

SUCCESSORS OF SINGULARS, COFINALITIES OF REDUCED PRODUCTS OF CARDINALS AND PRODUCTIVITY OF CHAIN CONDITIONS

BY

SAHARON SHELAH[†]

*Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel;
Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA;
and Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, USA*

ABSTRACT

We continue here our investigation of cofinalities of reduced products of regular cardinals and give some applications, such as the non-productiveness of λ^+ -c.c. when $\lambda > 2^{\text{cf}\lambda}$.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§0.	Introduction	213
	Conventions and notations	215
§1.	Cofinalities	215
§2.	Good stationary sets and existence of lub's	224
§3.	More on cofinalities	226
§4.	Representation by nice products	229
§5.	Applications	235
§6.	Additional information	239
§7.	On $\lambda \rightarrow [\mu^+]_{\delta}^2$	243
§8.	$\aleph_{\omega}^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{(2^{\aleph_0})^+}$ revisited	247
	References	255

§1. Introduction

A Boolean algebra B satisfies the λ -chain condition (λ -c.c.) if any family of pairwise disjoint nonzero members of B has cardinality $< \lambda$. For a topological space X , by $c(X)$ we denote the cellularity of X which is the supremum of

[†] Research partially supported by the United States–Israel Binational Science Foundation.
Received June 7, 1987 and in revised form December 31, 1987

cardinalities of families of pairwise disjoint nonempty open sets in X . Clearly $c(X) \leq \lambda$ iff the regular open algebra of X satisfies λ^+ -c.c. The problem whether the λ -c.c. is a productive property (of Boolean algebras or, equivalently, of topological spaces) has a very long history which we do not repeat here (see, for example, [T1], [T2]; Juhasz [J] and Monk [M] stress this problem in preliminary versions of their surveys). First ZFC examples of regular cardinals λ for which λ -c.c. is not productive were given by Todorcevic [T1]. The cardinals of [T1] are of the form of 2^κ where $\text{ded}(\kappa, 2^\kappa)$ holds (e.g., $\kappa = \aleph_0$), so all of them might be weakly inaccessible. Hence [T1] didn't solve the topological question: Is always $c(X \times Y) \leq c(X) \cdot c(Y)$? Note that this question is trivially equivalent to the question: Is λ^+ -c.c. productive for all λ ? In [T2], Todorcevic answered this question (in ZFC) by providing a class of cardinals λ for which λ^+ -c.c. is not productive: the λ such that $(\forall \mu < \lambda)(\mu^{\text{cf}\lambda} < \lambda)$. Todorcevic [T2] uses (e.g., when $\lambda = (2^{\aleph_0})^{+\omega}$) [Sh 1] about cofinalities of reduced products of regular cardinals. He also got negative partition relations, e.g., $\lambda^+ \not\rightarrow [\lambda^+]_{\text{cf}\lambda}^2$ when $(\forall \mu < \lambda)[\mu^{\text{cf}\lambda} < \lambda]$, and got $\lambda - S$ and $\lambda - L$ spaces. He told me that a proof of the consistency of " λ^+ -c.c. is productive" will be the real generalization of MA (unlike some soft ones; see e.g. [Sh 2]). By [Sh 7], this fails for $\lambda \geq 2^{\aleph_0}$ regular (even $\text{Pr}_0(\lambda^+, \aleph_0, \aleph_0)$ fails, see Definition 31 and for some consequences 36, 37). This makes it more desirable to get parallel results not just for some successor of singular, but for quite many.

In [Sh 1], [Sh 3], [Sh 4], [Sh 5, Ch. XIII, §5, §6] and [M Sh] the cofinalities of reduced products of regular cardinals (usually $\leq \kappa$ cardinals $> 2^\kappa$) were investigated for various purposes. We continue this here (but start from the beginning, for the reader's convenience, giving the statements but usually not the proof of the repeated parts, but in a way that the reader may reconstruct them).

The main new conclusions are (the hypothesis can be weakened, and apply to some weakly inaccessible):

A. THEOREM. *If $\lambda = \mu^+$, $\mu > 2^\kappa$, $\kappa = \text{cf}\mu$, or $\lambda = \text{cf}(\prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / \mathcal{D})$ where $2^\kappa > \lambda$, $\lambda_i < \lambda$, \mathcal{D} a filter on κ , then:*

(A) *for some regular cardinals σ and λ_i from $((2^\kappa)^+, \lambda)$ for $i < \sigma$, $\sigma \leq \kappa$ ($i < j \Rightarrow \lambda_i < \lambda_j$) and letting $\mathcal{D}_\sigma^{\text{cobjd}} = \{a \subseteq \sigma : \sigma - a \text{ bounded}\}$, $\prod_{i < \sigma} \lambda_i / \mathcal{D}_\sigma^{\text{cobjd}}$ has true cofinality λ , i.e., there are $f_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \sigma} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ [$\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha / \mathcal{D} < f_\beta / \mathcal{D}$] and*

$$\left(\forall f \in \prod_{i < \sigma} \lambda_i \right) (\exists \alpha < \lambda^+) [f / \mathcal{D}^{\text{cobjd}} < f_\alpha / \mathcal{D}^{\text{cobjd}}];$$

(B) *there are regular cardinals $\lambda_i \in (2^\kappa, \lambda)$ for $i < \delta$, $\delta < \kappa^+$ [$i < j \Rightarrow \lambda_i < \lambda_j$] and a $|\delta|$ -complete filter \mathcal{D} on δ , and $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta \rangle$ witnessing $\prod_{i < \delta} \lambda_i / \mathcal{D}$ has true cofinality λ , which form a kind of a strong Kurepa tree: i.e., for each i , $\{f_\alpha \upharpoonright i : \alpha < \lambda\}$ has cardinality $< \lambda_i$.*

We then define some strong negative partition relations, observe their interrelations and consequences, and draw some of them from the work on the cofinalities (mainly Theorem I). Part (B) of Theorem I is motivated by its being used by Todorcevic [T2]. In that case it follows by cardinal arithmetic. Lastly we deal with powers of singulars, giving some information of $(\lambda, 2^\lambda)$. We may represent the proof of $\aleph_\delta^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_{(|\delta|^{\text{cf } \delta})^+}$ in a simpler way than in [Sh 5], at least in most cases.⁽¹⁾

Conventions and notations

$\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \zeta, \xi, i, j, \delta$ are ordinals, δ should be limit;

$\lambda, \kappa, \mu, \chi, \theta, \sigma$ are cardinals, usually infinite;

for a set a , $\Pi a = \{f : \text{dom } f = a, f(\theta) \in \theta \text{ for } \theta \in a\}$; $\mathcal{P}(a) = \{b : b \subseteq a\}$;

for a sequence $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i \in u \rangle$, $\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i = \Pi \bar{\lambda} = \{f : \text{dom } f = u, f(i) \in \lambda_i\}$;

for a filter \mathcal{D} on u , $\mathcal{D} + A = \{X \subseteq u : X \cup (u - A) \in \mathcal{D}\}$;

for an ideal I on u , $I + A = \{X \subseteq u : X - A \in I\}$.

Many times we do not distinguish between a filter and the ideal dual to it.

\mathcal{D}_λ is the filter of closed unbounded subsets of λ , for λ regular uncountable.

$\mathcal{D}_\lambda^{\text{cobd}}$ is the filter $\{A : A \subseteq \lambda, |\lambda - A| < \lambda\}$, $J_a^{\text{bd}} = \{b \subseteq a : |b| < |a|\}$. If (P, \cong) is a partial (quasi)order, $p < q$ means $p \cong q \wedge \neg q \cong p$.

§1. Cofinalities

1. DEFINITION. For a partial order P , $p \in P$ is a lub (a least upper bound) of $A \subseteq P$ if it is an upper bound ($(\forall x \in A)(x \cong p)$) and $p \cong q$ for any upper bound q of A .

We say $p \in P$ is a weak lub of A if it is an upper bound and no $q < p$ is an upper bound.

1A. FACT. (1) If a lub exists, it is unique up to equivalence.

⁽¹⁾ For further advances, see [Sh 11] on λ^+ -c.c is not productive, e.g. for λ regular $> \aleph_1$; and [Sh 12] for more information on cofinalities of products of regular cardinals.

(2) If $A, B \subseteq P$, $\forall p \in A \exists q \in B (p \leq q)$, $\forall q \in B \exists p \in A (q \leq p)$, then A, B has the same lub (if any).

1B. NOTATION. (1) $R^{\kappa,0} = \{\lambda : \lambda \text{ a regular cardinal}\}$,
 $R^{\kappa,1} = \{\lambda \in R^{\kappa,0} : \lambda > \kappa\}$,
 $R^{\kappa,2} = \{\lambda \in R^{\kappa,0} : \lambda > 2^\kappa\}$,
 $I^{\kappa,l} = \{a \subseteq R^{\kappa,l} : |a| \leq \kappa\}$,
 $\mathcal{J}^{\kappa,l} = \{\bar{\lambda} : \bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i \in u \rangle \text{ a sequence of cardinals from } R^{\kappa,l}, |u| \leq \kappa\}$.

(2) If we omit l it means $l = 2$; we usually omit κ as it is fixed.

2. DEFINITION. For a partial order P (which is $(|P|, <)$ or $(|P|, \leq)$):

- (a) $\text{cf}(P) = \text{Min}\{|A| : A \subseteq P, (\forall p \in P)(\exists q \in A)p \leq q\}$ (it is always well defined). Such A is called a cover.
 (b) λ is a possible scale of P if there are $p_i \in P$ for $i < \lambda$ such that $[i < j < \lambda \Rightarrow p_i < p_j]$, $(\forall p \in P)\forall_i p_i \not\leq p$ and λ is a regular cardinal.
 (c) $\text{psc}(P) = \{\lambda : \lambda \text{ is a possible scale of } P\}$.
 (d) λ is the true cofinality of P , $\lambda = \text{tcf}(P)$ if it is a regular cardinal and there are $p_i \in P$ for $i < \lambda$, $[i < j < \lambda \Rightarrow p_i < p_j]$ and $(\forall q \in P)\forall_i q \leq p_i$. [Note that $\text{tcf}(P)$, if it exists, is unique and then $\text{cf}(P) = \text{tcf}(P)$, $\text{psc}(P) = \{\text{tcf}(P)\}$.] Also $\text{tcf}(P) = 1$ if there is $p \in P$ such that $(\forall q \in P) q \leq p$.⁽²⁾

3. DEFINITION. (1) For $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i \in u \rangle$ a sequence of cardinals, and \mathcal{D} a filter on u , then for $f, g \in \prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i$, $f \leq g \text{ mod } \mathcal{D}$, or $f \leq_{\mathcal{D}} g$ iff $\{i \in u : f(i) \leq g(i)\} \in \mathcal{D}$ [it is a partial order].

(2) If $\mathcal{D} = \{u\}$, we omit it.

(3) If \mathcal{D} is a filter on some u' , $u \subseteq u'$, this will mean

$$\{i \in u : f(i) \leq g(i)\} \cup (u' - u) \in \mathcal{D}.$$

(4) We sometimes replace \mathcal{D} by the dual ideal.

(5) We can replace \leq by any other relation (in particular $<$).

4. FACT. (1) If $\text{cf } \alpha_i = \text{cf } \beta_i$ for $i \in u$, \mathcal{D} a filter on u , then:

- (a) $\text{cf}(\prod \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \text{cf}(\prod \beta_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$;
 (b) $\text{tcf}(\prod \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \lambda \Leftrightarrow \text{tcf}(\prod \beta_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \lambda$;
 (c) $\text{psc}(\prod \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \text{psc}(\prod \beta_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$;

⁽²⁾ Remember, if we are using $P = (P, \leq)$ then $p < q$ means $p \leq q$ or $p = q$.

(d) if in addition $u(*) = \{i \in u : \alpha_i \text{ is limit}\} \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } \mathcal{D}$, then for $X \in \{\text{cf}, \text{tcf}\}$

$$X\left(\prod_{i \in u} \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}\right) = X\left(\prod_{i \in u} \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D} + u(*)}\right);^{(3)}$$

(e) if $\{i \in u : \alpha_i \text{ is limit}\} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witnesses $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i \in u} \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ then for some club C of λ

$$\alpha \in C \wedge \beta \in C \wedge \alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{\mathcal{D}} f_\beta$$

(so wlog $C = \lambda$).

(2) If \mathcal{D} is an ultrafilter over u then $(\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ has a true cofinality (in fact every P such that $(\forall x, y \in P)(x \leq y \vee y \leq x)$).

(3) Suppose for a filter \mathcal{D} on u ,

$$\text{tcf}\left(\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}\right) = \lambda, \quad \bigwedge_{i \in u} |u| < \lambda_i \text{ cf } \lambda_i \neq \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad |u| < \lambda,$$

then

(a) for each cardinal μ ,

$$\{i : \lambda_i = \mu\} = \emptyset \text{ mod } \mathcal{D}, \text{ and } \lambda \cong \text{Min}\{\kappa : \{i : \lambda_i < \kappa\} \in \mathcal{D}\}$$

and

(b) for each filter \mathcal{D}_1 extending \mathcal{D} , $\text{tcf}(\prod \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}_1}) = \lambda$ (here the assumptions on u , λ_i are not necessary, except " λ_i a limit ordinal").

Also

(c) defining $[iEj \Leftrightarrow i \in u \wedge \lambda_i = \lambda_j]$ (an equivalence relation) $u/E = \{i/E : i \in u\}$, $\mathcal{D}/E = \{A \subseteq u/E : \bigcup\{i/E : i/E \in A\} \text{ belong to } \mathcal{D}\}$, $\lambda_{i/E} = \lambda_i$, we have

$$\text{tcf}\left(\prod_{\zeta \in u/E} \lambda_\zeta, <_{\mathcal{D}/E}\right) = \lambda.$$

(4) In (3)(c), if \mathcal{D} is σ -complete then \mathcal{D}/E is σ -complete; if

$$\mathcal{D} = \{v : v \subseteq u, |u - v| < \kappa\}$$

⁽³⁾ Also $\text{psc}(\prod_{i \in u} \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \text{psc}(\prod_{i \in u} \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D} + u(*)}) - \{1\}$ and $\{1\} \in \text{psc}(\prod_{i \in u} \alpha_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$ iff $u - u(*) \neq \emptyset \text{ mod } \mathcal{D} + u(*)$.

where $\kappa \leq |u|$ or $u = \theta \in R^{\kappa,0}$, \mathcal{D} normal,⁽⁴⁾ then for some $s \subseteq u$, $s \neq \emptyset \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$, and E is equality on s .

(5) If \mathcal{D} is a filter on u ,

$$\text{tcf}\left(\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}\right) = \lambda, \quad \wedge_{i \in u} \lambda_i < \lambda \quad \text{and} \quad 2^{|u|} < \lambda$$

then $\{i \in u : \lambda_i \leq |u|\} = \emptyset \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$ so the conclusion of (3) holds.

(6) In (5), if $\lambda > \mu^{|u|}$ (e.g. $\mu = 2^{|u|}$) then $\{i \in u : \lambda_i \leq \mu\} = \emptyset \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$, so $\text{tcf}(\prod\{\lambda_i : \lambda_i > \mu\}, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \lambda$.

(7) If $f_{\alpha} \in \prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha < \delta$, \mathcal{D} a filter on u , $u^* \in \mathcal{D}$, $\text{cf } \delta > |u|$ (or alternatively, \mathcal{D} is $(\text{cf } \delta)^+$ -complete) and $[\alpha < \beta < \delta \wedge i \in u^* \Rightarrow f_{\alpha}(i) \leq f_{\beta}(i)]$, then $\{f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \delta\}$ has a $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$ -lub f , where

$$f(i) = \begin{cases} \bigcup_{\alpha < \delta} f_{\alpha}(i), & i \in u^*, \\ 0, & i \notin u^*. \end{cases}$$

(8) If λ is regular $> 2^{|u|}$, \mathcal{D} a filter on u , $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$ -increasing, then for some $v \subseteq u$:

- (i) if $v \neq \emptyset \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$ then $\langle f_{\alpha}/(\mathcal{D} + v) : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is eventually constant,
- (ii) if $u - v \neq \emptyset \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$ then for some club $C \subseteq \lambda$, $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha \in C \rangle$ is $<_{\mathcal{D}}$ -increasing.

(9) If \mathcal{D} is a filter on u , λ regular, $f_{\alpha} \in \prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, $[\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_{\alpha} \leq_{\mathcal{D}} f_{\beta}]$ and in $\mathcal{P}(u)/\mathcal{D}$ there is no strictly increasing sequence of elements of length λ , then the conclusion of (8) above holds [use the assumption twice].

(10) Suppose λ is regular $> |u|$, \mathcal{D} a filter on u , $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$ -increasing and $\langle f_{\alpha}/\mathcal{D} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is not eventually constant. Let

$$E = \{v \subseteq u : \langle f_{\alpha}/(\mathcal{D} + (u - v)) : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \text{ is eventually constant}\}.$$

Then

- (i) $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is \leq_E -increasing;
- (ii) if $v \neq \emptyset \pmod{E}$ then $\langle f_{\alpha}/(\mathcal{D} + v) : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is not eventually constant;
- (iii) if \mathcal{D} is σ -complete then E is σ -complete (and always E is a proper filter).

5. FACT. (1) Suppose \mathcal{D} is a filter on u , $f_{\alpha} \in \prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, $f_{\alpha} \leq f_{\beta} \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$ for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$, and λ is regular $> 2^{|u|}$. Then there is $f \in \prod_{i \in u} (\lambda_i + 1)$ such that

- (a) f is a $\leq_{\mathcal{D}}$ -least upper bound of $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$:

$$f_\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{D}} f \quad \text{for } \alpha < \lambda,$$

$$(\forall f') \left[\bigwedge_{\alpha < \lambda} f_\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{D}} f' \Rightarrow f \leq_{\mathcal{D}} f' \right];$$

(b) w.l.o.g. $(\forall i) f(i) \neq 0$ (provided that $\{i : f(i) = 0\} = \emptyset \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$) and for every $f' <_{\mathcal{D}} f$, for some α , $f' <_{\mathcal{D}} f_\alpha$ (if $\{i : f(i) \text{ limit}\} \in \mathcal{D}$).

(2) If λ is regular $> 2^{|\mathfrak{u}|}$, \mathcal{D} a filter on u , $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha \leq \lambda \rangle$ is $<_{\mathcal{D}}$ -increasing, then for some $f \leq f_\lambda$, $\text{tcf}(\prod_{i \in u} f(i), <_{\mathcal{D}}) = \lambda$.

PROOF. See [Sh 4] 2.3.

6. DEFINITION. (1) For any $a \in I^{\kappa,l}$

(a) $\text{pcf}(a) = \{\text{cf}(\prod a, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) : \mathcal{D} \text{ an ultrafilter over } a\}$.

(b) For a property Γ of filters,

$$\text{pcf}_{\Gamma}(a) = \{\text{tcf}(\prod a, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) : \mathcal{D} \text{ a filter over } a, \vDash \Gamma(\mathcal{D})\}.$$

(c) For $\Gamma =$ being σ -complete, we write σ ; for $\Gamma =$ "extending \mathcal{D} " we write \mathcal{D} .

(2) Similarly for $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{I}^{\kappa,l}$.

6A. REMARK. (1) As the number of ultrafilters over a is $2^{2^{|\mathfrak{u}|}}$, we know that $|\text{pcf}(a)| \leq 2^{2^{|\mathfrak{u}|}}$; however (see 16(3)) $|\text{pcf}(a)| \leq 2^{\kappa}$.

(2) For $l = 2$ the difference between dealing with $I^{\kappa,l}$, and $\mathcal{I}^{\kappa,l}$ is slight by 4(2)–4(6). For $l = 0, 1$ $I^{\kappa,l}$ is more interesting.

6B. PROBLEM. Can $|\text{pcf}(a)| > |a|$ for $a \in I^{\kappa,2}$?

7. FACT. $\text{pcf}_{\kappa_0}(a) = \text{pcf}(a)$ (for any $a \in I^{\kappa,l}$).

8. DEFINITION. For a regular λ (we may omit l if $l = 2$):

(1) $I^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda} = \{a \in I^{\kappa,l} : \text{cf}(\prod a, \leq) < \lambda\}$.

(2) $J^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda} = J^{\kappa,a,l}_{<\lambda} = \{b \subseteq a : b \in I^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda}\}$ for $a \in I^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda}$.

(3) $\mathcal{I}^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda} = \{\bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{I}^{\kappa,l} : \text{cf}(\prod \bar{\lambda}, \leq) < \lambda\}$.

