

FEW NON-MINIMAL TYPES AND NON-STRUCTURE

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, IsraelRutgers University
Department of Mathematics
New Brunswick, NJ USA

ABSTRACT. We pay two debts from [Sh:576]. The main demands little knowledge from [Sh:576], just quoting a model theoretic consequence of the weak diamond. We assume that \aleph has amalgamation in λ , and that the minimal types are not dense to get many non-isomorphic models in λ^+ . For this also pcf considerations are relevant.

The minor debt was the use in one point of [Sh:576] of $\lambda \neq \aleph_0$, it is minor as for this case by [Sh:88] we “usually” know more.

I thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing
Latest Revision - 99/Feb/5
Publication 603

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

In [Sh 576] there was one point where we used as assumption $I(\lambda^{+3}, K) = 0$. This was fine for the purpose there, but is unsuitable in our present framework: we want to analyze what occurs in higher cardinals, so our main aim here is to eliminate its use and add to our knowledge on non-structure.

The point was “the minimal triples in K_λ^3 are dense” ([Sh 576], 3.17). For this we assume we have a counterexample, and try to build many nonisomorphic models; hence we get cases of amalgamation which are necessarily unique. So we try to build many models in λ^+ by omitting “types” over models of size λ , in a specific way where unique amalgamation holds. If this argument fails, we prove $\mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{K}, \lambda}^1$ has weak λ^+ -coding and by it get $2^{\lambda^{++}}$ non-isomorphic models except when the weak diamond ideal on λ^+ is λ^{++} -saturated and use pcf to get the full result. We work also to get large IE (many models no one $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding to another).

There was also another point left in [Sh 576, 4.2], for the case $\lambda = \aleph_0$ only this is filled in the end.

A third point we needed to prove in [Sh 576] was [Sh 576, Th.6.5], see notation there: $K_\lambda^{2, uq} = \emptyset \Rightarrow I(\lambda^{++}, K) = 2^{\lambda^{++}}$ (assuming $2^n < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$, etc. we just prove $I(\lambda^{++}, K) \geq \mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^+)$). This holds as the context of [Sh 576] is included in our context (λ -good $^-$).

We assume here some knowledge of [Sh 576, §2].

1.1 Context.

- (a) \mathfrak{K} abstract elementary class $LS(\mathfrak{K}) \leq \lambda$
- (b) \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ .

1.2 Definition. 1) For $x \in \{a, d\}$ we say $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ if:

- (a) $M_\ell \in K_\lambda$ for $\ell \leq 3$
- (b) $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_\ell$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (c) if for $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we have $M_\ell^i \in K_\lambda$, for $\ell < 4$ and $M_0^i \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_\ell^i \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_3^i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ell = 1, 2$ and $[x = d \Rightarrow M_1^i \cap M_2^i = M_0^i]$ and f_ℓ^i is an isomorphism from M_ℓ onto M_ℓ^i for $\ell < 3$ and $f_0^i \subseteq f_1^i, f_0^i \subseteq f_2^i$ then there are M'_3, f_3 such that $M_3^2 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M'_3$ and f_3 is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of M_3^1 into M'_3 extending $(f_1^2 \circ (f_1^1)^{-1}) \cup (f_2^2 \circ (f_2^1)^{-1})$ i.e. $f_3 \circ f_1^1 = f_1^2$ & $f_3 \circ f_2^1 = f_2^2$
- (d) $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_\ell \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_3 \in K_\lambda$ for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (e) $x = d \Rightarrow M_1 \cap M_2 = M_0$.

2) We say $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2)$ if $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ for some M_3 .

3) If we omit x , we mean $x = a$.

4) $K_\lambda^{3, *m}$ is the family of triple $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ such that there is no minimal triple above it.

5) $K_\lambda^{2, *}$ is the family $\{(M, N) : \text{for some } a, (M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3, *}\}$.

6) $\mathcal{S}_*(M) = \{p \in \mathcal{S}(M) : \text{for some } (M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^{3, *} \text{ we have } p = \text{tp}(a, M, N)\}$.

- 1.3 Claim.** 1) *Symmetry: assuming $x \in \{a, d\}$ we have $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3) \Rightarrow UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_2, M_1, M_3)$; we can also omit M_3 .*
 2) $UQ_\lambda^a(M_0, M_1, M_2) \Rightarrow UQ_\lambda^d(M_0, M_1, M_2)$ recalling M_0 is an amalgamation base (in \mathfrak{K}_λ).
 3) $UQ_\lambda^a(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$ iff clauses (a), (b), (d), (e) of Definition 1.2(1),(2) holds and also (c)⁻, i.e. clause (c) restricted to the case $M_\ell^1 = M_\ell$ for $\ell \leq 3$.
 4) If $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3), M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M'_3 \in K_\lambda$ then $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2, M'_3)$; and also the inverse: if $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2, M'_3)$ and $M_1 \cup M_2 \subseteq M_3 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M'_3$ then $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2, M_3)$.
 5) Assume $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ and no triple above it is minimal then $\neg UQ(M, N, N)$.

Proof. 1),2) Trivial.

- 3) Chasing arrows, we should prove clause (c) of Definition 1.2(1). Assume we are given $\langle M_\ell^1 : \ell < 4 \rangle, \langle M_\ell^2 : \ell < 4 \rangle, \langle f_\ell^i : \ell < 3 \rangle$ as there for $i = 1, 2$. First for $i = 1, 2$ apply clause (c)⁻ to $\langle M_\ell^i : \ell < 4 \rangle, \langle f_\ell^i : \ell < 3 \rangle$. So there are N_3^i, f_3^i such that: $M_3^i \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N_3^i \in K_\lambda$, and f_3^i a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of M_3 into N_3^i extending $f_1^i \cup f_2^i$. As \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ (by 1.1(b)) there are $N \in K_\lambda$ and $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embeddings $g^i : N^i \rightarrow N$ such that $g^1 \circ f_3^1 = g^2 \circ f_3^2$, so we are done.
 4) Again by the amalgamation i.e. 1.1(b).
 5) By [Sh 576, 2.6(1)]. □_{1.3}

- 1.4 Claim.** 1) *transitivity: If $UQ_\lambda(M_\ell, N_\ell, M_{\ell+1}, N_{\ell+1})$ for $\ell = 0, 1$ then $UQ_\lambda(M_0, N_0, M_2, N_2)$.*
 2) If $\theta = \text{cf}(\theta) < \lambda^+$, and $\langle M_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -increasing continuous and $\langle N_i : i \leq \theta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -increasing and $UQ_\lambda(M_i, N_i, M_{i+1}, N_{i+1})$ for each $i < \theta$ then $UQ_\lambda(M_0, N_0, M_\theta, N_\theta)$.
 3) Assume:

- (a) $\alpha, \beta < \lambda^+$
- (b) $M_{i,j} \in K_\lambda$ for $i \leq \alpha, j \leq \beta$
- (c) $i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \alpha$ & $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \beta \Rightarrow M_{i_1, j_1} \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_{i_2, j_2}$
- (d) $\langle M_{i,j} : i \leq \alpha \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -increasing continuous for each $j \leq \beta$
- (e) $\langle M_{i,j} : j \leq \beta \rangle$ is $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -increasing continuous for each $i \leq \alpha$
- (f) $UQ_\lambda(M_{i,j}, M_{i+1,j}, M_{i,j+1}, M_{i+1,j+1})$.

Then $UQ_\lambda(M_{0,0}, M_{\alpha,0}, M_{0,\beta}, M_{\alpha,\beta})$.

- 4) If $UQ_\lambda^x(M_0, M_1, M_2)$ and $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M'_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_1$ and $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M'_2 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_2$ then $UQ_\lambda(M_0, M'_1, M'_2)$.

Proof. Chasing arrows (note: $UQ = UQ^a$ is easier than UQ^d , for UQ^d the parallel claim is not clear at this point, e.g. seemingly transitivity fails). □_{1.4}

- 1.5 Definition.** 1) $\mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}] = \{(M, \Gamma) : M \in K_\lambda, \Gamma \subseteq K_\lambda, |\Gamma| \leq \lambda \text{ and } N \in \Gamma \Rightarrow M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N\}$.

- 2) We define relations on $\mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$:

(α) $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq_h (M_2, \Gamma_2)$ iff

- (a) $M_1 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_2$
- (b) h is a partial function from Γ_2 onto Γ_1
- (c) if $h(N_2) = N_1$ then $UQ_\lambda(M_1, N_1, M_2, N_2)$.

(β) $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq^h (M_2, \Gamma_2)$ iff h is a one to one function from Γ_1 to Γ_2 such that $(M_1, \Gamma_2) \leq_{h^{-1}} (M_2, \Gamma_2)$

(γ) $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq_{h_1}^{h_2} (M_2, \Gamma_2)$ iff $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq_{h_1} (M_2, \Gamma_2)$, $(M_1, \Gamma_2) \leq_{h_2} (M_2, \Gamma_2)$ and $h_1 \circ h_2 = \text{id}_{\Gamma_1}$.

3) We write $<_h$ (or $<^h$ or $<_{h_1}^{h_2}$) if in addition $M_1 \neq M_2$ moreover¹ $(M_1, M_2) \in K_\lambda^{2,*}$.

4) $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq (M_2, \Gamma_2)$ means:

- (a) $\langle N \setminus M_\ell : N \in \Gamma_\ell \rangle$ are pairwise disjoint non-empty (and $(M_\ell, \Gamma_\ell) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$) for $\ell = 1, 2$
- (b) for every $N_1 \in \Gamma_1$ there is exactly one $N_2 \in \Gamma_2$ such that $(N_1 \setminus M_1) \cap (N_2 \setminus M_2) \neq \emptyset$ (so $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq (M_1, \Gamma_1)$ just means clause (a) and we call (M_1, Γ_1) disjoint)
- (c) $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq^h (M_2, \Gamma_2)$ when $h : \Gamma_1 \rightarrow \Gamma_2$ is defined by: $h(N_1) = N_2 \Leftrightarrow (N_1 \setminus M_1) \cap (N_2 \setminus M_2) \neq \emptyset$.

