BOREL SETS WITHOUT PERFECTLY MANY OVERLAPPING TRANSLATIONS

ANDRZEJ ROSŁANOWSKI AND SAHARON SHELAH

Abstract. For a cardinal $\lambda < \lambda_{\omega_1}$ we give a ccc forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ such that

$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ " some Σ^0_2 set $B \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ admits a sequence $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ of distinct elements of ${}^\omega 2$ such that $\big|(\eta_\alpha + B) \cap (\eta_\beta + B)\big| \geq 6$ for all $\alpha, \beta < \lambda$ but does not have a perfect set of such η's ".

The construction closely follows the one from Shelah [6, Section 1].

1. Introduction

Shelah [6] analyzed when there are Borel in the plane which contain large squares but no perfect squares. A rank on models with a countable vocabulary was introduced and a used to define a cardinal λ_{ω_1} (the first λ such that there is no model with universe λ, countable vocabulary and rank $< \omega_1$). It was shown in [6, Claim 1.12] that every Borel set $B \subseteq {}^\omega 2 \times {}^\omega 2$ which contains a λ_{ω_1}–square must contain a perfect square. On the other hand, by [6, Theorem 1.13], if $\mu = \mu^{\aleph_0} < \lambda_{\omega_1}$ then some ccc forcing notion forces that (the continuum is arbitrarily large and) some Borel set contains a μ–square but no μ^+–square.

We would like to understand what the results mentioned above mean for general relations. Natural first step is to ask about Borel sets with $\mu \geq \aleph_1$ pairwise disjoint translations but without any perfect set of such translations, as motivated e.g. by Balcerzak, Rosłanowski and Shelah [1] (were we studied the σ–ideal of subsets of ${}^\omega 2$ generated by Borel sets with a perfect set of pairwise disjoint translations). A generalization of this direction could follow Zakrzewski [7] who introduced perfectly k–small sets.

However, preliminary analysis of the problem revealed that another, somewhat orthogonal to the one described above, direction is more natural in the setting of [6]. Thus we investigate Borel sets with many, but not too many, pairwise overlapping intersections.

Easily, every uncountable Borel subset B of ${}^\omega 2$ has a perfect set of pairwise non-disjoint translations (just consider a perfect set $P \subseteq B$ and note that for $x, y \in P$ we have $\mathbf{0}, x+y \in (B+x) \cap (B+y)$). The problem of many non-disjoint translations becomes more interesting if we demand that the intersections have more elements. Note that in ${}^\omega 2$, if $x + b_0 = y + b_1$ then also $x + b_1 = y + b_0$, so $x \neq y$ and $|(B+x) \cap (B+y)| < \omega$ imply that $|(B+x) \cap (B+y)|$ is even.

Date: June, 2018.
1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E35; Secondary: 03E15, 03E50.
Publication 1138 of the second author.

In the present paper we study the case when the intersections $(B+x)\cap(B+y)$ have at least 6 elements. We show that for $\lambda<\lambda_{\omega_1}$ there is a ccc forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ adding a Σ^0_2 subset B of the Cantor space ${}^\omega 2$ such that

- for some $H\subseteq {}^\omega 2$ of size λ, $|(B+h)\cap(B+h')|\geq 6$ for all $h,h'\in H$, but
- for every perfect set $P\subseteq {}^\omega 2$ there are $x,x'\in P$ with $|(B+x)\cap(B+x')|<6$.

We fully utilize the algebraic properties of $({}^\omega 2,+)$, in particular the fact that all elements of ${}^\omega 2$ are self-inverse. The general case of Polish groups will be investigated in the subsequent work [5].

In Section 2 of the paper we recall the rank from [6]. We give the relevant definitions, state and prove all the properties needed for our results later. In the third section we analyze when a Σ^0_2 subset of ${}^\omega 2$ has a perfect set of pairwise overlapping translations. The main consistency result concerning adding a Borel set with no perfect set of overlapping translations is given in the fourth section.

Notation: Our notation is rather standard and compatible with that of classical textbooks (like Jech [3] or Bartoszyński and Judah [2]). However, in forcing we keep the older convention that *a stronger condition is the larger one.*

(1) For a set u we let
$$u^{\langle 2\rangle}=\{(x,y)\in u\times u: x\neq y\}.$$
(2) The Cantor space ${}^\omega 2$ of all infinite sequences with values 0 and 1 is equipped with the natural product topology and the group operation of coordinate-wise addition + modulo 2.
(3) Ordinal numbers will be denoted be the lower case initial letters of the Greek alphabet $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta$. Finite ordinals (non-negative integers) will be denoted by letters a,b,c,d,i,j,k,ℓ,m,n,M and ι.
(4) The Greek letters κ,λ will stand for uncountable cardinals.
(5) For a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$, all $\mathbb{P}$–names for objects in the extension via $\mathbb{P}$ will be denoted with a tilde below (e.g., $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$, $\underset{\sim}{X}$), and $\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}}$ will stand for the canonical $\mathbb{P}$–name for the generic filter in $\mathbb{P}$.

2. The rank

We will remind some basic facts from [6, Section 1] concerning a rank (on models with countable vocabulary) which will be used in the construction of a forcing notion in the next section. For the convenience of the reader we provide proofs for most of the claims, even though they were given in [6]. Our rank rk is the rk^0 of [6] and rk^* is the rk^2 there.

Let λ be a cardinal and $\mathbb{M}$ be a model with the universe λ and a countable vocabulary τ.

Definition 2.1. (1) By induction on ordinals α, for finite non-empty sets $w\subseteq\lambda$ we define when $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})\geq\alpha$. Let $w=\{a_0,\ldots,a_n\}\subseteq\lambda$, $|w|=n+1$.

(a) $\mathrm{rk}(w)\geq 0$ if and only if for every quantifier free formula $\varphi\in\mathcal{L}(\tau)$ and each $k\leq n$, if $\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_k,\ldots,a_n]$ then the set
$$\big\{a\in\lambda:\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},a,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_n]\big\}$$
is uncountable;

(b) if α is limit, then $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})\geq\alpha$ if and only if $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})\geq\beta$ for all $\beta<\alpha$;

(c) $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha+1$ if and only if for every quantifier free formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}(\tau)$ and each $k \leq n$, if $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_k,\ldots,a_n]$ then there is $a^* \in \lambda \setminus w$ such that

$$\mathrm{rk}(w \cup \{a^*\},\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},a^*,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_n].$$

(2) Similarly, for finite non-empty sets $w \subseteq \lambda$ we define when $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha$ (by induction on ordinals α). Let $w = \{a_0,\ldots,a_n\} \subseteq \lambda$. We take clauses (a) and (b) above and

(c)* $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha+1$ if and only if for every quantifier free formula $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}(\tau)$ and each $k \leq n$, if $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_k,\ldots,a_n]$ then there are pairwise distinct $\langle a^*_i : i < \omega_1\rangle \subseteq \lambda \setminus (w \setminus \{a_k\})$ such that $a^*_0 = a_k$ and for all $i < j < \omega_1$ we have

$$\mathrm{rk}^*(w \setminus \{a_k\} \cup \{a^*_i,a^*_j\},\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},a^*_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_n].$$

By a straightforward induction on α one easily shows the following observation.

Observation 2.2. *If $\emptyset \neq v \subseteq w$ then*

- $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha \geq \beta$ *implies* $\mathrm{rk}(v,\mathbb{M}) \geq \beta$, *and*
- $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha \geq \beta$ *implies* $\mathrm{rk}^*(v,\mathbb{M}) \geq \beta$.

Hence we may define the rank functions on finite non-empty subsets of λ.

Definition 2.3. The ranks $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})$ and $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M})$ of a finite non-empty set $w \subseteq \lambda$ are defined as:

- $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) = -1$ if $\neg(\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq 0)$, and $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) = -1$ if $\neg(\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq 0)$,
- $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) = \infty$ if $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha$ for all ordinals α, and $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) = \infty$ if $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha$ for all ordinals α,
- for an ordinal α: $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) = \alpha$ if $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha$ but $\neg(\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha+1)$, and $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) = \alpha$ if $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha$ but $\neg(\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}) \geq \alpha+1)$.

Definition 2.4. (1) For an ordinal ε and a cardinal λ let $\mathrm{NPr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ be the following statement: "there is a model $\mathbb{M}^*$ with the universe λ and a countable vocabulary τ^* such that $\sup\{\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}^*) : \emptyset \neq w \in [\lambda]^{<\omega}\} < \varepsilon$."

(2) The statement $\mathrm{NPr}^*_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ is defined similarly but using the rank rk^*.

(3) $\mathrm{Pr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{Pr}^*_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ are the negations of $\mathrm{NPr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{NPr}^*_\varepsilon(\lambda)$, respectively.

Observation 2.5. (1) *If a model $\mathbb{M}^+$ (on λ) is an expansion of the model $\mathbb{M}$, then* $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M}^+) \leq \mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}^+) \leq \mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})$.

(2) *If λ is uncountable and $\mathrm{NPr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$, then there is a model $\mathbb{M}^*$ with the universe λ and a countable vocabulary τ^* such that*

- $\mathrm{rk}(\{a\},\mathbb{M}^*) \geq 0$ *for all $a \in \lambda$ and*
- $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}^*) < \varepsilon$ *for every finite non-empty set $w \subseteq \lambda$.*

Proposition 2.6 (See [6, Claim 1.7])**.** (1) $\mathrm{NPr}_1(\omega_1)$.

(2) *If* $\mathrm{NPr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$, *then* $\mathrm{NPr}_{\varepsilon+1}(\lambda^+)$.

(3) *If* $\mathrm{NPr}_\varepsilon(\mu)$ *for* $\mu < \lambda$ *and* $\mathrm{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$, *then* $\mathrm{NPr}_{\varepsilon+1}(\lambda)$.

(4) $\mathrm{NPr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ *implies* $\mathrm{NPr}^*_\varepsilon(\lambda)$.

Proof. (1) Let Q be a binary relational symbol and let $\mathbb{M}_1$ be a model with the universe ω_1, the vocabulary $\tau(\mathbb{M}_1) = \{Q\}$ and such that $Q^{\mathbb{M}_1} = \{(\alpha,\beta) \in \omega_1 \times \omega_1 : \alpha < \beta\}$. Then for each $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \omega_1$ we have $\mathbb{M}_1 \models Q[\alpha_0,\alpha_1]$ but the set

$\{\alpha<\omega_1:\mathbb{M}_1\models Q[\alpha,\alpha_1]\}$ is countable. Hence $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}_1)=-1$ whenever $|w|\geq 2$ and $\mathrm{rk}(\{\alpha\},\mathbb{M}_1)=0$ for $\alpha\in\omega_1$. Consequently, $\mathbb{M}_1$ witnesses $\mathrm{NPr}_1(\omega_1)$.

(2) Assume $\mathrm{NPr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ holds true as witnessed by a model $\mathbb{M}$ with the universe λ and a countable vocabulary τ. We may assume that $\tau=\{R_i:i<\omega\}$, where each R_i is a relational symbol of arity $n(i)$. Let S be a new binary relational symbol, T be a new unary relational symbol, and Q_i be a new $(n(i)+1)$–ary relational symbol (for $i<\omega$). Let $\tau^+=\{R_i,Q_i:i<\omega\}\cup\{S,T\}$.

For each $\gamma\in[\lambda,\lambda^+)$ fix a bijection $f_\gamma:\gamma\stackrel{1-1}{\longrightarrow}\lambda$ with f_λ being the identity. We define a model $\mathbb{M}^+$:

- the vocabulary of $\mathbb{M}^+$ is τ^+ and the universe of $\mathbb{M}^+$ is λ^+,
- $R_i^{\mathbb{M}^+}=R_i^{\mathbb{M}}\subseteq\lambda^{n(i)}$,
- $Q_i^{\mathbb{M}^+}=\{\big(a_0,\ldots,a_{n(i)-1},a_{n(i)}\big):\lambda\leq a_{n(i)}<\lambda^+\ \&\ (\forall\ell<n(i))(a_\ell<a_{n(i)})\ \&\ \big(f_{a_{n(i)}}(a_0),\ldots,f_{a_{n(i)}}(a_{n(i)-1})\big)\in R_i^{\mathbb{M}}\}$,
- $S^{\mathbb{M}^+}=\{(a_0,a_1)\in\lambda^+\times\lambda^+:a_0<a_1\}$ and $T^{\mathbb{M}^+}=[\lambda,\lambda^+)$.

Claim 2.6.1. (i) *If $\lambda\leq\gamma<\lambda^+$, $\emptyset\neq w\subseteq\gamma$, then $\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)\leq\mathrm{rk}(f_\gamma[w],\mathbb{M})$ and thus $\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)<\varepsilon$.*
(ii) *If $\emptyset\neq w\subseteq\lambda$, then $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}^+)\leq\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})$ and thus $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}^+)<\varepsilon$.*
(iii) *If $\lambda\leq\gamma<\lambda^+$, then $\mathrm{rk}(\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)\leq\varepsilon$.*

Proof of the Claim. (i) By induction on α we show that $\alpha\leq\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)$ implies $\alpha\leq\mathrm{rk}(f_\gamma[w],\mathbb{M})$ (for all sets $w\subseteq\gamma$ with fixed $\gamma\in[\lambda,\lambda^+)$).

$(*)_0$ Assume $\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)\geq 0$, $w=\{a_0,\ldots,a_n\}$ and $k\leq n$. Let $\varphi(x_0,\ldots,x_n)$ be a quantifier free formula in the vocabulary τ such that

$$\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[f_\gamma(a_0),\ldots,f_\gamma(a_k),\ldots,f_\gamma(a_n)].$$

Let $\varphi^*(x_0,\ldots,x_n,x_{n+1})$ be a quantifier free formula in the vocabulary τ^+ obtained from φ by replacing each $R_i(y_0,\ldots,y_{n(i)-1})$ (where $\{y_0,\ldots,y_{n(i)-1}\}\subseteq\{x_0,\ldots,x_n\}$) with $Q_i(y_0,\ldots,y_{n(i)-1},x_{n+1})$ and let φ^+ be

$$\varphi^*(x_0,\ldots,x_n,x_{n+1})\ \wedge\ S(x_0,x_{n+1})\ \wedge\ldots\wedge S(x_n,x_{n+1}).$$

Then $\mathbb{M}^+\models\varphi^+[a_0,\ldots,a_k,\ldots,a_n,\gamma]$. By our assumption on $w\cup\{\gamma\}$ we know that the set $A=\{b<\lambda^+:\mathbb{M}^+\models\varphi^+[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_n,\gamma]\}$ is uncountable. Clearly $A\subseteq\gamma$ (note $S(x_k,x_{n+1})$ in φ^+) and thus the set $f_\gamma[A]$ is an uncountable subset of λ. For each $b\in A$ we have $\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[f_\gamma(a_0),\ldots,f_\gamma(b),\ldots,f_\gamma(a_n)]$, so now we may conclude that $\mathrm{rk}(f_\gamma[w],\mathbb{M})\geq 0$.

