

NON-TRIVIAL COPIES OF \mathbb{N}^*

ALAN DOW

ABSTRACT. We show that it is consistent to have regular closed non-clopen copies of \mathbb{N}^* within \mathbb{N}^* and a non-trivial self-map of \mathbb{N}^* even if all autohomeomorphisms of \mathbb{N}^* are trivial.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we are interested in the possible existence of regular closed subsets of \mathbb{N}^* that are non-trivial copies of \mathbb{N}^* , i.e. that are not clopen. A proper subspace $K \subset \mathbb{N}^*$ is said to be a trivial copy if there is an embedding of $\beta\mathbb{N}$ into $\beta\mathbb{N}$ which sends the remainder \mathbb{N}^* onto K . More generally, a function $h \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is said to *induce* a function $F : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ on $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ if $F(a) =^* h^{-1}(a) = \{n \in \mathbb{N} : h(n) \in a\}$ for all $a \subset I$. The function F is said to be *trivial* on I if there is a such a function h . We use $\text{triv}(F)$ to denote the ideal of sets on which F is trivial. Such a function F is usually a *lifting* of a homomorphism $\psi : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ in the sense that $F(a)/\text{fin} = \psi(a/\text{fin})$ for all $a \subset \mathbb{N}$. The ideal $\text{triv}(\psi)$ would coincide with that of $\text{triv}(F)$ for any such lifting of ψ .

It was shown in [1] that there are non-trivial nowhere dense copies of \mathbb{N}^* while Farah [7] proved that PFA implies that if $K \subset \mathbb{N}^*$ is homeomorphic to \mathbb{N}^* , then there is a, possibly empty, clopen subset A of \mathbb{N}^* such that $A \subset K$ and $K \setminus A$ is nowhere dense.

Velickovic [14] introduced the poset \mathbb{P}_2 which was created to produce a model of Martin's Axiom in which $\mathfrak{c} = \aleph_2$ and in which there are non-trivial autohomeomorphisms on \mathbb{N}^* . This was achieved by forcing over a model of PFA. Several variations of \mathbb{P}_2 are possible and we continue the study of the properties of \mathbb{N}^* that hold in the model(s) obtained when forcing with \mathbb{P}_2 (and its variants) over a model of PFA (see also [10, 12, 4]).

Farah [7] defines the important notion of an ideal of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ being ccc over fin to mean that there is no uncountable almost disjoint family of

Date: June 6, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 03A35.

Key words and phrases. homomorphism, Stone-Cech, PFA, forcing.

subsets of \mathbb{N} none of which are in the ideal. By Stone duality, we define a closed subset K of \mathbb{N}^* to be ccc over fin if there is no uncountable family of pairwise disjoint clopen subsets of \mathbb{N}^* each meeting K in a non-empty set. It is shown in [7] that PFA implies that for each homomorphism ψ from $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ onto $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$, which is the Stone dual of a copy of \mathbb{N}^* in \mathbb{N}^* , $\text{triv}(\psi)$ is ccc over fin. One of our main results is that this is true of automorphisms ψ in the forcing extension by \mathbb{P}_2 over a model of PFA. It was already shown in [10] that $\text{triv}(\psi)$ is a dense P -ideal in such models.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Now we recall the partial order \mathbb{P}_2 from [14].

Definition 2.1. The partial order \mathbb{P}_2 is defined to consist of all 1-to-1 functions f where

- (1) $\text{dom}(f) = \text{range}(f) \subset \mathbb{N}$,
- (2) for all $i \in \text{dom}(f)$ and $n \in \omega$, $f(i) \in [2^n, 2^{n+1})$ if and only if $i \in [2^n, 2^{n+1})$
- (3) $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |[2^n, 2^{n+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(f)| = \infty$
- (4) for all $i \in \text{dom}(f)$, $i = f^2(i) \neq f(i)$.

The ordering on \mathbb{P}_2 is \subseteq^* .

Definition 2.2. The poset \mathbb{P}_1 is defined to consist of all $\{0, 1\}$ -valued partial functions f such that $\text{dom}(f) \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} |[2^n, 2^{n+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(f)| = \infty$. The ordering on \mathbb{P}_1 is \subseteq^* .

The poset \mathbb{P}_0 is the subposet of \mathbb{P}_1 consisting of those $f \in \mathbb{P}_1$ satisfying that for all $n \in \omega$, $f^{-1}(1) \cap [2^n, 2^{n+1})$ has size at most 1, and it is non-empty if and only if $[2^n, 2^{n+1}) \subset \text{dom}(f)$.

Each of these posets introduces a new generic ultrafilter \mathcal{U} which is a tie-point of \mathbb{N}^* (as introduced in [6] $A \overset{\mathcal{U}}{\times} B$, see also [3, 4]): namely there is a cover by regular closed subsets A, B satisfying that $A \cap B = \{\mathcal{U}\}$. For a regular closed set A of \mathbb{N}^* , we let \mathcal{I}_A denote the ideal $\{a \subset \mathbb{N} : a^* \subset A\}$. Let G denote a \mathbb{P}_2 -generic filter. It is shown in [14], that the collection $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathbb{N} \setminus \text{dom}(f) : f \in G\}$ is an ultrafilter. This is also true for the posets \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 . In the cases of G being generic for either of \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 , \mathcal{I}_A would be $\{f^{-1}(1) : f \in G\}$, while, for \mathbb{P}_2 , $\mathcal{I}_A = \{\{i \in \text{dom}(f) : i < f(i)\} : f \in G\}$. This is discussed in [4]. One of our main motivations is to discover if A or B can be homeomorphic to \mathbb{N}^* as this information can be quite useful in applications (again, see [4]).

If PFA holds, then each of $\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2$ is \aleph_1 -closed and \aleph_2 -distributive (see [12, p.4226]). In this paper we will restrict our study to forcing

with these posets individually, but the reader is referred to [12] for the method to generalize to countable support infinite products. In particular, the result that $\text{triv}(F)$ is ccc over fin for all onto homomorphisms F on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ will hold in these more general models but we will only prove this for automorphisms in this paper.

Theorem 2.3. *If G is \mathbb{P}_0 -generic and $A \overset{\mathcal{U}}{\Delta} B$ are as defined above, then there is a homeomorphism from A to $\overset{\mathcal{U}}{\mathbb{N}^*}$ which extends to a continuous mapping with domain all of \mathbb{N}^* .*

Proof. Let $\psi \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be defined so that $\psi([2^n, 2^{n+1})) = \{n\}$ for all n , and let ψ^* denote the canonical extension with domain and range \mathbb{N}^* . In fact, for each free ultrafilter \mathcal{W} , the preimage of \mathcal{W} under ψ^* is the set of ultrafilters extending $\{\psi^{-1}[W] : W \in \mathcal{W}\}$. Recall that A is the closure of the set $\bigcup\{(f^{-1}(1))^* : f \in G\}$. We will simply show that $\psi^* \upharpoonright A$ is one-to-one. Let $\mathcal{V} = \{b \subset \mathbb{N} : \psi^{-1}(b) \in \mathcal{U}\}$. By the definition of \mathbb{P}_0 , it follows that, for each $f \in G$, $\psi^* \upharpoonright (f^{-1}(1))^*$ is one-to-one and that $\psi(f^{-1}(1)) \notin \mathcal{V}$. It follows easily that the preimage of any point of $\mathbb{N}^* \setminus \{\mathcal{V}\}$ contains a single point in A . Now suppose that $\mathcal{W} \neq \mathcal{U}$ is in the preimage of \mathcal{V} . Since \mathcal{U} is generated by $\{\mathbb{N} \setminus \text{dom}(f) : f \in G\}$, we may choose an $f \in G$ with $\text{dom}(f) \in \mathcal{W}$. Since $\psi(f^{-1}(1)) \notin \mathcal{V}$, we have that $f^{-1}(0) \in \mathcal{W}$. But now, $f^{-1}(0)$ is mod finite disjoint from each member of \mathcal{I}_A , which shows that $\mathcal{W} \notin A$. \square

The rest of the paper is devoted to proving the following theorems.

