

MAGDALENA GRZECH*

SOME REMARKS ON NON-SEPARABLE GAPS IN $P(\omega)/FIN$

KILKA UWAG O LUKACH HAUSDORFFA I AUTOMORFIZMACH $P(\omega)/FIN$

Abstract

The Hausdorff gap is the well known example of a non-separable, increasingly ordered gap in $P(\omega)/fin$. In this paper new construction of a non-separable gap in $P(\omega)/fin$ is presented.

Keywords: Boolean algebra, Cech-Stone compactification, gap

Streszczenie

W artykule została przedstawiona nowa konstrukcja nierozdzielalnej luki w $P(\omega)/fin$.

Słowa kluczowe: algebra Boole'a, uzwarcenie Cecha-Stone'a, luka

The author is responsible for the language in all paper.

* Institute of Mathematics, Faculty of Physics, Mathematics and Computer Science, Cracow University of Technology, Poland; magdag@pk.edu.pl.

Boolean algebra $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ plays an important role in the foundations of mathematics. Many mathematical problems can be reduced to questions on properties of $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$. Notion, which is frequently used in investigation concerning $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ is the notion of gap (cf. [1], [4]).

Let us begin by reviewing some basic facts and definitions. By ω the set of all natural numbers is denoted. The symbol fin stands for the ideal of all finite subsets of ω . The ideal determines the following equivalence relation:

$$\text{For } A, B \subseteq \omega, A \underset{*}{=} B \text{ if and only if } A \dot{-} B \in \mathit{fin}.$$

$P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ is its factor algebra. An order in $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ is defined as usual, namely:

$$A \subseteq_* B \text{ iff } A \setminus B \in \mathit{fin}.$$

Let λ, κ be cardinals. A gap of type λ, κ in the $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ is a pair:

$$(\{A_\gamma: \gamma < \lambda\}, \{B_\beta: \beta < \kappa\})$$

of subsets of $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ such that $A_\gamma \cap B_\beta \underset{*}{=} \emptyset$. If for every $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \lambda$, $\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \kappa$ $A_{\gamma_1} \subseteq_* A_{\gamma_2}$ and $B_{\beta_1} \subseteq_* B_{\beta_2}$, the gap is said to be increasingly ordered. An element $C \subseteq \omega$ **fills** (separates) the gap if $A_\gamma \subseteq_* C$ and $B_\beta \cap C \underset{*}{=} \emptyset$ for every $\gamma < \lambda$, $\beta < \kappa$. If there is no such an element, the gap is called non-separable. One can ask gaps of what type exist in $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$.

A research concerning gaps in $(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ is an important and deep line of investigation. Let us recall basic facts. It is easily proved that there are no non-separable gaps of type (ω, ω) . On the other hand Hausdorff constructed a non-separable gap of type (ω_1, ω_1) (cf. [2]). This gap, say $\mathcal{L} = (\{X_\alpha: \alpha < \omega_1\}, \{Y_\beta: \beta < \omega_1\})$, is increasingly ordered and $\{\gamma < \beta: \max X_\gamma \cap Y_\beta < k\}$ is finite for every $\beta < \omega_1$ and $k \in \omega$.

Under CH (the Continuum Hypothesis), there exist only gaps of type (ω_1, ω_1) . If $2^\omega > \omega_1$ and MA (the Martin Axiom) holds the each increasingly ordered gap f type λ, κ with $\lambda, \kappa < 2^\omega$, $\lambda \neq \omega_1$ or $\kappa \neq \omega_1$ is separated ([5]).

The smallest cardinal number for which there exists a non-separable gap in $P(\omega)/\mathit{fin}$ is the bounding number \mathbf{b} (cf. [6]). Remind that \mathbf{b} is the size of the smallest unbounded family in ω^ω equipped with the following order: for $f, g \in \omega^\omega$, $f \leq_* g$ iff $\{n: f(n) > g(n)\} \in \mathit{fin}$.

