradiction by swapping $z$ and $x$, while if $z \not\in f_1(\langle x, y \rangle)$ we get a contradiction by swapping $z$ and $y$. This shows that $f_1$ cannot belong to $\mathbf{V}_N$.

For what concerns $\mathcal{S}$, let us consider the set $\mathcal{S}$ consisting of sequences without repetition of $\{x, y, z\}$ of length 2 or 3. Notice that $|\mathcal{S}| = 12$. Now, for each element $s \in \mathcal{S}$, if $f_2(s) = \langle a, b \rangle$, then $a$ and $b$ are such that $a \neq b$ and $(a, b) \in \{x, y, z\}^2$ — notice that otherwise, for example, if $(a, b) \cap \{x, y\} = \emptyset$, then we can swap $x$ and $y$ and hence move $s$ without moving $\langle a, b \rangle$, which is not consistent with $S$ being a support of $f_2$. We get the conclusion by noticing that, because of this restriction, there are only six possible images of elements of $E$, which implies that $f_2$ cannot be an injection.

It remains to show that in $\mathbf{V}_N$ there are no injections from $\text{fin}(M_*)$ into $[M_*]^2$. For this, assume towards a contradiction that there exists such a function $f_3$ in $\mathbf{V}_N$ and assume that $S$ is a finite support of $f_3$. Then, let $N_1$ be a countable model in $K$ with $S \subseteq N_1 \leq M_*$. We will
construct a countable model \((N_2, g) \in K\) satisfying \((N_1, h_N) \leq (N_2, g) \leq M_4\) with a finite subset \(u \in \text{fin}(N_2 \setminus N_1)\) such that, for all \((x, y) \in (N_2 \setminus N_1)^2\), one of the following holds:

- there is no finite set \(E \in \text{fin}(N_2)\) with \(h(E) = (x, y)\);
- there exists an automorphism \(\pi\) of \(N_2\) over \(N_1\) with \(\pi(u) \neq u\) and \(\pi \{x, y\} = \{x, y\}\).

Let \(u = \{a_0, b_0, c_0\}\) be disjoint from \(N_1\) and define \(G^1_0 = N_1 \cup \{a_0, b_0, c_0\}\). Now, for each finite set \(E \in \text{fin}(G^1_0)\) which is not in the domain of \(h_0 = h_{|N_1}\), that is, for each finite set \(E \in \text{fin}(G^1_0)\) with \(E \cap \{a_0, b_0, c_0\} \neq \emptyset\), let \(\{x_E, y_E\}\) be a pair of new elements and define

\[
G^*_0 := G^1_0 \cup \bigcup_{E \in \text{fin}(G^1_0) \setminus \text{dom}(h_0)} \{x_E, y_E\} \quad \text{and} \quad h^*_0 := h_0 \cup \bigcup_{E \in \text{fin}(G^1_0) \setminus \text{dom}(h_0)} \{(E, \langle x_E, y_E \rangle)\}.
\]

Let now \(G^2_0\) be an extension of \(G^*_0\) by adding a copy of \(G^1_0 \setminus N_1\), where the “copy function” is denoted \(\tau_0\). Notice that at this stage, \(G^1_0 \setminus N_1 = \{a_0, b_0, c_0\}\). More formally, \(G^2_0 = G^1_0 \cup \{\tau_0(a) : a \in G^1_0 \setminus N_1\}\), together with an extension of \(h^*_0\) defined as

\[
h^2_0 := h^*_0 \cup \bigcup_{E \in \text{fin}(G^1_0) \setminus \text{dom}(h_0)} \{(\tau_0(E), \langle y_E, x_E \rangle)\},
\]

where, given \(E \in \text{fin}(G^1_0) \setminus \text{dom}(h_0)\), \(\tau_0(E)\) is defined as

\[
\tau_0(E) := (E \cap N_1) \cup \{\tau_0(a) : a \in E \setminus N_1\}.
\]

Notice that if \(a \in G^1_0 \setminus N_1\), then \(\tau_0(a) \in G^2_0 \setminus G^*_0\). The construction carried out so far is actually the first of countably many analogous extension steps we will consequently apply in order to consider the union of all the progressive extensions. That is, assume that for some \(i \in \omega\) we have already defined \(G^i_0\) and \(h^i_0\). Define \(G^{i+1}_0 = G^2_0\) and, for each finite set \(E \in \text{fin}(G^{i+1}_0)\) which is not in the domain of \(h^i_2\), consider a pair of new elements \(\{x_E, y_E\}\) and define

\[
G^{i+1}_0 := G^{i+1}_0 \cup \bigcup_{E \in \text{fin}(G^{i+1}_0) \setminus \text{dom}(h^i_2)} \{x_E, y_E\} \quad \text{and} \quad h^{i+1}_0 := h^i_2 \cup \bigcup_{E \in \text{fin}(G^{i+1}_0) \setminus \text{dom}(h^i_2)} \{(E, \langle x_E, y_E \rangle)\}.
\]

