

THE NUMBER OF FULL SETS WITH n ELEMENTS

RICHARD PEDDICORD

1. Introduction. This paper gives a recursion for $F(n)$, the number of full sets with n elements. Using a function discovered by Ackermann [1] we give a well-ordering for the elements of any finite full set, and then construct a bijection between the full sets of order n and the vectors of order $n-1$ whose positive integral coefficients satisfy $a_1=1, a_{i-1} < a_i < 2^i$ for $i=2, \dots, n-1$. These vectors are then counted.

A set x is full if every element of x is also a subset of x . The terminology follows the appendix on set theory in Kelley [2]. Throughout, \emptyset denotes the null set, and 0 denotes the number zero. Without loss of generality we assume the full sets encountered in the proofs have cardinality 2 or greater.

2. The ordering function. We first prove

LEMMA 1. *If x is full, $y \subset x, y \neq x$, then there is $y_1 \in x$ with $y_1 \subset y$ but $y_1 \notin y$.*

PROOF. Assume $y \subset x$ and $y \neq x$. Then $x - y \neq \emptyset$. By the axiom of regularity there is a $y_1 \in x - y$ where $y_1 \cap (x - y) = \emptyset$. Since x is full, $y_1 \subset x$ and hence $y_1 \subset y$. Note that if x is full and $x \neq \emptyset$, then $\emptyset \in x$. We state without proof the next

LEMMA 2. *If x is a finite full set, then there is a unique $g: x \rightarrow J$ (where J is the set of non-negative integers) satisfying*

$$(2.1) \quad g(\emptyset) = 0, \quad \text{and for each } y \in x, \quad g(y) = \sum_{z \in y} 2^{g(z)}.$$

THEOREM 1. *$g: x \rightarrow J$ is an injection.*

PROOF. It will be sufficient to show that if $y \subset x, \emptyset \in y, y \neq x$, and the restriction $g: y \rightarrow J$ is injective, then $g: y \cup \{y_1\} \rightarrow J$ is injective, where y_1 refers to the element of Lemma 1. Observe that $g(y_1) = \sum_{z \in y_1} 2^{g(z)}$. Since $2^a > a$ for any real $a \geq 0$, $g(y_1) > g(z)$ for each $z \in y_1$. Thus $g: y \cup \{y_1\} \rightarrow J$ is injective.

We may now order any finite full set x in the form

$$(2.2) \quad x = \{x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n\} \quad \text{by the demand} \quad g(x_i) < g(x_{i+1}), \\ i = 0, \dots, n - 1.$$

Received by the editors October 3, 1960 and, in revised form, March 31, 1961 and August 5, 1961.

Since the functions g agree on the intersections of their domains, a well-ordering (of type ω) is also obtained for the union of all finite full sets.

3. Full sets and vectors. If x is a finite full set, write $x = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ using (2.2) and define $h: x \rightarrow J$ inductively by

$$h(\emptyset) = 0, \text{ and for each } x_i \in x, h(x_i) = \sum_{x_j \in x_i} 2^j.$$

The following lemma shows h to be defined.

LEMMA 3. $x_{k+1} \subset \{x_0, \dots, x_k\}$.

PROOF. Assume the lemma false. Then there is $x_j \in x_{k+1}$ with $j > k+1$. Since $x_j \in x_{k+1}$, $g(x_j) < g(x_{k+1})$. But by (2.2), $g(x_j) > g(x_{k+1})$.

THEOREM 2. h is injective.

PROOF. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1. Assume h is injective when restricted to some $y \subset x$, $y = \{x_0, \dots, x_k\}$. When $h(x_{k+1})$ is represented as the sum of powers of two, the powers are the subscripts of elements of y and hence determine the members of x_{k+1} .

Let X_{n+1} be the class of all full sets of cardinality $n+1$, where $n \geq 1$, and let V_n be the n -fold Cartesian product of J . Define $H: X_{n+1} \rightarrow V_n$ by

$$H(x) = (h(x_1), \dots, h(x_n)), \text{ where } x = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}.$$

Clearly H is defined for any full set $x \in X_{n+1}$, and it follows that

THEOREM 3. H is injective.

Now let A_n be the set of vectors of order n with positive integral coefficients that satisfy

$$(3.1) \quad a_1 = 1, \text{ and } a_{i-1} < a_i < 2^i \text{ for } i = 2, \dots, n.$$

THEOREM 4. $H: X_{n+1} \rightarrow A_n$ is a bijection.

PROOF. We first prove that $H \subset A_n$. Take an arbitrary $x \in X_{n+1}$, where $x = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$. Clearly $h(x_i) \in J$ for all $i \leq n$. Since $x_1 = \{\emptyset\}$, $h(x_1) = a_1 = 1$. Now if $i < j$, then $x_j \notin x_i$ by (2.1) and (2.3). Then by Lemma 3, there is $x_k \in x_j$ with $k > i$ and hence $h(x_j) > h(x_i)$ and the left inequality of (3.1) is satisfied. For an arbitrary x_i , $h(x_i)$ will be maximum if x_i has for elements all of the x_k 's for $k < i$. But $\sum_{k=0}^{i-1} 2^k < 2^i$, and the right inequality of (3.1) is satisfied.

