

Superatomic Boolean Algebras: maximal rigidity

Saharon Shelah

ABSTRACT. We prove that for any superatomic Boolean Algebra of cardinality $> \beth_4$ there is an automorphism moving uncountably many atoms. Similarly for larger cardinals. Each of these results are essentially best possible.

Annotated Content

§0 Introduction

§1 Superatomic Boolean algebras have nontrivial automorphisms

[We prove that if \mathbb{B} is a superatomic Boolean Algebra, then it has a quite nontrivial automorphism; specifically, if \mathbb{B} is of cardinality $> \beth_4(\sigma)$, then \mathbb{B} has an automorphism moving $> \sigma$ atoms. We then discuss how much we can weaken the superatomicity assumptions.]

§2 Constructing counterexamples

[Under some assumptions, we construct examples of superatomic Boolean Algebras for which every automorphism moves few atoms.]

§3 Sufficient conditions for the construction assumptions

[We deal with the assumptions of the construction in §2 deducing that in many cases, even usually, the bound in §1 is essentially best possible.]

§4 On Independence

[We show e.g. that $\beth_4(\sigma)$ consistently can be improved.]

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E04, 06E99, 20B27.

Key words and phrases. Set Theory, Boolean Algebras, superatomic, rigid; pcf, MAD.

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing. This paper is number 704 in the cumulative list of the author's publications. This research was supported by The Israel Science Foundation.

§0 Introduction

We show that any superatomic Boolean Algebra has an automorphism moving uncountably many atoms if it is large enough, really $> \beth_4$; similarly replacing \aleph_0 by θ ; (an automorphism moves an atom if its image is not itself). We then show that those results are essentially best possible. Of course, we can express those results in topological terms. See [M] and [M1] on Boolean Algebra.

Rubin and Koppleberg [RuKo01] have proved: if $\diamond_{\lambda^+} + 2^{\lambda^+} = \lambda^{++}$, then there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B} of cardinality λ^{++} with λ atoms and exactly λ^+ automorphisms answering a question 80 of Monk [M2], i.e. in a preliminary version asking for a consistent example.

By [Sh 641, §1], provably in ZFC, there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B} such that $|\text{Aut}(\mathbb{B})| < |\text{End}(\mathbb{B})|$ answering question 96 of Monk [M2, p.291].

By [Sh 641, §2], provably in ZFC, there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B} such that $|\text{Aut}(\mathbb{B})| < |\mathbb{B}|$, answering Problem 80 of [M2, p.291]. In fact, if μ is strong limit, $\mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$ and $\lambda = \text{Min}\{\lambda : 2^\lambda > 2^\mu\}$, then there is a Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B} with 2^μ atoms, 2^λ elements and every automorphism of \mathbb{B} moves $< \mu$ atoms so $|\text{Aut}(\mathbb{B})| \leq 2^\mu < 2^\lambda$.

Notation

0.1 DEFINITION. 1) For a Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B} , its operation are denoted by $x \cap y, x \cup y, x - y, -x$ and $0_{\mathbb{B}}$ is its zero. Let us define the ideal $\text{id}_{\alpha}(\mathbb{B})$ by induction:

$$\text{id}_0(\mathbb{B}) = \{0\}$$

$$\text{id}_{\beta}(\mathbb{B}) = \{x_1 \cup \dots \cup x_n : n < \omega \text{ and } x_{\ell} \in \mathbb{B} \text{ for } \ell = 1, \dots, n \text{ such that for some } \alpha < \beta \text{ and for each } \ell \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ the element } x_{\ell}/\text{id}_{\alpha}(B) \text{ is an atom of } \mathbb{B}/\text{id}_{\alpha}(B) \text{ or } x_{\ell} \in \text{id}_{\alpha}(B)\}.$$

Hence for limit δ we have

$$\text{id}_{\delta}(\mathbb{B}) = \bigcup_{\beta < \delta} \text{id}_{\beta}(\mathbb{B}).$$

$$\text{Let } \text{id}_{\infty}(\mathbb{B}) = \bigcup_{\alpha} \text{id}_{\alpha}(\mathbb{B}).$$

2) For $x \in \text{id}_{\infty}(\mathbb{B})$, let $\text{rk}(x, \mathbb{B}) = \text{Min}\{\alpha : x \in \text{id}_{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{B})\}$.

3) \mathbb{B} is superatomic if $\mathbb{B} = \text{id}_{\infty}(\mathbb{B})$ and $\text{dp}(\mathbb{B})$ is the ordinal α such that $\mathbb{B}/\text{id}_{\alpha}(\mathbb{B})$ is a finite Boolean Algebra (so $\mathbb{B} = \text{id}_{\alpha+1}(\mathbb{B})$).

4) For a Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B} and $x \in \mathbb{B}$, let $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x$ be \mathbb{B} restricted to $\{y \in \mathbb{B} : y \leq_{\mathbb{B}} x\}$; clearly $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x$ is a Boolean Algebra.

5) Define by induction on $n = 1, 2, \dots$:

$$\beth_1(< \theta) = 2^{< \theta} = \sum_{\kappa < \theta} 2^{\kappa}$$

$$\beth_{n+1}(< \theta) = 2^{\beth_n(< \theta)}$$

§1 Supratomic Boolean Algebras have nontrivial automorphisms

1.1 THEOREM. *Assume*

- (a) \mathbb{B} is a supratomic Boolean Algebra with no automorphism moving $\geq \theta$ atoms; that is, if π is an automorphism of \mathbb{B} then $\{x : x \in \text{atom}(\mathbb{B}) \text{ and } \pi(x) \neq x\}$ is a set of cardinality $< \theta$
- (b) θ regular uncountable.

Then $|\mathbb{B}| \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$, so if $\theta = \sigma^+$ then $|\mathbb{B}| \leq \beth_4(\sigma)$.

REMARK. If $|\mathbb{B}|$ is close to $\beth_4(< \theta)$, the proof says much on the structure of \mathbb{B} .

PROOF. Let \mathbb{B} be the Boolean algebra satisfying clause (a) and let μ be the number of atoms of \mathbb{B} . Without loss of generality

- ⊠₁ \mathbb{B} is a Boolean Algebra of subsets of μ and its atoms are the singletons $\{\alpha\}$, $\alpha < \mu$; so $\mathbb{B} \models a - b = c$ iff $a \setminus b = c$.

Let $I =: [\mu]^{<\theta} \cap \mathbb{B} = \{x \in \mathbb{B} : |x| < \theta\}$, clearly I is an ideal of \mathbb{B} and let $Y =: \{x : x \in \mathbb{B} \text{ and } x/I \text{ is an atom of } \mathbb{B}/I\}$.

We shall prove (after some preliminary things) that:

- ⊠₂ if $x \in Y$ then $|x| \leq \beth_2(< \theta)$, i.e. $2^{(2^{<\theta})}$.

We shall say that a set $a \subseteq \mu$ is \mathbb{B} -autonomous if $(\forall y \in I)(y \cap a \in \mathbb{B})$; in this case we let $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a = \mathbb{B} \cap \mathcal{P}(a)$; this notation is compatible with 0.1(4).

Clearly

- ⊠₁ the family of \mathbb{B} -autonomous subsets of μ is a Boolean ring and even a Boolean algebra of subsets of μ (i.e. closed under $a \cap b, a \cup b, a \setminus b$) and include I and even \mathbb{B}
- ⊠₂ for a \mathbb{B} -autonomous set a , $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a = \{x \in \mathbb{B} : x \subseteq a\}$ is a Boolean ring of subsets of a which include $\{\{\alpha\} : \alpha \in a\}$.

Also

- ⊠₃ if a_0, a_1 are \mathbb{B} -autonomous subsets of μ , $x \in Y$, $a_0 \subseteq x$, $a_1 \subseteq x$ and $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_0 \cong \mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_1$ over $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright (a_1 \cap a_2) = \mathbb{B} \cap \mathcal{P}(a_1 \cap a_2)$, then there is an automorphism h of \mathbb{B} such that h maps a_0 to a_1 , a_1 to a_0 and $\alpha \in \mu \setminus a_0 \setminus a_1 \Rightarrow h(\{\alpha\}) = \{\alpha\}$.

[Why? Let g be an isomorphism from $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_0$ onto $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_1$ over $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright (a_0 \cap a_1)$; now we define a permutation h of $\text{atom}(\mathbb{B}) = \{\{\alpha\} : \alpha < \mu\}$; let $\alpha \in a_0 \Rightarrow h(\{\alpha\}) = g(\{\alpha\})$, $h(g(\{\alpha\})) = \{\alpha\}$ and $\alpha \in \mu \setminus a_0 \setminus a_1 \Rightarrow h(\{\alpha\}) = \{\alpha\}$, by the demands on g clearly h is a well defined permutation of $\text{atom}(\mathbb{B})$. Now h can be naturally extended to an automorphism \hat{h} of $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ as a Boolean Algebra, it is of order two. We have to check that \hat{h} maps \mathbb{B} onto itself; even into itself suffice (because of “order two”). Clearly $\hat{h}(x) = x$ and $\hat{h} \upharpoonright (\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright (\mu \setminus x))$ is the identity. So it is enough to check that: $\hat{h} \upharpoonright (\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x)$ is an automorphism of $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x$. But $I \cap (\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x)$ is a maximal ideal of the Boolean Algebra $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x$ (as $x \in Y$) hence it is enough to check that \hat{h} maps $I \cap (\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x)$ into itself. As $b \in I \cap (\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x) \Rightarrow b = (b \setminus a_0 \setminus a_1) \cup (b \cap a_0 \cap a_1) \cup (b \cap a_0 \setminus a_1) \cup$

- $(b \cap a_1 \setminus a_0)$, and all four are in I ; clearly it is enough to check the following statements: $b \in I$ & $b \subseteq x \setminus a_0 \setminus a_1 \Rightarrow h(b) \in I$, and $\ell < 2$ & $b \in I$ & $b \subseteq x \cap a_\ell \setminus a_{1-\ell} \Rightarrow \hat{h}(b) \in I$ and lastly $b \in I$ & $b \subseteq a_0 \cap a_1 \Rightarrow \hat{h}(b) \in I$. The second implication holds by the choice of g , the first as $\hat{h}(b) = b$ in this case and the last one as $h \upharpoonright \{\{\alpha\} : \alpha \in a_0 \cap a_1\}$ is the identity so again $\hat{h}(b) = b$.]
- ⊗₄ if $b \subseteq \mu$, $|b| \leq 2^{<\theta}$ then for some \mathbb{B} -autonomous set c we have $b \subseteq c \subseteq \mu$, $|c| \leq 2^{<\theta}$.
 [Why? Find c satisfying $b \subseteq c \subseteq \mu$, $|c| \leq 2^{<\theta}$ such that $(\forall y \in [c]^{<\theta})[(\exists z)(y \subseteq z \in I) \rightarrow (\exists z \subseteq c)(y \subseteq z \in I)]$, just close θ times recalling θ is regular. Now if $y \in I$ then $|y| < \theta$ hence $y \cap c \in [c]^{<\theta}$ so there is z such that $y \cap c \subseteq z \in I$ & $z \subseteq c$; hence $y \cap c = y \cap z \in I$. This proves that c is \mathbb{B} -autonomous as required.]

Now we return to the promised \boxtimes_2 .

PROOF OF \boxtimes_2 . Toward contradiction assume $x \in Y$ and $|x| > \beth_2(<\theta)$; let $\alpha_i \in x$ for $i < (\beth_2(<\theta))^+$ be pairwise distinct, let a_i be a \mathbb{B} -autonomous set of cardinality $\leq 2^{<\theta}$ such that $\{\alpha_{i+\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < 2^{<\theta}\} \subseteq a_i$ (exists¹ by \otimes_4), and without loss of generality $a_i \subseteq x$ (just use $a_i \cap x$, it is as required by \otimes_1). For some club C of $(\beth_2(<\theta))^+$, we have $i < j \in C \Rightarrow a_i \cap \{\alpha_{j+\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < 2^{<\theta}\} = \emptyset$ hence $i < j \in C \Rightarrow |a_j \setminus a_i| \geq 2^{<\theta}$. Now $I \cap \mathcal{P}(a_i)$ has cardinality $\leq |a_i|^{<\theta} \leq 2^{<\theta}$ (as θ is regular) hence $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_i$ has cardinality $\leq 2^{<\theta}$. Hence there are a stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < (\beth_2(<\theta))^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = (2^{<\theta})^+\}$ and a^* such that $i \in S$ & $j \in S$ & $i \neq j \Rightarrow a_i \cap a_j = a^*$ (the Δ -system lemma). Also the number of isomorphism types of $(\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_i, \{\alpha\})_{\alpha \in a^*}$ is at most $\leq \beth_2(<\theta)$ hence for some $i < j$ from $C \cap S$ we have $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_i \cong \mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a_j$ over $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright a^*$, but $|a_j \setminus a_i| \geq 2^{<\theta} \geq \theta$ hence by \otimes_3 there is an automorphism h of \mathbb{B} which moves $\geq 2^{<\theta}$ atoms, contradiction.

