

A SIMULTANEOUS GENERALIZATION OF INDEPENDENCE AND DISJOINTNESS IN BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS

COREY T. BRUNS

ABSTRACT. We give a definition of some classes of boolean algebras generalizing free boolean algebras; they satisfy a universal property that certain functions extend to homomorphisms. We give a combinatorial property of generating sets of these algebras, which we call n -independent. The properties of these classes (n -free and ω -free boolean algebras) are investigated. These include connections to hypergraph theory and cardinal invariants on these algebras. Related cardinal functions, i_n , the minimum size of a maximal n -independent subset and i_ω , the minimum size of an ω -independent subset, are introduced and investigated. The values of i_n and i_ω on $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$ are shown to be independent of ZFC.

1. DEFINITIONS

A boolean algebra A is free over its subset X if it has the universal property that every function f from X to a boolean algebra B extends to a unique homomorphism. This is equivalent to requiring that X be independent and generate A (uniqueness). A generalization, \perp -free, is introduced in Heindorf [5], and some of its properties are dealt with. I follow his notation for some of its properties, but that of Koppelberg [6] for the operations $+$, \cdot , $-$, 0 , 1 on Boolean Algebras, with the addition that for an element a of a boolean algebra, we let $a^0 = -a$ and $a^1 = a$. An elementary product of X is an element of the form $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x}$ where R is a finite subset of X and $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$. We further generalize the notion of freeness to n -freeness for $1 \leq n \leq \omega$.

It is nice to have a symbol for disjointness; we define $a \perp b$ if and only if $a \cdot b = 0$.

Definition 1.1. Let n be a positive integer, A and B be nontrivial boolean algebras, and $U \subseteq A$. A function $f : U \rightarrow B$ is n -preserving if and only if for every $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} \in U$, $\prod_{i < n} a_i = 0$ implies that $\prod_{i < n} f(a_i) = 0$.

An infinite version of this is also important.

Definition 1.2. Let A and B be nontrivial boolean algebras, and $U \subseteq A$. A function $f : U \rightarrow B$ is ω -preserving if and only if for every finite $H \subseteq U$, $\prod H = 0$ implies that $\prod f[H] = 0$.

Then we say that A is n -free over X if every n -preserving function from X into arbitrary B extends to a unique homomorphism. The uniqueness just requires that X be a generating set for A .

The existence of such extensions is equivalent to an algebraic property of X , namely that X^+ is n -independent. This notion is defined below, and the equivalence is proved. (For $n = 1$, this is the usual notion of free and independent; for $n = 2$,

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 03G05; Secondary: 03E17.
Key words and phrases. boolean algebra, independence, delta system, forcing.

the notions are called \perp -free and \perp -independent by Heindorf [5]; Theorem 1.3 in the same paper shows that a 2-free boolean algebra has a 2-independent generating set. We differ from Heindorf in that he allows 0 to be an element of a \perp -independent set.) Since any function that is n -preserving is also m -preserving for all $m \leq n \leq \omega$, so that an m -free boolean algebra is also n -free over the same set; in particular, any n -free boolean algebra is ω -free. It's also worth noting that a function is ω -preserving if and only if it's n -preserving for all finite n .

Freeness over X implies that no elementary products over X can be 0. n -independence weakens this by allowing products of n or fewer elements of X to be 0. This requires some other elementary products to be 0 as well—if $x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdot \dots \cdot x_m = 0$, then any elementary product that includes x_1, \dots, x_m each with exponent 1 must also be 0.

Definition 1.3. Let A be a boolean algebra. For n a positive integer, $X \subseteq A$ is n -independent if and only if $0 \notin X$ and for all nonempty finite subsets F and G of X , the following three conditions hold:

- ($\perp 1$): $\sum F \neq 1$.
- ($\perp 2$) _{n} : If $\prod F = 0$, there is an $F' \subseteq F$ with $|F'| \leq n$ such that $\prod F' = 0$.
- ($\perp 3$): If $0 \neq \prod F \leq \sum G$, then $F \cap G \neq \emptyset$.

Definition 1.4. Let A be a boolean algebra. $X \subseteq A$ is ω -independent if and only if $0 \notin X$ and for all nonempty finite subsets F and G of X , the following two conditions hold:

- ($\perp 1$): $\sum F \neq 1$.
- ($\perp 3$): If $0 \neq \prod F \leq \sum G$, then $F \cap G \neq \emptyset$.

We note that in both the above definitions, if X is infinite, then ($\perp 3$) \Rightarrow ($\perp 1$); suppose ($\perp 1$) fails; take a finite G with $\sum G = 1$, then take some $x \notin G$ and let $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x\}$; then $0 < \prod F \leq \sum G$ and $F \cap G = \emptyset$.

($\perp 3$) has several equivalent forms which will be useful in the sequel.

Proposition 1.5. *The following are equivalent for a subset of X of a boolean algebra A :*

- (1) For all nonempty finite $F, G \subseteq X$, ($\perp 3$).
- (2) For all nonempty finite $F, G \subseteq X$ such that $F \cap G = \emptyset$ and $\prod F \neq 0$, $\prod F \not\leq \sum G$.
- (3) For all nonempty finite $F, G \subseteq X$ such that $F \cap G = \emptyset$ and $\prod F \neq 0$, $\prod F \cdot \prod -G \neq 0$, where $-G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{-g : g \in G\}$.
- (4) Let X be bijectively enumerated by I such that $X = \{x_i : i \in I\}$. For all nonempty finite $R \subseteq I$ and all $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ such that $1 \in \text{rng } \varepsilon$ and $\prod_{\substack{i \in R \\ \varepsilon_i = 1}} x_i \neq 0$, $\prod_{i \in R} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} \neq 0$.

In words, the final equivalent says that no elementary product of elements of X is 0 unless the product of the non-complemented elements is 0. We note that in the presence of ($\perp 2$) _{n} , the words “of n ” may be inserted after “product.”

Proof. We begin by pointing out that ($\perp 3$) has two hypotheses, $0 \neq \prod F$ and $\prod F \leq \sum G$. Thus the contrapositive of ($\perp 3$) is “If $F \cap G = \emptyset$, then $0 = \prod F$ or $\prod F \not\leq \sum G$,” which is equivalent to (2).

(2) and (3) are equivalent by some elementary facts: $a \leq b \iff a \cdot -b = 0$ and de Morgan's law that $-\sum G = \prod -G$.

(3) \Rightarrow (4):

Assume (3) and the hypotheses of (4). If $\text{rng } \varepsilon = \{1\}$, the conclusion is clear. Otherwise, let $F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x_i : i \in R \text{ and } \varepsilon_i = 0\}$. Then (3) implies that $\prod_{i \in R} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} \neq 0$, as we wanted.

(4) \Rightarrow (3):

Assume (4) and the hypotheses of (3). Let $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in I : x_i \in F \cup G\}$ and let $\varepsilon_i = 1$ if $x_i \in F$ and $\varepsilon_i = 0$ otherwise. Then (4) implies that $\prod F \cdot \prod -G \neq 0$, as we wanted. \square

Proposition 1.6. *The following are equivalent for a subset X of a boolean algebra A :*

- (1) X is ω -independent
- (2) Let X be bijectively enumerated by I such that $X = \{x_i : i \in I\}$. For all nonempty finite $R \subseteq I$ and all $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ such that $\prod_{\varepsilon_i=1} x_i \neq 0$, $\prod_{i \in R} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} \neq 0$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of proposition 1.5. $(\perp 1)$ is taken care of since products over an empty index set are taken to be 1 by definition. \square

In the same spirit, we have an equivalent definition of n -independent.

Proposition 1.7. *Let n be a positive integer or ω , A a nontrivial boolean algebra and $X \subseteq A^+$. X is n -independent if and only if for every $R \in [X]^{<\omega}$ and every $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$, if $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$ then there is an $R' \subseteq R$ with $|R'| \leq n$ such that $\varepsilon[R'] = \{1\}$ and $\prod R' = 0$.*

Proof. If $n = \omega$, this is part of proposition 1.6.

Let n be a positive integer, A a boolean algebra, and $X \subseteq A^+$.

We first show that n -independent sets have the indicated property.

Assume that X is n -independent; take $R \in [X]^{<\omega}$ and $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ such that $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$. Let $F = \{x \in R : \varepsilon_x = 1\}$ and $G = \{x \in R : \varepsilon_x = 0\}$. $F \neq \emptyset$; otherwise $\sum R = -\prod R = 1$, contradicting $(\perp 1)$. Since $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = \prod F \cdot \prod -G$, we have that $\prod F \leq \sum G$. If $G = \emptyset$, then $\sum G = 0$ and so $\prod F = 0$ as well. If $G \neq \emptyset$, then $\prod F = 0$ since $F \cap G = \emptyset$, using $(\perp 3)$. Then R' is found by $(\perp 2)_n$. Now we show that sets with the indicated property are n -independent.