5) Let $\mathcal{T}_\lambda^{dis}[\mathfrak{K}] = \{(M, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}] : (M, \Gamma) \leq (M, \Gamma)\}$.

Remark. 1) Of course, except for bookkeeping only the isomorphic type of the $N \in \Gamma$ over M matters.

2) In 1.6(2) below, if the continuity is not demanded, the result may be that $h_{i,\delta}$ is not onto Γ_i . So we may use $\leq_{h_1}^{h_2}$.

3) Note that we can use 1.6(3) and not 1.6(2).

1.6 Claim. 1) If $(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq_{h_1} (M_2, \Gamma_2) \leq_{h_2} (M_3, \Gamma_3)$ then

$(M_1, \Gamma_1) \leq_{h_1 \circ h_2} (M_3, \Gamma_3)$.

2) If $\delta < \lambda^+$ is a limit ordinal, for $i < j < \delta$, $(M_i, \Gamma_i) \leq_{h_{i,j}} (M_j, \Gamma_j)$ and the $h_{i,j}$ commute, and for limit $\alpha < \delta$, $(\Gamma_\alpha, \langle h_{i,\alpha} : i < \alpha \rangle)$ is the (direct) limit of $\langle \Gamma_i, h_{i,j} : i < j < \alpha \rangle$ then we can find $(M_\delta, \Gamma_\delta)$ and $\langle h_{i,\delta} : i < \delta \rangle$ such that $(M_i, \Gamma_i) \leq_{h_{i,\delta}} (M_\delta, \Gamma_\delta)$ and $M_\delta = \bigcup_{i < \delta} M_i$ and $(\Gamma_\delta, \langle h_{i,\delta} : i < \delta \rangle)$ is the limit of

$\langle \Gamma_i, h_{i,j} : i < j < \delta \rangle$.

3) $(\mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}], \leq)$ is a partial order in which any increasing sequence of length $< \lambda^+$ has a lub (= the natural limit). (Actually, only $\mathcal{T}_\lambda^{dis}[\mathfrak{K}]$ matters.)

Proof. 1) The main point is the use of 1.4(1).

2) In addition to chasing arrows we use 1.4(2) (or 1.4(3) for $\beta = 1$).

3) Reformulation of 1), 2). □_{1.6}

¹note that: if there is no minimal triple in K_λ^3 then every $a \in M_2 \setminus M_2$ is as required so the moreover is not necessary

1.7 Claim. Assume $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+}$ or at least the definitional² weak diamond; i.e. $DfWD^+(\lambda^+)$, see [Sh 576, 1.7]. If $(*)_\lambda$ or at least $(*)'_\lambda$ below holds (hence above some triple from K_λ^3 there is no minimal one), then $I(\lambda^+, K) \geq 2^{\lambda^+}$ where

- $(*)_\lambda$ for every $(M, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$ for some h, M', Γ' we have $(M, \Gamma) <^h (M', \Gamma')$ (without loss of generality h is onto Γ') or just
- $(*)'_\lambda$ for some $(M_0, \Gamma_0) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$, if $(M_0, \Gamma_0) \leq^{h_0} (M, \Gamma)$ then for some h, M', Γ' we have $(M, \Gamma) <^h (M', \Gamma')$.

Proof. We choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda$, $\langle (M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta, \Gamma_\eta^+) : \eta \in {}^\alpha 2 \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $M_\eta \in K_\lambda$ has universe $\gamma_\eta < \lambda^+$
- (b) $(M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$
- (c) (M_η, Γ_η) is disjoint (see 1.5(4)(b)) and $N \in \Gamma_\eta \rightarrow (N \setminus M_\eta) \cap \lambda^+ = \emptyset$
- (d) $\nu \triangleleft \eta \Rightarrow (M_\nu, \Gamma_\nu) < (M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta)$
- (e) $(M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta^+) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$ is disjoint (see 1.5(4)(b)) and $N \in \Gamma_\eta^+ \Rightarrow (N \setminus M_\eta) \cap \lambda^+ = \emptyset$
- (f) $\Gamma_\eta \subseteq \Gamma_\eta^+$
- (g) $(M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta^+) \leq (M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle}, \Gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle})$
- (h) for some $N \in \Gamma_\eta^+$ we have $N \cong_{M_\eta} M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}$
- (i) $(M_\eta, M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}) \in K_\lambda^{2,*}$, that is for some $a \in M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}$ we have $(M_\eta, M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ and above it there is no minimal triple from K_λ^3 .

There is no problem to carry the induction with Γ_η^+ ($\eta \in {}^\alpha 2$) chosen in the $(\alpha + 1)$ -th step. For $\alpha = 0$ let $(M_{<>}, \Gamma_{<>})$ be the (M_0, Γ_0) from $(*)'_\lambda$ except that we rename the elements to make the relevant parts of clauses (a), (c) true. For α limit use 1.6(3) (part on lub). For $\alpha = \beta + 1, \eta \in {}^\beta 2$, by $(*)'_\lambda$ we can find $(M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}, \Gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle})$ such that $(M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}, \Gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$, $(M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta) < (M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}, \Gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle})$. So by the Definition 1.5(3) of $<$, for some $a \in M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle} \setminus M_\eta$, no triple in K_λ^3 above $(M_\eta, M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}, a)$ is minimal. By renaming without loss of generality the universe of $M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}$ is some $\gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle} (\in (\gamma_\eta, \lambda^+))$ and clause (c) holds. Let N_η be isomorphic to $M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}$ over M_η with universe disjoint to $\lambda^+ \cup \bigcup_{N \in \Gamma_\eta} |N| \setminus \gamma_\eta$ and let $\Gamma_\eta^+ = \Gamma_\eta \cup \{N_\eta\}$,

so $(M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta^+) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$ is disjoint, now apply to it $(*)'_\lambda$ to get $(M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle}, \Gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle})$. Why does clause (h) hold? By the choice of N_η . So $M_\eta, \Gamma_\eta, \Gamma_\eta^+$ ($\eta \in {}^{\lambda^+} 2$) are defined.

Note: if $\eta \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle \triangleleft \nu \in {}^{\lambda^+} 2$, then $M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}$ is not $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embeddable into M_ν over M_η (by clause (g) + (h) because by 1.3(5) and clause (i) we have $\neg UQ(M_\eta, M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}, N_\eta)$). By [Sh 576, 1.4] we get the desired conclusion (really also on IE). $\square_{1.7}$

1.8 Claim. An equivalent condition for $(*)_\lambda$ or just $(*)'_\lambda$ of 1.7 is (respectively):

- $(**)_{\lambda}$ for every $M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N$ from K_λ for some $M', M <_{\mathfrak{K}} M' \in K_\lambda$ and $UQ_\lambda(M, M', N)$ & $(M, M') \in K_\lambda^{2,*}$

²we could make the relation on $(M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle}, \Gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 0 \rangle}), (M_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle}, \Gamma_{\eta \hat{\ } \langle 1 \rangle})$ symmetric

or just

$(**)'_\lambda$ for some $M_0 \in K_\lambda$ if $M_0 \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N \in K_\lambda$ then for some M' ,
 $M <_{\mathfrak{K}} M' \in K_\lambda$ and $UQ_\lambda(M, M', N)$ & $(M, M') \in K_\lambda^{2,*}$.

Proof. For any $(M, \Gamma) \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda[\mathfrak{K}]$, by “ \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ ” (and properties of abstract elementary classes) there are N^* , $\langle f_N : N \in \Gamma \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $M \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N^* \in K_\lambda$
- (b) for $N \in \Gamma$, f_N is a $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding of N into N^* over M .

This shows $(**)_{\lambda} \Rightarrow (*)'_{\lambda}$ and also $(**)_{\lambda}' \Rightarrow (*)'_{\lambda}$.

The other direction are by applying $(*)_{\lambda}$ (or $(*)'_{\lambda}$) to $(M, \{N\})$. $\square_{1.8}$

1.9 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $(**)_{\lambda}$ of 1.8 fails
- (b) $M \in K_\lambda \Rightarrow |\mathcal{S}_*(M)| > \lambda^+$ (follows from “above $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ there is no minimal triple” $+ 2^\lambda > \lambda^+$)
- (c) K is categorical in λ
- (d) K is categorical in λ^+
- (e) $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$.

Then $I(\lambda^{++}, K) = 2^{\lambda^{++}}$ except possibly when

- (*) $W\text{DmId}(\lambda^+)$ is λ^{++} -saturated (normal ideal on λ^+).

Proof. We rely on [Sh 576, §3]. By (a) (and (c)) for every $M \in K_\lambda$ for some $N = N_{[M]}$ we have $M <_{\mathfrak{K}} N \in K_\lambda$ and without loss of generality even $(M, N) \in K_\lambda^{2,*}$ and $(M, M') \in K_\lambda^{2,*} \Rightarrow \neg UQ(M, M', N)$, of course, using N' where $N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N' \in K_\lambda$ will do too as \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ .

Let $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_{\lambda^+}^1[\mathfrak{K}]$, see [Sh 576, Definition 3.3]. So there is $\langle M_i^* : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ such that $(M_i^*, M_{i+1}^*) \cong (M_i^*, N_{[M_i^*]})$.

Now for $\langle M_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle \in \mathbf{Seq}_{\lambda^+}[\mathbf{C}]$, by clause (b) there is $p^* \in \mathcal{S}_*(M_0)$ not realized in $\bigcup_{i < \lambda^+} M_i$ hence $M_i <_K M' \in K_\lambda$ & (some $a \in M'$ realizes p) \Rightarrow

$(M, M') \in K_\lambda^{2,*}$; for a club of i 's, for some $j \in (i, \lambda^+)$ we have, by 1.4(4) as K is categorical in λ^+ :

- (α) for some $\leq_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -embedding f_i of $N_{[M_i^*]}$ into M_j , f_i maps M_i^* onto M_i so by assumption (a)
- (β) $M_i <_{\mathfrak{K}} M' \in K_\lambda$ & some $a \in M'$ realizes $p^* \Rightarrow \neg UQ_\lambda(M_i, M_j, M')$.

