

BULLETIN DE LA S. M. F.

G. CHOODNOWSKY

K. WOLFSDORF

**A theorem on polarised partition relations
for singular cardinals**

Bulletin de la S. M. F., tome 110 (1982), p. 349-356

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=BSMF_1982__110__349_0

© Bulletin de la S. M. F., 1982, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Bulletin de la S. M. F. » (<http://smf.emath.fr/Publications/Bulletin/Presentation.html>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

A THEOREM ON POLARISED PARTITION RELATIONS FOR SINGULAR CARDINALS

BY

G. CHOODNOWSKY and K. WOLFSDORF (*)

RÉSUMÉ. — Si κ est un nombre cardinal singulaire et une limite des nombres cardinales mesurable, pour chaque $\alpha < \kappa^+$ est valide :

$$\binom{\kappa^+}{\kappa} \rightarrow \binom{\alpha}{\kappa}.$$

ABSTRACT. — If κ is a measurable limit cardinal then

$$\binom{\kappa^+}{\kappa} \rightarrow \binom{\alpha}{\kappa} \quad \text{for any } \alpha < \kappa^+.$$

In [EHR], ERDŐS, HAJNAL and RADO discussed polarized partition relations for cardinal numbers. By an easy counterexample it is shown that for all cardinals κ we have $\binom{\kappa}{\kappa} \nrightarrow \binom{\kappa}{\kappa}$. So it is a natural question to ask for which cardinals κ the following relation is valid:

$$\binom{\kappa}{\kappa^+} \rightarrow \binom{\kappa}{\kappa}.$$

PRIKRY proved [PR] that the negation of the partition relation is consistent for all successor cardinals κ . The first author proved the partition relation

(*) Texte reçu le 14 avril 1978, version révisée le 10 juin 1981.

G. CHOODNOWSKY, Department of Mathematics, Columbia University, New York, NY-10027 (U.S.A.).

K. WOLFSDORF, Technische Universität Berlin, Fachbereich 3, Mathematik, 1000 Berlin (R.F.A.).

$\binom{\kappa}{\kappa^+} \rightarrow \binom{\kappa}{\kappa}$ for all measurable cardinals in [CH], the second author proved the theorem for weakly compact cardinals [WO 2].

For singular cardinals, there is a positive result in [EHR] for cardinals with cofinality ω . Here we want to show the relation for measurable limit cardinals.

1. 1. Notation.

The set theoretical notations are standard, see [DR]. Small Greek letters denote ordinals, κ, λ are infinite cardinals.

An ultrafilter U is κ -complete iff for all n. e. sets $X \subset U, |X| < \kappa, \cap X \in U$.

The cardinal κ is measurable iff there exists a κ -complete non-principal ultrafilter on κ ; κ is a measurable limit cardinal iff there exists a strongly monotone increasing sequence of cardinals $(\kappa_\nu | \nu < \text{cf } \kappa)$, such that all κ_ν are measurable and $\lim_{\nu < \text{cf } \kappa} \kappa_\nu = \kappa$.

Let $\mathcal{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. \mathcal{P} is a forcing set iff there exists a $O_p \in P$ such that for all $p \in P, O_p \leq p$. If $p, q \in P$ and $p \leq q$ then q is called an extension of p . A subset D of P is P -dense in \mathcal{P} iff every $p \in P$ has an extension in D .

Let $\mathcal{P} = (P, \leq)$ be a forcing set, and \mathcal{D} be a family of dense subsets of \mathcal{P} . A subset G of P is \mathcal{D} -generic iff:

- (i) for all $p \in G$ and $q \leq p, q \in G$;
- (ii) for all $p, q \in G, p$ and q have a common extension in G ;
- (iii) for all dense sets $D \in \mathcal{D}, G \cap D \neq \emptyset$.

A subset K of P is an α -chain iff (K, \leq) is a total ordering and has order type α .

For ordinals α, β, γ and δ , the polarised partition relation:

$$(1) \quad \binom{\alpha}{\beta} \rightarrow \binom{\gamma}{\delta},$$

has the following meaning:

(1') Let $\alpha \times \beta = I_0 \cup I_1$. Then there exists a subset $A \subset \alpha$, $\text{type}(A) = \gamma$ and a subset $B \subset \beta$, $\text{type}(B) = \delta$ and $A \times B \subset I_0$ or $A \times B \subset I_1$.

