

## Some Properties on a Set of Ideals

by

Nobuo KUBOTA

(Received May 18, 1982)

Saturation property is a property of ideals. In [2], A. Taylor extended a saturation property to sets of ideals. In this paper we shall propose a certain property of ideals, and shall prove the property implies a saturation property. Further we shall extend the property to sets of ideals.

Let  $\kappa$  be a regular uncountable cardinal number. An ideal over  $\kappa$  is a set  $I$  of subsets of  $\kappa$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (1)  $\phi \in I$ ,
- (2) if  $X \in I$  and  $Y \subseteq X$  then  $Y \in I$ ,
- (3) if  $X \in I$  and  $Y \in I$  then  $X \cup Y \in I$ .

An ideal  $I$  over  $\kappa$  is proper, if  $\kappa \notin I$ . And an ideal  $I$  over  $\kappa$  is called uniform, if  $I$  satisfies the following condition:

If  $X \subseteq \kappa$  and  $|X| < \kappa$ , then  $X \in I$ . ( $|X|$  denotes the cardinality of  $X$ .)

Let  $\nu$  be a cardinal. An ideal  $I$  over  $\kappa$  is said to be  $\nu$ -complete, if  $I$  satisfies the following condition:

If  $\lambda < \nu$  and  $\{X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda\} \subseteq I$ , then  $\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} X_\alpha \in I$ .

An ideal  $I$  over  $\kappa$  is nontrivial, if  $\{\alpha\} \in I$ , for all  $\alpha < \kappa$ . Hence if  $I$  is a nontrivial  $\kappa$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa$ ,  $I$  is a uniform ideal.

Throughout this paper, an ideal means a proper uniform ideal over  $\kappa$ . Let  $I$  be an ideal. We set

$$I^+ = \{X \mid X \subseteq \kappa \text{ and } X \notin I\}.$$

And if  $A \in I^+$ , then the ideal

$$I|A = \{X \mid X \subseteq \kappa \text{ and } X \cap A \in I\}$$

is an ideal generated by  $I \cup \{\kappa - A\}$ . It is easy to know that if  $I$  is  $\nu$ -complete, then  $I|A$  is also  $\nu$ -complete. Let  $I$  be an ideal over  $\kappa$ . Then a function  $f$  is called  $I$ -function if  $\text{dom}(f) \in I^+$ . Let  $\lambda$  be a cardinal number, and  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda\}$  be a set of ideals over  $\kappa$ . We set

$$\mathcal{I}^+ = \bigcap_{\alpha < \lambda} I_\alpha^+.$$

And a function  $f$  is said to be  $\mathcal{I}$ -function if  $\text{dom}(f) \in \mathcal{I}^+$ .

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Let  $I$  be a  $\kappa$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa = \mu^+$ . Then if there is a collection of  $I$ -functions  $F = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$  such that for all  $\alpha < \kappa$   $\text{range}(f_\alpha) \subseteq \mu$ , and  $\{\delta \mid f_\alpha(\delta) = f_\beta(\delta)\} \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ , then there is a collection  $\{X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq I^+$  such that  $X_\alpha \cap X_\beta \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $F = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$  be a set of  $I$ -functions satisfying the hypothesis. Let  $\{Y_\alpha^\beta \mid \beta < \mu\}$  be a collection of subsets of  $\text{dom}(f_\alpha)$  such that  $f_\alpha^{-1}(\beta) = Y_\alpha^\beta$  for all  $\beta < \mu$ . If  $Y_\alpha^\beta \in I$  for all  $\beta < \mu$ , then

$$\text{dom}(f_\alpha) = \bigcup_{\beta < \mu} Y_\alpha^\beta \in I,$$

because  $\mu < \kappa$  and  $I$  is a  $\kappa$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa$ . This contradicts  $f_\alpha$  is an  $I$ -function. Hence we have  $\gamma_\alpha < \mu$  and  $Y_\alpha \subseteq \text{dom}(f_\alpha)$  such that

$$Y_\alpha \in I^+ \quad \text{and} \quad f_\alpha''(Y_\alpha) = \gamma_\alpha, \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \kappa.$$

Since  $\kappa$  is regular and  $\mu < \kappa$ , there is a collection  $\{X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$  and  $\gamma < \mu$  such that

$$\{X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq \{Y_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\} \quad \text{and} \quad f_\alpha''(X_\alpha) = \gamma, \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \kappa.$$

Thus if  $X_\alpha \cap X_\beta \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ , then the proof is complete.

