Journal of Mathematical Logic, Vol. 2, No. 1 (2002) 81–89

NOWHERE PRECIPITOUSNESS OF THE NON-STATIONARY IDEAL OVER $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$

YO MATSUBARA

Department of Mathematics, School of Information and Sciences,
Nagoya University, Chikusa-ku, Nagoya 464-8601, Japan
yom@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp

SAHARON SHELAH

Department of Mathematics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
and
Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University,
New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA
shelah@sunrise.huji.ac.il

Received 1 January 2001

We prove that if λ is a strong limit singular cardinal and κ a regular uncountable cardinal $< \lambda$, then $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$, the non-stationary ideal over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, is nowhere precipitous. We also show that under the same hypothesis every stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ can be partitioned into $\lambda^{<\kappa}$ disjoint stationary sets.

Keywords: Forcing; large cardinals.

1. Introduction

Throughout this paper we let κ denote an uncountable regular cardinal and λ a cardinal $\geq \kappa$. Let $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ denote the non-stationary ideal over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ is the minimal κ-complete normal ideal over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. If X is a stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, then $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}|X$ denotes the κ-complete normal ideal generated by the members of $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ and $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda - X$. We refer the reader to Kanamori [6, Sec. 25] for basic facts about the combinatorics of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$.

Large cardinal properties of ideals have been investigated by various authors. One of the problems studied by these set theorists was to determine which large cardinal properties can $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ or $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}|X$ bear for various κ, λ and $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. In the course of this investigation, special interest has been paid to two large cardinal properties, namely precipitousness and saturation.

If $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}|X$ is not precipitous for every stationary $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, then we say that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ is *nowhere precipitous*. In [8], Matsubara and Shioya proved that if λ is a strong limit singular cardinal and $\mathrm{cf}\lambda < \kappa$, then $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ is nowhere precipitous. In

Sec. 2, we extend this result by showing that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ is nowhere precipitous if λ is a strong limit singular cardinal.

In [10], Menas conjectured the following:

Menas' Conjecture. *Every stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ can be partitioned into $\lambda^{<\kappa}$ disjoint stationary sets.*

This conjecture implies that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}|X$ cannot be $\lambda^{<\kappa}$-saturated for every stationary $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. By the work of several set theorists we know that Menas' Conjecture is independent of ZFC. One of the most striking results concerning this conjecture is the following theorem of Gitik [4].

Gitik's Theorem. *Suppose that κ is a supercompact cardinal and $\lambda > \kappa$. Then there is a p.o. $\mathbb{P}$ that preserves cardinals $\geq \kappa$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ "$\exists X$ (X is a stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \wedge X$ cannot be partitioned into κ^+ disjoint stationary sets)".*

In Sec. 2, we also show that if λ is a strong limit singular cardinal, then every stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ can be partitioned into $\lambda^{<\kappa}$ disjoint stationary sets. Gitik [4] mentions that GCH fails in his model of a "non-splittable" stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. Our result shows that GCH *must* fail in such a model of a non-splittable stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ if λ is singular.

We often consider the poset $\mathbb{P}_I$ of I-positive subsets of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ i.e. subsets of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ not belonging to I, ordered by

$$X \leq_{\mathbb{P}_I} Y \Longleftrightarrow X \subseteq Y .$$

We say that an ideal I is "proper" if $\mathbb{P}_I$ is a proper poset. In [9], Matsubara proved the following result:

Proposition 1.1. *Let δ be a cardinal $\geq 2^{2^{2^\lambda}}$. If there is a "proper" λ^+-complete normal ideal over $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda^+}\delta$ then $\mathrm{NS}_{\aleph_1\lambda}$ is precipitous.*

It is not known whether $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ can be precipitous for singular λ. In [1], it is conjectured that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ cannot be precipitous if λ is singular. Therefore it is interesting to ask the following question:

Question 1.2. Can $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ bear a "proper" κ-complete normal ideal where κ is the successor cardinal of a singular cardinal?