Next

- \boxtimes_3 $|Y/I| \leq \beth_3(<\theta)$.

[Why? If not, we can find $x_i \in Y$ for $i < (\beth_3(<\theta))^+$ such that $i \neq j \Rightarrow x_i/I \neq x_j/I$. As $|x_i| \leq \beth_2(<\theta)$ by \boxtimes_2 , by the Δ -system lemma for some unbounded $A \subseteq (\beth_3(<\theta))^+$ the set $\langle x_i : i \in A \rangle$ is a Δ -system hence without loss of generality $\langle x_i : i \in A \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint (by substruction; not really needed just clearer). As $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x_i$ is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality $\leq \beth_2(<\theta)$ (as $I \cap \mathcal{P}(x_i)$ is a maximal ideal of $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x_i$ and $I \cap \mathcal{P}(x_i) \subseteq [x_i]^{<\theta}$ and $|x_i| \leq \beth_2(<\theta)$ by \boxtimes_2) there are at most $\beth_3(<\theta)$ isomorphism types of $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x_i$. So for some $i \neq j$ in A we have $\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x_i \cong \mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x_j$, so as in the proof of \otimes_3 there is an automorphism h of \mathbb{B} mapping x_i to x_j , x_j to x_i and $h \upharpoonright (\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright (1_{\mathbb{B}} - x_i - x_j))$ is the identity hence h moves $\geq |x_i \setminus x_j| \geq \theta$ atoms because $x_i \neq x_j \bmod I$.]

Choose a set $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^* \leq \beth_3(<\theta)\}$ of representatives of Y/I and let $x^* = \bigcup_{\alpha < \alpha^*} x_\alpha$, so $x^* \subseteq \mu$, $|x^*| \leq \beth_3(<\theta)$.

Define $J = \{a \in \mathbb{B} : a \cap x^* = \emptyset\}$.

- \boxtimes_4 $J \subseteq I$.

[Why? If not, there is $x \in J \setminus I$ such that x/I is an atom of \mathbb{B}/I so $x/I \in$

¹we can use also $\{a_{i+\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \theta\}$

$\{x_\alpha/I : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$, so for some $\alpha, x/I = x_\alpha/I$ hence $|x \setminus x_\alpha| < \theta$ hence $|x \cap x_\alpha| = \theta$ hence $x \cap x^* \neq \emptyset$ hence $x \notin J$, a contradiction.]

Define an equivalence relation \mathcal{E} on $\mathbb{B} : y_1 \mathcal{E} y_2$ iff $y_1 \cap x^* = y_2 \cap x^*$. Clearly \mathcal{E} has $\leq 2^{|x^*|}$ equivalence classes and $2^{|x^*|} \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$; also $y_1 \mathcal{E} y_2 \rightarrow y_1 \setminus y_2 \in J$, in fact $y_1 \mathcal{E} y_2 \leftrightarrow (y_1 \Delta y_2 \in J)$ (see J 's definition). Choose a set of representatives $\{y_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma^*\}$ for \mathcal{E} so $|\gamma^*| \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$ and let \mathbb{B}^* be the subalgebra of \mathbb{B} which $\{y_\gamma : \gamma < \gamma^*\}$ generates. So $|\mathbb{B}^*| \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$ and, being superatomic, the number of ultrafilters of \mathbb{B}^* is also $\leq \beth_4(< \theta)$. Next \mathbb{B} is generated by $J \cup \mathbb{B}^*$ as for $y \in \mathbb{B}$ there is γ such that $y \mathcal{E} y_\gamma$ and $y_\gamma \in \mathbb{B}^*, y - y_\gamma \in J, y_\gamma - y \in J$ hence $y \in \langle J \cup \mathbb{B}^* \rangle$. For D an ultrafilter of \mathbb{B}^* let $Z_D = \{\alpha < \mu : (\forall y \in \mathbb{B}^*)(\alpha \in y \leftrightarrow y \in D)\}$.

Clearly

- ⊗₅ for every $\alpha \in \mu \setminus x^*$ there is a unique ultrafilter $D = D[\alpha]$ on \mathbb{B}^* such that $\alpha \in Z_D$ (and the number of such ultrafilters is $\leq \beth_4(< \theta)$).

Now

- ⊗₆ $\mu \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$.

[Why? Assume that not. By ⊗₄ for each $i < \mu$ we can find a \mathbb{B} -autonomous a_i such that $|a_i| \leq 2^{<\theta}$ and $[i, i + 2^{<\theta}) \subseteq a_i$; let $a_i = \{\beta_{i,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \varepsilon_i\}$ with $\beta_{i,\varepsilon}$ increasing with ε . Clearly for some unbounded $A \subseteq (\beth_4(< \theta))^+$ for all $i \in A$ the following does not depend on $i : \varepsilon_i$ and $D[\beta_{i,\varepsilon}]$ for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_i$ (use ⊗₅), and $\{u \in [\varepsilon_i]^{<\theta} : \{\beta_{i,\varepsilon} : i \in u\} \in I\}$, and for $\zeta < 2^{<\theta}, \varepsilon = \varepsilon(i, \zeta) =$ the unique ε such that $\beta_{i,\varepsilon} = i + \zeta$ and without loss of generality for $j < i$ in $A, a_j \cap [i, i + 2^{<\theta}) = \emptyset$. By the Δ -system lemma without loss of generality for some a^* we have: for $i < j$ in $A, a_i \cap a_j = a^*$. So by ⊗₁ the set a^* is \mathbb{B} -autonomous and also $a_i \setminus a^*$ is so we can use $a_i \setminus a^*$, so without loss of generality for $i \neq j$ in $A, a_i \cap a_j = \emptyset$ and as $|x^*| \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$ clearly without loss of generality $i \in A \Rightarrow a_i \cap x^* = \emptyset$. So for $i \neq j$ in A there is a permutation g of order two of μ interchanging a_i, a_j , that is $g(\beta_{i,\varepsilon}) = \beta_{j,\varepsilon}, g(\beta_{j,\varepsilon}) = \beta_{i,\varepsilon}$ and $g(\{\beta\}) = \beta$ for $\beta \in \mu \setminus a_i \setminus a_j$. Clearly g can be extended to an automorphism \hat{g} of $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ and $\hat{g} \upharpoonright \mathbb{B}^*$ is the identity (the proof is like that proof of ⊗₃ using “ \mathbb{B} is generated by $J \cup \mathbb{B}^*$ ”). So we get a contradiction.]

So $|J| \leq |[\mu]^{<\theta}| = \mu^{<\theta} \leq (\beth_4(< \theta))^{<\theta} = \beth_4(< \theta)$ and $|\mathbb{B}^*| \leq |\mathbb{B}/\mathcal{E}| \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$ so as \mathbb{B} is generated by $J \cup \mathbb{B}^*$ together we get the desired conclusion. $\square_{1.1}$

1.2 DISCUSSION. 1) We can weaken the assumption “ \mathbb{B} is superatomic” to “ $\mathbb{B}/I_{<\theta}[\mathbb{B}]$ is superatomic”, where: for a Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B} and infinite cardinal θ we define $I_{<\theta}[\mathbb{B}] = \{x \in \mathbb{B} : \mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x \text{ has (algebraic) density } < \theta\}$ (see a little in [Sh 397, §1]). For \mathbb{B} superatomic this is the I in the proof of 1.1 on such Boolean Algebras.

[We can choose a maximal set Z of pairwise disjoint elements of $\{x \in \mathbb{B} : x \neq 0_{\mathbb{B}} : \text{and } \pi(\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x) < \theta\}$, now without loss of generality \mathbb{B} is a Boolean subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ such that $x \in Z \Rightarrow x \in [\mu]^{<\theta}$, and continue as in the proof of 1.1.]

2) What if we just assume “ $\mathbb{B}/I_{<\theta}[\mathbb{B}]$ is atomic”? One point in the proof may fail: the number of ultrafilters of \mathbb{B}^* is not necessarily $\leq |\mathbb{B}^*| \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$ but is $\leq 2^{|\mathbb{B}^*|} \leq 2^{2^{|\gamma^*|}} \leq \beth_5(< \theta)$, so we should replace $\beth_4(< \theta)$ by $\beth_5(< \theta)$ in the conclusion.

3) We may above think of replacing “ $\pi(\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright x)$, algebraic density, is $< \theta$ ” by “ $d(\mathbb{B} \upharpoonright$

x), topological density, is $< \theta$ " (recalling that any Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B}' can be embedded into a Boolean subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(d(\mathbb{B}'))$).

1.3 DISCUSSION. 1) We can adapt 2.1 from §2 below to this case, i.e. show that $\beth_5(< \theta)$ cannot be improved in general. E.g. let $\langle d_\zeta : \zeta < \lambda = 2^\mu \rangle$ be an independent family of subsets of μ (so any finite Boolean combination of them is infinite) and let \mathbb{B}^* be the Boolean subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ generated by $\{d_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda = 2^\mu\} \cup \{\{i\} : i < \mu\}$. We let $\lambda' = 2^\lambda$, let $\{c_\gamma^* : \gamma < \lambda'\}$ be an independent family of subsets of λ and let $X^* = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} X_\alpha \cup \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma < \lambda'\}$. We ignore \mathcal{A}' (and omit clause (k) of the assumption) and among the generators of \mathbb{B} , clause (i), (ii) remains and (iii)' $c_\zeta = \{x \in X : \text{for some } \alpha \in d_\zeta \text{ we have } x \in X_\alpha\} \cup \{x_\gamma^* : \zeta \in c_\gamma^*, \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda']\}$.

2) We may consider replacing automorphism by monomorphisms. The problem is only in the proof of 2.1, " f maps J_1 into J_1 " does not seem to follow.

§2 Constructing counterexamples

We would like to show that the bound from §1 is essentially best possible. The construction (in 2.1) is closely related to the proof in §1, but we need various assumptions. So in particular κ here corresponds to $\sup\{|\mathbb{B} \restriction a| : a \in Y\} \leq \beth_2(< \theta)$ there, μ here corresponds to $|Y| \leq \beth_3(< \theta)$ there, λ' here corresponds to $|\text{atom}(\mathbb{B})| \leq \beth_4(< \theta)$ there. We shall deal with them later.

