

MAXIMALLY EMBEDDABLE COMPONENTS

Miloš S. Kurilić

Department of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Novi Sad,
Trg Dositeja Obradovića 4, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia.
e-mail: milos@dmi.uns.ac.rs

Abstract

We investigate the partial orderings of the form $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$, where $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \rho \rangle$ is a countable binary relational structure and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ the set of the domains of its isomorphic substructures and show that if the components of \mathbb{X} are maximally embeddable and satisfy an additional condition related to connectivity, then the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is forcing equivalent to a finite power of $(P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$, or to $(P(\omega \times \omega)/(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}))^+$, or to the direct product $(P(\Delta)/\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}})^+ \times ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^n$, for some $n \in \omega$. In particular we obtain forcing equivalents of the posets of copies of countable equivalence relations, disconnected ultrahomogeneous graphs and some partial orderings.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 03C15, 03E40, 06A10.

Keywords: relational structure, isomorphic substructure, poset, forcing.

1 Introduction

The posets of the form $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$, where \mathbb{X} is a relational structure and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ the set of the domains of its isomorphic substructures, were investigated in [4]. In particular, a classification of countable binary structures related to the forcing-related properties of the posets of their copies is described in Diagram 1: for the structures from column *A* (resp. *B*; *D*) the corresponding posets are forcing equivalent to the trivial poset (resp. the Cohen forcing, $\langle {}^{<\omega}2, \supset \rangle$; an ω_1 -closed atomless poset) and, for the structures from the class C_4 , the posets of copies are forcing equivalent to the quotients of the form $P(\omega)/\mathcal{I}$, for some co-analytic tall ideal \mathcal{I} .

The aim of the paper is to investigate a subclass of column *D*, the class of structures \mathbb{X} for which the separative quotient $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is an ω_1 -closed and atomless poset (containing, for example, the class of all countable scattered linear orders [5]). Clearly, such a classification depends on the model of set theory in which we work. For example, under the CH all the structures from column *D* are in the same class (having the posets of copies forcing equivalent to the algebra $P(\omega)/\text{Fin}$ without zero), but this is not true in, for example, the Mathias model.

Applying the main theorem of the paper, proved in Section 4, in Section 5 we obtain forcing equivalents of the posets of copies of countable equivalence relations, disconnected ultrahomogeneous graphs and some partial orderings.




Diagram 1: Binary relations on countable sets

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P, \leq \rangle$ be a pre-order. Then $p \in P$ is an *atom*, in notation $p \in \text{At}(\mathbb{P})$, iff each $q, r \leq p$ are compatible (there is $s \leq q, r$). \mathbb{P} is called *atomless* iff $\text{At}(\mathbb{P}) = \emptyset$; *atomic* iff $\text{At}(\mathbb{P})$ is dense in \mathbb{P} . If κ is a regular cardinal, \mathbb{P} is called κ -*closed* iff for each $\gamma < \kappa$ each sequence $\langle p_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma \rangle$ in P , such that $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow p_\beta \leq p_\alpha$, has a lower bound in P . ω_1 -closed pre-orders are called σ -*closed*. Two pre-orders \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} are called *forcing equivalent* iff they produce the same generic extensions.

A partial order $\mathbb{P} = \langle P, \leq \rangle$ is called *separative* iff for each $p, q \in P$ satisfying $p \not\leq q$ there is $r \leq p$ such that $r \perp q$. The *separative modification* of \mathbb{P} is the separative pre-order $\text{sm}(\mathbb{P}) = \langle P, \leq^* \rangle$, where $p \leq^* q \Leftrightarrow \forall r \leq p \exists s \leq r \ s \leq q$. The *separative quotient* of \mathbb{P} is the separative partial order $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}) = \langle P / \equiv^*, \trianglelefteq \rangle$, where $p \equiv^* q \Leftrightarrow p \leq^* q \wedge q \leq^* p$ and $[p] \trianglelefteq [q] \Leftrightarrow p \leq^* q$.

Let $\text{Fin} = [\omega]^{<\omega}$ and $\Delta = \{\langle m, n \rangle \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : n \leq m\}$. Then the ideals $\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin} \subset P(\omega \times \omega)$ and $\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}_{\text{fin}} \subset P(\Delta)$ are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fin} \times \text{Fin} &= \{S \subset \omega \times \omega : \exists j \in \omega \forall i \geq j |S \cap (\{i\} \times \omega)| < \omega\} \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}_{\text{fin}} &= \{S \subset \Delta : \exists r \in \mathbb{N} \forall m \in \mathbb{N} |S \cap (\{m\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, m\})| \leq r\}. \end{aligned}$$

By $\mathfrak{h}(\mathbb{P})$ we denote the *distributivity number* of a poset \mathbb{P} . In particular, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathfrak{h}_n = \mathfrak{h}(((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^n)$; thus $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}_1$. The following statements will be used in the paper.

Fact 2.1 (Folklore) If $\mathbb{P}_i, i \in I$, are κ -closed pre-orders, then $\prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}_i$ is κ -closed.

Fact 2.2 (Folklore) Let \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q} and $\mathbb{P}_i, i \in I$, be partial orderings. Then

- (a) \mathbb{P} , $\text{sm}(\mathbb{P})$ and $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P})$ are forcing equivalent forcing notions;
- (b) \mathbb{P} is atomless iff $\text{sm}(\mathbb{P})$ is atomless iff $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P})$ is atomless;
- (c) $\text{sm}(\mathbb{P})$ is κ -closed iff $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P})$ is κ -closed;
- (d) $\mathbb{P} \cong \mathbb{Q}$ implies that $\text{sm } \mathbb{P} \cong \text{sm } \mathbb{Q}$ and $\text{sq } \mathbb{P} \cong \text{sq } \mathbb{Q}$;
- (e) $\text{sm}(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}_i) = \prod_{i \in I} \text{sm } \mathbb{P}_i$;
- (f) $\text{sq}(\prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}_i) \cong \prod_{i \in I} \text{sq } \mathbb{P}_i$.

Fact 2.3 (Folklore) Let \mathbb{P} be an atomless separative pre-order. Then we have

- (a) If $\omega_1 = \mathfrak{c}$ and \mathbb{P} is ω_1 -closed of size \mathfrak{c} , then \mathbb{P} is forcing equivalent to $(\text{Coll}(\omega_1, \omega_1))^+$ or, equivalently, to $(P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$;
- (b) If $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{c}$ and \mathbb{P} is \mathfrak{t} -closed of size \mathfrak{t} , then \mathbb{P} is forcing equivalent to $(\text{Coll}(\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{t}))^+$ or, equivalently, to $(P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$.

Fact 2.4 (a) $\text{sm}(\langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset \rangle^n) = \langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset^* \rangle^n$ and $\text{sq}(\langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset \rangle^n) = ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^n$ are forcing equivalent, \mathfrak{t} -closed atomless pre-orders of size \mathfrak{c} .

- (b) (**Shelah and Spinas [8]**) $\text{Con}(\mathfrak{h}_{n+1} < \mathfrak{h}_n)$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (c) (**Szymański and Zhou [9]**) $(P(\omega \times \omega)/(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}))^+$ is an ω_1 -closed, but not ω_2 -closed atomless poset.
- (d) (**Hernández-Hernández [3]**) $\text{Con}(\mathfrak{h}((P(\omega \times \omega)/(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}))^+) < \mathfrak{h})$.
- (e) (**Brendle [1]**) $\text{Con}(\mathfrak{h}((P(\Delta)/\mathcal{E}\mathcal{D}_{\text{fin}})^+) < \mathfrak{h})$.

