REFLECTION IMPLIES THE SCH
SH794

Saharon Shelah

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

Abstract. We prove that, e.g., if $\mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$ and $\mu > 2^{\aleph_0}$ and every stationary family of countable subsets of μ^+ reflect in some subset of μ^+ of cardinality $\aleph_1$ then the SCH for μ^+ holds (moreover, for μ^+, any scale for μ^+ has a bad stationary set of cofinality $\aleph_1$). This answers a question of Foreman and Todorčević who gets such conclusion from the simultaneous reflection of four stationary sets.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E04, 03E05.

Key words and phrases. reflection, stationary sets, Singular Cardinal Hypotheses, pcf, set theory.

The author would like to thank the Israel Science Foundation for partial support of this research (Grant No. 242/03)
I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.
First Typed - 01/12/18
Done - Dec. 2001
Latest Revisions - 07/Oct/1

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

§0 Introduction

In §1 we prove that the strong hypothesis ($\mathrm{pp}(\mu) = \mu^+$ for every singular μ) hence the SCH (singular cardinal hypothesis, that is $\lambda^\kappa \le \lambda^+ + 2^\kappa$) holds when: for every $\lambda \ge \aleph_1$ every stationary $\mathscr{S} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ reflect in some $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_1}$.

This answers a question of Foreman and Todorčević [FoTo] where they proved that the SCH holds for every $\lambda \ge \aleph_1$ when: every four stationary $\mathscr{S}_\ell \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}, \ell = 1,2,3,4$ reflect simultaneously in some $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_1}$. They were probably motivated by Velicković [Ve92a] which used another reflection principle: for every stationary $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ there is $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_1}$ such that $\mathscr{A} \cap [A]^{\aleph_0}$ contains a closed unbounded subset, rather than just a stationary set.

The proof here is self-contained modulo two basic quotations from [Sh:g], [Sh:f]; we continued [Sh:e], [Sh 755] in some respects. We prove more in §1. In particular if $\mu >$ cf$(\mu) = \aleph_0$ and $\mathrm{pp}(\mu) > \mu^+$ then some $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\mu^+]^{\aleph_0}$ reflect in no uncountable $A \in [\mu^+]^{\le\mu}$ and see more in the end.

We thank the referee and Shimoni Garti for not few helpful comments.

For the reader's convenience let us recall some basic definitions.

0.1 Definition. Assume θ is regular uncountable (if $\theta = \sigma^+, [B]^{<\sigma} = [B]^{\le\theta}$, we can use $[B]^{\le\theta}$, the main case is $B = \lambda$)

- (a) $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [B]^{<\theta}$ is closed in $[B]^{<\theta}$, if for every $\{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \subseteq \mathscr{A}$ where $0 < \alpha < \theta$ and $\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \alpha \Rightarrow x_{\beta_1} \subseteq x_{\beta_2}$, we have $\bigcup\limits_{\beta<\alpha} x_\beta \in \mathscr{A}$
- (b) $\mathscr{A}$ is unbounded in $[B]^{<\theta}$, if for any $y \in [B]^{<\theta}$ we can find $x \in \mathscr{A}$, such that $x \supseteq y$
- (c) $\mathscr{A}$ is a club in $[B]^{<\theta}$, if $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [B]^{<\theta}$ and (a)+(b) hold for $\mathscr{A}$
- (d) $\mathscr{A}$ is stationary in $[B]^{<\theta}$, or is a stationary subset of $[B]^{<\theta}$ when $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [B]^{<\theta}$ and $\mathscr{A} \cap \mathscr{C} \ne \emptyset$ for every club $\mathscr{C}$ of $[B]^{<\theta}$
- (e) similarly for $[B]^{\le\theta}$ or $[B]^\theta$ or consider $\mathscr{S} \subseteq [B]^{<\theta}$ as a subset of $[B]^{\le\theta}$.

0.2 Remark. Note: if $B = \theta$ then $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [B]^{<\theta}$ is stationary iff $\mathscr{A} \cap \theta$ is a stationary subset of θ.

0.3 Definition. Let $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [B_1]^{<\theta}$ and $B_2 \in [B_1]^\mu$. We say that $\mathscr{A}$ reflects in B_2 when $\mathscr{A} \cap [B_2]^{<\theta}$ is a stationary subset of $[B']^{<\theta}$.

0.4 Definition. Let κ be a regular uncountable cardinal, and assume $\mathscr{A}$ is a stationary subset of $[B]^{<\kappa}$. We define $\diamondsuit_{\mathscr{A}}$ (i.e., the diamond principle for $\mathscr{A}$) as the following assertion:
there exists a sequence $\langle u_a : a \in \mathscr{A}\rangle$, such that $u_a \subseteq a$ for any $a \in \mathscr{A}$, and for every $B' \subseteq B$ the set $\{a \in \mathscr{A} : B' \cap a = u_a\}$ is stationary in $[B']^{<\kappa}$.

0.5 Notation. 1) For regular $\lambda > \kappa$ let $S^\lambda_\kappa = \{\delta < \lambda\colon \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \kappa\}$.
2) $\mathscr{H}(\lambda)$ is the set of x with transitive closure of cardinality $< \lambda$.
3) $<^*_\lambda$ denotes any well ordering of $\mathscr{H}(\lambda)$.

Let us repeat the definition of the next ideal: (see [Sh:E12]).

0.6 Definition. For $S \subseteq \lambda$ we say that $S \in \check{I}[\lambda]$ iff: there is a club E in λ, and a sequence $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ such that:

- (i) $C_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$
- (ii) $\mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) < \alpha$
- (iii) $\beta \in C_\alpha \Rightarrow C_\beta = \beta \cap C_\alpha$
- (iv) $\alpha \in E \cap S \Rightarrow \alpha = \sup(C_\alpha)$.

0.7 Claim. *(By [Sh 420] or see [Sh:E12]).*
1) If κ, λ are regular and $\lambda > \kappa^+$ <u>then</u> there is a stationary $S \subseteq S^\lambda_\kappa$ such that $S \in \check{I}[\lambda]$.
2) In 0.6 we can add $\alpha \in E \cap S \Rightarrow \mathrm{otp}(C_\alpha) = \mathrm{cf}(\alpha)$.

0.8 Definition/Observation. Let $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^\theta$ be stationary and $\lambda \geq \sigma > \theta$ and σ has uncountable cofinality <u>then</u> $\mathrm{prj}_\sigma(\mathscr{A}) := \{\sup(a) : a \in \mathscr{A}\}$, and it is a stationary subset of σ; if $\sigma = \lambda$ we may omit it.

0.9 Definition. Let f_i be a function with domain $\aleph_0$ to the ordinals, for every $i \in I$ where I is a set of ordinals. We say that the sequence $\bar{f} = \langle f_i : i \in I\rangle$ is free, if we can find a sequence $\bar{n} = \langle n_i : i \in I\rangle$ of natural numbers such that: $(i, j \in I) \wedge (i < j) \wedge (n_i, n_j \leq n < \omega) \Rightarrow f_i(n) < f_j(n)$. We say that $\bar{f}$ is μ-free when for every $J \in [I]^{<\mu}$ the sequence $\bar{f} \restriction J$ is free.

0.10 Remark. If we consider "$\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \in S\rangle$ for some stationary $S \subseteq \theta$" when $\theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) > \aleph_0$, then we can assume (without loss of generality) that $n_i = n(*)$ for every $i \in S$, as we can decrease S.

§1 Reflection in $[\mu^+]^{\aleph_0}$ and the strong hypothesis

1.1 The Main Claim. *Assume*

(A) $\lambda = \mu^+$ *and* $\mu > \mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$ *and* $\aleph_2 \le \mu_* \le \lambda$ *(e.g.,* $\mu_* = \aleph_2$ *which implies that below always* $\theta = \aleph_1$*)*

(B) $\bar\lambda = \langle \lambda_n : n < \omega\rangle$ *is an increasing sequence of regular cardinals* $> \aleph_1$ *with limit* μ *and* $\lambda = \mathrm{tcf}(\Pi\lambda_n, <_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega})$

(C) $\bar f = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ *is* $<_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega}$*-increasing cofinal in* $(\prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n, <_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega})$

(D) *the sequence* $\bar f$ *is* μ_**-free or at least for every cardinal* θ *for which* $\aleph_1 \le \theta = \mathrm{cf}(\theta) < \mu_*$ *the following is satisfied: if* $\theta \le \sigma < \mu_*, \mathscr{A} \subseteq [\sigma]^{\aleph_0}$ *is stationary (recall 0.2) and* $\langle \delta_i : i < \theta\rangle$ *is an increasing continuous sequence of ordinals* $< \lambda$ *<u>then</u> for some stationary subfamily* $\mathscr{A}_1$ *of* $\mathscr{A}$ *(*$\mathscr{A}_1$ *is stationary in* $[\sigma]^{\aleph_0}$ *of course) letting* $R_1 = \mathrm{prj}_\theta(\mathscr{A}_1)$*, see 0.8 we have* $\langle f_{\delta_i} : i \in R_1\rangle$ *is free. See 0.9 and by 0.10 we can assume that* $i \in R_1 \Rightarrow n_i = n(*)$ *so* $\langle f_{\delta_i}(n) : i \in R_1\rangle$ *is strictly increasing for every* $n \in [n(*), \omega)$*.*

<u>Then</u> some stationary $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ *does not reflect in any* $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_1}$ *or even in any uncountable* $A \in [\lambda]^{<\mu_*}$*, (see Definition 0.3).*

1.2 Remark. 0) From the main claim the result on SCH should be clear from pcf theory (by translating between the pp,cov and cardinal arithmetic) but we shall give details (i.e. quotes).
1) Clause (D) from claim 1.1 is related to "the good set of $\bar f$, $\mathrm{gd}(\bar f)$ contains S^λ_θ modulo the club filter". But the clause (D) is stronger.