(4) $\mathcal{J}^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda} = \mathcal{J}^{\kappa,\bar{\lambda},l}_{<\lambda} = \{u : u \subseteq \text{dom}(\bar{\lambda}), \bar{\lambda} \upharpoonright u \in \mathcal{I}^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda}\}$ for $\bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{I}^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda}$ [so $u \in \mathcal{J}^{\kappa,l}_{<\lambda}$ iff $u \subseteq \text{dom}(\bar{\lambda})$ and $\text{cf}(\bar{\lambda} \upharpoonright u, \leq) < \lambda$].

9. LEMMA. (1) Suppose $\lambda \in \text{psc}(\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_I)$, I an ideal on u , and: $\lambda > 2^{|\mathfrak{u}|}$ or at least in $\mathcal{P}(u)/I$ there is no strictly increasing sequence of elements of length λ .

Then there is an ideal I_1 on u such that:

(i) $I \subseteq I_1$,

(ii) $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_{I_1})$.

(2) If I is σ -complete then there is a σ -complete ideal I_1 satisfying (i) + (ii) above.

(3) Similarly for normal filters.

(4) If $f_\alpha \in \Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, $[\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_I f_\beta]$ where I is an \aleph_1 -complete ideal on u , then for some $g \in \Pi_{i \in u} (\lambda_i + 1)$ and $f'_\alpha = f_\alpha \bmod I$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, $f'_\alpha \in \Pi_{i \in u} g(i)$ and $\langle f'_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is a witness for $\lambda \in \text{psc}(\Pi_{i \in u} g(i), <_I)$.

(5) If $\langle \lambda_i : i < \delta \rangle$ is increasing, $\lambda_i \in R^{\kappa, 0}$, $\delta < \lambda_0$ [or at least $\delta < \Sigma_{i < \delta} \lambda_i$], I an ideal on δ , δ is a limit ordinal, I includes all bounded subsets of δ , then in $\Pi_{i < \delta} \lambda_i$ there are f_α for $\alpha < (\Sigma_{i < \delta} \lambda_i)^+$ as in (4).

(6) If $\lambda \in \text{psc}(\langle \lambda_i : i \in u \rangle, <_I)$, $\lambda > 2^{|u|}$ then there is a minimal I_1 , satisfying (i), (ii) from (1); i.e. every I'_1 satisfying (i), (ii) from (1) extends I_1 . Similarly for (2), (3).

PROOF. (1) Let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witness $\lambda \in \text{psc}(\Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_I)$. Define

$$I_1 = \{A \subseteq u : \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \text{ does not witness } \lambda \in \text{psc}(\Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_{I+(u-A)})\}.$$

By 4(8) there are $v \leq u$, C as there, so $v \in I_1$; and for notational simplicity let $C = \lambda$. So for $A \in I_1$, there is $g_A \in \Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ such that $f_\alpha <_{I+(u-A)} g_A$ for $\alpha < \lambda$. Clearly $u \notin I_1$ (by the choice of $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$). Note that $I \subseteq I_1$ as $A \in I \Rightarrow u \in I + (u - A)$, hence $f_\alpha <_{I+(u-A)} f_0$ for every $\alpha < \lambda$ so $g_A \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f_0$ is o.k.

Now I_1 is downward closed: if $A \in I_1$, $B \subseteq A$ then g_A witnesses that $B \in I_1$.

Next I_1 is closed under union: if $A, B \in I_1$, then g defined by $g(i) = \text{Max}\{g_A(i), g_B(i)\}$ witness $A \cup B \in I_1$.

Lastly $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i, I_1)$ because $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witness it; let us check the conditions of 2(d).

$f_\alpha \in \Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ trivially; $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{I_1} f_\beta$ as $I \subseteq I_1$, $v \in I_1$, $C = \lambda$; lastly if $f \in \Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i$, let $u_\alpha = \{i \in u : f(i) \geq f_\alpha(i)\}$, then for some u^* , $\{\alpha < \lambda : u_\alpha = u^*\}$ is an unbounded subset of λ [or at least $\{\alpha < \lambda : u_\alpha = u^* \bmod I\}$ is an unbounded subset of λ], hence f can serve as g_{u^*} hence $u^* \in I_1$ and we finish easily.

(2), (3) Left to the reader.

(4) Choose by induction on n , $g_n \in \Pi_{i \in u} (\lambda_i + 1)$ such that $f_\alpha < g_n \bmod I$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, and $g_{n+1} < g_n \bmod I$.

Let g_0 be: $g_0(i) = \lambda_i$. As I is \aleph_1 -complete, for some $n < \omega$, we have chosen g_n but cannot choose g_{n+1} . As $f_0 <_{I_1} g_n$, w.l.o.g. $(\forall i) g_n(i) > 0$. Let $f'_\alpha(i)$ be $f_\alpha(i)$ if $f_\alpha(i) < g_n(i)$ and be zero otherwise. Check.

(5) Left to the reader.

(6) We can choose for every $w \subseteq u$, I_1^w , $\langle f_\alpha^w : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ as in the proof of (1) such that $w \notin I_1^w$, if possible. Easily $\{w \subseteq a : I_1^w \text{ is not defined}\}$ is as required.

10. CONCLUSION. (1) If

$$\lambda \in \text{psc} \left(\prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i, \leq_I \right), \quad \lambda_i < \lambda, \quad |u| < \lambda$$

(λ regular, I an ideal on u) and $\lambda > 2^{|u|}$ or at least in $\mathcal{P}(u)/I$ there is no strictly increasing sequence of length λ , then for some u_1 , $|u_1| \leq u$, regular cardinals μ_i ($i \in u_1$), $\mu_i \leq \lambda_i$ and ideal I_1 on u_1 ,

$$\lambda = \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i \in u_1} \mu_i, \leq_{I_1} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad [i \neq j \Rightarrow \mu_i \neq \mu_j].$$

(2) If $\lambda > 2^{|u|}$, we can have $\mu_i \in R^{|u|, 2}$ (for $i \in u_1$).

(3) If I is σ -complete, we can have " I_1 σ -complete" and if I is normal ($u = \theta \in R^{\kappa, 1}$) we can have " I_1 is normal ideal on θ ".

(4) Suppose $f_\alpha \in \prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, I is an ideal on u and $[\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_I f_\beta]$, $\lambda > 2^{|u|}$, $\lambda > \lambda_i$ for $i \in u$, λ regular. Then we can find a set v , a function h from some u_1 , $u - u_1 \in I$, onto v , an ideal J on v and regular cardinals μ_i for $i \in v$ s.t.:

- (i) $J = \{h''(A) : A \in I\}$,
- (ii) $\lambda = \text{trf}(\prod_{i \in v} \mu_i, \leq_J)$,
- (iii) $\mu_{h(i)} \leq \lambda_i$ for $i \in u$,
- (iv) if $i \in v, j \in v, i \neq j$ then $\mu_i \neq \mu_j$,
- (v) $2^{|u|} < \mu_j$ for $j \in v$.

(5) If in (1) I is selective [i.e., for every equivalence relation E on u , for some i if $E \neq \emptyset \pmod I$ or for some $v \neq \emptyset \pmod I$, $|v \cap i/E| \leq 1$ for $i \in u$ ($v \subseteq u$)], then we can have (i) $v \subseteq u$, $J = \{w \cap v : w \in I\}$, $h \upharpoonright v = \text{id}_v$ [note: if $\kappa \leq |u|$, then $\{v \subseteq u : |v| < |u|\}$ is selective, and if $u = \theta = \text{cf } \theta > \aleph_0$ then \mathcal{D}_θ is selective].

(6) Suppose $f_\alpha \in \prod_{i \in u} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, J, I ideals on u , $J \subseteq I$, I is an \aleph_1 -complete ideal on u , $[\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha \leq_J f_\beta]$, λ is regular, $\bigwedge_{i \in u} \lambda_i < \lambda$, $|u| < \lambda$ and $\langle f_\alpha / I : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is not eventually constant and in $\mathcal{P}(u)/J$ there is no strictly increasing sequence of length λ (which remains so mod I) and I is \aleph_1 -complete, then

- (i) for some $v \subseteq u$, and pairwise distinct or equal regular cardinals μ_i ($i \in v$), $\mu_i \leq \lambda_i$, and some filter $I(*)$ on v , $\text{tcf}(\prod_{i \in v} \mu_i \leq_{I(*)}) = \lambda$, $I(*)$ \aleph_1 -complete (and is σ -complete, normal, if J is),
- (ii) $\text{tcf}(\prod \mu_i, \leq_{I(*)}) = \lambda$ is witness by $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ s.t. $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha \leq f_\beta \pmod J$.

PROOF. (1) by 5(2) and 9(1); and for " $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ " use 4(3). (We use 4(1) without saying.)

(2) Use 4(6).

(3) Use 9(2), 9(3), too.

(4) By 5(2), 4(3).

(5) Easy.

(6) By 4(9), $wlog[\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_I f_\beta]$ and then use 9(4) to have some $g, \wedge_{i \in u} g(i) \leq \lambda_i$, and $\lambda \in psc(\Pi_{i \in u} g(i), \leq_I)$, then use 9(1) + 9(2) and lastly 4(3). (There is no problem to preserve normality too.) (When $J \neq I$, we have to look again at the proof of 9(1).)

10A. COROLLARY. (1) Suppose $\lambda > cf \lambda > \aleph_0$, I is a normal ideal on $cf \lambda$ such that (*) for no $\langle u_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle : u_\alpha \subseteq cf \lambda, [\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow |u_\beta - u_\alpha| < cf \lambda], [\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow u_\alpha \not\subseteq u_\beta \text{ mod } I]$. Then

(i) for some normal ideal J on $cf \lambda$, $I \subseteq J$, and some regular $\lambda_i < \lambda$ for $i < cf \lambda$, $\langle \lambda_i : i < cf \lambda \rangle$ constant or strictly increasing, $\lambda^+ = tcf(\Pi_{i < cf \lambda} \lambda_i, \leq_J)$,

(ii) $\lambda^+ = tcf(\Pi_{i < cf \lambda} \lambda_i, \leq_J)$ is witnessed by some $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ s.t. for $\alpha < \beta$, $f_\alpha \leq f_\beta \text{ mod } \mathcal{D}_{cf \lambda}^{cobd}$,

(iii) the λ_i 's are all equal or $\langle \lambda_i : i < cf \lambda \rangle$ is strictly increasing.

(2) We can replace "normal" by " σ -complete" if: $cf \lambda \geq \sigma > \aleph_0$ and in (iii) we assume $I = \{v \subseteq cf \lambda : |v| < cf \lambda\}$.

PROOF. (1) Let $\langle \lambda_i : i < cf \lambda \rangle$ be strictly increasing $< \lambda$ s.t. $\lambda = \Sigma_{i < cf \lambda} \lambda_i$. By 9(5) we can find $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ s.t. $f_\alpha \in \Pi_{i < cf \lambda} \lambda_i^+$ and $[\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha < f_\beta \text{ mod } \mathcal{D}_{cf \lambda}^{cobd}]$. By 10(6) we can finish (with μ_i there as our desired λ_i 's).

(2) Similarly,

11. COROLLARY. If $2^{cf \lambda} < \lambda$ then for some constant or strictly increasing sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < cf \lambda \rangle$ of regular cardinals $< \lambda$ $tcf(\Pi \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}_{cf \lambda}^{cobd}}) = \lambda^+$ (witnessed by a $\leq_{\mathcal{D}_{cf \lambda}^{cobd}}$ -increasing sequence).

PROOF. Choose $\lambda_i, \lambda = \Sigma\{\lambda_i : i < cf \lambda\}$, $\langle \lambda_i : i < cf \lambda \rangle$ as in 9(5) and then use 9(5), 10(4).

12. LEMMA. If $\sigma = cf \mu > \aleph_0$, $(\forall \theta < \mu)[\theta^{< \sigma} \leq \mu]$, $\mu < \lambda \leq \mu^\sigma$, λ regular, then for some normal filter \mathcal{D} on σ and $\theta_i < \mu$ (for $i < \sigma$), $tcf(\Pi_{i < \sigma}, \mathcal{D}) = \lambda$.

PROOF. By [Sh 4] §7.

13. LEMMA. (1) In 9(4) if $(u = \theta$ a regular cardinal) E, \mathcal{D} are nice

(normal) filters on λ , θ resp. (see [Sh 4, 7.10]), then for some nice \mathcal{D}_1 extending \mathcal{D} ,

$$\text{tcf}\left(\prod_{i < \theta} \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}_1}\right) = \lambda.$$

(2) If λ is singular, on λ^+ , cf λ there are nice filters E , \mathcal{D} then for some nice filter \mathcal{D}_1 , extending \mathcal{D} and $\lambda_i < \lambda$ (for $i < \text{cf } \lambda$)

$$\text{tcf}\left(\prod_{i < \text{cf } \lambda} \lambda_i / \mathcal{D}\right) = \lambda^+.$$

PROOF. (1) Let g_n be as in the proof of 9(4) and let for $\alpha < \lambda$

$$A_\alpha = \{i \leq \theta : f_\alpha(i) < g_n(i)\}.$$

Clearly: $A_\alpha \neq \emptyset \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$,

$$\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow A_\beta \subseteq A_\alpha \pmod{\mathcal{D}}.$$

W.l.o.g. $(\forall i)g_n(i) > 0$.

Let $\mathcal{D} = \{A \subseteq \theta : \text{for every } \alpha, A \cup (\theta - A_\alpha) \in \mathcal{D}^+\}$. Clearly

$$\text{tcf}\left(\prod_{i < \theta} \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}\right) = \lambda.$$

Why is \mathcal{D} nice? By observation 13A below.

(2) By 13(1) and 9(5).

13A. OBSERVATION. If $\lambda > \theta > \aleph_0$ are regular, E a nice filter on λ , and for $\alpha < \lambda$ \mathcal{D}_α is a nice filter on θ , then:

(i) $\mathcal{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{A \subseteq \theta : \{\alpha < \lambda : A \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha\} \in E\}$ is nice,

(ii) if $f \in {}^\theta \text{Ord}$, $h \in {}^\lambda \text{Ord}$, $\text{rk}(f, \mathcal{D}_\alpha) \leq h(\alpha)$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, then $\text{rk}(f, \mathcal{D}) \leq \text{rk}(h, E)$.

PROOF. See [Sh 4] Def. 5.1, 3.1

13B. REMARK. (1) Note that: if

$$(\exists \kappa)(\exists \mu)[\mu > 2^{2^{\aleph_1}} \wedge \mu^\kappa > (\mu + \kappa)^+], \quad \text{cf } \lambda > \aleph_0$$

then there is a nice filter \mathcal{D} on $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ (see [Sh 4] 4.14, 4.15) and also on $I = \{a \subseteq \lambda : |a| < \theta\}$ if $\theta = \text{cf } \theta > \aleph_0$, $\lambda^\theta = \lambda$.

(2) In fact, in (1) the club filter is nice (on λ and on $\{a \subseteq \lambda : |a| < \theta\}$).

(3) If $\lambda^\theta = \lambda$, $\aleph_0 < \sigma = \text{cf } \sigma \leq \theta$, and the club filter on $\{a \subseteq \lambda : |a| < \theta\}$ is nice, then every normal fine filter on $\{a \subseteq \theta : |a| < \sigma\}$ is nice.

§2. Good stationary sets and existence of lub's

14. LEMMA. (1) If λ is singular, $S \subseteq \lambda^+$ is a stationary subset of λ^+ which is good (see below) and $\delta \in S \Rightarrow \text{cf}(\delta) > \kappa \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{cf} \lambda$, then for some $\lambda_i < \lambda$ (for $i < \kappa$), and a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{D} on κ , $\Pi_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / \mathcal{D}$ has cofinality λ^+ .

(2) Suppose λ_i is regular $< \lambda$ for $i < \kappa$, λ is regular, \mathcal{D} a filter on κ , $\kappa < \lambda$, $f_\alpha \in \Pi_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$, $[\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha <_{\mathcal{D}} f_\beta]$. Then one of the following occurs:

- (a) $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ has a w $<_{\mathcal{D}}$ -lub f_λ (hence for some filter \mathcal{D}_1 extending \mathcal{D} $[f <_{\mathcal{D}} f_\lambda \Rightarrow (\exists \alpha < \lambda) f <_{\mathcal{D}_1} f_\alpha]$).
- (b) In $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) / \mathcal{D}$ there is a strictly increasing sequence $\langle a_\alpha / \mathcal{D} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ of length λ (in particular, \mathcal{D} is not an ultrafilter).
- (c) There is a club $B \subseteq \lambda$ and functions $g_\alpha \in \Pi_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$ for $\alpha \in B$ such that
 - (a) $f_\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{D}} g_\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{D}} f_\beta$ for $\alpha < \beta$ in B (so you can get $f_\alpha <_{\mathcal{D}} g_\alpha <_{\mathcal{D}} f_\beta$),
 - (b) $\bigcup_{\alpha \in \beta} \text{rang } g_\alpha$ has cardinality $\leq \kappa$.

(3) If there is a good stationary set

$$S \subseteq \{\delta < \lambda : \kappa < \text{cf } \delta < \text{Min}\{\lambda_i : i < \kappa\}\},$$

$\lambda, \lambda_i, \kappa, f_\alpha$ ($i < \kappa, \alpha < \lambda$) as in (2), $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ witnesses "S is good" and $[\alpha \in A_\beta \Rightarrow \bigwedge_i f_\alpha(i) < f_\beta(i)]$, then in (2) above (c) and (b) do not occur.

(4) In (3) (using of) we can conclude $\lambda \rightarrow \{\lambda_i : i < \kappa\}$ ([Sh 1]), so, e.g., if $\lambda = \aleph_{\omega+1}$ there is on λ a Jonsson algebra.

(5) In (1), if $\kappa < \lambda$, $\{\delta \in S : \text{cf}(\delta) \geq \kappa\}$ is stationary, then

$$(\exists i < \text{cf } \lambda) \forall j [i < j < \text{cf}(\lambda) \Rightarrow \lambda_i > \kappa].$$

REMARK. On good sets see [Sh 8] and Appendix of [Sh 9]; they are defined in 15 below.

15. DEFINITION. For a regular λ , $S \subseteq \lambda$ is good if there is a sequence $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$, $A_\alpha \subseteq \alpha$ and for some closed unbounded $C \subseteq \lambda$ for every $\delta \in C \cap S$ there is an unbounded $A \subseteq \delta$ of order type $\text{cf } \delta$ such that $(\forall \alpha < \delta) [A \cap \alpha \in \{A_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}]$.

PROOF. (1) Let $\langle A_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be as in Definition 15. W.l.o.g. for each limit α $\{A_\alpha \cap \gamma : \gamma \in A_\alpha\} \subseteq \{A_\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$. Note that w.l.o.g. $|A_\alpha| < \lambda$ for every α . Let $\langle \lambda_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of cardinals $< \lambda$ with $\lambda = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i$. We can define, by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$, a function f_α such that

- (i) $f_\alpha \in \Pi_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i^+$;
- (ii) for $\beta < \alpha$, for every large enough $i < \kappa$, $f_\beta(i) < f_\alpha(i)$;
- (iii) if $\beta \in A_\alpha$, $i < \kappa$, $|A_\alpha| \leq \lambda_i$ then $f_\beta(i) < f_\alpha(i)$.

Now $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda^+ \rangle$ has a lub f_{λ^+} [as otherwise use part 3 of 14, i.e., for (c) find a closed unbounded $C \subseteq \lambda^+$ and $\langle g_\alpha : \alpha \in C \rangle$, $g_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} A_i$, $|A_i| \leq \kappa$, $f_\alpha <_{\mathcal{Q}} g_\alpha <_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\beta$ for $\alpha < \beta$ from C ; choose $\delta \in S$ a limit point of C , and get easy contradiction by (iii) above]. By 4(1),(3), 9(1) we get the conclusion.

(2) We define, by induction on $\zeta < \kappa^+$, a function $g_\zeta \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (\lambda_i + 1)$ such that $[\xi < \zeta \Rightarrow g_\xi \leq_{\mathcal{Q}} g_\zeta]$, $[\zeta = \xi + 1 \Rightarrow g_\xi \neq_{\mathcal{Q}} g_\zeta]$ and $[\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow f_\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{Q}} g_\zeta]$. We let g_0 be defined by $g_0(i) = \lambda_i$. If $\langle g_\xi : \xi \leq \zeta \rangle$ are defined, and there is $g, g \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (\lambda_i + 1)$, $f_\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{Q}} g$ for $\alpha < \lambda$, $g \neq_{\mathcal{Q}} g_\zeta$ and $g \leq_{\mathcal{Q}} g_\zeta$, then choose such a function g as $g_{\zeta+1}$; if we cannot, we have gotten " $\langle f_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ has a $w <_{\mathcal{Q}}$ -lub", hence (a) holds. If ζ is limit ordinal, $\zeta \leq \kappa^+$, let $A_\zeta^i = \{g_\xi(i) : \xi < \zeta\} \cup \{\lambda_i\}$, so A_ζ^i is a set of $\leq |\zeta| + 1$ ordinals. For $\alpha < \lambda$, let $f_\alpha^\zeta \in \prod_{i < \kappa} (\lambda_i + 1)$ be defined by

$$f_\alpha^\zeta(i) = \text{Min}\{\gamma \in A_\zeta^i : f_\alpha(i) \leq \gamma\}$$

(well defined as $f_\alpha(i) < \lambda_i \in A_\zeta^i$). Clearly $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow f_\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\alpha^\zeta$ and also $[\alpha < \beta < \lambda \Rightarrow f_\alpha^\zeta \leq_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\beta^\zeta]$.

