

Subalgebras of Cohen algebras need not be Cohen

Sabine Koppelberg and Saharon Shelah

0 Introduction

Let us denote by \mathbb{C}_κ the standard Cohen algebra of π -weight κ , i.e. the complete Boolean algebra adjoining κ Cohen reals, where κ is an infinite cardinal or 0. More generally, we call a Boolean algebra A a Cohen algebra if (for technical convenience in Theorems 0.3 and 0.4 below) it satisfies the countable chain condition and forcing with A (more precisely with the partial ordering $A \setminus \{0\}$) is equivalent to Cohen forcing, i.e. if every generic extension of the universe of set theory arising from forcing with A arises from forcing with some standard Cohen algebra. Since forcing with an arbitrary Boolean algebra is equivalent to forcing with its completion and forcing with a product of algebras is equivalent to forcing with one of the factors, an algebra is Cohen iff its completion is isomorphic to a product of at most countably many standard Cohen algebras; we will use this description as the definition of a Cohen algebra in the rest of the paper.

Cohen algebras are among the most important objects to be studied in the realm of Boolean algebras or forcing. There is a general feeling that more or less “every” algebraic property of the standard Cohen algebras is well-known; similarly, the effect of adding Cohen reals to a given model of set theory is, generally, quite well understood. It is therefore quite surprising that the answer to an apparently innocent question was open, up to now; cf. Problem 5.2 in [Koppelberg, 1993].

Definition 0.1 (Problem). If B is a regular subalgebra of some Cohen algebra A , does it follow that B is Cohen?

The first reference to this problem we are aware of is in Kamburelis’s paper [Kamburelis, 1989]. By Example 5.5 in [Koppelberg, 1993], the assumption that B be regular in A cannot be disposed with.

We make some simple observations which somewhat restrict the problem (cf. [Koppelberg, 1993]). First, both A and B may be assumed to be complete; moreover A may be assumed to be a standard Cohen algebra

\mathbb{C}_κ . Finally, κ may be assumed to be at least ω_2 , by Proposition 5.4 in [Koppelberg, 1993]. Thus the following theorem, the unique result of the paper, is the strongest result one can hope for.

Theorem 0.2 *For every $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, \mathbb{C}_κ has a complete regular subalgebra of π -weight κ which is not Cohen.*

Let us mention that several beautiful internal descriptions of Cohen algebras were proved in recent years, based on Shapiro's theorem (cf. [Shapiro, 1986], [Shapiro, 1987]) that every subalgebra of a free Boolean algebra is Cohen; see Section 1 for all unexplained notions. Two of these are given below; they will, however, not be applied in the present paper.

Theorem 0.3 ([Koppelberg, 1993], 0.3) *A Boolean algebra is Cohen iff it is the union of a continuous chain $(A_\alpha)_{\alpha < \rho}$ where ρ is any ordinal, $\pi(A_0) \leq \omega$, A_α is a regular subalgebra of $A_{\alpha+1}$ and $\pi(A_{\alpha+1}/A_\alpha) \leq \omega$.*

The following is a reformulation of a result due to Bandlow ([Bandlow, 1994]).

Theorem 0.4 *A Boolean algebra A is Cohen iff there is a club subset \mathbb{S} of $[A]^\omega$ such that the elements of \mathbb{S} are subalgebras of A and, for every subset T of \mathbb{S} , the subalgebra of A generated by $\bigcup T$ is regular in A .*

We now give a survey of the proof of our theorem and explain the organization of the paper. In fact, what we show is a result on forcing: we find a Boolean extension V^{Q^0} of the universe V of set theory which is not Cohen, but some Boolean extension $V^{Q^0 * Q^1}$ of V^{Q^0} is. — After reviewing some material on Boolean algebras and forcing in Section 1, we will define forcings Q^0 , Q^1 , P^0 , and P^1 , most of which depend on the cardinal κ given in the Main Theorem as a parameter. More precisely, we define Q^0 in Section 2 and list some of its basic properties. In Section 3, we prove that for $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, Q^0 respectively its associated complete Boolean algebra $B(Q^0)$ is not Cohen. We define Q^1 in Section 4, P^0 and P^1 in Section 5; moreover, we find dense subsets D_Q of the iteration $Q^0 * Q^1$ of Q^0 and Q^1 , respectively D_P of $P^0 * P^1$, and prove that $P^0 * P^1$ is Cohen. Finally in Section 6, we prove that D_Q and D_P are isomorphic.

This proves the Theorem, because of the following well-known facts on the connection between partial orderings P and their associated Boolean algebras $B(P)$. For D a dense subset of P , $B(D)$ is isomorphic to $B(P)$; thus $B(Q^0 * Q^1)$ is isomorphic to $B(P^0 * P^1)$ and $B(Q^0 * Q^1)$ is Cohen. Q^0 is completely contained in the iteration $Q^0 * Q^1$ and thus $B(Q^0)$ is completely embeddable into the Cohen algebra $B(Q^0 * Q^1)$, but $B(Q^0)$ was not Cohen.

Both iterations $Q^0 * Q^1$ and $P^0 * P^1$ will adjoin the same generic objects (\underline{f} and, for each $\alpha \in \kappa$, functions $\underline{t}_\alpha : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ and $\underline{x}_\alpha : \omega \rightarrow 2$), but in different order; this is why $B(P^0 * P^1)$ is isomorphic to $B(Q^0 * Q^1)$. The functions \underline{t}_α , $\alpha \in \kappa$, will be almost disjoint in the sense that for $\alpha \neq \beta$, $\underline{t}_\alpha(i) \neq \underline{t}_\beta(i)$ will hold for almost all i . And the generic objects will be

connected as follows. Denote by B the binary tree of height ω and by $\text{lev}_i B$ its i 'th level. For $i \in \omega$, let a_i be a subset of ω of size $|\text{lev}_i B| = 2^i$ (for ease of notation, a_i will later be the set $\{0, \dots, 2^i - 1\}$, but this is neither important nor necessary for the proof). f will be a function from B into ω mapping $\text{lev}_i B$ onto a_i ; for every $\alpha \in \kappa$, t_α and x_α will be connected by f in such a way that for almost all i , $t_\alpha(i) = f(x_\alpha \upharpoonright i)$. Now the branches $\{x_\alpha \upharpoonright i : i \in \omega\}$ through B induced by the x_α are almost disjoint, and this causes the t_α to be almost disjoint. In fact, this line of argument reflects the standard construction of a family of 2^ω almost disjoint subsets of ω out of the branches of a binary tree: if we choose the sets a_i to be pairwise disjoint, then even the sets $\text{ran } t_\alpha$, $\alpha \in \kappa$, will be almost disjoint.

