September 15, 2020

Large Normal Ideals Concentrating on a Fixed Small Cardinality

Saharon Shelah

Institut of Mathematics

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

91904 Jerusalem, Israel

and

Department of Mathematics

Rutgers University

New Brunswick, NJ 08854, USA

The property on the filter in Definition 1, a kind of large cardinal property, suffices for the proof in Liu Shelah [484] and is proved consistent as required there (see conclusion 6). A natural property which looks better, not only is not obtained here, but is shown to be false (in Claim 7). On earlier related theorems see Gitik Shelah [GiSh310].

* * *

1. Definition (1) Let κ be a cardinal and D a filter on κ and θ be an ordinal $\leq \kappa$ and $\mu < \chi$ but $\mu \geq 2$ and $\chi \leq \kappa$. Let $\mathrm{GM}_{\kappa,\chi,\theta,\mu}$ (D) be there following game:

Research supported by "Basic Research Foundation" of The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Publication 542.

a play lasts θ moves, in the $\zeta' s$ move the first player chooses a function h_ζ from κ to some ordinal $\gamma_\zeta < \chi$ and the second player chooses a subset B_ζ of γ_ζ of cardinality $< \mu$.

The second player wins a play if for every $\zeta < \theta$ the set $\bigcap\{\{\beta < \kappa : h_\varepsilon(\beta) \in B_\epsilon\} : \epsilon \leq \zeta\}$ is $\neq \emptyset \bmod D$.

(2) If $\mu = 2$ we may omit it, if $\mu = 2$ and $\chi = \kappa$ we omit χ and μ.

2. Definition: $(P \leq, \leq_{\rm pr}) \in K_{\kappa,\chi,\theta,\mu}$ iff

1. κ is a regular cardinal.
2. $(P, \leq)$ is a forcing notion with minimal element $\emptyset$ (if in doubt we use $\leq_P$, $\emptyset_P$).
3. P satisfies the κ-c.c.
4. $\leq_{\rm pr}$ is a partial order on P such that:
   a. $p \leq_{\rm pr} q$ implies $p \leq q$
   b. any $\leq_{\rm pr}$-increasing chain of length $< \theta$ with first element $\emptyset$ in P has an $\leq_{\rm pr}$-upper bound.
   c. if $\gamma < \chi$ and $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ is a P-name of an ordinal $< \gamma$ and $\emptyset \leq_{\rm pr} p \in P$ then for some q and $B \subseteq \gamma$ of cardinality $< \mu$ we have $p \leq_{\rm pr} q \in P$ and q forces $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in B$.
5. for any $Y \subseteq P$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ there is $P^* \lessdot P$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ such that P/P^* satisfies condition (4), i.e. if $G^* \subseteq P^*$ is generic over V and $P/G^* \stackrel{\rm def}{=} \{p \in P : p$ compatible with every $q \in G^*\}$ then
   a. in P/G^*, any $\leq_{\rm pr}$-increasing sequences starting with $\emptyset$ of length $< \theta$ have an $\leq_{\rm pr}$-upper bound in P/G^*.
   b. if $p \in P/G^*$ and $\underset{\sim}{\tau}$ a P-name of an ordinal $< \gamma$ where $\gamma < \chi$ then there is a subset B of γ of cardinality $< \mu$ and p', $p \leq_{\rm pr} p' \in P/G^*$ such that p' forces $\underset{\sim}{\tau} \in B$.

2A Remark: The relation in clause 4(b) is not really stronger than having a winning strategy in the corresponding play, see [Sh250, 2.43] (or [Sh-f, XIV 2.4]).

3. Lemma: Assume

a. κ is a measurable cardinal with D a κ-complete ultrafilter on it

b. $(P \leq, \leq_{\text{pr}}) \in K_{\kappa,\chi,\theta,\mu}$

Then in V^P the second player wins $\text{GM}_{\kappa,\chi,\theta,\mu}(\text{D})$

3A Remark: 1. We can replace ultrafilter by a filter in which the first player wins $\text{GM}_{\theta,\kappa}(\text{D})$ [see Lemma 5].