We present another construction of an (unordered) gap of type $(2^\omega, 2^\omega)$. The set F consist of all finite sequences $\underline{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$ such that:

$$\varepsilon_0 = 0, \varepsilon_{2n+1} = 2 \text{ and } \varepsilon_{2n+2} \in \{0, 1\}, n \in \omega.$$

Let

$$F_n = \{\underline{\varepsilon} \in F: \ell(\underline{\varepsilon}) \leq 2n\}$$

and

$$F_e = \{\underline{\varepsilon} \in F: \ell(\underline{\varepsilon}) = 2n \text{ for some } n \in \omega\}.$$

Divide ω into two disjoint, infinite subsets X and Y and fix two functions f and g such that:

$$(*) f: F \rightarrow X \text{ is a bijection and if } \underline{\varepsilon} \subseteq \underline{\rho} \text{ then } f(\underline{\varepsilon}) \leq f(\underline{\rho}).$$

$$(**) g: F_e \times F_e \rightarrow Y \text{ is an injection and if } \underline{\varepsilon}^1 \subseteq \underline{\rho}^1, \underline{\varepsilon}^2 \subseteq \underline{\rho}^2 \text{ then}$$

$$g(\underline{\mathbf{e}}^1, \underline{\mathbf{e}}^2) \leq g(\underline{\mathbf{p}}^1, \underline{\mathbf{p}}^2).$$

We define two families of finite subsets $\{A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}): \underline{\mathbf{e}} \in F\}$, $\{B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}): \underline{\mathbf{e}} \in F\}$ by induction on the length of $\underline{\mathbf{e}}$.

For $\underline{\mathbf{e}}$ such that $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) = 1$ or $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) = 2$ put $A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) = B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) = \emptyset$.

Assume that $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) = 3, 4$. Then:

$$A_{(0,2,0)} = \{f(0), f(0,2), f(0,2,0)\}, A_{(0,2,1)} = \{f(0), f(0,2), f(0,2,1)\},$$

$$B_{(0,2,0)} = \{f(0,2,1)\}, B_{(0,2,1)} = \{f(0,2,0)\},$$

$$A_{(0,2,0,2)} = A_{(0,2,0)} \cup \{f(0,2,0,2)\}, A_{(0,2,1,2)} = A_{(0,2,1)} \cup \{f(0,2,1,2)\}$$

$$B_{(0,2,0,2)} = B_{(0,2,0)} \cup \{g((0,2,1,2), (0,2,0,2))\}, B_{(0,2,1,2)} = B_{(0,2,1)} \cup \{g((0,2,1,2), (0,2,0,2))\}$$

Assume inductively that for $n \geq 2$, we have defined families $\{A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}): \underline{\mathbf{e}} \in F_n\}$ and $\{B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}): \underline{\mathbf{e}} \in F_n\}$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cap B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) = \emptyset$ for every $\underline{\mathbf{e}} \in F_n$.
2. If $\underline{\mathbf{e}}, \underline{\mathbf{p}} \in F_n$ and $\underline{\mathbf{e}}(k) \neq \underline{\mathbf{p}}(k)$, for some $k \leq 2n$, then

$$A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cap B(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) \neq \emptyset \text{ and } B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cap A(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) \neq \emptyset.$$

3. If $\underline{\mathbf{e}}, \underline{\mathbf{p}} \in F_n$ and $\underline{\mathbf{e}} \subseteq \underline{\mathbf{p}}$, then $A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \subseteq A(\underline{\mathbf{p}})$ and $B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \subseteq B(\underline{\mathbf{p}})$.
4. If $\underline{\mathbf{e}}, \underline{\mathbf{p}} \in F_n$ and $\underline{\mathbf{e}}(k) \neq \underline{\mathbf{p}}(k)$, let $l = \min \{k: \underline{\mathbf{e}}(k) \neq \underline{\mathbf{p}}(k)\}$. Then $\max A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cap B(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = f(\underline{\mathbf{e}}|_l)$, $\max B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cap A(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = f(\underline{\mathbf{e}}|_{l-1})$, $\max A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cap A(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = f(\underline{\mathbf{e}}|_{l-1})$.

For $\underline{\mathbf{e}} \in F_n$ put:

$$A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 0) = A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cup \{f(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 0)\}, A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 1) = A(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cup \{f(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 1)\},$$

$$B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 0) = B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cup \{f(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 1)\}, B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 1) = B(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) \cup \{f(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 1)\},$$

$$A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 02) = A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 0) \cup \{f(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 02)\}, A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 12) = A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 1) \cup \{f(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 12)\},$$

$$B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 02) = B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 0) \cup \{g(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 02, \underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 12)\}, B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 12) = B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 1) \cup \{g(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 02, \underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge 12)\}.$$

It is obvious that the family F_{n+1} satisfies conditions (1) and (3).

For (2), let $\underline{\mathbf{p}}, \underline{\mathbf{e}} \in F_{n+1}$. If $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = \ell(\underline{\mathbf{e}})$ or $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = 2n+1$, $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{e}}) = 2n+2$, the condition follows from the definition. Suppose that $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = k < 2n+1 \leq \ell(\underline{\mathbf{e}})$. Let $l = \min \{k: \underline{\mathbf{e}}_k \neq \underline{\mathbf{p}}_k\}$. Then $\underline{\sigma} = \underline{\mathbf{e}}|l = \underline{\mathbf{p}}|l$ and $\emptyset \neq A(\underline{\sigma}) \wedge \underline{\mathbf{p}}_l \cap B(\underline{\sigma}) \wedge \underline{\mathbf{e}}_l = A(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) \cap B(\underline{\mathbf{e}})$. (The remaining cases can be checked in the same way.)