The fact that Q^0 is not Cohen can be partially explained by a combinatorial principle forced by Q^0 , as observed by Soukup ([Juhász *et al.*, 1996]). Call an almost disjoint family A of subsets of ω a κ -Luzin gap if $|A| = \kappa$ and there is no $X \subseteq \omega$ such that both $\{a \in A : a \text{ is almost contained in } X\}$ and $\{a \in A : a \text{ is almost contained in } \omega \setminus X\}$ have size κ . Now Q^0 forces that $\{\text{ran } t_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ is a κ -Luzin gap. On the other hand, if $\kappa = \omega_2$ and CH holds in the ground model, then Cohen's partial order $Fn(\kappa, 2)$ forces that there is no κ -Luzin gap.

The paper uses basic notions and results on forcing respectively two-step iterated forcing in the proof of Proposition 3.2 and in Sections 4 and 5. It is however possible to give an elementary proof which deals only with partial orderings and their associated Boolean algebras: Proposition 3.2 is provable without forcing, as explained in Section 3. In Section 4, one can define the partial ordering D_Q by Proposition 5.5 (plus Proposition 5.4) and then check that the map $e : Q^0 \rightarrow B(D_Q)$ given by $e(p) = \sum^{B(D_Q)} \{(p', q') \in D_Q : p' \text{ extends } p, \text{ in } Q^0\}$ is a complete embedding. A similar argument gives a complete embedding from P^0 into $B(D_P)$, and it can be checked in an elementary way that $B(D_P)$ is Cohen.

The first author wants to thank several colleagues for gentle pressure and constant encouragement during the untimely long preparation of the paper, in particular Sakaé Fuchino, Lutz Heindorf, and Bohuslav Balcar, and Lajos Soukup for several enlightening remarks on the final version.

1 Preliminaries

For unknown results or unexplained notions, cf. [Jech, 1978] and [Jech, 1989] in set theory, [Koppelberg, 1989] in Boolean algebras.

Definition 1.1 (Boolean algebras). The finitary Boolean operations are denoted by $+$, \cdot , and $-$, the infinitary ones by \sum and \prod . 0 and 1 are the distinguished elements.

For a Boolean algebra D , D^+ is the set $D \setminus \{0\}$ of non-zero elements of

D . For $X \subseteq D$, $\langle X \rangle$ (respectively $\langle X \rangle^{cm}$) is the subalgebra of D generated by X (respectively completely generated by X , if D is complete).

$B \leq D$ denotes that B is a subalgebra of D . B is a regular subalgebra of D if all infinite sums and products of subsets of B that happen to exist in B are preserved in D .

Definition 1.2 (Dense subsets of Boolean algebras). A subset P of D is dense in D if for every $d \in D^+$ there is $p \in P$ such that $0 < p \leq d$, i.e. every element of D is the least upper bound of some subset of P . $\pi(D)$, the π -weight of D , is the minimal size of a dense subset of D . More generally for $B \leq D$, the relative π -weight of D over B , $\pi(D/B)$, is defined as $\min \{|A| : A \subseteq D \text{ and } A \cup B \text{ generates a dense subalgebra of } D\}$; replacing A by a subalgebra of D including A , we can assume that A is a subalgebra of D . In this case $\{a \cdot b : a \in A, b \in B\} \setminus \{0\}$ is dense in $\langle A \cup B \rangle$, so $\langle A \cup B \rangle$ is dense in D iff, for every $d \in D^+$, there are $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ such that $0 < a \cdot b \leq d$. Moreover, if A and B are regular subalgebras of D and $P_A \subseteq A$, $P_B \subseteq B$, $P_D \subseteq D$ are dense and $P_A \cup P_B \subseteq P_D$, then $\langle A \cup B \rangle$ is dense in D iff for every $q \in P_D$ there are elements $p \in P_A$ and $p' \in P_B$ such that $p \cdot p' > 0$ and for every $r \in P_D$, if $r \leq p$ and $r \leq p'$, then $r \leq q$; this is because every element of A respectively B is the sum of a subset of P_A respectively P_B .

If A and B are complete and regular subalgebras of D and $A \leq B \leq D$, then $\pi(B/A) \leq \pi(D/A)$. This is proved as follows. Choose a subalgebra E of D such that $|E| = \pi(D/A)$ and $\langle A \cup E \rangle$ is dense in D . Then consider the set $F = \{h(e) : e \in E\}$ where $h : D \rightarrow B$ denotes the projection map given by $h(d) = \min \{b \in B : b \geq d\}$ from D to B . Then $|F| \leq \pi(D/A)$ and it is easily checked that $\langle A \cup F \rangle$ is dense in B .

For a partially ordered set (P, \leq_P) , we write $B(P)$ for its associated Boolean algebra or completion, i.e. $B(P)$ is the unique complete Boolean algebra B such that there is an embedding $i : P \rightarrow B$ with $i[P]$ dense in B ; cf. [Kunen, 1980] II.3.3. Caused by the notation on forcing used in Definition 1.3, we assume that i is order-reversing. Moreover, i is one-one and satisfies $p \leq_P q$ iff $i(q) \leq_B i(p)$, for all $p, q \in P$, iff P is separative, i.e. for p and q satisfying $p \not\leq_P q$, there is $r \in P$ such that $q \leq_P r$ and r is incompatible with p . In this case, we will think about P as being a dense subset of $B(P)$.

Definition 1.3 (Forcing). When dealing with notions of forcing (P, \leq) , $p \leq q$ means that the condition q is stronger than p . For an arbitrary cardinal κ , $F_n(\kappa, 2)$ is the forcing which adjoins κ Cohen reals, i.e. a condition in $F_n(\kappa, 2)$ is a function p from some finite subset of κ into 2 , and $p \leq q$ holds iff $p \subseteq q$. We call its completion $\mathbb{C}_\kappa = B(F_n(\kappa, 2))$ the standard Cohen algebra of π -weight κ , since $\pi(\mathbb{C}_\kappa) = \kappa$. \mathbb{C}_κ is also the completion of the free Boolean algebra over κ generators; this is the definition used in

[Koppelberg, 1993]. As usual in the literature, we will also call a forcing P Cohen if $B(P)$ is isomorphic to some standard Cohen algebra.

Definition 1.4 (Two-step iterated forcing). Let us recall the general version of two-step iterated forcing. If (P, \leq_P) is a partial ordering in the ground model V and $(Q, \leq_Q) \in V^P$ is a P -name for a partial ordering (i.e. if $P \Vdash \text{“}(Q, \leq_Q) \text{ is a partial ordering”}$), then the iteration $P * Q$ of P and Q is the partial ordering (in V) defined as follows. The elements of $P * Q$ are certain pairs (p, q) where $p \in P$, $q \in \text{dom } Q$ (thus $q \in V^P$) and $p \Vdash q \in Q$. And $(p, q) \leq (p', q')$ holds in $P * Q$ if $p \leq_P p'$ and $p' \Vdash q \leq_Q q'$.

