

[5] J. M. H. Olmsted, *Lebesgue theory on a Boolean algebra*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 51 (1942), p. 164-193.

[6] J. Ridder, *Zur Mass- und Integrationstheorie in Strukturen*, Indagationes Mathematicae 8 (1946), p. 64-81.

[7] S. Saks, *Theory of the integral*, Monografie Matematyczne, Warszawa—Lwów 1937.

[8] R. Sikorski, *On the representation of Boolean algebras as fields of sets*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 35 (1948), p. 247-258.

[9] R. Sikorski, *On the inducing of homomorphisms by mappings*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 36 (1949), p. 7-22.

ON AN UNSOLVED PROBLEM
FROM THE THEORY OF BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

BY

R. SIKORSKI (WARSAW)

Let X and I be respectively a σ -field¹⁾ and a σ -ideal of subsets of a set \mathcal{X} . It is well known that the quotient algebra X/I is σ -complete. In some cases X/I is further a complete²⁾ Boolean algebra. The latter is true, for instance, in two following cases, where:

(a) X is a σ -field on which an enumerably additive finite measure μ is defined, and I is the σ -ideal of all sets of measure zero³⁾;

(b) X is the σ -field of all subsets of a topological space⁴⁾ \mathcal{X} which possess the property of Baire⁵⁾ (or: X is the σ -field of all Borel subsets⁶⁾ of \mathcal{X} , and I is the σ -ideal of all subsets of the first category in \mathcal{X}).

Another kind of σ -field which is often considered beside the fields of measurable or Borel sets is the field $S(\mathcal{X})$ of all subsets of an abstract set \mathcal{X} . If I is a *principal* ideal, i. e. if I is formed of all subsets of a set $X \subset \mathcal{X}$, then obviously $S(\mathcal{X})/I = S(\mathcal{X} - X)$ is complete.

¹⁾ Terminology and notation are in this paper the same as in my paper *The integral in a Boolean algebra*, this fascicle, p. 20-21.

²⁾ A Boolean algebra A is called *complete*, if for every class $A_0 \subset A$ there exists the least element containing all elements $A \in A_0$.

³⁾ More generally: let I be a σ -ideal of a σ -field X ; if every class of disjoint sets $X \in X - I$ is enumerable, X/I is complete.

⁴⁾ A space is called *topological*, if it fulfils the four well-known axioms of Kuratowski. See e. g. P. Alexandroff und H. Hopf, *Topologie*, Berlin, 1935, p. 37.

⁵⁾ A subset X of a topological space possesses the *property of Baire* if it can be represented in the form $X = G + P - R$, where G is open, and P and R are of the first category. See C. Kuratowski, *Topologie I*, Monografie Matematyczne, Warszawa—Lwów 1933, p. 49.

⁶⁾ If X_1 is the field of all subsets with the property of Baire, X_2 is the field of Borel sets, and I is the ideal of sets of the first category, then the algebras X_1/I and X_2/I are isomorphic.

The question arises whether principal ideals are the only σ -ideals I of $S(\mathcal{X})$, such that $S(\mathcal{X})/I$ is a complete Boolean algebra. On account of (a) the answer is negative, if there exists an enumerably additive finite measure μ defined for all subsets of \mathcal{X} and vanishing for all one-point sets ($\mu(\mathcal{X}) > 0$). Banach and Ulam have proved ⁷⁾ that such a measure μ does not exist if the potency of \mathcal{X} is less than the first aleph inaccessible in the weak sense ⁸⁾. The hypothesis that 2^{\aleph_0} is less than the first aleph inaccessible in the weak sense implies that such a measure μ does not exist also if the potency of \mathcal{X} is less than the first aleph inaccessible in the strict sense ⁹⁾. Thus the problem may be formulated in the following way:

P61. \mathcal{X} is a set of potency less than the first aleph inaccessible in the weak (strict) sense. Are principal ideals the only σ -ideals I of $S(\mathcal{X})$ such that $S(\mathcal{X})/I$ is complete? ¹⁰⁾

On account of (a) the positive answer to this problem would imply the above mentioned theorems of Banach and Ulam on the non-existence of non-trivial measures on $S(\mathcal{X})$; by (b) this answer would imply also that, if a topological space \mathcal{X} (of potency less than the first inaccessible aleph) dense in itself is not of the first category in itself, it contains a subset which does not possess the property of Baire.

