

Representations of ideals in Polish groups and in Banach spaces

Barnabás Farkas¹

joint work (in progress) with

Piotr Borodulin–Nadzieja¹ and Grzegorz Plebanek¹

Hejnice 2013

¹Mathematical Institute, University of Wrocław

Motivation
○○○○○

Non complete groups
○○

Polish-representability
○○○○○

Banach-representability
○○○○

Motivation: summable ideals

Definition

Let $h : \omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a sequence such that $\sum_{n \in \omega} h(n) = \infty$.
Then the **summable ideal associated to h** is

$$\mathcal{I}_h = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \sum_{n \in A} h(n) < \infty \right\} \quad (\text{a } F_\sigma \text{ P-ideal}).$$

Motivation: summable ideals

Definition

Let $h : \omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a sequence such that $\sum_{n \in \omega} h(n) = \infty$. Then the **summable ideal associated to h** is

$$\mathcal{I}_h = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \sum_{n \in A} h(n) < \infty \right\} \quad (\text{a } F_\sigma \text{ P-ideal}).$$

Observation

We can also allow that $h : \omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ IF we use **unconditional (or u -)convergency**, that is, $A \in \mathcal{I}_h$ if the net

$$\sum h \upharpoonright A = \left\{ s_h(F) = \sum_{n \in F} h(n) : F \in [A]^{<\omega} \right\} \text{ is convergent.}$$

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

Let G be an Abelian topological group and $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\sum_{n \in \omega} h(n)$ is not u-convergent. Then the **generalized summable ideal associated to G and h** is

$$\mathcal{I}_h^G = \text{ideal} \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \sum h \upharpoonright A \text{ is u-convergent} \right\}.$$

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

Let G be an Abelian topological group and $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\sum_{n \in \omega} h(n)$ is not u-convergent. Then the **generalized summable ideal associated to G and h** is

$$\mathcal{I}_h^G = \text{ideal} \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \sum h \upharpoonright A \text{ is u-convergent} \right\}.$$

Remarks

- (1) $\{A \subseteq \omega : \sum h \upharpoonright A \text{ is convergent}\}$ is not necessarily an ideal.
- (2) If G is complete (i.e. Cauchy nets are convergent), then $\mathcal{I}_h^G = \{A \subseteq \omega : \sum h \upharpoonright A \text{ is convergent}\}$.

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

We say that an ideal \mathcal{J} on ω is **representable in G** if there is an $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$. If \mathbf{C} is a class of groups then \mathcal{J} is **\mathbf{C} -representable** if it is representable in a $G \in \mathbf{C}$.

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

We say that an ideal \mathcal{J} on ω is **representable in G** if there is an $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$. If \mathbf{C} is a class of groups then \mathcal{J} is **\mathbf{C} -representable** if it is representable in a $G \in \mathbf{C}$.

Our research plan

In general, we want to characterize the following classes:

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

We say that an ideal \mathcal{J} on ω is **representable in G** if there is an $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$. If \mathbf{C} is a class of groups then \mathcal{J} is **\mathbf{C} -representable** if it is representable in a $G \in \mathbf{C}$.

Our research plan

In general, we want to characterize the following classes:

- (a) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is } \mathbf{Polish}\text{-representable}\}$. Done!

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

We say that an ideal \mathcal{J} on ω is **representable in G** if there is an $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$. If \mathbf{C} is a class of groups then \mathcal{J} is **\mathbf{C} -representable** if it is representable in a $G \in \mathbf{C}$.

Our research plan

In general, we want to characterize the following classes:

- (a) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is } \mathbf{Polish-representable}\}$. Done!
- (b) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is } \mathbf{Banach-representable}\}$. Done!

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

We say that an ideal \mathcal{J} on ω is **representable in G** if there is an $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$. If \mathbf{C} is a class of groups then \mathcal{J} is **\mathbf{C} -representable** if it is representable in a $G \in \mathbf{C}$.

Our research plan

In general, we want to characterize the following classes:

- (a) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is } \mathbf{Polish-representable}\}$. Done!
- (b) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is } \mathbf{Banach-representable}\}$. Done!
- (c) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is representable in } G\}$ for some fixed G .