When applying this in Sections 4 and 5, we will deal with a simpler situation: we will have a set N in V such that $P \Vdash Q \subseteq \check{N}$. If $(p, q) \in P * Q$, let us say that p decides q if, for some $n \in N$, $p \Vdash q = \check{n}$. Here \check{n} is the canonical name for $n \in V$ in V^P ; we will usually write n for \check{n} . We call the subset

$$\text{stp}_N(P * Q) = \{(p, q) : p \in P, q \in N, p \Vdash q \in Q\}$$

of $P * Q$ the standard part of $P * Q$ relative to N . This is a dense subset of $P * Q$, hence their associated Boolean algebras are isomorphic. We will omit the subscript N and, if convenient, tacitly pass to a dense subset of $\text{stp}(P * Q)$ and still call it the standard part of $P * Q$.

Note that if p decides $q (= \check{n})$ and if, e.g., n is, in V , a function, then p also decides the domain, the range, and the values of q since the statements “ $u = \text{dom } n$ ”, “ $v = \text{ran } n$ ”, “ $i \in u = \text{dom } n$ and $j = n(i)$ ” are Δ_0 , hence absolute for V and V^P .

Definition 1.5 (Some definitions for Sections 2 to 6). We fix some notation which will be used throughout the paper.

For $n \in \omega$, let $a_n = 2^n = \{0, \dots, 2^n - 1\} \subseteq \omega$.

T is the tree of height ω with n 'th level $\text{lev}_n T$ the set of those functions t from n to ω such that, for $i < n$, $t(i) \in a_i$, i.e. $\text{lev}_n T = a_0 \times \dots \times a_{n-1}$. B is the binary tree of height ω with $\text{lev}_n B$ the set of all functions from n to 2. In both cases, the tree ordering is set-theoretic inclusion.

For M a set of sequences with common domain some $n \leq \omega$ and $k \leq n$, we say that the elements of M are disjoint above k if for every $i \in [k, n)$, the values $m(i)$, $m \in M$, are pairwise distinct.

2 Simple properties of Q_X^0

Our investigation of the forcing Q^0 will use, more generally, the forcings Q_X^0 where X is an arbitrary set (or, in section 3, a subset of some cardinal $\kappa \geq \omega_2$). Q^0 will simply be the special case Q_X^0 where $X = \kappa$. In this section, we collect some basic properties of the Q_X^0 .

Definition 2.1 For any set X , the forcing Q_X^0 is defined as follows. An element of Q_X^0 is a function p with $\text{dom } p$ a finite subset of X such that, for some $n \in \omega$ (the *height* of p , $\text{ht } p$):

- (a) $|\text{dom } p| \leq a_n$
- (b) writing t_α^p for $p(\alpha)$: each t_α^p , $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$, is an element of $\text{lev}_n T$, i.e. $t_\alpha^p(i) \in a_i$ for $i < n$
- (c) $\text{dom } p = \emptyset$ implies $\text{ht } p = 0$ and $\text{dom } p \neq \emptyset$ implies $\text{ht } p \geq 2$ (this is only for technical convenience).

For p and q in Q_X^0 , $p \leq q$ iff

- (d) $\text{dom } p \subseteq \text{dom } q$ and $\text{ht } p \leq \text{ht } q$
- (e) for $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$, $t_\alpha^p \subseteq t_\alpha^q$
- (f) the t_α^q , $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$, are disjoint above $\text{ht } p$.

Lemma 2.2 (and Definition). *For every $k \in \omega$, the set $\{q : \text{ht } q \geq k\}$ is dense in Q_X^0 . Also for every $\alpha \in X$, $\{q : \alpha \in \text{dom } q\}$ is dense in Q_X^0 . It follows that, if $G \subseteq Q_X^0$ is Q_X^0 -generic over the ground model V and we put $t_{\alpha G} = \bigcup \{t_\alpha^p : p \in G \text{ and } \alpha \in \text{dom } p\}$ for $\alpha \in X$, each $t_{\alpha G}$ is an element of the cartesian product $\prod_{i \in \omega} a_i$.*

PROOF. Obvious. For the first claim, note that this is where (a) of Definition 2.1 is used; for the second one, enlarge first the height of a given condition in Q_X^0 , if necessary, and then the domain. ■

The subsequent propositions will use the following criterion for compatibility in Q_X^0 .

Proposition 2.3 *Assume p and q are in Q_X^0 and $\text{ht } p \leq \text{ht } q$. Then p and q are compatible in Q_X^0 iff*

- (a) for $\alpha \in \text{dom } p \cap \text{dom } q$, $t_\alpha^p \subseteq t_\alpha^q$
- (b) the t_α^q , $\alpha \in \text{dom } p \cap \text{dom } q$, are disjoint above $\text{ht } p$.

PROOF. Obvious. ■

Corollary 2.4 Q_X^0 *satisfies the countable chain condition.*

PROOF. By the usual Δ -system lemma argument. ■

The next proposition says that we can think of Q_X^0 as being a dense subset of its associated Boolean algebra $B_X = B(Q_X^0)$.

Proposition 2.5 Q_X^0 *is separative.*

PROOF. Assume p and q are in Q_X^0 and $p \not\leq q$. We will find $r \in Q_X^0$ such that $q \leq r$ and r is incompatible with p . Without loss of generality, we may assume that p and q are compatible.

Case 1. $\text{dom } p \not\subseteq \text{dom } q$. Fix $\alpha \in \text{dom } p \setminus \text{dom } q$. We will choose $r \geq q$ such that $\text{dom } r = \text{dom } q \cup \{\alpha\}$, $\text{ht } r > \text{ht } q$, and $|\text{dom } r| \leq a_{\text{ht } r}$. More

precisely, take $t_\alpha^r \in a_0 \times \dots \times a_{\text{ht } r-1}$ such that $t_\alpha^r(1) \neq t_\alpha^p(1)$ (recall Definition 2.1(c) and $a_1 = 2$). For $\beta \in \text{dom } q$, let $t_\beta^r \in \text{lev}_{\text{ht } r}$ extend t_β^q in such a way that all $t_\beta^r(i)$, $\text{ht } \leq i < \text{ht } r$, are distinct.

Case 2. $\text{dom } p \subseteq \text{dom } q$, but $\text{ht } q < \text{ht } p$. $\text{ht } p > 0$, so by Definition 2.1(c), also $\text{dom } p \neq \emptyset$; fix $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$. Now take $r \geq q$ such that $\text{dom } r = \text{dom } q$, $\text{ht } r = \text{ht } p$, and $t_\alpha^r(\text{ht } q) \neq t_\alpha^p(\text{ht } q)$; thus r and p are incompatible. This is possible since $\text{dom } q \neq \emptyset$ (so $\text{ht } q \geq 2$) and $a_{\text{ht } q} \geq 2$.

