

ON LONG INCREASING  
CHAINS MODULO FLAT IDEALS  
SH908

SAHARON SHELAH

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem  
Einstein Institute of Mathematics  
Edmond J. Safra Campus, Givat Ram  
Jerusalem 91904, Israel

Department of Mathematics  
Hill Center-Busch Campus  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey  
110 Frelinghuysen Road  
Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019 USA

ABSTRACT. We prove that e.g. in  $(\omega_3)^{(\omega_3)}$  there is no sequence of length  $\omega_4$  increasing modulo the ideal of countable sets.

---

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.  
This comes from F816, which was first typed 2006/Nov/15  
First Typed - 07/Apr/12  
Latest Revision - 2009/Aug/23

Typeset by  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ - $\mathcal{T}\mathcal{E}\mathcal{X}$

## §0 INTRODUCTION

We hope sometime to prove: e.g.

*0.1 Conjecture.* For every  $\mu > \theta$  in  $(\theta^{+3})\mu$  there is no increasing sequence of length  $\mu^+$  modulo  $[\theta^{+3}]^{\leq \theta}$ .

Let  $\kappa = \text{cf}(\kappa) > \aleph_0$ . If  $\mu = \kappa$ , then  $\text{Length}({}^\kappa\mu, <_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}}) = \sup\{|\mathcal{F}| : \mathcal{F} \subseteq {}^\kappa\kappa \text{ linearly ordered by } <_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}}\}$  can be (forced to be) large. But for  $\mu > \text{Length}({}^\kappa\mu, <_{J_\kappa^{\text{bd}}})$  this implies pcf results (see [Sh 410], [Sh 589]).

However, e.g. for the ideal  $\mathcal{I} = [\omega_3]^{\leq \aleph_0}$  it is harder to get long increasing sequence, as above for “high  $\mu$ ”, this leads to pcf results so let  $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i < \omega_3 \rangle \in {}^{\omega_3}\text{Reg}$ ,  $(\pi\bar{\lambda}, <_{\mathcal{I}})$  has cofinality  $> \sup\{\lambda_i; i < \omega_3\}$  which are much stronger than known consistency results. Even for  $I = [\omega_1]^{\leq \aleph_0}$  we do not know, for  $I = [\beth_\omega]^{\leq \aleph_0}$  we know ([Sh 460]), so even  $[\aleph_\omega]^{\leq \aleph_0}$  would be interesting good news

The following may be a first step and anyhow stand by itself.

## §1 INCREASING SEQUENCES MODULO COUNTABLE

**1.1 Claim.** Assume  $\partial^+ < \kappa \leq \theta$  and  $\mathcal{I} = [\kappa]^{<\partial}$ , an ideal and  $\text{cf}([\theta]^\partial, \subseteq) \leq \theta$ . Then there is no  $\mathcal{I}$ -increasing sequence  $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \theta^+ \rangle$  of functions from  ${}^\kappa\theta$  (or even  ${}^\kappa\gamma(*)$  for some  $\gamma(*) < \theta^+$ ).

*Remark.* E.g.  $\partial = \aleph_1, \kappa = \theta = \aleph_3$  was discussed above.

*Proof.* It is enough to treat the version with  $\gamma(*)$ . So toward contradiction assume  $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \theta^+ \rangle$  is a counterexample.

Let  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [\gamma(*)]^\partial$  be cofinal of cardinality  $\leq \theta$  exists as  $|\gamma(*)| = \theta$  and  $\text{cf}([\theta]^\partial, \subseteq) \leq \theta$ . Now for every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\beta < \kappa$  let  $I_\beta = I(\beta) := [\beta, \beta + \partial)$  and we define

(\*)<sub>0</sub> for  $\zeta < \theta^+$  let  $f_\zeta^{s,\beta} \in {}^{I(\beta)}(\gamma(*) + 1)$  be defined as  $f_\zeta^s \upharpoonright I(\beta)$  where  $f_\zeta^s \in {}^\kappa(\gamma(*) + 1)$  is defined by  $f_\zeta^s(i) = \min(s \cup \{\gamma(*)\} \setminus f_\zeta(i))$ .

