

# PARTITION RELATIONS VIA IDEAL PRODUCTS

CLINTON T. CONLEY

ABSTRACT. We analyze how a simple splitting condition relating an ideal with a linear order allows the construction of certain embeddings of the rationals into the order. We extract as consequences proofs of some well known partition relations, including the Baumgartner-Hajnal theorem ( $\varphi \rightarrow (\omega)_\omega^1$  implies  $\varphi \rightarrow (\alpha)_2^2$  for all countable ordinals  $\alpha$ ) for uncountable orders  $\varphi$  not containing  $\omega_1$ , the result of Erdős-Rado that  $\eta \rightarrow (\eta, \aleph_0)^2$ , and the standard canonization of colorings of pairs of rationals.

We fix a linearly ordered set  $(X, <)$ . For sets  $A, B \subseteq X$ ,  $A < B$  means  $a < b$  for all  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ . We also fix some ideal  $\mathcal{I}$  of subsets of  $X$ , and use terms like *small*, *positive* (or *non-small*), and *cosmall* in the obvious way. We say *positive sets split over the order* if any positive set  $A \subseteq X$  contains positive sets  $A_0$  and  $A_1$  with  $A_0 < A_1$ . Finally,  $\bar{i}$  is shorthand for  $1 - i$ .

**Definition 1.** Given a coloring  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  and  $i \in 2$ , we say that  $(A, B)$  is an  *$i$ -compatible pair* if  $A$  and  $B$  are both positive subsets of  $X$ , and moreover for every positive  $B' \subseteq B$  the set

$$\{a \in A : \text{the set } \{b \in B' : c(\{a, b\}) = i\} \text{ is positive}\}$$

is co-small in  $A$ .

**Definition 2.** Given a coloring  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  and  $i \in 2$ , we say that  $(A, B)$  is an  *$i$ -focused pair* if  $A$  and  $B$  are both positive subsets of  $X$ , and moreover for all  $a \in A$  the set

$$\{b \in B : c(\{a, b\}) = i\}$$

is co-small in  $B$ .

**Remark 3.** If  $(A, B)$  is an  *$i$ -compatible pair* (respectively, an  *$i$ -focused pair*) and  $A' \subseteq A$  and  $B' \subseteq B$  are both positive, then  $(A', B')$  is an  *$i$ -compatible* (resp.,  *$i$ -focused*) pair. Also, if  $(A, B)$  is an  *$i$ -focused pair*, then it is an  *$i$ -compatible pair*.

We first establish a lemma granting structure similar to the sort bequeathed by localization and Kuratowski-Ulam in the special case of the meager ideal (or, if you prefer, density and Fubini in the case of the null ideal).

**Lemma 4.** *Suppose that  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an arbitrary coloring, and suppose further that  $A, B \subseteq X$  are positive sets. Then there exist positive sets  $A^* \subseteq A$  and  $B^* \subseteq B$  such that one of the following holds:*

1.  $(A^*, B^*)$  is an  $i$ -focused pair for some  $i \in 2$ , or
2.  $(A^*, B^*)$  is an  $i$ -compatible pair for all  $i \in 2$ .

*Proof.* We simply consider two exhaustive cases, determined by the truth value of the sentence

$$\exists i \in 2 \exists^{\mathcal{I}} B' \subseteq B \exists^{\mathcal{I}} A' \subseteq A (\{a \in A' : \{b \in B' : c(\{a, b\}) = i\} \text{ is positive}\} \text{ is small}),$$

where  $\exists^{\mathcal{I}}$  is shorthand for “there exists a positive set.”

Case 1: it is true. In this case, we may choose  $i$ ,  $A'$ , and  $B'$  witnessing the statement’s truth, and let

$$A^* = A' \setminus \{a \in A' : \{b \in B' : c(\{a, b\}) = i\} \text{ is positive}\}.$$

Subsequently, we observe that  $(A^*, B')$  is an  $\bar{i}$ -focused pair.

Case 2: it is false. We then have

$$\forall i \in 2 \forall^{\mathcal{I}} B' \subseteq B \forall^{\mathcal{I}} A' \subseteq A (\{a \in A' : \{b \in B' : c(\{a, b\}) = i\} \text{ is positive}\} \text{ is positive}),$$

where  $\forall^{\mathcal{I}}$  is shorthand for “for all positive sets.” But this is equivalent to

$$\forall i \in 2 \forall^{\mathcal{I}} B' \subseteq B (\{a \in A : \{b \in B' : c(\{a, b\}) = i\} \text{ is positive}\} \text{ is cosmall in } A).$$

Consequently,  $(A, B)$  is  $i$ -compatible for all  $i \in 2$ . □

It would be nice if we could symmetrize our notion of compatibility, strengthening the conclusion of Lemma 4. Unfortunately, we can’t, but we can do the next best thing.