Proof: In V we define a set R, its members are sequences $\bar p = \langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in A^{\bar p}\rangle$ where $A^{\bar p} \in D$ and $\emptyset \leq_{\text{pr}} p_\alpha \in P$ (for $\alpha \in A^{\bar p}$). On R we define a partial order $\leq_R$ as follows: $\bar p \leq_R \bar q$ iff $A^{\bar q} \subseteq A^{\bar p}$ and for every $\alpha \in A^{\bar q}$ we have $p_\alpha \leq_{\text{pr}} q_\alpha$.

Clearly, in V the partial order $(R, \leq_R)$ is θ-complete.

For $G \subseteq P$ generic over V we define $R[G]$ as $\{\bar p : \bar p \in R$ and $\{\alpha \in A^{\bar p} : p_\alpha \in G\} \neq \emptyset \bmod D$ (in V^P, D is not a filter just a family of subsets of κ but it naturally generates a filter- just closed upward and we refer to this filter in "mod D"$\}$.

For $G \subseteq P$ generic over V and $\bar p \in R$ let $w[\bar p, G] \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha \in A^{\bar p} : p_\alpha \in G\}$.

So $R[G] = \{\bar p \in R : w[\bar p, G] \neq \emptyset \bmod D\}$. We now prove some facts.

3B. Fact: In $V[G]$, $(R[G], \leq_R)$ is θ-complete.

Proof: If not then there is a P-name of a sequence of length $< \theta$, $\langle \underset{\sim}{\bar p}^\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\rangle$ and $r \in P$ which forces this sequence to be a counter example, so $\zeta < \theta$. So there are maximal antichains $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon < \zeta$ of conditions in P forcing a value to $\underset{\sim}{\bar p}^\varepsilon$ (note $\underset{\sim}{\bar p}^\varepsilon$ is a P-name of a member of V); let Y be the set of elements appearing in some $\mathcal{I}_\varepsilon$ and r. As P satisfies the κ-c.c. clearly Y has cardinality $< \kappa$ so there is P^* as required in condition (5) of Definition 2. Let $G^* \subseteq P^*$ be generic over V and $r \in G^*$.

Now working in $V[G^*]$ we can (for each $\varepsilon < \zeta$) compute $\underset{\sim}{\bar{p}}^\varepsilon$ and $A^{\underset{\sim}{\bar{p}}^\varepsilon}$, call it then $\bar{p}^\varepsilon$ and A_ε respectively and so $\bigwedge_\varepsilon A_\varepsilon \in D$ and $A^* \overset{\text{def}}{=} \cap\{A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$ belongs to $D^{V[G^*]}$ (=the ultrafilter which D generates in $V[G^*]$, remember $|P^*| < \kappa$, D a κ-complete ultrafilter); also letting $w_\varepsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{\alpha \in A^* :$ there is $G \subseteq P$ generic over P extending G^* to which p^ε_α belongs$\} \in V[G^*]$ we know that in $V[G]$ we get a D-positive set $w[\underset{\sim}{\bar{p}}^\varepsilon, G]$ (because r forces this) hence in $V[G^*]$ the set w_ε is D-positive but in $V[G^*]$ we know $D^{V[G^*]}$ is an ultrafilter so necessarily w_ε belongs to $D^{V[G^*]}$; clearly for $\varepsilon < \zeta$, $\alpha \in w_\varepsilon$ we have $p^\varepsilon_\alpha \in P/G^*$. Let $B^* = A^* \cap \bigcap\{w_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$, it is in $D^{V[G^*]}$. Now for any $\alpha \in B^*$ the sequence $\langle p^\varepsilon_\alpha : \varepsilon < \zeta\rangle$ is a $\leq_{\text{pr}}$-increasing sequence of member of P/G^* and by demand (5) (a) of Definition 2, the sequence has an $\leq_{\text{pr}}$-upper bound q_α (in P/G^*). Let $r_\alpha \in G^*$ be above r and force that this holds and moreover force some specific $q_\alpha \in P_\alpha$ is as above. So, still in $V[G^*]$, for some $C \in D$, $C \subseteq B$ and $r^* \in G^*$ we have $(\forall \alpha \in C)[r_\alpha = r^*]$ without loss of generality $C \in V$. As for $\alpha \in C \subseteq B$, $r^* = r_\alpha \Vdash$ "$q_\alpha \in P/\underset{\sim}{G}_{p^*}$", r^* is compatible with every q_α ($\alpha \in C$). By 3D below for some q^+, $r^* \leq q^+ \in P$ and $q^+ \Vdash_P$ "$\{\alpha : q^+_\alpha \in \underset{\sim}{G}_{P^*}\}$"$\neq \emptyset \bmod D$. So q^+ (which is above $r \leq r^*$) force that $\bar{q} = \langle q_\alpha : \alpha \in C\rangle$ is an upper bound as required. (note: $\bar{q} \in V$, r^* force it is an upper bound of $\{\underset{\sim}{\bar{p}}^\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$; we need $q^+_{\alpha(*)}$ as we do not know the value of $\underset{\sim}{\bar{p}}^\varepsilon$. $\square_{3B}$