Case 3. $\text{dom } p \subseteq \text{dom } q$ and $\text{ht } p \leq \text{ht } q$. p and q are compatible, so by Proposition 2.3, we have that for every $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$, $t_\alpha^p \subseteq t_\alpha^q$ and the t_α^p , $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$, are disjoint above $\text{ht } p$. But then $p \leq q$, a contradiction. ■

In the two subsequent propositions, we use the following construction. Every permutation h of X induces an automorphism \bar{h} of the partial ordering Q_X^0 by letting, for $p \in Q_X^0$, $\text{dom } \bar{h}p = h[\text{dom } p]$, $\text{ht } \bar{h}p = \text{ht } p$, and, for $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$, $t_{h(\alpha)}^{\bar{h}p} = t_\alpha^p$. Moreover, we call a forcing Q *weakly homogeneous* if for arbitrary p and q in Q , there are p' and q' in Q such that $p \leq p'$, $q \leq q'$, and $Q \upharpoonright p'$ is isomorphic to $Q \upharpoonright q'$, where $Q \upharpoonright r = \{x \in Q : x \geq r\}$, for $r \in Q$.

Proposition 2.6 Q_X^0 is weakly homogeneous, for infinite X .

PROOF. Let p and q in Q_X^0 be given. Fix a permutation h of X such that $h[\text{dom } q]$ is disjoint from $\text{dom } p$. By Proposition 2.3, there is a common extension r of p and $\bar{h}(q)$. Now $r \geq \bar{h}(q)$, $h^{-1}(r) \geq q$, and $Q_X^0 \upharpoonright r$ is isomorphic to $Q_X^0 \upharpoonright \bar{h}^{-1}(r)$. ■

Proposition 2.7 Assume X is infinite and $X \subseteq Y$. Then Q_X^0 is completely contained in Q_Y^0 (cf. [Kunen, 1980] VII.7.1 for this notion).

PROOF. Clearly, Q_X^0 is a subordering of Q_Y^0 , and, by Proposition 2.3, two elements of Q_X^0 are compatible in Q_X^0 iff they are in Q_Y^0 . Thus assume $p' \in Q_Y^0$ with the aim of finding $p \in Q_X^0$ such that every extension of p in Q_X^0 is compatible with p' .

Write $\text{dom } p' = r \cup s'$ where $r \subseteq X$ and $s' \subseteq Y \setminus X$. Then choose a subset s of X disjoint from r such that $|s| = |s'|$ and a permutation h of Y satisfying $h \upharpoonright r = \text{id}$ and $h \upharpoonright s' = s$. We will show that $p = \bar{h}(p')$ works for our claim; note that $\text{dom } p = r \cup s$.

In fact, assume that $q \in Q_X^0$ extends p ; say $\text{dom } q = r \cup s \cup u$ where u is disjoint from $r \cup s$. Choose another permutation k of Y such that k and h^{-1} coincide on $\text{dom } p$ and k maps u onto a subset u' of Y disjoint from $\text{dom } q$. Clearly $q' = \bar{k}(q)$ extends p' ; thus it suffices to prove that q and q' are compatible. But $\text{ht } q = \text{ht } q'$, $\text{dom } q \cap \text{dom } q' = r$, and for every $\alpha \in r$, we have $k(\alpha) = \alpha$ and thus $t_\alpha^q = t_\alpha^{q'}$. ■

3 Q^0 is not Cohen

We prove in this section that the forcing $Q^0 = Q_\kappa^0$ is not Cohen, for $\kappa \geq \omega_2$, i.e. its associated Boolean algebra $B(Q^0)$ is not Cohen. The ideas lying behind the proof are from [Koppelberg, 1993] (cf. Theorem 0.1 in the introduction), i.e. essentially from Shapiro's proof that subalgebras of free algebras are Cohen, but we give a completely self-contained presentation here. The main argument in the proof is the following lemma. We have not tried to minimize its assumptions since they are so naturally satisfied in the intended application.

Lemma 3.1 *Assume that $\kappa \geq \omega_2$ is a cardinal and that, for every subset X of κ , we are given two separative partial orderings P_X and Q_X with the following properties. We write $A_X = B(P_X)$, $B_X = B(Q_X)$, and assume that P_X is a dense subset of A_X ; similarly for Q_X and B_X .*

- (a) P_X and Q_X satisfy the countable chain condition
 - (b) $X \subseteq Y \subseteq \kappa$ implies that $P_X \subseteq P_Y$ and P_X is completely contained in P_Y (so without loss of generality, A_X is a regular subalgebra of A_Y); similarly for $Q_X \subseteq Q_Y$ and $B_X \leq B_Y$
 - (c) $P_X = \bigcup \{P_e : e \subseteq X \text{ finite}\}$; similarly for Q_X
 - (d) $|P_X| \leq |X|$ for infinite X ; similarly for Q_X
 - (e) for $X, Y \subseteq \kappa$, $A_{X \cup Y}$ is completely generated by $A_X \cup A_Y$; similarly for $B_{X \cup Y}$
 - (f) if Y is countable, then $\pi(A_{X \cup Y}/A_X) \leq \omega$.
- Assume B_κ is isomorphic to A_κ . Then there is a club subset \mathbb{C} of $[\kappa]^{\omega_1}$ such that*
- (g) for $X \in \mathbb{C}$ and $Y \subseteq \kappa$ countable, $\pi(B_{X \cup Y}/B_X) \leq \omega$.

We will apply Lemma 3.1 to the situation where $P_X = Fn(X, 2)$ is standard Cohen forcing and $Q_X = Q_X^0$ as defined in Definition 2.1. (a) through (f) of Lemma 3.1 are clearly satisfied for the forcings P_X , and (a) through (d) hold for Q_X , by the results of Section 2. We prove in the subsequent lemmas that the Q_X satisfy (e), but not (g) — hence $B(Q_\kappa^0)$ is not isomorphic to $B(Fn(\kappa, 2))$.

PROOF of Lemma 3.1. For convenience of notation, we assume that A_κ and B_κ are the same Boolean algebra D ; so for $X \subseteq \kappa$, A_X and B_X are regular subalgebras of D .

Call a subset M of D nice if there is a regular complete subalgebra C of D such that M is a dense subset of C . (E. g., P_X and Q_X are nice.) In this case, C is uniquely determined by M since $C = \{\sum^D M_0 : M_0 \subseteq M\}$ and we write $C = C(M)$.

For M and N subsets of D , we say that M is dense for N if for every $n \in N$, there is $M_0 \subseteq M$ such that $n = \sum^D M_0$. Thus if M and N are nice, $C(M) = C(N)$ iff M is dense for N and N is dense for M .

Define

$$\mathbb{C} = \{X \subseteq \kappa : |X| = \omega_1, P_X \text{ is dense for } Q_X \text{ and } Q_X \text{ is dense for } P_X\}.$$

It follows from the assumptions (a), (c), and (d) that \mathbb{C} is club in $[\kappa]^{\omega_1}$. And for $X \in \mathbb{C}$, we have $A_X = B_X$.