I shall prove the following theorem:

Let I be an ideal (of subsets of a set \mathcal{X}) containing all one-point sets, and let $m(I)$ be the least cardinal m with the property: there exists a class $X_0 \subset S(\mathcal{X})$ of potency m , such that

⁷⁾ S. Banach, *Über additive Massfunktionen in abstrakten Mengen*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 15 (1930), p. 97-101; S. Ulam, *Zur Masstheorie in der allgemeinen Mengenlehre*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 16 (1930), p. 140-150.

⁸⁾ $p = \aleph_2 > \aleph_0$ is called inaccessible in the weak sense, if λ is a limit number and if the condition $p_t < p$, where t runs over a set T of potency less than p , implies $\sum_{t \in T} p_t < p$.

⁹⁾ A cardinal $p > \aleph_0$ is called inaccessible in the strict sense, if it is inaccessible in the weak sense and if, moreover, $m^n < p$ for every $m < p$ and $n < p$. See A. Tarski, *Über unerreichbare Kardinalzahlen*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 30 (1938), p. 69.

¹⁰⁾ This problem is unsolved also in the case where the space is of potency \aleph_1 or 2^{\aleph_0} .

I is formed of all subsets of sets belonging to X_0 . Then, if there exists a class X_1 of potency $m(I)$ of disjoint sets which do not belong to I , the Boolean algebra $S(\mathcal{X})/I$ is not complete ¹¹⁾.

In order to prove this theorem it is sufficient to show that if $X - X_1 \in I$ for every $X \in X_1$, then there exists a set $X_2 \subset X_1$ such that $X - X_2 \in I$ for every $X \in X_1$, and $X_1 - X_2 \text{ non } \in I$.

Let φ be a one-one mapping of the class X_1 in the class X_0 . Since $\varphi(X) \in I$ and $X - X_1 \text{ non } \in I$ for every $X \in X_1$, we have $X - X_1 - \varphi(X) \neq 0$. Let $x(X)$ be an element of the set $X - X_1 - \varphi(X)$, let X_0 denote the set of all elements $x(X)$, where $X \in X_1$, and let $X_2 = X_1 - X_0$. Since $x(X) \text{ non } \in \varphi(X)$, the set X_0 is not a subset of a set belonging to X_0 ; hence $X_0 \text{ non } \in I$. Since $x(X) \in I$, we have $X - X_2 = X - X_1 + x(X) \in I$ for every $X \in X_1$, q. e. d.

On the other hand, there exist σ -ideals I , such that $m(I) > \overline{\overline{\mathcal{X}}}$; such ideals do not fulfil the assumptions of the theorem just proved. For instance, let \mathcal{X} be a set of potency 2^{\aleph_0} and let X^0 be a class of enumerably independent sets ¹²⁾ with $\overline{\overline{X_0}} = 2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$. The class I of all subsets of all enumerable sums of sets $X \in X^0$ is an σ -ideal, such that $m(I) = 2^{2^{\aleph_0}} > 2^{\aleph_0}$.

¹¹⁾ Let R denote the set of all real numbers, and let M and N denote respectively: the σ -ideal of all sets $X \subset R$ of measure zero, and the σ -ideal of all sets $X \subset R$ of the first category. By the theorem above the Boolean algebra $S(R)/M$ is not complete. Similarly, the hypothesis $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1$ implies that the Boolean algebra $S(R)/N$ is not complete. See W. Sierpiński, *Hypothèse du continu*, Monografie Matematyczne, Warszawa-Lwów, 1934, p. 109-110.

¹²⁾ See E. Marczewski, *Ensembles indépendants et leurs applications à la théorie de la mesure*, Fundamenta Mathematicae 35 (1948), p. 21-22.