2.1 LEMMA. Assume

- (a) $\theta \leq \kappa \leq \mu \leq \lambda' \leq \lambda$ and $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) \geq \aleph_1$
- (b) there is an $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu]^{\aleph_0}$ almost disjoint (i.e. $A \neq B \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow |A \cap B| < \aleph_0$) such that $(\forall A \in [\mu]^\theta)(\exists B \in \mathcal{A})(B \subseteq^* A)$ and $|\mathcal{A}| = \mu$
- (c) $\bar{\mathbb{B}} = \langle \mathbb{B}_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$
- (d) \mathbb{B}_α is a superatomic Boolean Algebra with $\leq \kappa$ atoms such that any automorphism of \mathbb{B}_α moves $< \theta$ atoms and $|\mathbb{B}_\alpha| \leq \lambda$; moreover if $c_1, c_2 \in I_\alpha$ (see below) and f is an isomorphism from $\mathbb{B}_\alpha \restriction (1 - c_1)$ onto $\mathbb{B}_\alpha \restriction (1 - c_2)$ then $\theta > |\{x \in \text{atom}(\mathbb{B}_\alpha) : x \leq_{\mathbb{B}_\alpha} c_1 \text{ or } f(x) \neq x\}|$
- (e) $I_\alpha = \{b \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha : |\{x \in \text{atom}(\mathbb{B}_\alpha) : x \leq b\}| < \theta\}$ is a maximal ideal of \mathbb{B}_α
- (f) there is an infinite set $\{a_n : n < \omega\}$ of pairwise distinct atoms of \mathbb{B}_α such that for every $a \in I_\alpha$ the set $\{n < \omega : a_n \leq a\}$ is a finite
- (g) if $\alpha \neq \beta$ then for no $a_\alpha \in I_\alpha, a_\beta \in I_\beta$ do we have $\mathbb{B}_\alpha \restriction (1_{\mathbb{B}_\alpha} - a_\alpha) \cong \mathbb{B}_\beta \restriction (1_{\mathbb{B}_\beta} - a_\beta)$
- (h) \mathbb{B}^* is a superatomic Boolean Algebra
- (i) \mathbb{B}^* has μ atoms
- (j) \mathbb{B}^* has λ elements²

²if there is a tree \mathcal{T} with $\leq \mu$ nodes and $\geq \lambda$ branches (= maximal linearly ordered subsets) then such \mathbb{B}^* exists

- (k) if $\lambda' > \mu$ then we have χ, \mathcal{A}' satisfying:
- (1) (α) $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq [\lambda']^{\aleph_0}$ is a MAD family of cardinality χ such that: if π is a partial³ permutation of λ' , $\text{Dom}(\pi) = \lambda' \setminus Z_1$, $\text{Rang}(\pi) = \lambda' \setminus Z_2$ where $Z = Z_1 \cup Z_2 \in [\lambda']^{<\theta}$ satisfying $A \in \mathcal{A}' \Rightarrow |(A \Delta \pi''(A)) \setminus Z| < \aleph_0$, then π has support $\{\alpha < \lambda' : \pi(\alpha) \neq \alpha\}$ of cardinality $< \theta$
 - (2) (β) for some ideal I^* of \mathbb{B}^* containing $\text{id}_1(\mathbb{B}^*)$ the Boolean algebra \mathbb{B}^*/I^* is isomorphic to $\{a \subseteq \chi : a \text{ is finite or co-finite}\}$; so $\chi \leq |\mathbb{B}^*| = \lambda$ follows.

Then we can find \mathbf{B} such that:

- (α) \mathbf{B} is a superatomic Boolean Algebra
- (β) \mathbf{B} has λ' atoms and λ elements
- (γ) every automorphism g of \mathbf{B} moves $< \theta$ atoms; i.e.
 $|\{x \in \text{atom}(\mathbf{B}) : g(x) \neq x\}| < \theta$.

PROOF. Without loss of generality \mathbb{B}^* is a Boolean Algebra of subsets of μ with $\{\{\alpha\} : \alpha < \mu\}$ being the atoms of \mathbb{B}^* . If $\lambda' = \mu$ let $\mathcal{A}' = \emptyset, \chi = 0, I^* = \mathbb{B}^*$.

Without loss of generality \mathbb{B}_α is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(X_\alpha)$ and the set of atoms of \mathbb{B}_α is $\{\{x\} : x \in X_\alpha\}$. Without loss of generality $\alpha \neq \beta \Rightarrow X_\alpha \cap X_\beta = \emptyset$ and let $X = \cup\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$.

If $\lambda' = \mu$ let $Y^* = \emptyset$ and if $\lambda' > \mu$, let $Y^* \subseteq \mathbb{B}^*$ be such that $|Y^*| = \chi$ and $\{y/I^* : y \in Y^*\}$ is the set of atoms of \mathbb{B}^*/I^* with no repetitions; without loss of generality

\boxtimes_0 for every $y \in Y^*$ for some $\alpha, y/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*)$ is an atom of $\mathbb{B}^*/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*)$ and $(\forall z)[z \leq_{\mathbb{B}^*} y \rightarrow (z \in \text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*) \equiv z \in I^*)]$.

[Why is this possible? For each $y \in \mathbb{B}^* \setminus I^*$ let $\alpha = \alpha(y) =: \text{Min}\{\text{rk}_{\mathbb{B}^*}(y - x) : x \in I^*\}$ and choose x_y^0 exemplifying it, so $(y - x_y^0)/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*)$ is the union of finitely many atoms of $\mathbb{B}^*/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*)$, say $y_1/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*), \dots, y_n/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*)$ where $n \geq 1$ and without loss of generality $y_\ell \leq_{\mathbb{B}^*} y$. So $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ cannot be all in I^* and there cannot be two $y_\ell \in \mathbb{B}^* \setminus I^*$, so there is a unique $\ell = \ell(*)$ such that $y_\ell \notin I^*$, let $x_y^* = (1 - y_{\ell(*)}) \cup x_y^0$. Now $\{y - x_y^* : y \in Y^*\}$ is as required.]

Let Y be such that $Y \subseteq \mathbb{B}^*, \langle y/\text{id}_{\text{rk}(y, \mathbb{B}^*)}(\mathbb{B}^*) : y \in Y \rangle$ list with no repetitions $\{y/\text{id}_{\text{rk}(y, \mathbb{B}^*)}(\mathbb{B}^*) : y/\text{id}_{\text{rk}(y, \mathbb{B}^*)}(\mathbb{B}^*) \text{ an atom of } \mathbb{B}^*/\text{id}_{\text{rk}(y, \mathbb{B}^*)}(\mathbb{B}^*) \text{ and } \text{rk}(y, \mathbb{B}^*) > 0\}$ and let D_y be the ultrafilter on \mathbb{B}^* generated by $\{y\} \cup \{1 - x : x \in \mathbb{B}^*, \text{rk}(x, \mathbb{B}^*) < \text{rk}(y, \mathbb{B}^*)\}$ for each $y \in Y$. Without loss of generality $Y^* \subseteq Y$. Also as \mathbb{B}^*/I^* is isomorphic to the Boolean Algebra of finite, co-finite subsets of χ clearly $y \in Y \setminus Y^* \Rightarrow \{y' \in Y^* : y' - y \in \text{id}_{\text{rk}(y', \mathbb{B}^*)}(\mathbb{B}^*)\}$ is finite so without loss of generality is empty for $y \in Y \setminus Y^*$ (singleton for $y \in Y^*$ of course), note that if $\lambda' > \mu$ then Y^* is of cardinality $|\mathcal{A}'|$ and without loss of generality $|Y \setminus Y^*| = \lambda$.

Let g be a one-to-one function from μ onto X and for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ (from clause (b)) let $\{\gamma_{A,k} : k < \omega\}$ list A without repetition. Let $g^* : \mu \rightarrow \mu$ be $g^*(\gamma) =$ the unique $\alpha < \mu$ such that $g(\gamma) \in X_\alpha$. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$, choose if possible an infinite $u = u_A \subseteq \omega$ such that $\langle g^*(\gamma_{A,k}) : k \in u \rangle$ is with no repetitions and $\langle g^*(\gamma_{A,k}) : k \in u \rangle$ converge to some $D_y, y = y_A \in Y$; that is, $(\forall z \in \mathbb{B}^*)(z \in D_y \leftrightarrow \aleph_0 > \{k : g^*(\gamma_{A,k}) \notin z\})$. Note that the only case u is not well defined, is when the

³i.e. π is one to one such that $\text{Dom}(\pi) \subseteq \lambda$ and $\text{Rang}(\pi) \subseteq \lambda$

set $\{g^*(\gamma_{A,k}) : k \in u\}$ is finite. Why? As in the justification of \boxtimes_0 above, i.e. by the properties of superatomic Boolean Algebras. Assume now (justified in the end)

\boxtimes_1 we have $\langle \alpha[A] : A \in \mathcal{A}, u_A \text{ well defined} \rangle$ such that:

- (1) (i) $\alpha[A] < \mu$ and $\alpha[A] \in y_A$
- (2) (ii) $(\forall z \in Y)[\alpha[A] \in z \Leftrightarrow z \in D_{y_A}]$ and
- (3) (iii) $\alpha[A_1] = \alpha[A_2] \Rightarrow A_1 = A_2$.

For $\alpha < \mu$ let a_α be $\{g(\gamma_{A,k}) : k \in u_A\}$ if $A \in \mathcal{A}, \alpha[A] = \alpha$ and u_A is well defined, and \emptyset otherwise. Toward defining our Boolean Algebra let $\{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda']\}$ be pairwise distinct elements not in X . Let $\mathcal{A}'' = \{\{\mu + i : i \in A\} : A \in \mathcal{A}'\}$ so it is a maximal almost disjoint family of countable subsets of $[\mu, \lambda']$, as in clause (k) of the assumption so if $\mu = \lambda'$ then $\mathcal{A}'' = \emptyset = \mathcal{A}', \lambda' - \mu = 0, (\lambda' - \mu)^{\aleph_0} = 0 = |Y^*|$ and if $\lambda' > \mu$ then $|\mathcal{A}''| = |\mathcal{A}'| = \chi = |Y^*|$ so let $\langle d_y : y \in Y^* \rangle$ list \mathcal{A}'' with no repetitions.

Now we define our Boolean Algebra \mathbf{B} . It is the Boolean Algebra of subsets of $X^* = X \cup \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda']\}$ generated by the following (recall that a_α may be empty)(recall that $X = \cup\{X_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$):

- $\boxtimes_2(i)$ the sets $\{a \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha : |a| < \theta\} \cup \{a \cup a_\alpha : a \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha, |a| \geq \theta\}$ when $\alpha < \mu$
- (ii) $\{x_\gamma^*\}$ for $\gamma \in [\mu, \lambda']$
- (iii) the sets c_y (for $y \in Y$) where

$$c_y =: \{x \in X : \text{for some } \alpha < \mu \text{ we have } x \in X_\alpha \text{ \& \> } \{\alpha\} \leq_{\mathbb{B}^*} y\} \cup \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda'] \text{ and } y \in Y^* \text{ and } \gamma \in d_y\}.$$

Note that

- $\boxtimes_0(i)$ $X_\alpha \cap a_\beta, X_\beta \cap a_\alpha$ has at most one element when $\alpha \neq \beta$
- (ii) $X_\alpha \cap X_\beta$ is \emptyset (except when $\alpha = \beta$),
- (iii) $a_\alpha \cap a_\beta$ is finite (when $\alpha \neq \beta$) by \mathcal{A} being MAD
- (iv) $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \cap (X_\beta \cup a_\beta)$ is finite for $\alpha \neq \beta < \mu$ which holds by clauses (i) + (ii) + (iii)
- (v) if $\alpha < \mu$ and $y \in Y$, then the set $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \setminus c_y$ is finite or the set $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \cap c_y$ is finite.
[Why? As $\alpha[A] = \alpha, A \in \mathcal{A}$ implies that $\langle g^*(\gamma_{A,k}) : k < \omega \rangle$ converge to y_A and either $y \in D_{y_A}$ or $1_{\mathbb{B}^*} - y \in D_{y_A}$.]

Clearly

- \boxtimes_1 \mathbf{B} is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(X^*)$, including all the singletons hence is atomic; has λ' atoms and λ elements.
[Why? The least trivial is $x \in X = \bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} X_\alpha \Rightarrow \{x\} \in \mathbf{B}$, but if $x \in X_\alpha$, then $\{x\}$ is an atom of \mathbb{B}_α hence by \boxtimes_0 belongs to \mathbf{B} .]
- \boxtimes_2 for $\alpha < \mu$, we have $a \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha$ & $|a| < \theta \Rightarrow a \in \mathbf{B}$ & $\mathbf{B} \restriction a = \mathbb{B}_\alpha \restriction a$ but $a \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha \Rightarrow \mathbb{B}_\alpha \restriction a$ is superatomic so $\{a \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha : |a| < \theta\} \subseteq \text{id}_\infty(\mathbf{B})$.
[Why? For the first implication we should check that every one of the generators of \mathbf{B} listed in $\boxtimes_2(i), (ii), (iii)$ above satisfies: its intersection with

a belong to $\mathbb{B}_\alpha \upharpoonright a$. For $\boxtimes_2(ii)$ this is trivial, for $\boxtimes_2(i)$ use $\otimes_0(i) - (iv)$ and for $\boxtimes_2(iii)$ use $\otimes_0(v)$. The rest follows.]

