ON COUNTABLY CLOSED COMPLETE BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

Thomas Jech and Saharon Shelah

The Pennsylvania State University
The Hebrew University and Rutgers University

Abstract. It is unprovable that every complete subalgebra of a countably closed complete Boolean algebra is countably closed.

Introduction. A partially ordered set $(P, <)$ is *σ-closed* if every countable chain in P has a lower bound. A complete Boolean algebra B is *countably closed* if $(B^+, <)$ has a dense subset that is σ-closed. In [2] the first author introduced a weaker condition for Boolean algebras, *game-closed*: the second player has a winning strategy in the infinite game where the two players play an infinite descending chain of nonzero elements, and the second player wins if the chain has a lower bound. In [1], Foreman proved that when B has a dense subset of size $\aleph_1$ and is game-closed then B is countably closed. (By Vojtáš [5] and Veličković [4] this holds for every B that has a dense subset of size $2^{\aleph_0}$.) We show that, in general, it is unprovable that game-closed implies countably closed. We construct a model in which a B exists that is game-closed but not countably closed. It remains open whether a counterexample exists in ZFC.

Being game-closed is a hereditary property: If A is a complete subalgebra of a game-closed complete Boolean algebra B then A is game-closed. It is observed in [3] that every game-closed algebra is embedded in a countably closed algebra; in fact,

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E.

Key words and phrases. Boolean algebra, countably closed, game-closed, forcing.

The first author has been partially supported by the U.S.-Czechoslovakia cooperative grant INT-9016754 from the NSF.

The second author has been partially supported by the U.S.-Israel Binational Science Foundation. Publication number 565

for a forcing notion $(P,<)$, being game-closed is equivalent to the existence of a σ-closed forcing Q such that $P\times Q$ has a dense σ-closed subset. Hence the statement "every game-closed complete Boolean algebra is countably closed" is equivalent to the statement "every complete subalgebra of a countably closed complete Boolean algebra is countably closed".

Below we construct (by forcing) a model of ZFC+GCH and in it a partial ordering P of size $\aleph_2$ such that $B(P)$, the completion of P, is not countably closed, but $B(P\times Col)$ is, where Col is the Lévy collapse of $\aleph_2$ to $\aleph_1$ (with countable conditions).

Theorem. *It is consistent that there exists a partial ordering $(P,<)$ such that $B(P)$ is not countably closed but $B(P\times Col)$ is countably closed.*

Forcing Conditions.

We assume that the ground model satisfies GCH.

We want to construct, by forcing, a partially ordered set $(P,<_P)$ of size $\aleph_2$ that has the desired properties. We shall use as forcing conditions countable approximations of P. One part of a forcing condition will thus be a countable partial ordering $(A,<_A)$ with the intention that A be a subset of P and that the relation $<_A$ on A be the restriction of $<_P$. As P will have size $\aleph_2$, we let $P=\omega_2$, and so A is a countable subset of ω_2.

The second part of a forcing condition will be a countable set $B\subset A\times Col$, a countable approximation of a dense set in the product ordering $P\times Col$. The third part of a forcing condition will be a countable set C of countable descending chains in A that have no lower bound. Finally, a forcing condition includes a function that guarantees that the limit of the B's is σ-closed (and so $P\times Col$ has a σ-closed dense subset).

Whenever we use $<$ without a subscript, we mean the natural ordering of ordinal numbers.

Definition. For any set X, $Col(X)$ is the set of all countable functions q such that $dom(q)\in\omega_1$ and range $(q)\subset X$; $Col=Col(\omega_2)$.

Definition. The set R of forcing conditions r consists of quadruples $r = ((A_r, <_r), B_r, C_r, F_r)$ such that

(1) A_r is a countable subset of ω_2,

(2) $(A_r, <_r)$ is a partially ordered set,

(3) if $b <_r a$ then $a < b$,

(4) B_r is a countable subset of $A_r \times Col(A_r)$, and for every $(p, q) \in B_r$, $p \in \text{range}(q)$,

(5) C_r is a countable set of countable sequences $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ in A_r with the property that $a_0 >_r a_1 >_r \cdots >_r a_n >_r \cdots$ and that $\{a_n\}_n$ has no lower bound in A_r,

(6) F_r is a function of two variables, $\{a_n\}_n \in C_r$ and $(p, q) \in B_r$ such that $p \geq a_0$, and $\text{range}(F_r) \subset \omega$. If $m = F_r(\{a_n\}_n, (p, q))$ then for every $(p', q') \in B_r$ stronger than (p, q),

(*) if $p' <_r a_m$ then $p' \perp_r \{a_n\}_n$ (i.e. $p' \perp_r a_k$ for some k).

