The Journal of Symbolic Logic
Volume 69, Number 3, Sept. 2004

ON SOME SMALL CARDINALS FOR BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

RALPH MCKENZIE AND J. DONALD MONK

Abstract. Assume that all algebras are atomless. (1) $\mathrm{Spind}(A \times B) = \mathrm{Spind}(A) \cup \mathrm{Spind}(B)$. (2) $\mathrm{Spind}(\prod^{\mathrm{w}}_{i\in I} A_i) = \{\omega\} \cup \bigcup_{i\in I} \mathrm{Spind}(A_i)$. Now suppose that κ and λ are infinite cardinals, with κ uncountable and regular and with $\kappa < \lambda$. (3) There is an atomless Boolean algebra A such that $\mathfrak{u}(A) = \kappa$ and $\mathfrak{i}(A) = \lambda$. (4) If λ is also regular, then there is an atomless Boolean algebra A such that $\mathfrak{t}(A) = \mathfrak{s}(A) = \kappa$ and $\mathfrak{a}(A) = \lambda$. All results are in ZFC, and answer some problems posed in Monk [01] and Monk [∞].

Introduction. First we define the cardinal functions considered in this paper. In these definitions, assume that A is an atomless Boolean algebra. A subset X of A *splits* A provided that for every nonzero $a \in A$ there is a $b \in X$ such that $a \cdot b \neq 0 \neq a \cdot -b$. A *partition of unity* of A is a collection X of nonzero pairwise disjoint elements of A with supremum 1. A *tower* is a subset X of $A\backslash\{1\}$ well-ordered by the Boolean ordering, with supremum 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{i}(A) &= \min\{|X| : X \text{ is a maximal independent subset of } A\};\\
\mathfrak{u}(A) &= \min\{|X| : X \text{ generates an ultrafilter of } A\};\\
\mathfrak{s}(A) &= \min\{|X| : X \text{ splits } A\};\\
\mathfrak{a}(A) &= \min\{|X| : X \text{ is an infinite partition of unity in } A\};\\
\mathfrak{t}(A) &= \min\{|X| : X \text{ is a tower in } A\};\\
\mathrm{Spind}(A) &= \{|X| : X \text{ is a maximal independent subset of } A\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The main results are then as indicated in the abstract. As a corollary of (1) we have $\mathfrak{i}(A \times B) = \min\{\mathfrak{i}(A), \mathfrak{i}(B)\}$. (1) answers questions raised in Monk [01] and Monk [∞]. With $A = \mathscr{P}(\omega)/\mathrm{fin}$, models M, N of ZFC in which $\mathfrak{u}(A) < \mathfrak{i}(A)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(A) < \mathfrak{a}(A)$ respectively hold have been known for a long time; see Blass, Shelah [87] and Balcar, Simon [89]. Thus a contribution here is a construction of such Boolean algebras in ZFC. The problems about obtaining such examples in ZFC were also raised in Monk [01]. In fact, the only inequality holding in all atomless Boolean algebras between the cardinal functions $\mathfrak{i}$, $\mathfrak{u}$, $\mathfrak{s}$, $\mathfrak{a}$, and $\mathfrak{t}$ is $\mathfrak{t} \leq \mathfrak{s}$; these two results, together with examples in Monk [01], establish this. All of these cardinal functions for Boolean algebras generalize known ones for $\mathscr{P}(\omega)/\mathrm{fin}$, and they are extensively discussed in Monk [01] and Monk [∞]. This article is self-contained, however.

Received December 11, 2002; revised January 30, 2004.

0022-4812/04/6903-0004/$1.90

Notation. Our set-theoretic notation is mostly standard. The complement of Y relative to X is denoted by $X\backslash Y$. For any function f and subset X of its domain, $f[X] = \{f(a) : a \in X\}$. For a cartesian product $A \times B$, the two projections are denoted by π_0 and π_1. A set is called *denumerable* iff it is countably infinite. The restriction of a function f to a subset D of its domain is denoted by $f \upharpoonright D$.

For Boolean algebras we follow the notation of Koppelberg [Kop89]. In particular, the fundamental operations of a Boolean algebra are denoted by $+, \cdot, -, 0, 1$. The free product of Boolean algebras A, B is denoted by $A \oplus B$. The subalgebra generated by a set X is $\langle X \rangle$. For an element $a \in A$ we let $a^1 = a$ and $a^0 = -a$. Given a subset X of A, a *monomial* over X, or X-*monomial*, is a product of the form $a_0^{\varepsilon(0)} \cdot \ldots \cdot a_{m-1}^{\varepsilon(m-1)}$ where $a_0, \ldots, a_{m-1}$ are distinct elements of X and each $\varepsilon(i)$ is 0 or 1. The *weak product* of a system $\langle A_i : i \in I \rangle$ of Boolean algebras is denoted by $\prod_{i \in I}^{\mathrm{w}} A_i$; it consists of all elements x of the full product such that either $\{i \in I : x_i \neq 0\}$ is finite or $\{i \in I : x_i \neq 1\}$ is finite. If B is a subalgebra of A and $a \in A$, then $B \upharpoonright a$ is the Boolean algebra with underlying set $\{b \cdot a : b \in B\}$ and operations $+, \cdot, 0, a$, and with the complement of an element c being $-c \cdot a$, with $-c$ the complement in A. Essential use will be made of the well-known fact that every free Boolean algebra satisfies c.c.c.