**Definition 5.** Given a coloring  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  and  $i, j \in 2$ , we say that  $(A, B)$  is an  $(i, j)$ -compatible pair if  $(A, B)$  is an  $i$ -compatible pair, and  $(B, A)$  is a  $j$ -compatible pair.

Using this notion, it is easy to prove the following two corollaries by first applying Lemma 4 to the pair  $(A, B)$ , and then to the pair  $(B^*, A^*)$  obtained by flipping the pair granted by the lemma.

**Corollary 6.** *Suppose that  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an arbitrary coloring, and suppose further that  $A, B \subseteq X$  are positive sets. Then there exist positive sets  $A^* \subseteq A$  and  $B^* \subseteq B$  such that one of the following holds:*

1.  $(A^*, B^*)$  is an  $i$ -focused pair for some  $i \in 2$ , or
2.  $(A^*, B^*)$  is an  $(i, i)$ -compatible pair for some  $i \in 2$ .

**Corollary 7.** *Suppose that  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an arbitrary coloring, and suppose further that  $A, B \subseteq X$  are positive sets. Then there exist positive sets  $A^* \subseteq A$  and  $B^* \subseteq B$  and  $i, j \in 2$  such that  $(A^*, B^*)$  is an  $(i, j)$ -compatible pair.*

In particular, we can apply these corollaries to the pairs obtained by splitting positive sets, as we see in the lemma below.

**Lemma 8.** *Suppose that positive sets split over the order and  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an arbitrary coloring. Then there is a positive  $A \subseteq X$  and  $i, j \in 2$  such that whenever  $A' \subseteq A$  is positive, then we may find  $A'_0 < A'_1$ , both positive subsets of  $A'$ , so that the pair  $(A'_0, A'_1)$  is  $(i, j)$ -compatible.*

*Proof.* This follows from Corollary 7 and an easy density argument.  $\square$

The upshot of all this is that, passing down to a positive set if necessary, we may assume that there is a universal choice of  $i, j \in 2$  so that we can always split positive sets into  $(i, j)$ -compatible pairs. For convenience, we will refer to this situation by saying that the coloring is  $(i, j)$ -splitting. In fact, we can do slightly better than merely splitting — we can split with a point in the middle!

**Lemma 9.** *Suppose that  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an  $(i, j)$ -splitting coloring. Then there exist  $X_0, X_1 \subseteq X$  and  $x \in X$  with  $X_0 < \{x\} < X_1$  such that  $(X_0, X_1)$  is an  $(i, j)$ -compatible pair. Moreover, for all  $x_0 \in X_0$  and  $x_1 \in X_1$  we have  $c(\{x_0, x\}) = j$  and  $c(\{x, x_1\}) = i$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $c$  is  $(i, j)$ -splitting, we may split twice to find positive subsets  $A < B < D$  of  $X$  such that  $(A, B)$ ,  $(A, D)$ , and  $(B, D)$  are all  $(i, j)$ -compatible pairs. Since  $(B, A)$  is  $j$ -compatible, we know that the set

$$B_A := \{b \in B : \text{the set } \{a \in A : c(\{a, b\}) = j\} \text{ is positive}\}$$

is cosmall in  $B$ . Similarly, since  $(B, D)$  is  $i$ -compatible, we know that the set

$$B_D := \{b \in B : \text{the set } \{d \in D : c(\{b, d\}) = i\} \text{ is positive}\}$$

is cosmall in  $B$ . We may thus choose  $x \in B_A \cap B_D$ , and we are done once we set

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &= \{a \in A : c(\{a, x\}) = j\} \\ X_1 &= \{d \in D : c(\{x, d\}) = i\} \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

The complete binary tree,  $2^{<\omega}$ , plays a central role in the remainder of the note. We extend the lexicographical order on each  $2^n$  to a linear order on  $2^{<\omega}$  by setting  $s < t$  iff  $s(n) < t(n)$  where  $n$  is the first coordinate on which they differ (adopting the convention that  $0 < \text{undefined} < 1$ ). Clearly, the order type of  $2^{<\omega}$  under this ordering is  $\eta$ . For  $s \in 2^{<\omega}$ , we denote by  $|s|$  the *length* of  $s$ .