3C Fact: Let $G \subseteq P$ be generic over V. In $V[G]$, if $\gamma < \chi$ and $\bar{p} \in R[G]$ and h a function from κ to γ, *then* for some $\bar{q}$ we have:

a. $\bar{q} \in R[G]$

b. $\bar{p} \leq_R \bar{q}$

c. on $w[\bar{p}, G]$ the range of the function h is of cardinality $< \chi$.

Proof: Assume the conclusion fails then some $r \in G$ forces that it fails for a specific $\bar{p}$

and P-name $\underset{\sim}{h}$ (so in particular r forces that $w[\bar{p}, \underset{\sim}{G}] \neq \emptyset \bmod D$.) Let $w^* =: \{\alpha \in A^{\bar{p}}$: the conditions r, p_α are compatible in P (equivalently, r does not force $\alpha \notin w[\bar{p}, \underset{\sim}{G}]$)$\}$ (so $w^* \in V$) and $w^* \in D$. Now let P^* be as in condition (5) of Definition 2 for $Y = \{r\}$ (so in particular $r \in P^*$). Now:

(∗) for every $\alpha \in w^*$ there are r^*_α and q_α and B_α such that:

a. $r \leq r^*_\alpha \in P^*$.

b. $p_\alpha \leq_{\rm pr} q_\alpha$.

c. $r^*_\alpha \Vdash_{P^*}$ "$q_\alpha \in P/\underset{\sim}{G}_{P^*}$".

d. q_α forces (for P) that $\underset{\sim}{h}(\alpha) \in B_\alpha$ and for some set $B \subseteq \gamma$ ($B \in V$), we have $|B_\alpha| < \mu$.

[Why? for every α in w^* we can find $G \subseteq P$ generic over V to which r and p_α belong (as $\alpha \in w^*$); hence $p_\alpha \in P/(G \cap P^*)$ hence some $r^*_\alpha \in G \cap P^*$ force this (for P^*) so without loss of generality $r \leq r^*_\alpha$ (as $G \cap P^*$ is directed). Now apply condition (5) of Definition 2 to $G \cap P^*$, p_α and $\underset{\sim}{h}(\alpha)$ and we get some $B \subseteq \gamma$. $|B| < \mu$ and $q_\alpha \in P/(G \cap P^*)$ such that $p_\alpha \leq_{\rm pr} q_\alpha \in P/(G \cap P^*)$ and q_α forces $\underset{\sim}{h}(\alpha) \in B$. Now increasing again r^*_α we get (∗)].

So we can find for $\alpha \in w^*$, r_α, q_α and B_α as in (∗), (all in V); let $A^* \subseteq w^*$ be such that $A^* \in D$ and $\langle B_\alpha : \alpha \in w^* \rangle$ is constant on A^* and also r_α is constantly r^* (note: D is κ-complete $w^* \in D$, and κ is strongly inaccessible hence $|\gamma|^{<\mu} < \kappa$ and $|P^*| < \kappa$. Now some q^+, satisfying $r^* \leq q^+ \in P$, forces that $\langle q_\alpha : \alpha \in A^* \rangle$ is in $R[G]$ by fact 3D below and so clearly is as required in the Fact 3C. $\square_{3C}$

3D. Observation Assume $\bar{p} = \langle p_\alpha : \alpha \in A \rangle \in R$ and $r \in P$ is compatible (in P) with every p_α (for $\alpha \in A$). *Then* some r^*, $r \leq r^* \in P$, force that $\bar{p} \in R[\underset{\sim}{G}_P]$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a maximal antichain of P above r such that for every $q \in \mathcal{I}$ we have either $q| \vdash_P$ "$w[\bar{p}, \underset{\sim}{G}_P]$ is a subset of A_q" where $A_q \subseteq \kappa$ and $\kappa \setminus A_q \in D$ *or* $q| \vdash_P$ " $w[\bar{p}, \underset{\sim}{G}_P] \neq \emptyset \bmod D$.

