

## On minimal generators of $\sigma$ -fields

by

**Bohdan Aniszczyk (Wrocław) and Ryszard Frankiewicz (Warszawa)**

**Abstract.** In this note it is shown that

- (i) there is a  $\sigma$ -field without minimal generators;
- (ii) the  $\sigma$ -field  $\Sigma_{\beta\omega}$  has a minimal generator.

Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of the set  $X$ . A family  $\mathcal{G}$  is called a *generating family* (or *generator*) for  $\mathcal{B}$  if  $\mathcal{B}$  is the least  $\sigma$ -field containing  $\mathcal{G}$ , and a minimal generator if no proper subfamily of  $\mathcal{G}$  is a generator for  $\mathcal{B}$ . This concept was introduced by D. Basu and studied by B. V. Rao and K. P. S. Bhaskara-Rao, who raised the question whether every  $\sigma$ -field of subsets has a minimal generating family ([6, p. 685], [1, p. 2]). The aim of the first part of the paper is to give a negative answer to this question. The second part answers the question of M. Talagrand ([7, p. 59]) and shows that the family of all ultrafilters on  $\omega$  is a minimal generator for the  $\sigma$ -field generated by them on  $\{0, 1\}^\omega$ .

Let  $P(X)$  denote the family of all subsets of  $X$  and, for a family  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq P(X)$ , let  $\sigma(\mathcal{F})$  denote a  $\sigma$ -field generated by  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**1. Question of B. V. Rao and K. P. S. Bhaskara-Rao.**  $\omega_1$  stands for the set of all countable ordinals and also the least uncountable cardinal.

Proposition 1 is the clue to our further investigations; for the proof see [1, remark after Proposition 2]. Another proof, based on a theorem of Parovicenko-Rudin, is given at the end of the paper.

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Any family of subsets of  $\omega_1$  of cardinality  $\omega_1$  is contained in a  $\sigma$ -field generated by a countable family.*

**LEMMA** ([2, Lemma 7.4]. *For each family of cardinality  $\omega_1$  of cubs on  $\omega_1$  ("cub" means "an unbounded subset of  $\omega_1$  closed in order topology"), there is a cub almost contained in any cub of that family ("almost" means "all but countably many points").*

**PROPOSITION 2.** *The  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq P(\omega_1)$  of sets containing a cub or disjoint with one does not have a minimal generator.*

Proof. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a generator for  $\mathcal{B}$ .  $\text{card}\mathcal{G} > \omega_1$ . We may assume that any  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  contains a cub. Let  $\mathcal{G}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  be such that  $\text{card}\mathcal{G}_0 = \omega_1$  and all countable sets are in  $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_0)$ . Take  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0$ ,  $\text{card}\mathcal{F} = \omega_1$ . By the lemma there is a cub  $C$  almost contained in any element of  $\mathcal{F}$ . By Proposition 1 there is a countable family  $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  such that  $\{F \setminus C : F \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{C\} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{G}_1)$ . Thus we have  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{G}_0 \cup \mathcal{G}_1)$ . This shows that  $\sigma(\mathcal{G}) = \sigma(\mathcal{G} \setminus (\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{G}_1))$  and that  $\mathcal{G}$  is not a minimal generator.

PROPOSITION 3. (CH)  $P(\omega_1)$  does not have a minimal generator.

Proof. Assume that  $\mathcal{G}$  is a generator for  $P(\omega_1)$ . Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  be such that  $\text{card}(\mathcal{F}) = \omega_1$ . By Proposition 1 there is a countable family  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\sigma(\mathcal{A}) \supseteq \mathcal{F}$ . Any member of  $\mathcal{A}$  is generated by a countable subfamily of  $\mathcal{G}$ ; hence there is a countable family  $\mathcal{G}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  such that  $\mathcal{A}$  and therefore  $\mathcal{F}$  is contained in  $\sigma(\mathcal{G}_0)$ . This shows that  $\sigma(\mathcal{G} \setminus (\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0)) = \sigma(\mathcal{G})$  and finally  $\mathcal{G}$  is not a minimal generator. Because of the arbitrariness of  $\mathcal{G}$  the proof is complete.