§1. Products and independence.

The first lemma is needed for the result (1) above.

LEMMA 1. *If A is countable and F is an infinite free BA, then $F \cong A \oplus F$.*

PROOF. Let X be a set of free generators of F, and write $X = Y_0 \cup Y_1$ with Y_0 denumerable and $Y_0 \cap Y_1 = \emptyset$. Then $F = \langle Y_0 \rangle \oplus \langle Y_1 \rangle$. Now $A \oplus \langle Y_0 \rangle$ is denumerable and atomless, and hence is isomorphic to $\langle Y_0 \rangle$. Hence the conclusion of the lemma follows. ⊣

THEOREM 2. *If A_0 and A_1 are atomless Boolean algebras, then* $\mathrm{Spind}(A_0 \times A_1) = \mathrm{Spind}(A_0) \cup \mathrm{Spind}(A_1)$.

PROOF. $\supseteq$ is easy. Suppose that $\kappa \in \mathrm{Spind}(A_0 \times A_1) \backslash (\mathrm{Spind}(A_0) \cup \mathrm{Spind}(A_1))$. First we show that $\kappa > \omega$. In fact, suppose that $\kappa = \omega$. Let X be a denumerable maximal independent subset of $A_0 \times A_1$. Then $\pi_0[X]$ is contained in a denumerable atomless subalgebra B of A_0, and since $\mathrm{i}(A_0) > \omega$ we get an element $a_0 \in A_0$ such that $\pi_0(b) \cdot a_0 \neq 0 \neq \pi_0(b) \cdot -a_0$ for every $b \in X$ such that $\pi_0(b) \neq 0$. Similarly we get an element $a_1 \in A_1$ such that $\pi_1(b) \cdot a_1 \neq 0 \neq \pi_1(b) \cdot -a_1$ for every $b \in X$ such that $\pi_1(b) \neq 0$. Then $(a_0, a_1) \notin X$ and $X \cup \{(a_0, a_1)\}$ is still independent, contradiction. Thus $\kappa > \omega$.

Let $X \subseteq A_0 \times A_1$ be maximal independent with $|X| = \kappa$. *Temporarily fix $j \in 2$.* We define

$$D_j = \{w : w \text{ is an } X\text{-monomial and } \pi_j(v) \neq 0 \text{ for every } X\text{-monomial } v \leq w\}.$$

Note that if $w \in D_j$ and v is an X-monomial such that $v \leq w$, then also $v \in D_j$.

(1) There is a X-monomial w such that $\pi_j(w) = 0$.

In fact, suppose not. Then $\langle \pi_j(a) : a \in X \rangle$ is an independent subset of A_j. Since A_j has no maximal independent subset of size κ, it follows that there is a $c \in A_j \backslash \{\pi_j(a) : a \in X\}$ such that $\langle \pi_j(a) : a \in X \rangle ^\frown \langle c \rangle$ is independent. Let $c' \in A_0 \times A_1$ be such that $\pi_j(c') = c$. Then $\langle a : a \in X \rangle ^\frown \langle c' \rangle$ is independent, contradicting the maximality of X. So (1) holds.

(2) If w is an X-monomial such that $\pi_j(w) = 0$, then $w \in D_{1-j}$.

For, suppose that v is a X-monomial with $v \leq w$ and $\pi_{1-j}(v) = 0$. Then $v = 0$, contradiction. So (2) holds.

(3) $D_j \neq \emptyset$.

This is true by (1) and (2) (since j is arbitrary).

(4) If w is an X-monomial and $w \notin D_j$, then there is an X-monomial $v \leq w$ such that $v \in D_{1-j}$.

For, choose an X-monomial $v \leq w$ such that $\pi_j(v) = 0$. Then $v \in D_{1-j}$ by (2).

Now let M_j be a maximal set of pairwise disjoint members of D_j. So, M_j is countable. Let X_j be a denumerable subset of X such that $M_j \subseteq \langle X_j \rangle$, and let $Y_j = X \backslash X_j$.

(5) There is an element b_j of $\langle X \rangle$ and a subalgebra C_j of $\langle X \rangle \restriction b_j$ such that C_j is free of size κ and the following conditions hold:
   (a) If $w \in D_j$, then there is a nonzero $v \in C_j$ such that $v \leq w$.
   (b) If c is a nonzero element of C_j, then there is a $w \in D_j$ such that $w \leq c$.

To prove this, we consider two cases.

CASE 1. M_j is infinite. Let $b_j = 1$. Let J_j be the ideal of $\langle X_j \rangle$ generated by M_j, and let B_j be the subalgebra of $\langle X_j \rangle$ generated by J_j. Note that $B_j = J_j \cup \{a \in \langle X_j \rangle : -a \in J_j\}$, so J_j is a maximal ideal in B_j. Let $C_j = \langle B_j \cup Y_j \rangle$. Now B_j is a denumerable BA, and $b \cdot c \neq 0$ whenever $0 \neq b \in B_j$ and $0 \neq c \in \langle Y_j \rangle$. Thus $C_j = B_j \oplus \langle Y_j \rangle$. So by Lemma 1, C_j is free. Clearly it has size κ.

