

ANTICHAINS IN PRODUCTS OF LINEAR ORDERS

MARTIN GOLDSTERN AND SAHARON SHELAH

ABSTRACT. We show that:

- (1) For many regular cardinals λ (in particular, for all successors of singular strong limit cardinals, and for all successors of singular ω -limits), for all $n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$: There is a linear order L such that L^n has no (incomparability-)antichain of cardinality λ , while L^{n+1} has an antichain of cardinality λ .
- (2) For any nondecreasing sequence $\langle \lambda_n : n \in \{2, 3, 4, \dots\} \rangle$ of infinite cardinals it is consistent that there is a linear order L such that, for all n : L^n has an antichain of cardinality λ_n , but no antichain of cardinality λ_n^+ .

1. INTRODUCTION

For any nontrivial linear ordering L and any natural number $n > 1$, the set L^n (ordered by the “pointwise” or “product” order) is partial order which is not linear any more. A natural measure for its non-linearity is obtained by considering the possible sizes (cardinalities) of antichains in L^n (that is, sets of pairwise incomparable elements).

Haviar and Ploščica in [2] asked: Can there be a linear ordering L and an infinite cardinal number λ such that for some natural number $n > 1$, the partial order L^n does not have antichains of size λ , while L^{n+1} has such antichains?

Farley [1] has constructed, for any *singular* cardinal κ , a linear order L of size κ such that L^3 has an antichain of cardinality κ while L^2 does not.

We will be mainly interested in this question for *regular* cardinals.

First we show in ZFC that there are many successor cardinals λ (including $\aleph_{\omega+1}$) with the following property:

For every $n \geq 2$ there is a linear order J of size λ such that J^n has no antichain of size λ , while J^{n+1} does.

This proof is given in section 2. It uses a basic fact from pcf theory.

In section 3 we show that partial orders L^n can all be very different as far as the possible sizes of antichains in these orders are concerned. More

This paper is also available from the authors' homepages, and from www.arXiv.org.

The first author is partially supported by the Austrian Science Foundation, FWF grant P13325-MAT.

The second author is supported by the German-Israeli Foundation for Scientific Research & Development Grant No. G-294.081.06/93. Publication number 696.

precisely, we show that for any nondecreasing sequence of infinite cardinals $\langle \lambda_n : 2 \leq n < \omega \rangle$ there is a cardinal-preserving forcing extension of the universe in which we can find a linear order L such that for all $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$: in L^n there are antichains of cardinality λ_n , but no larger ones.

For example, it is consistent that there is a linear order L such that L^2 has no uncountable antichain, while L^3 does.

Here we use forcing. The heart of this second proof is the well-known Δ -system lemma.

2. A ZFC PROOF

Let μ be a regular cardinal. We will write D_μ for the filter of cobounded sets, i.e.,

$$D_\mu = \{A \subseteq \mu : \exists i < \mu \ \mu \setminus i \subseteq A\}$$

For any sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \mu \rangle$ of cardinals, we write $\prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i$ for the set of all functions f with domain μ satisfying $f(i) < \lambda_i$ for all i . The relation $f \sim_{D_\mu} g \Leftrightarrow \{i < \mu : f(i) = g(i)\} \in D_\mu$ is an equivalence relation. We call the quotient structure $\prod_i \lambda_i / D_\mu$ (and we often do not distinguish between a function f and its equivalence class). $\prod_i \lambda_i / D_\mu$ is partially ordered by the relation

$$f <_{D_\mu} g \quad \text{iff} \quad \{i < \mu : f(i) < g(i)\} \in D_\mu$$

Definition 2.1. For any partial order (P, \leq) and any regular cardinal λ we say $\lambda = \text{tcf}(P)$ (“ λ is the true cofinality of P ”) iff there is an increasing sequence $\langle p_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ such that $\forall p \in P \exists i < \lambda : p \leq p_i$.

Remark 2.2. (1) For any partial order P there is at most one regular cardinal λ which can be the true cofinality of P , that is: if $\langle p_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ and $\langle p'_j : j < \lambda' \rangle$ are both as above, then $\lambda = \lambda'$.