To check (g), assume X is an element of \mathbb{C} and $Y \subseteq \kappa$ is countable. By (a), (c), and (d) again, we find a countable $Z \subseteq \kappa$ such that P_Z is dense for Q_Y ; so $B_Y \leq A_Z$. Now by (e),

$$A_X = B_X \leq B_{X \cup Y} = \langle B_X \cup B_Y \rangle^{\text{cm}} \leq \langle A_X \cup A_Z \rangle^{\text{cm}} = A_{X \cup Z}$$

and $\pi(A_{X \cup Z}/A_X) \leq \omega$ holds by (f). It follows from 1.2 that

$$\pi(B_{X \cup Y}/B_X) \leq \omega.$$

■

For the rest of this section, fix a cardinal $\kappa \geq \omega_2$ and write, for $X \subseteq \kappa$:

$$B_X = B(Q_X^0),$$

a regular subalgebra of B_κ . We proceed to show that assumption (e) of Lemma 3.1 holds for the B_X , but (g) fails. In B_κ , note that B_X has Q_X^0 as set of complete generators, since Q_X^0 is a dense subset of B_X and thus every element of B_X is (in B_κ) the join of some subset of Q_X^0 .

The details of the following proof may be unnecessary for a reader experienced with forcing. On the other hand, the use of forcing can be avoided, at the price of a little more computation and less insight: simply define $b_{\alpha ij}$ to be $\sum N_{\alpha ij}$ (where $N_{\alpha ij}$ is as in the proof of Claim 1 below); this makes Claim 1 trivial. For Claim 2, just prove that, for $p \in Q_X^0$ with domain u and height n :

$$p = \prod \{b_{\alpha ij} : \alpha \in u, i < n, t_\alpha^p(i) = j\} \cdot \prod \{-(b_{\beta ij} \cdot b_{\gamma ij}) : \beta \neq \gamma \text{ in } u, i \geq n, j \in a_i\}.$$

Proposition 3.2 *For $X, Y \subseteq \kappa$, $B_{X \cup Y}$ is completely generated by $B_X \cup B_Y$.*

PROOF. For $\alpha \in \kappa$, $i \in \omega$, and $j \in a_i$, let $\sigma_{\alpha ij}$ be the sentence “ $t_\alpha(i) = j$ ” of the forcing language over Q_κ^0 and let $b_{\alpha ij}$ be its Boolean truth value $\|\sigma_{\alpha ij}\|$, computed in B_κ . Here t_α is (the canonical name for) the generic object introduced in Lemma 2.2; we do not distinguish notationally between

α, i, j in the ground model and their canonical names $\check{\alpha}, \dots$ in the forcing language.

For $X \subseteq \kappa$, consider the set $M_X = \{b_{\alpha ij} : \alpha \in X, i \in \omega, j \in a_i\}$, and the subsequent claims.

Claim 1. $M_X \subseteq B_X$.

Claim 2. M_X completely generates B_X .

Now clearly $M_{X \cup Y} = M_X \cup M_Y$, and thus the proposition follows from the claims.

To prove the claims, recall the basic fact on the connection between forcing and Boolean-valued models (cf. [Jech, 1978] p. 166): for $p \in Q_\kappa^0$ and σ a sentence of the forcing language over Q_κ^0 ,

$$p \Vdash \sigma \text{ iff } p \leq_B \|\sigma\|.$$

Here we write \leq_B for the Boolean partial ordering. All joins and meets below are computed in B_κ .

Proof of Claim 1. We prove that for $\alpha \in X$, $i \in \omega$, $j \in a_i$, we have $b_{\alpha ij} = \sum N_{\alpha ij}$ where $N_{\alpha ij} = \{p \in Q_{\{\alpha\}}^0 : \text{dom } p = \{\alpha\}, \text{ht } p > i, t_\alpha^p(i) = j\}$. Here, \geq is obvious since every $p \in N_{\alpha ij}$ forces $\sigma_{\alpha ij}$. Assume for contradiction that $b_{\alpha ij}$ is (in B_κ) strictly greater than $\sum N_{\alpha ij}$. Then there is some $q \in Q_\kappa^0$ forcing $\sigma_{\alpha ij}$ but incompatible with all $p \in N_{\alpha ij}$. By extending q , we may assume that $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$ and $i < \text{ht } q$. Consider $k = t_\alpha^q(i)$. Now $k \neq j$: otherwise, let p be the restriction of q with domain $\{\alpha\}$ and height $i+1$. Then $p \in N_{\alpha ij}$ and q extends p in Q_κ^0 ; a contradiction since q was incompatible with all $p \in N_{\alpha ij}$. - It follows that $q \Vdash t_\alpha(i) = k \neq j$ and thus $q \Vdash \neg \sigma_{\alpha ij}$, a contradiction.

Proof of Claim 2. It suffices to show that $Q_X^0 \subseteq B_X$ is completely generated by M_X . So let $p \in Q_X^0$, say with domain u and height n , and consider the set of sentences of the forcing language

$$\Sigma_p = \{\sigma_{\alpha ij} : \alpha \in u, i < n, t_\alpha^p(i) = j\} \cup \{\neg(\sigma_{\beta ij} \wedge \sigma_{\gamma ij}) : \beta \neq \gamma \text{ in } u, i \geq n, j \in a_i\}.$$

The Boolean value of each $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$ is clearly generated by $M_u \subseteq M_X$, thus it suffices to prove that $p = \prod \{\|\sigma\| : \sigma \in \Sigma_p\}$, i. e. that for each $q \in Q_\kappa^0$, q extends p iff $q \Vdash \Sigma_p$ (where $q \Vdash \Sigma_p$ means that $q \Vdash \sigma$, for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_p$). Here, \Rightarrow is clear since $p \Vdash \Sigma_p$, by (f) of Definition 2.1. Conversely, assume for contradiction that $q \Vdash \Sigma_p$ but q does not extend p . By applying Proposition 2.5 and extending q , we may assume that q is incompatible with p , $u \subseteq \text{dom } q$ and $n \leq \text{ht } q$. By Proposition 2.3, we have to distinguish two cases. Either there are $\alpha \in u$ and $i < n$ such that $t_\alpha^p(i) \neq t_\alpha^q(i)$; then $q \Vdash \neg \sigma_{\alpha ij}$ where $j = t_\alpha^p(i)$, contradiction. Or there are $i \in [n, \text{ht } q]$ and $\beta \neq \gamma$ in u such that $t_\beta^p(i) = t_\gamma^p(i)$; then $q \Vdash \sigma_{\beta ij} \wedge \sigma_{\gamma ij}$ where $j = t_\beta^p(i)$, a contradiction again. ■

The example given in Proposition 3.4 below is the crucial fact responsible for the failure of (g) in Lemma 3.1 for the algebra B_κ . We need another easy lemma on the forcings Q_X^0 for this.