We also define, using this ordering, four colorings of  $[2^{<\omega}]^2$ . For  $i, j \in 2$ , we define  $c_{ij} : [2^{<\omega}]^2 \rightarrow 2$  by

$$c_{ij}(\{s, t\}) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } s < t \text{ and } |s| \leq |t| \\ j & \text{if } s < t \text{ and } |s| > |t|. \end{cases}$$

These can be viewed as colorings of  $[\mathbb{Q}]^2$  in the obvious way. The two colorings  $c_{ii}$  and  $c_{jj}$  simply correspond to constant colorings, while the other two are the standard impediments to Ramsey's theorem on order type  $\eta$ . The main result of this note is that these four colorings form a basis for colorings of pairs in well behaved spaces.

**Theorem 10.** *Suppose that positive sets split over the order and  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an arbitrary coloring. Then there exists  $i, j \in 2$  and an order-preserving injection  $\varphi : 2^{<\omega} \rightarrow X$  such that*

$$\forall s, t \in 2^{<\omega} \quad c(\{\varphi(s), \varphi(t)\}) = c_{ij}(\{s, t\}).$$

*Proof.* By Lemma 8, we may assume that  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an  $(i, j)$ -splitting coloring. We will embed the coloring  $c_{ij}$  corresponding to these values of  $i$  and  $j$ .

We recursively construct for each  $n \in \omega$  a function  $\varphi_n : 2^n \rightarrow X$  approximating the desired function. In addition, we construct for each  $s \in 2^{n+1}$  a positive set  $A_s \subseteq X$  such that for all  $s < t \in 2^{n+1}$ ,  $(A_s, A_t)$  is an  $(i, j)$ -compatible pair. Moreover, for all  $s \in 2^{<n+1}$  and  $t \in 2^{<n+1}$ ,

$$a \in A_t \Rightarrow c(\{\varphi|_s(s), a\}) = c_{ij}(\{s, t\}).$$

At stage  $n = 0$  of the construction, simply use the splitting assumption and Lemma 9 to find  $x \in X$ , and positive sets  $A_0$  and  $A_1$  satisfying  $A_0 < \{x\} < A_1$  such that  $c(\{a_0, x\}) = j$  and  $c(\{x, a_1\}) = i$  for all  $a_0 \in A_0$  and  $a_1 \in A_1$ , and additionally that  $(A_0, A_1)$  is an  $(i, j)$ -compatible pair. Set  $\varphi(\emptyset) = x$ .

Now suppose that we have completed the construction up through stage  $n - 1$ . We complete stage  $n$  from left to right. By the assumption of compatibility, we may assume that there is a set  $A'_{0^n}$  cosmall in  $A_{0^n}$  such that for all  $x \in A'_{0^n}$  and  $t \in 2^n$  with  $0^n < t$ , the set

$$\{a \in A_t : c(\{a, x\}) = c_{ij}(\{0^n, t\}) = i\}$$

is positive. We apply Lemma 9 to  $A'_{0^n}$  as before to obtain  $\varphi_n(0^n) \in A'_{0^n}$ , and an  $(i, j)$ -compatible pair  $(A_{0^n 0}, A_{0^n 1})$ . Then, replace each  $A_t$  with the set

$$\{a \in A_t : c(\{\varphi_n(0^n), a\}) = c_{ij}(\{0^n, t\})\},$$

which is guaranteed to be positive.

Continuing from left to right, fix  $s \in 2^n$  and suppose we have defined  $\varphi_n$ ,  $A_{s0}$ , and  $A_{s1}$  for all elements of  $2^n$  less than  $s$ . By the assumption of compatibility, we may assume (discarding a small set if necessary) that for all  $x \in A_s$  and  $t \in 2^n$  with  $s < t$ , the set

$$\{a \in A_t : c(\{x, a\}) = c_{ij}(\{x, a\}) = i\}$$

is positive. Moreover, we may assume that for all  $x \in A_s$  and  $t \in 2^{n+1}$  with  $t < s$ , the set