In Sec. 3, we give a negative answer to this question.

2. On $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ for Strong Limit Singular λ

We first state our main results.

Theorem 2.1. *If λ is a strong limit singular cardinal, then $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ is nowhere precipitous.*

Theorem 2.2. *If λ is a strong limit singular cardinal, then every stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ can be partitioned into $\lambda^{<\kappa}$ disjoint stationary sets.*

One of the key ingredients of our proof of the main results is Lemma 2.3. Lemma 2.3(ii) was proved in Matsubara [7] and (i) appeared in Matsubara–Shioya [8]. For the proof of Lemma 2.3(ii) we refer the reader to Kanamori [6, p. 345]. However we will present the proof of (i) because the idea of this proof will be used later.

Lemma 2.3. *If* $2^{<\kappa} < \lambda^{<\kappa} = 2^\lambda$, *then*

(i) $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ *is nowhere precipitous,*
(ii) *every stationary subset of* $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ *can be partitioned into* $\lambda^{<\kappa}$ *disjoint stationary sets.*

Before we present the proof of (i), we make some comments concerning this lemma. First note that the hypothesis of our lemma is satisfied if λ is a strong limit cardinal with $\mathrm{cf}\lambda < \kappa$. Secondly under this hypothesis every unbounded subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ must have a size of 2^λ. We also note that Lemma 2.3 can be generalized in the following manner.

For an ideal I over some set A, we let $\mathrm{non}(I) = \min\{|X| \,|\, X \subseteq A, X \notin I\}$ and $\mathrm{cof}(I) = \min\{|J| \,|\, J \subseteq I,\ \forall X \in I,\ \exists Y \in J\ (X \subseteq Y)\}$. The proof of Lemma 2.3 actually shows that if $\mathrm{non}(I) = \mathrm{cof}(I)$ then I is nowhere precipitous (i.e. for every I-positive X, $I|X$ is not precipitous) and every I-positive subset X of A can be partitioned into $\mathrm{non}(I)$ many disjoint I-positive sets.

Proof of Lemma 2.3(i). For I an ideal over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, let $G(I)$ denote the following game between two players, Nonempty and Empty: Nonempty and Empty alternately choose I-positive sets X_n, $Y_n \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ respectively so that $X_n \supseteq Y_n \supseteq X_{n+1}$ for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. After ω moves, Empty wins $G(I)$ if $\bigcap_{n\in\omega-\{0\}} X_n = \emptyset$. See [3] for a proof of the following characterization.

Proposition 2.4. I *is nowhere precipitous if and only if Empty has a winning strategy in* $G(I)$.

Let $\langle f_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < 2^\lambda\rangle$ enumerate functions from $\lambda^{<\omega}$ into $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. For a function $f : \lambda^{<\omega} \to \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, we let $C(f) = \{s \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, \bigcup f'' s^{<\omega} \subseteq s\}$. For $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, X is stationary if and only if $C(f_\alpha) \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for every $\alpha < 2^\lambda$.

We now describe Empty's strategy in $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$ using the hypothesis $2^{<\kappa} < \lambda^{<\kappa} = 2^\lambda$. Suppose that X_1 is Nonempty's first move. Choose $\langle s^1_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < 2^\lambda\rangle$, a sequence of elements of X_1 by induction on α in the following manner: let s^1_0 be any element of $X_1 \cap C(f_0)$. Suppose we have $\langle s^1_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \beta\rangle$ for some $\beta < 2^\lambda$. Since $\{s^1_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \beta\}$ is a non-stationary, in fact bounded, subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, $X_1 - \{s^1_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \beta\}$ is stationary. Pick an element from $(X_1 - \{s^1_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \beta\}) \cap C(f_\beta)$ and call it s^1_β. Let Empty play $Y_1 = \{s^1_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < 2^\lambda\}$. It is easy to see that Y_1 is a stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. Inductively suppose Nonempty plays his $(n+1)$th move X_{n+1} immediately following Empty's nth move $Y_n = \{s^n_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < 2^\lambda\}$. Choose $\langle s^{n+1}_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < 2^\lambda\rangle$, a sequence from X_{n+1} in the following manner: let s^{n+1}_0 be any element of $(X_{n+1} - \{s^n_0\}) \cap C(f_0)$.