$(*)_1$ Assume $\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)\geq\alpha+1$. Let $\varphi(x_0,\ldots,x_n)$ be a quantifier free formula in the vocabulary τ, $k\leq n$ and $w=\{a_0,\ldots,a_n\}$, and suppose that $\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[f_\gamma(a_0),\ldots,f_\gamma(a_k),\ldots,f_\gamma(a_n)]$. Let φ^* and φ^+ be defined exactly as in $(*)_0$. Then $\mathbb{M}^+\models\varphi^+[a_0,\ldots,a_k,\ldots,a_n,\gamma]$. By our assumption there is $a^*\in\lambda^+\setminus(w\cup\{\gamma\})$ such that $\mathbb{M}^+\models\varphi^+[a_0,\ldots,a^*,\ldots,a_n,\gamma]$ and $\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma,a^*\},\mathbb{M}^+)\geq\alpha$. Necessarily $a^*<\gamma$, and by the inductive hypothesis $\mathrm{rk}(f_\gamma[w\cup\{a^*\}],\mathbb{M})\geq\alpha$. Clearly $\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[f_\gamma(a_0),\ldots,f_\gamma(a^*),\ldots,f_\gamma(a_n)]$ and we may conclude $\mathrm{rk}(f_\gamma[w],\mathbb{M})\geq\alpha+1$.

$(*)_2$ If α is limit and $\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)\geq\alpha$ then, by the inductive hypothesis, for each $\beta<\alpha$ we have $\beta\leq\mathrm{rk}(w\cup\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)\leq\mathrm{rk}(f_\gamma[w],\mathbb{M})$. Hence $\alpha\leq\mathrm{rk}(f_\gamma[w],\mathbb{M})$.

(ii) Induction similar to part (i). For a quantifier free formula $\varphi(x_0,\ldots,x_n)$ in the vocabulary τ, let φ^* be the formula $\varphi(x_0,\ldots,x_n)\wedge\neg T(x_0)\wedge\ldots\wedge\neg T(x_n)$ (so φ^* is a quantifier free formula in the vocabulary τ^+). If φ witnesses that $\neg(\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})\geq 0)$, then φ^* witnesses $\neg(\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}^+)\geq 0)$, and similarly with $\alpha+1$ in place of 0.

(iii) Suppose towards contradiction that $\varepsilon+1\leq \mathrm{rk}(\{\gamma\},\mathbb{M}^+)$. Since $\mathbb{M}^+\models T[\gamma]$, we may find $\gamma'\neq\gamma$ such that $\mathrm{rk}(\{\gamma,\gamma'\},\mathbb{M}^+)\geq\varepsilon$ and $\mathbb{M}^+\models T[\gamma']$. Let $\{\gamma,\gamma'\}=\{\gamma_0,\gamma_1\}$ where $\gamma_0<\gamma_1$. It follows from part (i) that $\mathrm{rk}(\{\gamma_0,\gamma_1\},\mathbb{M}^+)<\varepsilon$, a contradiction. □

It follows from Claim 2.6.1 (and Observation 2.2) that $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}^+)\leq\varepsilon$ for every non-empty set $w\subseteq\lambda^+$. Consequently, the model $\mathbb{M}^+$ witnesses $\mathrm{NPr}_{\varepsilon+1}(\lambda^+)$.

(3) Let $\langle\mu_n:n<\omega\rangle$ be an increasing sequence cofinal in λ. For each n fix a model $\mathbb{M}_n$ with a countable vocabulary $\tau(\mathbb{M}_n)$ consisting of relational symbols only and with the universe μ_n and such that $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}_n)<\varepsilon$ for nonempty finite $w\subseteq\mu_n$. We also assume that $\tau(\mathbb{M}_n)\cap\tau(\mathbb{M}_m)=\emptyset$ for $n<m<\omega$. Let P_n (for $n<\omega$) be new unary relational symbols and let $\tau^+=\bigcup\{\tau(\mathbb{M}_n):n<\omega\}\cup\{P_n:n<\omega\}$. Consider a model $\mathbb{M}^+$ in vocabulary τ^+ with the universe λ and such that

- $P_n^{\mathbb{M}}=\mu_n$ for $n<\omega$, and
- for each $n<\omega$ and $S\in\tau(\mathbb{M}_n)$ we have $S^{\mathbb{M}}=S^{\mathbb{M}_n}$.

Claim 2.6.2. *If w is a finite non-empty subset of μ_n, $n<\omega$, then* $\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M})\leq\mathrm{rk}(w,\mathbb{M}_n)<\varepsilon$.

Proof of the Claim. Similar to the proofs in Claim 2.6.1. □

(4) Follows from Observation 2.5(1). □

Proposition 2.7 (See [6, Conclusion 1.8]).
(1) $\mathrm{Pr}^*_{\omega_1}(\beth_{\omega_1})$ *holds and hence also* $\mathrm{Pr}_{\omega_1}(\beth_{\omega_1})$.
(2) *Assume $\beta<\alpha<\omega_1$, $\mathbb{M}$ is a model with a countable vocabulary τ and the universe μ, $m,n<\omega$, $n>0$, $A\subseteq\mu$ and $|A|\geq\beth_{\omega\cdot\alpha}$. Then there is $w\subseteq A$ with $|w|=n$ and* $\mathrm{rk}^*(w,\mathbb{M})\geq\omega\cdot\beta+m$ [1].

Proof. (1) Follows from part (2) (and 2.6(4)).

(2) Induction on $\alpha<\omega_1$.

STEP $\alpha=1$ (AND $\beta=0$): Let $\mathbb{M},\mu,n,m$ be as in the assumptions, $A\subseteq\mu$ and $|A|\geq\beth_\omega$. Using the Erdős–Rado theorem we may choose a sequence $\langle a_i:i<\omega_2\rangle$ of distinct elements of A such that:

(a) the quantifier free type of $\langle a_{i_0},\dots,a_{i_{m+n}}\rangle$ in $\mathbb{M}$ is constant for $i_0<\dots<i_{m+n}<\omega_2$, and
(b) for each $k\leq m+n$ the value of $\min\{\omega,\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0},\dots,a_{i_{n+m-k}}\},\mathbb{M})\}$ is constant for $i_0<\dots<i_{m+n-k}<\omega_2$.

Let $i_\ell=\omega_1\cdot(\ell+1)$ (for $\ell=-1,0,\dots,n+m$). Suppose $\phi(x_0,\dots,x_{n+m})\in\mathcal{L}(\tau)$ is a quantifier free formula, $k\leq n+m$ and $\mathbb{M}\models\phi[a_{i_0},\dots,a_{i_k},\dots,a_{i_{n+m}}]$. It follows from the property stated in (a) above that for every i in the (uncountable) interval (i_{k-1},i_k) we have $\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[a_{i_0},\dots,a_{i_{k-1}},a_i,a_{i_{k+1}},\dots,a_{i_{m+n}}]$. Consequently, $\mathrm{rk}^*\big(\{a_{i_0},\dots,a_{i_{n+m}}\},\mathbb{M}\big)\geq 0$, and the homogeneity stated in (b) implies that for every nonempty set $w\subseteq\omega_2$ with at most $n+m+1$ elements we have $\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_i:i\in w\},\mathbb{M})\geq 0$. Now, by induction on $k\leq m+n$ we will argue that

[1] "$\cdot$" stands for the ordinal multiplication

$(*)_k$ for every nonempty set $w \subseteq \omega_2$ with at most $n+m+1-k$ elements we have $\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_i : i \in w\}, \mathbb{M}) \geq k$.

We have already justified $(*)_0$. For the inductive step assume $(*)_k$ and $k < m+n$. Let $i_\ell = \omega_1 \cdot (\ell+1)$ and suppose that $\varphi(x_0, \ldots, x_{m+n-k-1})$ is a quantifier free formula, $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_z}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}]$ and $0 \leq z \leq n+m-k-1$. By the homogeneity stated in (a), for every i in the uncountable interval (i_{z-1}, i_z) we have $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{z-1}}, a_i, a_{i_{z+1}}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}]$. The inductive hypothesis $(*)_k$ implies that $\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{z-1}}, a_i, a_j, a_{i_{z+1}}, \ldots a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}\}, \mathbb{M}) \geq k$ (for any $i_{z-1} < i < j \leq i_z$). Now we easily conclude that $k+1 \leq \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}\}, \mathbb{M})$ and $(*)_{k+1}$ follows by the homogeneity given by (b).

Finally note that $(*)_{m+1}$ gives the desired conclusion: taking any $i_0 < \ldots < i_{n-1} < \omega_2$ we will have $m+1 \leq \mathrm{rk}^*\big(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{n-1}}\}, \mathbb{M}\big)$.

Step $\alpha = \gamma+1$: Let $\mathbb{M}, \mu, n, m$ be as in the assumptions, $A \subseteq \mu$ and $|A| \geq \beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma+\omega}$. By the Erdős–Rado theorem we may choose a sequence $\langle a_i : i < \beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma}\rangle$ of distinct elements of A such that the following two demands are satisfied.

(c) The quantifier free type of $\langle a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n}}\rangle$ in $\mathbb{M}$ is constant for $i_0 < \ldots < i_{m+n} < \beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma}$.

(d) For each $k \leq m+n$ the value of $\min\{\omega\cdot\alpha, \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{n+m-k}}\}, \mathbb{M})\}$ is constant for $i_0 < \ldots < i_{m+n-k} < \beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma}$.

For any $\ell < \omega$ and $\gamma' < \gamma$, we may apply the inductive hypothesis to $\{a_i : i < \beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma}\}$, ℓ, $m+n+1$ and γ' to find $i_0 < \ldots < i_{m+n} < \beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma}$ such that $\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n}}\}, \mathbb{M}) \geq \omega\cdot\gamma' + \ell$. By the homogeneity in (d) this implies that

$(**)_0$ for all $i_0 < \ldots < i_{m+n} < \beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma}$ we have $\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n}}\}, \mathbb{M}) \geq \omega\cdot\gamma$.

Now, by induction on $k \leq m+n$ we argue that

$(**)_k$ for each $i_0 < \ldots < i_{m+n-k} < (\beth_{\omega\cdot\gamma})^+$ we have

$$\omega\cdot\gamma + k \leq \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n-k}}\}, \mathbb{M}).$$

So assume $(**)_k$, $k < m+n$ and let $i_\ell = \omega_1 \cdot (\ell+1)$ (for $\ell = -1, 0, \ldots, m+n$) and $0 \leq z \leq n+m-k-1$. Suppose that $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_z}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}]$. Then by the homogeneity in (c), for every i in the uncountable interval (i_{z-1}, i_z) we have $\mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{z-1}}, a_i, a_{i_{z+1}}, \ldots, a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}]$. By the inductive hypothesis $(**)_k$ we know $\omega\cdot\gamma + k \leq \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{z-1}}, a_i, a_j, a_{i_{z+1}}, \ldots a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}\}, \mathbb{M})$ (for $i_{z-1} < i < j \leq i_z$). Now we easily conclude that $\omega\cdot\gamma + k + 1 \leq \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots a_{i_{m+n-k-1}}\}, \mathbb{M})$, and $(**)_{k+1}$ follows by the homogeneity in (d).

Finally note that $(**)_{m+1}$ gives the desired conclusion: taking any $i_0 < \ldots < i_{n-1} < \beth_{\omega_\gamma}$ we will have $\mathrm{rk}^*\big(\{a_{i_0}, \ldots, a_{i_{n-1}}\}, \mathbb{M}\big) \geq \omega\cdot\gamma + m + 1$.

Step α is limit: should be clear. □

Definition 2.8. Let λ_{ω_1} be the smallest cardinal κ such that $\mathrm{Pr}_{\omega_1}(\kappa)$ and $\lambda^*_{\omega_1}$ be the smallest cardinal κ such that $\mathrm{Pr}^*_{\omega_1}(\kappa)$.

By Propositions 2.6(4) and 2.7 we have $\lambda_{\omega_1} \leq \lambda^*_{\omega_1} \leq \beth_{\omega_1}$.

Proposition 2.9 (See [6, Claim 1.10(1)])**.** *If $\mathbb{P}$ is a ccc forcing notion and λ is a cardinal such that $\mathrm{Pr}^*_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$ holds, then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\mathrm{Pr}^*_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$ and hence also $\mathrm{Pr}_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$".*

Proof. Suppose towards contradiction that for some $p \in \mathbb{P}$ we have $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \mathrm{NPr}^*_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$. Let $\tau = \{R_{n,\zeta} : n, \zeta < \omega\}$ where $R_{n,\zeta}$ is an n–ary relation symbol (for $n, \zeta < \omega$).

Then we may pick a name $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}$ for a model on λ in vocabulary τ and an ordinal $\alpha_0 < \omega_1$ such that

$p \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}} = (\lambda, \{R^{\mathbb{M}}_{\underset{\sim}{n,\zeta}}\}_{n,\zeta<\omega})$ is a model such that
(a) for every n and a quantifier free formula $\varphi(x_0,\ldots,x_{n-1}) \in \mathcal{L}(\tau)$ there is $\zeta < \omega$ such that for all $a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}$ $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}} \models \varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}] \Leftrightarrow R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$
(b) $\sup\{\mathrm{rk}(w,\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}) : \emptyset \neq w \in [\lambda]^{<\omega}\} < \alpha_0$ ".

Now, let $S_{n,\zeta,\beta,k}$ be an n–ary predicate (for $k < n, \zeta < \omega$ and $-1 \leq \beta < \alpha_0$) and let $\tau^* = \{S_{n,\zeta,\beta,k} : k < n < \omega,\ \zeta < \omega \text{ and } -1 \leq \beta < \alpha_0\}$. (So τ^* is a countable vocabulary.) We define a model $\mathbb{M}^*$ in the vocabulary τ^*. The universe of $\mathbb{M}^*$ is λ and for $k < n$, $\zeta < \omega$ and $-1 \leq \beta < \alpha_0$:

$$S^{\mathbb{M}^*}_{n,\zeta,\beta,k} = \Big\{(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}) \in {}^n\lambda : a_0 < \ldots < a_{n-1} \text{ and some condition } q \geq p \text{ forces that "}\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}] \text{ and } \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}) = \beta \text{ and } R_{n,\zeta}, k \text{ witness that } \neg\big(\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}) \geq \beta+1\big)\text{ "}\Big\}.$$

Claim 2.9.1. *For every n and every increasing tuple $(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}) \in {}^n\lambda$ there are $\zeta < \omega$ and $-1 \leq \beta < \alpha_0$ and $k < n$ such that $\mathbb{M}^* \models S_{n,\zeta,\beta,k}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$.*

Proof of the Claim. Should be clear. □

Claim 2.9.2. *If $(a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}) \in {}^n\lambda$ and $\mathbb{M}^* \models S_{n,\zeta,\beta,k}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$, then*

$$\mathrm{rk}^*\big(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\mathbb{M}^*\big) \leq \beta.$$

Proof of the Claim. First let us deal with the case of $\beta = -1$. Assume towards contradiction that $\mathbb{M}^* \models S_{n,\zeta,-1,k}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$, but $\mathrm{rk}^*\big(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\mathbb{M}^*\big) \geq 0$. Then we may find distinct $\langle b_i : i < \omega_1\rangle \subseteq \lambda \setminus \{a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}\}$ such that

$(\otimes)_1$ $\mathbb{M}^* \models S_{n,\zeta,-1,k}[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}]$ for all $i < \omega_1$.