Remark. 1 In view of Silver's result ([4, p. 162]) Martin's Axiom  $\dagger$  CH implies that  $P(\omega_1)$  has a countable generator and has a minimal one [6]. Therefore, in Proposition 2 some additional assumption, in place of CH are needed.

PROPOSITION 4 (CH). Let  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the  $\sigma$ -field of Lebesgue measurable sets on the real line does not have a minimal generator.

Proof. By CH there is a family  $\{B_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$  of increasing zero measure Borel sets such that any zero measure set is contained in some  $B_\alpha$  (use, for example, [5, Theorem 19.6 and the last remark in Ch. 19]). Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a generator for  $\mathcal{L}$ . Obviously  $\text{card}\mathcal{G} > \omega_1$ . For any element  $G \in \mathcal{G}$  fix a Borel set  $B(G)$  satisfying  $B(G) \subseteq G$ ,  $G \setminus B(G)$  having measure zero. There is a Borel set  $B$  such that

$$\text{card}\{G : B(G) = B\} > \omega_1;$$

then, for some  $\alpha < \omega_1$ ,  $\mathcal{G}_\alpha = \{G : B(G) = B, G \setminus B \subseteq B_\alpha\}$  is of cardinality at least  $\omega_1$ . Choose a subfamily  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $G_\alpha$  of cardinality  $\omega_1$ . By Proposition 1 there is a countable family of subsets of  $B_\alpha$  hence in  $\mathcal{L}$ -generating on  $B_\alpha$  a  $\sigma$ -field which contains  $\{G \setminus B : G \in \mathcal{F}\}$ . So there is a countable  $\mathcal{G}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  such that  $\{G \setminus B : G \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{B, B_\alpha\} \subseteq \sigma(\mathcal{G}_0)$ . Finally  $\sigma(\mathcal{G}) = \sigma(\mathcal{G} \setminus (\mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{G}_0))$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  is not a minimal generator.

Remark 2. The same proof works for the  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of real line with the Baire property (consult [5]).

**2. Question of M. Talagrand.** Let  $\omega$  denote the set of all finite ordinals and  $\beta\omega$  the set of all ultrafilters on  $\omega$ . We identify  $\{0, 1\}^\omega$  with  $P(\omega)$ . The ultrafilter  $u \in \beta\omega$  is principal if there is a  $j \in \omega$  such that  $A \in u$  iff  $j \in A$  and  $u \in \beta\omega$  is free if it is not a principal. All principal ultrafilters generate on  $P(\omega)$  the  $\sigma$ -field of usual Borel subsets of  $\{0, 1\}^\omega$ . It is well known from Sierpiński [8] that free ultrafilters on  $\omega$  are non-Borel. M. Talagrand posed the following question at a conference on analytic sets in 1979: For a set  $\mathcal{A}$  of ultrafilters on  $\omega$ , let  $\sigma(\mathcal{A})$  be a  $\sigma$ -field of subsets of  $P(\omega)$  generated by the elements of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Does there exist a  $u \in \beta\omega$  such that  $u \in \sigma(\beta\omega \setminus \{u\})$ ?

We prove the following

THEOREM.  $\beta\omega$  is a minimal generator for  $\sigma(\beta\omega)$ .

Proof. Assume, a contrario, that there is a  $u \in \beta\omega$ ,  $u \in \sigma(\beta\omega \setminus \{u\})$ . Then obviously there are  $\{u_i : i \in \omega\} \subseteq \beta\omega \setminus \{u\}$  such that  $u \in \sigma(\{u_i : i \in \omega\})$ . The ultrafilter  $u$  is not principal (if it were, for two points, one with each coordinate equal to zero and the other with a coordinate equal to one only on the coordinate which gives  $u$ ,  $u$  would separate them while  $\sigma(\{u_i : i \in \omega\})$  would not, which is impossible if  $u \in \sigma(\{u_i : i \in \omega\})$ .