Generalized summable ideals

Definition

We say that an ideal \mathcal{J} on ω is **representable in G** if there is an $h : \omega \rightarrow G$ such that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$. If \mathbf{C} is a class of groups then \mathcal{J} is **\mathbf{C} -representable** if it is representable in a $G \in \mathbf{C}$.

Our research plan

In general, we want to characterize the following classes:

- (a) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is } \mathbf{Polish-representable}\}$. Done!
- (b) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is } \mathbf{Banach-representable}\}$. Done!
- (c) $\{\mathcal{J} : \mathcal{J} \text{ is representable in } G\}$ for some fixed G .
- (d) $\{G : \mathcal{J} \text{ is representable in } G\}$ for some fixed \mathcal{J} .

Examples

Example

The *density zero ideal*

$$\mathcal{Z} = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \frac{|A \cap n|}{n} \rightarrow 0 \right\} = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \frac{|A \cap [2^n, 2^{n+1})|}{2^n} \rightarrow 0 \right\}$$

Examples

Example

The *density zero ideal*

$$\mathcal{Z} = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \frac{|A \cap n|}{n} \rightarrow 0 \right\} = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \frac{|A \cap [2^n, 2^{n+1})|}{2^n} \rightarrow 0 \right\}$$

is representable in c_0 : Let $h(0) = 0$, and if $k \in [2^n, 2^{n+1})$ then let $h(k) = 2^{-n} e_k$ where $e_k = (\delta_{k,m})_{m \in \omega}$.
In other words...

Examples

$$h(0) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(1) = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(2) = (0, 0, 1/2, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(3) = (0, 0, 1/2, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(4) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(5) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(6) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(7) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \end{array}$$

Examples

$$h(0) = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(1) = (0, 1, 0, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(2) = (0, 0, 1/2, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(3) = (0, 0, 1/2, 0, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(4) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(5) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(6) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$h(7) = (0, 0, 0, 1/4, 0, \dots)$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

If $A \subseteq \omega$ then $\sum h \upharpoonright A$ is u -convergent iff

$$\sum_{n \in A} h(n) = \left(0, \frac{|A \cap [2, 4]|}{2}, \frac{|A \cap [4, 8]|}{4}, \dots \right) \in \mathfrak{c}_0 \iff A \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

Examples

Example

It is easy to see that if $(G_n)_{n \in \omega}$ is a sequence of discrete Abelian groups, then \mathcal{J} is representable in $\prod_{n \in \omega} G_n$ iff there is a sequence $(X_n)_{n \in \omega}$ in $[\omega]^\omega$ such that

$$\mathcal{J} = \{A \subseteq \omega : \forall n \in \omega \ A \cap X_n \text{ is finite}\}.$$

Examples

Example

It is easy to see that if $(G_n)_{n \in \omega}$ is a sequence of discrete Abelian groups, then \mathcal{J} is representable in $\prod_{n \in \omega} G_n$ iff there is a sequence $(X_n)_{n \in \omega}$ in $[\omega]^\omega$ such that

$$\mathcal{J} = \{A \subseteq \omega : \forall n \in \omega \ A \cap X_n \text{ is finite}\}.$$

For example,

$$\{\emptyset\} \otimes \text{Fin} = \{A \subseteq \omega \times \omega : \forall n \in \omega \ \{m : (n, m) \in A\} \text{ is finite}\}$$

has this property. It is a non tall $F_{\sigma\delta}$ P-ideal.

Representations in non complete groups

Proposition

Representations in non complete groups

Proposition

- (i) Each ideal is representable in a normed space.

Representations in non complete groups

Proposition

- (i) Each ideal is representable in a normed space.
- (ii) Each ideal is representable in a group G satisfying $-g = g$.

Representations in non complete groups

Proposition

- (i) Each ideal is representable in a normed space.
- (ii) Each ideal is representable in a group G satisfying $-g = g$.