Suppose we have $\langle s^{n+1}_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \beta\rangle$, for some $\beta < 2^\lambda$. Pick an element of the stationary set $(X_{n+1} \cap C(f_\beta)) - (\{s^{n+1}_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \beta\} \cup \{s^n_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \le \beta\})$ and call it s^{n+1}_β. Let Empty play $Y_{n+1} = \{s^{n+1}_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < 2^\lambda\}$. This defines a strategy for Empty.

Claim 2.5. *The strategy described above is a winning strategy for Empty.*

Proof. Suppose X_1, Y_1, X_2, $Y_2, \ldots$ is a run of the game $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$ where Empty followed the above strategy. We want to show that $\bigcap_{n\in\omega-\{0\}} Y_n = \emptyset$. Suppose otherwise. Let t be an element of $\bigcap_{n\in\omega-\{0\}} Y_n$. Then for each $m \in \omega - \{0\}$, there is a unique ordinal $\alpha_m < 2^\lambda$ such that $s^m_{\alpha_m} = t$. But by the way the s^n_αs are chosen, $s^0_{\alpha_0} = s^1_{\alpha_1} = s^2_{\alpha_2} = \cdots$ implies $\alpha_0 > \alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \cdots$. This is impossible. Thus we must have $\bigcap_{n\in\omega-\{0\}} Y_n = \emptyset$. □

Then Lemma 2.3(i) is proved. □

We now prove Theorem 2.2 using Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let λ be a strong limit singular cardinal. If $\mathrm{cf}\lambda < \kappa$, then by Lemma 2.3(ii), we are done. So assume $\mathrm{cf}\lambda \ge \kappa$. In this case we have $\lambda^{<\kappa} = \lambda$. Therefore it is enough to show that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}|X$ is not λ-saturated for every stationary $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. But this is a consequence of $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ being nowhere precipitous. In fact we know that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}|X$ cannot be λ^+-saturated for every stationary $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. □

We need some preparation to present the proof of Theorem 2.1. Let λ be a strong limit singular cardinal and κ be a regular uncountable cardinal $< \lambda$. If $\mathrm{cf}\lambda < \kappa$, then by Lemma 2.3, we conclude that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ is nowhere precipitous.

From now on let us assume that λ is a strong limit cardinal with $\kappa \le \mathrm{cf}\lambda < \lambda$. Let $\langle \lambda_\alpha \,|\, \alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda\rangle$ be a continuous increasing sequence of strong limit singular cardinals converging to λ with $\lambda_0 > \mathrm{cf}\lambda$. The following lemma is another key ingredient of our proof.

Lemma 2.6. *For every $X \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, if for each $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$, $|\{t \in X \,|\, \sup(t) = \lambda_\alpha\}| < 2^{\lambda_\alpha}$, then X is non-stationary.*

Proof of Lemma 2.6. Since $\{t \in X \,|\, \sup(t) \notin t\}$ is a club subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, without loss of generality we may assume that $\sup(t) \notin t$ for every t in X. For each $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$, we let $X_\alpha = \{t \in X \,|\, \sup(t) = \lambda_\alpha\}$. We need the following fact from pcf theory by S. Shelah.

Fact 2.7. *There is a club subset $C \subseteq \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ such that $\mathrm{pp}(\lambda_\alpha) = 2^{\lambda_\alpha}$ for every $\alpha \in C$.*

The proof of the above fact can be obtained from [12, 5.15] or by combining [11, p. 414, Conclusion XI 5.13], [11, p. 321, Corollary VIII 1.6(2)], and [11, p. 94, Conclusion II 5.7]. [12] contains updates and corrections to [11]. The reader can look at Holz–Steffens–Weitz [5] for the pcf theory, particularly [5, p. 271, Theorem 9.1.3].