Theorem 2.4. *In the extension obtained by forcing over a model of PFA by any of \mathbb{P}_0 , \mathbb{P}_1 , or \mathbb{P}_2 , if Φ is an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$, then $\text{triv}(\Phi)$ is a ccc over fin ideal.*

Theorem 2.5. *In the extension obtained by forcing over a model of PFA by \mathbb{P}_0 all automorphisms on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ are trivial.*

Theorem 2.6. *In the extension obtained by forcing over a model of PFA by \mathbb{P}_1 , there are non-trivial automorphisms.*

These results are re-stated and proven as theorems 4.17, 5.2, and 6.1 respectively. Let us again remark that Theorem 2.4 holds for all onto homomorphisms but this requires lengthy verifications that the results for automorphisms from [10, 12, 4] also hold for onto homomorphisms. As mentioned above a homomorphism ψ from $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ onto $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ is said to be trivial, if there is function $h \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ which induces ψ in the sense that $\psi(a/\text{fin}) = (h^{-1}(a))/\text{fin}$ for all $a \subset \mathbb{N}$. We intend to deal with automorphisms only so it will be more convenient to work with the inverse map; hence $\psi(a/\text{fin}) = h(a)/\text{fin}$. We will say that ψ is not

trivial at a point $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$ if no member of $\text{triv}(\psi)$ is in the ultrafilter corresponding to x .

3. THE AUXILLARY POSET $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$

For this section let \mathbb{P} denote any one of the posets $\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2$. It is known that \mathbb{P} is σ -directed closed. The following partial order was introduced in [10] as a tool to uncover the forcing preservation properties of \mathbb{P} , such as Velickovic's result that PFA implies that \mathbb{P} is \aleph_2 -distributive (and so introduces no new ω_1 -sequences of subsets of \mathbb{N}).

Definition 3.1. Let \mathfrak{F} denote any filter on \mathbb{P} . Define $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ to be the partial order consisting of all $g \in \mathbb{P}$ such that there is some $f \in \mathfrak{F}$ which is almost equal to it. The ordering on $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ is $f \leq g$ if $f \supseteq g$.

The forcing poset $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ (which is just the set \mathcal{F}) introduces a new total function f which extends mod finite every member of \mathfrak{F} . Although f will not be a member of \mathbb{P} it is only because its domain does not satisfy the growth condition (3) in the definition of \mathbb{P} . There is a simple σ -centered poset \mathcal{S} which will force an appropriate set $I \subset \mathbb{N}$ which mod finite contains all the domains of members of \mathfrak{F} and satisfies that $f \upharpoonright I$ is a member of \mathbb{P} which is below each member of \mathfrak{F} (see [10, 2.1]).

A strategic choice of the filter \mathfrak{F} will ensure that $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ is ccc and much more. Again we are lifting results from [10, 2.6] and [12, proof of Thm. 3.1]. A poset is said to be ω^ω -bounding if every new function in ω^ω is bounded by some ground model function.

Lemma 3.2 ([12]). *In the forcing extension, $V[H]$, by $2^{<\omega_1}$, there is a maximal filter \mathfrak{F} on \mathbb{P} which is \mathbb{P} -generic over V and for which $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ is ccc, ω^ω -bounding, and preserves that $\mathbb{R} \cap V$ is not meager.*

Almost all of the work we have to do is to establish additional preservation results for the poset(s) $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$. Once these are established, we are able to apply the standard PFA type methodology as demonstrated in [10, 12] to determine properties of the forcing extension by \mathbb{P} . As mentioned above, we have this result from [12, Corollary 3.3].

Lemma 3.3. *In the model $V[H]$, the ideal $\text{triv}(F)$ is a dense P -ideal.*

4. σ -BOREL LIFTINGS AND CCC OVER FIN

A lifting of a map Φ from $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ to itself is any function F from $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ into $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ which satisfies that $F(a)/\text{fin} = \Phi(a/\text{fin})$ for all $a \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$. For each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s \subset \ell$, let $[s; \ell] = \{x \subset \mathbb{N} : x \cap \ell = s\}$. This defines the standard Polish topology on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$. For a set $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ and a function F on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, let us say that $F \upharpoonright \mathcal{C}$ is σ -Borel if there is

sequence $\{\psi_n : n \in \omega\}$ of Borel functions on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ such that for each $b \in \mathcal{C}$, there is an n such that $F(b) =^* \psi_n(b)$.

We continue the analysis of \mathbb{P} -names from V in the forcing extension $V[H]$ using a V -generic filter $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{P}$ (continuing that \mathbb{P} is one of $\mathbb{P}_0, \mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2$). In particular, fix $\dot{\Phi}$ a \mathbb{P} -name which is forced by $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{P}}$ to be a lifting of an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$. Let F denote $\text{val}_{\mathcal{F}}(\dot{\Phi})$. Of course it follows that, in $V[H]$, F is a lifting of an automorphism of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$. Note that forcing with $2^{<\omega_1}$ does not change the set $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$.

The following key result of ([4, 2.3]) was extracted from [10] and [12, Theorem 3.3].

Lemma 4.1 (PFA). *For any dense \mathbb{P} -ideal \mathcal{I} on \mathbb{N} and for each $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ -generic filter G , there is an $I \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $F \upharpoonright (V \cap [\mathbb{N} \setminus I]^\omega)$ is σ -Borel in the extension $V[H][G]$.*

One of the main results which we can extract from [12] and simply deduce from Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.5 is the following.

Lemma 4.2. *$F \upharpoonright (V \cap \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}))$ is σ -Borel in the extension obtained by forcing with $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$.*

We will also need several results from [4]. The following are [4, 3.1] and [4, 2.5] respectively.

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that $b \in V \cap [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ is such that $F \upharpoonright [V \cap [b]^\omega]$ is σ -Borel in $V[G]$. Then, in V , there is an increasing sequence $\{n_k : k \in \omega\} \subset \omega$ such that F is trivial on each $a \in [b]^\omega$ for which there is an $r \in \mathfrak{F}$, such that $a \subset \bigcup\{[n_k, n_{k+1}) : [n_k, n_{k+1}) \subset \text{dom}(r)\}$.*

Lemma 4.4. *Let H and \mathfrak{F} be as above. Then for each $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ -name $\dot{h} \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ there are an increasing sequence $n_0 < n_1 < \dots$ of integers and a condition $f \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that either*

- (1) $f \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})} \dot{h} \upharpoonright \bigcup\{[n_k, n_{k+1}) : k \in K\} \notin V$ for each infinite $K \subset \omega$ or
- (2) for each $i \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$ and each $g < f$ such that g forces a value on $\dot{h}(i)$, $f \cup (g \upharpoonright [n_k, n_{k+1}))$ also forces a value on $\dot{h}(i)$.

Furthermore, if f forces \dot{h} to be finite-to-one, we can arrange that for each k and each $i \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$, f forces that $\dot{h}(i) \in [n_{k-1}, n_{k+2})$.

Next we need to use a key Lemma from [4, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 4.5. *There is a condition $\bar{p} \in \mathfrak{F}$ and an increasing sequence $\{n_k : k \in \omega\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that \bar{p} forces (over \mathbb{P}) that $\text{triv}(F)$ contains all $a \subset \mathbb{N}$ for which there is an $r \in \mathfrak{F}$, such that $a \subset \bigcup\{[n_k, n_{k+1}) : [n_k, n_{k+1}) \subset \text{dom}(r)\}$.*

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.4. For the remainder of this section we assume \bar{p} and $\langle n_k : k \in \omega \rangle$ have the properties in Lemma 4.5. We proceed by contradiction using the following Lemma.

Lemma 4.6. *If p forces that $\text{triv}(\dot{\Phi})$ is not ccc over fin, then there is $\bar{p} < p$ and almost disjoint families $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subset [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ and $\{b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subset [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ such that $\{a_\alpha \cup b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ is also an almost disjoint family, and \bar{p} forces that $a_\alpha \notin \text{triv}(F)$ and $F(a_\alpha) = b_\alpha$ for each $\alpha < \omega_1$.*

Proof. Using that \mathbb{P} is \aleph_2 -distributive we then have that $\text{triv}(F)$ is not ccc over fin. Also, we can assume that p forces the following. The almost disjoint family $\{a_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\} \subset [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ satisfies that $a_\alpha \notin \text{triv}(F)$ and that $F(a_\alpha) = b_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \omega_1$. Notice that the family $\{b_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ is also an almost disjoint family. By compactness of a_α^* , we may choose an ultrafilter \mathcal{W}_α on \mathbb{N} so that $a_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\alpha$ and so that F is not trivial at \mathcal{W}_α . If there is an uncountable set of α such that $F(\mathcal{W}_\alpha) = \mathcal{W}_\alpha$, then we pass to such an uncountable subcollection as well as shrink each a_α so that the new b_α is a subset of the original a_α .