Case I: $\zeta < \kappa^+$ and $(\forall \alpha < \lambda)(\exists \beta < \lambda)[\alpha < \beta \wedge f_\alpha^\zeta <_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\beta^\zeta]$
then conclusion (c) holds.⁽⁵⁾

Case II: $\zeta < \kappa^+$ and for some $\alpha = \alpha_\zeta^0$,

$$(\forall \beta < \lambda)[f_\alpha^\zeta \not<_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\beta^\zeta] \text{ but } (\forall \alpha < \lambda)(\exists \beta < \lambda)[\alpha < \beta \wedge f_\beta^\zeta \not<_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\alpha^\zeta].$$

Then some closed unbounded subsequence of $\langle a_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ exemplifies (b) where

$$a_\beta = \{i : f_\beta^\zeta(\lambda_i) > f_{\alpha_\zeta^0}^\zeta(\lambda_i)\}.$$

Case III: $\zeta < \kappa^+$ and both previous cases fail, then for some $\alpha = \alpha_\zeta$
 $(\forall \beta < \lambda)[\alpha \leq \beta \Rightarrow f_\alpha^\zeta =_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\beta^\zeta]$.

We let g_ζ be $f_{\alpha_\zeta}^\zeta$.

Case IV: Suppose $\zeta = \kappa^+$ [so $\langle g_\xi : \xi < \kappa^+ \rangle$ are defined and for $\alpha < \lambda$ and limit $\zeta < \kappa^+$, α_ζ and f_α^ζ are defined].

Note that $\alpha^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup \{\alpha_\xi : \xi < \kappa^+\}$ is $< \lambda$.

Note that for each $\alpha < \lambda$, $i < \kappa$, $f_\alpha^\zeta(i) \in A_i^\zeta = \bigcup_{\xi < \kappa^+} A_i^\xi$, so for some $\xi = \xi(\alpha, i) < \kappa^+$, $f_\alpha^\zeta(i) \in A_i^{\xi(\alpha, i)}$. Let $\zeta(\alpha) = \sup_{i < \kappa} \xi(\alpha, i)$, it is $< \kappa^+$, and as $\langle A_i^\xi : \xi < \kappa^+ \rangle$ is increasing, $f_\alpha^\zeta(i) \in A_i^{\zeta(\alpha)}$. Clearly then, e.g., $f_\alpha^{\zeta(\alpha)+\omega} = f_\alpha^{\zeta(\alpha)+\omega+\omega}$

⁽⁵⁾ Note that $f_\alpha^\zeta <_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\beta^\zeta$ implies $f_\alpha^\zeta <_{\mathcal{Q}} f_\beta$.

hence using $\alpha \geq \alpha^*$, $g_{\xi(\alpha)+\omega} = \mathcal{D} g_{\xi(\alpha)+\omega+\omega}$ hence $g_{\xi(\alpha)+\omega+1} \leq \mathcal{D} g_{\xi(\alpha)+\omega}$, contradiction to the choice of $g_{\xi(\alpha)+\omega+1}$.

(3), (4), (5) Left to the reader.

§3. More on cofinalities

16. LEMMA. Let $a \in I^{\kappa,2}$, $\lambda \in R^{\kappa,2}$.

(1) For some set $b \subseteq a$, $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a} = (J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}) + b$ [we choose such a set b and call it $b_{\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$, and w.l.o.g. if $a \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ then $b = a$ and if $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a} = J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ then $b_{\lambda}^{\kappa,a} = \emptyset$].

(2) $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ is the ideal (of subsets of a) generated by $\{b_{\mu}^{\kappa,a} : \mu \in R^{\kappa,2}, \mu < \lambda\}$.

(3) $\text{pcf}(a)$ has cardinality $\leq 2^{\kappa}$ and has a maximal element, which is equal to $\text{cf}(\Pi a, \leq)$.

(4) For $b = b_{\lambda}^{\kappa,a} \neq \emptyset$ there are functions $f_{\lambda,\alpha}^{\kappa,a}$ ($\alpha < \lambda$) which witness “ $\text{tcf}(\Pi b, \leq_{J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}}) = \lambda$ ” (though the choice of $f_{\lambda,\alpha}^{\kappa,a}$ is not unique, we choose such functions). W.l.o.g. if $\langle f_{\lambda,\alpha}^{\kappa,a} \upharpoonright b_{\lambda}^{\kappa,a} : \alpha < \delta < \lambda \rangle$ has a least upper bound mod $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$, then $(f_{\lambda,\delta}^{\kappa,a} \upharpoonright b_{\lambda}^{\kappa,a})/J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ is such a least upper bound.

(5) For every $f \in \Pi a$ there are $n > 0$, $\lambda_0 > \lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_n$ from $\text{pcf}(a)$, $\alpha_0 < \lambda_0$, $\alpha_1 < \lambda_1, \dots, \alpha_n < \lambda_n$, and $b_l \subseteq a$ for $l \leq n$ such that $\langle b_l : l \leq n \rangle$ is a partition of a , and

$$b_0 \equiv b_{\lambda_0}^{\kappa,a} \text{ mod } J_{<\lambda_0}^{\kappa,a}, \quad b_l \equiv b_{\lambda_l}^{\kappa,a} \text{ mod } J_{<\lambda_l}^{\kappa,a}, \quad f \upharpoonright b_l \leq f_{\lambda_l,\alpha_l}^{\kappa,a} \upharpoonright b_l$$

(note: $a - b_0 \in J_{<\lambda_0}^{\kappa,a}$, $a - b_0 \cup \dots \cup b_l \in J_{<\lambda_l}^{\kappa,a}$, $a - b_0 \cup \dots \cup b_n = \emptyset$).

(6) Let \mathcal{D} be an ultrafilter on a : $\text{cf}(\Pi a, <_{\mathcal{D}}) = \lambda$ iff $\lambda \in R^{\kappa,2}$ and $b_{\lambda}^{\kappa,a} \in \mathcal{D}$, $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a} \cap \mathcal{D} = \emptyset$.

PROOF. By [Sh 5] Ch. XIII, §5, §6.

17. CLAIM. (1) $a \subseteq \text{pcf}(a)$, [$a \subseteq b \Rightarrow \text{pcf}(a) \subseteq \text{pcf}(b)$];

(2) $\mu \in \text{pcf}(a) \Rightarrow \mu \in \text{pcf}(a \cap \mu^+)$;

(3) for $\mu > 2^{|\alpha|}$, $\mu \in \text{pcf}(\text{pcf}(a)) \Leftrightarrow \mu \in \text{pcf}(a)$;

(4) $\text{pcf}(a - \{\theta\}) \supseteq \text{pcf}(a) - \{\theta\}$;

(5) if $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(a)$, $\lambda > 2^{\kappa}$, $a \in I^{\kappa,2}$ then $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(a - (2^{\kappa})^+)$ (we can use any $\mu = \mu^{\kappa}$ instead of 2^{κ}) and $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(b_{\lambda}^{\kappa,a})$;

(6) if $\theta \in \text{pcf}(a)$, $a \in I^{\kappa,2}$ and $(\forall \alpha < \theta)[|\alpha| < \sigma < \theta]$ then $J_{<\theta}^{\kappa,b}$ is σ -complete for $b = b_{\theta}^{\kappa,a}$.

PROOF. (1) Easy (see Definition 6(1)).

(2) If \mathcal{D} is an ultrafilter on a , and $\{\theta \in a : \theta > \mu\} \in \mathcal{D}$, then easily $\text{tcf}(\Pi a, <_{\mathcal{D}}) > \mu$. Now as $\mu \in \text{pcf}(a)$, for some ultrafilter \mathcal{D} on a , $\text{tcf}(\Pi a, <_{\mathcal{D}}) = \mu$ hence $(a - \mu^+) \notin \mathcal{D}$ hence $a \cap \mu^+ \in \mathcal{D}$, hence $\mathcal{D}_1 =$

$\mathcal{D} \uparrow (a \cap \mu^+)$ is an ultrafilter on $a \cap \mu^+$ and $\text{cf}(\Pi(a \cap \mu^+), <_{\mathcal{D}_i}) = \mu$, so $\mu \in \text{pcf}(a \cap \mu^+)$.

(3) By 17(1), $\mu \in \text{pcf}(a) \Rightarrow \mu \in \text{pcf}(\text{pcf}(a))$. So assume $\mu \in \text{pcf}(\text{pcf}(a))$. Let $\text{pcf}(a) = \{\mu_i : i < i(\ast)\}$, so $i(\ast) < (2^{|a|})^+$, for each i there is an ultrafilter \mathcal{D}_i on a such that $\mu_i = \text{tcf}(\Pi a, <_{\mathcal{D}_i})$. So $\mu = \text{tcf}(\Pi \mu_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}})$, \mathcal{D} an ultrafilter on $i(\ast)$. By the theorem of ultraproducts of ultraproducts

$$\mu = \text{tcf}(\Pi\{\theta_j : \langle j, i \rangle \in j(\ast) \times i(\ast)\}, \leq_{\mathcal{D}^\ast})$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}^\ast = \{A \subseteq j(\ast) \times i(\ast) : \{j < j(\ast) : \{i : i < i(\ast) \text{ and } \langle j, i \rangle \in A\} \in \mathcal{D}_j\} \in \mathcal{D}\}.$$

By 4(3)(c) we finish.

(4), (5) Left to the reader.

(6) Suppose $b_i \in J_{< \theta}^{\kappa, b}$ for $i < i(\ast)$, $i(\ast) < \sigma$, $\bigcup_i b_i \notin J_{< \theta}^{\kappa, b}$; w.l.o.g. $b = \bigcup_i b_i$ and the b_i 's are pairwise disjoint. Let $F_i \subseteq \Pi(b_i)$ be a cover of cardinality $< \lambda$ (exists as we know $\text{cf}(\Pi b_i) < \theta$ as $b_i \in J_{< \theta}^{\kappa, b}$ by 16(3)). Now

$$F = \left\{ \bigcup_{i < i(\ast)} f_i : f_i \in F_i \text{ for } i < i(\ast) \right\}$$

has cardinality $\leq \prod_{i < i(\ast)} |F_i| < \theta$ by our assumptions and F is a cover of Πb , contradiction.

17A. LEMMA. Suppose $\sigma = \text{cf } \mu > \aleph_0$, $(\forall \theta < \mu) [\theta^\sigma \leq \mu]$, $\mu < \lambda = \text{cf } \lambda \leq \mu^\sigma$, $2^\sigma < \mu$.

(1) If $\lambda = \text{cf } \lambda < \mu^{+\ast}$ then we can have $\langle \theta_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ strictly increasing and

$$\theta_i < \mu, \quad \text{tcf}(\Pi \theta_i, <_{J_{\mu^\ast}}) = \lambda.$$

(2) If $[a \in R^{\sigma^2}, a \subseteq \mu \Rightarrow |\text{pcf}(a)| \leq \sigma]$ then the conclusion of (2) holds.

(3) We can allow $\sigma = \text{cf } \mu = \aleph_0$ if we add $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(a)$, $a \in \mu$, $a \in R^{\sigma^2}$.

PROOF. (1) By the proof of (2).

(2) As in 12(1), we can find $\langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$, \mathcal{D} s.t.: $\langle \lambda_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ is strictly increasing, \mathcal{D} a normal filter on σ , $\lambda_i < \mu$ and $\text{tcf}(\Pi_{i < \sigma} \lambda_i, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \lambda$. Let $a = \{\lambda_i : i < \sigma\}$, clearly $J_{\mu^\ast}^{a, \sigma} = J_{\mu^\ast}^{\text{bd}}$, let $\text{pcf}(a) - \mu = \{\mu_\alpha : \alpha \leq \alpha(\ast)\}$ (μ_α increasing), so for some γ , $\lambda = \mu_\gamma$, and necessarily $\bigwedge_{\alpha < \gamma} (a - b_{\mu^\ast}^{\kappa, \alpha}) \in \mathcal{D}$. As $\gamma < \sigma^+$ (by an assumption) and \mathcal{D} is normal, there is $a^\ast \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $a^\ast \subseteq b_{\mu^\ast}^{\kappa, \gamma}$ and $[\alpha < \gamma \Rightarrow |a^\ast \cap b_{\mu^\ast}^{\kappa, \alpha}| < \sigma]$.

17B. LEMMA. If $\lambda < \mu$ belongs to $\text{pcf}(a)$, $2^\kappa < \lambda$, $a \in R^{\kappa,2}$ and $\text{pcf}(a) \cap [\lambda, \mu) = \text{pcf}(\text{pcf}(a) \cap [\lambda, \mu))$ then for some b

$$J_{<\mu}^{a,\kappa} = (J_{<\mu}^{a,\kappa}) + b.$$

PROOF. Easy.

REMARK. Below, ac stands for “accessible”, ia stands for “inaccessible”.

18. DEFINITION. (1) $R_{ac,\sigma}^{\kappa,2} = \{\theta \in R^{\kappa,2} : \text{for some } a \in I^{\kappa,2}, \theta \in \text{pcf}_\sigma(a) \text{ and } \theta > \sup(a)\}$.

(2) $R_{ia,\sigma}^{\kappa,2} = R^{\kappa,2} - R_{ac,\sigma}^{\kappa,2}$.

(3) If $\sigma = \aleph_0$ we omit it.

(4) Instead of σ we can use Γ (see 6(1)(b)).

19. DEFINITION. (1) $R_{ac,\Gamma}^{\kappa,l} = \{\theta \in R^{\kappa,l} : \text{for some } \bar{\lambda} \in \mathcal{I}^{\kappa,l}, \theta \in \text{pcf}_\Gamma(a) \text{ and } (\forall i \in \text{dom } \bar{\lambda}) \lambda_i < \theta\}$

(2) $R_{ia,\Gamma}^{\kappa,l} = R^{\kappa,l} - R_{ac,\Gamma}^{\kappa,l}$.

(3) If Γ is being σ -complete we write σ .

(4) If $\sigma = \aleph_0$ we omit it.

20. REMARK. A disturbing point of $R^{\kappa,1}$ is that 17(5) is not known.

21. FACT. Definitions 18 and 19 are compatible.

22. LEMMA. If $\theta \in R_{ac}^{\kappa,2}$ then for some $a \in I^{\kappa,2} : \theta \in \text{pcf}(a)$ and $a \subseteq R_{ia}^{\kappa,2}$.

PROOF. We define by induction on $n < \omega$ the following T_n , and a_η, \mathcal{D}_η (for $\eta \in T_n$) such that:

- (i) $T_0 = \{\langle \theta \rangle\}$.
- (ii) T_n is a set of decreasing sequences of cardinals from $R^{\kappa,2}$, each sequence has length $n + 1$ and $|T_n| \leq \kappa$.
- (iii) $\eta \in T_{n+1}$ implies $\eta \upharpoonright (n + 1) \in T_n$.
- (iv) For $\eta \in T_n$, $a_\eta = \{\mu : \eta \wedge \langle \mu \rangle \text{ belongs to } T_{n+1}\}$.
- (v) If $\eta \in T_n$, $a_\eta \neq \emptyset$ then \mathcal{D}_η is an ultrafilter on a_η , $\text{cf}(\prod a_\eta, \leq_{\mathcal{D}_\eta}) = \eta(n)$.
- (vi) For $\eta \in T_n$, $a_\eta = \emptyset$ then $\eta(n) \in R_{ia}^{\kappa,l}$.

There is no problem to carry the definition.

Also letting $a^* = \{\eta(n) : n < \omega, \eta \in T_n, a_\eta = \emptyset\}$ easily $|a^*| \leq \kappa$, $a^* \in I^{\kappa,2}$ and $\theta \in \text{pcf}(a^*)$.

23. REMARK. The same proof gives 24 below (we can even replace $R^{\kappa,2}$ by any $R \subseteq R^0$ [interestingly Γ may be “ σ -complete”, “nice”; note they are closed under the sum operation below].

24. LEMMA. Let Γ be a property of filters, $\theta \in R_{ac, \Gamma}^{\kappa, l}$. Then there is $\bar{\lambda} = \langle \lambda_i : i \in u \rangle$ and filter \mathcal{D} on u such that

(a) $\theta = \text{tcf}(\Pi_{i \in u} \lambda_i, <_{\mathcal{D}})$,

(b) $\lambda_i < \lambda$, $\lambda_i \in R_{ia, \Gamma}^{\kappa, l}$,

(c) there is a set Y of finite sequences of cardinality $\leq \kappa$, closed under initial segments, $\langle \cdot \rangle \in Y$, which is well founded, $u = \{\eta \in Y : \text{for no } v \in Y, \eta \text{ is a proper initial segment of } v\}$, $\langle \cdot \rangle \notin u$, and there are filters \mathcal{D}_η on $Y_\eta = \{\eta^\wedge \langle x \rangle : \eta^\wedge \langle x \rangle \in Y\}$ for $\eta \in Y - u$ such that $\Vdash \Gamma(\mathcal{D}_\eta)$ and for $X \subseteq u : X \in \mathcal{D}$ iff for some $X' \subseteq Y$, $X' \cap u = X$, $\langle \cdot \rangle \in X'$ and

$$[\eta \in X' \Rightarrow \{\eta^\wedge \langle x \rangle : \eta^\wedge \langle x \rangle \in X'\} \in \mathcal{D}_\eta].$$

§4. Representation by nice products

25. MAIN LEMMA. Suppose $a \in I^{\kappa, 2}$, $a \subseteq R_{ia}^{\kappa, 2}$, $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(a)$, $\lambda > \sup(a)$, and for $\mu < \sup(a)$, $\sup \text{pcf}(a \cap \mu) < \lambda$. Then there are $f_\alpha \in \Pi a$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ which witness $\text{tcf}(\Pi a, \leq_{\mathcal{F}_\alpha}) = \lambda$ and

(*) for $\mu \in a$, $\{f_\alpha \upharpoonright (a \cap \mu) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ has cardinality $< \mu$

(and f_δ is $<_{\mathcal{F}_\delta}$ -lub of $\{f_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\}$ when $\text{cf } \delta > 2^\kappa$).

REMARK. Note that a has no last element.

PROOF. Let $a = \{\mu_i : i < \delta(*)\}$, μ_i increasing with i , $a(\zeta) = a_\zeta = \{\mu_i : i < \zeta\}$ for $\zeta < \delta(*)$ ($\delta(*)$ is a limit ordinal as $\sup \text{pcf}(a \cap \mu) < \lambda$ for $\mu < \sup(a)$). Let F_ζ be the set of functions of the form $f_0 \upharpoonright b_0 \cup \dots \cup f_n \upharpoonright b_n$ where $\langle b_l : l \leq n \rangle$ is a partition of a_ζ and $b_l \equiv b_{\theta_l}^{a, \kappa} \text{ mod } J_{< \theta_l}^{\kappa, a}$ and

$$f_l \in \{f_{\theta_l, \alpha}^{\kappa, a(\zeta)} : \xi \leq \zeta, \theta_l \in \text{pcf}(a_\xi), \alpha < \theta_l\}.$$

Clearly $|F_\zeta| \leq 2^\kappa + \sum_{\xi \leq \zeta} \sup \text{pcf}(a_\xi) = 2^\kappa + \max \text{pcf}(a_\zeta)$ which is $< \mu_\zeta$ as $[a \subseteq R_{ia}^{\kappa, 2} \Rightarrow 2^\kappa < \min(a)]$ and as $a \subseteq R_{ia}^{\kappa, 2}$ by

26. FACT. If $\lambda \in R_{ia}^{\kappa, 2}$, $a \subseteq R^{\kappa, 2}$ (or even $a \subseteq R^{\kappa, 0}$), $(\forall \mu \in a)[\mu < \lambda]$, then $\lambda > \max \text{pcf}(a)$.