Fact 2.5 If $\langle P, \leq_P \rangle$ and $\langle Q, \leq_Q \rangle$ are partial orderings and $f : P \rightarrow Q$, where

- (i) $\forall p_1, p_2 \in P (p_1 \leq_P p_2 \Rightarrow f(p_1) \leq_Q f(p_2))$,
- (ii) $\forall p_1, p_2 \in P (p_1 \perp_P p_2 \Rightarrow f(p_1) \perp_Q f(p_2))$,
- (iii) $f[P] = Q$,

then $\text{sq } \mathbb{P} \cong \text{sq } \mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. We have $\text{sm } \mathbb{P} = \langle P, \leq_P^* \rangle$, $\text{sq } \mathbb{P} = \langle P/\equiv_P, \trianglelefteq_P \rangle$, $\text{sm } \mathbb{Q} = \langle Q, \leq_Q^* \rangle$ and $\text{sq } \mathbb{Q} = \langle Q/\equiv_Q, \trianglelefteq_Q \rangle$, where for each $p_1, p_2 \in P$ and each $q_1, q_2 \in Q$

$$p_1 \leq_P^* p_2 \Leftrightarrow \forall p \leq_P p_1 \exists p' \leq_P p, p_2, \quad (1)$$

$$p_1 =_P p_2 \Leftrightarrow p_1 \leq_P^* p_2 \wedge p_2 \leq_P^* p_1 \quad \text{and} \quad [p_1] \trianglelefteq_P [p_2] \Leftrightarrow p_1 \leq_P^* p_2, \quad (2)$$

$$q_1 \leq_Q^* q_2 \Leftrightarrow \forall q \leq_Q q_1 \exists q' \leq_Q q, q_2, \quad (3)$$

$$q_1 =_Q q_2 \Leftrightarrow q_1 \leq_Q^* q_2 \wedge q_2 \leq_Q^* q_1 \quad \text{and} \quad [q_1] \trianglelefteq_Q [q_2] \Leftrightarrow q_1 \leq_Q^* q_2. \quad (4)$$

Claim. $p_1 \leq_P^* p_2 \Leftrightarrow f(p_1) \leq_Q^* f(p_2)$, for each $p_1, p_2 \in P$.

Proof of Claim. (\Rightarrow) Let $p_1 \leq_P^* p_2$. According to (3) we prove

$$\forall q \leq_Q f(p_1) \exists q' \leq_Q q, f(p_2). \quad (5)$$

If $q \leq_Q f(p_1)$ then, by (iii) there is $p_3 \in P$ such that $f(p_3) = q$. By (ii) and since $f(p_3) \leq_Q f(p_1)$, there is $p_4 \leq_P p_3, p_1$ and, by (1), there is $p_5 \leq_P p_4, p_2$, which, by (i), implies $f(p_5) \leq_Q f(p_2)$. Since $p_5 \leq_P p_4 \leq_P p_3$ by (i) we have $f(p_5) \leq_Q f(p_3) = q$ and $q' = f(p_5)$ satisfies (5).

(\Leftarrow) Assuming (5) we prove that $p_1 \leq_P^* p_2$. If $p \leq_P p_1$, then, by (i), $f(p) \leq_Q f(p_1)$ and, by (5), there is $q' \leq_Q f(p), f(p_2)$ and, by (ii), there is $p' \leq_P p, p_2$ and Claim is proved.

Now we show that $\langle P/=P, \trianglelefteq_P \rangle \cong_F \langle Q/=Q, \trianglelefteq_Q \rangle$, where $F([p]) = [f(p)]$.

By Claim, (2) and (4), for each $p_1, p_2 \in P$ we have $[p_1] = [p_2]$ iff $p_1 =_P p_2$ iff $p_1 \leq_P^* p_2 \wedge p_2 \leq_P^* p_1$ iff $f(p_1) \leq_Q^* f(p_2) \wedge f(p_2) \leq_Q^* f(p_1)$ iff $f(p_1) =_Q f(p_2)$ iff $[f(p_1)] = [f(p_2)]$ iff $F([p_1]) = F([p_2])$ and F is a well defined injection. By (iii), for $[q] \in Q/=Q$ there is $p \in P$ such that $q = f(p)$. Thus $F([p]) = [f(p)] = [q]$ and F is a surjection.

By Claim, (2) and (4) again, $[p_1] \trianglelefteq_P [p_2]$ iff $p_1 \leq_P^* p_2$ iff $f(p_1) \leq_Q^* f(p_2)$ iff $[f(p_1)] \trianglelefteq_Q [f(p_2)]$ iff $F([p_1]) \trianglelefteq_Q F([p_2])$. Thus F is an isomorphism. \square

3 Structures and posets of their copies

Let $L = \{R\}$ be a relational language, where $\text{ar}(R) = 2$. An L -structure $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \rho \rangle$ is called a *countable structure* iff $|X| = \omega$. If $A \subset X$, then $\langle A, \rho_A \rangle$ is a *substructure* of \mathbb{X} , where $\rho_A = \rho \cap A^2$. If $\mathbb{Y} = \langle Y, \tau \rangle$ is an L -structure too, a map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is called an *embedding* (we write $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow_f \mathbb{Y}$) iff it is an injection and $\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in \rho \Leftrightarrow \langle f(x_1), f(x_2) \rangle \in \tau$, for each $\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in X^2$. If \mathbb{X} embeds in \mathbb{Y} we write $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$. Let $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = \{f : \mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow_f \mathbb{Y}\}$ and, in particular, $\text{Emb}(\mathbb{X}) = \{f : \mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow_f \mathbb{X}\}$. If, in addition, f is a surjection, it is an *isomorphism* (we write $\mathbb{X} \cong_f \mathbb{Y}$) and the structures \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{Y} are *isomorphic*, in notation $\mathbb{X} \cong \mathbb{Y}$. \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{Y} are *equimorphic* iff $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ and $\mathbb{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}$. According to [2] a relational structure \mathbb{X} is: *p-monomorphic* iff all its substructures of size p are isomorphic; *indivisible* iff for each partition $X = A \cup B$ we have $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow A$ or $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow B$.

If $\mathbb{X}_i = \langle X_i, \rho_i \rangle, i \in I$, are L -structures and $X_i \cap X_j = \emptyset$, for $i \neq j$, then the structure $\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{X}_i = \langle \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i, \bigcup_{i \in I} \rho_i \rangle$ is the *union* of the structures $\mathbb{X}_i, i \in I$.

Let $\langle X, \rho \rangle$ be an L -structure and ρ_{rst} the minimal equivalence relation on X containing ρ (the transitive closure of the relation $\rho_{rs} = \Delta_X \cup \rho \cup \rho^{-1}$ given by $x \rho_{rst} y$ iff there are $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $z_0 = x, z_1, \dots, z_n = y$ such that $z_i \rho_{rs} z_{i+1}$, for each $i < n$). For $x \in X$ the corresponding equivalence class will be denoted by $[x]$ and called the *component* of $\langle X, \rho \rangle$ containing x . The structure $\langle X, \rho \rangle$ will be called *connected* iff it has only one component. It is easy to prove (see [4]) that $\langle X, \rho \rangle = \langle \bigcup_{x \in X} [x], \bigcup_{x \in X} \rho_{[x]} \rangle$ is the unique representation of $\langle X, \rho \rangle$ as a disjoint union of connected relations.

Here we investigate the partial orders of the form $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$, where $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \rho \rangle$ is an L -structure and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ the set of its isomorphic substructures, that is

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) = \{A \subset X : \langle A, \rho_A \rangle \cong \mathbb{X}\} = \{f[X] : f \in \text{Emb}(\mathbb{X})\}.$$

More generally, if $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \rho \rangle$ and $\mathbb{Y} = \langle Y, \tau \rangle$ are two L -structures we define $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = \{B \subset Y : \langle B, \tau_B \rangle \cong \mathbb{X}\} = \{f[X] : f \in \text{Emb}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y})\}$. Also let $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}} = \{S \subset X : \neg \exists A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) A \subset S\}$. We will use the following statements.

Fact 3.1 ([4]) For each relational structure \mathbb{X} we have: $|\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)| \geq \aleph_0$ iff the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is atomless iff $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ contains two incompatible elements.

