

MONOTONICITY OF THE ULTRAFILTER NUMBER FUNCTION

TOSHIMICHI USUBA

ABSTRACT. We investigate whether the ultrafilter number function $\kappa \mapsto \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ on the cardinals is monotone, that is, $\mathfrak{u}(\lambda) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ holds for all cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$ or not. We show that monotonicity can fail, but the failure has a large cardinal strength. On the other hand, we prove that there are many limitations of the failure of monotonicity. For instance, if κ is a singular cardinal with countable cofinality or a strong limit singular cardinal, then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ holds.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a cardinal κ , let $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ denote the ultrafilter number at κ , that is, the minimal cardinality of a base of a uniform ultrafilter over κ . A central research on the ultrafilter number is comparison between $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ and other cardinal invariants at κ : A typical one is, whether $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < 2^\kappa$ is consistent or not. In this context, the ultrafilter number at ω is studied extensively, and recently the ultrafilter number at singular cardinals is actively researched (e.g., [3], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]). In contrast, little is known about the ultrafilter number at successor cardinals. While it is still open if $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_1) < 2^{\omega_1}$ is consistent or not, Raghavan and Shelah [14] proved the consistency of $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_{\omega+1}) < 2^{\omega_{\omega+1}}$ under some large cardinal assumption. However it is unknown if this large cardinal assumption is necessary or not.

This paper also investigates the ultrafilter number, but does not aim to study comparison between $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ and other cardinal invariants at κ . Instead, we identify the ultrafilter numbers as the function $\kappa \mapsto \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ on the cardinals, and we shall consider a behavior of the ultrafilter number function. Under GCH, the ultrafilter number $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ is just $2^\kappa = \kappa^+$, hence the ultrafilter number function is just the continuum function $\kappa \mapsto 2^\kappa$, in particular it is strictly increasing. On the other hand, it is easy to construct a model in which the ultrafilter number function is not strictly increasing: Assuming GCH, just add ω_2 many Cohen real. Then $\mathfrak{u}(\omega) = \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1) = \omega_2$ holds in the generic extension (e.g., see Lemma 4.1). Under this viewpoint, a natural question arises. This is a main topic of this paper.

Question 1.1. Is the ultrafilter number function *monotone*? That is, for every cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$, does $\mathfrak{u}(\lambda) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ always hold?

For some cardinal invariant, it is easy to show that monotonicity of that cardinal invariant can fail: For the dominating number $\mathfrak{d}(\kappa)$, suppose GCH and add ω_3 many Cohen reals. Then $\mathfrak{d}(\omega) = \omega_3 > \omega_2 = \mathfrak{d}(\omega_1)$ holds in

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03E10, 03E35, 03E55.

Key words and phrases. Indecomposable ultrafilter, Ultrafilter number.

the generic extension. However, this naive approach does not work for the ultrafilter numbers; In the generic extension, we have $\mathfrak{u}(\omega) = \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1) = \omega_3$ (see Lemma 4.1 again).

In this paper, we prove that the failure of monotonicity is actually consistent. On the other hand, we also prove that the failure of it has a large cardinal strength. Moreover there are many ZFC-limitations of the failure of monotonicity. First, by using Raghavan and Shelah's argument, we show that monotonicity of the ultrafilter number function can fail.

- Theorem 1.2.** (1) *Suppose there is a measurable cardinal. Then, in some generic extension, there are cardinals κ, λ such that $\lambda < \kappa$ but $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$.*
- (2) *Suppose there is a supercompact cardinal. Then, in some generic extension, $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_{\omega+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$ holds.*
- (3) *Suppose there is a strongly compact cardinal. Then, in some generic extension, there is a singular cardinal κ with cofinality ω_1 such that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$.*
- (4) *Suppose there is a strongly compact cardinal. Then, in some generic extension, there is a regular cardinal κ such that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$.*

Raghavan and Shelah's argument involves indecomposable ultrafilters, but it is not clear if the use of indecomposable ultrafilters is necessary for their theorem. We see that, however, the failure of monotonicity is directly connected with indecomposability. Using this connection, we also prove that there are many limitations of the failure of monotonicity.

- Theorem 1.3.** (1) *$\mathfrak{u}(\omega) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ holds for every cardinal κ .*
- (2) *For cardinals κ, λ , if λ is regular, $\lambda < \kappa$, but $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$, then $\lambda^{+\omega} \leq \kappa$.*
- (3) *If κ is a singular cardinal with countable cofinality, or a strong limit singular cardinal, then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$.*
- (4) *For a singular cardinal κ , if $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$, then the set $\{\lambda < \kappa \mid \lambda \text{ is regular, } \mathfrak{u}(\lambda) > \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)\}$ is bounded in κ .*
- (5) *If $\square(\kappa)$ holds for a regular κ , then $\mathfrak{u}(\lambda) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ holds for every $\lambda < \kappa$.*

Finally we show that the failure of monotonicity has a large cardinal strength, so the large cardinal assumption in Theorem 1.2 cannot be eliminated.

Theorem 1.4. *The following theories are equiconsistent:*

- (1) *ZFC + "there is a measurable cardinal".*
- (2) *ZFC + "there are cardinals κ, λ such that $\lambda < \kappa$ but $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ ".*

Theorem 1.5. *Suppose there are cardinals κ, λ such that $\lambda \leq \kappa$ but $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$. Then there is an inner models of a proper class of strong cardinals.*

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, a *filter* means a non-principal proper filter over a non-empty set. A filter \mathcal{F} over a set S is *uniform* if $|X| = |S|$ for every $X \in \mathcal{F}$. For an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over a set S , a subfamily $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ is a *base* for \mathcal{U} if for every $Y \in \mathcal{U}$ there is $X \in \mathcal{G}$ with $X \subseteq Y$. Let $\chi(\mathcal{U}) = \min\{|\mathcal{G}| \mid \mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{U}\}$

is a base}. $\chi(\mathcal{U})$ is called the *character* of \mathcal{U} . Let $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ be the cardinal $\min\{\chi(\mathcal{U}) \mid \mathcal{U} \text{ is a uniform ultrafilter over } \kappa\}$, it is called the *ultrafilter number at κ* . It is clear that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq 2^\kappa$.

Fact 2.1 (Garti and Shelah [6]). $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \geq \kappa^+$ and $\text{cf}(\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)) > \omega$.

Let λ be a cardinal. A filter \mathcal{F} over a set S is said to be λ -*decomposable* if there is a family $\{A_\alpha \mid \alpha < \lambda\}$ such that $\bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda} A_\alpha = S$ and $\bigcup_{\alpha \in X} A_\alpha \notin \mathcal{F}$ for every $X \in [\lambda]^{<\lambda}$. \mathcal{F} is λ -*indecomposable* if it is not λ -decomposable. The following lemmas can be verified easily:

Lemma 2.2. *For a filter \mathcal{F} over a set S and a cardinal λ , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{F} is λ -decomposable.
- (2) There is $f : S \rightarrow \lambda$ such that for every $X \subseteq \lambda$ with size $< \lambda$, we have $f^{-1}(X) \notin \mathcal{F}$.

Lemma 2.3. *If \mathcal{F} is a λ -indecomposable filter, then every filter extending \mathcal{F} is λ -indecomposable.*

It is known that the existence of an indecomposable uniform ultrafilter is a large cardinal property.

Fact 2.4 (Prikrý and Silver [13]). *Let $\lambda < \kappa$ be regular cardinals. If κ has a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter, then every stationary subset of $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda\}$ is reflecting, that is, for every stationary $S \subseteq \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda\}$, there is $\beta < \kappa$ such that $S \cap \beta$ is stationary in β .*

If κ is regular, then the set $\{\alpha < \kappa^+ \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \kappa\}$ is a non-reflecting stationary set. By this observation, we have:

Lemma 2.5. *If κ is regular, then every uniform ultrafilter over κ^+ is κ -decomposable.*

If δ is a cardinal, then every δ^+ -complete ultrafilter is δ -indecomposable, and an ultrafilter is σ -complete if and only if it is ω -indecomposable.

Non-large cardinal can have an indecomposable ultrafilter.

Fact 2.6 (Ben-David and Magidor [2]). *Suppose GCH and there is a supercompact cardinal. Then there is a forcing extension in which GCH holds and $\omega_{\omega+1}$ has a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} such that \mathcal{U} is ω_n -indecomposable for every $0 < n < \omega$.*

Let μ, ν be cardinals. An ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over a set S is (μ, ν) -*regular* if there is a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ of size ν such that for every $\mathcal{F}' \in [\mathcal{F}]^\mu$, we have $\bigcap \mathcal{F}' = \emptyset$. It is easy to check that an ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over S is (μ, ν) -regular if and only if there is a family $\{x_s \mid s \in S\}$ such that $x_s \in [\nu]^{<\mu}$, and for every $i < \nu$, the set $\{s \in S \mid i \in x_s\}$ is in \mathcal{U} .

The following lemma might be folklore:

Lemma 2.7. *Every ν -indecomposable ultrafilter is not (ω, ν) -regular.*

Proof. For a given $\{x_s \mid s \in S\}$ with $x_s \in [\nu]^{<\omega}$, suppose $\{s \in S \mid \beta \in x_s\} \in \mathcal{U}$ for every $\beta < \nu$. Because $\nu^{<\omega} = \nu$ and \mathcal{U} is ν -indecomposable, we can find $A \subseteq [\nu]^{<\omega}$ such that $|A| < \nu$ and $\{s \in S \mid x_s \in A\} \in \mathcal{U}$. We have $|\bigcup A| < \nu$, hence there is $\beta \in \nu \setminus \bigcup A$. But then $\{s \in S \mid \beta \notin x_s\} \in \mathcal{U}$, this is a contradiction. \square

Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter over a set S . For a set T and $f : S \rightarrow T$, let $f_*(\mathcal{U}) = \{X \subseteq T \mid f^{-1}(X) \in \mathcal{U}\}$. $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is an ultrafilter (possibly principal) over T . It is easy to check that if \mathcal{U} is λ -indecomposable, then so is $f_*(\mathcal{U})$.

The next lemma can be verified easily.