To check the assumption (4), note that $A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge i) \cap B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge j) = A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge i2) \cap B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge j2)$, for $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, $i \neq j$. Since f satisfies the condition (*), it follows that $\max A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge i) \cap B(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge j) = f(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge i)$. Moreover $A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge i) \cap A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge j) = A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge i2) \cap A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge j2) = A(\underline{\mathbf{e}})$, thus

$$\max A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge i) \cap A(\underline{\mathbf{e}} \wedge j) = f(\underline{\mathbf{e}}).$$

If $\ell(\underline{\mathbf{p}}) = k < 2n+1 \leq \ell(\underline{\mathbf{e}})$ and $\underline{\sigma} = \underline{\mathbf{e}}|l = \underline{\mathbf{p}}|l$, $\underline{\mathbf{p}}_l \neq \underline{\mathbf{e}}_l$ then

$$\max A(\underline{\sigma} \wedge \underline{\rho}) \cap B(\underline{\sigma} \wedge \underline{\epsilon}) = \max A(\underline{\rho}) \cap B(\underline{\epsilon}) = f(\underline{\rho}|I).$$

(The remaining cases can be checked in the same way.) This finishes the inductive construction.

Let X be the family of all sequences $x: \omega \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ which satisfy the conditions:

$$x(0) = 0, x(2n+1) = 2, x(2n+2) \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Then

$$\underline{A}(x) = \mathbf{U}_{n \in \omega} A(x|n), \underline{B}(x) = \mathbf{U}_{n \in \omega} B(x|n)$$

are infinite subsets of ω .

It is easy to check that for $x, y \in X$, if $x \neq y$ then:

$$\underline{A}(x) \cap \underline{B}(x) = \emptyset, \underline{A}(x) \cap \underline{B}(y) \neq \emptyset, \underline{A}(x) \cap \underline{A}(y) \in \mathbf{fin} \text{ and } \underline{B}(x) \cap \underline{B}(y) \in \mathbf{fin}.$$

Theorem 1 *The gap $\mathcal{L} = (\{\underline{A}(x): x \in X\}, \{\underline{B}(x): x \in X\})$ satisfies the following condition: for every uncountable set $Y \subseteq X$, $\mathcal{L}_Y = (\{\underline{A}(x): x \in Y\}, \{\underline{B}(x): x \in Y\})$ is non-separable.*

Proof. Suppose that for $Y = \{x_\alpha: \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq X$, $\omega < \kappa \leq 2^\omega$, there exists a C which separates the gap \mathcal{L}_Y . Let $s_\alpha = \underline{A}(x_\alpha) \setminus C$, $t_\alpha = \underline{B}(x_\alpha) \cap C$.

Then s_α, t_α are finite subsets of ω and since $\underline{A}(x_\alpha) \cap \underline{B}(x_\alpha) = \emptyset$, it follows that $s_\alpha \cap t_\alpha = \emptyset$. Δ -lemma implies that there exist an uncountable set $\Gamma \subseteq \kappa$, $\Gamma \subset \kappa$ and finite sets s, t such that for all $\alpha \in \gamma$, $s_\alpha = s$ and $t_\alpha = t$.

If $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ then $\emptyset = s_\alpha \cap t_\beta = s \cap t = s_\alpha \cap t_\alpha = \emptyset$, a contradiction. This finishes the proof.

References

- [1] Comfort W.W., Negrepointis S., *The theory of ultrafilters*, Springer Verlag, New York 1974.
- [2] Hausdorff Summen von Mengen F_1 , *Fund. Math.* 26, 1936, 241-255.
- [3] Hechler S., *On existence of certain cofinal subsets of*, *Axiomatic Set Theory*, T. Jech (ed.), Proc. Symp. Pure Math. vol. 13 II, 1974, 155-173.
- [4] Jech T., *Set Theory*, Academic Press, New York et al., 1978.
- [5] Kunen K., *Weak P-points in N^** , *Colloq. Math. soc. Jano's Bolyai* 23, Topology, Budapest 1978, 741-749.
- [6] Rothberger F., *Une remarque concernant l'hipotése du continu*, *Fund. Math.* 31, 1939, 224-226.