

# Resolvability and almost resolvability

István Juhász

-

[juhasz@renyi.hu](mailto:juhasz@renyi.hu)

Kunen Fest

April 3, 2009

## BASIC DEFINITIONS:

$X$  is  $\kappa$ -**resolvable** iff  $\exists \kappa$  disjoint dense sets in  $X$

$X$  is **maximally resolvable** iff  $X$  is  $\Delta(X)$ -resolvable, where

$$\Delta(X) = \min\{|G| : G \neq \emptyset \text{ open in } X\}$$

$\kappa$ -**irresolvable**  $\equiv$  not  $\kappa$ -resolvable

$X$  is **almost  $\kappa$ -resolvable** iff  $\exists \kappa$  almost disjoint dense sets in  $X$  w.r.t.  $\mathcal{N}(X) =$  ideal of nwd subsets of  $X$

CLASSICAL, “EASY” RESULTS:

– **COMPACT, METRIC**, and **ORDERED** spaces are MAXIMALLY RESOLVABLE

Proofs are “elementary”: use BERNSTEIN’s thm

– There is a **COUNTABLE** crowded  $T_3$  space that is (2-)IRRESOLVABLE

PROOF: take a maximal crowded  $T_3$  extension of  $\tau_{\mathbb{Q}}$

## I. SEPARATION OF RESOLVABILITY PROPERTIES

DEFINITION. Fix a family  $\mathcal{D}$  of dense subsets of  $X$ .  $M \subset X$  is a  $\mathcal{D}$ -**mosaic** iff there is a maximal disjoint  $\mathcal{V} \subset \tau(X)$  and for each  $V \in \mathcal{V}$  there is  $D_V \in \mathcal{D}$  with

$$M = \cup\{V \cap D_V : V \in \mathcal{V}\}$$

Every  $\mathcal{D}$ -mosaic is dense.

$X$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -**forced** iff every dense subset of  $X$  includes a  $\mathcal{D}$ -mosaic.

If  $\mathcal{D}$  is simple and  $X$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -forced we have a handle on all dense subsets of  $X$ .

$$\mathbb{B} = \{\langle B_\zeta^0, B_\zeta^1 \rangle : \zeta < 2^\kappa\} \in \Pi(\kappa)$$

means that  $\mathbb{B}$  is a  $\kappa$ -independent, (i.e.

$$|B_{\zeta_1}^{i_1} \cap B_{\zeta_2}^{i_2} \cap \dots \cap B_{\zeta_n}^{i_n}| = \kappa$$

for  $\zeta_1 < \zeta_2 < \dots < \zeta_n < 2^\kappa$ ) separating family of 2-partitions of  $\kappa$ .

$$X_{\mathbb{B}} = \langle \kappa, \tau_{\mathbb{B}} \rangle,$$

where  $\tau_{\mathbb{B}}$  is generated by  $\{B_\zeta^0, B_\zeta^1 : \zeta < 2^\kappa\}$ .

Spaces  $X_{\mathbb{B}}$  with  $\mathbb{B} \in \Pi(\kappa)$  are the same as  $\kappa$ -dense subspaces  $X \subset D(2)^{2^\kappa}$  with  $|X| = \kappa \equiv \mathcal{C}(\kappa)$ -spaces.

**THEOREM.** Given  $\mathbb{B} \in \Pi(\kappa)$  and a family  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $\kappa$ -dense sets in  $X_{\mathbb{B}}$ , there is  $\mathbb{C} \in \Pi(\kappa)$  s.t. each  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  is  $\kappa$ -dense in  $X_{\mathbb{C}}$  and  $X_{\mathbb{C}}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -forced. Moreover,  $X_{\mathbb{C}}$  is NODEC and  $[\kappa]^{<\kappa} \subset \mathcal{N}(X_{\mathbb{C}})$ .

