

Bohdan Aniszczyk

Two-valued measure need not be purely  $\aleph_0$ -compact

*Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae*, Vol. 23 (1982), No. 1, 167--171

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/106141>

## Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1982

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>

**TWO-VALUED MEASURE NEED NOT BE PURELY  $\mathfrak{K}_0$ -COMPACT**  
Bohdan ANISZCZYK

**Abstract:** The conjecture of Z. Frolík and J. Pahl ([2]) stated in the title is true (purely  $\mathfrak{K}_0$ -compact measures were introduced in [2]).

**Key words:** Purely  $\mathfrak{K}_0$ -compact measure.

**Classification:** 28A12

This note is closely related to the paper "Pure measures" by Z. Frolík and J. Pahl ([2]). We answer in the affirmative the conjecture stated there [2, 4, 2(c)] and in the title of this note. For the definition of a purely  $\mathfrak{K}_0$ -compact measure see the above mentioned paper. Our measure will be defined on a special  $\sigma$ -algebra, we call it  $\mathfrak{B}(I)$ , and we will describe it now.

Let  $I$  be any index set. For  $J \subseteq I$ ,  $p_J$  denotes a canonical projection of  $\{0,1\}^I$  onto  $\{0,1\}^J$ .  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the family of sets  $\{p_{\{i\}}^{-1}(1) : i \in I\}$ . Let  $X(J) \subseteq \{0,1\}^J$  be the set of points all but finitely many coordinates of which are zero. Put  $\mathfrak{B}(I) = \{A \cap X(I) : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ .

The following properties of  $\mathfrak{B}(I)$  are easily established. For any set  $B \in \mathfrak{B}(I)$  there are a countable set  $J(B) \subseteq I$  and a set  $B \subseteq X(J(B))$  such that  $B = p_{J(B)}^{-1}(B) \cap X(I)$ . If two points  $x, y \in X(I)$  are different only on coordinates not in  $J(B)$  then

either  $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{B}$ , or  $\{x, y\} \cap B = \emptyset$ .

Two further properties of  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  are a little less obvious.

- (i) Any  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by a countable subfamily of  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  has countable many atoms.
- (ii)  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  satisfies the continuum chain condition (i.e. any family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(I)$  of nonempty pairwise disjoint sets has cardinality at most continuum - the cardinality of the real line).

Proof. (i) Let  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(I)$  be the smallest  $\sigma$ -algebra containing a family  $\{C_1, C_2, \dots\} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(I)$ . Let  $A_i = p_{\{i\}}^{-1}(1)$ , and  $\mathcal{D}$  be a  $\sigma$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{A}$  generated by a family  $\{A_i : i \in J\}$ , where  $J = J(C_1) \cup J(C_2) \cup \dots$ .  $J$  is countable. Any atom of  $\mathcal{D}$  is of the form

$$\bigcap \{A_i : i \in K\} \cap \bigcap \{1 - A_i : i \in J - K\},$$

for some  $K \subseteq J$ . Only countably many of these are not disjoint with  $X(I)$  (those with  $K$  finite), so the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{D} \cap X(I) = \{D \cap X(I) : D \in \mathcal{D}\}$  on  $X(I)$  has only countably many atoms.  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $\sigma$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{D} \cap X(I)$ , then it has only countably many atoms, too.

(ii) Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(I)$  be a family of nonempty pairwise disjoint sets. For any  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  take the set  $A(B) = p_{J(B)}^{-1}(p_{J(B)}(B))$ .  $A(B)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{G} = \{A(B) : B \in \mathcal{F}\}$  is a family of nonempty pairwise disjoint sets (if  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ , then  $p_J(B_1) \cap p_J(B_2) = \emptyset$ , where  $J = J(B_1) \cap J(B_2)$ , and  $p_J^{-1}(p_J(B_i)) \supseteq A(B_i)$ ,  $i=1,2$ ). But for  $\mathcal{A}$  it is known that it satisfies the continuum chain condition

[1, Theorem 3.13]. This ends the proof.

We say that a measure  $\mu$  defined on  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  is given by a point if there is  $x \in X(I)$  such that  $\mu(B) = 1$  in case  $x \in B$  and  $\mu(B) = 0$  otherwise.

Let  $x_0$  denote a point each coordinate of which is zero.

The answer to the above mentioned Frolík-Pachl conjecture is given in the following

**Proposition.** If  $\text{card}(I) > 2^c$ , where  $c$  stands for the continuum, then the measure  $\mu$  defined on  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  by the point  $x_0$  is not purely  $\mathcal{K}_0$ -compact.