Assume that X has the indicated condition and $F, G \in [X]^{<\omega} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$. We have three conditions to check.

- $(\perp 1)$: Suppose that $\sum F = 1$. We let F be the set R in the condition, setting $\varepsilon_x = 0$ for all $x \in F$. Then $\prod_{x \in F} x^{\varepsilon_x} = \prod -F = -\sum F = 0$ and $\{x \in F : \varepsilon_x = 1\} = \emptyset$, thus there is no R' as in the condition, since products over an empty index set are equal to 1.
- $(\perp 2)_n$: Suppose that $\prod F = 0$. Again we let F be the set R in the condition, this time setting $\varepsilon_x = 1$ for all $x \in F$. Then the condition gives us the necessary F'
- $(\perp 3)$: Suppose that $0 \neq \prod F \leq \sum G$ and $F \cap G = \emptyset$. Let $R = F \cup G$ and $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ be such that $\varepsilon[F] = \{1\}$ and $\varepsilon[G] = \{0\}$. Then $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$ and the condition gives $\prod F = 0$, which contradicts the original supposition.

\square

Lemma 1.8. *If H is an ω -independent set that has no finite subset F such that $\prod F = 0$, H is in fact independent. Furthermore, if H is n -independent with no subset F of size n or less with $\prod F = 0$, then H is independent.*

Proof. We only need show that $(\perp 2)_1$ holds, which it does vacuously. \square

2-independence, and thus n -independence for $2 \leq n \leq \omega$, is also a generalization of pairwise disjointness on infinite sets.

Theorem 1.9. *If $X \subseteq B^+$ is an infinite pairwise disjoint set, then X is 2-independent.*

Proof. This is clear from proposition 1.7. \square

Some non-trivial examples of 2-free boolean algebras are the finite-cofinite algebras. For infinite κ , let $A = \text{FinCo}(\kappa)$. $\text{At}(A)$ is a 2-independent generating set for A .

Having an n -independent generating set is equivalent to n -freeness. This is known in Koppelberg [6] for $n = 1$ and Heindorf [5] for $n = 2$. Our proof is more elementary than that of Heindorf [5] in that it avoids clone theory.

Theorem 1.10. *If A is ω -free over X , then X^+ is ω -independent.*

Proof. Let A and X be as in the hypothesis; we show that X^+ is ω -independent. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 \notin X$ so that $X^+ = X$.

($\perp 1$): Let $f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be such that $f[X] = \{0\}$. Clearly f is ω -preserving and thus extends to a homomorphism \bar{f} . Take $F \in [X]^{<\omega}$; then $\bar{f}(\sum F) = \sum f[F] = 0$, so that $\sum F \neq 1$.

($\perp 3$): Take $F, G \in [X]^{<\omega}$ such that $F \cap G = \emptyset$ and $\prod F \neq 0$. Let $f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be such that $f[F] = \{1\}$ and $f[X \setminus F] = \{0\}$. We claim that f is ω -preserving. If $H \subseteq X$ is finite such that $\prod f[H] \neq 0$, then it must be that $H \subseteq F$, and hence $\prod H \neq 0$. Thus f extends to a homomorphism \bar{f} . Then

$$\bar{f}\left(\prod F \cdot \prod -G\right) = \prod f[F] \cdot \prod \bar{f}[-G] = 1,$$

and so $\prod F \cdot \prod -G \neq 0$. \square

Theorem 1.11. *Let n be a positive integer and A a boolean algebra. If A is n -free over X , then X^+ is n -independent.*

Proof. Again, without loss of generality $X = X^+$.

From theorem 1.10, X is ω -independent, so we need only show that $(\perp 2)_n$ holds for X . We do this by contradiction; assume that $F \subseteq X$ is finite, of cardinality greater than n , $\prod F = 0$, and every subset $F' \subseteq F$ where F' is of size n is such that $\prod F' \neq 0$.

Define $f : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by letting $f[F] = \{1\}$ and $f[X \setminus F] = \{0\}$.

Then f is n -preserving. Let $G \subseteq X$ be of size n and have $\prod G = 0$. Then $G \not\subseteq F$, so some $x \in G$ has $f(x) = 0$, so $\prod f[G] = 0$. Thus f must extend to a homomorphism, but then $f(0) = f(\prod F) = \prod f[F] = \prod \{1\} = 1$, which is a contradiction. \square

Theorem 1.12. *Let A be generated by its ω -independent subset X . Then A is ω -free over X .*

Proof. Let f be an ω -preserving function with domain X ; we will show that f extends to a unique homomorphism.

Take a finite $H \subseteq X$ and $\varepsilon \in {}^H 2$ such that $\prod_{h \in H} h^{\varepsilon_h} = 0$. Then by $(\perp 3)$ and $(\perp 1)$, $\prod_{\varepsilon_h=1} h = 0$. Then since f is ω -preserving, $\prod_{\varepsilon_h=1} f(h) = 0$ and thus $\prod_{h \in H} f(h)^{\varepsilon_h} = 0$. Thus by Sikorski's extension criterion, f extends to a homomorphism.

Uniqueness is clear as X is a generating set. □

Theorem 1.13. *Let n be a positive integer. If X generates A and X is n -independent, then A is n -free over X*

Proof. Let f be an n -preserving function with domain X .

Take any distinct x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{k-1} and $\varepsilon \in {}^k 2$ such that $\prod_{i < k} x_i^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$.

Then by proposition 1.7, there is an $F' \subseteq \{x_i : \varepsilon_i = 1 \text{ and } i < k\}$ such that $|F'| \leq n$ and $\prod F' = 0$. Since f is n -preserving, it must be that $\prod f[F'] = 0$, and thus $\prod_{i < k} f(x_i)^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$. Thus, by Sikorski's extension criterion, f extends to a homomorphism.

Uniqueness is clear as X is a generating set. □

So we have shown that the universal algebraic property defining n -free boolean algebras is equivalent to having an n -independent generating set.

Theorem 1.14. *ω -free boolean algebras (and thus all n -free boolean algebras) are semigroup algebras.*

A semigroup algebra is a boolean algebra that has a generating set that includes $\{0, 1\}$, is closed under the product operation, and is disjunctive when 0 is removed.

Proof. Let A be ω -free over G . Then let H' be the closure of $G \cup \{0, 1\}$ under finite products, that is, the set of all finite products of elements of G , along with 0 and 1. Clearly H' generates A , includes $\{0, 1\}$, and is closed under products, so all that remains is to show that $H = H' \setminus \{0\}$ is disjunctive. From proposition 2.1 of Monk [8], H is disjunctive if and only if for every $M \subseteq H$ there is a homomorphism f from $\langle H \rangle$ into $\mathcal{P}(M)$ such that $f(h) = M \downarrow h$ for all $h \in H$.

To this end, given $M \subseteq H$, let $f : G \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M)$ be defined by $g \mapsto M \downarrow g$. We claim that f is ω -preserving. Suppose $G' \in [G]^{<\omega}$ is such that $\prod G' = 0$. Then $\prod_{g \in G'} f(g) = \bigcap_{g \in G'} (M \downarrow g) = \{a \in M : \forall g \in G' [a \leq g]\} = \emptyset$. So f extends to a unique homomorphism \hat{f} from A to $\mathcal{P}(M)$. If $h \in H \setminus \{1\}$, then $h = g_1 \cdot g_2 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n$ where each $g_i \in G$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}(h) &= \hat{f}(g_1 \cdot g_2 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n) = f(g_1) \cap f(g_2) \cap \dots \cap f(g_n) = \\ &(M \downarrow g_1) \cap (M \downarrow g_2) \cap \dots \cap (M \downarrow g_n) = M \downarrow (g_1 \cdot g_2 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n) = M \downarrow h. \end{aligned}$$

Likewise, $\hat{f}(1) = M = M \downarrow 1$. Thus H is disjunctive and A is a semigroup algebra over H' . □

2. HYPERGRAPHS AND THEIR ANTICLIQUE ALGEBRAS

There is a correspondence with hypergraphs for ω -free boolean algebras. We recall that a hypergraph is a pair $\mathcal{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$ where V is called the vertex set, and $E \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ is called the hyperedge set; an element of E is called a hyperedge. We will insist on loopless hypergraphs, that is, $E \subseteq \mathcal{P}(V) \setminus [V]^{\leq 1}$. A hypergraph is n -uniform if $E \subseteq [V]^n$. For a given hypergraph, we call a set $A \subseteq V$ an anticlique

if it includes no hyperedges; that is, for all $e \in E$, $e \setminus A \neq \emptyset$, and call the set of anticliques $A(\mathcal{G})$. Given a hypergraph \mathcal{G} , we define an ω -free boolean algebra as a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(A(\mathcal{G}))$. For $v \in V$, let $v_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \in A(\mathcal{G}) : v \in A\}$, which is an element of $\mathcal{P}(A(\mathcal{G}))$, and for a set H of vertices, $H_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{v_+ : v \in H\}$. We then define the anticlique algebra of \mathcal{G} as $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle V_+ \rangle$.

