

*Marek Balcerzak and Stanisław Wroński*

### ON $\sigma$ -IDEALS WITHOUT MAXIMAL EXTENSIONS

We characterize those  $\sigma$ -ideals in a Boolean  $\sigma$ -algebra which have no maximal extensions in this algebra. We show some applications.

It is well known that every ideal of a Boolean algebra is included in some maximal ideal of that algebra. It seems interesting to verify if the above fact has its analogue for  $\sigma$ -ideals.

Let us observe first that, if  $\Delta$  is a maximal  $\sigma$ -ideal in the class of all  $\sigma$ -ideals of a given  $\sigma$ -algebra, then it is also maximal in the class of all ideals of that  $\sigma$ -algebra.

Really, if  $\Delta$  is not maximal in the class of all ideals, then there exists a maximal ideal  $\Delta'$  such that  $\Delta \subsetneq \Delta'$ . Let  $a$  be an element of our  $\sigma$ -algebra such that  $a \in \Delta' \setminus \Delta$ . Then the  $\sigma$ -ideal generated by  $\Delta$  and  $a$ , being a proper extension of the  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\Delta$ , cannot be a proper ideal. This yields that there exist elements  $a_1, a_2, \dots$  of the  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\Delta$  such that  $1 := a \vee \sup a_i$ . Now we conclude that  $-a \leq \sup a_i \in \Delta$  and  $-a \in \Delta \subseteq \Delta'$ . Thus we obtain that  $a \in \Delta'$  and  $-a \in \Delta'$ . It is impossible.

Now we introduce the notion of an essential ideal. We shall say that a proper  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\Delta$  of a given  $\sigma$ -algebra is *essential* if and only if for each maximal ideal  $\Delta'$  including  $\Delta$  there exists a sequence  $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  of elements of that  $\sigma$ -algebra fulfilling the conditions:

- (1)  $a_i \notin \Delta'$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ ,  
 (2)  $\inf a_i \in \Delta$ .

**Theorem 1.** *A proper  $\sigma$ -ideal of some  $\sigma$ -algebra is essential if and only if it is not included in any maximal  $\sigma$ -ideal of this  $\sigma$ -algebra.*

*Proof.*  $\Rightarrow$  Suppose that an essential  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\Delta$  of a  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  is included in some maximal  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\Delta'$  which is also a maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{A}$  as we have noticed above. According to the definition of an essential ideal there exists a sequence  $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  fulfilling both conditions (1) and (2). Since  $a_i \notin \Delta'$ , therefore the  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\Delta'_{a_i}$  generated by  $\Delta'$  and  $a_i$  is essentially larger than  $\Delta'$ . Thus  $1: \in \Delta'_{a_i}$  for every  $i$  because  $\Delta'$  is a maximal  $\sigma$ -ideal. It enables us to conclude that for every  $i$  there exists  $b_i \in \Delta'$  such that  $1: = a_i \vee b_i$ . As a result of taking (2) into account we obtain  $1: = \inf(a_i \vee b_i) \leq (\inf a_i) \vee (\sup b_i) \in \Delta'$ . It is impossible since  $\Delta'$  is proper as a maximal ideal.

$\Leftarrow$  Assume that a proper  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\Delta$  is not included in any maximal  $\sigma$ -ideal. Let  $\Delta'$  denote a maximal ideal containing  $\Delta$ . Since the  $\sigma$ -ideal generated by  $\Delta'$  is not proper, there exists a sequence  $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$  of elements of  $\Delta'$  such that  $\sup a_i =: 1$ . This enables us to conclude that  $-a_i \notin \Delta'$  for each  $i$ , and that  $\inf(-a_i) =: 1: - (\sup a_i) =: 1: -: 1 = 0: \in \Delta$ . It means that  $\Delta$  is an essential  $\sigma$ -ideal.

**Theorem 2.** *For each  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of subsets of  $[0, 1]$  containing all Borel sets, a  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\mathcal{I}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is a maximal  $\sigma$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{A}$  if and only if it is of the form*

$$(x) = \{E \subset \mathcal{A} : x \notin E\}$$

for some  $x \in [0, 1]$ .