Note that the good set $\mathrm{gd}(\bar f)$ of $\bar f$ is $\{\delta < \lambda : \aleph_0 < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \mu$ and for some increasing sequence $\langle \alpha_i : i < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)\rangle$ of ordinals with limit δ and sequence $\bar n = \langle n_i : i < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)\rangle$ of natural numbers we have $i < j < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) \wedge n_i \le n < \omega \wedge n_j \le n < \omega \Rightarrow f_{\alpha_i}(n) < f_{\alpha_j}(n)$ (so $\langle \cup\{f_{\alpha_i}(n) : i < \mathrm{cf}(\delta)$ and $n \ge n_i\} : n < \omega\rangle$ is a $<_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega}$-eub of $\bar f \restriction \delta$).

If we use another ideal J say on $\theta < \mu$, the n_i is replaced by $s_i \in J$.
2) Recall that by using the silly square ([Sh:g, II,1.5A,pg.51]), if $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) \le \theta < \mu, J$ an ideal on θ (e.g. $\theta = \aleph_0, J = J^{\rm bd}_\omega$) and $\mathrm{pp}_J(\mu) > \lambda = \mathrm{cf}(\lambda) > \mu$ <u>then</u> we can find a sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \theta\rangle$ of regulars $< \mu$ such that $\mu = \lim_J\langle \lambda_i : i < \theta\rangle$ and $\mathrm{tcf}(\prod\limits_{i<\theta} \lambda_i, <_J) = \lambda$ and some $\bar f = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ exemplifying it satisfies $\mathrm{gd}(\bar f) = \{\delta < \lambda : \theta < \mathrm{cf}(\delta) < \mu\}$ and moreover $\bar f$ is μ^+-free which here means that for every $u \subseteq \lambda$ of cardinality $\le \mu$ we can find $\langle s_\alpha : \alpha \in u\rangle$ such that $s_\alpha \in J$, and for $\alpha < \beta$

from u we have $\varepsilon \in \theta \backslash (s_\alpha \cup s_\beta) \Rightarrow f_\alpha(\varepsilon) < f_\beta(\varepsilon)$. This is stronger than the demand in clause (D).
3) Also recall that if κ is supercompact, $\mu > \kappa > \theta = \text{cf}(\mu)$ and $\langle \lambda_i : i < \theta \rangle$ is an increasing sequence of regulars with limit μ, $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exemplifies $\lambda = \mu^+ = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i<\theta} \lambda_i, <_{J^{\rm bd}_\theta})$ then for unboundedly many $\kappa' \in \kappa \cap \text{Reg} \backslash \theta^+$ the set $S^\lambda_{\kappa'} \backslash \text{gd}(\bar f)$ is stationary. This is preserved by e.g. Levy$(\aleph_1, < \kappa)$.
4) For part of the proof (mainly subclaim 1.5) we can weaken clause (D) of the assumption, e.g. in the end demand "$\Rightarrow f_{\delta_i}(n) \neq f_{\delta_j}(n)$" only. The weakest version of clause (D) which suffices there is: for any club C of θ the set $\cup\{\text{Rang}(f_\alpha) : \alpha \in C\}$ has cardinality θ.

Before proving 1.1 we draw some conclusions.

1.3 Conclusion. 1) Assume $\mu > 2^{\aleph_0}$ then $\mu^{\aleph_0} = \mu^+$ provided that

- $(A)_\mu$ $\mu > \text{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0$
- $(B)_\mu$ every stationary $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\mu^+]^{\aleph_0}$ reflects in some $A \in [\mu^+]^{\aleph_1}$.

2) Assume $\lambda \geq \mu_* \geq \aleph_2$. We can replace $(B)_\mu$ by

$(B)_{\mu,\mu_*}$ every stationary $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\mu^+]^{\aleph_0}$ reflects in some uncountable $A \in [\mu^+]^{<\mu_*}$.

Proof. 1) Easily if $\aleph_1 \leq \mu' \leq \mu$ then $(B)_{\mu'}$ holds. Now if μ is a counterexample, without loss of generality μ is a minimal counterexample and then by [Sh:g, IX,§1] we have $\text{pp}(\mu) > \mu^+$, hence there is a sequence $\langle \lambda^0_n : n < \omega \rangle$ of regular cardinals with limit μ such that $\mu^{++} = \text{tcf}(\prod_{n<\omega} \lambda^0_n / J^{\rm bd}_\omega)$, (see [Sh:g]; more [Sh:E12] or [Sh 430, 6.5]; e.g. using "no hole for pp" and the pcf theorem). Let $\bar f^0 = \langle f^0_\alpha : \alpha < \mu^{++} \rangle$ witness this. Hence by [Sh:g, II,1.5A,p.51] there is $\bar f$ as required in 1.1 even a μ^+-free one and also the other assumptions there hold so we can conclude that there exists $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\mu^+]^{\aleph_0}$ which does not reflect in any $A \in [\mu^+]^{\aleph_1}$, so we get a contradiction to $(B)_\mu$.
2) The same proof. $\square_{1.3}$

1.4 Conclusion. 1) If for every $\lambda > \aleph_1$, every stationary $\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ reflects in some $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_1}$, <u>then</u>

- (a) the strong hypothesis (see [Sh 410], [Sh 420], [Sh:E12]) holds, i.e. for every singular μ, $\text{pp}(\mu) = \mu^+$ and moreover $\text{cf}([\mu]^{\text{cf}(\mu)}, \subseteq) = \mu^+$ which follows
- (b) the SCH holds.

2) Let $\theta \geq \aleph_0$. We can restrict ourselves to $\lambda > \theta^+, A \in [\lambda]^{\theta^+}$ (getting the strong hypothesis and SCH above θ).

Proof. 1) As in 1.3, by 1.1 we have $\mu > \mathrm{cf}(\mu) = \aleph_0 \Rightarrow \mathrm{pp}(\mu) = \mu^+$, this implies clause (a) (i.e. by [Sh:g, VIII,§1], $\mu >\ \mathrm{cf}(\mu) \Rightarrow \mathrm{pp}(\mu) = \mu^+$). Hence inductively by [Sh:g, IX,1.8,pg.369], [Sh 430, 1.1] we have $\kappa < \mu \Rightarrow\ \mathrm{cf}([\mu]^\kappa, \subseteq) = \mu$ if $\mathrm{cf}(\mu) > \kappa$ and is μ^+ if $\mu > \kappa \geq\ \mathrm{cf}(\mu)$. This is a consequence of the strong hypothesis.) The SCH follows.
2) The same proof. $\square_{1.4}$

Proof of 1.1. Let M^* be an algebra with universe λ and countably many functions, e.g. all those definable in $(\mathscr{H}(\lambda^+), \in, <^*_{\lambda^+}, \bar f)$ and are functions from λ to λ or just the functions $\alpha \mapsto f_\alpha(n), \alpha \mapsto \alpha + 1$.

1.5 Subclaim. *There are $\bar S, S^*, \bar D$ such that:*

$(*)_1$ $\bar S = \langle S_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$ *is a sequence of pairwise disjoint stationary subsets of* $S^\lambda_{\aleph_0}$

$(*)_2(i)$ $S^* \subseteq S^\lambda_{\aleph_1} = \{\delta < \lambda : \mathrm{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_1\}$ *is stationary and belongs to* $\check I[\lambda]$

(ii) *if* $\delta \in S^*$ *then there is an increasing continuous sequence* $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$ *of ordinals with limit* δ *such that for some sequence* $\bar\zeta = \langle \zeta_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in R\rangle$ *of ordinals* $< \omega_1$, *the set* $R \subseteq \omega_1$ *is stationary,* $\varepsilon \in R \Rightarrow \alpha_\varepsilon \in S_{\zeta_\varepsilon}$ *and* $\bar\zeta$ *is with no repetitions*

$(*)_3(i)$ $\bar D = \langle (D_{1,\varepsilon}, D_{2,\varepsilon}) : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$

(ii) $D_{\ell,\varepsilon}$ *is a filter on* ω *containing the filter of cobounded subsets of* ω

(iii) *if* $R_1 \subseteq \omega_1$ *is unbounded and* $A \in \cap\{D_{1,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon \in R_1\}$ *then for some* $\varepsilon \in R_1$ *we have* $A \neq \emptyset \bmod D_{2,\varepsilon}$

(iv) *for each* $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ *for some* A *we have* $A \in D_{1,\varepsilon}\ \&\ \omega \backslash A \in D_{2,\varepsilon}$.

