ON CON(**DOMINATING**_{λ}) > **COV**_{λ}(**MEAGRE**)

SAHARON SHELAH

ABSTRACT. We prove the consistency of: for suitable strongly inaccessible cardinal λ the dominating number, i.e. the cofinality of ${}^{\lambda}\lambda$ is strictly bigger than cov(meagre_{λ}), i.e. the minimal number of no-where-dense subsets of ${}^{\lambda}2$ needed to cover it. This answers a question of Matet.

0. INTRODUCTION

It is interesting to investigate cardinal invariants and iterated forcing replacing \aleph_0 by a regular uncountable cardinal κ , in particular κ strongly inaccessible.

The situation is related but usually quite different than the one for \aleph_0 . See on this Landver [2], Cummings-Shelah [1], Matet-Shelah [4].

In particular Matet asked whether always $\mathfrak{d}_{\kappa} \leq \operatorname{cov}(\operatorname{meagre})_{\kappa}$.

We here prove the consistency of the negation starting with a super-compact cardinal κ . We intend to return to this for weakly compact κ elsewhere.

Date: April 1, 2009.

The author thanks Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing. This research was supported by the United States-Israel Binational Science Foundation. Publication 945.

1. The forcing

Claim 1.0.1. Assume

(a) λ is strongly inaccessible

 $(a)^+$ supercompact

(b) $\lambda < \kappa = \operatorname{cf}(\kappa) < \mu = \operatorname{cf}(\mu) = \mu^{\lambda}$.

<u>Then</u> for some forcing notion \mathbb{P} in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$, not collapsing cardinals $\geq \lambda, \lambda$ is still supercompact and $\operatorname{cov}_{\lambda}(\operatorname{meagre}) = \kappa, \mathfrak{d}_{\lambda} = \mu$.

Proof. By 1.1.1 below.

Definition 1.1. 1) We say that a forcing notion \mathbb{P} is α -strategically complete when for each $p \in \mathbb{P}$ in the following game $\partial_{\alpha}(p, \mathbb{P})$ between the players COM and INC, COM has a winning strategy.

A play last α moves; in the β -th move, first the player COM chooses $p_{\beta} \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $p \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p_{\beta}$ and $\gamma < \beta \Rightarrow q_{\gamma} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} p_{\beta}$ and second the player INC chooses $q_{\beta} \in \mathbb{P}$ such that $p_{\beta} \leq_{\mathbb{P}} q_{\beta}$.

The player COM wins a play if he has a legal move for every $\beta < \alpha$.

2) We say that a forcing notion \mathbb{P} is $(< \lambda)$ -strategically complete <u>when</u> it is α -strategically complete for every $\alpha < \lambda$.

Claim 1.1.1. 1) If λ is supercompact <u>then</u> after some preliminary forcing of cardinality λ, λ is still supercompact and \Box_{λ} below holds.

2) If λ is strongly inaccessible and \Box_{λ} below holds and $\lambda < \kappa = cf(\kappa) < \mu = \mu^{\lambda}$ for some λ^+ -c.c., $(<\lambda)$ -strategically complete forcing notion \mathbb{P} we have $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}}$ " $\mathfrak{d}_{\lambda} = \mu$, $cov_{\lambda}(meagre) = \kappa$ "

where

 \Box_{λ} for any regular cardinal $\chi > \lambda$ and forcing notion \mathbb{P} which is $(<\lambda)$ strategically complete (see Definition 1.1) the following set $S = S_{\mathbb{P}}$ is a
stationary subset of $[\mathcal{H}(\chi)]^{<\lambda}$:

S is the set of N such that for some $\lambda_N, \chi_N, \mathbf{j} = \mathbf{j}_N, N' = N'_N, M = M_N, \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_N$ we have: we may say $(\lambda_N, \chi_N, \mathbf{j}_N, N'_N, M_N, \mathbf{G}_N)$ is a witness for (N, \mathbb{P})

- (a) $N \prec (\mathcal{H}(\chi)^{\mathbf{V}}, \in)$ and $\mathbb{P} \in N$
- (b) the Mostowski collapse N' of N is $\subseteq \mathcal{H}(\chi')$, and $\mathbf{j}_N : N \to N'$ is the unique isomorphism
- (c) $N \cap \lambda = \lambda_N$ and λ_N strongly inaccessible
- (d) $N' \subseteq M = (\mathcal{H}(\chi_N), \in)$ so is transitive, too
- (e) $\mathbf{G} \subseteq (\mathbf{j}(\mathbb{P}))^N$ is generic over N
- (f) $M = N'[\mathbf{G}].$

Proof. 1) This is essentially by Laver [3]. 2) We use a $(< \lambda)$ -support iteration $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} = \langle \mathbb{P}_{\alpha}, \mathbb{Q}_{\beta} : \alpha \leq \mu + \kappa, \beta < \mu + \kappa \rangle$ such that

(A) if $\alpha < \mu$ then \mathbb{Q}_{α} is the dominating forcing, i.e.