From this it follows that for some λ^+ -amalgamation function F , F has the weak λ^+ -coding property for \mathbf{C} (see [Sh 576, 3.8(2)] hence the weaker version, too. Hence by [Sh 576, 3.12], if $W\text{DmId}(\lambda^+)$ is not λ^{++} -saturated then $I(\lambda^{++}, K) = 2^{\lambda^{++}}$. $\square_{1.9}$

1.10 Remark. 1) We can get more abstract results.

2) Note $\neg(*)_\lambda$ of 1.9 is a “light” assumption, in fact, e.g. its negation has high consistency strength.

* * *

The following will provide us a useful division into cases (it is from pcf theory; on $\mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda)$ see [Sh 576, 1.1]), we can replace λ^+ by regular λ such that $2^\theta = 2^{<\lambda} < 2^\lambda$ for some θ).

1.11 Fact. Assume $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+}$.

Then one of the following cases occurs:

(A) $_\lambda$ we can find μ such that letting $\chi^* = 2^{\lambda^+}$

(α) $\lambda^+ < \mu \leq 2^\lambda$ and $\text{cf}(\mu) = \lambda^+$

(β) $pp(\mu) = \chi^*$, moreover $pp^+(\mu) = (\chi^*)^+$ and $\chi^* > 2^\lambda$

(γ) $(\forall \mu')(\text{cf}(\mu') \leq \lambda^+ < \mu' < \mu \rightarrow pp(\mu') < \mu)$ hence
 $\text{cf}(\mu') \leq \lambda^+ < \mu' < \mu \Rightarrow pp_{\lambda^+}(\mu') < \mu$

(δ) for every regular cardinal χ in the interval $(\mu, \chi^*]$ there is an increasing sequence $\langle \lambda_i : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of regular cardinals $> \lambda^+$ with limit μ such that $\chi = \text{tcf} \left(\prod_{i < \lambda^+} \lambda_i / J_{\lambda^+}^{bd} \right)$

(ε) for some regular $\kappa \leq \lambda$, for any $\mu' < \mu$ there is a tree T with $\leq \lambda$ nodes, κ levels and $|\text{Lim}_\kappa(T)| \geq \mu'$ (in fact e.g. $\kappa = \text{Min}\{\kappa : 2^\kappa \geq \mu\}$ is appropriate; without loss of generality $T \subseteq {}^{\kappa > \lambda}$; we can get, of course, a tree T with $\text{cf}(\kappa)$ levels, $\leq \lambda$ nodes and $|\text{Lim}_{\text{cf}(\kappa)}(T)| \geq \mu'$).

(B) $_\lambda$ for some μ, χ^* we have: clauses (α) – (ε) from above (so $2^\lambda < \chi^*$) and

(ζ) there is $\langle T_\zeta : \zeta < \chi^* \rangle$ such that: $T_\zeta \subseteq {}^{\lambda^+ > 2}$ a tree, of cardinality $\leq \lambda^+$ and $2^{\lambda^+} = \bigcup_{\zeta < \chi^*} \text{Lim}_{\lambda^+}(T_\zeta)$ and $\chi^* < 2^{\lambda^+}$

(η) $2^\lambda \leq \chi^* < \mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda)$ (but $< \mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda)$ not used here, see [Sh 576, Definition f.1(5)])

(θ) for some $\zeta < \chi^*$ we have $\text{Lim}_{\lambda^+}(T_\zeta) \notin \text{WDmTId}(\lambda^+)$

(ι) if there is a normal λ^{++} -saturated ideal on λ^+ , e.g. the ideal $\text{WDmId}(\lambda^+)$ is, then $2^{\lambda^+} = \lambda^{++}$ (so as $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+}$, necessarily $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$)

(κ) $\text{cov}(\chi^*, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \aleph_1) = \chi^*$, equivalently $\chi^* = \sup\{pp(\chi) : \chi \leq 2^\lambda, \aleph_1 \leq \text{cf}(\chi) \leq \lambda^+ < \chi\}$ by [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4]

(C) $_\lambda$ letting $\chi^* = 2^\lambda$ we have (ζ) (except “ $\chi^* < 2^{\lambda^+}$ ”), (η), (θ), (ι), (κ) of clause (B) and

(λ) for no $\mu \in (\lambda^+, 2^\lambda]$ do we have $\text{cf}(\mu) \leq \lambda^+, pp(\mu) > 2^\lambda$ equivalently $\text{cf}([2^\lambda]^{\lambda^+}, \subseteq) = 2^\lambda$ hence $\mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda) = 2^{\lambda^+}$ except (maybe) when $\lambda < \beth_\omega$ and there is $\mathcal{A} \subseteq [\mu_{\text{wd}}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda)]^\lambda$ such that $A \neq B \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow |A \cap B| = \aleph_0$.

Remark. Remember that

$$\text{cov}(\chi, \mu, \theta, \sigma) = \chi + \text{Min}\{|\mathcal{P}| : \mathcal{P} \subseteq [\chi]^{<\mu} \text{ and every member of } [\chi]^{<\theta} \text{ is included in the union of } < \sigma \text{ members of } \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Proof. This is related to [Sh:g, II,5.11]; we assume basic knowledge of pcf (or a readiness to believe). Note that if $2^\lambda > \lambda^+$ then $\text{cf}([2^\lambda]^{\leq \lambda^+}, \subseteq) = 2^\lambda \Leftrightarrow \text{cov}(2^\lambda, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \aleph_0) = 2^\lambda$ and $\text{cov}(2^\lambda, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \aleph_0) \geq \text{cov}(2^\lambda, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \theta) = 2^\lambda$ for $\theta \in [\aleph_0, \lambda]$.

Possibility 1: $\chi^* =: \text{cov}(2^\lambda, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \aleph_1) = 2^\lambda$.

We shall show that case (C) holds.

Now by the definition of cov, clause (ζ) is obvious, as well as (κ). As on the one hand by [Sh:f, AP,1.16 + 1.19] we have $(\mu_{wd}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda))^{\aleph_0} = 2^{\lambda^+} > 2^\lambda = \chi^*$ and on the other hand $(\chi^*)^{\aleph_0} = (2^\lambda)^{\aleph_0} = 2^\lambda = \chi^*$ necessarily $\chi^* < \mu_{wd}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda)$ so clause (η) follows; now clause (θ) follows from clause (ζ) as $\text{WDmTId}(\lambda^+)$ is $(2^\lambda)^+$ -complete by [Sh 576, 1.2(5)] and we have chosen $\chi^* = 2^\lambda$. Now if $2^{\lambda^+} > \lambda^{++}$, (so $2^{\lambda^+} \geq \lambda^{+3}$), then for some $\zeta < \chi^*, T_\zeta$ is (a tree with $\leq \lambda^+$ nodes, λ^+ levels and) at least λ^{+3} λ^+ -branches which is well known (see e.g. [J]) to imply “no normal ideal on λ^+ is λ^{++} -saturated”; so we got clause (ι). As for (λ) the definition of χ^* and the assumption $\chi^* = 2^\lambda$ we have the first two phrases, as for $\mu_{wd}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda) = 2^{\lambda^+}$ by [Sh:f, 1.14 + 1.16] there is \mathcal{A} as mentioned in (λ)? and by [Sh 460] we get $\lambda < \beth_\omega$. The “equivalently” holds as $(2^\lambda)^{\aleph_0} = 2^\lambda$.

Possibility 2: $\chi^* = \text{cov}(2^\lambda, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \aleph_1) > 2^\lambda$.

Let $\mu = \text{Min}\{\mu : \text{cf}(\mu) \leq \lambda^+, \lambda^+ < \mu \leq 2^\lambda \text{ and } \text{pp}(\mu) = \chi^*\}$, we know by [Sh:g, II,5.4] that μ exists and (by [Sh:g, II,2.3(2)]) clause (γ) holds, also $2^\lambda < \text{pp}(\mu) \leq \mu^{\text{cf}(\mu)}$ hence $\text{cf}(\mu) = \lambda^+$. So clauses (α), (β), (γ) hold (moreover, for clause (β) use [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4(2)]), and by (γ) + [Sh:g, VIII,§1] also clause (δ) holds.

For clause (ε) let $\Upsilon = \text{Min}\{\Upsilon : 2^\Upsilon \geq \mu\}$, clearly $\alpha < \Upsilon \Rightarrow 2^{|\alpha|} < \mu$ and $\Upsilon \leq \lambda$ (as $2^\lambda \geq \mu$) hence $\text{cf}(\Upsilon) \leq \Upsilon \leq \lambda < \lambda^+ = \text{cf}(\mu)$ hence $2^{<\Upsilon} < \mu$. Now we shall first prove

(*) there³ is a tree with λ^+ nodes, $\text{cf}(\Upsilon)$ levels and $\geq \mu$ Υ -branches

why? otherwise we shall get contradiction to the claim 1.13 below with $\sigma, \kappa, \theta_0, \theta_1, \mu, \chi$ there standing for $\text{cf}(\Upsilon), \lambda^+, \lambda^+, 2^{<\Upsilon}, \mu, (2^\lambda)^+$ here and T^* defined below; let us check the conditions there:

³the less easy point is when $\text{cf}(\Upsilon) = \aleph_0$, otherwise we can get the conclusion differently (by [Sh:g, II,5.4]), so 1.11(A) suffice

Clause (a): It says $\text{cf}(\Upsilon) < \lambda^+ = \text{cf}(\mu) \leq \lambda^+ \leq 2^{<\Upsilon} < \mu$ which is readily checked except the inequality $\lambda^+ \leq 2^{<\Upsilon}$ but if it fails we immediately get more than required.

Clause (b): This is clause (γ) of (A) which we have proved.

Clause (c): The tree T^* is $(\Upsilon > 2, \triangleleft)$ restricted to an unbounded set of levels of order type $\text{cf}(\Upsilon)$.

Clause (d): Let $\theta_2 =: \text{cov}(2^{<\Upsilon}, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \text{cf}(\Upsilon)^+)$.