Proof: (i) Let $X_{\mathcal{J}}$ be the linear subspace of ℓ_{∞} generated by

$$\left\{ \sum_{n \in A} \frac{e_n}{n^2} : A \in \mathcal{J} \right\}$$

and let $h : \omega \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{J}}$, $h(n) = \frac{e_n}{n^2}$. Then $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^{X_{\mathcal{J}}}$.

Representations in non complete groups

Proposition

- (i) Each ideal is representable in a normed space.
- (ii) Each ideal is representable in a group G satisfying $-g = g$.

Proof: (i) Let $X_{\mathcal{J}}$ be the linear subspace of ℓ_{∞} generated by

$$\left\{ \sum_{n \in A} \frac{e_n}{n^2} : A \in \mathcal{J} \right\}$$

and let $h : \omega \rightarrow X_{\mathcal{J}}$, $h(n) = \frac{e_n}{n^2}$. Then $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^{X_{\mathcal{J}}}$.

(ii): Consider \mathcal{J} as a subgroup of $(\mathcal{P}(\omega), \Delta)$, and let $h(n) = \{n\}$. Then $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_h^{\mathcal{J}}$.

All ideals in a single normed spaces

Corollary

There is a normed space X with $\dim(X) = 2^c$ such that all ideals on ω are representable in X .

All ideals in a single normed spaces

Corollary

There is a normed space X with $\dim(X) = 2^{\aleph_1}$ such that all ideals on ω are representable in X .

Question (maybe easy)

Does there exist a normed space X such that all ideals on ω are representable in X and $\dim(X) < 2^{\aleph_1}$?

All ideals in a single normed spaces

Corollary

There is a normed space X with $\dim(X) = 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$ such that all ideals on ω are representable in X .

Question (maybe easy)

Does there exist a normed space X such that all ideals on ω are representable in X and $\dim(X) < 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$? (No if $2^{\mathfrak{c}} = \mathfrak{c}^{+n}$ for some $n \in \omega$ because then $|X|^{\omega} = (\dim(X)^{<\omega} \mathfrak{c})^{\omega} = \dim(X)^{\omega} < 2^{\mathfrak{c}}$.)

Polish-representability

We will need Solecki's representation theorem.

Polish-representability

We will need Solecki's representation theorem.

A function $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a **submeasure** (on ω) if

- $\varphi(\emptyset) = 0$;
- if $X, Y \subseteq \omega$ then $\varphi(X) \leq \varphi(X \cup Y) \leq \varphi(X) + \varphi(Y)$;
- $\varphi(\{n\}) < \infty$ for $n \in \omega$.

Polish-representability

We will need Solecki's representation theorem.

A function $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a **submeasure** (on ω) if

- $\varphi(\emptyset) = 0$;
- if $X, Y \subseteq \omega$ then $\varphi(X) \leq \varphi(X \cup Y) \leq \varphi(X) + \varphi(Y)$;
- $\varphi(\{n\}) < \infty$ for $n \in \omega$.

φ is **lower semicontinuous** (lsc, in short) if

$\varphi(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(X \cap n)$ for each $X \subseteq \omega$.

Polish-representability

We will need Solecki's representation theorem.

A function $\varphi : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is a **submeasure** (on ω) if

- $\varphi(\emptyset) = 0$;
- if $X, Y \subseteq \omega$ then $\varphi(X) \leq \varphi(X \cup Y) \leq \varphi(X) + \varphi(Y)$;
- $\varphi(\{n\}) < \infty$ for $n \in \omega$.

φ is **lower semicontinuous** (lsc, in short) if

$\varphi(X) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(X \cap n)$ for each $X \subseteq \omega$.

If φ is an lsc submeasure then let

$$\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \left\{ A \subseteq \omega : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(A \setminus n) = 0 \right\}.$$

It is easy to see that if $\text{Exh}(\varphi) \neq \mathcal{P}(\omega)$, then it is an $F_{\sigma\delta}$ P-ideal.

Polish-representability

Theorem (Solecki)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . Then the followings are equivalent:

Polish-representability

Theorem (Solecki)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . Then the followings are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is an analytic \mathcal{P} -ideal.