- \otimes_3 for $\alpha < \mu$ the set $I_\alpha^+ =: \{a \in \mathbf{B} : a \subseteq X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha \text{ and } |a| < \theta\}$ satisfies
- (1) (i) it is equal to $\{a \cup b : a \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha \text{ \& } |a| < \theta \text{ and } b \subseteq a_\alpha \text{ is finite}\}$
 - (2) (ii) it is a maximal ideal of $\mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)$
 [Why? Easy. The main point concerns $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \cap (X_\beta \cup a_\beta)$ satisfying clause (i) when it has cardinality $< \theta$ this holds by $\otimes_0(iv)$ and $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \cap c_y$ has cardinality $< \theta$ or $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \setminus c_y$ has cardinality $< \theta$ which holds by $\otimes_0(v)$.]
- \otimes_4 $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha \in \text{id}_\infty(\mathbf{B})$
 [Why? First $X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha \in \mathbf{B}$ by clause (i) of \boxtimes_2 above, second if $X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha \notin \text{id}_\infty(\mathbf{B})$ then by \otimes_2 for some ordinal ζ we have $[a \in \mathbb{B}_\alpha \text{ \& } |a| < \theta \Rightarrow a \in \text{id}_\zeta(\mathbf{B})]$, hence by \otimes_3 above $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)$ is an atom of $\mathbf{B}/\text{id}_\zeta(\mathbf{B})$ for ζ large enough, hence $X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha$ belong to $\text{id}_{\zeta+1}(\mathbf{B})$, contradiction.]
- \otimes_5 for $\alpha < \mu, \mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \cong \mathbb{B}_\alpha$ hence if $\alpha < \beta < \omega$ then for no c_α such that $c_\alpha \in \mathbf{B}_\alpha, c_\alpha \leq_{\mathbf{B}} X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha, |c_\alpha| < \theta$ and $c_\beta \in \mathbf{B}, c_\beta \leq_{\mathbf{B}} X_\beta \cup a_\beta, |c_\beta| < \theta$ do we have $\mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha \setminus c_\alpha) \cong \mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\beta \cup a_\beta \setminus c_\beta)$.
 [Why? By clauses (f) + (e) of the assumption, the first phrase holds. The “hence” follows by clause (g) of the assumption.]

Let J_1 be the ideal of \mathbf{B} generated by $\bigcup_{\alpha < \mu} I_\alpha^+ \cup \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda')\}$.

- $\otimes_6(i)$ $J_1 \subseteq \text{id}_\infty(\mathbf{B})$
 (ii) $J_1 \subseteq [X^*]^{<\theta}$ is a (proper) ideal.
 [Why? For clause (i), note that $\text{id}_\infty(\mathbf{B})$ is an ideal of \mathbf{B} and the generators of J_1 are in it by \otimes_4 (for $X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha$ that is for the members of I_α^+) and by the $\{x_\gamma^*\}$ being atomic (for $\gamma \in [\mu, \lambda')$). Clause (ii) is obvious.]

We shall prove that

- \otimes_7 \mathbf{B}/J_1 is isomorphic to a homomorphic image of \mathbb{B}^* .

Toward proving \otimes_7 let $S = \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda')\}$ and define a function h as follows: its domain is $\{c_y : y \in Y\} \cup \{X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha : \alpha < \mu\}$ and $h(c_y) = y, h(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$, so h is into \mathbb{B}^* . Now

- (*)₀ $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)/J_1$ is an atom of \mathbf{B}/J_1
 [why? by \otimes_3 .]
 (*)₁ $\{b/J_1 : b \in \text{Dom}(h)\}$ is a subset of \mathbf{B}/J_1 which generates it
 [why? see the definitions of \mathbf{B} and of J_1 and by \otimes_3 .]
 (*)₂ if $n_1 \leq n < \omega, m_1 \leq m < \omega, y_0, \dots, y_{n-1} \in Y$ is with no repetitions and $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{m-1} < \mu$ is with no repetitions, then:

in $\mathbf{B}, \tau_1 =: \bigcap_{\ell < n_1} c_{y_\ell} \cap \bigcap_{\ell < m_1} (X_{\alpha_\ell} \cup a_{\alpha_\ell}) - \bigcup_{\ell=n_1}^{n-1} c_{y_\ell} \cup \bigcup_{\ell=m_1}^{m-1} (X_{\alpha_\ell} \cup a_{\alpha_\ell})$ belongs to J_1 iff

in $\mathbb{B}^*, \tau_2 =: \bigcap_{\ell < n_1} y_\ell \cap \bigcap_{\ell < m_1} \{\alpha_\ell\} - \bigcup_{\ell=n_1}^{n-1} y_\ell \cup \bigcup_{\ell=m_1}^{m-1} \{\alpha_\ell\}$ is empty.

[Why? First, assume that the second statement holds (i.e. $\tau_2 = \emptyset$) then by

the choice of the c_y 's trivially $\tau_1' =: \bigcap_{\ell < n_1} (c_{y_\ell} \setminus S) \cap \bigcap_{\ell < m_1} X_{\alpha_\ell} - \bigcup_{\ell=n_1}^{n-1} (c_{y_\ell} \setminus S) \cup$

$\bigcup_{\ell=m_1}^{m-1} X_{\alpha_\ell} = \bigcup \{X_\beta : \mathbb{B}^* \models \{\alpha\} \leq \tau_2\} = \emptyset$ but $(\tau'_1 \Delta \tau_1) \subseteq S \cup \bigcup_{\ell < m} a_{\alpha_\ell}$ and

$a_{\alpha_\ell} \in [X^*]^{<\theta}$ (but $a_{\alpha_\ell} \notin \mathbf{B}$, if $a_{\alpha_\ell} \neq 0$) and $\tau'_1 = \emptyset$, so $\tau_1 \subseteq S \bmod [X^*]^{<\theta}$.

Now assume $\tau_1 \cap S$ is infinite, hence $\lambda' > \mu$. So $\{d_z : z \in Y^*\}$ is a MAD family of subsets of $\lambda' \setminus \mu$, in fact is \mathcal{A}''' . Hence $\{\{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in d_z\} : z \in Y^*\}$ is a MAD family of subsets of $S = \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda']\}$. So necessarily for some $z \in Y^*$ we have $\tau_1 \cap S \cap \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in d_z\}$ is infinite. As $\tau_1 \cap S \cap \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in d_z\} \subseteq c_{y_\ell}$ for $\ell < n_1$, and $\text{id}_1(\mathbb{B}^*/J_1)$ is a maximal ideal and the choice of Y, Y^* necessarily $y_\ell = z$, hence $y_0 = z, n_1 = 1$. Similarly $\ell \in [n_1, n_2] \Rightarrow y_\ell \neq z$ hence $\ell \in [n_1, n] \Rightarrow y_\ell \cap y_0 = y_\ell \cap z \in \text{id}_{\text{rk}(z, \mathbb{B}^*)}(\mathbb{B}^*) \Rightarrow |\{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in d_z\} \cap c_{y_\ell}| < \aleph_0$.

Hence clearly $\ell \in [n_1, n] \Rightarrow y_\ell \notin D_z$ but $y_0 \in D_z$ and $\alpha < \mu \Rightarrow \{\alpha\} \notin D_z$ (as $z \in Y$!) hence $\mathbb{B}^* \models \text{"}\tau_2 > 0\text{"}$, contradiction to our present assumption, so necessarily $\tau_1 \cap S$ is finite.

Hence $\tau_1 - \bigcup_{\ell < m_1} (X_{\alpha_\ell} \cup a_{\alpha_\ell}) = \tau_1 \cap S$ is finite hence $\in J_1$ and also for each

$\ell < m_1$, the set $\tau_1 \cap (X_{\alpha_\ell} \cup a_{\alpha_\ell})$ is $(\tau_1 \Delta \tau'_1) \cap (X_{\alpha_\ell} \cup a_{\alpha_\ell}) \subseteq (\bigcup_{k < m} a_k) \cap (X_{\alpha_\ell} \cup a_{\alpha_\ell})$

which is necessarily countable but also belongs to \mathbf{B} hence belongs to $I_\alpha^+ \subseteq J_1$ so together $\tau_1 \in J_1$. So really $\tau_2 = \emptyset \Rightarrow \tau_1 \in J_1$.

Second, if the second statement fails that is, $\tau_2 \neq \emptyset$, then for some $\beta < \mu, \mathbb{B}^* \models \{\beta\} \leq \tau_2$, but then $X_\beta \subseteq \tau'_1$ and as above $\tau_1 \cup S \supseteq X_\beta \bmod J_1$ but $S \cap X_\beta = \emptyset$, so $X_\beta \subseteq \tau_1 \bmod J_1$; now $X_\beta \notin J_1$ (as $|X_\beta| \geq \theta$ by clause (e) of the assumptions) hence $\tau_1 \notin J_1$. So we have proved $(*)_2$.

As \mathbb{B}^* is superatomic and the choice of $\{\{\alpha\} : \alpha < \mu\} \cup Y$ (a set of representations of $\{y/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*) : \alpha, y \text{ satisfies } \mathbb{B}^* \not\subseteq \text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*) \text{ and } y/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*) \text{ an atom of } \mathbb{B}^*/\text{id}_\alpha(\mathbb{B}^*)\}$) clearly by $(*)_2$ the statement \otimes_7 follows, in fact h induces an isomorphism \hat{h} from \mathbf{B}/J_0 onto \mathbb{B}^* . But \mathbb{B}^* is superatomic and $J_0 \subseteq \text{id}_\infty(\mathbb{B})$ by $\otimes_6(i)$ hence

\otimes_8 \mathbf{B} is superatomic.

Now as $\{\{\alpha\} : \alpha < \mu\}$ are the atoms of \mathbb{B}^* clearly $\{X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha/J_1 : \alpha < \mu\}$ are the atoms of \mathbf{B}/J_1 (h is an isomorphism from \mathbf{B}/J_0 onto \mathbb{B}^*) and as $J_0 \subseteq [X^*]^{<\theta}$ while $|X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha| \geq \theta$, clearly

\otimes_9 $J_1 = \mathbf{B} \cap [X^*]^{<\theta}$.

For the rest of the proof let $f \in \text{AUT}(\mathbf{B})$ and toward contradiction we assume $\text{sup}(f) = \{x \in \text{atom}(\mathbb{B}) : f(x) \neq x\}$ has cardinality $\geq \theta$.

Recall that $J_1 = \{a \in \mathbf{B} : |a| < \theta\}$ and $\{\{x\} : x \in X^*\}$ are the atoms of \mathbf{B} so necessarily f maps J_1 onto itself. Note that $\{(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)/J_1 : \alpha < \mu\}$ list the atoms of \mathbf{B}/J_1 by $\otimes_6 + \otimes_7$. Assume $f(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)/J_1 = (X_\beta \cup a_\beta)/J_1, \alpha \neq \beta$; let $c_1 = (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) - f^{-1}(X_\beta \cup a_\beta)$ and $c_2 = (X_\beta \cup a_\beta) - f(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)$, so both being the difference of two members of \mathbf{B} are in \mathbf{B} and $c_1 \leq X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha, c_2 \leq X_\beta \cup a_\beta$ and of course $c_1, c_2 \in J_1$ hence $|c_1| < \theta$ and $|c_2| < \theta$. Now $c_1 \leq X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha, |c_1| < \theta$ implies $c_1 \in I_\alpha^+$ so $c_1 \cap X_\alpha \in I_\alpha$ and $c_1 \setminus X_\alpha$ is finite; similarly $c_2 \cap X_\beta \in I_\beta, c_2 \setminus X_\beta$ is finite. Clearly $f \upharpoonright (\mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha - c_1))$ is an isomorphism from $\mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha - c_1)$ onto $\mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\beta \cup a_\beta - c_2)$, contradicting \otimes_5 by the “moreover” part of the clause (d) of the assumption of Lemma 2.1. Hence the automorphism which f induced on \mathbb{B}^*/I_1 maps each atom to itself hence is the identity. Also for $\alpha < \mu$ we have $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \Delta f(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \in J_1$, that is, has cardinality $< \theta$. So

⊠₃ for each $\alpha < \mu$, letting $c_\alpha^1 = ((X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) - f^{-1}(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)) \in J_1$ and $c_\alpha^2 = (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) - f(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \in J$ we have $f \upharpoonright (\mathbb{B}_\alpha \upharpoonright (1 - c_\alpha^1))$ is an isomorphism from $\mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha - c_\alpha^1)$ onto $\mathbf{B} \upharpoonright (X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha - c_\alpha^2)$

hence

⊠₄ $Z_\alpha = \{x : x \text{ an atom of } \mathbb{B}_\alpha \text{ and } x \leq_{\mathbb{B}_\alpha} c_\alpha^1 \vee f(x) \neq x\}$ has cardinality $< \theta$

by clause (d) of the assumptions on \mathbb{B}_α . Let $v = \{\alpha < \mu : \text{for some } x \in X_\alpha \text{ we have } f(\{x\}) \neq \{x\}\}$. Assume (toward contradiction) for the time being

⊠₅ v has cardinality $\geq \text{cf}(\theta)$.