**Proof.** Assume, a contrario, that  $\mu$  is purely  $\mathcal{K}_0$ -compact. There is an  $\mathcal{K}_0$ -compact algebra  $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(I)$  satisfying

$$(1) \quad \mu(B) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(R_i) : \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} R_i \supseteq B, R_i \in \mathcal{R} \right\} \text{ for } B \in \mathcal{B}(I).$$

Put

$$\mathcal{R}_0 = \{R \in \mathcal{R} - \{\emptyset\} : (R_1 \subseteq R, R_2 \in \mathcal{R} \text{ imply } R = R_1 \text{ or } R_1 = \emptyset)\}.$$

$\mathcal{R}_0$  contains pairwise disjoint nonempty sets, hence by (ii) is of cardinality at most  $c$ .

**Claim.** For any  $R \in \mathcal{R} - \{\emptyset\}$  there is  $R_0 \in \mathcal{R}_0$ ,  $R_0 \subseteq R$ .  
Suppose not. There is a set  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $R$  and all its nonempty subsets belonging to  $\mathcal{R}$  can be divided into two nonempty sets contained in  $\mathcal{R}$ . Let  $R(0), R(1) \in \mathcal{R} - \{\emptyset\}$  be two disjoint sets such that  $R = R(0) \cup R(1)$ . If we have a family  $\{R(e_1, \dots, e_i) : e_1, \dots, e_i \in \{0, 1\}, i=1, \dots, N\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  satisfying

$$(2) \quad \begin{cases} R(e_1, \dots, e_i, 0) \cap R(e_1, \dots, e_i, 1) = \emptyset \\ R(e_1, \dots, e_i, 0) \cup R(e_1, \dots, e_i, 1) = R(e_1, \dots, e_i) \end{cases}$$

for  $i < N$ , then in each set  $R(e_1, \dots, e_N)$  we can find two its subsets  $R(e_1, \dots, e_N, 0), R(e_1, \dots, e_N, 1) \in \mathcal{R} - \{\emptyset\}$  disjoint and with sum equal to  $R(e_1, \dots, e_N)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by a family  $\{R(e_1, \dots, e_i) : e_1, \dots, e_i \in \{0, 1\}, i = 1, 2, \dots\} \subseteq \mathcal{R} - \{\emptyset\}$  satisfying (2).  $\mathcal{C}$  is obviously countably generated. Any sequence  $e_1, e_2, \dots$  where  $e_i \in \{0, 1\}$ , defines an atom of  $\mathcal{C}$  - namely  $\bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} R(e_1, \dots, e_i)$  - nonempty because of compactness of  $\mathcal{R}$ . So  $\mathcal{C}$  has uncountably many atoms which contradicts (i). This contradiction proves the claim.

With each set  $R \in \mathcal{R}$  we can associate a family  $\{R_i \in \mathcal{R}_0 : R_0 \subseteq R\}$ . By the claim different sets have different families, then there are at most  $2^c$  many sets in  $\mathcal{R}$ . While for any set  $B$  in  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  the set  $J(B)$  is countable, the set  $J = \bigcup \{J(R) : R \in \mathcal{R}\}$  has cardinality at most  $2^c$ . For any  $i \in I$   $\mu(B(i)) = 0$ , where  $B(i)$  is the set of points whose  $i$ -th coordinate is equal to 1. By (1) there is a countable family  $\mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \mathcal{R}$  which covers  $B(i)$  and does not cover the point  $x_0$ . There is a set  $R_i \in \mathcal{R}_i$  containing a point  $x_i$ , the point which differs from  $x_0$  only on the  $i$ -th coordinate. Hence  $i$  must belong to  $J(R_i)$ , and then  $I = J$ . This implies  $\text{card}(I) \leq 2^c$ . This contradiction with assumption of proposition ends the proof.

**Remarks.** A little modification is needed to show that the proposition is true for any measure on  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  defined by a point. It may be shown that any 0-1 measure on  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  is defined by a point. Property (i) implies that any measure on  $\mathcal{B}(I)$  is at most countable sum of two-valued measures, so everyone is pure ([2, Lemma 2.2]) and hence  $\mu_0$ -compact

([3, Corollary 4]) but none is purely  $\mathcal{K}_0$ -compact.

R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] W.W. COMFORT, S. NEGREPONTIS: The theory of ultrafilters, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, Springer 1974.
- [2] Z. FROLÍK, J. PACHL: Pure measures, Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae 14(1973), 279-293.
- [3] J. PACHL: Every weakly compact probability is compact, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci., Sér. Math. Astronom. Phys.23(1975), 401-405.

Instytut Matematyki Politechniki Wrocławskiej, 50-370 Wrocław, Polska

(Oblatum 14.8. 1981)