So the statement we have to prove is $\text{pp}(\mu) \geq \chi = \text{cf}(\chi) > \theta_2^{\text{cf}(\Upsilon)}$. Now $\text{pp}(\mu) \geq \chi$ holds by the choice of μ and $\chi = \text{cf}(\chi)$ as $\chi = (2^\lambda)^+$. For the last inequality, by [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4] and the choice of μ , as we have shown $2^{<\Upsilon} < \mu$ we know $\theta_2 < \mu$, but $\mu \leq 2^\lambda$ so $\theta_2^{\text{cf}(\Upsilon)} \leq (2^\lambda)^{\text{cf}(\Upsilon)} \leq (2^\lambda)^\Upsilon \leq (2^\lambda)^\lambda = 2^\lambda < \chi$.

So we have verified clauses (a) – (d) of 1.13 hence its conclusion holds, but this gives $(*)$, i.e. the desired conclusion in clause (ε) of Case A in 1.11; well not exactly, it gives only $|T^*| \leq \lambda^+$, so $T^* = \bigcup_{i < \lambda^+} T_i$, T_i increases continuously with each T_i of cardinality $\leq \lambda$, so for every $\mu' < \mu$ for some i we have $|\text{Lim}_{\text{cf}(\Upsilon)}(T_i)| \geq \mu'$, so we have clauses $(\alpha) - (\varepsilon)$ there.

Subpossibility 2a: $\chi^* < 2^{\lambda^+}$.

We shall prove $(B)_\lambda$, so we are left with proving $(\zeta) - (\kappa)$ when $\chi^* < 2^{\lambda^+}$. By the choice of χ^* , easily clause (ζ) (in Case B of 1.11) holds. In clause (η) , “ $2^\lambda < \chi^*$ ” holds as we are in possibility 2.

Also as $\text{pp}(\mu) = \chi^*$ by the choice of μ necessarily (by transitivity of pcf, i.e. [Sh:g, Ch.II,2.3(2)]) $\text{cf}(\chi^*) > \lambda^+$ but $\mu > \lambda^+$. Easily $\chi \leq \chi^* \wedge \text{cf}(\chi) \leq \lambda^+ \Rightarrow \text{pp}(\chi) \leq \chi^*$ hence $\text{cov}(\chi^*, \lambda^{++}, \lambda^{++}, \aleph_1) = \chi^*$ by [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4], which gives clause (κ) , so as $(\lambda^+)^{\aleph_0} \leq 2^\lambda < \chi^*$ certainly there is no family of $> \chi^*$ subsets of χ^* each of cardinality λ^+ with pairwise finite intersections, hence (by [Sh:b, Ch.XIV,§1] or see [Sh 576, 1.2(1)] or [Sh:f, AP,1.16]) we have $\chi^* < \mu_{wd}(\lambda^+, 2^\lambda)$ thus completing the proof of (η) .

Now clause (θ) follows by $(\zeta) + (\eta)$ by [Sh 576, 1.2(5)]. Also if $2^{\lambda^+} \neq \lambda^{++}$ then $2^{\lambda^+} \geq \lambda^{++}$ so by clause (ζ) (as $\chi^* < 2^{\lambda^+}$), for some ζ , $|\text{Lim}_{\lambda^+}(T_\zeta)| \geq \lambda^{++}$, which is well known to imply no normal ideal on λ^+ is λ^{++} -saturated; i.e. clause (ι) . So we have proved that case $(B)_\lambda$ holds.

Subpossibility 2b: $\chi^* = 2^{\lambda^+}$.

We have proved that case $(A)_\lambda$ holds, as we already defined μ and χ^* and proved $(\alpha), (\beta), (\gamma), (\delta), (\varepsilon)$ we are done.

Still we depend on 1.13 below which in turn depends on 1.12.

1.12 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\sigma < \kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) \leq \theta_0 \leq \theta_1 < \mu \leq \theta_1^\sigma$
- (b) $(\forall \mu')[\theta_0 < \mu' < \mu \ \& \ \text{cf}(\mu') \leq \kappa \Rightarrow \text{pp}(\mu') < \mu]$
- (c) $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + \text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, \sigma^+)$ (by clause (b) and [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4] we know that it is $< \mu$)
- (d) $\text{pp}(\mu) \geq \chi = \text{cf}(\chi) > \theta_2^\sigma (\geq \theta_1^\sigma \geq \mu)$.

Then $\theta_0^\sigma \geq \mu$.

Remark. In fact $\theta_2^\sigma \geq \text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, 2)$.

Proof. Assume toward contradiction $\theta_0^\sigma < \mu$. By [Sh:g, Ch.II,2.3(2)] and clause (b) of the assumption we have $\sup\{\text{pp}(\mu') : \theta_0^+ \leq \mu' \leq \theta_0^\sigma \text{ and } \text{cf}(\mu') \leq \kappa\} < \mu$ hence by [Sh:g, Ch.II,5.4] it follows that $\kappa^* =: \text{cov}(\theta_0^\sigma, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, \sigma^+) < \mu$. We can by assumption (b) + (d) and [Sh:g, Ch.II,3.5] + [Sh:g, Ch.VIII,§1] find $T \subseteq {}^{\kappa \geq \mu}$ a tree with $\leq \mu$ nodes, $|\text{Lim}_\kappa(T)| \geq \chi$, (if $\chi = \text{pp}(\mu)$, the supremum in the definition of $\text{pp}(\mu)$ is obtained by [Sh:g, II,5.4(2)]). Moreover, by the construction there is $\Xi \subseteq \text{Lim}_\kappa(T)$, $|\Xi| = \chi$ such that $\Xi' \subseteq \Xi$ & $|\Xi'| \geq \chi \Rightarrow |\{\eta \restriction \alpha : \alpha < \kappa, \eta \in \Xi'\}| = \mu$. By renaming (and also by the construction), without loss of generality

\otimes if $\eta_0 \hat{\ } \langle \alpha_0 \rangle \neq \eta_1 \hat{\ } \langle \alpha_1 \rangle$ belongs to T then $\alpha_0 \neq \alpha_1$.

So let $\eta_i \in \text{Lim}_\kappa(T)$ for $i < \chi$ be pairwise distinct, listing Ξ .

As $\mu \leq \theta_1^\sigma$ there is a sequence $\bar{F} = \langle F_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \sigma \rangle$ satisfying: F_ε a function from μ to θ_1 such that $\alpha < \beta < \mu \Rightarrow (\exists \varepsilon < \theta) F_\varepsilon(\alpha) \neq F_\varepsilon(\beta)$.

Let $w_{i,\varepsilon} = \{F_\varepsilon(\eta_i(\alpha)) : \alpha < \kappa\}$, so $w_{i,\varepsilon} \in [\theta_1]^\kappa$. By assumption (c) we have $\theta_2 = \theta_1 + \text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, \sigma^+)$ so there is $\mathcal{P} \subseteq [\theta_1]^{\theta_0}$, $\theta_2 = |\mathcal{P}|$ such that: any $w \in [\theta_1]^\kappa$ is included in a union of $\leq \sigma$ members of \mathcal{P} . So we can find $X_{i,\varepsilon,\zeta} \in \mathcal{P}$ for $\zeta < \sigma$ such that $w_{i,\varepsilon} \subseteq \bigcup_{\zeta < \sigma} X_{i,\varepsilon,\zeta}$. So $\bigcup_{\varepsilon < \sigma} w_{i,\varepsilon} \subseteq Y_i =: \bigcup_{\zeta, \varepsilon < \sigma} X_{i,\varepsilon,\zeta}$. Let

$\mathcal{P}^* = \{\bigcup_{\varepsilon < \sigma} X_\varepsilon : X_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{P} \text{ for } \varepsilon < \sigma\}$, so \mathcal{P}^* is a family of $\leq |\mathcal{P}|^\sigma \leq \theta_2^\sigma$ sets and $i < \chi \Rightarrow Y_i \in \mathcal{P}^*$.

For each $Y \in \mathcal{P}^*$ let

$$Z_Y = \{\alpha < \mu : (\forall \varepsilon < \sigma)(F_\varepsilon(\alpha) \in Y)\}$$

clearly $Y = Y_i \Rightarrow \text{Rang}(\eta_i) \subseteq Z_Y$, also $|Y| \leq \theta_0$ hence $|Z_Y| \leq \theta_0^\sigma < \mu$ hence there is a family Q_Y of cardinality $\kappa^* =: \text{cov}(\theta_0^\sigma, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, \sigma^+) < \mu$ whose members are subsets of Z_Y each of cardinality $\leq \theta_0$ such that any $X \in [Z_Y]^{\leq \kappa}$ is included in the union of $\leq \sigma$ of them. For each $Y \in \mathcal{P}^*$ and $W \in Q_Y$ let $T'_W = \{\eta \in T : \text{for some } \alpha < \kappa \text{ we have: } \alpha + 1 = \ell g(\eta) \text{ and } \eta(\alpha) \in W\}$ and $T_W = \{\eta \in T'_W : (\exists \nu)(\eta \restriction \nu \in T_W)\}$.

So by \otimes above we have: T'_W , hence T_W is a set of $\leq |W| + \kappa \leq \theta_0$ nodes in T , \triangleleft -downward closed. Also

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad & \left| \bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{P}^*} Q_Y \right| \leq |\mathcal{P}^*| \times \sup_{Y \in \mathcal{P}^*} |Z_Y| \\ & \leq \theta_2^\sigma \times \kappa^\sigma \leq \theta_2^\sigma + \text{cov}(\theta_0^\sigma, \theta_0^+, \theta_0^+, \sigma^+) < \mu. \end{aligned}$$

However, for every $i < \chi$, $Y_i \in \mathcal{P}^*$ and $\text{Rang}(\eta_i) \in [Y_i]^{\leq \kappa}$ so for some $W \in Q_{Y_i}$, $(\exists^\kappa \alpha < \kappa)[\eta_i(\alpha) \in W]$ hence $\eta_i \in \text{Lim}_\kappa(T_W)$.