Let now \(G^2_{i+1}\) be an extension of \(G^*_0\) by adding a copy of \(G^1_{i+1} \setminus N_1\), where the “copy function” is now \(\tau_{i+1}\). More formally, \(G^2_{i+1} := G^*_0 \cup \{a \in G^1_{i+1} \setminus N_1\}\), together with an extension of \(h^i_{i+1}\) defined as

\[
h^{2}_{i+1} := h^i_{i+1} \cup \bigcup_{E \in \text{fin}(G^1_{i+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(h^i_2)} \{(\tau_{i+1}(E), \langle y_E, x_E \rangle)\},
\]

where, again, given \(E \in \text{fin}(G^1_{i+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(h^i_2)\), \(\tau_{i+1}(E)\) is defined as \(\tau_{i+1}(E) := (E \cap N_1) \cup \{\tau_{i+1}(a) : a \in E \setminus N_1\}\), for which we newly remark that if \(a \in G^1_{i+1} \setminus N_1\), then \(\tau_{i+1}(a) \in G^2_{i+1} \setminus G^*_0\). Notice that every automorphism of \(G^1_{i+1}\) which moves a finite set \(E\) to \(E'\), moves the pair \(\{x_E, y_E\}\) to \(\{x_{E'}, y_{E'}\}\), and consequently, it moves \(\{E, \langle x_E, y_E \rangle\}\) to \(\{E', \langle x_{E'}, y_{E'} \rangle\}\). In particular, every automorphism of \((G^1_{i+1}, h^i_2)\) can be extended to an automorphism of \((G^*_0, h^i_{i+1})\). Moreover, every automorphism of \((G^*_0, h^1_{i+1})\) can be extended to an automorphism of \((G^2_{i+1}, h^2_{i+1})\).
Now, let

\[ N_2 := \bigcup_{i \in \omega} G_i \quad \text{and} \quad g := \bigcup_{i \in \omega} h_i. \]

We claim that \((N_2, g)\) satisfies the required properties. Indeed, if \(\langle x, y \rangle \in (N_2 \setminus N_1)^2\) and there is some finite set \(E \in \text{fin}(N_2)\) with \(g(E) = h(E) = \langle x, y \rangle\), then by construction there exists some index \(n \in \omega\) such that \(\langle x, y \rangle \in (G_n \setminus G_1)^2\), which implies that there exists an automorphism \(\pi\) of \(N_2\) over \(N_1\) acting as follows:

\[ \pi \langle x, y \rangle = \langle y, x \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \pi u = \pi \{a_0, b_0, c_0\} = \{\tau_n(a_0), \tau_n(b_0), \tau_n(c_0)\}, \]

which in particular means \(\pi \{x, y\} = \{x, y\}\) and \(\pi u \neq u\), as desired. We can finally consider the image \(f_3(u) = \{x, y\}\): If \(\{x, y\} \not\subseteq N_2 \setminus N_1\), then we can apply the third property of Proposition \(4\) with respect to \(\{x, y\}\) and \(N_1\) and \(N_2\), which gives us a contradiction. Thus \(\{x, y\} \subseteq N_2 \setminus N_1\), and if there exists some finite set \(E \in \text{fin}(N_2)\) with \(g(E) = h(E) = \langle x, y \rangle\), then by the reasoning above we find that some automorphism of \(N_2\) over \(N_1\) does not preserve \(f_3\), a contradiction. In every other case, we consider \(\text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{x, y\}, M_\ast)\) and notice that, since for no \(E \in \text{fin}(N_2)\) we have \(h(E) = \langle x, y \rangle\) or \(h(E) = \langle y, x \rangle\), then \(u\) cannot be a subset of \(\text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{x, y\}, M_\ast)\), which allows us to fix \(\text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{x, y\}, M_\ast)\) pointwise, while not preserving \(u\), a contradiction as well. \(\dashv\)

So, the model \(\mathcal{V}_N\) witnesses the following

**Consistency Result 1.** The existence of an infinite cardinal \(m\) satisfying

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{fin}(m) & \xrightarrow{f} & [m]^2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{seq}(m) & \xrightarrow{g} & m^2
\end{array}
\]

is consistent with \(\text{ZF}\).

### 2.2 A Model for Diagram \(Z\)

We are now going to set an analogue framework to the one for Diagram \(\mathcal{N}\), just with the definitions adapted, in order to show the consistency of Diagram \(Z\). In fact, as mentioned above, we can state the same proposition, guaranteeing the existence of a suitable \(\aleph_1\)-universal and \(\aleph_1\)-homogeneous model.