So $\mathcal{I}$ has cardinality $< \kappa$ and if the conclusion fails then always the first possibility holds; now we let $B \overset{\text{def}}{=} \bigcap\{\kappa \setminus A_q : q \in \mathcal{I}\}$, clearly it belongs to D. Now there is $\alpha \in B \cap A$ (as $B \cap A \in D$) and there is $r^* \in P$ above r and above p_α (exist by assumption); now r^* force that $\alpha \in w[\bar{p}, \underset{\sim}{G}_p] \subseteq A_q \subseteq \kappa \setminus B$, contradiction. $\square_{3D}$

3E. *Continuation of the Proof of Lemma 3:* immediate for the Facts 3B, 3C. $\square_3$

Now we shall redo it all in another version:

4. Lemma: (From Gitik [Gi] §3, relaying on §1 there, in different terminology). Assume $\chi < \kappa$, $\theta < \kappa$ a regular cardinal, κ is a measurable cardinal of order $\theta + 1$ (i.e. there is a coherent sequence of ultrafilters on κ of length $\theta + 1$, see [Gi, §3 p.293], with D an ultrafilter on κ appearing in the θ'th place in the appropriate sequence.

Then for some forcing notion P we have

(a) P of cardinality κ, $| \vdash_P$ "κ is strongly inaccessible".

(b) $\{\delta : | \vdash_P \text{"cf}(\delta) = \theta\text{"}\} \in D$

(c) $P \in K_{\kappa,\chi,\theta,2}$ (in particular P satisfies the κ-c.c., $\leq_{\text{pr}}$ for P is called $\leq_E$ in [Gi] (called Easton)

(d) For some $\leq_{\text{pr}}$ Condition (4) of Definition 2 is satisfied by P (for $\mu = 2$). Moreover, given any $\chi^* < \kappa$ and $Y \subseteq P$ of cardinality $< \kappa$ we can find $P^* \lessdot P$ as in clause (5) of Definition 2 replacing θ and χ by χ^*.

5. Claim: Under the assumptions of lemma 4, if $\theta + \chi \leq \mu = \text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$ let $Q =$

$P * (\mathrm{Levy}(\mu, < \kappa))^{V^P}$ defining $(p_1, q_1) \leq_{\mathrm{pr}} (p_2, q_2)$ iff $p_1 \leq_P p_2$ and $p_2 \Vdash_P$ "$q_1 \leq q_2 \in \mathrm{Levy}(\mu, < \kappa)^{V^P}$"

Then $Q \in K_{\kappa,\chi,\theta,2}$ and in V^Q, $\kappa = \mu^+ = 2^\mu$.

Proof: Easy.

5A Remark: Actually in the conclusion of Claim 5 we can weaken $\theta+\chi \leq \mu$ to $\theta^+ + \chi \leq \mu^+$ hence in the conclusion $\chi = \mu^+ (= \kappa)$ is o.k. This applies also to conclusion 6.

5B Remark: Of course Claim 5 and Definition 2 are formulated so that we get consistency results justifying the name of the paper. We formulate below (conclusion 6) the one used in Liu Shelah [LiSh484].

6. Conclusion: Assume $0 = n_0 < n_1 < n_2 < \ldots < n_\ell, n_\ell + 1 < n_{\ell+1}$, $\kappa_{\ell+1}$ is a measurable of order $\theta_\ell + 1$ and for simplicity GCH holds and stipulate $\kappa_0 = \aleph_0$ and $\theta_{\ell+1} < \kappa_{\ell+1}$ is regular for $\ell < \omega$, moreover $\theta_\ell \leq \kappa_{\ell+1}^{+(n_{\ell+1}-n_\ell)}$.