For each $\alpha \in C$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$, let a_α be a set of regular cardinals cofinal in λ_α such that

(a) every member of a_α is above $\mathrm{cf}\lambda$,
(b) $|a_\alpha| = \mathrm{cf}\lambda_\alpha$, and
(c) $\exists\delta_\alpha > |X_\alpha|\ [\delta_\alpha \in \mathrm{pcf}(a_\alpha)]$.

Let $a = \bigcup\{a_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in C \wedge \mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa\}$. Let $\langle f_\beta \,|\, \beta < \lambda\rangle$ enumerate all of the members of $\{f \,|\, f$ is a function, domain(f) is a bounded subset of λ, and f is regressive i.e. $f(\gamma) < \gamma$ for every $\gamma \in \mathrm{domain}(f)\}$.

For each $t \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ we define $g_t \in \prod a$ by letting $g_t(\sigma) = \sup\{f_\beta(\sigma) + 1 \,|\, \beta \in t \wedge \sigma \in \mathrm{dom}(f_\beta)\}$, if $\sigma \in \bigcup_{\beta\in t} \mathrm{domain}(f_\beta)$, and $g_t(\sigma) = 0$ otherwise. Note that $|t| < \kappa \leq \mathrm{cf}\lambda < \min(a)$ guarantees $g_t \in \prod a$. Now by (c) in the definition of a_αs and the fact that $\{g_t \restriction a_\alpha \,|\, t \in X_\alpha\}$ is a subset of $\prod a_\alpha$ of cardinality $\leq |X_\alpha| < \delta_\alpha \in \mathrm{pcf}(a_\alpha)$, there is some $h_\alpha \in \prod a_\alpha$ such that $\forall t \in X_\alpha\ [g_t \restriction a_\alpha <_{J_{<\delta_\alpha}(a_\alpha)} h_\alpha]$. (For the definition of $J_{<\delta_\alpha}(a_\alpha)$, we refer the reader to [5, Sec. 3.4].) Therefore

$$\forall t \in X_\alpha\ \exists\sigma \in a_\alpha\ [g_t(\sigma) < h_\alpha(\sigma)] \tag{1}$$

holds. As $\min(a) > \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ and $a = \bigcup\{a_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in C \wedge \mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa\}$, there is $h \in \prod a$ such that $h_\alpha < h \restriction a_\alpha$ for every $\alpha \in C$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$.

Let $W = \{t \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|$ (i) for some $\alpha \in C$ $\sup(t) = \lambda_\alpha$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$, and (ii) if $\delta \in t$ then for some $\beta \in t$, $h \restriction (a \cap \delta) = f_\beta\}$. Note that W is a club subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$.

Claim 2.8. *$X \cap W = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose otherwise, say $t \in X \cap W$. By (i) in the definition of W, $t \in X_\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in C$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$. By (1) we have

$$\exists\sigma \in a_\alpha\ [g_t(\sigma) < h_\alpha(\sigma)]\,. \tag{2}$$

Since $\sup(t) = \lambda_\alpha$, there must be some $\delta \in t$ such that $\delta > \sigma$. Now by (ii) in the definition of W, $h \restriction (a\cap\delta) = f_\beta$ for some $\beta \in t$. Since $\sigma \in a\cap\delta$, $h(\sigma) = f_\beta(\sigma)$. By the definition of g_t we have $f_\beta(\sigma) < g_t(\sigma)$. From $h_\alpha < h \restriction a_\alpha$, we know $h_\alpha(\sigma) < h(\sigma)$. Therefore we have $h_\alpha(\sigma) < g_t(\sigma)$ contradicting (2). □