[PROOF. If $\lambda \leq \max \text{pcf}(a)$, $a \subseteq R^{\kappa, 0}$ then there is an ultrafilter \mathcal{D} on a , and in Πa , a $<_{\mathcal{D}}$ -increasing sequence $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \max \text{pcf}(a) \rangle$, so by 4(1), 5(2) for some $b \subseteq R^{\kappa, 0}$, $|b| \leq \kappa$, $\sup(b) \leq \sup(a) (< \lambda)$ and $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(b)$. By 4(6) w.l.o.g. $b \subseteq R^{\kappa, 2}$, so we get a contradiction to $\lambda \in R_{ia}^{\kappa, 2}$.]

Now it is enough to show

(*) for every $\alpha < \lambda$ for some $f_\alpha^* \in \Pi_{\zeta < \delta(*)} \mu_\zeta$:

$$(i) f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} \leq_{j_{\alpha}^{\kappa, a}} f_\alpha^* \in \prod_{\zeta < \delta(*)} \mu_\zeta$$

(ii) for every $\zeta < \delta(*)$, $f_\alpha^* \upharpoonright a_\zeta \in F_\zeta$.

[Why is (*) enough? We then can choose by induction on $\alpha, \beta_\alpha, f_\alpha^*$ such that

(a) $\beta_\alpha < \lambda$ is such that $(\forall \gamma < \alpha) f_\gamma^* <_{j_{\alpha}^{\kappa, a}} f_{\lambda, \beta_\alpha}^{\kappa, a}$,

(b) $f_\alpha^* \in \Pi_{\zeta < \delta(*)} \mu_\zeta$ is such that $f_{\lambda, \beta_\alpha}^{\kappa, a} \leq_{j_{\alpha}^{\kappa, a}} f_\alpha^*$ and f_α^* satisfies (ii),

the first step by the choice of $\langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$, the second by (*). Clearly $\langle f_\alpha^* : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ satisfies the conclusion. More accurately, when α is limit of cofinality $> 2^\kappa$ we want also that f_α^* is $<_{j_{\alpha}^{\kappa, a}}$ -lub of $\{f_\beta^* : \beta < \alpha\}$, but the proof of this is by 27 (i.e., 27 say this holds for a club of δ 's and now rename).]

PROOF OF (*). W.l.o.g. $[\theta \in a \Rightarrow \theta > (2^\kappa)^+]$. Let χ be a regular cardinal, large enough. We choose by inductions on $i < (2^\kappa)^+$ a model N_i such that:

(a) N_i is an elementary submodel of $(H(\chi), \in)$,

(b) $\|N_i\| \leq 2^\kappa$ but $\{j : j < 2^\kappa + i\} \subseteq N_i$,

(c) $\bigcup_{j < i} N_j \subseteq N_i$,

(d) the following belongs to N_{i+1} :

(i) $\langle N_j : j \leq i \rangle$,

(ii) $\text{pcf}(a)$ (hence $\text{pcf}(a) \subseteq N_{i+1}$),

(iii) $\langle \langle f_{\theta, \alpha}^{\kappa, b} : \alpha < \theta \rangle : \theta \in \text{pcf}(b), b \in R^{\kappa, 2}, b \subseteq \lambda \rangle$,

(iv) α (see (*)),

(e) for i limit, $N_i = \bigcup_{j < i} N_j$.

We now define $g_\gamma \in \Pi a$ for $\gamma \leq (2^\kappa)^+$ by

$$g_\gamma(\mu_\zeta) = \sup \left(\mu_\zeta \cap \left(\bigcup_{i < \gamma} N_i \right) \right),$$

and for each $\theta \in R^{\kappa, 2} \cap N_\gamma$, let $\delta_\theta^\gamma = \sup(\theta \cap (\bigcup_{i < \gamma} N_i))$. As we have assumed $[\theta \in a \Rightarrow \theta > (2^\kappa)^+]$ clearly $g_\gamma(\mu_\zeta) < \mu_\zeta$ for $\zeta < \delta(*)$ and $\delta_\theta^\gamma < \theta$ for $\theta \in R^{\kappa, 2} \cap N_\gamma$.

From Fact 27 below we can prove (*), as $f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} \in N_0$ and, e.g., $g_{(2^\kappa)^+}$ is an f_α^* as required. (Really for a closed unbounded set of $\gamma < (2^\kappa)^+$, cf $\gamma > \kappa$ implies g_γ is as required.)

27. FACT. Suppose $\langle N_i : i \leq \delta \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of elementary submodels of $(H(\chi), \in)$, $N_i \in N_{i+1}$. Define a function $g_i : \text{dom } g_i = R^0 \cap N_i - \|N_i\|^+$, $g_i(\theta) = \sup(\theta \cap N_i)$; note that necessarily $g(\theta) < \theta$ as θ

is regular $> \|N_i\|$. Let $g = g_\delta$. Suppose further that $a \subseteq R^0 \cap N_\delta - |a|^+$, $a \in N_\delta$, $|a| \leq \kappa$,

$$\langle \langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle : \lambda \in \text{pcf}(a) \rangle \in N_\delta, \quad \langle b_\theta^{\kappa, a} : \theta \in \text{pcf}(a) \rangle \in N_\delta.$$

Then:

(1) If $\theta \in \text{pcf}(a)$, $\theta \in N_\delta$, $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$ then

$$\bigoplus_\theta g \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a} = f_{\theta, g(\theta)}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a} \text{ mod } I_{< \theta}^{\kappa, 2}.$$

(2) If $\theta \in \text{pcf}(a)$, $\theta \in N_\delta$, $I_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, 2} \upharpoonright b_\lambda^{\kappa, a}$ is σ -complete and $\sigma > \text{cf}(\delta)$ then \bigoplus_θ .

(3) If $I_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, 2} \upharpoonright b_\lambda^{\kappa, a}$ is generated by $\leq \sigma$ sets (as an ideal) and $\text{cf}(\delta) > \sigma$ then \bigoplus_θ .

(4) If $\text{cf}(\delta) > 2^\kappa$ (or for each $\theta \in N_\delta$, the assumptions of (2) or (3) hold) then for some $n < \omega$, $\theta_0 > \theta_1 > \dots > \theta_n$ from $\text{pcf}(a)$, $\theta_0 = \max \text{pcf}(a)$ and for some partition $\langle b_l : l \leq n \rangle$ of a ,

$$g \upharpoonright a = \bigcup_{l=0}^n (f_{\theta_l, g(\theta_l)}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright b_{\theta_l}^{\kappa, a}).$$

(5) If the assumptions of (1) or (2) or (3) hold, $\text{cf}(\delta) > \aleph_0$, then for a closed unbounded set of $\delta_1 < \delta$, $\text{cf}(\delta_1) > \kappa$ implies

$$g_{\delta_1} \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a} = f_{\theta, g_{\delta_1}(\theta)}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a} \text{ mod } I_{< \theta}^{\kappa, 2}.$$

PROOF. (1) W.l.o.g. $a \cup \{a, \langle \langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle : \lambda \in \text{pcf}(a) \rangle, \theta\} \subseteq N_0$ so $a \subseteq \text{dom}(g_i)$ for each i . Also as $N_i \in N_{i+1}$, $g_i \upharpoonright a \in N_{i+1}$. So for $i < j < \delta$, $g_i \upharpoonright a \in N_j$, hence $g_i(\mu) \in N_j$ for $\mu \in a$ hence $g_i \upharpoonright a < g_j \upharpoonright a$. Also $f_{\theta, g(\theta)}^{\kappa, a} \in N_j$ hence $f_{\theta, g(\theta)}^{\kappa, a}(\mu) \in N_j$ for $\mu \in a$ hence $f_{\theta, g(\theta)}^{\kappa, a} < g_j \upharpoonright a$. Lastly, as $g_i \upharpoonright a \in N_j$ and for some $\alpha < \theta$,

$$g_i \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a} < f_{\theta, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a} \text{ mod } I_{< \theta}^{\kappa, 2}$$

this holds for some $\alpha \in N_j$ too, hence it holds for $\alpha = g_j(\theta)$. Now for each $i < \delta$, there is $c_i \subseteq b_\theta^{\kappa, a}$, $c_i \equiv b_\theta^{\kappa, a} \text{ mod } I_{< \theta}^{\kappa, 2}$, and

$$g_i \upharpoonright c_i \leq f_{\theta, g_{i+1}(\theta)}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright c_i < g_{i+2} \upharpoonright c_i.$$

So for some c , $A = \{i < \delta : c_i = c\}$ is unbounded, and now by 4(7) $\{f_{\theta, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a} : \alpha < g_\delta(\theta)\}$ has a least upper bound $\text{mod}(I_{< \theta}^{\kappa, 2} \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a}) : g \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, a}$ so we can finish.

(2), (3) Similar.

(4) Like the proof of 16(5).

(5) Left to the reader.

28. MAIN LEMMA. *If $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(a) > \sup(a)$, $a \in R^{\kappa, 2}$, $\langle a_i : i < \sigma \rangle$ is a partition of a , and $(\forall i < \sigma) a_i \in J_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, a}$, then for some $n_i < \omega$ and $\theta_{i,0}, \dots, \theta_{i,n(i)-1}$ from $\text{pcf}(a_i)$ (for $i < \sigma$),*

$$\lambda \in \text{pcf}(\{\theta_{i,l} : i < \sigma, l < n(i)\}).$$

PROOF. Let $\lambda(0) = \sup(\lambda \cap \text{pcf}(a))$. As $|\text{pcf}(a)| \leq 2^\kappa < \lambda$ (as $\lambda > \sup(a)$, $a \in I^{\kappa, 2}$) clearly $\lambda(0)$ is $< \lambda$. (We could obtain $\lambda(0) \notin \text{pcf}(a)$ but have no need.) Let χ be a regular cardinal large enough and M an elementary submodel of $(H(\chi), \in)$ such that:

$$a \in M, \quad \{i : i \leq \lambda(0)\} \subseteq M, \quad \text{and} \quad \|M\| = \lambda(0),$$

$$\langle \langle f_{\theta, \alpha}^{\kappa, b} : \alpha < \theta \rangle : b \subseteq a, \theta \in \text{pcf}(b) \rangle \in M.$$

We now assume that the conclusion fails, and eventually we shall get a contradiction.

It is enough to show that for every $f \in \Pi a$ for some $g \in (\Pi a) \cap M$, $f \leq g \bmod J_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, a}$. So let $f \in \Pi a$ be fixed.

We let $\gamma(\star) = (2^\kappa)^+$, and $\langle N_i : i \leq \gamma(\star) \rangle$ be an increasing continuous sequence of elementary submodels of $(H(\chi), \in)$, such that:

- (i) $\lambda, a, M, \langle \langle f_{\mu, \alpha}^{\kappa, b} : \alpha < \mu \rangle : \mu \in \text{pcf}(b), b \subseteq a \rangle$ belong to N_0 ,
- (ii) $\langle N_j : j \leq i \rangle \in N_{i+1}$,
- (iii) $\|N_i\| = 2^\kappa + |i|$,
- (iv) $\{\alpha : \alpha < 2^\kappa + i\} \subseteq N_i$.

Clearly $a \subseteq \text{pcf}(a) \subseteq N_0$ and every subset of $\text{pcf}(a)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$ belongs to N_0 . Let for each $b \subseteq \text{pcf}(a)$ of cardinality $\leq \kappa$, $g_b \in \Pi b$ be defined by

$$g_b(\theta) = \sup(\theta \cap N_{\gamma(\star)}).$$

Let $g = \bigcup \{g_b : b \subseteq \text{pcf}(a), |b| \leq \kappa\}$. By Fact 27(1)

$$g_a \equiv f_{\lambda, g(\lambda)}^{\kappa, a} \bmod J_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, a}.$$

We shall show that $g_a \in M$ thus deriving the desired contradiction [as $f \in N_{\gamma(\star)}$, clearly $f \leq g_a$].

For each $i < \sigma$, by Fact 27(4) there are $\theta_i(l) \in \text{pcf}(a_i)$,

$$b_i(l) \subseteq a_i - \bigcup_{m < l} b_i(m), \quad b_i(l) \equiv b_{\theta_i(l)}^{\kappa, a} \bmod J_{< \theta_i(l)}^{\kappa, a},$$

$$g_a \upharpoonright b_i(l) = f_{\theta_i(l), g(\theta_i(l))}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright b_i(l), \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_i(0) = \max \text{pcf}(a_i), \quad \theta_i(l+1) < \theta_i(l),$$

and $\theta_i(l), b_i(l)$ are defined just for $l \leq n(i)$, and lastly

$$a_i = \bigcup_{l \leq n(i)} b_i(l).$$

As $\mathcal{P}(\kappa) \subseteq M$, $\{\langle i, l, \theta_i(l) \rangle : i < \sigma, l < n(i)\} \in M$, it is enough to show that

$$\langle f_{\theta_i(l), g(\theta_i(l))}^{\kappa, a_i} : l \leq n(i), i < \sigma \rangle \in M.$$

As $\langle \langle f_{\theta, \alpha}^{\kappa, b} : \alpha < \theta \rangle : b \subseteq a, \theta \in \text{pcf}(b) \rangle \in M$ it is enough to have $g_c = g \upharpoonright c \in M$ where $c = \{\theta_i(l) : i < \sigma, l < n(i)\}$. Now $|c| \leq \sigma \leq \kappa$, $c \subseteq \text{pcf}(a)$ hence $c \in M$ and $\text{pcf}(c) \subseteq \text{pcf}(a)$ (so $c \subseteq R^{\kappa, 2}$), therefore $\max \text{pcf}(c) \leq \max \text{pcf}(a) = \lambda$. If $\max \text{pcf}(c) = \lambda$ we finish. Otherwise (as $\text{pcf}(c) \subseteq \text{pcf}(a)$) $\max \text{pcf}(c) \leq \lambda(0)$, and as $c \in M$, by 27 easily $g_c \in M$, and as we said above, we finish.

29. CONCLUSION. (1) If $\lambda \in R_{\text{ac}}^{\kappa, 2}$, κ minimal, then

(i) for some a

$$\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(a), \quad \sup a < \lambda, \quad a \in I^{\kappa, 2},$$

(ii) for any such a , $J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a}$ is a κ -complete ideal on a , hence $[b \subseteq a \wedge |b| < \kappa \Rightarrow b \in J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a}]$ (and $\lambda = \text{tcf}(\Pi a, \leq_{J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a}})$ and necessarily is regular.

(2) If $(\forall \alpha < \delta)(\aleph_\alpha^\kappa < \aleph_\delta)$, \aleph_δ is singular, $a \subseteq R^{\kappa, 2} \cap \aleph_\delta$, $\kappa < \aleph_\delta$, $\mu \in \text{pcf}(a) \cap [\aleph_\delta, \aleph_\delta^\kappa)$, then there is $a \subseteq R^{\text{cf } \delta, 2} \cap \aleph_\delta$, $|a| \leq \text{cf } \delta$ such that $\mu \in \text{pcf}(a)$ (even a has order type $\leq \text{cf } \delta$).

PROOF. (1) (i) This holds by the definition of $R_{\text{ac}}^{\kappa, 2}$ and 17(5).

(ii) If $J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a}$ is not κ -complete, we can find $\sigma < \kappa$, $a_i \in J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a}$ for $i < \sigma$,

$$\bigcup_{i < \sigma} a_i \notin J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a}.$$

W.l.o.g. the a_i 's are pairwise disjoint (otherwise use $a_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_i - \bigcup_{j < i} a_j$) and $a = \bigcup_{i < \sigma} a_i$ (otherwise replace a by $a' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{i < \sigma} a_i$).

By 28 we get a contradiction to minimality of κ .

(2) Easy (by 12 and 29(1)).

30. MAIN LEMMA. Suppose $\lambda \in R_{\text{ac}}^{\kappa, 2}$, σ is minimal such that $\lambda \in R_{\text{ac}}^{\sigma, 2}$.

(1) For some $a \in I^{\kappa, 2}$: $a \subseteq \lambda$ and $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(a)$.

(2) For a as above for some $b \subseteq a$, $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(b)$ and $\lambda > \max \text{pcf}(b \cap \mu)$ for $\mu \in b$ (take first $b = b_\lambda^{\kappa, a}$ and then $b \cap \mu$ for the minimal $\mu \in b$ such that $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(b \cap \mu)$).

(3) For b as above $J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, b}$ is σ -complete.

(4) For b as above for some $c \subseteq b$, letting $d_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{pcf}(c)$, $\lambda = \max d_1$, $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_1 - \{\lambda\}$ has no last element; in fact

$$d - \theta = \text{pcf}(b) - \{\mu : \mu \in \text{pcf}(b), \mu < \lambda, \text{pcf}(b) - \mu \text{ is finite}\} - \theta$$

for some $\theta \in d$ (so $\text{pcf}(b) - \text{pcf}(c)$ is finite and $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, \sigma}$ is σ -complete by (3)).

(5) For c as above, the order type of the sets c, d has cofinality $\geq \sigma$.

(6) Letting J_d^{bd} be the ideal of bounded subsets of d , then $\text{tcf}(\Pi d, <_{J_d^{\text{bd}}}) = \lambda$.

(7) For some $d_2 \subseteq d$ of order type $\text{cf}(\text{otp } d)$, $\text{pcf}_{|d_2|}(d_2) = \{\lambda\}$.

REMARK. The main conclusion here is part (6).

PROOF. (1) By definition of $R_{\text{ac}}^{\kappa, 2}$.

(2) Clear.

(3) By the assumption on σ and 28.

(4) Clearly $\{\mu \in \text{pcf}(b) : \mu < \lambda, \text{pcf}(b) - \mu \text{ is finite}\}$ is finite. So by 16

$$c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b - \bigcup \{b_\mu^{\kappa, b} : \mu \in \text{pcf}(b), \mu < \lambda, |\text{pcf}(b) - \mu| < \aleph_0\}$$

is as required.

(5) By (3) $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, \sigma}$ is σ -complete. If $\mu_i \in d$ for $i < \delta < \sigma$, then $b_{\mu_i}^{\kappa, c} \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, \sigma}$, so $\bigcup_{i < \delta} b_{\mu_i}^{\kappa, c} \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, \sigma}$ hence by 16 for some $n < \omega$,

$$\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{n-1} \in d_1 = \text{pcf}(c) - \{\lambda\}, \quad \bigcup_{i < \delta} b_{\mu_i}^{\kappa, c} \subseteq \bigcup_{l < n} b_{\theta_l}^{\kappa, c}.$$

So necessarily each μ_i is $\leq \text{Max}\{\theta_l : l < n\}$, so (as d has no last element by 30(4)) $\sup_{i < \delta} \mu_i < \sup d$, as required.

As for $\text{cf}(\text{otp}(c))$, use 30(2) and σ -completeness of the ideal.

(6) For each $\alpha < \lambda$, choose, if possible, a function $g = g_\alpha, g \in \Pi d$ such that: for every $\theta \in \text{pcf}(c)$ (for $\theta = \lambda$ stipulating $g(\theta) = \alpha$)

$$g \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa, c} \equiv f_{\theta, g(\theta)}^{\kappa, c} \pmod{J_{<\theta}^{\kappa, \sigma}}.$$

Let $A = \{\alpha < \lambda : g_\alpha \text{ is well defined}\}$. Now

FACT α . A is an unbounded subset of λ .

PROOF. By 27.

FACT β . For $\alpha < \beta$ in A , $g_\alpha < g_\beta \pmod{J_d^{\text{bd}}}$.

PROOF OF FACT β . Clearly $f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, c} < f_{\lambda, \beta}^{\kappa, c} \pmod{J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, \sigma}}$ hence

$$c_1 = \{\theta \in c : f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, c}(\theta) \geq f_{\lambda, \beta}^{\kappa, c}(\theta)\} \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, \sigma}.$$

Now $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,c} = \bigcup \{J_{\leq\mu}^{\kappa,c} : \mu \in \text{pcf}(c), \mu \neq \lambda\} = \bigcup \{J_{<\mu}^{\kappa,c} : \mu \in \text{pcf}(c), \mu \neq \lambda\}$ (as $\text{pcf}(c) - \{\lambda\}$ has no last element). So for some $\theta(*) \in \text{pcf}(c) - \{\lambda\}$, $c_1 \in J_{<\theta(*)}^{\kappa,c}$. Also

$$c_2 = \{\mu \in c : f_{\lambda,\alpha}^{\kappa,c}(\mu) \neq g_\alpha(\mu)\} \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,c},$$

$$c_3 = \{\mu \in c : f_{\lambda,\beta}^{\kappa,c}(\mu) \neq g_\beta(\mu)\} \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,c}.$$

So w.l.o.g. also $c_2, c_3 \in J_{<\theta(*)}^{\kappa,c}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} g_\alpha \upharpoonright (c - c_1 \cup c_2 \cup c_3) &= f_{\lambda,\alpha}^{\kappa,c} \upharpoonright (c - c_1 \cup c_2 \cup c_3) \\ &< f_{\lambda,\beta}^{\kappa,c} \upharpoonright (c - c_1 \cup c_2 \cup c_3) = g_\beta \upharpoonright (c - c_1 \cup c_2 \cup c_3). \end{aligned}$$

Hence for every $\theta \in d$, if $\theta \geq \theta(*)$ (as $c_1 \cup c_2 \cup c_3 \in J_{<\theta(*)}^{\kappa,c} \subseteq J_{<\theta}^{\kappa,c}$) then

$$f_{\theta,g_\alpha(\theta)}^{\kappa,c} \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa,c} \equiv g_\alpha \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa,c} < g_\beta \upharpoonright b_\theta^{\kappa,c} \equiv f_{\theta,g_\beta(\theta)}^{\kappa,c} \pmod{J_{<\theta}^{\kappa,c}}.$$

Hence by the choice of $\langle f_{\theta,\gamma}^{\kappa,c} : \gamma < \theta \rangle$ necessarily $g_\alpha(\theta) < g_\beta(\theta)$ as required.