Lemma 2.8. *An ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over S is λ -decomposable if and only if there is a function $f : S \rightarrow \lambda$ such that $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is a uniform ultrafilter over λ .*

For a regular cardinal κ and a non-empty set X , let $\text{Add}(\kappa, X)$ be the poset of all partial functions $p : \kappa \times X \rightarrow 2$ with $\text{size } p < \kappa$. The order is given by the reverse inclusion. The poset $\text{Add}(\kappa, X)$ is κ -closed, satisfies the $(2^{<\kappa})^+$ -c.c., and adds X -many new subsets of κ . For $Y \subseteq X$, we will identify $\text{Add}(\kappa, Y)$ as a complete suborder of $\text{Add}(\kappa, X)$.

3. RAGHAVAN AND SHELAH'S THEOREM

In this section we give a slightly general form of Raghavan and Shelah's theorem with relatively simple proof. Using this theorem, we will show the consistency of the failure of monotonicity of the ultrafilter number function in the next section.

Theorem 3.1 (Raghavan and Shelah [14]). *Let κ and μ be uncountable cardinals such that:*

- (1) $\text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa < \mu$.
- (2) $\nu^\kappa < \mu$ for every $\nu < \mu$.
- (3) κ has a $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} .

Let \mathbb{P} be a poset such that \mathbb{P} has the $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -c.c. and $|\mathbb{P}| \leq \mu$. Then \mathbb{P} forces that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mu$.

Proof. We may assume that $|\mathbb{P}| = \mu$, otherwise the assertion is trivial. Fix an enumeration $\{p_i \mid i < \mu\}$ of \mathbb{P} . For $\gamma < \mu$, let us say that a \mathbb{P} -name \dot{A} is a γ -nice name if \dot{A} is of the form $\bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} (\{\check{\alpha}\} \times I_\alpha)$, where each I_α is an antichain in \mathbb{P} and $I_\alpha \subseteq \{p_i \mid i < \gamma\}$ ($I_\alpha = \emptyset$ is possible).

Claim 3.2. *For every \mathbb{P} -name \dot{B} with $\Vdash \dot{B} \subseteq \check{\kappa}$, there is $D \in \mathcal{U}$, $\gamma < \mu$, and a γ -nice name \dot{A} such that $\Vdash \dot{B} \cap \check{D} = \dot{A}$.*

Proof. For each $\alpha < \kappa$, take a maximal antichain J_α in \mathbb{P} such that each $p \in J_\alpha$ decides the statement $\check{\alpha} \in \dot{B}$. Since \mathbb{P} has the $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -c.c., there is $\gamma_\alpha < \mu$ such that $J_\alpha \subseteq \{p_i \mid i < \gamma_\alpha\}$. \mathcal{U} is $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -indecomposable, hence we can find $\gamma < \mu$ such that $D = \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \gamma_\alpha \leq \gamma\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Let $\dot{A} = \{\langle \check{\alpha}, p \rangle \mid \alpha \in D, p \in J_\alpha, p \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{B}\}$. Clearly \dot{A} is a γ -nice name and $\Vdash \dot{A} \subseteq \dot{B}$. We shall show that $\Vdash \dot{B} \cap \check{D} = \dot{A}$.

Fix $q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\alpha < \kappa$, and first suppose $q \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{A}$. We have $\alpha \in D$ by the definition of \dot{A} . Pick $p \in J_\alpha$ which is compatible with q . Take $r \leq p, q$. Since $r \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{A}$, there is some $\langle \check{\alpha}, p' \rangle \in \dot{A}$ such that p' is compatible with r . Since $p, p' \in J_\alpha$ and J_α is an antichain, we have $p = p'$. Hence $p \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{B}$, and $r \Vdash \alpha \in \check{D}$.

For the converse, suppose $q \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{B} \cap \check{D}$. Again, pick $p \in J_\alpha$ which is compatible with q . Take $r \leq p, q$. We have $p \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{B}$, hence $\langle \check{\alpha}, p \rangle \in \dot{A}$, and $p \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{A}$. Thus $r \Vdash \check{\alpha} \in \dot{A}$. \square

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{\dot{A} \mid \dot{A} \text{ is a } \gamma\text{-nice name for some } \gamma < \mu\}$. Since \mathbb{P} has the $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -c.c., $|\{p_i \mid i < \gamma\}| < \mu$ for $\gamma < \mu$, and $\nu^\kappa < \mu$ for every $\nu < \mu$, we have $|\mathcal{N}| \leq \mu$.

Take a (V, \mathbb{P}) -generic G . In $V[G]$, take a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{V} over κ extending \mathcal{U} . Let $\mathcal{G} = \{\dot{A}_G \in \mathcal{V} \mid \dot{A} \in \mathcal{N}\}$. We have $|\mathcal{G}| \leq \mu$ and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. We prove that for every $B \in \mathcal{V}$, there is some $A \in \mathcal{G}$ with $A \subseteq B$. This completes our proof.

Fix $B \in \mathcal{V}$, and take a \mathbb{P} -name \dot{B} for B . We may assume that $\Vdash \dot{B} \subseteq \check{\kappa}$ in V . By the claim, there is $\dot{A} \in \mathcal{N}$ and $D \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\Vdash \dot{B} \cap \dot{D} = \dot{A}$. Since $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, we have $\dot{A}_G = B \cap D \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\dot{A}_G \in \mathcal{G}$. \square

Theorem 3.3 ([14]). *Let κ be a measurable cardinal, and $\mu > \kappa$ a strong limit singular cardinal with $\omega_1 \leq \text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$. Then $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < 2^\kappa$.*

Proof. Note that $|\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)| = \mu$ and every κ -complete ultrafilter over κ is $\text{cf}(\mu)$ -indecomposable. Hence, in the generic extension, we have $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mu = 2^\omega \leq 2^\kappa$ by Theorem 3.1, and we know $\mu < 2^\kappa$ since $\text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$. \square

Theorem 3.4 ([14]). *Suppose the continuum hypothesis. Let κ be a measurable cardinal, and $\mu > \kappa$ a strong limit singular cardinal with $\omega_2 \leq \text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$. Then $\text{Add}(\omega, \kappa) \times \text{Add}(\omega_1, \mu)$ forces that $\kappa = 2^\omega$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < 2^\kappa$.*

Proof. We know that the cardinality of $\text{Add}(\omega, \kappa) \times \text{Add}(\omega_1, \mu)$ is just μ , and has the ω_2 -c.c. By the standard argument, $\text{Add}(\omega, \kappa) \times \text{Add}(\omega_1, \mu)$ forces that $\kappa = 2^\omega$ and $2^\kappa > 2^{\omega_1} = \mu$. By Proposition 3.1, we have $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mu < 2^\kappa$ in the generic extension. \square

The same argument together with Fact 2.6 proves:

Theorem 3.5 ([14]). *Suppose there is a supercompact cardinal. Then there is a forcing extension in which $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_{\omega+1}) < 2^{\omega_{\omega+1}}$ holds.*

Theorem 3.6. *Let κ be a measurable cardinal, and $\mu > \kappa$ a strong limit singular cardinal with $\omega_1 \leq \text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$. Let \mathcal{U} be a normal measure over κ , and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}}$ the Prikry forcing associated with \mathcal{U} . Then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}} \times \text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces that $\text{cf}(\kappa) = \omega$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < 2^\kappa$.*

Proof. In the Prikry forcing extension $V^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}}}$, it is known that \mathcal{U} generates an ν -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter for every regular uncountable $\nu < \kappa$ (e.g., see Kanamori [12]). Hence, the forcing with $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ over $V^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}}}$ forces that κ is singular with countable cofinality and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mu$ by Proposition 3.1. Moreover $\mu < 2^\kappa$ since $\text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$. \square

4. MODELS WITH THE FAILURE OF MONOTONICITY 1

In this section we construct models in which monotonicity of the ultrafilter number function fails. For this sake, we need the following lemmas.

The next lemma might be a kind of folklore.

Lemma 4.1. *Let κ be a cardinal, $\mu > \kappa$ a cardinal, and $\delta \leq \kappa$ a regular cardinal. If $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$ has the κ' -c.c. for some $\kappa' < \mu$ and preserves κ , then it forces $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \geq \mu$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Take an $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$ -name \dot{U} for a uniform ultrafilter over κ with character $\nu < \mu$, and $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ -names $\{\dot{A}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \nu\}$ of a base for \mathcal{U} . Fix a sufficiently large regular cardinal θ , and take $M \prec H_\theta$ such that $\nu + \kappa \subseteq M$ and $|M| < \mu$. By the κ' -c.c. of $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$, we may assume that for every $\alpha < \nu$, \dot{A}_α is an $\text{Add}(\delta, M \cap \mu)$ -name. Take a $(V, \text{Add}(\delta, \mu))$ -generic G , and let $H = G \cap \text{Add}(\delta, M \cap \mu)$, which is $(V, \text{Add}(\delta, M \cap \mu))$ -generic. We know $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G = (\dot{A}_\alpha)_H$, hence $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \in V[H]$. By the standard genericity argument, the forcing $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu \setminus M)$ over $V[H]$ adds a new set $B \in [\kappa]^\kappa$ such that $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \not\subseteq B$ and $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \not\subseteq \kappa \setminus B$ for every $\alpha < \nu$, this contradicts to that $\{(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \mid \alpha < \nu\}$ is a base for \mathcal{U} . \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let κ be a cardinal, $\mu > \kappa$ a cardinal with $\text{cf}(\mu) = \text{cf}(\kappa)$, and $\delta < \kappa$ a regular cardinal. If $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$ satisfies the κ' -c.c. for some $\kappa' < \mu$, preserves κ , and $|\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)| = \mu$, then it forces $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \neq \mu$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Take an $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$ -name \dot{U} for a uniform ultrafilter over κ with character μ , and $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$ -names $\{\dot{A}_\alpha \mid \alpha < \mu\}$ of a base for \mathcal{U} .

Fix a sufficiently large regular cardinal θ . Since $\text{cf}(\mu) = \text{cf}(\kappa)$, we can take a sequence $\langle M_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ such that:

- (1) $M_i \prec H_\theta$ and M_i contains all relevant objects.
- (2) $M_i \subseteq M_j$ for $i < j < \kappa$.
- (3) $\kappa \subseteq M_i$.
- (4) $|M_i| < \mu$.
- (5) $\mu \subseteq \bigcup_{i < \kappa} M_i$.

For $i < \kappa$, since $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$ has the κ' -c.c., we may assume that for every $\alpha \in M_i \cap \mu$, \dot{A}_α is an $\text{Add}(\delta, M_i \cap \mu)$ -name. Fix a partition $\{C_i \mid i < \kappa\}$ of κ with $|C_i| = \delta$. Fix also a bijection $\pi_i : \delta \rightarrow C_i$. Take a sequence $\langle \beta_i \mid i < \kappa \rangle$ in μ such that $\beta_i \notin M_i \cap \mu$ for $i < \kappa$.