We do not consider cliques in general hypergraphs; it's not clear which way to define them. For an n -uniform hypergraph, a clique may be non-controversially defined as a set C where $[C]^n \subseteq E$, but for a hypergraph with hyperedges of different cardinalities, it is not clear how many hyperedges must be included in a clique. This difficulty stems from a lack of a reasonable way to define "complement hypergraph." A few possibilities for the hyperedge set of $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ are $\mathcal{P}(G) \setminus E$, $[G]^{<\omega} \setminus E$, and $[G]^{\leq(\sup_{e \in E}(|e|))} \setminus E$. For an n -uniform hypergraph $\langle G, E \rangle$, the complementary hypergraph is $\langle G, [G]^n \setminus E \rangle$, and then a clique in \mathcal{G} is an anticlique in $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$. Each possible definition for complement hypergraph results in a different definition for clique, all of which are more complicated than our definition of anticlique. Since anticliques suffice for our study, we do not choose a side on what a clique ought to be.

Theorem 2.1. *For any hypergraph $\mathcal{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$, $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$ is ω -free over V_+ .*

Proof. We need only show that V_+ is ω -independent; we will use proposition 1.7.

Suppose that $R \in [V]^{<\omega}$, $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$, and $\bigcap_{v \in R} v_+^{\varepsilon_v} = \emptyset$. Let $S = \{v \in R : \varepsilon_v = 1\}$. If $\bigcap_{v \in S} v_+ \neq \emptyset$, let T be a member of $\bigcap_{v \in S} v_+$. So then T is an anticlique, and $S \subseteq T$. We note that clearly every subset of an anticlique is again an anticlique, so S is also an anticlique, and $S \in \bigcap_{v \in R} v_+^{\varepsilon_v}$. \square

If the hypergraph is somewhat special, we have more:

Theorem 2.2. *For any hypergraph $\mathcal{G} = \langle V, E \rangle$ where $E \subseteq [V]^{\leq n}$, $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$ is n -free.*

Proof. We show that V_+ is n -independent.

From the previous theorem, we need only show that $(\perp 2)_n$ holds for V_+ . Let F be a finite subset of V such that $\prod F_+ = 0$. Using the observation that $\prod F_+$ is the set of anticliques that include F , F is not an anticlique. Thus some hyperedge e is a subset of F . Then $\prod e_+ = 0$ as no anticlique can include that hyperedge. Since all hyperedges have at most n vertices, $|e| \leq n$, which is what we wanted. \square

We also reverse this construction. Given a boolean algebra A with an ω -independent generating set H , we construct a hypergraph \mathcal{G} such that $A \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$; we call it the \perp -hypergraph of A, H . The vertex set is H , and the hyperedge set is defined as follows; a subset e of H is a hyperedge if and only if the following three conditions are all true:

- (1) e is finite.
- (2) $\prod e = 0$.
- (3) If $f \subsetneq e$, then $\prod f \neq 0$.

We have only finite hyperedges in this graph, and no hyperedge is contained in another. Note that if H is n -independent, the hyperedge set is included in $[H]^{\leq n}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let n be a positive integer or ω , $X \subseteq A$ be n -independent and generate A , and $\mathcal{G} = \langle X, E \rangle$ be the \perp -hypergraph of A . Then $A \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$.*

Proof. Let $f : X \rightarrow X_+$ be defined so that $v \mapsto v_+$ for $v \in X$. We claim that f is an n -preserving function. If $G \subseteq X$ is of size $\leq n$ such that $\prod G = 0$, then it has a subset G' minimal for the property of having 0 product; thus $G' \in E$, so that $\prod G'_+ = 0$, and so $\prod f[G] = 0$.

f is bijective, and its inverse is also n -preserving; the image of f is a generating set, so that f extends to an isomorphism. \square

Definition 2.4. Let $\mathcal{G}_i \langle V_i, E_i \rangle$ be hypergraphs for $i \in \{0, 1\}$. A hypergraph homomorphism is a function $f : V_0 \rightarrow V_1$ such that if $e \in E_0$, then $f[e] \in E_1$.

Notice that a graph homomorphism is a hypergraph homomorphism when the graphs are considered as 2-uniform hypergraphs.

In the rest of this section we consider ordinary graphs, that is, hypergraphs for which $E \subseteq V^2$. In this case, “clique” is not ambiguous, so we can define the clique algebra of a graph. We let $C(\mathcal{G})$ be the set of cliques in \mathcal{G} , and v_+ be the set of cliques including vertex v . (This conflicts with an earlier use of v_+ , but context will make it clear which is meant.) Then $\mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G})$ is the subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(C(\mathcal{G}))$ generated by $\{v_+ : v \in G\}$.

We give some examples of 2-free boolean algebras with unusual properties.

For a 2-free algebra of the form $\mathcal{B}_c(T)$ for a tree (in the graph-theoretical sense—a connected acyclic graph) or a forest T of size κ , there are further conclusions that can be drawn. As a forest has no triangles, all the cliques in T are of size at most 2.

So any subset of T_+ of size 3 or more has a disjoint pair.

If T is a κ -tree (in the order theoretic sense, that is, of height κ and each level of size $< \kappa$), and we take the edge set to consist of pairs $\{u, v\}$ where v is an immediate successor of u , then T_+ has a pairwise disjoint subset of size κ —take an element of every other level—so that $\text{FinCo}(\kappa) \leq \mathcal{B}_c(T)$, and $\text{Fr}(\kappa) \leq \mathcal{B}_a(T)$.

It seems difficult to avoid one of $\text{FinCo}(\kappa)$ and $\text{Fr}(\kappa)$ as a subalgebra, as it is necessary to find a graph of size κ with no clique or anticlique of size κ . A witness to $\kappa \not\rightarrow (\kappa)_2^2$ is the edge set of such a graph, but we do not know about the variety of such witnesses. If κ is weakly compact, then there are no such witnesses and so for any graph of size κ , $\text{FinCo}(\kappa)$ or $\text{Fr}(\kappa)$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G})$.

As a graph can be characterized as a symmetric non-reflexive relation, for any non-reflexive relation R , we may form algebras $\mathcal{B}_a(R \cup R^{-1})$ and $\mathcal{B}_c(R \cup R^{-1})$. When R is an ordering of some sort, $R \cup R^{-1}$ is usually called the (edge set of the) comparability graph of R . Thus for a (non-reflexive) ordering $\langle P, < \rangle$, it has comparability graph $\mathcal{G}_P = \langle P, < \cup <^{-1} \rangle$ and we define its comparability algebra $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G}_P)$ and its incomparability algebra $\mathcal{B}_{aco}(P) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}_P)$. Since points in the partial order are vertices of the comparability graph, we may use the p_+ notation without fear of confusion. When P is a partial order in the strict sense, $C \subseteq P$ is a clique in \mathcal{G}_P if and only if C is a chain in \leq if and only if C_+ is an independent subset of $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P)$, and $A \subseteq P$ is an anticlique in \mathcal{G}_P if and only if A is an antichain in \leq if and only if A_+ is a pairwise disjoint set in $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P)$. So if $\langle T, \leq \rangle$ is a κ -Suslin tree, in both $\mathcal{B}_{co}(T)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{aco}(T)$, T_+ is a 2-independent set of size κ , but has no independent subset of size κ , nor a pairwise disjoint subset of size κ since T has neither chains nor antichains of size κ .

Proposition 2.5. *If $f : P \rightarrow Q$ is a strictly order-preserving function, that is, a morphism in the category of partial orders, then there is a homomorphism $f^* : \mathcal{B}_{aco}(P) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{aco}(Q)$ such that $f^*(p_+) = f(p)_+$.*

Proof. By the universal property of 2-free boolean algebras, we need only show that g is 2-preserving where $g(p_+) = f(p)_+$; then g extends to the f^* of the conclusion.

Fix distinct $p, p' \in P$; if $p_+ \perp p'_+$ in $\mathcal{B}_{aco}(P)$, then p and p' are comparable in P , without loss of generality, $p < p'$. Then $f(p) < f(p')$, so that $f(p)_+ \perp f(p')_+$. \square

Similarly, an incomparability-preserving map from P to Q gives rise to a homomorphism of $\mathcal{B}_{co}(P)$ and $\mathcal{B}_{co}(Q)$.