FACT γ . If $g \in \Pi d$, then for some $\alpha \in A$, $g < g_\alpha \pmod{J_d^{\text{bd}}}$ [use 27 with $g \in N_0$].

By Facts α, β, γ we finish.

(7) Follows by 30(6).

§5. Applications

31. **DEFINITION.** $\text{Pr}_0(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ where $\lambda \geq \kappa + \theta$, λ an infinite cardinal, means that there is a two place function c from λ to κ which witnesses it, which means:

(*) if $\xi < \theta$ and for $i < \lambda$, $\langle \alpha_{i,\zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals $\geq i$, $< \lambda$ and h is a two place function from $\xi = \{\zeta : \zeta < \xi\}$ to κ , then there are $i < j < \lambda$, such that $\bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} \alpha_{i,\zeta} < \alpha_{j,0}$ and

$$[\zeta_1 < \xi \wedge \zeta_2 < \xi \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{j,\zeta_2}) = h(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)].$$

32. **DEFINITION.** (1) $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ where $\lambda \geq \kappa + \theta$, λ an infinite cardinal, means that there is a two place function c from λ to κ which witnesses it, which means:

(*) if $\xi < \theta$ and for $i < \lambda$, $\langle \alpha_{i,\zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals $\geq i$, $< \lambda$ and $\gamma < \kappa$, then there are $i < j < \lambda$ such that $\bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} \alpha_{i,\zeta} < \alpha_{j,0}$ and

$$[\zeta_1 < \xi \wedge \zeta_2 < \xi \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{j,\zeta_2}) = \gamma].$$

(2) $\text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ is defined similarly but we add to the assumption of (*):

$$[i < \lambda, \zeta_1 < \zeta_2 < \xi \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{i,\zeta_2}) = \gamma].$$

33. DEFINITION. (1) $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ where $\lambda \geq \kappa + \theta$, λ an infinite cardinal, means that there is a symmetric two place function c from λ to κ which witnesses it, which means:

(*) if $\xi < \theta$ and for $i < \lambda$, $\langle \alpha_{i,\zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals $\geq i$ and $< \lambda$ and $\gamma < \kappa$, then there are $i < j < \lambda$, such that $\bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} \alpha_{i,\zeta} < \alpha_{j,0}$ and for $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \xi$

- (i) $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2 \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{j,\zeta_2}) = \gamma$,
- (ii) $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2 \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{j,\zeta_2}) = c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_2}, \alpha_{i,\zeta_1})$.

(2) $\text{Pr}_2^1(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ is defined similarly, replacing (i), (ii) by

- (i)' $\xi > \zeta_1 > \zeta_2 \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{j,\zeta_2}) = 2\gamma$,
- (ii)' $\zeta_1 < \zeta_2 < \xi \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{j,\zeta_2}) = c(\alpha_{i,\zeta_2}, \alpha_{i,\zeta_1})$
- (iii)' $\zeta < \xi \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta}, \alpha_{j,\zeta}) = 2\gamma + 1$.

(3) $\text{Pr}_2^2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ is defined similarly, interchanging the conclusions of (i)', (ii)'.

(4) $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta, \mu)$ is defined as in (1), but we add to the assumption of (*) an ordinal $\gamma_0 < \mu$ and get a set $u \subseteq \lambda$ of order type γ_0 such that any $i < j$ from u satisfies the conclusion of (*).

34. DEFINITION. (1) $\text{Pr}_3^1(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ where $\lambda \geq \kappa + \theta$, λ an infinite cardinal, means that there is a two place function c from λ to κ which witnesses it, which means:

(*) if $\xi < \theta$ and for $i < \lambda$, $\langle \alpha_{i,\zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals $\geq i$ and $< \lambda$ and $2\gamma + 1 < \kappa$ and $\zeta(*) < \xi$, then there are $i < j < \lambda$ such that $\bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} \alpha_{i,\zeta} < \alpha_{j,0}$ and

- (i) $\zeta < \zeta(*) \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta(*)}, \alpha_{j,\zeta}) = 2\gamma$,
- (ii) $\zeta(*) < \zeta < \xi \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta(*)}, \alpha_{j,\zeta}) = c(\alpha_{i,\zeta(*)}, \alpha_{j,\zeta(*)})$,
- (iii) $c(\alpha_{i,\zeta(*)}, \alpha_{j,\zeta(*)}) = 2\gamma + 1$.


(2) $\text{Pr}_3^2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ is defined similarly replacing (i), (ii), (iii) by:

- (i)' $\zeta < \zeta(*) \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta}, \alpha_{j,\zeta(*)}) = c(\alpha_{i,\zeta}, \alpha_{i,\zeta(*)})$,
- (ii)' $\zeta(*) < \zeta < \xi \Rightarrow c(\alpha_{i,\zeta}, \alpha_{j,\zeta(*)}) = 2\gamma$,
- (iii)' $c(\alpha_{i,\zeta(*)}, \alpha_{j,\zeta(*)}) = 2\gamma + 1$.

35. DEFINITION. In Definitions 31–34, omitting θ means that it is \aleph_0 .

36. OBSERVATION. (1) $\text{Pr}_0(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ implies $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$, $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$.
 (2) $\text{Pr}_2^a(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ implies $\text{Pr}_3^a(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ when $y = a$, $x = S$ or $y = b$, $x = L$.
 (3) $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ implies $\text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$.
 (4) $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$ implies $\text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$.
 (5) $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta, 2)$ is equivalent to $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \theta)$.
 (6) If $\kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2$, $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$, $\mu_1 \leq \mu_2$ then $\text{Pr}_0(\lambda, \kappa_2, \theta_2) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}_0(\lambda, \kappa_1, \theta_1)$,
 $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \kappa_2, \theta_2) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \kappa_1, \theta_1)$, $\text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, \kappa_2, \theta_2) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, \kappa_1, \theta_1)$, $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa_2, \theta_2, \mu_2) \Rightarrow$
 $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa_1, \theta_1, \mu_1)$, $\text{Pr}_3(\lambda, \kappa_2, \theta_2) \Rightarrow \text{Pr}_3(\lambda, \kappa_1, \theta_1)$.
 (7) $\text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, 2)$ implies that the λ -c.c. is not productive for Boolean algebras (see [Sh 7] proof of 1.10).
 (8) $\text{Pr}_3^a(\lambda, 2)$ implies that there are $\lambda - X$ spaces for $X = L, S$ (Hausdorff with a basis of clopen sets). (See [Sh 7] proof of 1.10.)
 (9) $\text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, n)$ implies that there are Boolean algebras $B_l (l < n)$. $\prod_{l < n} B_l$ does not satisfy the λ -c.c. but $\prod_{l < n, l \neq m} B_l$ satisfies it for $m < n$. (See [Sh 7] proof of 1.10.)

37. DIAGRAM. (For $\kappa \geq 2, \theta \geq 2$.)



38. LEMMA. (1) Suppose $c \subseteq R^0$, $\text{tcf}(\prod c, \leq_{j^*}) = \lambda$ (c has no last element) ($\forall \mu \in c)(\mu < \lambda)$ and let $\chi = \text{Min}\{ |c - \mu| : \mu \in c \} < \text{sup } c$. Then $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \chi, \text{cf}(c))$.
 (2) If in addition for arbitrarily large $\theta \in c$, $\text{Pr}_l(\theta, \chi', 2\sigma)$, $\theta^{<\sigma} < \text{Min}(c - \theta^+)$, $l \in \{0, 1\}$, $\text{sup}(c \cap \theta) \in c$, $\sigma \leq \text{cf}(c)$ then $\text{Pr}_l(\lambda, \chi', \sigma)$.

39. REMARK. (1) Every unbounded $c' \subseteq c$ satisfies all the assumptions (though: maybe with a smaller χ). So w.l.o.g. $|c| = \chi$.

(2) If in 38(2) we want to interpret σ as order type, 2σ should be replaced by $\sigma 2$.

(3) In 38(1) we can have $\text{Pr}_i(\theta, \chi'_\theta, 2\sigma_\theta)$ for $\theta \in c$, such that

$$[\forall(1) \leq \theta(2) \Rightarrow \chi'_{\theta(1)} \leq \chi'_{\theta(2)} \wedge \sigma_{\theta(1)} \leq \sigma_{\theta(2)}]$$

and get $\text{Pr}_i(\lambda, \Sigma_\theta \chi'_\theta, \Sigma_\theta \sigma_\theta)$.

(4) $\text{cf}(c)$ is the cofinality of the order type of c .

PROOF. (1) Let $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify $\text{tcf}(\Pi c, \leq_{\mathcal{L}^M}) = \lambda$, $\langle c_i : i < \chi \rangle$ a partition of c to χ sets, each c_i is an unbounded subset of c . Let $h : c \rightarrow \chi$ be such that $\theta \in c_{h(\theta)}$.

Let us define two two-place functions, θ, e from λ with range of power χ : for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$, $\theta(\alpha, \beta) = \sup\{\theta : f_\alpha(\theta) \geq f_\beta(\theta)\}$ (so if there is a maximal θ for which $f_\alpha(\theta) \geq f_\beta(\theta)$, it is $\theta(\alpha, \beta)$) and

$$e(\alpha, \beta) = h(\theta(\alpha, \beta)).$$

Suppose $\xi < \text{cf}(c)$, $\langle \alpha_{\beta, \zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals $\geq \beta$ but $< \lambda$ for each $\beta < \lambda$. Now for any given $i(*) < \chi$ we should find $\beta < \gamma < \lambda$ such that $\bigcup_\zeta \alpha_{\beta, \zeta} < \alpha_{\gamma, 0}$ and for every $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \xi$, $\theta(\alpha_{\beta, \zeta_1}, \alpha_{\gamma, \zeta_2})$ belongs to $c_{i(*)}$.

Let χ^* be a regular large enough cardinal. Let M_0 be an elementary submodel of $(H(\chi^*), \in, <^*)$ where $<^*$ is a well ordering of $H(\chi^*)$, to which $\lambda, c, \xi, \langle \langle \alpha_{\beta, \zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle : \beta < \lambda \rangle, \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ belongs, $\xi \cup c \subseteq M$, and $\|M_0\| < \sup c$.

Let $c' = \{\theta \in c : \sup(M_0 \cap \theta) < \theta\}$, so $c' \equiv c \pmod{J_c^{\text{bd}}}$. Define a function $g \in \Pi c : g(\theta)$ is $\sup(M_0 \cap \theta)$ for $\theta \in c'$ and zero otherwise. As $\langle f_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle$ exemplify $\text{tcf}(\Pi c, <_{\mathcal{L}^M}) = \lambda$ for some $\beta(0) < \lambda$, $g < f_{\beta(0)} \pmod{J_c^{\text{bd}}}$, and $\beta(0) > \sup(M_0 \cap \lambda)$.

As $\alpha_{\beta(0), \zeta} \geq \beta(0)$ for each $\zeta < \xi$ for some $\theta_\zeta^0 \in c$,

$$[\theta_\zeta^0 < \theta \in c \Rightarrow g(\theta) < f_{\alpha_{\beta(0), \zeta}}(\theta)].$$

Let $\theta(0) = \sup\{\theta_\zeta^0 : \zeta < \xi\}$ so as $\text{cf}(c) > \xi$ clearly $\theta(0) < \sup(c)$. Let $\theta(1) \in c_{i(*)}$ be $> \theta(0)$. Let for $\beta < \lambda$, $f_\beta^* \in \Pi c$ be defined by

$$f_\beta^*(\theta) = \text{Min}\{f_{\alpha_{\beta, \zeta}}(\theta) : \zeta < \xi\}.$$

Easily $f_\beta \leq f_\beta^* \pmod{J_c^{\text{bd}}}$ (as $\text{cf}(\text{otp } c) > \xi$). Let

$$c^* = \{\theta \in c : \sup\{f_\beta^*(\theta) : \beta < \lambda\} = \theta\}.$$

So $c^* = c \bmod J_c^{\text{bd}}$ [otherwise define $g^* \in \Pi c : g^*(\theta) = \sup\{f_\beta^*(\theta) : \beta < \lambda\}$ if $\theta \in c - c^*$, and zero otherwise. So for some $\beta < \lambda$, $g^* < f_\beta \bmod J_c^{\text{bd}}$, and we get a contradiction easily].

So we could have chosen $\theta(1) \in c^*$, such that $\theta(1) > \|M_0\|$ and for some $\beta(1)$,

$$\gamma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f_{\beta(1)}^*(\theta(1)) > \sup\{f_{\alpha\beta(0),\zeta}(\theta(1)) : \zeta < \xi\}.$$

Let M_1 be the Skolem Hull of $M \cup \{\gamma\}$ (in $(H(\chi^*), \in, <^*)$). Now clearly $(H(\chi^*), \in, <^*) \vDash (\exists \beta < \lambda) f_\beta^*(\theta(1)) = \gamma$; as $\lambda, \langle f_\beta^*, \beta < \lambda \rangle, \theta(1), \gamma$ are in M_1 there is $\beta(2) \in M_1 \cap \lambda, f_{\beta(2)}^*(\theta(1)) = \gamma$. So

$$[\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \xi \Rightarrow f_{\alpha\beta(0),\zeta_1}^*(\theta(1)) < f_{\alpha\beta(2),\zeta_2}^*(\theta(1))].$$

Easily, for every regular cardinal $\sigma \in M_0$, if $\sigma > \theta(1)$, then $\sup(M_0 \cap \sigma) = \sup(M_1 \cap \sigma)$.

As $\beta(0) > \sup(M_0 \cap \lambda)$, also $\beta(0) > \sup(M_1 \cap \lambda)$, but $\beta(2) \in M_1$, so $\beta(0) > \beta(2)$, and similarly $\alpha_{\beta(2),\zeta_1} < \alpha_{\beta(0),\zeta_2}$ (for $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \xi$). Also for every $\theta \in c$, if $\theta > \theta(1)$, $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \xi$, then $f_{\alpha\beta(2),\zeta_1}(\theta) \in M_1$ hence $f_{\alpha\beta(2),\zeta_1}(\theta) < \sup(M_0 \cap \theta)$ hence $f_{\alpha\beta(2),\zeta_1}(\theta) < g(\theta)$, but $g(\theta) < f_{\alpha\beta(0),\zeta_2}(\theta)$. So $\theta(\alpha_{\beta(2),\zeta_1}, \alpha_{\beta(2),\zeta_2}) = \theta(1)$, but $h(\theta(1)) = i^*$, so we finish.

(2) Let c_θ be a two place function from θ to χ' , which exemplifies our hypothesis when possible. Let

$$c^*(\alpha, \beta) = c_{\theta(\alpha,\beta)}(f_\alpha(\theta(\alpha, \beta)), f_\beta(\theta(\alpha, \beta))).$$

The rest is left to the reader.

§6. Additional information

40. LEMMA. Suppose $a \in I^{\kappa,2}$, $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(a)$, $c = \text{pcf}(a) - \{\lambda\}$, c has no last element, $\chi = \min\{|\mu - \nu| : \mu \in c\}$. Then $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \chi, \aleph_0)$.

PROOF. Let $\langle c_i : i < \lambda \rangle$ be a partition of c such that each c_i is an unbounded subset of c . Let $h : c \rightarrow \chi$ be defined by $\theta \in c_{h(\theta)}$. W.l.o.g. $(\forall \mu \in c) \mu > (2^\kappa)^+$. Let $f_\alpha \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f_{\lambda,\alpha}^{\kappa,a}$, $\sigma = \aleph_0$. Let us define two two-place functions θ^-, e^- from λ to $\text{cf } \chi$ respectively:

$$\text{for } \alpha < \beta < \lambda, \quad \theta^-(\alpha, \beta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{\mu : \{\theta \in a : f_\alpha(\theta) = f_\beta(\theta)\} \in I_{<\mu}^{\kappa,2+}\}$$

(so $\theta^-(\alpha, \beta) \in \text{pcf}(a)$ and as $f_\alpha \neq f_\beta \bmod I_{\geq \lambda}^{\kappa,2}$ clearly $\theta^-(\alpha, \beta) \in c$. Let $e^-(\alpha, \beta) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h(\theta^-(\alpha, \beta))$).

Define A as in the proof of 30(6). W.l.o.g. we restrict ourselves to A .

Suppose $\xi < \aleph_0$, $\langle \alpha_{\beta,\zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle$ is a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals $\geq \beta$ but from A , for each $\beta < \lambda$.

Now for any given $i(*) < \chi$ we should find $\beta < \gamma < \lambda$ such that $\bigcup_{\zeta} \alpha_{\beta,\zeta} < \alpha_{\gamma,0}$ and $\theta(\alpha_{\beta,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{\gamma,\zeta_2})$ belongs to $c_{i(*)}$ if $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2$ and is $\theta^-(\alpha_{\beta,\zeta_1}, \alpha_{\beta,\zeta_2})$ if $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2$.

Let χ^* be regular large enough. Let M_0 be an elementary submodel of $(H(\chi^*), \in, <^*)$ where $<^*$ is a well ordering of $H(\chi^*)$, such that the following belongs to M_0 : $\lambda, a, c, \langle \langle \alpha_{\beta,\zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle : \beta < \lambda \rangle, \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle, \mu$ for $\mu \in c$, and M has cardinality 2^κ and every subset of M_0 of cardinality $\leq \kappa$ belongs to M .

Let $g \in \Pi c$ be defined by $g(\theta) = \sup(M_0 \cap \theta)$; as $a \subseteq R^{0,\kappa}$, $(\forall \mu \in a)[\mu > (2^\kappa)^+]$, clearly $g \in \Pi c$; so for some $\beta(0) \in A$, $g \upharpoonright a < f_{\beta(0)} \bmod J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$. But $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a} = \bigcup_{\theta \in c} J_{<\theta}^{\kappa,a}$, so

$$a \upharpoonright \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \theta \in a : g(\theta) \geq f_{\alpha_{\theta(0),\zeta}}(\theta) \}$$

belongs to $J_{<\theta_\zeta}^{\kappa,a}$, for some θ_ζ . As $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ is σ -complete, $\xi < \sigma$, for some $\theta(0) \in c$, $\bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} a \upharpoonright \in J_{<\theta(0)}^{\kappa,a}$. Let $\theta(1) \in c_{i(*)}$, $\theta(1) > \theta(0)$.

As $\beta(0) \in A$, for $\zeta < \xi$ we can find $\mu_{\zeta,l}$ ($l \leq n_\zeta$) from $c \cap \theta(1)^+$ and partition $\langle a_{\zeta,l} : l \leq n_\zeta \rangle$ of $a_2 = \bigcup_{\zeta < \xi} a \upharpoonright \cup b_{\theta(1)}^{\kappa,a} \cup \bigcup \{ b_\theta^\kappa : \theta = (\alpha_{\beta(0),\xi}, \alpha_{\beta(0),\xi}) \}$ such that:

$$f_{\alpha_{\theta(0),\zeta}} \upharpoonright a_2 = \bigcup_{l \leq n_\zeta} f_{\mu_{\zeta,l}}^{\kappa,a}, \gamma_{\zeta,l} \upharpoonright \zeta, l \quad \text{where } \gamma_{\zeta,l} = f_{\alpha_{\theta(0),\zeta}}(\mu_{\zeta,l}).$$

Let M_2 be the Skolem Hull of

$$M_1 \cup \{ \langle \langle \mu_{\zeta,l}, f_{\alpha_{\theta(0),\zeta}}(\mu_{\zeta,l}), a_{\zeta,l} \rangle : l \leq n_\zeta \rangle : \zeta < \xi \}.$$

So there is $\beta(1) \in M_1$, $\beta(1) \in A$, and $f_{\alpha_{\beta(1),\zeta}} \upharpoonright a_2 = f_{\alpha_{\theta(0),\zeta}} \upharpoonright a_2$. As in the proof of 38, for $\theta \in \text{pcf}(a) - \theta(1)^+$,

$$\sup(M_0 \cap \theta) = \sup(M_2 \cap \theta).$$

Easily $\beta(1) < \beta(0)$ are as required.