For $i < \omega_1$ let $p_i \in \mathbb{P}$ be such that $p_i \geq p$ and

$$p_i \Vdash \text{" } \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,b_i,\ldots,a_{n-1}] \text{ and } \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,b_i,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}) = -1 \text{ and } R_{n,\zeta}, k \text{ witness that } \neg\big(\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}) \geq 0\big) \text{ "}$$

Let $\underset{\sim}{Y}$ be a name $\mathbb{P}$–name such that $p \Vdash \underset{\sim}{Y} = \{i < \omega_1 : p_i \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}}\}$. Since $\mathbb{P}$ satisfies ccc, we may pick $p^* \geq p$ such that $p^* \Vdash$ "$\underset{\sim}{Y}$ is uncountable ". Then

$$p^* \Vdash \big(\forall i \in \underset{\sim}{Y}\big)\big(\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}]\big),$$

so also

$$p^* \Vdash \big\{b < \lambda : \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}]\big\} \text{ is uncountable.}$$

But

$$p^* \Vdash \big(\forall i \in \underset{\sim}{Y}\big)\big(R_{n,\zeta}, k \text{ witness } \neg\big(\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}) \geq 0\big)\big),$$

and hence

$$p^* \Vdash \big\{b < \lambda : \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}]\big\} \text{ is countable ,}$$

a contradiction.

Next we continue the proof of the Claim by induction on $\beta < \alpha_0$, so we assume that $0 \leq \beta$ and for $\beta' < \beta$ our claim holds true (for any n, ζ, k). Assume towards contradiction that $\mathbb{M}^* \models S_{n,\zeta,\beta,k}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]$, but $\mathrm{rk}^*\big(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\mathbb{M}^*\big) \geq \beta+1$. Then we may find distinct $\langle b_i : i < \omega_1\rangle \subseteq \lambda \setminus (w \setminus \{a_k\})$ such that

$(\oplus)_1$ $\mathbb{M}^* \models S_{n,\zeta,\beta,k}[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}]$ for all $i<\omega_1$, $b_0=a_k$ and
$(\oplus)_2$ $\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,b_j,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\mathbb{M}^*)\geq\beta$ for all $i<j<\omega_1$.

For $i<\omega_1$ let $p_i\in\mathbb{P}$ be such that $p_i\geq p$ and

$$p_i\Vdash \text{“ } \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}\models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,b_i,\ldots,a_{n-1}] \text{ and } \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,b_i,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}})=\beta \text{ and } R_{n,\zeta},k \text{ witness that } \neg\big(\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}})\geq\beta+1\big)\text{ ”}$$

Take $p^*\geq p$ such that

$$p^*\Vdash \text{“}\underset{\sim}{Y}\stackrel{\rm def}{=}\{i<\omega_1: p_i\in \underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}}\} \text{ is uncountable ”}.$$

Since

$$p^*\Vdash \quad (\forall i\in\underset{\sim}{Y})\Big(\ \underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}}\models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}]\ \wedge\ R_{n,\zeta},k \text{ witness that } \neg\big(\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,b_i,\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}})\geq\beta+1\big)\Big),$$

we see that

$$p^*\not\Vdash (\forall i,j\in\underset{\sim}{Y})\big(i\neq j\Rightarrow\ \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_i,b_j,a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}})\geq\beta\big).$$

Consequently we may pick $q\geq p^*$, $i_0,j_0<\omega_1$ and $\gamma<\beta$ and $\xi<\omega$ and $\ell\leq n$ such that $b_{i_0}<b_{j_0}$ and

$$q\Vdash \quad \text{“}p_{i_0},p_{j_0}\in\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}} \text{ and } \mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_{i_0},b_{j_0},a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}})=\gamma \text{ and } R_{n+1,\xi} \text{ and } \ell \text{ witness that } \neg\big(\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_{i_0},b_{j_0},a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}})\geq\gamma+1\big)\text{ ”}.$$

Then $\mathbb{M}^*\models S_{n+1,\xi,\ell,\gamma}[a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_{i_0},b_{j_0},a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}]$ and by the inductive hypothesis $\mathrm{rk}^*(\{a_0,\ldots,a_{k-1},b_{i_0},b_{j_0},a_{k+1},\ldots,a_{n-1}\},\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{M}})\leq\gamma$, contradicting clause $(\oplus)_2$ above. □

□

Corollary 2.10. *Let $\mu=\beth_{\omega_1}\leq\kappa$ and $\mathbb{C}_\kappa$ be the forcing notion adding κ Cohen reals. Then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\kappa}\lambda_{\omega_1}\leq\mu\leq\mathfrak{c}$.*

3. Spectrum of translation non-disjointness

Definition 3.1. Let $B\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ and $1\leq k\leq\mathfrak{c}$.

(1) We say that B is *perfectly orthogonal to k–small* (or a k–**pots**–set) if there is a perfect set $P\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ such that $|(B+x)\cap(B+y)|\geq k$ for all $x,y\in P$. The set B is *a k–**npots**–set* if it is not k–**pots**.
(2) We say that B has λ *many pairwise k–nondisjoint translations* if for some set $X\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ of cardinality λ, for all $x,y\in X$ we have $\big|(B+x)\cap(B+y)\big|\geq k$.
(3) We define the *spectrum of translation k–non-disjointness of B* as

$$\mathrm{stnd}_k(B)=\{(x,y)\in{}^\omega 2\times{}^\omega 2:|(B+x)\cap(B+y)|\geq k\}.$$

Remark 3.2. (1) Note that if $B\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ is an uncountable Borel set, then there is a perfect set $P\subseteq B$. For B,P as abovefor every $x,y\in P$ we have $0=x+x=y+y\in(B+x)\cap(B+y)$ and $x+y\in(B+x)\cap(B+y)$. Consequently every uncountable Borel subset of ${}^\omega 2$ is a 2–**pots**–set.
(2) Assume $B\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ and $x,y\in{}^\omega 2$. If $b_x,b_y\in B$ and $b_x+x=b_y+y\in(B+x)\cap(B+y)$, then also $b_x+y=b_y+x\in(B+x)\cap(B+y)$. Consequently, if $(B+x)\cap(B+y)\neq\emptyset$ is finite, then it has an even number of elements.

Proposition 3.3. (1) *Let $1 \leq k \leq \mathfrak{c}$. A set $B \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ is a k–**pots**–set if and only if there is a perfect set $P \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ such that $P \times P \subseteq \mathrm{stnd}_k(B)$.*

(2) *Assume $k < \omega$. If B is Σ^0_2, then $\mathrm{stnd}_k(B)$ is Σ^0_2 as well. If B is Borel, then $\mathrm{stnd}_k(B)$ and $\mathrm{stnd}_\omega(B)$ are Σ^1_1 and $\mathrm{stnd}_{\mathfrak{c}}(B)$ is Δ^1_2.*

(3) *Let $\mathfrak{c} < \kappa \leq \mu$ and let $\mathbb{C}_\mu$ be the forcing notion adding μ Cohen reals. Then, remembering Definition 3.1(2),*

$\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\mu}$ *" if a Borel set $B \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ has κ many pairwise k–non-disjoint translates, then B is an k–**pots**–set ".*

(4) *If $k < \omega$, B is a (code for) Σ^0_2 k–**npots**–set and $\mathbb{P}$ is a forcing notion, then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ " B is a (code for) k–**npots**–set ".*

(5) *Assume $\mathrm{Pr}_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$. If $k \leq \omega$ and a Borel set $B \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ has λ many pairwise k–nondisjoint translates, then it is a k–**pots**–set.*

Proof. (2) Let $B = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} F_n$, where each F_n is a closed subset of ${}^\omega 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(x,y) \in \mathrm{stnd}_k(B) \Leftrightarrow \\ \big(\exists n_0,\ldots,n_{k-1},m_0,\ldots,m_{k-1},N<\omega\big)\big(\exists z_0,\ldots,z_{k-1}\in {}^\omega 2\big)\big(\forall i,j<k\big)\Big(\\ (i\neq j \Rightarrow z_i{\restriction}N \neq z_j{\restriction}N)\ \wedge\ z_i+x\in F_{n_i}\ \wedge\ z_i+y\in F_{m_i}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

The formula $\big(\forall i,j<k\big)\big((i\neq j \Rightarrow z_i{\restriction}N \neq z_j{\restriction}N)\ \wedge\ z_i+x\in F_{n_i}\ \wedge\ z_i+y\in F_{m_i}\big)$ represents a compact subset of $\big({}^\omega 2\big)^{k+2}$ and hence easily the assertion follows.

(3) This is a consequence of (1,2) above and Shelah [6, Fact 1.16].

(4) If B is a Σ^0_2 set then the formula "there is a perfect set $P \subseteq {}^\omega 2$ such that for all $x, y \in P$ we have $(x,y) \in \mathrm{stnd}_k(B)$ " is Σ^1_2 (remember (2) above).

(5) By [6, Claim 1.12(1)]. □

We want to analyze k–**pots**–sets in more detail, restricting ourselves to Σ^0_2 subsets of ${}^\omega 2$. For the rest of this section we assume the following Hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3.4. (1) $T_n \subseteq {}^{\omega>}2$ is a tree with no maximal nodes (for $n < \omega$);

(2) $B = \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} \lim(T_n)$, $\bar{T} = \langle T_n : n < \omega\rangle$;

(3) $2 \leq \iota < \omega$, $k = 2\iota$.

Definition 3.5. Let $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ consist of all tuples

$$\mathbf{m} = (\ell_{\mathbf{m}}, u_{\mathbf{m}}, \bar{h}_{\mathbf{m}}, \bar{g}_{\mathbf{m}}) = (\ell, u, \bar{h}, \bar{g})$$

such that:

(a) $0 < \ell < \omega$, $u \subseteq {}^\ell 2$ and $2 \leq |u|$;

(b) $\bar{h} = \langle h_i : i < \iota\rangle$, $\bar{g} = \langle g_i : i < \iota\rangle$ and for each $i < \iota$ we have

$$h_i : u^{\langle 2\rangle} \longrightarrow \omega \quad \text{ and } \quad g_i : u^{\langle 2\rangle} \longrightarrow \bigcup_{n<\omega} (T_n \cap {}^\ell 2);$$

(c) $g_i(\eta,\nu) \in T_{h_i(\eta,\nu)} \cap {}^\ell 2$ for all $(\eta,\nu) \in u^{\langle 2\rangle}$, $i < \iota$;

(d) if $(\eta,\nu) \in u^{\langle 2\rangle}$ and $i < \iota$, then $\eta + g_i(\eta,\nu) = \nu + g_i(\nu,\eta)$;

(e) for any $(\eta,\nu) \in u^{\langle 2\rangle}$, there are no repetitions in the sequence $\langle g_i(\eta,\nu), g_i(\nu,\eta) : i < \iota\rangle$.

Definition 3.6. Assume $\mathbf{m} = (\ell, u, \bar{h}, \bar{g}) \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\rho \in {}^{\ell}2$. We define $\mathbf{m} + \rho = (\ell', u', \bar{h}', \bar{g}')$ by

- $\ell' = \ell$, $u' = \{\eta + \rho : \eta \in u\}$,
- $\bar{h}' = \langle h'_i : i < \iota \rangle$ where $h'_i : (u')^{\langle 2 \rangle} \longrightarrow \omega$ are such that $h'_i(\eta + \rho, \nu + \rho) = h_i(\eta, \nu)$ for $(\eta, \nu) \in u^{\langle 2 \rangle}$,
- $\bar{g}' = \langle g'_i : i < \iota \rangle$ where $g'_i : (u')^{\langle 2 \rangle} \longrightarrow \bigcup\limits_{n<\omega} (T_n \cap {}^{\ell}2)$ are such that $g'_i(\eta + \rho, \nu + \rho) = g_i(\eta, \nu)$ for $(\eta, \nu) \in u^{\langle 2 \rangle}$.

Also if $\rho \in {}^{\omega}2$, then we set $\mathbf{m} + \rho = \mathbf{m} + (\rho \restriction \ell)$.

Observation 3.7. (1) *If $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\rho \in {}^{\ell_{\mathbf{m}}}2$, then $\mathbf{m} + \rho \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$.*

(2) *For each $\rho \in {}^{\omega}2$ the mapping*

$$\mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k} \longrightarrow \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k} : \mathbf{m} \mapsto \mathbf{m} + \rho$$

is a bijection.

Definition 3.8. Assume $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$. We say that $\mathbf{n}$ *extends* $\mathbf{m}$ ($\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$ in short) if and only if:

- $\ell_{\mathbf{m}} \le \ell_{\mathbf{n}}$, $u_{\mathbf{m}} = \{\eta \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}} : \eta \in u_{\mathbf{n}}\}$, and
- for every $(\eta, \nu) \in (u_{\mathbf{n}})^{\langle 2 \rangle}$ such that $\eta \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}} \ne \nu \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}}$ and each $i < \iota$ we have

$$h^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}}, \nu \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}}) = h^{\mathbf{n}}_i(\eta, \nu) \quad \text{and} \quad g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}}, \nu \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}}) = g^{\mathbf{n}}_i(\eta, \nu) \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}}.$$

Definition 3.9. We define a function $\mathrm{ndrk} : \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k} \longrightarrow \mathrm{ON} \cup \{\infty\}$ declaring inductively when $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ge \alpha$ (for an ordinal α).

- $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ge 0$ always;
- if α is a limit ordinal, then

$$\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ge \alpha \Leftrightarrow (\forall \beta < \alpha)(\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ge \beta);$$

- if $\alpha = \beta + 1$, then $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ge \alpha$ if and only if for every $\nu \in u_{\mathbf{m}}$ there is $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\ell_{\mathbf{n}} > \ell_{\mathbf{m}}$, $\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$ and $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}) \ge \beta$ and

$$|\{\eta \in u_{\mathbf{n}} : \nu \vartriangleleft \eta\}| \ge 2;$$

- $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$ if and only if $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ge \alpha$ for all ordinals α.

We also define

$$\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) = \sup\{\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) + 1 : \mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}\}.$$

Lemma 3.10. (1) *The relation $\sqsubseteq$ is a partial order on $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$.*

(2) *If $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$ and $\alpha \le \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n})$, then $\alpha \le \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m})$.*

(3) *The function* ndrk *is well defined.*

(4) *If $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\rho \in {}^{\omega}2$ then $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m} + \rho)$.*

(5) *If $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$, $\nu \in u_{\mathbf{m}}$ and $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ge \omega_1$, then there is an $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$, $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}) \ge \omega_1$, and*

$$|\{\eta \in u_{\mathbf{n}} : \nu \vartriangleleft \eta\}| \ge 2.$$

(6) *If $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\infty > \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) = \beta > \alpha$, then there is $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$ and $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}) = \alpha$.*

(7) *If $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) \ge \omega_1$, then $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) = \infty$.*

(8) *Assume $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $u' \subseteq u_{\mathbf{m}}$, $|u'| \ge 2$. Put $\ell' = \ell_m$, $h'_i = h^{\mathbf{m}}_i \restriction u^{\langle 2 \rangle}$ and $g'_i = g^{\mathbf{m}}_i \restriction u^{\langle 2 \rangle}$ (for $i < \iota$), and let $\mathbf{m} \restriction u' = (\ell', u', \bar{h}', \bar{g}')$. Then $\mathbf{m} \restriction u' \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \le \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m} \restriction u')$.*

Proof. (1) Should be clear.

(2) Induction on α. If $\alpha = \alpha_0 + 1$ and $\mathbf{n}' \sqsupseteq \mathbf{n}$ is one of the witnesses used to claim that $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}) \geq \alpha_0 + 1$, then this $\mathbf{n}'$ can also be used for $\mathbf{m}$. Hence we can argue the successor step of the induction. The limit steps are even easier.