For $\alpha \in v$ choose $x_\alpha \in X_\alpha$ such that $f(\{x_\alpha\}) \neq \{x_\alpha\}$ and possibly shrinking v without loss of generality $\alpha, \beta \in v \Rightarrow \{x_\alpha\} \neq f(\{x_\beta\})$. Let $g' : v \rightarrow \mu + 1$ be such that $f(\{x_\alpha\}) \subseteq X_{g'(\alpha)}$ where we stipulate $X_\mu = S$. Applying the above to f^{-1} we could have chosen $(x_i, \alpha_i, \gamma_i)$ by induction on $i < \text{cf}(\theta)$ such that $\alpha_i \in v$, $f(\{x_i\}) \neq \{x_i\}$, $x_i \in X_{\alpha_i}$, $f(\{x_i\}) \subseteq X_{\gamma_i}$ and $\alpha_i, \gamma_i \notin \{\alpha_j, \gamma_j : j < i\} \setminus \{\mu\}$, and let $v = \{\alpha_i : i < \text{cf}(\theta)\}$ without loss of generality either g' is one-to-one into μ or g' is constantly μ . Now by clause (b) of the assumption without loss of generality for some $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we have $A \subseteq \{x_\alpha : \alpha \in v\}$. So $\alpha[A] < \mu$ is well defined and $\{x \in X_{\alpha[A]} \cup a_{\alpha[A]} : f(\{x\}) \leq_{\mathbf{B}} X_{\alpha[A]} \cup a_{\alpha[A]}\}$ does not belong to $I_{\alpha[A]}^+$; so by ⊠₃ (applied to $\alpha = \alpha[A]$ and the properties of $c_{\alpha[A]}^1, c_{\alpha[A]}^2$) an easy contradiction.

We can conclude that $\neg \boxtimes_5$ hence v has cardinality $< \text{cf}(\theta)$ hence $|\{x \in X : f(x) \neq x\}| < \theta$. If $\mu = \lambda'$ we are done so assume $\mu < \lambda'$.

Now $S = \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda']\} = X^* \setminus X \subseteq X^*$ satisfies:

⊠₉(α) ($\forall b \in \mathbf{B})(b \cap S \text{ infinite} \Rightarrow 1 \leq \text{rk}(b/J_1, \mathbf{B}/J_1))$ and

(β) if S' satisfies the property of S in clause (α), then $|S' \setminus S| < \theta$

[Why? Clause (α) is proved by inspecting the definition of \mathbf{B} . As for clause (β), if $|S' \setminus S| \geq \theta$ as $S' \setminus S \subseteq X$ clearly then there is $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\{g(i) : i \in A\} \subseteq^* S' \setminus S$. First if $\alpha =: \alpha[A]$ is well defined then $X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha \in \mathbf{B}$, $\text{rk}((X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha)/J_1, \mathbf{B}/J_1) = 0 < 1$ but $(X_\alpha \cup a_\alpha) \cap S' \supseteq a_\alpha$ is infinite; contradiction. Second if $\alpha[A]$ is not well defined then for some $\alpha < \mu$ we have $\{g(i) : i \in A\} \cap X_\alpha$ is infinite and we get a similar contradiction.]

Hence for $n = 1, -1$ the set $S_f^n =: \{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in [\mu, \lambda'] \text{ and } f^n(\{x_\gamma^*\}) \subseteq X \text{ has cardinality } < \theta$. Let $S_f^* = S_f^{-1} \cup S_f^1$.

Also for every $y \in Y^*$ letting $\gamma = \text{rk}(y, \mathbb{B}^*)$ we have $c_y \Delta f(c_y) \in J_1$, (just recall that the automorphism that f induced on \mathbf{B}/J_1 is the identity, and recall that $[d \subseteq S \ \& \ d \in J_1 \Rightarrow d \text{ is finite by } \otimes_6]$, hence the symmetric difference of $\{\{x_\gamma^* : \gamma \in d_y\} \setminus S_f^* \text{ and } \{f\{x_\gamma^*\} : \gamma \in d_y\} \setminus S_f^*\}$ is finite.

As $\mathcal{A}'' = \{d_y : y \in Y^*\}$ is a MAD family of subsets of $\lambda' \setminus \mu$ as in clause (k)(α) of the assumption, the set $\{\gamma \in [\mu, \lambda'] : f(\{x_\gamma^*\}) \neq \{x_\gamma^*\}\}$ is of cardinality $< \theta$; so seemingly we are done.

Not exactly: we have assumed ⊠₁.

To eliminate this extra assumption we make some minor changes. First without loss of generality \mathbb{B}^* is a Boolean Algebra of subsets of $\{\alpha : \alpha < \mu \text{ even}\}$ with the singletons being its atoms. Second, for $A \in \mathcal{A}$, if possible we choose $u = u_A$ as follows, as we can replace u_A by any infinite subset, without loss of generality [clause (c) is possible as in the justification of ⊠₀ above]:

- (a) if case (α) occurs in (b) below then $\langle g^*(\gamma_{A,k}) : k \in u \rangle$ is with no repetitions
- (b) either (α) or (β) where
 - (1) (α) $g^*(\gamma_{A,k})$ is odd for every $k \in u$
 - (2) (β) $g^*(\gamma_{A,k})$ is even for every $k \in u$
- (c) if case (β) occurs in clause (b), then there is a unique $y = y_A \in Y$ such that $\langle \{g^*(\gamma_{A,k})\} : k \in u \rangle$ converge to D_{y_A} .

Note

- (*) if u_A is not well defined then for some finite $w \subseteq \mu$ we have $\{g(\gamma_{A,k}) : k < \omega\} \subseteq \bigcup_{\alpha \in w} X_\alpha$.

Now we choose $\langle \alpha[A] : A \in \mathcal{A}, u_A \text{ well defined} \rangle$ such that:

- (**) $\langle \alpha[A] : A \in \mathcal{A}, u_A \text{ well defined} \rangle$ is with no repetitions, each $\alpha[A]$ is an odd ordinal $< \mu$ and if possible it lists all of them.

Clearly without loss of generality $\mathbb{B}^*/\text{id}_1(\mathbb{B}^*)$ is nontrivial hence $Y \neq \emptyset$ so choose $y^* \in Y$. Now we define a function g from \mathbb{B}^* into $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ as follows:

$$g(x) = \{ \alpha < \mu : \alpha \text{ is even and } \in x \text{ or } \alpha = \alpha[A] \text{ hence odd,} \\ A \in \mathcal{A}, u_A \text{ and } y_A \text{ are well defined and } x \cap y_A \notin \text{id}_{\text{rk}(y_A, \mathbb{B}^*)}(\mathbb{B}^*) \text{ or} \\ \alpha \text{ is odd but } \notin \{ \alpha[A] : A \in \mathcal{A}, u_A \text{ and } y_A \text{ are well defined} \} \text{ and} \\ x \cap y^* \notin \text{id}_{\text{rk}(y^*, \mathbb{B})}(\mathbb{B}^*) \}.$$

Easily g is a homomorphism from \mathbb{B}^* into $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ as \mathbb{B}^* is superatomic. Let \mathbb{B}^{**} be the Boolean Algebra of subsets of μ generated by $\text{Rang}(g) \cup \{(\alpha) : \alpha < \mu\}$. Now we just replace \mathbb{B}^* by $\mathbb{B}^{**} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(\mu)$. $\square_{2.1}$

2.2 Discussion:

Why do we use MAD families $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu]^{\aleph_0}$ and not $\subseteq [\mu]^{\aleph_1}$? If we use the latter, we have to take more care about superatomicity as the intersections of such members may otherwise contradict superatomicity.

§3 Sufficient conditions for the construction's assumptions

Here we shall show that the assumptions of 2.1 are reasonable. Now in 3.2 we shall reduce the clause (k) of 2.1 to $\text{Pr}(\lambda', \theta)$ where Pr formalizes clause (b) there. In 3.3, 3.5 we give sufficient conditions for $\text{Pr}(\mu, \sigma)$. In fact, it is clear that (high enough) it is not easy to fail it. In 3.10 we give a sufficient condition for a strong version of clauses (e) - (f) of 2.1 (and earlier deal with the conditions appearing in it). So at least for some cardinals θ the statement “not having the assumptions of 2.1” with $\theta = \sigma^+$ (for simplicity) $\kappa = \beth_2(\sigma), \mu = \beth_3(\sigma)$ and λ such (h) + (i) + (j) of 2.1 holds has large consistency strength.

3.1 DEFINITION. 1) $\text{Pr}(\chi, \mu, \theta)$ means that $\mu \geq \theta$ for some \mathcal{A} we have:

- (a) $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu]^{\aleph_0}$
- (b) \mathcal{A} is almost disjoint, i.e. $A \neq B \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow |A \cap B| < \aleph_0$
- (c) $|\mathcal{A}| = \chi$
- (d) $(\forall B \in [\mu]^\theta)(\exists A \in \mathcal{A})[A \subseteq^* B]$.

2) If we omit χ we mean “some χ ”.

3) We call $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ saturated if for every $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ not almost contained⁴ in a finite union of members of \mathcal{A} , almost contains a member of \mathcal{A} .

3.2 Fact: 1) Clause (b) of the assumption of 2.1 is equivalent to $\text{Pr}(\mu, \mu, \text{cf}(\theta))$.

2) Clause (k)(α) of the assumption of 2.1 follows from $\text{Pr}(\chi', \lambda', \theta)$ & $\chi = \chi' + 2^{\aleph_0}$.

3) If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu]^{\aleph_0}$ is almost disjoint and is saturated then $\text{Pr}(|\mathcal{A}|, \mu, \aleph_1)$.

4) If $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0} \geq \theta$ then $\text{Pr}(\mu, \theta) \equiv \text{Pr}(\mu, \mu, \theta)$ and $\chi \neq \mu \Rightarrow \neg \text{Pr}(\chi, \mu, \theta)$.

5) If $\theta < \mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ and $\text{Pr}(\mu_2, \theta)$ then $\text{Pr}(\mu_1, \theta)$.

PROOF. 1) Read the two statements.

2) Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\lambda']^{\aleph_0}$ exemplify $\text{Pr}(\chi', \lambda', \theta)$. For each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we can find $\langle B_{A,\zeta} : \zeta < 2^{\aleph_0} \rangle$ such that:

- (*) (i) $B_{A,\zeta} \in [A]^{\aleph_0}$
- (ii) $\zeta \neq \varepsilon \Rightarrow B_{A,\zeta} \cap B_{A,\varepsilon}$ is finite
- (iii) if π is a partial one-to-one function from A to A such that $x \in \text{Dom}(\pi) \rightarrow x \neq \pi(x)$ then for some $\zeta < 2^{\aleph_0}$ we have $\alpha \in B_{A,\zeta} \Rightarrow \alpha \notin \text{Dom}(\pi) \vee \pi(\alpha) \notin B_{A,\zeta}$.

[Why? First find $\langle B'_{A,\zeta} : \zeta < 2^{\aleph_0} \rangle$ satisfying (i), (ii), let $\langle \pi_\zeta : \zeta < 2^{\aleph_0} \rangle$ list the π 's from (iii) and choose $B_{A,\zeta} \in [B'_{A,\zeta}]^{\aleph_0}$ to satisfy clause (iii) for π_ζ .