To check (a), suppose that $w \in D_j$. By the maximality of M_j, there is a member r of M_j such that $w \cdot r \neq 0$. Note that $w \cdot r$ is an X-monomial. Now we can write $w \cdot r = s_0 \cdot s_1$ with s_0 an X_j-monomial and s_1 a Y_j-monomial. So $s_0 \leq r$, and hence s_0 is in J_j and hence is also in B_j. Hence $w \cdot r$ is a member of C_j. Hence (a) holds.

To check (b), suppose that c is a nonzero element of C_j. Choose d, e so that $d \in B_j$, d is an X_j-monomial, e is an Y_j-monomial, and $d \cdot e \leq c$. If $d \in J_j$, then there exist $r_0, \ldots, r_{m-1} \in M_j$ such that $d \leq r_0 + \cdots + r_{m-1}$. Wlog $d \cdot r_0 \neq 0$. So $d \cdot r_0 \cdot e$ is an X-monomial, $d \cdot r_0 \cdot e \leq r_0 \in M_j \subseteq D_j$, so $d \cdot r_0 \cdot e \in D_j$. Since $d \cdot r_0 \cdot e \leq c$, this is as desired.

On the other hand, suppose that $d \notin J_j$. Then $-d \in J_j$, and so we get members $r_0, \ldots, r_{m-1}$ of M_j such that $-d \leq r_0 + \cdots + r_{m-1}$. Since M_j is infinite, there is a member s of M_j different from each r_i, and hence $s \leq d$. Clearly then $s \in D_j$, so $s \cdot e \in D_j$, and $s \cdot e \leq c$, as desired.

CASE 2. M_j is finite. Let $b_j = \sum M_j$ and $B_j = \langle X_j \rangle \restriction b_j$. Then B_j is a denumerable atomless BA. Let C_j be the subalgebra of $\langle X \rangle \restriction b_j$ generated by $B_j \cup \{b_j \cdot y : y \in Y_j\}$. Again C_j is free of size κ by Lemma 1. Conditions (a) and (b) can be checked by easy modifications of the arguments in Case 1; they are in fact easier than in Case 1.

This completes the proof of (5).

(6) π_j is injective on C_j.

In fact, suppose that $c \in C_j$ and $c \neq 0$. By (5)(b), choose $w \in D_j$ such that $w \leq c$. Then by the definition of D_j we have $\pi_j(w) \neq 0$, and hence $\pi_j(c) \neq 0$.

Now since $\kappa \notin \mathrm{Spind}(A_j)$, it follows that also $\kappa \notin \mathrm{Spind}(A_j \restriction \pi_j(b_j))$. Since $\pi_j[C_j]$ is free and of size κ, its free generators do not form a maximal independent set. Hence we can choose $w_j \in (A_j \restriction \pi_j(b_j)) \backslash \pi_j[C_j]$ such that w_j is free over $\pi_j[C_j]$.

(7) $w_j \cdot \pi_j(d) \neq 0 \neq -w_j \cdot \pi_j(d)$ for all $d \in D_j$.

For, by (5)(a) choose a nonzero v in C_j such that $v \leq d$. Then $0 \neq w_j \cdot \pi_j(v) \leq w_j \cdot \pi_j(d)$, so $w_j \cdot \pi_j(d) \neq 0$. Similarly, $-w_j \cdot \pi_j(d) \neq 0$.

Now unfix j. Let $w = (w_0, w_1)$. Suppose that v is a X-monomial If $v \in D_0$, then $w \cdot v \neq 0 \neq -w \cdot v$ by (7). Suppose that $v \notin D_0$. By (4), choose an X-monomial $s \leq v$ such that $s \in D_1$. Then again $w \cdot v \neq 0 \neq -w \cdot v$ by (7).

This contradicts the maximality of X. ⊣

COROLLARY 3. *If A_0 and A_1 are atomless BAs, then* $\mathrm{i}(A_0 \times A_1) = \min(\mathrm{i}(A_0), \mathrm{i}(A_1))$.

THEOREM 4. *Suppose that I is an infinite set, and $\langle A_i : i \in I\rangle$ is a system of atomless BAs. Then*

$$\mathrm{Spind}\Big(\prod_{i \in I}^{\mathrm{w}} A_i\Big) = \{\omega\} \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathrm{Spind}(A_i).$$

PROOF. $\supseteq$ holds, using Proposition 8 of Monk [01]. For $\subseteq$, suppose to the contrary that $\kappa \in \left(\prod_{i \in I}^{\mathrm{w}} A_i\right) \backslash (\{\omega\} \cup \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathrm{Spind}(A_i))$. Let X be a maximal independent subset of $\prod_{i \in I}^{\mathrm{w}} A_i$ of size κ. Wlog for all $x \in X$ the set $F_x = \{i \in I : x(i) \neq 0\}$ is finite. Let Y be an uncountable subset of X such that $\langle F_x : x \in Y\rangle$ forms a Δ-system, say with kernel G. That is, $F_x \cap F_y = G$ for any two distinct members $x, y \in Y$. Obviously $G \neq \emptyset$.