Now take a $(V, \text{Add}(\delta, \mu))$ -generic G , and for $\gamma < \mu$, let r_γ be the γ -th generic subset of δ induced by G . Since $\beta_i \notin M_i$, we know that r_{β_i} is $V[G \cap \text{Add}(\delta, M_i \cap \mu)]$ -generic, hence we have that $s_i = \pi_i \restriction r_{\beta_i}$ has cardinality δ . Let $B = \bigcup_{i < \kappa} s_i$. We know $B \in [\kappa]^\kappa$. We prove that $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \not\subseteq B$ for $\alpha < \mu$. Fix $\alpha < \mu$, and take a condition $p \in G$. Pick a large $i < \kappa$ such that $\alpha, p \in M_i$. Let $H = G \cap \text{Add}(\delta, M_i \cap \mu)$. We know $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G = (\dot{A}_\alpha)_H$, hence $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \in V[H]$. Since $\bigcup_{j \leq i} C_j$ has cardinality $< \kappa$ but $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G$ has κ , we can take $k > i$ and $\xi \in (\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \cap C_k$. By the definition of s_k , there is a condition $q \in \text{Add}(\delta, \mu \setminus M_i)$ such that, in $V[H]$, q forces that $\xi \notin \dot{s}_k$, where \dot{s}_k is a canonical name for s_k . Thus, in V , there is some $p' \leq p$ in $\text{Add}(\delta, \mu)$ such that $p' \Vdash \dot{A}_\alpha \not\subseteq \dot{B}$, where \dot{B} is a canonical name for B . A similar argument shows that $(\dot{A}_\alpha)_G \not\subseteq \kappa \setminus B$ for $\alpha < \mu$. These means that $B, \kappa \setminus B \notin (\dot{U})_G$, this is a contradiction. \square

Note 4.3. We does not need this lemma if $\text{cf}(\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)) \neq \text{cf}(\kappa)$ is provable from ZFC, and it is an open problem asked in [6].

We are ready to show that monotonicity of the ultrafilter number function can fail.

Proposition 4.4. *Let κ be a cardinal, and $\mu > \kappa$ a strong limit singular cardinal with $\omega_1 \leq \text{cf}(\mu) < \kappa$. Let $\lambda < \kappa$ be a cardinal with $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \text{cf}(\mu)$. If*

κ has a $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter, then $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$.

Proof. In the generic extension, we know $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mu \leq \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ by Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 4.1. By Lemma 4.2, we have $\mu \neq \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$, so $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$. \square

The following theorems are typical applications of this proposition:

Theorem 4.5. *If κ is measurable and $\mu > \kappa$ is a strong limit singular cardinal with cofinality ω_1 , then $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$.*

We note that ω_1 can be replaced by any cardinal $< \kappa$ with uncountable cofinality.

Theorem 4.6. *Suppose κ is measurable and \mathcal{U} a normal measure over κ . Let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}}$ be the Prikry forcing associated with \mathcal{U} . Let $\mu > \kappa$ be a strong limit singular cardinal with cofinality ω_1 . Then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}} \times \text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces that κ is a singular cardinal with countable cofinality and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$.*

By using Fact 2.6 we have:

Theorem 4.7. *Relative to a certain large cardinal assumption, it is consistent that $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_{\omega+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$.*

If κ is strongly compact, then every regular cardinal $\lambda \geq \kappa$ has a κ -complete uniform ultrafilter. By this fact, we have:

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose κ is strongly compact. Let $\mu > \kappa^{+\omega_1}$ be a strong limit singular cardinal with $\text{cf}(\mu) = \omega_1$. Then $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1})$.*

5. EASY ZFC-RESULTS

In this section we shall establish some easy but useful observations about the ultrafilter number function.

The following lemmas will be used frequently.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\lambda < \kappa$ be cardinals, and \mathcal{U} a λ -decomposable ultrafilter over κ . Then $\mathfrak{u}(\lambda) \leq \chi(\mathcal{U})$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{U} is λ -decomposable, there is $f : \kappa \rightarrow \lambda$ such that $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is a uniform ultrafilter over λ . If \mathcal{G} is a base for \mathcal{U} , then $\{f^*A \mid A \in \mathcal{G}\}$ generates $f_*(\mathcal{U})$; For $A \in \mathcal{G}$, since $A \subseteq f^{-1}(f^*A)$, we have $f^*A \in f_*(\mathcal{U})$. For the converse, if $X \in f_*(\mathcal{U})$, pick $A \in \mathcal{G}$ with $A \subseteq f^{-1}(X)$. Then $f^*A \subseteq X$. These show that $\{f^*A \mid A \in \mathcal{G}\}$ generates $f_*(\mathcal{U})$. Therefore $\mathfrak{u}(\lambda) \leq \chi(f_*(\mathcal{U})) \leq \chi(\mathcal{U})$. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\lambda < \kappa$ be cardinals with $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$. Then every uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over κ with $\chi(\mathcal{U}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ is λ -indecomposable.*

Proof. Take any uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over κ with $\chi(\mathcal{U}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$. If it is λ -decomposable, then $\mathfrak{u}(\lambda) \leq \chi(\mathcal{U}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ by Lemma 5.1, this contradicts to the assumption. \square

By these observations, we can obtain some limitations of the failure of monotonicity.

Proposition 5.3. $u(\omega) \leq u(\kappa)$ for every cardinal κ .

Proof. If not, then κ has an ω -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} by Lemma 5.2. Then \mathcal{U} is in fact σ -complete, so there is a measurable cardinal $\lambda \leq \kappa$. Hence we have $u(\omega) \leq 2^\omega < \lambda \leq \kappa \leq u(\kappa)$, this is a contradiction. \square

Proposition 5.4. (1) If κ is regular, then $u(\kappa) \leq u(\kappa^+)$.

(2) If λ is regular, $\kappa > \lambda$ a cardinal, and $u(\kappa) < u(\lambda)$, then $\lambda^{+\omega} \leq \kappa$.

Proof. (1). If $u(\kappa^+) < u(\kappa)$, then κ^+ has a κ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter, but this is impossible by Lemma 2.5.

(2). By (1), we have $u(\lambda) \leq u(\lambda^+) \leq u(\lambda^{++}) \leq \dots$, hence $\lambda^{+\omega} \leq \kappa$. \square

We will prove that $u(\omega_\omega) < u(\omega_1)$ is consistent (Corollary 7.7). In this sense, $\lambda^{+\omega} \leq \kappa$ in (2) of this corollary cannot be strengthened to $\lambda^{+\omega+1} \leq \kappa$.

If κ is singular, every uniform ultrafilter over κ is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable.

Corollary 5.5. If κ is singular, then $u(\text{cf}(\kappa)) \leq u(\kappa)$.

6. MODELS WITH THE FAILURE OF MONOTONICITY 2

In Section 4, we constructed some models with $\lambda < \kappa$ but $u(\kappa) < u(\lambda)$. Our main tools were Raghavan and Shelah's theorem 3.1 and Lemmas 4.1, 4.2. However, to use these tools, it is necessary that $\text{cf}(\lambda) > \omega$, and we cannot apply our argument to the case $\text{cf}(\lambda) = \omega$ easily. In this section, we show that it is possible that $u(\kappa) < u(\omega_\omega)$ for some $\kappa > \omega_\omega$.

The following lemma was proved by Donder [4], but we give a proof for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 6.1 (Donder [4]). Let κ be a singular cardinal with countable cofinality, and $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ a strictly increasing sequence of regular cardinals with limit κ . If \mathcal{U} is a uniform ultrafilter over κ such that \mathcal{U} is not (ω, λ) -regular for some $\lambda < \kappa_0$, then there is $f : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ such that $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is a uniform ultrafilter over κ and for every $C \subseteq \kappa$, if $C \cap \kappa_n$ is a club in κ_n for every $n < \omega$, then $C \in f_*(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. We recall some definition and notations. For $f, g \in {}^\kappa\kappa$, define $f \leq g$ if $f(\alpha) \leq g(\alpha)$ for every $\alpha < \kappa$, and $f <_{\mathcal{U}} g$ if $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid f(\alpha) < g(\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Let \mathcal{F} be the family of all $f : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ such that:

- (1) f is monotone, that is, if $\alpha \leq \beta$ then $f(\alpha) \leq f(\beta)$.
- (2) $\sup(f \upharpoonright \kappa_n) = \kappa_n$ for every $n < \omega$.

We claim that there is $f \in \mathcal{F}$ which is $<_{\mathcal{U}}$ -minimal in \mathcal{F} , that is, if $g \in \mathcal{F}$ then $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid g(\alpha) \geq f(\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Such a $<_{\mathcal{U}}$ -minimal function is a require one; This can be verified as follows. It is easy to check that $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is uniform. First note that for every $g \in \mathcal{F}$, since $g \circ f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $f \leq_U g \circ f$, if $g \leq \text{id}$ then $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid g(\alpha) = \alpha\} \in f_*(\mathcal{U})$. Now take $C \subseteq \kappa$ such that $C \cap \kappa_n$ is a club in κ_n for every $n < \omega$. Define $g : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$ by $g(\alpha) = \sup(C \cap \alpha)$. Clearly $g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $g \leq \text{id}$. Hence $X = \{\alpha < \kappa \mid g(\alpha) = \alpha\} \in f_*(\mathcal{U})$. By the definition of g , we have $X \subseteq (C \setminus (\min(C) + 1)) \cup \{\kappa_n \mid n < \omega\}$. On the other hand, since $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is uniform, we have $\{\kappa_n \mid n < \omega\} \notin \mathcal{U}$, hence $C \in f_*(\mathcal{U})$.

We show that \mathcal{F} has a $<_{\mathcal{U}}$ -minimal element. Suppose to the contrary that such an element does not exist. By induction on $\xi < \lambda$, we take $f_\xi \in \mathcal{F}$ so that:

- (a) $f_{\xi+1} <_{\mathcal{U}} f_{\xi}$.
- (b) $f_{\xi} \leq f_{\eta}$ whenever $\eta < \xi < \delta$.