By assumption (a) and (*) above for some $W \in \bigcup_{Y \in \mathcal{P}^*} Q_Y$ we have

$$|\{i < \chi : \eta_i \in \text{Lim}_\kappa(T_W)\}| = \chi.$$

T_W is (essentially) a tree and contradict the choice of $\Xi = \{\eta_i : i < \chi\}$.
(We could have instead using κ^*, Q_Y to fix $Y_i = Y$ as $|\mathcal{P}^*| < \chi = \text{cf}(\chi)$.) $\square_{1.12}$

1.13 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $\sigma < \kappa = \text{cf}(\mu) \leq \theta_0 \leq \theta_1 < \mu$
- (b) $(\forall \mu')[\theta_0 < \mu' < \mu \ \& \ \text{cf}(\mu') \leq \kappa \rightarrow \text{pp}(\mu') < \mu]$
- (c) T^* is a tree with $\leq \theta_1$ nodes, σ levels and $\geq \mu$ σ -branches
- (d) $\text{pp}(\mu) \geq \chi = \text{cf}(\chi) > \theta_2^\sigma$ where $\theta_2 = \text{cov}(\theta_1, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, \sigma^+)$.

Then for some subtree $Y \subseteq T^*$, $|Y| \leq \theta_0$ and $|\text{Lim}_\sigma(Y)| \geq \mu$ (enough $\geq \mu'$ for any given $\mu' < \mu$).

Proof. Let $T, \Xi = \{\eta_i : i < \chi\}$ be as in the proof of the previous claim. Let $\{\nu_\zeta : \zeta < \mu\}$ list μ distinct σ -branches of T^* (see clause (c)). Without loss of generality the set of nodes of T^* is θ_1 . Choose for each $\varepsilon < \sigma$ the function $F_\varepsilon : \mu \rightarrow \theta_1$ by $F_\varepsilon(\gamma) = \nu_\gamma(\varepsilon)$. Define $w_{i,\varepsilon}, \mathcal{P}, X_{i,\varepsilon,\zeta}, Y_i, \mathcal{P}^*, Z_Y$ as in the proof of 1.12. But for $Y \in \mathcal{P}^*$ we change the choice of Z_Y , first

$$Y' = \{\beta < \theta_1 : \text{for some } \alpha \in Y, \text{ we have } \beta <_{T^*} \alpha\}$$

So $|Y'| \leq \sigma + |Y|$ and let

$$Z_Y = \{\alpha < \mu : (\forall \varepsilon < \sigma)(F_\varepsilon(\alpha) \in Y')\}.$$

We continue as in the proof of 1.12. $\square_{1.13}, \square_{1.11}$

- 1.14 Remark.* 1) We could have used in 1.12, 1.13,
 $\theta_2 = \text{cov}(\theta_0^\sigma, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, \kappa^+)$ instead $\text{cov}(\theta_0^\sigma, \theta_0^+, \kappa^+, \sigma^+)$ and similarly in the proof of 1.11.
2) We can also play with assumption (b) as 1.12, 1.13.

It may be useful to note

1.15 Fact. If $T \subseteq {}^{\lambda^+}2$ is a tree, $|T| \leq \lambda^+$ and $\lambda \geq \beth_\omega$ then for every regular $\kappa < \beth_\omega$ large enough, we can find $\langle Y_\delta : \delta < \lambda^+, \text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa \rangle, |Y_\delta| \leq \lambda$ such that:
for every $\eta \in \text{Lim}_{\lambda^+}(T)$ for a club of $\delta < \lambda^+$ we have
 $\text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa \Rightarrow \eta \restriction \delta \in Y_\delta$.

1.16 Fact. Assume \mathfrak{K} is an abstract elementary class with amalgamation in λ , and above $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ there is no minimal pair.

- 1) Assume T is a tree with $\delta < \lambda^+$ levels and $\leq \lambda$ nodes. Then we can find $(M^*, N_\eta, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ above (M, N, a) for $\eta \in \text{Lim}_\delta(T)$ such that $\text{tp}(a, M^*, N_\eta)$ for $\eta \in \text{Lim}_\delta(T)$ are pairwise distinct. We can add “ (M^*, N_η, a) is reduced”.
- 2) If $M \in K_\lambda$ is universal then $\mathcal{S}(M) \geq \sup\{\text{Lim}_\delta(T) : T \text{ a tree with } \leq \lambda \text{ nodes and } \delta \text{ levels}\}$.

Proof. 1) Straight (or see the proof of 1.20(1)).

2) As for any $N \in K_\lambda$ there is a model $N' \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M$ isomorphic to N , now $p \mapsto p \upharpoonright N'$ is a function from $\mathcal{S}(M)$ onto $\mathcal{S}(N')$ by [Sh 576, §2] hence $|\mathcal{S}(M)| \geq |\mathcal{S}(N')| = |\mathcal{S}(N)|$.
Now use part (1). $\square_{1.16}$

Recall from [Sh 576, 3.13(3)].

1.17 Claim. 1) *Assume*

- (a) $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+}$ and Case A or B of Fact 1.11 holds for μ, χ^* (or just the conclusion there)
- (b) \mathfrak{K} is an abstract elementary class with $LS(\mathfrak{K}) \leq \lambda$
- (c) $K_{\lambda^+} \neq \emptyset$
- (d) \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ
- (e) in K_λ^3 , the minimal triples are not dense.

Then

$(*)_1$ for any regular $\chi \leq \mu$ we have:

$(*)_\chi^1$ there is $M \in K_\lambda$, $|\mathcal{S}(M)| \geq \chi$.

2) If in part (1) we strengthen clause (d) to $(d)^+$, then we get $(*)_1^+$ where:

$(d)^+$ \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ and a universal member in λ

$(*)_1^+$ for some $M \in K_\lambda$ we have $|\mathcal{S}(M)| \geq \mu$.

3) Assume (a), (b), (c), (e) of part (1) and $(d)^+$ of part (2) then:

$(*)_2$ $I(\lambda^+, K) \geq \chi^*$ and if $(2^\lambda)^+ < \chi^*$ then $IE(\lambda^+, \mathfrak{K}) \geq \chi^*$.

4) If in clause (a) of part (1) we restrict ourselves to Case A of 1.11, then

$\chi^* = 2^{\lambda^+}$ so in part (3) we get

$(*)_2^+$ $I(\lambda^+, K) = 2^{\lambda^+}$ and $(2^\lambda)^+ < 2^{\lambda^+} \Rightarrow IE(\lambda^+, K) \geq 2^{\lambda^+}$.

1.18 Remark. 1) We can restrict clause (b) to K_λ , interpreting in (c) + (e), K_{λ^+} as $\{\bigcup_{i < \lambda^+} M_i : M_i \in K_\lambda\}$ is $<_{\mathfrak{K}}$ -increasing (strictly and) continuous, but see §0, mainly ?.

2) Part (3) of 1.17 is like [Sh:g, Ch.II,4.10E], Kojman Shelah [KjSh 409, §2].

3) We can apply this to λ^+ standing for λ .

4) We can state the part of (A) of 1.11 used (and can replace 2^{λ^+} by smaller cardinals).

5) We can replace λ^+ by a weakly inaccessible cardinal with suitable changes.

Proof. 1) Note that μ is singular (as by clause (α) of (A) of 1.11, $\text{cf}(\mu) = \lambda^+ < \mu$). By 1.16(1) it suffices for each $\mu' < \mu$ to have $\delta < \lambda^+$ and a tree with $\leq \lambda$ nodes

and $\geq \mu'$ δ -branches. They exist by clause (ε) of (A) of 1.11.

2) Similarly using 1.16(2).

3) So assume $M^* \in K_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{S}(M^*)$ has cardinality $\geq \mu$, let $p_\eta \in \mathcal{S}(M^*)$ for $\eta \in Z$ be pairwise distinct, $|Z| \geq \mu$ and let $M^* \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N_\eta \in K_\lambda, p_\eta = \text{tp}(a_\eta, M^*, N_\eta)$.

Now for every $X \in [Z]^{\lambda^+}$, as \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ there is $M_X \in K_{\lambda^+}$ such that $M^* \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_X$ and $\eta \in X \Rightarrow N_\eta^*$ is embeddable into M_X over M^* (hence p_η is realized in M_X). Let $Y[X] = \{\eta \in Z : p_\eta \text{ is realized in } M_X\}$. So $X \subseteq Y[X] \in [Z]^{\lambda^+}$, so $\{Y[X] : X \in [Z]^{\lambda^+}\}$ is a cofinal subset of $[Z]^{\lambda^+}$, hence

$$\begin{aligned} |\{(M_X, c)_{c \in M^*} / \cong : X \in [Z]^{\lambda^+}\}| &\geq \\ |\{Y[X] : X \in [Z]^{\lambda^+}\}| &\geq \text{cf}([Z]^{\lambda^+}, \subseteq) \geq \\ \text{cf}([\mu]^{\lambda^+}, \subseteq) &\geq \text{pp}(\mu) = \chi^*. \end{aligned}$$

As $2^\lambda < \chi^*$ also $|\{M_X / \cong : X \in [Z]^{\lambda^+}\}| \geq \chi^*$ (clear or see [Sh:a, Ch.VIII,1.2] because $\|M_X\| = \lambda^+, \|M^*\| = \lambda$ and $(\lambda^+)^{\lambda} < \mu$) but $I(\lambda^+, K)$ is \geq than the former.

Lastly we shall prove $(2^\lambda)^+ < 2^{\lambda^+} \Rightarrow IE(\lambda^+, K) \geq \chi^*$ (so the reader may skip this, sufficing himself with the estimate on $I(\lambda^+, K)$).

For each $X \in [\mu]^{\lambda^+}$, let $\mathbf{F}_X = \{f : f \text{ a } \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}\text{-embedding of } M^* \text{ into } M_X\}$, and for $f \in F_X$ let

$$\mathcal{Z}_{X,f} = \{X_1 \in [Z]^{\lambda^+} : \text{there is a } \leq_{\mathfrak{K}}\text{-embedding of } M_{X_1} \text{ into } M_X \text{ extending } f\},$$

and let $\mathcal{S}_{X,f} = \{p \in \mathcal{S}(M^*) : f(p) \text{ is realized in } M_X\}$, so $\mathcal{Z}_{X,f} \subseteq \{X_1 : X_1 \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{X,f}\}$ and $|\mathcal{S}_{X,f}| \leq \lambda^+$.

Now the result follows from the the fact 1.19 below.

4) Should be clear from the proof of part (3).