So we now assume that $F(\mathcal{W}_\alpha) \neq \mathcal{W}_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \omega_1$. Next, for each $\gamma \in \omega_1$, let S_γ be the set of all $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that either $a_\alpha \in F(\mathcal{W}_\alpha)$ or $b_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\alpha$. If, there is some $\gamma \in \omega_1$ such that S_γ is uncountable, then we can, by shrinking a_α for all $\alpha \in S_\gamma$ ensure that either $a_\alpha \subset F(a_\gamma)$ or $b_\alpha \subset a_\gamma$. In either case, we obtain a new family, $a_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in S_\gamma$, such that $\{a_\alpha \cup b_\alpha : \alpha \in S_\gamma\}$ is an almost disjoint family. Otherwise, we have that S_γ is countable for every $\gamma \in \omega_1$. Recursively choose an uncountable subcollection $\{\alpha_\xi : \xi \in \omega_1\} \subset \omega_1$ so that $\alpha_\xi \notin S_{\alpha_\eta}$ for all $\eta < \xi$. First suppose there is a $\delta < \omega_1$ such that there is an uncountable set $S \subset \omega_1$ with each \mathcal{W}_{α_ξ} (for $\xi \in S$) being in the $\beta\mathbb{N}$ closure of the union of the family of clopen sets $\{b_{\alpha_\eta}^* : \eta < \delta\}$. It then follows that, for all $\xi \in S$, \mathcal{W}_{α_ξ} is not in the closure of the family $\{b_{\alpha_\eta}^* : \delta \leq \eta < \xi\}$. For each $\xi \in S \setminus \delta$, replace a_{α_ξ} by a smaller $a_{\alpha_\xi} \in \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_\xi}$ satisfying that $a_{\alpha_\xi} \cap b_{\alpha_\eta}$ is finite for all $\delta \leq \eta < \xi$. If there is no such $\delta < \omega_1$, then we can assume, by passing to an uncountable subfamily, that \mathcal{W}_{α_ξ} is not in the closure of the union of the family $\{b_{\alpha_\eta}^* : \eta < \xi\}$. In this case we may also assume that each $a_{\alpha_\xi} \in \mathcal{W}_{\alpha_\xi}$ is mod finite disjoint from b_{α_η} for all $\eta < \xi$. By symmetry, we may perform the same reduction so that for all $\xi < \omega_1$, b_{α_ξ} is almost disjoint from a_{α_η} for all $\eta < \xi$.

We have now shown that the family $\{a_\alpha \cup b_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ can be assumed to be almost disjoint. It is not needed but it is interesting that since this argument can take place in the ground model of PFA, we have, by a result of Shelah reported in [2, 3.11], that we may assume

that either $F(\mathcal{W}_\alpha) = \mathcal{W}_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in \omega_1$ or the sets $\{\mathcal{W}_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ and $\{F(\mathcal{W}_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1)\}$ have disjoint closures in $\beta\mathbb{N}$. \square

Finally, by possibly thinning out the collection, with $F(a_\alpha) = b_\alpha$, assume that b_α is not a member of \mathcal{W}_β for all $\beta \neq \alpha$. Fix any $p \in \mathcal{F}$ which forces, over \mathbb{P} , that $\dot{\Phi}$ and, therefore F have all of the above properties. Assume also that p satisfies the requirement in Lemma 4.5.

Notice that for each $q \in \mathfrak{F}$, we have a one-to-one function h_q with domain $a_q = \bigcup\{[n_k, n_{k+1}) : [n_k, n_{k+1}) \subset \text{dom}(q)\}$ which witnesses that $a_q \in \text{triv}(F)$. Therefore the family $\{h_q : q \in \mathfrak{F}\}$ is a σ -directed (mod finite) family of functions which, because $\mathbb{N} \notin \text{triv}(F)$ in $V[H]$, has no extension in $V[H]$.

Lemma 4.7. *The family $\{\text{dom}(h_q) : q \in \mathfrak{F}\}$ generates a dense ideal in $V[H]$ which remains dense after forcing with $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$.*

Proof. The finite-to-one map sending $[n_k, n_{k+1})$ to k is easily seen to send the family $\{a_q : q \in \mathfrak{F}\}$ to a maximal ideal, and it is also the preimage of this maximal ideal. The forcing $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ is ω^ω -bounding and so does not diagonalize the dual ultrafilter. \square

We prove, using this next well-known result, that there is a $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ -name, \dot{h} , of a function in $\mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ that is forced to mod finite extend every member of $\{h_q : q \in \mathfrak{F}\}$. Uncountable pairwise incompatible families of partial functions on \mathbb{N} are similar to Luzin gaps. Such a family will not have a common mod finite extension. The following result is an easy consequence of a result of Todorcevic (see [7, 2.2.1] and [5]). Proper posets were introduced in [?].

Proposition 4.8. *If $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ is a family of partial functions on \mathbb{N} with mod finite increasing domains, and if there is no common mod finite extension, then there is a proper poset which introduces an uncountable pairwise incompatible subfamily.*

So now we assume that forcing with $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ preserves that the family $\{h_q : q \in \mathfrak{F}\}$ has no common mod finite extension. Let \dot{q}_{ω_1} denote the $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ -name of the function that equals the union of the generic filter G . We note that the sequence $\{n_k : k \in \omega\}$ is a sequence from V . Let \dot{Q} be the $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ -name of the proper poset as described in Lemma 4.8. That is, there is a $2^{<\omega_1} * \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F}) * \dot{Q}$ -name, $\{(\dot{q}_\alpha, \dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{h}_\alpha, \dot{L}_\alpha) : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$, satisfying that, for each $\alpha < \beta \in \omega_1$, it is forced that

- (1) $\{\dot{q}_\alpha, \dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{h}_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ are $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F})$ -names,
- (2) $\dot{q}_\alpha \subset \dot{q}_{\omega_1}$,
- (3) $\dot{a}_\alpha = \bigcup\{[n_k, n_{k+1}) : k \in \dot{L}_\alpha\} \subset \text{dom}(\dot{q}_\alpha)$,

- (4) \dot{q}_α forces that $\dot{h}_\alpha \in V$ induces $\dot{\Phi}$ on \dot{a}_α ,
- (5) $\dot{L}_\alpha \subset^* \dot{L}_\beta$,
- (6) there is an $n \in \dot{a}_\alpha \cap \dot{a}_\beta$ with $\dot{h}_\alpha(n) \neq \dot{h}_\beta(n)$.

Next let \dot{R}_1 be the $2^{<\omega_1} * \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F}) * \dot{Q}$ -name of the usual σ -centered poset that will force the mod finite ascending sequence $\{\dot{L}_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ has a co-infinite extension. That is, there is a $2^{<\omega_1} * \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F}) * \dot{Q} * \dot{R}_1$ -name, \dot{L} , such that it is forced that $\mathbb{N} \setminus \dot{L}$ is infinite and $\dot{L}_\alpha \subset^* \dot{L}$ for all $\alpha < \omega_1$. And finally, let \dot{R}_2 be the $2^{<\omega_1} * \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F}) * \dot{Q} * \dot{R}_1$ -name of the σ -centered poset such that there is a name, evidently a $2^{<\omega_1} * \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F}) * \dot{Q} * \dot{R}_1 * \dot{R}_2$ -name, \dot{S} of a subset of \mathbb{N} such that it is forced that $\dot{q}_{\omega_1} \upharpoonright \dot{S} \in \mathbb{P}$, $\bigcup\{[n_k, n_{k+1}) : k \in \dot{L}\} \subset \dot{S}$, $\text{dom}(\dot{q}_\alpha) \subset^* \dot{S}$ for all $\alpha < \omega_1$.