- (2) Every linear order has a true cofinality
- (3) If P has true cofinality, then P is upward directed
- (4) There are partial orders which are upward directed but have no true cofinality, for example $\omega \times \omega_1$.

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that*

- (1) $\langle \lambda_i : i < \mu \rangle$ is an increasing sequence of regular cardinals
- (2) For each $j < \mu$, $|\prod_{i < j} \lambda_i| < \lambda_j$
- (3) λ is regular and $\text{tcf}(\prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i / D_\mu) = \lambda$,
- (4) $n \geq 2$.

Then there is a linear order J of size λ such that

- J^{n+1} has an antichain of size λ
- J^n has no antichain of size λ

To show that there are indeed many cardinals λ of the form $\prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i / D_\mu$ as in our theorem, we use theorem II.1.5 from [3, page 50]:

Theorem 2.4. *If κ is singular and $\text{cf}\kappa = \mu$, then there is a strictly increasing sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \mu \rangle$ of regular cardinals such that $\kappa = \sum_{i < \mu} \lambda_i$ and $(\prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i, <_{D_\mu})$ has true cofinality κ^+ .*

It is clear that in the above theorem we can replace $\langle \lambda_i : i < \mu \rangle$ by any increasing cofinal subsequence $\langle \lambda_{f(j)} : j < \mu \rangle$.

Conclusion 2.5. *Whenever $\lambda = \kappa^+$, where κ is a singular strong limit cardinal, or even only the following holds:*

$$\kappa \text{ is singular, and } \forall \kappa' < \kappa : (\kappa')^{<\text{cf}(\kappa)} < \kappa,$$

then we can find a sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ as in the assumption of theorem 2.3.

For example, if $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega+1}$, then there is an increasing sequence $\langle n_k : k \in \omega \rangle$ of natural numbers such that $\text{tcf}(\prod_{k \in \omega} \aleph_{n_k} / D_\omega) = \aleph_{\omega+1}$. So theorem 2.3 implies for any $n > 1$ there is a linear order J such that J^n has no antichain of size $\aleph_{\omega+1}$, whereas J^{n+1} has one.

Proof. Let $\mu = \text{cf}(\kappa)$. We can start with a sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \mu \rangle$ such that $\prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i / D_\mu$ has true cofinality $\lambda = \kappa^+$. Choose $f : \mu \rightarrow \mu$ increasing cofinal such that $\prod_{j < i} \lambda_{f(j)} < \lambda_{f(i)}$ for all $i < \mu$, then $\langle \lambda_{f(j)} : j < \mu \rangle$ is as required. \square

The proof of theorem 2.3 will occupy the rest of this section. The assumption of theorem 2.3 says $\text{tcf} \prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i / D_\mu = \lambda$, so we may fix a sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ of functions in $\prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i$ such that for all $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$ we have $f_\alpha <_{D_\mu} f_\beta$.

We start by writing $\mu = \bigcup_{\ell=0}^n A_\ell$ as a disjoint union of $n + 1$ many D_μ -positive (i.e., unbounded) sets. For $\ell = 0, \dots, n$ we define a linear order $<_\ell$ on λ as follows:

Definition 2.6. For any two distinct functions $f, g \in \prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i$ we define

$$(1) \quad d(f, g) = \sup\{i < \mu : f \upharpoonright i = g \upharpoonright i\} = \max\{i < \mu : f \upharpoonright i = g \upharpoonright i\}$$

That is: if $f \neq g$, then $d(f, g) = \min\{j : f(j) \neq g(j)\}$ is the first point where f and g differ.

For $\alpha, \beta \in \lambda$ we define $\alpha <_\ell \beta$ iff:

$$\text{letting } i := d(f_\alpha, f_\beta),$$

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{either } i \in A_\ell \text{ and } f_\alpha(i) < f_\beta(i) \\ &\text{or } i \notin A_\ell \text{ and } f_\alpha(i) > f_\beta(i) \end{aligned}$$

We leave it to the reader to check that $<_\ell$ is indeed a linear order on λ .