Then there is a forcing notion P of cardinality $\leq 2^{\Sigma_{\ell<\omega}\kappa_{\ell+1}}$ which preserves $\mathrm{cf}(\theta_{\ell+1}) = \theta_{\ell+1}$, makes $\kappa_{\ell+1}$ to $\aleph_{n_{\ell+1}}$ and preserves $(\kappa_\ell)^{+i}$ if $i < n_{\ell+1}$, preserves G.C.H. and for $\ell < \omega$ in V^P the second player wins $\mathrm{GM}_{\aleph_{\ell+1}, \aleph_{n_{\ell+1}-1}, \theta_{\ell+1}, 2}(D_{\ell+1})$ for some $D_{\ell+1} \in V$, a normal ultrafilter on $\kappa_{\ell+1}$ of order $\theta_\ell + 1$.

Proof: We use iteration $\langle P_i, Q_i : i < \omega \rangle$ described as follows: Q_ℓ=the forcing notion from lemma 5 (for $\kappa = \kappa_{\ell+1}$, $\theta = \theta_{\ell+1}$, $\mu = \kappa_\ell^{+(n_{\ell+1}-n_\ell)}$ and $\chi_{\ell+1} = \kappa_{\ell+1}^{+(n_{\ell+1}-n_\ell-1)}$), the limit is a full support for pure extensions of the $\emptyset$ and finite support otherwise (for the Levy collapse all conditions are pure extensions of $\emptyset$). The checking is standard. $\square_6$

Discussion: We shall now prove that for a natural strengthening of Definition 2, we cannot get consistency results. Specifically we cannot, in the game in Definition 2, let player I just decrease the present D-positive set. $\square_6$

7. Definition: (1) Let κ be a cardinal and D a filter on κ and θ be an ordinal $\leq \kappa$. Let $\mathrm{GM}^*_\theta(D)$ be the following game:

a play lasts θ moves; in the ζ's move

first player chooses a subset A_ζ of κ, $A_\zeta \neq \emptyset \bmod D$ such that: if $\zeta = 0$, $A_\zeta \subseteq \kappa$ and if $\zeta = \varepsilon + 1$ then $A_\zeta \subseteq B_\varepsilon$ and if ζ is a limit ordinal then $A_\zeta = \cap\{A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \zeta\}$

and then *the second player* chooses a subset B_ζ of A_ζ satisfying $B_\zeta \neq \emptyset \bmod D$.

A player wins the play if he has no legal move (can occur only to the first player in a limit stage), if the play lasts θ moves then the second player wins.

8. Definition: Let λ be regular countable, $S \subseteq \lambda$; we say that there is a $(\leq \theta)$-square for S if: there is a set S^+, and sequence $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha \in S^+\rangle$ such that:

a. $S \subseteq S^+ \subseteq \lambda$

b. for $\beta \in C_\alpha$ (so $\alpha \in S^+$) we have: $\beta \in S^+$ and $C_\beta = \beta \cap C_\alpha$.

c. $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) \leq \theta$ for $\alpha \in S^+$.

d. if $\delta \in S$ is a limit ordinal then $\delta = \sup(C_\delta)$

e. C_α is a closed subset of α.

9. Claim; 1) Assume λ is regular $> \theta$, D is a normal filter on λ^+ to which $\{\delta : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \theta\}$ belongs. *Then* in the game $\mathrm{GM}^*_{\omega+1}(D)$ (see Definition 8 below) the second player does not have a winning strategy.

2) Assume λ is regular larger than $|\theta|^+$, θ an ordinal, D is a normal filter on λ to which a set S belongs, and for S there is a $(\leq \theta)$-square (as defined in Definition 7 above) (or just

every $S \subseteq \lambda$, $S \neq \emptyset \operatorname{mod} D$ has a subset S' for which there is a $(\leq \theta)$-square. $S' \neq \emptyset \operatorname{mod} D$).

Then in the game $\mathrm{GM}^*_{\omega+1}(D)$ (see Definition 8 below), the second player does not have a winning strategy.

Proof: Part (1) follows form part (2) as the assumption of part (2) follows by [Sh 365, 2.14] (or [Sh 351, Th. 4.1]). So we concentrate on proving part (2).

So let $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha \in S^+ \rangle$ be as in Definition 8. So without loss of generality $S^+ \in D$. We divide $\{\delta : \delta < \lambda,\ \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$ to $|\theta|^+$ stationary sets $\langle T_i : i < |\theta|^+ \rangle$. As D is a normal ideal on λ, $|\theta|^+ < \lambda$, clearly for each stationary subset S' of S which is D-positive there are $S^* \subseteq S'$ which is D-positive and ordinal $j^* < |\theta|^+$ such that for every $\alpha \in S^*$ we have: $C_\alpha \cup \{\alpha\}$ is disjoint to $T_{j(*)}$.