If $r, s \in R$ then $r <_R s$ (r is stronger than s) if

(7) $A_r \supseteq A_s$,

(8) $<_r$ and $<_s$ agree on A_s, and $\perp_r$ and $\perp_s$ agree on A_s; i.e. if $a, b \in A_s$ then $a <_r b$ iff $a <_s b$ and $a \perp_r b$ iff $a \perp_s b$ for all $a, b \in A_s$,

(9) $B_r \supseteq B_s$,

(10) $C_r \supseteq C_s$,

(11) $F_r \supseteq F_s$.

The relation $<_R$ on R is a partial ordering. We shall prove that the forcing extension by R contains a desired example $(P, <_P)$. Assuming the GCH in the ground model, the forcing R preserves cardinals and V^R is a model of $ZFC+GCH$; this follows from the next two lemmas:

Lemma 1. *R is σ-closed.*

Proof. Let $\{r_n\}_n$ be a sequence of conditions such that $r_0 >_R r_1 >_R \cdots >_R r_n >_R \cdots$. We show that $\{r_n\}_n$ has a lower bound.

Assuming that for each n, $r_n = ((A_n, <_n), B_n, C_n, F_n)$, we let $A_r = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} A_n$, $B_r = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n$, $C_r = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n$, $F_r = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} F_n$ and $<_r = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} <_n$; we claim that $r = ((A_r, <_r), B_r, C_r, F_r)$ is a condition, and is stronger than each r_n.

The quadruple r clearly has properties (1)–(4). It is also easy to see that for every n, $<_r$ agrees with $<_n$ and $\perp_r$ agrees with $\perp_n$ on A_n. To verify (5), let $\{a_n\}_n \in C_r$. There is an m such that $\{a_n\}_n \in C_k$ for all $k \geq m$, and therefore $\{a_n\}_n$ has no lower bound in any A_k. Thus $\{a_n\}_n$ has no lower bound in A_r. Finally, to verify (6), let $F_r(\vec{a}, (p, q)) = m$ and let (p', q') be stronger than (p, q). Since (*) holds in r_n where n is large enough so that $\vec{a} \in C_n$ and $(p, q), (p', q') \in B_n$, (*) holds in r as well.

Therefore r is a condition and for every n, r is stronger than r_n.

Lemma 2. *R has the $\aleph_2$-chain condition.*

Proof. If W is a set of conditions of size $\aleph_2$, then a Δ-system argument (using CH) yields two conditions $r, s \in W$ such that if $r = ((A_r, <_r), B_r, C_r, F_r)$ and $s = ((A_s, <_s), B_s, C_s, F_s)$, then there is a D (the root of the Δ-system) such that $D = A_r \cap A_s$, $\sup D < \min(A_r - D)$, $\sup A_r < \min(A_s - D)$, $<_r$ and $<_s$ agree on D, $\perp_r$ and $\perp_s$ agree on D, $B_r \cap (D \times Col(D)) = B_s \cap (D \times Col(D))$, $C_r \cap D^\omega = C_s \cap D^\omega$, and $F_r(\vec{a}, (p, q)) = F_s(\vec{a}, (p, q))$ whenever $\vec{a} \in C_r \cap D^\omega$ and $(p, q) \in B_r \cap (D \times Col(D))$.

Moreover, there exists a mapping π of A_s onto A_r that is an isomorphism between s and r and is the identity on D.

Let $t = ((A_t, <_t), B_t, C_t, F_t)$ where $A_t = A_r \cup A_s$, $B_t = B_r \cup B_s$, $C_t = C_r \cup C_s$, $<_t = <_r \cup <_s$, and F_t will be defined below such that $F_t \supseteq F_r \cup F_s$. We claim that t is a condition, and is stronger than both r and s; thus r and s are compatible. Properties (1)–(4) are easy to verify. It is also easy to see that $<_t$ agrees with $<_r$ on A_r and with $<_s$ on A_s, and $\perp_t$ agrees with $\perp_r$ on A_r and with $\perp_s$ on A_s.