(3) One has to show that if $\beta < \alpha$ and $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \alpha$, then $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \beta$. This can be shown by induction on α: at the successor stage if $\mathbf{n}$ is one of the witnesses used to claim that $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \alpha+1$, then $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}) \geq \alpha$. By (2) we get $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \alpha$ and by the inductive hypothesis $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \gamma$ for $\gamma \leq \alpha$. Limit stages should be clear too.

(4) Should be clear.

(5) Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the collection of all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$ and $|\{\eta \in u_{\mathbf{n}} : \nu \lhd \eta\}| \geq 2$. If $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}_0) \geq \omega_1$ for some $\mathbf{n}_0 \in \mathcal{N}$, then we are done. So suppose towards contradiction that there is no such $\mathbf{n}_0$. Then, as $\mathcal{N}$ is countable,

$$\alpha_0 \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \sup\{\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}) + 1 : \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{N}\} < \omega_1.$$

But $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \alpha_0+1$ implies that $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}_1) \geq \alpha_0$ for some $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \mathcal{N}$, a contradiction.

(6) Induction on ordinals β (for all $\alpha < \beta$). The main point is that if $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) = \beta$, then for some $\nu \in u_{\mathbf{m}}$ we cannot find $\mathbf{n}$ as needed for witnessing $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \beta + 1$, but for each $\gamma < \beta$ we can find $\mathbf{n}$ needed for $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \gamma + 1$. Therefore for each $\gamma < \beta$ we may find $\mathbf{n} \sqsupseteq \mathbf{m}$ such that $\gamma \leq \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n}) < \beta$.

(7) Follows from (6) above.

(8) It should clear that $(\ell', u', \bar{h}', \bar{g}') \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$. Also, by a straightforward induction on α for all $\mathbf{m}$ and restrictions $\mathbf{m}{\restriction}u'$, one shows that

$$\alpha \leq \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \ \Rightarrow\ \alpha \leq \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}{\restriction}u').$$

□

Proposition 3.11. *The following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) \geq \omega_1$.
(b) $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) = \infty$.
(c) *There is a perfect set $P \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ such that*

$$\big(\forall \eta, \nu \in P\big)\big(|(B + \eta) \cap (B + \nu)| \geq k\big).$$

(d) *In some ccc forcing extension, there is $A \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ of cardinality λ_{ω_1} such that*

$$\big(\forall \eta, \nu \in A\big)\big(|(B + \eta) \cap (B + \nu)| \geq k\big).$$

Proof. (a) ⇒ (b) This is Lemma 3.10(7).

(b) ⇒ (c) If $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) = \infty$ then there is $\mathbf{m}_0 \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ with $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}_0) \geq \omega_1$. Using Lemma 3.10(5) we may now choose a sequence $\langle \mathbf{m}_j : j < \omega\rangle \subseteq \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that for each $j < \omega$:

(i) $\mathbf{m}_j \sqsubseteq \mathbf{m}_{j+1}$,
(ii) $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}_j) \geq \omega_1$,
(iii) $|\{\eta \in u_{\mathbf{m}_{j+1}} : \nu \lhd \eta| \geq 2$ for each $\nu \in u_{\mathbf{m}_j}$.

Let $P = \{\rho \in {}^\omega 2 : (\forall j < \omega)(\rho{\restriction}\ell_{\mathbf{m}_j} \in u_{\mathbf{m}_j})\}$. Clearly, P is a perfect set. For $\eta, \nu \in P$, $\eta \neq \nu$, let j_0 be the smallest such that $\eta{\restriction}\ell_{\mathbf{m}_{j_0}} \neq \nu{\restriction}\ell_{\mathbf{m}_{j_0}}$ and let

$$G_i(\eta,\nu) = \bigcup\{g_i^{\mathbf{m}_j}(\eta{\restriction}\ell_{\mathbf{m}_j}, \nu{\restriction}\ell_{\mathbf{m}_j}) : j \geq j_0\} \in \lim\Big(T_{h_i^{\mathbf{m}_{j_0}}(\eta{\restriction}\ell_{\mathbf{m}_{j_0}}, \nu{\restriction}\ell_{\mathbf{m}_{j_0}})}\Big) \quad \text{for } i < \iota.$$

Then $G_i : P^{\langle 2\rangle} \longrightarrow B$ and for $(\eta,\nu) \in P^{\langle 2\rangle}$ and $i < \iota$:

$$\eta + G_i(\eta,\nu) = \nu + G_i(\nu,\eta) \quad \text{and} \quad \eta + G_i(\nu,\eta) = \nu + G_i(\eta,\nu).$$

Moreover, there are no repetitions in the sequence $\langle G_i(\eta,\nu), G_i(\nu,\eta) : i < \iota\rangle$. Hence, for distinct $\eta,\nu \in P$ we have $|(B+\eta)\cap(B+\nu)| \geq 2\iota = k$.

(c) $\Rightarrow$ (d) Assume (c). Let $\kappa = \beth_{\omega_1}$. By Corollary 2.10 we know that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\kappa} \lambda_{\omega_1} \leq \mathfrak{c}$. Remembering Proposition 3.3(1,2), we note that the formula "$P \times P \subseteq \mathrm{stnd}_k(B)$" is Π^1_1, so it holds in the forcing extension by $\mathbb{C}_\kappa$. Now we easily conclude (d).

(d) $\Rightarrow$ (a) Assume (d) and let $\mathbb{P}$ be the ccc forcing notion witnessing this assumption, $G \subseteq \mathbb{P}$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}$. Let us work in $\mathbf{V}[G]$.

Let $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_{\omega_1}\rangle$ be a sequence of distinct elements of ${}^\omega 2$ such that

$$\big(\forall \alpha < \beta < \lambda_{\omega_1}\big)\big(|(B+\eta_\alpha)\cap(B+\eta_\beta)| \geq k\big).$$

Let $\tau = \{R_{\mathbf{m}} : \mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}\}$ be a (countable) vocabulary where each $R_{\mathbf{m}}$ is a $|u_{\mathbf{m}}|$–ary relational symbol. Let $\mathbb{M} = \big(\lambda_{\omega_1}, \{R^{\mathbb{M}}_{\mathbf{m}}\}_{\mathbf{m}\in\mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}}\big)$ be the model in the vocabulary τ, where for $\mathbf{m} = (\ell, u, \bar{h}, \bar{g}) \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ the relation $R^{\mathbb{M}}_{\mathbf{m}}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\mathbb{M}}_{\mathbf{m}} = \Big\{ & (\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{|u|-1}) \in (\lambda_{\omega_1})^{|u|} : \{\eta_{\alpha_0}{\restriction}\ell,\ldots,\eta_{|u|-1}{\restriction}\ell\} = u \text{ and} \\ & \text{for distinct } j_1, j_2 < |u| \text{ there are } G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}) \text{ (for } i<\iota) \text{ such that} \\ & g_i(\eta_{\alpha_{j_1}}{\restriction}\ell, \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}}{\restriction}\ell) \vartriangleleft G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}) \in \lim\big(T_{h_i(\eta_{\alpha_{j_1}}{\restriction}\ell, \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}}{\restriction}\ell)}\big) \text{ and} \\ & \eta_{\alpha_{j_1}} + G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}) = \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}} + G_i(\alpha_{j_2},\alpha_{j_1}) \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Claim 3.11.1. (1) *If $\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{j-1} < \lambda_{\omega_1}$ are distinct, $j \geq 2$, then for sufficiently large $\ell < \omega$ there is $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that*

$$\ell_{\mathbf{m}} = \ell, \quad u_{\mathbf{m}} = \{\eta_{\alpha_0}{\restriction}\ell,\ldots,\eta_{\alpha_{j-1}}{\restriction}\ell\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{j-1}].$$

(2) *Assume that $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$, $j < |u_{\mathbf{m}_0}|$, $\alpha_0,\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1} < \lambda_{\omega_1}$ and $\alpha^* < \lambda_{\omega_1}$ are all pairwise distinct and such that $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_j,\ldots,\alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}]$ and $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{j-1},\alpha^*,\alpha_{j+1},\ldots\alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}]$. Then for every sufficiently large $\ell > \ell_{\mathbf{m}}$ there is $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$ and*

$$\ell_{\mathbf{n}} = \ell, \quad u_{\mathbf{n}} = \{\eta_{\alpha_0}{\restriction}\ell,\ldots,\eta_{\alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}}{\restriction}\ell, \eta_{\alpha^*}{\restriction}\ell\} \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{n}}[\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1},\alpha^*].$$

(3) *If $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}]$, then*

$$\mathrm{rk}(\{\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}\},\mathbb{M}) \leq \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}).$$

Proof of the Claim. (1) For distinct $j_1, j_2 < j$ let $G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}) \in B$ (for $i < \iota$) be such that

$$\eta_{\alpha_{j_1}} + G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}) = \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}} + G_i(\alpha_{j_2},\alpha_{j_1})$$

and there are no repetitions in the sequence $\langle G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}), G_i(\alpha_{j_2},\alpha_{j_1}) : i < \iota\rangle$. Suppose that $\ell < \omega$ is such that for any distinct $j_1, j_2 < j$ we have $\eta_{\alpha_{j_1}}{\restriction}\ell \neq \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}}{\restriction}\ell$ and there are no repetitions in the sequence $\langle G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}){\restriction}\ell, G_i(\alpha_{j_2},\alpha_{j_1}){\restriction}\ell : i < \iota\rangle$. Now let $u = \{\eta_{\alpha_{j'}}{\restriction}\ell : j' < j\}$, and for $i < \iota$ let $g_i(\eta_{\alpha_{j_1}}{\restriction}\ell, \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}}{\restriction}\ell) = G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}){\restriction}\ell$, and let $h_i(\eta_{\alpha_{j_1}}{\restriction}\ell, \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}}{\restriction}\ell) < \omega$ be such that $G_i(\alpha_{j_1},\alpha_{j_2}) \in \lim\big(T_{h_i(\eta_{\alpha_{j_1}}{\restriction}\ell, \eta_{\alpha_{j_2}}{\restriction}\ell)}\big)$.

It should be clear that this way we defined $\mathbf{m} = (\ell, u, \bar{h}, \bar{g}) \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1}]$.

(2) An obvious modification of the argument above.

(3) By induction on β we show that *for every* $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and *all* $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1} < \lambda_{\omega_1}$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}]$:

$$\beta \leq \mathrm{rk}(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}\}, \mathbb{M}) \text{ implies } \beta \leq \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}).$$

Steps $\beta = 0$ and β is limit: should be clear.

Step $\beta = \gamma + 1$: Suppose $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ and $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1} < \lambda_{\omega_1}$ are such that $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}]$ and $\gamma + 1 \leq \mathrm{rk}(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}\}, \mathbb{M})$. Let $\nu \in u_{\mathbf{m}}$, so $\nu = \eta_{\alpha_j} \restriction \ell_{\mathbf{m}}$ for some $j < |u_{\mathbf{m}}|$. Since $\gamma+1 \leq \mathrm{rk}(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}\}, \mathbb{M})$ we may find $\alpha^* \in \lambda_{\omega_1} \setminus \{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}\}$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1}, \alpha^*, \alpha_{j+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{|u|-1}]$ and $\mathrm{rk}(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u|-1}, \alpha^*\}, \mathbb{M}) \geq \gamma$. Taking sufficiently large ℓ we may use clause (2) to find $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\mathbf{m} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{n}$, $\ell_{\mathbf{n}} = \ell$ and $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{n}}[\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{|u_{\mathbf{m}}|-1}, \alpha^*]$ and $|\{\eta \in u_{\mathbf{n}} : \nu \lhd \eta\}| \geq 2$. By the inductive hypothesis we have also $\gamma \leq \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{n})$. Now we may easily conclude that $\gamma + 1 \leq \mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m})$. □

By the definition of λ_{ω_1},

($\odot$) $\sup\{\mathrm{rk}(w, \mathbb{M}) : \emptyset \neq w \in [\lambda_{\omega_1}]^{<\omega}\} \geq \omega_1$

Now, suppose that $\beta < \omega_1$. By ($\odot$), there are distinct $\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1} < \lambda_{\omega_1}$, $j \geq 2$, such that $\mathrm{rk}(\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1}\}, \mathbb{M}) \geq \beta$. By Claim 3.11.1(1) we may find $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\mathbb{M} \models R_{\mathbf{m}}[\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_{j-1}]$. Then by Claim 3.11.1(3) we also have $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}) \geq \beta$. Consequently, $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) \geq \omega_1$.

All the considerations above where carried out in $\mathbf{V}[G]$. However, the rank function ndrk is absolute, so we may also claim that in $\mathbf{V}$ we have $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) \geq \omega_1$. □

Corollary 3.12. *Assume that* $\varepsilon \leq \omega_1$ *and* $\mathrm{Pr}_\varepsilon(\lambda)$. *If there is* $A \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ *of cardinality* λ *such that*

$$\big(\forall \eta, \nu \in A\big)\big(|(B + \eta) \cap (B + \nu)| \geq k\big),$$

then $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) \geq \varepsilon$.

Proof. This is essentialy shown by the proof of the implication (d) ⇒ (a) of Proposition 3.11. □

4. The forcing

In this section we construct a forcing notion adding a sequence $\bar{T}$ of subtrees of ${}^{\omega>}2$ such that $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar{T}) < \omega_1$. The sequence $\bar{T}$ will be added by finite approximations, so it will be convenient to have finite version of Definition 3.5.

Definition 4.1. Assume that

- $2 \leq \iota < \omega$, $k = 2\iota$, and $0 < n, M < \omega$,
- $\bar{t} = \langle t_m : m < M \rangle$, and each t_m is a subtree of ${}^{n\geq}2$ in which all terminal branches are of length n,
- $T_j \subseteq {}^{\omega>}2$ (for $j < \omega$) are trees with no maximal nodes, $\bar{T} = \langle T_j : j < \omega \rangle$ and $t_m = T_m \cap {}^{n\geq}2$ for $m < M$,
- $\mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ is defined as in Definition 3.5.

(1) Let $\mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$ consist of all tuples $\mathbf{m} = (\ell_{\mathbf{m}}, u_{\mathbf{m}}, \bar{h}_{\mathbf{m}}, \bar{g}_{\mathbf{m}}) \in \mathbf{M}_{\bar{T},k}$ such that $\ell_{\mathbf{m}} \leq n$ and $\mathrm{rng}(h^{\mathbf{m}}_i) \subseteq M$ for each $i < \iota$.

(2) Assume $\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$. We say that $\mathbf{m}$, $\mathbf{n}$ *are essentially the same* ($\mathbf{m}\doteqdot\mathbf{n}$ in short) if and only if:
- $\ell_{\mathbf{m}}=\ell_{\mathbf{n}}$, $u_{\mathbf{m}}=u_{\mathbf{n}}$ and
- for each $(\eta,\nu)\in(u_{\mathbf{m}})^{\langle 2\rangle}$ we have

$$\big\{\{g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta,\nu),g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\nu,\eta)\}:i<\iota\big\}=\big\{\{g^{\mathbf{n}}_i(\eta,\nu),g^{\mathbf{n}}_i(\nu,\eta)\}:i<\iota\big\},$$

and for $i,j<\iota$:
if $g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta,\nu)=g^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\eta,\nu)$, then $h^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta,\nu)=h^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\eta,\nu)$,
if $g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta,\nu)=g^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\nu,\eta)$, then $h^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta,\nu)=h^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\nu,\eta)$.