We now define J to be the “ordinal sum” of all the orders $<_\ell$:

Definition 2.7. Let

$$J = \bigcup_{\ell=0}^n \{\ell\} \times (\lambda, <_\ell)$$

modified:2002-04-07

696 revision:2002-04-06

with the “lexicographic” order, i.e., $(\ell_1, \alpha_1) < (\ell_2, \alpha_2)$ iff $\ell_1 < \ell_2$, or $\ell_1 = \ell_2$ and $\alpha_1 <_{\ell_1} \alpha_2$.

Claim 2.8. J^{n+1} has an antichain of size λ .

Proof. Let $\vec{t}_\alpha = \langle (0, \alpha), \dots, (n, \alpha) \rangle \in J^{n+1}$.

For any $\alpha \neq \beta$ we have to check that \vec{t}_α and \vec{t}_β are incomparable. Let $i^* = d(f_\alpha, f_\beta)$, and find ℓ^* such that $i^* \in A_{\ell^*}$. Wlog assume $f_\alpha(i^*) < f_\beta(i^*)$. Then $\alpha <_{\ell^*} \beta$, but $\alpha >_\ell \beta$ for all $\ell \neq \ell^*$, i.e., $(\ell^*, \alpha) <_J (\ell^*, \beta)$, but $(\ell, \alpha) >_J (\ell, \beta)$ for all $\ell \neq \ell^*$. □

Finishing the proof of 2.3. It remains to show that J^n does not have an antichain of size λ . Towards a contradiction, assume that $\langle \vec{t}_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ is an antichain in J^m , $m \leq n$, and m as small as possible. Let $\vec{t}_\beta = (t_\beta(1), \dots, t_\beta(m)) \in J^m$. For $k = 1, \dots, m$ we can find functions ℓ_k, ξ_k such that

$$\forall \beta < \lambda \forall k : t_\beta(k) = (\ell_k(\beta), \xi_k(\beta))$$

Thinning out we may assume that the functions ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_m are constant. We will again write ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_m for those constant values.

We may also assume that for each k the function $\beta \mapsto \xi_k(\beta)$ is either constant or strictly increasing. If any of the functions ξ_k is constant we get a contradiction to the minimality of m , so all the ξ_k are strictly increasing. So we may moreover assume that $\beta < \gamma$ implies $\xi_k(\beta) < \xi_{k'}(\gamma)$ for all k, k' , and in particular $\beta \leq \xi_k(\beta)$ for all β, k .

Now define $g_\beta^+, g_\beta^- \in \prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i$ for every $\beta < \lambda$ as follows:

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} g_\beta^+(i) &= \max(f_{\xi_1(\beta)}(i), \dots, f_{\xi_n(\beta)}(i)) \\ g_\beta^-(i) &= \min(f_{\xi_1(\beta)}(i), \dots, f_{\xi_n(\beta)}(i)) \end{aligned}$$

Claim. The set

$$(4) \quad C := \{i < \mu : \forall \beta \{g_\gamma^-(i) : \gamma > \beta\} \text{ is unbounded in } \lambda_i\}$$

is in the filter D_μ .

Proof of the Claim. Let $S = \mu \setminus C$, or more explicitly:

$$S := \{i < \mu : \exists \beta < \lambda \exists s < \lambda_i \{g_\gamma^-(i) : \gamma > \beta\} \subseteq s\}$$

We have to show that S is a bounded set.

For each $i \in S$ let $\beta_i < \lambda$ and $h(i) < \lambda_i$ be such that $\{g_\gamma^-(i) : \gamma > \beta_i\} \subseteq h(i)$. Let $\beta^* = \sup\{\beta_i : i \in S\} < \lambda$, and extend h arbitrarily to a total function on μ . Since the sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is cofinal in $\prod_{i < \mu} \lambda_i / D_\mu$, we can find $\gamma > \beta^*$ such that $h <_{D_\mu} f_\gamma$.