(α) $p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\alpha}$ iff (a) $p = (\eta, f) = (\eta^p, f^p)$ (b) $\eta \in {}^{\varepsilon}\lambda$ for some $\varepsilon < \lambda$, the trunk of p (c) $f \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$ and $\eta \triangleleft f$ $(\beta) p \leq_{\mathbb{Q}_{\alpha}} q$ iff (a) $\eta^p \triangleleft \eta^q$ (b) $f^p \leq f^q$, i.e. $(\forall \varepsilon < \lambda) f^p(\varepsilon) \leq f^q(\varepsilon)$ (c) if $\ell g(\eta^p) \leq \varepsilon < \ell g(\eta^q)$ then $\eta^q(\varepsilon) \in [f^p(\varepsilon), \lambda)$; this follows (B) fix $\bar{\theta} = \langle \theta_{\alpha} : \alpha < \lambda \rangle$ with $\theta_{\alpha} = (2^{|\alpha| + \aleph_0})^+$, or any sequence of cardinals $\in \operatorname{Reg} \cap \lambda$, increasing fast enough (C) if $\alpha \in [\mu, \mu + \kappa]$ then \mathbb{Q}_{α} is the $\overline{\theta}$ -dominating forcing, i.e., $(\alpha) \ p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\alpha}$ iff (a) $p = (\eta, f) = (\eta^p, f^p)$ (b) $\eta \in \prod_{\zeta < \ell q(\eta)} \theta_{\zeta}$ and $\ell q(\eta)$ is an ordinal $< \lambda$ (c) $f \in \prod_{\zeta < \lambda} \theta_{\zeta}$ (d) $\eta \triangleleft f$ (β) order: as in (A)(β).

Let f_{α} be the generic for \mathbb{Q}_{α} and g_i be the generic for $\mathbb{Q}_{\mu+i}$ for $i < \kappa$. Now:

- $(*)_1$ each \mathbb{Q}_{α} is strategically $(<\lambda)$ -complete, in fact
 - (α) for $\alpha \in [\mu, \mu + \kappa)$ it is not ($< \lambda$)-complete¹ but is strategically λ complete; simply, in a play, COM can keep having the trunk being of
 length \geq length of the play so far
 - (β) for $\alpha \in [0, \mu), \mathbb{Q}_{\alpha}$ is (< λ)-complete even for directed systems
- (*)₂ for each α , the forcing \mathbb{Q}_{α} satisfies a strong form of the λ^+ -c.c., e.g. see [6] hence also each \mathbb{P}_{α}
- (*)₃ forcing with $\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}$ collapses no cardinal changes no cofinality and adds no sequence to ${}^{\lambda>}\mathbf{V}$
- $(*)_4$ in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mu}}, \mathfrak{b}_{\lambda} = \mathfrak{d}_{\lambda} = \mu$ as witnessed by $\langle \underline{f}_{\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle$
- (*)₅ $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\mu+i+1}}$ " $\tilde{g}_i \in \prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}$ dominate $(\prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_{\mu+i}]}$ ", the order being modulo J_{λ}^{bd} = the ideal of bounded subsets of λ .

[Why? As in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mu+i}}$ for each $g \in \prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}$ the set $\{(\eta, f) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\bar{\theta}}$: for every $\varepsilon \in [\ell g(\eta), \lambda)$ we have $g(\varepsilon) \leq f(\varepsilon)\}$ is a dense open subset of $\mathbb{Q}_{\mu+i}$.]

$$(*)_6 \Vdash_{\mu+\kappa} "\{\underline{g}_i : i < \kappa\} \text{ is } <_{J_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{bd}}} \text{-increasing and cofinal in } (\prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}, <_{J_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{bd}}})".$$

[Why? By (*)₅ noting that $(\prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}]} = \bigcup \{ (\prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}_{\mu+i}]} : i < \kappa \}$ which holds as $\kappa = \operatorname{cf}(\kappa) \ge \lambda^+$ in \mathbf{V} and $\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}$ satisfies the λ^+ -c.c. and so $\langle \mathbb{P}_{\mu+i} : i < \kappa \rangle$ is \lessdot -increasing and with union $\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}$ as $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is an iteration with ($< \lambda$)-support.] Now

 $(*)_7 \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}}$ "cov $_{\lambda}$ (meagre) $\leq \kappa$ ".