1.19 Fact: Assume:

- (a) $\text{cf}(\mu) \leq \kappa < \mu$, $\text{pp}_\kappa(\mu) = \chi^*$, moreover $\text{pp}_\kappa^+(\mu) = (\chi^*)^+$ and $\kappa^+ < \theta < \chi^*$
- (b) \mathbf{F} is a function, with domain $[\mu]^\kappa$, such that: for $a \in [\mu]^\kappa$, $\mathbf{F}(a)$ is a family of $< \theta$ members of $[\mu]^\kappa$
- (c) F is a function with domain $[\mu]^\kappa$ such that

$$a \in [\mu]^\kappa \Rightarrow a \subseteq F(a) \in \mathbf{F}(a).$$

Then we can find pairwise distinct $a_i \in [\mu]^\kappa$ for $i < \chi^*$ such that $\mathcal{I} = \{a_i : i < \chi\}$ is (F, \mathbf{F}) -independent which means

$$(*)_{F, \mathbf{F}, \mathcal{I}} \quad \text{if } a \neq b \ \& \ a \in \mathcal{I} \ \& \ b \in \mathcal{I} \ \& \ c \in \mathbf{F}(a) \Rightarrow \neg(F(b) \subseteq c).$$

Remark. 1) Similar to Hajnal's free subset theorem [Ha61]. Without loss of generality $F(a) = F(b)$. No loss in assuming $F(a) = a$.

2) Note that we can let $F(a) = a$.

3) Note that if $\lambda = \text{cf}([\mu]^\kappa, \subseteq)$ then for some \mathbf{F} as in the Fact

(*) if $a_i \in [\mu]^\kappa$ for $i < \lambda^+$ are pairwise distinct then no pair $\{a_i, a_j\}$ is (\mathbf{F}, F) -independent

[why? let $\mathcal{P} \subseteq [\mu]^\kappa$ be cofinal (under \subseteq) of cardinality λ , and let \mathbf{F} be such that

$\mathbf{F}(a) \subseteq \{b \in [\mu]^\kappa : a \subseteq b \text{ and } b \in \mathcal{P}\}$;

clearly there is such \mathbf{F} . Now clearly

(*)₁ if $a \neq b$ are from $[\mu]^\kappa$ and $\mathbf{F}(a) \cap \mathbf{F}(b) \neq \emptyset$ then $\{a, b\}$ is not (\mathbf{F}, F) -independent.

Also if $\mu_1 \leq \mu$, $\text{cf}(\mu_1) \leq \kappa \leq \kappa + \theta < \mu_1$ and $\text{pp}_\kappa(\mu_1) \leq ?$ then by [Sh:g, Ch.II,2.3] the Fact for μ_1 implies the one for μ .]

Proof. We can define $g : [\mu]^{\leq \kappa} \rightarrow [\mu]^\kappa, F', \mathbf{F}'$ as follows:

$$g(a) = \{\kappa + \alpha : \alpha \in a\} \cup \{\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$$

$$\mathbf{F}'(a) = \{\{\alpha : \kappa + \alpha \in b\} : b \in \mathbf{F}'(g(a))\}$$

$$F(a) = \{\alpha : \kappa + \alpha \in F(g(a))\}.$$

Now \mathbf{F}, F are as above only replacing everywhere $[\mu]^\kappa$ by $[\kappa]^\kappa$, and if $\mathcal{I} = \{a_i : i < \chi\} \subseteq [\mu]^{\leq \kappa}$ with no repetitions satisfying $(*)_{F', \mathbf{F}', \mathcal{I}}$ then $\mathcal{I}' = \{g(a_i) : i < \chi\}$ is with no repetitions and $(*)_{F, \mathbf{F}, \mathcal{I}'}$.

So we conclude that we can replace $[\mu]^{\leq \kappa}$ by $[\mu]^{|\mathbf{a}|}$ where \mathbf{a} is chosen below, i.e. we can replace κ by $|\mathbf{a}|$.

Without loss of generality $\kappa^{++} < \theta$.

Assume $\theta < \chi = \text{cf}(\Pi\mathbf{a}/J)$ where $\mathbf{a} \subseteq \mu \cap \text{Reg} \setminus \kappa^+$, $|\mathbf{a}| \leq \kappa$, $\sup(\mathbf{a}) = \mu$, $J_{\mathbf{a}}^{bd} \subseteq J$ and for simplicity $\chi = \max \text{pcf}(\mathbf{a})$ so as explained above without loss of generality $|\mathbf{a}| < \kappa$ and let $f = \langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \chi \rangle$ be a sequence of members of $\Pi\mathbf{a}, <_J$ -increasing, and cofinal in $(\Pi\mathbf{a}, <_J)$, so, of course, $\chi \leq \chi^*$. Without loss of generality $f_\alpha(\tau) > \sup(\mathbf{a} \cap \tau)$ for $\tau \in \mathbf{a}$. Also for every $a \in [\mu]^\kappa$, define $f_a \in \Pi\mathbf{a}$ by $f_a(\tau) = \sup(a \cap \tau)$ for $\tau \in \mathbf{a}$ so for some $\zeta(a) < \chi$ we have $f_a <_J f_{\zeta(a)}$ (as $\langle f_\alpha : \alpha < \chi \rangle$ is cofinal in $(\Pi\mathbf{a}, <_J)$). So for each $a \in [\mu]^\kappa$, as $|\mathbf{F}(a)| < \theta < \chi = \text{cf}(\chi)$ clearly $\xi(a) = \sup\{\zeta(b) : b \in \mathbf{F}(a)\}$ is $< \chi$, and clearly $(\forall b \in \mathbf{F}(a))[f_b <_J f_{\xi(a)}]$. So

$C = \{\gamma < \chi : \text{for every } \beta < \gamma, \xi(\kappa \cup \text{Rang } f_\beta) < \gamma\}$ is a club of χ .

For each $\alpha < \chi$, $\text{Rang}(f_\alpha) \cup \kappa \in [\mu]^\kappa$, hence $\mathbf{F}(\text{Rang}(f_\alpha) \cup \kappa)$ has cardinality $< \theta$, but $\theta < \chi = \text{cf}(\chi)$ hence for some $\theta_1 < \theta$; we have $\theta_1 > \kappa^{++}$ and $\chi = \sup\{\alpha < \chi : |\mathbf{F}(\text{Rang}(f_\alpha) \cup \kappa)| \leq \theta_1\}$, so without loss of generality $\alpha < \chi \Rightarrow \theta_1 \geq |\mathbf{F}(\text{Rang}(f_\alpha) \cup \kappa)|$.

As $\kappa^+ < \theta_1$, there is a stationary $S \subseteq \{\delta < \theta_1^+ : \text{cf}(\delta) = \kappa^+\}$ which is in $I[\theta_1^+]$, by [Sh 420, §1] and let $\langle d_i : i < \theta_1^+ \rangle$ witness it, so $\text{otp}(d_i) \leq \kappa^+, d_i \subseteq i, [j \in d_i \Rightarrow$

$d_j = d_i \cap i]$ and $i \in S \Rightarrow i = \sup(d_i)$, and for simplicity: for every club E of θ_1^+ for stationarily many $\delta \in S$ we have $(\forall \alpha \in d_\delta)[(\exists \beta \in E)(\sup(\alpha \cap d_\delta) < \beta < \alpha)]$, exists by [Sh 420, §1]. Now try to choose by induction on $i < \theta_1^+$, a triple (g_i, α_i, w_i) such that:

- (a) $g_i \in \Pi \mathfrak{a}$
 - (b) $j < i \Rightarrow g_j <_J g_i$
 - (c) $(\forall \tau \in \mathfrak{a})(\sup_{j \in d_i} g_j(\tau) < g_i(\tau))$
 - (d) $\alpha_i < \chi, \alpha_i > \sup(\bigcup_{j < i} w_j)$
 - (e) $j < i \Rightarrow \alpha_j < \alpha_i$
 - (f) $g_i <_J f_{\alpha_i}$
 - (g) $\beta \in \bigcup_{j < i} w_j \Rightarrow \xi(\beta) < \alpha_i \text{ \& } f_\beta <_J g_i$
 - (h) w_i is a maximal subset of (α_i, χ) satisfying
 - (*) $\beta \in w_i \text{ \& } \gamma \in w_i \text{ \& } \beta \neq \gamma \text{ \& } a \in \mathbf{F}(\kappa \cup \text{Rang}(f_\beta)) \Rightarrow \neg(F(\text{Rang } f_\gamma) \subseteq a)$
- or just
- (*)⁺ $\beta \in w_i \text{ \& } \gamma \in w_i \text{ \& } \beta \neq \gamma \text{ \& } a \in \mathbf{F}(\kappa \cup \text{Rang}(f_\beta)) \Rightarrow \{\tau \in \mathfrak{a} : f_\gamma(\tau) \in a\} \in J.$

[note that really

- ⊗ if $w \subseteq (\alpha_i, \chi)$ satisfies (*)⁺ then it satisfies (*)

why? let us check (*), so let $\beta \in w, \gamma \in w, \beta \neq \gamma$ and $a \in \mathbf{F}(\text{Rang}(f_\beta))$; by (*)⁺ we know that $\mathfrak{a}' = \{\tau \in \mathfrak{a} : f_\gamma(\tau) \in a\} \in J, J$ is a proper ideal on \mathfrak{a} clearly for some $\tau \in \mathfrak{a}$ we have $\tau \notin \mathfrak{a}'$, hence $f_\gamma(\tau) \notin a$ but $f_\gamma(\tau) \in \text{Rang}(f_\gamma) \subseteq F(\text{Rang}(f_\gamma))$ hence $f_\gamma(\tau) \in F(\text{Rang}(f_\gamma)) \setminus a$ so $\neg(F(\text{Rang}(f_\gamma) \subseteq a)$, as required.]