(3) Assume $\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}\in\mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$. We say that $\mathbf{n}$ *essentially extends* $\mathbf{m}$ ($\mathbf{m}\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{n}$ in short) if and only if:
- $\ell_{\mathbf{m}}\leq\ell_{\mathbf{n}}$, $u_{\mathbf{m}}=\{\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}}:\eta\in u_{\mathbf{n}}\}$, and
- for every $(\eta,\nu)\in(u_{\mathbf{n}})^{\langle 2\rangle}$ such that $\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}}\neq\nu\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}}$ we have

$$\big\{\{g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}},\nu\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}}),g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\nu\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}},\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}})\}:i<\iota\big\}=\big\{\{g^{\mathbf{n}}_i(\eta,\nu)\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}},g^{\mathbf{n}}_i(\nu,\eta)\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}}\}:i<\iota\big\},$$

and for $i,j<\iota$:
if $g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}},\nu\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}})=g^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\eta,\nu)\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}}$, then $h^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}},\nu\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}})=h^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\eta,\nu)$,
if $g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}},\nu\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}})=g^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\nu,\eta)\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}}$, then $h^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}},\nu\restriction\ell_{\mathbf{m}})=h^{\mathbf{n}}_j(\nu,\eta)$.

Observation 4.2. *If $\mathbf{m}\in\mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$ and $\rho\in{}^{\ell_{\mathbf{m}}}2$, then $\mathbf{m}+\rho\in\mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$.*

Lemma 4.3. *Let $0<\ell<\omega$ and let $\mathcal{B}\subseteq{}^{\ell}2$ be a linearly independent set of vectors (in $({}^{\ell}2,+)$ over $(2,+_2,\cdot_2)$).*

(1) *If $\mathcal{A}\subseteq{}^{\ell}2$, $|\mathcal{A}|\geq 5$ and $\mathcal{A}+\mathcal{A}\subseteq\mathcal{B}+\mathcal{B}$, then for a unique $x\in{}^{\ell}2$ we have $\mathcal{A}+x\subseteq\mathcal{B}$.*
(2) *Let $b^*\in\mathcal{B}$. Suppose that $\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i\in\big(\mathcal{B}\cup(b^*+\mathcal{B})\big)\setminus\{\mathbf{0},b^*\}$ (for $i<3$) are such that*
   (a) *there are no repetitions in $\langle\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i:i<3\rangle$, and*
   (b) *$\rho^0_i+\rho^1_i=\rho^0_j+\rho^1_j$ for $i<j<3$.*

   Then $\big\{\{\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i\}:i<3\big\}\subseteq\big\{\{b,b+b^*\}:b\in\mathcal{B},\ b\neq b^*\big\}$.

Proof. Easy, for (1) see e.g. [4, Lemma 2.3]. □

Theorem 4.4. *Assume $\mathrm{NPr}_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$ and let $3\leq\iota<\omega$. Then there is a ccc forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ of size λ such that*

$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "*for some Σ^0_2 2ι–**npots**–set $B\subseteq{}^{\omega}2$ there is a sequence $\langle\eta_\alpha:\alpha<\lambda\rangle$ of distinct elements of ${}^{\omega}2$ such that $\big|(\eta_\alpha+B)\cap(\eta_\beta+B)\big|\geq 2\iota$ for all $\alpha,\beta<\lambda$* ".

Proof. We may assume that λ is uncountable.

Fix a countable vocabulary $\tau=\{R_{n,\zeta}:n,\zeta<\omega\}$, where $R_{n,\zeta}$ is an n–ary relational symbol (for $n,\zeta<\omega$). By the assumption on λ, we may fix a model $\mathbb{M}=(\lambda,\{R^{\mathbb{M}}_{n,\zeta}\}_{n,\zeta<\omega})$ in the vocabulary τ with the universe λ and an ordinal $\alpha^*<\omega_1$ such that:

$(\circledast)_{\rm a}$ for every n and a quantifier free formula $\varphi(x_0,\ldots,x_{n-1})\in\mathcal{L}(\tau)$ there is $\zeta<\omega$ such that for all $a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}\in\lambda$,

$$\mathbb{M}\models\varphi[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}]\Leftrightarrow R_{n,\zeta}[a_0,\ldots,a_{n-1}],$$

$(\circledast)_{\rm b}$ $\sup\{\mathrm{rk}(v,\mathbb{M}):\emptyset\neq v\in[\lambda]^{<\omega}\}<\alpha^*$,
$(\circledast)_{\rm c}$ the rank of every singleton is at least 0.

For a nonempty finite set $v \subseteq \lambda$ let $\mathrm{rk}(v) = \mathrm{rk}(v, \mathbb{M})$, and let $\zeta(v) < \omega$ and $k(v) < |v|$ be such that $R_{|v|,\zeta(v)}, k(v)$ witness the rank of v. Thus letting $\{a_0, \ldots, a_k, \ldots a_{n-1}\}$ be the increasing enumeration of v and $k = k(v)$ and $\zeta = \zeta(v)$, we have

$(\circledast)_{\rm d}$ if $\mathrm{rk}(v) \geq 0$, then $\mathbb{M} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0, \ldots, a_k, \ldots, a_{n-1}]$ but there is no $a \in \lambda \setminus v$ such that

$$\mathrm{rk}(v \cup \{a\}) \geq \mathrm{rk}(v) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{M} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1}, a, a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_{n-1}],$$

$(\circledast)_{\rm e}$ if $\mathrm{rk}(v) = -1$, then $\mathbb{M} \models R_{n,\zeta}[a_0, \ldots, a_k, \ldots, a_{n-1}]$ but the set

$$\big\{a \in \lambda : \mathbb{M} \models \varphi[a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1}, a, a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_{n-1}]\big\}$$

is countable.

Without loss of generality we may also require that (for $\zeta = \zeta(v)$, $n = |v|$)

$(\circledast)_{\rm f}$ for every $b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1} < \lambda$

$$\text{if } \ \mathbb{M} \models R_{n,\zeta}[b_0, \ldots, b_{n-1}] \text{ then } \ b_0 < \ldots < b_{n-1}.$$

Now we will define a forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$. *A condition* p in $\mathbb{P}$ is a tuple

$$\big(w^p, n^p, M^p, \bar{\eta}^p, \bar{t}^p, \bar{r}^p, \bar{h}^p, \bar{g}^p, \mathcal{M}^p\big) = \big(w, n, M, \bar{\eta}, \bar{t}, \bar{r}, \bar{h}, \bar{g}, \mathcal{M}\big)$$

such that the following demands $(*)_1$–$(*)_{11}$ are satisfied.

$(*)_1$ $w \in [\lambda]^{<\omega}$, $|w| \geq 5$, $0 < n, M < \omega$.

$(*)_2$ $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha \in w\rangle$ is a sequence of linearly independent vectors in ${}^n 2$ (over the field $\mathbb{Z}_2$); so in particular $\eta_\alpha \in {}^n 2$ are pairwise distinct non-zero sequences (for $\alpha \in w$).

$(*)_3$ $\bar{t} = \langle t_m : m < M\rangle$, where $\emptyset \neq t_m \subseteq {}^{n\geq} 2$ for $m < M$ is a tree in which all terminal branches are of length n and $t_m \cap t_{m'} \cap {}^n 2 = \emptyset$ for $m < m' < M$.

$(*)_4$ $\bar{r} = \langle r_m : m < M\rangle$, where $0 < r_m \leq n$ for $m < M$.

$(*)_5$ $\bar{h} = \langle h_i : i < \iota\rangle$, where $h_i : w^{\langle 2\rangle} \longrightarrow M$.

$(*)_6$ $\bar{g} = \langle g_i : i < \iota\rangle$, where $g_i : w^{\langle 2\rangle} \longrightarrow \bigcup\limits_{m<M} (t_m \cap {}^n 2)$, and $g_i(\alpha, \beta) \in t_{h_i(\alpha,\beta)}$ and $\eta_\alpha + g_i(\alpha, \beta) = \eta_\beta + g_i(\beta, \alpha)$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in w^{\langle 2\rangle}$ and $i < \iota$.

$(*)_7$ There are no repetitions in the sequence

$$\langle g_i(\alpha, \beta) : i < \iota, \ (\alpha, \beta) \in w^{\langle 2\rangle}\rangle.$$

$(*)_8$ $\mathcal{M}$ consists of all those $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$ (see Definition 4.1) that for some ℓ_*, w_* we have

$(*)^{\rm a}_8$ $w_* \subseteq w$, $5 \leq |w_*|$, $0 < \ell_{\mathbf{m}} = \ell_* \leq n$, and for each $(\alpha, \beta) \in (w_*)^{\langle 2\rangle}$ and $i < \iota$ we have $r_{h_i(\alpha,\beta)} \leq \ell_*$,

$(*)^{\rm b}_8$ $u_{\mathbf{m}} = \{\eta_\alpha{\restriction}\ell_* : \alpha \in w_*\}$ and $\eta_\alpha{\restriction}\ell_* \neq \eta_\beta{\restriction}\ell_*$ for distinct $\alpha, \beta \in w_*$,

$(*)^{\rm c}_8$ $\bar{h}_{\mathbf{m}} = \langle h^{\mathbf{m}}_i : i < \iota\rangle$, where

$$h^{\mathbf{m}}_i : (u_{\mathbf{m}})^{\langle 2\rangle} \longrightarrow M : (\eta_\alpha{\restriction}\ell_*, \eta_\beta{\restriction}\ell_*) \mapsto h_i(\alpha, \beta),$$

$(*)^{\rm d}_8$ $\bar{g}_{\mathbf{m}} = \langle g^{\mathbf{m}}_i : i < \iota\rangle$, where

$$g^{\mathbf{m}}_i : (u_{\mathbf{m}})^{\langle 2\rangle} \longrightarrow \bigcup_{m<M} (t_m \cap {}^{\ell_*} 2) : (\eta_\alpha{\restriction}\ell_*, \eta_\beta{\restriction}\ell_*) \mapsto g_i(\alpha, \beta){\restriction}\ell_*$$

In the above situation we will write $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{m}(\ell_*, w_*) = \mathbf{m}^p(\ell_*, w_*)$. (Note that w_* is not determined uniquely by $\mathbf{m}$ and we may have $\mathbf{m}(\ell, w_0) = \mathbf{m}(\ell, w_1)$ for distinct $w_0, w_1 \subseteq w$. Also, the conditions $(*)^{\rm a}_8$–$(*)^{\rm d}_8$ alone do not necessarily determine an element of $\mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$, but clearly for each $w_* \subseteq w$ of size ≥ 5 we have $\mathbf{m}^p(n^p, w_*) \in \mathcal{M}^p$.)

$(*)_9$ If $\mathbf{m}(\ell, w_0), \mathbf{m}(\ell, w_1) \in \mathcal{M}$, $\rho \in {}^{\ell}2$ and $\mathbf{m}(\ell, w_0) \doteqdot \mathbf{m}(\ell, w_1) + \rho$, then $\mathrm{rk}(w_0) = \mathrm{rk}(w_1)$, $\zeta(w_0) = \zeta(w_1)$, $k(w_0) = k(w_1)$ and if $\alpha \in w_0$, $\beta \in w_1$ are such that $|\alpha \cap w_0| = k(w_0) = k(w_1) = |\beta \cap w_1|$, then $(\eta_\alpha{\restriction}\ell) + \rho = \eta_\beta{\restriction}\ell$.

$(*)_{10}$ If $\mathbf{m}(\ell_*, w_*) \in \mathcal{M}$, $\alpha \in w_*$, $|\alpha \cap w_*| = k(w_*)$, $\mathrm{rk}(w_*) = -1$, and $\mathbf{m}(\ell_*, w_*) \sqsubseteq^* \mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{M}$, then $|\{\nu \in u_{\mathbf{n}} : (\eta_\alpha{\restriction}\ell_*) \trianglelefteq \nu\}| = 1$.

$(*)_{11}$ If $\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M} (t_m \cap {}^n2)$ (for $i < \iota$) are such that

(a) there are no repetitions in $\langle \rho^0_i, \rho^1_i : i < \iota \rangle$, and
(b) $\rho^0_i + \rho^1_i = \rho^0_j + \rho^1_j$ for $i < j < \iota$,

then for some $\alpha, \beta \in w$ we have

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i\} : i < \iota\big\} = \big\{\{g_i(\alpha, \beta), g_i(\beta, \alpha)\} : i < \iota\big\}.$$

To define *the order* $\leq$ *of* $\mathbb{P}$ we declare for $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ that $p \leq q$ if and only if

- $w^p \subseteq w^q$, $n^p \leq n^q$, $M^p \leq M^q$, and
- $t^p_m = t^q_m \cap {}^{n^p \geq}2$ and $r^p_m = r^q_m$ for all $m < M^p$, and
- $\eta^p_\alpha \trianglelefteq \eta^q_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in w^p$, and
- $h^q_i{\restriction}(w^p)^{\langle 2 \rangle} = h^p_i$ and $g^p_i(\alpha, \beta) \trianglelefteq g^q_i(\alpha, \beta)$ for $i < \iota$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in (w^p)^{\langle 2 \rangle}$.

Claim 4.4.1. *Assume* $p = \big(w, n, M, \bar{\eta}, \bar{t}, \bar{h}, \bar{g}, \mathcal{M}\big) \in \mathbb{P}$. *If* $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$ *is such that* $\ell_{\mathbf{m}} = n$ *and* $|u_{\mathbf{m}}| \geq 5$, *then for some* $\rho \in {}^n2$ *and* $\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{M}$ *we have* $(\mathbf{m} + \rho) \doteqdot \mathbf{n}$.

Proof of the Claim. Let $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}^n_{\bar{t},k}$ be such that $\ell_{\mathbf{m}} = n$. It follows from Definition 3.5(d) and clauses $(*)_6 + (*)_{11}$ that

($\boxdot$) for every $(\nu, \eta) \in (u_{\mathbf{m}})^{\langle 2 \rangle}$ there is $(\alpha, \beta) \in w^{\langle 2 \rangle}$ such that $\nu + \eta = \eta_\alpha + \eta_\beta$.

By Lemma 4.3 for some ρ we have $u_{\mathbf{m}} + \rho \subseteq \{\eta_\alpha : \alpha \in w\}$. Let $w_0 = \{\alpha \in w : \eta_\alpha + \rho \in u_{\mathbf{m}}\}$ and $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{m}^p(n, w_0) \in \mathcal{M}$. Using clause $(*)_{11}$ again we easily conclude $(\mathbf{m} + \rho) \doteqdot \mathbf{n}$. (Note that since $t_m \cap t_{m'} \cap {}^n2 = \emptyset$ for $m < m' < M$, $h^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta, \nu)$ is determined by $g^{\mathbf{m}}_i(\eta, \nu)$.) $\square$

Claim 4.4.2. (1) *$\mathbb{P} \neq \emptyset$ and $(\mathbb{P}, \leq)$ is a partial order.*

(2) *For each $\beta < \lambda$ and $n_0, M_0 < \omega$ the set*

$$D^{n_0, M_0}_\beta = \big\{p \in \mathbb{P} : n^p > n_0 \ \wedge\ M^p > M_0 \ \wedge\ \beta \in w^p\big\}$$

is open dense in $\mathbb{P}$.