2. Two simple remarks

Using the axiom of choice we can trivially prove the following:

PROPOSITION 1. — *Let $\mathcal{P}=(P; \leq)$ be a forcing set and κ be an infinite cardinal. Let for all $\xi < \kappa$ and ξ -chain $K \subset P$ there exists a $p \in P \setminus K$ such that for all $q \in K, q \leq p$ (\mathcal{P} is closed under unions of chains of length $< \kappa$). If \mathcal{D} is a system of P -dense sets and $|\mathcal{D}| \leq \kappa$, then there exists a \mathcal{D} -generic set $G \subset P$.*

The following proposition is also clear:

PROPOSITION 2. — *We have:*

$$\binom{\alpha}{\beta} \rightarrow \binom{\gamma}{\delta},$$

iff for every family $(X_\nu : \nu < \beta)$ of subsets of α , there exists an $I \subset \beta$, $\text{type}(I) = \delta$ such that $\text{type}(\bigcap_{\nu \in I} X_\nu) \geq \gamma$ or $\text{type}(\bigcap_{\nu \in I} (\alpha - X_\nu)) \geq \gamma$.

3. Our main result is the following theorem, which generalizes results in [CH] and [WO 1].

THEOREM. — *Let κ be a singular, measurable limit cardinal. Then for any $\alpha < (\text{cf } \kappa)^+ \cdot \kappa$:*

$$\binom{\kappa}{\kappa^+} \rightarrow \binom{\kappa}{\alpha}$$

Proof. — Let κ be a singular measurable limit cardinal, $\text{cf } \kappa < \kappa$ and let $(\kappa_\nu : \nu < \text{cf } \kappa)$ be a monotonic strictly increasing sequence of measurable cardinals such that:

$$\text{cf } \kappa < \kappa_0 < \dots < \kappa_\nu < \dots < \kappa: \quad \nu < \kappa;$$

$$\lim_{\mu < \nu} \kappa_\mu < \kappa_\nu \quad \text{for any } \nu < \text{cf } \kappa$$

and:

$$\lim_{\nu < \text{cf } \kappa} \kappa_\nu = \kappa.$$

Let $\kappa = \bigcup_{\nu < \text{cf } \kappa} M_\nu$, where $M_\nu = \kappa_\nu$ for all $\nu < \text{cf } \kappa$. Let U_ν be a κ_ν -complete non-principal ultrafilter on M_ν for any $\nu < \text{cf } \kappa$ and \mathcal{D}_0 be an uniform ultrafilter on $\text{cf } \kappa$.

We define a product ultrafilter \mathcal{D} on κ :

$$\mathcal{D} = \{ X \subset \kappa : \{ \nu < \text{cf } \kappa : X \cap M_\nu \in U_\nu \} \in \mathcal{D}_0 \}.$$

Let $(X_\rho : \rho < \kappa^+)$ be an arbitrary family of subsets of κ . According to Proposition 2 it is necessary to show that there exists such an $I \subset \kappa^+$, type $(I) = \alpha$ that:

$$|\bigcap_{\zeta \in I} X_\zeta| = \kappa \quad \text{or} \quad |\bigcap_{\zeta \in I} (\kappa \setminus X_\zeta)| = \kappa.$$

As \mathcal{D} is an ultrafilter on κ ; we can suppose without loss of generality that:

$$E_0 = \{\zeta < \kappa^+ : X_\zeta \in \mathcal{D}\} \text{ has power } \kappa^+.$$

Thus for any $\zeta \in E_0$, $C_\zeta = \{\gamma < \text{cf } \kappa : X_\zeta \cap M_\gamma \in U_\gamma\} \in \mathcal{D}_0$ and so C_ζ has power $\text{cf } \kappa$ for any $\zeta \in E_0$. Because $2^{\text{cf } \kappa} < \kappa$, there exists such $E_1 \subset E_0$, $|E_1| = \kappa^+$ that for all $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 \in E_1$:

$$C_{\zeta_1} = C_{\zeta_2} = C, \quad |C| = \text{cf } \kappa.$$

We denote for simplicity $A = \bigcup_{\mu \in C} M_\mu$ and $Y_\zeta = X_\zeta \cap A$ for $\zeta \in E_1$. Without loss of generality we can suppose that $C = \text{cf } \kappa$. Thus:

$$(2) \quad A = \bigcup_{\mu < \text{cf } \kappa} M_\mu$$

and for all $\rho \in E_1$

$$(3) \quad Y_\zeta \subseteq A \text{ and } Y_\zeta \cap M_\nu \in U_\nu \text{ for all } \nu < \text{cf } \kappa, \text{ where } |E_1| = \kappa^+.$$

Let $w \subseteq A$ and $w \subseteq \bigcup_{\nu < \mu} M_\nu$ for some $\mu < \text{cf } \kappa$. We denote:

$$T_w = \{\zeta \in E_1 : w \subset Y_\zeta\}$$

and call w exceptional (symbolically, $w \in Ex$), if $|T_w| \leq \kappa$. Since κ is a strong limit cardinal, $\sum_{\alpha < \kappa} 2^\alpha = \kappa$, the number of all sets $w \subseteq \bigcup_{\nu < \mu} M_\nu$ for some $\mu < \text{cf } \kappa$, is at most κ .

