

Jiří Souček

On some problems in βN

In: Zdeněk Frolík (ed.): Abstracta. 8th Winter School on Abstract Analysis. Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Praha, 1980. pp. 158–160.

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/701200>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, 1980

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library <http://dml.cz>

8th Winter school on abstract analysis (1980)

On some problems in $\beta\mathcal{N}$.

J. Soušek

I have introduced a new type of infinite numbers.

Definition. Let E be a set and R a reflexive symmetric transitive relation between subsets of E denoted by

$a_1 \sim_R a_2$ or $a_1 = a_2 \bmod R$ (for $a_1, a_2 \subseteq E$). Let us denote

$a_1 \leq a_2 \bmod R \iff \exists a'_1 \subseteq a_2$ such that $a_1 = a'_1 \bmod R$,

$a_1 < a_2 \bmod R \iff (a_1 \leq a_2 \bmod R \text{ and } a_1 \neq a_2 \bmod R)$.

(E, R) is an ∞ -number if

(i) $a_1, a_2 \subseteq E$, $|a_1|, |a_2| < \aleph_0 \implies (a_1 = a_2 \bmod R \iff |a_1| = |a_2|)$,

(ii) $a_1, a_2 \subseteq E \implies a_1 \leq a_2 \bmod R$ or $a_1 \geq a_2 \bmod R$ (com. comparit.),

(iii) $a_1 \subset a_2$ (i.e. $a_1 \neq a_2$) $\implies a_1 < a_2 \bmod R$

- i.e. " $<$ " is the finest relation possible - for $x \in E$, $x \setminus \{x\}$

is strictly smaller than x ,

(iv) $a_1 \sim a'_1$, $a_2 \sim a'_2$, $a_1 \cap a_2 = a'_1 \cap a'_2 = \emptyset \implies (a_1 \cup a_2) \sim (a'_1 \cup a'_2)$.

Cardinal and ordinal numbers are not very different from each other with respect to the inclusion. ($\omega_0 = \aleph_0 = \omega_0$) - ∞ -numbers are the finest possible ones in this sense.

Definition. Let $\alpha_i = (E_i, R_i)$, $i=1,2$ be two ∞ -numbers. Then

$(E_1, R_1) = (E_2, R_2)$ iff they are isomorphic,

$(E_1, R_1) \leq (E_2, R_2)$ iff $\exists L \subseteq E_2$ s.t. $(E_1, R_1) = (L, R_{1|L})$,

where $R_{1|L}$ denotes restriction of R_1 to subsets of L ,

$(E_1, R_1) + (E_2, R_2) = (E, R)$ iff $\exists E = E'_1 \cup E'_2$, $E'_1 \cap E'_2 = \emptyset$ such that

$$(E_i, R_i) = (E'_i, R_{i|E'_i}), \quad i=1,2.$$

Basic properties of ∞ -numbers are summarized in

Theorem 1. Let (E, R) be an ∞ -number. Then the relation "finer"

for $a_1, a_2 \subseteq E$ by $(a_1, R_{1|a_1}) = (a_2, R_{2|a_2})$ coincides with $a_1 \sim a_2$.

Especially $E_1 \subset E$ (i.e. $E_1 \neq E$) $\Rightarrow (E_1, R) \not\subseteq (E, R)$.

Theorem 2. $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ is uniquely determined and $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ exists iff $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \Leftrightarrow \alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$ or $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2$. Moreover $\sum_{\alpha \in (E, R)} n_\alpha$ may be uniquely defined as ∞ -number if $|n_\alpha| \leq K, \forall \alpha, (K \text{ finite number})$.

In fact, there is a more subtle structure in (E, R) .

Definition. $\mathcal{P} = \{\text{all partitions of } E\}$;

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \{P = \{I^\alpha\} \in \mathcal{P} \mid |I^\alpha| < \aleph_0, \forall \alpha\};$$

$$\mathcal{P}_{\infty} = \{P = \{I^\alpha\} \mid |I^\alpha| > 1 \text{ only for finite number of } \alpha\};$$

$$I_1 \leq I_2 \Leftrightarrow \forall I_1^{\alpha_1} \exists I_2^{\alpha_2} : I_1^{\alpha_1} \subseteq I_2^{\alpha_2};$$

$$I_1 \vee I_2 = \inf \{I \mid I \supseteq I_1, I \supseteq I_2\};$$

$$\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{P}_0 \text{ is an ideal} \Leftrightarrow (I_1 \leq I \in \mathcal{I} \Rightarrow I_1 \in \mathcal{I}; I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I} \Rightarrow I_1 \vee I_2 \in \mathcal{I});$$