Polish-representability

Theorem (Solecki)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . Then the followings are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is an analytic \mathcal{P} -ideal.
- (ii) $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some (finite) lsc submeasure φ .

Polish-representability

Theorem (Solecki)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . Then the followings are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is an analytic \mathcal{P} -ideal.
- (ii) $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some (finite) lsc submeasure φ .
- (iii) There is a Polish group topology on \mathcal{I} (with respect to Δ) such that the Borel structure of this topology coincides with the Borel structure inherited from $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

Polish-representability

Theorem (Solecki)

Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on ω . Then the followings are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is an analytic \mathcal{P} -ideal.
- (ii) $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some (finite) lsc submeasure φ .
- (iii) There is a Polish group topology on \mathcal{I} (with respect to Δ) such that the Borel structure of this topology coincides with the Borel structure inherited from $\mathcal{P}(\omega)$.

Remark

The Polish topology on $\text{Exh}(\varphi)$ is generated by the complete metric $d_\varphi(A, B) = \varphi(A \Delta B)$.

Polish-representability

Theorem

An ideal \mathcal{I} is Polish-representable iff \mathcal{I} is an analytic P-ideal.

Polish-representability

Theorem

An ideal \mathcal{I} is Polish-representable iff \mathcal{I} is an analytic P-ideal.

Proof of “ \Leftarrow ”: If φ is a lsc submeasure on ω , then

$$\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^{\text{Exh}(\varphi)} \quad \text{where } h : \omega \rightarrow \text{Exh}(\varphi), \quad h(n) = \{n\}.$$

Polish-representability

Theorem

An ideal \mathcal{I} is Polish-representable iff \mathcal{I} is an analytic P-ideal.

First proof of “ \Rightarrow ”: Assume that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$ for some Polish G and h .

Polish-representability

Theorem

An ideal \mathcal{I} is Polish-representable iff \mathcal{I} is an analytic P-ideal.

First proof of “ \Rightarrow ”: Assume that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$ for some Polish G and h .

- The property “ $\sum h \upharpoonright A$ is u-convergent” is clearly $F_{\sigma\delta}$.

Polish-representability

Theorem

An ideal \mathcal{I} is Polish-representable iff \mathcal{I} is an analytic P-ideal.

First proof of “ \Rightarrow ”: Assume that $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_h^G$ for some Polish G and h .

- The property “ $\sum h \upharpoonright A$ is u-convergent” is clearly $F_{\sigma\delta}$.
- Applying that we can fix a complete and *translation invariant* metric on G , it is easy to see that \mathcal{I}_h^G is a P-ideal.

Polish-representability

Theorem

An ideal \mathcal{I} is Polish-representable iff \mathcal{I} is an analytic P-ideal.

Second proof of “ \Rightarrow ”: Let G, h, d be as above. Then

$$\varphi(A) = \sup \{ d(0, s_h(F)) : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}$$

is a lsc submeasure and it is easy to check that $\mathcal{I}_h^G = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$.

Banach-representability

A submeasure φ is ***non-pathological*** if for every $A \subseteq \omega$

$$\varphi(A) = \sup \{ \mu(A) : \mu \text{ is a measure on } \mathcal{P}(\omega) \text{ and } \mu \leq \varphi \}.$$

Banach-representability

A submeasure φ is **non-pathological** if for every $A \subseteq \omega$

$$\varphi(A) = \sup \{ \mu(A) : \mu \text{ is a measure on } \mathcal{P}(\omega) \text{ and } \mu \leq \varphi \}.$$

An analytic P-ideal \mathcal{J} is **non-pathological** iff $\mathcal{J} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some non-pathological lsc submeasure φ .

For example, summable ideals, density ideals, and $\{\emptyset\} \otimes \text{Fin}$ are non-pathological.

Banach-representability

A submeasure φ is **non-pathological** if for every $A \subseteq \omega$

$$\varphi(A) = \sup \{ \mu(A) : \mu \text{ is a measure on } \mathcal{P}(\omega) \text{ and } \mu \leq \varphi \}.$$

An analytic P-ideal \mathcal{I} is **non-pathological** iff $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some non-pathological lsc submeasure φ .

