FUNDAMENTA
MATHEMATICAE
166 (2000)

On a problem of Steve Kalikow

by

Saharon Shelah (Jerusalem and New Brunswick, NJ)

Abstract. The Kalikow problem for a pair (λ, κ) of cardinal numbers, $\lambda > \kappa$ (in particular $\kappa = 2$) is whether we can map the family of ω-sequences from λ to the family of ω-sequences from κ in a very continuous manner. Namely, we demand that for $\eta, \nu \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$ we have: η, ν are almost equal if and only if their images are.

We show consistency of the negative answer, e.g., for $\aleph_\omega$ but we prove it for smaller cardinals. We indicate a close connection with the free subset property and its variants.

0. Introduction. In the present paper we are interested in the following property of pairs of cardinal numbers:

Definition 0.1. Let λ, κ be cardinals. We say that the pair (λ, κ) has the *Kalikow property* (and then we write $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda, \kappa)$) if there is a sequence $\langle F_n : n < \omega \rangle$ of functions such that

$$F_n : {}^{n}\lambda \to \kappa \quad (\text{for } n < \omega)$$

and if $F : {}^{\omega}\lambda \to {}^{\omega}\kappa$ is given by

$$(\forall \eta \in {}^{\omega}\lambda)(\forall n \in \omega)(F(\eta)(n) = F_n(\eta \restriction n))$$

then for every $\eta, \nu \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$,

$$(\forall^\infty n)(\eta(n) = \nu(n)) \quad \text{iff} \quad (\forall^\infty n)(F(\eta)(n) = F(\nu)(n)).$$

In particular we answer the following question of Kalikow:

Kalikow Problem 0.2. Is $\mathcal{KL}(2^{\aleph_0}, 2)$ provable in ZFC?

The Kalikow property of pairs of cardinals was studied in [Ka90]. Several results are known already. Let us mention some of them. First, one can easily notice that

$$\mathcal{KL}(\lambda, \kappa) \ \& \ \lambda' \le \lambda \ \& \ \kappa' \ge \kappa \ \Rightarrow \ \mathcal{KL}(\lambda', \kappa').$$

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 03E35, 03E05.

Key words and phrases: set theory, forcing, continuity, Kalikow, free subset.

The research was partially supported by the Israel Science Foundation. Publication 590.

Also ("transitivity")

$$\mathcal{KL}(\lambda_2,\lambda_1)\ \&\ \mathcal{KL}(\lambda_1,\lambda_0)\ \Rightarrow\ \mathcal{KL}(\lambda_2,\lambda_0)$$

and

$$\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,\kappa)\ \Rightarrow\ \lambda\le\kappa^{\aleph_0}.$$

Kalikow proved that CH implies $\mathcal{KL}(2^{\aleph_0},2)$ (in fact that $\mathcal{KL}(\aleph_1,2)$ holds true) and he conjectured that CH is equivalent to $\mathcal{KL}(2^{\aleph_0},2)$.

The question 0.2 is formulated in [Mi91, Problem 15.15, p. 653].

We shall prove that $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,2)$ is closely tied with some variants of the free subset property (both positively and negatively). First we present an answer to problem 0.2 proving the consistency of $\neg\mathcal{KL}(2^{\aleph_0},2)$ in 1.1 (see 2.8 too). Later we discuss variants of the proof (concerning the cardinal and the forcing). Then we deal with a positive answer, in particular $\mathcal{KL}(\aleph_n,2)$, and we show that the negation of a relative of the free subset property for λ implies $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,2)$.

We thank the participants of the Jerusalem Logic Seminar 1994/95 and particularly Andrzej Rosłanowski for writing it up so nicely.

NOTATION. We will use the Greek letters κ,λ,χ to denote (infinite) cardinals and the letters α, β, γ, ζ, ξ to denote ordinals. Sequences of ordinals will be called $\bar\alpha$, $\bar\beta$, $\bar\zeta$ with the usual convention that $\bar\alpha=\langle\alpha_n : n<\lg(\bar\alpha)\rangle$ etc. Sets of ordinals will be denoted by u, v, w (with possible indexes).

The quantifiers $(\forall^\infty n)$ and $(\exists^\infty n)$ are abbreviations for "for all but finitely many $n\in\omega$" and "for infinitely many $n\in\omega$", respectively.

1. The negative result. For a cardinal χ, the forcing notion $\mathbb{C}_\chi$ for adding χ many Cohen reals consists of finite functions p such that for some $w\in[\chi]^{<\omega}$, $n<\omega$,

$$\mathrm{dom}(p)=\{(\zeta,k):\zeta\in w\ \&\ k<n\}\quad\text{and}\quad\mathrm{rang}(p)\subseteq 2$$

ordered by inclusion.

THEOREM 1.1. *Assume* $\lambda\to(\omega_1\cdot\omega)^{<\omega}_{2^\kappa}$, $2^\kappa<\lambda\le\chi$. *Then*

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi}\neg\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,\kappa)\quad\textit{and hence}\quad\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi}\neg\mathcal{KL}(2^{\aleph_0},2).$$

Proof. Suppose that $\mathbb{C}_\chi$-names $\underset{\sim}{F}_n$ (for $n\in\omega$) and a condition $p\in\mathbb{C}_\chi$ are such that

$$p\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi}\text{"}\langle\underset{\sim}{F}_n:n<\omega\rangle\text{ exemplifies }\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,\kappa)\text{"}.$$

For $\bar\alpha\in{}^n\lambda$ choose a maximal antichain $\langle p^n_{\bar\alpha,l}:l<\omega\rangle$ of $\mathbb{C}_\chi$ deciding the values of $\underset{\sim}{F}_n(\bar\alpha)$. Thus we have a sequence $\langle\gamma^n_{\bar\alpha,l}:l<\omega\rangle\subseteq\kappa$ such that

$$p^n_{\bar\alpha,l}\Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi}\underset{\sim}{F}_n(\bar\alpha)=\gamma^n_{\bar\alpha,l}.$$

Let χ^* be a sufficiently large regular cardinal. Take an elementary submodel M of $(\mathcal{H}(\chi^*), \in, <^*_{\chi^*})$ such that

- $\|M\| = \chi$, $\chi + 1 \subseteq M$,
- $\langle p^n_{\bar\alpha,l} : l < \omega, n \in \omega, \bar\alpha \in {}^n\lambda\rangle, \langle \gamma^n_{\bar\alpha,l} : l < \omega, n \in \omega, \bar\alpha \in {}^n\lambda\rangle \in M$.

By $\lambda \to (\omega_1 \cdot \omega)^{<\omega}_{2^\kappa}$ (see [Sh 481, Claim 1.3]), we find a set $B \subseteq \lambda$ of indiscernibles in M over

$$\kappa \cup \{\langle p^n_{\bar\alpha,l} : l < \omega : n \in \omega, \bar\alpha \in {}^n\lambda\rangle, \langle \gamma^n_{\bar\alpha,l} : l < \omega : n \in \omega, \bar\alpha \in {}^n\lambda\rangle, \chi, p\}$$

and a system $\langle N_u : u \in [B]^{<\omega}\rangle$ of elementary submodels of M such that

(a) B is of order type $\omega_1 \cdot \omega$ and for $u, v \in [B]^{<\omega}$:
(b) $\kappa + 1 \subseteq N_u$,
(c) $\chi, p, \langle p^n_{\bar\alpha,l} : l < \omega, n < \omega, \bar\alpha \in {}^n\lambda\rangle, \langle \gamma^n_{\bar\alpha,l} : l < \omega, n < \omega, \bar\alpha \in {}^n\lambda\rangle \in N_u$,
(d) $|N_u| = \kappa$, $N_u \cap B = u$,
(e) $N_u \cap N_v = N_{u\cap v}$,
(f) $|u| = |v| \Rightarrow N_u \cong N_v$, and let $\pi_{u,v} : N_v \to N_u$ be this (unique) isomorphism,
(g) $\pi_{v,v} = \mathrm{id}_{N_v}$, $\pi_{u,v}(v) = u$, $\pi_{u_0,u_1} \circ \pi_{u_1,u_2} = \pi_{u_0,u_2}$,
(h) if $v' \subseteq v$, $|v| = |u|$ and $u' = \pi_{u,v}(v')$ then $\pi_{u',v'} \subseteq \pi_{u,v}$.

