

Lajos Soukup

On  $\omega^2$ -saturated families

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 32 (1991), No. 2, 355--359

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/116976>

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1991

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



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

## On $\omega^2$ -saturated families

LAJOS SOUKUP

*Abstract.* If there is no inner model with measurable cardinals, then for each cardinal  $\lambda$  there is an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$  of countable subsets of  $\lambda$  such that every subset of  $\lambda$  with order type  $\geq \omega^2$  contains an element of  $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ .

*Keywords:* almost disjoint, saturated family, refinement, large cardinals

*Classification:* 03E35

### 1. Introduction.

In this paper we use the standard set-theoretical notation throughout, cf. [7]. The usual ordering of ordinals will be denoted by  $<_{\text{On}}$ . For  $A \subset \text{On}$ , write  $\text{tp}(A)$  for the order type of  $\langle A, <_{\text{On}} \rangle$ .

Given a set  $X \subset \text{On}$  and an ordinal  $\alpha$ , take  $[X]^\alpha = \{a \subset X : |a| = |\alpha|\}$  and  $(X)^\alpha = \{a \subset X : \text{tp}(a) = \alpha\}$ . For  $\mathcal{A} \subset [X]^\omega$  and  $Y \subset X$ , let

$$I_{\mathcal{A}} = \{a \subset X : |a \setminus \cup \mathcal{C}| < \omega \text{ for some finite } \mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{A}\}$$

and  $I_{Y, \mathcal{A}}^+ = [Y]^\omega \setminus I_{\mathcal{A}}$ .

An almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A} \subset [X]^\omega$  is called  $\omega^2$ -saturated (saturated) for  $Y \subset X$ , iff for each  $b \in (Y)^\omega$  ( $b \in I_{Y, \mathcal{A}}^+$ ) there is an  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $a \subset b$ .

Let  $S_2(\alpha)$  ( $S(\alpha)$ ) mean that “there exists an almost disjoint,  $\omega^2$ -saturated (saturated) family on  $\alpha$ ”. For an ordinal  $\beta$ , take

$$\text{cov}([\beta]^\omega) = \min\{|\mathcal{B}| : \mathcal{B} \subset [\beta]^\omega \text{ and } \forall a \in [\beta]^\omega \exists b \in \mathcal{B} a \subset b\}.$$

In [5], the following problem was raised: for what cardinals  $\lambda$  is there an almost disjoint family of countable subsets of  $\lambda$  which refines  $[\lambda]^{\omega_1}$ ? B. Balcar, J. Dočkálková and P. Simon [1] showed  $S_2(\kappa)$  for  $\kappa < (2^\omega)^{+\omega}$ . P. Komjath [8] proved that if  $V=L$ , then for each  $\lambda < \aleph_{\omega_1}$  there is an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{A} \subset [\lambda]^\omega$  that refines  $[\lambda]^{\omega_1}$ . A. Hajnal, I. Juhász and L. Soukup [6] showed that if one adds  $\omega_1$  dominating reals to the ground model iteratedly, then in the generic extension  $S(\kappa)$  holds for each  $\kappa$ . M. Goldstern, H. Judah and S. Shelah proved that if  $S(\omega)$ ,  $\lambda^\omega = \lambda^+$  and  $\square_\lambda$  for each singular cardinal  $\lambda$  with cofinality  $\omega$ , then  $S(\alpha)$  for each  $\alpha$ . The author of the present paper noticed that  $\lambda^\omega = \lambda^+$  can be replaced by the assumption  $\text{cov}([\lambda]^\omega) = \lambda^+$  in their proof, see [4]. Using their technique, we prove the following result.

---

The preparation of this paper was supported by Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research grant no. 1805

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume that  $\square_\lambda$  holds and  $\text{cov}([\lambda]^\omega) = \lambda^+$  for each singular cardinal  $\lambda$  with cofinality  $\omega$ . Then  $S_2(\kappa)$  holds for each  $\kappa$ .*

Although it is still unknown whether one can prove  $S(\kappa)$  or  $S_2(\kappa)$  for each  $\kappa$  in ZFC, this theorem shows that the failure of  $S_2(\kappa)$  for some  $\kappa$  is a large cardinal assumption: it demands the failure of the covering lemma for  $K$ .