Fact 3.2 ([4]) A structure \mathbb{X} is indivisible iff $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$ is an ideal in $P(X)$. Then

- (a) $\text{sm}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset) = \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset_{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}} \rangle$, where $A \subset_{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}} B \Leftrightarrow A \setminus B \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$;
 - (b) $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)$ is isomorphic to a dense subset of $\langle (P(X)/\equiv_{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}})^+, \leq_{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}} \rangle$.
- Hence the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is forcing equivalent to $(P(X)/\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}})^+$.
- (c) If \mathbb{X} is countable, then $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is an atomless partial order of size \mathfrak{c} .

Fact 3.3 ([4]) Let $\mathbb{X}_i = \langle X_i, \rho_i \rangle, i \in I$, and $\mathbb{Y}_j = \langle Y_j, \sigma_j \rangle, j \in J$, be two families of disjoint connected L -structures and \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{Y} their unions. Then

- (a) $F : \mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ iff $F = \bigcup_{i \in I} g_i$, where $f : I \rightarrow J, g_i : \mathbb{X}_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}_{f(i)}, i \in I$, and

$$\forall \{i_1, i_2\} \in [I]^2 \quad \forall x_{i_1} \in X_{i_1} \quad \forall x_{i_2} \in X_{i_2} \quad \neg g_{i_1}(x_{i_1}) \sigma_{rs} g_{i_2}(x_{i_2}); \quad (6)$$

- (b) $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ iff $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} g_i[X_i]$, where $f : I \rightarrow I, g_i : \mathbb{X}_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}_{f(i)}, i \in I$, and

$$\forall \{i, j\} \in [I]^2 \quad \forall x \in X_i \quad \forall y \in X_j \quad \neg g_i(x) \rho_{rs} g_j(y). \quad (7)$$

Fact 3.4 ([4]) If \mathbb{X} and \mathbb{Y} are equimorphic structures, then the posets $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$ are forcing equivalent.

Fact 3.5 (Pouzet [7]) If $p \leq |X|$ and \mathbb{X} is p -monomorphic, then \mathbb{X} is r -monomorphic for each $r \leq \min\{p, |X| - p\}$. (See also [2], p. 259.)

4 Structures with maximally embeddable components

Theorem 4.1 Let $\mathbb{X}_i = \langle X_i, \rho_{X_i} \rangle$, $i \in I$, be the components of a countable L -structure $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \rho \rangle$ and, for all $i, j \in I$, let

(i) $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}_j) = [\mathbb{X}_j]^{|\mathbb{X}_i|}$ (the components of \mathbb{X} are maximally embeddable),

(ii) $\forall A, B \in [\mathbb{X}_j]^{|\mathbb{X}_i|} \exists a \in A \exists b \in B \ a \rho_{rs} \ b$.

If $N = \{|X_i| : i \in I\}$, $N_{\text{fin}} = N \setminus \{\omega\}$, $I_\kappa = \{i \in I : |X_i| = \kappa\}$, for $\kappa \in N$, $|I_\omega| = \mu$ and $Y = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus I_\omega} X_i$, then we have

(a) $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)$ is an ω_1 -closed atomless poset of size \mathfrak{c} . In addition, it is isomorphic (and, hence, the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is forcing equivalent) to the poset

$$(P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+{}^\mu \quad \text{if } 1 \leq \mu < \omega, \ |N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega \text{ and } |Y| < \omega, \quad (\text{a1})$$

$$((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^{\mu+1} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq \mu < \omega, \ |N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega \text{ and } |Y| = \omega, \quad (\text{a2})$$

$$\mathbb{P} \times ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^{\mu} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq \mu < \omega, \ |N_{\text{fin}}| = \omega, \quad (\text{a3})$$

$$(P(\omega \times \omega)/(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}))^+ \quad \text{if } \mu = \omega, \quad (\text{a4})$$

where \mathbb{P} is an ω_1 -closed atomless poset, forcing equivalent to $(P(\Delta)/\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}})^+$.

(b) For some forcing related cardinal invariants of the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ we have

If \mathbb{X} satisfies	$\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is forcing equivalent to	$\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)$ is	$\text{ZFC} \vdash \text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)$ is \mathfrak{h} -distributive
$\mu < \omega \wedge N_{\text{fin}} < \omega$	$((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^n$, for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$	t-closed	yes iff $n = 1$
$\mu < \omega \wedge N_{\text{fin}} = \omega$	$(P(\Delta)/\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}})^+ \times ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^{\mu}$	ω_1 -closed	no
$\mu = \omega$	$(P(\omega \times \omega)/(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}))^+$	ω_1 but not ω_2 -closed	no

where $n = 1$ iff $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega} \vee (|Y| < \omega \wedge \mu = 1)$.

(c) \mathbb{X} is indivisible iff $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ or $N = \{1\}$ or $|I| = 1$ or $|I_\omega| = \omega$.

A proof of the theorem, given at the end of this section, is based on the following five claims.

Claim 4.2 $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ iff there is an injection $f : I \rightarrow I$ and there are $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^{|\mathbb{X}_i|}$, $i \in I$, such that $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow) Let $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. By Fact 3.3(b) there are functions $f : I \rightarrow I$ and $g_i : \mathbb{X}_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}_{f(i)}$, $i \in I$, satisfying (7) and such that $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} g_i[X_i]$. By (7) and (ii), f is an injection. Since $g_i : \mathbb{X}_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}_{f(i)}$ we have $C_i = g_i[X_i] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}_{f(i)}) = [\mathbb{X}_{f(i)}]^{|\mathbb{X}_i|}$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that f and C_i , $i \in I$, satisfy the assumptions. Since $[\mathbb{X}_{f(i)}]^{|\mathbb{X}_i|} = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}_{f(i)})$ there are $g_i : \mathbb{X}_i \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}_{f(i)}$, $i \in I$, such that $C_i = g_i[X_i]$. Since f

is an injection, for different $i, j \in I$ the sets $g_i[X_i]$ and $g_j[X_j]$ are in different components of \mathbb{X} and, hence, we have (7). By Fact 3.3(b), $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. \square

We continue the proof considering the following cases and subcases.

1. $N \subset \mathbb{N}$, with subcases $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ (Claim 4.3) and $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$ (Claim 4.4);
2. $N \not\subset \mathbb{N}$, with subcases $|I_\omega| < \omega$ (Claim 4.5) and $|I_\omega| = \omega$ (Claim 4.6).

Case 1: $N \subset \mathbb{N}$.

Claim 4.3 (Case 1.1) If $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$, then

- (a) \mathbb{X} is an indivisible structure;
- (b) $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)$ is an ω_1 -closed atomless poset;
- (c) The structures \mathbb{X}_i , $i \in I$, are either full relations or complete graphs or reflexive or irreflexive linear orderings;
- (d) There are structures \mathbb{X}_n , $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus N$, such that $|X_n| = n$ and that the extended family $\{\mathbb{X}_i : i \in I\} \cup \{\mathbb{X}_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus N\}$ satisfies (i) and (ii);
- (e) The poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is forcing equivalent to $(P(\Delta)/\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}})^+$.

Proof. Clearly, $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$ implies that $|I| = \omega$. First we prove

$$S \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}} \Leftrightarrow \exists n \in \omega \forall i \in I |S \cap X_i| \leq n. \quad (8)$$

(\Rightarrow) Here, for convenience, we assume that $I = \omega$. Suppose that for each $n \in \omega$ there is $i \in I$ such that $|S \cap X_i| > n$. Then $I_{>n}^S = \{i \in \omega : |S \cap X_i| > n\}$, $n \in \omega$, are infinite sets. By recursion we define sequences $\langle i_k : k \in \omega \rangle$ in ω and $\langle C_k : k \in \omega \rangle$ in $P(X)$ such that for each $k, l \in \omega$

- (i) $k < l \Rightarrow i_k < i_l$,
- (ii) $C_k \in [S \cap X_{i_k}]^{|X_k|}$.