Lastly, let \mathcal{A}' be any MAD family of subsets of A extending $\{B_{A,\zeta} : A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } \zeta < 2^{\aleph_0}\}$.]

Having found $\langle B_{A,\zeta} : \zeta < 2^{\aleph_0} \rangle$ we let $\mathcal{A}' = \{B_{A,\zeta} : A \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } \zeta < 2^{\aleph_0}\}$, it has cardinality $|\mathcal{A}'| + 2^{\aleph_0} = \chi' + 2^{\aleph_0}$ and is as required in clause (k)(α) of 2.1.

3), 4), 5) Easy. □_{3.2}

3.3 CLAIM. 1) Assume

- (a) $\kappa_n < \kappa_{n+1} < \kappa < \mu_n < \mu_{n+1} < \mu$ for $n < \omega$
- (b) $\kappa = \sum \kappa_n, \mu = \sum \mu_n$ and $\max \text{pcf}\{\kappa_n : n < \omega\} > \mu$
- (c) κ strong limit and $2^\kappa \geq \mu^+$
- (d) $\langle \mu_n : n < \omega \rangle$ satisfies the requirements from [Sh 513, §1] or at least the conclusion, i.e.
 - (1) \odot for every $\lambda \geq \mu$ for some n we have: if $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \text{Reg} \cap \lambda \setminus \mu$ and $|\mathfrak{a}| < \mu$ then $\sup \text{pcf}_{\mu_n\text{-complete}}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq \lambda$.

⁴“ A is almost contained in B ”, i.e. $A \subseteq^* B$ means that $A \setminus B$ is finite.

Then for every $\lambda \geq \kappa$:

$\otimes_{\lambda, \kappa}$ we can find $\{\bar{A}_\alpha : \alpha < \alpha^*\}$ such that

- (1) (α) each \bar{A}_α has the form $\langle A_{\alpha, n} : n < \omega \rangle$, it belongs to $\prod_{n < \omega} [\lambda]^{\kappa_n}$ and for each α we have $\langle A_{\alpha, n} : n < \omega \rangle$ pairwise disjoint
- (2) (β) if $\alpha \neq \beta$, then $\bar{A}_\alpha, \bar{A}_\beta$ are almost disjoint which means that $f \in \prod_{n < \omega} A_{\alpha, n}$ & $f' \in \prod_{n < \omega} A_{\beta, n} \Rightarrow |\text{Rang}(f) \cap \text{Rang}(f')| < \aleph_0$
- (3) (γ) if $\bar{A} \in \prod_{n < \omega} [\lambda]^{\kappa_n}$ then for some $\alpha < \alpha^*$ and one to one function $h_1, h_2 \in {}^\omega \omega$ we have $\kappa = \lim(|A_{\alpha, h_1(n)} \cap A_{\alpha, h_2(n)}| : n < \omega)$.

2) If $\kappa = \aleph_0, \kappa_n = 1, \mu_n < \mu_{n+1} < \mu = \Sigma\{\mu_\ell : \ell < \omega\} < 2^{\aleph_0}$ and \odot of (1), then the conclusion of (1) holds.

3) We can conclude in (1) that: there is $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$, an almost disjoint family such that $(\forall B \in [\lambda]^\kappa)(\exists A \in \mathcal{A})(A \subseteq B)$.

PROOF. By [Sh 460], [Sh 668, §3] (even more).

3.4 REMARK. 1) Are the hypotheses of 3.3(1) reasonable?

1a) Assume that κ is strong limit of cofinality $\aleph_0 < \kappa$ and $2^\kappa > \kappa^{+\omega}$. We let $\mu_n = \kappa^{+1+n}$. There is a sequence $\bar{\kappa} = \langle \kappa_n : n < \omega \rangle$ as in clause (a), (b), (c) of 3.3(1); such $\bar{\kappa}$ exists (by [Sh:g, Ch.IX, §5], and it is hard not to satisfy clause (d) (see [Sh 513]).

1b) Clause (c), i.e. κ strong limit, is needed just to start the induction.

2) Similarly for 3.3(2).

We quote Goldstern Judah and Shelah [GJSh 399] which implies 3.5(1) and (2).

3.5 CLAIM. 1) Assume $CH + SCH + (\forall \mu)(\text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0 \text{ \& } 2^{\aleph_0} < \mu \rightarrow \square_{\mu^+})$. Then there is a saturated MAD family $\mathcal{A}_\lambda \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ for every uncountable λ (of cardinality λ^{\aleph_0}).

PROOF. 1) This is the main result of Goldstern, Judah and Shelah [GJSh 399].

3.6 DEFINITION. Let $\mu \geq \theta$.

1) Let \mathcal{S}_θ be the class of $\bar{a} = \langle a_n : n < \omega \rangle$ such that $|a_n| \leq \theta, a_n \subseteq a_{n+1}, [\text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0 \Rightarrow |a_n| < \theta]$ and $\theta = \lim \sup_n |a_{n+1} \setminus a_n|$. Let $\mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu} = \{\bar{a} : \bar{a} = \langle a_n : n < \omega \rangle \in \mathcal{S}_\theta \text{ and } a_n \in [\mu]^{\leq \theta}\}$.

3) For $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta$ let $\text{set}(\bar{a}) = \{w : |w| = \aleph_0 \text{ and } w \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n \text{ and } n < \omega \Rightarrow |w \cap a_n \setminus \bigcup_{\ell < n} a_\ell| < \aleph_0\}$.

4) For $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta$ let $\bar{a} \leq^* \bar{b}$ mean $\text{set}(\bar{a}) \supseteq \text{set}(\bar{b})$.

5) We say $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta$ are compatible iff $(\exists \bar{c} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta)[\bar{a} \leq^* \bar{c} \ \& \ \bar{b} \leq^* \bar{c} \ \& \ \bigcup_n c_n \subseteq \bigcup_n a_n \cap \bigcup_n b_n]$ (if $\text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0 < \theta$, this is equivalent to “ $\bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n \cap \bigcup_n b_n$ ” has cardinality θ).

3.7 DEFINITION. 1) For $\theta \leq \mu$ let $\boxtimes_{\theta, \mu}$ be

$\boxtimes_{\theta, \mu}$ there is $\mathcal{S}^* \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}$ such that:

- (1) (a) for every $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}$ there is $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}^*$ compatible with \bar{a}
- (2) (b) if $\bar{a} \neq \bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}^*$ then $\text{set}(\bar{a}) \cap \text{set}(\bar{b}) = \emptyset$.

2) For $\theta \leq \mu$, let $\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$ mean:

$\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$ if $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}$ has cardinality $\leq \mu$ then we can find $\mathcal{S}^* \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}$ such that:

- (1) (a) for every $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{S}$ there is $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}^*$ such that $\bar{b} \leq \bar{a}$
- (2) (b) for every $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}^*$ there is $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\bar{b} \leq \bar{a}$
- (3) (c) $\langle \text{set}(\bar{b}) : \bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}^* \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint.

3) We may replace μ by a set A (but obviously $\boxtimes_{\theta, A}$ is equivalent to $\boxtimes_{\theta, |A|}$ and $\boxtimes'_{\theta, A}$ to $\boxtimes'_{\theta, |A|}$).

3.8 FACT. 1) Assume $\theta > \text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0$ is strong limit, $\theta = \Sigma\{\theta_n : n < \omega\}$, $\theta_n < \theta_{n+1}$ and $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}$. Then we can find $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_\theta$ such that:

- (a) if $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ then $(\forall n)(\exists m)(a_n \subseteq b_m)$ (so $\bar{a} \leq \bar{b}$)
- (b) if $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ then $|a_n| = \theta_n$ moreover $\text{otp}(a_n) = \theta_n$ and a_{n+1} is an end extension of a_n
- (c) if $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ then $\langle a_n : n < \omega \rangle$ is increasing
- (d) $\bar{a}^1 \neq \bar{a}^2$ then $\text{set}(\bar{a}^1) \cap \text{set}(\bar{a}^2) = \emptyset$
- (e) if $\bar{c} \in \mathcal{S}_\theta$ is compatible with \bar{b} then it is compatible with \bar{a} for some $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}$.

2) If $(\forall \alpha < \theta_n)(|\alpha|^\sigma < \theta_n = \text{cf}(\theta_n))$ and $<_\alpha$ is a well ordering of $\cup\{b_n : n < \omega\}$ for $\alpha < \sigma$, then we can strengthen (b) to

- (b)⁺ for $\alpha < \sigma$ and $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $n < \omega$, $\text{otp}(b_n, <_\alpha \upharpoonright b_n) = \theta_n$ and if $\sigma < \aleph_0$ then b_{n+1} is a $<_\alpha$ -end extension of b_n .

3) $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta, A}$ are incompatible iff $\bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n \cap \bigcup_{n < \omega} b_n$ has cardinality $< \theta$ ($\text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0 < \theta$ suffice).

4) (a) $\boxtimes_{\theta, \mu}$ implies $\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$.

- (b) $\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$ is equivalent of $\boxtimes_{\theta, \mu}$ if $\mu = \mu^\theta$.

PROOF. As in 3.9 below.

3.9 CLAIM. Assume θ is strong limit, $\theta > \text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0$.

- 1) $\mu \in (\theta, 2^\theta]$ then $\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$ from 3.7 holds.
- 2) Also if $\theta < \mu < (2^\theta)^{+2^\theta}$ then $\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$.
- 3) If $2^\theta < \mu$ and $(\forall \lambda)(2^\theta < \lambda < \mu, \text{cf}(\lambda) = \aleph_0 \rightarrow \lambda^{\aleph_0} = \lambda^+ + \square_\lambda)$ then $\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$.

PROOF. 1) Straight, as $|\mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}| = \mu^\theta = 2^\theta$ we can find $\langle \bar{a}^\alpha : \alpha < 2^\theta \rangle$ listing $\mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}$. Now we choose $\gamma(\alpha), \bar{b}^\alpha$ by induction on $\alpha < 2^\theta$ such that

- (a) $\bar{b}^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \mu}$
- (b) $\beta < \alpha \Rightarrow \text{set}(\bar{b}^\beta) \cap \text{set}(\bar{b}^\alpha) = \emptyset$
- (c) $\bar{c}^\alpha \leq a^{\gamma(\alpha)}$
- (d) $\gamma(\alpha) = \text{Min}\{\gamma : \bar{a}^\gamma \text{ incompatible with } \bar{b}^\beta \text{ for every } \beta < \alpha\}$.

Arriving to α choose $\gamma(\alpha)$ by clause (d), we note that $\beta < \gamma(\alpha) \Rightarrow c_\beta^\alpha = \bigcup_n a_n^{\gamma(\alpha)} \cap$

$\bigcup_n b_n^\beta$ has cardinality $< \theta$, hence we can find $\bar{b}_{\alpha, \varepsilon} \leq \bar{a}^{\gamma(\alpha)}$ for $\varepsilon < 2^\theta$ with $\langle \text{set}(\bar{b}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < 2^\theta \rangle$ pairwise disjoint. So for all but $\leq \theta + |\alpha|$ of the $\varepsilon < 2^\theta, \bar{b}_\alpha = \bar{b}_{\alpha, \varepsilon}$ is as needed.

2) After reading [Sh 460] this is easy and anyhow in subsequent work we give fuller answers.

3) As in [GJSh 399]. $\square_{3.9}$

3.10 CLAIM. 1) Assume

$\boxtimes_{\theta, \kappa, \mu}$ θ is strong limit, $\aleph_0 = \text{cf}(\theta) < \theta$ and $\theta \leq \kappa \leq 2^{2^\theta}, \mu = 2^\kappa$ and $\boxtimes_{\theta, \kappa}$ (from 3.7) holds so $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0}$.

Then some $\mathbb{B} = \langle \mathbb{B}_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ satisfies clauses (c) - (g) of 2.1; in fact \mathbb{B}_α is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ with 2 levels and $\text{id}_{< \infty}(\mathbb{B}_\alpha)$ is included in $[\kappa]^{< \aleph_1}$ hence $\mathbb{B}_\alpha \subseteq \{a \subseteq \kappa : a \text{ countable or co-countable}\}$.