Thus for:

$$E_2 = E_1 \setminus \bigcup_{w \in Ex} T_w,$$

we have:

$$|E_2| = \kappa^+.$$

We can assume without loss of generality that:

$$E_2 = \kappa^+.$$

In particular, if $w \subseteq A$ and w is bounded in κ and $w \subseteq Y_\zeta$ for some $\zeta < \kappa^+$, then w is not exceptional and $|\{\eta < \kappa^+ : w \subseteq Y_\eta\}| = \kappa^+$.

Now we define a forcing set $\mathcal{P} = (P; \leq)$. Let P be the set of all pairs $\tau = (C; D)$ such that:

(i) there exists such $\xi < \text{cf } \kappa$, that $\xi \geq 1$:

$$(4) \quad C \subset \bigcup_{\mu < \xi} M_\mu$$

and:

- (5) $|C \cap M_\mu| = \kappa_\mu$ for all $\mu < \xi$;
- (ii) $D \subseteq \kappa^+$;
- (iii) $C \subseteq \bigcap_{\zeta \in D} Y_\zeta$;
- (iv) $|D| \leq |C|$;
- (v) $M_0 \cap Y_0 \subseteq C$ and $O \in D$.

Because $M_0 \cap Y_0 \in U_0$, $|M_0 \cap Y_0| = \kappa_0$, C is infinite. By (iii) and (v), $C \subset Y_0$, so if $(C; D) \in P$, then C is not exceptional.

For $\tau_i = (C_i; D_i) \in P$ we put $\tau_0 \leq \tau_1$ iff $C_0 \subseteq C_1$, $D_0 \subseteq D_1$. Then $\mathcal{P} = \{P; \leq\}$ is a forcing set with a minimal element $(M_0 \cap Y_0; \{0\}) \in P$.

LEMMA 3. — *The set \mathcal{P} is closed under union of chains of length $< \text{cf } \kappa$.*

Proof of lemma 3. — Let $\{\tau_v : v < \xi\}$ be a chain in \mathcal{P} of length ξ , $\xi < \text{cf } \kappa$, i. e. $\tau_{v_1} \leq \tau_{v_2}$ for $v_1 \leq v_2 < \xi$.

Case 1: $\xi = \eta + 1$. So $\tau_\eta = (C; D)$ is the greatest element in the chain. There exists such an $\rho < \text{cf } \kappa$, $1 \leq \rho$, that $C \subseteq \bigcup_{\mu < \rho} M_\mu$ and $|C \cap M_\mu| = \kappa_\mu$ for all $\mu < \rho$ and $C \subseteq \bigcap_{\zeta \in D} Y_\zeta$. As C is not exceptional by definition of \mathcal{P} and $|D| < \kappa$, there exists such a $\zeta_0 \in \kappa^+ \setminus D$, that $C \subseteq Y_{\zeta_0}$. Then $(C; D \cup \{\zeta_0\})$ is an element of P and $(C; D) \leq (C; D \cup \{\zeta_0\})$, where $(C; D) \neq (C; D \cup \{\zeta_0\})$.

Case 2: ξ is a limit ordinal. If $\tau_v = (C_v; D_v) : v < \xi$, then $(\bigcup_{v < \xi} C_v; \bigcup_{v < \xi} D_v)$ belongs to P as $|\bigcup_{v < \xi} D_v| < \kappa$ for $|D_v| < \kappa : v < \xi$ and $\xi < \text{cf } \kappa$. For all $\mu < \xi$, $\tau_\mu \leq (\bigcup_{v < \xi} C; \bigcup_{v < \xi} D_v)$ and Lemma 3 is proved. \square

We shall now define a family of dense subsets of \mathcal{P} in order to apply Proposition 1.