Suppose that the sequences i_0, \dots, i_k and C_0, \dots, C_k satisfy (i) and (ii). Since $|I_{>|X_{k+1}|}^S| = \omega$ there is $i_{k+1} = \min\{i > i_k : |S \cap X_i| > |X_{k+1}|\}$ so $|S \cap X_{i_{k+1}}| > |X_{k+1}|$, we choose $C_{k+1} \in [S \cap X_{i_{k+1}}]^{|X_{k+1}|}$ and the recursion works.

By (i) the function $f : I \rightarrow I$ defined by $f(k) = i_k$ is an injection. By (ii) we have $C_k \in [X_{f(k)}]^{|X_k|}$ and, by Claim 4.2 $C = \bigcup_{k \in \omega} C_k \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. Since $C \subset S$ we have $S \notin \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$.

(\Leftarrow) Suppose that $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, where $C \subset S$. By Claim 4.2 there are an injection $f : I \rightarrow I$ and $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^{|X_i|}$, $i \in I$, such that $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$. For $n \in \omega$ there is $i_0 \in I$ such that $|X_{i_0}| > n$ and, hence, $C_{i_0} \in [X_{f(i_0)}]^{|X_{i_0}|}$, which implies $|X_{f(i_0)} \cap S| \geq |C_{i_0}| > n$. (8) is proved.

(a) Suppose that $X = C \cup D$ is a partition, where $C, D \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$. Then, by (8), there are $m, n \in \omega$ such that $|C \cap X_i| \leq m$ and $|D \cap X_i| \leq n$, for each $i \in I$. Hence for each $i \in I$ we have $|X_i| = |(X_i \cap C) \cup (X_i \cap D)| \leq m + n$, which is impossible since, by the assumption, $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$.

(b) By Facts 2.2(b) and (c) it is sufficient to show that $\text{sm}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is an ω_1 -closed and atomless pre-order. Let $\text{sm}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle = \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \leq \rangle$. By Fact 3.2 and (a) for each $A, B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ we have $A \leq B$ iff $A \setminus B \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and, by (8),

$$A \leq B \Leftrightarrow \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \forall i \in I \ |A \setminus B \cap X_i| \leq n. \quad (9)$$

Let $A_n \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $n \in \omega$, and $A_{n+1} \leq A_n$, for all $n \in \omega$. We will find $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ such that $A \leq A_n$, for all $n \in \omega$, that is, by (9),

$$\forall n \in \omega \ \exists m \in \mathbb{N} \ \forall i \in I \ |A \setminus A_n \cap X_i| \leq m. \quad (10)$$

By recursion we define a sequence $\langle i_r : r \in \omega \rangle$ in I such that for each $r, s \in \omega$

- (i) $r \neq s \Rightarrow i_r \neq i_s$,
- (ii) $|A_0 \cap A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_r \cap X_{i_r}| > r$.

First we choose i_0 such that $|A_0 \cap X_{i_0}| > 0$. Let the sequence i_0, \dots, i_r satisfy (i) and (ii). For each $k \leq r$ we have $A_{k+1} \leq A_k$ and, by (9), there is $m_k \in \omega$ such that $\forall i \in I \ |A_{k+1} \setminus A_k \cap X_i| \leq m_k$. Thus

$$\forall i \in I \ \forall k \leq r \ |A_{k+1} \setminus A_k \cap X_i| \leq m_k. \quad (11)$$

Since $A_{r+1} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ and $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$, by Claim 4.2 the set

$$J_{r+1} = \{i \in I : |A_{r+1} \cap X_i| > (\sum_{k \leq r} m_k) + r + 1\} \quad (12)$$

is infinite and we choose

$$i_{r+1} \in J_{r+1} \setminus \{i_0, \dots, i_r\}. \quad (13)$$

Then (i) is true. Clearly, $A_{r+1} \subset (\bigcap_{k=0}^{r+1} A_k) \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^r (A_{k+1} \setminus A_k)$ and, hence, $A_{r+1} \cap X_{i_{r+1}} \subset (\bigcap_{k=0}^{r+1} A_k \cap X_{i_{r+1}}) \cup \bigcup_{k=0}^r (A_{k+1} \setminus A_k \cap X_{i_{r+1}})$. So, by (11)-(13) $(\sum_{k \leq r} m_k) + r + 1 < |A_{r+1} \cap X_{i_{r+1}}| \leq |\bigcap_{k=0}^{r+1} A_k \cap X_{i_{r+1}}| + \sum_{k \leq r} m_k$, which implies $|A_0 \cap \dots \cap A_r \cap A_{r+1} \cap X_{i_{r+1}}| > r + 1$ and (ii) is true. The recursion works.

Let $S = \bigcup_{r \in \omega} (A_0 \cap A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_r \cap X_{i_r})$. By (i), (ii) and (8) we have $S \notin \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and, hence, there is $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ such that $A \subset S$. We prove (10). For $n \in \omega$ we have $A \setminus A_n \subset S \setminus A_n \subset \bigcup_{r < n} (A_0 \cap A_1 \cap \dots \cap A_r \cap X_{i_r}) \subset \bigcup_{r < n} X_{i_r}$, thus $|A \setminus A_n| = m$, for some $m \in \omega$ and, hence, $|A \setminus A_n \cap X_i| \leq m$, for each $i \in I$.

So $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is ω_1 -closed. By (a) and Facts 3.2(c) and 2.2(b) it is atomless.

(c) Since $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$, there are $i_0, i_1 \in I$ such that $|X_{i_0}| \geq 3$ and $|X_{i_1}| \geq |X_{i_0}| + 3$. By (i) we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_{i_0}, \mathbb{X}_{i_1}) = [\mathbb{X}_{i_1}]^{|\mathbb{X}_{i_0}|}$ and, hence, the structure \mathbb{X}_{i_1} is $|X_{i_0}|$ -monomorphic. Since $|X_{i_1}| - |X_{i_0}| \geq 3$ we have $\min\{|X_{i_0}|, |X_{i_1}| - |X_{i_0}|\} \geq 3$ and, by Fact 3.5,

$$\forall r \leq 3 \ (\mathbb{X}_{i_1} \text{ is } r\text{-monomorphic}). \quad (14)$$

Let $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\} \in [X_{i_1}]^3$ and, for $r \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, let $\mathbb{Y}_r = \langle Y_r, \tau_r \rangle$, where $Y_r = \{y_k : k \leq r\}$ and $\tau_r = (\rho_{i_1})_{Y_r}$. We prove

$$\forall i \in I \quad \forall r \leq \min\{3, |X_i|\} \quad \forall A \in [X_i]^r \quad \langle A, (\rho_i)_A \rangle \cong \mathbb{Y}_r. \quad (15)$$

If $|X_i| \geq |X_{i_1}|$, let $A \subset B \in [X_i]^{|X_{i_1}|}$. By (i) there exists an isomorphism $f : \langle B, (\rho_i)_B \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_{i_1}$ and, by (14) we have $\langle A, (\rho_i)_A \rangle \cong \langle f[A], (\rho_{i_1})_{f[A]} \rangle \cong \mathbb{Y}_r$.

If $|X_i| < |X_{i_1}|$ then, by (i), there exists an isomorphism $f : \mathbb{X}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_{i_1}$ and by (14) we have $\langle A, (\rho_i)_A \rangle \cong \langle f[A], (\rho_{i_1})_{f[A]} \rangle \cong \mathbb{Y}_r$. Thus (15) is true.

Clearly we have $\tau_1 = \emptyset$ or $\tau_1 = \{\langle y_1, y_1 \rangle\}$.

First, suppose that $\tau_1 = \emptyset$. Then by (15), for each $i \in I$ we have

$$\forall x \in X_i \quad \neg x \rho_i x, \quad (16)$$

that is, all relations $\rho_i, i \in I$, are irreflexive. Suppose that $\tau_2 \cap \{\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle, \langle y_2, y_1 \rangle\} = \emptyset$. Then by (15) we would have $\rho_{i_1} = \emptyset$ and \mathbb{X}_{i_1} would be a disconnected structure, which is not true. Thus $\tau_2 \cap \{\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle, \langle y_2, y_1 \rangle\} \neq \emptyset$.