We claim that we cannot carry the induction because if we succeed, then as $\text{cf}(\chi) = \chi > \theta \geq \theta_1^+$ there is α such that $\bigcup_{i < \theta_1^+} \alpha_i < \alpha < \chi$ and let $\mathbf{F}(\kappa \cup \text{Rang}(f_\alpha)) =$

$\{a_\zeta^\alpha : \zeta < \theta_1\}$ (possible as $1 \leq |\mathbf{F}(\kappa \cup \text{Rang}(f_\alpha))| \leq \theta_1$). Now for each $i < \theta_1^+$, by the choice of w_i clearly $w_i \cup \{\alpha\}$ does not satisfy the demand in clause (h), so as $\beta \in w_i \Rightarrow \xi(\beta) < \alpha_{i+1} < \alpha$, necessarily for some $\beta_i \in w_i$ and $\zeta_i < \theta_1$ we have

$$\mathfrak{a}_i = \{\tau \in \mathfrak{a} : f_{\beta_i}(\tau) \in a_{\zeta_i}^\alpha\} \notin J.$$

[why use the ideal? In order to show that $\mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$.] Now $\text{cf}(\theta_1^+) = \theta_1^+ > \theta_1$, for some $\zeta(*) < \theta_1^+$ we have $A = \{i : \zeta_i = \zeta(*)\}$ is unbounded in θ_1^+ . Hence $E = \{\alpha < \theta_1^+ : \alpha \text{ a limit ordinal and } A \cap \alpha \text{ is unbounded in } \alpha\}$ is a club of θ_1^+ . So for some $\delta \in S$ we have $\delta = \sup(A \cap \delta)$, moreover if $d_\delta = \{\alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \kappa^+\}$ (increasing) then $(\forall \varepsilon)[E \cap (\sup_{\zeta < \varepsilon} \alpha_\zeta, \alpha_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset]$ hence we can find $i(\delta, \varepsilon) \in (\sup_{\zeta < \varepsilon} \alpha_\zeta, \alpha_\varepsilon) \cap A$ for each $\varepsilon < \kappa^+$.

Clearly for each $\varepsilon < \kappa^+$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon = \{ \tau \in \mathfrak{a} : g_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}(\tau) < f_{\alpha_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}}(\tau) < f_{\beta_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}}(\tau) \\ < g_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)+1} < f_{\alpha_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)+1}}(\tau) < f_\alpha(\tau) \} = \mathfrak{a} \bmod J \end{aligned}$$

hence $\mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \cap \mathfrak{a}_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)} \notin \emptyset$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \cap \mathfrak{a}_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)} \notin J$. Now for each $\tau \in \mathfrak{a}$ let $\varepsilon(\tau)$ be $\sup\{\varepsilon < \kappa^+ : \tau \in \mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \cap \mathfrak{a}_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}\}$ and let $\varepsilon(*) = \sup\{\varepsilon(\tau) : \tau \in \mathfrak{a} \text{ and } \varepsilon(\tau) < \kappa^+\}$ so as $|\mathfrak{a}| \leq \kappa$ clearly $\varepsilon(*) < \kappa^+$. Let $\tau^* \in \mathfrak{b}_{\varepsilon(*)+1} \cap \mathfrak{a}_{i(\delta, \varepsilon(*)+1)}$, so $B = \{\varepsilon < \kappa^+ : \tau^* \in \mathfrak{b}_\varepsilon \cap \mathfrak{a}_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}\}$ is unbounded in κ^+ , $\langle f_{\beta_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}}(\tau^*) : \varepsilon \in B \rangle$ is strictly increasing (see clause (c) above and the choice of \mathfrak{b}_ε) and $\varepsilon \in B \Rightarrow f_{\beta_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}}(\tau^*) \in a_{\zeta(*)}$ (by the definition of $\mathfrak{a}_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)}$, and $\zeta(*)$ as $\zeta_{i(\delta, \varepsilon)} = \zeta(*)$). We get contradiction to $a \in \mathbf{F}(\kappa \cup \text{Rang}(f_\alpha)) \Rightarrow |a| \leq \kappa$.

So really we cannot carry the induction so we are stuck at some i . If $i = 0$, or i limit, or $i = j + 1$ & $\sup w_j < \chi$ we can find g_i and then α_i and then w_i as required. So necessarily $i = j + 1$, $\sup(w_j) = \chi$. Now if $\chi = \chi^*$, then this w_j is as required in the fact. As $\text{pp}^+(\mu) = (\chi^*)^+$, the only case we cannot have is when χ^* is singular. Let $\chi^* = \sup_{\varepsilon < \text{cf}(\chi^*)} \chi_\varepsilon$ and $\chi_\varepsilon \in (\mu, \chi^*) \cap \text{Reg}$ is (strictly) increasing with ε . By [Sh:g, Ch.II, §1] we can find, for each $\varepsilon < \text{cf}(\chi^*)$, $\mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon, J_\varepsilon, \bar{f}^\varepsilon = \langle f_\alpha^\varepsilon : \alpha < \chi_\varepsilon \rangle$ as above, but in addition

- (*) \bar{f}^ε is μ^+ -free i.e. for every $u \in [\chi_\varepsilon]^\mu$ there is $\langle \mathfrak{b}_\alpha : \alpha \in u \rangle$ such that $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha \in J_\varepsilon$ and for each $\tau \in \mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon$, $\langle f_\alpha^\varepsilon(\tau) : \alpha \text{ satisfies } : \tau \notin \mathfrak{b}_\alpha \rangle$ is strictly increasing.

So for every $a \in [\mu]^\kappa$ and $\varepsilon < \text{cf}(\chi^*)$ we have

$$\{ \alpha < \chi_\varepsilon : \{ \tau \in \mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon : f_\alpha(\tau) \in a \} \notin J_\varepsilon \} \text{ has cardinality } \leq \kappa.$$

Hence for each $a \in [\mu]^\kappa$

$$\{ (\varepsilon, \alpha) : \varepsilon < \text{cf}(\chi^*) \text{ and } \alpha < \chi_\varepsilon \text{ and } \{ \tau \in \mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon : f_\alpha(\tau) \in a \} \notin J_\varepsilon \}$$

has cardinality $\leq \kappa + \text{cf}(\chi^*) = \text{cf}(\chi^*)$ as for singular $\mu > \kappa \geq \text{cf}(\mu)$ we have $\text{cf}(\text{pp}_\kappa(\mu)) > \kappa$.

Define: $X = \{ (\varepsilon, \alpha) : \varepsilon < \text{cf}(\chi^*), \alpha < \chi_\varepsilon \}$

$F'((\varepsilon, \alpha)) = \{ (\varepsilon', \alpha') : (\varepsilon', \alpha') \in X \setminus \{ (\varepsilon, \alpha) \} \text{ and for some}$

$$d \in \mathbf{F}(\kappa \cup \text{Rang}(f_\alpha^\varepsilon)) \text{ we have } \{ \tau \in \mathfrak{a}_\varepsilon : f_{\alpha'}^{\varepsilon'}(\tau) \in d \} \notin J_{\varepsilon'} \}$$

so $F'((\varepsilon, \alpha))$ is a subset of X of cardinality $< \text{cf}(\chi^*)^+ + \theta < \chi^*$.

So by Hajnal's free subset theorem we finish (we could alternatively, for χ^* singular, have imitated his proof). $\square_{1.17}, \square_{1.19}$

1.20 Claim. 1) Assume

- (a) $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$ and case B or C of Fact 1.11 for λ occurs (so χ^*, T_ζ are determined)
- (b) \mathfrak{K} is an abstract elementary class $LS(\mathfrak{K}) \leq \lambda$
- (c) $K_{\lambda^{++}} \neq \emptyset$,
- (d) \mathfrak{K} has amalgamation in λ and in λ^+
- (e) in K_λ^3 , the minimal triples are not dense.

Then

- (α) for each $\zeta < \chi^*$ for some $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$ we have $|\mathcal{S}_*(M)| \geq |Lim_{\lambda^+}(T_\zeta)|$ (the tree from clause (ζ) of 1.11).
- 2) If K satisfies (a)-(e) and is categorical in λ^+ or just has a universal member in λ^+ , then for some $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$ we have $|\mathcal{S}_*(M)| = 2^{\lambda^+}$.
- 3) If $(f)^+$, then $I(\lambda^{++}, K) \geq 2^{\lambda^{++}}$ where
- (f)⁺ \mathfrak{K} is categorical in λ and λ^+ .
- 4) Assume (a)-(e) of part (1) then $\mathbf{C}_{\mathfrak{K}, \lambda}^1$ has weaker λ -coding (if we have restricted to (M, N, a) in Definition of \mathbf{C}).

Remark. Note that for 1.21 we do not use 1.20.

Proof. 1) Let $\zeta < \chi^*$. Let

$T_\zeta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} T_\alpha^\zeta$ where T_α^ζ are pairwise disjoint in α , each T_α^ζ has cardinality $\leq \lambda$,

$T_0^\zeta = \{<\rangle\}$ and $\eta \in T_\alpha^\zeta$ & $\beta < \ell g(\eta) \Rightarrow \eta \restriction \beta \in \bigcup_{\gamma < \alpha} T_\gamma^\zeta$, and

$\eta \in T_\alpha^\zeta \Rightarrow \bigwedge_{\ell < 2} \eta^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle \in T_{\zeta, \alpha+1}^\zeta$ so $T_{\zeta, \alpha+1}^\zeta = \{\eta^\wedge \langle \ell \rangle : \eta \in T_\alpha^\zeta \text{ and } \ell < 2\}$. For $\eta \in T_\delta^\zeta, \delta$

a limit ordinal, necessarily both $\ell g(\eta)$ and $\alpha(\eta) = \sup\{\gamma : \text{for some } \varepsilon < \ell g(\eta), \eta \restriction \varepsilon \in T_\gamma^\zeta\}$ are limit ordinals $\leq \delta$.

Let $(M, N, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ be such that there is no minimal triple above it.