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\}, \quad \mathbb{Z} = \text{integers};$$

$$\mathcal{F}_b = \{f : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \mid f \text{ is bounded}\};$$

$$\text{For } f \in \mathcal{F}, I \in \mathcal{P}_0 \text{ we define } f_I \text{ on } I = \{I^\alpha\} \text{ by } f_I(I^\alpha) = \sum_{x \in I^\alpha} f(x).$$

Theorem 3. Let (E, R) be an ∞ -number. Then there exists an ideal

$$\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{I} \supset \mathcal{P}_{\infty} \text{ such that}$$

$$(1) \forall f \in \mathcal{F}_b \exists I \in \mathcal{I} : f_I \geq 0 \text{ or } f_I \leq 0 \text{ on } I,$$

$$(2) a_1 \neq a_2 \text{ not } \perp \Leftrightarrow \exists I = \{I^\alpha\} \in \mathcal{I} : |I^\alpha \cap a_1| = |I^\alpha \cap a_2|, \forall \alpha.$$

Proof. Opposite is obvious - R is defined by (2) and (ii) follows from (1).

Theorem 4. Suppose that there is a selective ultrafilter in $\beta\mathcal{N}$ ($\mathcal{N}$ a cardinal number). Then there is an ∞ -number $(\mathcal{N}, R)$.

Sketch of proof: Let ϕ be a selective ultrafilter in $\mathcal{N}$ (i.e. if $\{I^\alpha\}$ is a partition of $\mathcal{N}$, $I^\alpha \notin \phi \forall \alpha \Rightarrow \exists u \in \phi : |u \cap I^\alpha| = 1 \forall \alpha$).

The existence of ϕ follows from the continuum hypothesis. For

$$u = \{u_1, u_2, \dots\} \in \phi \text{ we define } I[u] = \{(1, u_1), (u_1+1, u_2), (u_2+1, u_3), \dots\}$$

where (a, b) means an interval in the natural ordering of $\mathcal{N}$.

Lemma. $\forall f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \exists u \in \phi$ such that f is non-decreasing on u or f is non-increasing on u .

Lemma $\Rightarrow$ Th.4 : let us denote $\mathcal{I} = \{P[u] \mid u \in \phi\}$ and $\forall f : \mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ denote $\tilde{f}(n) = \sum_{k=1}^n f(k)$, $n \in \mathcal{N}$. For each f there is $u \in \phi$, such that $\tilde{f}$ is (for example) non-decreasing on u and then

$\forall P^\alpha = (u_{\alpha-1}+1, u_\alpha) \in P[u]$ we obtain

$$f/\mathcal{I}[u](P^\alpha) = \sum_{k \in P^\alpha} f(k) = \tilde{f}(u_\alpha) - \tilde{f}(u_{\alpha-1}) \geq 0.$$

Let us denote $\mathcal{A}$ the set of all ∞ -numbers $(\mathcal{N}, R)$ obtainable from some selective ultrafilter through this construction.

Problems.

Problem 1. Does $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2$ hold? Especially for $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$?

If the answer is negative, is there a reasonable subclass of comparable ∞ -numbers?

Problem 2. Assuming the generalized continuum hypothesis, are there $(\mathbb{E}, R)$ with uncountable $\mathbb{E}$?

Problem 3. To find the explicite condition for $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. To clarify the relation between $\mathcal{A}$ and the set of selective ultrafilters in $\beta\mathcal{N}$ - our construction (from ϕ to α) depends clearly on the natural ordering of $\mathcal{N}$. To study properties of

$$\mathcal{A}_\phi = \{\alpha \text{ obtainable from } \phi \text{ by some } \omega_0\text{-ordering of } \mathbb{E}\},$$

$$\Phi_\alpha = \{\phi \mid \alpha \text{ can be obtained from } \phi \text{ using some } \omega_0\text{-ordering of } \mathbb{E}\}.$$

Problem 4. May the product $\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2$ be reasonably defined?

probably the definition of ∞ -numbers must be refined.

Problem 5. The set $\{\alpha \mid \alpha \leq (\mathbb{E}, R)\} \cong \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{E}}/R$ is linearly ordered by the inclusion. May properties of $(\mathbb{E}, R)$ (or relations between them) be translated into language of such orderings? To characterize all orderings of this type.