Note that if $u \subseteq B$ is of order type ω then we may define

$$N_u = \bigcup\{N_v : v \text{ is a finite initial segment of } u\}.$$

Then the models N_u (for $u \subseteq B$ of order type $\leq \omega$) have the properties (b)–(h) too.

Let $\langle \beta_\zeta : \zeta < \omega_1 \cdot \omega\rangle$ be the increasing enumeration of B. For a set $u \subseteq B$ of order type $\leq \omega$ let $\bar\beta^u$ be the increasing enumeration of u (so $\lg(\bar\beta^u) = |u|$). Let $u^* = \{\beta_{\omega_1\cdot n} : n < \omega\}$. For $k \leq \omega$ and a sequence $\bar\xi = \langle \xi_m : m < k\rangle \subseteq \omega_1$ we define

$$u[\bar\xi] = \{\beta_{\omega_1\cdot m+\xi_m} : m < k\} \cup \{\beta_{\omega_1\cdot n} : n \in \omega \setminus k\}.$$

Now, working in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{C}_\chi}$, we say that a sequence $\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}$ is *k-strange* if

(1) $\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}$ is a sequence of countable ordinals greater than 0, $\lg(\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}) = k \leq \omega$,
(2) $(\forall m < \omega)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u[\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}]}{\restriction}m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u^*}{\restriction}m))$.

Claim 1.1.1. *In* $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{C}_\chi}$, *if* $\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}^k$ *are* k*-strange sequences* (*for* $k < \omega$) *such that* $(\forall k < \omega)(\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}^k \lhd \underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}^{k+1})$ *then the sequence* $\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi} := \bigcup_{k<\omega} \underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}^k$ *is* ω*-strange.*

Proof. Should be clear (note that in this situation we have $\bar\beta^{u[\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}]}{\restriction}m = \bar\beta^{u[\underset{\sim}{\bar\xi}^m]}{\restriction}m$). ■

Claim 1.1.2. $p \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi}$ *"there are no* ω*-strange sequences".*

Proof. Assume not. Then we find a name $\underset{\sim}{\bar{\xi}} = \langle \underset{\sim}{\xi}_m : m < \omega\rangle$ for an ω-sequence and a condition $q \geq p$ such that

$$q \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall m < \omega)(0 < \underset{\sim}{\xi}_m < \omega_1 \ \&\ \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u[\underset{\sim}{\bar{\xi}}]}{\restriction} m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u^*}{\restriction} m))\text{”}.$$

By the choice of p and $\underset{\sim}{F}_m$ we conclude that

$$q \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall^\infty m)(\bar{\beta}^{u[\underset{\sim}{\bar{\xi}}]}(m) = \bar{\beta}^{u^*}(m))\text{”},$$

which contradicts the definition of $\bar{\beta}^{u[\underset{\sim}{\bar{\xi}}]}$, $\bar{\beta}^{u^*}$, Definition 0.1 and the fact that

$$q \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall m < \omega)(0 < \underset{\sim}{\xi}_m < \omega_1)\text{”}. \ \blacksquare$$

By 1.1.1, 1.1.2, any inductive attempt to construct (in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{C}_\chi}$) an ω-strange sequence $\underset{\sim}{\bar{\xi}}$ has to fail. Consequently, we find a condition $p^* \geq p$, an integer $k < \omega$ and a sequence $\bar{\xi} = \langle \xi_l : l < k\rangle$ such that

$$p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}\bar{\xi} \text{ is } k\text{-strange but } \neg(\exists \xi < \omega_1)(\bar{\xi}^\frown\langle\xi\rangle \text{ is } (k+1)\text{-strange})\text{”}.$$

Then in particular

$$(\boxtimes) \qquad p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall m < \omega)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u[\bar{\xi}]}{\restriction} m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u^*}{\restriction} m))\text{”}.$$

[It may happen that $k = 0$, i.e., $\bar{\xi} = \langle\rangle$.]

For $\xi < \omega_1$ let $u_\xi = u[\bar{\xi}^\frown\langle\xi\rangle]$ and $w_\xi = u_\xi \cup (u^* \setminus \{\omega_1 \cdot k\})$. Thus $w_0 = u[\bar{\xi}] \cup u^*$ and all w_ξ have order type ω and $\pi_{w_{\xi_1}, w_{\xi_2}}$ is the identity on $N_{w_\xi \setminus \{\omega_1 \cdot k + \xi_2\}}$. Let $q := p^*{\restriction} N_{w_0}$ and $q_\xi = \pi_{w_\xi, w_0}(q) \in N_{w_\xi}$ (so $q_0 = q$). As the isomorphism π_{w_ξ, w_0} is the identity on $N_{w_0} \cap N_{w_\xi} = N_{w_0 \cap w_\xi}$ (and by the definition of Cohen forcing), we see that the conditions q, q_ξ are compatible. Moreover, as $p^* \geq p$ and $p \in N_\emptyset$, we find that both q and q_ξ are stronger than p.

Now fix $\xi_0 \in (0, \omega_1)$ (e.g. $\xi_0 = 1$) and look at the sequences $\bar{\beta}^{u_{\xi_0}}$ and $\bar{\beta}^{u^*}$. They are eventually equal and hence

$$p \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall^\infty m)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u_{\xi_0}}{\restriction} m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u^*}{\restriction} m))\text{”}.$$

So we find $m^* < \omega$ and a condition $q'_{\xi_0} \geq q_{\xi_0}, q$ such that

$$(\otimes^{\xi_0, m^*}_{q'_{\xi_0}}) \qquad q'_{\xi_0} \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall m \geq m^*)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u_{\xi_0}}{\restriction} m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u^*}{\restriction} m))\text{”}$$

and (as we can increase q'_{ξ_0})

$(\oplus^{\xi_0, m^*}_{q'_{\xi_0}})$ $\quad q'_{\xi_0}$ decides the values of $\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u_{\xi_0}}{\restriction} m)$ and $\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar{\beta}^{u^*}{\restriction} m)$ for all $m \leq m^*$.