Let \(K\) be the class of all the pairs \((A, f, g, h)\) such that \(A\) is a (possibly empty) set and \(f, g, h\) are the following three injections:

\[ f : A^2 \to [A]^2 \quad g : [A]^2 \to \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \quad h : \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \to \text{fin}(A) \]

As before, we define a partial ordering \(\leq\) on \(K\) by stipulating \((A, f_1, g_1, h_1) \leq (B, f_2, g_2, h_2)\) if and only if

- \(A \subseteq B\),
- \(f_1 \subseteq f_2\), \(\text{ran}(f_2|_{B^2 \setminus A^2}) \subseteq [B \setminus A]^2\),

\[ \text{fin}(m) \quad \text{seq}(m) \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{fin}(m) & \xrightarrow{f} & [m]^2 \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{seq}(m) & \xrightarrow{g} & m^2
\end{array}
\]

is consistent with \(\text{ZF}\).
• \( g_1 \subseteq g_2, \text{ran} \left( g_2|_{B \setminus [A]^2} \right) \subseteq \text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(B \setminus A) \),

• \( h_1 \subseteq h_2, \text{ran} \left( h_2|_{\text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(B) \setminus \text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(A)} \right) \subseteq \text{fin}(B \setminus A) \).

**Proposition 6 (CH).** There is a model \( M_* \) of cardinality \( \kappa \) in \( K \) such that:

- \( M_* \) is \( \aleph_1 \)-universal, i.e., if \( N \subseteq K \) is countable then \( N \) is isomorphic to some \( N_* \subseteq M_* \).
- \( M_* \) is \( \aleph_1 \)-homogeneous, i.e., if \( N_1, N_2 \subseteq M_* \) are countable and \( \pi: N_1 \to N_2 \) is an isomorphism then there exists an automorphism \( \pi_* \) of \( M_* \) such that \( \pi \subseteq \pi_* \).
- If \( N \subseteq M_* \) and \( A \subseteq M_* \) are countable, then there is an automorphism \( \pi \) of \( M_* \) over \( N \) such that \( \pi(A) \setminus N \) is disjoint from \( A \).

**Proof.** The proof is essentially the same as the one of **Proposition 3**.

We define \( \mathcal{V}_Z \) as the permutation model obtained by setting the elements of the \( \aleph_1 \)-universal and \( \aleph_1 \)-homogeneous model \( M_* \) as the set of atoms and its automorphisms \( \text{Aut}(M_*) \) as the group \( G \) of permutations. In particular, each permutation of \( M_* \) preserves the injections \( f, g, h \) that the model \( (M_*, f, g, h) \) comes with.

**Theorem 7.** Let \( M_* \) be the set of atoms of \( \mathcal{V}_Z \) and let \( m = |M_*| \). Then

\[
\mathcal{V}_Z \models m^2 < [m]^2 < \text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(m) < \text{fin}(m).
\]

**Proof.** The existence of the required injections is clear by the definition of the model. Thus, it remains to prove that there are no reverse injections. First, we give two preliminary definitions. Given a model \( (M, f, g, h) \) and a countable subset \( A \subseteq M \), we define the closure \( \text{cl}(A, M) \) as the smallest superset of \( A \) that is closed under \( f, g, h \) and pre-images with respect to the same functions. Constructively, we can characterize \( \text{cl}(A, M) \) as a countable union as follows: Define \( \text{cl}_0 = \text{cl}_0(A, M) := A \) and, for all \( i \in \omega \),

\[
\text{cl}_{i+1} = \text{cl}_i \cup \bigcup_{p \in [\text{cl}_i]^2} f(p) \cup \bigcup_{q \in [\text{cl}_i]^2} \text{ran}(g(q)) \cup \bigcup_{s \in \text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(\text{cl}_i)} h(s)
\]

\[
\cup \bigcup_{q \in [\text{cl}_i]^2} \text{ran}(f^{-1}(q)) \cup \bigcup_{s \in \text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(\text{cl}_i)} g^{-1}(s) \cup \bigcup_{r \in \text{fin}(\text{cl}_i)} \text{ran}(h^{-1}(r)),
\]

in order to finally define \( \text{cl}(A, M) = \bigcup_{i \in \omega} \text{cl}_i \). Furthermore, we set a standardized way to extend a partial model \( (A, f, g, h) \), where \( f, g, h \) are only partial functions, to an element of \( K \): Consider \( (A, f', g', h') \), where \( A \) is a countable set and \( f, g, h \) are injections with

\[
\text{dom}(f) \subseteq A^2, \quad \text{dom}(g) \subseteq [A]^2; \quad \text{dom}(h) \subseteq \text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(A)
\]

\[
\text{ran}(f) \subseteq [A]^2, \quad \text{ran}(g) \subseteq \text{seq}^{1^{-1}}(A), \quad \text{ran}(h) \subseteq \text{fin}(A).
\]
Let \((M_0, f_0', g_0', h_0') = (A, f', g', h')\) and, for \(j \in \omega\), define inductively \((M_{j+1}, f_{j+1}', g_{j+1}', h_{j+1}')\) as follows: \(M_{j+1}\) is the fully disjoint union
\[
M_j \uplus \bigcup_{P \in M_j^2(\text{dom}(f_j))} \{ a_P, b_P \} \uplus \bigcup_{Q \in [M_j]^2 \setminus \text{dom}(g_j)} \{ a_Q, b_Q, c_Q \} \uplus \bigcup_{R \in \text{seq}^{-1}(M_j)(\text{dom}(h_j))} \{ a_R, b_R, c_R \}.
\]