Now return to the PFA model and choose a filter Γ on $2^{<\omega_1} * \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F}) * \dot{Q} * \dot{R}_1 * \dot{R}_2$ that meets ω_1 -many dense open sets sufficient to ensure that properties (1)-(5) of the valuations of the names $\{(\dot{q}_\alpha, \dot{a}_\alpha, \dot{h}_\alpha, \dot{L}_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ will all hold and so that the valuations of \dot{L} , \dot{q}_{ω_1} , and \dot{S} all have the properties mentioned above. We may also assume that the condition p of Lemma 4.5 is an element of Γ in the sense that the condition $(1, p, 1, 1, 1)$ (as an element of $2^{<\omega_1} * \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F}) * \dot{Q} * \dot{R}_1 * \dot{R}_2$) is an element of Γ . Now let $\{h_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ be the valuations of the elements of $\{\dot{h}_\alpha : \alpha \in \omega_1\}$ by the filter Γ . Also let L be the valuation of \dot{L} by Γ and let r be the valuation of the condition $\dot{q}_{\omega_1} \upharpoonright \dot{S}$ by Γ . We observe that $a_r = \bigcup\{[n_k, n_{k+1}) : k \in L\}$ is a subset of $\text{dom}(r)$ and so, by Lemma 4.5 there is a function h_r (with domain a_r) that induces F on $\mathcal{P}(a_r)$. Choose an uncountable $\Lambda \subset \omega_1$ so that there is a $\bar{k} \in \omega$ such that $L_\alpha \setminus L \subset \bar{k}$ and $h_\alpha \upharpoonright (a_\alpha \setminus n_{\bar{k}}) \subset h_r$ for all $\alpha \in \Lambda$. We may further suppose that $h_\alpha \upharpoonright (a_\alpha \cap n_{\bar{k}}) = h_\beta \upharpoonright (a_\beta \cap n_{\bar{k}})$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$. It should now be clear that for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$, condition (6) does not hold.

This contradiction therefore shows that there is a $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ -name \dot{h} of a function on \mathbb{N} that is forced to mod finite extend every member of $\{h_q : q \in \mathfrak{F}\}$.

For partial functions p and s with domains contained in \mathbb{N} , we let $s \sqcup p$ denote the function $s \cup (p \upharpoonright (\text{dom}(p) \setminus \text{dom}(s)))$. Since \dot{h} is forced to mod finite extend each h_q (for $q \in \mathfrak{F}$), we have that condition (1) of Lemma 4.4 fails to hold. Furthermore, we can suppose that there is a $\bar{p} \supset \bar{q} \in \mathfrak{F}$ such that for each k , there is a single m_k such that $[2^{m_k}, 2^{m_k+1})$ properly contains $[n_k, n_{k+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(\bar{q})$. By further grouping and by extending the condition \bar{q} we can assume that for all k and $j \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$, if \bar{q} does not force a value on $\dot{h}(j)$, then \bar{q} does force that $\dot{h}(j) \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$. We record this as a new Lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *It is forced by $\bar{q} < \bar{p}$ that the increasing sequence $n_0 < n_1 < \dots$ of integers satisfies that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and for each $i \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$ such that \bar{q} does not force a value on $\dot{h}(i)$ and for each $q < \bar{q}$ that does force a value on $\dot{h}(i)$, $(q \upharpoonright [n_k, n_{k+1})) \sqcup \bar{q}$ also forces that value on $\dot{h}(i)$ and that value is in $[n_k, n_{k+1})$.*

For each k , let $H_k = [n_k, n_{k+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(\bar{q}) = [2^{m_k}, 2^{m_{k+1}}) \setminus \text{dom}(\bar{q})$. Finally, let \mathcal{H}_k denote the set of functions s with domain contained in H_k for which there is a $q \leq \bar{q}$ with $s = q \upharpoonright H_k$. Recall that for the posets \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_1 the conditions are functions into 2, while for the poset \mathbb{P}_2 , the conditions q extending \bar{q} are permutations which send each H_k into itself. Therefore, with \mathbb{P} being any of the three posets considered in this paper, \mathcal{H}_k is a finite set of functions with domain and range contained in $2 \cup H_k$. For the remainder of the section we will assume that each condition we choose in $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ is below this \bar{q} .

Lemma 4.10. *If $Y = \{y_k : k \in \omega\}$ is such that $y_k \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$ for each k , then for each $q \in \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$, there is a $p < q$ such that p decides $\dot{h} \upharpoonright Y$.*

Proof. Let K be the set of k such that q does not already force a value on $\dot{h}(y_k)$ and let $Y' = \{y_k : k \in K\}$. Now, using the V -genericity of \mathcal{F} , choose $q' < q$ in \mathfrak{F} so that q' forces a value on $F(Y')$. For each $k \in K$, choose $j_k \in F(Y') \cap [n_k, n_{k+1})$ if it is non-empty, otherwise set $j_k = 0$. Assume that the set K' , those $k \in K$ such that q' does not force $\dot{h}(y_k) = j_k$, is infinite. It then follows from Lemma 4.9 that there is a condition $p < q'$ for which there are infinitely many $k \in K'$ such that $y_k \in \text{dom}(h_p)$ and $p \Vdash \dot{h}(y_k) \neq j_k$. But now we have that p forces that $F(Y' \cap \text{dom}(h_p)) =^* h_p(Y' \cap \text{dom}(h_p))$ is not almost equal to $\dot{h}(Y' \cap \text{dom}(h_p))$, since for each $k \in K'$ with $y_k \in \text{dom}(h_p)$, $j_k \in F(Y') \cap F(\text{dom}(h_p)) \setminus \dot{h}(Y' \cap \text{dom}(h_p))$. \square

Definition 4.11. For each condition $q \in \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$, and each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\text{Orb}_q(i) = \{j : (\exists p < q) p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})} \dot{h}(i) = j\}$. Also let $S(k, q) = \{s \in \mathcal{H}_k : q \upharpoonright H_k \subset s\}$.

Corollary 4.12. *Our condition \bar{q} also satisfies that for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q < \bar{q}$, if $\text{Orb}_q(i)$ has more than one element, there is a k such that $\{i\} \cup \text{Orb}_q(i) \subset [n_k, n_{k+1})$.*

Lemma 4.13. *For each $\alpha \in \omega_1$, there are $r_\alpha < \bar{q} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ and $W_\alpha \subset a_\alpha$ such that $r_\alpha \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})} \text{``}W_\alpha \in \mathcal{W}_\alpha \text{ and } \dot{h}[W_\alpha] \subset b_\alpha \text{''}$*

Proof. Otherwise we can choose a fusion sequence $\{r_k^\alpha : k \in \omega\}$, an increasing sequence of integers ℓ_k and values $y_k \in a_\alpha \cap [n_{\ell_k}, n_{\ell_{k+1}})$,

and conditions $s_k \in \mathcal{H}_k$ such that $s_k \sqcup r_k^\alpha \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})} \dot{h}(y_k) \notin b_\alpha$. There is an infinite set $L \subset \omega$ and an r below $s_k \sqcup r_k^\alpha$ for all $k \in L$ and such that $Y = \{y_k : k \in L\} \subset \text{dom}(h_r)$. Since r forces that \dot{h} extends h_r , we have our contradiction since $h_r[Y] \subset^* \dot{F}(a_\alpha) = b_\alpha$ while $r \Vdash \dot{h}[Y] \cap b_\alpha = \emptyset$. \square

By strengthening the condition \bar{q} , we can assume that we have the following property.