For a successor step, if f_{ξ} is defined, there is $g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $g <_{\mathcal{U}} f_{\xi}$ by our assumption. Define $f_{\xi+1} \in {}^{\kappa}\kappa$ by $f_{\xi+1}(\alpha) = g(\xi)$ if $g(\alpha) < f_{\xi}(\alpha)$, otherwise let $f_{\xi+1}(\alpha) = f_{\xi}(\alpha)$. One can check that $f_{\xi+1} \in \mathcal{F}$, $f_{\xi+1} \leq f_{\xi}$, and $f_{\xi+1} <_{\mathcal{U}} f_{\xi}$. For a limit $\xi < \lambda$, define $f_{\xi}(\alpha) = \min\{f_{\zeta}(\alpha) \mid \zeta < \xi\}$. It is not hard to check that $f_{\xi} \in \mathcal{F}$ and $f_{\xi} \leq f_{\zeta}$ for $\zeta < \xi$.

Finally, for $\xi < \delta$, let $X_{\xi} = \{\alpha < \kappa \mid f_{\xi+1}(\alpha) < f_{\xi}(\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$. It is easy to check that $\{X_{\xi} \mid \xi < \delta\}$ witnesses that U is (ω, λ) -regular, this is a contradiction. \square

The following can be seen as a diagonal version of Prikry and Silver's theorem (Fact 2.4).

Proposition 6.2. *Let κ be a singular cardinal with countable cofinality, and $\lambda < \kappa$ a regular cardinal with $\lambda^{\omega} = \lambda$. Suppose there are sequences $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ and $\langle S_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ satisfying the following:*

- (1) $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ is an increasing sequence of regular cardinals with limit κ .
- (2) For each $n < \omega$, S_n is a non-reflecting stationary subset of $\{\alpha < \kappa_n \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda\}$.
- (3) For every large regular cardinal θ , the set $\{M \in [H_{\theta}]^{\lambda} \mid {}^{\omega}M \subseteq M, \text{ and } \forall n < \omega (\sup(M \cap \kappa_n) \in S_n)\}$ is stationary in $[H_{\theta}]^{\lambda}$.

Then there is no λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over κ .

Proof. Fix such $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ and $\langle S_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$. We may assume that $\lambda < \kappa_0$ and $S_n \cap S_m = \emptyset$ whenever $n < m < \omega$. For each $\beta < \kappa$, let $n(\beta)$ be the minimal $n < \omega$ with $\beta < \kappa_n$.

For $n < \omega$ and $\alpha \in S_n$, fix a club $c_{\alpha} \subseteq \alpha$ with order type λ . Let $\langle \xi_i^{\alpha} \mid i < \lambda \rangle$ be the increasing enumeration of c_{α} . The following is well-known, e.g., see Lemma 2.12 in Eisworth [5]:

Fact 6.3. *For every $n < \omega$ and $\beta < \kappa_n$, there is a function $F_{\beta} : S_n \cap \beta \rightarrow \lambda$ such that whenever $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in S_n \cap \beta$ with $\alpha_0 \neq \alpha_1$, the set $\{\xi_i^{\alpha_0} \mid F_{\beta}(\alpha_0) < i < \lambda\}$ is disjoint from $\{\xi_i^{\alpha_1} \mid F_{\beta}(\alpha_1) < i < \lambda\}$.*

Now suppose the contrary that there is a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over κ . By Lemma 6.1, we may assume that for every $t \in \prod_{n < \omega} \kappa_n$, the set $\bigcup_{n < \omega} [t(n), \kappa_n)$ is in \mathcal{U} . For $t \in \prod_{n < \omega} S_n$, define $\lambda(t) < \lambda$ as follows: By the choice of \mathcal{U} , we have that $X_t = \{\beta < \kappa \mid \beta > t(n(\beta))\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Define $G_t : X_t \rightarrow \lambda$ by $G_t(\beta) = F_{\beta}(t(n(\beta)))$. Since \mathcal{U} is λ -indecomposable, there is $\lambda(t) < \lambda$ such that $Y_t = \{\beta \in X_t \mid G_t(\beta) = F_{\beta}(t(n(\beta))) < \lambda(t)\} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Claim 6.4. *For $t, t' \in \prod_{n < \omega} S_n$, if $\{n < \omega \mid t(n) \neq t'(n)\}$ is cofinite, then there are infinitely many $n < \omega$ such that $\{\xi_i^{t(n)} \mid \lambda(t) < i < \lambda\} \cap \{\xi_i^{t'(n)} \mid \lambda(t') < i < \lambda\} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. We know $Y_t \cap Y_{t'} \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence for a given $m < \omega$, we can find $\beta \in Y_t \cap Y_{t'}$ such that $m < n(\beta)$, $t(n(\beta)) \neq t'(n(\beta))$, and $t(n(\beta)), t'(n(\beta)) < \beta$. By the choice of F_{β} , we have $\{\xi_i^{t(n(\beta))} \mid F_{\beta}(t(n(\beta))) < i < \lambda\} \cap \{\xi_i^{t'(n(\beta))} \mid F_{\beta}(t'(n(\beta))) < i < \lambda\} = \emptyset$. Because $\beta \in Y_t \cap Y_{t'}$, we know $F_{\beta}(t(n(\beta))) < \lambda(t)$

and $F_\beta(t'(n(\beta))) < \lambda(t')$. Hence $\{\xi_i^{t(n(\beta))} \mid \lambda(t) < i < \lambda\} \cap \{\xi_i^{t'(n(\beta))} \mid \lambda(t') < i < \lambda\} = \emptyset$. \square

Fix a large regular θ . By the choice of the S_n 's, we can find $M \in [H_\theta]^\lambda$ containing all relevant objects such that $M \prec H_\theta$, ${}^\omega M \subseteq M$, and $\forall n < \omega$ ($\sup(M \cap \kappa_n) \in S_n$). Define $t \in \prod_n S_n$ by $t(n) = \sup(M \cap \kappa_n)$. Note that $\sup(c_{t(n)} \cap M \cap \kappa_n) = \sup(M \cap \kappa_n)$ because $c_{t(n)}$ is a club in $t(n)$ and ${}^\omega M \subseteq M$. For $n < \omega$, pick $\xi_n \in M \cap \{\xi_i^{t(n)} \mid \lambda(t) < i < \lambda\}$. We know $\langle \xi_n \mid n < \omega \rangle \in M$ by the closure property of M . By the elementarity of M , there is $t' \in M \cap \prod_n S_n$ such that $\xi_n \in \{\xi_i^{t'(n)} \mid \lambda(t') < i < \lambda\}$ for every $n < \omega$. Clearly $t(n) \neq t'(n)$ for every $n < \omega$, hence there is $n < \omega$ with $\{\xi_i^{t(n)} \mid \lambda(t) < i < \lambda\} \cap \{\xi_i^{t'(n)} \mid \lambda(t') < i < \lambda\} = \emptyset$ by Claim 6.4. However this is impossible since $\xi_n \in \{\xi_i^{t(n)} \mid \lambda(t) < i < \lambda\} \cap \{\xi_i^{t'(n)} \mid \lambda(t') < i < \lambda\}$. \square

To show that the assumption of Proposition 6.2 is consistent, we use the forcing notion which adds a non-reflecting stationary subsets.

For a poset \mathbb{P} and an ordinal α , let $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbb{P})$ denote the following two players game of length α : At each inning, Players I and II choose conditions of \mathbb{P} alternately with $p_0 \geq q_0 \geq p_1 \geq q_1 \geq \dots$, but if $\beta < \alpha$ is limit, at the β -th inning, Player I does not move and only Player II choose a condition q_β which is a lower bound of the partial play $\langle p_\xi, q_\zeta \mid \xi, \zeta < \beta, \xi = 0 \text{ or successor} \rangle$ (if it is possible):

		0		1		...		ω		$\omega + 1$...
I		p_0		p_1		...				$p_{\omega+1}$...
II		q_0		q_1		...		q_ω		$q_{\omega+1}$...

Player II *wins* if I and II could choose their moves at each inning, otherwise, I *wins*.

\mathbb{P} is α -strategically closed if Player II has a winning strategy in the game $\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbb{P})$. If κ is a cardinal and \mathbb{P} is κ -strategically closed, then it is easy to see that \mathbb{P} is κ -Baire, and the forcing with \mathbb{P} does not add new $< \kappa$ -sequences.

Fact 6.5. *Let κ be a cardinal, and $\langle \mathbb{P}_n, \dot{Q}_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be an ω -stage iteration such that each \dot{Q}_n is forced to be κ -strategically closed. Then the inverse limit of the \mathbb{P}_n 's is κ -strategically closed.*

For a regular uncountable cardinal μ and regular $\lambda < \mu$, let $\mathbb{S}_{\mu, \lambda}$ be the poset of all bounded subsets $p \subseteq \{\alpha < \mu \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda\}$ such that p has a maximal element $\max(p)$ and for every $\beta \leq \max(p)$, $p \cap \beta$ is non-stationary in β . Define $p \leq q$ if p is an end-extension of q .

Let $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{S}_{\mu, \lambda}$. The following is easy to check:

Lemma 6.6. $|\mathbb{S}| = 2^{< \mu}$, so \mathbb{S} satisfies the $(2^{< \mu})^+$ -c.c.

The following lemma is well-known, and we only sketch the proof.

Lemma 6.7. (1) \mathbb{S} is μ -strategically closed, hence the forcing with \mathbb{S} does not add new $< \mu$ -sequences.

(2) If G is (V, \mathbb{S}) -generic, then $\bigcup G$ is a non-reflecting stationary subset of $\{\alpha < \mu \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda\}$.

Sketch of the proof. (1). For a limit $\beta < \mu$ and a partial play $\langle p_\xi, q_\zeta \mid \xi, \zeta < \beta, \xi = 0 \text{ or successor} \rangle$, suppose $q = \bigcup_{\zeta < \beta} q_\zeta$ is non-reflecting. Let $\gamma = \sup(q)$. Then Player II takes $q \cup \{\gamma + \lambda\}$ as his move. This is a winning strategy of Player II.