**2. Proof of the theorem.**

Given a set  $X$  of cardinality  $\lambda$  and a sequence  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\} \subset [X]^\omega$ , a family  $\langle A_\alpha^k : k < \omega, \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  is called  $\langle X, \mathcal{X} \rangle$ -nice iff conditions (A)–(E) below hold:

- (A)  $A_\alpha^k \subset X, |A_\alpha^k| < \lambda,$
- (B)  $A_\alpha^k \subset A_\alpha^{k+1}, \bigcup_{k \in \omega} A_\alpha^k = X,$
- (C)  $\forall \alpha < \beta \exists k_{\alpha, \beta} \forall k \geq k_{\alpha, \beta} A_\alpha^k \subset A_\beta^k,$
- (D)  $x_\alpha \in A_{\alpha+1}^0,$
- (E) if  $\text{cf}(\alpha) > \omega$ , then

$$\bigcup_k [A_\alpha^k]^\omega \subset \bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} \bigcup_l [A_\gamma^l]^\omega.$$

**Lemma 2.1.** *Given a set  $X$  of cardinality  $\lambda > \text{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$  and a sequence  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+\} \subset [X]^\omega$ , if  $\square_\lambda$  holds, then there is an  $\langle X, \mathcal{X} \rangle$ -nice family.*

PROOF: It was proved in [4]. Since the property (E) was not explicitly claimed and to make this note self-contained, we give a proof.

Let  $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  be a  $\square_\lambda$ -sequence, fix an increasing sequence of cardinals,  $\langle \lambda_k : k < \omega \rangle$ , which is cofinal in  $\lambda$  and write  $X = \{\xi_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ .

We will construct the family  $\langle A_\alpha^k : k < \omega, \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  by induction on  $\alpha$ .

Take  $A_0^k = \{\xi_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_k\}$ . Assume  $\langle A_\gamma^k : k < \omega, \gamma < \alpha \rangle$  is constructed.

If  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ , then put  $A_\alpha^k = A_\beta^k \cup x_\beta$ .

If  $\alpha$  is limit, then take  $C_\alpha^* = C'_\alpha \cup (C_\alpha \setminus \sup C'_\alpha)$ , where  $C'_\alpha$  is the set of limit points of  $C_\alpha$ , pick  $l_\alpha \in \omega$  with  $|C'_\alpha| \leq \lambda_{l_\alpha}$  and put

$$A_\alpha^k = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } k < l_\alpha, \\ \bigcup_{\gamma \in C_\alpha^*} A_\gamma^k & \text{if } k \geq l_\alpha. \end{cases}$$

By induction on  $\alpha$ , it is straightforward that  $|A_\alpha^k| \leq \lambda_k$  and the family  $\langle A_\alpha^k : k < \omega, \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$  satisfies (A)–(E). □

**Lemma 2.2.** *Assume that  $X \subset \text{On}$ ,  $X \subset \bigcup_n A_n$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \subset \bigcup_n [A_n]^\omega$  is an almost disjoint family which is  $\omega^2$ -saturated for all  $A_n$ . If  $S_2(\text{tp}(X))$ , then there is an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{B} \supset \mathcal{A}$  with  $\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{A} \subset [X]^\omega$  such that  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $X$ .*

PROOF: Since  $\omega^2$  cannot be the sum of finitely many smaller ordinals, the family  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $\bigcup_{m \leq n} A_m$  and so we can assume that

$$A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_n \subset \dots$$

Fix an almost disjoint family  $\mathcal{C} \subset (X)^\omega$  witnessing  $S_2(\text{tp}(X))$  and take  $\mathcal{D} = \{c \in \mathcal{C} : |n : c \cap (A_{n+1} \setminus A_n) \neq \emptyset| = \omega\}$ . For  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , pick a set  $d^* \in [d]^\omega$  with  $|d^* \cap A_n| < \omega$  for each  $n < \omega$ . Put  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A} \cup \{d^* : d \in \mathcal{D}\}$ .

First let us observe that  $\mathcal{B}$  is almost disjoint. Indeed, if  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , then there is an  $n$  with  $a \subset A_n$ , so for each  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , we have  $|a \cap d^*| \leq |A_n \cap d^*| < \omega$ .

To show that  $\mathcal{B}$  is  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $X$ , consider a  $Y \in (X)^{\omega^2}$  and we will find a  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  with  $b \subset Y$ .

Write  $Y = \bigcup_m Y_m$ , where  $Y_0 <_{\text{rm } \text{on}} Y_1 <_{\text{on}} \dots <_{\text{on}} Y_m <_{\text{on}} \dots$  and  $\text{tp}(Y_m) = \omega$ .

Put  $Z_m = \bigcup_{l \leq m} Y_l$ .

Let  $n \in \omega$ . If  $\text{tp}(Y \cap A_n) = \omega^2$ , then there is an  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $a \subset Y$ . So we can assume that  $\text{tp}(Y \cap A_n) < \omega^2$ . Thus we can choose a natural number  $f(n) \geq n$  such that  $Y_m \cap A_n$  is finite for each  $m \geq f(n)$ .