3. HYPERGRAPH SPACES

The dual spaces to ω -free boolean algebras are also interesting. Like with graphs, a hypergraph space may be defined in terms of a hypergraph—the definition generalizes that of a graph space.

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{G} = \langle G, E \rangle$ be a hypergraph and $A(\mathcal{G})$ its set of anticliques. For each $v \in G$, we define two sets:

$$v_+ \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \in A(\mathcal{G}) : v \in A\}$$

$$v_- \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \in A(\mathcal{G}) : v \notin A\}.$$

Then the hypergraph space of \mathcal{G} is the topology on $A(\mathcal{G})$ with $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$ as a closed subbase.

Any topological space \mathcal{T} for which there is a hypergraph \mathcal{G} such that \mathcal{T} is homeomorphic to the hypergraph space of \mathcal{G} is called a hypergraph space.

Theorem 3.2. *The Stone dual of an ω -free boolean algebra is a hypergraph space.*

Proof. Let A be an ω -free boolean algebra. Thus by theorem 2.3, there is a hypergraph \mathcal{G} such that $A \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$. Let \mathcal{T} be the hypergraph space of \mathcal{G} . We claim that $\text{Clopt}(\mathcal{T}) \cong A$.

In fact, $\text{Clopt}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$. On both sides here, elements are sets of anticliques of \mathcal{G} . As \mathcal{T} is defined by a clopen subbase, elements of $\text{Clopt}(\mathcal{T})$ are finite unions of finite intersections of elements of that subbase $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$. Elements of the right hand side are sums of elementary products of elements of $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v\}_+$, that is, sums of finite products of elements of $\bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$. As the operations are the usual set-theoretic ones on both sides, they are in fact the same algebra.

The topological result follows by duality. \square

We repeat a few definitions from Bell and van Mill [3] needed for some topological applications.

Definition 3.3. Let $n \in \omega$ for all these definitions.

A set S is n -linked if every $X \in [S]^n$ has non-empty intersection.

A set P is n -ary if every n -linked subset of P has non-empty intersection.

A compact topological space \mathcal{T} has compactness number at most n , written $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$, if and only if it has an n -ary closed subbase. \mathcal{T} has compactness number n , written $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) = n$, if and only if n is the least integer for which $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) \leq n$. $\text{cmpn}(\mathcal{T}) = \omega$ if there is no such n .

The following generalizes and algebraizes proposition 3.1 of Bell [1].

Proposition 3.4. *If a boolean algebra A is n -free for some $2 \leq n \leq \omega$, then $\text{cmprn}(\text{Ult } A) \leq n$.*

Proof. This is vacuous if $n = \omega$. If $n < \omega$, then $\text{Ult}(A)$ is a hypergraph space for a hypergraph \mathcal{G} with all hyperedges of size $\leq n$.

We take the clopen subbase $S = \bigcup_{v \in G} \{v_+, v_-\}$ of the hypergraph space of \mathcal{G} and show that it is n -ary. Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq S$ be n -linked. We may write $\mathcal{F} = \{v_+ : v \in A\} \cup \{v_- : v \in B\}$ for some $A, B \subseteq G$. Since $v_+ \cap v_- = \emptyset$ and $n \geq 2$, $A \cap B = \emptyset$. Let A' be a finite subset of A . Since any product of n or fewer elements of \mathcal{F} is non-zero, A' must be an anticlique in \mathcal{G} ; if not, then $\prod A'_+ = 0$, so then A'_+ would have a subset of size n with empty intersection, contradicting that \mathcal{F} is n -linked. Thus $A' \in \bigcap \mathcal{F}$, that is, \mathcal{F} has non-empty intersection and thus S is n -ary. \square

Bell's [2] corollary 5.2 shows that certain topologies on $[\omega_1]^{\leq m}$ have compactness number n for certain $n, m \leq \omega$. These topologies are the hypergraph spaces of $\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-3} \rangle$ and $\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-2} \rangle$.

Theorem 3.5. *For infinitely many $n \in \omega$, there is a boolean algebra which is n -free and is not $(n - 1)$ -free.*

Proof. Let k be the least integer for which $\mathcal{B}_a(\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-3} \rangle)$ is k -free and ℓ be the least integer for which $\mathcal{B}_a(\langle \omega_1, [\omega_1]^{2n-2} \rangle)$ is ℓ -free. We have that $n \leq k \leq 2n - 3$ and $n \leq \ell \leq 2n - 2$. The lower bounds are a consequence of the compactness numbers of those spaces (Bell's [2] result and proposition 3.4), while the upper bounds are a consequence of theorem 2.2.

Thus we have, for arbitrary $n \in \omega$, an ω -free boolean algebra of finite freeness at least n . \square

4. CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section, we consider the categories of n -independently generated boolean algebras and of hypergraph spaces and their behavior under some constructions.

If a boolean algebra A is ω -free, it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G})$ for some hypergraph \mathcal{G} ; we'll call this the \perp -hypergraph of A . If a boolean algebra is 2-free, this \perp -hypergraph is a graph, so we can just call it the \perp -graph. Such a boolean algebra is also isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G})$ for a graph \mathcal{G} , which is called the intersection graph of A .

We will show in section 5 that complete boolean algebras are not ω -free. As $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)$ is isomorphic to ${}^\kappa 2$, the class of ω -free boolean algebras is not closed under infinite products.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $2 \leq n \leq \omega$. If $H \subseteq A$ and $K \subseteq B$ are n -independent, then $L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (H \times \{0\}) \cup (\{0\} \times K)$ is n -independent in $A \times B$.*

Proof. We will apply proposition 1.7. Suppose that $F \in [H]^{<\omega}$, $G \in [K]^{<\omega}$, $\varepsilon \in {}^F 2$, $\delta \in {}^G 2$, and $\prod_{x \in F} (x, 0)^{\varepsilon_x} \cdot \prod_{y \in G} (0, y)^{\delta_y} = 0$. If there are $x \in F$ and $y \in G$ such that $\varepsilon_x = \delta_y = 1$, then $(x, 0) \cdot (0, y) = 0$ as desired. Otherwise, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\varepsilon[F] \subseteq \{0\}$. Then $\prod_{x \in F} (x, 0)^{\varepsilon_x} = (\prod_{x \in F} -x, 1)$, so that $\prod_{y \in Y} y^{\delta_y} = 0$; then the n -independence of K gives the result. \square

It is important to note that L does not generate $\langle H \rangle \times \langle K \rangle$; in fact (theorem 4.4), the product of n -free boolean algebras is not in general n -free. However, it is the case that $\langle H \rangle \times \langle K \rangle$ is a simple extension of the subalgebra generated by L ; $\langle L \rangle ((1, 0)) = \langle H \rangle \times \langle K \rangle$.

This result generalizes to infinite products quite easily, though the notation is considerably more cumbersome.

Theorem 4.2. *For $2 \leq n \leq \omega$, if $\langle A_i : i \in I \rangle$ is a system of boolean algebras and for every $i \in I$, $H_i \subseteq A_i$ is n -independent in A_i , then the set $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i \in I} p_i [H_i]$, where*

$$p_i(h)(j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} h & i = j \\ 0 & i \neq j \end{cases}$$

is n -independent in $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i \in I} A_i$ and $\prod_{i \in I}^w A_i$.

Proof. This is essentially the same as theorem 4.1 with more cumbersome notation.

$p_i(h)$ is the function in A that is 0 in all but the i th coordinate and is h in the i th coordinate, so that the projections $\pi_i [p_i [H_i]] = H_i$ and for $i \neq j$, $\pi_j [p_i [H_i]] = \{0\}$.

We apply proposition 1.7. Suppose that $R \in [H]^{<\omega}$, $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$, and $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$. Let $J \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i \in I : R \cap p_i [H_i] \neq \emptyset\}$. If J is a singleton, say $J = \{i\}$, then the n -independence of H_i clearly makes H n -independent. So we now concern ourselves with the case that $|J| > 1$, that is, we have distinct $i, j \in J$. If there are $x \in p_i [H_i]$ and $y \in p_j [H_j]$ with $\varepsilon_x = \varepsilon_y = 1$, then $x \cdot y = 0$ and we have our conclusion. So we may assume that there is at most one $i \in J$ for which there is an $x \in p_i [H_i]$ such that $\varepsilon_x = 1$. Then for any particular $i \in I$, $\prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R, x \notin p_i [H_i]\}$ has i -th coordinate 1, and so the facts that

$$0 = \prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = \prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R \cap p_i [H_i]\},$$

and that all the H_i are n -independent make H n -independent. □

When $n = 2$, we can also consider the \perp -graph and intersection graph of H in the above theorem. The intersection graph is easily described: two elements of H have non-zero product if and only if they have non-zero product in one of the factors, so that the intersection graph is the disjoint union of the intersection graphs of the H_i . The \perp -graph is more complex. The \perp -graph of each H_i is an induced subgraph, but these subgraphs are connected to each other—each vertex in H_i is connected to every vertex in H_j for $i \neq j$. This construction is the “join”.

