

Petr Simon

Sacks forcing collapses \mathfrak{c} to \mathfrak{b}

Commentationes Mathematicae Universitatis Carolinae, Vol. 34 (1993), No. 4, 707--710

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/118627>

Terms of use:

© Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, 1993

Institute of Mathematics of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.



This paper has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* <http://project.dml.cz>

Sacks forcing collapses \mathfrak{c} to \mathfrak{b}

PETR SIMON

Abstract. We shall prove that Sacks algebra is nowhere $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c})$ -distributive, which implies that Sacks forcing collapses \mathfrak{c} to \mathfrak{b} .

Keywords: perfect tree, distributivity of Boolean algebra, almost disjoint refinement

Classification: Primary 03C25; Secondary 03E25, 06A07, 06E05

A. Roslanowski and S. Shelah recently proved that Sacks forcing \mathbb{S} collapses \mathfrak{c} to $\mathfrak{b}^{+\epsilon}$ [RS]. The aim of the present note is to prove the theorem from the title. Since Roslanowski and Shelah showed also the consistency of the inequality $\mathfrak{b}^{+\epsilon} > \mathfrak{b}$, our theorem improves that result and answers a question from their paper. To put the things to the right perspective, let us mention first that PFA implies that Sacks forcing does not collapse cardinals at all [A]. Next, it is consistent that $\text{MA}+\neg\text{CH}$ holds (hence $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{c} > \omega_1$) and \mathfrak{c} is still collapsed to ω_1 [JMS, Theorem 2.1]. Hence the question, whether \mathbb{S} collapses \mathfrak{c} below \mathfrak{b} is undecidable.

Let us start with some definitions. A *binary tree* is a subset of $\bigcup_{n \in \omega} {}^n 2$ such that $\emptyset \in T$ and whenever $s \in T$ and $n \in \text{dom } s$, then $s \upharpoonright n \in T$. There is a natural partial order of elements of a tree given by \subseteq . For a (binary) tree T , a subset $V \subseteq T$ is called a *branch*, if V is a maximal linearly ordered subset of T .

A binary tree T is called *perfect*, if it satisfies the following: For every $s \in T$ there are $q, r \in T$, $q \neq r$ both extending s , i.e., $s \subseteq q$, $s \subseteq r$. Notice that in a perfect tree, all branches are infinite.

A Sacks forcing is a partially ordered set \mathbb{S} of all perfect trees ordered by inclusion. Since every partially ordered set determines uniquely a complete Boolean algebra, we shall use the same symbol \mathbb{S} to denote the complete Boolean algebra, whose dense subset is isomorphic to the set of all perfect trees.

Let us recall a three-parameter distributivity of Boolean algebras. Suppose that \mathcal{B} is a Boolean algebra, κ, λ, μ are cardinal numbers. \mathcal{B} is called to be (κ, λ, μ) -distributive, if for every collection $\{P_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ of partitions of $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}$ with $|P_\alpha| \leq \lambda$ for all $\alpha \in \kappa$ there is a partition of unity Q such that for every $q \in Q$ and for every $\alpha \in \kappa$, $|\{p \in P_\alpha : q \wedge p \neq \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}\}| < \mu$. A bit stronger property than just the negation of being (κ, λ, μ) -distributive, is the following. A Boolean algebra \mathcal{B} is (κ, λ, μ) -nowhere distributive, if there is some collection $\{P_\alpha : \alpha \in \kappa\}$ of partitions of $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}}$ with $|P_\alpha| \leq \lambda$ for all $\alpha \in \kappa$ such that for every non-zero $q \in \mathcal{B}$ there is some $\alpha \in \kappa$ such that $|\{p \in P_\alpha : q \wedge p \neq \mathbf{0}_{\mathcal{B}}\}| \geq \mu$. It is well-known and easy to prove

*Research supported by Grant Agency of Charles University no. 350.

that if $\kappa < \mu$ and \mathcal{B} is (κ, μ, μ) -nowhere distributive, then forcing with \mathcal{B} changes the cofinality of μ to κ . If moreover the density of \mathcal{B} does not exceed μ , then forcing with \mathcal{B} collapses μ to κ .

Before stating the Theorem, let us note that the letter \mathfrak{c} stands for the cardinal 2^ω and the cardinal number \mathfrak{b} is defined by $\mathfrak{b} = \min\{|\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega \text{ \& } \mathcal{F} \text{ has no upper bound in the order } < \text{ mod } \text{fin}\}$.