Put  $\gamma = \{i : u_i \text{ is principal}\}$ ;  $\alpha = \omega \setminus \gamma$ .

CLAIM.  $u \in \text{cl}_{\beta\omega} \{u_i : i \in \alpha\}$  (closure in  $\beta\omega$  of  $\{u_i : i \in \alpha\}$ ). Otherwise there is an  $A \in [u]^\omega$  (infinite subset of  $\omega$ ),  $A \in u$  and  $A \not\subseteq u_i$  for  $i \in \alpha$ .

$P(A)$ , as a subset of  $P(\omega)$ , is in one atom of  $\sigma(\{u_i : i \in \alpha\})$ , namely

$$\bigcap \{P(\omega) \setminus u_i : i \in \alpha\}.$$

$P(A) \cap \sigma(\{u_i : i \in \gamma\})$  is a sub- $\sigma$ -field of Borel sets on  $P(A)$  ( $u_i$  is principal for  $i \in \gamma$ ), while

$P(A) \cap u$ , as a free ultrafilter on  $A$ , is non-Borel. Finally  $u \notin \sigma(\{u_i : i \in \omega\})$ .

This contradiction proves the claim.

Since  $u \in \text{cl}_{\beta\omega} \{u_i : i \in \omega\}$ , there is a partition of  $\omega$ ,  $\{P_n : n \in \omega\} \subseteq \{\omega\}^\omega$  such that

- (i)  $\forall n P_n \notin u$ ,
- (ii)  $\forall j \exists n P_n \in u_j$

(it is easy to obtain such a partition by induction).

This partition defines a function  $f : \omega \rightarrow \omega$  by  $f(i) = n$  if  $i \in P_n$ . For  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq P(\omega)$  put

$$f_*(\mathcal{A}) = \{A \in P(\omega) : f^{-1}(A) \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

$f_*$  is a  $\sigma$ -homomorphism on  $P(\omega)$  (i.e., preserves complementation and countable unions in  $P(P(\omega))$ ). Hence

- (iii)  $f_*(u) \subseteq f_*(\sigma(\{u_i : i \in \omega\})) = \sigma(\{f(u_i) : i \in \omega\})$ .

By (ii),  $f_*(u_i)$  is a principal ultrafilter on  $\omega$ ; thus  $\sigma(\{f_*(u_i) : i \in \omega\})$  consists only of Borel subsets of  $P(\omega)$ . On the other hand, by (i),  $f_*(u)$  is free, hence non-Borel. This contradiction of (iii) proves the theorem.

**3. Another proof of Proposition 1.** Our proof of Proposition 1 is based on the following theorem of Parovicenko and W. Rudin:

THEOREM. Let  $B$  be a Boolean algebra of cardinality not greater than  $\omega_1$ . There is a one-to-one homomorphism from  $B$  into  $P(\omega)/\text{Fin}$ .

The proof can be found in [2] (Theorem 14.12).

Proof of Proposition 1. Let  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq P(\omega_1)$   $\text{card}(\mathcal{F}) \leq \omega_1$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra of cardinality  $\omega_1$  containing  $\mathcal{F}$  and all one-point subsets of  $\omega_1$ . Let  $\varphi$  be a homo-

morphism of  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $P(\omega)/\text{Fin}$ . For  $A \in \mathcal{A}$  let  $\chi_A \in P(\omega)$  be any element of the equivalent class of  $\varphi(A)$ . Since  $\omega_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we have obtained a function  $\chi: \omega_1 \rightarrow P(\omega)$ .

For any  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  consider the set  $K_F = \{x \in P(\omega): \text{card}(\chi_F \setminus x) < \omega\}$ . It is easy to see,  $K_F$  is  $\sigma$ -compact in  $P(\omega)$  (with Cantor set topology). Hence  $K_F$  is a Borel set. Also, it is easy to see that  $\chi^{-1}(K_F) = F$ .