For example, summable ideals, density ideals, and $\{\emptyset\} \otimes \text{Fin}$ are non-pathological.

Theorem

Let $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ be an analytic P-ideal. Then the followings are equivalent:

Banach-representability

A submeasure φ is **non-pathological** if for every $A \subseteq \omega$

$$\varphi(A) = \sup \{ \mu(A) : \mu \text{ is a measure on } \mathcal{P}(\omega) \text{ and } \mu \leq \varphi \}.$$

An analytic P-ideal \mathcal{I} is **non-pathological** iff $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some non-pathological lsc submeasure φ .

For example, summable ideals, density ideals, and $\{\emptyset\} \otimes \text{Fin}$ are non-pathological.

Theorem

Let $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ be an analytic P-ideal. Then the followings are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is non-pathological.

Banach-representability

A submeasure φ is **non-pathological** if for every $A \subseteq \omega$

$$\varphi(A) = \sup \{ \mu(A) : \mu \text{ is a measure on } \mathcal{P}(\omega) \text{ and } \mu \leq \varphi \}.$$

An analytic P-ideal \mathcal{I} is **non-pathological** iff $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some non-pathological lsc submeasure φ .

For example, summable ideals, density ideals, and $\{\emptyset\} \otimes \text{Fin}$ are non-pathological.

Theorem

Let $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ be an analytic P-ideal. Then the followings are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is non-pathological.
- (ii) \mathcal{I} is representable in ℓ_∞ .

Banach-representability

A submeasure φ is **non-pathological** if for every $A \subseteq \omega$

$$\varphi(A) = \sup \{ \mu(A) : \mu \text{ is a measure on } \mathcal{P}(\omega) \text{ and } \mu \leq \varphi \}.$$

An analytic P-ideal \mathcal{I} is **non-pathological** iff $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ for some non-pathological lsc submeasure φ .

For example, summable ideals, density ideals, and $\{\emptyset\} \otimes \text{Fin}$ are non-pathological.

Theorem

Let $\mathcal{I} = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$ be an analytic P-ideal. Then the followings are equivalent:

- (i) \mathcal{I} is non-pathological.
- (ii) \mathcal{I} is representable in ℓ_∞ .
- (iii) \mathcal{I} is Banach-representable.

\mathcal{J} is non-pathological $\Rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ is representable in ℓ_∞

Proof: Fix a sequence $(\mu_k)_{k \in \omega}$ of measures on ω such that

$$\varphi(F) = \sup \{ \mu_k(F) : k \in \omega \} \quad \text{for every } F \in [\omega]^{<\omega},$$

\mathcal{J} is non-pathological $\Rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ is representable in ℓ_∞

Proof: Fix a sequence $(\mu_k)_{k \in \omega}$ of measures on ω such that

$$\varphi(F) = \sup \{ \mu_k(F) : k \in \omega \} \quad \text{for every } F \in [\omega]^{<\omega},$$

and let $h : \omega \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ be defined by

$$h(0) = (\mu_0(\{0\}), \mu_1(\{0\}), \mu_2(\{0\}), \dots)$$

$$h(1) = (\mu_0(\{1\}), \mu_1(\{1\}), \mu_2(\{1\}), \dots)$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

$$h(n) = (\mu_0(\{n\}), \mu_1(\{n\}), \mu_2(\{n\}), \dots)$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

\mathcal{I} is non-pathological $\Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is representable in ℓ_∞

Proof: Fix a sequence $(\mu_k)_{k \in \omega}$ of measures on ω such that

$$\varphi(F) = \sup \{ \mu_k(F) : k \in \omega \} \quad \text{for every } F \in [\omega]^{<\omega},$$

and let $h : \omega \rightarrow \ell_\infty$ be defined by

$$h(0) = (\mu_0(\{0\}), \mu_1(\{0\}), \mu_2(\{0\}), \dots)$$

$$h(1) = (\mu_0(\{1\}), \mu_1(\{1\}), \mu_2(\{1\}), \dots)$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

$$h(n) = (\mu_0(\{n\}), \mu_1(\{n\}), \mu_2(\{n\}), \dots)$$

$$\vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots \quad \vdots$$

Then $\|s_h(F)\| = \varphi(F)$ for every $F \in [\omega]^{<\omega}$ and so $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^{\ell_\infty}$.