In other words, for any collection $\langle \mathcal{G}_i \rangle$ of graphs, $\mathcal{B}_c (\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i) \leq \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_c (\mathcal{G}_i)$ and $\mathcal{B}_a (\biguplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i) \leq \prod_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_a (\mathcal{G}_i)$.

The use of the word “free” in n -free is warranted by the following:

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigoplus_{i \in I}^C A_i$ is an amalgamated free product of subalgebras A_i for $i \in I$, where $C \leq A_i$ for each $i \in I$, $A_i \cap A_j = C$ for $i \neq j$, A_i is n -free over H_i , and $C \leq \langle H_i \cap H_j \rangle$. Then A is n -free over $\bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$.*

Proof. For convenience, assume that each $A_i \leq A$, $C \leq A_i$ and that, for $i \neq j$, $A_i \cap A_j = C$, and that H_i is a set over which A_i is n -free. We show that A is n -free over $H \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$.

Let B be a boolean algebra, and $f : H \rightarrow B$ be n -preserving. Then for each $i \in I$, $f_i := f \upharpoonright H_i$ is also n -preserving. So each f_i extends to a unique homomorphism $\varphi_i : A_i \rightarrow B$. That $\varphi_i \upharpoonright C = \varphi_j \upharpoonright C$ is clear as $C \subseteq \langle H_i \cap H_j \rangle$.

Then the universal property of amalgamated free products gives a unique homomorphism $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ that extends every φ_i . Note that

$$\varphi \upharpoonright H = \varphi \upharpoonright \bigcup_{i \in I} H_i = \bigcup_{i \in I} (\varphi \upharpoonright H_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (\varphi_i \upharpoonright H_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} f_i = f.$$

So we have a unique extension of f to a homomorphism, which is what we wanted. \square

This of course includes free products.

An example where $C \neq \{0, 1\}$ is as follows: Let \mathcal{G} be the complete graph on the ordinal $\omega_1 + \omega$ and \mathcal{H} the complete graph on the ordinal interval $(\omega_1, \omega_1 \cdot 2)$. Then $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}) \cong \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{H}) \cong \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$. Note that $G \cap H = (\omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega)$ so that $G_+ \cap H_+ = (\omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega)_+$; we let $C = \langle (\omega_1, \omega_1 + \omega)_+ \rangle \cong \text{Fr}(\omega)$. It is clear that C is as required in theorem 4.3. Then we have that $\mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}) \oplus_C \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{H})$ is 2-free over $G_+ \cup H_+$.

If C is 2-free over $\bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$, the \perp -graph of $\bigcup_{i \in I} H_i$ is easily described in terms of those of H_i . It is the ‘‘amalgamated free product’’ or ‘‘amalgamated disjoint union’’ in the category of graphs—the same universal property holds. More concretely, given a set of graphs $\mathcal{G}_i = \langle G_i, E_i \rangle$, each of which has $\mathcal{F} = \langle F, E \rangle$ as a subgraph, the amalgamated disjoint union of the \mathcal{G}_i over \mathcal{F} is a graph on the union of the vertex sets where two vertices are adjacent if and only if they are adjacent in some \mathcal{G}_i . That is, elements of $G_i \setminus F$ and $G_j \setminus F$ are not adjacent for $i \neq j$.

In case $C = 2$ and we have a free product, the A_i form a family of independent subalgebras, so two elements of H (constructed in the proof above) have product zero if and only if they are in the same H_i and have zero product in A_i . So the \perp -graph of H is the disjoint union of the \perp graphs of the H_i . The intersection graph of H is similarly constructed from those of the H_i : the independence of the A_i means that the intersection graph of H is the join of the intersection graphs of the H_i .

That is, $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_a(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathcal{B}_a(\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i)$ and $\bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{B}_c(\mathcal{G}_i) = \mathcal{B}_c(\biguplus_{i \in I} \mathcal{G}_i)$.

Products of n -free boolean algebras behave in a somewhat more complicated manner. As discussed previously, infinite products of ω -free boolean algebras are not necessarily ω -free.

Theorem 4.4. $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ is not 2-free.

Proof. We use subscript function notation for the coordinates of tuples; i.e. $(a, b)_0 = a$ and $(a, b)_1 = b$. We also extend this to sets of tuples; $\{(a, b), (c, d)\}_0 = \{a, c\}$.

We proceed by contradiction; suppose that $A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ is 2-free over X , where $0 \notin X$, that is, X is 2-independent.

Consider $a_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\{\alpha\}, 0)$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$. a_α is an atom in A , so it must be an elementary product of X , that is, $a_\alpha = \prod_{x \in H_\alpha} x^{\varepsilon(\alpha, x)}$, with $H_\alpha \in [X]^{<\omega}$. So let $M \in [\omega_1]^{\omega_1}$ be such that $\{H_\alpha : \alpha \in M\}$ is a Δ -system with root F . Let $G_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H_\alpha \setminus F$. Since

$$M = \bigcup_{\delta \in {}^F 2} \{\alpha \in M : \forall x \in F [\varepsilon(\alpha, x) = \delta_x]\},$$

there is an uncountable $N \subseteq M$ such that $\varepsilon(\alpha, x) = \varepsilon(\beta, x)$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in N$ and all $x \in F$, so that we may write, for $\alpha \in N$, $a_\alpha = \prod_{x \in F} x^{\delta_x} \cdot \prod_{x \in G_\alpha} x^{\varepsilon(\alpha, x)}$. For each $\alpha \in N$, let $G'_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{x \in G_\alpha : \varepsilon(\alpha, x) = 1\}$. If $\alpha, \beta \in N$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$, then there are $x \in G'_\alpha$ and $y \in G'_\beta$ such that $x \cdot y = 0$, by the 2-independence of X and the fact that

$$0 = a_\alpha \cdot a_\beta = \prod_{x \in F} x^{\delta_x} \cdot \prod_{x \in G_\alpha} x^{\varepsilon(\alpha, x)} \cdot \prod_{x \in G_\beta} x^{\varepsilon(\beta, x)},$$

thus $\prod G'_\alpha \cdot \prod G'_\beta = 0$. Since $\text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ has cellularity ω , the set $\{\alpha \in N : (\prod G'_\alpha)_1 \neq 0\}$ is countable, hence $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} N \setminus \{\alpha \in N : (\prod G'_\alpha)_1 \neq 0\}$ is uncountable and for $\alpha \in P$, $(\prod G'_\alpha)_1 = 0$. Since $(\prod G'_\alpha)_0 \cdot (\prod G'_\beta)_0 = 0$ for distinct $\alpha, \beta \in P$, each $(\prod G'_\alpha)_0$ is finite when $\alpha \in P$.

X must generate $(1, 0)$; let b_j for $j < n$ be disjoint elementary products of X such that $\sum_{j < n} b_j = (1, 0)$. Thus there must be exactly one $i < n$ such that b_{i0} is cofinite; without loss of generality, $i = 0$ so that b_{00} is cofinite and $b_{01} = 0$. Write b_0 as an elementary product, that is $b_0 = \prod_{j < m} c_j^{\xi_j}$ with each $c_j \in X$. Then choose an $\alpha \in P$ such that $\prod G'_\alpha \leq b_0$ and $G'_\alpha \cap \{c_j : j < m\} = \emptyset$. Then $\prod G'_\alpha \cdot \sum_{j < n} c_j^{1-\xi_j} = 0$, so $\text{rng } \xi = \{0\}$; that is, $b_0 = \prod_{j < m} -c_j$.

Note that X_1 generates $\text{Fr}(\omega_1)$, so it must be uncountable, thus $(X \setminus \{c_j : j < m\} \setminus F)_1$ is also uncountable; let $Y \subseteq X$ be such that Y_1 is an uncountable independent subset of $(X \setminus \{c_j : j < m\} \setminus F)_1$; such a Y exists by theorem 9.16 of Koppelberg [6]. Note that no finite product of elements of Y is 0. Let $\theta : Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be such that $d_y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (y^{\theta_y})_0$ is finite for each $y \in Y$.

Consider $\{d_y : y \in Y\}$; Each d_y is finite and Y is an uncountable set, and thus there is an uncountable $Z \subseteq Y$ where $\{d_y : y \in Z\}$ is a Δ -system with root r . Let $y, z, t \in Z$ be distinct. Then let $e_y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_y \setminus r$, $e_z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_z \setminus r$, and $e_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_t \setminus r$. Then

$$d_y \cdot d_z \cdot -d_t = (e_y \cup r) \cap (e_z \cup r) \cap (\omega_1 \setminus (e_t \cup r)) = r \cap (\omega_1 \setminus (e_t \cup r)) = \emptyset,$$

Then $\prod_{j < n} -c_j \cdot y^{\theta_y} \cdot z^{\theta_z} \cdot t^{1-\theta_t} = 0$ and again, the only elements with exponent 1 are elements of Y and thus there is no disjoint pair, contradicting proposition 1.7.