Now

(\*)<sub>1</sub> for  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  we have

- (a)  $\zeta < \theta^+ \Rightarrow f_\zeta^{s,\beta} \in {}^{I(\beta)}(s \cup \{\gamma(*)\})$
- (b)  $\zeta < \xi < \theta^+ \Rightarrow f_\zeta^{s,\beta} \leq f_\xi^{s,\beta} \text{ mod } \mathcal{I} \upharpoonright I_\beta$ .

For  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , let

(\*)<sub>2</sub>  $B_s = \{\beta < \kappa : \text{for every } \zeta < \theta^+ \text{ there is } \xi \in (\zeta, \theta^+) \text{ such that } \neg(f_\zeta^{s,\beta} = f_\xi^{s,\beta} \text{ mod } \mathcal{I} \upharpoonright I_\beta)\}$ .

For  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\beta < \kappa$  clearly we can choose  $C_\beta^s$  such that

- (\*)<sub>3</sub> (a)  $C_\beta^s$  is a club of  $\theta^+$
- (b) if  $\beta \in B_s$  and  $\xi \in C_\beta^s$  then  $\zeta < \xi \Rightarrow \neg(f_\zeta^{s,\beta} = f_\xi^{s,\beta} \text{ mod } \mathcal{I} \upharpoonright I_\beta)$
- (c) if  $\beta \in \kappa \setminus B_s$  then  $\theta^+ > \xi \geq \zeta \geq \text{Min}(C_\beta^s) \Rightarrow (f_\zeta^{s,\beta} = f_\xi^{s,\beta} \text{ mod } \mathcal{I} \upharpoonright I_\beta)$ .

So

(\*)<sub>4</sub>  $C := \bigcap \{C_\beta^s : s \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \beta < \kappa\}$  is a club of  $\theta^+$  as  $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \theta, \kappa \leq \theta$ .

Now choose

$$(*)_5 \quad \alpha_\varepsilon \in C \text{ for } \varepsilon < \partial^+ \text{ increasing with } \varepsilon$$

hence

$$(*)_6 \quad u_{\varepsilon, \zeta} := \{i < \kappa : f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i) \geq f_{\alpha_\zeta}(i)\} \in \mathcal{I} \text{ for } \varepsilon < \zeta < \partial^+.$$

As we are assuming  $\partial^+ < \kappa$  we can find  $\beta(*)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} (*)_7 \quad (a) \quad & \beta(*) < \kappa \\ (b) \quad & I_{\beta(*)} = [\beta(*), \beta(*) + \partial] \text{ is disjoint to } \cup\{u_{\varepsilon, \zeta} : \varepsilon < \zeta < \partial^+\} \text{ hence} \\ (c) \quad & \text{the sequence } \langle f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i) : \varepsilon < \partial^+ \rangle \text{ is increasing for each } i \in I_{\beta(*)}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $|I_{\beta(*)}| = \partial$  and  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq [\gamma(*)]^{\leq \partial}$  is cofinal (for the partial order  $\subseteq$ ), we can find  $s$  such that

$$(*)_8 \quad s \in \mathcal{I} \text{ and } s \supseteq \{f_{\alpha_0}(i), f_{\alpha_1}(i) : i \in I_{\beta(*)}\}$$

hence by  $(*)_6 + (*)_7 + (*)_8$  we have

$$(*)_9 \quad f_{\alpha_0}^s(i) = f_{\alpha_0}(i) < f_{\alpha_1}(i) = f_{\alpha_1}^s(i) \text{ for every } i \in I_{\beta(*)}.$$