Now suppose the second player has a winning strategy in $\mathrm{GM}^*_{\omega+1}(D)$ which we call Sty. We can choose by induction on $n < \omega$ a sequence $\langle A_\rho, B_\rho, \beta_\rho : \rho \in {}^n\lambda \rangle$ such that

1. for every $\rho \in {}^n\lambda$ the sequence $\langle A_{\rho\restriction k}, B_{\rho\restriction k} : k \leq n \rangle$ is an initial segment of a play of the game in which the second player uses his winning strategy Sty
2. for some $j < |\theta|^+$, for every $\alpha \in A_{\langle\rangle}$ we have $C_\alpha \cup \{\alpha\}$ is disjoint to T_j.
3. $\beta_\rho \in S^+$ and for every $\rho \in {}^n\lambda$ and $\alpha \in A_\rho$ we have $\beta_\rho \in C_\alpha$.
4. for $\rho \in {}^n\lambda$ we have: β_ρ is larger than sup range (ρ).

There is no problem to carry the definition (for clause (3) remember D is a normal filter on λ); now let $E \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \{\delta < \lambda : \text{for every } \rho \in {}^{\omega>}\delta \text{ we have } \beta_\rho < \delta\}$; clearly E is a club of λ hence there is an ordinal $\delta \in E \cap T_j$; so choose an increasing ω-sequence ρ of ordinals $< \delta$ with limit δ; look at $\langle A_{\rho\restriction k}, B_{\rho\restriction k} : k < \omega \rangle$ which is an initial segment of a play of the game in which the second player uses his winning strategy Sty. Let now $B = \cap\{B_{\rho\restriction k} : k < \omega\}$; if $\sup(B) > \delta$ (which holds if $B \neq \emptyset \operatorname{mod} D$), $\alpha \in B \setminus (\delta+1)$ then for every n, $\beta_{\rho\restriction n} \in C_\alpha$.

Note: as $\rho \in {}^{\omega}\delta$, and $\delta \in E$ clearly $\beta_{\rho\restriction n} < \delta$; so $\delta \geq \bigcup_{n<\omega} \beta_{\rho\restriction n}$; as $\beta_{\rho\restriction n} \geq \sup \mathrm{range}(\rho\restriction n)$ necessarily $\delta \leq \bigcup_{n<\omega} \beta_{\rho\restriction n}$ so equality holds. Hence also $\delta = (\cup_{n<\omega} \beta_{\rho\restriction n}) \in C_\alpha$ (as $\alpha > \delta = \bigcup_{n<\omega} \beta_{\rho\restriction n}$). So $\delta \in C_\alpha$ but $\delta \in T_j$ whereas $\alpha \in B_{\langle\rangle}$, contradiction. So B is a subset of $\delta + 1$, contradicting to "Sty is a winning strategy".

9A Remark: This continues the argument that e.g. not for every stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < \aleph_3 : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$, there is a club E of $\aleph_3$ such that $\delta \in E\ \&$ if $(\delta) = \aleph_2 \Rightarrow S \cap \delta$ stationary in δ (find pairwise disjoint $S_i \subseteq \{\delta < \aleph_3 : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0\}$, for $i < \aleph_3$, if for S_i we have E_i, choose $\delta \in \bigcap_{i<\aleph_2} E_i$ of cofinality $\aleph_2$.

References

[Gi] M. Gitik. Changing cofinalities and the non stationary ideal, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* 56(1986) pp.280-314 .

[GiSh310] M.Gitik and S.Shelah, Cardinal preserving ideals, *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, to appear.

[LiSh 484] K.Liu and S.Shelah, Confinalities of elementary substructures of structures on $\aleph_\omega$, *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, to appear.

[Sh 351] S.Shelah, Reflecting stationary sets and successors of singular cardinals, *Archive fur Math Logic* 31 (1991) pp. 25–34.

[Sh 365] S.Shelah, There are Jonsson algebras in many inaccessible cardinals, Ch III *Cardinal Arithmetic, OUP*. accepted.