(2). Non-reflectingness is immediate from the definition of \mathbb{S} . To show that $\bigcup G$ is stationary, take a name \dot{C} for a club in μ . Take a descending sequence $\langle p_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$ such that for every $i < \lambda$, there is α_i such that $\alpha_i < \sup(p_i) < \alpha_{i+1}$ and $p_{i+1} \Vdash \check{\alpha}_i \in \dot{C}$. Let $\alpha = \sup_i \alpha_i$, and $p = \bigcup_{i < \lambda} p_i \cup \{\alpha\}$. It is easy to check that $p \in \mathbb{S}$ and $p \Vdash \alpha \in \dot{C} \cap \bigcup \dot{G}$. \square

Proposition 6.8. *Let κ be a singular cardinal with countable cofinality, and suppose GCH. Let $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ be a strictly increasing sequence of regular uncountable cardinals with limit κ , and λ a regular uncountable cardinal with $\lambda < \kappa_0$. Then there is a poset \mathbb{P} such that \mathbb{P} preserves all cardinals, and adds a sequence $\langle S_n \subseteq \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ satisfying the conditions of Proposition 6.2.*

Proof. Fix such $\langle \kappa_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ and λ . Define \mathbb{P}_n and \dot{Q}_n for $n < \omega$ as follows. Let \mathbb{P}_0 be the trivial poset. Suppose \mathbb{P}_n is defined. Then \dot{Q}_n is a \mathbb{P}_n -name such that

$$\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_n} \dot{Q}_n = \dot{S}_{\kappa_n, \lambda}.$$

Put \mathbb{P}_{n+1} as the forcing product $\mathbb{P}_n * \dot{Q}_n$. It is routine to show that $|\mathbb{P}_{n+1}| \leq 2^{< \kappa_n} = \kappa_n$, so it satisfies the $(\kappa_n)^+$ -c.c. Let \mathbb{P} be the inverse limit of the \mathbb{P}_n 's. We check that \mathbb{P} is a required poset.

By Fact 6.5, for each $n < \omega$, \mathbb{P} can be factored as a forcing product $\mathbb{P}_n * \dot{Q}_n * \dot{P}_{tail}$ such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_n * \dot{Q}_n} \dot{P}_{tail}$ is κ_{n+1} -strategically closed". This factorization shows that the forcing with \mathbb{P} preserves all cofinalities.

Take a (V, \mathbb{P}) -generic G , and let S_n be a generic subset of κ_n induced by G . By the factorization before, we have that S_n is a non-reflecting stationary subset of $\{\alpha < \kappa_n \mid \text{cf}(\alpha) = \lambda\}$ in $V[G]$.

Finally, we see that the sequence $\langle S_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ satisfies the the conditions of Proposition 6.2. To do this, return to V . Let θ be a sufficiently large regular cardinal and $N = H_\theta$. Let \dot{S}_n be a canonical name for S_n . Take a \mathbb{P} -name \dot{f} such that $p \Vdash \dot{f} : [\check{N}]^{< \omega} \rightarrow N$. It is enough to show that there is $X \subseteq N$ and $q \leq p$ such that $|X| = \lambda \subseteq X$, $[X]^\omega \subseteq X$, and

$$q \Vdash \dot{f} "[\check{X}]^{< \omega} \subseteq \check{X}, \sup(\check{X} \cap \kappa_n) \in \dot{S}_n \text{ for } n < \omega.$$

Take a large regular cardinal $\chi > \theta$ and $M \prec H_\chi$ containing all relevant objects such that $|M| = \lambda \subseteq M$ and $[M]^{< \lambda} \subseteq M$. Let $X = M \cap H_\theta$. Note that $|X| = \lambda$, $[X]^\omega \subseteq X$, and $\text{cf}(\sup(X \cap \kappa_n)) = \lambda$ for every $n < \omega$. Fix an enumeration $\langle x_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$ of all elements of X . By the λ -strategically closedness of \mathbb{P} and the closure property of M , we can take a descending sequence $\langle q_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$ in \mathbb{P} such that the following holds:

- (1) $q_0 \leq p$ and $q_i \in M$ for $i < \lambda$.
- (2) For $i < \lambda$, there is $y_i \in X$ such that $q_i \Vdash \dot{f}(\check{x}_i) = \check{y}_i$.
- (3) For $i < \lambda$ and $n < \omega$, there is $\alpha \in X \cap \kappa_n$ such that $q_{i+1} \Vdash \max(q_i(n)) = \check{\alpha}$.

Then take a function q on ω as follows: $q(n)$ is a \mathbb{P}_n -name such that $\Vdash_{\mathbb{P}_n} q(n) = \bigcup_{i < \lambda} q_i(n) \cup \{\sup(\check{X} \cap \check{\kappa}_n)\}$. It is straightforward to show that

q is a lower bound of the q_i 's, and $q \Vdash \dot{f}^{\llbracket \check{X} \rrbracket^{<\omega}} \subseteq \check{X}, \sup(\check{X} \cap \kappa_n) \in \dot{S}_n$ for $n < \omega$. \square

By this proposition, if κ is measurable we can take a generic extension in which κ is measurable and there is no ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over ω_ω .

Theorem 6.9. *Suppose there is no ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over ω_ω . Let κ be a measurable cardinal, and $\mu > \kappa$ a strong limit singular cardinal with cofinality ω_1 .*

- (1) $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.
- (2) If \mathcal{U} is a normal measure over κ and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the Prikry forcing associated with \mathcal{U} , then $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{U}} \times \text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces that κ is a singular cardinal with countable cofinality and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.

Proof. (1). Take a $(V, \text{Add}(\omega, \mu))$ -generic G . In $V[G]$, we have $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$. We claim that, in $V[G]$, ω_ω does not have an ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter. Suppose to the contrary that there is an ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} . Let $\dot{\mathcal{U}}$ be a name for \mathcal{U} . In V , let $\mathcal{F} = \{X \subseteq \omega_\omega \mid \Vdash X \in \dot{\mathcal{U}}\}$. \mathcal{F} is a uniform filter over ω_ω , and since $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ has the c.c.c. and \mathcal{U} is ω_1 -indecomposable, for every $f : \omega_\omega \rightarrow \omega_1$ there is $\gamma < \omega_1$ such that $\{\alpha \mid f(\alpha) \leq \gamma\} \in \mathcal{F}$. Then every ultrafilter extending \mathcal{F} is an ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter, this is a contradiction.

Now, in $V[G]$, every uniform ultrafilter over ω_ω is ω_1 -decomposable. By Lemma 5.2, we have that $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_1) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$, hence $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.

(2) follows from a similar argument. \square

We also have the following theorem. We leave the proof to the reader.

Theorem 6.10. *Suppose there is no ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over ω_ω . Let κ be a strongly compact cardinal, and $\mu > \kappa$ a strong limit singular cardinal with cofinality ω_1 . Then $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.*

We will show that both $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$ are consistent as well. See Corollaries 7.7 and Proposition 7.18.

7. MONOTONICITY AT A SINGULAR CARDINAL AND ITS SUCCESSOR

We had seen that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ always holds if κ is regular. By Theorem 4.8, if κ is singular then it is possible that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$. On the other hand, we will show there are some limitation of the failure of monotonicity at singular and its successor.

We use Shelah's PCF theory. We present some definitions and basic facts. See Shelah [16], Abraham and Magidor [1], and Eisworth [5] for details.

Fact 7.1 (Shelah). *Let κ be a singular cardinal. Then there is an increasing sequence $\langle \kappa_\xi \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ of regular cardinals with limit κ such that $\prod_{\xi} \kappa_\xi$ admits a scale $\langle f_i \mid i < \kappa^+ \rangle$ of length κ^+ , that is, the following hold:*

- (1) $f_i \in \prod_{\xi} \kappa_\xi$.
- (2) For $i < j < \kappa^+$, $f_i \leq^* f_j$ holds, that is, there is $\zeta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ with $f_i(\xi) \leq f_j(\xi)$ for every $\xi \geq \zeta$.

(3) For every $g \in \prod_{\xi} \kappa_{\xi}$, there is $i < \kappa^+$ with $g \leq^* f_i$.

We also use the following Kanamori's result.

Fact 7.2 (Kanamori [11]). *Let κ be a singular cardinal. Then every uniform ultrafilter over κ^+ is (κ, κ^+) -regular.*

Now we prove the following proposition, which plays a crucial role in this section.

Proposition 7.3. *Let κ be a singular cardinal. Let S be a set and \mathcal{U} an ultrafilter over S . If \mathcal{U} is κ^+ -decomposable and $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -decomposable, then \mathcal{U} is κ -decomposable as well.*

Proof. First we check that \mathcal{U} is (κ, κ^+) -regular. Since \mathcal{U} is κ^+ -decomposable, we can find $f : S \rightarrow \kappa^+$ such that $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is a uniform ultrafilter over κ^+ . By Fact 7.2, $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is (κ, κ^+) -regular. Fix $\mathcal{F} \subseteq f_*(\mathcal{U})$ which witnesses that $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ is (κ, κ^+) -regular. Then it is easy to show that $\{f^{-1}(X) \mid X \in \mathcal{F}\}$ also witnesses that \mathcal{U} is (κ, κ^+) -regular.

Since \mathcal{U} is (κ, κ^+) -regular, we can take a family $\{x_s \mid s \in S\}$ such that $|x_s| < \kappa$ and for every $i < \kappa^+$, we have $\{s \in S \mid i \in x_s\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Fix an increasing sequence $\langle \kappa_{\xi} \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ of regular cardinals with limit κ which admits a scale $\langle f_i \mid i < \kappa^+ \rangle$. Since \mathcal{U} is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -decomposable, we can find $g : S \rightarrow \{\kappa_{\xi} \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa)\}$ such that for every $\eta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$, we have $\{s \in S \mid g(s) > \kappa_{\eta}\} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Now we define $h : S \rightarrow \kappa$ as follows: Fix $s \in S$. Take $\xi_s < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ such that $g(s) + |x_s| < \kappa_{\xi_s}$. Then the set $\{f_i(\xi_s) \mid i \in x_s\}$ is bounded in κ_{ξ_s} . So we can take $h(s) < \kappa_{\xi_s}$ with $h(s) > f_i(\xi_s)$ for every $i \in x_s$. We show that h witnesses that \mathcal{U} is κ -decomposable. Suppose not. Take $X \in [\kappa]^{<\kappa}$ such that $\{s \in S \mid h(s) \in X\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Fix $\zeta_0 < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ with $|X| < \kappa_{\zeta_0}$. Then we can find $j < \kappa^+$ and $\zeta_1 > \zeta_0$ such that $\sup(X \cap \kappa_{\xi}) < f_j(\xi)$ for every ξ with $\zeta_1 \leq \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa)$. Pick $s \in S$ with $g(s) > \kappa_{\zeta_1}$, $j \in x_s$, and $h(s) \in X$. Since $g(s) > \kappa_{\zeta_1}$, we have $\kappa_{\xi_s} > \kappa_{\zeta_1}$. Hence $f_j(\xi_s) < h(s) < \kappa_{\xi_s}$, however this is impossible since $h(s) \leq \sup(X \cap \kappa_{\xi_s}) < f_j(\xi_s)$. \square

Lemma 7.4. *Let κ be a cardinal, and suppose κ has a σ -complete uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} with $\chi(\mathcal{U}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$. Then there is a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{V} over κ such that $\chi(\mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ and \mathcal{V} is not σ -complete.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that there is a non- σ -complete uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{V} over $\omega \times \kappa$ with $\chi(\mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$.