1.6 Remark. 1) For 1.5 we can assume (A), (B), (C) of 1.1 and weaken clause (D): because (inside the proof below) necessarily for any stationary $S^* \subseteq S^\lambda_{\aleph_1}$, which belongs to $\check I[\lambda]$, we can restrict the demand in (D) of 1.1 for any $\langle \delta_i : i < \theta\rangle$ with limit in S^*. See more in [Sh 775].
2) In Subclaim 1.5 we can demand $\zeta_\varepsilon = \varepsilon$ in $(*)_2(ii)$. See the proof.
3) If we like to demand that each $D_{\ell,\varepsilon}$ is an ultrafilter (or just have "$A \in D_{2,\varepsilon}$" in the end of $(*)_3(iii)$ of 1.5), use [Sh:E3].

Proof of the subclaim 1.5. How do we choose them?

Let $\langle A_i : i \le \omega_1 \rangle$ be a sequence of infinite pairwise almost disjoint subsets of ω. Let $D_{1,i} = \{A \subseteq \omega : A_i \backslash A$ is finite$\}, D_{2,i} = \{A \subseteq \omega : A_j \backslash A$ is finite for all but finitely many $j < \omega_1\}$, so $D_{2,i}$ does not depend on i. Clearly $\langle (D_{1,i}, D_{2,i}) : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ satisfies $(*)_3$.

Recall, 0.7, that by 0.7 and the fact that $\lambda > \aleph_\omega > \aleph_2$, there is a stationary $S^* \subseteq S^\lambda_{\aleph_1}$ from $\check{I}[\lambda]$, and so every stationary $S' \subseteq S^*$ has the same properties (i.e. is a stationary subset of λ which belongs to $\check{I}[\lambda]$ and is included in $S^\lambda_{\aleph_1}$).

Let $N \prec (\mathscr{H}((2^\lambda)^+), \in, <^*)$ be of cardinality μ such that $\mu+1 \subseteq N$ and $\{\bar{\lambda}, \mu, \bar{f}\}$ belongs to N. Let $C^* = \cap\{C : C \in N$ is a club of $\lambda\}$, so clearly C^* is a club of λ. For each $h \in {}^\lambda(\omega_1)$ we can try $\bar{S}^h = \langle S^h_\gamma : \gamma < \omega_1 \rangle$ where $S^h_\gamma = \{\delta < \lambda : \text{cf}(\delta) = \aleph_0$ and $h(\delta) = \gamma\}$, so it is enough to show that for some $h \in N$, the sequence $\bar{S}^h$ is as required. As $\|N\| < \lambda$, for this it is enough to show that for every $\delta \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_1} \cap C^*$ (or just for every $\delta \in S^* \cap C^*$, or just for stationarily many $\delta \in S^* \cap C^*$) the demand holds for $\bar{S}^h$ for some $h \in ({}^\lambda(\omega_1)) \cap N$. That is, $S^{\bar{h}}$ satisfies $(*)_1$ and $(*)_2(ii)$ of subclaim 1.5. Given any $\delta \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_1} \cap C^*$ let $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of ordinals with limit δ, without loss of generality $\varepsilon < \omega_1 \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\alpha_\varepsilon) = \aleph_0$, and by assumption (D) of 1.1 for some[1] stationary $R \subseteq \omega_1$ and $n = n(*) < \omega$, the sequence $\langle f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n) : \varepsilon \in R \rangle$ is strictly increasing, so let its limit be β^*. So $\beta^* \le \mu$ and $\text{cf}(\beta^*) = \aleph_1$ but $\mu + 1 \subseteq N$ hence $\beta^* \in N$.

Note that

$(*)_1$ for every $\beta' < \beta^*$ the set $\{\alpha \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_0} : f_\alpha(n(*)) \in [\beta', \beta^*)\}$ is a stationary subset of λ.

[Why? So assume that $\beta' < \beta^*$ and that the set $S' = \{\alpha \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_0} : f_\alpha(n(*)) \in [\beta', \beta^*)\}$ is not a stationary subset of λ. As $\beta^*+1 \subseteq N$ and $\bar{f} \in N$ clearly $S' \in N$ hence there is a club C' of λ disjoint to S' which belongs to N. Clearly $\text{acc}(C')$ too is a club of λ which belongs to N hence $C^* \subseteq \text{acc}(C')$ hence $\delta \in \text{acc}(C')$. So $\delta = \sup(C' \cap \delta)$, so $C' \cap \delta$ is a club of δ. Recall that $\{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon \in R\}$ is a stationary subset of δ of order type $\aleph_1$.

Now by the choice of β^* for some $\varepsilon(*) \in R$ we have $\beta' \le f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon(*)}}(n(*))$, hence $\varepsilon \in R \backslash \varepsilon(*) \Rightarrow f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n(*)) \in [\beta', \beta^*)$, so δ has a stationary subset included in S' hence disjoint to C', contradiction.]

$(*)_2$ for every $\beta' < \beta^*$ there is $\beta'' \in (\beta', \beta^*)$ such that $\{\alpha \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_0} : f_\alpha(n(*)) \in [\beta', \beta'')\}$ is a stationary subset of λ.

[Why? Follows from $(*)_1$ as $\aleph_1 < \lambda$.]

[1] Note that if we require just that $\langle f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n) : \varepsilon \in R \rangle$ is without repetitions, <u>then</u> for some stationary subset R' of R the sequence $\langle f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n) : \varepsilon \in R' \rangle$ is increasing.

As $\beta^* \in N$ we can find an increasing continuous sequence $\langle \beta_\xi : \xi < \omega_1 \rangle \in N$ of ordinals with limit β^*. So by $(*)_2$

$(*)_3$ for every $\xi_1 < \omega_1$ for some $\xi_2 \in (\xi_1, \omega_1)$ the set $\{\alpha \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_0} : f_\alpha(n(*)) \in [\beta_{\xi_1}, \beta_{\xi_2})\}$ is stationary.

Hence for some unbounded subset u of ω_1 we have

$(*)_4$ for every $\xi \in u$ the set $\{\alpha \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_0} : f_\alpha(n(*)) \in [\beta_\xi, \beta_{\xi+1})\}$ is a stationary subset of λ.

If $2^{\aleph_1} \le \mu$ then $u = \omega_1$ recalling we demand $\langle \beta_\xi : \xi < \omega_1 \rangle \in N$.

We define $h : \lambda \to \omega_1$ by $h(\alpha) = \zeta$ iff for some $\xi \in u$ we have $\zeta = \mathrm{otp}(u \cap f_\alpha(n(*)))$ and/or $\xi = 0$ & $f_\alpha(n(*)) \ge \sup(u)$.
Clearly $h \in N$ is as required. So $\bar{S} = \bar{S}^h$ as required exists. But maybe $2^{\aleph_1} > \mu$, then after $(*)_3$ we continue as follows. Let $\bar{C} = \langle C_\delta : \delta \in S^{\aleph_3}_{\aleph_1} \rangle$ be such that C_δ is a club of δ of order type ω_1 which guess clubs, i.e. for every club C of $\aleph_3$ for stationarily many $\delta \in S^{\aleph_3}_{\aleph_1}$ we have $C_\delta \subseteq C$, exists by [Sh:g, III]. Without loss of generality $\bar{C} \in N$.

Now let $\delta_* \in \mathrm{acc}(C^*)$ has cofinality $\aleph_3$. Again $\delta_* \le \mu$ belongs to N hence some increasing continuous sequence $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \aleph_3 \rangle \in N$ has limit δ_*. Now for each $\varepsilon \in S^{\aleph_3}_{\aleph_1}$ we could choose above $\delta = \alpha_\varepsilon$ hence for some $n_\varepsilon < \omega$ we have $(\forall \beta' < \alpha_\varepsilon)(\exists \beta'' < \alpha_\varepsilon)[\beta' < \beta'' \wedge (\exists^{\mathrm{stat}} \gamma \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_0})(\beta' \le f_\gamma(n_\varepsilon) < \beta'']$. So for some $n_* < \omega$ the set $S' := \{\varepsilon < \aleph_3 : \mathrm{cf}(\varepsilon) = \aleph_1 \text{ and } n_\varepsilon = n_*\}$ is a stationary subset of $S^{\aleph_3}_{\aleph_1}$. It follows that $(\forall \varepsilon < \aleph_3)(\exists \zeta < \aleph_3)[\varepsilon < \zeta \wedge (\exists^{\mathrm{stat}} \gamma \in S^\lambda_{\aleph_0})(\alpha_\varepsilon \le f_\gamma(n_*) < \alpha_{\varepsilon+1})]$.