(*) $\langle x \restriction G : x \in X\rangle$ is independent in $\prod_{i \in G} A_i$.

In fact, suppose that K is a finite subset of X and $\varepsilon \in {}^K2$. Choose distinct $x, z \in Y \backslash K$. Then $x \cdot z \cdot \prod_{y \in K} y^{\varepsilon(y)} \neq 0$, so $\prod_{y \in K}(y \restriction G)^{\varepsilon(y)} \neq 0$, as desired in (*).

By Theorem 2, there is an element w of $\prod_{i \in G} A_i$ such that $\langle x \restriction G : x \in X\rangle^\frown\langle w\rangle$ is independent. Let v be the member of $\prod_{i \in I}^{\mathrm{w}} A_i$ whose restriction to G is w, and with value 0 outside of G. For any finite subset K of X, any $\varepsilon \in {}^K2$, and any $\delta \in 2$, choose distinct $x, z \in Y \backslash K$; then

$$x \cdot z \cdot \prod_{y \in K} y^{\varepsilon(y)} \cdot v^\delta \neq 0.$$

But this contradicts the maximality of X. ⊣

The following problem remains open.

PROBLEM. If $\langle A_i : i \in I\rangle$ is a system of atomless Boolean algebras with I infinite, is $\mathrm{i}\left(\prod_{i \in I} A_i\right) = \min_{i \in I} \mathrm{i}(A_i)$?

§2. An atomless BA B such that $\mathrm{u}(B) < \mathrm{i}(B)$. More precisely, we show:

THEOREM 5. *Let κ and λ be cardinals, with $\kappa < \lambda$ and κ regular and uncountable. Then there is a BA B such that* $\mathrm{u}(B) = \kappa$ *and* $\mathrm{i}(B) = |B| = \lambda$.

PROOF. The construction goes as follows. Let A be free on the distinct generators

$$Y \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{x_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \cup \{y_{\alpha\beta} : \alpha < \kappa,\ \beta < \lambda\}.$$

Then let

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \{x_\beta \cdot -x_\alpha : \alpha < \beta < \kappa\}; \\ L &= \{x_\alpha \cdot -y_{\alpha\beta} : \alpha < \kappa,\ \beta < \lambda\}; \\ I &= \text{ ideal generated by } K \cup L; \\ B &= A/I. \end{aligned}$$

We denote the equivalence class of $a \in A$ under I by $[a]$. Let $u_\alpha = [x_\alpha]$ and $v_{\alpha\beta} = [y_{\alpha\beta}]$ for all $\alpha < \kappa$, $\beta < \lambda$. We make use of the following easy algebraic fact several times:

(1) If $c \in I$, then we can write $c \leq a + b$ with a a finite sum of elements of K and b a finite sum of elements of L.

(2) If $\alpha < \beta < \kappa$, then $u_\beta < u_\alpha$.

In fact, clearly $u_\beta \leq u_\alpha$, and if they are equal, then we can write $x_\alpha \cdot -x_\beta \leq a + b$ as in (1). Let f be the homomorphism of A into 2 such that $f(x_\gamma) = 1$ for all $\gamma \leq \alpha$, $f(x_\gamma) = 0$ for all $\gamma > \alpha$, and $f(y_{\gamma\delta}) = 1$ for all γ, δ. Applying f to the above inequality we get $1 \leq 0$, contradiction.

(3) $\{u_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ generates an ultrafilter on B.

This is obvious, using (2) to see that the indicated set does not contain 0.

(4) $\prod_{\alpha<\kappa} u_\alpha = 0$.

(We do not yet know that B is atomless, so (4) is not obvious.) To prove (4), suppose that w is a lower bound for $\{u_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$. By (3) there are two possibilities. First, w is in the indicated ultrafilter. Hence $u_\alpha \leq w$ for some α. Since $w \leq u_{\alpha+1}$, this contradicts (2). So, we must have $-w$ in the ultrafilter, so $u_\alpha \leq -w$ for some α. Hence $w \leq -u_\alpha$. But $w \leq u_\alpha$ too, so $w = 0$, as desired for (4).

(5) If $\alpha < \kappa$, $\beta, \gamma < \lambda$, and $\beta \neq \gamma$, then $v_{\alpha\beta} \neq v_{\alpha\gamma}$.

For, suppose that this is not true. Then we get a, b as above such that $y_{\alpha\beta} \triangle y_{\alpha\gamma} \leq a + b$, where $\triangle$ denotes symmetric difference. Mapping each x_δ to 0 and fixing each $y_{\delta\xi}$, we get an endomorphism f of A, and $0 \neq y_{\alpha\beta} \triangle y_{\alpha\gamma} = f(y_{\alpha\beta} \triangle y_{\alpha\gamma}) \leq 0$, contradiction. Thus (5) holds.