Then Lemma 2.6 is proved. □

For each $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$, let us fix a sequence $\langle f^\alpha_\xi \,|\, \xi < 2^{\lambda_\alpha}\rangle$ that enumerates members of $\{f \,|\, f$ is a function such that domain$(f) \subseteq \lambda_\alpha^{<\omega}$ and range$(f) \subseteq \lambda_\alpha\}$. Furthermore for each function f with domain$(f) \subseteq \lambda_\alpha^{<\omega}$ and range$(f) \subseteq \lambda_\alpha$, we let $C_\alpha[f] = \{t \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, t^{<\omega} \subseteq \mathrm{domain}(f)$, $\sup(t) = \lambda_\alpha$, and t is closed under $f\}$. We need the following lemma to present the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose X is a stationary subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. For every $Y \subseteq \{s \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, s\cap\kappa \in \kappa\}$, if for each $\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa$ the following condition* (3) *holds, then Y is stationary.*

$$\forall\xi < 2^{\lambda_\alpha}\ \left(|C_\alpha[f^\alpha_\xi] \cap X| = 2^{\lambda_\alpha} \longrightarrow C_\alpha[f^\alpha_\xi] \cap Y \neq \emptyset\right). \tag{3}$$

Proof. Since $s \cap \kappa \in \kappa$ for every $s \in Y$, to show that Y is stationary it is enough to show that $Y \cap C[g] \neq \emptyset$ for every function $g : \lambda^{<\omega} \to \lambda$ where $C[g]$ denotes the set $\{t \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, g''t^{<\omega} \subseteq t\}$. For the proof of this fact, we refer the reader to Foreman–Magidor–Shelah [2, Lemma 0]. Let us fix a function $g : \lambda^{<\omega} \to \lambda$. Now we let $E = \{\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa\}$ and for each $\alpha \in E$ we let $W_\alpha = \{s \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, \sup(s) = \lambda_\alpha \wedge \lambda_\alpha \notin s\}$. Note that $\bigcup_{\alpha\in E} W_\alpha$ is a club subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. For each $\alpha \in E$, we let g_α denote $g \cap (\lambda_\alpha^{<\omega} \times \lambda_\alpha)$. Now partition E into two sets E^+ and E^- where

$$E^+ = \{\alpha \in E \,|\, |C_\alpha[g_\alpha] \cap X| = 2^{\lambda_\alpha}\} \quad \text{and} \quad E^- = \{\alpha \in E \,|\, |C_\alpha[g_\alpha] \cap X| < 2^{\lambda_\alpha}\}\,.$$

We need the following:

Claim 2.10. *$X \cap \bigcup\{W_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in E^-\}$ is non-stationary.*

Proof. It is enough to show that $Z = C[g] \cap X \cap \bigcup\{W_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in E^-\}$ is non-stationary. Note that for each $\alpha \in E^+$, $Z \cap W_\alpha = \emptyset$ and for each $\alpha \in E^-$, $Z \cap W_\alpha \subseteq C_\alpha[g_\alpha] \cap X$. Therefore $|Z \cap W_\alpha| < 2^{\lambda_\alpha}$ for every $\alpha \in E$. Hence, by Lemma 2.6, we conclude that Z is non-stationary. □

From Claim 2.10 we know that $X \cap \bigcup\{W_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in E^+\}$ is stationary. Pick an element α^* from E^+. Consider the partial function g_{α^*} $(= g \cap (\lambda_{\alpha^*}^{<\omega} \times \lambda_{\alpha^*}))$. Let $\xi^* < 2^{\lambda_{\alpha^*}}$ be such that $f_{\xi^*}^{\alpha^*} = g_{\alpha^*}$. Since $\alpha^* \in E^+$, we have $|C_{\alpha^*}[g_{\alpha^*}] \cap X| = 2^{\lambda_{\alpha^*}}$. Since $f_{\xi^*}^{\alpha^*} = g_{\alpha^*}$ and Y satisfies condition (3), we know that $C_{\alpha^*}[g_{\alpha^*}] \cap Y \neq \emptyset$. Therefore $C[g] \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ showing that Y is stationary. Lemma 2.9 is proved. □