For what concerns the injections \(f_{j+1}', g_{j+1}', h_{j+1}'\), we naturally require the inclusions \(f_j' \subseteq f_{j+1}'\), \(g_j' \subseteq g_{j+1}'\), and \(h_j' \subseteq h_{j+1}'\), as well as the equalities \(\text{dom}(f_{j+1}') = M_j^2\), \(\text{dom}(g_{j+1}') = [M_j]^2\), and \(\text{dom}(h_{j+1}') = \text{seq}^{-1}(M_j)\), respectively, where for \(P \in M_j^2 \setminus \text{dom}(f_j)\), \(Q \in [M_j]^2 \setminus \text{dom}(g_j)\), and \(R \in \text{seq}^{-1}(M_j) \setminus \text{dom}(h_j)\), we define
\[
f_{j+1}'(P) := \{ a_P, b_P \}, \quad g_{j+1}'(Q) := \langle a_Q, b_Q, c_Q \rangle, \quad h_{j+1}'(R) := \{ a_R, b_R, c_R \}.
\]

We are now in the position of defining the plain extension of \((A, f', g', h')\) as
\[
(M, f, g, h) = \left( \bigcup_{j \in \omega} M_j, \bigcup_{j \in \omega} f'_j, \bigcup_{j \in \omega} g'_j, \bigcup_{j \in \omega} h'_j \right),
\]
and we can finally prove, in three analogous steps, that neither of the three injections of the model \((M, f, g, h)\) admits a reverse injection.

Assume there is an injection \(i: [A]^2 \to A^2\) with finite support \(S\), where \(A\) is the set of atoms. Let \(N_1 \in K\) be a countable model such that \(N_1 \leq M_\ast\) and \(S \subseteq N_1\). Let \(\{ x, y \} \in [A]^2\) with \(N_1 \cap \{ x, y \} = \emptyset\), let \(M_0 = N_1 \cup \{ x, y \}\), and let \(N_2\) be the plain extension of \(M_0\). Without loss of generality we can assume that \(N_2 \leq M_\ast\). Consider \(\langle a, b \rangle = i(\{ x, y \})\). Then \(\{ a, b \} \not\subseteq N_1\) and \(\{ a, b \} \subseteq N_2\), since otherwise, we could apply the third property of \textsc{Proposition 4}\ with respect to \(\{ a, b \}\) and \(N_1\) and \(N_2\), respectively. Moreover, \(\{ a, b \} \cap \{ x, y \} = \emptyset\), since otherwise, (e.g., \(a = x\)), we can swap \(x\) and \(y\) which would imply that \(b = y\), and since \(x \neq y\), we get \(i(\{ x, y \}) = \langle x, y \rangle \neq \langle y, x \rangle = i(\{ y, x \})\) which is a contradiction to the assumption that \(i\) is a function. Furthermore, we have
\[
\{ x, y \} \subseteq \text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{ a, b \}, M_\ast)
\]
and we can apply the third property of \textsc{Proposition 4}\ with respect to \(\{ x, y \}\) and \(\text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{ a, b \}, M_\ast) \leq M_\ast\). Now, this last inclusion implies that \(a \neq b\) and that \(\{ a, b \} = f(\langle x', y' \rangle)\) for some \(x', y' \in N_2 \setminus N_1\). To see this, notice first that since \(N_1 \cup \{ a, b \} \subseteq N_2\), we build the closure \(\text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{ a, b \}, M_\ast)\) within the plain extension \(N_2\), and recall that for \(\{ u, v \} \in [N_2]^2 \setminus [M_0]^2\) we have \(g(\{ u, v \}) = \langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle\) where \(\langle x_1, x_2, x_3 \rangle \in \text{seq}^{-1}(N_2 \setminus M_0)\), and that for \(\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle \in \text{seq}^{-1}(N_2) \setminus \text{seq}^{-1}(M_0)\) we have \(h(\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle) \in [N_2 \setminus M_0]^3\). If there are no \(x', y'\) such that \(f(\langle x', y' \rangle) = \{ a, b \}\), then, since \(\{ a, b \} \subseteq N_2\), \(\{ a, b \}\) is a proper subset of \(\text{ran}(g(\{ u, v \}))\) for some \(u, v\), or of \(h(\langle x_1, \ldots, x_n \rangle)\) for some \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\). In both cases we have that \(\{ x, y \} \not\subseteq \text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{ a, b \}, M_\ast)\), which is a contradiction to (\(\ast\)). Now, since \(f(\langle x', y' \rangle) = \{ a, b \}\), by the construction of the plain extension \(N_2\) we find an automorphism \(\pi\) of \(N_2\) that fixes \(N_1 \cup \{ x, y \}\) pointwise and for which we have \(\pi(a) = b\) and \(\pi(b) = a\). Hence, \(i(\pi(x, y)) = \langle a, b \rangle = \langle b, a \rangle = \pi i(\{ x, y \})\), which is a contradiction.