Note that if $a \in A_r - D$ and $b \in A_s - D$ then $a \perp_t b$. Thus if $\{a_n\}_n$ is in C_r

but not in C_s (or vice versa) then $\{a_n\}_n$ has no lower bound in $A_r \cup A_s$, and so (5) holds.

In order to deal with (6), we first verify it for the values of F_t inherited from either r or s. Thus let $\vec{a} \in C_r$, $(p,q) \in B_r$, $m = F_r(\vec{a},(p,q))$ and let $(p',q') \in B_t$ be stronger than (p,q). (The argument for s in place of r is completely analogous.) If $(p',q') \in B_r$ then (*) holds in r and therefore in t. Thus assume that $(p',q') \in B_s$.

Since $p' \in A_s$ and $p' <_t p$, it follows that $p \in D$, and since range$(q) \subseteq$ range$(q') \subseteq A_s$, we have $(p,q) \in B_s$. Now if $\vec{a} \in C_s$ then $F_s(\vec{a},(p,q)) = F_r(\vec{a},(p,q))$ and so p' satisfies (*) in s and hence in t.

If $\vec{a} \notin C_s$ and $p' \notin A_r$ then $p' \perp_t \vec{a}$ and again p' satisfies (*).

The remaining case is when $p' \in D$ and $(p,q) \in B_r \cap B_s$. Since $(p',\pi q') = (\pi p',\pi q')$ is stronger than $(p,q) = (\pi p,\pi q)$, p' satisfies (*) in r and therefore in t.

To complete the verification of (6) we define $F_t(\vec{a},(p,q))$ for those $\vec{a}$ and (p,q) that come from the two different conditions. Let $\vec{a} \in C_r - C_s$ and $(p,q) \in B_s - B_r$ (the other case being analogous) be such that $p \geq a_0$. We let $F_t(\vec{a},(p,q))$ be the least m such that $a_m \notin D$.

Let $(p',q') \in B_t$ be stronger than (p,q); we shall show that $p' \not<_t a_m$. This is clear if $p' \in D$, by (3). If $p' \notin D$ then we claim that p' cannot be in A_r; then it follows that $p' \perp_t a_m$. To prove the claim, note that range$(q) \not\subseteq A_r$ (because $(p,q) \notin B_r$) and hence range$(q') \subseteq A_s$. By (4), $p' \in A_s$ and so $p \notin A_r$.

Therefore t is a condition and is stronger than both r and s.

Let G be a generic filter on R. In V_G, we let $P = \bigcup\{A_r : r \in G\}$, $<_P = \bigcup\{<_r : r \in G\}$, and $Q = \bigcup\{B_r : r \in G\}$. $(P,<_P)$ is a partial ordering and $Q \subset P \times Col$. We shall prove that Q is σ-closed and is dense in $P \times Col$, and that the complete Boolean algebra $B(P)$ does not have a dense σ-closed subset.

Lemma 3. $P = \omega_2$.

Proof. We prove that for every s and every $p \in \omega_2$ there exists an $r <_R s$ such that $p \in A_r$. But this is straightforward: let $A_r = A_s \cup \{p\}$, $B_r = B_s$, $C_r = C_s$,

$F_r = F_s$ and $<_r=<_s$; properties (1)–(11) are easily verified. (Note that $p \perp_r a$ for all $a \in A_s$.)

Lemma 4. *Q is dense in $P \times Col$.*

Proof. Let s be a condition and let $p_0 \in A_s$ and $q_0 \in Col$. We shall find an $r <_R s$, $p \in A_r$ and $q \supset q_0$ such that $p <_r p_0$ and $(p,q) \in B_r$: Let p be an ordinal greater than $\sup A_s$, let $q \in Col$ be such that $q \supset q_0$ and $p \in$ range (q), and let $A_r = A_s \cup$ range (q), $B_r = B_s \cup \{(p,q)\}$, $C_r = C_s$, and let $<_r$ be the partial order of A_r that extends $<_s$ by making $p <_r p_0$. Finally, let $F_r(\vec{a},(p,q)) = 0$ for all $\vec{a} \in C_r$.

To see that $r = ((A_r,<_r),B_r,C_r,F_r)$ is a condition, note that for every $\vec{a} \in C_r$, p is not a lower bound of $\vec{a}$ (because p_0 isn't) and hence $p \perp_r \vec{a}$. This implies both (5) and (6). Since adding p does not affect the relation $\perp$ on A_s, we have (8) and so r is stronger than s.