Proof of the Claim. (1) Should be clear.

(2) Let $p \in \mathbb{P}$, $\beta \in \lambda \setminus w^p$. Put $N = |w^p| \cdot \iota + 2$.

We will define a condition $q \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $q \geq p$ and

$$w^q = w^p \cup \{\beta\}, \quad n^q = n^p + N > n^p + 1, \quad M^q = M^p + N - 2 > M^p + 1.$$

For $\alpha \in w^p$ we set $\eta^q_\alpha = \eta^p_\alpha {}^\frown \langle \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{N} \rangle$ and we also let $\eta^q_\beta = \langle \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{n^p+1} \rangle {}^\frown \langle \underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{N-1} \rangle$.

Next, if $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) \in (w^p)^{\langle 2 \rangle}$, then for all $i < \iota$

$$h^q_i(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) = h^p_i(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) \quad \text{and} \quad g^q_i(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) = g^p_i(\alpha_0, \alpha_1) {}^\frown \langle \underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{N} \rangle.$$

If $\alpha \in w^p$ and $j = |w^p \cap \alpha|$, then for $i < \iota$:

- $g^q_i(\alpha,\beta) = \langle\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{n^p}\rangle^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{j\iota+i+1}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1,\ldots,1}_{N-j\iota-i-2}\rangle$,
- $g^q_i(\beta,\alpha) = \eta^p_\alpha{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{1,\ldots,1}_{j\iota+i+2}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{N-j\iota-i-2}\rangle$,
- $h^q_i(\beta,\alpha) = h^q_i(\alpha,\beta) = M^p + j\iota + i$.

We also set:

- if $m < M^p$, then $r^q_m = r^p_m$ and

  $t^q_m = \{\eta \in {}^{n^q\geq}2 : \eta\restriction n^p \in t^p_m \ \wedge\ (\forall j < n^q)(n^p \leq j < |\eta| \Rightarrow \eta(j) = 0)\}$

  and
- if $M^p \leq m < M^q$, $m = M^p + j\iota + i$, $i < \iota$ and $j < |w^p|$, then $r^q_m = n^q$ and

  $$t^q_m = \{g^q_i(\alpha,\beta)\restriction\ell, g^q_i(\beta,\alpha)\restriction\ell : \ell \leq n^q\},$$

  where $\alpha \in w^p$ is such that $|\alpha \cap w^p| = j$.

Now letting $\mathcal{M}^q$ be defined as in $(*)_8$ we check that

$$q = \big(w^q, n^q, M^q, \bar{\eta}^q, \bar{t}^q, \bar{r}^q, \bar{h}^q, \bar{g}^q, \mathcal{M}^p\big) \in \mathbb{P}.$$

Demands $(*)_1$–$(*)_8$ are pretty straightforward.

RE $(*)_9$ **:** To justify clause $(*)_9$, suppose that $\mathbf{m}^q(\ell,w_0), \mathbf{m}^q(\ell,w_1) \in \mathcal{M}^q$, $\rho \in {}^\ell 2$ and $\mathbf{m}^q(\ell,w_0) \doteqdot \mathbf{m}^q(\ell,w_1) + \rho$, and consider the following two cases.
Case 1: $\beta \notin w_0 \cup w_1$
Then letting $\ell^* = \min(\ell, n^p)$ and $\rho^* = \rho\restriction\ell^*$ we see that $\mathbf{m}^p(\ell^*,w_0) \doteqdot \mathbf{m}^p(\ell^*,w_1) + \rho^*$ (and both belong to $\mathcal{M}^p$). Hence clause $(*)_9$ for p applies.
Case 2: $\beta \in w_0 \cup w_1$
Say, $\beta \in w_0$. If $\alpha \in w_0 \setminus \{\beta\}$, then $h^q_i(\alpha,\beta) = h^q_i(\beta,\alpha) \geq M^p$ and $r^q_{h^q_i(\alpha,\beta} = n^q$. Consequently, $\ell = n^q$. Moreover,

$$(\gamma,\delta) \in (w^q)^{\langle 2\rangle} \ \wedge\ h^q_j(\gamma,\delta) = h^q_i(\alpha,\beta) \quad\Rightarrow\quad \{\gamma,\delta\} = \{\alpha,\beta\}.$$

Therefore, $\beta \in w_1$ and $w_1 = w_0$ and since $|w_1| \geq 5$, the linear independence of $\bar{\eta}$ implies $\rho = \mathbf{0}$.

RE $(*)_{10}$ **:** Concerning clause $(*)_{10}$, suppose that $\mathbf{m}^q(\ell_0,w_0), \mathbf{m}^q(\ell_1,w_1) \in \mathcal{M}^q$, $\alpha \in w_0$, $|\alpha \cap w_0| = k(w_0)$, $\mathrm{rk}(w_0) = -1$, and $\mathbf{m}^q(\ell_0,w_0) \sqsubseteq^* \mathbf{m}^q(\ell_1,w_1)$. Assume towards contradiction that there are $\alpha_0,\alpha_1 \in w_1$ such that

$$\eta^q_{\alpha_0}\restriction\ell_1 \neq \eta^q_{\alpha_1}\restriction\ell_1 \ \wedge\ \eta^q_\alpha\restriction\ell_0 \vartriangleleft \eta^q_{\alpha_0} \ \wedge\ \eta^q_\alpha\restriction\ell_0 \vartriangleleft \eta^q_{\alpha_1}.$$

Suppose $\beta \in w_0 \cup w_1$. Then looking at the function h^q_i in a manner similar to considerations for clause $(*)_9$ we get $\beta \in w_0 \cap w_1$. Let $\beta' \in w_0 \setminus \{\beta\}$. Then $h^q_0(\beta,\beta') \geq M^p$ and hence $r^q_{h_0(\beta,\beta')} = n^q = \ell_0 = \ell_1$, contradicting our assumptions. Therefore $\beta \notin w_0 \cup w_1$. But then we immediately get contradiction with clause $(*)_{10}$ for p.

RE $(*)_{11}$ **:** Let us argue that $(*)_{11}$ is satisfied as well and for this suppose that $\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M^q} (t_m \cap {}^{n^q}2)$ (for $i < \iota$) are such that

(a) there are no repetitions in $\langle \rho^0_i, \rho^1_i : i < \iota\rangle$, and
(b) $\rho^0_i + \rho^1_i = \rho^0_j + \rho^1_j$ for $i < j < \iota$.

Clearly, if

$(\odot)_1$ all ρ^0_i, ρ^1_i are from $\bigcup\limits_{m<M^p} t_m$,

then we may use the condition $(*)_{11}$ for p and conclude that for some $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in w^p$ we have

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i\} : i < \iota\big\} = \big\{\{g_i(\alpha_0, \alpha_1), g_i(\alpha_1, \alpha_0)\} : i < \iota\big\}.$$

Now note that if $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M^q} (t_m \cap {}^{n^q}2)$, $\rho_0 + \rho_1 = \rho_2 + \rho_3$ and $\rho_0 \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M^p} (t_m \cap {}^{n^q}2)$ but $\rho_1 \notin \bigcup\limits_{m<M^p} (t_m \cap {}^{n^q}2)$, then $\{\rho_0, \rho_1\} = \{\rho_2, \rho_3\}$. Hence easily, if $(\odot)_1$ fails we must have

$(\odot)_2$ $\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i \in \bigcup\limits_{m=M^p}^{M^q-1} (t_m \cap {}^{n^q}2)$ for $i < \iota$.

But then necessarily

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i{\restriction}[n^p, n^q), \rho^1_i{\restriction}[n^p, n^q)\} : i < \iota\big\} \subseteq \big\{\{g_i(\alpha,\beta){\restriction}[n^p, n^q), g_i(\beta,\alpha){\restriction}[n^p, n^q)\} : i < \iota,\ \alpha \in w^p\big\}.$$

(Use Lemma 4.3(2), remember $\iota \geq 3$.) Since $\big(g_i(\alpha,\beta) + g_i(\beta,\alpha)\big){\restriction}n^p = \eta^p_\alpha$ we easily conclude that for some $\alpha \in w^p$ we have

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i\} : i < \iota\big\} = \big\{\{g_i(\alpha,\beta), g_i(\beta,\alpha)\} : i < \iota\big\}.$$

Finally, it should be clear that q is a condition stronger than p. □

Claim 4.4.3. *The forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ has the Knaster property.*

Proof of the Claim. Suppose that $\langle p_\xi : \xi < \omega_1\rangle$ is a sequence of pairwise distinct conditions from $\mathbb{P}$ and let

$$p_\xi = \big(w_\xi, n_\xi, M_\xi, \bar{\eta}_\xi, \bar{t}_\xi, \bar{r}_\xi, \bar{h}_\xi, \bar{g}_\xi, \mathcal{M}_\xi\big)$$

where $\bar{\eta}_\xi = \langle \eta^\xi_\alpha : \alpha \in w_\xi\rangle$, $\bar{t}_\xi = \langle t^\xi_m : m < M_\xi\rangle$, $\bar{r}_\xi = \langle r^\xi_m : m < M_\xi\rangle$, and $\bar{h}_\xi = \langle h^\xi_i : i < \iota\rangle$, $\bar{g}_\xi = \langle g^\xi_i : i < \iota\rangle$. By a standard Δ–system cleaning procedure we may find an uncountable set $A \subseteq \omega_1$ such that the following demands $(*)_{12}$–$(*)_{15}$ are satisfied.

- $(*)_{12}$ $\{w_\xi : \xi \in A\}$ forms a Δ–system.
- $(*)_{13}$ If $\xi, \varsigma \in A$, then $|w_\xi| = |w_\varsigma|$, $n_\xi = n_\varsigma$, $M_\xi = M_\varsigma$, and $t^\xi_m = t^\varsigma_m$ and $r^\xi_m = r^\varsigma_m$ (for $m < M_\xi$).
- $(*)_{14}$ If $\xi < \varsigma$ are from A and $\pi : w_\xi \longrightarrow w_\varsigma$ is the order isomorphism, then
  - (a) $\pi(\alpha) = \alpha$ for $\alpha \in w_\xi \cap w_\varsigma$,
  - (b) if $\emptyset \neq v \subseteq w_\xi$, then $\mathrm{rk}(v) = \mathrm{rk}(\pi[v])$, $\zeta(v) = \zeta(\pi[v])$ and $k(v) = k(\pi[v])$,
  - (c) $\eta^\xi_\alpha = \eta^\varsigma_{\pi(\alpha)}$ (for $\alpha \in w_\xi$),
  - (d) $g_i(\alpha,\beta) = g_i(\pi(\alpha), \pi(\beta))$ and $h_i(\alpha,\beta) = h_i(\pi(\alpha), \pi(\beta))$ for $(\alpha,\beta) \in (w_\xi)^{\langle 2\rangle}$ and $i < \iota$,

  and
- $(*)_{15}$ $\mathcal{M}_\xi = \mathcal{M}_\varsigma$ (this actually follows from the previous demands).

Following the pattern of Claim 4.4.2(2) we will argue that for distinct ξ, ς from A the conditions p_ξ, p_ς are compatible. So let $\xi, \varsigma \in A$, $\xi < \varsigma$ and let $\pi : w_\xi \longrightarrow w_\varsigma$ be the order isomorphism. We will define $q = \big(w, n, M, \bar{\eta}, \bar{t}, \bar{r}, \bar{h}, \bar{g}, \mathcal{M}\big)$ where $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha \in w\rangle$, $\bar{t} = \langle t_m : m < M\rangle$, $\bar{r} = \langle r_m : m < M\rangle$, and $\bar{h} = \langle h_i : i < \iota\rangle$, $\bar{g} = \langle g_i : i < \iota\rangle$.

Let $w_\xi \cap w_\varsigma = \{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{k-1}\}$, $w_\xi \setminus w_\varsigma = \{\beta_0, \dots, \beta_{\ell-1}\}$ and $w_\varsigma \setminus w_\xi = \{\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{\ell-1}\}$ be the increasing enumerations.

We set $N_0 = \iota \cdot \ell(\ell + k) + \iota \cdot \frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2} + 1$, $N = N_0 + \ell + 1$, and we define

$(*)_{16}$ $w = w_\xi \cup w_\varsigma$, $n = n_\xi + N$, and $M = M_\xi + 1$;

$(*)_{17}$ $\eta_\alpha = \eta_\alpha{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N}\rangle$ for $\alpha \in w_\xi$ and we also let for $c < \ell$

$$\eta_{\gamma_c} = \eta^\xi_{\gamma_c}{}^\frown\langle 0\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{N_0}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{c}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\ell-c}\rangle.$$

Next we are going to define $h_i(\alpha, \beta)$ and $g_i(\alpha, \beta)$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in w^{\langle 2\rangle}$. For $d < N_0$ let

$$\nu_d = \langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{d}\rangle^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N_0-d-1}\rangle \in {}^{N_0}2, \quad \text{and} \quad \nu^*_d = \mathbf{1} + \nu_d \in {}^{N_0}2$$

and note that $\{\nu_d : d < N_0 - 1\} \cup \{\mathbf{1}\}$ are linearly independent in ${}^{N_0}2$. Fix a bijection

$$\Theta : (k \times \ell \times \iota \times \{0\}) \cup (\{(a, b) \in \ell^2 : a < b\} \times \iota \times \{1\}) \cup (\ell \times \ell \times \iota \times \{2\}) \longrightarrow N_0 - 1$$

and define h_i, g_i as follows.

$(*)^{\rm a}_{18}$ If $(\alpha, \beta) \in (w_\xi)^{\langle 2\rangle}$ and $i < \iota$, then
$h_i(\alpha, \beta) = h^\xi_i(\alpha, \beta)$ and $g_i(\alpha, \beta) = g^\xi_i(\alpha, \beta)^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{N}\rangle$.

$(*)^{\rm b}_{18}$ If $a < k$, $c < \ell$ and $i < \iota$, then $h_i(\alpha_a, \gamma_c) = h^\varsigma_i(\alpha_a, \gamma_c)$ and $h_i(\gamma_c, \alpha_a) = h^\varsigma_i(\gamma_c, \alpha_a)$, and

$$g_i(\alpha_a, \gamma_c) = g^\varsigma_i(\alpha_a, \gamma_c)^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu_{\Theta(a,c,i,0)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\ell}\rangle \quad \text{and}$$
$$g_i(\gamma_c, \alpha_a) = g^\varsigma_i(\gamma_c, \alpha_a)^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu^*_{\Theta(a,c,i,0)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{c}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\ell-c}\rangle.$$

$(*)^{\rm c}_{18}$ If $b < c < \ell$ and $i < \iota$, then $h_i(\gamma_b, \gamma_c) = h^\varsigma_i(\gamma_b, \gamma_c)$, $h_i(\gamma_c, \gamma_b) = h^\varsigma_i(\gamma_c, \gamma_b)$, and

$$g_i(\gamma_b, \gamma_c) = g^\varsigma_i(\gamma_b, \gamma_c)^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu_{\Theta(b,c,i,1)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{b}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\ell-b}\rangle \quad \text{and}$$
$$g_i(\gamma_c, \gamma_b) = g^\varsigma_i(\gamma_c, \gamma_b)^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu_{\Theta(b,c,i,1)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{c}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\ell-c}\rangle$$

(note: ν_Θ not ν^*_Θ).