Now each $c \in B$ can be written in the form $\sum_{d \in S_c} [d]$, where S_c is a finite collection of Y-monomials, each $[d] \neq 0$. For each Y-monomial d, let

$$\begin{aligned} T_d = \{x_\alpha &: x_\alpha^\varepsilon \text{ is a term of } d \text{ for some } \varepsilon\} \\ &\cup \{y_{\alpha\beta} : y_{\alpha\beta}^\varepsilon \text{ is a term of } d \text{ for some } \varepsilon\}. \end{aligned}$$

(6) $\mathrm{u}(B) = \kappa$.

To prove this, suppose that X filter-generates an ultrafilter F, and $|X| < \kappa$; we want to get a contradiction. We may assume that X is closed under multiplication. Now $\bigcup_{c \in X} \bigcup_{d \in S_c} T_d$ has size less than κ, and κ is regular, so choose α greater than each index β such that x_β or $y_{\beta\gamma}$ is in this set for some γ. Since F is an ultrafilter and X filter-generates F and is closed under multiplication, there is a $c \in F$ and a $\varepsilon \in 2$ such that $c \cdot v_{\alpha 0}^\varepsilon = 0$. Take any $d \in S_c$. Then there are a, b as above such that $d \cdot y_{\alpha 0}^\varepsilon \leq a + b$. Let f be the homomorphism from A into B such that $f(x_\delta) = u_\delta$ for all $\delta < \alpha$, $f(x_\delta) = 0$ for all $\delta \geq \alpha$, $f(y_{\alpha 0}) = \varepsilon$, and $f(y_{\delta\xi}) = v_{\delta\xi}$ otherwise. Then the inequality gives $[d] = 0$, contradiction. So (6) holds.

By (6), B is atomless.

(7) $\mathrm{i}(B) = |B| = \lambda$.

By (5) we clearly have $|B| = \lambda$. Hence it suffices to take an independent subset Z of B with $|Z| < \lambda$, assume that Z is maximal, and get a contradiction.

Let $U = \bigcup_{c \in Z} \bigcup_{d \in S_c} T_d$. Note that $Z \subseteq \langle\{[u] : u \in U\}\rangle$.

(8) For each $\alpha < \kappa$ there is a Z-monomial w such that $w \leq u_\alpha$.

For, by (5) choose β such that

$$v_{\alpha\beta} \notin \langle\{[u] : u \in U\}\rangle.$$

So $Z \cup \{v_{\alpha\beta}\}$ is dependent, and hence there is a Z-monomial w and a $\delta \in 2$ such that $w \cdot v_{\alpha\beta}^\delta = 0$. Choose $t \in \langle U\rangle_A$ such that $w = [t]$. Note that $y_{\alpha\beta} \notin \langle U\rangle_A$. Then there are a, b as above such that $t \cdot y_{\alpha\beta}^\delta \leq a + b$. If $\delta = 1$, let f be the homomorphism from A into B such that $f(y_{\alpha\beta}) = 1$ and $f(s) = [s]$ for any $s \in Y \backslash \{y_{\alpha\beta}\}$. Then $f(t) = w$, and so $w = 0$, contradiction. So $\delta = 0$. Then let $f(y_{\alpha\beta}) = u_\alpha$ and $f(s) = [s]$ for any $s \in Y \backslash \{y_{\alpha\beta}\}$. The inequality gives $w \cdot -u_\alpha = 0$, proving (8).

(9) For every $\alpha < \kappa$ there exist a $\beta \in [\alpha, \kappa)$ and a Z-monomial w such that $w \leq u_\beta$, while for each $\gamma \in (\beta, \kappa)$ we have $w \not\leq u_\gamma$.

For, by (8) choose a Z-monomial w such that $w \leq u_\alpha$. Let $\beta = \sup\{\gamma < \kappa : w \leq u_\gamma\}$. By (2) and (4) we have $\alpha \leq \beta < \kappa$. It suffices now to show that $w \leq u_\beta$. Suppose not. Hence β is a limit ordinal and there is a $d \in S_w$ such that $[d] \neq 0$ and for each $\gamma \in [\beta, \kappa)$, the element x_γ is not a factor of d. Then choose $\varepsilon < \beta$ such that no x_γ with $\gamma \in [\varepsilon, \beta)$ is a factor of d. Now $[d] \leq u_\varepsilon$, so we get a, b as above such that $d \cdot -x_\varepsilon \leq a + b$. Let f be the homomorphism of A into B such that $f(x_\gamma) = u_\gamma$ for each $\gamma < \varepsilon$, $f(x_\gamma) = 0$ for all $\gamma \in [\varepsilon, \kappa)$, and $f(y_{\delta\xi}) = v_{\delta\xi}$ for all δ, ξ. Although there may be some $\gamma \in [\varepsilon, \kappa)$ such that $-x_\gamma$ is a factor of d, this still implies that $[d] = 0$, contradiction. Thus (9) holds.

We call a pair (w, β) *special* iff w and β satisfy the conclusion of (9). Since $w = w \cdot u_\beta$ in this case, wlog each $d \in S_w$ has exactly one factor x_γ, and for it, $\gamma \geq \beta$; d has at most one factor $-x_\delta$, and if it has such, then $\delta > \gamma$;and if $y_{\delta\xi}^\varepsilon$ is a factor, then $\delta > \gamma$.