Assume there is an injection \(i: \text{seq}^{-1}(A) \to [A]^2\) with finite support \(S\). Let \(N_1 \in K\) be a countable model such that \(N_1 \leq M_\ast\) and \(S \subseteq N_1\). Let \(\langle x, y, z \rangle \in \text{seq}^{-1}(A)\) with \(N_1 \cap\)
\{x, y, z\} = \emptyset$, let $M_0 = N_1 \cup \{x, y, z\}$, and let $N_2$ be the plain extension of $M_0$. Finally, let 
\{a, b\} = i((x, y, z)). Then, a contradiction follows by noticing — with similar arguments as above — that necessarily $\{x, y, z\} \not\subseteq \text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{a, b\}, M_s)$. So, similarly as above, there is an automorphism $\pi$ of $M_s$ which fixes $\text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{a, b\}, M_s)$ pointwise, but $\pi(\{x, y, z\}) \not= \{x, y, z\}$.

Finally, assume there is an injection $i: \text{fin}(A) \to \text{seq}^{1-1}(A)$ with finite support $S$. Let $N_1 \in K$ be a countable model such that $N_1 \leq M_s$ and $S \subseteq N_1$. Let $\{x, y, z\} \in [A]^3$ be such that $N_1 \cap \{x, y, z\} = \emptyset$, let $M_0 = N_1 \cup \{x, y, z\}$, and let $N_2$ be the plain extension of $M_0$. Consider $\langle a_j : j \in n \rangle = i(\{x, y, z\})$ for some $n \in \omega$. It is easy to see that we must have $\{a_j : j \in n\} \cap (N_2 \setminus M_0) \neq \emptyset$, and as before it must also hold $\{x, y, z\} \subseteq \text{cl}(N_1 \cup \{a_j : j \in n\}, M_s)$. The last inclusion implies that a 3-cycle $\pi$ applied to $\{x, y, z\}$ cannot leave $\{a_j : j \in n\} \cap (N_2 \setminus M_0)$ unchanged, since $\pi$ moves every unordered pair, ordered pair and injective sequence with values in $\{x, y, z\}$. We conclude the proof by noticing that we can easily find an automorphism of $N_2$ that fixes $N_1$ pointwise and that acts on $\{x, y, z\}$ as a 3-cycle.

So, the model $\mathcal{V}_2$ witnesses the following

**Consistency Result 2.** The existence of an infinite cardinal $m$ satisfying

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fin}(m) & \rightarrow \text{seq}^{1-1}(m) \\
[m]^2 & \rightarrow m^2
\end{align*}
\]

is consistent with ZF.

### 2.3 A Model for Diagram  \(\mathcal{U}\)

We show that Diagram $\mathcal{U}$ holds in the model constructed in [3] (see also [5, p. 209 ff]), where $m$ is the cardinality of the set of atoms of that model.

The atoms of the permutation model $\mathcal{V}_\mathcal{U}$ for Diagram $\mathcal{U}$ are constructed as follows:

1. Let $A_0$ be an arbitrary infinite set.
2. $G_0$ is the group of all permutations of $A_0$.
3. $A_{n+1} := A_n \cup \{(n+1, p, \varepsilon) : p \in \bigcup_{k=0}^{n+1} A_n^k \text{ and } \varepsilon \in \{0, 1\}\}$.
4. $G_{n+1}$ is the subgroup of the permutation group of $A_{n+1}$ containing all permutations $\sigma$ for which there are $\pi_\sigma \in G_n$ and $\varepsilon_{\sigma, p} \in \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$
\sigma(x) = \begin{cases} 
\pi_\sigma(x) & \text{if } x \in A_n, \\
(n+1, \pi_\sigma(p), \varepsilon_{\sigma, p} + 2 \varepsilon) & \text{if } x = (n+1, p, \varepsilon),
\end{cases}
$$

where for $p = \langle p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1} \rangle \in \bigcup_{0 \leq k \leq n+1} A_n^k$, $\pi_\sigma(p) := \langle \pi_\sigma(p_0), \ldots, \pi_\sigma(p_{n-1}) \rangle$ and $+2$ denotes addition modulo 2.
Let $A := \bigcup \{ A_n : n \in \omega \}$ be the set of atoms and let $\text{Aut}(A)$ be the group of all permutations of $A$. Then

$$G := \{ H \in \text{Aut}(A) : \forall n \in \omega (H|_{A_n} \in G_n) \}$$

is a group of permutations of $A$. The sets in $\mathcal{V}_n$ are those with finite support.