It remains only to show that H is surjective. Given any $A \in A_n$, we will construct a full set x such that $H(x) = A$. Say $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Let $x_0 = \emptyset$ and $x_1 = \{\emptyset\}$. Suppose that the x_i s are determined for $i < k$ such that $h(x_i) = a_i$ for all $i < k$. Then let $x_k = \{x_j : j \in D(a_k)\}$ where $D(a_k)$ is the unique set of integers such that $\sum_{y \in D(a_k)} 2^y = a_k$. Then, since $a_k < 2^k$, $y \in D(a_k)$ implies that $0 \leq y < k$. Observe that this ordering of x agrees with (2.2). x_k is uniquely determined and $h(x_k) = a_k$. The set $x = \{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ is full, and $h(x_i) = a_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

4. The counting recursion. Let $f(n, k)$ be the number of distinct vectors in A_n whose n th coefficient is k . There are as many such vectors as there are vectors in A_{n-1} whose $(n-1)$ th coefficient is less than k (with each vector in A_{n-1} , provided $a_{n-1} < k$, form the vector in A_n by adjoining $a_n = k$). That is, $f(n, k) = \sum_{i < k} f(n-1, i)$, where $f(n, k) = 0$ if $k < n$ or if $k \geq 2^n$, and $f(1, 1) = 1$.

We then obtain the related function $F(n+1) = \sum_k f(n, k)$. The author wishes to thank John Riordan, who has reduced this related function to a recursive formula for $F(n+1)$ in terms of $F(i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

Consider the generating function $f_k(x) = \sum_n f(n, k)x^n$. Observe that $f_{2^k+j}(x) = (1+x)^j f_{2^k}(x)$, $0 \leq j < 2^k$. Write $f_{2^k}(x) = x^{k+1}g_k(x)$. Then $g_1(x) = 1$, $g_2(x) = 2+x = [(1+x)^2 - 1]x^{-1}$, and in general,

$$xg_{k+1}(x) = (1+x)^K g_k(x) - g_k(0), \quad K = 2^k, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots$$

By iteration (and $xg_2(x) = (1+x)^2 - 1$),

$$x^{n-1}g_n(x) = (1+x)^{N-2} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} g_j(0)x^{j-1}(1+x)^{N-2j+1} - x^{n-2}g_{n-1}(0),$$

$N = 2^n.$

Then

$$g_n(0) = \binom{N-2}{n-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} g_j(0) \binom{N-2j+1}{n-j},$$

$n = 3, 4, \dots \quad (g_1(0) = 1, g_2(0) = 2).$

The constant term of $g_n(x)$ is $f(n+1, 2^n)$. Noting that $F(n+1) = f(n+1, 2^n)$, we obtain $g_n(0) = F(n+1)$, which, by substitution, gives

$$F(n+1) = \binom{2^n-2}{n-1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-2} F(j+1) \binom{2^n-2j+1}{n-j}, \quad n = 3, 4, \dots$$

We conclude with a list of values for $F(n)$ from $n = 1$ to $n = 10$.

$F(1) = 1$	$F(5) = 88$	$F(9) = 1,097,780,312$
$F(2) = 1$	$F(6) = 1,802$	$F(10) = 376,516,036,188$
$F(3) = 2$	$F(7) = 75,598$	
$F(4) = 9$	$F(8) = 6,421,599$	

REFERENCES

1. W. Ackermann, *Die Widerspruchsfreiheit der allgemeinen Mengenlehre*, Math. Ann. 114 (1937), 305-315.
2. J. L. Kelley, *General topology*, Van Nostrand, New, York, 1955.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

A NOTE ON THE GREATEST CROSSNORM

A. F. RUSTON

Schatten has shown [5, Lemma 2, p. 323; 6, Lemma 3.7, p. 55] that, if \mathfrak{M} is a closed subspace of a Banach space \mathfrak{B} , and there is a projection of \mathfrak{B} onto \mathfrak{M} with bound unity, then the greatest crossnorm on the tensor product $\mathfrak{B} \odot \mathfrak{N}$ is an extension of the greatest crossnorm on $\mathfrak{M} \odot \mathfrak{N}$ for any Banach space \mathfrak{N} .

Now it is known that there is a projection with bound unity of the second conjugate \mathfrak{B}^{**} of a Banach space \mathfrak{B} onto \mathfrak{B}_0 (the canonical image of \mathfrak{B} in \mathfrak{B}^{**}) for conjugate spaces \mathfrak{B} and for some others [3, p. 580], though not for *all* Banach spaces (cf. [7]). For such spaces, then, the greatest crossnorm on $\mathfrak{B}^{**} \odot \mathfrak{N}$ is an extension of the greatest crossnorm on $\mathfrak{B}_0 \odot \mathfrak{N}$. The purpose of this note is to show that the restriction to such spaces is unnecessary. (N.B. \mathfrak{B} is sometimes embedded in \mathfrak{B}^{**} by identifying it with \mathfrak{B}_0 .)

THEOREM. *Let \mathfrak{B} and \mathfrak{N} be any Banach spaces. Then the greatest crossnorm on $\mathfrak{B}^{**} \odot \mathfrak{N}$ is an extension of the greatest crossnorm on $\mathfrak{B}_0 \odot \mathfrak{N}$ (where \mathfrak{B}_0 is the canonical image of \mathfrak{B} in \mathfrak{B}^{**}).*

Let \mathfrak{x} be any element of $\mathfrak{B}_0 \odot \mathfrak{N} \subset \mathfrak{B}^{**} \odot \mathfrak{N}$. Clearly (in the notation of [2, §2.4, pp. 347-351])

$$\gamma\{\mathfrak{B}^{**} \odot \mathfrak{N}\}(\mathfrak{x}) \leq \gamma\{\mathfrak{B}_0 \odot \mathfrak{N}\}(\mathfrak{x})$$

(since the infimum on the left-hand side is taken over a larger collection of expressions). On the other hand, there exists a continuous

Received by the editors October 5, 1961.