Finally we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. To present a winning strategy for Empty in the game $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$, we introduce some new types of games. For each $\alpha \in E = \{\alpha < \mathrm{cf}\lambda \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha < \kappa\}$, we define the game G_α between Nonempty and Empty as follows: Nonempty and Empty alternately choose sets $X_n, Y_n \subseteq W_\alpha = \{s \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, \sup(s) = \lambda_\alpha \notin s\}$ respectively so that $X_n \supseteq Y_n \supseteq X_{n+1}$ and $\forall\xi < 2^{\lambda_\alpha}$ $(|C_\alpha[f_\xi^\alpha] \cap X_n| = 2^{\lambda_\alpha} \longrightarrow C_\alpha[f_\xi^\alpha] \cap Y_n \neq \emptyset)$ for $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. Empty wins G_α if and only if $\bigcap_{n\in\omega-\{0\}} Y_n = \emptyset$.

By the same argument as the proof of Lemma 2.3(i), we know that Empty has a winning strategy, say τ_α, in the game G_α for each $\alpha \in E$. Now we show how to combine the strategies τ_αs to produce a winning strategy for Empty in $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$. Suppose X_1 is Nonempty's first move in $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$. We let $X_1^* = X_1 \cap \{s \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, s \cap \kappa \in \kappa\} \cap \bigcup\{W_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in E\}$. Since $\{s \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, s \cap \kappa \in \kappa\} \cap \bigcup\{W_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in E\}$ is a club subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$, X_1^* is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. For each $\alpha \in E$, we simulate a run of the game G_α as follows: let us pretend that Nonempty's first move in G_α is $X_1^* \cap W_\alpha$. Let Empty play her strategy τ_α, so Empty's first move is $\tau_\alpha(\langle X_1^* \cap W_\alpha\rangle)$. Now in the game $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$, let Empty play $Y_1 = \bigcup\{\tau_\alpha(\langle X_1^* \cap W_\alpha\rangle) \,|\, \alpha \in E\}$. Lemma 2.9 guarantees that Y_1 is stationary in $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. In general if $\langle X_1, Y_1, X_2, Y_2, \ldots, X_n\rangle$ is a run of $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$ up to Nonempty's nth move, then we let Empty play $Y_n = \bigcup\{\tau_\alpha(\langle X_1^* \cap W_\alpha, X_2 \cap W_\alpha, \ldots, X_n \cap W_\alpha\rangle) \,|\, \alpha \in E\}$. Once again we know Y_n is a stationary subset of X_n. For each $\alpha \in E$, since τ_α is a winning strategy in G_α we have

$$\bigcap_{n\in\omega-\{0\}} \tau_\alpha(\langle X_1^* \cap W_\alpha, X_2 \cap W_\alpha, \ldots, X_n \cap W_\alpha\rangle) = \emptyset\,.$$

Because the W_αs are pairwise disjoint, we conclude that $\bigcap_{n\in\omega-\{0\}} Y_n = \emptyset$. Therefore we have a winning strategy for Empty in the game $G(\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda})$. This proves that $\mathrm{NS}_{\kappa\lambda}$ is nowhere precipitous for every strong limit singular λ. Theorem 2.1 is proved. □

3. On "Proper" Ideals over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$

First we define that we mean by a "proper" ideal.

Definition 3.1. An ideal I over a set A is a "proper" ideal if the corresponding p.o. $\mathbb{P}_I$ is proper (in the sense of proper forcing).

We refer the reader to Shelah [13] for the background of properness.

As we mentioned in Sec. 1, we are interested in the question of whether it is possible to have a κ-complete normal "proper" ideal over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ where κ is the successor of some singular cardinal. We give a negative answer to this question. Here we present a more general result.