$$\{a \in A_t : c(\{a, x\}) = c_{ij}(\{a, x\}) = j\}$$

is positive. We apply Lemma 9 to  $A_s$  as before to obtain  $\varphi_n(s) \in A_s$ ,  $f_n(s) \in 2$ , and a  $(i, j)$ -compatible pair  $(A_{s0}, A_{s1})$ . For each  $t \in 2^n$  with  $s < t$ , replace  $A_t$  with the set

$$\{a \in A_t : c(\{\varphi_n(s), a\}) = c_{ij}(\{s, t\})\},$$

and, analogously, for each  $t \in 2^{n+1}$  with  $t < s$ , replace  $A_t$  with the set

$$\{a \in A_t : c(\{a, \varphi_n(s)\}) = c_{ij}(\{t, s\})\},$$

Now suppose that we have completed the construction for all  $n \in \omega$ ; we set  $\varphi = \bigcup_n \varphi_n$ . We just need to check that this function works. Fix  $s, t \in 2^{<\omega}$ .

Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\varphi(s)$  was determined before  $\varphi(t)$ . Then, since  $\varphi(t)$  belongs to the refined version of  $A_t$  constructed when  $\varphi(s)$  was decided, we know that  $c(\{\varphi(s), \varphi(t)\}) = c_{ij}(\{s, t\})$ .  $\square$

We close the note with a couple of applications of the main theorem.

**Corollary 11 (Devlin, Galvin, Vuksanovic).** *Suppose that  $c : [\mathbb{Q}]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an arbitrary coloring. Then we may find  $i, j \in 2$  and  $A \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$  of order type  $\eta$  such that  $c|A = c_{ij}|A$ .*

*Proof.* Simply apply Theorem 10 to  $\mathbb{Q}$  equipped with the ideal of sets not containing a set of order type  $\eta$ .  $\square$

**Remark 12.** The above result (and everything else in the note) holds for any finite number of colors. In this setting, you get a larger basis of colorings, but they are all either constant functions or  $c_{ij}$  for  $i \neq j$  (in particular, they all use at most two colors). Also, this corollary yields the result (due to Erdős-Rado) that  $\eta \rightarrow (\eta, \aleph_0)^2$ , meaning that any coloring of pairs of rationals by  $\{0, 1\}$  admits either a 0-homogeneous set of order type  $\eta$  or an infinite 1-homogeneous set.

**Corollary 13.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{I}$  is a  $\sigma$ -additive ideal on  $X$ , that positive sets split over the order, and  $c : [X]^2 \rightarrow 2$  is an arbitrary coloring. Then for all  $\alpha < \omega_1$  there exists a  $c$ -homogeneous set  $A \subseteq X$  of order type  $\alpha$ .*

*Proof.* Note that if we can find an  $(i, i)$ -splitting, positive  $X' \subseteq X$ , Theorem 10 would let us construct a  $c$ -homogeneous set of order type  $\eta$ , which is more than enough to get  $c$ -homogeneous sets of order type  $\alpha$ .

By Corollary 6 and a standard density argument, we may assume that there exists  $i \in 2$  such that every positive set  $X' \subseteq X$  can split into  $X_0 < X_1$  with  $(X_0, X_1)$  an  $i$ -focused pair. We use transfinite induction to argue that in any such set we may find a homogeneous set (of color  $i$ ) for all  $\alpha < \omega_1$ .

Suppose first that  $\alpha = \beta + 1$ . Simply split  $X$  into  $X_0 < X_1$  with  $(X_0, X_1)$  an  $i$ -focused pair. We know we may find a homogeneous set  $A_\beta$  of order type  $\beta$  inside  $X_0$ . For each  $x_0 \in A_\beta$ , the set

$$\{x_1 \in X_1 : c(\{x_0, x_1\}) = i\}$$

is cosmall in  $X_1$ . Since  $\mathcal{I}$  is  $\sigma$ -additive and  $A_\beta$  is countable, we may find an  $x_\beta$  in the intersection of all these sets. The set  $A_\beta \cup \{x_\beta\}$  is as desired.