\mathcal{J} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

\mathcal{I} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$.

\mathcal{I} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$. How to construct ψ ?

\mathcal{I} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$. How to construct ψ ?

- $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \rightsquigarrow a' \subseteq a$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(a) = \|s_h(a')\|$.

\mathcal{J} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$. How to construct ψ ?

- $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \rightsquigarrow a' \subseteq a$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(a) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Fix an $x_a^* \in X^*$ with $\|x_a^*\| = 1$ and $x_a^*(s_h(a')) = \|s_h(a')\|$.

\mathcal{I} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$. How to construct ψ ?

- $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \rightsquigarrow a' \subseteq a$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(a) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Fix an $x_a^* \in X^*$ with $\|x_a^*\| = 1$ and $x_a^*(s_h(a')) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Let $\nu_a(b) = x_a^*(s_h(a' \cap b))$, it is a signed measure.

\mathcal{I} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$. How to construct ψ ?

- $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \rightsquigarrow a' \subseteq a$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(a) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Fix an $x_a^* \in X^*$ with $\|x_a^*\| = 1$ and $x_a^*(s_h(a')) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Let $\nu_a(b) = x_a^*(s_h(a' \cap b))$, it is a signed measure.
- Let $\mu_a = \nu_a^+ + \nu_a^-$ (in other words $\mu_a(\{n\}) = |\nu_a(\{n\})|$).

\mathcal{J} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{J}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$. How to construct ψ ?

- $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \rightsquigarrow a' \subseteq a$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(a) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Fix an $x_a^* \in X^*$ with $\|x_a^*\| = 1$ and $x_a^*(s_h(a')) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Let $\nu_a(b) = x_a^*(s_h(a' \cap b))$, it is a signed measure.
- Let $\mu_a = \nu_a^+ + \nu_a^-$ (in other words $\mu_a(\{n\}) = |\nu_a(\{n\})|$).
- Finally let $\psi = \sup \{ \mu_a : a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \}$.

\mathcal{I} is Banach-representable $\Rightarrow \mathcal{I}$ is non-pathological

Proof: Assume that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \mathcal{I}_h^X$ for some Banach space X and $h : \omega \rightarrow X$. We will construct a non-pathological ψ such that $\text{Exh}(\varphi) = \text{Exh}(\psi)$.

Let the submeasure $\widehat{\varphi}$ be defined by

$$\widehat{\varphi}(A) = \sup \{ \|s_h(A)\| : \emptyset \neq F \in [A]^{<\omega} \}.$$

We know that $\text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \mathcal{I}_h^X = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$. How to construct ψ ?

- $a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \rightsquigarrow a' \subseteq a$ such that $\widehat{\varphi}(a) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Fix an $x_a^* \in X^*$ with $\|x_a^*\| = 1$ and $x_a^*(s_h(a')) = \|s_h(a')\|$.
- Let $\nu_a(b) = x_a^*(s_h(a' \cap b))$, it is a signed measure.
- Let $\mu_a = \nu_a^+ + \nu_a^-$ (in other words $\mu_a(\{n\}) = |\nu_a(\{n\})|$).
- Finally let $\psi = \sup \{ \mu_a : a \in [\omega]^{<\omega} \}$.

Then $\widehat{\varphi} \leq \psi \leq 2\widehat{\varphi}$ and so $\text{Exh}(\psi) = \text{Exh}(\widehat{\varphi}) = \text{Exh}(\varphi)$.

Motivation
○○○○○

Non complete groups
○○

Polish-representability
○○○○○

Banach-representability
○○○●

My favorite question...

My favorite question...

Question

Which ideals are representable in c_0 ?

Thank you!