We put for $\xi < \text{cf } \kappa$:

$$\Delta_\xi = \{(C; D) \in P : |C \cap M_\xi| = \kappa_\xi\}.$$

LEMMA 4. — *For any $\xi < \text{cf } \kappa$, Δ_ξ is dense in \mathcal{P} .*

Proof of lemma 4. — Let $\tau_0 = (C; D) \in P$ and $(C; D) \notin \Delta_\xi$. Then there exists an $\eta \leq \xi$ such that $C \subseteq \bigcup_{\mu < \eta} M_\mu$ and since $|D| \leq |C|$, $|D| \leq \sum_{\mu < \eta} \kappa_\mu < \kappa$. Because $Y_\zeta \cap M_\rho \in U_\rho$ for all $\zeta \in D$, $\eta \leq \rho \leq \xi$ and all U_ρ are κ_η -complete and uniform on $M_\rho : \eta \leq \rho \leq \xi$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{\zeta \in D} (Y_\zeta \cap M_\rho) &\in U_\rho, & \eta \leq \rho \leq \xi, \\ \bigcap_{\zeta \in D} (Y_\zeta \cap M_\rho) &| = \kappa_\rho & \text{for } \eta \leq \rho \leq \xi. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\tau_1 = (C \cup (\bigcap_{\zeta \in D} Y_\zeta \cap (\bigcup_{\eta \in \rho \leq \xi} M_\rho)), D)$ belongs to P and $\tau_1 \in \Delta_\xi$ by construction. Also $\tau_0 = (C; D) \leq \tau_1$ and Δ_ξ is dense. \square

Let's take a sequence $(\alpha_\lambda : \lambda < \kappa^+)$ such that $\alpha_\lambda \in \{\kappa_\nu : \nu < \text{cf } \kappa\}$ and each κ_ν has κ^+ many appearances in the sequence $(\alpha_\lambda : \lambda < \kappa^+)$.

LEMMA 5. — *There exists a sequence $(\xi_\lambda : \lambda < \kappa^+)$ of elements κ^+ , such that the sets:*

$$\nabla_\lambda = \{(C; D) \in P : |D \cap \{\zeta : \xi_\lambda \leq \zeta < \xi_{\lambda+1}\}| \geq \alpha_\lambda\}$$

are dense in \mathcal{P} for all $\lambda < \kappa^+$.

Proof of lemma 5. — Let $\xi_0 < \kappa^+$ be arbitrary. We shall construct the sequence $(\xi_\lambda : \lambda < \kappa^+)$ by induction.

Suppose that we have constructed $(\xi_\lambda : \lambda \leq \delta)$ for $\delta < \kappa^+$ such that all $\nabla_\zeta : \zeta < \delta$ are dense in \mathcal{P} . Let us suppose however that there are no $\xi_{\delta+1}$ such that ∇_δ is dense in \mathcal{P} . Then for any $\beta > \xi_\delta$, $\beta < \kappa^+$, there is $\tau_\beta = (C_\beta; D_\beta) \in P$ such that τ_β is not extended by a member of ∇_δ , where (in definition of ∇_δ) we put $\xi_{\delta+1} = \beta$.

For each $C_\beta : \xi_\delta < \beta < \kappa^+$ there exists an $\eta < \text{cf } \kappa$ with $C_\beta \subseteq \bigcup_{\mu < \eta} M_\mu$. Because κ is a strong limit, $\sum_{\alpha < \kappa} 2^\alpha \leq \kappa$, we can find $E \subset \kappa^+$, $|E| = \kappa^+$ with:

$$(6) \quad C_{\beta_1} = C_{\beta_2} = C \quad \text{for all } \beta_1, \beta_2 \in E.$$

Case 1: Let $|C| \geq \alpha_\delta$. Since C is not an exceptional set (by (6) and definition of P), $|\{\zeta > \xi_\delta : C \subseteq Y_\zeta\}| = \kappa^+$. Let us take $M \subseteq \kappa^+$ with:

$$M \subseteq \{\zeta > \xi_\delta : C \subseteq Y_\zeta\} \quad \text{and} \quad |M| = \alpha_\delta.$$

Then we take $\beta \in E$ such that $\beta > M$, i. e. for any $\zeta \in M$, $\beta > \zeta$. We obtain by $|C| \geq \alpha_\delta$:

$$|D_\beta \cup M| \leq |C_\beta| + \alpha_\delta = |C| + \alpha_\delta = |C|;$$

and by our choice of M :

$$C \subseteq \bigcap_{\zeta \in (D_\beta \cup M)} Y_\zeta.$$

In other words, $(C; D_\beta \cup M) \in P$. Further, for $C_\beta = C : \beta \in E$, we have $\tau_\beta \leq (C; D_\beta \cup M)$. But $(C; D_\beta \cup M) \in \nabla_\delta$, where we put $\xi_{\delta+1} = \beta$, and so we come to a contradiction.