Note that the condition $(\otimes^{\xi_0, m^*}_{q'_{\xi_0}})$ means that there are NO $m \geq m^*$, $l_0, l_1 < \omega$ with $\gamma^m_{\bar{\beta}^{u_{\xi_0}}{\restriction} m, l_0} \neq \gamma^m_{\bar{\beta}^{u^*}{\restriction} m, l_1}$ and the three conditions q'_{ξ_0}, $p^m_{\bar{\beta}^{u_{\xi_0}}{\restriction} m, l_0}$ and $p^m_{\bar{\beta}^{u^*}{\restriction} m, l_1}$ have a common upper bound in $\mathbb{C}_\chi$ (remember the choice of the $p^n_{\bar{\alpha}, l}$'s and $\gamma^n_{\bar{\alpha}, l}$'s). Similarly, the condition $(\oplus^{\xi_0, m^*}_{q'_{\xi_0}})$ means there are

NO $m \le m^*$, $l_0, l_1 < \omega$ with *either* $\gamma^m_{\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_0}}\restriction m, l_0} \ne \gamma^m_{\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_0}}\restriction m, l_1}$ and both q'_{ξ_0} and $p^m_{\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_0}}\restriction m, l_0}$, and q'_{ξ_0} and $p^m_{\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_0}}\restriction m, l_1}$ are compatible in $\mathbb{C}_\chi$, *or* $\gamma^m_{\bar\beta^{u^*}\restriction m, l_0} \ne \gamma^m_{\bar\beta^{u^*}\restriction m, l_1}$ and both q'_{ξ_0} and $p^m_{\bar\beta^{u^*}\restriction m, l_0}$, and q'_{ξ_0} and $p^m_{\bar\beta^{u^*}\restriction m, l_1}$ are compatible in $\mathbb{C}_\chi$.

Consequently, the condition $q^*_{\xi_0} := q'_{\xi_0}\restriction N_{w_0\cup w_{\xi_0}}$ has both properties $(\otimes^{\xi_0,m^*}_{q^*_{\xi_0}})$ and $(\oplus^{\xi_0,m^*}_{q^*_{\xi_0}})$ (and it is stronger than both q and q_{ξ_0}).

Now, for $0<\xi<\omega_1$ let

$$q^*_\xi := \pi_{w_0\cup w_\xi, w_0\cup w_{\xi_0}}(q^*_{\xi_0}) \in N_{w_0\cup w_\xi}.$$

Then (for $\xi\in(0,\omega_1)$) the condition q^*_ξ is stronger than

$$\text{both}\quad q = \pi_{w_0\cup w_\xi, w_0\cup w_{\xi_0}}(q) \quad\text{and}\quad q_\xi = \pi_{w_0\cup w_\xi, w_0\cup w_{\xi_0}}(q_{\xi_0})$$

and it has the properties $(\otimes^{\xi,m^*}_{q^*_\xi})$ and $(\oplus^{\xi,m^*}_{q^*_\xi})$. Moreover for all ξ_1,ξ_2 the conditions $q^*_{\xi_1}, q^*_{\xi_2}$ are compatible. [Why? By the definition of Cohen forcing, and $\pi_{w_0\cup w_{\xi_2}, w_0\cup w_{\xi_1}}(q^*_{\xi_1}) = q^*_{\xi_2}$ (chasing arrows) and $\pi_{w_0\cup w_{\xi_2}, w_0\cup w_{\xi_1}}$ is the identity on $N_{w_0\cup w_{\xi_2}} \cap N_{w_0\cup w_{\xi_1}} = N_{(w_0\cup w_{\xi_2})\cap(w_0\cup w_{\xi_1})}$ (see clauses (e), (f), (h) above).]

Claim 1.1.3. *For each* $\xi_1,\xi_2\in(0,\omega_1)$ *the condition* $q^*_{\xi_1}\cup q^*_{\xi_2}$ *forces in* $\mathbb{C}_\chi$ *that*

$$(\forall m<\omega)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_1}}\restriction m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_2}}\restriction m)).$$

Proof. If $m\ge m^*$ then, by $(\otimes^{\xi_1,m^*}_{q^*_{\xi_1}})$ and $(\otimes^{\xi_2,m^*}_{q^*_{\xi_2}})$ (passing through $\underset{\sim}{F}(\bar\beta^{u^*}\restriction m)$), we get

$$q^*_{\xi_1}\cup q^*_{\xi_2} \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_1}}\restriction m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_2}}\restriction m)\text{”}.$$

If $m<m^*$ then we use $(\oplus^{\xi_1,m^*}_{q^*_{\xi_1}})$ and $(\oplus^{\xi_1,m^*}_{q^*_{\xi_2}})$ and the isomorphism: the values assigned by $q^*_{\xi_1}$, $q^*_{\xi_2}$ to $\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_1}}\restriction m)$ and $\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_2}}\restriction m)$ have to be equal (remember $\kappa\subseteq N_\emptyset$, so the isomorphism is the identity on κ). ■

Look at the conditions

$$q_{\xi_1,\xi_2} := q^*_{\xi_1}\restriction N_{w_{\xi_1}} \cup q^*_{\xi_2}\restriction N_{w_{\xi_2}} \in N_{w_{\xi_1}\cup w_{\xi_2}}.$$

It should be clear that for each $\xi_1,\xi_2\in(0,\omega_1)$,

$$q_{\xi_1,\xi_2} \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall m<\omega)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_1}}\restriction m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_{\xi_2}}\restriction m))\text{”}.$$

Now choose $\xi\in(0,\omega_1)$ so large that

$$\mathrm{dom}(p^*)\cap(N_{w_\xi}\setminus N_{w_0}) = \emptyset$$

(possible as $\mathrm{dom}(p^*)$ is finite, use (e)). Take any $0<\xi_1<\xi_2<\omega_1$ and put

$$q^* := \pi_{w_0\cup w_\xi, w_{\xi_1}\cup w_{\xi_2}}(q_{\xi_1,\xi_2}).$$

(Note: $\pi_{w_0,w_{\xi_1}} \subseteq \pi_{w_0\cup w_\xi,w_{\xi_1}\cup w_{\xi_2}}$ and $\pi_{w_\xi,w_{\xi_2}} \subseteq \pi_{w_0\cup w_\xi,w_{\xi_1}\cup w_{\xi_2}}$.) By the isomorphism we get

$$q^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall m<\omega)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_\xi}{\restriction}m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u[\bar\xi]}{\restriction}m))\text{”}.$$

Now look back:

$$\begin{aligned} q^*_{\xi_1} \ge q_{\xi_1} &= \pi_{w_0\cup w_{\xi_1},w_0\cup w_{\xi_0}}(q_{\xi_0}) = \pi_{w_{\xi_1},w_{\xi_0}}(q_{\xi_0})\\ &= \pi_{w_{\xi_1},w_{\xi_0}}(\pi_{w_{\xi_0},w_0}(q)) = \pi_{w_{\xi_1},w_0}(q)\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$q^*_{\xi_1}{\restriction}N_{w_{\xi_1}} \ge \pi_{w_{\xi_1},w_0}(q)$$

and thus

$$q^*{\restriction}N_{w_0} \ge \pi_{w_0,w_{\xi_1}}(q^*_{\xi_1}{\restriction}N_{w_{\xi_1}}) \ge q = p^*{\restriction}N_{w_0}.$$

Consequently, by the choice of ξ, the conditions q^* and p^* are compatible (remember the definition of q_{ξ_1,ξ_2} and q^*). Now use (⊠) to conclude that

$$q^*\cup p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi} \text{“}(\forall m<\omega)(\underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u^*}{\restriction}m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u[\bar\xi]}{\restriction}m) = \underset{\sim}{F}_m(\bar\beta^{u_\xi}{\restriction}m))\text{”},$$

which implies that $q^*\cup p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{C}_\chi}$ “$\bar\xi^\frown\langle\xi\rangle$ is $(k+1)$-strange”, a contradiction. ■

Remark 1.2. About the proof of 1.1:

(1) No harm is done by forgetting 0 and replacing it by ξ_1, ξ_2.