So we have a contradiction and thus there is no 2-independent generating set for A . \square

This is also an example of a simple extension of a 2-free boolean algebra that is not 2-free; the full product is a simple extension by $(0, 1)$ of the subalgebra generated by the set in theorem 4.1.

The dual of this theorem is that we have two graph spaces whose disjoint union is not a graph space; in fact we can say a bit more since the disjoint union of two supercompact spaces is supercompact. We show a slightly more general result here:

Proposition 4.5. *If X and Y are n -compact spaces, then $X \dot{\cup} Y$ is n -compact.*

Proof. Suppose that S and T are n -ary subbases for the closed sets of X and Y respectively; that is, for any $S' \subseteq S$ with $\bigcap S' = \emptyset$, there are n members a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n of S' such that $a_1 \cap a_2 \cap \dots \cap a_n = \emptyset$, and similarly for T . Then $W \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S \cup T \cup \{X, Y\}$ is an n -ary subbase for the closed sets of $X \dot{\cup} Y$. \square

So, letting $n = 2$, the dual space of $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ is supercompact, but is not a graph space.

Theorem 4.6. $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ is 3-free.

Proof. Let $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ be an independent generating set for $\text{Fr}(\omega_1)$. Then the set $X \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(\{\alpha\}, x_\alpha) : \alpha < \omega_1\} \cup \{(1, 0)\}$ is a 3-independent generating set for $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$. That X generates $\text{FinCo}(\omega_1) \times \text{Fr}(\omega_1)$ is clear. We use proposition 1.7 to show that X is 3-independent. Take any $R \in [X]^{<\omega}$ and $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ such that $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = (0, 0)$. Since there is no elementary product of elements of $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ that is 0, $(1, 0) \in R$ and $\varepsilon_{(1,0)} = 1$. Then there is a pair a, b of elements in R such that $\pi_2(a) \perp \pi_2 b$ and $\varepsilon_a = \varepsilon_b = 1$, so that $\{(1, 0), a, b\} \subseteq R$ and $(1, 0) \cdot a \cdot b = 0$. \square

5. CARDINAL FUNCTION RESULTS

Cellularity and independence have been considered earlier. Here we give a few results relating other cardinal functions to properties of \perp -graphs and intersection graphs. We will always assume that the graphs and algebras are infinite in this section.

Lemma 5.1. Let A be ω -free and $\omega \leq \kappa = |A|$. Then $B \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{FinCo}(\kappa)$ is a homomorphic image of A .

Proof. Let G be a set over which A is ω -free. Any bijective function $f : G \rightarrow \text{At}(B)$ is ω -preserving as all elements of $\text{At}(B)$ are disjoint. Since A is ω -free, f extends to a homomorphism \tilde{f} from A to B . Since the image of f includes a set of generators, \tilde{f} is surjective as well; that is, B is a homomorphic image of A . \square

The first use of this is that no infinite ω -free boolean algebra has the countable separation property. The countable separation property is inherited by homomorphic images (5.27(c) in Koppelberg [6]), so if any infinite ω -free boolean algebra of size κ has the countable separation property, then by 5.1, $\text{FinCo}(\kappa)$ has the countable separation property, which is a contradiction. In particular, $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$ is not ω -free.

We show that the spread of an ω -free boolean algebra is equal to its cardinality.

Theorem 13.1 of Monk [8] gives several equivalent definitions of spread, all of which have the same attainment properties; the relevant one to our purposes is the following.

$$s(A) = \sup \{c(B) : B \text{ is a homomorphic image of } A\}.$$

Theorem 5.2. For A ω -free, $s(A) = |A|$. Furthermore, it is attained.

Proof. From lemma 5.1, $B = \text{FinCo}(|A|)$ is a homomorphic image of A . Since $c(B) = |B| = |A|$, an element of the set in the above definition of $s(A)$ is $|A|$. Thus $s(A) = |A|$ is attained. \square

As they are greater than or equal to s , Inc , Irr , h-cof , hL , and hd are also equal to cardinality for ω -free boolean algebras. Incomparability and irredundance are also attained by the ω -free generating set. This result also determines that $|\text{Id}A| = 2^{|A|}$ as $2^{sA} \leq |\text{Id}A|$. Then since s is attained, $|\text{Sub}A| = 2^{|A|}$ as well.

The character of an ω -free boolean algebra is also equal to cardinality. Namely, at the bottom of page 183 in Monk [8], it is shown that if A is a homomorphic image of B , then $\chi(A) \leq \chi(B)$. For B ω -free, let $A = \text{FinCo}(|B|)$, so that A is a homomorphic image of B by lemma 5.1, so we have that $|B| = \chi(A) \leq \chi(B) \leq |B|$.

Theorem 5.3. *If A is infinite and ω -free, then $\pi(A) = |A|$.*

Here π is the density of A , the minimum of the cardinalities of dense subsets of A .

Proof. Take H to be a set over which A is ω -free and let $D \subseteq A^+$ be dense.

For each $d \in D$, we can find a non-zero elementary product of elements of H below d ; write it as $\prod F_d \cdot \prod -G_d$ for finite disjoint $F_d, G_d \subseteq H$.

Now we show that $H = \bigcup_{d \in D} F_d$. Obviously $\bigcup_{d \in D} F_d \subseteq H$, so we need only show $H \subseteq \bigcup_{d \in D} F_d$. Choose an $h \in H$. Since D is dense, there is a $d \in D$ with $d \leq h$. So $\prod F_d \cdot \prod -G_d \leq d \leq h$. Thus $\prod F_d \leq h + \sum G_d$, and since H is ω -independent, $h \in F_d$.

Since all the F_d are finite, $|D| = |H| = |A|$ □

We claim that the length (and therefore depth) of an ω -free boolean algebra is \aleph_0 . This uses several preceding results.

Theorem 5.4. *If A is ω -free, then A has no uncountable chain.*

Proof. Let A be ω -free over G .

Recall from theorem 1.14 that A is a semigroup algebra over the set H of finite products of elements of $G \cup \{0, 1\}$. For $h \in H \setminus \{0, 1\}$, choose $g_1, \dots, g_n \in G$ such that $h = g_1 \cdot \dots \cdot g_n$ and set $h_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$.

Due to the result of Heindorf [4], if there is an uncountable chain in A , there is an uncountable chain in H . So by way of contradiction, we assume that there is an uncountable chain $C \subseteq H$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0, 1 \notin C$ so that every element of C is a finite product of elements of G .

Let $C_G \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{h_G : h \in C\}$. We note that

$$\bigcup C_G = \bigcup_{h \in C} h_G \subseteq G$$

is the set of all elements of G that are needed to generate the elements of C , that is,

$C \subseteq \langle \bigcup C_G \rangle$. so C is a chain in that subalgebra of A as well.

In order to reach a contradiction, we first show that there are no finite subsets of $\bigcup C_G$ with zero product. Take $F \in [\bigcup C_G]^{<\omega}$. Then for each $v \in F$, there is a $c_v \in C_G$ such that $v \in c_v$. Note that $\prod c_v \in C$ and $\prod c_v \leq v$. Thus $\{\prod c_v : v \in F\} \subseteq C$, so $0 \neq \prod \{\prod c_v : v \in F\} \leq \prod F$, and hence $\prod F \neq 0$.

Thus $\bigcup C_G$ has no finite subset with zero product. As $\bigcup C_G \subseteq G$ is ω -independent, by lemma 1.8, it is independent. Thus $\langle \bigcup C_G \rangle$ is free and hence has no uncountable chain, contradicting our original assumption. □

Theorem 5.5. *Let A be ω -free over H . Then $|\text{End } A| = 2^{|A|}$.*

Proof. For each $x \in H$, choose $y_x \in A$ such that $y_x < x$. For each $J \subset H$, define $f_J : H \rightarrow A$ as

$$f_J(x) = \begin{cases} y_x & x \in J \\ x & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

f_J is 2-preserving and extends to an endomorphism. So we have exhibited $2^{|A|}$ endomorphisms. □

6. MAXIMAL n -INDEPENDENCE NUMBER

We can look at n -independent sets in boolean algebras that aren't n -free. The natural thing to do is introduce a cardinal function, $n\text{Ind}$, that measures the supremum of the cardinalities of those sets. Since $n\text{Ind}$ is a regular sup-function, we can define a spectrum function and a maximal n -independence number of a boolean algebra in the standard way.