Let ζ_ε be the minimal ζ as required above, so $C = \{\xi < \aleph_3$: if $\varepsilon < \xi$ then $\zeta_\varepsilon < \xi$ and ξ is a limit ordinal$\}$ is a club of $\aleph_3$. Hence for some $\varepsilon(*) \in S^{\aleph_3}_{\aleph_1}$ we have $C_{\varepsilon(*)} \subseteq C$. Let $u := \{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta \in C_{\varepsilon(*)}\}$ so clearly $\langle \alpha_\zeta : \zeta \in u \rangle$ belongs to N. $\square_{1.5}$

1.7 Remark. Why can't we, in the proof of 1.5, after $(*)_3$, put the instead assuming $2^{\aleph_1} \le \mu$ use "as $N \prec (\mathscr{H}(2^\lambda)^+), \in, <^*)$ without loss of generality $u = w_1$"?

The set u chosen above depends on δ, so if $2^{\aleph_1} \le \mu$ still $u \in N$, but otherwise the "without loss of generality $u \in N$" does not seem to be justified.

Continuation of the proof of 1.1. Let $S := \cup\{S_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\}$. For $\varepsilon < \omega_1, \delta \in S_\varepsilon$ let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{A}^\varepsilon_\delta = \{a : & a \in [\delta]^{\aleph_0} \text{ is } M^*\text{-closed}, \sup(a) = \delta, \\ & \mathrm{otp}(a) \le \varepsilon \text{ and} \\ & (\forall^{D_{1,\varepsilon}} n)(a \cap \lambda_n \subseteq f_\delta(n)) \\ & \text{and } (\forall^{D_{2,\varepsilon}} n)(a \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f_\delta(n))\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathscr{A}^\varepsilon = \cup\{\mathscr{A}^\varepsilon_\delta : \delta \in S_\varepsilon\}$$

$$\mathscr{A} = \cup\{\mathscr{A}^\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\}.$$

So

$$\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}.$$

As the case $\mu_* = \aleph_2$ was the original question and its proof is simpler we first prove it.

1.8 Subclaim. *$\mathscr{A}$ does not reflect in any $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_1}$.*

Proof. So assume $A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_1}$, let $\langle a_i : i < \omega_1\rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of countable subsets of A with union A, and let $R = \{i < \omega_1 : a_i \in \mathscr{A}\}$, and assume toward contradiction that R is a stationary subset of ω_1. As every $a \in \mathscr{A}$ is M^*-closed, necessarily A is M^*-closed and so without loss of generality each a_i is M^*-closed.
For each $i \in R$ as $a_i \in \mathscr{A}$ by the definition of $\mathscr{A}$ we can find $\varepsilon_i < \omega_1$ and $\delta_i \in S_{\varepsilon_i}$ such that $a_i \in \mathscr{A}^{\varepsilon_i}_{\delta_i}$ hence by the definition of $\mathscr{A}^{\varepsilon_i}_{\delta_i}$ we have $\text{otp}(a_i) \le \varepsilon_i$. But as $A = \cup\{a_i : i < \omega_1\}$ with a_i countable increasing with i and $|A| = \aleph_1$, clearly for some club E of ω_1 the sequence $\langle \text{otp}(a_i) : i \in E\rangle$ is strictly increasing, hence $i \in E \Rightarrow \text{otp}(i \cap E) \le \text{otp}(a_i)$ so without loss of generality $i \in E \Rightarrow i \le \text{otp}(a_i)$ and without loss of generality $i < j \in E \Rightarrow \varepsilon_i < j \le \text{otp}(a_j)$.

Now $j \in E \cap R \Rightarrow j \le \text{otp}(a_j) \le \varepsilon_j$ so $\langle \varepsilon_i : i \in E \cap R\rangle$ is strictly increasing but $\langle S_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$ are pairwise disjoint and $\delta_i \in S_{\varepsilon_i}$ so $\langle \delta_i : i \in E \cap R\rangle$ is without repetitions; but $\delta_i = \sup(a_i)$ and for $i < j$ from $R \cap E$ we have $a_i \subseteq a_j$ which implies that $\delta_i = \sup(a_i) \le \sup(a_j) = \delta_j$ so necessarily $\langle \delta_i : i \in R \cap E\rangle$ is strictly increasing.

As $\sup(a_i) = \delta_i$ for $i \in R \cap E$, clearly $\sup(A) = \cup\{\delta_i : i \in E \cap R\}$ and let $\beta_i = \text{Min}(A \backslash \delta_i)$ for $i < \omega_1$, it is well defined as $\langle \delta_j : j \in R \cap E\rangle$ is strictly increasing. Thinning E without loss of generality

$\circledast_1$ $i < j \in E \cap R \Rightarrow \beta_i < \delta_j \ \& \ \beta_i \in a_j$.

Note that, by the choice of M^*,

$\circledast_2$ $i \in E \cap R \wedge i < j \in E \cap R \Rightarrow \beta_i \in a_j \Rightarrow \bigwedge_n (f_{\beta_i}(n) \in a_j) \Rightarrow \bigwedge_n (f_{\beta_i}(n) + 1 \in a_j)$.

As $\langle \delta_i : i \in E \cap R\rangle$ is (strictly) increasing continuous and $R \cap E$ is a stationary subset of ω_1 clearly by clause (D) of the assumption of 1.1 we can find a stationary

$R_1 \subseteq E \cap R$ and $n(*)$ such that $i \in R_1 \wedge j \in R_1 \wedge i < j \wedge n(*) \le n < \omega \Rightarrow f_{\delta_i}(n) < f_{\delta_j}(n)$.

Now if $i \in R_1$, let $\mathbf{j}(i) =: \mathrm{Min}(R_1 \backslash (i+1))$, so $f_{\delta_i} \le_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega} f_{\beta_i} <_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega} f_{\delta_{\mathbf{j}(i)}}$ so for some $m_i < \omega$ we have $n \in [m_i, \omega) \Rightarrow f_{\delta_i}(n) \le f_{\beta_i}(n) < f_{\delta_{j(i)}}(n)$. Clearly for some stationary $R_2 \subseteq R_1$ we have $i,j \in R_2 \Rightarrow m_i = m_j = m(*)$, so possibly increasing $n(*)$ without loss of generality $n(*) \ge m(*)$; so we have (where $\mathrm{Ch}_a \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ is defined by $\mathrm{Ch}_a(n) = \sup(a \cap \lambda_n)$ for any $a \in [\mu]^{<\lambda_0}$):

- $\circledast_3$ for $i < j$ from R_2 we have $\mathbf{j}(i) \le j$ and
  - (α) $f_{\delta_i} \restriction [n(*),\omega) \le f_{\beta_i} \restriction [n(*),\omega)$
  - (β) $f_{\beta_i} \restriction [n(*),\omega) < f_{\delta_{\mathbf{j}(i)}} \restriction [n(*),\omega) \le f_{\delta_j} \restriction [n(*),\omega)$
  - (γ) $f_{\beta_i} \restriction [n(*),\omega) <$ $\mathrm{Ch}_{a_j} \restriction [n(*),\omega)$, by $\circledast_2$.

Now by the definition of $\mathscr{A}^{\varepsilon_i}_{\delta_i}$ as $a_i \in \mathscr{A}^{\varepsilon_i}_{\delta_i} \subseteq \mathscr{A}^{\varepsilon_i}$ we have

- $\circledast_4$ if $i \in R_2$ then
  - (α) $\mathrm{Ch}_{a_i} \le_{D_{1,\varepsilon_i}} f_{\delta_i}$
  - (β) $f_{\delta_i} <_{D_{2,\varepsilon_i}}$ Ch_{a_i}.

Let $f^* \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ be $f^*(n) = \cup\{f_{\beta_i}(n) : i \in R_2\}$ if $n \ge n(*)$ and zero otherwise. As $f_{\beta_i}(n) \in a_{j(i)}$ for $i \in R_2$ by $\circledast_3(\gamma)$ clearly $n \ge n(*) \Rightarrow f^*(n) \le \sup\{\mathrm{Ch}_{a_i}(n) : i \in R_2\} = \sup(A \cap \lambda_n) =$ $\mathrm{Ch}_A(n)$ and by $\circledast_3(\beta)$ we have $n \ge n(*) \Rightarrow$ $\mathrm{cf}(f^*(n)) = \aleph_1$. Let $B_1 =: \{n < \omega : n \ge n(*)$ and $f^*(n) = \sup(A \cap \lambda_n)\}$ and $B_2 =: [n(*),\omega) \backslash B_1$. As $\alpha \in A \Rightarrow \alpha + 1 \in A$ we have $n \in B_1 \Rightarrow A \cap \lambda_n \subseteq f^*(n) = \sup(A \cap \lambda_n)$. Also as by the previous sentence $f^* \restriction [n(*),\omega) \le$ $\mathrm{Ch}_A \restriction [n(*),\omega)$ clearly $n \in B_2 \Rightarrow A \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f^*(n)$. As $\langle a_i : i \in R_2 \rangle$ is increasing with union A, clearly there is $i(*) \in R_2$ such that: $n \in B_2 \Rightarrow a_{i(*)} \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f^*(n)$, so as $i \in R_2$ & $\alpha \in a_i \Rightarrow \alpha + 1 \in a_i$ we have $i(*) \le i \in R_2 \Rightarrow$ $\mathrm{Ch}_{a_i} \restriction B_2 > f_{\delta_i} \restriction B_2$ hence by clause $\circledast_4(\alpha)$ we have $i \in R_2 \backslash i(*) \Rightarrow B_2 = \emptyset \bmod D_{1,\varepsilon_i} \Rightarrow B_1 \in D_{1,\varepsilon_i}$. Also by $\circledast_3$ and the choice of f^* and B_1, for each $n \in B_1$ for some club E_n of ω_1 we have $i \in E_n \cap R_2 \Rightarrow \sup(a_i \cap \lambda_n) = \sup\{f_{\beta_j}(n) : j \in R_2 \cap i\} = \sup\{f_{\delta_j}(n) : j \in R_2 \cap i\} \subseteq f_{\delta_i}(n)$, hence $R_3 = R_2 \cap \bigcap\{E_n \backslash i(*) : n < \omega\}$ is a stationary subset of ω_1. So $n \in B_1$ & $i \in R_3 \Rightarrow a_i \cap \lambda_n \subseteq f_{\delta_i}(n)$ hence $i \in R_3 \Rightarrow$ $\mathrm{Ch}_{a_i} \restriction B_1 \le f_{\delta_i} \restriction B_1$ hence by $\circledast_4(\beta)$ we have $i \in R_3 \Rightarrow B_1 = \emptyset \bmod D_{2,\varepsilon_i}$ hence $i \in R_3 \Rightarrow B_2 \in D_{2,\varepsilon_i}$.