Lemma 3.3 *Let X and Y be arbitrary sets and assume that $p \in Q_X^0$ and $p' \in Q_Y^0$ are compatible in $Q_{X \cup Y}^0$, $k \in \omega$, $\alpha \in X$, and $\beta \in Y$. Then there are compatible $q \in Q_X^0$ and $q' \in Q_Y^0$ such that: $p \leq q$, $p' \leq q'$, $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$, $\beta \in \text{dom } q'$, and $\text{ht } q = \text{ht } q' \geq k$.*

PROOF. In $Q_{X \cup Y}^0$, take a common extension r of p and p' . By extending r , we may assume that $\text{ht } r \geq k$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \text{dom } r$. Then let q respectively q' be the restrictions of r to $\text{dom } p \cup \{\alpha\}$ respectively $\text{dom } p' \cup \{\beta\}$. ■

Proposition 3.4 *Let T be a proper subset of X and let Y be a non-empty set disjoint from X . Then, for some $q \in Q_{X \cup Y}^0$, there are no compatible*

$p \in Q_X^0$ and $p' \in Q_{T \cup Y}^0$ such that every common extension of p and p' extends q .

PROOF. Fix elements $\alpha \in X \setminus T$, $\beta \in Y$; thus $\alpha \in X$, $\beta \in Y$, and $\alpha \neq \beta$. Let q be an arbitrary element of $Q_{X \cup Y}^0$ satisfying $\text{dom } q = \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

Assume for contradiction that we have compatible $p \in Q_X^0$ and $p' \in Q_{T \cup Y}^0$ such that every common extension of p and p' extends q . Applying Lemma 3.3 and extending p and p' if necessary, we may assume that $\alpha \in \text{dom } p$, $\beta \in \text{dom } p'$, $\text{ht } p = \text{ht } p' = m \geq \text{ht } q$, and $w = \text{dom } p \cup \text{dom } p'$ has size at most a_m .

We choose a common extension $r \in Q_{X \cup Y}^0$ of p and p' as follows: put $\text{dom } r = w$ and $\text{ht } r = m + 1$. We are left with defining $t_\gamma^r(m)$, for all $\gamma \in w$. Simply define these values such that: all $t_\gamma^r(m)$, $\gamma \in \text{dom } p$, are distinct; all $t_\gamma^r(m)$, $\gamma \in \text{dom } p'$, are distinct; but $t_\alpha^r(m) = t_\beta^r(m)$. This is possible since $\alpha \in \text{dom } p \setminus \text{dom } p'$ and $\beta \in \text{dom } p' \setminus \text{dom } p$.

By our assumption above, r must extend q . But this is not the case, since α, β are distinct elements of $\text{dom } q$, $m \in [\text{ht } q, \text{ht } r)$, and $t_\alpha^r(m) = t_\beta^r(m)$. ■

Corollary 3.5 *Assume $X \subseteq \kappa$ is uncountable and $Y \subseteq \kappa$ is nonempty and disjoint from X . Then $\pi(B_{X \cup Y}/B_X)$ is uncountable.*

PROOF. If not, we can find a countable subset C of $B_{X \cup Y}$ such that $B_X \cup C$ generates a dense subalgebra of $B_{X \cup Y}$. Choose a countable subset T of X such that $C \subseteq B_{T \cup Y}$; the subalgebra generated by $B_X \cup B_{T \cup Y}$ is still dense in $B_{X \cup Y}$. A remark in 1.2, applied to $B_X, B_{T \cup Y} \leq B_{X \cup Y}$, gives that for every $q \in Q_{X \cup Y}^0$, there are compatible $p \in Q_X^0$ and $p' \in Q_{T \cup Y}^0$ such that every common extension of p and p' (in $Q_{X \cup Y}^0$) extends q . But this contradicts Proposition 3.4. ■

Theorem 3.6 $B_\kappa (= B(Q_\kappa^0))$ is not Cohen, for $\kappa \geq \omega_2$.

PROOF. Assume it is. It is easily checked that $\pi(B_\kappa) = \kappa$. Also B_κ is weakly homogeneous, by Proposition 2.6; thus B_κ must be isomorphic to the standard Cohen algebra \mathbb{C}_κ of π -weight κ .

By Lemma 3.1, there is some $X \in [\kappa]^{\omega_1}$ such that for every countable $Y \subseteq \kappa$, $\pi(B_{X \cup Y}/B_X) \leq \omega$, contradicting Corollary 3.5. ■

4 Q^1 and a dense subset of $Q^0 * Q^1$

For the remaining sections, let κ be an arbitrary cardinal and put, as before, $Q^0 = Q_\kappa^0$. Following the plan in the introduction, we will define a forcing

Q^1 in V^{Q^0} , i.e. a Q^0 -name Q^1 such that $Q^0 \Vdash$ “ Q^1 is a partial ordering”, describe the standard part of $Q^0 * Q^1$ and find a dense subset of the standard part. The definition of Q^1 will use the generic functions $\underline{t}_{\alpha G} : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ defined in Lemma 2.2 for $\alpha \in \kappa$ respectively their canonical Q^0 -names \underline{t}_α . Recall from Definition 1.5 the definitions concerning the trees B and T and the numbers a_n .

Definition 4.1 (In V^{Q^0}) An element of Q^1 is a pair $q = (f^q, (x_\alpha^q)_{\alpha \in u})$ such that for some finite $u \subseteq \kappa$ (the domain of q , $\text{dom } q$) and some $m \in \omega$ (the height of q , $\text{ht } q$):

(a) f^q maps $\bigcup_{i < m} \text{lev}_i B$ into ω ; for $i < m$, $f^q \upharpoonright \text{lev}_i B$ is a bijection from $\text{lev}_i B$ onto a_i (note $a_i = 2^i = |\text{lev}_i B|$)

(b) the x_α^q , $\alpha \in u = \text{dom } q$, are pairwise distinct elements of $\text{lev}_m B$ (and thus $|\text{dom } q| \leq 2^m = a_m$)

(c) the \underline{t}_α , $\alpha \in u = \text{dom } q$, are disjoint above $m = \text{ht } q$.

For q and q' in Q^1 , $q \leq q'$ iff

(d) $\text{dom } q \subseteq \text{dom } q'$ and $\text{ht } q \leq \text{ht } q'$

(e) $f^q \subseteq f^{q'}$ and, for $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$, $x_\alpha^q \subseteq x_\alpha^{q'}$

(f) for $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$ and $i \in [\text{ht } q, \text{ht } q')$, $\underline{t}_\alpha(i) = f^{q'}(x_\alpha^{q'} \upharpoonright i)$.