By the assumption, there is a measurable cardinal $\leq \kappa$. Hence we have $2^{\omega} \leq \kappa$. Fix a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{W} over ω . Define the filter \mathcal{V} over $\omega \times \kappa$ by: $X \in \mathcal{V} \iff$ there is $Y \in \mathcal{W}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{U}$ with $Y \times Z \subseteq X$. We have that $\chi(\mathcal{V}) \leq \chi(\mathcal{U}) \times 2^{\omega} = \chi(\mathcal{U})$. We can check \mathcal{V} is not σ -complete as follows: $X_n = [n, \omega) \times \kappa \in \mathcal{V}$ but $\bigcap_n X_n = \emptyset$. We have to show that \mathcal{V} is an ultrafilter. Take $X \subseteq \omega \times \kappa$. Consider the set $Y = \{n < \omega \mid \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \langle n, \alpha \rangle \in X\} \in \mathcal{U}\}$.

Case 1: $Y \in \mathcal{W}$. For $n \in Y$, take $Z_n = \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \langle n, \alpha \rangle \in X\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Since \mathcal{U} is σ -complete, we have $Z = \bigcap_n Z_n \in \mathcal{U}$. Then $Y \times Z \subseteq X$, hence $X \in \mathcal{V}$.

Case 2: $Y \notin \mathcal{W}$. Then $Y' = \{n < \omega \mid \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \langle n, \alpha \rangle \in \kappa \setminus X\} \in \mathcal{U}\}$ is in \mathcal{W} . For $n \in Y'$, let $Z'_n = \{\alpha < \kappa \mid \langle n, \alpha \rangle \in \kappa \setminus X\} \in \mathcal{U}$, and $Z' = \bigcap_n Z'_n \in \mathcal{U}$. Then $Y' \times Z' \subseteq (\omega \times \kappa) \setminus X$, hence $(\omega \times \kappa) \setminus X \in \mathcal{V}$. \square

Now we can prove that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ always holds if κ is a singular cardinal with countable cofinality.

Theorem 7.5. *If κ is a singular cardinal with countable cofinality, then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) > \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$. If \mathcal{U} is a uniform ultrafilter over κ^+ with $\chi(\mathcal{U}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$, then \mathcal{U} is κ -indecomposable but κ^+ -decomposable, so ω -indecomposable by Proposition 7.3. In particular \mathcal{U} is σ -complete. By Lemma 7.4, there is a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{V} over κ^+ such that $\chi(\mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ and \mathcal{V} is not σ -complete. Then \mathcal{V} is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -decomposable, hence is κ -decomposable by Proposition 7.3 again, and we have $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \chi(\mathcal{V}) = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ by Lemma 5.1. This is a contradiction. \square

We note that, by Theorem 4.8, the countable cofinality assumption of this theorem cannot be eliminated.

Corollary 7.6. *If κ is regular, then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\alpha}) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\alpha+1})$ for every $\alpha < \omega_1$.*

Again, $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1})$ is consistent by Theorem 4.8.

Combining Theorem 7.5 with Theorems 4.7 and 6.10 we have:

Corollary 7.7. (1) *Relative to a certain large cardinal assumption, it is consistent that $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$.*

(2) *Relative to a certain large cardinal assumption, it is consistent that there is a cardinal κ with $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.*

Next we prove that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ holds if κ is a strong limit singular cardinal.

Proposition 7.8. *Let κ be a singular cardinal and $\lambda < \kappa$ a cardinal, and suppose $\mu^\lambda \leq \kappa^+$ for every $\mu < \kappa$. If κ^+ has a κ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter, then $\kappa^\lambda \leq \kappa^+$.*

Proof. We may assume $\lambda \geq \text{cf}(\kappa)$. Fix a κ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over κ^+ , which is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable by Proposition 7.3. \mathcal{U} is (κ, κ^+) -regular by Fact 7.2, so we can take a family $\{x_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa^+\}$ such that $|x_\alpha| < \kappa$ and $\{\alpha \mid i \in x_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{U}$ for $i < \kappa^+$.

Fix an enumeration $\{B_i \mid i < \kappa^+\}$ of $\bigcup_{\mu < \kappa} [\mu]^{\leq \lambda}$ such that for every $j < \kappa^+$, the set $\{i \mid B_i = B_j\}$ is cofinal in κ^+ . For $\alpha < \kappa^+$, let $\mathcal{B}_\alpha = \{\bigcup_{i \in c} B_i \mid c \in [x_\alpha]^{\text{cf}(\kappa)}\}$. Since $\mu^\lambda \leq \kappa^+$ for every $\mu < \kappa$ and $|x_\alpha| < \kappa$, we have $|\mathcal{B}_\alpha| \leq \kappa^+$. Thus $|\bigcup_\alpha \mathcal{B}_\alpha| \leq \kappa^+$. We prove that $[\kappa]^\lambda \subseteq \bigcup_\alpha \mathcal{B}_\alpha$, then we have $\kappa^\lambda \leq \kappa^+$ as required.

Fix an increasing sequence $\langle \kappa_\xi \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ with limit κ . For $X \in [\kappa]^\lambda$, we can take an increasing sequence $\langle i_\xi \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ such that $X \cap \kappa_\xi = B_{i_\xi}$. Put $d = \{i_\xi \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa)\}$, which has order type $\text{cf}(\kappa)$. Because $\{\alpha \mid i_\xi \in x_\alpha\} \in \mathcal{U}$ for $\xi < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ and \mathcal{U} is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable, there must be $\alpha < \kappa^+$ such that $|d \cap x_\alpha| = \text{cf}(\kappa)$. Then $X = \bigcup_{i \in d \cap x_\alpha} B_i \in \mathcal{B}_\alpha$. \square

Theorem 7.9. *If κ is a strong limit singular cardinal, then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$, then κ^+ has a κ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter, hence $2^\kappa = \kappa^{\text{cf}(\kappa)} = \kappa^+$ by Proposition 7.8. But then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq 2^\kappa = \kappa^+ \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$, this is a contradiction. \square

The strong limit assumption of this theorem cannot be eliminated by Theorem 4.8.

Next we prove that if $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$, then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ is an upper bound of the ultrafilter numbers at almost all regular cardinals below κ .

Definition 7.10. Let κ be a singular cardinal, and $A \subseteq \kappa$ be a set of regular cardinals with $\sup(A) = \kappa$ and $|A| = \text{cf}(\kappa)$. Let U be an ultrafilter over A . For $f, g \in \prod A$, define $f \leq_U g$ by $\{\mu \in A \mid f(\mu) \leq g(\mu)\} \in U$. A set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \prod A$ is \leq_U -*cofinal* if for every $f \in \prod A$, there is $g \in \mathcal{F}$ with $f \leq_U g$. Let $\text{cf}(\prod A, \leq_U) = \min\{|\mathcal{F}| \mid \mathcal{F} \text{ is } \leq_U\text{-cofinal}\}$, and $\text{PP}(\kappa)$ the set of all $\text{cf}(\prod A, \leq_U)$'s where $A \subseteq \kappa$ is a set of regular cardinals with $\sup(A) = \kappa$, $|A| = \text{cf}(\kappa)$, and U an ultrafilter over A which does not contain bounded subsets of A . Let $\text{pp}(\kappa)$ be the supremum of $\text{PP}(\kappa)$.

Fact 7.11 (Shelah). *For a singular cardinal κ , the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\text{pp}(\kappa) = \kappa^+$.
- (2) *For every increasing sequence $\langle \kappa_\xi \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ of regular cardinals with limit κ , there is a subsequence $\langle \kappa'_\xi \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ of the sequence with limit κ which admits a scale of length κ^+ .*

Definition 7.12. For a cardinal κ , let ADS_κ be the following assertion: there is a sequence $\langle A_i \mid i < \kappa^+ \rangle$ such that A_i is an unbounded subset of κ with size $\text{cf}(\kappa)$, and for every $\alpha < \kappa^+$ there is $f : \alpha \rightarrow \kappa$ such that $(A_i \setminus f(i)) \cap (A_j \setminus f(j)) = \emptyset$ for every $i < j < \alpha$.

Fact 7.13 (Shelah). *Let κ be a singular cardinal. If $\text{pp}(\kappa) > \kappa^+$, then ADS_κ holds.*

Proposition 7.14. *Let κ be a singular cardinal, and suppose κ^+ has a κ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter. Then ADS_κ fails, in particular $\text{pp}(\kappa) = \kappa^+$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that ADS_κ holds. Let $\langle A_i \mid i < \kappa^+ \rangle$ be a ADS_κ -sequence.

Let \mathcal{U} be a κ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over κ^+ . By Proposition 7.3, \mathcal{U} is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable. For $\alpha < \kappa^+$, we can find $g_\alpha : \alpha + 1 \rightarrow \kappa$ such that the sequence $\langle A_i \setminus f(i) \mid i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is pairwise disjoint. Fix $\beta < \kappa^+$. Since \mathcal{U} is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable, we can find $\delta_\beta < \kappa$ such that $X_\beta = \{\alpha < \kappa^+ \mid g_\alpha(\beta) < \delta_\beta\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Now there must be some $\delta < \kappa^+$ such that $Y = \{\beta < \kappa^+ \mid \delta_\beta = \delta\}$ is unbounded in κ^+ . We show that the sequence $\langle A_\beta \setminus \delta \mid \beta \in Y \rangle$ is pairwise disjoint, but this is impossible since $|Y| = \kappa^+$

Pick $\beta, \beta' \in Y$ with $\beta < \beta'$. We know that $X_\beta \cap X_{\beta'} \in \mathcal{U}$, so there is a large $\alpha > \beta, \beta'$ with $\alpha \in X_\beta \cap X_{\beta'}$. Then $g_\alpha(\beta), g_\alpha(\beta') < \delta$. Because $A_\beta \setminus g_\alpha(\beta)$ and $A_{\beta'} \setminus g_\alpha(\beta')$ are disjoint and $g_\alpha(\beta), g_\alpha(\beta') < \delta$, we have that $A_\beta \setminus \delta$ and $A_{\beta'} \setminus \delta$ are disjoint as well. \square

Proposition 7.15. *Let κ be a singular cardinal, and \mathcal{U} a uniform ultrafilter over κ^+ . If \mathcal{U} is κ -indecomposable, then there is a cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$ such that \mathcal{U} is μ -decomposable for every regular μ with $\lambda < \mu < \kappa$.*

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that the set $\{\mu < \kappa \mid \mu \text{ is regular, } \mathcal{U} \text{ is } \mu\text{-indecomposable}\}$ is unbounded in κ .