By the choice of $\langle (D_{1,i}, D_{2,i}) : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ in 1.5 as $B_1 \cup B_2$ is a cofinite subset of $\omega, B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ (by the choice of B_1, B_2, clearly) and $R_3 \subseteq \omega_1$ is stationary we get a contradiction, see $(*)_3(iii)$ of 1.5. $\square_{1.8}$

1.9 Subclaim. *$\mathscr{A}$ is a stationary subset of $[\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$.*

Remark. See [RuSh 117], [Sh:f, XI,3.5,pg.546], [Sh:f, XV,2.6].

We give a proof relying only on [Sh:f, XI,3.5,pg.546]. In fact, also if we are interested in $\mathrm{Ch}_N = \langle \sup(\theta \cap N) : \aleph_0 < \theta \in N \cap \text{ Reg}\rangle, N \prec (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in)$ we have full control, e.g., if $\bar S = \langle S_\theta : \aleph_1 \le \theta \in \text{ Reg } \cap \chi\rangle, S_\theta \subseteq S^\theta_{\aleph_0}$ stationary we can demand $\aleph_1 \le \theta = \text{ cf}(\theta) \wedge \theta \in N \Rightarrow \text{ Ch}_N(\theta) \in S_\theta$ and control the order of $f^{\mathfrak{a},\lambda}_{\sup(N\cap\lambda)}$ and $\mathrm{Ch}_N \restriction \mathfrak{a}$.

Proof. Let M^{**} be an expansion of M^* by countably many functions; without loss of generality M^{**} has Skolem functions.

Recall that $S^* \subseteq S^\lambda_{\aleph_1}$ is from 1.5 so it belongs to $\check I[\lambda]$ and let $\bar a = \langle a_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$ witness it (see 0.6, 0.7) so $\mathrm{otp}(a_\alpha) \le \omega_1$ and $\beta \in a_\alpha \Rightarrow a_\beta = \beta \cap a_\alpha$, and omitting a non-stationary subset of S^* we have $\delta \in S^* \Rightarrow \mathrm{otp}(a_\delta) = \omega_1 \ \& \ \delta = \sup(a_\delta)$.

Let

$$T^* = \{\eta : \eta \text{ is a finite sequence of ordinals, } \eta(2n) < \lambda \text{ and } \eta(2n+1) < \lambda_n\}.$$

Let $\lambda_\eta = \lambda$ if $\ell g(\eta)$ is even and $\lambda_\eta = \lambda_n$ if $\ell g(\eta) = 2n+1$ and let $\mathbf{I}_\eta$ be the non-stationary ideal on λ_η for $\eta \in T^*$, so $(T^*, \bar{\mathbf{I}})$ is well defined where $\bar{\mathbf{I}} := \langle \mathbf{I}_\eta : \eta \in T^*\rangle$.

For $\eta \in T^*$, let M_η be the M^{**}-closure of $\{\eta(\ell) : \ell < \ell g(\eta)\}$ so each M_η is countable and $\eta \triangleleft \nu \in T^* \Rightarrow M_\eta \subseteq M_\nu$ and for $\eta \in \lim(T^*) = \{\eta \in {}^\omega\lambda : \eta \restriction n \in T^*$ for every $n < \omega\}$ let $M_\eta = \cup\{M_{\eta\restriction n} : n < \omega\}$, so it is enough to prove that $M_\eta \in \mathscr{A}$ for some $\eta \in \lim(T^*)$, more exactly $|M_\eta| \in \mathscr{A}$ recall $M_\eta \subseteq M^{**} \Leftrightarrow M_\eta \prec M^{**}$ as M^{**} has Skolem functions. Let $\bar M = \langle M_\eta : \eta \in T^*\rangle$ and we can find a subtree $T \subseteq T^*$ such that

⊠ $(T^*, \mathbf{I}) \le (T, \mathbf{I})$ and for some $\varepsilon^* < \omega_1$ we have $\eta \in \lim(T) \Rightarrow \mathrm{otp}(M_\eta) = \varepsilon^*$ (recalling $(T^*, \mathbf{I}) \le (T, \mathbf{I})$ means $T \subseteq T^*, (\forall \eta \in T^*)(\forall \ell < \ell g(\eta))(\eta \restriction \ell \in T^*), <> \in T^*$ and $(\forall \eta \in T)(\{\alpha < \lambda_\eta : \eta\hat{\ }\langle\alpha\rangle \in T^*\} \ne \emptyset \mod \mathbf{I}_\eta$, i.e. is stationary)).

Why? As $\lim(T^*) = \cup\{\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\}$, see $\boxtimes_4$ below, and by $\boxtimes_1$ below each $\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon$ is a Borel subset of $\lim(T^*)$ and note that ⊠ says the $(\exists \varepsilon < \omega_1)(\exists T)[(T^*, \mathbf{I}) \le (T, \mathbf{I}) \cap \lim(T) \subseteq \mathbf{B}_\varepsilon)$. The existence of such ε is, e.g., [Sh:f, XI;3.5,p.546]; the reader may ask to justify the sets being Borel, so let u_η be the universe of M_η, a countable set of ordinals.

So we use

$\boxtimes_1$ for any $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ the set $\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon = \{\eta \in \lim(T) : \mathrm{otp}(u_\eta) = \varepsilon\}$ is a Borel set.

[Why? Without loss of generality $u_\eta \neq \emptyset$ and let $\langle \alpha_{\eta,n} : n < \omega\rangle$ enumerate the members of u_η and for $n_1, n_2 < \omega$ and $m_1, m_2 < \omega$ let $\mathbf{B}_{n_1,n_2,m_1,m_2} := \{\eta \in \lim(T^*) : \alpha_{\eta\restriction n_1, m_1} < \alpha_{\eta\restriction n_2,m_2}\}$.

Clearly

$\boxtimes_2$ $\mathbf{B}_{n_1,n_2,m_1,m_2}$ is an open subset of $\lim(T^*)$

$\boxtimes_3$ there is a $\mathbb{L}_{\omega_1,\omega}$ sentence ψ_ε in the vocabulary consisting of $\{p_{n_1,n_2,m_1,m_2,\ell} : n_1, n_2, m_1, m_2 < \omega\}$ such that: the p's are propositional variables (i.e. 0-place predicates) and if $\langle \alpha_{n,m} : n, m < \omega\rangle$ is a sequence of ordinals and p_{n_1,n_2,m_1,m_2} is assigned the truth value of $\alpha_{n_1,m_1} < \alpha_{n_2,m_2}$ then $\gamma = \mathrm{otp}\{\alpha_{n,m} : n, m < \omega\}$ iff ψ_ε is assigned the truth value true

$\boxtimes_4$ $\lim(T^*) = \cup\{\mathbf{B}_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\}$.

[Why? As $\mathrm{otp}(M_\eta \cap \lambda) < \|M_\eta\|^+ = \aleph_1$. Together $\boxtimes$ should be clear.]

Note that for every $\eta \in T^*$ of length $2n+2$ we have $\eta \trianglelefteq \nu \in T^* \Rightarrow \mathbf{I}_\nu$ is λ_n^+-complete. As we can shrink T further by [Sh:f, XI,3.5,pg.346] without loss of generality

$\circledast$ for every $n < \omega$ and $\eta \in T \cap {}^{2n+2}\lambda$ for some $\alpha = \alpha_\eta < \lambda_n$ we have: if $\eta \triangleleft \nu \in \lim(T)$ then $\alpha_\eta = \sup(\lambda_n \cap M_\nu)$.

[Why? As above applied to each $T' = \{\rho \in {}^{\omega>}\lambda : \eta\hat{\ }\rho \in T\}$.]