Thus, if $\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle, \langle y_2, y_1 \rangle \in \tau_2$, then by (15), for each $i \in I$ we have

$$\forall \{x, y\} \in [X_i]^2 \quad (x \rho_i y \wedge y \rho_i x) \quad (17)$$

and, hence, \mathbb{X}_i is a complete graph.

Otherwise, if $|\tau_2 \cap \{\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle, \langle y_2, y_1 \rangle\}| = 1$ then, by (15), for each $i \in I$ we have

$$\forall \{x, y\} \in [X_i]^2 \quad (x \rho_i y \vee y \rho_i x) \quad (18)$$

and, hence, \mathbb{X}_i is a tournament. Thus \mathbb{Y}_3 is a tournament with three nodes and, hence, $\mathbb{Y}_3 \cong C_3 = \langle \{1, 2, 3\}, \{\langle 1, 2 \rangle, \langle 2, 3 \rangle, \langle 3, 1 \rangle\} \rangle$ (the oriented circle graph) or $\mathbb{Y}_3 \cong L_3 = \langle \{1, 2, 3\}, \{\langle 1, 2 \rangle, \langle 2, 3 \rangle, \langle 1, 3 \rangle\} \rangle$ (the transitive triple, the strict linear order of size 3). But $\mathbb{Y}_3 \cong C_3$ would imply that \mathbb{X}_{i_1} contains a four element tournament having all substructures of size 3 isomorphic to C_3 , which is impossible. Thus $\mathbb{Y}_3 \cong L_3$ which, together with (15), (16) and (18) implies that all relations $\rho_i, i \in I$ are transitive, so $\mathbb{X}_i, i \in I$, are strict linear orders.

If $\tau_1 = \{\langle y_1, y_1 \rangle\}$ then using the same arguments we show that the structures $\mathbb{X}_i, i \in I$, are either full relations or reflexive linear orders.

(d) follows from (c). Namely, if, for example, \mathbb{X}_i are complete graphs, then \mathbb{X}_n are complete graphs of size n .

(e) Let $N = \{n_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ and let $\mathbb{X}_n, n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus N$, be the structures from (d). W.l.o.g. suppose that $I_{n_k} = \{n_k\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, |I_{n_k}|\}$, if $|I_{n_k}| \in \mathbb{N}$, and $I_{n_k} = \{n_k\} \times \mathbb{N}$, if $|I_{n_k}| = \omega$. Then $I \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ and $X = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{\langle n_k, r \rangle \in I_{n_k}} X_{\langle n_k, r \rangle}$. For $l \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbb{Y}_l = \langle Y_l, \rho_l \rangle$ be defined by

$$\mathbb{Y}_l = \begin{cases} \mathbb{X}_l & \text{if } l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus N, \\ \mathbb{X}_{\langle n_k, 1 \rangle} & \text{if } l = n_k, \text{ for a } k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

and let $\mathbb{Y} = \langle \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} Y_l, \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \rho_l \rangle$. We prove that $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$ and $\mathbb{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}$.

$\mathbb{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}$. Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow I$, where $f(l) = \langle n_l, 1 \rangle$. Since $n_1 < n_2 < \dots$ we have $|Y_l| = l \leq n_l = |X_{\langle n_l, 1 \rangle}| = |X_{f(l)}|$ and, since the extended family of structures satisfies (i), there is $g_l : Y_l \hookrightarrow X_{f(l)}$. Since f is an injection, the sets $g_l[Y_l]$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, are in different components of \mathbb{X} and, hence, condition (6) is satisfied. Thus, by Fact 3.3(a), $F = \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} g_l : \mathbb{Y} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{X}$.

$\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$. Let $\mathbb{N} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} J_k$ be a partition, where $|J_k| = \omega$, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $Z_k = \bigcup_{\langle n_k, r \rangle \in I_{n_k}} X_{\langle n_k, r \rangle}$ and $T_k = \bigcup_{l \in J_k} Y_l$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Now $|I_{n_k}| \leq \omega = |J_k|$ and for $l \geq n_k$ we have $|X_{\langle n_k, r \rangle}| = n_k \leq l = |Y_l|$. Hence there is an injection $f_k : I_{n_k} \rightarrow J_k \setminus n_k$ and, since the extended family satisfies (i), there are embeddings $g_{\langle n_k, r \rangle} : X_{\langle n_k, r \rangle} \hookrightarrow Y_{f_k(\langle n_k, r \rangle)}$, for $\langle n_k, r \rangle \in I_{n_k}$. Thus, $f = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} f_k : I \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and condition (6) is satisfied so, by Fact 3.3, $F = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{\langle n_k, r \rangle \in I_{n_k}} g_{\langle n_k, r \rangle}$ embeds $\mathbb{X} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{\langle n_k, r \rangle \in I_{n_k}} X_{\langle n_k, r \rangle}$ into $\mathbb{Y} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{l \in J_k} Y_l$.

Now, by Fact 3.4, the posets $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ and $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$ are forcing equivalent. W.l.o.g. suppose that $Y_l = \{l\} \times \{1, 2, \dots, l\} \subset \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$. Then $Y = \Delta = \{\langle l, m \rangle \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : m \leq l\}$ and, by (8), $S \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{Y}}$ iff $\exists n \in \mathbb{N} \forall l \in \mathbb{N} |S \cap Y_l| \leq n$ iff $S \in \mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}}$. Thus $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{Y}} = \mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}}$ and, by Claim 4.3(a) and Fact 3.2(b), $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$ is forcing equivalent to $(P(Y)/\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{Y}})^+$, that is to $(P(\Delta)/\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}})^+$. \square

Claim 4.4 (Case 1.2) If $N \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$, then we have

- (a) $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$;
- (b) \mathbb{X} is an indivisible structure iff $m = 1$, where $m = \max N$.

Proof. (a) Case A: $|I_m| = \omega$. For $S \subset X$ let $I_m^S = \{i \in I_m : X_i \subset S\}$. First we prove

$$S \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}} \Leftrightarrow |I_m^S| < \omega. \quad (19)$$

Let $S \notin \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and $C \subset S$, where $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. By Claim 4.2 there are an injection $f : I \rightarrow I$ and $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^{X_i}$, $i \in I$, such that $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$. For $i \in I_m$ we have $|X_i| = m$ and, since $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^m$, we have $|X_{f(i)}| = m$ and $C_i = X_{f(i)} \subset S$. Thus $f(i) \in I_m^S$, for each $i \in I_m$ which, since f is one-to-one, implies $|I_m^S| = \omega$.

Suppose that $|I_m^S| = \omega$ and let $f : I \rightarrow I_m^S$ be a bijection. For $i \in I$ we have $X_{f(i)} \subset S$ and $|X_i| \leq m = |X_{f(i)}|$ and we choose $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^{X_i}$. Now $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i \subset S$ and, by Claim 4.2, $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. Thus $S \notin \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and (19) is proved.

W.l.o.g. we assume that $I_m = \omega$. By (19), for $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ we have $I_m^A \in [\omega]^\omega$ and we show that the posets $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ and $\langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset \rangle$ and the mapping $f : \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) \rightarrow [\omega]^\omega$ defined by $f(A) = I_m^A$ satisfy the assumptions of Fact 2.5. Clearly, $A \subset B$ implies $I_m^A \subset I_m^B$ and (i) is true. If A and B are incompatible elements of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, that is $A \cap B \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$, then, by (19), we have $|I_m^{A \cap B}| < \omega$ and, since $I_m^A \cap I_m^B = I_m^{A \cap B}$, $f(A)$ and $f(B)$ are incompatible in the poset $\langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset \rangle$. Thus (ii) is true as well.