Theorem 3.2. (i) *Suppose I is a κ-complete normal ideal over κ. If $\{\alpha < \kappa \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha = \delta\} \notin I$ for some cardinal δ satisfying $\delta^+ < \kappa$, then I is not "proper".*

(ii) *Suppose I is a κ-complete normal ideal over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$. If $\{s \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda \,|\, \mathrm{cf}(s\cap\kappa) = \delta\} \notin I$ for some cardinal δ satisfying $\delta^+ < \kappa$, then I is not "proper".*

Note that if κ is the successor cardinal of a singular cardinal, then every κ-complete normal ideal over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$ satisfies the hypothesis of (ii).

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Since the proof of (ii) is identical to that of (i), we only present the proof of (i).

Let I and δ be as in the hypothesis of (i). First note that if $\delta = \aleph_0$ then the set $\{\alpha < \kappa \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha = \delta\}$ forces "$\mathrm{cf}\kappa = \aleph_0$" showing $\mathbb{P}_I$ cannot be proper. Therefore we may assume that δ is uncountable.

We need the following claim:

Claim 3.3. *There are a stationary subset E of $\{\alpha < \kappa \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha = \aleph_0\}$ and an I-positive subset X of $\{\alpha < \kappa \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha = \delta\}$ such that $E \cap \alpha$ is non-stationary for every α in X.*

Proof. Let $\{E_\gamma \,|\, \gamma < \delta^+\}$ be a family of pairwise disjoint stationary subsets of $\{\alpha < \kappa \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha = \aleph_0\}$. For each $\alpha < \kappa$ with $\mathrm{cf}\alpha = \delta$, there must be a club subset of α with cardinality δ. Therefore for such an ordinal α, there is some $\gamma_\alpha < \delta^+$ such that $E_{\gamma_\alpha} \cap \alpha$ is non-stationary. By the κ-completeness of I, there is some $\gamma^* < \delta^+$ such that $X = \{\alpha < \kappa \,|\, \mathrm{cf}\alpha = \delta \wedge \gamma_\alpha = \gamma^*\} \notin I$. If we let $E = E_{\gamma^*}$, then $E \cap \alpha$ is non-stationary for every α in X. □

For each α from X, let c_α be a club subset of α with $c_\alpha \cap E = \emptyset$. Let $\vec{C}$ denote $\langle c_\alpha \,|\, \alpha \in X\rangle$. Let χ be a large enough regular cardinal. Assume that N is a countable elementary substructure of $\langle H(\chi), \epsilon\rangle$ satisfying $\{I, E, X, \vec{C}\} \subseteq N$ and $\sup(N \cap \kappa) \in E$.

We are ready to show that I is not "proper".

Claim 3.4. *If Y is a subset of X such that $Y \notin I$ (therefore $Y \in \mathbb{P}_I$ and $Y \leq X$), then Y is not $(N, \mathbb{P}_I)$-generic.*

Claim 3.4 implies that $\mathbb{P}_I$ is not proper.

Proof of Claim 3.4. Suppose otherwise. Assume that there exists $Y \leq X$ such that Y is $(N, \mathbb{P}_I)$-generic.

For each $\alpha < \kappa$ we define a function $f_\alpha : X \to \kappa$ by $f_\alpha(\gamma) = \mathrm{Min}(c_\gamma - \alpha)$ if $\gamma > \alpha$, and $f_\alpha(\gamma) = 0$ otherwise. It is clear that $f_\alpha \in N$ for each $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$.

For each $\alpha \leq \beta < \kappa$, we let $T^\alpha_\beta = \{\gamma \in X \,|\, f_\alpha(\gamma) = \beta\}$. For each fixed $\alpha < \kappa$, using the normality of I, we see that $\{T^\alpha_\beta \,|\, \alpha \leq \beta < \kappa, T^\alpha_\beta \notin I\}$ is a maximal antichain below X in $\mathbb{P}_I$. Let $\vec{T}^\alpha = \langle T^\alpha_\beta \,|\, \alpha \leq \beta < \kappa, T^\alpha_\beta \notin I\rangle$. It is clear that $\vec{T}^\alpha \in N$ for $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$.