We have $\gamma \leq \xi_k(\gamma)$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, so the sets

$$X_k := \{i < \mu : h(i) < f_{\xi_k(\gamma)}(i)\}$$

are all in D_μ . Now if S were positive mod D_μ (i.e., unbounded), then we could find $i_* \in S \cap X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_m$. But then $i^* \in X_1 \cap \dots \cap X_m$ implies

$$h(i_*) < g_\gamma^-(i_*),$$

and $i \in S$ implies

$$g_\gamma^-(i_*) < h(i_*),$$

a contradiction.

This shows that C is indeed a set in the filter D_μ . □

We will now use the fact that $m < n + 1$. Let

$$\ell^* \in \{0, \dots, n\} \setminus \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m\}.$$

Since A_{ℓ^*} is positive mod D_μ , we can pick

$$(5) \quad i^* \in A_{\ell^*} \cap C$$

Using the fact that $i^* \in C$ and definition (4) we can find a sequence $\langle \beta_\sigma : \sigma < \lambda_{i^*} \rangle$ such that

$$(6) \quad \forall \sigma < \sigma' < \lambda_{i^*} : g_{\beta_\sigma}^+(i^*) < g_{\beta_{\sigma'}}^-(i^*),$$

We now restrict our attention from $\langle \vec{t}_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ to the subsequence $\langle \vec{t}_{\beta_\sigma} : \sigma < \lambda_{i^*} \rangle$; we will show that this sequence cannot be an antichain. For notational simplicity only we will assume $\beta_\sigma = \sigma$ for all $\sigma < \lambda_{i^*}$.

Recall that $\vec{t}_\sigma = \langle (\ell_1, \xi_1(\sigma)), \dots, (\ell_m, \xi_m(\sigma)) \rangle$. For each $\sigma < \lambda_{i^*}$ define

$$\vec{x}_\sigma := \langle f_{\xi_1(\sigma)} \upharpoonright i^*, \dots, f_{\xi_m(\sigma)} \upharpoonright i^* \rangle \in \left(\prod_{j < i^*} \lambda_j \right)^m.$$

Since $|\prod_{j < i^*} \lambda_j| < \lambda_{i^*}$, there are only $< \lambda_{i^*}$ many possible values for \vec{x}_σ , so we can find $\sigma_1 < \sigma_2 < \lambda_{i^*}$ such that $\vec{x}_{\sigma_1} = \vec{x}_{\sigma_2}$.

Now note that by (3) and (6) we have

$$(7) \quad f_{\xi_k(\sigma_1)}(i^*) \leq g_{\sigma_1}^+(i^*) < g_{\sigma_2}^-(i^*) \leq f_{\xi_k(\sigma_2)}(i^*).$$

Hence $d(f_{\xi_k(\sigma_1)}, f_{\xi_k(\sigma_2)}) = i^*$ for $k = 1, \dots, m$.

Since $i^* \in A_{\ell^*}$ we have for all k : $i^* \notin A_{\ell_k}$. From (1), (2), (7) we get

$$\xi_k(\sigma_1) <_{\ell_k} \xi_k(\sigma_2) \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, m.$$

Hence $(\ell_k, \xi_k(\sigma_1)) < (\ell_k, \xi_k(\sigma_2))$ for all k , which means $\vec{t}_{\sigma_1} < \vec{t}_{\sigma_2}$. □

modified:2002-04-07

696 revision:2002-04-06

3. CONSISTENCY

Theorem 3.1. Assume $\aleph_0 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3 \leq \dots$, where $\lambda_n^{<\kappa} = \lambda_n$ for all n , and $\kappa^{<\kappa} = \kappa$. Then there is a forcing notion \mathbb{P} which satisfies the κ^+ -cc and is κ -complete, and a \mathbb{P} -name \underline{I} of a subset of 2^κ (where 2^κ is endowed with the lexicographic order, which is inherited by \underline{I}) such that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \forall n > 1 : \underline{I}^n \text{ has antichains of size } \lambda_n, \text{ but no larger ones.}$$

Remark 3.2. At first reading, the reader may want to consider the special case $\kappa = \omega$, $\lambda_{n+2} = \aleph_n$. Note that 2^ω is order isomorphic to the Cantor set, a subset of the real line \mathbb{R} , so we obtain as a special case of theorem 3.1:

Consistently, there is a set $I \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ such that for each n , I^{n+1} admits much larger antichains than I^n .