Put

$$Y^* = Y \setminus \bigcup \{Y_m \cap A_n : m, n \in \omega, m \geq f(n)\}.$$

Then  $Y_m \setminus Y^* = \bigcup_{m \geq f(n)} (Y_m \cap A_n)$  is finite. So  $\text{tp}(Y^* \cap Y_m) = \omega$  and  $\text{tp}(Y^*) = \omega^2$ .

On the other hand,  $Y^* \cap A_n \subset \bigcup_{m < f(n)} Y_m \subset Z_{f(n)}$ .

We will choose  $c_k \in \mathcal{C}$  and  $m_k \in \omega$  by induction on  $k$  such that  $c_k \subset (Y^* \setminus Z_{m_{k-1}}) \cap Z_{m_k}$ . To simplify our notation, put  $m_{-1} = -1$  and  $Z_{-1} = \emptyset$ . If  $m_{k-1}$  is chosen, pick a  $c_k \in \mathcal{C} \cap (Y^* \setminus Z_{m_{k-1}})^\omega$ . If  $c_k \in \mathcal{D}$ , then  $c_k^* \in \mathcal{B} \cap (Y)^\omega$ , and so we are done. Thus we can assume that  $c_k \notin \mathcal{D}$ . So there is an  $n$  with  $c_k \subset A_n$ . Taking  $m_k = f(n)$ , it follows that  $c_k \subset Y^* \cap A_n \subset Z_{f(n)} = Z_{m_k}$ . So the inductive step can be carried out.

After constructing the sequence  $\{c_k : k < \omega\}$ , fix for each  $k \in \omega$  a partition  $(c_k^0, c_k^1)$  of  $c_k$  into infinite pieces and take  $W = \bigcup_k c_k^0$ . Since  $W \in (X)^{\omega^2}$ , there is a  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  with  $c \subset W$ . If  $c \notin \mathcal{D}$ , then there were an  $n$  with  $c \subset A_n$ . Thus  $c \subset Y^* \cap A_n \subset Z_{f(n)}$ . Hence  $c \subset \bigcup_{m_k \leq f(n)} c_k^0$  and so  $c \cap c_k$  is infinite for some  $k$ . But

$c \neq c_k$  because  $c \cap c_k^1 = \emptyset$ . But it is a contradiction, because  $\mathcal{C}$  is almost disjoint. Thus  $c \in \mathcal{D}$  and  $c^* \in \mathcal{B} \cap (Y)^\omega$ , which proves that  $\mathcal{B}$  is really  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $X$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Assume that  $\lambda$  is a singular cardinal with cofinality  $\omega$ ,  $\square_\lambda$  holds and  $\text{cov}([\lambda]^\omega) = \lambda^+$ . If  $S_2(\alpha)$  for each  $\alpha < \lambda$ , then  $S_2(\beta)$  for each  $\beta < \lambda^+$ .*

PROOF: Let  $\lambda \leq \beta < \lambda^+$  and fix a sequence  $\mathcal{X} = \{x_\nu : \nu < \lambda^+\} \subset [\beta]^\omega$  witnessing  $\text{cov}([\beta]^\omega) = \lambda^+$ .

By Lemma 2.1, there is a  $\langle \beta, \mathcal{X} \rangle$ -nice family  $\langle A_\alpha^k : k < \omega, \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle \subset [\beta]^{<\lambda}$ . By induction on  $\nu < \lambda^+$ , we will define almost disjoint families  $\mathcal{A}_\nu \subset (\beta)^\omega$  such that

- (i)  $\mathcal{A}_\nu \subset \bigcup_k (A_\nu^k)^\omega$ ,
- (ii)  $\mathcal{A}_\mu \subset \mathcal{A}_\nu$  for  $\mu < \nu$ ,
- (iii)  $\mathcal{A}_\nu$  is  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $A_\nu^k$  for each  $k \in \omega$ .

To simplify our notation, write  $A_\nu^{-1} = \emptyset$  and  $X_\alpha^k = A_\alpha^k \setminus A_\alpha^{k-1}$ .

**Case 1.**  $\nu = 0$ .

Choose almost disjoint,  $\omega^2$ -saturated families  $\mathcal{A}_{0,k} \subset (X_0^k)^\omega$  for each  $k \in \omega$  and take  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \bigcup_k \mathcal{A}_{0,k}$ .

**Case 2.**  $\nu = \mu + 1$ .

For each  $k \in \omega$ , apply Lemma 2.2 taking  $X_\nu^k$  as  $X$ ,  $A_\mu^n$  as  $A_n$  for each  $n \in \omega$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\mu$  as  $\mathcal{A}$  to get the family  $\mathcal{A}_{\nu,k}$  which is  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $X_\nu^k$ . Put  $\mathcal{A}_\nu = \bigcup_k \mathcal{A}_{\nu,k}$ .