(2) A small modification of the proof shows that in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{C}_\chi}$: *If* $F_n : {}^n\lambda \to \kappa$ $(n\in\omega)$ *are such that*

$$(\forall \eta,\nu \in {}^\omega\lambda)[(\forall^\infty n)(\eta(n)=\nu(n)) \Rightarrow (\forall^\infty n)(F_n(\eta{\restriction}n) = F_n(\nu{\restriction}n))]$$

then there are infinite sets $X_n \subseteq \lambda$ *(for* $n<\omega$*) such that*

$$(\forall n<\omega)\Big(\forall \nu,\eta\in \prod_{l<n} X_l\Big)(F_n(\nu) = F_n(\eta)).$$

Say we shall have $X_n = \{\gamma_{n,i} : i<\omega\}$. Starting we have $\gamma^*_0,\dots,\gamma^*_n,\dots$ In the proof at stage n we have determined $\gamma_{l,i}$ $(l,i<n)$ and $p\in G$, $p\in N_{\{\gamma_{l,i}:l,i<\omega\}\cup\{\gamma^*_n,\gamma^*_{n+1},\dots\}}$. For $n=0,1,2$ as before. For $n+1>2$ first $\gamma_{0,n},\dots,\gamma_{n-1,n}$ are easy by transitivity of equalities. Then find $\gamma_{n,0},\gamma_{n,1}$ as before, and then again duplicate.

(3) In the proof it is enough to use $\{\beta_{\omega\cdot n+l} : n<\omega,\ l<\omega\}$. Hence, by 1.2 of [Sh 481] it is enough to assume $\lambda \to (\omega^3)^{<\omega}_{2^\kappa}$. This condition is compatible with $\mathbf{V}=\mathbf{L}$.

(4) We can use only $\lambda\to(\omega^2)^{<\omega}_{2^\kappa}$.

Definition 1.3. (1) For a sequence $\bar\lambda = \langle\lambda_n : n<\omega\rangle$ of cardinals we define the property $(\circledast)_{\bar\lambda}$:

$(\circledast)_{\bar\lambda}$ for every model M of a countable language with universe $\sup_{n\in\omega}\lambda_n$ and Skolem functions (for simplicity) there is a sequence $\langle X_n : n<\omega\rangle$ such that

(a) $X_n \in [\lambda_n]^{\lambda_n}$ (actually $X_n \in [\lambda_n]^{\omega_1}$ suffices)

(b) for every $n < \omega$ and $\bar\alpha = \langle \alpha_l : l \in [n+1,\omega)\rangle \in \prod_{l \geq n+1} X_l$, letting (for $\xi \in X_n$)

$$M^\xi_{\bar\alpha} = \mathrm{Sk}\Big(\bigcup_{l<n} X_l \cup \{\xi\} \cup \{\alpha_l : l \in [n+1,\omega)\}\Big)$$

we have:

($\bigoplus$) the sequence $\langle M^\xi_{\bar\alpha} : \xi \in X_n\rangle$ forms a Δ-system with heart $N_{\bar\alpha}$ and its elements are pairwise isomorphic over the heart $N_{\bar\alpha}$.

(2) For a cardinal λ the condition $(\circledast)^\lambda$ is:

$(\circledast)^\lambda$ there exists a sequence $\bar\lambda = \langle \lambda_n : n < \omega\rangle$ such that $\sum_{n<\omega} \lambda_n = \lambda$ and the condition $(\circledast)_{\bar\lambda}$ holds true.

In [Sh 76] a condition $(*)_\lambda$, weaker than $(\circledast)^\lambda$, was considered. Now, [Sh 124] continues [Sh 76] to get stronger indiscernibility. But by the same proof (using ω-measurable) one can show the consistency of $(\circledast)^{\aleph_\omega} + \mathrm{GCH}$.

Note that to carry out the proof of 1.1 we need even less than $(\circledast)^\lambda$: the $\bigcup_{l<n} X_l$ (in (b) of 1.3) is much more than needed; it suffices to have $\bar\beta^0 \cup \bar\beta^1$ where $\bar\beta^0, \bar\beta^1 \in \prod_{l<n} X_l$.

Conclusion 1.4. It is consistent that

$$2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_{\omega+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \bigwedge_{n<\omega} \neg\mathcal{KL}(\aleph_\omega, \aleph_n) \quad \text{so} \quad \neg\mathcal{KL}(2^{\aleph_0}, 2).$$

Remark 1.5. Koepke [Ko84] continues [Sh 76] to get equiconsistency. His refinement of [Sh 76] (for the upper bound) works below too.

2. The positive result. For an algebra M on λ and a set $X \subseteq \lambda$ the closure of X under functions of M is denoted by $\mathrm{cl}_M(X)$. Before proving our result (2.6) we remind the reader of some definitions and propositions.

Proposition 2.1. *For an algebra M on λ the following conditions are equivalent*:

$(\bigstar)^0_M$ *for each sequence $\langle \alpha_n : n \in \omega\rangle \subseteq \lambda$ we have*

$$(\forall^\infty n)(\alpha_n \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\{\alpha_k : n < k < \omega\})),$$

$(\bigstar)^1_M$ *there is no sequence $\langle A_n : n \in \omega\rangle \subseteq [\lambda]^{\aleph_0}$ such that*

$$(\forall n \in \omega)(\mathrm{cl}_M(A_{n+1}) \subsetneq \mathrm{cl}_M(A_n)),$$

$(\bigstar)^2_M$ $(\forall A \in [\lambda]^{\aleph_0})(\exists B \in [A]^{\aleph_0})(\forall C \in [B]^{\aleph_0})(\mathrm{cl}_M(B) = \mathrm{cl}_M(C))$.

Definition 2.2. We say that a cardinal λ has the $(\bigstar)$-*property* for κ (and then we write $\Pr^\bigstar(\lambda,\kappa)$) if there is an algebra M on λ with vocabulary of cardinality $\le \kappa$ satisfying one (equivalently: all) of the conditions $(\bigstar)^i_M$ $(i < 3)$ of 2.1. If $\kappa = \aleph_0$ we may omit it.

Remember

PROPOSITION 2.3. *If* $\mathbf{V}_0 \subseteq \mathbf{V}_1$ *are universes of set theory and* $\mathbf{V}_1 \models \neg\mathrm{Pr}^\bigstar(\lambda)$ *then* $\mathbf{V}_0 \models \neg\mathrm{Pr}^\bigstar(\lambda)$.

Proof. By absoluteness of the existence of an ω-branch of a tree. ■

REMARK 2.4. The property $\neg\mathrm{Pr}^\bigstar(\lambda)$ is a kind of large cardinal property. It was clarified in **L** (remember that it is inherited from **V** to **L**) by Silver [Si70] to be equiconsistent with "there is a beautiful cardinal" (terminology of 2.3 of [Sh 110]), another partition property inherited by **L**. More in [Sh 513].

PROPOSITION 2.5. *For each* $n \in \omega$, $\mathrm{Pr}^\bigstar(\aleph_n)$.

Proof. This was done in [Sh:b, Chapter XIII], see [Sh:g, Chapter VII] too, and probably earlier by Silver. However, for the sake of completeness we will give the proof.

First note that clearly $\mathrm{Pr}^\bigstar(\aleph_0)$ and thus we have to deal with the case when $n > 0$. Let $f, g : \aleph_n \to \aleph_n$ be two functions such that if $m < n$, $\alpha \in [\aleph_m, \aleph_{m+1})$ then $f(\alpha,\cdot)\restriction\alpha : \alpha \xrightarrow{1\text{-}1} \aleph_m$, $g(\alpha,\cdot)\restriction\aleph_m : \aleph_m \xrightarrow{1\text{-}1} \alpha$ are functions inverse to each other.