2) As above except that instead “ θ strong limit, $\text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0 < \theta$ ” we demand $2^\theta = \theta^{\aleph_0} > 2^{\aleph_0}$ & $\theta > \text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0$ or $\theta = \aleph_0 +$ “there is no infinite MAD family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^{\aleph_0}$ of cardinality $< \text{the continuum}$ ”.

PROOF. 1) Let $\theta = \sum_{n < \omega} \theta_n, \theta_n < \theta_{n+1} < \theta$.

Fact: Letting $\bar{a}^* = \langle \theta_n : n < \omega \rangle$, i.e. $a_n^* = \theta_n$ we can find $\bar{t}^a = \langle t_{\ell, \alpha} : \ell < 3, \alpha < 2^\theta \rangle$ such that:

- (i) $t_{\ell, \alpha} \in \text{set}(\bar{a}^*)$ has order type ω
- (ii) for some one to one onto $\pi : 2^\theta \times 2^\theta \rightarrow 2^\theta$ we write $t_{2, \alpha, \beta}$ for $t_{2, \pi(\alpha, \beta)}$
- (iii) if $(\ell_1, \alpha_1) \neq (\ell_2, \alpha_2)$ then $t_{\ell_1, \alpha_1} \cap t_{\ell_2, \alpha_2}$ is finite
- (iv) if $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \kappa}$ and $\bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n \subseteq \theta$ then for some $\alpha < 2^\theta$ we have $[\beta < 2^\theta \Rightarrow t_{2, \alpha, \beta} \in \text{set}(\bar{a})]$

(v) if $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathcal{S}_{\theta, \kappa}$ and $\bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n \cup \bigcup_{n < \omega} b_n \subseteq \theta$ and $\text{set}(\bar{a}) \cap \text{set}(\bar{b}) = \emptyset$ and $h : \bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n \rightarrow \bigcup_{n < \omega} b_n$ is one to one and maps a_n onto b_n then for some $\alpha, t_{0, \alpha} \in \text{set}(\bar{a}), t_{1, \alpha} \in \text{set}(\bar{b})$ and h maps $t_{0, \alpha}$ into a co-infinite subset of $t_{1, \alpha}$.

PROOF OF THE FACT. Straight.

Construction: Let $\mathcal{S}^* = \{\bar{a}^\gamma : \gamma < \gamma^*\}$ exemplify $\boxtimes_{\theta, \kappa}$ so $|\gamma^*| \leq \kappa^\theta$, without loss of generality $\bar{a} \in \mathcal{S}^*$ & $n < \omega \Rightarrow (\text{otp}(a_n) \ \& \ a_{n+1} \text{ is an end extension of } a_n)$; (by 3.8, i.e. by replacing \bar{a}^γ by a suitable family $\subseteq \{\bar{b} : \bar{b} \leq \bar{a}^\gamma\}$). Let $\{X_\gamma : \gamma < \kappa\}$ be a sequence of subsets of 2^θ such that $\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2 \Rightarrow |X_{\gamma_1} \setminus X_{\gamma_2}| = 2^\theta$; let $\{Y_j : j < \mu\}$ be a sequence of subsets of κ such that $j_1 \neq j_2 \Rightarrow |Y_{j_1} \setminus Y_{j_2}| = \kappa$, let g_γ be a one to one mapping from θ into $\bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n^\gamma$ mapping θ_n onto a_n^γ , and lastly let $t_{\ell, \alpha}^\gamma = g_\gamma''(t_{\ell, \alpha}) = \{g_\gamma(\zeta) : \zeta \in t_{\ell, \alpha}\}$ for $\ell < 3, \alpha < \gamma^+$ hence $t_{2, \alpha, \beta}^\gamma = g_\gamma''(t_{2, \alpha, \beta}^\gamma)$. Let $t_{3, \alpha, \beta}^\gamma = \{g_\gamma(\varepsilon) : \varepsilon \in t_{2, \alpha, \beta} \text{ and } |t_{2, \alpha, \beta} \cap \varepsilon| \text{ is even}\}$.

For $j < \mu$, let \mathcal{A}_j be the following family of subsets of κ

$$\begin{aligned} & t_{0, \alpha}^\gamma, t_{1, \alpha}^\gamma \text{ when } \gamma < \gamma^*, \alpha < 2^\theta \\ & t_{2, \alpha, 1+\beta}^\gamma \text{ when } \gamma < \gamma^*, \beta \notin X_\gamma, \alpha < 2^\theta \\ & t_{3, \alpha, 1+\beta}^\gamma \text{ when } \gamma < \gamma^*, \beta \in X_\gamma, \alpha < 2^\theta \\ & t_{2, \alpha, 0}^\gamma \text{ when } \gamma < \gamma^*, \alpha < 2^\theta, \gamma \notin Y_j \text{ and} \\ & t_{3, \alpha, 0}^\gamma \text{ when } \gamma \in Y_j. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly

$$\odot_1 \quad t' \neq t'' \in \mathcal{A}_j \Rightarrow |t' \cap t''| < \aleph_0 = |t'|.$$

Let \mathcal{A}_j^+ be a maximal almost disjoint family of countable subsets of κ extending \mathcal{A}_j . Let I_j be the Boolean ring of subsets of κ generated by $\mathcal{A}_j^+ \cup \{\{\varepsilon\} : \varepsilon < \kappa\}$ and \mathbb{B}_j be the Boolean algebra of subsets of κ generated by I_j . Now

- \odot_2 if $i_0, i_1 < \mu$ and $b_0, b_1 \in [\kappa]^\theta$ and h is a one to one mapping from b_0 onto b_1 such that $\alpha \in \text{Dom}(h) \Rightarrow h(\alpha) \neq \alpha$, then for some $t^0 \in \mathcal{A}_{i_0}^+, t^1 \in \mathcal{A}_{i_1}^+$ we have: $t^0 \subseteq^* b_0, t^1 \subseteq^* b_1$ and h maps t^0 into a co-infinite subset of t^1 [why? for some $\gamma_0 < \kappa$ the set $b_0 \cap \bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n^{\gamma_0}$ have cardinality θ , so without loss of generality $b_0 \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n^{\gamma_0}$ and similarly for some $\gamma_1 < \kappa$ without loss of generality $b_1 \subseteq \bigcup_{n < \omega} a_n^{\gamma_1}$. For $\ell = 0, 1$ let $b_\ell^- \in [\theta]^\theta$ be such that g_{γ_ℓ} maps b_ℓ^- onto b_ℓ . Now without loss of generality $b_0^- \cap b_1^- = \emptyset$ or $b_0^- = b_1^-$ (recall we have to preserve "h is from b_0 onto b_1 ", too!). If $b_0^- \cap b_1^- = \emptyset$ then by

clause (v) of the fact some $t_{0,\alpha_0}^{\gamma_0} \in \mathcal{A}_{i_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{i_0}^+$ and $t_{0,\alpha_1}^{\gamma_1} \in \mathcal{A}_{i_1} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{i_1}^+$ will be as required in the conclusion of \odot_2 . So assume $b_0^- = b_1^-$, let $b_0^* = \{\alpha \in b_0^- : h \circ g_{\gamma_0}(\alpha) \neq g_{\gamma_1}(\alpha)\}$. If b_0^* has cardinality θ , we get the desired conclusion (in \odot_2) as above, so assume $|b_0^*| < \theta$ hence without loss of generality $b_0^* = \emptyset$. Also if $\gamma_0 \neq \gamma_1$ then $|X_{\gamma_0} \setminus X_{\gamma_1}| = 2^\theta$ hence we can find a non zero ordinal $\beta \in X_{\gamma_0} \setminus X_{\gamma_1}$ and by clause (ii) of the fact we can find an ordinal $\alpha < 2^\theta$ such that $(\forall \beta < 2^\theta)[t_{2,\alpha,\beta}^\gamma \subseteq b_0^-]$ hence we can use $t_{3,\alpha,\beta}^\gamma, t_{2,\alpha,\beta}^\gamma$. So we have to assume $\gamma_0 = \gamma_1$ but then $g_{\gamma_0} = g_{\gamma_1}$ so $h \upharpoonright (b_0 \setminus b_0^*)$ is the identity, a contradiction.]

\odot_3 if $i_0 \neq i_1 < \mu$ and⁵ $Z \in [\kappa]^{<\kappa}$ and h is a one to one function from $\kappa \setminus Z$ onto $\kappa \setminus Z$ then for some $t^0 \in \mathcal{A}_{i_0}^+$ satisfying $t^0 \subseteq^* \text{Dom}(h)$ and $t^1 \in \mathcal{A}_{i_1}^+$ we have: $h''(t^0) \subseteq^* t^1$ and $t^1 \setminus h''(t^0)$ is infinite.

[Why? Let $Z_1 = \{\alpha \in \text{Dom}(h) : h(\alpha) \neq \alpha\}$, so by \odot_2 we know $|Z_1| < \theta$. We know that $Y_{i_0} \setminus Y_{i_1}$ has cardinality μ , hence for some $\gamma \in Y_{i_0} \setminus Y_{i_1}$ we have $\text{set}(\bar{a}_\gamma) \cap [Z \cup Z_1]^{\aleph_0} = \emptyset$. So $t_{3,\alpha,0}^\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{i_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_j^+$ and $t_{2,\alpha,0}^\gamma \in \mathcal{A}_{i_1} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{i_1}^+$, so $t_{3,\alpha,0}^\gamma$ is a co-infinite subset of $t_{2,\alpha,0}^\gamma, t_{2,\alpha,0}^\gamma \subseteq^* \kappa \setminus Z \setminus Z_0$ and h maps $t_{3,\alpha,0}^\gamma \setminus Z \setminus Z_0$ to itself a co-infinite subset of $t_{2,\alpha,0}^\gamma$.]

Clearly $\langle \mathbb{B}_j : j < \mu \rangle$ is as required so we are done.

2) Similar proof.

□_{3.10}

3.11 CONCLUSION. 1) Under the assumption $\boxtimes_{\theta,\kappa,\mu}$ of 3.10, let $\lambda^* = \text{Ded}^+(\mu) = \text{Min}\{\lambda : \text{there is no tree with } \leq \mu \text{ nodes and } \geq \lambda \text{ branches (equivalently, a linear order of cardinality } \lambda \text{ and density } \leq \mu)\}$. Then for any λ satisfying $\mu \leq \lambda < \lambda^*$, there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ and μ atoms with no automorphism moving $\geq \theta$ atoms.

2) Assume: θ is uncountable strong limit of cofinality \aleph_0 , $\text{pp}_{J_{\omega}^{\text{ad}}}(\theta) = 2^\theta$ (see [Sh:g, Ch.IX,§5] why this is reasonable) and $\kappa = (2^\theta)^{+\alpha} \leq 2^{2^\theta}, \alpha < (2^\theta)^+, \mu = 2^\kappa$ and $\mu < \lambda < \text{Ded}^+(\mu)$, e.g. $\lambda = 2^\chi$ for $\chi = \text{Min}\{\chi : 2^\chi > \mu\}$. Then there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ and μ atoms, with no automorphism moving $\geq \theta$ atoms.

3) In part (2) we can replace $\kappa = (2^\theta)^{+\alpha}$ by $\kappa = 2^{2^\theta}$, if some very weak pcf hypothesis (whose negation is not known to be consistent and also of §4), e.g.

(*) if \mathfrak{a} is a countable set of regular cardinal then $\text{pcf}(\mathfrak{a})$ is countable (or just $\leq \aleph_{n(*)}$).

PROOF. 1) We, of course, use Lemma 2.1 with θ^+ here standing for θ there, so we have to show that the assumptions there holds.

Clause (a) of 2.1 holds trivially.