Lemma 4.14. *For each integer ℓ and each condition $q < \bar{q}$, there is a condition $p < q$ and a set $I \in [\omega_1]^\ell$ such that $p < r_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in I$.*

Proof. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})$ is ccc, there is a condition $q \leq \bar{q}$ forcing that there is an uncountable set of $\alpha \in \omega_1$ such that r_α is in the generic filter. \square

Lemma 4.15. *For each $\alpha \in \omega_1$, there is an integer ℓ_α such that for each k and each $s_k \in S(k, r_\alpha)$, if $|H_k \setminus \text{dom}(s_k)| > \ell_\alpha$, then $s_k \sqcup r_\alpha$ does not decide $\dot{h} \upharpoonright W_\alpha \cap [n_k, n_{k+1})$.*

Proof. If such an integer ℓ_α did not exist, then we could find an infinite $K \subset \omega$ and a sequence $\langle s_k : k \in \omega \rangle \in \prod_{k \in \omega} S(k, r)$ with $\{|H_k \setminus \text{dom}(s_k)| : k \in K\}$ diverging to infinity, and such that $s_k \sqcup r$ decides $\dot{h} \upharpoonright W_\alpha \cap [n_k, n_{k+1})$ for each k . But then of course, $q = \bigcup_{k \in K} s_k \sqcup r_\alpha$ would force that $\dot{h} \upharpoonright W_\alpha = h_\alpha$ for some $h_\alpha \in V$. It follows easily from the assumption that F is not trivial at W_α , that there is some $q' < q$ and some infinite $W \subset W_\alpha$ such that $q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \dot{F}(W) \cap h_\alpha[W] = \emptyset$. By further extending q' and possibly shrinking W , we can assume that $W \subset \text{dom}(h_{q'})$. This contradicts that $h_{q'}[W]$ is supposed to be forced by q' to be (mod finite) equal to both $\dot{h}[W]$ and $\dot{F}(W)$. \square

By passing to an uncountable subcollection we may suppose that there is some $\bar{\ell}$ such that $\ell_\alpha = \bar{\ell}$ for all α . Now define $S'(k, q) = \{s \in S(k, q) : |H_k \setminus \text{dom}(s)| > \bar{\ell}\}$.

Lemma 4.16. *There is a condition r and an infinite set K such that $\{|H_k \setminus \text{dom}(r)| : k \in K\}$ diverges to infinity, and, for each $k \in K$, we can select $\{i_s : s \in S'(k, r)\} \subset [n_k, n_{k+1})$ such that $\text{Orb}_r(i_s) \cap \text{Orb}_r(i_{s'})$ is empty for each $s \neq s' \in S'(k, r)$, and $s \sqcup r$ does not decide $\dot{h}(i_s)$.*

Proof. Fix any integer ℓ and let L be bigger than $(\ell + 2)^{\ell+2}$. Apply Lemma 4.14 to find an r which is below r_α for each $\alpha \in I$ for some $I \subset \omega_1$ of cardinality at least L . For each $\alpha \in I$, we can assume that r decides $\dot{F}(W_\alpha) = F(W_\alpha)$ and, by Lemma 4.9, that $\text{dom}(h_r)$ contains $[n_k, n_{k+1})$ for each k such that r decides $\dot{h} \upharpoonright W_\alpha \cap [n_k, n_{k+1})$. Recall

that a_α and b_α were defined in Lemma 4.6. We may choose an m such that $[a_\alpha \cup F(W_\alpha) \cup b_\alpha] \cap [a_\beta \cup F(W_\beta) \cup b_\beta] \subset m$ for each $\alpha \neq \beta \in I$.

Let $K = \{k : |H_k \setminus \text{dom}(r)| > \ell\}$. It follows from Lemma 4.15, that for each $\alpha \in I$, $k \in K$, and $s \in S'(k, r)$, there is an $i \in W_\alpha \cap [n_k, n_{k+1})$ for which $s \sqcup r$ does not decide $\dot{h}(i)$. Therefore, we can select any $k \in K$ and $s_k \in S(k, r)$ with $\ell \leq |H_k \setminus \text{dom}(s_k)| < \ell + 2$ and fix any injection from $S'(k, s_k \cup r)$ into I (i.e. $\{\alpha_s : s \in S'(k, s_k \cup r)\}$). For each $s \in S'(k, s_k \sqcup r)$, there is an $i_s \in W_\alpha \cap [n_k, n_{k+1})$ such that $s \sqcup r$ does not decide $\dot{h}(i_s)$. Since r forces that $\{i_s, \dot{h}(i_s)\} \subset a_{\alpha_s} \cup b_{\alpha_s}$ and for $s' \neq s$, r forces that $i_{s'}, \dot{h}(i_{s'}) \notin a_{\alpha_s} \cup b_{\alpha_s}$, we have satisfied the requirement that $i_s \notin \text{Orb}_r(i_{s'})$ (the hard part was making them distinct). To complete the proof of the Lemma, simply perform another fusion to inductively choose s_k and extend $s_k \sqcup r$ for larger and larger ℓ . \square

Theorem 4.17. *The trivial ideal, $\text{triv}(F)$, is ccc over fin .*

Proof. Let r and the sequence $\{\{i_s : s \in S'(k, r)\} : k \in K\}$ be as constructed in Lemma 4.16. Since $\{|H_k \setminus \text{dom}(r)| : k \in K\}$ diverges to infinity, we may assume that $\text{dom}(r) \supset [n_k, n_{k+1})$ for each $k \notin K$. We define a \mathbb{P} -name of an ultrafilter. Each $q < r$ forces that the set $X(q) = \bigcup_{k \in K} \{i_s : s \in S'(k, q)\}$ is a member. Let x be any ultrafilter extending this filter. We claim that $\dot{\Phi}(x)$ has no value. Assume first that there is some $q < r$ which forces that $X(r) \in \dot{\Phi}(x)$ (i.e. q forces that $F^{-1}(X(r)) \in x$). We may then further assume that some $q' < q$ forces that $X(q)$ has some infinite subset $Y(q) \in x$ such that for some m , $(F(Y(q)) \setminus m) \subset X(r)$. Of course, $Y(q)$ is just a set in V and $Y(q) \cap X(q')$ is large. Choose an infinite sequence $\{k_j : j \in \omega\}$ so that for each j , we can choose $i_j \in Y(q) \cap \{i_s : s \in S'(k_j, q')\}$ and so that $\{|H_k \setminus \text{dom}(q')| : k \notin \{k_j : j \in \omega\}\}$ diverges to infinity. For each j , let s_{k_j} denote the member s of $S'(k_j, q')$ such that $i_j = i_s$. For each j , choose any $s'_j \in S'(k_j, q')$ which extends s_{k_j} that satisfies that $s'_j \sqcup q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})} \text{“}\dot{h}(i_j) \neq i_j\text{”}$. Let h^* denote the function with domain $\{i_j : j \in \omega\}$ satisfying that $s'_j \sqcup q' \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}(\mathfrak{F})} \text{“}\dot{h}(i_j) = h^*(i_j)\text{”}$. Note that $h^*(i_j) \notin X(r)$ for all j since i_j is the only member of $\text{Orb}_r(i_j)$ in $X(r)$. We can extend the condition $q' \cup \bigcup_j s'_j$ further to some q^* so that $\text{dom}(q^*) \supset [n_{k_j}, n_{k_j+1})$ for each j . We observe that $J = \{i_j : j \in \omega\} \subset Y(q) \cap \text{dom}(h_{q^*})$. By removing finitely many elements, we may assume that q^* forces that h^* agrees with h_{q^*} on J . However, we now have a contradiction since $h_{q^*}[J] =^* F(J) \subset^* F(Y(q)) \subset^* X(r)$.

Now assume that there is a $q < r$ which forces that $X(r)$ is not in $\dot{\Phi}(x)$. There is a $q' < q$ and a $Y(q) \subset X(q)$ such that for some $Z \subset \mathbb{N} \setminus X(r)$, q' forces that $Y(q) \in x$ and $Z = F(Y(q))$. Again select

a sequence $\{k_j : j \in \omega\}$ so that for each j , $[n_{k_j}, n_{k_j+1}) \cap Y(q) \cap X(q')$ is not empty, and choose i_j from this set. We may choose this sequence so that $\{|H_k \setminus \text{dom}(q')| : k \notin \{k_j : j \in \omega\}\}$ diverges to infinity. For each j , let $s_j \in S'(k_j, q')$ be chosen so that $i_j = i_{s_j}$. If for infinitely many j , it is possible to select $s'_j \in S'(k_j, s_j \cup q')$ so that $s'_j \cup q'$ forces that $\dot{h}(i_j)$ is not in Z , then we select such an s'_j . The proof then proceeds much as in the first case because it will allow us to obtain that for an infinite J , $\dot{h}[\{i_j : j \in J\}]$ is disjoint from Z in contradiction to $F(\{i_j : j \in J\})$ being contained in Z . In the other case, we select $z_j \in Z$ such that s_j has an extension forcing that $\dot{h}(i_j)$ is equal to z_j , but we also know that we can (and do) select s'_j extending s_j to force that $\dot{h}(i_j)$ is not equal to z_j . Applying the same arguments to the automorphism \dot{F}^{-1} we may certainly select an infinite $J \subset \omega$ and a $q^* < q' \cup \bigcup_j s'_j$ so that $\{z_j : j \in J\}$ is in the range of h_{q^*} . It follows that there is a sequence $Y = \{y_j : j \in J\} \subset Y(q)$ such that $h_{q^*}(y_j) = z_j$ for each $j \in J$. Clearly then this puts $z_j \in \text{Orb}_r(y_j)$ for all but finitely many j . By Lemma 4.12, we actually have that y_j is also from $[n_{k_j}, n_{k_j+1})$ and so the contradiction is that we have arranged that $\text{Orb}_r(y_j)$ and $\text{Orb}_r(i_j)$ are disjoint. \square