Let M be the following algebra on $\aleph_n$:

$$M = (\aleph_n, f, g, m)_{m\in\omega}.$$

We want to check the condition $(\bigstar)^1_M$: assume that a sequence $\langle A_k : k < \omega\rangle \subseteq [\aleph_n]^{\aleph_0}$ is such that for each $k < \omega$,

$$\mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k+1}) \subsetneq \mathrm{cl}_M(A_k).$$

For each $m < n$, the sequence $\langle \sup(\mathrm{cl}_M(A_k) \cap \aleph_{m+1}) : k < \omega\rangle$ is non-increasing and therefore it is eventually constant. Consequently, we find k^* such that

$$(\forall m < n)(\sup(\mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*+1}) \cap \aleph_{m+1}) = \sup(\mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*}) \cap \aleph_{m+1})).$$

By the choice of $\langle A_k : k < \omega\rangle$ we have $\mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*+1}) \subsetneq \mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*})$. Let

$$\alpha_0 := \min(\mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*}) \setminus \mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*+1})).$$

As the model M contains individual constants m (for $m \in \omega$) we know that $\aleph_0 \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_M(\emptyset)$ and hence $\aleph_0 \le \alpha_0$. Let $m < n$ be such that $\aleph_m \le \alpha_0 < \aleph_{m+1}$. By the choice of k^* we find $\beta \in \mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*+1}) \cap \aleph_{m+1}$ such that $\alpha_0 \le \beta$. Then necessarily $\alpha_0 < \beta$. Look at $f(\beta, \alpha_0)$: we know that $\alpha_0, \beta \in \mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*})$ and therefore $f(\beta, \alpha_0) \in \mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*}) \cap \aleph_m$ and $f(\beta, \alpha_0) < \alpha_0$. The minimality of α_0 implies that $f(\beta, \alpha_0) \in \mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*+1})$ and hence

$$\alpha_0 = g(\beta, f(\beta, \alpha_0)) \in \mathrm{cl}_M(A_{k^*+1}),$$

a contradiction. ■

EXPLANATION. Better think of the proof below from the end. Let $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_n : n < \omega \rangle \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$. So for some $n(*)$, $n(*) \le n < \omega \Rightarrow \alpha_n \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\alpha_l : l > n)$. So for some $m_n > n$, $\{\alpha_{n(*)}, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}\} \subseteq \mathrm{cl}_M(\alpha_n, \ldots, \alpha_{m_m-1})$ and

$$(\forall l < n(*))(\alpha_l \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\alpha_k : k > n(*)) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha_l \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\alpha_k : k \in [n, m_n))).$$

Let $w = \{l < n(*) : \alpha_l \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\alpha_n : n \ge n(*))$. It is natural to aim at:

(∗) for n large enough (say $n > m_{n(*)}$), $F_n(\langle \alpha_l : l < n \rangle)$ depends just on $\{\alpha_l : l \in [n(*), n)$ or $l \in w\}$ and $\langle F_m(\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}m) : m \ge n \rangle$ codes $\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}(w \cup [n(*), \omega))$.

Of course, we are given an n and we do not know how to compute the real $n(*)$, but we can approximate. Then we look at a late enough end segment where we compute down.

THEOREM 2.6. *Assume that $\lambda \le 2^{\aleph_0}$ is such that $\mathrm{Pr}^{\bigstar}(\lambda)$ holds. Then $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda, \omega)$ (and hence $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda, 2)$).*

Proof. We have to construct functions $F_n : {}^{n}\lambda \to \omega$ witnessing $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda, \omega)$. For this we will introduce functions $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{l}$ such that for $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{n}\lambda$ the value of $\mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha})$ will say which initial segment of $\bar{\alpha}$ will be irrelevant for $F_n(\bar{\alpha})$ and $\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha})$ will be such that (under certain circumstances) elements α_i (for $\mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}) \le i < \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha})$) will be encoded by $\langle \alpha_j : j \in [\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}), n) \rangle$.

Fix a sequence $\langle \eta_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda \rangle \subseteq {}^{\omega}2$ with no repetitions.

Let M be an algebra on λ such that $(\bigstar)^0_M$ holds true. We may assume that there are no individual constants in M (so $\mathrm{cl}_M(\emptyset) = \emptyset$).

Let $\langle \tau^n_l(x_0, \ldots, x_{n-1}) : l < \omega \rangle$ list all n-place terms of the language of the algebra M (and $\tau^1_0(x)$ is x) when $0 < n < \omega$. For $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{\omega \ge}\lambda$ (with α_j the jth element in $\bar{\alpha}$) let

$$u(\bar{\alpha}) = \{l < \mathrm{lg}(\bar{\alpha}) : \alpha_l \notin \mathrm{cl}_M(\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}(l, \mathrm{lg}(\bar{\alpha})))\} \cup \{0\}$$

and for $l \notin u(\bar{\alpha})$, $l < \mathrm{lg}(\bar{\alpha})$ let

$$f_l(\bar{\alpha}) = \min\{j : \alpha_l \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}(l, j))\},$$
$$g_l(\bar{\alpha}) = \min\{i : \alpha_l = \tau_i^{f_l(\bar{\alpha})-l-1}(\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}(l, f_l(\bar{\alpha})))\}.$$

For $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{n}\lambda$ $(1 < n < \omega)$ put

$$k_1(\bar{\alpha}) = \min((u(\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}(n-1)) \setminus u(\bar{\alpha})) \cup \{n-1\}),$$
$$k_0(\bar{\alpha}) = \max(u(\bar{\alpha}) \cap k_1(\bar{\alpha})).$$

Note that if ($n > 1$ and) $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{n}\lambda$ then $n-1 \in u(\bar{\alpha})$ (as $\mathrm{cl}_M(\emptyset) = \emptyset$) and $k_1(\bar{\alpha}) > 0$ (as always $0 \in u(\bar{\beta})$) and $k_0(\bar{\alpha})$ is well defined (as $0 \in u(\bar{\alpha}) \cap k_1(\bar{\alpha})$) and $k_0(\bar{\alpha}) < k_1(\bar{\alpha}) < n$. Moreover, for all $l \in (k_0(\bar{\alpha}), k_1(\bar{\alpha}))$ we have $\alpha_l \notin u(\bar{\alpha})$ by the choice of $k_0(\bar{\alpha})$, hence $\alpha_l \notin u(\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}(n-1))$ by the choice of $k_1(\bar{\alpha})$ and thus $\alpha_l \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\bar{\alpha}{\restriction}(l, n-1))$. Now, for $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{\omega >}\lambda$, $\mathrm{lg}(\bar{\alpha}) > 1$ we define

$$\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}) = \max\{j \le k_1(\bar{\alpha}) : j > k_0(\bar{\alpha}) \Rightarrow (\forall i \in (k_0(\bar{\alpha}), j))(g_i(\bar{\alpha}) \le \mathrm{lg}(\bar{\alpha}))\},$$

$$\mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}) = \max\{j \le \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}) : j > \max\{1, k_0(\bar{\alpha})\} \Rightarrow k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction j) = k_0(\bar{\alpha})\},$$

$$\mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}) = \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha})) \quad \text{(if } \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}) \le 1 \text{ then put } \mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}) = -1\text{)}.$$

Clearly $\mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}) < \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}) \le \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}) \le k_1(\bar{\alpha}) < \lg(\bar{\alpha})$.