Case 2: $|C| < \alpha_{\delta}$, where $\alpha_{\delta} = \kappa_v$. Let ρ be the least ordinal with $|C| < \kappa_{\rho}$; $\rho \leq v$.

Let $\beta_0 \in E$ be arbitrary; since $|D_{\beta_0}| \leq |C|$ and $C \subseteq \bigcup_{\mu < \rho} M_{\mu}$, $|D_{\beta_0}| \leq \sum_{\mu < \rho} \kappa_{\mu} < \kappa_{\rho}$. Consequently, if:

$$C_1 := \bigcup_{\rho \leq \mu \leq v} \bigcap_{\xi \in D_{\beta_0}} (M_{\mu} \cap Y_{\xi}),$$

then $C \cup C_1$ is not exceptional as $C \cup C_1 = C_{\beta_0} \cup C_1 \in Y_{\xi}$ for any $\xi \in D_{\beta_0}$. From this it follows that:

$$|\{\zeta > \xi_{\delta} : C \cup C_1 \subseteq Y_{\zeta}\}| = \kappa^+;$$

we choose $M \subseteq \{\zeta > \xi_{\delta} : C \cup C_1 \subseteq Y_{\zeta}\}$; $|M| = \kappa_v = \alpha_{\delta}$ and $\beta \in E$ with $\beta > M$.

From $|D_{\beta}| \leq |C|$ it follows $|D_{\beta}| < \kappa_{\rho}$ and $\bigcap_{\zeta \in D_{\beta}} (M_{\mu} \cap Y_{\zeta}) \in U_{\mu}$ for all μ , $\rho \leq \mu \leq v$. Then by definition of C_1 , $(M_{\mu} \cap C_1) \in U_{\mu}$ $\rho \leq \mu \leq v$. We put:

$$D_2 = D_{\beta} \cup M; \quad C_2 = C \cup \bigcup_{\rho \leq \mu \leq v} \bigcap_{\xi \in D_{\beta}} (M_{\mu} \cap Y_{\xi} \cap C_1).$$

In these notations, $|D_2| \leq \kappa_v \leq |C_2|$ and $C_2 \subseteq \bigcap_{\zeta \in D_2} Y_{\zeta}$ and $(C_{\beta}; D_{\beta}) \leq (C_2; D_2)$. But $|D_2 \cap \{\zeta : \zeta_{\delta} \leq \zeta < \beta\}| = \kappa_v$ and this contradicts the construction of $\tau_{\beta} = (C_{\beta}; D_{\beta})$. Lemma 5 is proved. \square

Now we can prove our theorem. Let $\alpha < (\text{cf } \kappa)^+ \cdot \kappa$; then there is a sequence sum $\sum_{i \in I} \xi_{\lambda_i} \geq \alpha$.

We consider the following family:

$$\mathcal{D} = \{ \Delta_{\xi} : \xi < \text{cf } \kappa \} \cup \{ \nabla_{\lambda_i} : i \in I \},$$

of $\text{cf } \kappa$ dense subsets of \mathcal{P} .

By Proposition 1 there exists a \mathcal{D} -generic set $G \subset P$. We put:

$$I = \bigcup \text{rg } G = \bigcup \{ D : (C; D) \in G \};$$

$$J = \bigcup \text{dom } G = \bigcup \{ C : (C; D) \in G \}.$$

Then $I < \kappa^+$, $\text{typ } (I) \geq \alpha$; $J < \kappa$, $|J| = \kappa$ and by Proposition 2, the theorem is proved.

REFERENCES

[CH] CHOODNOWSKY (G.). — Combinatorial properties of compact cardinals in *Infinite and finite sets*, Keszthely, 1972, North-Holland, pp. 289-306.

- [EHR] ERDŐS, HAJNAL, RADO. — Partition relations for cardinal numbers, *Acta Math.*, *Acad. sc. hung.*, vol. 16, pp. 93-196.
- [DR] DRAKE (F.). — *Set theory*, North-Holland.
- [WO 1] WOLFSDORF (K.). — *Notices on polarised partition relations* (unpublished).
- [WO 2] WOLFSDORF (K.). — Der Beweis eines Satzes von G. Chodnowsky, *Arch. math Logik*, vol. 20, 1980, pp. 161-171.
- [PR] PRIKRY (K.). — On a problem of Erdős, Hajnal and Rado, *Discr. Math.*, vol. 2, pp. 51-59.