[J-Soukup-Szentmiklóssy,  $\mathcal{D}$ -forced spaces: A new approach to resolvability, Top. Appl. 153 (2006), 1800–1824]

Similar results by Comfort and Hu.

PROBLEM (Ceder and Pearson, 1967) Is an  $\omega$ -resolvable space maximally resolvable?

Very strong counter-examples:

THEOREM. For any  $\omega < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) \leq \kappa$  there is a  $\mathcal{C}(\kappa)$ -space that is hereditarily  $\mu$ -resolvable  $\forall \mu < \lambda$  but is not almost  $\lambda$ -resolvable.

[hereditarily  $\mu$ -resolvable  $\equiv$  all **crowded** subspaces are  $\mu$ -resolvable]

THEOREM. Let  $\omega \leq \kappa < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) \leq (2^\kappa)^+$ . Then there is a  $\mathcal{C}(\kappa)$ -space that is

- (1) hereditarily  $\kappa$ -resolvable,
- (2) hereditarily almost  $\mu$ -resolvable  $\forall \mu < \lambda$ ,
- (3) not almost  $\lambda$ -resolvable.

FACT. Almost  $\omega$ -resolvable  $\equiv$   $\omega$ -resolvable

So the following thm (for  $\kappa > \omega$ ) also yields a solution to the Ceder–Pearson problem.

THEOREM (J-Shelah-Soukup)

For each  $\kappa \geq \omega$  there is a  $\mathcal{C}(\kappa)$ -space that is almost  $2^\kappa$ -resolvable (i.e. maximally almost resolvable) and  $\omega_1$ -irresolvable.

The proof requires a further, non-trivial, refinement of a topology  $\tau_{\mathbb{C}}$  obtained from the main thm.

THEOREM (Illanes, Bhaskara Rao)

If  $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$  and a space is  $\mu$ -resolvable for all  $\mu < \lambda$  then it is also  $\lambda$ -resolvable.

PROBLEMS.

(i) What if  $\omega < \text{cf}(\lambda) < \lambda$ ?

(ii) How about singular compactness for almost resolvability?

## II. TOPOLOGICAL PROPERTIES IMPLYING RESOLVABILITY

LEMMA 1. If  $Y \subset X$  :  $Y$  is  $\kappa$ -resolvable is a  $\pi$ -network in  $X$  then  $X$  is  $\kappa$ -resolvable.

Since  $\{U \in \tau(X) : |U| = \Delta(U)\}$  is a  $\pi$ -base, this often let's us reduce proofs to  $|X| = \Delta(X)$ .

LEMMA 2. If no non-empty open  $U \subset X$  is covered by fewer than  $\kappa$  left-separated subspaces then  $X$  is  $\kappa$ -resolvable.

COROLLARY. Every crowded countably compact  $T_3$  space is  $\omega_1$ -resolvable.

Tkachenko (1979): If a countably compact  $T_3$  space is  $\sigma$ -left-separated then it is scattered.

Apply this to all regular closed sets. (Pytkeev gave a different proof.)

PROBLEM. Are crowded countably compact  $T_3$  spaces  $c$ -resolvable (or even maximally resolvable)?

LEMMA 3. If  $D$  is dense in  $X$  with  $|D| \leq \kappa$  and  $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{P}(X)$  is s.t. for any  $x \in D$  and for any disjoint  $\mathcal{Y} \subset [\mathcal{I}]^{<\kappa}$  there is  $Z \in \mathcal{I}$  with  $x \in \overline{Z}$  and  $Z \cap \cup \mathcal{Y} = \emptyset$  then  $X$  is  $\kappa$ -resolvable.

Applying this with  $\mathcal{I} = [\kappa]^{\leq \mu}$  (where  $\mu < \kappa$ ) and  $|X| = \Delta(X) = \kappa$  yields:

THEOREM. (Pytkeev)

If  $\Delta(X) > t(X)$  then  $X$  is maximally resolvable.