41. REMARK. Can we have $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \chi', \sigma)$? Yes, if e.g. for some $\mu_0 \in c$, $[\mu_0 < \mu \in c \Rightarrow \mu^\sigma < \text{Min}(c - \mu^+)]$, even replacing c by $c' \subseteq c$, $\sup c = \sup c'$, $\chi' = \text{Min}\{ |c' - \mu| : \mu \in c \}$.

42. CONCLUSION. If $\lambda \in R_{ac}^{\kappa,2}$, κ minimal, then $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa)$ and $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \aleph_0)$.

PROOF. By 30(6), (5) the assumption of 38 and 40 holds. By 38 and 40 we get respectively our two conclusions.

43. **CONCLUSION.** (1) If $\lambda > 2^{\text{cf}\lambda}$ then for some κ ,

$$\text{Pr}_1(\lambda^+, \kappa, \kappa), \quad \text{Pr}_2(\lambda^+, \kappa, \aleph_0)$$

(and see 37).

(2) If $\mu < \lambda \leq \mu^\kappa$, $\text{cf}\mu > \aleph_0$, $(\forall \theta < \mu)\theta^\kappa < \mu$, $\text{cf}\lambda = \lambda$, then $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa)$, $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \kappa, \kappa)$.

44. **LEMMA.** Suppose $a \in I^{\kappa,2}$, $a \subseteq R^{\kappa,2}$, $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(a) > \sup(a)$.

$$[\forall \theta \in a][\forall \mu < \theta][\mu^{<\sigma} < \theta],$$

$a \cap \theta \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ for $\theta \in a$. Suppose $\mu_\theta, \sigma_\theta$ are cardinals for each $\theta \in a$, and

$$[\theta_1 < \theta_2 \text{ from } a \Rightarrow \mu_{\theta(1)} \leq \mu_{\theta(2)} \wedge \sigma_{\theta(1)} \leq \sigma_{\theta(2)}], \quad \sigma_\theta \leq \sigma.$$

Then for $l = 2$, $\bigwedge_{\theta \in a} \text{Pr}_l(\theta, \mu_\theta, \sigma_\theta)$ implies $\text{Pr}_l(\lambda, \sup \mu_\theta, \sup \sigma_\theta)$.

PROOF. Straightforward.

REMARK. The improvement 2σ below enables us to have $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, 2)$ even when $I_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ is a maximal ideal.

45. **LEMMA.** Suppose $a \in I^{\kappa,2}$, $a \subseteq R_{\text{ia}}^{\kappa,a}$, $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(a) > \sup(a)$, $\langle a_i : i < \sigma_1 \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint subsets of a , $a_i \notin J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$, $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa,a}$ is σ_2 -complete and for $\theta \in a$, $[\forall \mu < \theta]\mu^{<\sigma_2} < \theta$. Then

(1) $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \sigma_1, \sigma_2)$.

Moreover

(2) $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, 2\sigma_1, \sigma_2)$.

(3) If for $\theta \in a$, $\text{Pr}_2(\theta, \chi_\theta, \sigma_\theta)$, $\sigma_\theta \leq \sigma_2$,

$$[\theta(1) \leq \theta(2) \Rightarrow \chi_{\theta(1)} \leq \chi_{\theta(2)} \wedge \sigma_{\theta(1)} \leq \sigma_{\theta(2)}]$$

then $\text{Pr}_2(\lambda, \sum_{\theta \in a} \chi_\theta, \sum_{\theta \in a} \sigma_\theta)$.

PROOF. (1) Let f_α be such that $(*)$ of 25 holds (and the other demands there). We define for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$: $\theta(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Min}\{\theta \in a : f_\alpha(\theta) \neq f_\beta(\theta)\}$. Now $\langle a_i : i < \sigma_1 \rangle$ is a partition of a , and let $h : a \rightarrow \sigma_1$ be defined by $\theta \in a_{h(\theta)}$.

Let for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$, $e(\alpha, \beta) = h(\theta(\alpha, \beta))$. Let $\xi < \sigma_2$, $\langle \alpha_{\beta,\zeta} : \zeta < \xi \rangle$ be a strictly increasing sequence of ordinals $< \lambda$, $\geq \beta$, and let $i(*) < \sigma_1$. Let us define $f_\beta^* \in \Pi a$ by

$$f_\beta^*(\theta) = \text{Min}\{f_{\alpha_{\beta,\zeta}}(\theta) : \zeta < \xi\}.$$

As $\xi < \sigma_2$, $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a}$ is σ_2 -complete, clearly $f_\alpha \leq f_\beta^* \bmod J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a}$. Let

$$c^* = \{\theta \in a : \sup\{f_\beta^*(\theta) : \beta < \lambda\} = \theta\}.$$

Then $c^* \equiv c \bmod J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a}$.

So we can find $\theta^* \in c^* \cap c_i$ so there are $\beta(i) < \lambda$ for $i < \theta^*$ such that $f_{\beta(i)}^*(\theta^*) \geq i$, w.l.o.g. $[i < j < \theta^* \Rightarrow \beta(i) < \beta(j)]$, and (by $(*)$ of 25) w.l.o.g. $\langle f_{\alpha_{\beta(i), \zeta}} \upharpoonright (a \cap \theta^* : \zeta < \xi) \rangle$ is the same for all. The rest should be clear.

(2) What for 2σ colours? Let $\text{pr}(\alpha, \beta)$ be 0 if $\alpha < \beta \equiv f_\alpha(\theta(\alpha, \beta)) < f_\beta(\theta(\alpha, \beta))$, and 1 otherwise, and let $e''(\alpha, \beta) = \sigma_1 \times \text{pr}(\alpha, \beta) + h(\theta(\alpha, \beta))$.

46. CLAIM. Suppose $\lambda = \max \text{pcf}(a)$, $a \in I^{\kappa, 2}$, $J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a}$ is σ -complete. Then $\text{Pr}_1^-(\lambda, 2, \sigma)$.

PROOF. For $\alpha < \beta$

$$c(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} 0 & (\forall \mu \in a) f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a}(\mu) \leq f_{\lambda, \beta}^{\kappa, a}(\mu), \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $\gamma = 1$, the proof is similar to the proof of 38 (using f_α^* , but now we get only $c^* \neq \emptyset \bmod J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a}$, which suffice. For $\gamma = 0$, take a close enough elementary submodel M of $(H(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$ of cardinality χ , choose $\beta(1) < \lambda$, $\beta(1) < \sup(M \cap \lambda)$ and then choose $\beta(0) \in \lambda \cap M$ such that for $\zeta < \xi$,

$$f_{\alpha_{\beta(0), \zeta}}(\theta) < \text{Min}[M \cap (\theta + 1) - f_{\alpha_{\beta(0), \zeta}}(\theta)]$$

and is large enough.

47. REMARK. (1) We can analyze $\Pi c / J_c^{\text{bc}}$ when $\kappa = |c| < \min c$, $\sigma = \text{cf}(c)$, $2^\sigma < \text{Min}(c)$ define pcf , hence the $f_{\lambda, \alpha}$ etc. This essentially is what is used in proving the bound on $\aleph_\delta^{\text{cf } \delta}$ when $\delta < \aleph_\delta$, $2^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_\delta$.

(2) A conclusion (of 25) is that for singular $\lambda > 2^{\text{cf } \delta}$, there is a Kurepa tree for λ .

Note

48. CLAIM. If $\text{Pr}_1(\lambda, \chi, \sigma)$ and $2^\chi \geq \lambda$ then $\text{Pr}_0(\lambda, \chi, \sigma)$.

PROOF. As in [Sh 6] — 3.x (and explicitly in [Sh 11] 1.3).

48A. REMARK. Note that our partition relations show that it is quite hard to get positive ones.

A slight strengthening of Todorćević [T2] is

49. THEOREM. *If $\lambda \in R_{ac}^{\kappa, 2}$, κ minimal, then there are a $\lambda - L$ -space and a $\lambda - S$ -space with κ -directed nb basis for each point.*

PROOF. By the definition there are an $a \in I^{\kappa, 2}$, $\text{supa } a < \lambda$ ($2^\kappa < \lambda$) and $f_\alpha \in \Pi a$ ($\alpha < \lambda$) such that for no $\alpha < \beta$, $f_\beta \leq f_\alpha$. For repeating the Todorcevic proof [T2] we seemingly need also

$$(*) \quad \text{for } \mu \in a, \quad |\{f_\alpha \uparrow \mu^+ : \alpha < \lambda\}| < \lambda.$$

We can get it w.l.o.g. by 22, 25 (we get really more).

In his proof a basis of clopen neighbourhoods of α is

$$u_{\alpha, \mu}^S = \{\beta < \lambda : f_\beta \leq f_\alpha, f_\beta \uparrow \mu^+ = f_\alpha \uparrow \mu^+\}$$

for $\mu \in A$ (thus we get a $\lambda - S$ -space).

For a $\lambda - L$ -space use as a basis of clopen neighbourhoods of α

$$u_{\alpha, \mu}^L = \{\beta < \lambda : f_\alpha \leq f_\beta, f_\beta \uparrow \mu^+ = f_\alpha \uparrow \mu^+\}.$$

§7. On $\lambda \rightarrow [\mu^+]_\theta^2$

50. LEMMA. *Suppose b is a set of regular cardinals $> 2^\kappa$, $|b| \leq \kappa$, b has no last element, \mathcal{D} is a filter on b to which all cobounded subsets of b belong,*

$$(\forall b') [b' \subseteq b \wedge |b'| < |b| \rightarrow b - b' \in \mathcal{D}]$$

and $\mu \geq (\sup b)^+$, μ regular, $\theta \leq \kappa$.

Suppose further $\lambda \geq \mu$, $f_\alpha \in \Pi b$ for $\alpha < \lambda$ and $f_\alpha < f_\beta \pmod{\mathcal{D}}$ for $\alpha < \beta < \lambda$.

If $a_i \subseteq b$ for $i < \theta$, $b - a_i \notin \mathcal{D}$, $[i \neq j \Rightarrow a_i \cap a_j = \emptyset]$ then there is a symmetric two place function e from λ to θ such that:

If $k < \omega$, $\alpha_{\beta, \zeta}$ ($\beta < \mu$, $\zeta < k$) are pairwise distinct ordinals $< \lambda$, $k < \omega$, $h : \{1, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \theta$, then we can find $\beta(1) < \dots < \beta(k) < \mu$ such that:

- (i) $\alpha_{\beta(1), \zeta} < \alpha_{\beta(2), \zeta} < \dots < \alpha_{\beta(k), \zeta}$ for $\zeta < k$;
- (ii) for $\zeta(1) \neq \zeta(2)$ one of the following holds:
 - (a) for $l, m = 1, \dots, k$, $\alpha_{\beta(l), \zeta(1)} < \alpha_{\beta(m), \zeta(2)}$;
 - (b) for $l, m = 1, \dots, k$, $\alpha_{\beta(l), \zeta(1)} > \alpha_{\beta(m), \zeta(2)}$;
 - (c) either

$$\alpha_{\beta(1), \zeta(1)} < \alpha_{\beta(1), \zeta(2)} < \alpha_{\beta(2), \zeta(1)} < \alpha_{\beta(2), \zeta(2)} \dots$$

or

$$\alpha_{\beta(1), \zeta(2)} < \alpha_{\beta(1), \zeta(1)} < \alpha_{\beta(2), \zeta(2)} < \alpha_{\beta(2), \zeta(1)} \dots$$

- (iii) for $l < m$, $\zeta < k$: $e(\alpha_{\beta(l), \zeta}, \alpha_{\beta(m), \zeta}) = h(l)$;
- (iv) for $\zeta(1) \neq \zeta(2) < k$,

$$(a) \text{ for } l \neq m, e(\alpha_{\beta(l), \zeta(1)}, \alpha_{\beta(m), \zeta(2)}) = 0$$

or

$$(b) \text{ for } l < m, e(\alpha_{\beta(l), \zeta(1)}, \alpha_{\beta(m), \zeta(2)}) = h(l).$$

50A. REMARK. In (iv) there are some restrictions on $\{(\zeta(1), \zeta(2)) : (\text{iv})(a) \text{ occurs}\}$; see the proof.

PROOF. We define the colouring as follows: θ, e are symmetric functions; for $\alpha < \beta$

$$\theta(\alpha, \beta) = \text{Max}\{\theta \in b : f_\alpha(\theta) > f_\beta(\theta)\}$$

$(\theta(\alpha, \beta))$ is undefined if there is no maximal such as θ ,

$$e(\alpha, \beta) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } \theta(\alpha, \beta) \in a_i, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose $k < \omega$, $\langle \alpha_{\beta, \zeta} : \zeta < k \rangle$ is a sequence of ordinals $< \lambda$ for $\beta < \mu$ such that:

$$\alpha_{\beta(1), \zeta(1)} = \alpha_{\beta(2), \zeta(2)} \Leftrightarrow \beta(1) = \beta(2) \wedge \zeta(1) = \zeta(2).$$

Let $\alpha(\beta, \zeta) = \alpha_{\beta, \zeta}$.

Let χ be regular large enough, $<_\chi^*$ a well ordering of $H(\chi)$.

Let $\langle N_i : i < \kappa^+ \rangle$ be increasing continuous, $\|N_i\| = 2^\kappa$, $N_i < (H(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$, $\langle N_j : j \leq i \rangle \in N_{i+1}$ and every subset of N_{i+1} of cardinality $\leq \kappa$ belongs to N_{i+1} and $b, \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle, \langle \langle \alpha_{\beta, \zeta} : \zeta < k \rangle : \beta < \mu \rangle$ belongs to N_0 . Let $N_{\kappa^+} = \bigcup_{i < \kappa^+} N_i$.

Choose $\beta(*) < \mu$, $\beta(*) > \sup(\mu \cap \bigcup_{i < \kappa^+} N_i)$. For each $\zeta < k$ let $b_\zeta = \{\sigma \in b : f_{\alpha(\beta(*), \zeta)}(\sigma) \in \bigcup_{i < \kappa^+} N_i\}$, $b^\zeta = b - b_\zeta$, and f_ζ^*, f_ζ^+ be defined by:

$$\text{dom } f_\zeta^* = b^\zeta,$$

$$f_\zeta^*(\sigma) = \text{Min}\{j \in \bigcup_{i < \kappa^+} N_i, j > f_{\alpha(\beta(*), \zeta)}(\sigma)\},$$

$$\text{dom } f_\zeta^+ = b,$$

$$f_\zeta^+ = f_\zeta^* \cup (f_{\alpha(\beta(*), \zeta)} \upharpoonright b_\zeta).$$

Clearly for some successor $i(*) < \kappa^+$, $\text{rang } f_\zeta^+ \subseteq N_{i(*)}$ for every $\zeta < k$, hence $\langle f_\zeta^+ : \zeta < k \rangle \in N_{i(*)}$.

Let, for $\zeta(1) \neq \zeta(2) < k$, $c_{\zeta(1), \zeta(2)} = \{\sigma \in b : f_{\alpha(\beta(*), \zeta(1))}(\sigma) = f_{\alpha(\beta(*), \zeta(2))}(\sigma)\}$. For $\sigma \in b$ let

$$N_{i+1}^\sigma = \text{Skolem Hull in } (H(\mathcal{X}), \in, <^*) \text{ of } N_{i+1} \cup \{f_{\alpha(\beta(i), \zeta)}(\sigma) : \zeta < k\},$$

$$N_\delta^\sigma = \bigcup_{i < \delta} N_{i+1}^\sigma.$$

We can find $\beta(i, \sigma) \in \mu \cap N_{i(*)+i+2}^\sigma$ such that

- (a) $f_{\alpha(\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta)}(\sigma_1) = f_{\alpha(\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta)}(\sigma)$ for $\zeta < k$,
- (b) $f_{\alpha(\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta)}(\tau) = f_{\alpha(\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta)}(\tau)$ for $\zeta < k$, $\tau \in b_\zeta$,
- (c) $\sup(f_\zeta^*(\tau) \cap N_{i(*)+i+1}) < f_{\alpha(\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta)}(\tau) < \sup f_\zeta^*(\tau) \cap N_{i(*)+i+2}$ for $\zeta < k$, $\tau \in b - b_\zeta - \sigma^+$.
- (d) $f_{\alpha(\beta(i_1), \zeta_1)}(\theta_1) < f_{\alpha(\beta(i_2), \zeta_2)}(\theta_2)$ iff $f_{\alpha(\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta_1)}(\theta_1) < f_{\alpha(\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta_2)}(\theta_2)$ for any $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < \xi$ and $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in b$.

Now suppose $i_1 < i_2 < i(*)$, and $\zeta_1, \zeta_2 < k$ and $\sigma_2 < \sigma_1 \in b - \bigcup_\zeta b_\zeta$ and we shall check the color of $\alpha_{\beta(i_1, \sigma_1), \zeta_1}$, $\alpha_{\beta(i_2, \sigma_2), \zeta_2}$.

Case I: $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2 = \zeta$.

Easily

$$b_\zeta \subseteq \{\tau : f_{\alpha(\beta(i_1, \sigma_1), \zeta)}(\tau) = f_{\alpha(\beta(i_2, \sigma_2), \zeta)}(\tau)\} \subseteq b_\zeta \cup (b \cap \sigma_2^+),$$

$$\{\sigma_2\} \subseteq \{\tau : f_{\alpha(\beta(i_1, \sigma_1), \zeta)}(\tau) > f_{\alpha(\beta(i_2, \sigma_2), \zeta)}(\tau)\} \subseteq \{\sigma_2\} \cup (b \cap \sigma_2).$$

So $e(\alpha_{\beta(i_1, \sigma_1), \zeta_1}, \alpha_{\beta(i_2, \sigma_2), \zeta_2}) = h(\sigma_2)$.

Case II: $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2$.

$$b_{\zeta_1} \cap b_{\zeta_2} \cap c_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2} \subseteq \{\tau \in b : f_{\alpha(\beta(i_1, \sigma_1), \zeta_1)}(\tau) = f_{\alpha(\beta(i_2, \sigma_2), \zeta_2)}(\tau)\}$$

$$\subseteq (b_{\zeta_1} \cap b_{\zeta_2} \cap c_{\zeta_1, \zeta_2}) \cup (b \cap \sigma_2),$$

$$\{\tau \in b : f_{\zeta_1}^+(\tau) > f_{\zeta_2}^+(\tau)\} \cup \{\sigma_2\} \subseteq \{\tau : f_{\alpha(\beta(i_1, \sigma_1), \zeta_1)}(\tau) > f_{\alpha(\beta(i_2, \sigma_2), \zeta_2)}(\tau)\}$$

$$\subseteq \{\tau \in b : f_{\zeta_1}^+(\tau) > f_{\zeta_2}^+(\tau)\} \cup \{\sigma_2\} \cup (b \cap \sigma_2).$$

Now choose $i(*) < i_1 < \dots < i_k < \kappa^+$, $\sigma_1 > \dots > \sigma_k$ in $b - \bigcup_\zeta b_\zeta$, such that if $\{\sigma : f_{\zeta(1)}^+(\sigma) > f_{\zeta(2)}^+(\sigma)\}$ is bounded in b then σ_k is a bound. Now $\{\alpha_{\beta(i, \sigma), \zeta} : i, \zeta\}$ are as required.

51. LEMMA. Suppose $b, \kappa, \mathcal{D}, \mu = (\sup b)^+$, $\lambda, f_\alpha (\alpha < \lambda)$ are as in Lemma 50, and suppose further that for $\sigma \in b$, $\{f_\alpha \upharpoonright (b \cap \sigma) : \alpha < \lambda\}$ has cardinality $< \sigma$ (see 22, 25 for such cases), and $\xi < \kappa^+$, $(\forall \sigma \in b)(\forall \theta < \sigma)[|\theta^{|\xi|} < \sigma]$.