**Proposition 8.** Let $A$ be the set of atoms of $\mathcal{V}_n$ and let $m := |A|$. Then

$$\mathcal{V}_n \models m^2 < \text{seq}^{1-1}(m) < [m]^2 < \text{fin}(m).$$

**Proof.** In [3] it is shown that $\mathcal{V}_n \models \text{seq}(m) < [m]^2$, which implies that $\mathcal{V}_n \models \text{seq}^{1-1}(m) < [m]^2$. Thus, since $m^2 \leq \text{seq}^{1-1}(m)$ and $[m]^2 \leq \text{fin}(m)$, it remains to show that in $\mathcal{V}_n$ we have $m^2 \neq \text{seq}^{1-1}(m)$ and $[m]^2 \neq \text{fin}(m)$.

$m^2 \neq \text{seq}^{1-1}(m)$: We show that there is no injection $g_1 : \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \to A^2$. Assume towards a contradiction that there is such an injection with finite support $E_1$.

Since $E_1$ is finite, there is an integer $n_1 \in \omega$ such that $E_1 \subseteq A_{n_1}$. By extending $E_1$ if necessary, we may assume that if $(n + 1, \langle a_0, \ldots, a_{l-1}, \varepsilon \rangle) \in E_1$, then also $a_0, \ldots, a_{l-1}$ belong to $E_1$ as well as the atom $(n + 1, \langle a_0, \ldots, a_{l-1}, 1 - \varepsilon \rangle)$.

For a large enough number $k \in \omega$ choose a $k$-element set $X \subseteq A_0 \setminus E_1$ such that $|\text{seq}^{1-1}(X)| > |(E_1 \cup X)^2|$. Notice that $|\text{seq}^{1-1}(X)| \geq k!$ and that $|(E_1 \cup X)^2| = (|E_1| + k)^2$. Thus, we find a sequence $s \in \text{seq}^{1-1}(X)$ such that $g_1(s) \notin (E_1 \cup X)^2$. So, there exists a $\pi \in \text{Fix}_G(E_1 \cup X)$ such that $\pi g_1(s) \neq g_1(s)$ but $\pi s = s$, which contradicts the fact that $E_1$ is a support of $g_1$.

$[m]^2 \neq \text{fin}(m)$: We show that there is no injection $g_2 : \text{fin}(A) \to [A]^2$. Assume towards a contradiction that there is such an injection with finite support $E_2$. After extending $E_2$ in the same way as above, if necessary, for a large enough number $k \in \omega$ we choose again a $k$-element set $X \subseteq A_0 \setminus E_2$ such that $|\text{fin}(X)| > |[E_2 \cup X]^2|$. Then, by similar arguments as above, we can show that $E_2$ is not a support of $g_2$, which gives us the desired contradiction. \hfill \dagger

So, the permutation model $\mathcal{V}_n$ witnesses the following

**Consistency Result 3.** The existence of an infinite cardinal $m$ satisfying

$$\text{fin}(m) \overset{\text{seq}^{1-1}(m)}{\downarrow} m^2 \
\downarrow \quad \downarrow
\quad [m]^2$$

is consistent with ZF.

### 2.4 A Model for Diagram $\mathcal{C}$

We show that Diagram $\mathcal{C}$ holds in a permutation model $\mathcal{V}_2$ which is similar to the Second Fraenkel Model, where $m$ is the cardinality of the set of atoms of $\mathcal{V}_2$. 
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The permutation model $\mathcal{V}_2$ is constructed as follows (see also [5, p. 197]): The set of atoms of the model $\mathcal{V}_2$ consists of countably many mutually disjoint, cyclically ordered 3-element sets. More formally,

$$A = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} P_n,$$

where $P_n = \{a_n, b_n, c_n\}$ (for $n \in \omega$), and the cyclic ordering on $P_n$ is illustrated by the following figure:

On each triple $P_n$, we define the cyclic distance between two elements by stipulating

$$\text{cyc}(a_n, b_n) = \text{cyc}(b_n, c_n) = \text{cyc}(c_n, a_n) = 1$$

and

$$\text{cyc}(a_n, c_n) = \text{cyc}(b_n, a_n) = \text{cyc}(c_n, b_n) = 2.$$

Let $G$ be the group of those permutations of $A$ which preserve the triples $P_n$ (i.e., $\pi P_n = P_n$ for $\pi \in G$ and $n \in \omega$) and their cyclic ordering. The sets in $\mathcal{V}_2$ are those with finite support.