Another application (with  $\mathcal{I} = NS(\kappa)$  for  $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \omega$ ) yields:

THEOREM. (J-S-Sz)

Any  $X$  with  $\Delta(X) > s(X)$  (in particular, any HL  $X$  with  $\Delta(X) > \omega$ ) is maximally resolvable.

With further work one gets the answer to a question of Malychin:

THEOREM. (Filatova)

Any Lindelöf  $T_3$  space  $X$  with  $\Delta(X) > \omega$  is 2-resolvable.

Recall that

COMPACT = CTBLY COMPACT + LINDELÖF

PROBLEM. Is it 3-,  $\omega$ -, or maximally resolvable?

THEOREM. (Pavlov)

If  $X$  is  $T_3$  and  $\Delta(X) > e(X)^+$  then  $X$  is  $\omega$ -resolvable. In particular, any Lindelöf  $T_3$  space  $X$  with  $\Delta(X) > \omega_1$  is  $\omega$ -resolvable.

THEOREM (Kunen-Szymanski-Tall)

The existence of an irresolvable  $T_2$  Baire space is equiconsistent with that of a measurable cardinal.

THEOREM (Pytkeev, 1983)

Pseudo-radial and  $k$ -spaces are both maximally resolvable.

DEFINITION.

(i) The point  $p \in X$  is a  $B_\kappa$ -point iff it has a local  $\pi$ -network consisting of  $\kappa$  sets of size  $\kappa$ .

(ii)  $X$  is a Pytkeev space iff for any non-closed  $A \subset X$  there is a  $B_\kappa$ -point  $p \in \overline{A}^\kappa \setminus A$ .

FACT. Pseudo-radial and  $k$ -spaces are both Pytkeev.

The first is trivial; the second uses

$$\chi(p, K) = \psi(p, K)$$

for  $p \in K$  compact  $T_2$ .

THEOREM (Pytkeev)

Every Pytkeev space is maximally resolvable.

COROLLARY. (Pytkeev)

If every  $p \in X$  is a  $B_\kappa$ -point for some  $\kappa \geq \mu$  (depending on  $p$ ) then  $X$  is  $\mu$ -resolvable.

## MONOTONE NORMALITY

$X$  is *monotonically normal* (MN) iff it's  $T_1$  and admits a monotone normality operator  $H$ :

For  $x \in U$ ,  $(x, U) \mapsto H(x, U)$  open s.t.

(i)  $x \in H(x, U) \subset U$  ,

(ii) if  $H(x, U) \cap H(y, V) \neq \emptyset$  then  $x \in V$  or  $y \in U$

FACT. Metric and ordered spaces are MN.

$D \subset X$  is *strongly discrete* iff the points in  $D$  have disjoint nbd's

FACT. In MN spaces,

discrete  $\equiv$  strongly discrete

DEFINITION.

$X$  is SD iff every non-isolated point in  $X$  is the accumulation point of a strongly discrete set

FACT. (DTTW) Every MN space is SD

HSD  $\equiv$  hereditary SD

DSD  $\equiv$  dense subspaces are SD

MN  $\Rightarrow$  HSD  $\Rightarrow$  DSD  $\Rightarrow$  SD

None of these arrows can be reversed.

All results from now on are from: [J-S-Sz, Resolvability and monotone normality, Israel J. Math. 166 (2008), 1-16.]

THEOREM 1. Every crowded SD space is  $\omega$ -resolvable.

THEOREM 2. Every crowded DSD space is almost  $\min\{\omega_2, 2^\omega\}$ -resolvable.

QUESTION. How sharp are these results (in particular, for MN spaces)?

## MN topologies on trees:

$(T, <)$  a tree, for  $t \in T$ ,  $S_t =$  set of immediate successors of  $t$  in  $T$ .

$T$  is **infinitely branching** iff  $S_t$  is infinite for all  $t \in T$ .