We prove that f is a surjection. Let $S \in [\omega]^\omega$ and let $g : \omega \rightarrow S$ be a bijection. Then $h = \text{id}_{I \setminus \omega} \cup g : I \rightarrow I$ is an injection. For $i \in \omega$ we have $h(i) = g(i) \in S$ and we define $C_i = X_{g(i)} \in [X_{g(i)}]^{|X_i|}$. For $i \in I \setminus \omega$ let $C_i = X_i$. Then, by Claim 4.2, $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \omega} X_i \cup \bigcup_{i \in \omega} X_{g(i)} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. Now we have $f(C) = I_m^C = \{g(i) : i \in \omega\} = S$.

By Fact 2.5, $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong \text{sq}\langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset \rangle = (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$.

Case B: $|I_m| < \omega$. Since $|X| = \omega$ the set $I = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} I_n$ is infinite and, hence, there is $m_0 = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : |I_n| = \omega\}$. Clearly we have

$$|I_{m_0}| = \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus [0, m_0] \quad |I_n| < \omega \quad (20)$$

and $X = Y \cup Z$, where $Y = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \cap [0, m_0]} \bigcup_{i \in I_n} X_i$ and $Z = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus [0, m_0]} \bigcup_{i \in I_n} X_i$. If $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, then for each $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus [0, m_0]$ the copy A has exactly $|I_n|$ -many components of size n and, by (20) and Claim 4.2, $Z \subset A$. So, it is easy to see that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) = \{C \cup Z : C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y})\}$ and, hence, the mapping $F : \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ given by $F(C) = C \cup Z$ is well defined and onto. If $F(C_1) = F(C_2)$ then $(C_1 \cup Z) \cap Y = (C_2 \cup Z) \cap Y$, which implies $C_1 = C_2$, thus F is an injection. Clearly $C_1 \subset C_2$ implies $F(C_1) \subset F(C_2)$ and, if $F(C_1) \subset F(C_2)$, then $(C_1 \cup Z) \cap Y \subset (C_2 \cup Z) \cap Y$, which implies $C_1 \subset C_2$. Thus $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong_F \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$ and, by Fact 2.2(d), $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong \text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$. By (20) the structure \mathbb{Y} satisfies the assumption of Case A and, hence, $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$.

(b) If $m > 1$, then there is a partition $X = A \cup B$ such that $A \cap X_i \neq \emptyset$ and $B \cap X_i \neq \emptyset$, for each $i \in I_m$. Now, neither A nor B have a component of size m and, hence, does not contain a copy of \mathbb{X} . Thus \mathbb{X} is not indivisible.

If $m = 1$, then $N = \{1\}$ and, since $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}_j) = [\mathbb{X}_j]^{|X_i|}$, the structures $\mathbb{X}_i = \langle \{x_i\}, \rho_{\{x_i\}} \rangle$, $i \in I$, are isomorphic and, hence, either $\rho_{\{x_i\}} = \emptyset$, for all $i \in I$, which implies $\rho = \emptyset$ or $\rho_{\{x_i\}} = \langle \{x_i, x_i\} \rangle$, for all $i \in I$, which implies $\rho = \Delta_X$. Thus, since $|I| = \omega$, either $\mathbb{X} \cong \langle \omega, \emptyset \rangle$ or $\mathbb{X} \cong \langle \omega, \Delta_\omega \rangle$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) = [X]^\omega$ in both cases, which implies that \mathbb{X} is an indivisible structure. \square

Case 2: $N \not\subset \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mu > 0$, $X = (\bigcup_{i \in I \setminus I_\omega} X_i) \dot{\cup} (\bigcup_{i \in I_\omega} X_i) = Y \dot{\cup} Z$ (maybe $Y = \emptyset$) and \mathbb{X} is the disjoint union of the structures $\mathbb{Y} = \langle Y, \rho_Y \rangle$ and $\mathbb{Z} = \langle Z, \rho_Z \rangle$.

Claim 4.5 (Case 2.1) If $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$(a) \quad \text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong \begin{cases} ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^{\mu} & \text{if } |N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega \text{ and } |Y| < \omega, \\ ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^{\mu+1} & \text{if } |N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega \text{ and } |Y| = \omega, \\ \mathbb{P} \times ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^{\mu} & \text{if } |N_{\text{fin}}| = \omega, \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where \mathbb{P} is an ω_1 -closed atomless poset;

(b) If $|N_{\text{fin}}| = \omega$, then $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ and $(P(\Delta)/\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}})^+ \times (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$ are forcing equivalent posets;

(c) \mathbb{X} is indivisible iff $|I| = 1$, that is $Y = \emptyset$ and $\mu = 1$.

Proof. (a) For $i \in I_\omega$, let $A_i, B_i \in [X_i]^\omega$ be disjoint sets, $A = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus I_\omega} X_i \cup \bigcup_{i \in I_\omega} A_i$ and $B = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus I_\omega} X_i \cup \bigcup_{i \in I_\omega} B_i$. Then, by Claim 4.2, $A, B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ and, since $A \cap B$ does not contain infinite components, we have $A \cap B \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$. By Facts 3.1 and 2.2(b), the posets $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ and $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ are atomless.

Concerning the closure properties of $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$, first we prove the equality

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) = \{A \cup B : A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}) \wedge B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z})\}. \quad (22)$$

If $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, then, by Claim 4.2, there is an injection $f : I \rightarrow I$ and there are $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^{|X_i|}$, $i \in I$, such that $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$. For $i \in I_\omega$ we have $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^\omega$ and, hence, $f(i) \in I_\omega$. Thus $f[I_\omega] \subset I_\omega$ and, since f is one-to-one and I_ω is finite, $f[I_\omega] = I_\omega$ and $f[I \setminus I_\omega] \subset I \setminus I_\omega$. Now we have $C = A \dot{\cup} B$, where $A = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus I_\omega} C_i \subset Y$ and $B = \bigcup_{i \in I_\omega} C_i \subset Z$. Clearly the structures \mathbb{Y} and \mathbb{Z} satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 and, since the restrictions $f \upharpoonright I \setminus I_\omega : I \setminus I_\omega \rightarrow I \setminus I_\omega$ and $f \upharpoonright I_\omega : I_\omega \rightarrow I_\omega$ are injections, by Claim 4.2 we have $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y})$ and $B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z})$.

Let $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y})$ and $B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z})$. Since the structures \mathbb{Y} and \mathbb{Z} satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, by Claim 4.2 there are injections $g : I \setminus I_\omega \rightarrow I \setminus I_\omega$ and $h : I_\omega \rightarrow I_\omega$ and there are $C_i \in [X_{g(i)}]^{|X_i|}$, $i \in I \setminus I_\omega$, and $C_i \in [X_{h(i)}]^{|X_i|}$, $i \in I_\omega$, such that $A = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus I_\omega} C_i$ and $B = \bigcup_{i \in I_\omega} C_i$. Now $f = g \cup h : I \rightarrow I$ is an injection, $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^{|X_i|}$, for all $i \in I$, and, by Claim 4.2, $A \cup B = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. Thus (22) is true.

Now we prove that

$$\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong \text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle \times \text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z}), \subset \rangle. \quad (23)$$

By (22), the function $F : \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}) \times \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ given by $F(\langle A, B \rangle) = A \cup B$ is well defined and onto and, clearly, it is a monotone injection. If $F(\langle A, B \rangle) \subset F(\langle A', B' \rangle)$, then $(A \cup B) \cap Y \subset (A' \cup B') \cap Y$, that is $A \subset A'$ and, similarly, $B \subset B'$, thus $\langle A, B \rangle \leq \langle A', B' \rangle$. So F is an isomorphism and (23) follows from (d) and (f) of Fact 2.2.