- Notation 3.3.** (1) We let $\lambda_1 = 0$, $\lambda_\omega = \sup\{\lambda_n : n < \omega\}$.
 (2) It is understood that 2^α is linearly ordered lexicographically, and $(2^\alpha)^m$ is partially ordered by the pointwise order.
 (3) For $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \kappa$, $\eta \in 2^\alpha$, $\nu \in 2^\beta$, we define

$$\eta \sqsubseteq \nu \text{ iff } \nu \text{ extends } \eta, \text{ i.e., } \eta \subseteq \nu$$


- (4) For $\bar{\eta} = \langle \eta(0), \dots, \eta(n-1) \rangle \in (2^\alpha)^n$, $\bar{\nu} = \langle \nu(0), \dots, \nu(n-1) \rangle \in (2^\beta)^n$, we let

$$\bar{\eta} \sqsubseteq \bar{\nu} \text{ iff } \eta(0) \sqsubseteq \nu(0), \dots, \eta(n-1) \sqsubseteq \nu(n-1).$$

- (5) For $\eta \in 2^\alpha$, $i \in \{0, 1\}$ we write $\eta \hat{\ } i$ for the element $\nu \in 2^{\alpha+1}$ satisfying $\eta \sqsubseteq \nu$, $\nu(\alpha) = i$.

Definition 3.4. Let $\bar{\eta} \in (2^\alpha)^m$, $k \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, $m \geq 2$. We define $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \bar{1}$, $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \bar{0}$, $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \{k \mapsto 1 \text{ else } \bar{0}\}$, $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \{k \mapsto 0 \text{ else } \bar{1}\}$ in $(2^{\alpha+1})^m$ as follows: All four are \sqsubseteq -extensions of $\bar{\eta}$, and:

- $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \bar{0}(n) = \eta(n) \hat{\ } 0$ for all $n < m$.
- $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \bar{1}(n) = \eta(n) \hat{\ } 1$ for all $n < m$.
- $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \{k \mapsto 0 \text{ else } \bar{1}\}(n) = \eta(n) \hat{\ } 1$ for all $n \neq k$, $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \{k \mapsto 0 \text{ else } \bar{1}\}(k) = \eta(n) \hat{\ } 0$.
- $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \{k \mapsto 1 \text{ else } \bar{0}\}(n) = \eta(n) \hat{\ } 0$ for all $n \neq k$, $\bar{\eta} \hat{\ } \{k \mapsto 1 \text{ else } \bar{0}\}(k) = \eta(n) \hat{\ } 1$.



Fact 3.5. (1) If $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \kappa$, $\bar{\eta}, \bar{\eta}' \in (2^\alpha)^n$ are incomparable, $\bar{\nu}, \bar{\nu}' \in (2^\beta)^n$, $\bar{\eta} \sqsubseteq \bar{\nu}$, $\bar{\eta}' \sqsubseteq \bar{\nu}'$, then also $\bar{\nu}$ and $\bar{\nu}'$ are incomparable.

- (2) $\bar{\eta} \widehat{\ } \bar{0} < \bar{\eta} \widehat{\ } \bar{1}$.
- (3) $\bar{\eta} \widehat{\ } \{k \mapsto 0 \text{ else } \bar{1}\}$ and $\bar{\eta} \widehat{\ } \{k \mapsto 1 \text{ else } \bar{0}\}$ are incomparable.

Definition 3.6. We let \mathbb{P} be the set of all “conditions”

$$p = (u^p, \alpha^p, \langle \bar{\eta}_\xi^p : \xi \in u^p \rangle)$$

satisfying the following requirements for all m :

- $u^p \in [\lambda_\omega]^{<\kappa}$
- $\alpha^p < \kappa$
- For all $\xi \in u^p \cap (\lambda_m \setminus \lambda_{m-1})$: $\bar{\eta}_\xi^p = \langle \eta_\xi^p(0), \dots, \eta_\xi^p(m-1) \rangle \in (2^{\alpha^p})^m$.
- For all $\xi \neq \xi'$ in $u^p \cap (\lambda_m \setminus \lambda_{m-1})$, $\bar{\eta}_\xi^p$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\xi'}^p$ are incomparable in $(2^{\alpha^p})^m$.