*Proof.*  $\Rightarrow$  Consider two cases:

1°  $\mathcal{I}$  contains all singletons  $\{x\}$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Then  $\mathcal{I}$  is an essential  $\sigma$ -ideal. Indeed, let  $\Delta$  be an arbitrary maximal ideal  $\Delta$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We define a descending sequence of intervals as follows. Since  $\Delta$  is a maximal ideal, therefore either  $[0, \frac{1}{2}] \notin \Delta$  or  $[\frac{1}{2}, 1] \notin \Delta$ . Put  $A_1 = [0, \frac{1}{2}]$  in the first case and  $A_1 = [\frac{1}{2}, 1]$  in the other case. Suppose that

we have defined  $A_n = [\frac{k}{2^n}, \frac{k+1}{2^n}] \notin \Delta$  where  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ . Consider the pair of intervals  $[\frac{k}{2^n}, \frac{2k+1}{2^{n+1}})$  and  $[\frac{2k+1}{2^{n+1}}, \frac{k+1}{2^n}]$ . At least one of these intervals does not belong to  $\Delta$ . We choose  $A_{n+1}$  as that interval. Then the set  $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} A_n$  is a singleton, hence it belongs to  $\mathcal{I}$ . This shows that  $\mathcal{I}$  is an essential  $\sigma$ -ideal. So it cannot be maximal, by Theorem 1. Thus the case 1° is impossible.

2° There exists  $\{x\} \notin \mathcal{I}$ . If there exists  $y \neq x$  such that  $\{y\} \notin \mathcal{I}$  then  $\mathcal{I}$  is not maximal since the  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\mathcal{I}_{\{y\}}$  generated by  $\mathcal{I}$  and  $\{y\}$  is proper and larger than  $\mathcal{I}$ . So  $\{x\}$  is a unique singleton which is not in  $\mathcal{I}$  and thus  $\mathcal{I} = (x)$  since  $(x)$  is the biggest proper  $\sigma$ -ideal which does not contain  $x$ .

$\Leftarrow$  Obvious.

**Corollary.** *Each of the following  $\sigma$ -ideals:*

- the  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\mathcal{L}_0$  of Lebesgue null sets in the  $\sigma$ -algebra of  $\mathcal{L}$  of measurable subsets of  $[0, 1]$ .
- the  $\sigma$ -ideal  $\mathcal{B}_0$  of the first category sets in the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  of subsets of  $[0, 1]$  with the Baire property,

*is not maximal (in fact, it is an essential  $\sigma$ -ideal).*

*Remark.* Note that  $\mathcal{L}_0$  and  $\mathcal{B}_0$  can be maximal  $\sigma$ -ideals in some non-trivial subfamilies of the family of all ideals of  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$ , respectively. Namely, consider the family  $\mathcal{F}$  of all  $\sigma$ -ideals  $\Delta$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  such that

$$(*) \quad (\forall A \in \Delta) (\forall B \subset A) (B \in \mathcal{L})$$

Then  $\mathcal{L}_0$  is the greatest  $\sigma$ -ideal in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Indeed, let  $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}$  and suppose that  $A \in \Delta \setminus \mathcal{L}_0$ . It is known that  $A$  contains a nonmeasurable set  $B$  (see [1]). Hence  $(*)$  is false, which contradicts  $\Delta \in \mathcal{F}$ . Consequently  $\Delta \subset \mathcal{L}_0$ . The category case is analogous.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J.C. Oxtoby, *Measure and Category*, Springer Verlag, New York, 1971.

*Marek Balcerzak i Stanisław Wroński*

## O $\sigma$ -IDEAŁACH BEZ MAKSYMALNYCH ROZSZERZEŃ

Scharakteryzowano  $\sigma$ -ideały w dowolnej  $\sigma$ -algebrze Boole'a, których nie da się rozszerzyć do  $\sigma$ -ideału maksymalnego w tej algebrze. Podano kilka zastosowań.

Institute of Mathematics  
 Łódź Technical University  
 al. Politechniki 11, I-2  
 90-924 Łódź, Poland