By Proposition 7.3, we have that \mathcal{U} is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable. Applying Proposition 7.14 and Facts 7.11, 7.13, we can take an increasing sequence $\langle \kappa_\xi \mid \xi < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ of regular cardinals with limit κ such that \mathcal{U} is κ_ξ -indecomposable, and $\prod_\xi \kappa_\xi$ admits a scale $\langle f_i \mid i < \kappa^+ \rangle$.

For $\xi < \text{cf}(\kappa)$, since \mathcal{U} is κ_ξ -indecomposable, we can find $\delta_\xi < \kappa_\xi$ such that $\{\alpha < \kappa^+ \mid f_\alpha(\xi) < \delta_\xi\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Now take a large $\beta < \kappa^+$ such that $\delta_\xi < f_\beta(\xi)$ for almost all $\xi < \text{cf}(\kappa)$.

For $\alpha < \kappa^+$ with $\alpha > \beta$, there is $\zeta_\alpha < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ such that $f_\beta(\xi) < f_\alpha(\xi)$ for all $\xi \geq \zeta_\alpha$. Since \mathcal{U} is $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable, there is $\zeta < \text{cf}(\kappa)$ with $\{\alpha < \kappa^+ \mid \zeta_\alpha < \zeta\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Hence we can find $\alpha < \kappa^+$ with $\beta < \alpha$ and $\zeta_\alpha < \zeta$. By the choice of ζ_α , we have $\delta_\zeta < f_\beta(\zeta) < f_\alpha(\zeta)$, this is a contradiction. \square

The following theorem is immediate from Lemmas 5.1, 5.2 and Proposition 7.15.

Theorem 7.16. *Let κ be a singular cardinal, and suppose $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$. Then there is a cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$ such that $\mathfrak{u}(\mu) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ for every regular μ with $\lambda < \mu < \kappa$.*

Note that we can improve “every regular μ ” in this theorem to “every regular or singular with countable cofinality μ ” by Theorem 7.5, however cannot to “every cardinal μ ”; Suppose κ is strongly compact, and let $\mu > \kappa$ be a strong limit singular cardinal with cofinality ω_1 . Then $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$ forces $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1^2+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1^2})$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1^2+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1 \cdot (\alpha+1)})$ for every $\alpha < \omega_1$.

We end this section by showing the consistency of $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.

Lemma 7.17. *Let κ be a singular cardinal. Then $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)^{\text{cf}(\kappa)}$.*

Proof. We may assume $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$. Fix an increasing sequence $\langle \kappa_i \mid i < \text{cf}(\kappa) \rangle$ of regular cardinals with limit κ . By Proposition 7.15, there is $\lambda < \kappa$ such that $\mathfrak{u}(\mu) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$ for every regular μ with $\lambda < \mu < \kappa$. Hence we may assume that for every $i < \text{cf}(\kappa)$, there is a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U}_i over κ_i with $\chi(\mathcal{U}_i) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$. Fix also a uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{V} over $\text{cf}(\kappa)$. Now define a filter \mathcal{D} over κ as: $X \in \mathcal{D} \iff \{i < \text{cf}(\kappa) \mid X \cap \kappa_i \in \mathcal{U}_i\} \in \mathcal{V}$. It is easy to show that \mathcal{D} is a uniform ultrafilter over κ , and since $\chi(\mathcal{U}_i) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)$, we have $\chi(\mathcal{D}) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)^{\text{cf}(\kappa)} \cdot 2^{\text{cf}(\kappa)}$. Thus $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \chi(\mathcal{D}) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+)^{\text{cf}(\kappa)}$. \square

Proposition 7.18. *Suppose there is no ω_3 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over ω_ω and $2^{\omega_1} = \omega_2$. Let κ be a strongly compact cardinal, and $\mu > \kappa$ a strong limit singular cardinal with $\text{cf}(\mu) = \omega_3$. Then $\text{Add}(\omega_2, \mu)$ forces $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.*

Proof. In the generic extension, we have that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_3)$. Since $\text{Add}(\omega_2, \mu)$ satisfies the ω_3 -c.c., we have $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_3) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$ as in the proof of Theorem 6.9, so we have that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_\omega)$.

We prove that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1}) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1})$ in the generic extension. Suppose to the contrary that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1}) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1})$. We note that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1}) = \mu$ by Lemma 4.1. By Lemma 7.17, we have $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1}) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1})^{\omega_1}$. However, since $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1}) = \mu$, $\text{cf}(\mu) = \omega_3$, and $\text{Add}(\omega_2, \mu)$ is ω_2 -closed, we have $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1}) \leq \mu^{\omega_1} = \mu = \mathfrak{u}(\kappa^{+\omega_1+1})$, this is a contradiction. \square

8. CONSISTENCY STRENGTH OF THE FAILURE OF MONOTONICITY

In this section, we study the consistency strength of the failure of monotonicity of the ultrafilter number function. We will show that the failure has a large cardinal strength.

We use the following Donder's theorem.

Fact 8.1 (Donder [4]). *Suppose there is no inner model of a measurable cardinal. Let κ be an uncountable cardinal.*

- (1) *If κ is singular, then every uniform ultrafilter over κ is (ω, κ) -regular.*
- (2) *If κ is regular, then every uniform ultrafilter over κ is (ω, λ) -regular for every $\lambda < \kappa$.*

Proposition 8.2. *Suppose there is a cardinal κ such that κ has a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter for some $\lambda < \kappa$. Then there is an inner model of a measurable cardinal.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{U} be a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over κ . Then \mathcal{U} is not (ω, λ) -regular by Lemma 2.7, and the assertion follows from Fact 8.1. \square

Theorem 8.3. *Suppose there are cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$ such that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$. Then there is an inner model of a measurable cardinal.*

Proof. By the assumption, κ has a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter. Then there is an inner model of a measurable cardinal by Proposition 8.2. \square

By Theorems 4.5, 4.6, and 8.3, we have the equiconsistency result.

Theorem 8.4. *The following are equiconsistent:*

- (1) *There is a measurable cardinal.*
- (2) *There are cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$ with $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$.*
- (3) *There is a weakly inaccessible cardinal κ and a cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$ with $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$.*
- (4) *There is a singular cardinal κ and a cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$ with $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$.*
- (5) *There are cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$ such that κ has a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter.*

Here let us mention another application of Donder's theorem, which contrasts with Theorem 7.16.

Proposition 8.5. *Relative to a certain large cardinal assumption, it is consistent that there is a weakly inaccessible cardinal κ such that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ for every uncountable cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$.*

Proof. Suppose there is a measurable cardinal κ and a normal measure U over κ such that $V = L[U]$, and V_κ is a model of ZFC+“there is no inner model of a measurable cardinal”. By Fact 8.1, for every uncountable cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$, λ has no ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter.

Fix a large strong limit singular cardinal $\mu > \kappa$ with cofinality ω_1 , and take a generic extension $V[G]$ via poset $\text{Add}(\omega, \mu)$. In $V[G]$, we have $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) \leq \mu < \mathfrak{u}(\omega_1)$. We see that, in $V[G]$, every uncountable cardinal $\lambda < \kappa$ does not have an ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter. Then $\mathfrak{u}(\omega_1) \leq \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$, hence

$u(\kappa) < u(\omega_1) \leq u(\lambda)$ as required. Suppose to the contrary that λ has an ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter. Since $V[G]$ is a c.c.c. forcing extension of V , by the argument used in the proof of Theorem 6.9, we can take an ω_1 -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over λ in V . This contradicts to the choice of V . \square

Next we turn to the consistency strength of the statement $u(\lambda) < u(\kappa^+)$ for some $\lambda \leq \kappa$. For this sake, we will consider the square principles.

Definition 8.6. Let κ be a cardinal. A sequence $\langle c_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa^+ \rangle$ is said to be a \square_κ -sequence if the following hold:

- (1) c_α is a club in α with order type $\leq \kappa$.
- (2) For every $\alpha < \beta < \kappa^+$, if α is a limit point of c_β then $c_\alpha = c_\beta \cap \alpha$.

Let \square_κ be the assertion that there is a \square_κ -sequence.

Definition 8.7. Let κ be a cardinal. A sequence $\langle c_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is said to be a $\square(\kappa)$ -sequence if the following hold:

- (1) c_α is a club in α .
- (2) There is no club C in κ such that for every $\alpha < \kappa$, if α is a limit point of C then $C \cap \alpha = c_\alpha$.

Let $\square(\kappa)$ be the assertion that there is a $\square(\kappa)$ -sequence.

Clearly $\square_\kappa \Rightarrow \square(\kappa^+)$. It is known that the failure of the square principle at a singular cardinal, or at successive cardinals have a very strong large cardinal strength, but the exact strength is unknown. We just present the following Schimmerling's result.

Fact 8.8 (Schimmerling [15]). *Suppose that:*

- (1) \square_κ fails for some singular κ , or
- (2) Both $\square(\kappa)$ and \square_κ fail for some $\kappa \geq \omega_2$.

Then there is an inner model of a proper class of strong cardinals.

We will prove that if κ has a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter then $\square(\kappa)$ fails. For this sake, we also need the next definition and Kanamori's another result.

Definition 8.9. Let \mathcal{U} be an ultrafilter over κ .

- (1) A function $f : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa + 1$ is a *least function* of \mathcal{U} if $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \beta < f(\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$ for every $\beta < \kappa$, and for every $g : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$, if $\{\alpha \mid g(\alpha) < f(\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$, then there is $\beta < \kappa$ such that $\{\alpha \mid g(\alpha) \leq \beta\} \in \mathcal{U}$.
- (2) If the identity map is a least function, then \mathcal{U} is called a *weakly normal ultrafilter*.