5. ALL HOMEOMORPHISMS ARE TRIVIAL WHEN FORCING WITH \mathbb{P}_0

In this section we first restrict to the case where \mathbb{P} is \mathbb{P}_0 and we continue with the assumptions on F and \dot{h} and the sequence $\{n_k : k \in \omega\}$ established in the previous section. We begin with a \bar{q} and the sequence $\{n_k, m_k : k \in \omega\}$ as developed in the paragraph following Lemma 4.9. In particular, that $[2^{m_k}, 2^{m_k+1})$ contains $[n_k, n_{k+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(\bar{q})$. For each k , we will now let H_k be the set $[2^{m_k}, 2^{m_k+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(\bar{q})$. We may assume that $\{|H_k| : k \in \omega\}$ diverges to infinity. Say that a condition q is standard, if for each $\ell > 0$, there are at most finitely many k such that $H_k \setminus \text{dom}(q)$ has cardinality ℓ . The standard conditions are dense below \bar{q} in \mathbb{P}_0 . For a standard condition q , let $K(q)$ denote those k such that $H_k \setminus \text{dom}(q)$ is not empty. It follows then that $\{|H_k \setminus \text{dom}(q)| : k \in K(q)\}$ diverges to infinity. Recall that q is identically 0 on $\text{dom}(q) \cap S^k$ for all $k \in K(q)$. For a condition p and $i \in H_k \setminus \text{dom}(p)$, we abuse notation and suppose that $p \cup \{(i, 1)\}$ denotes the smallest condition in \mathbb{P}_0 that contains $p \cup \{(i, 1)\}$.

Lemma 5.1. *If $p_0 < \bar{q}$ in \mathbb{P}_0 is a standard condition such that no extension of p_0 decides $\dot{h}(t)$ for all values of t , then there is an extension $p < p_0$ such that for all $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \text{dom}(p)$, there is a value t_i so that for*

some distinct pair u_i, v_i , $p \cup \{(i, 0)\} \Vdash \dot{h}(t_i) = u_i$ and $p \cup \{(i, 1)\} \Vdash \dot{h}(t_i) = v_i$.

Proof. We proceed by a simple recursion. By induction on ℓ , suppose we have chosen p_ℓ together with a family $\{i(k, j) : j < \ell\} \subset H_k \setminus \text{dom}(p_\ell)$ for all $k \in K(p_\ell)$. We assume that for each $j < \ell$ and $k \in K(p_\ell)$, there is a value $t_{k,j}$ so that $p_{j+1} \cup \{(i(k, j'), 0) : j' \leq j\}$ and $p_{j+1} \cup \{(i(k, j'), 0) : j' < j\} \cup \{(i(k, j), 1)\}$ force distinct values, $u_{k,j}, v_{k,j}$, on $\dot{h}(t_{k,j})$. As usual in such a fusion, we assume that $p_{j+1} \upharpoonright n_{m_j} \subset p_j$ so that we will have that $\bigcup_\ell p_\ell$ is a condition. Now we may choose a sequence $\langle t_{k,\ell} : k \in K \rangle$ (for some infinite $K \subset K(p_\ell)$) such that, for each $k \in K$, $t_{k,\ell} \in [n_k, n_{k+1})$ and $p_\ell \cup \{(i(k, j), 0) : j < \ell\}$ does not force a value on $\dot{h}(t_{k,\ell})$. For each $k \in K$, there are two values $\bar{1}_0^k, \bar{1}_1^k$ from $H_k \setminus (\text{dom}(p_\ell) \cup \{i(k, j) : j < \ell\})$, such that $p_\ell \cup \{(\bar{1}_0^k, 1)\}$ and $p_\ell \cup \{(\bar{1}_1^k, 1)\}$ force distinct values, v_0^k, v_1^k , on $\dot{h}(t_{k,\ell})$. Using Lemma 4.10, choose $\bar{p}_{\ell+1} < p_\ell$ such that for all $k \in K(\bar{p}_{\ell+1}) \subset K$, $\{i(k, j) : j < \ell\}$ is disjoint from $\text{dom}(\bar{p}_{\ell+1})$ and $\bar{p}_{\ell+1} \cup \{(i(k, j), 0) : j < \ell\}$ forces a value, $u_{k,\ell}$, on $\dot{h}(t_{k,\ell})$. Suppose, without loss of generality, that $v_1^k \neq u_{k,\ell}$ and let $i_{k,\ell} = \bar{1}_1^k$. It follows that $i_{k,\ell} \in \text{dom}(\bar{p}_{\ell+1})$ and so define $p_{\ell+1}$ to be the condition we get by removing $i_{k,\ell}$ from the domain of $\bar{p}_{\ell+1}$ for all $k \in K = K(p_{\ell+1})$.

When the recursion is finished, we choose any increasing sequence $\{k_\ell : \ell \in \omega\}$ so that $k_\ell \in K(p_{\ell+1})$, and $p < p_0$ any condition so that $K(p) = \{k_\ell : \ell \in \omega\}$, and $H_{k_\ell} \setminus \text{dom}(p) = \{i(k_\ell, j) : j < \ell\}$. Of course this implies that p is constantly 0 on each $H_{k_\ell} \cap \text{dom}(p)$. For each $k = k_\ell$ and $j < \ell$, we have that $p \cup \{(i(k, j), 1)\}$ forces the value $v_{k,j}$ on $\dot{h}(t_{k,j})$ because of Lemma 4.9. And similarly, since $p_{\ell+1} \upharpoonright H_k \subset p$, we have that $p \cup \{(i(k, j'), 0) : j' \leq j\}$ forces that $\dot{h}(t_{k,j}) = u_{k,j}$. Because of this, we have that if $q < p$ is such that $k \in K(q)$ and q forces a value on $\dot{h}(t_{k,j})$, then this value has to be $u_{k,j}$. We finish the construction by another more routine recursion. There should be no risk of confusion if we re-use the notation p_1, p_2 etc. for the values in this new recursion. For each $k \in K(p)$, let $j_{k,0}$ denote the largest value so that $i(k, j_{k,0}) \notin \text{dom}(p)$. By Lemma 4.10, there is a condition $p_1 < p$ so that p_1 forces a value on $\dot{h} \upharpoonright \{t_{k,j_{k,0}} : k \in K(p)\}$. Again, as discussed above, we have that p_1 forces that $\dot{h}(t_{k,j_{k,0}}) = u_{k,j_{k,0}}$ for each $k \in K(p_1)$. There is an infinite set $K_1 \subset K(p_1)$ such that there is a largest $j_{k,1} < j_{k,0}$ such that $i(k, j_{k,1}) \notin \text{dom}(p_1)$. Find a condition $p_2 < p_1$ which forces a value on $\dot{h} \upharpoonright \{t_{k,j_{k,1}} : k \in K_1\}$. Continue this induction. Again there is a sequence $\{k_\ell : \ell \in \omega\}$ such that $j_{k,\ell}$ was successfully chosen for $k = k_{\ell+1}$. We extend p to a condition p' so that