So  $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{\chi^{-1}(B) \mid B \subset P(\omega), B \text{ is a Borel set}\}$ .

The above family is a  $\sigma$ -field which is a countable generating family. The proof of Proposition 1 is complete.

#### References

- [1] K. P. S. Bhaskara-Rao and B. V. Rao, *Borel spaces*, Dissertationes Math. 190 (1981).
- [2] W. Comfort and S. Negrepointis, *The Theory of Ultrafilters*, Springer, Berlin 1974.
- [3] T. J. Jech, *Set Theory*, Academic Press, New York 1978.
- [4] D. A. Martin and R. Solovay, *Internal Cohen extensions*, Ann. Math. Logic 2 (1970), pp. 143–178.
- [5] J. Oxtoby, *Measure and Category*, Springer-Verlag, New York–Heidelberg–Berlin 1971.
- [6] B. V. Rao, *On Borel structures*, Colloq. Math. 21 (1970), pp. 199–204.
- [7] C. Rogers, *Analytic Sets*, Academic Press, London 1980.
- [8] W. Sierpiński, *Fonctions additives non complètement additives et fonctions non-mesurables*, Fund. Math. 30 (1938), pp. 96–99.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS  
POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
Wrocław, Kopernika 18  
INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS  
POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES  
Warszawa, Śniadeckich 8

Received 4 October 1982

## On the homotopy classification of pairs of linked maps of manifolds into a linear space

by

C. Bowszyc (Warszawa)

**Abstract.** It is shown that the linking number of maps  $f: M \rightarrow E$  and  $g: N \rightarrow E$  of connected closed manifolds into a linear space with disjoint images gives the homotopy classification of such pairs of maps if  $\dim M + \dim N + 1 = \dim E$ .

Let  $M$  and  $N$  be two closed connected oriented smooth manifolds of dimensions  $m$  and  $n$  respectively. We shall suppose that  $0 \leq m \leq n$ . Let  $E$  be a real oriented  $k$ -dimensional linear space with  $k = m + n + 1 \geq 2$ . Denote  $E_0 = E \setminus \{0\}$ . A pair  $(f, g)$  of smooth maps  $f: M \rightarrow E$  and  $g: N \rightarrow E$  with disjoint images  $f(M)$  and  $g(N)$  will be called a *pair of linked maps*.

Two pairs of linked maps  $(f_0, g_0)$  and  $(f_1, g_1)$  are said to be *homotopic* if there are two smooth homotopies  $f_t: M \rightarrow E$  and  $g_t: N \rightarrow E$  with  $f_t(M)$  and  $g_t(N)$  disjoint for every  $t \in I = [0, 1]$ . We shall write  $(f_0, g_0) \simeq (f_1, g_1)$  in this case. Denote by  $\mathcal{H}$  the set of all homotopy classes of pairs of linked maps.

For a pair of linked maps  $(f, g)$  their linking number  $l(f, g)$  is defined to be the winding number around 0 (comp. [2], p. 144)  $W(\Phi)$  of the map  $\Phi: M \times N \rightarrow E_0$  of oriented manifolds defined by  $\Phi(u, v) = g(v) - f(u)$  (or the degree of the map  $\Phi \mid \Phi: M \times N \rightarrow S^{m+n}$  if  $E$  is Euclidean). It is known ([8], p. 104) that homotopic pairs of linked maps have the same linking number.

The main result of this paper is the following

**THEOREM 1.** *The function  $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  assigning to a homotopy class of a pair of linked maps  $(f, g)$  their linking number  $l(f, g)$  is bijective.*

If  $m = 0$  then  $M$  is a point and the theorem is really the Hopf classification theorem (comp. [7], § 7). If  $m = n = 1$  then  $M$  and  $N$  are diffeomorphic to circles; this result was obtained by J. Milnor in [6], p. 190 by means of tools developed there. We shall give also another, more direct proof of this case.

We shall need some lemmas.