Now an easy recursive definition gives sequences $\langle w_\xi : \xi < \kappa\rangle$ and $\langle \beta_\xi : \xi < \kappa\rangle$ such that the following conditions hold:

(10) $\langle \beta_\xi : \xi < \kappa\rangle$ is strictly increasing;

(11) each (w_ξ, β_ξ) is special;

(12) if $\xi < \eta < \kappa$ and x_γ or $-x_\gamma$ is a factor of some $d \in S_{w_\xi}$, then $\gamma < \beta_\eta$;

(13) if $\xi < \eta < \kappa$ and $y_{\delta\sigma}^\varepsilon$ is a factor of some $d \in S_{w_\xi}$, then $\delta < \beta_\eta$;

Now we claim:

(14) If $\xi < \eta < \kappa$, then $w_\xi \cdot -w_\eta \neq 0$.

For, $w_\xi \not\leq u_{\beta_\eta}$, so $w_\xi \cdot -u_{\beta_\eta} \neq 0$. But $w_\eta \leq u_{\beta_\eta}$, so $-u_{\beta_\eta} \leq -w_\eta$. Hence (15) holds.

Let Γ be the set of all $\xi < \kappa$ such that there is a $d \in S_{w_\xi}$ such that every factor $y_{\rho\sigma}^\varepsilon$ of d has $\varepsilon = 1$, and d does not have a factor $-x_\gamma$.

(15) If $\xi < \eta$ and $\xi \in \Gamma$, then $w_\eta < w_\xi$.

In fact, choose $d \in S_{w_\xi}$ in accordance with the definition of Γ. Then $w_\eta \leq [d] \leq w_\xi$. Then (15) follows from (14).

Now $\langle Z \rangle$ satisfies ccc, so it follows from (15) that Γ is countable. Let $\nu < \kappa$ be greater than each $\xi \in \Gamma$. Now if $\nu \leq \xi < \eta < \kappa$, then each $d \in S_{w_\xi}$ has a factor $-y_{\rho\sigma}$ or a factor $-x_\gamma$, and hence $w_\eta \cdot w_\xi = 0$. This again contradicts ccc.

This finishes the proof. ⊣

§3. A Boolean algebra B such that $\mathfrak{s}(B) < \mathfrak{a}(B)$. More precisely, we prove the following:

THEOREM 6. *Let κ and λ be regular cardinals, with $\aleph_0 < \kappa < \lambda$. Then there exists a Boolean algebra A such that $\mathfrak{t}(A) = \mathfrak{s}(A) = \kappa$ and $\mathfrak{a}(A) = \lambda$.*

PROOF. We begin by defining a base algebra, and then extending it many times to get the desired algebra. The base algebra B_0 is an algebra of subsets of the set ${}^\kappa 2$ of all functions mapping κ into $2 = \{0, 1\}$. We call a set $U \subseteq {}^\kappa 2$ $(< \kappa)$*-defined* iff there is a $D \subseteq \kappa$ of size less than κ such that for all $f, g \in {}^\kappa 2$, if $f \in U$ and $f \restriction D = g \restriction D$, then $g \in U$. Let B_0 be the collection of all $(< \kappa)$-defined subsets of ${}^\kappa 2$. Clearly B_0 is a κ-field of subsets of ${}^\kappa 2$, i.e., it is closed under complements and under unions of fewer than κ sets.

Let

$$S = \{s_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\} \quad \text{where} \quad s_\alpha = \{f \in {}^\kappa 2 : f(\alpha) = 1\}.$$

Clearly $S \subseteq B_0$. Given $B \geq B_0$, we say that S has the *co-κ splitting property in B* provided that for all nonzero elements b of B, there is a set $T \subseteq \kappa$ of size less than κ such that for all $\beta \in \kappa \backslash T$ we have $b \cdot s_\beta \neq 0 \neq b \cdot -s_\beta$. Clearly this implies that S splits B. It is also clear that S has the co-κ splitting property in B_0.

We are going to construct a tower of Boolean algebras containing B_0, in each of which S has the co-κ splitting property.

(1) *Let $B_0 \leq B$, and suppose that X is an infinite partition of unity in B and that S has the co-κ splitting property in B. Then there is an algebra $B' \geq B$, generated by $B \cup \{u\}$ where u is a new element, such that in B', $u \neq 0$ and $u \cdot x = 0$ for all $x \in X$, and such that S has the co-κ splitting property in B'.*

To prove (1), we consider the free extension $B(u)$ (the free product of B and the four-element algebra), and its ideal J generated by all elements of the form $x \cdot u$ with $x \in X$. It turns out that $B' = B/J$ naturally embeds B and has the required properties. All properties are pretty obvious, except that S (or S/J) has the co-κ splitting property in B'. To see that S/J has this property, it suffices to consider separately elements of B' of the form $(b \cdot u)/J$ $(b \in B)$ and of the form $(b \cdot -u)$ $(b \in B)$.

Consider first $(b \cdot -u)/J \neq 0$ in B', $b \in B$. If $v \in B$ and $v/J \cdot (b \cdot -u)/J = 0$, then $v \cdot b \cdot -u \leq w \cdot u$ in $B(u)$, where w is the sum of finitely many elements of X, and hence $v \cdot b \cdot -u = 0$ and so $v \cdot b = 0$. Thus the fact that S has the co-κ splitting property in B implies that with the exception of fewer than κ many $\beta \in \kappa$ we have that $(b \cdot -u)/J$ intersects both s_β/J and its complement.