$(*)^{\rm d}_{18}$ If $b < \ell$, $c < \ell$ and $b \neq c$ and $i < \iota$, then $h_i(\beta_b, \gamma_c) = h_i(\gamma_c, \beta_b) = M_\xi = M_\varsigma$, and

$$g_i(\beta_b, \gamma_c) = g^\xi_i(\beta_b, \beta_c)^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu_{\Theta(b,c,i,2)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{c}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\ell-c}\rangle \quad \text{and}$$
$$g_i(\gamma_c, \beta_b) = g^\varsigma_i(\gamma_c, \gamma_b)^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu^*_{\Theta(b,c,i,2)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\ell}\rangle.$$

$(*)^{\rm e}_{18}$ If $b<\ell$ and $i<\iota$, then $h_i(\beta_b,\gamma_b)=h_i(\gamma_b,\beta_b)=M_\xi=M_\varsigma$, and

$$g_i(\beta_b,\gamma_b)=\eta^\xi_{\beta_b}{}^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu_{\Theta(b,b,i,2)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{b}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1,\ldots,1}_{\ell-b}\rangle \quad \text{and}$$

$$g_i(\gamma_b,\beta_b)=\eta^\varsigma_{\gamma_b}{}^\frown\langle 1\rangle^\frown\nu^*_{\Theta(b,b,i,2)}{}^\frown\langle\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_{\ell}\rangle.$$

We also set:

$(*)_{19}$ $r_m=r^\xi_m$ for $m<M_\xi$, $r_{M_\xi}=n$ and if $m<M_\xi$, then

$$t_m=\begin{array}{l}\big\{\eta\in{}^{n\geq}2:\eta{\restriction}n_\xi\in t^\xi_m\ \wedge\ (\forall j<n)(n\leq j<|\eta|\Rightarrow\eta(j)=0)\big\}\ \cup\\ \big\{g_i(\delta,\varepsilon){\restriction}n':(\delta,\varepsilon)\in w^{\langle 2\rangle},\ i<\iota,\ \text{and } n'\leq n \text{ and } h_i(\delta,\varepsilon)=m\big\}\end{array}$$

and

$$t_{M_\xi}=\big\{g_i(\delta,\varepsilon){\restriction}n':(\delta,\varepsilon)\in w^{\langle 2\rangle},\ i<\iota,\ \text{and } n'\leq n\text{ and } h_i(\delta,\varepsilon)=M_\xi\big\}.$$

Now letting $\mathcal{M}$ be defined by $(*)_8$ we claim that

$$q=\big(w,n,M,\bar\eta,\bar t,\bar r,\bar h,\bar g,\mathcal{M}\big)\in\mathbb{P}.$$

Demands $(*)_1$–$(*)_8$ are pretty straightforward.

RE $(*)_9$ **:** To justify clause $(*)_9$, suppose that $\mathbf{m}(\ell,w'),\mathbf{m}(\ell,w'')\in\mathcal{M}$, $\rho\in{}^\ell 2$ and $\mathbf{m}(\ell,w')\doteqdot\mathbf{m}(\ell,w'')+\rho$, and consider the following three cases.

Case 1: $w'\subseteq w_\xi$
Then for each $(\delta,\varepsilon)\in(w')^{\langle 2\rangle}$ we have $h_i(\delta,\varepsilon)<M_\xi$, so this also holds for $(\delta,\varepsilon)\in(w'')^{\langle 2\rangle}$. Consequently, either $w''\subseteq w_\xi$ or $w''\subseteq w_\varsigma$.

If $w''\subseteq w_\xi$, then let $\ell'=\min(\ell,n_\xi)$ and consider $\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(w',\ell'),\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(w'',\ell')\in\mathcal{M}_\xi$. Using clause $(*)_9$ for p_ξ we immediately obtain the desired conclusion.

If $w''\subseteq w_\varsigma$, then we let $\ell'=\min(\ell,n_\xi)$ and we consider $\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(w',\ell')$ and $\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\pi^{-1}[w''],\ell')$ (both from $\mathcal{M}_\xi$). By $(*)_{14}$, clause $(*)_9$ for p_ξ applies to them and we get

- $\mathrm{rk}(w')=\mathrm{rk}(\pi^{-1}[w''])$, $\zeta(w')=\zeta(\pi^{-1}[w''])$, $k(w')=k(\pi^{-1}[w''])$ and
- if $\delta\in w'$, $\varepsilon\in\pi^{-1}[w'']$ are such that $|\delta\cap w'|=k(w')=k(\pi^{-1}[w''])=|\varepsilon\cap\pi^{-1}[w'']|$, then $(\eta^{p_\xi}_\delta{\restriction}\ell')+\rho=\eta^{p_\xi}_\varepsilon{\restriction}\ell'$.

By $(*)_{14}$ this immediately implies the desired conclusion.

Case 2: $w'\subseteq w_\varsigma$
Same as the previous case, just interchanging ξ and ς.

Case 3: $w'\setminus w_\xi\neq\emptyset\neq w'\setminus w_\varsigma$
Then for some $(\delta,\varepsilon)\in(w')^{\langle 2\rangle}$ we have $h_i(\delta,\varepsilon)=M_\xi$, so necessarily $\ell=r_{M_\xi}=n$. Hence $\{\eta_\alpha:\alpha\in w'\}=\{\eta_\alpha+\rho:\alpha\in w''\}$ and since $|w'|\geq 5$, the linear independence of $\bar\eta$ implies $\rho=\mathbf{0}$ and $w'=w''$ and the desired conclusion follows.

RE $(*)_{10}$ **:** Let us prove clause $(*)_{10}$ now. Suppose that $\mathbf{m}(\ell_0,w'),\mathbf{m}(\ell_1,w'')\in\mathcal{M}$, $\delta\in w'$, $|\delta\cap w'|=k(w')$, $\mathrm{rk}(w')=-1$, and $\mathbf{m}(\ell_0,w')\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{m}(\ell_1,w'')$. Assume towards contradiction that there are $\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1\in w''$ such that

$(\otimes)_0$ $\eta_{\varepsilon_0}{\restriction}\ell_1\neq\eta_{\varepsilon_1}{\restriction}\ell_1$ and $\eta_\delta{\restriction}\ell_0\vartriangleleft\eta_{\varepsilon_0}$ and $\eta_\delta{\restriction}\ell_0\vartriangleleft\eta_{\varepsilon_1}$.

Without loss of generality $|w''|=|w'|+1\geq 6$.

Since we must have $\ell_0<n$, for no $\alpha,\beta\in w'$ we can have $h_i(\alpha,\beta)=M_\xi$. Therefore either $w'\subseteq w_\xi$ or $w'\subseteq w_\varsigma$. Also,

$(\otimes)_1$ if $(\alpha,\beta)\in (w'')^{\langle 2\rangle}\setminus\{(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1),(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0)\}$ then $h_i(\alpha,\beta)<M_\xi$ for $i<\iota$.

Note that

$(\otimes)_2$ if $(\alpha,\beta)\in (w_\xi)^{\langle 2\rangle}\cup(w_\varsigma)^{\langle 2\rangle}$ then $\min(\{\ell:\eta_\alpha(\ell)\neq\eta_\beta(\ell)\})<n_\xi$ and there are no repetitions in the sequence $\langle g_i(\alpha,\beta){\restriction}n_\xi, g_i(\beta,\alpha){\restriction}n_\xi : i<\iota\rangle$.

Let $\ell^*=\min(\ell_1,n_\xi)$.

Now, if $w'\cup w''\subseteq w_\xi$, then considering $\mathbf{m}(\ell_0,w')$ and $\mathbf{m}(\ell^*,w'')$ (and remembering $(\otimes)_2$) we see that $\ell_0<n_\xi$, $\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell_0,w')\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell^*,w'')$ and they have the property contradicting $(*)_{10}$ for p_ξ.

If $w'\cup w''\subseteq w_\varsigma$, then in a similar manner we get contradiction with $(*)_{10}$ for p_ς.

If $w'\subseteq w_\xi$ and $w''\subseteq w_\varsigma$ then one easily verifies that $\ell_0<n_\xi$ and $\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell_0,w')\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell^*,\pi^{-1}[w''])$ provide a counterexample for $(*)_{10}$ for p_ξ. Similarly if $w'\subseteq w_\varsigma$ and $w''\subseteq w_\xi$.

Consequently, the only possibility left is that $w''\setminus w_\xi\neq\emptyset\neq w''\setminus w_\varsigma$ and it follows from $(\otimes)_1$ that $|w''\setminus w_\xi|=|w''\setminus w_\varsigma|=1$. Let $\{\beta_b\}=w''\setminus w_\varsigma$ and $\{\gamma_c\}=w''\setminus w_\xi$; then $\{\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1\}=\{\beta_b,\gamma_c\}$.

Assume $w'\subseteq w_\xi$ (the case when $w'\subseteq w_\varsigma$ can be handled similarly). If we had $b\neq c$, then $\eta_{\beta_b}{\restriction}n_\xi=\eta^{p_\xi}_{\beta_b}{\restriction}n_\xi\neq\eta^{p_\varsigma}_{\gamma_c}{\restriction}n_\xi=\eta_{\gamma_c}{\restriction}n_\xi$. Since $w''\subseteq(w_\xi\cap w_\varsigma)\cup\{\beta_b,\gamma_c\}$ we could see that $\ell_0<n_\xi$ and $\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell_0,w')\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell^*,\pi^{-1}[w''])$ would provide a counterexample for $(*)_{10}$ for p_ξ. Consequently, $b=c$ and $\ell_1>n_\xi$. Now, remembering $(\otimes)_0$, $\eta^{p_\xi}_\delta{\restriction}\ell_0=\eta^{p_\xi}_{\beta_b}{\restriction}\ell_0$ and $\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell_0,w')\doteqdot\mathbf{m}^{p_\xi}(\ell_0,w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\})$, so by $(*)_9$ for p_ξ we conclude

$$\mathrm{rk}(w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\})=-1\quad\text{ and }\quad|\beta_b\cap(w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\})|=k(w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}).$$

Let $\zeta^*=\zeta(w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\})$ and $k^*=k(w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\})$. For $\varepsilon\in A\setminus\{\xi\}$ let $\pi^\varepsilon:w_\xi\longrightarrow w_\varepsilon$ be the order isomorphism and let $\gamma(\varepsilon)\in\pi^\varepsilon\big[w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}\big]$ be such that $|\pi^\varepsilon\big[w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}\big]\cap\gamma(\varepsilon)|=k^*$ (necessarily $\gamma(\varepsilon)=\pi^\varepsilon(\beta_b)\in w_\varepsilon\setminus w_\xi$). Then

- $\pi^\varepsilon[w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}]=\big(w''\cap(w_\xi\cap w_\varepsilon)\big)\cup\{\gamma(\varepsilon)\}=w''\setminus\{\beta_b,\gamma_b\}\cup\{\gamma(\varepsilon)\}$,
- $\mathrm{rk}\Big(\pi^\varepsilon[w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}]\Big)=-1$, and $\zeta\Big(\pi^\varepsilon[w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}]\Big)=\zeta^*$, and
- $k\Big(\pi^\varepsilon[w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}]\Big)=k^*=|\pi^\varepsilon[w''\setminus\{\gamma_b\}]\cap\gamma(\varepsilon)|$.

Hence $\mathbb{M}\models R_{|w'|,\zeta^*}\big[w''\setminus\{\beta_b,\gamma_b\}\cup\{\gamma(\varepsilon)\}\big]$ for each $\varepsilon\in A\setminus\{\xi\}$. Consequently, the set

$$\Big\{\alpha<\lambda:\mathbb{M}\models R_{|w'|,\zeta^*}\big[w''\setminus\{\beta_b,\gamma_b\}\cup\{\alpha\}\big]\Big\}$$

is uncountable, contradicting $(\circledast)_{\rm e}$.

RE $(*)_{11}$ **:** Let us argue that $(*)_{11}$ is satisfied as well and for this suppose that $\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i\in\bigcup\limits_{m<M}(t_m\cap{}^n2)$ (for $i<\iota$) are such that

(a) there are no repetitions in $\langle\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i:i<\iota\rangle$, and
(b) $\rho^0_i+\rho^1_i=\rho^0_j+\rho^1_j$ for $i<j<\iota$.

Clearly, if all ρ^0_i,ρ^1_i are form $\rho^\frown\langle\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_N\rangle$, then we may use condition $(*)_{11}$ for p_ξ and conclude that for some $\alpha_0,\alpha_1\in w_\xi$ we have

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i\}:i<\iota\big\}=\big\{\{g_i(\alpha_0,\alpha_1),g_i(\alpha_1,\alpha_0)\}:i<\iota\big\}.$$

So assume that we are not in the situation when all ρ^0_i,ρ^1_i are form $\rho^\frown\langle\underbrace{0,\ldots,0}_N\rangle$.

Note that if $\rho \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M}(t_m \cap {}^n2)$ and $\rho(n_\xi) = 0$, then $\rho{\restriction}[n_\xi, n) = \mathbf{0}$. Hence, remembering definitions in $(*)_{18}$, if $\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3 \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M}(t_m \cap {}^n2)$, $\rho_0 + \rho_1 = \rho_2 + \rho_3$ and $\rho_0(n_\xi) = 0$ but $\rho_1(n_\xi) = 1$, then $\{\rho_0, \rho_1\} = \{\rho_2, \rho_3\}$. Therefore, under current assumption, we must have $\rho^0_i(n_\xi) = \rho^1_i(n_\xi) = 1$ for all $i < \iota$. Define

$B = \{(\alpha_a, \gamma_c) : a < k \ \&\ c < \ell\}$,
$C = \{(\gamma_b, \gamma_c) : b < c < \ell\}$,
$D = \{(\beta_b, \gamma_c) : b < \ell \ \&\ c < \ell \ \&\ b \neq c\}$,
$E = \{(\beta_b, \gamma_b) : b < \ell\}$.

(These four sets correspond to the conditions $(*)^{\rm b}_{18}$–$(*)^{\rm e}_{18}$ in the definition of g_i.) Clearly, $\rho^0_i(n_\xi) = \rho^1_i(n_\xi) = 1$ implies that

$$\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i \in \{g_j(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1), g_j(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0) : (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1) \in B \cup C \cup D \cup E,\ j < \iota\}.$$

Note also that for each $d < N_0 - 1$,

$(\boxtimes)_a$ the set $\{\rho \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M}(t_m \cap {}^n2) : \rho{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] = \nu_d\}$ is not empty but it has at most two elements, and

$(\boxtimes)_b$ $|\{\rho \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M}(t_m \cap {}^n2) : \rho{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] = \nu_d\}| = 2$ if and only if $d = \Theta(b, c, i, 1)$ for some $b < c < \ell$ and $i < \iota$, and

$(\boxtimes)_c$ the set $\{\rho \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M}(t_m \cap {}^n2) : \rho{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] = \nu^*_d\}$ has at most one element, and

$(\boxtimes)_d$ $\{\rho \in \bigcup\limits_{m<M}(t_m \cap {}^n2) : \rho{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] = \nu^*_d\} = \emptyset$ if and only if $d = \Theta(b, c, i, 1)$ for some $b < c < \ell$ and $i < \iota$.

Now consider $\rho^0_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big]$, $\rho^1_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi + 1, n_\xi + N_0\big]$ for $i < \iota$.