Clause (b) of 2.1 follows from $\boxtimes_{\theta,\kappa}$ (every $(\forall A \in [\mu]^\theta)(\exists B \in \mathcal{A})(B \subseteq A)$) rather than just $(\forall A \in [\mu]^{\theta^+})$. There is a sequence $\langle \mathbb{B}_\alpha : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ satisfying clauses (c) - (g) of 2.1 by 3.10. There is a Boolean Algebra \mathbb{B}^* satisfying clauses (h), (i), (j) of 2.1 because $\lambda < \lambda^*$, so there is a tree \mathcal{T} with μ nodes and $\geq \lambda$ branches, let \mathcal{B} be a set of λ branches of \mathcal{T} and let \mathbb{B} be the Boolean Algebra of subsets of \mathcal{T} generated

⁵by a little more care in indexing, $Z \in [\mu]^{<\mu}$ is O.K. and we can choose γ such that

$$\bigcup_n a_{\gamma,n} \subseteq \kappa \setminus Z \setminus Z_0$$

by $\{a : a \subseteq T, a \text{ is linearly ordered by } <_T \text{ and } x \in a \ \& \ y <_T x \Rightarrow y \in a \text{ and } a \text{ is bounded on } a \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

Lastly, clause (k) of 2.1 hold vacuously as we choose $\lambda' = \mu$. $\square_{3.11}$

3.12 CLAIM. Assume

- (a) $Pr(\beth_3, \aleph_1)$
- (b) $\lambda^* = \text{Min}\{\lambda' : \text{there is a tree with } \beth_3 \text{ models of } \geq \lambda' \text{ branches}\}$
- (c) $\beth_3 \leq \lambda < \lambda^*$.

Then there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra with λ elements \beth_3 atoms and no automorphisms moving uncountably many atoms.

PROOF. The main new point is that we can prove a parallel of 3.10 noting that as $Pr(\beth_3, \aleph_1)$ holds also $Pr(\beth_2, \aleph_1)$ holds. $\square_{3.12}$

3.13 REMARK. 1) So clearly in many models of ZFC we get that the bound is 1.1 cannot be improved.

2) The question is whether inductively we can get for many θ 's the parallel of 3.10.

3) We can under weak assumptions add $\lambda', \mu \leq \lambda' \leq (\lambda')^{\aleph_0} \leq \lambda$ and demand that the Boolean algebra has μ' atoms. For this we need to check condition (k)(α). We probably can omit the demand " $(\lambda')^{\aleph_0} \leq \lambda$ " in the generalization of 3.11 indicated above, for this we just need to weaken " \mathcal{A} is MAD" in 2.1.

3.14 CLAIM. 1) Let $\lambda > \aleph_0$. A sufficient condition for the existence of a saturated MAD family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ is

$\boxplus_{\lambda, \theta}$ letting i.e. $\theta = \text{Min}\{|\mathcal{A}| : \mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^{\aleph_0} \text{ is an infinite MAD family, then for every } \mu \text{ satisfying } 2^{\aleph_0} < \mu \leq \lambda^{\aleph_0} \text{ we have } \neg(a)_{\mu, \theta} \text{ and } \aleph_0 < \sigma = \text{cf}(\sigma) \leq \theta \Rightarrow \neg(b)_{\mu, \theta} \text{ where}$

- (1) $(a)_{\mu, \theta}$ there is a set $\mathbf{b} \subseteq \text{Reg} \cap \mu \setminus 2^{\aleph_0}$ of cardinality $\leq \theta$ such that $\Pi \mathbf{b} / [\mathbf{b}]^{< \aleph_0}$ is μ -directed, moreover, for no sequence $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = \langle \mathbf{b}_i : i < \theta \rangle$, each $\mathbf{b}_i \subseteq \text{Reg} \cap \mu \setminus 2^{\aleph_0}$ finite and $\mathbf{c} \subseteq \cup \{\mathbf{b}_i : i < \theta\} \ \& \ \max \text{pcf}(\mathbf{c}) < \mu \Rightarrow \aleph_1 > |\{i < \theta : \mathbf{b}_i \subseteq \mathbf{c}\}|$
- (2) $(b)_{\mu, \theta}$ μ is regular, $S \subseteq \{\delta < \mu : \text{cf}(\delta) = \text{cf}(\theta)\}$ is stationary, $\bar{A} = \langle A_\delta : \delta \in S \rangle$, $A_\delta \subseteq \delta$, $\text{otp}(A_\delta) = \theta$, $\delta_2 \neq \delta_2 \Rightarrow A_{\delta_1} \cap A_{\delta_2}$ finite.

2) Similarly concerning $\boxtimes'_{\theta, \mu}$

PROOF. As in [Sh 668].

§4 On independence

In the bound $\beth_4(\sigma)$, the last exponentiation was really $sa(\mu)$ where

4.1 DEFINITION. 1) $sa^+(\mu) = \sup\{|\mathbb{B}|^+ : \mathbb{B} \text{ is a superatomic Boolean Algebra with } \mu \text{ atoms}\}.$

2) $sa(\mu) = \sup\{|\mathbb{B}| : \mathbb{B} \text{ is a superatomic Boolean Algebra with } \mu \text{ atoms}\}.$

3) $sa^+(\mu, \theta) = \sup\{|\mathbb{B}|^+ : \mathbb{B} \text{ is a superatomic Boolean subalgebra of } \mathcal{P}(\mu) \text{ extending } \{a \subseteq \mu : a \text{ finite or cofinite}\} \text{ such that } a \in \mathbb{B} \Rightarrow |a| < \theta \vee |\mu \setminus a| < \theta\}.$

4) $sa(\mu, \theta) = \sup\{|\mathbb{B}| : \mathbb{B} \text{ is as in (3)}\}.$

5) $sa^*(\theta) = \text{Min}\{\lambda : cf(\lambda) \geq \theta \text{ and if } \mu < \lambda \text{ then } sa^+(\mu, \theta) \leq \lambda\}.$

That is, by the proof of Theorem 1.1

4.2 CLAIM. *If \mathbb{B} is a superatomic Boolean Algebra with no automorphism moving $\geq \theta$ atoms, $\theta = cf(\theta) > \aleph_0$ then $|\mathbb{B}| < sa^+(\beth_3(<\theta))$, moreover $|\mathbb{B}| < sa^+(\beth_2(sa^*(\theta)))$.*

4.3 Discussion: Now consistently $sa(\aleph_1) < 2^{\aleph_1}$, as [Sh 620, 8.1] show the consistency of a considerably stronger statement. It proves that e.g. if we start with $\mathbf{V} \models \text{GCH}$ and \mathbb{P} is adding \aleph_{ω_1} Cohen reals then in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$, $(2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_{\omega_1} < 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_{\omega_1+1})$ and among any \aleph_{ω_1+1} members of $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)$ there are \aleph_{ω_1+1} which form an independent family, i.e. any finite nontrivial Boolean combination of them is nonempty, in other words “ $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)$ has \aleph_{ω_1+1} -free precaliber in Monk’s question definition”. (Not surprising this is the same model for “no tree with \aleph_1 nodes has 2^{\aleph_1} branches” in [B1]).

So the bound $\beth_4(\theta)$ is not always the right ones though this needs use of more complicated functions.

We have not looked at the question: does the use of $sa^*(\theta)$ in claim 4.2 really help?

4.4 CLAIM. *Assume*

- (a) $\Upsilon = \Upsilon^{<\Upsilon} < \mu = cf(\mu) < \chi$
- (b) $cf(\chi) = \mu$ and $(\forall \alpha < \chi)(|\alpha|^\mu < \chi)$ and $(\forall \alpha < \mu)(|\alpha|^{<\Upsilon} < \mu)$
- (c) \mathbb{Q} is a forcing notion of cardinality $< \chi$ such that in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$: μ is a regular cardinal and $(\forall a \in [\chi]^{<\mu})(\exists b)[a \subseteq b \in ([\chi]^{<\mu})^{\mathbf{V}}]$
- (d) $\mathbb{P} = \{f : f \text{ a partial function from } \chi \text{ to } \{0, 1\} \text{ of cardinality } < \Upsilon\}$ order by inclusion (that is, adding a χ Υ -Cohen).

Then in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q} \times \mathbb{P}}$ we have: $(2^\Upsilon = 2^{<\mu} = \chi, 2^\mu = \chi^\mu = (\chi^\mu)^{\mathbf{V}}$ and $sa(\mu) = \chi < 2^\mu$, moreover the Boolean Algebra $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ has χ^+ -free precaliber.

PROOF. Work in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$, like [Sh 620, 8.1], not using “ \mathbb{P} is σ -complete” which may fail in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$. □_{4.4}

On the other hand

4.5 CLAIM. *Assume $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_n : n < \omega \rangle$ satisfies $\lambda_{n+1} = \text{Min}\{\lambda : 2^\lambda > 2^{\lambda_n}\}$. Then for infinitely many n ’s for some $\mu_n \in [\lambda_n, \lambda_{n+1})$ we have $sa(\mu_n) = 2^{\mu_n} = 2^{\lambda_n}$ (in fact $sa^+(\mu_n) = (2^{\mu_n})^+ = (2^{\lambda_n})^+$ except possibly when $cf(2^{\lambda_n}) \leq 2^{\lambda_{n-1}}$).*

PROOF. By [Sh 430, 3.4] we have for infinitely many n 's $\mu_n \in [\lambda_n, \lambda_{n+1})$ and for every regular $\chi \leq 2^{\lambda_n} = 2^{\mu_n}$, a tree with $\leq \mu_{n+1}$ nodes, λ_n levels and $\geq \chi$ λ_n -branches.

□_{4.5}

4.6 Conclusion: 1) Assume θ is strong limit, $\theta > \text{cf}(\theta) = \aleph_0$ and $\text{Pr}(2^{2^\theta}, \theta)$ and $\lambda < \text{sa}^+(\beth_3(\theta))$. Then

$(*)_{\theta, \lambda}$ there is a superatomic Boolean Algebra without any automorphism moving $\geq \theta$ atoms such that \mathbb{B} has cardinality λ (and has $\beth_3(\theta)$ atoms⁶).

2) Assume $\text{Pr}(\beth_2, \aleph_1)$ and $\lambda < \text{sa}^+(\beth_3)$. Then $(*)_{\theta, \lambda}$ holds.

PROOF. 1) Use 3.10 and 2.1.

2) Similar only replace 3.10 by a parallel claim.

□_{4.6}

REFERENCES.

- [B1] James E. Baumgartner. *Results and independence proofs in combinatorial set theory*. PhD thesis, Univ. of Calif. Berkeley, 1970.
- [GJSh 399] Martin Goldstern, Haim Judah, and Saharon Shelah. Saturated families. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, **111**:1095–1104, 1991.
- [M] J. Donald Monk. Cardinal functions of Boolean algebras. circulated notes.
- [M1] J. Donald Monk. *Cardinal Invariants of Boolean Algebras*. Lectures in Mathematics. ETH Zurich, Birkhauser Verlag, Basel Boston Berlin, 1990.
- [M2] J. Donald Monk. *Cardinal Invariants of Boolean Algebras*, volume 142 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel–Boston–Berlin, 1996.
- [RuKo01] Matatyahu Rubin and Sabine Koppelberg. A superatomic Boolean algebra with few automorphisms. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **40**:125–129, 2001.
- [Sh 668] Saharon Shelah. Anti-homogeneous Partitions of a Topological Space. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **submitted**. [math.LO/9906025](#)⁷
- [Sh 513] Saharon Shelah. pcf and infinite free subsets in an algebra. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **accepted**. [math.LO/9807177](#)
- [Sh 397] Saharon Shelah. Factor = quotient, uncountable Boolean algebras, number of endomorphism and width. *Mathematica Japonica*, **37**:385–400, 1992. [math.LO/9201250](#)

⁶we can allow less atoms and less elements

⁷References of the form [math.XX/...](#) refer to the [xxx.lanl.gov](#) archive

- [Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh 430] Saharon Shelah. Further cardinal arithmetic. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **95**:61–114, 1996. [math.LO/9610226](#)
- [Sh 620] Saharon Shelah. Special Subsets of ${}^{\text{cf}(\mu)}\mu$, Boolean Algebras and Maharam measure Algebras. *Topology and its Applications*, **99**:135–235, 1999. 8th Prague Topological Symposium on General Topology and its Relations to Modern Analysis and Algebra, Part II (1996). [math.LO/9804156](#)
- [Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **116**:285–321, 2000. [math.LO/9809200](#)
- [Sh 641] Saharon Shelah. Constructing Boolean algebras for cardinal invariants. *Algebra Universalis*, **45**:353–373, 2001. [math.LO/9712286](#)

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM, ISRAEL
E-mail address: shelah@math.huji.ac.il

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY, 110 FRELINGHUYSEN ROAD, PISCATAWAY, NEW JERSEY 08854-8019
E-mail address: shelah@math.rutgers.edu