CLAIM 2.6.1. *For each $\bar{\alpha} \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$, the set $u(\bar{\alpha})$ is finite and*:

(1) *The sequence $\langle k_1(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) : n < \omega\rangle$ diverges to ∞.*

(2) *The sequence $\langle k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) : n < \omega \ \&\ k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) \ne \max u(\bar{\alpha})\rangle$, if infinite, diverges to ∞. There are infinitely many $n < \omega$ with $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha})$.*

(3) *The sequence $\langle \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) : n < \omega\rangle$ diverges to ∞.*

(4) *The sequences $\langle \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) : n < \omega\rangle$ and $\langle \mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) : n < \omega\rangle$ diverge to ∞.*

Proof. Let $\bar{\alpha} = \langle \alpha_n : n < \omega\rangle \in {}^{\omega}\lambda$. By the property $(\bigstar)^0_M$ we find $n^* < \omega$ such that $u(\bar{\alpha}) \subseteq n^*$. Fix $n_0 > n^*$ and define

$$n_1 = \max\{f_n(\bar{\alpha}) + g_n(\bar{\alpha}) + 2 : n \in (n_0+1) \setminus u(\bar{\alpha})\}$$

(so as $\mathrm{cl}_M(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ we have $n_1 \ge f_{n_0}(\bar{\alpha}) + 2 > n_0 + 3$ and for $l \in (n_0+1)\setminus u(\bar{\alpha})$, $\alpha_l \in \mathrm{cl}_M(\alpha_{l+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{n_1-1})$ is witnessed by $\tau^{f_l(\bar{\alpha})-l-1}_{g_l(\bar{\alpha})}(\alpha_{l+1}, \ldots, \alpha_{f_l(\bar{\alpha})-1})$ with $f_l(\bar{\alpha}), g_l(\bar{\alpha}) < n_1 - 1$).

(1) Note that $u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) \cap (n_0+1) = u(\bar{\alpha})$ for all $n \ge n_1 - 1$ and hence for $n \ge n_1$,

$$u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) \cap (n_0+1) = u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction (n-1)) \cap (n_0+1).$$

Consequently, for all $n \ge n_1$ we have $k_1(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > n_0$. As we could have chosen n_0 arbitrarily large we may conclude that $\lim_{n\to\infty} k_1(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \infty$.

(2) Note that for all $n \ge n_1$,

$$\text{either} \quad k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \max(u(\bar{\alpha})) \quad \text{or} \quad k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > n_0.$$

Hence, by the arbitrariness of n_0, we get the first part of (2).

Let $l^* = \min(u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n_1)\setminus u(\bar{\alpha}))$ (note that $n_1 - 1 \in u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n_1)\setminus u(\bar{\alpha})$). Clearly $l^* > n_0$ and $\alpha_{l^*} \notin u(\bar{\alpha})$. Consider $n = f_{l^*}(\bar{\alpha})$ (so $l^* \le n-2$, $n_1 \le n-1$). Then $l^* \in u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction (n-1)) \setminus u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n)$. As

$$l^* \cap u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n_1) = l^* \cap u(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n-1) = u(\bar{\alpha})$$

(remember the choice of l^*) we conclude that

$$l^* = k_1(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) \quad \text{and} \quad k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha}).$$

Now, since n_0 was arbitrarily large, we find that for infinitely many n, $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha})$.

(3) Suppose that $n \ge n_1$. Then we know that $k_1(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > n_0$ and either $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha})$ or $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > n_0$ (see above). If the first possibility takes place then, as $n \ge n_1$, we may use $j = n_0 + 1$ to witness that $\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > n_0$ (remember the choice of n_1). If $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > n_0$ then clearly $\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > n_0$. As n_0 could be arbitrarily large we are done.

(4) Suppose we are given $m_0 < \omega$. Take $m_1 > m_0$ such that for all $n \geq m_1$,

$$\text{either} \quad k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha}) \quad \text{or} \quad k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > m_0$$

(possible by (2)) and then choose $m_2 > m_1$ such that $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction m_2) = \max u(\bar{\alpha})$ (by (2)). Due to (3) we find $m_3 > m_2$ such that for all $n \geq m_3$, $\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > m_2$. Now suppose that $n \geq m_3$. If $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha})$ then, as $\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > m_2$, we get $\mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) \geq m_2 > m_0$. Otherwise $k_0(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > m_0$ (as $n > m_1$) and hence $\mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) > m_0$. This shows that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \infty$. Now, immediately by the definition of $\mathbf{k}$ and (3) above we conclude that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}\restriction n) = \infty$. ■

CLAIM 2.6.2. *If $\bar{\alpha}^1, \bar{\alpha}^2 \in {}^\omega\lambda$ are such that $(\forall^\infty n)(\alpha^1_n = \alpha^2_n)$ then*

$$(\forall^\infty n)(\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n)\ \&\ \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n)\ \&\ \mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = \mathbf{k}(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n)).$$

Proof. Let n_0 be greater than $\max(u(\bar{\alpha}^1) \cup u(\bar{\alpha}^2))$ and such that

$$\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction[n_0,\omega) = \bar{\alpha}^2\restriction[n_0,\omega).$$

For $k = 1, 2, 3$ define n_k by

$$n_{k+1} = \max\{f_n(\bar{\alpha}^i) + g_n(\bar{\alpha}^i) + 2 : n \in (n_k + 1) \setminus u(\bar{\alpha}^i),\ i < 2\}.$$

As in the proof of 2.6.1, for $i = 1, 2$ and $j < 3$ we have:

($\otimes^1$) $(\forall n \geq n_{j+1})(k_0(\bar{\alpha}^i\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha}^i)$ or $k_0(\bar{\alpha}^i\restriction n) > n_j)$,

($\otimes^2$) $(\forall n \geq n_{j+1})(k_1(\bar{\alpha}^i\restriction n) > n_j\ \&\ \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}^i\restriction n) > n_j\ \&\ \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}^i\restriction n) > n_j\ \&\ \mathbf{h}(\bar{\alpha}^i\restriction n) > n_j)$,

($\otimes^3$) $(\exists n' \in (n_1, n_2))(k_0(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n') = \max u(\bar{\alpha}^1)\ \&\ k_0(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n') = \max u(\bar{\alpha}^2))$

(for ($\otimes^3$) repeat arguments from 2.6.1(2) and use the fact that $\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction[n_0,\omega) = \bar{\alpha}^2\restriction[n_0,\omega)$). Clearly

($\otimes^4$) $(\forall n > n_0)(u(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) \setminus n_0 = u(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n) \setminus n_0)$.

Hence, applying ($\otimes^4$) + ($\otimes^2$) + the definition of $k_1(-)$, we conclude that

($\otimes^5$) $(\forall n \geq n_1)(k_1(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = k_1(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n))$,

and then applying ($\otimes^4$) + ($\otimes^2$) + ($\otimes^5$) + the definition of $k_0(-)$, we get

($\otimes^6$) for all $n \geq n_1$: either $k_0(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha}^1)$ and $k_0(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n) = \max u(\bar{\alpha}^2)$, or $k_0(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = k_0(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n)$.