Next we prove that Q is σ-closed.

Lemma 5. *If $u = \{(p_n,q_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a descending chain in Q then u has a lower bound.*

Proof. Let $\dot{u}$ be a name for a descending chain and let s be a condition. By extending s ω times if necessary (R is σ-closed), we may assume that there is a sequence $u = \{(p_n,q_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ in $\omega_2 \times Col$ such that s forces $\dot{u} = u$, such that for every n, $p_n \in A_s$, $(p_n,q_n) \in B_s$, that $p_0 >_s p_1 >_s \cdots >_s p_n > \cdots$ is a descending chain in $(A_s,<_s)$ and that $q_0 \subset q_1 \subset \cdots \subset q_n \subset \ldots$.

Let p be an ordinal greater than $\sup A_s$, let $q \supseteq \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} q_n$ be such that $p \in$ range$(q) \subseteq A_s \cup \{p\}$, let $A_r = A_s \cup \{p\}$, $B_r = B_s \cup \{(p,q)\}$, $C_r = C_s$, and let $<_r$ be the partial order of A_r that extends $<_s$ by making p a lower bound of $\{p_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$. Finally, let $F_r(\vec{a},(p,q)) = 0$ for all $\vec{a} \in C_r$ and $r = ((A_r,<_r),B_r,C_r,F_r)$.

We shall show that for every $\vec{a} \in C_s$, p is not a lower bound of $\vec{a}$. This implies that $p \perp_r \vec{a}$ and (5) and (6) follow. Since making p a lower bound of $\{p_n\}_n$ does not affect the relation $\perp$ on A_s, we'll have (8) and hence $r <_R s$. In r, (p,q) is a lower bound of u.

Thus let $\vec{a} = \{a_k\}_k \in C_s$. We claim that

$$\exists k\, \forall n\, p_n \not<_s a_k.$$

This implies that $p \not<_r a_k$ and hence p is not a lower bound of $\vec{a}$.

If $p_n < a_0$ for all n then we let $k = 0$ because then $p_n \not<_s a_0$ for all n.

Otherwise let N be the least N such that $p_N \geq a_0$, and let $m = F_s(\vec{a}, (p_N, q_N))$. Either $p_n \not<_s a_m$ for all n and we are done (with $k = m$) or else $p_M <_s a_m$ for some $M \geq N$. By (*) there exists some k such that $p_M \perp_s a_k$ and hence $p_n \not<_s a_k$ for all n.

Finally, we shall prove that $B(P)$ is not countably closed.

Lemma 6. *The complete Boolean algebra $B(P)$ does not have a dense σ-closed subset.*

Proof. Assume that $B(P)$ does have a dense σ-closed subset D. For $a, b \in P$, we define

$$a \prec b \quad \text{if} \quad a <_P b \quad \text{and} \quad \exists\, d \in D \quad \text{such that} \quad a <_{B(P)} d <_{B(P)} b.$$

The relation $\prec$ is a partial ordering of P, $(P, \prec)$ is σ-closed, $a \prec b$ implies $a <_P b$ and for every $a \in P$ there is some $b \in P$ such that $b \prec a$.

Toward a contradiction, let s be a condition and assume that s forces the preceding statement. For each $\alpha < \omega_2$, there exist a condition s_α stronger than s, and a descending chain $\{c_n^\alpha\}_n$ in A_{s_α} such that $c_0^\alpha \geq \alpha$ and that for every n, $s_\alpha \Vdash c_{n+1}^\alpha \prec c_n^\alpha$.

By a Δ-system argument we find among these a countable sequence $r_n = s_{\alpha_n} = ((A_n, <_n), B_n, C_n, F_n)$ and a set E such that for every m and n with $m < n$ we have $E = A_m \cap A_n$, $\sup E < \min(A_m - E)$, $\sup A_m < \min(A_n - E)$, $<_m$ and $<_n$ agree on E, $\perp_m$ and $\perp_n$ agree on E, $B_m \cap (E \times\ Col(E)) = B_n \cap (E \times Col(E))$, $C_m \cap E^\omega = C_n \cap E^\omega$, and $F_m(\vec{a}, (p, q)) = F_n(\vec{a}, (p, q))$ whenever $\vec{a} \in C_m \cap E^\omega$ and $(p, q) \in B_m \cap (E \times Col(E))$. Moreover, there exists a mapping π_{mn} of A_m onto A_n that is an isomorphism between $(r_m, \{c_k^{\alpha_m}\}_k)$ and $(r_n, \{c_k^{\alpha_n}\}_k)$ and is the identity on E. We also let $\pi_{nm} = {\pi_{mn}}^{-1}, \pi_{mm} = id$ and assume that the π_{mn} form a commutative system. Note that for every n and k, $c_k^{\alpha_n} \notin E$.