Now consider $(b \cdot u)/J \neq 0$, $b \in B$. Since this element is nonzero in B' and $\sum X = 1$ in B, it follows that there is a set $\{x_n : n \in \omega\}$ of distinct members of X such that $b \cdot x_n \neq 0$ for all n. Let $T \subseteq \kappa$ be a set of size less than κ such that for all $\beta \in \kappa \backslash T$ and all n we have $b \cdot x_n \cdot s_\beta \neq 0 \neq b \cdot x_n \cdot -s_\beta$. Thus for such β we have $(b \cdot u)/J \cdot s_\beta/J \neq 0 \neq (b \cdot u)/J \cdot -s_\beta/J$. This finishes the proof of (1).

Now we do a similar thing for towers. Note here that in general $\mathfrak{t}(C) \leq \mathfrak{s}(C)$. This step concerning towers can be omitted if $\kappa = \omega_1$, since in general every tower is uncountable if $\mathfrak{a}(C)$ is uncountable.

(2) *Let $B_0 \leq B$, and suppose that X is a tower in B of size less than κ and that S has the co-κ splitting property in B. Then there is an algebra $B' \geq B$, generated by $B \cup \{u\}$ where u is a new element, such that in B', $u \neq 1$ and $x \leq u$ for all $x \in X$, and such that S has the co-κ splitting property in B'.*

The proof is very similar to that of (1). We consider the free extension $B(u)$, and its ideal J generated by all elements of the form $x \cdot -u$ with $x \in X$. Again $B'' = B/J$ naturally embeds B and has the required properties, and we check only that S (or S/J) has the co-κ splitting property in B', considering separately elements of B' of the form $(b \cdot u)/J$ $(b \in B)$ and of the form $(b \cdot -u)$ $(b \in B)$.

Consider first $(b \cdot -u)/J \neq 0$ in B', $b \in B$. Now $(b \cdot -u)/J \neq 0$ implies that $b \cdot -w \neq 0$, for each $w \in X$. So for each $w \in X$ we can choose a subset Y_w of X of size less than κ such that $b \cdot -w \cdot s_\alpha \neq 0 \neq b \cdot -w \cdot -s_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in \kappa \backslash Y_w$. So if we take any $\alpha \in \kappa \backslash \bigcup_{w \in X} Y_w$ we get $(s_\alpha/J) \cdot (b \cdot -u)/J \neq 0 \neq -(s_\alpha/J) \cdot (b \cdot -u)/J$.

Now consider $(b \cdot u)/J \neq 0$, $b \in B$. If $b \cdot s_\alpha \neq 0 \neq b \cdot -s_\alpha$, then clearly also $(s_\alpha/J) \cdot (b \cdot u)/J \neq 0 \neq -(s_\alpha/J) \cdot (b \cdot u)/J$. Thus (2) holds.

(3) *Suppose that $B_0 \subseteq B$ and S has the co-κ splitting property in B. Then there is an extension B''' of B such that S has the co-κ splitting property in B''', and B''' does not have any partition of unity X such that $X \subseteq B$ and $\aleph_0 \leq |X| < \lambda$, and does not have any tower $X \subseteq B$ of size less than κ.*

To prove this, let $\langle X_\tau : 0 < \tau < \gamma \rangle$ be a list of all the infinite sets X of pairwise disjoint elements of B with $|X| < \lambda$, and let $\langle Y_\tau : 0 < \tau < \gamma \rangle$ be a list of all the well-ordered subsets of $B \backslash \{1\}$ of size less than κ. Define C_τ by recursion for $\tau < \gamma$ as follows. Let $C_0 = B$. Suppose that C_τ has been defined for all $\delta < \tau$, where $0 < \tau < \gamma$. Take C'_τ to the the union of $\{C_\delta : \delta < \tau\}$, and take C_τ to be the algebra obtained from C'_τ by applying first (1) to X_τ and then (2) to Y_τ. Finally, take $B''' = \bigcup_{\tau < \gamma} C_\tau$. This proves (3).

Now we can finish the main part of the proof of the theorem as follows. We define a tower $\langle B_\tau : \tau < \lambda \rangle$ and take A to be its union. B_0 was defined at the beginning of the proof. For a successor $\tau = \delta + 1$, take B_τ to be the algebra supplied by (3) with $B = B_\delta$. For limit τ, take $B_\tau = \bigcup_{\delta < \tau} B_\delta$. Clearly this works, as any infinite partition of unity of A of size less than λ is contained in some B_δ, and by construction this is impossible. Similarly for towers of size less than κ. Also, since S splits A, it follows that A is atomless.

The only thing missing is that A may not have a partition of unity of size λ. To assure this property, we extend A further. Take $C = A \oplus D$, where D is the algebra of finite and cofinite subsets of λ. Clearly S still splits C, C has a partition of unity of size λ, and C has a tower of size κ. We need to check that C has no infinite partition of unity of size less than λ, and no tower of size less than κ.