Let  $X_\alpha \cap X_\beta \in I^+$  for some  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ . Then we have

$$\{\delta \mid f_\alpha(\delta) = f_\beta(\delta) = \gamma\} \supseteq X_\alpha \cap X_\beta \in I^+,$$

a contradiction.

**COROLLARY 2.** *Let  $I$  be a  $\kappa$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa = \mu^+$ . Then if there is a collection of  $I$ -functions  $F = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa^+\}$  such that for all  $\alpha < \kappa^+$   $\text{range}(f_\alpha) \subseteq \mu$ , and  $\{\delta \mid f_\alpha(\delta) = f_\beta(\delta)\} \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa^+$ , then there is a collection  $\{X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa^+\} \subseteq I^+$  such that  $X_\alpha \cap X_\beta \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa^+$ .*

Let  $\nu$  be a cardinal. An ideal  $I$  over  $\kappa$  is said to be not  $\nu$ -saturated, if there is a collection  $\{X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \nu\} \subseteq I^+$  such that  $X_\alpha \cap X_\beta \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \nu$ .

Hence Proposition 1 (Corollary 2) means that if  $I$  is a  $\kappa$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa = \mu^+$  such that there is a collection of  $I$ -functions  $F = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$  ( $F = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ ) with  $\text{range}(f_\alpha) \subseteq \mu$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$  ( $\alpha < \kappa^+$ ) and  $\{\delta \mid f_\alpha(\delta) = f_\beta(\delta)\} \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$  ( $\alpha < \beta < \kappa^+$ ), then  $I$  is not  $\kappa$ -saturated ( $\kappa^+$ -saturated).

In [2] Taylor showed that some set of ideals has a certain saturation property, if a single ideal has the same one. That is,

**THEOREM 3 ([2]).** *Let  $\kappa$  be a regular uncountable cardinal number and  $\nu$  be a cardinal number with  $\nu < \kappa$ . Then the following two assertions are equivalent.*

- (1) *If  $I$  is at least  $\nu^+$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa$ , then  $I$  is not  $\nu^+$ -saturated.*
- (2) *If  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_\eta \mid \eta < \nu\}$  is a set of at least  $\nu^+$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa$ , then there is a collection  $\{X_\alpha \mid \alpha < \nu^+\} \subseteq \mathcal{I}^+$  such that*

$$X_\alpha \cap X_\beta \in \bigcap_{\eta < \nu} I_\eta \quad \text{for } \alpha < \beta < \nu^+.$$

Taylor proved this theorem in order to modify the technique used by Baumgartner, Hajnal and Máté in [1].

Now we shall show that some set of ideals has the property in the hypothesis of Proposition 1, if a single ideal has the same one using the technique of Baumgartner, Hajnal and Máté.

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $\nu$  be a cardinal number with  $\nu < \kappa = \mu^+$ . Then the following two assertions are equivalent.*

- (1) *If  $I$  is a  $\kappa$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa$ , then there is a collection of  $I$ -functions  $F = \{f_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$  such that  $\text{range}(f_\alpha) \subseteq \mu$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$  and  $\{\delta \mid f_\alpha(\delta) = f_\beta(\delta)\} \in I$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ .*
- (2) *If  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_\eta \mid \eta < \nu\}$  is a set of  $\kappa$ -complete ideals over  $\kappa$ , then there is a collection of  $\mathcal{I}$ -functions  $G = \{g_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$  such that  $\text{range}(g_\alpha) \subseteq \mu$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$  and*

$$\{\delta \mid g_\alpha(\delta) = g_\beta(\delta)\} \in \bigcap_{\eta < \nu} I_\eta \quad \text{for } \alpha < \beta < \kappa.$$

*Proof.* From (2) to (1) is obvious. We shall prove (1) to (2).

Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{I_\xi \mid \xi < \nu\}$  be a set of  $\kappa$ -complete ideals over  $\kappa$ . For each  $\xi < \nu$   $I_\xi$  is  $\kappa$ -complete over  $\kappa$ . So by (1) and Proposition 1 there is a collection  $\{X_\alpha^\xi \mid \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq I_\xi^+$  such that  $X_\alpha^\xi \cap X_\beta^\xi \in I_\xi$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ . Hence we can construct a collection  $\{Y_\alpha^\xi \mid \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq I_\xi^+$  of pairwise disjoint sets from  $\{X_\alpha^\xi \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$ , because  $I_\xi$  is  $\kappa$ -complete. Now we define a function  $h: \nu \rightarrow \nu$  by

$$h(\eta) = \inf \{ \xi < \nu \mid |\{ \alpha < \kappa \mid Y_\alpha^\xi \in I_\eta^+ \}| = \kappa \} \quad \text{for } \eta < \nu.$$

If  $\gamma < h(\eta)$ , then  $|\{ \alpha < \kappa \mid Y_\alpha^\gamma \in I_\eta^+ \}| < \kappa$ . Hence there is a  $\beta_\gamma < \kappa$  such that, if  $Y_\alpha^\gamma \in I_\eta^+$  then  $\alpha < \beta_\gamma$ . So if we set  $\delta_\eta = \bigcup_{\gamma < h(\eta)} \beta_\gamma$ , we know that for every  $\gamma < h(\eta)$  if  $Y_\alpha^\gamma \in I_\eta^+$  then  $\alpha < \delta_\eta < \kappa$ , because  $\kappa$  is a regular cardinal number. Now set

$$\delta = \bigcup_{\eta < \nu} \delta_\eta \quad (< \kappa).$$

Then we get that for every  $\eta < \nu$  if  $\gamma < h(\eta)$  and  $Y_\alpha^\gamma \in I_\eta^+$  then  $\alpha < \delta$ . Of course  $|\{ \alpha < \kappa \mid Y_\alpha^{h(\eta)} \in I_\eta^+ \}| = \kappa$ , so  $|\{ Y_\alpha^{h(\eta)} \mid Y_\alpha^{h(\eta)} \in I_\eta^+ \text{ and } \delta < \alpha < \kappa \}| = \kappa$ . Thus we can get a collection  $\{W_\eta \mid \eta < \nu\}$  of distinct sets such that  $W_\eta \in \{ Y_\alpha^{h(\eta)} \mid Y_\alpha^{h(\eta)} \in I_\eta^+ \text{ and } \delta < \alpha < \kappa \}$  for each  $\eta < \nu$ . Define  $T_\eta$  for every  $\eta < \nu$  by

$$T_\eta = W_\eta - \bigcup_{h(\lambda) < h(\eta)} W_\lambda.$$

We show that  $\{T_\eta \mid \eta < \nu\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets such that  $T_\eta \in I_\eta^+$  for every  $\eta < \nu$ . First we show  $T_\eta \in I_\eta^+$ . If we can prove  $W_\lambda \in I_\eta$  for all  $h(\lambda) < h(\eta)$  we have  $T_\eta \in I_\eta^+$ , because  $W_\eta \in I_\eta^+$ ,  $|\{ \lambda \mid h(\lambda) < h(\eta) \}| \leq \nu < \kappa$  and  $I_\eta$  is  $\kappa$ -complete. As we show above if  $h(\lambda) < h(\eta)$  and  $W_\lambda = Y_\alpha^{h(\lambda)} \in I_\eta^+$  then  $\alpha < \delta$ . But this contradicts the definition of  $W_\eta$ . Second we show  $\{T_\eta \mid \eta < \nu\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets. If  $h(\lambda) \neq h(\eta)$ ,  $T_\lambda$  and  $T_\eta$  are clearly disjoint. Hence let  $h(\lambda) = h(\eta) = \xi$ . Then we have  $W_\lambda = Y_\sigma^\xi$  and  $W_\eta = Y_\tau^\xi$  for some  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ . But  $\{Y_\alpha^\xi \mid \alpha < \kappa\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets and  $W_\lambda$  and  $W_\eta$  are distinct, so we get  $W_\lambda$  and  $W_\eta$  are disjoint. Therefore  $T_\lambda$  and  $T_\eta$  are disjoint. Since  $T_\eta \in I_\eta^+$ ,  $I_\eta \upharpoonright T_\eta$  is a  $\kappa$ -complete ideal over  $\kappa$ . Then from (1) there is a