Theorem. *The Boolean algebra \mathbb{S} is $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c})$ -nowhere distributive.*

To begin the proof of the theorem, we shall introduce some notation and observe several easy facts.

If $n < m$ are integers, we shall denote by $[n, m)$ the set of all integers i satisfying $n \leq i < m$. Two infinite sets are called *almost disjoint*, if their intersection is finite.

If $T \in \mathbb{S}$, define a mapping $f_T \in {}^\omega\omega$ by induction as follows. $f_T(0) = 0$. If $f_T(n)$ is known, then $f_T(n+1)$ is the minimal $k \in \omega$ such that for every $s \in T$ with $\text{dom } s = f_T(n)$ there are at least two distinct $r, q \in T$ satisfying $\text{dom } r = \text{dom } q = k$, $s \subseteq r$, $s \subseteq q$.

If T is a binary tree and if $A \subseteq \omega$, we shall denote by $T[A]$ the subtree of T defined by induction on nodes. $\emptyset \in T[A]$; if $s \in T[A]$ and $\text{dom } s = n$, then we distinguish two cases: If $n \in A$, then $r \in T[A]$ for all $r \in T$ with $\text{dom } r = n+1$ and $r \supseteq s$. If $n \notin A$ and $s \frown 0 \in T$, then $s \frown 0 \in T[A]$ but $s \frown 1 \notin T[A]$; if $s \frown 0 \notin T$, then $s \frown 0 \notin T[A]$ and $s \frown 1 \in T[A]$ only if $s \frown 1 \in T$. So $s \in T[A]$ branches in $T[A]$ only if $\text{dom } s \in A$ and s branches in T .

The symbols f_T and $T[A]$ will have the meaning just described till the end of the proof. Let us notice without proofs a few observations concerning the notions just introduced.

Fact 1. Let $T \in \mathbb{S}$ and suppose that $A \in [\omega]^\omega$ satisfies $A \supseteq [f_T(n), f_T(n+1))$ for infinitely many $n \in \omega$. Then $T[A] \in \mathbb{S}$.

Fact 2. Let T_0, T_1 be binary trees, A_0, A_1 subsets of ω . Then $T_0[A_0] \cap T_1[A_1] = (T_0 \cap T_1)[A_0 \cap A_1]$.

An immediate consequence of Fact 2 is the next Fact 3. The trivial Fact 4 is mentioned for the sake of completeness.

Fact 3. If $A, B \subseteq \omega$ are almost disjoint, then for arbitrary binary trees T_0, T_1 , $T_0[A] \cap T_1[B] \notin \mathbb{S}$.

Fact 4. Let $\{R_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a pairwise disjoint family of finite sets. If $A, B \in [\omega]^\omega$ are almost disjoint, then so are the sets $\bigcup_{n \in A} R_n$ and $\bigcup_{n \in B} R_n$.

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a partition of ω . We shall denote by $\mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R})$ the set of all subsets of ω , which are large if measured by \mathcal{R} , precisely, $\mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R}) = \{X \subseteq \omega : \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |X \cap R_n| = \infty\}$. Two facts are necessary to be mentioned:

Fact 5. Let $X \in [\omega]^\omega$ be arbitrary, let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ be a family without an upper bound consisting of strictly increasing functions. Then there is an $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $X \in \mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R})$ for $\mathcal{R} = \{[f(n), f(n+1)) : n \in \omega\}$.

Indeed, one may write $X = \{x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n < \dots\}$ and put $g(n) = x_{n^2}$. By the assumption, the mapping g does not dominate the family \mathcal{F} , so there is

some $f \in \mathcal{F}$ with $f(n) \geq g(n)$ for infinitely many integers n . We may assume that $f(0) = 0$. If $K \in \omega$ is arbitrary, find $n > K$ with $g(n) \leq f(n)$. The number of intervals $[f(j), f(j+1))$ covering the interval $[0, f(n))$ is n , but $[0, f(n))$ contains at least n^2 points of X . So $|X \cap [f(j), f(j+1))| \geq n > K$ for some $j < n$. As all sets $[f(n), f(n+1))$ are finite, $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |X \cap [f(n), f(n+1))| = \infty$.