Since

$$(\forall n \geq n_0)(f_n(\bar{\alpha}^1) = f_n(\bar{\alpha}^2)\ \&\ g_n(\bar{\alpha}^1) = g_n(\bar{\alpha}^2))$$

and by ($\otimes^2$)+($\otimes^5$)+the choice of n_0+the definition of $\mathbf{l}(-)$, we get (compare the proof of 2.6.1)

($\otimes^7$) $$(\forall n \geq n_1)(\mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = \mathbf{l}(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n))$$

and by ($\otimes^2$) + ($\otimes^7$) + ($\otimes^6$) + the definition of $\mathbf{m}(-)$,

$$(\forall n \geq n_3)(\mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}^1\restriction n) = \mathbf{m}(\bar{\alpha}^2\restriction n) \geq n_2).$$

Moreover, now we easily get

$$(\forall n \ge n_3)(\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n)).\ \blacksquare$$

For integers $n_0 \le n_1 \le n_2$ we define functions $F^0_{n_0,n_1,n_2} : {}^{n_2}\lambda \to \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$ by letting $F^0_{n_0,n_1,n_2}(\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{n_2-1})$ (for $\langle\alpha_0,\ldots,\alpha_{n_2-1}\rangle \in {}^{n_2}\lambda$) be the sequence consisting of:

(a) $\langle n_0, n_1, n_2\rangle$,

(b) the set T_{n_1,n_2} of all terms τ^n_l such that $n \le n_2 - n_1$ and either $l \le n_2$ (we will call it *the simple case*) or τ^n_l is a composition of depth at most n_2 of such terms,

(c) $\langle \eta_\alpha{\restriction}n_2, n, l, \langle i_0,\ldots,i_{n-1}\rangle\rangle$ for $n \le n_2 - n_1$, $i_0,\ldots,i_{n-1} \in [n_1,n_2)$ and l such that $\tau^n_l \in T_{n_1,n_2}$ and $\alpha = \tau^n_l(\alpha_{i_0},\ldots,\alpha_{i_{n-1}})$,

(d) $\langle n, l, \langle i_0,\ldots,i_{n-1}\rangle, i\rangle$ for $n \le n_2 - n_1$, $i_0,\ldots,i_{n-1} \in [n_1,n_2)$, $i \in [n_0,n_1)$ and l such that $\tau^n_l \in T_{n_1,n_2}$ and $\alpha_i = \tau^n_l(\alpha_{i_0},\ldots,\alpha_{i_{n-1}})$,

(e) equalities among appropriate terms, i.e. all tuples

$$\langle n', l', n'', l'', \langle i'_0,\ldots,i'_{n'-1}\rangle, \langle i''_0,\ldots,i''_{n''-1}\rangle\rangle$$

such that $n_1 \le i'_0 < \ldots < i'_{n'-1} < n_2$, $n_1 \le i''_0 < \ldots < i''_{n''-1} < n_2$, $n', n'' \le n_2 - n_1$, l', l'' are such that $\tau^{n'}_{l'}, \tau^{n''}_{l''} \in T_{n_1,n_2}$ and

$$\tau^{n'}_{l'}(\alpha_{i'_0},\ldots,\alpha_{i'_{n'-1}}) = \tau^{n''}_{l''}(\alpha_{i''_0},\ldots,\alpha_{i''_{n''-1}}).$$

(Note that the value of $F^0_{n_0,n_1,n_2}(\bar\alpha)$ does not depend on $\bar\alpha{\restriction}n_0$.)

Finally we define functions $F_n : {}^n\lambda \to \mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$ (for $1 < n < \omega$) by:

$$\text{if } \bar\alpha \in {}^n\lambda \quad \text{then} \quad F_n(\bar\alpha) = F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha),n}(\bar\alpha).$$

As $\mathcal{H}(\aleph_0)$ is countable we may think that these functions are into ω. We are going to show that they witness $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,\omega)$.

CLAIM 2.6.3. *If* $\bar\alpha^1, \bar\alpha^2 \in {}^\omega\lambda$ *are such that* $(\forall^\infty n)(\alpha^1_n = \alpha^2_n)$ *then*

$$(\forall^\infty n)(F_n(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = F_n(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n)).$$

Proof. Take $m_0 < \omega$ such that for all $n \in [m_0,\omega)$ we have

$$\alpha^1_n = \alpha^2_n, \quad \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n), \quad \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n)$$

(possible by 2.6.2). Let $m_1 > m_0$ be such that for all $n \ge m_1$,

$$\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n) > m_0$$

(use 2.6.1). Then, for $n \ge m_1$, $i = 1, 2$ we have

$$F_n(\bar\alpha^i{\restriction}n) = F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^i{\restriction}n),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^i{\restriction}n),n}(\bar\alpha^i{\restriction}n) = F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n),n}(\bar\alpha^i{\restriction}n).$$

Since the value of $F^0_{n_0,n_1,n_2}(\bar\beta)$ does not depend on $\bar\beta{\restriction}n_0$ and the sequences $\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n$, $\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n$ agree on $[m_0,\omega)$, we get

$$F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n),n}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n),n}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n) = F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n),n}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n),$$

and hence

$$(\forall n \geq m_1)(F_n(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = F_n(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n)). \blacksquare$$

CLAIM 2.6.4. *If $\bar\alpha^1, \bar\alpha^2 \in {}^\omega\lambda$ and $(\forall^\infty n)(F_n(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = F_n(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n))$ then $(\forall^\infty n)(\alpha^1_n = \alpha^2_n)$.*

Proof. Take $n_0 < \omega$ such that

$$u(\bar\alpha^1) \cup u(\bar\alpha^2) \subseteq n_0 \quad \text{and} \quad (\forall n \geq n_0)(F_n(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = F_n(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n)).$$

Then for all $n \geq n_0$ we have (by clause (a) of the definition of $F^0_{n_0,n_1,n_2}$)

$$\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}n).$$

Further, let $n_1 > n_0$ be such that for all $n \geq n_1$, $\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) > n_0$ and $k_0(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n_1) = \max u(\bar\alpha^1)$ (exists by 2.6.1) and choose $n_2 > n_1$ such that $n \geq n_2$ implies $\mathbf{m}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n) > n_2$.

We are going to show that $\alpha^1_n = \alpha^2_n$ for all $n > n_1$. Assume not. Then we have $n > n_1$ with $\alpha^1_n \neq \alpha^2_n$ and thus $\eta_{\alpha^1_n} \neq \eta_{\alpha^2_n}$. Take $n' > n$ such that $\eta_{\alpha^1_n}{\restriction}n' \neq \eta_{\alpha^2_n}{\restriction}n'$. Applying 2.6.1(2) and (4) choose $n'' > n'$ such that

$$\mathbf{m}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n'') > n' \quad \text{and} \quad k_0(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}n'') = \max u(\bar\alpha^1).$$

Now define inductively: $m_0 = n''$, $m_{k+1} = \mathbf{m}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k)$. Thus

$$n'' = m_0 > \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_0) \geq m_1 > \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_1) \geq m_2 > \ldots$$

and (by induction on k)

$$m_k > \max u(\bar\alpha^1) \;\Rightarrow\; k_0(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k) = \max u(\bar\alpha^1)$$

(see the definition of $\mathbf{m}$). Let k^* be the first such that $n \geq m_{k^*}$ (so $k^* \geq 2$, exists by the choice of n_1). Note that by the choice of n_1 above we necessarily have

$$m_{k^*} > \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_{k^*}) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_{k^*-1}) > n_0.$$

Hence for all $k < k^*$:

$$F_{m_k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k) = F_{m_k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}m_k),$$
$$\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_{k+1}) = \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}m_{k+1}) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}m_k).$$