¹for this, $\theta_{\alpha} > \alpha$ is enough

[Why? As we can look at $\prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}$ instead $^{\lambda}2$ and for each $\varepsilon < \lambda, i < \kappa$ the set $B_{\varepsilon,i} = \{\eta \in \prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}: \text{ for every } \zeta \in [\varepsilon, \lambda) \text{ we have } g_i(\zeta) \le \eta(\zeta) < \theta_{\zeta} \}$ is closed no-where dense, and $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}} \models \prod_{\zeta < \lambda} \theta_{\zeta} = \cup \{B_{\varepsilon,i} : \varepsilon < \lambda, i < \kappa\}^n$.]

Now we come to the main and last point

(*)₈ $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}}$ "no $f \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$ dominate $\{f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \mu\}$ ".

Why? Let $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mu}$ be generic over \mathbf{V} and so $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle = \langle f_{\alpha}[\mathbf{G}] : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ is well defined. Now $\mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}/\mathbf{G}$ is just the $(<\lambda)$ -support iteration of $\langle \mathbb{P}_{\mu+i}/\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{Q}_{\mu+i} : i < \kappa \rangle$. Let $p \in \mathbb{P}_{\mu+\kappa}/\mathbf{G}$. For $i \leq \kappa$ let $\mathbb{P}'_i = \mathbb{P}_{\mu+i}/\mathbf{G}, \mathbb{Q}'_i$ is the \mathbb{P}'_i -name of $\mathbb{Q}_{\mu+i}$.

Assume toward contradiction

 $\square p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_{\kappa}} "f \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda".$

We shall apply \Box_{λ} . The condition \Box_{λ} is preserved by forcing by \mathbb{P}_{μ} so $\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}] = \mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mu}}$ satisfies \Box_{λ} . So it suffices to prove:

(*)'₈ if **V** satisfies \Box_{λ} and $\langle \mathbb{P}'_i, \mathbb{Q}'_j : i \leq \gamma(*), j < \gamma(*) \rangle$ is a $(< \lambda)$ -support iteration, each \mathbb{Q}'_{α} is $(\mathbb{Q}_{\bar{\theta}})^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbb{P}'_i]}$ then forcing with $\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)}$ add no dominating $f \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$ and let $g_i \in \prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}$ be the name of the generic for \mathbb{Q}'_i .

[Why (*)'₈ suffice? We apply it to $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mu}} = \mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}]$; note that $\bar{f} = \langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ is a sequence of members of $^{\lambda}\lambda$ which is $<_{J_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{bd}}}$ -increasing and is cofinal in $((^{\lambda}\lambda)^{\mathbf{V}[\mathbf{G}]}, <_{J_{\lambda}^{\mathrm{bd}}})$). So in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)}}$ we have:

- (a) $f_{\alpha} \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$
- (b) $\langle f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \mu \rangle$ is $\langle J_{\lambda}^{\text{bd}}$ -increasing
- (c) $\{f_{\alpha} : \alpha < \mu\}$ has no common $\leq_{J_{\lambda}^{bd}}$ -upper bound.

This implies that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)}}$ " $\mathfrak{d}_{\lambda} \geq \mu$ ".]

To prove $(*)'_8$ assume toward contradiction

 $\circledast_0 p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)}}$ "f dominate $(^{\lambda}\lambda)^{\mathbf{V}}$ ".

Now we choose $\bar{N} = \langle N_{\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ such that

- \circledast_1 (a) N_{ε} is as in \boxdot_{λ} for $\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)}$
 - (b) $\bar{N} \upharpoonright \varepsilon \in N_{\varepsilon}$ hence $\lambda_{\varepsilon} := N_{\varepsilon} \cap \lambda > \lambda_{\varepsilon}^{-} := \Sigma \{\lambda_{\zeta} : \zeta < \varepsilon\}$
 - (c) p^*, f belong to N_{ε} .