$K(p') = \{k_\ell : \ell \in \omega\}$ and $H_{k_\ell} \setminus \text{dom}(p')$ is equal to $\{i(k_\ell, j_{k_\ell, m}) : m < \ell\}$. We still have that $p' \cup \{(i, 1)\} \Vdash \dot{h}(t_{k,i}) = v_{k,i}$ for each $i \in H_k \setminus \text{dom}(p')$, but we can now show that $p' \cup \{(i, 0)\}$ forces that $\dot{h}(t_{k,i}) = u_{k,i}$. The simplest way to do this is to consider any $i' \in H_k \setminus \text{dom}(p')$ with $i' \neq i$. If $i' < i$, then the condition $p' \cup \{(i', 1)\}$ is compatible with $p_{m+1} \upharpoonright H_k$ where m is chosen so that $i = i(k, j_{k,m})$. On the other hand if $i' > i$, then $p' \cup \{(i', 1)\}$ is compatible with $p \cup \{(i(k, j), 0) : j \leq j_{k,m}\}$. Since each of these force that $\dot{h}(t_{k,i}) = u_{k,i}$, we have that $p' \cup \{(i, 0)\}$ forces that $\dot{h}(t_{k,i}) = u_{k,i}$. \square

Theorem 5.2. *In the extension obtained by forcing over a model of PFA by \mathbb{P}_0 all automorphisms on $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})/\text{fin}$ are trivial.*

Proof. Fix a condition p as in Lemma 5.1 satisfying that for each $i \notin \text{dom}(p)$ there is a t_i such that there are distinct values u_i, v_i that $p \cup \{(i, 0)\}$ and $p \cup \{(i, 1)\}$, respectively, force on $\dot{h}(t_i)$. We prove that this leads to a contradiction. Choose a condition $q < p$ and a set Y so that q forces that $F(Y) = \{u_i : i \notin \text{dom}(p)\}$. Let $L_0 = \{i \notin \text{dom}(q) : t_i \notin Y\}$. If L_0 is infinite, then we have a contradiction by choosing any infinite subset L' of L_0 so that $L' \cap H_k$ has at most one element for each k , and considering the condition $q' = q \cup \{(i, 0) : i \in L'\}$. We now have that q' forces that $F(\{t_i : i \in L'\}) =^* h_{q'}(\{t_i : i \in L'\})$ will be almost contained in $F(Y)$ while $\{t_i : i \in L'\}$ is disjoint from Y .

Now suppose that L_0 is finite. If $\{v_i : i \notin \text{dom}(q)\} \setminus F(Y)$ is infinite, then we choose an infinite L' so that $L' \cap H_k$ is empty for infinitely many $k \in K(q)$ and so that $\{v_i : i \in L'\}$ is disjoint from $F(Y)$. Again the extension $q' = q \cup \{(i, 1) : i \in L'\}$ will force that $F(\{t_i : i \in L'\}) =^* h_{q'}(\{t_i : i \in L'\})$, but this contradicts that it is supposed to be mod finite contained in $F(Y)$.

The final case then is that there is an infinite sequence $L' \subset K(q)$ such that $K(q) \setminus L'$ is still infinite and there is a sequence of pairs $\{i_k, i'_k : k \in L'\}$ such that i_k, i'_k are distinct members of $H_k \setminus \text{dom}(q)$ and $v_{i_k} = u_{i'_k}$ for each $k \in L'$. Now we have that the extension $q' = q \cup \{(i_k, 1) : k \in L'\} \supset q \cup \{(i_k, 1), (i'_k, 0) : k \in L'\}$ will force that \dot{h} is not 1-to-1. \square

6. MORE PROPERTIES OF THE POSET \mathbb{P}_1

Theorem 6.1. *In a model obtained by forcing with the poset \mathbb{P}_1 over a model of PFA, there is a non-trivial autohomeomorphism φ of \mathbb{N}^* and two regular closed copies A, B of \mathbb{N}^* and a tie-point \mathcal{W} such that*

- (1) $\varphi[A] = B$ and $\varphi[B] = A$, and $A \cap B = \{\mathcal{W}\}$,
- (2) \mathcal{W} is the only point on the boundary of each of A and B ,

(3) φ is the identity on $\mathbb{N}^* \setminus (A \cup B)$.

Proof. We will define a strange sequence, $\{\dot{t}_m : m \in \omega\}$, of \mathbb{P}_1 -names of pairs. These will code liftings of the maps between A and B (each will “pick” a point from the pair) and the mappings of each onto \mathbb{N}^* (each member from the m -th pair being sent to m). The difficult part of the construction is to ensure that A and B meet in a single ultrafilter.

For each $m \in \omega$ and each function $\sigma \in 2^{[2^m, 2^{m+1})}$, we will choose a pair $a_\sigma \subset [2^m, 2^{m+1})$. The definition of \dot{t}_m will simply be that a condition $p \in \mathbb{P}_1$ such that $[2^m, 2^{m+1}) \subset \text{dom}(p)$, will force that \dot{t}_m is equal to $a_{p \upharpoonright [2^m, 2^{m+1})}$. Analogous to the definition of $K(p)$ above, let $M(p)$ denote the set $\{m \in \omega : [2^m, 2^{m+1}) \not\subset \text{dom}(p)\}$ for each $p \in \mathbb{P}_1$. Without mention, we will assume that we work with the dense set of conditions which satisfy that $\{|[2^m, 2^{m+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(p)| : m \in M(p)\}$ diverges to infinity.

For each $p \in \mathbb{P}_1$, let $T(p) = \{t_m : m \notin M(p) \text{ and } p \Vdash t_m = \dot{t}_m\}$, $A(p) = \{\min(t_m) : t_m \in T(p)\}$ and $B(p) = \{\max(t_m) : t_m \in T(p)\}$. If G is a generic filter on \mathbb{P}_1 , then we will set A to be the closure of the open set $\bigcup\{A(p)^* : p \in G\}$ and B to be the closure of the open set $\bigcup\{B(p)^* : p \in G\}$.

For each $p \in \mathbb{P}_1$, let $W(p)$ equal $\bigcup_{m \in M(p)} \{a_\sigma : \sigma \cup p \in \mathbb{P}_1\}$. Now define the filter \mathcal{W} to be the filter generated by the family $\{W(p) : p \in G\}$. If we define these names so that \mathcal{W} is forced to be an ultrafilter, then it is quite routine to check that \mathcal{W} is the only boundary point of each of A and B and that the map sending \mathbb{N}^* onto \mathbb{N}^* obtained by extending the map sending each interval $[2^m, 2^{m+1})$ to $\{m\}$ will restrict to a homeomorphism on each of A and B . This implies that there is a homeomorphism from A onto B that sends \mathcal{W} to itself. It should then be clear that there is a homeomorphism φ as in the statement of the theorem.

Now we set about showing that there is such a sequence of names. We will define, for $m \in \omega$ and $\sigma \in 2^{[2^m, 2^{m+1})}$, the value of a_σ based only on the cardinality of $\sigma^{-1}(1)$. In fact some Ramsey theory says this will effectively be the case anyway. To make these choices we now introduce the idea of an ℓ -structure for $\ell \in \omega$.

The 0-structure will be the empty set. We let $L_0 = 2$ and $n_0 = 6 = L_0 + L_0^{L_0}$. We next define a family of pairs $\{a_{\langle i \rangle} : i < n_0\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\langle 0 \rangle} &= \{0, 1\}, & a_{\langle 1 \rangle} &= \{2, 3\}, & a_{\langle 2 \rangle} &= \{0, 2\}, \\ a_{\langle 3 \rangle} &= \{0, 3\}, & a_{\langle 4 \rangle} &= \{1, 2\}, & a_{\langle 5 \rangle} &= \{1, 3\} \end{aligned}$$

This assignment satisfies that for each set Y such that $Y \cap a_{\langle i \rangle}$ is not empty for each $i < L_0$, there is a $j < n_0$ such that $Y \supset a_{\langle j \rangle}$. This is

the process by which we will ensure that the above defined \mathcal{W} is an ultrafilter.

By recursion on ℓ , we define $L_\ell = 2n_0n_1\cdots n_{\ell-1}$, set $n_\ell = L_\ell + L_\ell^{L_\ell}$, and we define our ℓ -structure based on the cartesian product

$$\mathcal{N}_\ell = n_\ell \times n_{\ell-1} \times \cdots \times n_1 \times n_0 .$$

It is awkward, but ultimately more convenient, to have this product in descending order. For each $j < \ell$, also let $\mathcal{N}_{\ell,j} = n_\ell \times \cdots \times n_j$.