By (C),  $\mathcal{A}_\nu \subset \bigcup_k (A_\nu^k)^\omega$ .

**Case 3.**  $\nu$  is a limit ordinal with cofinality  $\omega$ .

Fix an increasing, cofinal sequence of ordinals  $\{\nu_i : i < \omega\}$  in  $\nu$ . Take  $\mathcal{A}' = \bigcup_{\mu < \nu} \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . Let  $\{A'_n : n \in \omega\}$  be an enumeration of  $\{A_{\nu_i}^k : i, k \in \omega\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A} \subset \bigcup_n (A'_n)^\omega$  by (C). For each  $k \in \omega$ , apply Lemma 2.2 taking  $X_\nu^k$  as  $X$ ,  $A'_n$  as  $A_n$  for each  $n \in \omega$  and  $\mathcal{A}'$  as  $\mathcal{A}$  to get the family  $\mathcal{A}_{\nu,k}$  which is  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $X_\nu^k$ . Take  $\mathcal{A}_\nu = \bigcup_k \mathcal{A}_{\nu,k}$ .

**Case 4.**  $\nu$  is limit with uncountable cofinality.

Simply take  $\mathcal{A}_\nu = \bigcup_{\mu < \nu} \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . It works by (E).

The inductive construction is done. Put  $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{\nu < \lambda^+} \mathcal{A}_\nu$ . It is obviously almost disjoint and  $\omega^2$ -saturated for  $\beta$  by (D). So  $S_2(\beta)$  is proved. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1: We will prove  $S_2(\beta)$  by induction on  $\beta$ . If  $\beta < (2^\omega)^{+\omega}$ , then  $S_2(\beta)$  holds by [1].

Assume now that we know  $S_2(\alpha)$  for each  $\alpha < \beta$ . Let  $\kappa = |\beta|$  and write  $\beta = \{x_\mu : \mu < \kappa\}$ . Let  $X_\nu = \{x_\mu : \mu < \nu\}$  for  $\nu \leq \kappa$ . We will define almost disjoint,  $\omega^2$ -saturated families  $\mathcal{A}_\nu \subset (X_\nu)^\omega$  for  $\nu \leq \kappa$  such that  $\mathcal{A}_\mu \subset \mathcal{A}_\nu$  whenever  $\mu < \nu$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_0 = \emptyset$ . If  $\nu = \mu + 1$ , put  $\mathcal{A}_\nu = \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . If  $\nu$  is limit, then take  $\mathcal{A}_\nu^* = \bigcup_{\mu < \nu} \mathcal{A}_\mu$ . If  $\text{cf}(\nu) > \omega$ , then  $\mathcal{A}_\nu = \mathcal{A}_\nu^*$  is  $\omega^2$ -saturated. If  $\text{cf}(\nu) = \omega$  then we can apply Lemma 2.2

to get an  $\omega^2$ -saturated extension  $\mathcal{A}_\nu$  of  $\mathcal{A}_\nu^*$  provided  $S_2(\text{tp}(X_\nu))$  holds. But this holds by the induction hypothesis for  $\nu < \kappa$  and by Lemma 2.3 for  $\nu = \kappa$ . So  $\mathcal{A}_\kappa$  is an  $\omega^2$ -saturated family on  $\beta$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Balcar B., Dočkálková J., Simon P., *Almost disjoint families of countable sets*, in Proc. Coll. Soc. J. Bolyai 37, FINITE AND INFINITE SETS, Eger, 1981, vol I.
- [2] Erdős P., Hajnal A., *Unsolved problems in set theory*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math., vol. 13, part 1, Am. Math. Soc., R. I. 1971, 17–48.
- [3] Erdős P., Hajnal A., *Unsolved and solved problems in set theory*, Proc Symp. Pure Math., vol. 25, Am. Math. Soc., R. I. 1971, 269–287.
- [4] Goldstern M., Judah H., Shelah S., *Saturated families, and more on regular spaces omitting cardinals*, preprint.
- [5] Hajnal A., *Some results and problem on set theory*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. **11** (1960), 277–298.
- [6] Hajnal A., Juhász I., Soukup L., *On saturated almost disjoint families*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae **28** (1987), 629–633.
- [7] Jech T., *Set Theory*, Academic Press, New York, 1978.
- [8] Komáth P., *Dense systems of almost disjoint sets*, in Proc. Coll. Soc. J. Bolyai 37, FINITE AND INFINITE SETS, Eger, 1981, vol I.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE OF THE HUNGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, BUDAPEST V. KER,  
REÁLTANODA UTCA, 13–15, H–1053, HUNGARY

(Received December 14, 1990)