We now choose by induction on $\alpha < \lambda^+$, $\langle M_\alpha^\zeta, M_\eta^\zeta, N_\eta^\zeta : \eta \in T_\alpha^\zeta \rangle$ such that:

- (a) $(M_\alpha^\zeta, N_\eta^\zeta, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ and is reduced if $\eta \in T_\alpha^\zeta, \alpha$ non-limit
- (b) $(M_0^\zeta, N_{<\rangle}^\zeta, a) = (M, N, a)$
- (c) $\nu \in T_\beta^\zeta, \eta \in T_\alpha^\zeta, \nu \triangleleft \eta, \beta < \alpha \Rightarrow (M_\beta^\zeta, N_\nu^\zeta, a) \leq (M_\alpha^\zeta, N_\eta^\zeta, a)$ in the order of K_λ^3
- (d) if δ is a limit ordinal then: $M_\delta^\zeta = \bigcup_{\beta < \delta} M_\beta^\zeta$
- (e) if δ is a limit ordinal and $\eta \in T_\delta^\zeta$ then $N_{\ell g(\eta)}^\zeta = \bigcup_{\beta < \delta} N_{\eta \restriction \beta}^\zeta$ hence $(M_{\alpha(\eta)}, N_\eta^\zeta, a) \in K_\lambda^3$
- (f) if $\eta \in T_\alpha^\zeta$ then $\text{tp}(a, M_{\alpha+1}, N_{\eta^\wedge \langle 0 \rangle}) \neq \text{tp}(a, M_{\alpha+1}, N_{\eta^\wedge \langle 1 \rangle})$
- (g) $M_\alpha^\zeta \neq M_{\alpha+1}^\zeta$.

There is no problem to carry the definition. Let $M_\zeta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} M_\alpha^\zeta \in K_{\lambda^+}$, and for

each $\nu \in \text{Lim}_{\lambda^+}(T_\zeta)$ let $N_\nu^\zeta = \bigcup_{\alpha < \lambda^+} N_{\nu \upharpoonright \alpha}^\zeta$, clearly $M_\zeta \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} N_\nu^\zeta$ and $a \in N_\nu^*$ and

$\langle \text{tp}(a, M_\zeta, N_\nu^\zeta) : \nu \in \text{Lim}_{\lambda^+}(T_\zeta) \rangle$ are pairwise distinct members of $\mathcal{S}(M_\zeta)$. This proves clause (α) of part (1).

2) This part follows by 1.16(2).

3) Now 1.11 also applies to $(\lambda^+, \lambda^{++})$ in place of (λ, λ^+) , so if for this case, clause $(A)_{\lambda^+}$ holds then by $(f)^+$ we get that 1.17(4) applies (with $(f)^+$ providing assumption $(d)^+$ there) hence we get $I(\lambda^{++}, K) = 2^{\lambda^{++}}$, so we can assume $(C)_{\lambda^+} \vee (B)_{\lambda^+}$ occurs.

Now if $\text{WdId}(\lambda^+)$ is not λ^{++} -saturated we get the desired result as follows: by 1.9 if $\neg(**)$ of 1.8 holds and by 1.7 we get a contradiction to $I(\lambda^+, K) = 1$; if $(*)_\lambda$ (or $(*)'_\lambda$) of 1.7 holds, but by 1.8 one of the cases applies.

But as we are in case $(B)_\lambda$ or $(C)_\lambda$ (see (a) of 1.20(1)) by clause (ι) of 1.11 we have $2^\lambda = \lambda^+, 2^{\lambda^+} = \lambda^{++}$. However, once we know $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$ we deduce that there is a model in λ^+ saturated over λ so Claim [Sh 576, 3.16] applies.

4) Left to the reader as not used. $\square_{1.20}$

1.21 Claim. *Assume*

- (a) $2^\lambda < 2^{\lambda^+} < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$
- (b) K is categorical in λ, λ^+
- (c) $1 \leq I(\lambda^{++}, K) < 2^{\lambda^{++}}$.

Then above every $(M^*, N^*, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ there is a minimal triple.

Proof. Assume toward contradiction that above $(M^*, N^*, a) \in K_\lambda^3$ there is no minimal type. If $2^\lambda = \lambda^+$, then there is a $M \in K_{\lambda^+}$ saturated over λ hence we finish by [Sh 576, 3.16, At], possibility $(*)_2$. So we can assume $2^\lambda > \lambda^+$, hence [Sh 430, 6.3] (with λ^+ here for λ there so μ there is $\leq \lambda$ so $\delta < \lambda^+$ hence $|T| \leq |\delta| \leq \lambda$ and let $\kappa = \text{cf}(\delta)$) there are $\kappa \leq \lambda$ and⁴ tree T with $\leq \lambda$ nodes and κ levels with $|\text{Lim}_\kappa(T)| > \lambda^+$ hence for some $M \in K_\lambda, |\mathcal{S}_*(M)| > \lambda^+$ (e.g. by the proof of 1.20(1)). If $\text{WdId}(\lambda^+)$ is not λ^{++} -saturated then in 1.9 assumption (b) holds, and assumptions (c) + (d) + (e) holds by the assumptions of the present claim but not the conclusion, so (a) fails, that is $(**)_{\lambda^+}$ of 1.8 holds hence by 1.8, $(*)_{\lambda^+}$ of 1.7 holds. But now 1.7 contradicts clause (b) of the assumption, so we have to assume that $\text{WdId}(\lambda^+)$ is λ^{++} -saturated. Hence clause (ι) of 1.11, Case B does not occur, hence Cases B, C of 1.11 do not occur and hence Case A occurs. So by 1.17(3) we get a contradiction to categoricity in λ^+ . $\square_{1.21}$

* * *

⁴if $\kappa = \text{Min}\{\sigma : 2^\sigma > \lambda^+\}$, so if $2^{<\sigma} \leq \lambda$ then $(\sigma > 2, \Delta)$ is okay, otherwise $\sigma > 2 = \bigcup_{i < \lambda^+} T_i, |T_i| \leq \lambda, T_i$ increasing with i so for some $i, |\{\eta \in {}^\sigma 2 : \bigwedge_{\alpha < \sigma} \eta \upharpoonright \alpha \in T_i\}| > \lambda^+$

1.22 Claim. *We can prove [Sh 576, 4.2] also for $\lambda = \aleph_0$.*

Proof. We ask:

Question 1: are there $M <_{\mathfrak{K}} N$ in K_λ such that for no $a \in N \setminus M$ is $\text{tp}(a, M, N)$ minimal?

If the answer is yes, we can find $\langle M_i^1 : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ a representation of a model $M^1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ such that: $a \in M_{i+1}^1 \setminus M_i^1 \Rightarrow \text{tp}(a, M_i^1, M_{i+1}^1)$ is not minimal. This implies $a \in M^1 \setminus M_i^1 \Rightarrow \text{tp}(a, M_i^1, M^1)$ is not minimal (as for some $j \in [i, \lambda^+)$ we have $a \in M_{j+1}^1 \setminus M_j^1$ so $(M_i^1, M_{j+1}^1, a) \leq (M_j^1, M_{j+1}^1, a)$ and the latter is not minimal). But we can build another representation $\langle M_i^2 : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$ of $M^2 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ such that for each $i < \lambda^+$ for some $a \in M_{i+1}^1 \setminus M_i^1$, $\text{tp}(a, M_i^1, M_{i+1}^1)$ is minimal (as there is a minimal triple). So $M^1 \not\cong M^2$.

So we assume the answer is no.

Question 2: If $M \in K_\lambda$, $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma_M^* =: \{p \in \mathcal{S}(M) : p \text{ minimal}\}$ and $|\Gamma| \leq \lambda$, is there N such that: $M <_{\mathfrak{K}} N \in K_\lambda$ and N omit every $p \in \Gamma$?

If the answer to question 2 is yes, we can build $\langle M_\eta : \eta \in {}^{\lambda^+}2 \rangle$ as in the proof of 1.7 (more exactly $\eta \triangleleft \nu \Rightarrow M_\eta \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_\nu, M_\eta \in K_\lambda$) and we also have $\Gamma_\eta \subseteq \{p : \text{for some } N \leq_{\mathfrak{K}} M_\eta, N \in K_\lambda \text{ and } p \in \mathcal{S}(N) \text{ is minimal not realized in } M_\eta\}$ have cardinality $\leq \lambda$, $\eta \triangleleft \nu \Rightarrow \Gamma_\eta \subseteq \Gamma_\nu$ and there is $p \in \Gamma_{\eta \hat{<} 1}$ realized in $M_{\eta \hat{<} 0}$ (and if you like also $p' \in \Gamma_{\eta \hat{<} 0}$ realized in $M_{\eta \hat{<} 1}$). So by [Sh 576, 1.6] we get $I(\lambda^+, K) = 2^\lambda$. So assume the answer is no and for every $M \in K_\lambda$ let Γ_M be a counterexample. Let $\langle M_i^1 : i < \lambda^+ \rangle$, representing a model $M^1 \in K_{\lambda^+}$ be such that $i < \lambda^+$ & $p \in \Gamma_{M_i} \Rightarrow p$ realizes in M . Now as in the proof of saturated = model homogeneous (see [Sh 576, 0.21]) we can prove M^1 is saturated. But this proves more than required: $|\mathcal{S}(M_\ell^1)| \leq \lambda^+$. $\square_{1.22}$

REFERENCES.

- [Ha61] Andras Hajnal. Proof of a conjecture of S.Ruziewicz. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, **50**:123–128, 1961.
- [KjSh 409] Menachem Kojman and Saharon Shelah. Non-existence of Universal Orders in Many Cardinals. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, **57**:875–891, 1992.
- [Sh 576] Saharon Shelah. Categoricity of an abstract elementary class in two successive cardinals. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **submitted**.
- [Sh 460] Saharon Shelah. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis revisited. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **accepted**.
- [Sh:a] Saharon Shelah. *Classification theory and the number of nonisomorphic models*, volume 92 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, xvi+544 pp, \$62.25, 1978.
- [Sh:b] Saharon Shelah. *Proper forcing*, volume 940 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, xxix+496 pp, 1982.
- [Sh 420] Saharon Shelah. Advances in Cardinal Arithmetic. In *Finite and Infinite Combinatorics in Sets and Logic*, pages 355–383. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993. N.W. Sauer et al (eds.).
- [Sh:g] Saharon Shelah. *Cardinal Arithmetic*, volume 29 of *Oxford Logic Guides*. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [Sh 430] Saharon Shelah. Further cardinal arithmetic. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **95**:61–114, 1996.
- [Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.