An ℓ -structure is a family $\langle \{a_x : x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell\}, \{Y_\rho : \rho \in \bigcup_{j < \ell} \mathcal{N}_{\ell,j}\} \rangle$ satisfying

- (1) for each $x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$, a_x is a pair of integers
- (2) for each $\rho \in \bigcup_{j < \ell} \mathcal{N}_{\ell,j}$, Y_ρ is the union of all a_x with $x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$ and $\rho \subset x$,
- (3) for each $j < \ell - 1$ and $\rho \in \mathcal{N}_{\ell,j}$, the family $\langle \{a_x : \rho \subset x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell\}, \{Y_\psi : \rho \subset \psi \in \bigcup_{i < \ell} \mathcal{N}_{\ell,i}\} \rangle$ is an $(\ell - j)$ -structure (with a confusing prefix of ρ on each index),
- (4) the family $\{Y_{\langle m \rangle} : m < L_\ell\}$ are pairwise disjoint and Y_\emptyset is the union,
- (5) for each $Y \subset Y_\emptyset$ such that $Y \cap Y_{\langle m \rangle} \neq \emptyset$ for each $m < L_\ell$, there is a $k < n_\ell$ such that $Y \supset Y_{\langle k \rangle}$.

The construction is quite straightforward. Let $\{\bar{a}_x : x \in \mathcal{N}_{\ell-1}\}$ be the pairs from an $\ell-1$ -structure. The definition of L_ℓ ensures that it exceeds the cardinality of, \bar{Y}_\emptyset , the union of these pairs. Let $\{Y_{\langle m \rangle} : m < L_\ell\}$ be a pairwise disjoint family of sets of integers each of the same cardinality as \bar{Y}_\emptyset . Similarly, let $\{Y_{\langle k \rangle} : m \leq k < n_\ell\}$ be a family of sets, each of cardinality $|\bar{Y}_\emptyset|$, so that the last inductive assumption is satisfied. For each $k < n_\ell$, fix a bijection, f_k , between \bar{Y}_\emptyset and $Y_{\langle k \rangle}$ and define $a_{k \frown \bar{x}} = f_k[\bar{a}_{\bar{x}}]$ for each $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{N}_{\ell-1}$.

For each ℓ , let c_ℓ denote the order-preserving mapping from \mathcal{N}_ℓ with the natural lexicographic ordering into an initial segment of $[0, L_{\ell+1})$. It is important to observe that for each $\rho \in \bigcup_{j < \ell} \mathcal{N}_{\ell,j}$, the set $[\rho] = \{x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell : \rho \subset x\}$ is an interval in the lexicographic ordering, and so, $c_\ell([\rho])$ is an interval in $[0, L_{\ell+1})$. We may also assume that we have, for each ℓ , a fixed ℓ -structure so that the set $Y_\emptyset^\ell = Y_\emptyset$ from this structure is an initial segment of integers.

For each integer m , choose $\ell = \ell_m$ maximal so that $L_{\ell_m+1} \leq 2^m$ (hence the interval $[2^m, 2^{m+1})$ will support an ℓ -structure). For each $\sigma \in 2^{[2^m, 2^{m+1})}$ such that there is an $x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$ with $c_\ell(x) = |\sigma^{-1}(1)|$, define a_σ to be the pair obtained by adding 2^m to each member of a_x . It follows that $a_\sigma \subset [2^m, 2^{m+1})$. If there is no such $x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$, let $a_\sigma = \{2^m, 2^m+1\}$.

Define the condition $p_0 \in \mathbb{P}_1$ by the prescription that for all m and $\ell = \ell_m$, $p_0 \upharpoonright [2^m, 2^{m+1})$ is the partial function which is 0 on the segment $[2^m + |Y_\emptyset^\ell|, 2^{m+1})$. This ensures that for all $\sigma \in 2^{[2^m, 2^{m+1})}$ which extend $p_0 \upharpoonright [2^m, 2^{m+1})$, there will be an $x \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$ such that $c_\ell(x) = |\sigma^{-1}(1)|$.

To finish the proof, we prove that p_0 forces that \mathcal{W} is an ultrafilter. That is, if $q < p_0$ and $Y \subset \mathbb{N}$, then there is a $p < q$ such that Y either contains, or is disjoint from, $W(p)$.

We may assume that the sequence $\{k_m = |[2^m, 2^{m+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(q)| : m \in M(q)\}$ diverges to infinity. For each $m \in M(q)$, let $q_m = q \upharpoonright [2^m, 2^{m+1})$. Also, for $m \in M(q)$, let i_m be the largest integer so that $n_{i_m} < k_m/3$. By thinning out further (using any extension of q), we can also assume that $\{i_m : m \in M(q)\}$ diverges to infinity. It then follows that for each $m \in M(q)$ there is a $\rho_m \in \mathcal{N}_{\ell_m, i_m}$ such that the interval $c_{\ell_m}[\rho_m]$ is contained in $[|q_m^{-1}(1)|, |q_m^{-1}(1)| + k_m)$. By inductive hypotheses (3) and (5) in the definition of an ℓ_m -structure, there is an extension ψ_m of ρ_m with $\psi_m \in \mathcal{N}_{\ell_m, i_m+1}$ such that Y either contains, or is disjoint from, $W_m = 2^m + Y_{\psi_m}^{\ell_m}$ (i.e. $W_m = \bigcup \{a_\sigma : \sigma \in 2^{[2^m, 2^{m+1})}$ and $|\sigma^{-1}(1)| \in c_{\ell_m}[\psi_m]\}$). By symmetry, we may assume that there is an infinite $K \subset M(q)$ such that Y contains W_m for all $m \in K$. Let $p < q$ be any condition such that $p^{-1}(0) = q^{-1}(0)$ (no more 0's are added) and for each $m \in K$, the minimum element of $c_{\ell_m}[\psi_m]$ is the number of values in $[2^m, 2^{m+1})$ which are sent to 1 by p . Notice that for $m \in K$, $|[2^m, 2^{m+1}) \setminus \text{dom}(p)| > n_{i_m+2}$ and so we may assume that $M(p) = K$. In other words, p will satisfy that $W(p) = \bigcup_{m \in M(p)} W_m$. This shows that p forces that Y contains a member of \mathcal{W} . \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Alan Dow. A non-trivial copy of $\beta\mathbb{N} \setminus \mathbb{N}$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142(8):2907–2913, 2014.
- [2] Alan Dow, *PFA and ω_1^** , vol. 28, 1988, Special issue on set-theoretic topology, pp. 127–140. 932977
- [3] Alan Dow and Saharon Shelah. Tie-points and fixed-points in \mathbb{N}^* . *Topology Appl.*, 155(15):1661–1671, 2008.
- [4] Alan Dow and Saharon Shelah. More on tie-points and homeomorphism in \mathbb{N}^* . *Fund. Math.*, 203(3):191–210, 2009.
- [5] Alan Dow, Petr Simon, and Jerry E. Vaughan, *Strong homology and the proper forcing axiom*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **106** (1989), no. 3, 821–828. MR961403 (90a:55019)
- [6] Alan Dow and Geta Techanie, *Two-to-one continuous images of \mathbb{N}^** , Fund. Math. **186** (2005), no. 2, 177–192. MR2162384 (2006f:54003)
- [7] Ilijas Farah, *Analytic quotients: theory of liftings for quotients over analytic ideals on the integers*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **148** (2000), no. 702, xvi+177. MR1711328 (2001c:03076)

- [8] S. Shelah, *Proper forcing*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 940, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.
- [9] Saharon Shelah and Juris Steprāns. PFA implies all automorphisms are trivial. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 104(4):1220–1225, 1988.
- [10] S. Shelah and J. Steprāns. Somewhere trivial autohomeomorphisms. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 49:569–580, 1994.
- [11] Saharon Shelah and Juris Steprāns, *Martin's axiom is consistent with the existence of nowhere trivial automorphisms*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), no. 7, 2097–2106 (electronic). 1896046 (2003k:03063)
- [12] Juris Steprāns, *The autohomeomorphism group of the Čech-Stone compactification of the integers*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **355** (2003), no. 10, 4223–4240 (electronic). 1990584 (2004e:03087)
- [13] B. Velickovic. Definable automorphisms of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 96:130–135, 1986.
- [14] Boban Veličković. OCA and automorphisms of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$. *Topology Appl.*, 49(1):1–13, 1993.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNC CHARLOTTE