**Proposition 9.** Let $A$ be the set of atoms of $\mathcal{V}_2$ and let $m := |A|$. Then

$$\mathcal{V}_2 \models [m]^2 < m^2 < \text{seq}^{1-1}(m) < \text{fin}(m).$$

**Proof.** We first show that $[m]^2 \leq m^2$, $m^2 \leq \text{seq}^{1-1}(m)$, and $\text{seq}^{1-1}(m) \leq \text{fin}(m)$, and then we show that $[m]^2 \not= m^2$, $m^2 \not= \text{seq}^{1-1}(m)$, and $\text{seq}^{1-1}(m) \not= \text{fin}(m)$.

$[m]^2 \leq m^2$: We define an injective function $f_1 : [A]^2 \to A^2$. Let $\{x, y\} \in [A]^2$ and $m, n \in \omega$ be such that $x \in P_m$ and $y \in P_n$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $m \leq n$. If $m < n$, then $f_1(\{x, y\}) := \langle x, y \rangle$, and if $m = n$, then $f_1(\{x, y\}) := \langle z, z \rangle$ where $z := P_m \setminus \{x, y\}$.

It is easy to see that $f_1$ is an injective function, and since $f_1$ has empty support, $f_1$ belongs to $\mathcal{V}_2$.

$m^2 \leq \text{seq}^{1-1}(m)$: The function $f_2 : A^2 \to \text{seq}^{1-1}(A)$ defined by stipulating

$$f_2(\langle x, y \rangle) := \begin{cases} \langle x \rangle & \text{if } x = y, \\ \langle x, y \rangle & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

is an injective function from $A^2$ into $\text{seq}^{1-1}(A)$ which belongs to $\mathcal{V}_2$.

$\text{seq}^{1-1}(m) \leq \text{fin}(m)$: We define a injective function $f_3 : \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \to \text{fin}(A)$. First, let $f_3(\langle \rangle) := \emptyset$. Now, let $s = \langle a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1} \rangle \in \text{seq}^{1-1}(A)$ be a non-empty sequence without repetition of length $k$. 
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Let \( j : k \to \omega \) be such that for each \( i \in k, \ a_i \in P_{j(i)} \). Let \( E_0 := \emptyset \), and by induction, for \( i \in k \)
\[
E_{i+1} := \begin{cases} E_i \cup \{a_i\} & \text{if } P_{j(i)} \cap E_i = \emptyset, \\ E_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\]
and
\[
\varepsilon_i := \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } |P_{j(i)} \cap E_i| = 1 \text{ and } \operatorname{cyc}(P_{j(i)} \cap E_i, a_i) = 2, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]
Furthermore, let \( \sigma(0) := j(0) \), and by induction, for \( i \in k \) define \( \sigma(i+1) := \sigma(i) + j(i+1) + 1 \). Finally, let \( \{p_i : i \in \omega\} \) be an enumeration of the prime numbers and let
\[
q_s := \prod_{i \in k} p_{\sigma(i)}^{\varepsilon_i}.
\]
Now, we define \( f_3(s) := E_k \cup P_q \). It is easy to see that \( f_3 \) is an injective function from \( \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \) into \( \text{fin}(A) \), and since \( f_3 \) has empty support, \( f_3 \) belongs to \( \mathcal{V}_2 \).

\([m]^2 \neq m^2\): It is enough to show that there is no injection from \( A^2 \) into \( [A]^2 \). Assume towards a contradiction that there exists an injection \( g_1 : A^2 \to [A]^2 \) with finite support \( E_1 \).

Let \( E_1 \subseteq E \) for some non-empty set \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \). Then \( E \) is also a support of \( g_1 \). Now \( |[E]^2| < |E^2| \), which implies that there exists a pair \( \langle x, y \rangle \in E^2 \) such that \( g_1(\langle x, y \rangle) \notin [E]^2 \). So, there exists a \( \pi \in \text{Fix}_G(E) \) such that \( \pi g_1(\langle x, y \rangle) \neq g_1(\langle x, y \rangle) \), but \( \pi \langle x, y \rangle = \langle x, y \rangle \), which contradicts the fact that \( E \) is a support of \( g_1 \).

\( m^2 \neq \text{seq}^{1-1}(m) \): It is enough to show that there is no injection from \( \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \) into \( A^2 \). Assume towards a contradiction that there exists an injection \( g_2 : \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \to A^2 \) with finite support \( E_2 \). Let \( E_2 \subseteq E \) for some non-empty set \( E \in \text{fin}(A) \). Then \( E \) is also a support of \( g_2 \). Now \( |E^2| < |\text{seq}^{1-1}(E)| \), and by similar arguments as above, we obtain a contradiction.