Let $\chi = (2^\lambda)^+$ and $N^*_\alpha \prec \mathfrak{B} = (\mathscr{H}(\chi), \in, <^*_\chi)$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ be increasing continuous, $\|N^*_\alpha\| = \mu, \alpha \subseteq N^*_\alpha, \langle N^*_\beta : \beta \leq \alpha\rangle \in N^*_{\alpha+1}$ and $(T, \mathbf{I}, \bar{M}, \bar{a}, \bar{f}, \bar{\lambda}, \mu) \in N^*_\alpha$, clearly possible and $E = \{\delta < \lambda : N^*_\delta \cap \lambda = \delta\}$ is a club of λ, hence we can find $\delta(*) \in S^* \cap E$, so $a_{\delta(*)}$ is well defined. Let $\bar{N}^* = \langle N^*_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\rangle$. Let $C_{\delta(*)}$ be the closure of $a_{\delta(*)}$ as a subset of $\delta(*)$ in the order topology and let $\langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1\rangle$ list $C_{\delta(*)}$ in increasing order, so is increasing continuous.

We define N_ε by induction on $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ by:

$(*)_0$ N_ε is the Skolem hull in $\mathfrak{B}$ of
$\{\alpha_\zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\} \cup \{\langle N_\xi : \xi < \zeta\rangle, \bar{N}^* \restriction \zeta : \zeta < \varepsilon\} \cup \{(T, \mathbf{I}, \bar{M}, \bar{a}, \bar{f}, \bar{\lambda}, \mu)\}$.

Let

$(*)_1$ $g_\varepsilon \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ be defined by $g_\varepsilon(n) = \sup(N_\varepsilon \cap \lambda_n)$.

Clearly

$(*)_2$ (a) $\langle N_\zeta : \zeta \le \varepsilon\rangle \in N^*_{\delta(*)}$ and even $\in N_\xi$ for every $\xi \in [\varepsilon+1, \omega_1)$
(b) $C_{\delta(*)} \cap (\alpha_\varepsilon + 1)$ and a_{α_ε} belongs to N_ξ for $\xi \in [\varepsilon+1, \omega_1)$.

[Why? For clause (a), $\langle N_\zeta : \zeta \le \varepsilon\rangle$ appear in the set whose Skolem Hull is N_ξ. For clause (b) because $\bar{a} \in N^*_{\delta(*)}$ and $\alpha \in a_{\delta(*)} \Rightarrow a_\alpha = a_{\delta(*)} \cap \alpha$ and $C_{\delta(*)} \cap (\alpha_\varepsilon + 1) =$ the closure of $a_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}} \cap (\alpha_\varepsilon + 1)$.]

Let $e = \{\varepsilon < \omega_1 : \varepsilon$ is a limit ordinal and $N_\varepsilon \cap \omega_1 = \varepsilon\}$. So

$(*)_3$ (a) e is a club of ω_1,
(b) if $\varepsilon \in e$ then $\sup(N_\varepsilon \cap \lambda) = \alpha_\varepsilon = N^*_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \cap \lambda, N_\varepsilon \subseteq N^*_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ and $\varepsilon < \zeta < \omega_1 \Rightarrow N_\varepsilon \in N_\zeta$

hence

$(*)_4$ if $\varepsilon + 2 < \zeta \in e$ then $g_\varepsilon, g_{\varepsilon+1} \in N_{\varepsilon+2} \prec N_\zeta$.

Now $\bar{f}$ is increasing and cofinal in $\prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ hence

$(*)_5$ if $\varepsilon < \zeta \in e$ then $g_\varepsilon <_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega} f_{\alpha_\zeta}$ and $f_{\alpha_\varepsilon} <_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega} g_\zeta$.

Also easily

$(*)_6$ if $\varepsilon < \zeta \in e$ then $g_\varepsilon < g_\zeta$.

For $n < \omega, \varepsilon < \omega_1$ let $N_{\varepsilon,n+1}$ be the Skolem hull inside $\mathfrak{B}$ of $N_\varepsilon \cup \lambda_n$ and let $N_{\varepsilon,0} = N_\varepsilon$. Easily

$(*)_7$ if $n \le m < \omega$ and $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ then $g_\varepsilon(m) = \sup(N_{\varepsilon,n} \cap \lambda_m)$.

Recall that ε^* is the order type of $M_\eta \cap \lambda$ for every $\eta \in \lim(T)$.
Choose $\varepsilon \in \operatorname{acc}(e)$ such that $\varepsilon > \varepsilon^*, \alpha_\varepsilon \in S_\zeta$ for some $\zeta \in [\varepsilon, \omega_1)$ (possible by subclaim 1.5 particularly clause $(*)_2(ii)$) and choose $\varepsilon_k \in e \cap \varepsilon$ for $k < \omega$ such that $\varepsilon_k < \varepsilon_{k+1} < \varepsilon = \cup\{\varepsilon_\ell : \ell < \omega\}$. We also choose n_k by induction on $k < \omega$ such that

$(*)_8$ (a) $n_\ell < n_k < \omega$ for $\ell < k$
(b) $g_{\varepsilon_{k+1}} \restriction [n_k, \omega) < f_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \restriction [n_k, \omega)$.

[Why is this choice possible? By $(*)_5$.]

Stipulate $n_{-1} = 0$.

Let $B_1 \in D_{1,\zeta}$ be such that $B_2 = \omega \backslash B_1 \in D_{2,\zeta}$, exists by clause $(*)_3(iv)$ of subclaim 1.5.

Now we choose η_n by induction on $n < \omega$ such that

$\boxdot$ (a) $\eta_n \in T$ and $\ell g(\eta_n) = n$

(b) $m < n \Rightarrow \eta_m \triangleleft \eta_n$

(c) if $n \in [n_{k-1}, n_k)$ then $\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1} \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$

(d) if $n \in [n_{k-1}, n_k)$ then $\eta_{2n+1}(2n) =$ Min$\{\alpha < \lambda : \eta_{2n}\hat{\ }\langle\alpha\rangle \in T$ and $\alpha \geq \alpha_{\varepsilon_{k-1}}$ if $k > 0\}$

(e) if $n \in [n_{k-1}, n_k)$ and $n \in B_1$ then $\eta_{2n+2}(2n+1) =$ Min$\{\alpha < \lambda_n$: $\eta_{2n+1}\hat{\ }\langle\alpha\rangle \in T\}$

(f) if $n \in [n_{k-1}, n_k)$ and $n \in B_2$ then $\eta_{2n+2}(2n+1) =$ Min$\{\alpha < \lambda_n$: $\eta_{2n+1}\hat{\ }\langle\alpha\rangle \in T$ and $\alpha > f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n)\}$.

No problem to carry the induction.

[Clearly if η_n is well defined then $\eta_{n+1}(n)$ is well defined (by clause (c) or (d) or (e) according to the case; hence $\eta_{n+1} \in T \cap {}^{n+1}\lambda$ is well defined by why clause (c) holds, i.e. assume $n \in [n_{k-1}, n_k)$, why $\eta_{2n}, \eta_{2n+1} \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$?

Case 1: If $n = 0$, then $\eta_{2n} = <> \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ trivially.

Case 2: η_{2n} is O.K. hence $\in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ and show $\eta_{2n+1} \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$.
[Why? Because $N_{\varepsilon_k,n} \prec \mathfrak{B}$, if $k = 0$ as $\eta_{2n+2}(2)$ is defined from η_{2n} and T both of which belongs to $N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$. If $k > 0$ we have to check that also $\alpha_{\varepsilon_{k-1}} \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ which holds by $(*)_0$.

Case 3: η_{2n+1} is O.K. so $\in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ and we have to show $\eta_{2n+2} \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n+1}$.
As $\eta_{2n+2}(n) < \lambda_n \subseteq N_{\varepsilon_k,n+1}$ this should be clear.]

Let $\eta = \cup\{\eta_n : n < \omega\}$. Clearly $\eta \in \lim(T)$ hence $u =: |M_\eta| \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ and $M_\eta \subseteq M^{**}$, hence it is enough to prove that $u \in \mathscr{A}$.

Now

$\circledast_1$ $\sup(u) \leq \alpha_\varepsilon$
[Why? As η_n belongs to the Skolem hull of $N_\varepsilon \cup \mu \subseteq N^*_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ hence $M_{\eta_n} \subseteq N_\varepsilon \subseteq N^*_{\alpha_\varepsilon}$ and $N^*_{\alpha_\varepsilon} \cap \lambda = \alpha_\varepsilon$ as $\alpha_\varepsilon \in E$.]