For each n and k, let $a_k^n = c_{2k}^{\alpha_n}$ and $b_k^n = c_{2k+1}^{\alpha_n}$. Let $\vec{u} = \{u_n\}_n$ be the "diagonal sequence"

$$u_{2n} = a_n^n, \quad u_{2n+1} = b_n^n.$$

We shall find a condition $t = ((A_t, <_t), B_t, C_t, F_t)$ stronger than all r_n such that the diagonal sequence $\vec{u}$ is a descending chain and belongs to C_t. Since $t \Vdash b_n^n \prec a_n^n$ for every n, it forces that $(P, \prec)$ is not σ-closed. This will complete the proof.

To construct t we first let $A_t = \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty A_n$ and $B_t = \bigcup_{n=0}^\infty B_n$. Let $<_t$ be the minimal partial ordering extending $\bigcup_{n=0}^\infty <_n$ such that for every n, $a_{n+1}^{n+1} <_t b_n^n$. Before proceeding to define C_t and F_t we shall prove some properties of $(A_t, <_t)$.

Lemma 7. *(i) Let $m < n$ and let $y \in A_m - E$ and $x \in A_n - E$. If $x <_t y$ then $x \leq_n a_n^n$ and $b_m^m \leq_m y$. If x and y are compatible in $<_t$ then $b_m^m \leq_m y$.*

(ii) For all m and n, if $x \in A_n$ and $y \in A_m$ and if $x <_t y$ then $x <_n \pi_{mn} y$ (and $\pi_{nm} x <_m y$). In particular, if $x, y \in A_n$ then $x <_t y$ if and only if $x <_n y$.

(iii) For all m and n, if $x \in A_n$ and $y \in A_m$ and if x and y are compatible in $<_t$ then x and $\pi_{mn} y$ are compatible in $<_n$ (and $\pi_{nm} x$ and y are compatible in $<_m$). In particular, if $x, y \in A_n$ then $x \perp_t y$ if and only if $x \perp_n y$.

Proof. (i) The first statement is an obvious consequence of the definition of $<_t$, and the second follows because any z such that $z \leq_t x$ is in some $A_k - E$ where $k \geq n$.

(ii) Let $x \in A_n$ and $y \in A_m$ and let $x <_t y$. First assume that $y \notin E$ (and so $x \notin E$.) Necessarily, $m \leq n$ and if $m = n$ then clearly $x <_n y$. Thus consider $m < n$. By (i) $x \leq_n a_n^n <_n b_m^n = \pi_{mn}(b_m^m) \leq_n \pi_{mn} y$.

Now assume that $y \in E$ and proceed by induction on x. If $x \in E$ then $x <_n y$. If $x \notin E$ then either $x <_n y$ or there exists some $z \notin E$ such that $x <_t z <_t y$, and by the induction hypothesis $z <_k \pi_{mk} y$ (where $z \in A_k$). Applying the preceding paragraph to x and z we get $\pi_{nk} x <_k z$ and hence $\pi_{nk} x <_k \pi_{mk} y$. The statement now follows.

(iii) Let $x \in A_n$ and $y \in A_m$ and let $z \in A_k$ be such that $z <_t x$ and $z <_t y$. By (ii) we have $\pi_{kn} z <_n x$ and $\pi_{km} z <_m y$. Hence $\pi_{kn} z = \pi_{mn} \pi_{km} z <_n \pi_{mn} y$. The second statement follows from this and from the second statement of (ii).

Lemma 7 guarantees that t will be stronger than every r_n. Another consequence is that if $\vec{a} \in C_n$ then $\vec{a}$ has no lower bound in $<_t$: if $x \in A_m$ were a lower bound then $\pi_{mn} x$ would be a lower bound in $<_n$.

Let $C_t = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n \cup \{\vec{u}\}$. Every sequence in C_t is a descending chain in $<_t$ without a lower bound (clearly, $\vec{u}$ has no lower bound).