\( \text{seq}^{1-1}(m) \neq \text{fin}(m) \): It is enough to show that there is no injection from \( \text{fin}(A) \) into \( \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \). Assume towards a contradiction that there is an injection \( g_3 : \text{fin}(A) \to \text{seq}^{1-1}(A) \) with finite support \( E_3 \).

Since \( E_3 \) is finite, there exists an \( n \in \omega \) such that \( g_3(P_n) \notin \text{seq}^{1-1}(E_3) \). Let \( a \in A \) be the first element of the sequence \( g_3(P_n) \) which does not belong to \( E_3 \). Then we find a \( \pi \in \text{Fix}_G(E_3) \) such that \( \pi a \neq a \) (i.e., \( \pi g_3(P_n) \neq g_3(P_n) \)) but \( \pi P_n = P_n \), which contradicts the fact that \( E_3 \) is a support of \( g_3 \).

So, the model \( \mathcal{V}_2 \) witnesses the following

**Consistency Result 4.** The existence of an infinite cardinal \( m \) satisfying

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{fin}(m) & \leftarrow & \text{seq}^{1-1}(m) \\
\downarrow & & \\
[m]^2 & \rightarrow & m^2
\end{array}
\]

is consistent with \( \text{ZF} \).
2.5 A Model for Diagram $\Sigma$

As mentioned above, Diagram $\Sigma$ holds in the Ordered Mostowski Model, where $m$ is the set of atoms (see, for example, [5, Related Result 48, p. 217]). This leads to the following Consistency Result 5.

The existence of an infinite cardinal $m$ satisfying

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{fin}(m) \\
\downarrow
\\
\square
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
\text{seq}^{-1}(m) \\
\downarrow
\\
[m]^2
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
m^2
\end{array}
\]

is consistent with ZF.

3 On Diagram C

Similar as in the proof of Lemma 4 in every model for Diagram C, where $m = |A|$, we have that the cardinality $m$ is transfinite.

Lemma 10. If $m^2 \leq [m]^2$ and $\text{fin}(m) \leq \text{seq}^{-1}(m)$ for some $m \geq 1$, then $\aleph_0 \leq m$.

Proof. Assume that $m^2 \leq [m]^2$ and $\text{fin}(m) \leq \text{seq}^{-1}(m)$ for some cardinal $m \geq 1$ and let $A$ be a necessarily infinite set with $|A| = m$. Let $f : A^2 \to [A]^2$ and $g : \text{fin}(A) \to \text{seq}^{-1}(A)$ be injections. The goal is to construct with the functions $f$ and $g$ an injection $h : \omega \to A$. We first construct a countably infinite set of pairwise disjoint non-empty finite subsets of $A$. For this, we first choose an element $a_0 \in A$, let $E_0 := \{a_0\}$, and let $E_0 := \{E_0\}$.

Assume that for some $n \in \omega$ we have already constructed an $(n + 1)$-element set $E_n := \{E_i : i \leq n\}$ of pairwise disjoint non-empty finite subsets of $A$. Let

\[ E_{n+1} := \bigcup_{i,j \leq n} \{ (x, y) : \exists a \in E_i \exists b \in E_j (f((a, b)) = \{x, y\}) \} \setminus \bigcup_{i \leq n} E_i , \]

and let $E_{n+1} := E_n \cup \{E_{n+1}\}$. Notice that for $k := \bigcup_{i \leq n} E_i$, we have

\[ \left| \bigcup_{i \leq n} E_i \right|^2 = k^2 \geq \binom{k}{2} = \left| \bigcup_{i \leq n} E_i \right|^2 , \]

which implies that $E_{n+1} \neq \emptyset$. Proceeding this way, $\{E_n : n \in \omega\}$ is a countably infinite set of pairwise disjoint non-empty finite subsets of $A$.

Now, we apply the function $g$. For every $n \in \omega$, let $S_n := g(E_n)$. Furthermore, let $S_0 := S_0$, and in general, for $n \in \omega$ let $S_{n+1} := S_n \setminus S_{n+1}$. This way, we obtain an infinite sequence $S_\infty$ of elements of $A$. Since $g$ is injective and the sets finite sets $E_n$ are pairwise disjoint, the sequence $S_\infty$ must contain infinitely many pairwise distinct elements of $A$. Now, let $h$ be the enumeration of these pairwise distinct elements in the order they appear in $S_\infty$. Then $h : \omega \to A$ is an injection. -
As a consequence of Proposition 2 and Lemma 10 we get

**Corollary 11.** If $m^2 \leq [m]^2$ and $\text{fin}(m) \leq \text{seq}^{-1}(m)$ for some $m = |A| \geq 1$, then there exists a finite-to-one function $g : \text{seq}(A) \rightarrow \text{fin}(A)$.
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