By the definition of the functions $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{k}$ and the choice of m_0 (remember $k_0(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_0) = \max u(\bar\alpha^1)$) we know that for each $i \in [\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k), \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k))$ and $k < k^*$, for some $\tau^m_l \in T_{\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k),m_k}$ and $i_0, \ldots, i_{m-1} \in [\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k), m_k)$ we have $\alpha^1_i = \tau^m_l(\alpha^1_{i_0}, \ldots, \alpha^1_{i_{m-1}})$. Moreover we may demand that τ^m_l is a composition of depth at most $\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k) - i$ of simple case terms. Since

$$F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k),m_k}(\bar\alpha^1{\restriction}m_k) = F^0_{\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}m_k),\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}m_k),m_k}(\bar\alpha^2{\restriction}m_k)$$

we conclude that (by clause (d) of the definition of the functions $F^0_{n_0,n_1,n_2}$)

$$\alpha^2_i = \tau^m_l(\alpha^2_{i_0}, \ldots, \alpha^2_{i_{m-1}}).$$

Now look at our n. If $\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1}) > n$ then $\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1}) \le n < \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1})$ and thus we find $i_0,\dots,i_{m-1} \in [\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1}), m_{k^*-1})$ and $\tau^m_l \in T_{\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1}),m_{k^*-1}}$ such that

$$\alpha^1_n = \tau^m_l(\alpha^1_{i_0},\dots,\alpha^1_{m-1}) \quad\text{and}\quad \alpha^2_n = \tau^m_l(\alpha^2_{i_0},\dots,\alpha^2_{m-1}).$$

If $\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1}) \le n$ then $n \in [\mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-2}), \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-2}))$ (as $\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1}) = \mathbf{k}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-2})$ and $n < m_{k^*-1} \le \mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-2})$). Hence, for some $i_0,\dots,i_{m-1} \in [\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-2}), m_{k^*-2})$ and $\tau^m_l \in T_{\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-2}),m_{k^*-2}}$, we have

$$\alpha^1_n = \tau^m_l(\alpha^1_{i_0},\dots,\alpha^1_{m-1}) \quad\text{and}\quad \alpha^2_n = \tau^m_l(\alpha^2_{i_0},\dots,\alpha^2_{m-1}).$$

In both cases we may additionally demand that the term τ^m_l is a composition of depth $\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-1}) - n$ (or $\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_{k^*-2}) - n$, respectively) of terms of the simple case. Now we proceed inductively (taking care of the depth of the terms involved) and we find a term $\tau \in T_{\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_0),m_0}$ (which is a composition of depth at most $\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_0) - n$ of terms of the simple case) and $i_0,\dots,i_{m-1} \in [\mathbf{l}(\bar\alpha^1\restriction m_0), m_0)$ such that

$$\alpha^1_n = \tau(\alpha^1_{i_0},\dots,\alpha^1_{m-1}) \quad\text{and}\quad \alpha^2_n = \tau(\alpha^2_{i_0},\dots,\alpha^2_{m-1}).$$

But now applying clause (c) of the definition of the functions $F^0_{n_0,n_1,n_2}$ we conclude that $\eta_{\alpha^1_n}\restriction m_0 = \eta_{\alpha^2_n}\restriction m_0$, contradicting the choice of n' and the fact that $m_0 > n'$. ∎

The last two claims finish the proof of the theorem. ∎

Remark 2.7. If the model M has $\kappa < \lambda$ functions (so $\langle \tau^n_i(x_0,\dots,x_{n-1}) : i < \kappa\rangle$ lists the n-place terms) we can prove $\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,\kappa)$ and the proof is similar.

Final Remarks 2.8. (1) Now we phrase exactly what is needed to carry out the proof of Theorem 1.1 for $\lambda > \kappa$. It is:

(⊠) for every model M with universe λ and Skolem functions and with countable vocabulary, we can find pairwise distinct $\alpha_{n,l} < \lambda$ (for $n < \omega,\ l < \omega$) such that

(⊗) if $m_0 < m_1 < \omega$ and $l'_i < l''_i$ for $i < m_0$ and $l_i < \omega$ for $i \in [m_0, m_1)$ and $k_0 < k_1 < k_2 < \omega$ then the models

$$(\mathrm{Sk}(\{\alpha_{i,l'_i}, \alpha_{i,l''_i} : i < m_0\} \cup \{\alpha_{m_0,k_0}, \alpha_{m_0,k_1}\} \cup \{\alpha_{i,l_i} : i \in (m_0,m_1)\}),$$
$$\alpha_{0,l'_0}, \alpha_{0,l''_0}, \alpha_{1,l'_1}, \alpha_{1,l''_1}, \dots, \alpha_{m_0-1,l'_{m_0-1}}, \alpha_{m_0-1,l''_{m_0-1}}, \alpha_{m_0,k_0},$$
$$\alpha_{m_0,k_1}, \alpha_{m_0+1,l_{m_0+1}}, \dots, \alpha_{m_1-1,l_{m_1-1}})$$

and

$$(\mathrm{Sk}(\{\alpha_{i,l'_i}, \alpha_{i,l''_i} : i < m_0\} \cup \{\alpha_{m_0,k_0}, \alpha_{m_0,k_2}\} \cup \{\alpha_{i,l_i} : i \in (m_0,m_1)\}),$$
$$\alpha_{0,l'_0}, \alpha_{0,l''_0}, \alpha_{1,l'_1}, \alpha_{1,l''_1}, \dots, \alpha_{m_0-1,l'_{m_0-1}}, \alpha_{m_0-1,l''_{m_0-1}}, \alpha_{m_0,k_0},$$
$$\alpha_{m_0,k_2}, \alpha_{m_0+1,l_{m_0+1}}, \dots, \alpha_{m_1-1,l_{m_1-1}})$$

are isomorphic and the isomorphism is the identity on their intersection and they have the same intersection with κ.

For more details and more related results we refer the reader to [Sh:F254].

(2) Together with 1.5, 2.7 this gives a good bound on the consistency strength of $\neg\mathcal{KL}(\lambda,\kappa)$.

(3) What if we ask $F_n : {}^n\lambda \to {}^{\omega>}\kappa$ such that $F_n(\eta) \trianglelefteq F_{n+1}(\eta)$ and $\eta \in {}^\omega\lambda \Rightarrow F(\eta) = \bigcup F_n(\eta\restriction n) \in {}^\omega\kappa$? No real change.

References

[Ka90] S. Kalikow, *Sequences of reals to sequences of zeros and ones*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 108 (1990), 833–837.

[Ko84] P. Koepke, *The consistency strength of the free-subset property for ω_ω*, J. Symbolic Logic 49 (1984), 1198–1204.

[Mi91] A. W. Miller, *Arnie Miller's problem list*, in: H. Judah (ed.), Set Theory of the Reals (Ramat Gan, 1991), Israel Math. Conf. Proc. 6, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1993, 645–654.

[Sh 76] S. Shelah, *Independence of strong partition relation for small cardinals, and the free-subset problem*, J. Symbolic Logic 45 (1980), 505–509.

[Sh 124] —, *$\aleph_\omega$ may have a strong partition relation*, Israel J. Math. 38 (1981), 283–288.

[Sh 110] —, *Better quasi-orders for uncountable cardinals*, ibid. 42 (1982), 177–226.

[Sh:b] —, *Proper Forcing*, Lecture Notes in Math. 940, Springer, Berlin, 1982.

[Sh:g] —, *Cardinal Arithmetic*, Oxford Logic Guides 29, Oxford Univ. Press, 1994.

[Sh 481] —, *Was Sierpiński right? III Can continuum-c.c. times c.c.c. be continuum-c.c.?* Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 78 (1996), 259–269.

[Sh:F254] —, *More on Kalikow Property of pairs of cardinals.*

[Sh 513] —, *PCF and infinite free subsets*, Arch. Math. Logic, to appear.

[Si70] J. Silver, *A large cardinal in the constructible universe*, Fund. Math. 69 (1970), 93–100.

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
91904 Jerusalem, Israel
E-mail: shelah@math.huji.ac.il

Department of Mathematics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08854, U.S.A.
URL: http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~shelah

Received 2 September 1996;
in revised form 9 August 1999