For H Q^1 -generic over V^{Q^0} , we obtain the generic objects $\underline{f}_H = \bigcup \{f^q : q \in H\}$, a map from the binary tree B into ω which maps the i 'th level of B in a one-one manner onto a_i , and, for $\alpha \in \kappa$, $\underline{x}_{\alpha H} = \bigcup \{x_\alpha^q : q \in H \text{ and } \alpha \in \text{dom } q\} : \omega \rightarrow 2$. They are related to the generic objects $\underline{t}_{\alpha G}$ adjoined by Q^0 by the fact that, for almost all $i \in \omega$ (we omit the subscripts G and H), $\underline{t}_\alpha(i) = \underline{f}(\underline{x}_\alpha \upharpoonright i)$.

Let us describe the standard part $\text{stp}(Q^0 * Q^1)$ of $Q^0 * Q^1$. All conditions defining the elements of respectively the partial order on Q^1 in Definition 4.1 deal with objects in V or are absolute, except (c). But for $p \in Q^0$, $u \subseteq \text{dom } p$ finite, and $m \leq \text{ht } p$, p forces the \underline{t}_α , $\alpha \in u$, to be disjoint above m iff the \underline{t}_α^p , $\alpha \in u$, are disjoint above m (i.e. disjoint on the interval $[m, \text{ht } p)$). This is because p forces that the \underline{t}_α , $\alpha \in u$, are disjoint above $\text{ht } p$.

Proposition 4.2 *The elements of $\text{stp}(Q^0 * Q^1)$ are those pairs (p, q) such that $p \in Q^0$ and q is a pair $(f^q, (x_\alpha^q)_{\alpha \in u})$ where $u \subseteq \text{dom } p$, $m = \text{ht } q \leq \text{ht } p$ satisfying (in V) (a) and (b) of Definition 4.1, plus*

(c) the \underline{t}_α^p , $\alpha \in u$, are disjoint above m .

For (p, q) and (p', q') in $\text{stp}(Q^0 * Q^1)$, $(p, q) \leq (p', q')$ iff (d) and (e) of Definition 4.1 hold, plus

(f) for $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$ and $i \in [\text{ht } q, \text{ht } q')$, $\underline{t}_\alpha^{p'}(i) = f^{q'}(x_\alpha^{q'} \upharpoonright i)$.

Proposition 4.3 *The following subset of $\text{stp}(Q^0 * Q^1)$ is dense in $\text{stp}(Q^0 * Q^1)$, hence in $Q^0 * Q^1$.*

$$D_Q = \{(p, q) \in \text{stp}(Q^0 * Q^1) : \text{dom } p = \text{dom } q \text{ and } \text{ht } p = \text{ht } q\}.$$

PROOF. Let $(p, q) \in \text{stp}(Q^0 * Q^1)$ be given; we find q' such that (p, q') is in D_Q and extends (p, q) . Write $v = \text{dom } p \supseteq u = \text{dom } q$, $n = \text{ht } p \geq m = \text{ht } q$.

First pick, for $\alpha \in v$, an element $x_\alpha^{q'}$ of $\text{lev}_n B$ such that:

- (a) the $x_\alpha^{q'}$, $\alpha \in v$, are pairwise distinct
- (b) for $\alpha \in u$, $x_\alpha^q \subseteq x_\alpha^{q'}$.

This is possible since the x_α^q , $\alpha \in u$, are distinct in $\text{lev}_m B$ and $|\text{lev}_n B| = 2^n = a_n \geq |v|$ (cf. Definition 2.1(a)). Then define, for $m \leq i < n$, the bijection $f^{q'} \upharpoonright \text{lev}_i B \rightarrow a_i$ such that, if $x \in \text{lev}_i B$ happens to be $x_\alpha^{q'} \upharpoonright i$ for some $\alpha \in u$, $f^{q'}(x) = t_\alpha^p(i)$. This works since the $x_\alpha^{q'} \upharpoonright i$, $\alpha \in u$, are distinct (recall $m \leq i$ and the x_α^q , $\alpha \in u$ are distinct), and the $t_\alpha^p(i)$, $\alpha \in u$, are distinct by Proposition 4.2.(c). ■

5 P^0 , P^1 , and a dense subset of $P^0 * P^1$

We define here the forcings P^0 (in V) and P^1 (in V^{P^0}), describe the standard part of $P^0 * P^1$ and find a dense subset of the standard part. The central property of the construction is that, on one hand, $P^0 * P^1$ is easily seen to be Cohen and, on the other hand, P^0 and P^1 adjoin the same generic objects (a function \underline{f} and, for each $\alpha \in \kappa$, functions $\underline{t}_\alpha : \omega \rightarrow \omega$ and $\underline{x}_\alpha : \omega \rightarrow 2$) as Q^0 and Q^1 ; this is why $B(P^0 * P^1)$ is isomorphic to $B(Q^0 * Q^1)$.

Definition 5.1 An element of P^0 is a function f such that for some $n \in \omega$ (the height of f , $\text{ht } f$):

- (a) f maps $\bigcup_{i < n} \text{lev}_i B$ into ω and for $i < n$, $f \upharpoonright \text{lev}_i B$ is a bijection from $\text{lev}_i B$ onto a_i .

For f and f' in P^0 :

- (b) $f \leq f'$ iff $f \subseteq f'$ (and hence $\text{ht } f \leq \text{ht } f'$).

Thus for K P^0 -generic over V , $\underline{f}_K = \bigcup K$ is a map from the tree B into ω , mapping the i 'th level of B in a one-one manner onto a_i . Using the canonical name \underline{f} for the generic function \underline{f}_K , we can define the forcing P^1 in V^{P^0} .

Definition 5.2 (In V^{P^0}) P^1 is the finite-support product of the forcings P_α^1 , $\alpha \in \kappa$, defined as follows. An element of P_α^1 is a pair $q_\alpha = (x_\alpha^{q_\alpha}, t_\alpha^{q_\alpha})$ such that for some $m_\alpha \in \omega$ (the height of q_α , $\text{ht } q_\alpha$):

- (a) $x_\alpha^{q_\alpha} \in \text{lev}_{m_\alpha} B$ and $t_\alpha^{q_\alpha} \in \text{lev}_{m_\alpha} T$.

For q_α and q'_α in P_α^1 , $q_\alpha \leq q'_\alpha$ iff

- (b) $\text{ht } q_\alpha \leq \text{ht } q'_\alpha$, $x_\alpha^{q_\alpha} \subseteq x_\alpha^{q'_\alpha}$ and $t_\alpha^{q_\alpha} \subseteq t_\alpha^{q'_\alpha}$
- (c) for $i \in [\text{ht } q_\alpha, \text{ht } q'_\alpha)$, $t_\alpha^{q'_\alpha}(i) = \underline{f}(x_\alpha^{q'_\alpha} \upharpoonright i)$.

Remark 5.3 The forcing P^0 is Cohen, since it is countable and every element has two incompatible extensions. For the same reason, each P^1_α is Cohen (in V^{P^0}), hence P^1 is Cohen in V^{P^0} . It follows that $P^0 * P^1$ is Cohen.