If for some $(i, x) \neq (j, y)$ we have $\rho^x_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] = \rho^y_j{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big]$, then (using $(\boxtimes)_a$–$(\boxtimes)_d$ and the linear independence of ν_d's) we must also have that

$$\rho^0_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] = \rho^1_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] \quad \text{ for all } i < \iota.$$

Thus, for every $i < \iota$ there are $b < c < \ell$ and $j < \iota$ such that

$$\{\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i\} = \{g_j(\gamma_b, \gamma_c), g_j(\gamma_c, \gamma_b)\}.$$

Since for $b < c < \ell$ we have

$$\big(g_j(\gamma_b, \gamma_c) + g_j(\gamma_c, \gamma_b)\big){\restriction}(N_0, N_0 + \ell] = \langle\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{b}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{c-b}\rangle^\frown\langle\underbrace{0, \ldots, 0}_{\ell-c}\rangle$$

we immediately get that (in the current situation) for some $b < c < \ell$ we have

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i\} : i < \iota\big\} = \big\{\{g_i(\gamma_b, \gamma_c), g_i(\gamma_c, \gamma_b)\} : i < \iota\big\}.$$

So let us assume that $\rho^x_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big] \neq \rho^y_j{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big]$ for all distinct $(i, x), (j, y) \in \iota \times 2$. Since $\{\mathbf{1}, \nu_0, \ldots, \nu_{N_0-2}\}$ are linearly independent we may use Lemma 4.3(2) to conclude that

$$\Big\{\big\{\rho^0_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big], \rho^1_i{\restriction}\big(n_\xi, n_\xi + N_0\big]\big\} : i < \iota\Big\} \subseteq \Big\{\big\{\nu_d, \nu^*_d\big\} : d < N_0 - 1\Big\}.$$

Consequently, we easily deduce that

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i, \rho^1_i\} : i < \iota\big\} \subseteq \big\{\{g_i(\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1), g_i(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_0)\} : i < \iota \ \&\ (\varepsilon_0, \varepsilon_1) \in B \cup D \cup E\big\}.$$

Using the linear independence of η^ξ_ε's and the definitions of g_i's in $(*)_{18}$ one checks that the three sets
$\{g_i(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)+g_i(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0):(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)\in B,\ i<\iota\}$,
$\{g_i(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)+g_i(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0):(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)\in D,\ i<\iota\}$,
$\{g_i(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)+g_i(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0):(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)\in E,\ i<\iota\}$
are pairwise disjoint. Therefore, $\big\{\{\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i\}:i<\iota\big\}$ must be included in (exactly) one of the sets
$\big\{\{g_i(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1),g_i(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0)\}:i<\iota\ \&\ (\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)\in B\big\}$,
$\big\{\{g_i(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1),g_i(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0)\}:i<\iota\ \&\ (\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)\in D\big\}$, or
$\big\{\{g_i(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1),g_i(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0)\}:i<\iota\ \&\ (\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)\in E\big\}$.
But now we easily check that for some $(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1)\in B\cup D\cup E$ we must have

$$\big\{\{\rho^0_i,\rho^1_i\}:i<\iota\big\}=\big\{\{g_i(\varepsilon_0,\varepsilon_1),g_i(\varepsilon_1,\varepsilon_0)\}:i<\iota\big\}.$$

This completes the verification that $q=\big(w,n,M,\bar\eta,\bar t,\bar r,\bar h,\bar g,\mathcal{M}\big)\in\mathbb{P}$. It should be clear that q is stronger than both p_ξ and p_ς. $\square$

Define $\mathbb{P}$–names $\underset{\sim}{T}_m$ and $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\alpha$ (for $m<\omega$ and $\alpha<\lambda$) by
$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ " $\underset{\sim}{T}_m=\bigcup\{t^p_m:p\in\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}}\ \wedge\ m<M^p\}$ ", and
$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ " $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\alpha=\bigcup\{\eta^p_\alpha:p\in\underset{\sim}{G}_{\mathbb{P}}\ \wedge\ \alpha\in w^p\}$ ".

Claim 4.4.4. (1) *For each $m<\omega$ and $\alpha<\lambda$,*
$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ " $\underset{\sim}{\eta}_\alpha\in{}^\omega2$ *and* $\underset{\sim}{T}_m\subseteq{}^{\omega>}2$ *is a tree without terminal nodes* ".
(2) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ " $\bigcup\limits_{m<\omega}\lim(\underset{\sim}{T}_m)$ *is a 2ι–**npots** set* ".

Proof of the Claim. (1) By Claim 4.4.2 (and the definition of the order in $\mathbb{P}$).

(2) Let $G\subseteq\mathbb{P}$ be a generic filter over $\mathbf{V}$ and let us work in $\mathbf{V}[G]$.
Let $k=2\iota$ and $\bar T=\langle(\underset{\sim}{T}_m)^G:m<\omega\rangle$.
Suppose towards contradiction that $B=\bigcup\limits_{m<\omega}\lim\big((\underset{\sim}{T}_m)^G\big)$ is a k–**pots** set. Then, by Proposition 3.11, $\mathrm{NDRK}(\bar T)=\infty$. Using Lemma 3.10(5,), by induction on $j<\omega$ we choose $\mathbf{m}_j,\mathbf{m}^*_j\in\mathbf{M}_{\bar T,k}$ and $p_j\in G$ such that

(i) $\mathrm{ndrk}(\mathbf{m}_j)\geq\omega_1$, $|u_{\mathbf{m}_j}|>5$ and $\mathbf{m}_j\sqsubseteq\mathbf{m}^*_j\sqsubseteq\mathbf{m}_{j+1}$,
(ii) for each $\nu\in u_{\mathbf{m}^*_j}$ the set $\{\eta\in u_{\mathbf{m}_{j+1}}:\nu\vartriangleleft\eta\}$ has at least two elements,
(iii) $p_j\leq p_{j+1}$, $\ell_{\mathbf{m}_j}\leq\ell_{\mathbf{m}^*_j}=n^{p_j}<\ell_{\mathbf{m}_{j+1}}$ and $\mathrm{rng}(h^{\mathbf{m}_j}_i)\subseteq M^{p_j}$ for all $i<\iota$, and
(iv) $|\{\eta{\restriction}n^{p_j}:\eta\in u_{\mathbf{m}_{j+1}}\}|=|u_{\mathbf{m}_j}|=|u_{\mathbf{m}^*_j}|$.

Then, by (iii)+(iv), $\mathbf{m}_j,\mathbf{m}^*_j\in\mathbf{M}^{n^{p_j}}_{\bar t^{p_j},k}$. It follows from Claim 4.4.1 that for some $w_j\subseteq w^{p_j}$ and $\rho_j\in{}^{n^{p_j}}2$ we have $(\mathbf{m}^*_j+\rho_j)\doteqdot\mathbf{m}^{p_j}(n^{p_j},w_j)\in\mathcal{M}^{p_j}$.

Fix j for a moment and consider $\mathbf{m}^{p_j}(n^{p_j},w_j)\in\mathcal{M}^{p_j}$ and $\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_{j+1}},w_{j+1})\in\mathcal{M}^{p_{j+1}}$. Since $(\mathbf{m}^*_j+(\rho_{j+1}{\restriction}n^{p_j}))\sqsubseteq(\mathbf{m}^*_{j+1}+\rho_{j+1})\doteqdot\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_{j+1}},w_{j+1})$, we may choose $w^*_j\subseteq w_{j+1}$ such that

$$(\mathbf{m}^*_j+(\rho_{j+1}{\restriction}n^{p_j}))\doteqdot\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_j},w^*_j)\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_{j+1}},w_{j+1})$$

(and the latter two belong to $\mathcal{M}^{p_{j+1}}$). Then also

$\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_j},w^*_j)\doteqdot\mathbf{m}^{p_j}(n^{p_j},w_j)+(\rho_j+\rho_{j+1}{\restriction}n^{p_j})=\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_j},w_j)+(\rho_j+\rho_{j+1}{\restriction}n^{p_j})$,

so by clause $(*)_9$ for p_{j+1} we have

$$\mathrm{rk}(w^*_j)=\mathrm{rk}(w_j).$$

Clause (ii) of the choice of $\mathbf{m}_{j+1}$ implies that

$$(\forall\gamma\in w_j^*)(\exists\delta\in w_{j+1}\setminus w_j^*)(\eta^{p_{j+1}}_\gamma\restriction n^{p_j}=\eta^{p_{j+1}}_\delta\restriction n^{p_j}).$$

Let $\delta(\gamma)$ be the smallest $\delta\in w_{j+1}\setminus w_j^*$ with the above property and let $w_j^*(\gamma)=(w_j^*\setminus\{\gamma\})\cup\{\delta(\gamma)\}$. Then, for $\gamma\in w_j^*$, $\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_j},w_j^*(\gamma))\in\mathcal{M}^{p_{j+1}}$ and

$$\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_j},w_j^*)\doteqdot\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_j},w_j^*(\gamma))\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{m}^{p_{j+1}}(n^{p_{j+1}},w_{j+1}).$$

So by clause $(*)_9$ we know that for each $\gamma\in w_j$:

$$\mathrm{rk}(w_j^*(\gamma))=\mathrm{rk}(w_j^*),\quad \zeta(w_j^*(\gamma))=\zeta(w_j^*),\quad\text{and}\quad k(w_j^*(\gamma))=k(w_j^*).$$

Let $n=|w_j^*|$, $\zeta=\zeta(w_j^*)$, $k=k(w_j^*)$, and let $w_j^*=\{\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_k,\ldots,\alpha_{n-1}\}$ be the increasing enumeration. Let $\alpha_k^*=\delta(\alpha_k)$. Then clause $(*)_9$ also gives that $w_j^*(\alpha_k)=\{\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k^*,\alpha_{k+1},\ldots,\alpha_{n-1}\}$ is the increasing enumeration. Now,

$$\begin{array}{ll}\mathbb{M}\models R_{n,\zeta}[\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k,\alpha_{k+1},\ldots,\alpha_{n-1}] & \text{and}\\ \mathbb{M}\models R_{n,\zeta}[\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{k-1},\alpha_k^*,\alpha_{k+1},\ldots,\alpha_{n-1}], &\end{array}$$

and consequently if $\mathrm{rk}(w_j^*)\geq 0$, then

$$\mathrm{rk}(w_{j+1})\leq\mathrm{rk}(w_j^*\cup\{\alpha_k^*\})<\mathrm{rk}(w_j^*)=\mathrm{rk}(w_j)$$

(remember $(\circledast)_{\rm d}$).

Now, unfixing j, suppose that we constructed w_{j+1},w_j^* for all $j<\omega$. It follows from our considerations above that for some $j_0<\omega$ we must have:

(a) $\mathrm{rk}(w_{j_0}^*)=-1$, and
(b) $\mathbf{m}^{p_{j_0+1}}(n^{p_{j_0}},w_{j_0}^*)\sqsubseteq^*\mathbf{m}^{p_{j_0+1}}(n^{p_{j_0+1}},w_{j_0+1})$ (and both belong to $\mathcal{M}^{p_{j_0+1}}$),
(c) for every $\alpha\in w_{j_0}^*$ we have

$$\big|\{\beta\in w_{j_0+1}:\eta^{p_{j_0+1}}_\alpha\restriction n^{p_{j_0}}\lhd\eta^{p_{j_0+1}}_\beta\}\big|>1.$$

However, this contradicts clause $(*)_{10}$ (for p_{j_0+1}). □

□

Corollary 4.5. *Assume* **MA** $+\neg$**CH**, $\lambda<\mathfrak{c}$ *and* $\mathrm{NPr}_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$, $3\leq\iota<\omega$. *Then there exists a* Σ^0_2 2ι–**npots**–*set* $B\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ *which has* λ *many pairwise* 2ι–*nondisjoint translations.*

Proof. Standard modification of the proof of Theorem 4.4. □

Corollary 4.6. *Assume* $\mathrm{NPr}_{\omega_1}(\lambda)$ *and* $\lambda=\lambda^{\aleph_0}<\mu=\mu^{\aleph_0}$, $3\leq\iota<\omega$. *Then there is a ccc forcing notion* $\mathbb{Q}$ *of size* μ *forcing that*

(a) $2^{\aleph_0}=\mu$ *and*
(b) *there is a* Σ^0_2 2ι–**npots**–*set* $B\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ *which has* λ *many pairwise* 2ι–*nondisjoint translates but not* λ^+ *such translates.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the forcing notion given by Theorem 4.4 and let $\mathbb{Q}=\mathbb{P}*\mathbb{C}_\mu$. Use Proposition 3.3(4) to argue that the set B added by $\mathbb{P}$ is a **npots**–set in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$. By 3.3(3) this set cannot have λ^+ pairwise 2ι–nondisjoint translates, but it does have λ many pairwise 2ι–nondisjoint translates (by absoluteness). □

Remark 4.7. It follows from Proposition 3.3(1,2), that if there exists a Σ^0_2 **pots**–set $B\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ such that for some set $A\subseteq{}^\omega 2$ we have $(B+a)\cap(B+b)\neq\emptyset$ for all $a,b\in A$, then $\mathrm{stnd}(B)\subseteq{}^\omega 2\times{}^\omega 2$ is a Σ^0_2 set which contains a $|A|$–square but no perfect square. Thus Corollary 4.6 is a slight generalization of Shelah [6, Theorem 1.13].

5. Open questions

Problem 5.1. Is it consistent that for every Borel set $B \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$,

if there is $H \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ of size $\aleph_1$ such that $|(B+x) \cap (B+y)| \geq 6$ for all $x, y \in H$,
then there is a perfect set P such that $|(B+x) \cap (B+y)| \geq 6$ for all $x, y \in P$?

(Compare this with Proposition 3.3(3).)

Problem 5.2. Is is consistent to have a Borel set $B \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ such that

- for some uncountable set H, $(B+x) \cap (B+y)$ is uncountable for every $x, y \in H$, but
- for every perfect set P there are $x, y \in P$ with $(B+x) \cap (B+y)$ countable?

Problem 5.3. Is it consistent to have a Borel set $B \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ such that

- B has uncountably many pairwise disjoint translations, but
- there is no perfect of pairwise disjoint translations of B. ?

References

[1] Marek Balcerzak, Andrzej Roslanowski, and Saharon Shelah. Ideals without ccc. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 63:128–147, 1998. arxiv:math.LO/9610219.

[2] Tomek Bartoszyński and Haim Judah. *Set Theory: On the Structure of the Real Line.* A K Peters, Wellesley, Massachusetts, 1995.

[3] Thomas Jech. *Set theory.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.

[4] Andrzej Rosłanowski and Vyacheslav V. Rykov. Not so many non-disjoint translations, submitted. arxiv:1711.04058.

[5] Andrzej Rosłanowski and Saharon Shelah. Borel sets without perfectly many overlapping translations, II. In progress.

[6] Saharon Shelah. Borel sets with large squares. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 159:1–50, 1999. arxiv:math.LO/9802134.

[7] Piotr Zakrzewski. On Borel sets belonging to every invariant ccc σ–ideal on $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 141:1055–1065, 2013.

Department of Mathematics, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, NE 68182-0243, USA

Email address: aroslanowski@unomaha.edu

Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 91904 Jerusalem, Israel, and Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08854, USA

Email address: shelah@math.huji.ac.il

URL: http://shelah.logic.at