Fact 6. Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_n : n \in \omega\}$ be a partition of ω . Then there is a family $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\omega]^\omega$ such that:

- (i) \mathcal{A} is almost disjoint;
- (ii) every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is a transversal of \mathcal{R} , i.e., $|A \cap R_n| \leq 1$ for each $n \in \omega$;
- (iii) for every $X \in \mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R})$, the set $\{A \in \mathcal{A} : A \subseteq X\}$ is of size \mathfrak{c} .

Fact 6 is a special case of more general Theorem 4.6 from [BS]. This fact is rather nontrivial; we shall not indicate a proof here.

For the proof of the Theorem, fix a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\omega\omega$ such that \mathcal{F} has no upper bound, all mappings in \mathcal{F} are strictly increasing, all $f \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfy $f(0) = 0$ and $|\mathcal{F}| = \mathfrak{b}$.

We shall assign to every $T \in \mathbb{S}$ two mappings from \mathcal{F} and a subset of ω : By Fact 5, there is a mapping $h_T \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\text{rng } f_T \in \mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R})$, where $\mathcal{R} = \{[h_T(n), h_T(n+1)) : n \in \omega\}$. Since $\text{rng } f_T \in \mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{R})$, we conclude that the set X_T defined by $X_T = \{n \in \omega : |[h_T(n), h_T(n+1)) \cap \text{rng } f_T| \geq 2\}$ is infinite. Applying once more Fact 5, we can find the second mapping $g_T \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $X_T \in \mathcal{J}^+(\mathcal{Q})$, where \mathcal{Q} stands now for the partition $\{[g_T(n), g_T(n+1)) : n \in \omega\}$.

In order to prove the Theorem, we need to find the family of partitions witnessing the $(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{c})$ -nowhere distributivity of \mathbb{S} . We shall use as an index set the square $\mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$ and, instead of a partition of unity, we shall find only a subset of the desired partition, having the required properties. (It should be clear that this suffices.) For $(h, g) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$, denote by $\mathbb{S}(h, g)$ the set of all perfect trees $T \in \mathbb{S}$ satisfying $h_T = h, g_T = g$. Consider a partition $\mathcal{R}(g) = \{[g(n), g(n+1)) : n \in \omega\}$. Using Fact 6, there is an almost disjoint family \mathcal{A} satisfying (i), (ii) and (iii). Since $|\mathbb{S}(h, g)| \leq \mathfrak{c}$, one may choose for each $T \in \mathbb{S}(h, g)$ a subset $\mathcal{A}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ such that for each $A \in \mathcal{A}(T)$, $A \subseteq X_T$, $|\mathcal{A}(T)| = \mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathcal{A}(T) \cap \mathcal{A}(T') = \emptyset$ for $T \neq T'$, $T, T' \in \mathbb{S}(h, g)$.

For $A \in \mathcal{A}$, let $B_A = \bigcup_{n \in A} [h(n), h(n+1))$. The desired disjoint family $P_{(h, g)}$ will be now the set of all $T[B_A]$ for $T \in \mathbb{S}(h, g)$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}(T)$.

By Fact 6 (i), by Fact 4 and by Fact 3, $P_{(h, g)}$ is pairwise disjoint. By Fact 1, all members from $P_{(h, g)}$ are perfect trees. Finally, every tree $T \in \mathbb{S}(h, g)$ contains all $T[B_A]$ for $A \in \mathcal{A}(T)$, so by Fact 6 (iii), T meets \mathfrak{c} many members from $P_{(h, g)}$.

To conclude the proof notice that, by Fact 5, for every perfect tree T there is a pair $(h, g) \in \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{F}$ with $T \in \mathbb{S}(h, g)$. \square

REFERENCES

- [A] Abraham U., *A minimal model for $\neg CH$: iteration of Jensen's reals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **281** (1984), 657–674.
- [BS] Balcar B., Simon P., *Disjoint Refinement*, in: Handbook of Boolean Algebra, Elsevier Sci. Publ. (1989), 333–386.

- [JMS] Judah H., Miller A.W., Shelah S., *Sacks forcing, Laver forcing and Martin's axiom*, Arch. Math. Logic **31** (1992), 145–161.
- [RS] Rosłanowski A., Shelah S., *More forcing notions imply diamond*, (preprint January 4, 1993).
- [S] Sacks G.E., *Forcing with perfect closed sets*, Axiomatic set theory, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **13** (1971), 331–355.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, SOKOLOVSKÁ 83, 18600 PRAHA 8,
CZECH REPUBLIC

(Received April 20, 1993)