Suppose now that  $\alpha = \bigcup_n \beta_n$  with each  $\beta_n < \alpha$ . Splitting  $X$  several times, we may find  $X_0 < X_1 < \dots$  such that  $(X_{n_0}, X_{n_1})$  is an  $i$ -focused pair whenever  $n_0 < n_1$ . By the inductive hypothesis, we may find a homogeneous set  $A_{\beta_0}$  of order type  $\beta_0$  inside  $X_0$ . As before, we may refine  $X_n$  for all  $n > 0$  so that for all  $x_0 \in A_{\beta_0}$  and  $x_n \in X_n$ ,  $c(\{x_0, x_n\}) = i$ . We continue in this fashion, finding a homogeneous  $A_{\beta_n}$  of order type  $\beta_n$  within  $X_n$ , refining after each step. In the end,  $\bigcup_n A_{\beta_n}$  is a homogeneous set of order type  $\sum_n \beta_n \geq \alpha$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 14 (Baumgartner-Hajnal, Galvin).** *Suppose that  $\varphi$  is an order type such that  $\varphi \rightarrow (\omega)_\omega^1$  and, moreover, that  $\omega_1$  does not embed into  $\varphi$ . Then for all  $\alpha < \omega_1$ ,  $\varphi \rightarrow (\alpha)_2^2$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\varphi$  is an order type satisfying the hypotheses of the corollary, and let  $(X, <)$  be a linearly ordered set of order type  $\varphi$ . We equip  $X$  with the ideal  $\mathcal{I}$  defined by

$$A \in \mathcal{I} \Leftrightarrow A \not\rightarrow (\omega)_\omega^1.$$

It is clear that  $\mathcal{I}$  is a  $\sigma$ -additive ideal (indeed, it is the  $\sigma$ -ideal generated by subsets of  $X$  not containing a copy of  $\omega$ ), so once we check that positive sets split over the order we may appeal to Corollary 13.

Towards that end, suppose that  $A \subseteq X$  is not in  $\mathcal{I}$ . For each  $x \in A$ , define the sets  $A_{<x}$  and  $A_{>x}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{<x} &= \{a \in A : a < x\} \\ A_{>x} &= \{a \in A : a > x\}. \end{aligned}$$

We argue that there is a set  $A'$  cosmall in  $A$  such that for all  $x \in A'$ , both  $A_{<x}$  and  $A_{>x}$  are positive, which is more than enough to show that positive sets split over the order.

First, let  $B_0 = \{x \in A : A_{<x} \text{ is small}\}$ . Let  $(x_\beta)_{\beta < \kappa}$  be an increasing, cofinal sequence in  $B_0$ . Since  $\omega_1$  does not embed into  $\varphi$ , we may assume that  $\kappa$  is countable. Then  $B_0 \subseteq \bigcup_{\beta < \kappa} A_{<x_\beta}$ , and consequently  $B_0$  is small.

Next, let  $B_1 = \{x \in A : A_{>x} \text{ is small}\}$ . Parallel to the earlier argument, let  $(x_\beta)_{\beta < \kappa}$  be a decreasing, coinital sequence in  $B_1$ . We may no longer assume  $\kappa$  is countable, but we can directly argue that  $B_1$  is in  $\mathcal{I}$ . Define a function  $f : B_1 \rightarrow \kappa$  by  $f(x) = \min\{\beta < \kappa : x \in A_{>x_\beta}\}$ , and fix for each  $\beta < \kappa$  colorings  $c_\beta : A_{>x_\beta} \rightarrow \omega$  witnessing  $A_{>x_\beta} \not\rightarrow (\omega)_\omega^1$ . Define a coloring  $c : B_1 \rightarrow \omega$  by

$$c(x) = c_{f(x)}(x).$$

We claim that this coloring witnesses  $B_1 \not\rightarrow (\omega)_\omega^1$ .

Suppose, towards a contradiction, that we have an increasing sequence  $(b_n)_{n \in \omega}$  in  $B_1$  such  $c$  is constant on  $\{b_n : n \in \omega\}$ . Since the sequence  $(f(b_n))_{n \in \omega}$  is a nondecreasing sequence of ordinals, it must be eventually constant. We may thus assume without loss of generality that there exists  $\beta < \kappa$  such that  $f(b_n) = \beta$  for all  $n \in \omega$ . But we would then have that  $c_\beta$  is constant on  $\{b_n : n \in \omega\}$ , contradicting the choice of  $c_\beta$ .

Consequently, both  $B_0$  and  $B_1$  are small, and thus the set  $A \setminus (B_0 \cup B_1)$  is cosmall in  $A$  as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 15.** In fact, for all countable  $\alpha$  the statement  $\omega_1 \rightarrow (\alpha)_2^2$  is true, so the hypothesis in Corollary 14 that  $\omega_1$  does not embed into  $\varphi$  is unnecessary. Todorcevic has shown that an analog holds in the greater generality of partial orders.