If $|N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega$, then $|Y| < \omega$ implies $|\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y})| = 1$ and, hence, $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle \cong 1$; otherwise, if $|Y| = \omega$, then, by Claim 4.4, $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle \cong (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$. So

$$\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle \cong \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega \text{ and } |Y| < \omega, \\ (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+ & \text{if } |N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega \text{ and } |Y| = \omega. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

By the assumption, for $i, j \in I_\omega$ we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}_j) = [X_j]^\omega$. Since $|I_\omega| < \omega$, by Claim 4.2 we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z}) = \{\bigcup_{i \in I_\omega} C_i : \forall i \in I_\omega C_i \in [X_i]^\omega\}$ which implies

$\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z}), \subset \rangle \cong \prod_{i \in I_\omega} \langle [X_i]^\omega, \subset \rangle \cong \langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset \rangle^\mu$. Since $\text{sq}\langle [\omega]^\omega, \subset \rangle = (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$, by (d) and (f) of Fact 2.2 we have

$$\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Z}), \subset \rangle \cong ((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^{\mu}. \quad (25)$$

Now, for $|N_{\text{fin}}| < \omega$ (21) follows from (23), (24) and (25). If $|N_{\text{fin}}| = \omega$, then, by Claim 4.3, $\mathbb{P} = \text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$ is ω_1 -closed atomless and (21) follows from (23) and (25).

(b) By Claim 4.3(e) and Fact 2.2(a), the posets $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$, $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle$ and $(P(\Delta)/\mathcal{ED}_{\text{fin}})^+$ are forcing equivalent. By (23) and (25) we have $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong \text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Y}), \subset \rangle \times (P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+{}^\mu$.

(c) Let $Y = \emptyset$ and $\mu = 1$. Then $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) = [X]^\omega$ and, clearly, \mathbb{X} is indivisible.

If $Y \neq \emptyset$, then, by (a), each $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ must intersect both Y and Z and the partition $X = Y \cup Z$ witnesses that \mathbb{X} is not indivisible.

If $Y = \emptyset$ but $\mu > 1$, by (a), each $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ must intersect all components of \mathbb{X} and for $i_0 \in I_\omega = I$, the partition $X = X_{i_0} \cup \bigcup_{i \in I_\omega \setminus \{i_0\}} X_i$ witnesses that \mathbb{X} is not indivisible. \square

Claim 4.6 (Case 2.2) If $\mu = \omega$, then

- (a) \mathbb{X} is an indivisible structure;
- (b) $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong (P(\omega \times \omega)/(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}))^+$.

Proof. (a) For $S \subset X$ let $I_\omega^S = \{i \in I_\omega : |S \cap X_i| = \omega\}$ and first we prove

$$S \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}} \Leftrightarrow |I_\omega^S| < \omega. \quad (26)$$

Suppose that $|I_\omega^S| = \omega$. Let $f : I \rightarrow I_\omega^S$ be a bijection. Then, for $i \in I$ we have $|S \cap X_{f(i)}| = \omega$ and we can choose $C_i \in [S \cap X_{f(i)}]^{X_i} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_i, \mathbb{X}_{f(i)})$. By Claim 4.2 we have $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ and, clearly, $C \subset S$. Thus $S \notin \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$.

Let $S \notin \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, where $C \subset S$. By Claim 4.2 there are an injection $f : I \rightarrow I$ and $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^{X_i}$, $i \in I$, such that $C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i$. For $i \in I_\omega$ we have $C_i \in [X_{f(i)}]^\omega$, which implies $|S \cap X_{f(i)}| = \omega$, that is $f(i) \in I_\omega^S$. Thus $f[I_\omega] \subset I_\omega^S$ and, since f is one-to-one and $|I_\omega| = \omega$, we have $|I_\omega^S| = \omega$ and (26) is proved.

Suppose that \mathbb{X} is divisible and $X = A \cup B$, where $A, B \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$. Then, by (26), $|I_\omega^A \cup I_\omega^B| < \omega$ and there is $i \in I_\omega \setminus (I_\omega^A \cup I_\omega^B)$. Now, $|A \cap X_i|, |B \cap X_i| < \omega$, which is impossible since $X_i = (A \cap X_i) \cup (B \cap X_i)$ is an infinite set.

(b) W.l.o.g. we suppose that $I_\omega = \omega$ and $X_i = \{i\} \times \omega$, for $i \in \omega$. Then $X = Y \cup (\omega \times \omega)$, where $Y = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \omega} X_i$. Clearly, for $S \subset \omega \times \omega$,

$$S \in \text{Fin} \times \text{Fin} \Leftrightarrow |I_\omega^S| < \omega. \quad (27)$$

By (26), for $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ the set $I_\omega^A = I_\omega^{A \cap (\omega \times \omega)}$ is infinite and by (27) we have $A \cap (\omega \times \omega) \notin \text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}$. Hence the mapping

$$f : \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \rightarrow \langle (P(\omega \times \omega) / =_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}})^+, \trianglelefteq_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}} \rangle$$

given by $f(A) = [A \cap (\omega \times \omega)]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}}$, for all $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, is well defined and we show that it satisfies the assumptions of Fact 2.5. Let $A, B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$.

(i) If $A \subset B$, then $(A \cap (\omega \times \omega)) \setminus (B \cap (\omega \times \omega)) = \emptyset \in \text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}$ and $f(A) = [A \cap (\omega \times \omega)]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}} \trianglelefteq_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}} [B \cap (\omega \times \omega)]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}} = f(B)$.

(ii) If A and B are incompatible in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$, then $A \cap B \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{X}}$ and, by (26), $|I_\omega^{A \cap B}| < \omega$, that is $|I_\omega^{(A \cap (\omega \times \omega)) \cap (B \cap (\omega \times \omega))}| < \omega$, which, by (27) implies $(A \cap (\omega \times \omega)) \cap (B \cap (\omega \times \omega)) \in \text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}$. Hence $f(A) = [A \cap (\omega \times \omega)]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}}$ and $f(B) = [B \cap (\omega \times \omega)]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}}$ are incompatible in $(P(\omega \times \omega) / =_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}})^+$.

(iii) We show that f is a surjection. It is easy to see that for $A, B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$,

$$I_\omega^{A \setminus B} \cup I_\omega^{B \setminus A} = I_\omega^{A \Delta B}. \quad (28)$$

Let $[S]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}} \in (P(\omega \times \omega) / =_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}})^+$. Then, by (27), we have $|I_\omega^S| = \omega$. Let $g : \omega \rightarrow I_\omega^S$ be a bijection. Then $h = \text{id}_{I \setminus \omega} \cup g : I \rightarrow I$ is an injection. For $i \in \omega$ we have $h(i) = g(i) \in I_\omega^S$ and we define $C_i = S \cap X_{g(i)} \in [X_{g(i)}]^{X_i}$. For $i \in I \setminus \omega$ let $C_i = X_i$. Then, by Claim 4.2,

$$C = \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \omega} X_i \cup \bigcup_{i \in \omega} S \cap X_{g(i)} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}).$$

Now $S \setminus C = \bigcup_{j \in \omega \setminus I_\omega^S} S \cap X_j$, which implies $I_\omega^{S \setminus C} = \emptyset$ and $C \setminus S = \bigcup_{i \in I \setminus \omega} X_i \setminus S$, which implies $I_\omega^{C \setminus S} = \emptyset$. So, by (28), $I_\omega^{C \Delta S} = I_\omega^{(C \cap (\omega \times \omega)) \Delta S} = \emptyset$ and, by (27), $(C \cap (\omega \times \omega)) \Delta S \in \text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}$, so $f(C) = [C \cap (\omega \times \omega)]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}} = [S]_{=_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}}}$.

By Fact 2.5 and since $\langle (P(\omega \times \omega) / =_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}})^+, \trianglelefteq_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}} \rangle$ is a separative partial order we have $\text{sq} \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle \cong \text{sq} \langle (P(\omega \times \omega) / =_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}})^+, \trianglelefteq_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}} \rangle \cong \langle (P(\omega \times \omega) / =_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}})^+, \trianglelefteq_{\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}} \rangle$. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. (a) (a4) is Claim 4.6(b). For $\mu > 0$, (a1)-(a3) are proved in Claim 4.5(a). For $\mu = 0$, (a2) is proved in Claim 4.4(a) and (a3) in Claim 4.3(b). By Facts 2.1 and 2.4, $\text{sq} \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is an ω_1 -closed atomless poset. It is of size \mathfrak{c} since it contains a reversed binary tree of height ω and the set of lower bounds of its branches is of cardinality \mathfrak{c} . The forcing equivalent of \mathbb{P} is given in Claim 4.3(e).