We can find $f^* \in {}^{\lambda}\lambda$, i.e. $\in ({}^{\lambda}\lambda)^{\mathbf{V}}$ such that

 \circledast_2 for arbitrarily large $\varepsilon < \lambda$ for some $\zeta \in [\lambda_{\varepsilon}^-, \lambda_{\varepsilon})$ we have $f^*(\zeta) > \lambda_{\varepsilon}$.

For $\varepsilon < \lambda$ let $(\lambda_{\varepsilon}, \chi_{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{j}_{\varepsilon}, M_{\varepsilon}, N'_{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon})$ be a witness for $(N_{\varepsilon}, \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)})$ so $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \in (\varepsilon, \lambda)$ is strongly inaccessible and $\varepsilon < \zeta < \lambda \Rightarrow \chi_{\varepsilon} < \lambda_{\zeta}$, recalling \circledast_1 . Let

 $\circledast_3 \ u_{\varepsilon} = N_{\varepsilon} \cap \gamma(*) \text{ and let } \eta_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon} = (\tilde{g}_{\gamma})^{N_{\varepsilon}'}[\mathbf{G}_{\varepsilon}] \in {}^{(\lambda_{\varepsilon})}(\lambda_{\varepsilon}) \text{ and } \bar{\eta}^{\varepsilon} = \langle \eta_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon} : \gamma \in u_{\varepsilon} \rangle.$

Note

 \circledast_4 for each $\varepsilon < \lambda$, if we change $\eta_{\gamma}^{\varepsilon}(\zeta)$ (legally, i.e. $< \theta_{\zeta}$) for $< \lambda_{\varepsilon}$ pairs $(\gamma, \zeta) \in u_{\varepsilon} \times \lambda_{\varepsilon}$ and get $\bar{\eta}'$, then also $\bar{\eta}'$ is generic for $(N'_{\varepsilon}, \mathbb{P}^{N'_{\varepsilon}}_{\gamma(*)})$ and $N'_{\varepsilon}[\bar{\eta}'] = M_{\varepsilon}$.

By the assumption toward contradiction \circledast_0 and $\mathbb{P}'_{\alpha(*)}$ being $(<\lambda)$ -strategically closed there are $\zeta(*)$ and p^+ such that:

- - (c) $p^{+} \Vdash "f^{*}(\zeta)" < f(\zeta)$ whenever $\zeta(*) \leq \zeta < \lambda$
 - (d) if $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(p^+)$ then $\eta^{p^+(\gamma)}$ is an object (not just a \mathbb{P}'_{γ} -name) of length $\geq \zeta(*)$.

Note that possibly $\operatorname{Dom}(p^+) \not\subseteq \cup \{u_{\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda\}$. Choose $\varepsilon(*) < \lambda$ such that $\lambda_{\varepsilon(*)} > \zeta(*) + |\operatorname{Dom}(p^+)|$ and $(\exists \zeta) [\lambda_{\varepsilon}^- \leq \zeta < \lambda_{\varepsilon} < f^*(\zeta)].$

Let $\langle \gamma_i : i < i(*) \rangle$ list $u_{\varepsilon(*)}$ in increasing order and let $\gamma_{i(*)} = \gamma(*)$. Now we choose $p_i^+, \bar{\nu}^i$ by induction on $i \leq i(*)$ such that

- \circledast_6 (a) $p_i^+ \in \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma_i}$
 - (b) if j < i then $\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma} \models "p_i^+ \le p_i^+$ "
 - (c) if $\gamma \in \text{Dom}(p_i^+)$ or just $\gamma \in \bigcup \{\text{Dom}(p_j^+) : j < i\}$ then $p_i^+ \upharpoonright \gamma \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_{\gamma}}$ " $\eta^{p_i^+(\gamma)}$ has length $\ge i$ (or even $\ge i(*)$ and $\ge \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$)"
 - (d) $\mathbb{P}_{\gamma_i} \models "p^+ \upharpoonright \gamma_i \le p_i^+$ "
 - (e) $\bar{\nu}^i = \langle \nu_{\gamma_j} : j < i \rangle$ and $\nu_{\gamma_j} \in \prod_{\zeta < \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}} \theta_{\zeta}$
 - (f) for j < i we have $\nu_{\gamma_j}^i \leq \eta^{p_i^+(\gamma_j)}$ so $p_i^+ \upharpoonright \gamma_j \Vdash "\nu_{\gamma_j}^i < g_{\gamma_j}"$
 - (g) for j < i we have (recall $\bar{\eta}^{\varepsilon}$ from \circledast_3)
 - $(\alpha) \quad \eta_{\gamma_j}^{\varepsilon(*)} = \nu_{\gamma_j} \ \underline{\mathrm{or}}$
 - (β) $\gamma_j \in \text{Dom}(p^+)$ and $\{\zeta < \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)} : \eta_{\gamma_j}^{\varepsilon(*)}(\zeta) \neq \nu_{\gamma_j}(\zeta)\}$ is a bounded subset of $\lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$.