As  $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1$  are from  $C$  and  $I_{\beta(*)} \in \mathcal{I}^+$ , recalling  $(*)_2 + (*)_3 + (*)_4$ , clearly

$$(*)_{10} \quad \beta(*) \in B_s,$$

recalling that  $\alpha_\varepsilon \in C \subseteq C_{\beta(*)}^s$  for  $\varepsilon < \partial^+$  and  $\alpha_\varepsilon$  is increasing with  $\varepsilon$ , clearly (by  $(*)_{10}$ )

$$(*)_{11} \quad \text{for every } \varepsilon < \partial^+ \text{ there is } i_\varepsilon \in I_{\beta(*)} \text{ such that}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha) \quad & f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}^s(i_\varepsilon) < f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}}^s(i_\varepsilon) \\ & \text{hence there is } j_\varepsilon \in s \text{ such that} \\ (\beta) \quad & f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}^s(i_\varepsilon) \leq j_\varepsilon < f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}}^s(i_\varepsilon) \text{ hence} \\ (\gamma) \quad & f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i_\varepsilon) \leq j_\varepsilon < f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon+1}}(i_\varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

But  $|I_{\beta(*)}| + |s| = \partial < \partial^+$  hence for some pair  $(j_*, i_*) \in s \times I_{\beta(*)}$  we have

$$(*)_{12} \quad \partial^+ = \sup(\mathcal{U}) \text{ where } \mathcal{U} := \{\varepsilon < \theta^+ : j_\varepsilon = j_* \text{ and } i_\varepsilon = i_*\}.$$

Hence we can find  $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_2$  from  $\mathcal{U}$ , but  $\langle f_{\alpha_\varepsilon}(i_*) : \varepsilon < \theta^+ \rangle$  is increasing by  $(*)_7(c)$ , i.e. the choice of  $\beta(*)$ , so  $f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_1}}(i_*) < f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_1+1}}(i_*) \leq f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_2}}(i_*) < f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_2+1}}(i_*)$  but by  $(*)_{11}(\gamma) + (*)_{12}$  the ordinal  $j_*$  belongs to  $[f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_1}}(i_*), f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_1+1}}(i_*)]$  and to  $[f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_2}}(i_*), f_{\alpha_{\varepsilon_2+1}}(i_*)]$ , which are disjoint intervals, contradiction.  $\square_{1.1}$

Similarly

**1.2 Claim.** *There is no  $< \mathcal{I}$ -increasing sequence of functions from  $\kappa$  to  $\gamma(*)$  of length  $\lambda$  when*

- ⊗ (a)  $\mathcal{I}$  is an ideal on  $\kappa$
- (b)  $I_\beta \in [\kappa]^\partial$  for  $\beta < \kappa$
- (c)  $I_\beta \notin \mathcal{I}$  for  $\beta < \kappa$
- (d)  $\text{cf}([\theta]^\partial, \subseteq) < \lambda$  where  $\theta = |\gamma(*)| + \kappa$
- (e) if  $u_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{I}$  for  $\varepsilon < \partial^+$  then  $I_\beta$  is disjoint to  $\bigcup_{\varepsilon < \partial^+} u_\varepsilon$  for some  $\beta < \kappa$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality  $\lambda$  is the successor of  $\text{cf}([\theta]^\partial, \subseteq)$  hence is regular. The proof is similar to the proof of 1.1. □<sub>1.2</sub>

We may wonder could we have used same one “+”, i.e.

**1.3 Question:** Is it consistent that  ${}^\theta\theta$  contains  $< \mathcal{I}$ -increasing sequence of length  $\theta^+$  when  $\theta = \kappa^+$ ,  $I = [\theta]^{<\kappa}$ ?

REFERENCES.

- [Sh 410] Saharon Shelah. More on Cardinal Arithmetic. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, **32**:399–428, 1993.
- [Sh 589] Saharon Shelah. Applications of PCF theory. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **65**:1624–1674, 2000.
- [Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **116**:285–321, 2000.