We define $p \leq q$ (“ q is stronger than p ”) iff

- $u^p \subseteq u^q$
- $\alpha^p \leq \alpha^q$
- for all $\xi \in u^p$, $\bar{\eta}_\xi^p \leq \bar{\eta}_\xi^q$

Fact 3.7. (1) For all $\alpha < \kappa$: The set $\{p \in \mathbb{P} : \alpha^p \geq \alpha\}$ is dense in \mathbb{P} .

(2) For all $\xi < \lambda_\omega$: The set $\{p \in \mathbb{P} : \xi \in u^p\}$ is dense in \mathbb{P} .

Fact and Definition 3.8. We let $\langle \bar{\nu}_\xi : \xi < \lambda_\omega \rangle$ be the “generic object”, i.e., a name satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \forall m \in \omega \ \forall p \in \mathbb{P} \ \forall \xi \in u^p \cap (\lambda_m \setminus \lambda_{m-1}) : p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \bar{\nu}_\xi \in (2^\kappa)^m \\ \forall p \in \mathbb{P} \ \forall \xi \in u^p : p \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} \bar{\eta}_\xi^p \leq \bar{\nu}_\xi \end{aligned}$$

(This definition makes sense, by fact 3.7.)

Clearly, $\Vdash \xi, \xi' \in \lambda_m \setminus \lambda_{m-1} \Rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\xi, \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}$ incompatible.

We let $\Vdash \underline{I} = \bigcup_{m=2}^\infty \{\nu_\xi(\ell) : \xi \in \lambda_m \setminus \lambda_{m-1}, \ell < m\}$.

Lemma 3.9. Let $\mathbb{P}, \underline{I}$ be as in 3.6 and 3.8.

Then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}} I^m$ has antichains of size λ_m , but no larger ones.

It is clear that \mathbb{P} is κ -complete, and κ^+ -cc is proved by an argument similar to the Δ -system argument below. So all the λ_m stay cardinals.

We can show by induction that $\Vdash \alpha(\underline{I}^m) > \lambda_m$, i.e., \underline{I}^m has an antichain of size λ_m : This is clear if $\lambda_m = \lambda_{m-1}$ (and void if $m = 0$); if $\lambda_m > \lambda_{m-1}$ then $\langle \bar{\nu}_\xi : \xi \in \lambda_m \setminus \lambda_{m-1} \rangle$ will be forced to be antichain.

It remains to show that (for any m) there is no antichain of size λ_m^+ in \underline{I}^m .

Fix $m^* \in \omega$, and assume wlog that $\lambda_{m^*+1} > \lambda_{m^*}$.

[Why is this no loss of generality? If $\lambda_{m^*} = \lambda_\omega$, then the cardinality of \underline{I} is at most λ_{m^*} , and there is nothing to prove. If $\lambda_{m^*} = \lambda_{m^*+1} < \lambda_\omega$, then replace m^* by $\min\{m \geq m^* : \lambda_m < \lambda_{m+1}\}$]

Towards a contradiction, assume that there is a condition p and a sequence of names $\langle \bar{\rho}_\beta : \beta < \lambda_{m^*}^+ \rangle$ such that

$$p \Vdash \langle \bar{\rho}_\beta : \beta < \lambda_{m^*}^+ \rangle \text{ is an antichain in } \underline{I}^{m^*}$$

Let $\bar{\rho}_\beta = (\rho_\beta(n) : n < m^*)$. For each $\beta < \lambda_{m^*}^+$ and each $n < m^*$ we can find a condition $p_\beta \geq p$ and

$$m_n(\beta) \in \omega \quad \ell_n(\beta) < m_n(\beta) \quad \xi_n(\beta) \in \lambda_{m_n(\beta)} \setminus \lambda_{m_n(\beta)-1}$$

such that

$$p_\beta \Vdash \rho_\beta(n) = \nu_{\xi_n(\beta)}(\ell_n(\beta))$$

We will now employ a Δ -system argument.