(1) For every $A \subseteq \lambda$, $|A| = \mu$, there is $b_1 \in \mathcal{D}$ such that:

for every $k < \omega$, $m < \omega$ and one to one functions $h_l : \{0, \dots, k-1\} \rightarrow \omega$ and

Min $b = \sigma_0 < \sigma_2 < \dots < \sigma_m$ from b_1 there are $\alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \dots < \alpha_{k-1}$ from A such that for $i < j < k$: $p \leq m$

$$(\forall \sigma \in b_1)[f_{\alpha_i}(\sigma) = f_{\alpha_j}(\sigma)],$$

$$(\forall \sigma)[\sigma \in b \wedge \sigma \notin b_1 \wedge \sigma \in [\sigma_p, \sigma_{p+1}) \rightarrow f_{\alpha_i}(\sigma) < f_{\alpha_j}(\sigma) \equiv h_p(i) \leq b_p(j)],$$

$$(\forall \sigma)[\sigma \in b \wedge \sigma \notin b_1 \wedge \sigma \geq \sigma_m \rightarrow f_{\alpha_i}(\sigma) < f_{\alpha_j}(\sigma)].$$

(2) For every $\xi < \kappa^+$, $\alpha_{\beta, \zeta}$ ($\beta < \mu$, $\zeta < \xi$) distinct ordinals $< \lambda$, $r(*) < \kappa^+$, the following holds:

For some $b_\zeta \in \mathcal{D}$, $f_\zeta^+ : b \rightarrow \text{ord}$ (for $\zeta < \xi$):

For every sequence $\langle k_r \langle b_r^0, b_r^1 : r < r \rangle \rangle$ such that $k_n < \omega$, b_r^0 is a strictly increasing function from $k_r = \{0, \dots, k_i - 1\}$ to ordinal $[r \neq s \Rightarrow \text{rang}(b_r^0) \cap \text{rang}(b_s^0) = \emptyset]$, b_r^1 a strictly decreasing function from $k_r = \{0, \dots, k_r - 1\}$ to b there are $\beta(r)$ ($r < r(*)$), from A , such that:

(a) $r < j < i(0) \Rightarrow p(r) < \beta(s)$.

(b) Let $\zeta(1), \zeta(2) < \xi$, $i < j < i(*)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\sigma \in b : f_{\alpha(\beta(r), \zeta(1))}(\sigma) = f_{\alpha(\beta(s), \zeta(2))}(\sigma)\} \\ = b_{\zeta(1)} \cap b_{\zeta(2)} \cap \{\sigma \in b : f_{\zeta(1)}^+(\sigma) = f_{\zeta(2)}^+(\sigma)\}. \end{aligned}$$

(c) Let $\zeta(1), \zeta(2) < \xi$, $r < s$, $\sigma \in b$, if $f_{\zeta(1)}^+(\sigma) < f_{\zeta(2)}^+(\sigma)$ then $f_{\alpha(\beta(r), \zeta(1))}(\sigma) < f_{\alpha(\beta(s), \zeta(2))}(\sigma)$.

(d) Let $\zeta(1), \zeta(2) < \xi$, $r < s$, $\sigma \in b$, $f_{\zeta(1)}^+(\sigma) = f_{\zeta(2)}^+(\sigma)$; if $\sigma \in b_{\zeta(2)} - b_{\zeta(1)}$ then $f_{\alpha(\beta(r), \zeta(1))}(\sigma) < f_{\alpha(\beta(s), \zeta(1))}(\sigma)$ while if $\sigma \in b_{\zeta(1)} - b_{\zeta(2)}$ then $f_{\alpha(\beta(r), \zeta(1))}(\sigma) > f_{\alpha(\beta(s), \zeta(2))}(\sigma)$.

(e) Let $\zeta(1), \zeta(2) < \xi$, $r < s$, $\sigma \in b - b_{\zeta(1)} \cup b_{\zeta(2)}$, and $f_{\zeta(1)}^+(\sigma) = f_{\zeta(2)}^+(\sigma)$.

If $l \leq k, m \leq k_j$, $h_r^1(l) \leq \sigma < h_r^1(l+1)$, $h_s^1(m) \leq \sigma < h_s^1(m+1)$ (stipulating $h_r^1(k_i) = \text{sup } b$), then

$$f_{\alpha(\beta(r), \zeta(1))}(\sigma) < f_{\alpha(\beta(s), \zeta(2))}(\sigma) \Leftrightarrow h_r^0(l) \leq h_s^0(m).$$

51A. REMARK. The proof gives more than stated in the lemma.

PROOF. (1) Follows by 2.

(2) Let $\alpha_{\beta, \zeta}$ ($\beta < \mu$, $\zeta < \xi$) be distinct ordinals $< \lambda$ (for some $\xi < \kappa^+$). As in the proof of Lemma 50 we choose χ , $< \chi^*$, $\langle N_i : i < \kappa^+ \rangle$, and then $\beta(*) < \mu$, b_ζ , $g f_\zeta^*$, f_ζ^+ for $\zeta < \xi$ and $i(*)$. Note

- (*) if $\sigma \in b$, $\alpha_\zeta < \lambda$ for $\zeta < \xi$, $f = \langle f_{\alpha_\zeta} \upharpoonright \sigma : \zeta < \xi \rangle$;
 $N_{r+1}[f]$ is the Skolem Hull of $|N_{i+1}| \{f\}$, and
 $\theta \in b - \bigcup_i \sigma^+$ then $\text{sup}(\theta \cap N_{i+1}[f]) = \text{sup}(\theta \cap N_{i+1})$.

We shall show that b_ζ, f_ζ^+ ($\zeta < \xi$) are as required, so let $\langle k_r, b_r^0, b_r^1 : r < r(*) \rangle$.

W.l.o.g. each b_r^0 is into $\{i + 1 : i(*) < i < \kappa^+\}$. Now for each $r < r(*)$, we define $\beta(r, l)$, $l = 0, \dots, k_r$, by downward induction on l . For $l = k_r$, $\beta(r, l) = \beta(*)$. If $\beta(r, l + 1)$ is defined, let: $N_{r,l}$ be Skolem Hull of

$$N_{h_r^0(l)}[\langle f_{\alpha\beta(r,l+1),\zeta} \upharpoonright h_r^0(l) : \zeta < \xi \rangle]$$

and let: $\beta(r, l) \in N_{r,l} \cap \mu$ be such that

$$\langle f_{\alpha\beta(r,l),\zeta} \upharpoonright h_r^0(l) : \zeta < \xi \rangle = \langle f_{\alpha\beta(r,l+1),\zeta} \upharpoonright h_r^0(l) : \zeta < \xi \rangle,$$

$$\bigwedge_{\zeta < \xi} (\forall \sigma \in b_\zeta) f_{\alpha\beta(r,l),\zeta}(\sigma) = f_{\alpha\beta(r,l+1),\zeta}(\sigma) = f_{\alpha\beta(*),\zeta},$$

$$\bigwedge_{\zeta < \xi} (\forall \sigma \in b - b_\zeta) [f_{\alpha\beta(r,l),\zeta}(\sigma) \notin N_{h_r^0(l)-1}],$$

$$\bigwedge_{\zeta < \xi} (\forall \sigma \in b - b_\zeta - h_r^0(l)) [\forall \gamma \in o \cap N_{h_r^0(l)} (f_{\alpha\beta(r,l),\zeta}(\sigma) \leq \gamma \equiv f_\zeta^+(\sigma) \leq \gamma)].$$

There is no problem, and this suffices.

52. CONCLUSION. Under the assumptions of Lemma 51, $\lambda \rightarrow [\mu]_\theta^2$.

53. CONCLUSION. If, in Lemma 51, $\theta > k$, $k < \omega$, $\mu = (\sup b)^+$ then there are Boolean algebras B_1, \dots, B_k such that

(i) each B_i satisfies the μ^+ -c.c., and even

$$\prod_{\substack{i=1,k \\ i \neq l}} B_i \text{ satisfies the } \mu^+ \text{-c.c.}$$

(ii) $\prod_{i=1}^k B_i$ does not satisfy the λ^+ -c.c.

PROOF. Let e be a two place function from λ to θ as there. For $l = 1, \dots, k$ let B_l be the Boolean algebra generated freely by $\{x_\beta : \beta < \lambda\}$ except that $x_\beta \cap x_\gamma = 0$ when $e(\beta, \gamma) = l$. Also the rest is as in [Sh 7] 1.10.

§8. $\aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{(2^{\aleph_0})^+}$ revisited

We can generalize the information on Πa to more sets.

54. DEFINITION. (1) $I^{\kappa,3} = \{A : A \subseteq R^{\kappa,2}, \text{Min } A > |A|^\kappa\}$ (κ will be fixed below).

(2) $\text{pcf}^\kappa(A) = \bigcup \{\text{pcf}(b) : b \subseteq a, |b| \leq \kappa\} = \{\text{cf}(\Pi A, <_\mathcal{D}) : \mathcal{D} \in \text{uf}^\kappa(A)\}$
where

$$f^\kappa(A) = \{ \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{D} \text{ a filter on } A, \text{Min}\{|b| : b \in \mathcal{D}\} \leq \kappa \},$$

$$uf^\kappa(A) = \{ \mathcal{D} \in f^\kappa(A) : \mathcal{D} \text{ an ultrafilter on } A \}.$$

(3) For $f, g \in \Pi A$, $A \in I^{\kappa,3}$, $f \leq_{\lambda, \kappa} g$ iff for every $b \in [A]^\kappa$,

$$[b \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, \delta} \Rightarrow f \upharpoonright b \leq_{\leq \lambda} g \upharpoonright b].$$

55. CLAIM. (1) For $A \in I^{\kappa,3}$, $|\text{pcf}^\kappa(A)| \leq |A|^\kappa + 2^\kappa$.

(2) For $A \in I^{\kappa,3}$, $\lambda \in \text{pcf}^\kappa(A)$, we can define $\langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, A} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ such that:

(i) $\alpha < \beta \Rightarrow f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, A} <_{\lambda, \kappa} f_{\lambda, \beta}^{\kappa, A}$,

(ii) for every $g \in \Pi A$ for some $\alpha < \lambda$

$$g <_{\lambda, \kappa} f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, A}.$$

(3) For $A \in I^{\kappa,3}$, $\lambda \in \text{pcf}^\kappa(A)$ there is $B = B_\lambda^A$ such that

(i) $B \subseteq A$,

(ii) for every $a \in [A]^{\leq \kappa}$

$$a \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a} \Leftrightarrow a - B \subset J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a \cap B}.$$

(4) For $A \in I^{\kappa,3}$, and λ and $a \in [A]^{\leq \kappa}$: $\max \text{pcf}(a) < \lambda \Leftrightarrow a$ is in the ideal of $\mathcal{P}(A)$ generated by $\{B_\mu^A : \mu \in \lambda \cap \text{pcf}^\kappa(A)\}$.

(5) If $A = \{ \theta : \aleph_\alpha \leq \theta < \aleph_\delta, \theta \text{ regular} \}$, $\aleph_\alpha < \aleph_\delta$, then $\text{pcf}^\kappa(A)$ has the form $\{ \theta : \aleph_\alpha \leq \theta < \aleph_\gamma, \theta \text{ regular} \}$ for some γ .

PROOF. (1) Easy.

(2) We define by induction on $\alpha < \lambda$, a function $f_\alpha^* = f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, A} \in \Pi A$ and $\langle \gamma_\alpha^a : a \in L \rangle$ where

$$L = \{ a : a \in [A]^{\leq \kappa}, a \in J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a} - J_{\leq \lambda}^{\kappa, a} \}$$

such that

(a) $f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright a \leq f_\alpha^* \upharpoonright a$ for $a \in L$,

(b) $\alpha \leq \gamma_\alpha^a < \lambda$ for $a \in L$,

(c) for $\beta < \alpha$, $a \in L$, $f_\beta^* \upharpoonright a < f_{\lambda, \beta}^{\kappa, a} \text{ mod } J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a}$.

There is no problem to do it [for each α , first choose $\langle \gamma_\alpha^a : a \in L \rangle$ such that (b) and (c) are satisfied, next choose f_α^* such that (a) is satisfied; this is possible as $\text{Min } A > |A|^\kappa \geq |L|$, each $\theta \in A$ regular]. Now $\langle f_\alpha^* : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ is as required.

(3) Let $\langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, A} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be from (2). For every $a \in L_1 = \{ a \in [A]^{\leq \kappa} : a \notin J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a} \}$, we can find $h_a \in \Pi a$ such that, for every $\alpha < \lambda$, $h_a \not\leq f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, A} \upharpoonright a \text{ mod } J_{<\lambda}^{\kappa, a}$.

We can define $h \in \Pi A$,

$$h(\theta) = \sup[\{0\} \cup \{h_a(\theta) : \theta \in a \in L_1\}].$$

Now for every $b \in L$ for some $\gamma_b < \lambda$, $h \upharpoonright b \leq f_{\lambda, \gamma_b}^{\kappa, b} \bmod J_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, b}$. Let $\gamma(*) = \sup_{b \in L} \gamma_b < \lambda$, so for $b \in L$, $h \upharpoonright b \leq_{\lambda, \kappa} f_{\lambda, \gamma(*)}^{\kappa, A}$. Let $B = \{\theta \in A : h(\theta) \leq f_{\lambda, \gamma(*)}^{\kappa, A}(\theta)\}$.

(4) Easy.

(5) By 5(2).

56. REMARK. By [Sh 5] $(\aleph_\delta)^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_{(|\delta|^{\text{cf } \delta})^+}$ and when $\aleph_\alpha^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$, $(\aleph_{\alpha+\delta})^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_{\alpha+(|\delta|^{\text{cf } \delta})^+}$.

57. THE SIMPLER PROOF OF $(\aleph_{\alpha+\delta})^{|\delta|} < \aleph_{\alpha+(2^{|\delta|})^+}$ WHEN $\aleph_\alpha^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$.

Let $\kappa = |\delta|$, and δ a minimal counterexample. The case $\delta = \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$ is unreal so let $\delta < \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$. For some α_1, δ_1 , $\delta = \alpha_1 + \delta_1$, $|\delta_1| < \aleph_{\alpha_1+\delta_1}$, α_1 limit or zero and $|\delta_1|^\kappa \leq \aleph_{\alpha_1}$ or $\delta_1 = \omega$. If $(\aleph_{\alpha+\alpha_1})^\kappa \geq \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$ we can finish easily. So w.l.o.g. (remember $\aleph_{\alpha+1}^\kappa \leq \aleph_\alpha^\kappa + \aleph_{\alpha+1}$) $|\delta|^\kappa \leq \aleph_\alpha^\kappa$. Let $\mu = (\aleph_\alpha)^\kappa$, $a = \{\lambda : \mu^+ < \lambda < \aleph_\delta, \lambda \text{ regular}\}$. So $|a| \leq |\delta| < \aleph_\alpha \leq \mu < \text{Min } a$, so 16 applies.

Let $\langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, \alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ be as in Claim 55.

Let χ be regular large enough, $<_\chi^*$ a well ordering of $H(\chi)$. For each $x \subseteq \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$, $|x| \leq \kappa$ we define by induction on $\zeta < \mu^+$, N_ζ^x such that

- (a) $N_\zeta^x < (H(\chi), \in, <_\zeta^*)$,
- (b) $\|N_\zeta^x\| = \mu, \mu + 1 \subseteq N_\zeta^x, x \in N_\zeta^x, \langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, \alpha} : < \chi \rangle : \lambda \in \text{pcf } a \in N_\zeta^x, A \in N_\zeta^x$,
- (c) $\langle N_\zeta^x : \zeta < \mu^+ \rangle$ is increasing continuous,
- (d) $\langle N_\zeta^x : \zeta \leq \xi \rangle \in N_{\xi+1}^x$.

As $\mu + 1 \subseteq N_\zeta^x, \text{pcf}(A) \in N_\zeta^x$ clearly $\text{pcf}(a) \subseteq N_\zeta^x$. Let ch_ζ^x is the function with domain a , $ch_\zeta^x(\theta) = \sup(\theta \cap N_\zeta^x)$, it is $< \theta$ as $|N_\zeta^x| < \mu^+ = \text{Min } a$ hence $ch_\zeta^x \in \Pi a$. So for each $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(a)$ and ζ , for some $\alpha_\lambda(x, \zeta) < \lambda$ (letting $b = b_\lambda^{\kappa, \alpha}$)

$$f_{\lambda, \alpha_\lambda(x, \zeta)}^{b, \kappa} < ch_\zeta^x \upharpoonright b \leq f_{\lambda, \alpha_\lambda(x, \zeta)}^{b, \kappa} \bmod J_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, b}.$$

Let

$$N_{\mu^+}^x = \bigcup_{\zeta < \mu^+} N_\zeta^x, \quad ch_{\mu^+}^x(\theta) = \sup_{\zeta} ch_\zeta^x(\theta) = \sup(N_{\mu^+}^x \cap \theta).$$

Let $\alpha_\lambda(x) = \bigcup_{\zeta} \alpha_\lambda(x, \zeta)$. So easily $ch_{\mu^+}^x \upharpoonright b = f_{\lambda, \alpha_\lambda(x)}^{b, \kappa} \bmod J_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, b}$. So

$$ch_{\mu^+}^x = \bigcup_{l=1}^h f_{\lambda_l, \alpha_{\lambda_l}(x)}^{b_l, \kappa} \upharpoonright b_l \cap c_l$$

where $\langle b_l, c_l : l = 1, \kappa \rangle$ depend on x . So the number of possible $ch_{\mu^+}^x$ is $\leq \sup \text{pcf } a$ which, by 55(5), is $\leq \aleph_{\alpha+(2^{|\delta|})^+}$. Now $ch_{\mu^+}^x$ determines $N_{\mu^+}^x \cap \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$ as

(*) if $M_1, M_2 < (H(\chi), \in, <_\chi^*)$, $\mu^+ \subseteq M_l, \delta \in M_l$,

for each $\theta \in A$, $\sup(M_1 \cap \theta) = \sup(M_2 \cap \theta)$, it has cofinality $> \aleph_0$, and both M_1 and M_2 contains a club for it then $M_1 \cap \aleph_\delta = M_2 \cap \aleph_\delta$, so we finish.

58. THEOREM. Suppose $\text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa$, $(\forall i < \delta)(\aleph_i^\kappa < \aleph_\delta)$,

$$\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\aleph_\delta \cap R_{ia}^\kappa| < \aleph_\delta \quad \text{then } \aleph_\delta^\kappa < \aleph_{\delta+(\mu^\kappa)^+}.$$

59. REMARK. If \aleph_δ is minimal such that $\aleph_\delta = \delta$, $\kappa = \aleph_0$ then $\aleph_\delta \cap R_{ia}^\kappa - (2^{\aleph_0})^+ = \{\theta : \theta = \text{cf } \theta = \theta^{\aleph_0}, 2^{\aleph_0} < \theta < \aleph_\delta\}$.

60. PROOF. Either imitate proof of the bound or show inductively that $|\aleph_\delta \cap R_{ia}^\kappa|^\kappa \leq |\delta|^\kappa$.

61. THEOREM. If $S = \{\delta < \aleph_2 : \text{cf } \delta = \aleph_0, \aleph_\delta^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{\delta+\omega_1}\}$ is stationary, $2^{\aleph_1} < \aleph_{\omega_1}$ then $\aleph_{\omega_1}^{\aleph_1} < \aleph_{\omega_2}$.

PROOF. By 63.

62. THEOREM. Suppose $\text{cf}(\delta) \leq \theta < \kappa$, and for every $a \subseteq R^{\kappa,2} \cap \aleph_\delta$,

$$[|a| \leq \theta \Rightarrow \max \text{pcf}(a) \leq \aleph_{\delta+\alpha(*)}]$$

where $\alpha(*) < \theta^+$, and $2^\kappa < \aleph_\delta$.

Then for some $\gamma < \delta$, every $a \subseteq R^{\kappa,2} \cap [\aleph_\gamma, \aleph_\delta)$,

$$[|a| \leq \kappa \Rightarrow \max \text{pcf}(a) \leq \aleph_{\delta+\alpha(*)}].$$

62A. REMARK. If $(\aleph_\delta)^\theta < \aleph_{(\delta+\theta^+)}$, the assumption holds.⁽⁶⁾

PROOF. Now let $A \subseteq R^\kappa \cap [(2^\kappa)^{++}, \aleph_\delta]$ be a set of cardinality $\leq \kappa$, $\langle f_{\lambda,\beta}^{A,\theta} : \beta < \lambda \rangle \lambda \in c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\aleph_{\delta+\beta+1} : \beta < \alpha(*)\}$ are well defined. Now if $f \in \Pi A$ for each λ for some $\beta(f, \lambda) < \lambda$, $f <_{\lambda,\theta} f_{\lambda,\beta(f,\lambda)}^{A,\theta}$. If for every finite $w \subseteq c$, $f \not\leq \text{Max}_{\lambda \in w} f_{\lambda,\beta(f,\lambda)}^{A,\theta}$ then there is $\sigma(w) \in A$ which exemplifies it. Now let

$$b = \bigcup \{\sigma(w) : w \subseteq c; w \text{ finite}\}.$$

For $f \upharpoonright b$ we can find a w , hence we have shown $\text{cf } \Pi A \leq \aleph_{\delta+\alpha(*)}$; this shows the desired conclusion.