Definition 6.1. Let $1 \leq n \leq \omega$.

$$i_{nsp}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ |X| : X \text{ is a maximal } n\text{-independent subset of } A \}$$

$$i_n(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min(i_{nsp}(A))$$

This could be written as $n\text{Ind}_{mm}$ according to the notation of Monk [8]. Note that $i_1 = i$ where i is the minimal independence number as seen in Monk [9].

This is defined for every boolean algebra; from the definition it is easily seen that the union of a chain of n -independent sets is n -independent, so Zorn's lemma shows that there are maximal n -independent sets. $i_n(A)$ is infinite for all $n \leq \omega$ if A is atomless (shown in lemma 6.3), and has value 1 if A has an atom.

Proposition 6.2. For all n with $1 \leq n \leq \omega$, if A has an atom, then $i_n(A) = 1$.

Proof. If a is an atom of A , then we claim that $\{-a\}$ is a maximal n -independent subset of A^+ . That $\{-a\}$ is n -independent is clear as any singleton other than $\{0\}$ and $\{1\}$ is independent.

Let $x \in A^+ \setminus \{-a\}$, we show that $\{-a, x\}$ is not n -independent. There are two cases.

If $a \leq x$, then $1 = a + -a \leq x + -a$, so that $(\perp 1)$ fails.

If $a \leq -x$, then $x \leq -a$, so that $0 \neq \prod \{x\} \leq \sum \{-a\}$, but $\{x\} \cap \{-a\} = \emptyset$, so that $(\perp 3)$ fails. \square

Lemma 6.3. Let B be a boolean algebra, $2 \leq n \leq \omega$, and $H \subseteq B^+$ be n -independent. If H is maximal among n -independent subsets of B^+ , then H is infinite and $\sum H = 1$ or H is finite and $-\sum H$ is an atom.

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. First, the case that H is infinite. Let $H \subseteq B^+$ be n -independent and have $b < 1$ as an upper bound. We show that $H \cup \{-b\}$ is n -independent:

Note that $-b \notin H$, as $-b \not\leq b$. Now we will apply proposition 1.7. So, assume that $R \in [H \cup \{-b\}]^{<\omega}$, $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$, and $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$. If $-b \notin R$, the conclusion follows since H is n -independent. So suppose that $-b \in R$. Let $R' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R \setminus \{-b\}$. Then we have two cases:

Case 1. $\varepsilon_{-b} = 1$. If there is an $x \in R'$ such that $\varepsilon_x = 1$, then $x \leq b$ and so $x \cdot -b = 0$ as desired. So assume that $\varepsilon[R'] = \{0\}$. Then $-b \leq \sum_{x \in R'} x \leq b$, which is a contradiction.

Case 2. $\varepsilon_{-b} = 0$. If $\varepsilon_x = 1$ for some $x \in R'$, then

$$0 = \prod_{y \in R} y^{\varepsilon_y} = \prod_{y \in R'} y^{\varepsilon_y} \cdot b = \prod_{y \in R'} y^{\varepsilon_y}$$

and the n -independence of H gives the result. So assume that $\varepsilon[R'] = \{0\}$. Then $b \leq \sum R' \leq b$, so $b = \sum R'$. Then $b \cdot \prod_{x \in R'} -x = 0$, contradicting the n -independence of H .

So we have that if H is infinite and maximal n -independent, it has no upper bound other than 1, so $\sum H = 1$.

Now we consider the case that H is finite. If $-\sum H$ is not an atom, let $0 < a < -\sum H$, then we claim that $H \cup \{a\}$ is n -independent. Again we use proposition 1.7. Assume that $R \in [H \cup \{a\}]^{<\omega}$, $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$, and $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$. Without loss of generality, $a \in R$.

Case 1. $\varepsilon_a = 1$. If $\varepsilon_x = 1$ for some $x \in R \setminus \{a\}$, then $a \cdot x \leq a \cdot \sum H = 0$, as desired. Otherwise

$$a \leq \sum (R \setminus \{a\}) \leq \sum H$$

and so $a = 0$, contradiction.

Case 2. $\varepsilon_a = 0$. If $\varepsilon_x = 1$ for some $x \in R \setminus \{a\}$, then $a \cdot x = 0$, hence $x \leq -a$, and then

$$\prod_{y \in R} y^{\varepsilon_y} = \prod \{y^{\varepsilon_y} : y \in R \setminus \{a\}\}$$

and the conclusion follows. Otherwise

$$-a \leq \sum (R \setminus \{a\}) \leq \sum H,$$

so $-\sum H \leq a$, contradicting $a < -\sum H$. □

The converse of lemma 6.3 does not hold. An example due to Monk is in $\text{Fr}(X \cup Y)$ where $X \cap Y = \emptyset$ and $|X| = |Y| = \kappa \geq \omega$. X is independent, is not maximal for 2-independence, and has sum 1. Here $\sum X = 1$ is the only non-trivial part—by way of contradiction, let b be a non-1 upper bound for X . Then $-b$ has the property that $x \cdot -b = 0$ for all $x \in X$, so let a be an elementary product of elements of $X \cup Y$ where $a \leq -b$. Take some $x \in X$ that does not occur in that elementary product. Then since $X \cup Y$ is independent, $a \cdot x \neq 0$, but since $a \leq -b$, $a \cdot x = 0$.

Theorem 6.4. *For B atomless, and $2 \leq n \leq \omega$, $\mathfrak{p}(B) \leq \mathfrak{i}_n(B)$.*

Here $\mathfrak{p}(B)$ is the pseudo-intersection number, defined in Monk [9] as

$$\mathfrak{p}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min \left\{ |Y| : Y \subseteq A \text{ and } \sum Y = 1 \text{ and } \sum Y' \neq 1 \text{ for every finite } Y' \subseteq Y \right\}.$$

Proof. Since B is atomless, a maximal n -independent set Y has $\sum Y = 1$, and by $(\perp 1)$, if $Y' \subseteq Y$ is finite, $\sum Y' \neq 1$. That is, the maximal n -independent sets are included among the Y in the definition of \mathfrak{p} . □

We do not know if strict inequality is possible.

Corollary 6.5. *For all n with $1 \leq n \leq \omega$, $\mathfrak{i}_n(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) \geq \aleph_1$*

Proof. $\aleph_1 \leq \mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) \leq \mathfrak{i}_n(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin})$ □

We also recall that under Martin's Axiom, $\mathfrak{p}(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \mathfrak{m}_1$, so the same is true of \mathfrak{i}_n .

Proposition 6.6. *Any B with the strong countable separation property has, for all $2 \leq n \leq \omega$, $\mathfrak{i}_n(B) \geq \aleph_1$.*

Proof. Such a B is atomless, so let $H \subseteq B^+$ be n -independent and countably infinite, that is $H = \langle h_i : i \in \omega \rangle$. Then let $c_m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \leq m} h_i$. Each c_m is a finite sum of elements of H , thus by $(\perp 1)$, $c_m < 1$. Then $C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{c_i : i \in \omega\}$ is a countable chain in $B \setminus \{1\}$, so by the strong countable separation property, there is a $b \in B$ such that $c_i \leq b < 1$ for all $i \in \omega$. Then as $h_i \leq c_i$, $h_i \leq b$ for all $i \in \omega$ as well, that is, b is an upper bound for H . Thus by lemma 6.3, H is not maximal. \square

In addition, we show that maximal n -independent sets lead to weakly dense sets. We use the notation $-X = \{-x : x \in X\}$ frequently in the sequel.

Theorem 6.7. *Let $1 \leq n \leq \omega$. If $X \subseteq A$ is maximal n -independent in A , then the set Y of nonzero elementary products of elements of X is weakly dense in A .*

Recall that Y is weakly dense in A if and only if $Y \subseteq A^+$ and for every $a \in A^+$, there is a $y \in Y$ such that $y \leq a$ or $y \leq -a$.

Proof. If $a \in X$, this is trivial, so we may assume that $a \notin X$ and hence $X \cup \{a\}$ is not n -independent.

By proposition 1.7, there exist $R \in [X \cup \{a\}]^{<\omega}$ and $\varepsilon \in {}^R 2$ such that $\prod_{x \in R} x^{\varepsilon_x} = 0$ while for every $R' \in [R]^{\leq n}$, if $\varepsilon[R'] \subseteq \{1\}$ then $\prod R' \neq 0$. This last implication holds for every $R' \in [R \setminus \{a\}]^{\leq n}$, and so $\prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R \setminus \{a\}\} \neq 0$ since X is n -independent. But $\prod \{x^{\varepsilon_x} : x \in R \setminus \{a\}\} \leq a$ or $\leq -a$, as desired. \square

Corollary 6.8. *If A is atomless and $1 \leq n \leq \omega$, then $\mathfrak{r}(A) \leq \mathfrak{i}_n(A)$.*

Recall the definition of the reaping number:

$$\mathfrak{r}(A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min \{|X| : X \text{ is weakly dense in } A\}$$

Proof. Since A is atomless, all maximal n -independent sets are infinite, and thus there is a set of size $\mathfrak{i}_n(A)$ weakly dense in A . \square

We do not know if strict inequality is possible.