$\circledast_2$ $\sup(u) \geq \alpha_{\varepsilon_n}$, for every $n < \omega$
[by clause (d) of $\boxdot$]

$\circledast_3$ $\sup(u) = \alpha_\varepsilon$
[Why? By $\circledast_1 + \circledast_2$]

$\circledast_4$ $\alpha_\varepsilon \in S_\zeta$ and $\zeta \ge \varepsilon > \varepsilon^* = \text{otp}(u)$
[Why? By the choice of ε]

$\circledast_5$ if $n \ge n_0, n > 0$ and $n \in B_1$ then $u \cap \lambda_n \subseteq f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n)$
[Why? By the choice of $\eta_{2n+2}(2n+1)$, i.e., let k be such that $n \in [n_{k-1}, n_k)$, so $\eta_{2n+1} \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ by clause (c) and by clause (e) of $\boxdot$ we have $\eta_{2n+2}(2n+1) \in \lambda_n \cap N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ hence by $\otimes$ above, as $\eta \in \lim(T)$ we have $\alpha_{\eta \restriction (2n+2)} = \alpha_{\eta_{2n+2}} = \sup(u \cap \lambda_n)$ and as $\bar M \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ we have $\alpha_{\eta_{2n+2}} \in N_{\varepsilon_k,n}$ so $\sup(u \cap \lambda_n) = \alpha_{\eta_{2n+2}} < \sup(N_{\varepsilon_k,n} \cap \lambda_n)$ but the latter is equal to $\sup(N_{\varepsilon_k} \cap \lambda_n)$ by $(*)_7$ which is equal to $g_{\varepsilon_k}(n)$ which is $< f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n)$ by $(*)_8$, as required.]

$\circledast_6$ if $n \ge n_1$ and $n \in B_2$ then $u \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(n)$
[Why? By the choice of $\eta_{2n+2}(2n+1)$.]

So we are done. $\square_{1.9}$

This (i.e., 1.8 + 1.9) is enough for proving 1.1 in the case $\mu_* = \aleph_2$. In general we should replace 1.8 by the following claim.

1.10 Claim. *The family $\mathscr{A}$ does not reflect in any uncountable $A \in [\lambda]^{<\mu_*}$.*

Proof. Assume A is a counterexample.
Trivially

$\circledast_0$ A is M^*-closed.

For $a \in \mathscr{A}$ let $(\delta(a), \varepsilon(a))$ be such that $a \in \mathscr{A}^{\varepsilon(a)}_{\delta(a)}$ hence $\delta(a) = \sup(a)$, $\text{otp}(a) \le \varepsilon(a)$. Let $\mathscr{A}^- = \mathscr{A} \cap [A]^{\aleph_0}$ and let $\Gamma = \{\delta(a) : a \in \mathscr{A}^-\}$. Of course, $\Gamma \ne \emptyset$. Assume that $\delta_n \in \Gamma$ for $n < \omega$ so let $\delta_n = \delta(a_n)$ where $a_n \in \mathscr{A}$ so necessarily $\delta_n \in S_{\varepsilon(a_n)}$. As A is uncountable we can find a countable b such that $a_n \subseteq b \subseteq A$ and $\varepsilon(a_n) < \text{otp}(b)$ for every $n < \omega$ and as $\mathscr{A}^- \subseteq [A]^{\aleph_0}$ is stationary we can find c such that $b \subseteq c \in \mathscr{A}^-$; so $\varepsilon(c) \ge \text{otp}(c) \ge \text{otp}(b) > \varepsilon(a_n)$ & $\delta_n \in S_{\varepsilon(a_n)}$ & $\delta(a_n) = \delta_n \le \sup(a_n) \le \sup(c) = \delta(c)$ for each $n < \omega$. So if $\delta(a_n) = \delta_n = \delta(c), n < \omega$ necessarily $\varepsilon(a_n) = \varepsilon(c)$ contradiction so $\delta_n \ne \delta(c)$; hence $\delta(c) > \delta(a_n)$ and, of course, $\delta(c) \in \Gamma$ so $n < \omega \Rightarrow \delta_n < \delta(c) \in \Gamma$. As δ_n for $n < \omega$ were any members of Γ, clearly Γ has no last element, and let $\delta^* = \sup(\Gamma)$. Similarly $\text{cf}(\delta^*) = \aleph_0$ is impossible, so clearly $\text{cf}(\delta^*) > \aleph_0$ and let $\theta = \text{cf}(\delta^*)$ so $\theta \le |A| < \mu_*$ and θ is a regular uncountable cardinal.
As $a \in \mathscr{A}^\varepsilon_\delta \Rightarrow \sup(a) = \delta$ and $\mathscr{A}^- \subseteq [A]^{\aleph_0}$ is stationary clearly $A \subseteq \delta^* = \sup(A) = \sup(\Gamma)$. Let $\langle \delta_i : i < \theta \rangle$ be increasing continuous with limit δ^* and if $\delta_i \in S_\varepsilon$ then we let $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon$.

For $i < \theta$ let $\beta_i = \text{Min}(A \backslash \delta_i)$, so $\delta_i \le \beta_i < \delta^*, \beta_i \in A$ and $i < j < \theta \Rightarrow \beta_i \le \beta_j$. But $i < \theta \Rightarrow \beta_i < \delta^* \Rightarrow (\exists j)(i < j < \theta \wedge \beta_i < \delta_j)$ so for some club E_0 of θ we

have $i < j \in E_0 \Rightarrow \beta_i < \delta_j \le \beta_j$; as we can replace $\langle \delta_i : i < \theta\rangle$ by $\langle \delta_i : i \in E_0\rangle$ without loss of generality $\beta_i < \delta_{i+1}$ hence $\langle \beta_i : i < \theta\rangle$ is strictly increasing.
Let $A^- := \{\beta_i : i < \theta\}$ and let $H : [\theta]^{\aleph_0} \to \theta$ be $H(b) = \sup\{i : \beta_i \in b\}$ and let $J := \{R \subseteq \theta$: the family $\{b \in \mathscr{A}^- : H(b) \in R\} = \{b \in \mathscr{A}^- : \sup(\{i < \theta : \beta_i \in b\}) \in R\}$ is not a stationary subset of $[A^-]^{\aleph_0}\}$.
Clearly

- $\circledast_1$ J is an $\aleph_1$-complete ideal on θ extending the non-stationary ideal and $\theta \notin J$ by the definition of the ideal
- $\circledast_2$ if $B \in J^+$ (i.e., $B \in \mathscr{P}(\theta)\backslash J$) <u>then</u> $\{a \in \mathscr{A}^- : H(a) \in B\}$ is a stationary subset of $[\theta]^{\aleph_0}$.

By clause (D) of the assumption of 1.1, for some stationary $R_1 \in J^+$ and $n_i < \omega$ for $i \in R_1$ we have

- $\circledast_3$ if $i < j$ are from R_1 and $n \ge n_i, n_j$ (but $n < \omega$) then $f_{\beta_i}(n) < f_{\beta_j}(n)$.

Recall that

- $\circledast_4$ $i < j \in R_1 \Rightarrow \beta_i < \delta_j$.

Now if $i \in R_1$, let $j(i) = \text{Min}(R_1\backslash(i+1))$, so $f_{\delta_i} \le_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega} f_{\beta_i} <_{J^{\rm bd}_\omega} f_{\delta_{{\rm j}(i)}}$ hence for some $m_i < \omega$ we have $n \in [m_i, \omega) \Rightarrow f_{\delta_i}(n) \le f_{\beta_i}(n) < f_{\delta_{{\rm j}(i)}}(n)$. Clearly for some $n(*)$ satisfying $\lambda_{n(*)} > \theta$ and $R_2 \subseteq R_1$ from J^+ we have $i \in R_2 \Rightarrow n_i, m_i \le n(*)$, so

- $\circledast_5$ for $i < j$ in R_2 we have
  - (α) $f_{\delta_i} \restriction [n(*), \omega) \le f_{\beta_i}[n(*), \omega)$
  - (β) $f_{\beta_i} \restriction [n(*), \omega) < f_{\delta_j} \restriction [n(*), \omega)$.

Let $f^* \in \prod\limits_{n<\omega} \lambda_n$ be defined by $f^*(n) = \cup\{f_{\delta_i}(n) : i \in R_2\}$ if $n \ge n(*)$ and zero otherwise. Clearly $f^*(n) \le \sup(A \cap \lambda_n)$ for $n < \omega$.