collection of  $I_\eta | T_\eta$ -functions  $F_\eta = \{f_\alpha^\eta | \alpha < \kappa\}$  such that  $\text{range}(f_\alpha^\eta) \subseteq \mu$  and  $\{\delta | f_\alpha^\eta(\delta) = f_\beta^\eta(\delta)\} \in I_\eta | T_\eta$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ . Hence by the proof of Proposition 1, there is a collection  $\{C_\alpha^\eta | \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq (I_\eta | T_\eta)^+$  and a  $\gamma_\eta < \mu$  such that  $C_\alpha^\eta \cap C_\beta^\eta \in I_\eta | T_\eta$  for  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$  and  $f_\alpha^{\eta''}(C_\alpha^\eta) = \gamma_\eta$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$ . Let  $D_\alpha^\eta = C_\alpha^\eta - \bigcup_{\beta < \alpha} C_\beta^\eta$ . Then  $\{D_\alpha^\eta | \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq (I_\eta | T_\eta)^+$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets, because  $I_\eta | T_\eta$  is  $\kappa$ -complete. Set

$$E_\alpha^\eta = D_\alpha^\eta \cap T_\eta \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \kappa.$$

Then  $\{E_\alpha^\eta | \alpha < \kappa \text{ and } \eta < \nu\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets such that

$$\{E_\alpha^\eta | \alpha < \kappa\} \subseteq I_\eta^+ \quad \text{for all } \eta < \nu \text{ and } f_\alpha^{\eta''}(E_\alpha^\eta) = \gamma_\eta \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \kappa.$$

Now set

$$Z_\alpha = \bigcup_{\eta < \nu} E_\alpha^\eta \quad \text{for all } \alpha < \kappa.$$

Then we get  $Z_\alpha \in \bigcap_{\eta < \nu} I_\eta^+ = \mathcal{I}^+$  and  $\{Z_\alpha | \alpha < \kappa\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets.

Define functions  $g_\alpha$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$  such that

$$\text{dom}(g_\alpha) = Z_\alpha \text{ and } g_\alpha(\delta) = f_\alpha^{\eta''}(\delta) = \gamma_\eta \quad \text{if } \delta \in E_\alpha^\eta.$$

Because  $\{E_\alpha^\eta | \eta < \nu\}$  is a collection of pairwise disjoint sets, each  $g_\alpha$  is well defined and of course  $g_\alpha$  is an  $\mathcal{I}$ -function. Let  $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$ , then  $\text{dom}(g_\alpha) \cap \text{dom}(g_\beta) = \emptyset$ . So we have

$$\{\delta | g_\alpha(\delta) = g_\beta(\delta)\} = \emptyset \in \bigcap_{\eta < \nu} I_\eta.$$

Hence we get a collection of  $\mathcal{I}$ -functions  $G = \{g_\alpha | \alpha < \kappa\}$  such that  $\text{range}(g_\alpha) \subseteq \mu$  for all  $\alpha < \kappa$  and

$$\{\delta | g_\alpha(\delta) = g_\beta(\delta)\} \in \bigcap_{\eta < \nu} I_\eta \quad \text{for } \alpha < \beta < \kappa.$$

This completes the proof.

## References

- [1] BAUMGARTNER, J., HAJNAL, A. and MÁTÉ, A.; Weak saturation properties of ideals, *Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai* 10, *Infinite and Finite Sets*, Keszthely, 1973, pp. 137–158.
- [2] TAYLOR, A.; On saturated sets of ideals and Ulam's problem, *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **CIX** (1980), 37–53.

Department of Mathematics  
Rikkyo University  
Ikebukuro, Tokyo  
Japan