First, assume we have succeeded to carry this choice. Then on the one hand

 $\circledast'_{i} p^{+}_{i(*)}$ is above p^{+} hence it forces $\underline{f}^{*} \upharpoonright [\zeta(*), \lambda) < \underline{f} \upharpoonright [\zeta(*), \lambda)$ hence $f^{*} \upharpoonright [\zeta(*), \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}) < \underline{f} \upharpoonright [\zeta(*), \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)})$ recalling that $\zeta(*) < \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$.

On the other hand,

 $\circledast_7'' p_{i(*)}^+$ is $(N_{\varepsilon(*)}, \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)})$ -generic.

[Why? As it forces $\eta_{\gamma_i} \upharpoonright \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)} = \nu_{\gamma_i}$ for i < i(*) and $\langle \eta_{\gamma_i}^{\varepsilon(*)} : i < i(*) \rangle$ is (see \circledast_4) "almost equal" to $\bar{\eta}^{\varepsilon(*)}$ which is from \circledast_3 and see clause (g) of \circledast_6 . That is $\{(\gamma, \zeta) : \zeta < \lambda_{\varepsilon}, \gamma \in u_{\varepsilon(*)} \text{ and } \nu_{\gamma}(\zeta) \neq \eta_{\gamma}(\zeta)\} \subseteq \cup\{\{(\gamma, \zeta) : \zeta < \lambda_{\varepsilon} \text{ and } \nu_{\gamma}(\zeta) \neq \eta_{\gamma}(\zeta)\} : \gamma \in u_{\varepsilon(*)} \cap \operatorname{Dom}(p^+)\}$ so is the union of $\leq |\operatorname{Dom}(p^+)| < \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$ sets each of cardinality $< \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$ hence is of cardinality $< \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$. Hence by \circledast_4 the sequence $\bar{\nu}^{i(*)}$ is generic for $(N_{\varepsilon(*)}, \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)})$.]

- As $f \in N_{\varepsilon(*)}$ it follows from \circledast_7'' that
- $\circledast_7''' p_{i(*)}^+ \Vdash "f \upharpoonright \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$ is a function from $\lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$ to $\lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}$ ".

Together $\circledast'_7 + \circledast''_7$ gives a contradiction by the choice of f^* in \circledast_2 and of $\varepsilon(*)$ above. Let us carry the induction.

 $\frac{\text{Case 1}: i = 0.}{\text{Let } p_0^+ = p^+ \upharpoonright \gamma_0.}$

<u>Case 2</u>: i limit.

By clauses (b) and (c), there is $p_i^+ \in \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma_i}$ which is an upper bound (even l.u.b.) of $\{p_i^+ : j < i\}$ and it is easily as required. Also $\bar{\nu}^i$ is well defined and as required.

<u>Case 3</u>: i = j + 1 and $\gamma_j \notin \text{Dom}(p^+)$.

Clearly $\gamma_i = \gamma_j + 1$ and $\gamma_j \in u_{\varepsilon(*)}$. As in case 4 below but easier by the properties of the iteration, is easy.

<u>Case 4</u>: i = j + 1 and $\gamma_i \in \text{Dom}(p^+)$

Again $\gamma_i = \gamma_j + 1$ and $\gamma_j \in u_{\varepsilon(*)}$. First we find p'_j such that:

- \circledast_8 (a) $p_j^+ \leq p_j' \in \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma_i}$
 - (b) if $\gamma \in \operatorname{Dom}(p_i^+)$ then $p_i' \upharpoonright \gamma_j \Vdash {}^{{}^{\circ}}\ell g(\eta^{p_j'(\gamma)}) > i$ "
 - (c) p'_{γ} forces ² a value to the pair $(\eta^{p^+(\gamma_i)}, \underline{f}^{p^+(\gamma_j)} \upharpoonright \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)})$; we call this pair q_j .

This should be clear.