We define a family $\langle \zeta^\beta : \beta < \lambda_{m^*}^+ \rangle$ of functions as follows: Let i_β be the order type of u^{p_β} , and let

$$u^\beta = u^{p_\beta} = \{\zeta^\beta(i) : i < i_\beta\} \text{ in increasing enumeration}$$

By 3.7.2 may assume $\xi_n(\beta) \in u^\beta$, say $\xi_n(\beta) = \zeta^\beta(i_n(\beta))$.

By thinning out our alleged antichain $\langle \bar{\rho}_\beta : \beta < \lambda_{m^*}^+ \rangle$ we may assume

- For some $i^* < \kappa$, for all β : $i_\beta = i^*$
- For some $\alpha^* < \kappa$, for all β : $\alpha^{p_\beta} = \alpha^*$
- For each $i < i^*$ there is some $m_{\langle i \rangle}$ such that for all β : $\zeta^\beta(i) \in \lambda_{m_{\langle i \rangle}} \setminus \lambda_{m_{\langle i \rangle}-1}$
- For each $i < i^*$ there is some $\bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \in (2^{\alpha^*})^{m_{\langle i \rangle}}$ such that for all β : $\bar{\eta}_{\zeta^\beta(i)}^{p_\beta} = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle}$. (Here we use $\lambda_m^{<\kappa} = \lambda_m$.)
- the family $\langle u^\beta : \beta < \lambda_{m^*}^+ \rangle$ is a Δ -system, i.e., there is some set $u^* \in [\lambda_\omega]^{<\kappa}$ such that for all $\beta \neq \gamma$: $u^\beta \cap u^\gamma = u^*$.
- Moreover: there is a set $\Delta \subseteq i^*$ such that for all β : $u^* = \{\zeta^\beta(i) : i \in \Delta\}$. Since ζ^β is increasing, this also implies $\zeta^\beta(i) = \zeta^\gamma(i)$ for $i \in \Delta$.)
- For each $n < m^*$, the functions m_n , ℓ_n and i_n are constant. (Recall that these functions map $\lambda_{m^*}^+$ into ω .) We will again write m_n , ℓ_n , i_n for these constant values.

Note that for $i \in i^* \setminus \Delta$ all the $\zeta^\beta(i)$ are distinct elements of $\lambda_{m_{\langle i \rangle}}$, hence:

$$i \notin \Delta \text{ implies } \lambda_{m^*}^+ \leq \lambda_{m_{\langle i \rangle}}, \text{ hence } m_{\langle i \rangle} > m^*.$$

Now pick $k^* \leq m^*$ such that $k^* \notin \{\ell_n : n < m^*\}$. Pick any distinct $\beta, \gamma < \lambda_{m^*}^+$. We will find a condition q extending p_β and p_γ , such that $q \Vdash \bar{\rho}_\beta \leq \bar{\rho}_\gamma$.

We define q as follows:

- $u^q := u_\beta \cup u_\gamma = u^* \dot{\cup} \{\zeta^\beta(i) : i \in i^* \setminus \Delta\} \dot{\cup} \{\zeta^\gamma(i) : i \in i^* \setminus \Delta\}$.
- $\alpha^q = \alpha^* + 1$.
- For $\xi \in u^*$, say $\xi = \zeta^\beta(i) = \zeta^\gamma(i)$, recall that $\bar{\eta}_\xi^{p_\beta} = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} = \bar{\eta}_\xi^{p_\gamma}$. We let $\bar{\eta}_\xi^q = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \hat{\ } \bar{0}$ (see 3.3).
- For $\xi = \zeta^\beta(i)$, $i \in i^* \setminus \Delta$, we have $\bar{\eta}_\xi^{p_\beta} = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \in (2^{\alpha^*})^{m_{\langle i \rangle}}$, where $m_{\langle i \rangle} > m^*$. So $k^* \leq m^* < m_{\langle i \rangle}$, hence $\bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \hat{\ } \{k^* \mapsto 1 \text{ else } \bar{0}\}$ is well-defined. We let

$$\bar{\eta}_\xi^q = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \hat{\ } \{k^* \mapsto 1 \text{ else } \bar{0}\}$$