Suppose that X is an infinite partition of unity of C of size less than λ. We may assume that the elements x of X have the form $x = a_x \cdot d_x$ with $a_x \in A$ and $d_x \in D$. Clearly $\bigcup_{x \in X} d_x = \lambda$. It follows that for some element $\beta \in \lambda$, the set $\Gamma = \{x \in X : \beta \in d_x\}$ is infinite. For any two distinct $x, y \in \Gamma$ we have $a_x \cdot a_y = 0$, and so by our partition property for A, there is an element $e \in A$ such that $e \cdot a_x = 0$

for all $x \in \Gamma$. Then $e \cdot \{\beta\}$ is a nonzero element of C disjoint from each $x \in X$, contradiction.

Suppose that X is a tower in C of size less than κ. We can write each element $x \in X$ in the form $\sum_{i<m_x}(a_{i,x} \cdot d_{i,x})$ with $a_{i,x} \in A$, $d_{i,x} \in D$, and the $d_{i,x}$'s disjoint for distinct i's. Moreover, we may assume that the order type of X is regular. It is uncountable since $\mathfrak{t}(C) = \omega$ would imply that $\mathfrak{a}(C) = \omega$. So, we may assume that $m = m_x$ is independent of x. Note that $\sum_{i<m} d_{i,x} \leq \sum_{i<m} d_{i,y}$ if $x, y \in X$ and $x < y$, and $\sum_{x \in X} \sum_{i<m} d_{i,x} = \lambda$. Hence, as $|X| < \kappa < \lambda$, there is an $x \in X$ such that $\sum_{i<m} d_{i,x} = \lambda$. Thus for $y \in X$ and $x \leq y$, there is an $i < m$ such that $d_{i,y}$ is cofinite. We may assume that for each $y \in X$ with $x \leq y$, it is the element $d_{0,y}$ which is cofinite; also, for each $\beta \in \lambda$ let $i(\beta, y)$ be the index less than m such that $\beta \in d_{i(\beta,y),y}$. Now we claim

(*) For every $\beta \in \lambda$ there is a $y \in X$ with $x < y$ such that $a_{i(\beta,z),z} = 1$ for each $z \in X$ with $z \geq y$.

To prove this, for $y, z \in X$ and $x < y < z$ we have

$$a_{i(\beta,y),y} \cdot \{\beta\} = y \cdot \{\beta\} \leq z \cdot \{\beta\} = a_{i(\beta,z),z} \cdot \{\beta\},$$

and hence $a_{i(\beta,y),y} \leq a_{i(\beta,z),z}$. If the conclusion of (*) fails to hold, then because A has no tower of size less than κ, there is a $b \in A$ such that $a_{i(\beta,y),y} < b < 1$ for all $y \in X$ for which $x < y$. Then for any such y we have $y < b \cdot \{\beta\} + (\lambda \backslash \{\beta\}) < 1$, contradiction. So (*) holds.

By (*), for each $\beta \in d_{0,x}$ choose $y_\beta \in X$ with $x < y_\beta$ such that $a_{i(\beta,z),z} = 1$ for each $z \in X$ with $z \geq y$. Since $\kappa < \lambda$, there is an infinite $\Gamma \subseteq d_{0,x}$ and a $y \in X$ with $x < y$ such that $y_\beta = y$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma$. Choose $\beta \in \Gamma \backslash \bigcup_{0<i<m} d_{i,y}$. Then $\beta \in d_{0,y}$, and so $a_{0,y} = 1$. For each $\beta \in \lambda \backslash d_{0,y}$, by (*) choose $z_\beta \in X$ with $z_\beta > y$ such that $a_{i(\beta,w),w} = 1$ for each $w \in X$ with $z_\beta \leq w$. Let $w \in X$ be greater than each z_β with $\beta \in \lambda \backslash d_{0,y}$. Then $w = \lambda$, contradiction. $\dashv$

REFERENCES

[89] B. Balcar and P. Simon, *Disjoint refinement*, ***Handbook of Boolean algebras. Vol. 2*** (R. Bonnet and D. Monk, editors), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989, pp. 333–388.

[87] A. Blass and S. Shelah, *There may be simple $P_{\aleph_1}$- and $P_{\aleph_2}$-points and the Rudin-Keisler ordering may be downward directed*, ***Annals of Pure and Applied Logic***, vol. 33 (1987), pp. 213–243.

[Kop89] S. Koppelberg, *General theory of Boolean algebras*, ***Handbook of Boolean algebras. Vol. 1*** (R. Bonnet and D. Monk, editors), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.

[01] J. D. Monk, *Continuum cardinals generalized to Boolean algebras*, this Journal, vol. 66 (2001), no. 4, pp. 1928–1958.

[∞] ———, *The spectrum of maximal independent subsets of a boolean algebra.*, ***Proceedings of the 2001 Tarski Symposium***, Warsaw, to appear.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY
1326 STEVENSON CENTER
NASHVILLE, TN 37240, USA
E-mail: mckenzie@math.vanderbilt.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
395UCB
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, CO 80309-0395, USA
E-mail: monkd@euclid.colorado.edu