Second

 $\circledast_9 p_j^+$ hence p_j' is $(N_{\varepsilon(*)}, \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma_j})$ -generic and $\langle \eta_{j_1} : j_1 < j \rangle$ induces the generic.

[Why? As in the proof of \circledast''_7 above when we assume that we have carried the induction, by \circledast_6 , clause (g) and \circledast_4 .]

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \circledast_{10} & (a) \quad f^{q_j} \in (\prod_{\zeta < \lambda_{\varepsilon(*)}} \theta_{\zeta})^{N'_{\varepsilon(*)}[\bar{\eta}^j]} \\ & (b) \quad q_j \text{ belongs to } M_{\varepsilon(*)}[\langle \eta_{\gamma_{j_1}} : j_1 < j \rangle] \\ & (c) \quad \eta^{q_j} \triangleleft f^{q_j}. \end{aligned}$$

[Why? Clause (a) follows from clause (b) and clause (b) should be clear by $(*)_9$. Also clause (c) follows from (b).]

So we have carried the induction hence gotten the contradiction. $\Box_{1.1.1}$

<u>Concluding Remarks</u>: 0) So see (*)₇ in the proof of 1.1.1, if $\aleph_0 \leq \theta_{\varepsilon} \leq \lambda$ for $\varepsilon < \lambda$, then $\operatorname{cov}_{\lambda}(\operatorname{meagre}) \leq \operatorname{cf}(\prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}, <_{J_{\mathrm{bd}}})$.

1) In \circledast_0 we can require $\gamma(*) < \lambda^+$. Why? If $\kappa = \lambda^+$ so $\gamma(*) = \kappa^+$ then by " $\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)}$ satisfies the λ^+ -c.c." so if $p^* \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}'_{\kappa}}$ "f dominates $(\lambda^{\lambda})^{\mathbf{V}}$ " then for some $\gamma(*) < \kappa, f$ is a $\mathbb{P}'_{\gamma(*)}$ -name. Generally we can use a parallel of nep see [7]. We may treat this more generally.

2) We may control the various $cf(\prod_{\varepsilon < \lambda} \theta_{\varepsilon}, <_{J_{\lambda}^{bd}})$, see [5].

3) We may consider

 $\mathbf{6}$

²recall that $\eta^{p^*(\gamma)}$ is an object, not a name and p_i^+ is $(N_{\varepsilon(*)}, \mathbb{P}'_{\gamma_i})$ -generic

Definition 1.2. Assume λ is strongly inaccesible $(>\aleph_0)$, $\bar{\theta} = \langle \theta_{\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ where $\theta_{\varepsilon} = \operatorname{cf}(\theta_{\varepsilon}) < \lambda$ and $\langle \kappa_{\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \lambda \rangle$ are increasing continuous sequence of cardinals of length λ with limit λ . We say that the forcing notion \mathbb{Q} is $(\bar{\theta}, \bar{\kappa})$ -centered when: there is a function f witnessing it which means

(*) f is a function from \mathbb{Q} to λ such that: if $\kappa_{\varepsilon} \leq \alpha < \kappa_{\varepsilon+1}$ then $\{p \in \mathbb{Q} : f(p) = \alpha\}$ is θ_{ε} -directed.

SAHARON SHELAH

References

- James Cummings and Saharon Shelah. Cardinal invariants above the continuum. Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, 75:251–268, 1995. math.LO/9509228.
- [2] A. Landver. Baire numbers, uncountable cohen sets and perfect-set forcing. Journal of Symbolic Logic, 57:1086–1107, 1992.
- [3] Richard Laver. Making supercompact indestructible under κ-directed forcing. Israel J. of Math., 29:385–388, 1978.
- [4] Pierre Matet and Saharon Shelah. Positive partition relations for $P_{\kappa}(\lambda)$. Preprint. math.LO/0407440.
- [5] Saharon Shelah. Iterated creatures for inaccessibles.
- [6] Saharon Shelah. A weak generalization of MA to higher cardinals. Israel Journal of Mathematics, 30:297–306, 1978.
- [7] Saharon Shelah. Properness Without Elementaricity. Journal of Applied Analysis, 10:168–289, 2004. math.LO/9712283.

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, GIVAT RAM, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, JERUSALEM, 91904, ISRAEL, AND, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HILL CENTER - BUSCH CAMPUS, RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY, 110 FRELINGHUYSEN ROAD, PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854-8019 USA

 $E\text{-}mail \ address: \texttt{shelah@math.huji.ac.il}$

URL: http://shelah.logic.at