Note that if \mathcal{U} is an ultrafilter over κ and $f : \kappa \rightarrow \kappa$, then the filter $f_*(\mathcal{U})$ over κ is weakly normal if and only if f is a least function of \mathcal{U} .

Fact 8.10 (Kanamori [11]). *Let κ be a regular cardinal, and \mathcal{U} a uniform ultrafilter over κ . If there is $\lambda < \kappa$ such that \mathcal{U} is not (ω, λ) -regular, then \mathcal{U} has a least function.*

By Lemma 2.7, if \mathcal{U} is a uniform ultrafilter over κ and there is a $\lambda < \kappa$ such that \mathcal{U} is λ -indecomposable, then \mathcal{U} is not (ω, λ) -regular. Hence \mathcal{U} has a least function.

Proposition 8.11. *Let κ be a regular uncountable cardinal, and suppose there is a regular $\lambda < \kappa$ such that κ has a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} . Then $\square(\kappa)$ fails.*

Proof. To show that $\square(\kappa)$ fails, suppose to the contrary that there is a $\square(\kappa)$ -sequence $\langle c_\alpha \mid \alpha < \kappa \rangle$. By Fact 8.10, \mathcal{U} has a least function. Hence we may assume that \mathcal{U} is weakly normal.

Claim 8.12. *For every $\beta < \kappa$, there is $\gamma < \kappa$ such that $\beta < \gamma$ and $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \gamma \in \lim(c_\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$.*

Proof. We shall take a strictly increasing sequence $\langle \beta_i \mid i < \lambda \rangle$ by induction on λ such that for every $i < \lambda$, $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid [\beta_i, \beta_{i+1}) \cap c_\alpha \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{U}$. First let $\beta_0 = \beta$. Suppose β_j is defined for all $j < i$. If i is limit, then $\beta_i = \sup_{j < i} \beta_j$. Suppose i is successor, say $i = k + 1$. By the weak normality of \mathcal{U} , we can find β_{k+1} such that $\{\alpha \mid [\beta_k, \beta_{k+1}) \cap c_\alpha \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{U}$.

Let $\gamma = \sup_i \beta_i$. Clearly $\gamma > \beta$ and $\text{cf}(\gamma) = \lambda$. We show that $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \gamma \in \lim(c_\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$. For $i < \lambda$, let $X_i = \{\alpha \mid [\beta_i, \beta_{i+1}) \cap c_\alpha \neq \emptyset\} \in \mathcal{U}$. Since \mathcal{U} is λ -indecomposable, the set $Y = \{\alpha \mid \{i < \lambda \mid \alpha \in X_i\}$ is cofinal in $\lambda\}$ is in \mathcal{U} . Take $\alpha \in Y$. By the choice of the X_i 's, we have that $c_\alpha \cap \gamma$ is unbounded in γ , hence $\gamma \in \lim(c_\alpha)$. \square

Let A be the set of all $\gamma < \kappa$ such that $\{\alpha < \kappa \mid \gamma \in \lim(c_\alpha)\} \in \mathcal{U}$. A is unbounded in κ by the previous claim. For $\beta_0, \beta_1 \in A$ with $\beta_0 < \beta_1$, there is a large α such that $\beta_0, \beta_1 \in \lim(c_\alpha)$. Hence $c_{\beta_1} \cap \beta_0 = c_{\beta_0}$. This argument shows that $C = \bigcup \{c_\beta \mid \beta \in A\}$ is a club in κ and $C \cap \beta = c_\beta$ for every $\beta \in \lim(C)$. This is a contradiction. \square

Corollary 8.13. (1) *Let κ be a regular cardinal. If $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ holds for some $\lambda < \kappa$, then $\square(\kappa)$ fails.*

(2) *If $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ holds for some $\lambda \leq \kappa$, then \square_κ fails.*

Proof. (2) is immediate from (1).

(1). By the assumption, we can find a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} . If λ is regular, then $\square(\kappa)$ fails by Proposition 8.11. If λ is singular, then \mathcal{U} is either $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ -indecomposable, or λ^+ -indecomposable by Proposition 7.3. In either case, we have that $\square(\kappa)$ fails by Proposition 8.11 again. \square

We point out that, if κ is singular then the weak square principle \square_κ^* implies ADS_κ . Hence by Proposition 7.14, \square_κ^* fails if κ is singular and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$.

The failure of the square principle is reflecting.

Proposition 8.14. *Let κ be a regular cardinal, and suppose there is a cardinal $\lambda \leq \kappa$ such that $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ holds. Then both $\square(\kappa)$ and $\square(\kappa^+)$ fail.*

Proof. By the assumption, κ^+ has a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} . We know that \mathcal{U} is κ -decomposable. Now we show that there is a regular cardinal $\mu < \kappa$ such that \mathcal{U} is μ -indecomposable. Since $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$, there is a λ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter. If λ is regular, let $\mu = \lambda$. Suppose λ is singular. By Proposition 7.3, \mathcal{U} is either $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ -indecomposable, or else λ^+ -indecomposable. If it is $\text{cf}(\lambda)$ -indecomposable, then let $\mu = \text{cf}(\lambda)$. If λ^+ -indecomposable, we have $\lambda^+ < \kappa$ and put $\mu = \lambda^+$.

We have that $\square(\kappa^+)$ fails by Proposition 8.11. Because \mathcal{U} is κ -decomposable, we can find a μ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter over κ . By applying Proposition 8.11 again, $\square(\kappa)$ fails. \square

Proposition 8.15. *Let κ be a singular cardinal. If $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$, then the set $\{\lambda < \kappa \mid \lambda \text{ is regular and } \square(\lambda) \text{ holds}\}$ is bounded in κ .*

Proof. By the assumption, we can take a κ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{U} over κ^+ , which is in fact $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable by Proposition 7.3. Now suppose to contrary that the set $\{\lambda < \kappa \mid \lambda \text{ is regular and } \square(\lambda) \text{ holds}\}$ is unbounded in κ . By Proposition 7.15, we can take a regular $\lambda < \kappa$ such that $\lambda > \text{cf}(\kappa)$, \mathcal{U} is λ -decomposable, and $\square(\lambda)$ holds. Then we can take a $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ -indecomposable uniform ultrafilter \mathcal{V} over λ . Hence $\square(\lambda)$ fails by Proposition 8.11, this is a contradiction. \square

By Fact 8.8 and these propositions, we obtain the following lower bound of the consistency strength.

Theorem 8.16. *Let κ be a cardinal. If $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ holds for some cardinal $\lambda \leq \kappa$, then there is an inner model of a proper class of strong cardinals.*

To conclude this paper, we would like to ask some questions.

- Question 8.17.**
- (1) What is the exact consistency strength of the statement that “ $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa^+) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \leq \kappa$ ”?
 - (2) Is it consistent that there are cardinals $\lambda < \kappa$ such that $2^{<\lambda} = \lambda$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa) < \mathfrak{u}(\lambda)$?
 - (3) Is it consistent that monotonicity of the ultrafilter number function fails at three cardinals? Namely, is it consistent that there are three cardinals $\kappa_0 < \kappa_1 < \kappa_2$ with $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa_2) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa_1) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa_0)$? How about $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa_1) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa_2) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa_0)$ and $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa_2) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa_0) < \mathfrak{u}(\kappa_1)$?
 - (4) Is there another cardinal invariant function $\mathfrak{k}(\kappa)$ on the cardinals such that the failure of monotonicity of \mathfrak{k} has a large cardinal strength?

REFERENCES

- [1] U. Abraham, M. Magidor. *Cardinal arithmetic*. Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 1150–1226. Springer, Dordrecht, 2010.
- [2] S. Ben-David, M. Magidor. *The weak \square^* is really weaker than the full \square* . J. Symb. Log. 51(4), 1029–1033 (1986).
- [3] T. Benhamou, S. Jirattikansakul. *A small ultrafilter number at every singular cardinal*. Acta Math. Hungar. 171(2023), no.1, 12–38.
- [4] H.-D. Donder. *Regularity of ultrafilters and the core model*. Israel J. Math. 63(1988), no.3, 289–322.
- [5] T. Eisworth. *Successors of singular cardinals*. Handbook of set theory. Vols. 1, 2, 3, 1229–1350. Springer, Dordrecht, 2010.
- [6] S. Garti, S. Shelah. *The ultrafilter number for singular cardinals*. Acta Math. Hungar. 137(4), 296–301 (2012)
- [7] S. Garti, M. Gitik, S. Shelah. *Cardinal characteristics at \aleph_ω* . Acta Math. Hungar. 160(2020), no.2, 320–336.
- [8] M. Gitik. *A uniform ultrafilter over a singular cardinal with a singular character*. Acta Math. Hungar. 162(2020), no.1, 325–332.
- [9] M. Gitik. *More on uniform ultrafilters over a singular cardinal*. Fund. Math. 252(2021), no.2, 225–240.
- [10] R. Honzik, S. Stejskalová. *Small $\mathfrak{u}(\kappa)$ at singular κ with compactness at κ^{++}* . Arch. Math. Logic 61(2022), no.1-2, 33–54.

- [11] A. Kanamori. *Weakly normal filters and irregular ultrafilters*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 220(1976), 393–399.
- [12] A. Kanamori. *The higher infinite. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings*. Second edition Springer Monogr. Math. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. xxii+536 pp.
- [13] K. L. Prikry. *On descendingly complete ultrafilters*. In Cambridge Summer School in Mathematical Logic (1971), volume 337 of Lecture notes in Mathematics. pages 459–488. Springer, Berlin, 1973.
- [14] D. Raghavan, S. Shelah. *A small ultrafilter number at smaller cardinals*. Arch. Math. Logic 59(2020), no.3–4, 325–334.
- [15] E. Schimmerling. *Coherent sequences and threads*. Adv. Math. 216(2007), no.1, 89–117.
- [16] S. Shelah. *Cardinal arithmetic*. Oxford Logic Guides, 29 Oxford Sci. Publ. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1994. xxxii+481 pp.

(T. Usuba) FACULTY OF FUNDAMENTAL SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, WASEDA UNIVERSITY, OKUBO 3-4-1, SHINJYUKU, TOKYO, 169-8555 JAPAN

Email address: `usuba@waseda.jp`