We do not currently have any results for the behavior of \mathfrak{i}_n on any type of product or its relationship to \mathfrak{u} .

We show the consistency of $\mathfrak{i}_n(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) < \beth_1$ for $1 \leq n \leq \omega$. The argument is similar to exercises (A12) and (A13) in chapter VIII of Kunen [7]; the main lemma follows.

Lemma 6.9. *Let M be a countable transitive model of ZFC and $1 \leq k \leq \omega$. For a subset a of ω , let $[a]$ denote its equivalence class in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$. Suppose that κ is an infinite cardinal and $\langle a_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is a system of infinite subsets of ω such that $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$ is k -independent in $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$. Then there is a generic extension $M[G]$ of M using a ccc partial order such that in $M[G]$ there is a $d \subseteq \omega$ with the following properties:*

- (1) $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle \wedge \langle [\omega \setminus d] \rangle$ is k -independent.
- (2) If

$$x \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega) \cap M) \setminus (\{a_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{\omega \setminus d\}),$$

then

$$\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle \wedge \langle [\omega \setminus d], [x] \rangle$$

is not k -independent.

Proof. We work within M here.

Let B be the k -independent subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}$ generated by $\{[a_i] : i < \kappa\}$. By Sikorski's extension criterion, let f be a homomorphism from $\langle \{a_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{\overline{\{m\}} : m \in \omega\} \rangle$ to \overline{B} such that $f(a_i) = [a_i]$ and $f(\overline{\{m\}}) = 0$. Then let $h : \mathcal{P}(\omega) \rightarrow \overline{B}$ be a homomorphic extension of f as given by Sikorski's extension theorem.

Let $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{(b, y) : b \in \ker(h) \text{ and } y \in [\omega]^{<\omega}\}$ with the partial order given by $(b, y) \leq (b', y')$ if and only if $b \supseteq b'$, $y \supseteq y'$ and $y \cap b' \subseteq y'$. This is a ccc partial order. Let G be a P -generic filter over M , and let $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{(b,y) \in G} y$.

We now have several claims that combine to prove the lemma.

Claim 1. If R is a finite subset of κ and $\varepsilon \in {}^{R}2$ is such that $\bigcap_{\varepsilon_i=1}^{i \in R} a_i$ is infinite, then

$\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap d$ is infinite.

Let R and ε be as given, then for each $n \in \omega$, let

$$E_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (b, y) \in P : \exists m > n \left[m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap y \right] \right\}.$$

First, we show that each E_n is dense. Take $(b, y) \in P$. Then $c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i}) \setminus b$ is infinite; if not, then c is finite (thus in $\ker(h)$, as is b) and $\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \subseteq b \cup c$. Applying h to both sides gives $\prod_{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$, which is a contradiction of proposition 1.7. So we choose an $m \in c \setminus y$ such that $m > n$; then $(b, y \cup \{m\}) \leq (b, y)$ and $(b, y \cup \{m\}) \in E_n$, showing that E_n is dense. This shows the claim, as for each $n \in \omega$, $E_n \cap G \neq \emptyset$, so that we have an integer larger than n in $\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i \cap d$.

Claim 2. If R is a finite subset of κ and $\varepsilon \in {}^{R}2$ such that $\bigcap_{\varepsilon_i=1}^{i \in R} a_i$ is infinite, then

$\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \setminus d$ is infinite.

Let R and ε be as given, then for each $n \in \omega$, let

$$D_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ (b, y) \in P : \exists m > n \left[m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap b \setminus y \right] \right\}.$$

To show that D_n is dense, take any $(b, y) \in P$. Since $\bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i}$ is infinite from proposition 1.7, it follows that we may choose $m > n$ such that $m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \setminus y$. Then $(b \cup \{m\}, y) \leq (b, y)$ and $(b \cup \{m\}, y) \in D_n$, as desired.

Take some $(b, y) \in D_n \cap G$. Then there is an $m > n$ such that $m \notin d$ (thus proving the claim). In fact, choose $m > n$ such that $m \in \bigcap_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i} \cap b \setminus y$. We claim that $m \notin d$. Suppose that $m \in d$; then we have a $(c, z) \in G$ with $m \in z$ and $(e, w) \in G$ that is a common extension of (b, y) and (c, z) . Then $m \in w \cap b \setminus y$, contradicting that $(e, w) \leq (b, y)$.

Claim 3. $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle \widehat{\ } \langle [\omega \setminus d] \rangle$ is k -independent.

Suppose that $R \in [\kappa]^{<\omega}$, $\varepsilon \in {}^{R}2$, $\delta \in 2$, and $\prod_{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} \cdot [\omega \setminus d]^\delta = 0$. By claims 1 and 2 (depending on δ), $\prod_{\varepsilon_i=1}^{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} = 0$. Since $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$ is k -independent, there is a subset $R' \subseteq \{i \in R : \varepsilon_i = 1\}$ of size at most k such that $\prod_{i \in R'} [a_i] = 0$, as desired.

Claim 4. If $b \in \ker(h)$, then $b \cap d$ is finite.

$\{(c, y) \in P : b \subseteq c\}$ is dense in P , so that there is a $(c, y) \in G$ such that $b \subseteq c$. We show $b \cap d \subseteq y$ and thus is finite. Let $m \in b \cap d$ and choose an

$(e, z) \in G$ such that $m \in z$. Let $(r, w) \in G$ be a common extension of (e, z) and (c, y) ; then (recalling the definition of the order) $m \in w \cap c \subseteq y$.

Claim 5. If

$$x \in (\mathcal{P}(\omega) \cap M) \setminus (\{a_i : i < \kappa\} \cup \{\omega \setminus d\}),$$

then

$$s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle \frown \langle [\omega \setminus d], [x] \rangle$$

is not k -independent.

We have two cases here. The slightly easier is if $x \in \ker(h)$; then by claim 4, $x \cap d$ is finite, so that $[x] \leq [\omega \setminus d]$, causing s to fail to even be ideal-independent. If $x \notin \ker(h)$, then there is a $b \in B$ with $0 < b \leq h(x)$. Since B is k -freely generated by $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$, we may take b to be a elementary product of elements of $\langle [a_i] : i < \kappa \rangle$. Then $b = [c]$, where $c = \prod_{i \in R} a_i^{\varepsilon_i}$ is infinite. Then $c \setminus x \in \ker(h)$. By claim 4, this gives $\prod_{i \in R} [a_i]^{\varepsilon_i} \cdot [x] \cdot [d] = 0$, contradicting proposition 1.7 for s . □

Theorem 6.10. *For each $1 \leq k \leq \omega$, it is consistent with $\beth_1 > \aleph_1$ that $i_k(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \aleph_1$.*

Proof. We begin with a countable transitive model M of $ZFC + \beth_1 > \aleph_1$, then iterate the construction of lemma 6.9 ω_1 times as in lemma 5.14 of chapter VIII of Kunen [7]. This results in a model of $ZFC + \beth_1 > \aleph_1 + i_k(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \aleph_1$. □

This shows that $i_k(\mathcal{P}(\omega)/\text{fin}) = \beth_1$ is independent of ZFC .

REFERENCES

- [1] Bell, M.: The space of complete subgraphs of a graph. *Comm. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **23**(3), 525–536 (1982)
- [2] Bell, M.G.: Polyadic spaces of arbitrary compactness numbers. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.* **26**(2), 353–361 (1985)
- [3] Bell, M.G., van Mill, J.: The compactness number of a compact topological space. I. *Fund. Math.* **106**(3), 163–173 (1980)
- [4] Heindorf, L.: Chains in Boolean semigroup algebras. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlag. Math.* **37**(1), 93–96 (1991)
- [5] Heindorf, L.: Graph spaces and \perp -free boolean algebras. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society* **121**, 657–665 (1994)
- [6] Koppelberg, S.: *General theory of Boolean algebras*, pp. xix + 312l. North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (1989)
- [7] Kunen, K.: *Set theory, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, vol. 102. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1980). An introduction to independence proofs
- [8] Monk, J.D.: Cardinal invariants on Boolean algebras, *Progress in Mathematics*, vol. 142. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (1996)
- [9] Monk, J.D.: Continuum cardinals generalized to Boolean algebras. *J. Symbolic Logic* **66**(4), 1928–1958 (2001)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTER SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER,
800 W. MAIN STREET, WHITEWATER, WI 53190, USA

E-mail address: brunsc@uwv.edu

URL: <http://facstaff.uww.edu/brunsc>