Proposition 5.4 *The elements of $\text{stp}(P^0 * P^1)$ are those pairs (f, q) such that $f \in P^0$, $q = (x_\alpha^q, t_\alpha^q)_{\alpha \in w}$ where $w (= \text{dom } q)$ is a finite subset of κ , and there are natural numbers n_α , $\alpha \in w$, such that, for $\alpha \in w$:*

(a) *$\text{ht } f \geq n_\alpha$, $x_\alpha^q \in \text{lev}_{n_\alpha} B$, and $t_\alpha^q \in \text{lev}_{n_\alpha} T$ (we write $n_\alpha = \text{ht } x_\alpha^q = \text{ht } t_\alpha^q$).*

*For (f, q) and (f', q') in $\text{stp}(P^0 * P^1)$, $(f, q) \leq (f', q')$ iff*

(b) *$\text{ht } f \leq \text{ht } f'$, $\text{dom } q \subseteq \text{dom } q'$, and, for $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$, $\text{ht } x_\alpha^q \leq \text{ht } x_\alpha^{q'}$*

(c) *$f \subseteq f'$*

(d) *for $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$, $x_\alpha^q \subseteq x_\alpha^{q'}$ and $t_\alpha^q \subseteq t_\alpha^{q'}$*

(e) *for $\alpha \in \text{dom } q$ and $i \in [\text{ht } x_\alpha^q, \text{ht } x_\alpha^{q'})$, $t_\alpha^q(i) = f'(x_\alpha^{q'} \upharpoonright i)$.*

Proposition 5.5 *The following subset of $\text{stp}(P^0 * P^1)$ is dense in $\text{stp}(P^0 * P^1)$, hence in $P^0 * P^1$.*

$$D_P = \{(f, q) \in \text{stp}(P^0 * P^1) : \text{for all } \alpha \in \text{dom } q, \text{ht } x_\alpha^q (= \text{ht } t_\alpha^q) = \text{ht } f, \\ \text{and the } x_\alpha^q, \alpha \in \text{dom } q, \text{ are pairwise distinct}\}.$$

PROOF. Let $(f, q) \in \text{stp}(P^0 * P^1)$ be given; say with $\text{ht } f = n$, $\text{dom } q = w$, and $\text{ht } x_\alpha^q = \text{ht } t_\alpha^q = n_\alpha$, for $\alpha \in w$. We will find $(f', q') \in D_P$ extending (f, q) such that $\text{dom } q' = w$ and $\text{ht } f' = \text{ht } x_\alpha^{q'} = \text{ht } t_\alpha^{q'} = N$, where N is sufficiently large.

To this end, put $m = \max \{n_\alpha : \alpha \in w\}$ and take N so large that $m \leq N$ and $|w| \leq 2^{N-m}$. Thus we can choose, for $\alpha \in w$, $x_\alpha^{q'} \in \text{lev}_N B$ such that $x_\alpha^q \subseteq x_\alpha^{q'}$ and the $x_\alpha^{q'}$, $\alpha \in w$, are pairwise distinct. Fix an arbitrary extension f' of f in P^0 of height N . Finally define $t_\alpha^{q'} \supseteq t_\alpha^q$ for $\alpha \in w$ by $t_\alpha^{q'}(i) = f'(x_\alpha^{q'} \upharpoonright i)$, for $i \in [n_\alpha, N)$. ■

6 Conclusion

According to the sketch of proof given in the introduction, we are left with showing that the dense subsets D_P of $P^0 * P^1$ and D_Q of $Q^0 * Q^1$ given in Sections 4 and 5 are isomorphic. This is straightforward, since D_P is the following partial order (cf. Propositions 5.4, 5.5). An element ρ of D_P is, for some finite $u \subseteq \kappa$ and some $m \in \omega$, a sequence $\rho = (f, (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in u}, (t_\alpha)_{\alpha \in u})$ where

1. f maps $\bigcup_{i < m} \text{lev}_i B$ into ω ; for $i < m$, $f \upharpoonright \text{lev}_i B$ is a bijection from $\text{lev}_i B$ onto a_i
2. the x_α , $\alpha \in u$, are pairwise distinct elements of $\text{lev}_m B$

3. the t_α , $\alpha \in u$, are elements of $\text{lev}_m T$.

And for $\rho = (f, (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in u}, (t_\alpha)_{\alpha \in u})$ and $\sigma = (g, (y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in v}, (s_\alpha)_{\alpha \in v})$ (with domain v and height n) in D_P , $\rho \leq \sigma$ iff the following hold.

4. $u \subseteq v$ and $m \leq n$

5. $f \subseteq g$

6. for $\alpha \in u$, $x_\alpha \subseteq y_\alpha$ and $t_\alpha \subseteq s_\alpha$

7. for $\alpha \in u$ and $i \in [m, n)$, $s_\alpha(i) = g(y_\alpha \upharpoonright i)$.

Note that 2. implies that $|u| \leq a_m$; similarly, 2., 1., and 7. imply that the s_α , $\alpha \in u$, are disjoint above m . Thus, up to permutation of coordinates, D_Q is the same partial order (cf. Definition 4.1 and Propositions 4.2, 4.3).

References

- [Bandlow, 1994] I. Bandlow. Absolutes of compact spaces with minimal acting group. *Proceedings of American Math. Society*, 122:261–264, 1994.
- [Jech, 1978] T. Jech. *Set theory*. Academic Press, 1978.
- [Jech, 1989] T. Jech. *Multiple Forcing*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- [Juhász *et al.*, 1996] I. Juhász, Zs. Nagy, L. Soukup, and Z. Szentmiklóssy. Intersection properties of open sets, II. To appear in Proceedings of Tenth Summer Conference in General Topology and Applications, 1996.
- [Kamburelis, 1989] A. Kamburelis. *On cardinal numbers related to Baire property*. PhD thesis, Wrocław, 1989.
- [Koppelberg, 1989] S. Koppelberg. *General Theory of Boolean algebras. Handbook of Boolean algebras, Part I*. North-Holland, 1989.
- [Koppelberg, 1993] S. Koppelberg. Characterizations of Cohen algebras. In S. Andima, R. Kopperman, P.R. Misra, M.E. Rudin, and A.R. Todd, editors, *Papers on General Topology and Applications*, volume 704 of *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences*, pages 222–237. New York Academy of Sciences, 1993.
- [Kunen, 1980] Kenneth Kunen. *Set Theory*. North-Holland, 1980.
- [Shapiro, 1986] L. B. Shapiro. On spaces coabsolute to a generalized Cantor discontinuum. *Soviet Math. Doklady*, 33(3):870–874, 1986.
- [Shapiro, 1987] L. B. Shapiro. On spaces coabsolute to dyadic bicomacta. *Soviet Math. Doklady*, 35(2):434–438, 1987.