Since Y is $(N, \mathbb{P}_I)$-generic, for $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$ $\{T^\alpha_\beta \,|\, \alpha \leq \beta \wedge \beta \in N \cap \kappa \wedge T^\alpha_\beta \notin I\}$ is predense below Y in $\mathbb{P}_I$. So we must have $Y - \bigcup\{T^\alpha_\beta \,|\, \alpha \leq \beta \wedge \beta \in N \cap \kappa \wedge T^\alpha_\beta \notin I\} \in I$ for each $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$. Let $Y_\alpha = Y - \bigcup\{T^\alpha_\beta \,|\, \alpha \leq \beta \wedge \beta \in N \cap \kappa \wedge T^\alpha_\beta \notin I\}$. We have $\bigcup_{\alpha \in N \cap \kappa} Y_\alpha \in I$. This implies $Y - \bigcup_{\alpha \in N \cap \kappa} Y_\alpha \notin I$. Let γ^* be an element of $Y - \bigcup_{\alpha \in N \cap \kappa} Y_\alpha$ with $\gamma^* > \sup(N \cap \kappa)$. Note that $\gamma^* \in Y - Y_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$. Hence if $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$, then there exists $\beta_\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$ such that $\gamma^* \in T^\alpha_{\beta_\alpha}$. Thus $f_\alpha(\gamma^*) = \beta_\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$ for each $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$. This means that $\mathrm{Min}(c_{\gamma^*} - \alpha) \in N \cap \kappa$ for each $\alpha \in N \cap \kappa$, showing $c_{\gamma^*} \cap N$ is unbounded in $\sup(N \cap \kappa)$.

Since $\sup(N \cap \kappa) < \gamma^*$, we must have $\sup(N \cap \kappa) \in c_{\gamma^*}$. But this implies $\sup(N \cap \kappa) \in c_{\gamma^*} \cap E$ which contradicts $c_\alpha \cap E = \emptyset$ for each $\alpha \in X$ and $\gamma^* \in Y \subseteq X$. This contradiction shows that Y cannot be $(N, \mathbb{P}_I)$-generic. □

Then Theorem 3.2 is proved □

Acknowledgments

Yo Matsubara was partially supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (No. 11640112), Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan. Saharon Shelah was partially supported by The Israel Science Foundation funded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Publication 758.

References

[1] D. Burke and Y. Matsubara, *The extent of strength of the club filters*, Israel J. Math. **114** (1999), 253–263.

[2] M. Foreman, M. Magidor and S. Shelah, *Martin's maximum, saturated ideals, and non-regular ultrafilters*, Part I, Ann. Math. **127** (1988), 1–47.

[3] F. Galvin, T. Jech and M. Magidor, *An ideal game*, J. Symb. Logic **43** (1978), 284–292.
[4] M. Gitik, *Nonsplitting subset of $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(\kappa^+)$*, J. Symb. Logic **50** (1985), 881–894.
[5] M. Holz, K. Steffens and E. Weitz, *Introduction to Cardinal Arithmetic*, Birkhäuser, 1999.
[6] A. Kanamori, *The Higner Infinite*, Springer-Verlag, 1994.
[7] Y. Matsubara, *Consistency of Menas' conjecture*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **42** (1990), 259–263.
[8] Y. Matsubara and M. Shioya, *Nowhere precipitousness of some ideals*, J. Symb. Logic **63** (1998), 1003–1006.
[9] Y. Matsubara, *Stationary preserving ideals over $\mathcal{P}_\kappa\lambda$.*
[10] T. Menas, *On strong compactness and supercompactness*, Ann. Math. Logic **7** (1974), 327–359.
[11] S. Shelah, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford Science Publications, 1994.
[12] S. Shelah, *Analytical guide and updates for cardinal arithmetic E-12.*
[13] S. Shelah, *Proper and Improper Forcing*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.