Let $\mathscr{A}' = \{a \in \mathscr{A}^- : (\forall i < \theta)(i \in a \equiv \beta_i \in a \equiv \delta_i \in \beta_i) \sup\{i \in R_2 : \beta_i \in a\} = \sup\{i : \beta_i \in a\} = \sup(a \cap \theta) \in R_2$ and $\sup(A \cap \lambda_n) > f^*(n) \Rightarrow a \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f^*(n)\}$. As $R_2 \in J^+$ clearly $\mathscr{A}'$ is a stationary subset of $[A]^{\aleph_0}$.
Let $R_3 = \{i \in R_2 : i = \sup(i \cap R_2)\}$ so $R_3 \subseteq R_2, R_2\backslash R_3$ is a non-stationary subset of θ (hence belongs to J) and $a \in \mathscr{A}' \Rightarrow \sup(a) \in \{\delta_i : i \in R_3\}$.
Let

$$\mathscr{A}^* = \Big\{ a \in [A]^{\aleph_0} : \begin{array}{ll} (a) & \beta_{\min(R_2)} \in a \text{ and } a \text{ is } M^*\text{-closed} \\ (b) & \text{if } i \in R_2 \ \& \ j = \operatorname{Min}(R_2 \backslash (i+1)) \ \underline{\text{then}} \ [a \nsubseteq \delta_i \Rightarrow a \nsubseteq \delta_j] \text{ and} \\ & n \in [n(*), \omega) \ \& \ a \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f_{\delta_i}(n) \Rightarrow a \cap \lambda_n \backslash f_{\delta_j}(n) \neq \emptyset \\ (c) & \text{if } i < \theta \ \& \ n \in [n(*), \omega) \text{ then } (\exists \gamma)(\beta_i \leq \gamma \in a) \equiv \\ & (\exists j)(i < j < \theta \ \& \ \beta_j \in a) \equiv (\exists \gamma)(f_{\beta_i}(n) \leq \gamma \in a \cap f^*(n)) \text{ and} \\ (d) & \text{if } A \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f^*(n) \text{ then } a \cap \lambda_n \nsubseteq f^*(n) \\ & \text{but } (\forall \gamma \in a)(\gamma + 1 \in a) \\ & \text{hence sup } (a \cap \lambda_n) > f^*(n) \end{array} \Big\}.$$

Clearly $\mathscr{A}^*$ is a club of $[A]^{\aleph_0}$ (recall that A is M^*-closed). But if $a \in \mathscr{A}^* \cap \mathscr{A}'$, then for some limit ordinal $i \in R_3 \subseteq \theta$ we have $a \subseteq \sup(a) = \delta_i$ and $n \in [n(*), \omega) \Rightarrow \sup(a \cap f^*(n)) = \sup(a \cap \cup\{f_{\delta_j}(n) : j \in R_2\})$.
Let

$$B_1 = \{n : n(*) \leq n < \omega \text{ and } A \cap \lambda_n \subseteq f^*(n) = \sup(A \cap \lambda_n)\}.$$

$$B_2 = \{n : n(*) \leq n < \omega \text{ and } f^*(n) < \sup(A \cap \lambda_n)\}.$$

Clearly B_1, B_2 are disjoint with union $[n(*), \omega)$ recalling $\alpha \in A \Rightarrow \alpha + 1 \in A$ by $\circledast_0$.

By the definition of $\mathscr{A}'$, for every $a \in \mathscr{A}' \cap \mathscr{A}^*$, we have

$\circledast_6$ $n \in B_2 \Rightarrow \mathrm{Ch}_a(n) \geq f^*(n) > f_{\delta(a)}(n)$
$\circledast_7$ $n \in B_1 \Rightarrow \mathrm{Ch}_a(n) = \cup\{f_{\beta_\varepsilon}(n) : \varepsilon \in R_2 \cap \delta(a)\} \leq f_{\delta(a)}(n)$.

But this contradicts the observation below.

1.11 Observation. If $B \subseteq \omega$, <u>then</u> for some $\varepsilon < \omega_1$ we have:
if $a \in \mathscr{A}$ is M^*-closed and $\{n < \omega : \sup(a \cap \lambda_n) \leq f_{\sup(a)}(n)\} = B \bmod J^{\rm bd}_\omega$, <u>then</u> $\mathrm{otp}(a) < \varepsilon$.

Proof. Read the definition of $\mathscr{A}$ (and $\mathscr{A}^\varepsilon, \mathscr{A}^\varepsilon_\delta$) and subclaim 1.5 particularly $(*)_3$. $\square_{1.11}, \square_{1.10}, \square_{1.1}$

Remark. Clearly 1.11 shows that we have much freeness in the choice of $\mathscr{A}^\varepsilon_\delta$'s.

We can get somewhat more, as in [Sh:e]

1.12 Claim. *In Claim 1.1 we can add to the conclusion*

(∗) $\mathscr{A}$ *satisfies the diamond, i.e.* $\diamondsuit_{\mathscr{A}}$.

Proof. In 1.5 we can add

$(*)_5$ $\{2n+1 : n < \omega\} = \emptyset \bmod D_{\ell,\varepsilon}$ for $\ell < 2, \varepsilon < \omega_1$.

This is easy: replace $D_{\ell,\varepsilon}$ by $D'_{\ell,\varepsilon} = \{A \subseteq \omega : \{n : 2n \in A\} \in D_{\ell,\varepsilon}\}$. We can fix a countable vocabulary τ and for $\zeta < \omega_1$ choose a function F_ζ from $\mathscr{P}(\omega)$ onto $\{N : N \text{ is a } \tau\text{-model with universe } \zeta\}$ such that $F_\zeta(A) = F_\zeta(B)$ if $A = B$ mod finite.

<u>Case 1</u>: $\mu > 2^{\aleph_0}$.

Lastly, for $a \in \mathscr{A}$ let δ_a, ε_a be such that $a \in \mathscr{A}^{\varepsilon_a}_{\delta_a}$ and let $A_a = \{n : \sup(a \cap \lambda_{2n+1}) < f_{\delta_a}(2n)\}$, and let N_a be the τ-model with universe a such that the one-to-one order preserving function from ζ onto a is an isomorphism from $F_\zeta(N)$ onto N. Note that in the proof of "$\mathscr{A} \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ is stationary", i.e. of 1.9, given a τ-model M with universe λ without loss of generality $\lambda_0 > 2^{\aleph_0}$ and so can demand that the isomorphism type of M_η is the same for all $\eta \in \lim(T)$ and, of course, $M \in M_\eta$. Hence the isomorphic type of $M \restriction u_\eta$ is the same for all $\eta \in \lim(T)$ where u_η is the universe of M_η. Now in the choice for B_1 we can add the demand $F_{\varepsilon^*}(\{n : 2n+1 \in B_1\})$ is isomorphic to $M \restriction u_\eta$ for every $\eta \in \lim(T)$.
Now check.

<u>Case 2</u>: $\mu \le 2^{\aleph_0}$.

Similarly letting $\{2n+1 : n < \omega\}$ be the disjoint union of $\langle B^*_n : n < \omega\rangle$, each B_n infinite. We use $A_a \cap B^*_n$ to code model with universe $\subseteq \zeta$ for some $\zeta < \omega_1$, by a function $\mathbf{F}_n$. We then let N_a be the model with universe a sucht hat the order preserving function from a onto a countable ordinal ζ is an isomorphism from N_a onto $\cup\{\mathbf{F}_n(A_a \cap B^*_n) : n < \omega\}$ when the union is a τ-model with universe ζ.

Now we cannot demand them all $M_\eta, \eta \in \lim(T)$ has the same isomorphism type but only the same order type. The rest should be clear. $\square_{1.12}$

We can also generalize

1.13 Claim. *We can weaken the assumption of 1.1 as follows*

(a) $\lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda) > \mu$ *instead* $\lambda = \mu^+$ *(still necessarily* $\mu_* \le \mu$*)*

(b) *replace* J^{bd}_ω *by an ideal* J *on* ω *containing the finite subsets,* $\lambda_n = \text{cf}(\lambda_n) > \aleph_1, \mu = \lim_J \langle \lambda_n : n < \omega \rangle$ *but not necessarily* $n < \omega \Rightarrow \lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1}$ *and add* $\mathscr{P}(\omega)/J$ *is infinite (hence uncountable).*

Proof. In 1.5 in $(*)_3$ we choose $\langle A_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$, a sequence of subsets of ω such that $\langle A_\varepsilon / J : \varepsilon < \omega_1 \rangle$ are pairwise distinct. This implies some changes and waiving $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1}$ requires some changes in 1.9, in particular for each n using $\langle \mathbf{B}_\alpha : \alpha \in S^{\lambda_n}_{\aleph_0} \rangle$ with $\mathbf{B}_\delta = \{\eta \in \lim(T^*) : a \cap \lambda_n \subseteq \alpha\}$ and the partition theorem [Sh:f, XI,3.7,pg.549].

$\square_{1.13}$

REFERENCES.

[FoTo] Matthew Foreman and Stevo Todorčević. A new Löwenheim-Skolem theorem. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, **357**:1693–1715, 2005.

[RuSh 117] Matatyahu Rubin and Saharon Shelah. Combinatorial problems on trees: partitions, Δ-systems and large free subtrees. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, **33**:43–81, 1987.

[Sh:E3] S. Shelah. On some problems in general topology. In *Set Theory, Boise ID, 1992–1994*, volume 192 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 91–101.

[Sh:E12] Saharon Shelah. Analytical Guide and Corrections to [Sh:g].

[Sh:e] Saharon Shelah. *Non–structure theory*, accepted. Oxford University Press.

[Sh 420] Saharon Shelah. Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic. In *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, pages 355–383. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. N.W. Sauer et al (eds.).

[Sh 410] Saharon Shelah. More on Cardinal Arithmetic. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **32**:399–428, 1993.

[Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.

[Sh 430] Saharon Shelah. Further cardinal arithmetic. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **95**:61–114, 1996.

[Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.

[Sh 755] Saharon Shelah. Weak Diamond. *Mathematica Japonica*, **55**:531–538, 2002.

[Sh 775] Saharon Shelah. Middle Diamond. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **44**:527–560, 2005.

[Ve92a] Boban Veličković. Forcing axioms and stationary sets. *Advances in Mathematics*, **94**:256–284, 1992.