DEFINITION. Let  $T$  be infinitely branching. A map  $F$  defined on  $T$  is a **filtration** on  $T$  if  $F(t)$  is a filter on  $S_t$  extending the Frechet filter on  $S_t$ .  $F$  is an **ultrafiltration** if each  $F(t)$  is a (free) ultrafilter on  $S_t$ .

FACT:

$$\tau_F = \left\{ V \subset T : \forall t \in V \left( V \cap S_t \in F(t) \right) \right\}$$

is a MN topology on  $T$ .

We put

$$X(F) = \langle T, \tau_F \rangle$$

THEOREM 3. Let  $F$  be an ultrafiltration on  $T$  and  $\lambda$  be a regular cardinal such that  $F(t)$  is  $\lambda$ -descendingly complete for all  $t \in T$ . Then  $X(F)$  is hereditarily  $\lambda^+$ -irresolvable.

COROLLARY.  $\kappa$  measurable,  $u$  a measure on  $\kappa$ ,  $T = \text{Seq}(\kappa) = \kappa^{<\omega}$ , and  $F(t) = u$  for all  $t \in T$ , then  $|X(F)| = \Delta(X(F)) = \kappa$  and  $X(F)$  is a hereditarily  $\omega_1$ -irresolvable MN space.

FACT. (Magidor)  $\exists$  supercompact  $\Rightarrow$  it is consistent to have a uniform ultrafilter on  $\aleph_\omega$  that is  $\omega_1$ -descendingly complete.

COROLLARY. From a supercompact it is consistent to have a MN space  $X$  such that  $|X| = \Delta(X) = \aleph_\omega$  and  $X$  is hereditarily  $\omega_2$ -irresolvable. In particular,  $X$  is not maximally resolvable.

PROBLEM 1. Can we have a "small" MN space  $X$  with  $\Delta(X) > \omega$  that is  $\omega_1$ -irresolvable?

THEOREM 4. If  $X$  is MN and  $|X| < \aleph_\omega$  then  $X$  is maximally resolvable.

FACT. (Kunen and Prikry, 1971)  $\lambda$  is regular and  $u$  is  $\lambda$ -desc. complete then  $u$  is  $\lambda^+$ -desc. complete. Consequently, if  $\kappa < \aleph_\omega$  and  $u$  is a uniform ultrafilter on  $\kappa$  then  $u$  is  $\lambda$ -desc. incomplete for all  $\lambda \in [\omega, \kappa]$ .

THEOREM 5. If  $F$  is an ultrafiltration on  $\text{Seq}(\kappa)$  such that  $F(t)$  is  $\lambda$ -desc. incomplete whenever  $t \in \text{Seq}(\kappa)$  and  $\lambda \in [\omega, \mu]$  then  $X(F)$  is  $\mu$ -resolvable.

COROLLARY. If  $\kappa < \aleph_\omega$  and  $F$  is a uniform ultrafiltration on  $\text{Seq}(\kappa)$  then  $X(F)$  is  $\kappa$ -resolvable (hence maximally resolvable).

THEOREM 6. Fix  $\lambda \leq \kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa)$ . TFAE

(i) Every DSD space  $X$  with  $|X| = \Delta(X) = \kappa$  is  $\lambda$ -resolvable.

(ii) Every MN space  $X$  with  $|X| = \Delta(X) = \kappa$  is  $\lambda$ -resolvable.

(iii) For every uniform ultrafiltration  $F$  on  $\text{Seq}(\kappa)$ , the space  $X(F)$  is  $\lambda$ -resolvable.

COROLLARY. If  $X$  is DSD with  $|X| < \aleph_\omega$  then  $X$  is maximally resolvable.

PROBLEM 2. Is there a ZFC example of a MN space that is not maximally resolvable?

NOTE. Every space of the form  $X(F)$  is almost  $2^\omega$ -resolvable.

PROBLEM 3. Is every crowded MN space almost  $2^\omega$ -resolvable? (YES, if  $2^\omega \leq \omega_2$ .)