63. THEOREM. Suppose $\text{cf } \kappa = \kappa > \theta$, $\mu^{<\kappa} < \aleph_\mu$, $\text{cf } \mu = \mu$ and

$$S_1 = \{\delta < \mu : (\aleph_\delta)^\theta < \aleph_{(\delta+\theta^+)}, \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta\}$$

or

⁽⁶⁾ We can, in the assumption, restrict ourselves to $[\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_\delta] \supseteq a$ for some fixed $\alpha < \delta$.

$$S_2 = \{\delta < \mu : \text{cf } \delta = \theta \text{ and for some } \alpha < \delta \text{ and } \gamma < \mu, \text{ for every } a \in R^{\theta, 2}, \\ a \subseteq [\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_\delta] \Rightarrow \max \text{pcf } a < \aleph_\gamma\}$$

is stationary.

Then for every $\alpha < \mu$, $(\aleph_\alpha)^{<\kappa} < \aleph_\mu$.

64(1). REMARK. In the definition of S we need just the conclusion of the last theorem.

PROOF. Let $\alpha(*)$ be minimal such that $(\aleph_{\alpha(*)})^{<\kappa} \geq \aleph_\mu$ (assuming that the theorem fails). So $\aleph_{\alpha(*)} > \mu^{<\kappa}$, hence $\alpha(*)$ is limit, $[\alpha < \alpha(*) \Rightarrow \aleph_\alpha^{<\kappa} < \aleph_\mu]$; but $(\chi^{<\kappa})^{<\kappa} = \chi^{<\kappa}$ (as κ is regular) so $[\alpha < \alpha(*) \Rightarrow \aleph_\alpha^{<\kappa} < \aleph_{\alpha(*)}]$. So necessarily $\text{cf}(\alpha(*)) < \kappa$, and $(\aleph_{\alpha(*)})^{\text{cf}(\alpha(*))} \geq \aleph_\mu$ so $\kappa > \sigma \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{cf}(\alpha(*))$. By the last theorem and Fodor we know that for some $\delta(*) < \mu$, $> \alpha(*)$, S is stationary where

$$S = \{\delta < \mu : \text{cf}(\delta) = \theta, \aleph_\delta > \mu^\sigma, \text{ and } \sup \text{pcf}^\sigma \{\aleph_{\gamma+1} : \delta(*) \leq \gamma < \delta\} < \aleph_\mu\}.$$

Let for $\delta \leq \mu$, $A(\delta) = \{\aleph_\alpha : \mu^\sigma + \aleph_{\delta(*)} < \aleph_\alpha < \aleph_\delta, \aleph_\alpha \text{ regular}\}$. Let χ be regular large enough, $N_\zeta < (H(\chi), \in, <^*)$ for $\zeta < \mu_0^+$, $\mu_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mu^\sigma + \aleph_{\delta(*)}$, $\mu_0^+ \subseteq N_\zeta$, $\langle N_\xi : \xi \leq \zeta \rangle \in N_{\zeta+1}$, and $\langle \langle \langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{A(\delta), \sigma} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle : \lambda \in \text{pcf}^\sigma A(\delta) \rangle : \delta \in S \rangle$ belongs to N_0 , as well as letting $B = \{\aleph_\alpha : \aleph_\alpha \text{ regular} < \aleph_{\alpha(*)}, \aleph_\alpha > \mu + 2^\sigma\}$, $\langle \langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{B, \kappa} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle : \lambda \in \text{pcf } B \rangle$ and $\|N_\zeta\| = \mu_0^+$.

Now (if $\sigma > \aleph_0$ by 12 (holds if S_1 is stationary) and if $\sigma = \aleph_0$ by [Sh 5] Ch XIII (or see 65 below)) we know that, for every $\beta < \alpha(*)$ for some $a_\beta \in R^{\sigma, 2}$, $a_\beta \subseteq (\mu^\sigma, \aleph_{\alpha(*)})$ and $\aleph_{\beta+1} \in \text{pcf}(a_\beta)$. Let $W = \{\beta < \mu : \beta \geq \delta(*)\}$.

Let g be the function: $g(\theta) = \sup(\theta \cap \bigcup_\zeta N_\zeta)$ for $\theta \in [\mu_0^{++}, \aleph_\mu)$. For each $\beta \in W$ let $b_\beta \subseteq B$ be maximal s.t.

$$g \upharpoonright b_\beta = f_{\aleph_{\beta+1}, g(\aleph_{\beta+1})}^{a_\beta, \kappa} \upharpoonright b_\beta.$$

Now there is a set $w_0 \subseteq W$ of cardinality $\leq |B| \leq |\alpha(*)| < \mu$ such that

$$\bigcup \{b_\beta : \beta \in w_0\} = \bigcup \{b_\beta : \beta \in W\}.$$

Choose $\gamma \in S$, $\gamma > \delta(*)$, $\gamma > \sup(w_0)$ and (note: C is a club of μ as $S \in \mu$ is stationary)

$$\gamma \in C \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\delta < \mu : \text{if } a \subseteq R \cap [\aleph_{\delta(*)}, \aleph_\delta], |a| \leq \sigma, \sup a < \aleph_\delta, \text{ then} \\ \sup \text{pcf}(a) < \aleph_\delta\}.$$

So there is $w \subseteq w_0$, $|w| \leq \sigma$, s.t. $b_\gamma \subseteq \bigcup_{\beta \in w} b_\beta$.

Let $\delta = \sup w$, $a = \{\aleph_{\beta+1} : \beta \in w\}$, $a^* = \text{pcf}(a)$. Note that $a \subseteq a^* \subseteq [\aleph_{\delta(\ast)}, \aleph_\mu)$, hence we know that $\text{pcf}(a)$ has a bound $< \aleph_\gamma$ (and $|a| \leq \sigma$) so there are $\theta(\gamma, 1), \dots, \theta(\gamma, \eta), b_1^\gamma, \dots, b_\eta^\gamma$ s.t.:

- (i) $\theta(\gamma, l) \in a^*$,
- (ii) $b_l^\gamma \subseteq a$,
- (iii) $g \upharpoonright a^* = \bigcup_{l=1}^\eta f_{\theta(\gamma, l), g(\theta(\gamma, l))}^{A(\gamma), \sigma} \upharpoonright b_l^\gamma$.

So from the information in (i), (ii), (iii) we can reconstruct $g \upharpoonright (\bigcup \{b_\beta : \beta \in w\})$, hence $g \upharpoonright a_\gamma$, hence $g(\aleph_{\gamma+1})$. But we could easily choose the N_ζ 's so that this fails (for all possible γ 's).

64(2). REMARK. An instance of 64 for \aleph_ω is: suppose

$$S = \left\{ \delta < \omega_1 : \text{if } \mathcal{D} \text{ is an ultrafilter on } \{\aleph_{\alpha+1} : \alpha < \delta\} \right. \\ \left. \text{containing every cobounded subset then } \text{cf} \left(\prod_{\alpha < \delta} \aleph_{\alpha+1} / \mathcal{D} \right) < \aleph_{\omega_1} \right\}$$

is stationary and $2^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_\omega$, then $\aleph_\omega^{\aleph_0} < \aleph_{\omega_1}$.⁽⁷⁾ Similarly for 62.

During this proof we have really showed, e.g.,

64(3). FACT. Suppose $a \in R^{\kappa, 2}$, $\lambda \in \text{pcf}(a)$, $\mu = \sup(\lambda \cap \text{pcf}(a))$, μ a limit cardinal, $\text{cf } \mu > |a|$, and let $\mu = \bigcup \{\mu_i : i < \text{cf } \mu\}$, $\langle \mu_i : i < \text{cf } \mu \rangle$ strictly increasing continuous. Then

$$\{\delta < \text{cf } \mu : \text{for some } \chi < \mu_\delta, \max[\text{pcf}([\chi, \mu_\delta] \cap \text{pcf}(a))] < \lambda\}$$

is not stationary

64(4). FACT. Suppose $\mu = \sup(a)$, $a \in R^{\kappa, 2}$, $\theta < \kappa$, and for every $b \subseteq a$, $|b| \leq \theta$ we have:

(*)_b $\{\lambda : \text{for some ultrafilter } \mathcal{D} \text{ on } b, [\text{for } \chi < \mu(a - \chi) \in \mathcal{D} \Rightarrow \text{tcf}(\prod a, \leq_{\mathcal{D}}) = \lambda]\}$ has cardinality $\leq \theta$,

then (*)_a.

65. PROOF OF $(\aleph_\delta)^{\text{cf } \delta} < (\aleph_{(\delta_1)^{\ast_1}})^{\ast_1}$.⁽⁸⁾ We shall rely only on §1 and §3. Let $\kappa = \text{cf } \delta$,

⁽⁷⁾ Just let $\mu = \kappa = \aleph_1$, $\theta = \aleph_0$ (S_2 stationary). Note that in the definition of S , we can replace " $< \aleph_{\omega_1}$ " by " $< \aleph_{\gamma(\delta)}$ " for some $\gamma(\delta) < \omega_1$, as the set of such cofinalities has a last element.

⁽⁸⁾ The proof of $(\aleph_{\alpha+\delta})^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_{\alpha+(\delta_1)^{\ast_1}}$ when $\aleph_\alpha^{\text{cf } \delta} < \aleph_{\alpha+\delta}$ is similar.

the case $|\delta|^\kappa \geq \aleph_\delta$ is easy so w.l.o.g. $2^\kappa < \aleph_\delta$, $|\delta|^\kappa < \aleph_\delta$. Let $\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (|\delta|^\kappa)^+$. Let, for $a \in R^{\kappa,2}$, $a \subseteq \aleph_\delta$, $\langle \langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} : \lambda \rangle : \lambda \in \text{pcf}(a) \rangle$ as in 16.

Let, for every limit ordinal $\alpha < \aleph_\delta$, C_α be a club of α of order type $\text{cf}(\alpha)$. Let M be a model with universe \aleph_δ , and functions f, g s.t. for every $\alpha < \aleph_\delta$

- (i) $\{\beta : \beta < \alpha\} = \{f(\alpha, i) : i < |\alpha|\}$,
- (ii) for $i < |\alpha|$, $g(\alpha, f(\alpha, i)) = i$,
- (iii) for $\beta < \alpha$, $f(\alpha, g(\alpha, \beta)) = \beta$,
- (iv) $f(\alpha, \alpha) = |\alpha|$,
- (v) $g(\alpha, \alpha) = \alpha + 1$.

Easily

(*)₁ if $M^* < M$, $Y \subseteq M^*$ and for every $\theta \geq \aleph_0$, $[\theta, \theta^+) \cap M^* \neq \emptyset \Rightarrow \sup(Y \cap \theta^+) = \sup(M^* \cap \theta^+)$, then M^* is the Skolem Hull of Y in M . [Otherwise let α be minimal in M^* but not in the Skolem Hull of Y , let $\theta = |\alpha|$, so there is $\beta \in Y \cap \theta^+ \subseteq M^*$, $\alpha < \beta$ and let $i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(\beta, \alpha)$, so necessarily $i \in M^*$ (as $\beta, \alpha \in M^*$), but $i < \theta \leq \alpha$ so by α 's minimality i is in the Skolem Hull of Y ; but then so is $\alpha = f(\beta, i)$, contradiction.] We know that for some ordinal $\zeta(*) < (|\delta|^\kappa)^+$

(*)₂ for $a \in R^{\kappa,2}$, $a \subseteq [\mu^+, \aleph_\delta) \Rightarrow \max \text{pcf}(a) \leq \aleph_{\zeta(*)}$ (by 10(4)).

Let

$$F = \left\{ f : \begin{array}{l} \text{Dom } f = a \in R^{\kappa,2} \text{ for some } \eta < \omega, \\ \text{pairwise disjoint } b_1, \dots, b_n \in R^{\kappa,2} \cap [\mu^+, \aleph_\delta), \\ \text{and regular } \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \leq \aleph_{\zeta(*)} \text{ and } \alpha_1 < \lambda_1, \dots, \alpha_n < \lambda_n: \\ \bigcup_{l=1}^n b_l = a, f = \bigcup_{l=1}^n (f_{\lambda_l, \alpha_l}^{\kappa, a} \upharpoonright b_l) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Clearly

$$(*)_3 \quad |F| \leq \aleph_{\zeta(*)}.$$

Let $\chi = (2^{2^{\aleph_\delta}})^+$. Now for every $x \subseteq \aleph_\delta$, $|x| \leq \kappa$, we can choose $\langle N_i^\chi : i \leq \mu \rangle$ s.t.:

- (a) $N_i^\chi < (H(\chi), \in)$,
- (b) $j < i \Rightarrow N_j^\chi < N_i^\chi$,
- (c) $\|N_i^\chi\| = \mu$,
- (d) $\langle N_j^\chi : j \leq i \rangle \in N_i^\chi$,

- (e) $\{\alpha : \alpha \leq \mu\} \subseteq N_0^x$,
- (f) $\langle \langle f_{\lambda, \alpha}^{\kappa, a} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle : \lambda \in \text{pcf}(b) \text{ and } b \in R^{\kappa, 2} \cap [\mu^+, \aleph_\delta), |b| \leq x \rangle \in N_0$,
- (g) $\langle C_\alpha : \alpha < \aleph_\delta \text{ limit} \rangle \in N_0^x$,
- (h) $M \in N_0^x$,
- (i) $x \in N_0^x$ (hence $x \subseteq N_0^x$).

Let for $i \leq (|\delta|^\kappa)^+$, $g_i = g_i^x$ be a function with domain $R^{\kappa, 0} \cap (\mu, \aleph_\delta)$, $g_i(\theta) = \sup(\theta \cap N_i^x)$. By 27, for every $a \in R^{\kappa, 2}$, $a \subseteq (\mu, \aleph_\gamma)$ and $x \in \text{pcf}(a)$ we have $g_\mu \upharpoonright b_\lambda^a \equiv f_{\lambda, g_\mu(\lambda)}^{a, \kappa} \upharpoonright b_\lambda^a \pmod{J_{< \lambda}^{\kappa, b_\lambda^a}}$. Hence (see 27)

$$(*)_4 \text{ for } a \subseteq R^{\kappa, 2} \cap [\mu^+, \aleph_\delta), g_\mu \upharpoonright a \in F \text{ (and } a \in I^{\kappa, 2}).$$

It is also quite clear that for $\theta \in R^{\kappa, 2} \cap (\mu, \aleph_\delta)$, $\langle g_i(\theta) : i \leq \mu \rangle$ is strictly increasing continuous, so for i limit $\text{cf}(g_i(\theta)) = \text{cf } i > \aleph_0$ so

$$C_{x, \theta} = C_{g_\mu(\theta)} \cap \{g_i^x(\theta) : i < \mu\}$$

is a club of $g_\mu(\theta)$ and is included in N_μ^x .

Now we can define M_n^x by induction on n s.t.

- (α) $M_n^x < M$, $|M_n^x| \subseteq N_\mu^x$,
- (β) $\|M_n^x\| = \kappa$,
- (γ) $M_n^x < M_{n+1}^x$,
- (δ) $x \subseteq M_0^x$,
- (ε) if $\mu < \aleph_{\alpha+1} < \aleph_\delta$, $|M_n^x| \cap [\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_{\alpha+1}) \neq \emptyset$ then for some $\gamma(x, \aleph_{\alpha+1}, n) \in C_{x, \aleph_{\alpha+1}} \cap M_{n+1}^x$

$$\gamma(x, \aleph_{\alpha+1}, n) > \sup(\aleph_{\alpha+1} \cap M_n^x).$$

There is no problem to carry this.

Let $a(x) = \{\aleph_{\alpha+1} : \mu < \aleph_{\alpha+1} < \aleph_\delta, \text{ and for some } n [\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_{\alpha+1}) \cap M_n^x \neq \emptyset\}$, so $a(x) \subseteq R^{\kappa, 2} \cap [\mu^+, \aleph_\delta)$ (there is no weakly inaccessible in $[\mu^+, \aleph_\delta)$!) and let

$$Y_x = \{\gamma(x, \aleph_{\alpha+1}, n) : n < \omega, [\aleph_\alpha, \aleph_{\alpha+1}) \cap M_n^x \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Now Y_x has cardinality κ ; it is a subset of $M^x \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_n M_n^x$ so by $(*)_1$

$$(*)_4 \quad M^x \text{ is the Skolem Hull in } M \text{ of } (M^x \cap \mu^+) \cup Y_x.$$

Now

$$(*)_5 \quad Y_x \subseteq \bigcup_{\theta \in a(x)} C_{g_\mu(\theta)},$$

$$(*)_6 \quad |\bigcup_{\theta \in a(x)} C_{g_\mu(\theta)}| \leq \mu, |Y_x| \leq \kappa.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\{Y_x : x \subseteq \aleph_\delta, |x| \leq \kappa\}| \\
& \leq \left| \left\{ \left\langle g_\mu^x \uparrow a(x), \left\{ z : z \subseteq \bigcup_{\theta \in a(x)} C_{g_\mu(\theta)}, |z| \leq \kappa \right\} \right\rangle : x \subseteq \aleph_\delta, |x| \leq \kappa \right\} \right| \\
& \leq |F| \times \mu^\kappa \leq |F| \times \mu \leq \aleph_{\zeta^{(*)}}.
\end{aligned}$$

So if $\aleph_\delta^\kappa > \aleph_{\zeta^{(*)}}$, necessarily for some Y

$$|\{x : Y_x = Y\}| > \aleph_{\zeta^{(*)}}$$

and easily, for some $A \subseteq \mu$,

$$|\{x : Y_x = Y, M^x \cap \mu = A\}| > \aleph_{\zeta^{(*)}}.$$

But $x \subseteq M^x$, $\|M^x\| \leq \kappa$, $2^\kappa < \aleph_{\zeta^{(*)}}$; contradiction.

REFERENCES

- [B Sh] R. Bonnet and S. Shelah, *Narrow Boolean algebras*, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic **28** (1985), 1–12.
- [D M R] C. K. van Dornen, D. Monk and M. Rubin, *Some questions about Boolean Algebras*, Algebra Univ. **11** (1980), 220–243.
- [G H] F. Galvin and A. Hajnal, *Inequalities for cardinal powers*, Ann. of Math. **101** (1973), 491–498.
- [J] I. Juhasz, in *Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology* (K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [M] D. Monk, in *Handbook of Set-theoretic Topology* (K. Kunen and J. E. Vaughan, eds.), North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984.
- [M Sh] M. Magidor and S. Shelah, *When does almost free imply free?* (for groups, transversals etc.), to appear.
- [Sh 1] S. Shelah, *Jonsson algebras in successor cardinals*, Isr. J. Math. **30** (1978), 57–64.
- [Sh 2] S. Shelah, *A weak generalization of MA to higher cardinals*, Isr. J. Math. **30** (1978), 297–306.
- [Sh 3] S. Shelah, *A note on cardinal exponentiation*, J. Symb. Logic **45** (1980), 56–66.
- [Sh 4] S. Shelah, *On powers of singular cardinals*, Notre Dame J. Formal Logic **27** (1986), 263–299.
- [Sh 5] S. Shelah, *Proper Forcing*, Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 940, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1982.
- [Sh 6] S. Shelah, *Was Sierpinski right?*, Isr. J. Math., to appear.
- [Sh 7] S. Shelah, *Strong negative partition relations above the continuum*, J. Symb. Logic, to appear.
- [Sh 8] S. Shelah, *On successor of singular cardinals*, Proc. of ASL Meeting Mons, Aug. 1978 (M. Boffa, D. van Dalen and K. McAloon, eds.), Studies in Logic and the Foundation of Math. 97, North-Holland Publ. Co., Amsterdam, 1979, pp. 357–386.
- [Sh 9] S. Shelah, *Classification of nonelementary classes II, Abstract elementary classes*, Proc. of the USA–Israel Symp. on Classification Theory (J. Baldwin, ed.), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [Sh 10] S. Shelah, *More on power of singulars*, Isr. J. Math., **59** (1987), 299–326.
- [Sh 11] S. Shelah, *Strong negative partition relations below the continuum*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung., to appear.

[Sh 12] S. Shelah, *Products of regular cardinals and cardinals in variants of Boolean algebras*, manuscript, December 1987.

[T1] S. Todorcevic, *Remarks on chain conditions in products*, *Compositio Math.* **5** (1985), 295–302.

[T2] S. Todorcevic, *Remarks on cellularity in products*, *Compositio Math.* **57** (1986), 357–372.

[T3] S. Todorcevic, *Partition pairs of countable cardinals*, Berkeley notes, 1985.