- For $\xi = \zeta^\gamma(i)$, $i \in i^* \setminus \Delta$, we let

$$\bar{\eta}_\xi^q = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \widehat{\{k^* \mapsto 0 \text{ else } \bar{1}\}}$$

We claim that q is a condition. The only nontrivial requirement is the incompatibility of all $\bar{\eta}_\xi^q$: Let $\xi, \xi' \in u^q$, $\xi \neq \xi'$, and assume that $\xi, \xi' \in \lambda_m \setminus \lambda_{m-1}$ for some m .

If $\xi, \xi' \in u^\beta$, then the incompatibility of $\bar{\eta}_\xi^q$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\xi'}^q$ follows from the incompatibility of $\bar{\eta}_\xi^{p_\beta}$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\xi'}^{p_\beta}$. The same argument works for $\xi, \xi' \in u_\gamma$.

So let $\xi \in u_\beta \setminus u^*$, $\xi' \in u_\gamma \setminus u^*$. Say $\xi = \zeta^\beta(i)$, $\xi' = \zeta^\gamma(i')$.

If $i \neq i'$, then $\bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} = \bar{\eta}_{\zeta^\beta(i)}^{p_\beta} = \bar{\eta}_{\zeta^\gamma(i)}^{p_\gamma}$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\langle i' \rangle} = \bar{\eta}_{\zeta^\gamma(i')}^{p_\gamma}$ are incompatible (because p_γ is a condition). From $\bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \sqsubseteq \bar{\eta}_\xi^q$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\langle i' \rangle} \sqsubseteq \bar{\eta}_{\xi'}^q$ we conclude that also $\bar{\eta}_\xi^q$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\xi'}^q$ are incompatible.

Finally, we consider the case $i = i'$.

We have

$$\bar{\eta}_\xi^q = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \widehat{\{k^* \mapsto 0 \text{ else } \bar{1}\}} \quad \bar{\eta}_{\xi'}^q = \bar{\eta}_{\langle i \rangle} \widehat{\{k^* \mapsto 1 \text{ else } \bar{0}\}}$$

so by 3.7.3, $\bar{\eta}_\xi^q$ and $\bar{\eta}_{\xi'}^q$ are incompatible.

This concludes the construction of q . We now check that $q \Vdash \bar{\rho}_\beta \leq \bar{\rho}_\gamma$, i.e., $q \Vdash \rho_\beta(n) \leq \rho_\gamma(n)$ for all n . Clearly, $q \Vdash \rho_\beta(n) = \nu_{\zeta^\beta(i_n)}(\ell_n) \geq \bar{\eta}_{\zeta^\beta(i_n)}^q = \eta_{\langle i_n \rangle} \widehat{\bar{0}}$. Here we use the fact that $k^* \neq \ell_n$. Similarly, $q \Vdash \rho_\gamma(n) = \nu_{\zeta^\beta(i_n)}(\ell_n) \geq \eta_{\langle i_n \rangle} \widehat{\bar{1}}$.

Hence $q \Vdash \bar{\rho}_\beta \leq \bar{\rho}_\gamma$.

This concludes the proof of theorem 3.1

REFERENCES

- [1] Jonathan Farley. Cardinalities of infinite antichains in products of chains. *Algebra Universalis*, 42:235–238, 1999.
- [2] M. Ploščica and M. Haviar. On order-polynomial completeness of lattices. *Algebra Universalis*, 39:217–219, 1998.
- [3] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.

INSTITUT FÜR ALGEBRA, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WIEN, WIEDNER HAUPTSTRASSE 8-10/118.2, A-1040 WIEN, AUSTRIA

E-mail address: `Martin.Goldstern@tuwien.ac.at`

URL: `http://www.tuwien.ac.at/goldstern/`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, GIVAT RAM, 91904 JERUSALEM, ISRAEL

E-mail address: `shelah@math.huji.ac.il`

URL: `http://math.rutgers.edu/~shelah/`