Lemma 8. *For all k and n, if $(p,q) \in B_k - B_n$ and if $(p',q') \in B_t$ is stronger than (p,q) then $(p',q') \in B_k - B_n$.*

Proof. Since $(p,q) \notin B_n$, we have either $\text{range}(q) \not\subseteq E$ or $p \notin E$, in which case $p \in \text{range}(q)$ by (4) and again $\text{range}(q) \not\subseteq E$. Since $q \subseteq q'$ it must be the case that $(p',q') \in B_k - B_n$.

We shall now define F_t so that $F_t \supset \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} F_n$ and verify (6). This will complete the proof.

First we let $F_t(\vec{a},(p,q)) = F_n(\vec{a},(p,q))$ whenever the right-hand side is defined; we have to show that (6) holds in t. Let $m = F_n(\vec{a},(p,q))$ and let $(p',q') \in B_k$ be stronger than (p,q). It follows from Lemma 8 that $(p,q) \in B_k$. Now $(\pi_{kn} p', \pi_{kn} q')$ is stronger than $(\pi_{kn} p, \pi_{kn} q) = (p,q)$ and (*) holds for $\pi_{kn} p'$ in r_n. If $p' <_t a_m$ then by Lemma 7 $\pi_{kn} p' <_n a_m$ and hence $\pi_{kn} p' \perp_n \vec{a}$. By Lemma 7 again, $p' \perp_t \vec{a}$.

Next, let $\vec{a}$ and (p,q) be such that $\vec{a} \in C_n - C_k$, $(p,q) \in B_k - B_n$ and $p \geq a_0$. If $k < n$, we have $\pi_{kn} p \geq p \geq a_0$ and we let $F_t(\vec{a},(p,q)) = F_n(\vec{a},(\pi_{kn} p, \pi_{kn} q))$. To verify (6), let $m = F_t(\vec{a},(p,q))$ and let $(p',q') \in B_t$ be stronger than (p,q). By Lemma 8 $(p',q') \in B_k$, and $(\pi_{kn} p', \pi_{kn} q')$ is stronger (in r_n) than $(\pi_{kn} p, \pi_{kn} q)$. If $p' <_t a_m$ then by Lemma 7 $\pi_{kn} p' <_n a_m$ and so $\pi_{kn} p' \perp_n \vec{a}$. By Lemma 7 again, $p' \perp_t \vec{a}$.

If $k > n$, we let $F_t(\vec{a},(p,q))$ be the least m such that $a_m \notin E$ and that $b_n^n \not\leq_n a_m$ (such m exists as $\vec{a}$ does not have a lower bound in A_n). To verify (6), let $(p',q') \in B_t$ be stronger than (p,q). If $p' \in E$ then $p' \not<_t a_m$ and if $p' \notin E$ then by Lemma 7(i)

$p' \perp_t a_m$. In either case, (6) is satisfied.

Finally, we define $F_t(\vec{u}, (p,q))$. Thus let $(p,q) \in B_t$ be such that $p \geq u_0$. Since $u_0 = a_0^0 \notin E$, we have $p \notin E$. Let n be the n such that $p \in A_n$. We let $F_t(\vec{u}, (p,q)) = 2n+2$. That is, the chosen u_m is $u_{2n+2} = a_{n+1}^{n+1}$. To verify (6), let $(p', q') \in B_t$ be stronger than (p,q). Since $p \in A_n - E$, by Lemma 8 we have $(p', q') \in B_n$ and therefore $p' \in A_n - E$. But $a_{n+1}^{n+1} \in A_{n+1} - E$ and so $p' \not<_t a_{n+1}^{n+1}$. Therefore (6) holds.

References

1. M. Foreman, *Games played on Boolean algebras*, J. Symbolic Logic **48** (1983), 714–723.
2. T. Jech, *A game-theoretic property of Boolean algebras*, in: Logic Colloquium 77 (A. Macintyre et al., eds.), North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam 1978, pp. 135–144.
3. T. Jech, *More game-theoretic properties of Boolean algebras*, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic **26** (1984), 11–29.
4. B. Veličković, *Playful Boolean algebras*, Transactions of the American Math. Society **296** (1986), 727–740.
5. P. Vojtáš, *Game properties of Boolean algebras*, Comment. Math. Univ. Carol. **24** (1983), 349–369.

Department of Mathematics, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16803, USA

Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel, and Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, USA

E-mail address: jech@math.psu.edu, shelah@sunrise.huji.ac.il, shelah@math.rutgers.edu