(b) follows from (a), Claim 4.5(b) and Fact 2.4.

(c) The implication “ \Leftarrow ” follows from Claims 4.3(a), 4.4(b), 4.5(c) and 4.6(a). For a proof of (\Rightarrow) suppose that $N \notin [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$, $N \neq \{1\}$, $|I| \neq 1$ and $|I_\omega| < \omega$.

If $N \subset \mathbb{N}$, then, since $N \notin [\mathbb{N}]^\omega$, we have $N = \{n_0, \dots, n_m\}$, where $n_0 < \dots < n_m$ and, since $N \neq \{1\}$, $n_m > 1$. Let $x_i \in X_i$, for $i \in I_{n_m}$, let $A =$

$\bigcup_{i \in I \setminus I_{n_m}} X_i \cup \bigcup_{i \in I_{n_m}} \{x_i\}$ and $B = \bigcup_{i \in I_{n_m}} X_i \setminus \{x_i\}$. Then $X = A \cup B$ and neither A nor B contain a copy of \mathbb{X} , since all their components are of size $< n_m$.

If $N \not\subseteq \mathbb{N}$, then $I_\omega \neq \emptyset$ and, since $|I_\omega| < \omega$, we have $0 < |I_\omega| = m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $|I| \neq 1$, by Claim 4.5(c) \mathbb{X} is not indivisible. \square

5 Examples

Example 5.1 Equivalence relations on countable sets. If $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \rho \rangle$, where ρ is an equivalence relation on a countable set X , then, clearly, the components X_i , $i \in I$, of \mathbb{X} are the equivalence classes determined by ρ and for each $i \in I$ the restriction ρ_{X_i} is the full relation on X_i , which implies that conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied. Thus the poset $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)$ is ω_1 -closed and atomless and, hence, \mathbb{X} belongs to the column D of Diagram 1. Some examples of such structures are given in Diagram 2, where $\bigcup_m F_n$ denotes the disjoint union of m full relations on a set of size n . We note that \mathbb{X} is a ultrahomogeneous structure iff




Diagram 2: Equivalence relations on countable sets

all equivalence classes are of the same size, so the following countable equivalence relations are ultrahomogeneous and by Theorem 4.1 have the given properties.

$\bigcup_\omega F_n$. It is indivisible iff $n = 1$ (the diagonal) and the poset $\text{sq}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset)$ is isomorphic to $(P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+$ which is a \mathfrak{t} -closed and \mathfrak{h} -distributive poset.

$\bigcup_n F_\omega$. It is indivisible iff $n = 1$ (the full relation) and the poset $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is isomorphic to $((P(\omega)/\text{Fin})^+)^n$ which is \mathfrak{t} -closed, but for $n > 1$ not \mathfrak{h} -distributive poset in, for example, the Mathias model.

$\bigcup_\omega F_\omega$ (the ω -homogeneous-universal equivalence relation). It is indivisible and $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ is isomorphic to $(P(\omega \times \omega)/(\text{Fin} \times \text{Fin}))^+$, which is ω_1 -closed, but not ω_2 -closed and, hence, consistently neither \mathfrak{t} -closed nor \mathfrak{h} -distributive.

Example 5.2 Disjoint unions of complete graphs. The same picture as in Example 5.1 is obtained for countable graphs $\mathbb{X} = \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{X}_i$, where $\mathbb{X}_i = \langle X_i, \rho_i \rangle$, $i \in I$, are disjoint complete graphs (that is $\rho_i = (X_i \times X_i) \setminus \Delta_{X_i}$) since, clearly, conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied. Also, by a well known characterization of Lachlan and Woodrow [6] all disconnected countable ultrahomogeneous graphs are of the form $\bigcup_m K_n$ (the union of m -many complete graphs of size n), where $mn = \omega$ and $m > 1$. So in Diagram 2 we can replace F_n with K_n .

Example 5.3 Disjoint unions of ordinals $\leq \omega$. A similar picture is obtained for countable partial orders $\mathbb{X} = \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{X}_i$, where \mathbb{X}_i 's are disjoint copies of ordinals $\alpha_i \leq \omega$. (Clearly, linear orders satisfy (ii) of Theorem 4.1 and $\mathbb{P}(\alpha, \beta) = [\beta]^{|\alpha|}$, for each two ordinals $\alpha, \beta \leq \omega$.) So in Diagram 2 we can replace F_n with L_n , where $L_n \cong n \leq \omega$, but these partial orderings are not ultrahomogeneous.

Remark 5.4 All structures analyzed in Examples 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 are disconnected. But, since $\mathbb{P}(\langle X, \rho \rangle) = \mathbb{P}(\langle X, \rho^c \rangle)$, taking their complements we obtain connected structures with the same posets $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$ and $\text{sq}\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset \rangle$, having the properties established in these examples. For example, the complement of $\bigcup_m F_n$ is the graph-theoretic complement of the graph $\bigcup_m K_n$.

Remark 5.5 The structures satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. Let a countable structure $\mathbb{X} = \bigcup_{i \in I} \mathbb{X}_i$ satisfy conditions (i) and (ii).

First, (i) implies that all components of the same size are isomorphic.

Second, if $|X_i| = \omega$ for some $i \in I$, then, by (i), $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}_i) = [X_i]^\omega$ and, by [4], \mathbb{X}_i is isomorphic to one of the following structures: 1. The empty relation; 2. The complete graph; 3. The natural strict linear order on ω ; 4. Its inverse; 5. The diagonal relation; 6. The full relation; 7. The natural reflexive linear order on ω ; 8. Its inverse. Thus, since \mathbb{X}_i is a connected structure, it is isomorphic to the structure 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 or 8 and, by (i) again, this fact implies that

(*) All \mathbb{X}_i 's are either full relations or complete graphs or linear orders.

By Claim 4.3(c), (*) holds when \mathbb{X}_i 's are finite, but their sizes are unbounded.

But, if the size of the components of \mathbb{X} is bounded by some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are structures which do not satisfy (*). For example, take a disjoint union of ω copies of the linear graph L_n and ω copies of the circle graph C_{n+1} .

References

- [1] J. Brendle, Cardinal invariants of analytic quotients, a lecture at the Bonn University, 16.6.2009.
- [2] R. Fraïssé, Theory of relations, Revised edition, With an appendix by Norbert Sauer, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, 145, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2000.
- [3] F. Hernández-Hernández, Distributivity of quotients of countable products of Boolean algebras, *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste* 41 (2009) 27–33 (2010).
- [4] M. S. Kurilić, From A_1 to D_5 : Towards a forcing-related classification of relational structures, submitted.
- [5] M. S. Kurilić, Posets of copies of countable scattered linear orders, submitted.
- [6] A. H. Lachlan, R. E. Woodrow, Countable ultrahomogeneous undirected graphs, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 262,1 (1980) 51–94.
- [7] M. Pouzet, Application d'une propriété combinatoire des parties d'un ensemble aux groupes et aux relations, *Math. Z.* 150,2 (1976) 117–134.
- [8] S. Shelah, O. Spinas, The distributivity numbers of finite products of $P(\omega)/\text{fin}$, *Fund. Math.* 158,1 (1998) 81–93.
- [9] A. Szymański, Zhou Hao Xua, The behaviour of ω^{2^*} under some consequences of Martin's axiom, *General topology and its relations to modern analysis and algebra*, V (Prague, 1981), 577–584, *Sigma Ser. Pure Math.*, 3, Heldermann, Berlin, 1983.